THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' LEARNING STYLES AND THEIR TEACHERS' PREFERRED GRAMMAR TEACHING TECHNIQUES

Dr. Ibrahim Mohamed Al Faki
Nile Valley University, Atbara, North Sudan.
King Abdulaziz University, ELI, Jeddah, KSA.

Postal Address: **English Language Institute, King Abdulaziz University,
P.O. Box 80200, Jeddah 21589**

ABSTRACT: *The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between university students' preferred learning styles and their teachers' preferred grammar teaching techniques. The research paradigm was that of interpretivism and the particular research method adopted was the descriptive research method .The tool used for data collection was a pair of questionnaires : one for teachers and the other for students. The sample consisted of 50 teachers and 100 students. Both samples were selected randomly (simple random sampling) from the overall population of English language teachers (116), and that of English language students (584) in an Arabic – medium Middle eastern university. For data analysis frequency distribution tables and percentages were used. The findings indicate that those teachers use a variety of techniques to teach grammar. Most of these techniques suit the students' learning styles.*

KEYWORDS : learning styles , grammar teaching techniques.

INTRODUCTION

Grammar has been viewed differently at different ages in the history of language teaching. Initially , grammar was seen as a list of do's and don'ts, rules that tell learners to use this one and not that one. It was believed that grammar learning took place through the process of verbal 'habit formation' and then teachers were expected to use pattern practice drills of various kinds : repetition, transformation, question and answer, etc. In this teaching approach, habits were established through stimulus-response conditioning, which often led to the 'over learning' of the grammatical patterns of language (De Carrico and Larsen-Freeman (2002).

With the rise of generative grammar, this view was replaced by the view that looked at grammar as "*an objective description of a language as it is actually spoken by native speakers with no comment concerning correct versus incorrect forms*" (De Carrico and Larsen- Freeman, 2002: 19). Hence, language was viewed as a system of rules and thus grammar learning was seen to take place through a process of 'rule formation', which itself was brought about when students formulated, tested and revised hypotheses about grammatical structures in the target language. Learners were seen to play a much more active role in the classroom than they had earlier. Consistent with this perspective, learners' errors were not to be feared, but rather welcomed as evidence that learners were attempting to test their hypotheses and receive feedback, with which they could then revise

64

hypotheses. In the classroom, students were given written grammar exercises; so, they could induce the grammatical rules that would allow them to generate and understand novel sentences (Bygate, Tonkyn and Williams, 1994 , Batstone, 1995).

However, with the two views mentioned earlier, it was not possible to produce students who were communicatively competent. In other words, the students were found structurally competent but failed to use the structures (or forms) they learned , outside the classrooms in the real-life communicative situations (De Carrico and Larsen- Freeman, 2002; Mc Donough and Shaw, 2003). This problem was attributed to the kind of grammar taught , and the mismatch between the students' learning styles and the grammar teaching techniques adopted.

The purpose of this study is to compare the grammar teaching techniques and students learning styles in a College of Education in a middle-eastern university.

Statement of the Problem

It is known that English language students need to achieve not only a certain degree of formal accuracy but also need to use the structures meaningfully and appropriately as well. It has been observed that Arabic-speaking students of English language in the Middle East are increasingly unable to use English effectively in their daily lives. For this reason the study attempts to investigate the kind of relationship between the techniques used in teaching grammatical structures and the students' learning styles. The assumption being that if these two are in harmony then this will yield good learning . The students will be able to function appropriately in various situations. If , however , the grammar teaching techniques and the students' learning styles are in conflict, then it is likely that there will be no or very little learning . In other words students will not be able to function properly in real life situations.

Aims

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between the grammar teaching techniques and the students' learning styles. The study seeks to :
1. Identify the grammar teaching strategies.
2. Identify students' learning styles.
3.Find out whether these grammar teaching strategies suit the students' learning styles.

Questions

This study attempts to answer the following questions:
1. What are the students preferred learning styles?
2. Which grammar teaching technique is the most frequently used in Rabegh?
3. How does this technique suit the students' preferred learning styles?

Hypotheses

To answer the research questions the researcher hypothesizes the following:
1. There are certain learning styles which are preferred by students.
2. English language teachers use different grammar teaching techniques.
3. There is a mismatch between the techniques used by the teachers and the students' preferred learning styles.

Significance

The findings of this study may be useful to:

a. English language teachers to help them select suitable grammar teaching techniques.

b. Syllabus designers and materials developers to help them suggest and recommend the use of grammar teaching techniques that match students learning styles.

c. English language inspectors, classroom observers , supervisors in their assessment of classroom practices.

Methodology

The researcher uses quantitative data. The descriptive research method is used. The data will be analysed in frequency and percentage terms. For data collection a questionnaire is used. The sample consists of 50 English language teachers and 100 students at a college of Education , in one of the Middle East university.

Limits

This study is limited to the teaching of English language grammar and students' learning styles. It is conducted in the academic year 2015.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section reviews the available literature in the area of the study. It explores the concepts of grammar teaching and learning styles .

Approaches to Teaching Grammar

Grammar is taught in different ways, the main approaches are as follows:

Zero-grammar approach and form-focused approaches

Ellis (1985: 229) introduced three possible explanations of non-interface position; the interface position and the variability position. The non-interface position advanced by Krashen (Ellis, 1985: 229) distinguishes two types of knowledge: learnt knowledge and acquired knowledge. Krashen (1982) (cited in Ellis, 2002: 167) maintains that *"formal instruction in grammar will not contribute to the development of acquired knowledge - the knowledge needed to participate in authentic communication"*; therefore, there is no point in grammar teaching.

On the contrary, the interface position lends credence to grammar teaching because these two types of knowledge are not entirely separate (Ellis, 1985, p. 234). A weak interface position which has been proposed by Seliger (1979) (cited in Ellis, 1985:234) states that formal instruction facilitates acquisition. Seliger believes that the learnt knowledge of grammar rule may make the internalization of the rule easier and may facilitate the use of features which are acquired, but still only "shadow" (as cited in Ellis, 1985,p. 234). A strong interface position states that two types of knowledge can interact, and explicit knowledge (learnt knowledge) can turn into implicit knowledge (acquired knowledge) through practice (Ellis, 1985,p. 235).

The variability position holds the idea that different kinds of knowledge are used in different types of language performance; for example, formal instruction presumably develops the type of

66

knowledge that is required to undertake the kinds of tasks in "discrete-point" tests (Ellis, 1985,p. 237). Therefore, Bialystok (1982) (in Ellis, 1985,p. 244) suggests that *"instruction must consider the specific goals of the learner and attempt to provide the appropriate form of knowledge to achieve those goals"*. As can be inferred from the discussion, the question of whether or not grammar should be taught depends on learners' specific needs.

The three positions support very different approaches to language teaching (Ellis, 2006,p.97). Non-interface position leads to such zero-grammar approaches as: the Natural Approach and Total Physical; while the interface position provides a strong base for form-focused approaches. Particularly, the weak interface position supports techniques that induce learners to attend to grammatical feature. Examples of those techniques are Content-based Instruction and Task-based Language Learning. Whereas, the strong interface position is the ground for Presentation-Practice-Production model (Ellis, 2006,p. 97). Finally, the variability position supports the combination of various methods appropriate to specific teaching contexts, which serves as the base for Context-based Language Teaching or Post-method pedagogy.

Inductive approach
The inductive approach stands for a modern style of teaching where new grammatical structures are presented in a real language context. Thornbury (1999, p. 29) explains that *" an inductive approach starts with some examples from which a rule is inferred."* In other words, students learn structures through practice of the language in context, afterwards realize the rules from the practical examples. The inductive approach is similar to the way the mother tongue is acquired. It is often identified with the experiential methods, such as the Direct Method and the Natural Approach.

Deductive approach
The deductive approach represents a more traditional style of teaching. Thornbury (1999, p. 29) states, *"A deductive approach starts with the presentation of a rule and is followed by examples in which the rule is applied."* The deductive approach is often called 'rule driven' learning. It is traditionally associated with Grammar-Translation method which is not very favourable because of translating sentences out of and into the target language. For that reason, students did not have much opportunity to practise the target language. In comparison with the Grammar-Translation method, the deductive method is not necessarily dependent on translation. There are many students' books where grammar rules and exercises are given in the target language.

Cognitive Style and Learning Style
Cognitive style refers to the preferred way in which individuals process information or approach a task. Wilkin et al (1981) (quoted in Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991) define it as; *" a characteristic self-consistent mode of functioning which individuals show in their perceptual and intellectual activities"*

The term learning style is used to refer to how such cognitive styles may apply to learning. Skehan (1998) defines learning style as the characteristic manner in which an individual chooses to approach a learning task. Skehan also points out the importance of distinguishing learning style from language aptitude since a particular style adopted may reflect personal preference and not

innate ability. Individuals may display a given learning style to varying degrees, so there is not the same fixedness which applies to language aptitude.

The main application of learning style research to language learning has been through the concept of **F**ield **d**ependence/**i**ndependence(FD/I), developed in mainstream psychology by Wilkin (1962) (detailed in Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991), who proposed that a contrast can be made between analytic and holistic individuals. The most widely-known means of measuring FD/I is via the **G**roup **E**mbedded **F**igures **T**est (GEFT) whereby subjects have to pick out simple visual figures embedded in a complex pattern. When faced with a decision making task, analytic, or field independent learners, separate the problem into constituent parts and focus on these components, manipulating them individually, while holistic, or field dependent learners perceive situations as a whole.

According to Witkin, in language learning, an analytic learning style is shown by the individual's ability to analyse language material he/she is exposed to, identify components and explore the relationship between them. Such a learner extracts what is important from the flow of incoming speech or text, focusing on what is meaningful and separating out irrelevance. This ability to channel selectively the essential from the non-essential has its downside in that such learners tend to be more aloof and withdrawn, shunning opportunities to communicate and work with others.
A holistic learning style, on the other hand, is shown by the individual's ability to interpret situations as wholes. Such learners are not such effective information processors and depend on external reference points such as other people's opinions. However, they excel in communication situations and seek out opportunities to receive good quality, relevant input and are more sociable and people-oriented.

Witkin is not claiming that some people have greater ability than others, but that there are differences in the way people interact with the world and perceive and organize information. Neither type of learning style is better than the other but each is advantageous for different tasks. However, the main drawback to the concept of FD/I is that it is a polarized view. It is easy to categorise people at extreme ends of the continuum but those in the middle are harder to classify. Brown (1994) makes the point that people are flexible and may adapt to different situations in different ways. People are thus not fixed at one end of the continuum for all tasks and learning styles may vary according to the situation.

In language learning FD/I has not been shown to be a significant influence on language proficiency. Skehan (1989) suggests that investigators turn their attention to other issues such as memory retention. He concludes that the outcome of FD/I tests depend a lot on general intelligence factors. Griffiths and Sheen (1992) (quoted in Skehan, 1998) are even more critical and claim that FD/I is a case of a construct from one discipline being misapplied to another. The GEFT test was originally proposed as a visual/perceptual construct and is not, in their view, applicable to language learning in any convincing way.

However, Chappelle and Green (1992) defend FD/I as a learning style model and discuss how the construct should be divided into three distinct aspects:

1. Reliance on internal or external frames of reference.
2. Cognitive restructuring ability.
3. Interpersonal competence .

They argue that people are more or less likely to want to make judgments based on their own interpretations and some will want to check against others' opinions and may be less confident. Chapelle and Green propose that their 'cognitive restructuring ability' correlates with general intelligence and other cognitive abilities including language aptitude. They propose that the three component structure for aptitude should be extended with a language analytic component divided into a 'crystallised' language analytic ability (the capacity to draw upon relevant knowledge of language from the learner's L1) and a 'fluid' general analytic ability (capacity to solve language-learning problems without recourse to existing language knowledge).More recent research has tended to use two dimensions in measuring style preferences and characteristic modes of behaviour.

Riding and Cheema (1981) have developed computer-based procedures to measure the two dimensions of style; analytic/holistic and verbal/visual. In a similar way to the GEFT, their test uses embedded figures to assess analytic style but also uses geometric figures to assess holistic style, whereby subjects have to perceive a whole figure, retaining its unity, rather than just locate a simple figure within a more complex figure. They also use verbal judgement tests to assess verbal/visual preferences. Being computer-based, it can record how fast subjects respond and as such, even though all the subjects can answer the questions, the test can identify which are 'easier' and whether an individual has more or less capacity to make verbal or visual judgements.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects
The subjects the study consist of two groups: teachers and students. The number of the teachers is 42 while that of students is 72. Both groups constitute the whole population in this college who teach and learn English language as a foreign language.

Instrument
Two questionnaires are designed one to be used for the teachers and the other for the students. The validity of these questionnaires have been sought by giving them to expert in the fields of education and linguistics. Their comments have been considered in the preparation of the final versions. The reliability of both questionnaire has been computed via equivalent forms and by using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. The Teachers' questionnaire R = 00.89 , while in that of the students R= 00.85.

Procedures
Both questionnaire were distributed in hand by the researcher to the subjects. A week later, all the copies of the questionnaires were received back. The statistic means used in the analysis of the data were frequencies and percentages.

Data Analysis

Techniques of Teaching Grammar

1. Deductive Grammar Teaching *: (presenting the new grammar rule first using examples before letting students do grammar exercises)*

     Table 4.1.1

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	35	83.3%
Sometimes	6	14.3%
Rarely	1	2.4%
Never	0	0.0%
Total	42	100%

As it is shown in table 4.1 most of the respondents follow this grammar teaching pattern: 35 = 83%.

2. Using Contexts*: (presenting the new grammar item through contexts (e.g. dialogues, short texts, etc.) to show how the grammar item is used)*

     Table 4.1.2

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	34	81%
Sometimes	8	19%
Rarely	0	0.0%
Never	0	0.0%
Total	42	100 %

Table 4.1.2 shows that the majority of the respondents 81% (always) deal with use this grammar teaching model ,while only 19 % of the respondents (sometimes) follow that techniques. None of the participants ticked to the options (rarely) or (never). This means that 100% of the teachers follow the technique.

3. Inductive Grammar Teaching: (giving learners several sentences in which the new grammar item is used and encourage them to draw the rule by themselves.

     Table 4.1.3

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	32	76.2%
Sometimes	9	21.4%
Rarely	0	0.0%
Never	1	2.4%
Total	42	100%

Table(4.1.3) indicates that (76.2%) always follow this technique. Similarly (21.4) (sometimes) follow the technique. The final result points out that (97 %) of the respondents follow the technique.

70

4. Grammar Teaching Via Visual Aids : *(When necessary, I use visual aids, such as pictures and diagrams, to explain the target grammar item)*

Table 4.1.4

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	30	71.4 %
Sometimes	9	21.4 %
Rarely	0	0.0 %
Never	3	7.2 %
Total	42	100 %

71.4 % of the respondents always follow this technique when teaching grammar . 21.4% of them sometimes use it. Only 7.2 % of the respondents never follow it. The final result indicates that 93 % of the respondents use visual aids, such as pictures and diagrams, to explain the target grammar item, compared with only 7 % who don't use it.

5. Providing Sentences for Practice : *(providing sentences in which learners practice the form of the target grammar)*

Table 4.1.5

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	42	100 %
Sometimes	0	0.0 %
Rarely	0	0.0 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

Here there is a consensus : all the respondents always use this technique to practice the target grammar items.

6. Free Practice : *(Teachers allow learners practice the use of the target grammar freely)*

Table 4.1.6

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	34	81 %
Sometimes	8	19 %
Rarely	0	0.0 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

The result indicates that 81 % of the respondents always follow this technique when they teach the target grammar. 19 % sometimes follow it . The final result reveals that 100% of the respondents allow learners practice the use of the target grammar freely.

7. Supplementary Exercises : *(providing supplementary grammar exercises where they are needed*

Table 4.1.7.

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	29	69.1 %
Sometimes	10	23.8 %
Rarely	3	7.1 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

69.1% always and 23.8% sometimes of the respondents follow the technique of supplementary grammar exercises. In contrary, only 7.1% (rarely) use supplementary grammar exercise. The final result reveals that 93 % of the respondents follow the technique, compared with only 7% who (rarely) follow it.

8. Small Groups : *(organizing students in small groups to help them practice the use of the target grammar)*

Table 4.1.8

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	29	69.1 %
Sometimes	8	19 %
Rarely	5	11.9 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

According to the results in table (4.1.8), 69.1 % of the respondents always follow the technique of organizing students in small groups to help them practice the use of the target grammar and 19% of them sometimes follow it . Only 11.9 of the respondents rarely follow the strategy.

9. Emphasis : *(giving emphasis to the form of the target grammar)*

Table 4.1.9

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	28	66.7 %
Sometimes	10	23.8 %
Rarely	4	9.5 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

According to table (4.1.9), it is clear that all respondents use this technique The result indicates that 66.7 % of the teachers always follow it and 22.8 % sometimes follow it . Only 9.5 % of the respondents rarely use emphasis to the grammar form .The final result reveals that 91 % of the respondents follow the technique compared to 9 % who rarely follow it.

10. Emphasizing Meaning: *(giving emphasis to the meaning of the target grammar)*

Table 4.1.10

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	29	69.1 %
Sometimes	13	30.9 %
Rarely	0	0.0 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

Table 4.1.10 indicates that 69.1 % of the respondents always follow this technique and 30.9 % sometimes follow the technique. The final result reveals that 100 % of the respondents it.

11. (Emphasizing target grammar)

Table 4.1.11

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	38	90.5 %
Sometimes	4	9.5 %
Rarely	0	0.0 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

As it is shown in table 4.1.11 , all teachers apply the same technique by giving emphasis to the use of the target grammar. The result indicates that 90.5 % of the teachers (always) follow this technique and 9.5 % (sometimes) follow the same technique.

12 (Giving sufficient time to students to practice the target grammar).

Table 4.1.12

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	39	92.9 %
Sometimes	2	4.8 %
Rarely	1	2.3 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

92.9 % (always) and 4.8 % (sometimes) of the respondents use the technique of giving enough time to students to practice target grammar. Only 2.3 % of the respondents (rarely) use this technique. The final result reveals that 98 % of the respondents adopt this technique.

13. Correcting students' grammar error on the spot.

Table 4.1.13

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	36	85.8 %
Sometimes	6	14.2 %
Rarely	0	0.0 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

The result here indicates that 85.5 % of the teachers (always) use this technique and 14.2 % (sometimes) use it. The final result reveals that 100 % do use it.

14. (Providing clear instruction to the students on how the grammar exercises are to be done and on the objectives).

Table 4.1.14

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	35	83.3 %
Sometimes	7	16.7 %
Rarely	0	0.0 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

83.3 % of the teachers always use this technique and 16.7 % of the respondents sometimes do so
. The final result reveals that 100 % of the respondents use this technique.

15.(*Providing feedback to the students paying attention not only to the grammatical correctness of their utterances but also to the meaning of the utterances*).

Table 4.1.15

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	36	85.7 %
Sometimes	6	14.3 %
Rarely	0	0.0 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

The result indicates that 85.7 % of the teachers (always) use this technique and 14.3 % of the respondents (sometimes) use it. The final result reveals that 100 % of the respondents use it.

16 (Using different interaction patterns or formats : individual work, pair work, small group work and whole class work)

Table 4.1.16

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Always	33	78.6 %
Sometimes	9	21.4 %
Rarely	0	0.0 %
Never	0	0.0 %
Total	42	100 %

78.6 % of the respondents always use different interaction patterns and 21.4 % of the them sometimes do so. The final result indicates that 100% of the teachers follow the technique.

Learning Styles

17. (In dealing with grammar rules).

Table 4.1.18

Statements	Freq.	%
I like to learn rules of grammar indirectly .	23	31.9%
I like to start with rules and theories and specific examples.	49	68.1%
Total	72	100 %

Regarding the students' preference of grammar learning style , the analysis indicates that (31.9%) of the students like to learn rules of grammar indirectly by being exposed to texts with examples of grammatical structures, hence they prefer **inductive** grammar teaching approach. 68.1 % of the respondents like to start with rules and theories then specific examples, so this group prefers **deductive** grammar teaching approach.

18. *(Language games, are important for   grammar learning)*

Table 4.1.18

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	24	33.3 %
Agree	25	34.7 %
Not sure	16	22.2 %
Disagree	4	5.6 %
Strongly disagree	3	4.2 %
Total	72	100 %

As can be seen 33 % of the respondents strongly agree   and 35% of them agree, so the sum of the positive response is 68 %, whereas only 6 % chose disagree and only 2 % chose strongly disagree, and 22% not sure.   The final result shows that the majority of the participants agree with teaching or learning grammar through games.

19. *(It is useful to be taught a new language item through reading or listening to texts).*

Table 4.1.19

Reponses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	26	36 %
Agree	26	36 %
Not Sure	13	18 %
Disagree	4	6 %
Strongly Disagree	3	4 %
Total	72	100 %

As can be seen in the table , 36 % of the respondents strongly agree   and 36% of them agree, so the sum of the positive response is 72 %, whereas only 6 % give a response disagree and only 4 % strongly disagree, and 18% not sure. The final result shows that the majority of the participants agree with teaching or learning grammar through listening and reading texts.

20 . (Study explicit grammar rules in order to understand how a language works).

Table 4.1.20

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Very important	31	43.1 %
Important	28	38.9 %
Useful, but not very important	7	9.7 %
Unimportant	6	8.3 %
Total	72	100 %

4.3.1 % of the respondents think it (very important) to learn grammar explicitly and 38.9% of them think that it is (important). Only 18 % of them think that teaching grammar explicitly is (unimportant). The final result shows that the majority of the participants 82% think that it is important to do so .

21. (Problem solving activities help students discover grammatical rules)

Table 4.1.21

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	21	29.2 %
Agree	27	37.5 %
Not sure	15	20.8 %
Disagree	4	5.6 %
Strongly disagree	5	6.9 %
Total	72	100 %

As can be seen in the table 29.2 % of the respondents strongly agree   and 37.5 % of them agree, so the sum of the positive response is 66.7 %, whereas only 12.5 % chose disagree or strongly disagree, and 20.8 % of the students not sure. The final result shows that the majority of the participants agree with that problem solving activities help students to discover grammatical rules.

22 (When learning a new grammar point...)

Statements	Freq.	%
I prefer to study authentic material examples of the grammar as used by native speakers.	35	48.6 %
I prefer to be given simplified examples that show clearly how the grammar structure is used	37	51.4 %
Total	72	100 %

76

Most of the students (51.4 %) prefer to be given simplified examples that show clearly how the grammar structure is used, hence they prefer simplified materials. In the contrary (48.6 %) of the respondents prefer to study authentic examples of the grammar as used by native speakers, so this group prefers authentic materials.

23. (*Involving students' personalities is a good way to practise grammar*)

Table 4.1.23

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	20	27.8 %
Agree	34	47.2 %
Not sure	10	13.9 %
Disagree	3	4.2 %
Strongly disagree	5	6.9 %
Total	72	100 %

27.8 % of the respondents strongly agree and 47.2 % of them agree, so the sum of the positive response is 75 %, whereas only 11.1 % chose disagree or strongly disagree, and 18% of them not sure about the item. The final result shows that the majority of the participants agree with that involving the personality of students is a good way to practise grammar.

24 .(How easy is it to identify patterns in a foreign language and work out grammar rules from them?)

Table 4.1.24

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Very easy	22	30.6 %
Easy	18	25 %
Not sure	14	19.4 %
Difficult	14	19.4 %
Very difficult	4	5.6 %
Total	72	100 %

30.6 % of the respondents think that it is very easy for them to identify grammar patterns and 25 % of them think it easy, whereas only 25 % chose difficult or very difficult to do so, and 19.4 % of them remain neutral. The final result shows that the a sizable number of the participants (40)can identify patterns in a foreign language and work out grammar rules from them.

25. *Using drills allow me to practice and understand grammatical items*

Table 4.1.24

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	28	38.8 %
Agree	18	25 %
Not sure	10	13.9 %
Disagree	12	16.7 %
Strongly disagree	4	5.6 %
Total	72	100 %

38.8 % of the respondents strongly agree   and 25 % of them agree, so the sum of the positive response is 63.8 %，whereas only 22.3 % chose disagree or strongly disagree, and 13.9 % remained   neutral. The final result shows that the majority of the participants agree with the statement.

26*. (Visual representations of grammar items is preferable.)*

Table 4.1.26

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	18	25 %
Agree	31	43.1 %
Not sure	14	19.4 %
Disagree	2	2.8 %
Strongly disagree	7	9.7 %
Total	72	100 %

25 % of the respondents strongly agree   and 43.1% of them agree, so the sum of the positive response is 68.1 %，whereas only 12.5 % disagree or strongly disagree, and 19.4 % of them are neutral. The final result shows that the majority of the participants agree.

27. (*Verbal representations of grammar items is preferable).*

Table 4.1.27

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	28	38.9 %
Agree	22	30.6 %
Not sure	10	13.9 %
Disagree	5	6.9 %
Strongly disagree	7	9.7 %
Total	72	100 %

38.9 % of the respondents strongly agree   and 30.6 % of them agree, so the sum of the positive response is 69.5 %，whereas only 16.6 % disagree and only 4 %   strongly disagree, and 13.9 % not sure. The final result shows that the majority of the participants agree with using visual representations of grammar items.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the study can be summarized as follows:

1. Most teachers present the new grammar item using the deductive technique , and this grammar teaching technique does suit students well. (68.1%) prefer it.

2. Visual aids are used to explain the target grammar item. This technique suits students who prefer visual learning style, however a sizable number of the respondents prefer verbal 69 % item (27).

3. Different interaction patterns or formats (individual work, pair work, small group work and whole class work) are used, this technique goes in line with students who prefer problem solving activities to discover grammar items, but fails with autonomous learners students (extrovert students) .

4**.** Students   are allowed to practice the use of the target grammar freely, this technique suit students who are able to identify patterns in a foreign language   and work out grammar rules from them, but some of the students find difficult to generalize grammar rules.

5. Clear explanation to the students on how the grammar exercises are to be done and on their objectives is given, this technique goes in line with inductive students rather than deductive ones.

6. Supplementary grammar exercises are provided whenever necessary and this suits all students.

8. Teachers correct students' grammar error whenever they make it, extrovert learning style students get shocked from this technique.

9. Teachers provide feedback to the students paying attention not only to the grammatical correctness of their utterances but also the meaning of the utterances and use .This does suit all students.

In conclusion , in this particular context of the study, English language teachers do use various techniques to teach English grammar. Most of the techniques used by these teachers are suitable to the students' learning styles.

REFERENCES

Batstone, R. (1995). Grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Madsen, Harold, J. Donald Bowen and Ann Hilferty (1985). TESOL techniques and procedures. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Bygate, M. (1994)'Adjusting the Focus: Teacher Roles in Task-based Learning

of Grammar'. In Bygate, Tonkin and Williams (Eds) Grammar and the Language Teacher. London: Prentice Hall International(UK).

Bygate, M. , A. Tonkin , and E. Williams. (eds). (1994). Grammar and the Language

Teacher. London: Prentice Hall International.

Byrd, P.(1994) Writing Grammar Textbooks: Theory and Practice.

System, Vol.22/2, PP.245-255.

Canale , M. (1983) From Communicative Competence to Language Pedagogy

In J. Richards and R. Schmidt(Eds). Language and Communication. London: Longman.

Celce-Murcia, M., and Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). The Grammar Book: An ESL/ EFL Teacher's Course (2nd Edition). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Cunningsworth, A. (1984) Evaluating and Selecting EFL Teaching

Materials: with a Glossary of Basic EFL Terms by Brain Tomlinson. London: Heinemann International.

Decarrico, J. and Larsen Freeman, D. (2002) "Grammar". In Norbert Schmitt (ed) An Introduction to Applied Linguistics, PP. 19-34. London: Arnold.

Dickins and Woods. (1988). "Some Criteria for the Development of Communicative Grammar Tasks". TESOL QARTERLY, Vol. 22, No.4, pp. 623-646.

Doughty, C and Wiliiams;J(eds)(1998)Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2003). Task- Based Language Learning and Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fortune, A. (1992) "Self-Study Grammar Practice: Learners' Views and Preferences". ELT Journal, vol. 45, No.2, PP. 160-171.

Harmer, I. J. (1987) Teaching and Learning Grammar. London: Longman Group.

_____ (1991) The Practice of English Language Teaching. London: Longman Group.

Hedge, T. (2000) Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, K (1996) Language Teaching and Skill Learning. Oxford: Blackwell.

Krashen, S. and Terrell, T. (1983). The Natural Approach. New York: Pergamon.

Krashen,S.(1987) Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. New York: Prentice Hall International .

Larsen-Freeman, D.(1986)Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching

.New York : Oxford University Press.

Mosback, G. (1984) "Making A Structure-Based Course More Communicative." ELT Journal, Vol. 38, No.3, PP.178-186.

Nunan. D. (1988). Syllabus Design. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____ (1989). Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom.

Cambridge: Cambridge University.

_____ (1991) Language Teaching Methodology: a Textbook for

Teachers. London: Prentice Hall International .

_____ (2003)' Grammar' In Nunan (Ed.) Practical English Language Teaching(15tEdition)New York: The McGraw-Hill.

Prabhu, N. (1987) Second Language Pedagogy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Petrovitz ,W.(1997) "The Role of Context in the Presentation of Grammar.'

ELT Journal .Vol. 51/3.

Richards, J., John.P. and Heidi W. (1985). Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics. London : Longman.

Richards , J. and Theodore, S. R. (2001) Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (2nd edition).Cambridge: C.U.P.

Rivers, W.M (1981) Teaching Foreign-Language Skills (2nd edition).

Chicago: University of Chicago.

Rutherford, W. (1987). Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching

London: Longman.

Stevick E. (1997) Memory, Meaning and Method (2nd Edition).Boston: Heinle &Heinle.

Tarone , E. and Yule ,G (l989) Focus on the Language Learner. Oxford: Oxford University

Ur, P. (1988). Grammar Practice Activities: a Practical Guide for Teachers.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (1996). A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson , H. (1978). Teaching Language as Communication. Oxford : Oxford University Press