

Implicit Grammar Instruction Given To Vietnamese Students In The Hope That They Can Learn Grammar Better

Bui Vu The Duc

Institute of Languages and Social Sciences

Ho Chi Minh City University of Transport

Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

duc_nn@hcmutrans.edu.vn

Abstract-Whether grammar should be taught explicitly or implicitly has long been a controversial issue among language researchers and language practitioners. Much experimental research that has been conducted so far has shown mixed results in regard to this issue. This paper aims to investigate whether Vietnamese students learn grammar better through implicit instruction than through explicit instruction. A ten-week experiment was conducted using a pre-test, post-test control group design to compare the effectiveness of explicit and implicit grammar instruction to Vietnamese students, and data was collected and analyzed. The experiment was conducted in two different evening English as a Foreign Language class at the pre-intermediate level at Nong Lam University Center for Foreign Studies in Ho Chi Minh City. These two classes were supposed to be at the same level. One class (the control group) was given explicit grammar instruction. The other class (the experimental group) was given implicit grammar instruction. Two different tests of similar difficulty (pre-test and post-test) were given to both groups. The pre-test was administered prior to the inception of the treatment. The post-test was conducted after the treatment was completed. The result of the pre-test ($t = 0.05$, $p > 0.05$) showed no significant differences between the two groups, which meant that they were approximately at the same level. The result of the post-test, however, showed significant differences between the two groups: $t = 2.32$, $p < 0.05$. The result indicated that the difference between the two means was significant. This meant that the experimental group outperformed the control group. The key elements in the success and limitations of the innovation will be discussed in the closing remarks.

Keywords-*Implicit, implicit instruction, innovation, acquisition, explicit, grammar, grammar instruction.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Innovation is “a ubiquitous process going on almost everywhere and almost all the time” [1]. Although innovation is happening almost everywhere, not all innovation is successful unless it

can meet the requirements of the objectives of learning and teaching at a particular place.

Teaching grammar to English as a Second Language (ESL) learner has long been considered a major concern in the process of language learning pedagogy. It has been the object of numerous studies, each of which has its own contribution to the field. Many innovative research projects have been carried out in order to find out the most effective grammar teaching methods [2].

The issues concerning whether grammar should be taught explicitly or implicitly are crucial to English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning in the classroom because the types of instruction are likely to have an effect on EFL learners’ results. Many teachers of EFL have employed the grammar-translation method to teach EFL. They focus on forms and emphasize grammatical accuracy. In this teaching method, EFL learners are presented with grammatical structures of the target language through explicit explanation and are required to manipulate exactly those structures [3]. From my own learning experience in high school and university, I see that the primary method of teaching grammar in Vietnamese schools is the traditional method – Grammar Translation Method – in which the teacher is the center and students are given grammatical rules explicitly (directly) and then practice through translation exercises. The reason why they do it this way is that this way of teaching may be less strenuous and time-consuming. Language teachers are often faced with limited time in which to expose their students to the target language. Thus for the sake of time, teachers are forced to explicitly state grammatical rules rather than allow their students to be exposed to grammar contextually and acquire such concepts naturally. In Vietnam, language examinations in schools are mainly focused on written forms such as grammatical structures. Therefore, students who master the forms can get high scores in examinations and are considered good

students, and teachers who can help students get high scores in examinations are also considered good teachers. Much research that has been conducted so far has revealed mixed results concerning whether grammar should be taught explicitly or implicitly. Through this small scale research, I would like to investigate whether implicit instruction can help my students learn grammar better in comparison with explicit instruction so that I can choose the more effective way of teaching grammar to my students in the future.

The grammar I would like to teach is the present perfect tense and passive sentences for the following reasons:

- The present perfect tense may be a very common and useful but difficult tense for students.
- The present perfect tense and passive sentences are the two main parts in the course book. Therefore, the experiment can be carried out for a long enough time to probably see the differences in the results of the control group and the experimental group, and after finishing the experiment, I can have enough time to cover other minor parts in the course book.

II. RATIONALE

From my class observation, students tend to prefer assignments that allow them to explore the language. The knowledge they obtain becomes theirs, and it may often be much easier for them to remember. Instead of being given an explicit rule, students spend some time discussing and discovering grammatical structures, which probably helps them understand and remember the grammatical structures longer.

Implicit instruction is the way of teaching in which learners are exposed to a situation or example (e.g. a reading text) and required to infer the forms. As Ellis puts it, implicit instruction is “*instruction that requires learners to infer how a form works with awareness*” [4]. It involves cooperative learning which is defined by Olsen and Kagan as “*group learning activity organized so that learning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and is motivated to increase the learning of others*” [5]. Slavin also asserts that cooperative group learning is an instructional strategy that calls for students to work together in groups in order to achieve a common learning goal [6].

Last but not least, with this way of instruction, teachers can create a learner-centered classroom. In a learner-centered environment, students become autonomous learners, which accelerates the language learning processes. A learner-centered environment is communicative and authentic. It trains students to work in small groups or pairs and to negotiate meaning in a broad context. The negotiation of meaning develops students’ communicative competence [7].

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. A Brief Outline of Teaching Methodology

The role of grammar instruction has been of great interest to professionals in the field of second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) acquisition over the past 30 years [8]. The issues concerning how grammar should be taught are crucial to L2/FL learning because the types of instruction can have an effect on L2/FL learners’ outcomes. L2/FL teachers should recognize what kinds of grammar teaching strategies best facilitate learning in the classroom and choose the most beneficial ways for L2/FL learners [9]. In the 1960s, L2/FL acquisition was defined as the mastery of grammatical rules of the target language. Many educators of L2/FL employed the grammar-translation method to teach L2/FL. They focused on forms and grammatical accuracy. In this teaching method, L2/FL learners were presented with grammatical structures of the target language through explicit explanation and were required to manipulate exactly those structures by translating their first language (L1) into L2/FL and vice versa. On the other hand, those who emphasized oral fluency in L2/FL replaced the grammar-translation method with the Audiolingual Method (ALM), which aimed to develop the oral manipulation of grammatical rules by mimicry and memorization of example sentences [8]. Although the ALM changed the notion of L2/FL acquisition from mastery of grammatical knowledge in written form to oral fluency in the target language, grammatical structures were still taught explicitly. Grammatical forms and their accuracy were still emphasized. In the 1970s, however, many L2/FL acquisition researchers criticized the instruction that focused on forms and claimed the importance of learners’ ability to communicate in L2/FL. In other words, those against the grammar-translation method claimed that explicit grammar instruction is not enough for mastery of L2/FL. This notion of L2/FL

acquisition changed the role of grammar instruction dramatically and led to communicative language teaching (CLT). According to Wasanasomsithi, “*CLT seeks to promote interpretation, expression and negotiation of meaning*” as well as grammatical competence (e.g., one’s ability to use grammar) in the target language [10].

When researchers studied L1 acquisition more in the 1980s, they emphasized the role of communication and criticized theories that focused on linguistic knowledge. One of the strongest arguments was led by Krashen [11]. Krashen claimed that L2/FL learners acquire the target language more quickly and successfully through exposure to situations where the target language is used naturally than through explicit grammar instruction and pattern practice. This was based on the assumption that L2/FL acquisition process follows the same process of L1 acquisition in which “*children acquire L1 by hearing it spoken by family and friends in a variety of communicative events and by interacting with others*” [12]. Krashen emphasized the importance of comprehensible input through which L2/FL learners acquire the grammatical structures inductively. According to Krashen, conscious knowledge such as grammatical rules leads L2/FL learners to focusing on grammatical accuracy so much that natural L2/FL usage such as communication in L2/FL is distracted [13]. This suggests that implicit grammar instruction is preferable.

While more attention has been drawn to the importance of L2/FL communicative ability or proficiency developed through natural communication, there has been doubt about the extent to which learners can acquire the target language only from comprehensible input without explanation of rules. As DeKeyser puts it, it is not likely to happen that all linguistic features of L2/FL can be implicitly learned by hearing utterances that grammatical rules underlie [14].

B. Experimental Research Studies Concerning Two Different Perspectives on Grammar Instruction

Hammond and Winitz conducted experimental studies to investigate whether college students who learned Spanish grammar implicitly for one semester would demonstrate as much grammatical knowledge as those who were taught grammar explicitly [15], [16]. The results of both studies were in favor of implicit grammar instruction, showing that the

implicit grammar instruction resulted in higher mean scores on department-administered tests by Hammond and the grammaticality judgement test by Winitz than explicit grammar instruction. Hammond asserts that, unlike arguments made by explicit instruction supporters, implicit communicative methodology can provide students with grammatical accuracy as well as develop students’ communication ability in the target language. In addition, Winitz suggests that different instructions lead to the different language process of grammaticality judgement and emphasizes the importance of implicit instruction strategies to enhance L2/FL learning process. While researchers provide evidence that implicit grammar instruction develops learners’ grammatical knowledge better, other researchers present the opposite results and demonstrate the effectiveness of explicit grammar instruction. Arguments for explicit grammar instruction are represented by Scott and Doughty [17] [18]. Scott compared the effectiveness of explicit and implicit instruction in French. The treatment under explicit condition included explanation of grammatical rules, while the implicit treatment contained oral presentation of stories by the teacher. From the statistical analysis of the scores achieved by students after a two-week treatment, Scott found that college students who received the explicit instruction performed significantly better on the written section of the test than those who listened to the stories that included the target grammatical structures as implicit instruction. Furthermore, the total scores showed significant differences between the two treatments, indicating that explicit instruction benefited learning grammatical structures in second language overall. A computerized experiment conducted by DeKeyser also supports explicit grammar instruction [14]. Using a miniature linguistic system called “Implexan” consisting of five morphological rules and a lexicon of 98 words, DeKeyser tested the hypothesis that the subjects under the explicit-deductive conditions would learn simple categorical grammatical rules better than those under the implicit-inductive conditions. The analysis of the final production test taken after all learning sessions revealed that for morphological rules the explicit-deductive subjects significantly outperformed the implicit-inductive subjects. Based on the results obtained in this study, DeKeyser argues that categorical rules are better learned through explicit

instruction than implicitly. The results from experimental research conducted by VanPatten and Cadierno also indicate that explicit grammar instruction is more effective than implicit instruction [19]. The studies conducted by VanPatten and Doughty discuss that L2/FL learners have difficulty in consciously paying attention to form and meaning at the same time. It is suggested that implicit grammar instruction does not lead L2/FL learners to successful learning of the target language through comprehensible input supplied in natural communication.

In conclusion, the experimental research that has been conducted so far has reported mixed results in regard to the research question about whether grammar should be taught explicitly or implicitly. There is evidence that L2/FL instruction has some effect on language learning and enhances its process [20]. Nevertheless, how L2/FL, especially grammar, should be taught is still central in arguments and needs to be further studied.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. Context

Nong Lam University Center for Foreign Studies is a low-structured institution which gives teachers opportunities to be as innovative as they can in their teaching. It is a mixture of the role and person culture in which teachers have freedom to make changes to the course syllabus as long as these changes meet the needs of their students. A course evaluation form concerning teaching quality, materials, teaching facilities, etc. is given to each student at the end of the course. From the data collected in regard to teaching quality, students usually prefer those teachers who can incorporate supplemental material relevant to their needs. Those teachers who only stick to the course syllabus are usually complained about since most of the course books are taken from BANA countries such as England and the United States, and not all topics are relevant to Vietnamese cultures. Therefore, teachers are encouraged to be flexible in their teaching and incorporate supplementary material where necessary.

The center offers three types of programs: General English, TOEIC-oriented Business English and TOEFL iBT-oriented Academic English. Most of the students studying at the center are university students and workers. They have different learning objectives.

Some want to improve their English for work. Some want to get TOEIC or TOEFL iBT certificates. Others want to improve their English for their studies at school or for future jobs.

Each course lasts three months, three evenings per week, organized on a Monday-Wednesday- Friday and Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday basis.

B. Model and Strategy

According to Markee, there are five models of innovation:

- Social interaction model;
- Center-periphery model;
- Research, Development and Diffusion model (RD&D model);
- Problem-solving model;
- Linkage model.

Among these models, the researcher decided to use the problem-solving model for this innovation. *“The problem-solving model coupled with a normative-re-educative strategy of change is theoretically the most popular approach to promoting change in education”*, stated Markee [21]. In this approach, classroom teachers identify the need for change and implement the innovation. They themselves *“act as inside change agents”*. Therefore, it is a bottom-up process. According to White, if an innovation belongs to an institution, the process is often likely to be from the bottom-up [22].

The strategy the researcher applied is the “normative-re-educative strategy” as White stated “As rational and intelligent beings, people must participate in their own re-education, which involves normative as well as cognitive and perceptual changes” [22]. This innovation will result in a change in attitude, and stakeholders are responsible for their own learning.

C. Types of social change

This innovation involves an immanent change “[which] occurs when the persons who recognize a need for change and those who propose solutions to a perceived problem are all part of the same social system” [21]. It is considered as the most commonly discussed type of change in education literature. This kind of change “allows teachers to act as internal change agents and promotes ownership [21].” It derives from the teacher’s own willingness and thus the innovation is more likely to be successful.

D. Roles of stakeholders

According to Markee, people who are involved in an innovation are stakeholders. The same person might play different social roles. In this innovation, the researcher plays the roles of an adopter, implementer, change agent as well as a supplier since he makes a decision to change, implements the innovation, manages change in his own classroom and also supplies students with innovative materials from a different textbook. The students who receive the innovation are clients. As Markee puts it, learners who participate in an innovation are not passive, hence they might act as adopters of or resisters to learning proposals made by the teacher or other students [21].

E. Subjects (clients)

The subjects involved in this small scale research comprised 67 Vietnamese students enrolled in two evening pre-intermediate EFL classes at Nong Lam University Center for Foreign Studies in Ho Chi Minh City. 35 students (19 females and 16 males) enrolled in a Monday-Wednesday-Friday class (the experimental group) and 32 students (20 females and 12 males) enrolled in a Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday class (the control group). Their ages ranged from 19 to 30.

They were supposed to be at the same level because some were old students moving up to this class from the previous class. For new students, one week before the new course began, the center organized a placement test for students in order to arrange them into appropriate classes. Many of them took the placement test. However, there were some cases in which students were late for placement test registration. In this case, the registrar's office clerk would ask about their English learning experience carefully and offer an appropriate class for them.

The students were from different social backgrounds. Many of them were students at universities and some worked. They had probably learned the present perfect tense and passive sentences when they were in high school.

F. Material

The course book selected by the center for this class was mainly used to teach the present perfect tense and passive sentences to the control group. It was adapted from the book *Fundamentals of English Grammar*, beginning with chapter 7 (The Present Perfect). The book *Fundamentals of English*

Grammar (2nd ed.) was written by Betty Schramper Azar and published by Prentice Hall in 1992. It was designed in the way of explicit instruction. In this book, the forms are firstly presented, then examples for illustration and practice exercises.

The book *Grammar Sense 3*: Chapter 4 (The Present Perfect), Chapter 9 (Passive sentences: Part 1) and Chapter 10 (Passive sentences: Part 2) selected and modified by the researcher was used to teach the experimental group. This book was written by Susan Kesner Bland and published by Oxford University Press in 2003. They were designed mainly in the way of implicit instruction. Reading texts and situations containing the grammar points are firstly presented, then the forms and practice exercises.

G. Tests

Two different tests of similar difficulty: pre-test and post-test (see appendices 3 and 4) were used to compare the effectiveness of explicit instruction and implicit instruction. Both tests consisted of 30 items, 20 of which were tested on the present perfect tense and passive sentences and mixed up with 10 other items on other tenses students had studied in previous courses. The test items were adapted from the book *Test Bank for Fundamentals of English Grammar* (3rd ed.) written by Stacy A. Hagen and published by Pearson Education in 2003. The reason for using two different tests was to avoid the practice effect which was defined by Ward & Renandya as "*If students take a test or complete a questionnaire a second or third time, especially in a short time, they are likely to become familiar with it and thus do better or respond in a set pattern thus affecting the results of the research*" [23].

H. Procedure

The experiment took place during the first 10 weeks of the course – two periods per week (from June 18th to August 25th). Before the commencement of the research, a questionnaire on students' preferences of grammar instructions (see appendix 1) was given to the students in the experimental group in order that, from the results (see appendix 2), the teacher could anticipate the rate of adoption and modify his plan. This could be useful for better change management. Before the students filled out the questionnaire, the teacher explained it carefully in Vietnamese and demonstrated one example of each kind of instruction in order to make sure that the questionnaire was fully understood by all students.

The teacher informed the students of the objective and procedure of the research and asked for their consent and cooperation. A pre-test (see appendix 3) was administered before the instruction of the present perfect tense and passive sentences. The present perfect tense and passive sentences were presented to the experimental group implicitly and to the control group explicitly. Both groups received the same practice exercises. Some exercises were from *Fundamentals of English Grammar* and some from *Grammar Sense 3*.

A post-test (see appendix 4) was administered immediately after the instruction was completed. The interval between the pre-test and the post-test (10 weeks) was considered long enough to control for any

short-term memory effects. Only the mean scores of the number of correct answers to the present perfect tense and passive sentences in the pre-test and post-test were used for comparison. After the experiment was completed, the pre-test, post-test and results were handed out to students individually, followed by the teacher's correction of the two tests.

I. Data Analysis

The actual number of students who did both the pre-test and the post-test in the Monday-Wednesday-Friday class (the experimental group) was 25 and in the Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday class (the control group) was 23. Therefore, only the scores of these students were used for data analysis.

V. FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

A. Pre-test

TABLE I. COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST MEAN SCORES OF THE CONTROL GROUP AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUP.

Grammar	Control (N = 23)		Experimental (N = 25)		T-test	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Present Perfect Passive Sentences						
Pre-test	10.26	1.45	10.28	1.46	0.05	0.96

The pre-test (see appendix 3) was given to the students in both groups before the commencement of the instruction. The pre-test means scores of 10.26 and 10.28 out of the maximum possible means of 20 indicate that the participants had already studied the present perfect and passive sentences prior to the inception of the research. A comparison of the pre-test

means scores of the control group and experimental group in table 1 reveals no significant differences between the two groups: $t = 0.05$, $p > 0.05$. The difference between the two means is small. That is why the t-test value is also small, showing that the difference is not significant. This confirms that the two groups were approximately at the same level.

B. Post-test

TABLE II. COMPARISON OF POST-TEST MEAN SCORES AND MEAN GAIN SCORES OF THE CONTROL GROUP AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUP.

Grammar	Control (N = 23)		Experimental (N = 25)		T-test	P
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Present Perfect Passive Sentences						
Pre-test	15.82	1.80	17.12	2.05	2.32	0.025
Mean gain scores	5.56		6.84			

The post-test (see appendix 4) was conducted after the instruction, lasting 10 weeks, was completed. The same procedure was followed.

A comparison of the post-test means scores and means gain scores of the control group and experimental group in table 2 shows significant

differences between the two groups: $t = 2.32$, $p < 0.05$. The result indicates that the difference between the two means is significant. This means that the experimental group outperformed the control group.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study attempted to investigate whether Vietnamese students learn grammar better through implicit instruction in comparison with explicit instruction and the result showed significant difference between the control group and the experimental group. The experimental group outperformed the control group. The success of the innovation may be due to the following factors:

- The innovative grammar instruction (the implicit grammar instruction) addressed the needs and interests of the students since the results of the questionnaire on students' preference of grammar instruction (see appendix 2) showed that 26 students (74.3%) preferred the implicit grammar instruction and 24 of them stated that it was interesting.

- When the students worked in groups to discuss and explore the grammatical structures and their uses, followed by the teacher's feedback and summary, they probably understood and remembered them better.

- Last but not least, when the teacher elicited the answers from the students, they sometimes gave wrong answers. From their wrong answers, the teacher could know what parts they understood well and what needed more attention and explanation. According to Zydatiss, errors can indicate student's progress and success in language learning since they are signals that actual learning is taking place [24]. Corder also stated, "Errors provide feedback; they tell the teacher something about the effectiveness of his teaching materials and his teaching techniques, and show him what parts of the syllabus he has been following have been inadequately learned or taught and need further attention. They enable him to decide whether he must devote more time to the item he has been working on [25]."

However, some limitations may have occurred:

- The attendance at evening English classes is not compulsory. Some students, thus, were occasionally absent from class, which affected the number of scores used for data analysis and might have affected the result of the post-test.

- The research was conducted on a small scale with only two evening general English classes at Nong Lam University Center for Foreign Studies and the sample size (Control group: N=23) and Experimental

group: N=25) was lower than the number of 30 which Cohen and Manion described as the minimum for useful statistical analysis [26]. The research, therefore, might not be statistically reliable and generalizable to other contexts.

From the limitations mentioned above, further research needs to be conducted with more subjects involved in both groups, more cooperation of students regarding class attendance and last but not least, with different age groups to see whether the implicit grammar instruction works better than the explicit grammar instruction.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. A. Lundvall, , "National systems of innovation: Towards a theory of innovation and interactive learning," *The Learning Economy and The Economics of Hope*, London, UK: Pinter Publishers, 1992.
- [2] Z. Ghabanchi, M. Vosooghi, "The role of explicit contrastive instruction in learning difficult L2 grammatical forms: A cross-linguistic approach to language awareness," *The Reading Matrix*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 121-130, 2006.
- [3] T. Yamaoka, "Research on second language acquisition," Tokyo, Japan: Kiriyama Yuni, 1997.
- [4] R. Ellis, "Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review" Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education, 2005.
- [5] R. E. W.-B. Olsen, S. Kagan, "About cooperative learning," *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book*, New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall, 1992.
- [6] R. E. Slavin, "Cooperative learning," New York, USA: Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd, 1983.
- [7] M. A. Canale, M. Swain, "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing," *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1-47. DOI:10.1093/applin/1.1.1.
- [8] R. Ellis, "Instructed second language acquisition," Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 1991.
- [9] H. Muranoi, "Effects of interaction enhancement on restructuring of interlanguage grammar: A cognitive approach to foreign language instruction," PhD. Dissertation, Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., USA, 1996.
- [10] P. Wasanasomsithi, "An investigation into teachers' attitudes toward the use of literature in Thai EFL classroom," PhD. Dissertation, Philosophy in the School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA, 1998.

- [11] S. Krashen, "Second language acquisition and second language learning," Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press, 1981.
- [12] J. L. Shrum, E. W. Glisan, "Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction," Boston, USA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers, 1994.
- [13] S. Krashen, "The input hypothesis: issues and implications" New York, USA: Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd, 1985.
- [14] R. M. DeKeyser, "Learning second language grammar rules: An experiment with a miniature linguistics system," *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 379-410, 1995. DOI:10.1017/S027226310001425X.
- [15] R. M. Hammond, "Accuracy versus communicative competency: The acquisition of grammar in the second language classroom" *Hispania*, vol. 71, no. 2, pp. 408-417, 1988. DOI:10.2307/343089.
- [16] H. Winitz, "Grammaticality judgement as a function of explicit and implicit instruction in Spanish," *Modern Language Journal*, vol. 80, no. 1, pp. 32-43, 1996. DOI:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1996.tb01135.x.
- [17] V. M. Scott, "An empirical study of explicit and implicit teaching strategies in French," *Modern Language Journal*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 14- 25, 1988. DOI:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb05303.x.
- [18] C. Doughty, "Second language instruction does make a difference: Evidence from an empirical study of SL relativization," *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 431-469, 1991. DOI:10.1017/S0272263100010287.
- [19] B. V. Patten, T. Cadierno, "Explicit instruction and input processing", *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 225-241, 1993. DOI:10.1017/S0272263100011979.
- [20] M. H. Long, "Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of research," *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 35-82, 1983. DOI:10.2307/3586253.
- [21] N. Markee, "Managing curricular innovation," Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [22] R. V. White, "The ELT curriculum: Design, innovation and management," Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1988.
- [23] C. Ward, W. Renandya, "Research methodology," Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, 2003.
- [24] W. Zydattiss, "A Kiss of Life for the notion of error," *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, vol. 12, no.1-4, pp. 231-237, 1974. DOI:10.1515/iral.1974.12.1-4.231.
- [25] S. P. Corder, "The significance of learner's errors," *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 161-170, 1967.
- [26] L. Cohen, L. Manion, "Research methods in education," 4th Edition, London, UK: Routledge, 1994.

APPENDIX I. QUESTIONNAIRE

This is the questionnaire for my research paper. Would you please read the questions and circle your options and/or give your own opinions on the open-ended options?

Which of the following grammar instructions do you prefer? Why?

<p>1. Teacher presents a grammatical structure and its usage directly and then gives examples to illustrate.</p> <p>* You prefer this grammar instruction because _____</p> <p>(You can choose more than one answer)</p> <p>a. It is interesting.</p> <p>b. It is familiar to you.</p> <p>c. It can help you remember the structure and its usage easily.</p> <p>d. Other opinions:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>2. Teacher gives you a reading or a dialogue with a grammatical structure. You discuss with your friends in pairs or groups to discover the grammatical structure and its usage. Then, the teacher elicits your answers and gives feedback.</p> <p>* You prefer this grammar instruction because _____</p> <p>(You can choose more than one answer.)</p> <p>a. It is interesting.</p> <p>b. It is familiar to you.</p> <p>c. It can help you remember the structure and its usage easily.</p> <p>d. Other opinions:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
---	--

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

APPENDIX II. RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON STUDENT'S
PREFERENCES OF GRAMMAR INSTRUCTIONS

Which of the following grammar instructions do you prefer? Why?

1. Teacher presents a grammatical structure and its usage directly and then gives examples to illustrate.	9		
<u>Reasons:</u>			
a. It is interesting.	1		
b. It is familiar to you.	8		
c. It can help you remember the structure and its usage easily.	6		
d. Other opinions:		* It saves time. (1) * It saves time; If the teacher explains the grammatical structure carefully, students can remember it long. (1)	
2. Teacher gives you a reading or a dialogue with a grammatical structure. You discuss with your friends in pairs or groups to discover the grammatical structure and its usage. Then, the teacher elicits your answers and gives feedback.	26		
<u>Reasons:</u>			
a. It is interesting.	24		
b. It is familiar to you.	4		
c. It can help you remember the structure and its usage easily.	21		
d. Other opinions:		* Students can talk to each other and share their ideas.	

APPENDIX III

Class: Name: Date of Birth:	PRE-TEST Time allotted: 20 minutes	POINTS
---	---	---------------

Choose the best option. (30 points)

1. Carol _____ a pet snake when she was a child.
 A. has B. had C. has had
2. Mary: What happened to the roof of your car?
 Tom: It _____ in the windstorm.
 A. damaged B. has damaged C. was damaged
3. At 6:00 p.m. Bob sat down at the table and began to eat dinner. Ann came through the door at 6:05. When she came, he _____ dinner.
 A. is eating B. was eating C. ate
4. Brian _____ insurance for twenty years. He is still selling it and enjoys his job very much.
 A. sells B. has sold C. sold
5. Tom: Why is there such a long line of people?
 Mary: All passengers _____ before boarding their plane.
 A. must check B. must be checking C. must be checked
6. My tooth hurts. I _____ a toothache since this morning.
 A. have had B. had C. am having
7. This is the nicest car that I _____.
 A. have never seen B. have ever seen C. never see
8. Jed and Joanna are good friends. They _____ each other since they met in high school.
 A. know B. knew C. have known
9. When it _____ to rain yesterday afternoon, I _____ all the windows in the apartment.
 A. began / has closed B. began / closed C. begins / will close
10. Tom: Where is your motorcycle?
 Mary: At the repair shop. It _____.
 A. is repairing B. is being repaired C. was repairing
11. He _____ the cake into five pieces and took it into the sitting room.
 A. cuts B. will cut C. cut
12. The phone _____ several times today, but when I answer it, no one is there.
 A. ring B. was ringing C. has rung
13. You're out of breath. _____?
 A. Are you running B. Have you run C. Do you run
14. He has no chance now. They _____ a new person for the job two days ago.
 A. choose B. chose C. are choosing

15. A new supermarket is going _____ next year.
A. to build B. to be building C. to be built
16. He _____ sad whenever he gets bad marks.
A. is feeling B. feels C. felt
17. Ann's cat _____ last week.
A. was died B. died C. was being died
18. How many people _____ there at the party last night?
A. are B. will be C. were
19. This bottle is empty. Someone _____ all the milk.
A. drinks B. drank C. has drunk
20. Shhh. The baby _____. Please talk softly.
A. is sleeping B. sleeps C. slept
21. There was a fight at the party, but nobody _____.
A. was hurt B. was hurting C. hurt
22. They _____ the problem can be solved easily now.
A. are not thinking B. don't think C. won't think
23. Dr. Brooks treats patients, and she _____ two medical devices that help people with heart disease.
A. was inventing B. has invented C. invents
24. Mr. Perez _____ golf until he had a stroke at the age of 85.
A. played B. has played C. was playing
25. I _____ in the rainforest twice and plan to go again next year.
A. hiked B. have hiked C. will go
26. Tom: Has Peter finished the report yet?
Mary: No, he hasn't. It ought _____ soon.
A. to finish B. to be finishing C. to be finished
27. There's somebody walking behind us. I think _____.
A. we are B. we are followed C. we are being followed
being following
28. Jane _____ to phone me last night, but she didn't.
A. was supposed B. is supposed C. supposed
29. We haven't seen the dog _____ yesterday. I hope she didn't run away.
A. for B. from C. since
30. Doctor: My patient is not in Room 303.
Nurse: He _____ to the second floor.
A. has moving B. is moved C. has been moved

THIS IS THE END OF THE TEST

APPENDIX IV

Class:	POST-TEST Time allotted: 20 minutes	POINTS
Name:		
Date of Birth:		

Choose the best option. (30 points)

1. Peter _____ the guitar a lot when he was a child.
A. has played B. plays C. played
2. Tom: Do you know where Jack is living?
Mary: No, I don't. I _____ anything from him since he moved to Toronto
A. didn't hear B. haven't heard C. don't hear
3. Tom: Did you make your sweater?
Mary: No, I didn't. A friend gave it to me. It _____ by hand.
A. made B. was made C. has made
4. My mother called me around five. My husband came home a little after that. When he came home, I _____ to my mother on the phone.
A. talked B. was talking C. is talking
5. Peter _____ to the dentist several times this month. He's having problems with his teeth.
A. has gone B. went C. goes
6. Tom: When can you pick up the car?
Mary: It _____ by tomorrow afternoon.
A. should be fixed B. should fix C. should be fixing
7. It's 6:00 p.m. Mary is at home. She _____ dinner. She usually eats dinner with her family around six o'clock.
A. ate B. eats C. is eating
8. Tom: Where is the report?
Mary: In the office. It _____.
A. was typing B. is typing C. is being typed
9. Khalid _____ the keys to his car yet. He's still looking for it.
A. didn't find B. won't find C. hasn't found
10. When I _____ a strange noise last night, I _____ on all the lights in my house.
A. heard / turned B. heard / have turned C. hear / turn
11. This is the funniest story that I _____.
A. have ever heard B. have never heard C. ever hear
12. Mary _____ six dozen cookies since this morning. Now she needs to wrap them up.
A. baked B. was baking C. has baked
13. He _____ nervous whenever he answers his teacher's question.
A. is getting B. got C. gets
14. The test is going _____ by the teacher.
A. to correct B. to be correcting C. to be corrected
15. An accident _____ at the corner of Third and Main yesterday.
A. happened B. was happened C. was being happened
16. A: I'm sorry I'm late for work. I overslept.
B: I _____ that excuse from you too many times. You need to be more responsible.
A. heard B. hear C. have heard

17. He _____ some flowers and went to the hospital to visit his friend.
A. buys B. bought C. has bought
18. After she _____ the hospital, she had a long holiday.
A. leaves B. has left C. left
19. How are you doing? You _____ very tired.
A. looked B. are looking C. look
20. Tony: How do you like college?
Sarah: I like living in the dorm, but I _____ the food.
A. am not used to B. do not use to C. am not use to
21. Dave: Why are you crying?
Anna: Someone _____ my bike.
A. steals B. has stolen C. stole
22. *Reader's Digest* is the magazine which _____ into many languages.
A. has translated B. translated C. has been translated
23. Tom: You look like you are in a hurry.
Mary: I am. This project _____ by 5:00 p.m.
A. has to being done B. has to be done C. will to be done
24. We are very worried. The baby _____ a fever since she woke up this morning.
A. had B. has C. has had
25. Mr. Smith _____ here until he died in 1995.
A. lived B. has lived C. was living
26. We _____ by a loud noise last night.
A. woke up B. were woken up C. were waking up
27. When you _____ Dave, tell him he still owes me some money.
A. will see B. are seeing C. see
28. I haven't met Ben _____ last week. I hope everything is OK.
A. from B. for C. since
29. Where's the book I gave you? What _____ with it?
A. have you done B. do you do C. are you doing
30. Tom: Where _____, Paul?
Paul: In London.
A. were you born B. have you been born C. did you born

THIS IS THE END OF THE TEST