

A survey of Vietnamese EAP Teachers' Beliefs about Grammar Teaching

Le Van Canh

Hanoi University of Languages and International Studies, Vietnam

Roger Barnard

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Abstract

Although it is now generally agreed that grammar should be an integral element of second language programmes, there is still a diversity of opinions about how it should be taught. In this paper, attention is first drawn to relevant issues raised in reviews of the teaching of grammar derived from SLA research and teacher cognition. This paper then reports a survey of Vietnamese teachers' attitudes towards grammar and grammar teaching in their own particular teaching contexts. It uses a questionnaire adapted from that used by in a 2002 survey of teachers of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in British universities and in a 2008 parallel survey of EAP teachers in New Zealand. The findings of the present study indicate that, like the teachers reported in the 2002 and 2008 studies, EAP teachers in Vietnam appreciate the centrality of grammar in their language teaching and have a critical awareness of many of the problems and issues involved. The findings suggest that the teachers favour a discourse, rather than a decontextualised approach to the presentation of grammar and there is an emphasis on systematic practice of grammatical forms and the correction of grammatical errors.

Keywords: Grammar, Vietnam, Teachers, Survey, EAP

Literature Review

Ever since Stephen Krashen (1981) threw out the grammatical baby with the Audiolingual bathwater, there has been controversy about the role of grammar in teaching English as a second and foreign language. The current debate is one between those who favour a focus on forms (Fotos, 1998; Sheen 2003) and those who argue for a focus on form (Long 1991; Doughty & Williams, 1998). The former position proposes that grammatical forms should be explicitly dealt with through a pre-determined syllabus

- what Krashen dismissed as 'the structure of the day' - either by a conventional teacher-directed Presentation-Practice-Production approach, or by more student-centred strategies, such as consciousness-raising (Ellis, 1992) Proponents of focus on form (FonF), on the other hand, argue that grammatical issues should arise only incidentally in meaning-focussed activities, and where communication breaks down, or is likely to; when grammatical treatment occurs, it should be 'transitory', with no need for extensive practice. Various empirical studies investigating the application of FonF strategies in some English as a Second Language contexts have been recently conducted, notably by Ellis and his associates (Ellis, 2001a and b; Ellis 2002, Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001; Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2002; Basturkmen, Loewen & Ellis, 2004). However, as Sheen (2003) has pointed out, insufficient empirical studies in *foreign* language contexts have been conducted to more fully validate the FonF position.

Ellis (2006) reviewed current issues in the teaching of grammar, and pointed to the lack of empirical evidence within SLA research to provide clear answers about what, when and how grammatical items should be taught. He concluded his review with statement of ten personal beliefs based upon his interpretation of what the research has shown. It is interesting that while he made several suggestions for further research - including the need to study learners' implicit knowledge and use of grammar, longitudinal studies investigating the effects of instruction over time, and further research into the effects of corrective feedback - he did not suggest that language teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching should be investigated, nor does he refer in his review to any work carried out in this area.

This omission is perhaps surprising, especially given the long-standing recognition in educational circles that "[i]t is obvious that what teachers do is directed in no small measure by what they think" (National Institute of Education of America, p.1), and that teaching is "substantially influenced and even determined by teachers' underlying thinking" (Clark & Peterson 1986, p. 255). Thus, the relationship between teachers' beliefs and instructional practices has increasingly attracted educational researchers' attention. In general, research on teachers' thought processes is based on the three major assumptions: (i) teaching is largely influenced by teacher cognition, (ii) teaching is guided by teachers' thoughts and judgments, and (iii) teaching constitutes a high-level decision-making process (Isenberg, 1990). However, it was not until recently that understanding how second language teachers' cognitive processes influence their classroom instruction began to draw the attention of second language teacher education researchers, and the work of Simong Borg has been significant in this regard.

Borg (2006) reviewed 64 studies of language teacher cognition, most of which appeared after 1996, and identified five categories of study: prior language learning experience, teacher education, classroom practice, literacy instruction, and teaching grammar. The 38 studies focussing on grammar teaching were considered in terms of three distinctive sub-topics: (i) teachers' knowledge of grammar; (ii) surveys of teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching; and (iii) the relationships between teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching and their classroom practices. The overwhelming majority of studies reviewed by Borg took place in Europe, British or North America, and were mostly conducted in

second rather than foreign language contexts, with relatively few ‘native-speaking’ teachers working with adult learners in universities or private institutions. Only ten studies involving Asian teachers were reported: four in Singapore (Chia, 2003; Farrell, 1999; Ng & Farrell, 2003; Farrell & Lim, 2005) and five in Hong Kong (Andrews, 1997; 1999a and b; 2001; 2005). Borg (2006, p. 133), emphasized the need for research in a greater variety of contexts, but – apart from those reviewed by Borg - only a few studies have been published dealing with Asian teachers’ beliefs. (Richards, Gallo & Renandya, 2001; Patricia, 2003; Zhen & Murphy, 2007). As the latter authors point out, “compared to the amount of literature about native speaking ESL teachers’ beliefs...in western countries, there are fewer studies in pertinent research domains of nonnative speaking EFL teachers” (Zhen & Murphy’s, 2007, p. 2). The present study is intended as a modest contribution towards filling that gap.

Of particular relevance to the present study are two surveys. The first (Burgess & Etherington, 2002) sought to identify the attitudes of 48 teachers of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in British universities. The findings indicated that these teachers considered that grammar was important for their learners, and they favoured discourse-based approaches, rather than decontextualised presentation of grammar items, with an inclination towards the use of authentic, full texts and real-life tasks for practice. The authors claim (Burgess & Etherington, p.450) that the use of texts, rather than isolate structures, to introduce grammatical features suggests a tendency for these teachers to adopt an approach based on FonF principles. However, the emphasis placed by the British teachers on the systematic practice of grammatical features and the correction of errors suggests that there is also a clear attention to the explicit and detailed treatment of forms rather than strict adherence to essential principles of FonF.

The second (Barnard & Scampton, in press) adapted Burgess & Etherington’s questionnaire to survey 32 EAP teachers in New Zealand; in this case, the questionnaire was followed up with email interviews of a sample of the respondents. Like the British teachers, those in New Zealand favoured the treatment of grammatical features in complete texts, rather than in isolation. Consistent with this view, the New Zealand EAP teachers rejected a strictly forms-focussed strategy with a pre-determined grammatical syllabus and emphatically preferred to deal with grammatical issues as they arose from texts used to develop generic EAP skills. To this extent, their approach may be regarded as generally reactive, although there were some instances where they adopted forms-focussed strategies – for example, by devising grammar worksheets for systematic treatment in subsequent classes. However, it is clear that their treatment of the emerging grammatical issues was generally far from the ‘transitory’ remediation suggested by many proponents of a FonF strategy. Again like their British counterparts, they paid much attention to extensive practice and both they and their students attached importance to the explicit correction of formal errors.

As no studies have been identified that have investigated the attitudes of Vietnamese teachers regarding form-focussed instruction, it was decided that a survey of a group of these teachers’ attitudes would complement previous studies, and add to academic and

professional understanding about what a group of EAP teachers believe about key aspects of grammar teaching.

The present study

Research questions

The same research questions used by Burgess & Etherington (2002, p.437) guided the present study:

- Which beliefs about grammar and grammar teaching are most widely held by EAP teachers (in Vietnam)?
- Is there a bias towards decontextualised presentation of grammar and away from discourse-based, unified approaches?

Thus, the present study sought to ascertain whether EAP teachers in Vietnam held similar views to those in Britain and New Zealand about the importance of grammar and the use of discourse-based approaches.

Participants and setting

The participants were 29 teachers in Vietnamese universities and other institutes of higher education, all of whom taught EAP courses as all or part of their teaching duties. The participants were a cohort of graduate students following an MA programme in Applied Linguistics, which was not the case in either Britain or New Zealand; some of the latter, therefore, might have been more highly qualified than the Vietnamese teachers, although the length of teaching experience between the two groups was comparable.

Survey instrument

With the permission of Sian Etherington, a somewhat modified version of the 2002 questionnaire was used. The British questionnaire used a five-point response scale; however, the version used in Vietnam – like that in New Zealand (Barnard & Scampon, in press) - solicited only four responses: strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree. The reason for this was that there is a tendency for many responses to regress to the central point (#3 – no opinion) in a five-point scale; moreover, a four-point scale facilitates a clear analysis of positive and negative responses, something which led to some uncertainty in interpreting and discussions of the findings in Burgess & Etherington' study. Finally, unlike the 2002 questionnaire, no open-ended items were included.

The forty statements in the 2002 questionnaire were translated into Vietnamese, and translated back into English by a recognised bilingual translator, and piloted with a small group of EAP teachers working in a local university; minor adjustments to the wording were made in the light of comments by these respondents. The participants of the main study were advised in writing of the scope and purpose of the survey and their formal consent to participate was sought and granted. They were shown the Vietnamese version and then the back-translated English version, which they completed; this was done to ensure that, as fully as possible, they understood the meaning of the propositions.

The questionnaires were administered in class to 62 participants by the second author of this article, who was not at that time known to the participants; this ensured that there was a 100% return rate, although the possibility of a number of socially acceptable responses cannot be altogether dismissed. The 62 respondents included teachers other than the target group of EAP practitioner, and those questionnaires completed by non-EAP teachers (e.g., those who worked in high schools) were eliminated from the study.

Results and discussion

Please refer to the questionnaire (Appendix A) and the table of results (Appendix B). The discussion which follows focuses only on some of the questionnaire items – those most central to the two research questions.

Table 1: The centrality of grammar in language teaching

<i>1.1a - Grammar is a framework for the rest of language.</i>		
UK 60%	NZ 67%	Vietnam 64%
<i>1.3 – Teaching linguistic forms helps learners produce right grammar.</i>		
UK 70%	NZ 81%	Vietnam 72%
<i>1.20 – explicit discussion of grammar rules is beneficial to learners</i>		
UK 69%	NZ 81%	Vietnam 72%
<i>2.3 - My students expect teachers to present grammar points clearly/ explicitly.</i>		
UK 90%	NZ 71%	Vietnam 93%
<i>2.13- Not teaching grammar explicitly worries my students</i>		
UK 70 %	NZ 69%	Vietnam 76%

From the above, it can be seen that there is firm agreement among the three groups of teachers on the centrality of grammar (1.1a), of its benefit to the learners (1.3) and of the students' wish for grammar to be explicitly explained (1.20 and 2.3), as well as their apparent concern if it is not (2.13). It is important to note, as did Burgess & Etherington (2002, p. 441), that the above attitudes - while ostensibly focussing on the learners' needs and wishes - may actually reflect the pedagogical preferences of the teachers.

Table 2: The role of practice

<i>1.5 - Learners can improve their grammatical accuracy through regular structure drills</i>		
UK 74%	NZ 84%	Vietnam 86%
<i>1.12 – Structure drills for generative purposes play an essential role in the learning process.</i>		
UK 75%	NZ 80%	Vietnam 76%
<i>1.11- Non-contextual structural drills play a certain role in the language learning process</i>		
UK n/k	NZ 50%	Vietnam 51%
<i>2.2 - Problem-solving techniques in learning grammar increase my learners' motivation</i>		
UK 60%	NZ 68%	Vietnam 76%
<i>2.20 - My learners find it demotivating to use problem-solving techniques to study grammar</i>		
UK 58%	NZ %	Vietnam 69%

As can be seen from the responses agreeing with statement 1.5 positive attitudes towards the role of practice were reported in all three studies. Likewise, more than three-quarters of the Vietnamese teachers agreed with statement 1.12, a point with which a significant majority of the teachers in the other two studies concurred. Interestingly, half of the Vietnamese and New Zealand teachers felt that decontextualised practice of structures has a place in language learning; unfortunately, the figure for the British teachers was not provided by Burgess & Etherington.. Much may depend on the interpretation of

‘practice’; probably given the prevalence of the Presentation-Practice-Production model in Vietnam (Le, 2007), the translators of the questionnaire used the word ‘drills’ in both statements in contrast to the use of ‘practice’ and productive practice’ in the two relevant statements in the original questionnaire. Less ambiguous are the teachers’ responses to statement 2.2 and the contrasting statement 2.20, which indicate that students in all three settings found problem-solving tasks motivating rather than frustrating. On the whole, while there are differences of emphasis in the three studies, it is evident that the Vietnamese teachers consider that their learners benefit from grammar practice of one sort or another.

Table 3: The correction of errors

<i>1.18 - Correction focussing on language forms helps learners improve their grammatical usage.</i>			
UK 56%	NZ 83%	Vietnam 71%	
<i>2.15 - Teachers find it difficult to correct learners’ mistakes in communicative writing</i>			
UK 78%	NZ 67%	Vietnam 72%	DISAGREE
<i>2.16 - Teachers find it difficult to correct learners’ speaking mistakes</i>			
UK 22%	NZ 55%	Vietnam 59%	
<i>1. 16 - Teachers should only correct language forms which hinder communication.</i>			
UK 19%	NZ 45%	Vietnam 49%	

There was a clear evidence that these EAP teachers agreed with statement 1.18 that correction of language forms helped learners, although the figure for the British teachers was much lower than for the other two groups. The majority of teachers in all three contexts did not find it difficult to correct students’ written errors (2.15), whereas more than half of those in Vietnam and New Zealand – and only a fifth of those in the UK – found oral errors more problematic (2.16). The responses to statement 1.16 are interesting; less than one fifth of the British teachers agreed that teachers should correct only those errors which interfere with communication, while the New Zealand and Vietnamese teachers were fairly evenly split over the issue. One implication that can be drawn is that many teachers in all three settings correct their students even when there is no communication breakdown. If this assumption is correct, then it would seem that these teachers take a more rigorous attitude towards errors than is consistent with a FonF approach to the treatment of grammar. Clearly, this is an issue that warrants further investigation.

Table 4: The use of authentic texts

<i>1.15 – Students study grammar more effectively if grammar is introduced in a full text.</i>			
UK 56%	NZ 74%	Vietnam 69%	
<i>2.6 - My learners find it difficult to deal with grammar introduced in real-life materials</i>			
UK 53%	NZ 52%	Vietnam 43%	DISAGREE
<i>2.9 - My learners find real-life materials difficult because of the vocabulary used in these materials),</i>			
UK 52%	NZ 78%	Vietnam 89%	
<i>2.10 - My learners cannot find the relation between form and functions in real-life materials without teachers’ clear explanation</i>			
UK n/k	NZ 56 %	Vietnam 72%	
<i>2.11 - Teachers find it time-consuming to use real-life materials</i>			
UK 62%	NZ 52%	Vietnam 69%	DISAGREE

With regard to the introduction of grammatical features in complete texts, rather than in isolated sentences, 69% of the Vietnamese teachers and 74% of the New Zealand teachers showed their agreement or strong agreement with statement 1.15, compared to only 56% positive responses among the British. Fewer Vietnamese teachers (42.8%) than New Zealand and British teachers - 52% and 53% respectively - disagreed with the later statement (2.6) that authentic materials presented grammatical difficulties, but an overwhelming majority - 89.3% - agreed with statement 2.9 that such texts did present lexical problems, a point with which just over 78% of the New Zealanders and just over half the British teachers concurred. This may have led 72% of the Vietnamese teachers to point to the need for the teacher to clearly explain form and function relationship in authentic materials (2.10) - rather more than the 56% of the British teachers who agreed with this point; Burgess & Etherington did not present the findings for this item in their questionnaire. Over two thirds of the Vietnamese teachers disagreed that they find real-life materials (2.11) too time-consuming to use – a somewhat larger number than their New Zealand and British counterparts. On the whole, responses to a range of issues relating to the use of authentic materials indicate, among all three groups, “no general feeling that authentic texts take too much time in the classroom or in preparation” (Burgess & Etherington, 2002, p. 446).

Summary of findings as they relate to the research questions

- *Which beliefs about grammar and grammar teaching are most widely held by the EAP teachers in Vietnam?*

The survey responses strongly indicate that these Vietnamese teachers, like their British and New Zealand counterparts, consider grammar to be a central feature of language and a crucial element in their pedagogy. There is also strong correspondence of views regarding the need for explicit grammar instruction, the usefulness of explaining rules, the need for practice of various kinds, and the importance attached to appropriate error correction. Evidently, how these views are carried out by the teachers in their AP classes will vary between and within the groups.

- *Is there a bias towards decontextualised presentation of grammar and away from discourse-based, unified approaches?*

The findings of all three surveys strongly reject this bias. The Vietnamese, British and New Zealand teachers agreed with the introduction of grammar in complete texts; interestingly, the percentage of positive responses in Vietnam was higher than in the British study, and rather lower than in the New Zealand survey. None of the groups felt that the use of authentic materials was excessively time-consuming, or thought these materials presented their students with particular grammatical problems, although many more Vietnamese than British or New Zealand respondents pointed to the difficulties authentic materials presented in terms of vocabulary, and a very high proportion – almost nine out of ten - felt that their students needed to clear instruction in form-function mapping when using authentic materials. In summary, all three groups of teachers have “an inclination towards the use of authentic texts and real-life tasks for practice” (Burgess & Etherington, 2002, p.450), although there are likely to be varying interpretations of what exactly is meant by ‘authentic’ or ‘real life’.

Burgess & Etherington say that their findings indicate that their respondents were “well-disposed to a Focus-on-Form approach” rather than one which focusses on forms (2002, p. 450). This view may be given support by the clear preference of the teachers in all three surveys to introduce grammatical items through texts rather than in a decontextualised presentation. However, the strong endorsement by British – and New Zealand - teachers of explicit attention to grammar and the agreement more than two-thirds of them that explicit discussion of grammar rules is beneficial to learners, is quite inconsistent with Focus-on-Form as is currently advocated (Long 1991; Long & Robinson, 1998). The clear preference of Vietnamese teachers in the present study for explicit grammatical instruction and controlled forms-focussed practice also disconfirm basic tenets of Focus-on- Form.

Limitations of the study and implications for further research

The present study represents merely a one-off snapshot of the views of a small number of Vietnamese EAP teachers, and no firm generalizations from the survey can be inferred. As with the 2002 and 2008 studies, there was no opportunity to use a split-half method to check reliability, although certain statements were paired to check the consistency of responses. Moreover, unlike the 2002 survey of British teachers, the Vietnamese teachers were not asked for qualitative comments, which would have fleshed out the summary responses. Burgess & Etherington (2002, p.449) made the point that follow-up interviews with at least a sample of their teachers would have been helpful, and this was in fact done in the New Zealand study (Barnard & Scampton, in press), although for the sake of comparing the three studies, the interview data were not reported here. It was hoped to interview some of the Vietnamese teachers, but constraints of time and access did not permit it.

It has been useful to compare the attitudes of three groups of teachers working within the same broad field of endeavour, and to note that the Vietnamese responses are not substantially dissimilar either from their British and New Zealand counterparts or from those reported in the few studies that have been carried out with other Asian teachers of English. Evidently, further research needs to be carried out in more contexts - not only into what teachers believe about grammar teaching - among other things - but also into the extent to which such beliefs are manifest in their classroom activity. This is a point acknowledged by Burgess & Etherington (2002, p.449) and others (for example, Farrell and Lim, 2005; Borg, 2006; Zhen & Murphy, 2007). As Borg has pointed out (2003, p.105), “can language teacher cognition be usefully studied without reference to what happens in classrooms?” Human nature being what it is, it would not be surprising to find that there are both convergences and divergences between belief and action, but the important thing would be for both teachers and researchers to gain insights as to *why* there should be any disparities, and what effects these might have on language teaching and learning. Therefore, in addition to surveys, (in-depth) interviews and narrative accounts, research needs to be conducted through ethnographic studies of classroom interaction and by post-observation discussion, the latter facilitated, for example, by stimulated recall strategies. There is also a need to explore the beliefs of students as well as their teachers in order to see the extent to which their respective views coincide, and the pedagogical implications of any dissonance. Given the increasing importance of

English Language Teaching in all its aspects throughout Asian countries, and the relative lack of studies into teacher cognition in these contexts, the need for systematic research is both necessary and urgent.

References

- Andrews, S. (1997). Metalinguistic knowledge and teacher explanation. *Language Awareness* 6, 147-161.
- Andrews, S. (1999a). 'All these like little name things': A comparative study of language teachers' explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology. *Language Awareness* 8, 143-159.
- Andrews, S. (1999b). Why do L2 teachers need to 'know about language'? Teacher metalinguistic awareness and input for learning. *Language and Education* 13 (3), 161-177.
- Andrews, S. (2001). The language awareness of the L2 teacher: Its impact upon pedagogical practice. *Language Awareness* 10, 75-90.
- Barnard, R., & Scampton, D. (in press). Teaching grammar: a survey of EAP teachers in New Zealand. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics* 25, 243-272.
- Borg, S. (2003.) Teacher cognition in grammar teaching: A literature review. *Language Awareness*, 12 (2), 96-108.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum,
- Burgess, J., & Etherington, S. (2002). Focus on grammatical form: Explicit or implicit? *System*, 30, 433-458.
- Chia, S.C.C. (2003). Singapore primary teachers' beliefs in grammar teaching and learning. In D. Deterding, A.S. Brown & E.L. Low (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Research on grammar* (pp.117-127). Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P.L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research and teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillan.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Issues and terminology. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 1-12). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1992). *Second language acquisition and pedagogy*. Clevedon, England, Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (2001a.) Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning* 51, Supplement 1, 1-46.
- Ellis, R. (2001b.) *Form-focused instruction and second language learning*. Malden, MA: Blackwell,
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly* 40 (1), 83-108.

- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning* 51, 281-318.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S. (2002). Doing focus on form. *System* 34, 419-432.
- Farrell, T.S.C. (1999). The reflective assignment: Unlocking pre-service teachers' beliefs on grammar teaching. *RELC Journal* 30, 1-17.
- Farrell, T. S. C., & Lim P.C.P., (2005). Conceptions of grammar teaching: A case study of teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. *TESL-EJ* 9, 1-13.
- Fotos, S. (1998). Shifting the focus from forms to form in the EFL Classroom. *ELT Journal*, 52 (4) 301-307.
- Isenberg, J. P. (1990). Teachers thinking and beliefs and classroom practice. *Childhood Education*, 66, 322-327.
- Krashen, S., (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford, England: Pergamon.
- Le, V.C. (2007) A historical review of English language education in Vietnam. In Y.H. Choi & B. Spolsky (Eds.), *English education in Asia: History and policies*. (pp. 168-180), Seoul: Asia TEFL.
- Long, M.H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp.39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Long, H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research and practice. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15-41). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- National Institute of Education (1975). Teaching as clinical information processing [microform] : NIE Conference on Studies in Teaching : panel 6 [N.L. Gage, editor; Kent Viehoever, coordinating editor]. National Conference on Studies in Teaching 1974: Washington, DC.
- Ng, J., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2003). Do teachers' beliefs of grammar teaching match their classroom practices? A Singapore case study. . In D. Deterding, A.S. Brown & E.L. Low (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Research on grammar* (pp. 128-137). Singapore: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Patricia, L. P. C. (2003). Primary school teachers' beliefs about effective grammar teaching and their actual classroom practices: A Singapore case study. Online document retrieved December 27, 2006 from <http://davidd.myplace.nie.edu.sg>.
- Richards, J. C., Gallo, P. B., & Renandya, W.A. (2001). Exploring teachers' beliefs and the processes of change. *The PAC Journal* 1 (1), 41-62.
- Sheen, R., (2003). Focus on form: A myth in the making? *ELT Journal* 57 (3), 225-233.
- Zhen, Z., & Murphy, E. (2007). Tensions in the language learning experiences and beliefs of Chinese teachers of English as a foreign language. *TESL-EJ* 10 (4), 1-19.

Part I: Grammar Approach

Please specify the degree you agree or disagree with the statements on the roles of grammar and grammar teaching methods for an English preparatory class to serve academic purposes. If you strongly agree, please tick 4 in the table. If you agree, please tick 3. If you disagree, please tick 2. If you strongly disagree, please tick 1 in the table. Choose one option.

	Disagree		Agree	
1. The role of grammar in a language can be seen:				
a) As a framework of a language, i.e. a basic system on which other aspects are build.	1	2	3	4
b) As blocks of language combined to create the whole.	1	2	3	4
c) As a supplement for sufficient linguistic competence: a refinement for a more basic linguistic knowledge.	1	2	3	4
d) As an equal backbone for sufficient linguistic competence. (Other backbones can be knowledge of phonetics, appropriate and cultivated language command, etc.)	1	2	3	4
2. Learners study grammar by their exposure to the environment of using the language naturally.	1	2	3	4
3. Teaching linguistic forms helps learners produce right grammar.	1	2	3	4
4. Learners' using the language is unrelated to the conscious knowledge of the grammar system and its functions.	1	2	3	4
5. Learners can improve their grammatical accuracy through regular structure drills.	1	2	3	4
6. Learners need conscious knowledge of grammar to improve their language.	1	2	3	4
7. Structure drills are always in a complete communicative context.	1	2	3	4
8. Separate treatment of grammar cannot bring linguistic knowledge for students to use in natural communication.	1	2	3	4
9. Learners should be consciously aware of the forms and functions of structures before using them sufficiently.	1	2	3	4
10. Excluding grammar from the language teaching program is beneficial to the learners.	1	2	3	4
11. Non-contextual structure drills play a certain role in the language learning process.	1	2	3	4
12. Structure drills for generative purpose play an essential role in the learning process.	1	2	3	4
13. Grammar is best taught through communicative activities.	1	2	3	4
14. Participating in language activities in real life is the best way for learners to develop their grammatical knowledge.	1	2	3	4
15. Learners study grammar more effectively if grammar is introduced in a full text.	1	2	3	4
16. Teachers should only correct language forms which hinder communication.	1	2	3	4
17. Comparison and contrast of individual structures is beneficial to learners' grammar learning.	1	2	3	4
18. Correction focussing on language forms helps learners improve their grammar usage.	1	2	3	4
19. Grammar is best taught through individual structures.	1	2	3	4
20. Explicit discussion of grammar rules is beneficial to learners.	1	2	3	4

Part II. Learners' and teachers' difficulties with grammar

Following are the issues on learners' and teachers' way of dealing with grammar in the classroom. Please specify your agreement or disagreement on the following statements as in the previous part.

Disagree Agree

1. My learners find it difficult to apply grammatical knowledge to communicate.	1	2	3	4
2. Problem-solving techniques in learning grammar increase my learners' motivation.	1	2	3	4
3. My learners want the teacher to explain grammar clearly/explicitly.	1	2	3	4
4. My learners find it more interesting to learn grammar through an example of a sentence.	1	2	3	4
5. My learners like combining meanings and structures better by themselves.	1	2	3	4
6. My learners find it difficult to deal with grammar introduced in real-life materials.	1	2	3	4
7. My learners find real-life materials difficult because there are a variety of structures in these materials.	1	2	3	4
8. My learners find real-life materials difficult because these materials are closely related to culture.	1	2	3	4
9. My learners find real-life materials difficult because of the vocabulary used in these materials.	1	2	3	4
10. My learners cannot find the relations between forms and functions in real-life materials without teachers' clear explanation.	1	2	3	4
11. Teachers find it time-consuming to use real-life materials.	1	2	3	4
12. Teachers find it difficult to introduce suitable tasks on the basis of real-life materials.	1	2	3	4
13. Not teaching grammar explicitly worries my learners.	1	2	3	4
14. My learners find grammar terms beneficial.	1	2	3	4
15. Teachers find it difficult to correct learners' mistakes in communicative writing.	1	2	3	4
16. Teachers find it difficult to correct learners' speaking mistakes.	1	2	3	4
17. My learners find it difficult to improve grammar accuracy in a communicative writing activity.	1	2	3	4
18. My learners find it difficult to improve grammatical accuracy in a communicative speaking activity.	1	2	3	4
19. My learners find it difficult to use grammatical terms.	1	2	3	4
20. My learners find it demotivating to use problem-solving techniques to study grammar.	1	2	3	4

Appendix B: Table of results

Item	Frequency of responses					Valid percentages			
	1	2	3	4	0 Missingvalue	1	2	3	4
1.1a	1	9	15	3	1	3.6	32.1	53.6	10.7
1.1b	4	8	13	2	2	14.8	29.6	48.1	7.4
1.1c	1	7	13	4	4	4.0	28.0	52.0	16.0
1.1d	0	8	11	7	3	0	30.8	42.3	26.9
1.2	2	16	10	1	0	6.9	55.2	34.5	3.4
1.3	0	8	16	5	0	0	27.6	55.2	17.2
1.4	9	11	7	0	2	33.3	40.7	25.9	0
1.5	2	2	21	4	0	6.9	6.9	72.4	13.8
1.6	1	6	19	3	0	3.4	20.7	65.5	10.3
1.7	5	13	8	3	0	17.2	44.8	27.6	10.3
1.8	1	12	6	10	0	3.4	41.4	20.7	34.5
1.9	5	9	15	0	0	17.2	31.0	51.7	0
1.10	8	10	9	2	0	27.6	34.5	31.0	6.9
1.11	4	10	13	2	0	13.8	34.5	44.8	6.9
1.12	1	6	20	2	0	3.4	20.7	69.0	6.9
1.13	0	7	11	11	0	0	24.1	37.9	37.9
1.14	0	10	12	7	0	0	34.5	41.4	24.1
1.15	0	9	13	7	0	0	31.0	44.8	24.1
1.16	1	14	11	3	0	3.4	48.3	37.9	10.3
1.17	0	4	18	7	0	0	13.8	62.1	24.1
1.18	0	8	17	3	1	0	28.6	60.7	10.7
1.19	9	15	4	0	1	32.1	53.6	14.3	0
1.20	3	5	18	3	0	10.3	17.2	62.1	10.3
2.1	2	5	10	12	0	6.9	17.2	34.5	41.4
2.2	0	7	17	5	0	0	24.1	58.6	17.2
2.3	0	2	13	13	1	0	7.1	46.4	46.4
2.4	1	2	13	13	0	3.4	6.9	44.8	44.8
2.5	0	11	13	5	0	0	37.9	44.8	17.2
2.6	3	9	9	7	1	10.7	32.1	32.1	25.0
2.7	4	5	11	9	0	13.8	17.2	37.9	31.0
2.8	3	10	14	2	0	10.3	34.5	48.3	6.9
2.9	0	6	17	6	0	0	20.7	58.6	20.7
2.10	0	8	16	5	0	0	27.6	55.2	17.2
2.11	7	13	7	2	0	24.1	44.8	24.1	6.9
2.12	3	12	11	1	2	11.1	44.4	40.7	3.7
2.13	0	6	13	10	0	0	20.7	44.8	34.5
2.14	1	3	20	5	0	3.4	10.3	69.0	17.2
2.15	5	16	7	1	0	17.2	55.2	24.1	3.4
2.16	4	18	5	2	0	13.8	62.1	17.2	6.9
2.17	1	11	12	4	1	3.6	39.3	42.9	14.3
2.18	3	9	13	4	0	10.3	31.0	44.8	13.8
2.19	1	13	15	0	0	3.4	44.8	51.7	0
2.20	6	14	8	1	0	20.7	48.3	27.6	3.4