DEDUCTIVE OR INDUCTIVE GRAMMAR – WHICH IS THE CHOICE OF VIETNAMESE EFL TEACHERS?

BY
LAM HOANG PHUC
B.A., HCMC UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION, VIETNAM

A THESIS
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN LINGUISTICS (TESOL)

DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
BENEDICTINE UNIVERSITY
LISLE, ILLINOIS, USA

JUNE, 2019
ABSTRACT

This research study focused on the issue of deductive versus inductive approaches in grammar instruction. While many previous studies tried to compare the effectiveness of these two types of grammar teaching approaches, few examined the factors that can affect the choice of these approaches. Therefore, the present study aimed to fill this research gap by investigating Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches and whether or not their choice is influenced by the three grammar teaching factors: (1) structures’ complexity, (2) learners’ proficiency level, and (3) learners’ age.

The present study employed survey research design, utilizing a questionnaire containing both close-ended and open-ended questions. 34 Vietnamese EFL teachers working for a private English center took part in the survey, which was implemented online through the Google Forms platform. Quantitative data were analyzed through descriptive statistics in the form of percentages and inferential statistical analysis in the form of chi-square tests, while qualitative data were analyzed through qualitative coding.

The results of data analysis showed that the Vietnamese EFL teachers in the study preferred inductive approaches to deductive approaches and the teaching factors examined all had significant impacts on the teachers’ choice with learners’ age being the most influential, followed by learners’ proficiency level and structures’ complexity respectively. The results of the study offer a fresh view on the topic of deductive versus inductive grammar teaching; in addition, these results can act as a source of reference for new and inexperienced Vietnamese EFL teachers.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this very first chapter, the subject matter of the present study will be introduced and the rationale as to why the chosen subject is significant to study will also be provided. In addition, this chapter will present the gap in previous literature regarding the subject matter that the present study set out to fill as well as the aims of the study. The chapter concludes with a very brief summary of the content of the following chapters.

1.1 Grammar and Grammar Teaching

Grammar has always been an important if not inseparable part of English language teaching and learning. Grammar instruction is present in almost every English language teaching coursebook. For example, the Family and Friends series by Simmons, Thompson, and Quintana (2010), which was published by Oxford University Press and aimed at young and beginner learners of English, has grammar instruction in each learning unit. Another example is Collins’ series of IELTS examination preparation, which includes a whole volume – Grammar for IELTS by Aish and Tomlinson (2012) – dedicated to the teaching of grammatical rules and structures normally encountered and used in the IELTS exam. Even oral communication-oriented coursebooks such as the Breakthrough Plus series by Craven (2013), which was published by Macmillan Education, has explicit grammar instruction within the main books. These examples help to provide a clear illustration of the prevalence of grammar in English language teaching and learning.
On a more academic note, it seems that scholars and researchers within the field of language teaching and learning all agree on the vital role of grammar as a useful tool that can stimulate learners’ language development. Besides providing a means for language learners to generate original sentences (Thornbury, 1999), the knowledge of grammar can help enhance learners’ communicative competence, especially in written communication (Larsen-Freeman, 2001; Thornbury, 1999; Widodo, 2006).

Seeing the great importance of grammar to language learners, one would normally think that grammar teaching is a must in the language classroom. However, in actuality, verdicts on the necessity of grammar instruction are less unanimous than those on the role of grammar in language learning. There have been some notions that are against grammar instruction, one of which is Krashen’s. He hypothesized that attention to forms is irrelevant to learners’ acquisition of a second language (Krashen, 1981). Krashen’s notion is also supported by some scholars in cognitive linguistics such as Schwartz and Gubala-Ryzak (1992), Schwartz (1993), and Zobl (1995).

However, it should be noted that the arguments against grammar instruction are without the backing of strong empirical evidence. Some other scholars and researchers believe that grammar instruction is beneficial to language learners. Explicit instruction is seen as a suitable approach for the acquisition of grammatical structures and rules (Ellis, 2001; Nassaji & Fotos, 2004; Skehan, 1998). In addition, attention to forms can facilitate language learning (Doughty, 2001). Research has also shown that explicit grammar instruction leads to greater learning gains (Doughty, 1991; Fotos, 1993; Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Nassaji & Swain, 2000; Tamega-Helmantel, Arends, & Canrinus, 2014), which further supports the notion that grammar instruction is important and should not be discarded.
We can see from the above information that although there have been arguments against the necessity of grammar instruction, evidence from previous research studies and the fact that grammar lessons are a common practice in the language classroom as well as in many language learning coursebooks indicate that grammar instruction plays a vital role in language teaching and learning. Therefore, it can be said that grammar instruction is a research topic that is worthy of investigation.

1.2 Deductive and Inductive Grammar Teaching

Within the topic of grammar instruction, there are controversies as to how grammar lessons should be carried out, especially the one concerning whether deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches should be used. Regarding the differences between these two types of approaches, the most important factor that distinguishes the two is the way in which grammatical structures and rules are treated; grammar teaching methods that involve the explanation of grammatical structures and rules followed by examples are placed within deductive approaches, whereas inductive approaches consist of methods that encourage students to guess structures and rules from provided examples (DeKeyser, 1995; Jean & Simard, 2013; Thornbury, 1999).

There have been numerous research studies that aimed to answer the question of which type of approach is more effective, but so far a conclusive answer has yet to be reached as the findings yielded from these studies are varied. While some studies found that deductive grammar teaching approaches lead to greater learning gains (Erlam, 2003; Robinson, 1996), the results of some other studies are in favor of inductive approaches (Montazeran, Asadi, & Maghsoudi, 2014; Rokni, 2009; Vogel, Herron, Cole, & York, 2011).
Seeing such variety in the findings of these studies, some scholars such as Ellis (2006) have suggested changing the direction of deductive versus inductive approaches research from simply gauging the effectiveness of these two types of grammar teaching approaches through quasi-experimental studies to investigating the factors that can have influences on which type of approach to use, thus finding out which type works best in which teaching situation. Some suggestions have been given as to what these factors are: (1) the complexity of target grammatical structures (Fischer, 1979; Jean & Simard, 2013), (2) learners’ age (Jean & Simard, 2013), (3) learners’ language proficiency level (Jean & Simard, 2013), (4) learners’ aptitude for analyzing grammatical structures (Ellis, 2006), and (5) learners’ preferred learning styles (Ellis, 2008).

So far, there has been relatively little research that examines these factors, at least to my knowledge. It is likely that further research into this matter will provide valuable insights into the effects of these factors on the choice of grammar teaching approaches, thus enabling us to have a deeper understanding of the issue of deductive versus inductive approaches.

1.3 Aims of the Study

Seeing the importance of having more research into the factors that can influence the choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches, the present study aimed to investigate the possible relationships between the five factors that were mentioned above and EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive teaching approaches. However, since the resources of the present study were limited, it was not possible to examine all these five factors; instead, the scope of the study was narrowed down to only three factors: (1) target structures’ complexity, (2) learners’ proficiency level, and (3) learners’ age.
The context of the present study was set in Vietnam. There were two reasons for this choice. The first reason was that since the researcher is of Vietnamese nationality, it would be easier and more practical to carry out studies within the home country of the researcher. The other reason was the fact that research centering around deductive and inductive approaches seems to be lacking in the context of Vietnam.

1.4 Organization of the Thesis

In conclusion, this chapter has presented the significance of research into grammar teaching as well as the necessity for further investigation into the factors that can affect the choice of deductive or inductive approaches to grammar teaching. Detailed information about the present study will be given in the following chapters. Particularly, Chapter 2 will discuss in more detail the previous literature related to the subject matter of the present study and introduce the research questions; Chapter 3 will provide a detailed description of the methods used for the data collection phase, the actual instruments, and the collection procedures; Chapter 4 will provide details concerning the methods for data analysis as well as present the results of the present study; the detailed discussions of these results will be provided in Chapter 5; and finally, Chapter 6 will present a summary of the study together with its limitations and recommendations for future research.
The previous chapter introduced the subject matter of the present study, the research gap it set out to fill, and its general aims. In this chapter, the previous literature on the subject under investigation that was mentioned in the first chapter will be discussed in more detail so as to provide a clearer description of the theoretical justification that drove the present study. The chapter concludes with the statement of the research questions that were formulated in order to fulfill the aims of the study.

2.1 Grammar and the Importance of Grammar

Although it can be said that grammar is a familiar concept to most if not all people involved in the field of language teaching and learning, the notion of what grammar consists of may be more complex than one would think. For this reason, before venturing into the arguments concerning the benefits of grammar and the necessity of grammar teaching, I deemed it necessary to revisit the previous literature regarding the definition of grammar.

When the word “grammar” is uttered, we normally think of the study of forms and structures in a language; however, according to Larsen-Freeman’s (2001) framework, form/structure is just one of the three dimensions of grammar, with the other two being meaning/semantics and use/pragmatics. In this framework, form/structure concerns the rules governing the formation of grammatical structures and the arrangements of these structures in a sentence or text; meaning/semantics concerns the meanings of these grammatical structures; and
use/pragmatics concerns the contexts where these structures are used. Larsen-Freeman’s framework is in line with the notion of Thornbury (1999), who defined grammar as the study of (1) the morpho-syntactic features of a structure, (2) the meanings expressed by this structure, and (3) the functions of this structure in particular contexts.

From the information presented above, it can be seen that grammar is a multi-layered concept; however, in order to narrow down its focus, the present study only concentrated on the notion that grammar is the study of how forms and structures are constructed. Moreover, the study only examined grammar at the sentence level, although it does exist at the word and text levels. This decision was due to the fact that conventional grammar teaching has mainly concerned grammar at the level of the sentence (Thornbury, 1999).

It should also be noted that the type of grammar examined in the present study was written grammar rather than spoken grammar. It is a known fact that written grammar is different from spoken grammar with the latter normally being less formal than the former. Some of the differences between these two types of grammar were mentioned in Thornbury (1999); for instance, while written grammar can involve the use of syntactically complex structures like the passive voice or subordinate clauses, spoken grammar may contain features that are considered erroneous in written language such as the omission of subjects or the use of two subjects in a sentence.

With the question of what grammar is out of the way, we can now turn to the question of how important it is. Thornbury (1999) called grammar a “sentence-making machine” as it provides language users with the tools to generate a large number of original sentences from a limited number of lexical items (p. 15); this is extremely beneficial to language learners since even native speakers cannot possibly remember all of the lexical items in a language, let alone...
memorizing different combinations of these items, which are potentially limitless. Besides providing language learners with a means to produce sentences, the knowledge of grammar can help them enhance their ability to deliver messages in an intelligible and appropriate way (Thornbury, 1999), which is especially important in written communication where the negotiation of meaning is generally lacking. This view is supported by Widodo (2006), who claimed that the knowledge of grammatical forms, structures, and rules allows language learners to precisely grasp the messages in written text and in turn provide written input that can be understood by other people. In addition, Larsen-Freeman (2001) asserted there is an agreement among educators that communicative competence involves speaking and writing accurately as well as delivering meanings in an appropriate way; logically, a good knowledge of grammar is needed in order to perform these feats. From the information presented above, it can be concluded that grammatical knowledge plays a vital role in the development of learners’ second language.

Normally, the substantial role of grammatical knowledge would lead to the belief that lessons should be given to learners in order to help them take advantage of the benefits that grammar brings. However, there have been conflicting views regarding the teaching of grammar; at one extreme, it is believed that grammar should be the core of language teaching, whereas at the other extreme, some scholars advise against grammar instruction (Celce-Murcia, 1985). The question of whether or not grammar should be taught will be dealt with in the next section.

2.2 The Necessity of Grammar Teaching

Before we venture into the debate regarding whether or not explicit grammar instruction should be given, let us revisit the definition of grammar teaching. According to Ellis (2006),
grammar teaching is the process of drawing learners’ attention towards the rules and patterns underlying particular grammatical structures, which enables them to understand and form items of language that contain these structures. As seen from this definition, grammar teaching is by nature an explicit process where learning involves an awareness of what is being learned, not an implicit process where learners are not aware of what they are learning (DeKeyser, 1995).

The scholars who question the necessity of grammar teaching mainly base their arguments on the belief that learners acquire a second language implicitly through exposure to meaningful input rather than explicitly through attention to forms. One notable figure among these scholars is Krashen, who claimed there is no evidence to suggest that attention to forms needs to take place in order to enable learners to acquire the language (Krashen, 1981). To support his claim, Krashen argued that there have been instances of language learners who still make grammatical mistakes despite having consciously revised these structures many times and also instances of those who are able to use various complex structures without conscious learning. These cases provide a vivid illustration of the notion that explicit instruction has little to do with the acquisition of a second language and “explicit information about the language, and mechanical drill, may be the least important contributions the second language classroom makes” (Krashen, 1981, p. 116).

In support of Krashen’s view, Schwartz and Gubala-Ryzak (1992) stated that negative data (information regarding what is considered ungrammatical in a language), which are an important component of explicit grammar instruction, cannot cause the restructuring of interlanguage grammar, the system in the human brain that governs learners’ language production. In order to provide an explanation for his claim, Schwartz (1993) argued that unlike meaningful input, negative data are not linguistic information, and thus they cannot be fed into
the language faculty within the human brain. In addition, Zobl (1995) stipulated that the ways in which first and second language learners acquire a language are similar; as first language learners do not require explicit forms instruction to be able to use a language, neither do second language learners.

However, it is to be noted that my review of previous literature did not find any research study that shows the omission of explicit grammar instruction brings more benefits to language learners, which seems to corroborate the observation of Richards (1985) that there is a lack of actual empirical evidence to prove language classrooms where forms instruction is excluded lead to better learning gains than traditional classrooms with a focus on forms. Moreover, the cases of some language learners being able to use difficult structures without the grammatical knowledge of these structures that were mentioned in Krashen (1981) are just anecdotal evidence; there also exists anecdotal evidence that shows a lack of attention to forms can lead to learners using a broken and ungrammatical version of the target language, thus hampering their learning progress (Celce-Murcia, 1991). These factors inevitably make the arguments against grammar instruction less convincing.

On the other hand, explicit form instruction has also received support from many prominent scholars. Doughty (2001) stated that the cognitive awareness of structures facilitates the processing for language learning. Ellis (2001) asserted that explicit instruction suits the nature of grammatical structures and has lasting effects on language learners. Regarding the form-versus-meaning argument, Skehan (1998) argued that it is generally difficult for learners to pay attention to both the meanings and grammatical structures of the language input simultaneously; hence, the idea of acquiring grammatical patterns through natural input might not work for many learners. In support of this notion, Nassaji and Fotos (2004) argued that
language learners should be made aware of grammatical forms since they normally only pay attention to the meanings of language input, and thus unwittingly neglect the patterns underlying the input.

Unlike the arguments against explicit grammar instruction, the views in favor of this approach to language teaching have also received backing from various research studies. In the study by Lightbown and Spada (1990) on French students’ development of oral English, it was found that the students who were exposed to more form-focused instruction achieved higher accuracy in using English grammatical structures than the others. The same situation was reported in Doughty (1991), where the improvement on the use of relative clauses of the students who received both explicit instruction and relevant examples was significantly greater than that of the students who were exposed to examples only. Another study by Fotos (1993) found that most of the students who were taught only through communicative tasks did not notice the grammatical structures in the language input. The results of the study by Nassaji and Swain (2000) on the effects of corrective feedback on language development showed that explicit feedback was more effective in helping the learner in the study correct her errors than implicit feedback. Last but not least, a recent large-scale study by Tamega-Helmantel et al. (2014), which investigated the effects of different types of grammar instruction on students’ performance, found that in some cases, explicit instruction was observed to be more effective than other types of grammar instruction.

We have seen from the information presented above that regarding the necessity of grammar instruction, there are two main schools of thought. On one side, some scholars question the need to focus on forms and structures and favor teaching approaches based on natural input; on the other side, some other prominent figures defend grammar teaching by outlining the
benefits that forms instruction brings to language learners. We have also seen that only the latter school of thought has the backing of empirical evidence, which shows explicit forms instruction enhances learning gains. For this reason, it can be concluded that grammar teaching is necessary, and “no one should dismiss grammar instruction altogether” (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 462).

Within the topic of grammar instruction, there are two types of teaching approaches, namely deductive and inductive, which have attracted the attention of many scholars and researchers in the field of language teaching and learning. The definitions of these particular types of approaches together with the arguments centering around them will given and discussed in the next section.

### 2.3 Deductive and Inductive Approaches to Grammar Teaching

Regarding the definitions of deductive and inductive approaches, according to Thornbury (1999, p. 29), “a deductive approach starts with the presentation of a rule and is followed by examples in which the rule is applied”, while “an inductive approach starts with some examples from which a rule is inferred”; these definitions are in line with those given by DeKeyser (1995). Rather than being fixed, both deductive and inductive approaches can take different forms. According to Jean and Simard (2013), deductive grammar activities can range from being more controlled like the direct presentation of grammatical rules followed by mechanical drill to being less controlled like teachers highlighting the rules and students practicing them in communicative exercises; similarly, inductive grammar activities can take various forms such as guided questions, awareness-raising tasks, and students guessing the rules from well-prepared examples. Despite such variety, the two types of approaches can be clearly distinguished by one feature, namely the way in which grammatical rules are treated; in deductive approaches, these
rules are given directly by the teacher, whereas in inductive approaches, they are discovered by students through examples (Jean & Simard, 2013).

It should be noted that while deductive approaches are obviously explicit, inductive approaches can be either explicit or implicit (DeKeyser, 1995), depending on whether or not students are made aware of the grammatical rules being learned during the process of inferring them (Jean & Simard, 2013). This complex nature of inductive approaches may lead to the confusion of whether or not these approaches can be considered grammar instruction since students may not be aware of the rules and structures they are learning. Therefore, in order to avoid such confusion, the present study decided to restrict the term “inductive approaches” to grammar learning activities where students have an awareness of what they are learning.

As we can see from the definitions above, deductive approaches and inductive approaches are very different from each other, and many scholars and researchers have been pondering over the question of which type of approach is more effective. Numerous research studies have been carried out to compare the effectiveness of these two types of grammar teaching approaches, but so far the answer is inconclusive. On the one hand, the findings of some studies favor deductive approaches to grammar teaching. The study by Robinson (1996) on the effects of four different instructional methods on the ability of non-native learners to acquire a set of both simple and complex grammatical rules found that the students who received direct instruction performed significantly better than the students who learned the rules through rule-search activities. The same situation was observed in the study by Erlam (2003), which compared the effectiveness of deductive instruction in the form of rule explanation and inductive instruction in the form of hypothesis testing in helping secondary school students understand direct object pronouns in French; the results came out in favor of deductive approaches.
On the other hand, inductive grammar teaching was observed to be more effective than deductive grammar teaching in some studies. One such study by Rokni (2009) with the participation of 110 Iranian EFL students found that the students who were treated with inductive instruction scored significantly higher in the tests about the English relative clauses than those treated with deductive instruction. The results from the study of Vogel et al. (2011) are also in favor of inductive approaches, as the students receiving guided inductive instruction performed better in the lessons about 10 French grammatical rules than those who received the more traditional deductive instruction. Last but not least, Montazeran et al. (2014) also asserted that inductive approaches are the more effective of the two types of approaches as the results of their study showed a greater gain of knowledge about the English countable and uncountable nouns for the students exposed to inductive instruction.

As illustrated in the examples above, a consensus as to which of the two types of grammar teaching approaches, deductive or inductive, is more effective has yet to be reached and the arguments centering around the effectiveness of these two types of approaches will likely to remain in the future. As suggested by Ellis (2006), it is possible that the differences in the results of the studies mentioned above were due to the factors that can influence grammar teaching rather than the approaches themselves. Some researchers and scholars have given suggestions as to what these factors are:

- The complexity of target grammatical structures (Fischer, 1979; Jean & Simard, 2013).
- Learners’ age (Jean & Simard, 2013).
- Learners’ language proficiency level (Jean & Simard, 2013).
- Learners’ aptitude for analyzing grammatical structures (Ellis, 2006).
• Learners’ preferred learning styles (Ellis, 2008).

Of all these factors, structures’ complexity seems to be the only one that has been examined in detail. Fischer (1979) hypothesized that while inductive approaches can be used when teaching simpler grammatical structures, deductive approaches are the better choice for more complex structures. This view is corroborated by Hall’s (1998) claim that explicit and deductive instruction works better for grammatical rules and patterns that are complicated and subtle to foreign language learners. The results of Chernovaty’s (1990) study also confirm the notion that deductive grammar approaches should be used when teaching complex structures and rules.

Overall, it appears that except for the case of structures’ complexity, research that looks into the possible factors affecting the choice of deductive or inductive approaches is still relatively scarce, especially when compared with the studies on the effectiveness of these two types of approaches to grammar teaching. It is, therefore, reasonable to suggest that more research into the factors that can affect teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive approaches in grammar instruction is needed. In an effort to fill this research gap, the present study examined how the factors mentioned above influence the choice of Vietnamese EFL teachers regarding whether deductive or inductive approaches should be used for teaching grammar. Details about the aims and the research questions formulated for the present study will be given in the next section.

2.4 Research Aims and Questions

In this chapter, we have seen that while there have been arguments against the necessity of grammar teaching, many studies have shown the positive effects of forms instruction on
learners’ development of the target language; therefore, it is safe to conclude that explicit grammar instruction is still an important part of language teaching and learning. We have also seen that the question of whether deductive or inductive approaches, two popular types of grammar teaching approaches, are more effective is without a conclusive answer since previous research showed mixed results. Rather than continuing to dwell on this matter, it may be better to investigate the factors that can affect the choice of deductive or inductive approaches in grammar teaching. So far, few studies have looked into this matter, which makes this a possible research gap for the present study.

Based on this research gap, the present study set out to examine Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches and the possible influences of some factors related to grammar teaching on this choice. Due to the limited resources of the present study and the intangible nature of learners’ grammar analysis aptitude and learners’ preferred learning styles, I decided to only focus on the three factors: (1) the complexity of target grammatical structures, (2) learners’ language proficiency level and (3) learners’ age.

To fulfill the aims of the present study, the following research questions were formulated:

Q1. Which of the two types of approaches to grammar teaching, namely deductive and inductive, is more favored by Vietnamese EFL teachers?

Q2. Do the three factors related to grammar teaching – (1) target structures’ complexity, (2) learners’ language proficiency level (elementary / intermediate / advanced), and (3) learners’ age (children / teenagers / adults) – influence Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice?
Q3. If these three factors are found to have impacts on Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice, which factor has greater influence than the others?

In conclusion, this chapter has presented detailed reviews and discussions of previous literature on deductive and inductive approaches to grammar teaching, leading to a research gap for the present study. Additionally, this chapter has presented the aims of the present study together with its formulated research questions. Details concerning the design of the study will be given in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In the previous chapter, relevant literature on the topic discussed by the present study was reviewed, leading to the formation of research aims and questions. This chapter will provide information on the research design that was used to fulfill these aims and answer these questions. In particular, this chapter will describe in detail the data collection methods used in the present study together with theoretical justification, the participants of the study, the actual instruments used in the data collection process, and the procedures of this process. Additionally, in order to show the link between the research design and the purposes of the study, the research aims and questions will be restated at the beginning of this chapter.

3.1 Summary of Research Aims and Questions

The aims of the present study were to examine Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches and to find out whether or not their choice is influenced by some grammar teaching factors. In particular, the study investigated (1) whether deductive or inductive approaches are preferred by Vietnamese EFL teachers, (2) whether or not the teachers’ choice of approaches is influenced by the three factors: structures’ complexity / learners’ proficiency level / learners’ age, and (3) which factor is the most influential in case they are all found to have impacts on the teachers’ choice.

3.2 Research Methods and Theoretical Justification
It is of great importance that the research methods chosen for a study fit its purposes and aims as this will ensure harmony in theory and practice (Riazi & Candlin, 2014). Therefore, careful thought and consideration should be given when choosing methods for collecting and analyzing data, and this process should be theoretically informed. One important consideration regarding how to approach a research problem is within which research paradigm should the study be placed. Traditionally, research studies were either quantitative or qualitative and the advocates of these two paradigms have been in conflict with each other. The proponents of quantitative research state that qualitative approaches are imprecise, potentially subjective, and unsuitable for making generalizations, whereas those who support qualitative research express doubt about quantitative methods’ ability to capture the complex nature of reality and social phenomena (Riazi & Candlin, 2014). Amidst this debate, the emergence of the mixed-methods paradigm can be the key to resolving the conflict between quantitative and qualitative research. Many scholars call for the combination of quantitative and qualitative methods in order to maximize their strengths and minimize their weaknesses (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004), which can lead to greater comprehension of the object under investigation (Riazi & Candlin, 2014). Understanding the great benefits of incorporating both quantitative and qualitative methods in the investigation, the present study was placed within the mixed-methods paradigm so as to achieve a better understanding of the phenomena related to the topic of the study.

Regarding the particular data collection method used in the present study, as the aims were to determine whether Vietnamese EFL teachers prefer deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches and whether their preference is influenced by some factors related to grammar teaching, surveys seemed to be an appropriate choice. According to Dörnyei and Csizér (2012), surveys are a useful tool for investigating various language-related issues, including
participants’ behavior and feelings, and for generalizing these data to a larger population. On a practical note, the use of surveys is also advantageous since the technique allows researchers to obtain a large amount of data in a short time with little cost (Dörnyei, 2003, as cited in McKay, 2005, p. 35). On the other hand, it should be noted that survey research also has drawbacks. Two main disadvantages of the practice are the potential unreliability of the information given by participants and the fact that participants may provide responses which are very superficial or simple (McKay, 2005). Nevertheless, the numerous benefits of survey research make it a popular choice for social science researchers.

As mentioned earlier, the present study followed the mixed-methods paradigm, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative approaches in the investigation; hence, besides finding out Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches, the study also explored the rationale behind their choice. Normally, interviews, which are the most common method for eliciting information from participants in qualitative classroom-based and mixed-methods research (Friedman, 2012), would be the most appropriate option for achieving this aim. However, due to a practical issue, interviews were not possible for the present study. As all of the teachers participating in the present study worked for different institutes at the same time, their schedules were hectic, leading to their unwillingness to participate in further interview sessions. Therefore, open-ended survey questions were instead chosen to find out Vietnamese EFL teachers’ reasons for choosing deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches. Although the practice has many advantages such as being easy to implement, allowing participants more time to answer, and saving researchers the transcription process, it also has several drawbacks, including the fact that participants’ responses may be limited and cannot be clarified or followed up (Friedman, 2012). Nonetheless, open-ended
questionnaires are an adequate alternative to interviews, and it is fair to say that practicality should take precedence in the design of a research study.

3.3 Participants

The present study was conducted with the participation of the Vietnamese EFL teachers working for a large English language school in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. This institute, which has more than 10 branches in the city, is specialized in providing English language courses for a wide range of learners: from young children to working individuals, from elementary to advanced level students, and from those learning English for practical purposes to those who simply want to enrich their knowledge of the language. With such a variety of learners’ backgrounds, the language school was a suitable place for the present study’s investigation, which aimed to find out Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches in different teaching contexts and to determine whether there are significant relationships between their choice and teaching factors such as learners’ age and learners’ level of proficiency. At the behest of the school’s director, the name of the school will not be mentioned in this thesis report in order to protect the anonymity of the teachers participating in the study.

Sampling is a factor of great importance in conducting a research study. Dörnyei and Csizér (2012) provided detailed guidelines on the sampling techniques used in survey research, which was the data collection method employed by the present study. According to Dörnyei and Csizér, the generalizability of a survey research study is optimal when it employs probability sampling, which involves complex and expensive procedures to create a sample that can truly represent a larger population. However, as noted by Dörnyei and Csizér, this sampling technique
is normally outside the reach of applied linguistic researchers; therefore, the alternative, namely non-probability sampling, is usually used. One particularly effective non-probability sampling method is stratified random sampling, which involves dividing the population into different groups and filling these groups with random samples of proportionate sizes. Effective as it is, this sampling method was unfortunately also beyond the reach of the present study since I did not possess the means and resources necessary to reach out to every working Vietnamese EFL teacher; thus, random sampling had to be ruled out. Instead, the present study opted for convenience sampling, choosing participants who were readily available and accessible.

Although it can be said that this sampling method is not as effective as the others, it is normally the only feasible option for research studies whose resources are meager like the present study.

Regarding the participants, 34 Vietnamese EFL teachers took part in the present study’s investigation. The majority of these participants (79.4 percent) were female, and there was some variety in the participants’ ages and years of work experience. These details are provided in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 3.1, a large proportion of the participants belonged to the 25 – 29, 30 – 34, and 20 – 24 age groups (35.3, 17.6, and 14.7 percent respectively), accounting for roughly two thirds of the sample. This indicates that the present study’s sample was relatively young.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the participants’ years of experience, which are shown in Table 3.2, it is not a surprise that the majority of the participants (73.6 percent) had 10 or fewer years of experience, given the fact that the sample was relatively young. Those who had worked as EFL teachers for 1 to 5 years accounted for 47.1 percent of the sample, and those who had worked for 6 to 10 years accounted for 26.5 percent.

To my knowledge, there has yet to be a study investigating the demography of Vietnamese EFL teachers working in Vietnam; therefore, it is difficult to evaluate the representability of the present study’s sample. However, with my experience working as an EFL teacher for five different private language centers in Vietnam, I can say that the sample of the study to some extent can represent a larger population of Vietnamese EFL teachers working for private institutes. These institutes tend to favor female teachers when it comes to teaching adolescents, and these learners normally make up the majority of the students at these institutes. Moreover, young EFL teachers, especially those whose work experience is lacking, seem to
prefer private institutes as a place to start and develop their career since these educational establishments normally provide an optimal teaching environment where these fresh teachers can experiment with different teaching methods and gain experience; therefore, it is not surprising to see young teachers occupying a substantial proportion of the line-up of EFL instructors at private language centers. Nevertheless, it should be remembered that the above are just anecdotal evidence and thus are potentially inaccurate; moreover, even if this evidence turns out to be true, it may not be applicable to the context of public schools. Therefore, the generalizability of the present study’s sample is bound to be questioned.

3.4 Instruments

The instrument used in the present study was a questionnaire consisting of two parts. The first part, which comprises three fill-in questions, was used to collect the participants’ demographic information, namely their gender, age, and years of work experience. The data that were necessary for answering the research questions posted for the present study were gathered through the second part of the questionnaire. This part consists of 6 sets of questions which follow the same format. In each set of questions, the participants are required to choose either deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches for each of the provided teaching situations and also give a brief explanation for their choice. These teaching situations were designed based on the three grammar teaching factors – (1) target structures’ complexity, (2) learners’ proficiency level, and (3) learners’ age – which previous literature has claimed to have impacts on teachers’ choice of approaches (please refer back to Chapter 2, Section 2.3 – Deductive and Inductive Approaches to Grammar Teaching). In addition, the definitions of deductive and inductive approaches (called “Method A” and “Method B” respectively in the questionnaire) are
provided at the beginning of the second part in order for the participants to know clearly about the options they are given. These definitions were based on those given in previous literature (DeKeyser, 1995; Jean & Simard, 2013; Thornbury; 1999) but were simplified for ease of understanding.

The first set of questions investigates the participants’ choice of deductive or inductive approaches when teaching grammatical structures of different degrees of complexity. One problem was encountered during the design of this set, which was finding a way to determine whether a structure is simple or complex. According to Robinson (1996), there is no clear criteria for distinguishing the complexity of structures in a second language. Consequently, the present study had to devise a method for differentiating between simple and complex structures, which is counting the number of moves needed to generate a structure in terms of generative grammar. Logically speaking, complex structures would require more moves than simple ones. After some consideration, the two structures “Present Continuous” and “Reported Speech (yes-no question)” were chosen for the first set of questions since there is a large difference in the number of moves required to generate these structures. The Present Continuous structure only requires two moves: (1) choosing the appropriate “to be” verb and (2) adding the suffix “-ing” to the main verb, whereas five moves are required to generate the Reported Speech (yes-no question) structure: (1) adding “whether/if”, (2) changing pronouns and possessive adjectives, (3) changing word order, (4) changing tenses, (5) changing the words that describe place and time. Subsequent discussions with experienced EFL teachers also confirmed this choice with all of the teachers agreeing that Present Continuous is a simple structure and Reported Speech (yes-no question) is a much more complex one.
The second and third sets of questions examine the participants’ choice of teaching approaches when teaching students of different levels of proficiency (elementary / intermediate / advanced) and different ages (children / teenagers / adults). The remaining sets of questions were used to find out which among the three teaching factors investigated – structures’ complexity, level of proficiency, and age – has the greatest impact on the participants’ choice, assuming that the impacts of these factors are all significant. In order to investigate this matter, comparisons were made between the factors. In each set of questions, one factor is fixed and the other acts as an independent variable; if statistical analysis finds that there is a significant relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable (teaching approaches), then the factor acting as the independent variable has a greater influence on the participants’ choice; Otherwise, it is the fixed factor which has a greater influence. An example of these sets of questions is provided in Figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1

Example of Questionnaire Questions

4. You have to teach reported speech (yes-no questions) to different student groups of different proficiency levels:
   - a group of elementary learners (levels A1 – A2) □ A □ B
   - a group of intermediate learners (levels B1 – B2) □ A □ B
   - a group of advanced learners (level C1) □ A □ B

In this set of questions, the factor “structures’ complexity” is fixed since only the complex structure (reported speech – yes-no question) is included, whereas the factors “level of proficiency” and “teaching approaches” act as independent and dependent variables respectively. If it is found that the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable is significant, then “level of proficiency” is more influential than “structures’ complexity” as the
participants ignored the latter factor. Similarly, if this relationship is not significant, then “structures’ complexity” has a greater influence than the other factor.

For a complete sample of the questionnaire utilized in the present study, please refer to Appendix B.

One additional issue related to the design of the questionnaire was the translation of its contents into the participants’ first language, Vietnamese. Translating questionnaires is a common practice in survey research that can enhance the quality of the data gathered from the respondents (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012). It was also noted by Dörnyei and Csizér that researchers may face the dilemma of having to choose between close translation and text naturalness; fortunately, this problem was not encountered during the process of translating the contents of the present study’s questionnaire.

The last stage in the instrument design was piloting the questionnaire. Piloting helps researchers fine-tune their questionnaires for the official data collection process by offering numerous benefits such as eliminating irrelevancy and ambiguity in item design and improving the clarity of instructions (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012). The piloting stage of the present study involved the aid of four of my Vietnamese colleagues who were working as EFL teachers just like the intended participants of the study. Some useful suggestions regarding the wording of the questions and the overall format were provided by these colleagues that helped me improve the design of the questionnaire, thus enhancing the effectiveness of the data collection process.

3.5 Procedures

The data collection phase was carried out with the help of the director of the language school where the present study took place. After discussing with the director about the benefits
and the significance of the investigation and gaining his permission to conduct the survey, I was asked to provide a brief written description of the project together with a sample of the consent form (please refer to Appendix A for details about the consent form) so that he could mail these documents to all of the Vietnamese EFL teachers working at the school in order to look for potential participants. The director also helped to obtain the signatures of those who agreed to take part in the study and sent back the consent forms along with the list of the participants’ email addresses. After the consent forms had been checked to make sure that they were all in order, a web-based version of the questionnaire used in the present study was sent to each of the participants through email. The platform on which the online questionnaire was created was Google Forms, which is popular for its user-friendly interface. The answers of the participants were recorded and stored in my personal database on Google Forms. Once all of the participants had submitted their responses to the questionnaire, a record of the answers was generated for analysis using the features available on Google Forms.

In conclusion, this chapter has linked the research aims and questions of the present study to the research design. In addition, the chapter has provided detailed descriptions of the participants of the study, the instrument used for obtaining data from these participants, and the data collection process. In the following chapter, details concerning the methods for data analysis and the results of this process will be given.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The previous chapter provided a detailed description of the research design of the present study as well as the theoretical justification for the design. In this chapter, details concerning the methods used for data analysis and the actual results obtained from analyzing the information gathered from the data collection stage of the present study will be presented. In addition, to show the connections between the research purposes, design, and results, a brief summary of the research aims, questions, and also methodology will be given at the beginning of this chapter.

4.1 Summary of Research Aims, Questions, and Methodology

The present study aimed to investigate Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches and examine whether their choice is influenced by some factors related to grammar teaching. In particular, the study investigated (1) whether deductive or inductive approaches are preferred by Vietnamese EFL teachers, (2) whether or not the teachers’ choice of approaches is influenced by the three factors: structures’ complexity / learners’ proficiency level / learners’ age, and (3) which factor is the most influential in case they are all found to have impacts on the teachers’ choice.

Regarding research methodology, the present study was placed within the mixed-methods paradigm and employed survey research design. A questionnaire which contains both close-ended and open-ended questions was given to 34 Vietnamese EFL teachers working for a large language institute in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The survey was carried out online using the
Google Forms platform, and the responses of the participants were recorded and stored in my personal database on the platform before being extracted for analysis.

4.2 Methods for Data Analysis

Since the present study’s questionnaire consists of both close-ended and open-ended questions, both quantitative and qualitative analytical methods were employed to make sense of the data gathered from the participants. Quantitative analysis was carried out with the help of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), one of the most popular software packages for conducting statistical analysis; the version used in the present study was IBM SPSS Statistics 20. On the other hand, qualitative analysis was carried out manually through a word processor program (Microsoft Word).

Regarding the particular methods for analyzing the quantitative data from the present study’s survey, descriptive statistics in the form of percentages were used to analyze and describe the participants’ demographic information, the results of which have been presented in detail in Chapter 3, Section 3.3 – Participants. Percentages were also used to present the results for the first research question, which investigates whether deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches are more favored by the participants. The use of percentages can help to show the preferences of the participants regarding teaching approaches in a clear and illustrative manner. The process of calculating the figures for the first research question began with counting the numbers of times when a participant in the study chose deductive approaches and when he/she chose inductive approaches. This process was then repeated with all of the responses given by other participants to obtain the total sums of the choices for deductive approaches and
the choices for inductive approaches. These figures were then used to calculate the respective percentages using the features of SPSS so as to answer the first research question.

For the second research question, which investigates the possible relationships between the choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches and the factors related to grammar teaching, the analytical process involved two stages. Firstly, the participants’ choices of deductive and inductive approaches in each of the first three sets of questions of the second part of the present study’s questionnaire were counted separately and presented in percentages in order to show their preferences in different teaching situations. Subsequently, inferential statistical analysis in the form of chi-square tests was used to determine whether the relationships between the participants’ choice of teaching approaches and the three grammar teaching factors – target structures’ complexity, learners’ proficiency level, and learners’ age – are significant. The chi-square test, which is a useful tool for finding out whether two categorical variables are related (Larson-Hall, 2012), was the most appropriate choice for answering the second research question since the independent variables (structures’ complexity, learners’ proficiency level, and learners’ age) and the dependent variable (teaching approaches) were all categorical in the present study, and the study sought to examine the possible relationships between these variables. As noted by Larson-Hall (2012), the use of chi-square tests is not possible when there are cells with a count of less than 5 in the contingency table (the table displaying the counts for all of the combinations of the variables under investigation); in this case, alternative statistical tests should be used instead. The present study made use of Fisher’s exact tests, which can return a p-value showing whether there is a significant relationship between two variables (Larson-Hall, 2012), to counter this potential problem.
The same analytical procedures were applied in answering the third research question, which investigates which of the examined teaching factors has the greatest influence. Descriptive statistical analysis in the form of percentages was performed with the data gathered from the responses of the participants for the last three question sets of the second part of the present study’s questionnaire, which was followed by inferential statistical analysis in the form of chi-square tests and the alternative Fisher’s exact tests should the need arise. These statistical tests can help to show whether there are significant relationships between the independent and dependent variables, thus determining whether the fixed factor is more influential than the other factor in each set of questions (please refer back to Chapter 3, Section 3.4 – Instrument for the rationale behind the design of the last three question sets of the second part of the questionnaire).

For all of the chi-square and Fisher’s exact tests performed in the present study, the cut-off point for establishing statistical significance was set at $\alpha = .05$, which is a common practice in educational research (Creswell, 2012, p. 188).

Regarding the analysis of the qualitative data in the present study, namely the explanations given by the participants for their choices of grammar teaching approaches, qualitative coding was employed. According to Baralt (2012), qualitative coding is the continuous process of re-reading and interacting with the data in order to find out their patterns to explain the nature of phenomena. Unlike quantitative coding in which coding schemes are normally predetermined before the coding process (the top-down approach), for qualitative coding, codes and patterns are generated and identified as researchers enter the coding process (the bottom-up approach) (Révész, 2012). In the present study, the reasons given by the participants for their choice of grammar teaching approaches were read, compared, and contrasted multiple times in order to identify the patterns in their responses. Scholars such as
Baralt (2012) have recommended using the Computer-Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS) to facilitate the coding process as these software packages offer a variety of benefits concerning the management and coding of data. Unfortunately, since these software packages were not available to the present study, manual coding through a word processor program was used instead.

During the coding process, attention needs to be paid to the validity (whether the codes assigned are valid and accurate) and reliability (whether the codes assigned are consistent) of the process. In Creswell (2012, pp. 259-260), three main techniques for enhancing the validity and reliability (called “accuracy” and “credibility” in the book) of qualitative analyses were proposed, which are (1) triangulating data through different collection methods, (2) checking results with participants, and (3) getting feedback from people outside the project. Unfortunately, the first two techniques were not possible for the present study due to the unwillingness of the participants to take part in other collection processes besides the survey and further discussions. Nevertheless, the study managed to enlist the help of a highly experienced EFL teacher who is familiar with educational research to give feedback on the results of the coding process. This teacher first helped to decide which of the participants’ responses should be included in the analysis and which should be discarded; subsequently, discussions were carried out with the teacher to determine which parts of the results of the first coding process need amendments. This practice helped to enhance the validity and reliability of the coding procedures. It should be noted that errors that arise during the coding process may also come from less systematic sources such as fatigue, boredom, and technical problems like typing errors (Révész, 2012). Taking note of this issue, the coding process of the present study was carried out gradually and carefully in order to minimize these errors.
It is to be noted that some participants did not provide rationale for their choice of teaching approaches; also, a large number of responses (64 out of the original 129 responses) had to be discarded because they were vague, ambiguous, and did not contribute useful data to the study. For example, regarding the third question set, which asks the participants to choose grammar teaching approaches when teaching learners of different age groups, one participant gave the reason for his/her choice as “suitable for different age groups”; this response was not helpful for the study as the participant did not explain clearly why such a choice of approaches is suitable for these age groups.

### 4.3 Participants’ Overall Preferences for Teaching Approaches

Table 4.1 shows the total numbers of choices made by the participants for deductive and inductive grammar teaching approaches together with their respective percentages. As seen from the table, inductive approaches were clearly more popular with the participants with nearly two thirds of the choices being made for this type of approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar teaching approaches</th>
<th>Total count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (deductive)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (inductive)</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the participants’ rationale, “being direct, quick, and saving time” (stated by 5 participants) and “helping students understand the lessons more easily” (stated by 4 participants) were the two most popular reasons given by those who preferred deductive approaches. As for inductive approaches, “encouraging students to think and analyze structures actively” and
“helping students memorize structures better” were the two most popular reasons, being stated by 9 and 8 participants respectively.

4.4 Relationships between Teaching Factors and Participants’ Choice of Approaches

In each subsection, descriptive statistics which show the participants’ choice of teaching approaches in different teaching situations stated in the first three question sets of the questionnaire and inferential statistics which determine the relationships between their choice and the teaching factors examined in the question sets will be given. In addition, the participants’ explanations for their choice will also be provided.

4.4.1 Relationship between Structures’ Complexity and Choice of Approaches

The participants’ choice of approaches when teaching grammatical structures of different levels of complexity is reported in Table 4.2. It can be seen that the majority of the participants chose inductive approaches when teaching a simple structure, whereas deductive approaches were a more popular choice when teaching a complex structure.

Table 4.2
Participants’ Choice of Approaches for Structures of Different Complexity Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures’ complexity</th>
<th>Grammar teaching approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A (deductive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Continuous (simple)</td>
<td>10 (29.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported Speech (Y-N question) (complex)</td>
<td>20 (58.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-square test was performed to evaluate the relationship between the complexity of target grammatical structures and the participants’ choice of grammar teaching approaches. The result of the test was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 5.97, df = 1, p = .02$), meaning target
structures’ complexity has an impact on Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches.

Regarding the participants’ rationale, only one reason was given, namely “the Present Continuous is a relatively simple structure so it is easy for students to guess the structure from examples, whereas the Reported Speech (yes-no question) is more complicated so students will understand it better if the structure and rules are provided beforehand”; this reason was stated by 6 participants.

4.4.2 Relationship between Learners’ Proficiency Level and Choice of Approaches

Table 4.3 shows the participants’ choice of approaches when teaching learners of different levels of proficiency. As seen from the table, for elementary students, deductive approaches were the more popular choice, whereas inductive approaches were more popular when teaching intermediate and advanced learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency level</th>
<th>Grammar teaching approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A (deductive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (A1 – A2)</td>
<td>26 (76.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (B1 – B2)</td>
<td>7 (20.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced (C1)</td>
<td>5 (14.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-square test was performed to evaluate the relationship between learners’ level of proficiency and the participants’ choice of grammar teaching approaches. The result of the test was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 33.8, df = 2, p = .00$), meaning learners’ proficiency level has an impact on Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches.
Regarding the participants’ rationale, the most popular reason, which was stated by 12 participants, was “elementary students have yet to acquire the basic skills and knowledge necessary for guessing grammatical structures and rules, whereas intermediate and advanced students possess these skills and knowledge to perform the task”. Another reason, which was less popular (stated by 3 participants) but nonetheless interesting, was “for elementary students, guessing can make them confused and memorize wrong structures and rules”.

### 4.4.3 Relationship between Learners’ Age and Choice of Approaches

The participants’ choice of approaches when teaching learners of different ages is shown in Table 4.4. It can be seen that while deductive approaches were the more popular choice when teaching children, inductive approaches were chosen more by the participants for teaching teenagers and adults.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Grammar teaching approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A (deductive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (6 – 11)</td>
<td>27 (79.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers (12 – 17)</td>
<td>9 (26.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (18 or above)</td>
<td>6 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A chi-square test was performed to evaluate the relationship between learners’ age and the participants’ choice of grammar teaching approaches. The result of the test was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 31.33, df = 2, p = .00$), meaning learners’ age has an impact on Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches.

Regarding the participants’ rationale, the two most popular reasons were “the ability to guess grammatical structures and rules is related to age; and it is hard for children to guess these
structures and rules, whereas older learners can perform this task more easily” (stated by 7 participants) and “direct instruction can help children understand the lessons better” (stated by 3 participants).

4.5 Comparisons between the Impacts of Teaching Factors

Similar to the previous section, descriptive statistics showing the participants’ choice of teaching approaches for the situations examined in the last three question sets of the questionnaire will be reported in each subsection. Additionally, inferential statistics indicating the relationships between the participants’ choice of approaches and the teaching factors examined will be given in order to show which factor is more influential than the others. However, since none of the participants’ responses provided useful information concerning the comparisons between the teaching factors, it was not possible to carry out qualitative data analysis; therefore, the participants’ reasons as to why they prioritized one factor over another will not be provided in this section.

4.5.1 Comparison between the Impacts of Structures’ Complexity and Learners’ Proficiency Level

Table 4.5 shows the participants’ choice of approaches when teaching the Reported Speech (yes-no question) structure to learners of different levels of proficiency. As seen from the table, while deductive approaches were more popular when teaching elementary students, inductive approaches were chosen more when teaching intermediate and advanced students.

A chi-square test was performed to evaluate the relationship between learners’ level of proficiency and the participants’ choice of grammar teaching approaches when teaching a complex structure (reported speech – yes-no question). The result of the test was statistically
significant ($\chi^2 = 23.96, df = 2, p = .00$), meaning learners’ proficiency level has an impact on Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches. This indicates that the impact of learners’ proficiency level is greater than that of target structures’ complexity since the latter factor was ignored by the participants.

4.5.2 Comparison between the Impacts of Structures’ Complexity and Learners’ Age

Table 4.6 shows the participants’ choice of approaches when teaching the Reported Speech (yes-no question) structure to learners of different ages. It can be seen that deductive approaches were preferred when teaching children, whereas inductive approaches were favored when teaching teenagers and adults.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Grammar teaching approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A (deductive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (6 – 11)</td>
<td>23 (67.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers (12 – 17)</td>
<td>13 (38.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (18 or above)</td>
<td>7 (20.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A chi-square test was performed to evaluate the relationship between learners’ age and the participants’ choice of grammar teaching approaches when teaching a complex structure (reported speech – yes-no question). The result of the test was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 15.76, df = 2, p = .00$), meaning learners’ age has an impact on Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches. This indicates that the impact of learners’ age is greater than that of target structures’ complexity since the latter factor was ignored by the participants.

4.5.3 Comparison between the Impacts of Learners’ Proficiency Level and Learners’ Age

The participants’ choice of approaches when teaching intermediate learners of different ages is shown in Table 4.7. It can be seen that while the majority of the participants chose inductive approaches when teaching teenagers and adults, deductive approaches were the more popular choice when teaching children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Grammar teaching approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A (deductive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (6 – 11)</td>
<td>23 (67.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers (12 – 17)</td>
<td>3 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (18 or above)</td>
<td>5 (14.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since there is one cell in the contingency table with a count of less than 5, a Fisher’s exact test was used instead of a chi-square test to evaluate the relationship between learners’ age and the participants’ choice of grammar teaching approaches when teaching intermediate levels. The result of the test was statistically significant ($p = .00$), meaning learners’ age has an impact
on Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches. This indicates that the impact of learners’ age is greater than that of learners’ proficiency level since the latter factor was ignored by the participants.

From the comparisons presented in this section, it can be seen that of the three grammar teaching factors examined in the present study, both learners’ age and learners’ proficiency level are more influential than target structures’ complexity, and learners’ age is more influential than learners’ proficiency level; this means the factor learners’ age has the greatest impact on Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches.

In conclusion, this chapter has provided a detailed description of the data analysis methods used in the present study as well as presented the actual results of the analysis phase, which consist of three main findings. Firstly, it was found that inductive approaches were more favored by the Vietnamese EFL teachers in the study than deductive approaches. Secondly, the results of the chi-square tests indicate that the teachers’ choice of approaches was influenced by the three teaching factors examined in the present study; it seems that deductive approaches were preferred when teaching complex grammatical structures, elementary levels students, and children, whereas inductive approaches were preferred when teaching simple structures, intermediate and advanced levels students, and teenagers and adult learners. Finally, it was found that learners’ age is the most influential factor followed by learners’ proficiency level, whereas structures’ complexity is the least influential among the three. The discussion of these findings as to whether they support or contrast with previous literature and whether they have any pedagogical implications will be presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

In the previous chapter, the results of the analysis of the present study’s questionnaire data were presented in detail. Discussions centering on the significance of these results together with their pedagogical implications will be provided this chapter. Additionally, in order to make it easier for readers to follow, a brief summary of the research aims, questions, data collection and analysis methods of the present study will be provided at the beginning of this chapter.

5.1 Summary of Research Aims, Questions, and Methodology

The present study set out to investigate Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive approaches to grammar teaching and the possible relationships between their choice and some teaching-related factors. In particular, the study investigated (1) whether deductive or inductive approaches are preferred by Vietnamese EFL teachers, (2) whether or not the teachers’ choice of approaches is influenced by the three factors: structures’ complexity / learners’ proficiency level / learners’ age, and (3) which factor is the most influential in case they are all found to have impacts on the teachers’ choice.

The present study was a mixed-methods one which employed survey research design. The survey was carried out online through the Google Forms platform with the participation of 34 Vietnamese EFL teachers working for a large language school in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. Each participant answered a questionnaire containing both close-ended and open-ended questions and their responses were stored on Google Forms. For quantitative data, descriptive
statistics and inferential statistical analysis in the form of chi-square tests were used to examine
the participants’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching and the relationships
between their choice and the grammar teaching factors mentioned above. For qualitative data,
qualitative coding was utilized to find out the participants’ reasons for their choice of
approaches. The results of the study will be briefly restated and then discussed in detail in the
following sections.

5.2 Participants’ Overall Preferences for Teaching Approaches

The analysis of the questionnaire data showed that the majority of the Vietnamese EFL
teachers in the present study preferred inductive approaches over deductive approaches to
grammar teaching. This result seems to be in line with those from the studies that found
inductive approaches led to greater learning gains than deductive approaches (Cerezo, Caras, &
Leow, 2016; Haight, Herron, & Cole, 2007; Kheyrkahnia, 2013; Montazeran et al., 2014; Rokni,
2009; Smart, 2014; Vogel et al., 2011). On a different note, this result also supports the findings
of the analysis by Nitta and Gardner (2005) concerning grammar tasks in contemporary ELT
coursebooks that inductive approaches to grammar presentation were more popular than
deductive approaches. On the other hand, the result for research question 1 contrasts with the
findings of the studies conducted by AbuSeileek (2009), Erlam (2003), Mohammed and Jaber
(2008), and Robinson (1996), which all found that deductive grammar instruction was more
effective than inductive grammar instruction.

Regarding the participants’ reasons for preferring one type of approach to the other, the
advocates of deductive grammar teaching stated that these approaches are direct, quick, save
time, and help students understand the lessons more easily, which corroborates the previous
literature on the benefits of deductive grammar instruction. According to Hedge (2000),
deductive approaches can help teachers save time when explaining complex grammatical rules
and structures (as cited in Kheyrkahnia, 2013, p. 93); and it was asserted by Younie (1974) that
since deductive approaches are straight to the point, they are faster and more efficient (as cited in
get enough exposure to the target language to grasp grammatical structures and rules; therefore,
explicit and direct grammar instruction will aid them in the process.

On the other hand, “encouraging students to think and analyze structures actively” and
“helping students memorize structures better” were the two main reasons stated by the
participants who preferred inductive approaches. The first reason confirms the previous literature
on the benefits of inductive approaches; for instance, Hedge (2000) believed that inductive
approaches can stimulate students’ thinking activities (as cited in Kheyrkahnia, 2013, p. 93), a
view which was shared by Vogel et al. (2011). The second reason corroborates the findings of
some previous research studies that found inductive approaches had an edge over deductive
approaches in terms of retaining students’ learning gains (Cerezo et al., 2016; Erlam, 2003;
Kheyrkahnia, 2013; Smart, 2014).

To sum up, we have seen that the result concerning the participants’ overall preferences
for deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches supports previous studies that found
inductive approaches to be more effective than deductive approaches; in addition, the reasons
given by the participants for their choice confirm the previous literature on the advantages of
these two types of approaches. These results of the present study can provide a source of
reference for future studies that examine the issue of deductive versus inductive approaches.
5.3 Relationships between Teaching Factors and Participants’ Choice of Approaches

Similar to Section 4.4 of Chapter 4 – Results, this section will be divided into three subsections for ease of presentation and discussion.

5.3.1 Relationship between Structures’ Complexity and Choice of Approaches

Data analysis showed that there was a significant relationship between the participants’ choice of grammar teaching approaches and the complexity of target grammatical structures; in particular, for Vietnamese EFL teachers, inductive approaches should be used to teach simple structures, whereas deductive approaches should be used to teach more complex structures. The reason given by the participants was that for simple structures, it is easy for students to guess them from examples, whereas for complex structures, students will understand them better if the structures and rules are provided beforehand.

This result supports the previous literature on the relationship between structures’ complexity and the choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches. According to Fischer (1979), while inductive approaches can be used when the target grammatical structure is similar or dissimilar but simpler than its counterpart in a student’s native language, deductive approaches are required when the structure is dissimilar and more complex than the native language counterpart. In agreement with Fischer’s view, Hall (1998) asserted that direct and explicit instruction is the most suitable way to teach more complex and subtle grammatical structures in a foreign language. The result also confirms the findings of some previous studies. In Chernovaty’s (1990) experiment, it was found that elaborate explanations of grammatical rules and structures led to greater efficiency when they were applied in teaching more complex structures. A more recent study, AbuSeileek (2009), also found that when teaching more
complicated grammatical structures, deductive approaches were more effective than inductive approaches.

5.3.2 Relationship between Learners’ Proficiency Level and Choice of Approaches

Data analysis showed that there was a significant relationship between the participants’ choice of grammar teaching approaches and the language proficiency levels of students; in particular, while deductive approaches were preferred for teaching elementary learners, inductive approaches were favored when teaching intermediate and advanced learners. This result is potentially in line with the studies that showed deductive grammar teaching led to greater learning gains for elementary students (AbuSeileek, 2009; Mohammed & Jaber, 2008), and inductive grammar teaching led to greater learning gains for intermediate students (Kheyrkahnia, 2013; Vogel et al., 2011) and advanced students (Smart, 2014). On the other hand, the result seems to be in contrast with some studies. The findings from Cerezo et al. (2016) showed that inductive approaches were more effective with elementary learners. In addition, Robinson (1996) found that direct instruction worked better for intermediate-level students; a similar situation was reported in Mohammed and Jaber (2008).

Regarding the participants’ rationale, the most popular reason given was “elementary students have yet to acquire the basic skills and knowledge necessary for guessing grammatical structures and rules, whereas intermediate and advanced students possess these skills and knowledge to perform the task”. While this view seems logical, the findings of the study by Cerezo et al. (2016) which were mentioned above may indicate that inductive approaches can be employed effectively with elementary students. It is possible that learners will have already acquired the skills and knowledge needed to adequately guess grammatical structures and rules.
well before they reach intermediate level. More detailed research may find out at what stage elementary students acquire this ability.

Another reason stated by the participants was that guessing can make elementary students confused and memorize wrong structures and rules. This view is in line with Hall’s (1998), who claimed that without explicit grammar instruction, learners may make false assumptions about the target language due to the lack of linguistic data and the interference from their mother tongue or other previously learned languages. However, this can be avoided if students’ assumptions are checked by the teacher at the end of the guessing activity in order to ensure that the structures and rules inferred are the correct ones.

5.3.3 Relationship between Learners’ Age and Choice of Approaches

Data analysis showed that there was a significant relationship between the participants’ choice of grammar teaching approaches and learners’ age; particularly, deductive was the preferred type of approach for teaching children, whereas for teenagers and adults, it was inductive approaches. This result seems to be in line with the study of Montazeran et al. (2014) which found that inductive approaches were more effective with teenage learners and other studies which found that inductive approaches had an edge over deductive approaches when teaching adult learners (Cerezo et al., 2016; Haight et al., 2007; Kheyrkahnia, 2013; Rokni, 2009; Smart, 2014; Vogel et al., 2011). On the other hand, it is possible that this result is not in line with Erlam’s (2003) study which found that deductive approaches worked better with teenagers and other studies which found that adult students learned better with deductive approaches (Abuseileek, 2009; Mohammed & Jaber, 2008; Robinson, 1996).

Regarding the participants’ rationale, the most popular reason was “the ability to guess grammatical structures and rules is related to age; and it is hard for children to guess these
structures and rules, whereas older learners can perform this task more easily”. Another reason given was “direct instruction can help children understand the lessons better”, which is closely related to the first reason; if it is difficult for children to guess structures and rules, then direct explanations are the obvious choice. The view of the participants may be a valid one, given the fact that almost all of the studies that found inductive approaches to be more effective than deductive approaches were carried out with teenage and adult participants only, which may indicate that inductive approaches are not suitable for children. However, it is also possible that the absence of children as research participants in these studies was due to practical factors, such as the difficulty of obtaining the consent of the children’s parents or protectors.

Summing up the discussions of the results for research question 2, it has been shown that except for the case of target structures’ complexity, the present study’s participants’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches when the two factors learners’ proficiency level and learners’ age were involved partly corroborates and partly contrasts with the findings from the previous research studies that compared the effectiveness of the two types of grammar approaches. This may indicate that the type of approach chosen by the participants for a teaching situation may not necessarily be the most effective one in that situation. At the same time, it is also possible that the choice of deductive or inductive approaches is also influenced by other factors that were not investigated in the present study such as learners’ grammar analysis aptitude (Ellis, 2006) and learners’ preferred learning styles (Ellis, 2008). Further research that examines the impacts of these factors may provide a more accurate picture of the relationships between grammar teaching factors and the choice of deductive or inductive approaches.

5.4 Comparisons between the Impacts of Teaching Factors
Data analysis indicated that of the three grammar teaching factors investigated in the present study, learners’ age has the greatest impact on Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches, followed by learners’ proficiency level and subsequently target structures’ complexity. Regarding previous literature, there has been very little research on the comparisons between these three factors in the context of grammar teaching. However, this result of the present study seems to be in line with the findings from the study of Mohammed and Jaber (2008). This study, which compared the effectiveness of deductive and inductive grammar teaching approaches, involved the participation of EFL learners of the same age group (adults – university undergraduates) but of different levels of proficiency (elementary / pre-intermediate / intermediate). The results of the study showed that all of the participants who received deductive treatment performed better than those who received inductive treatment, which may indicate that whether deductive or inductive approaches should be used depends more on learners’ age rather than learners’ proficiency level since deductive approaches were effective with all of the adult students in the study regardless of their levels. Further research in which one factor is fixed and another factor varies like the study of Mohammed and Jaber (2008) may shed more light on the comparisons between these three factors in the context of grammar teaching.

5.5 Pedagogical Implications

Regarding the practical side of the present study, the information given by the participants about their choice of deductive or inductive approaches for different teaching situations examined in the study can provide a source of reference for Vietnamese EFL teachers who are new to the profession. These results can give them suggestions as to how to conduct
grammar lessons. For example, these new teachers can base their choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches on the ages of their students such as using inductive approaches for teenagers. Likewise, they can refer to their students’ proficiency level or the complexity of the structures they need to teach so as to make suitable changes to their grammar teaching approaches. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that these suggestions are based on the subjective opinions of the present study’s participants, and thus are potentially inaccurate. Therefore, these suggestions can only act as a source of reference and careful thought should be given when applying them in teaching.

In conclusion, this chapter has provided thorough discussions of the results of the present study as well as the pedagogical implications of these results. Regarding the participants’ choice of deductive or inductive grammar teaching approaches and the impacts of the three factors – structures’ complexity / learners’ proficiency level / learners’ age – on their choice, the results of the study partly support and partly contrast with the findings of the previous research on the topic of deductive versus inductive approaches; thus, these results can be a source of reference for future research that focuses on this topic. Regarding the comparisons between the impacts of the three factors mentioned above, since the previous literature on this issue is scarce, the result of the present study can be of great value, although further research is needed to confirm this result. On a more practical note, the results of the study can also act as a source of reference for Vietnamese EFL teachers who are still new to the profession and wonder how their grammar lessons should be approached. In the next chapter, a summary of the present study together with its limitations and recommendations for future research will be given.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The previous chapter provided detailed discussions of the present study’s results and findings. This chapter acts as a concluding remark for the study. In particular, a brief summary of the purposes, design, results, and findings of the study will be given. Additionally, details concerning the limitations and weaknesses of the present study and suggestions for future research will also be provided.

6.1 Summary of the Present Study

Understanding the importance of having more research into grammar teaching and the need to fill the gap in literature concerning the factors that can affect teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive approaches to grammar instruction, the present study set out to investigate Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of grammar teaching approaches and the possible impacts of the three teaching factors (1) target structures’ complexity, (2) learners’ language proficiency level, and (3) learners’ age on the teachers’ choice. In addition, the study also examined which of these three factors has a greater impact than the others.

Placed within the mixed-methods paradigm, the present study employed both quantitative and qualitative methods for data collection. Particularly, a written questionnaire which contains both close-ended and open-ended questions was used to find out Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive approaches to grammar teaching in different teaching situations as well as the rationale behind their choice. The survey took place online through the Google
Forms platform with the participation of 34 Vietnamese EFL teachers working for a language institute in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The data collected were analyzed quantitatively using descriptive statistics and inferential statistical analysis in the form of chi-square tests and qualitatively through manual qualitative coding.

The results of data analysis showed that the Vietnamese EFL teachers in the study preferred inductive to deductive grammar teaching approaches, which seems to support the previous studies that found inductive approaches led to greater learning gains. The participants’ rationale behind their choice is also in line with the literature on the benefits of these two types of grammar teaching approaches.

Regarding the impacts of the three grammar teaching factors examined in the present study – target structures’ complexity, learners’ proficiency level, and learners’ age – on the participants’ choice of approaches, it was found that the relationships between these factors and the participants’ choice were all significant; deductive approaches were favored more when teaching complex grammatical structures, elementary levels students, and children, whereas inductive approaches were the preferred choice for teaching simple structures, intermediate and advanced levels students, and teenagers and adult learners. Except for the result for the factor target structures’ complexity, which seems to completely support previous literature and research, the results for the other two factors partly corroborates and partly contrasts with the findings from previous studies, which may indicate that the participants’ choice of approaches may not necessarily be the most effective one for certain situations or there are other teaching factors that can also affect this choice.

Regarding the comparisons between the three factors’ impacts, it was found that learners’ age is the most influential factor, followed by learners’ proficiency level and target structures’
complexity respectively. Since the previous research that compares the impacts of these three grammar teaching factors seems to be extremely scarce, this result was compared with only one study and corroborates the findings of this study.

Summing up, the results of the present study may provide insightful information and a fresh view into the issue of deductive versus inductive grammar teaching approaches. On a more practical note, these results can serve as a guide for Vietnamese EFL teachers who are new to the field and would like to know how their grammar lessons should be approached. The following sections will provide details concerning the limitations of the present study as well as recommendations for future research.

6.2 Limitations of the Present Study

Flaws and limitations are almost inevitable when conducting a research study. The processes of designing and carrying out the present study have some notable limitations which will be outlined in this section.

The first limitation concerns the scope of the present study. As mentioned in Chapter 2 – Literature Review, previous literature has shown that the choice of grammar teaching approaches may be influenced by the following factors: (1) the complexity of target grammatical structures, (2) learners’ age, (3) learners’ proficiency level, (4) learners’ grammar analysis aptitude, and (5) learners’ preferred learning styles. However, the present study only focused on the first three factors since the inclusion of the other two factors may have made the study too cumbersome for me to handle, not to mention the fact that extra explanations for the terminology related to grammar analysis aptitude and learning styles may have been required as they may be unfamiliar to the participants. Moreover, due to the intangible nature of these two factors, the participants’
perceptions of their students’ aptitude and learning styles may have not reflected the reality, and
finding out whether this is the case would have required more investigations, thus increasing the
workload further. Nonetheless, this limitation in scope certainly made the results of the present
study less comprehensive.

The second limitation concerns the sample of the present study. Although the study’s
sample size of 34 participants is adequate for survey research (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991, as cited
in Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012, p. 82), such a small sample size may have limited the generalizability
and statistical significance of the results of the study. In addition, due to the constraints of time
and resources, the present study opted for convenience sampling instead of more effective
methods such as stratified random sampling. Although my experience working as an EFL teacher
for private language centers in Vietnam enables me to say that the present study’s sample to a
certain degree can represent a larger population, it is entirely possible that this anecdotal
evidence does not reflect the reality. Thus, the use of convenience sampling together with the
small sample size may have hindered the present study’s ability to represent the general
population of Vietnamese EFL teachers.

The third limitation concerns the data collection methods employed by the present study.
As described in Chapter 3 – Methodology, surveys were the only collection method utilized in
the present study. While the practice has practical benefits such as being inexpensive, quick, and
easy to implement, the absence of other data collection methods denied the present study the
opportunity to triangulate data from different sources to enhance the validity and reliability of the
data gathered. In addition, as mentioned in Chapter 3 – Methodology, the study used open-ended
written questions instead of interviews to investigate the participants’ rationale for their choice of
grammar teaching approaches due to a practical problem. It had been expected that the quality of
the data yielded from these written questions would be somewhat limited, and this turned out to be true; many of the participants’ responses (64 out of the original 129 responses) had to be discarded due to ambiguity and vagueness. An example of such responses is the rationale given by a participant for his/her choice of approaches when teaching students of different age groups, namely “suitable for different age groups”; this response was not helpful for the study since the participant did not point out exactly why such a choice is suitable for these age groups.

Moreover, the use of written questions also denied the opportunity for further discussions with the participants regarding their answers.

The last limitation concerns the data collection process of the present study. As shown in Chapter 3 – Methodology, the data collection phase was carried out online using the Google Forms platform. Although the use of an online platform was convenient for both the researcher and the participants, it also made it impossible for me to monitor the collection process. As a result, while all of the close-ended questions were answered adequately, some participants did not provide their responses to the open-ended questions, which negatively affected the overall quality of the data collected. Had the researcher been present, this problem may have been avoided.

6.3 Recommendations for Future Research

First of all, similar research studies which are conducted with a much larger sample size and employ different data collection methods such as surveys, interviews, and observations to triangulate data may yield results that are more reliable and accurate than those of the present study. This will help to confirm what was found in the present study.
Secondly, future research can focus on the two grammar teaching-related factors that were not touched in the present study, namely learners’ grammar analysis aptitude and learners’ preferred learning styles. The investigation of the possible impacts of these two factors on Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of deductive or inductive approaches can complement the results of the present study, thus creating a more comprehensive picture of the topic.

Finally, future research can investigate the topic of deductive versus inductive grammar teaching approaches through different angles. Particularly, these studies can triangulate the opinions of both EFL teachers and students concerning the overall effectiveness of the two types of approaches and the situations in which one type of approach is more beneficial than the other; additionally, these studies can compare teachers’ and students’ opinions with the results of quasi-experiments examining the effects of the two types of teaching approaches on students’ learning gains. The results and findings gained from these analyses will probably yield valuable insights into the topic of deductive versus inductive grammar teaching.
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Consent Form for Survey Research

DEDUCTIVE OR INDUCTIVE GRAMMAR – WHICH IS THE CHOICE OF VIETNAMESE EFL TEACHERS?

**Background Information:** The purpose of this study is to examine Vietnamese EFL teachers’ choice of grammar teaching methods and the possible influences of some teaching factors on this choice.

**Procedures:** Upon your agreement to participate in this study, you will complete a brief survey that will take less than 20 minutes.

**Risks and Benefits Associated with the Study:** This study does not have any known risks. The benefits in this study include providing a general picture of how Vietnamese EFL teachers approach grammar teaching, raising awareness of the factors that can influence the choice of grammar teaching methods, and establishing a starting point for future research that would yield practical benefits.

**Confidentiality:** These surveys are anonymous. The records of this study will be kept in a locked office at the university, preventing any breach of confidentiality. Should the study ever become published material, your name will in no way be linked to the study, nor will it mention your personal involvement.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:** Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with this BU student researcher or with Benedictine University faculty. You are free to withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with the researchers or Benedictine University.

**Contacts and Questions:** The researcher conducting this study is Hoang Phuc Lam with Dr. Olga Lambert. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please ask the student researcher at this time. If questions or concerns arise at a later time, you may direct them to [0122 803 3392 – hoangphuc10192@gmail.com] or to [630-829 6291 – olambert@ben.edu]. Questions and concerns may also be addressed to Alandra Devall, Ph.D., Chair, Institutional Review Board, Benedictine University, 5700 College Road, Lisle, IL 60532, 630-829-6295 or adevall@ben.edu.

**Statement of Consent:**
By signing below, you have agreed to the above information in its entirety. Signing also indicates that you are 18 years of age or more and that you have agreed to participate.

Signature _______________________________________ Date________________
APPENDIX B
The Present Study’s Questionnaire

DEDUCTIVE OR INDUCTIVE GRAMMAR - WHICH IS THE CHOICE OF VIETNAMESE EFL TEACHERS?

We would like to ask you to help us by completing the following questionnaire concerning grammar teaching. This is not a test so there are no “right” or “wrong” answers and you don’t even have to write your name on it. Please give your answers sincerely as only this will guarantee the success of the investigation. Thank you very much for your help!

PART I

What is your gender? .................................................................
What is your age? .................................................................
How long have you been teaching English? ................................

PART 2

Given that there are two grammar teaching methods:

- **Method A:** Explain grammar rules, then give examples
- **Method B:** Give examples, then let students guess grammar rules from examples

Which method will you choose for each of the situations below? Choose only ONE method for each situation, and give your choice for all of the situations. In addition, briefly state the reasons for your choice at the end of each section.

1. You have to teach your students the following structures:
   - **verb form of the present continuous tense** □ A □ B
     E.g.: Thomas is working hard in order to pass the final exam.
   - **reported speech (yes-no questions)** □ A □ B
E.g.: My dad asked me “Did you stay here yesterday?”.  
→ My dad asked me whether I had stayed there the previous day.

Your reasons: .........................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................

2. You have to teach grammar to different student groups of different proficiency levels:
   - a group of elementary learners (levels A1 – A2) □ A □ B
   - a group of intermediate learners (levels B1 – B2) □ A □ B
   - a group of advanced learners (level C1) □ A □ B

Your reasons: .........................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................

3. You have to teach grammar to different student groups of different ages:
   - a group of children aged 6 – 11 □ A □ B
   - a group of teenagers aged 12 – 17 □ A □ B
   - a group of adults aged 18 or above □ A □ B

Your reasons: .........................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................
.............................................................................................................................................................................

4. You have to teach reported speech (yes-no questions) to different student groups of different proficiency levels:
   - a group of elementary learners (levels A1 – A2) □ A □ B
   - a group of intermediate learners (levels B1 – B2) □ A □ B
• a group of advanced learners (level C1) □ A □ B

Your reasons: .................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................

5. You have to teach **reported speech (yes-no questions)** to different student groups of different ages:

• a group of children aged 6 – 11 □ A □ B
• a group of teenagers aged 12 – 17 □ A □ B
• a group of adults aged 18 or above □ A □ B

Your reasons: ........................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................

6. You have to teach 3 **intermediate** student groups of different ages:

• a group of children aged 6 – 11 (levels B1 – B2) □ A □ B
• a group of teenagers aged 12 – 17 (levels B1 – B2) □ A □ B
• a group of adults aged 18 or above (levels B1 – B2) □ A □ B

Your reasons: ........................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................
.....................................................................................................................................................................................................................
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