

## Unveiling the Preferred Methods in Grammar Learning: Beliefs from EFL Undergraduates

**Siti Anisah**

English Language Education Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang. Jl. Semarang No. 5, Malang, Indonesia

Corresponding Author e-mail: [sitianisah1126@gmail.com](mailto:sitianisah1126@gmail.com)

Received: April 2025; Revised: May 2025; Published: June 2025

### Abstract

Due to its fluidity, learners' beliefs in English language teaching (ELT) have long been a topic of discussion among scholars. This paper sheds light on what learners believe about grammar learning. This study involved forty-five undergraduate students from the English language education (ELE) department in five different universities in East Java, Indonesia. Then, using a survey design, the current investigation aims to reveal the beliefs of undergraduates concerning instructional methods they prefer while learning grammar in the classroom. Data were collected through a questionnaire covering statements representing form- and meaning-focused instruction, focus on form and focus on forms instruction, implicit and explicit instruction, deductive and inductive instruction. The questionnaire results were analyzed using descriptive statistics to facilitate the interpretation of numerical findings. Based on empirical evidence, it was found that Indonesian EFL undergraduates prefer methods that give them a central focus on grammar, such as form-focused instruction, focus on forms, explicit instruction, and deductive instruction. Furthermore, this study offers valuable insights into how teachers in higher education can effectively teach grammar to students by considering their individual learning preferences.

**Keywords:** Grammar teaching-learning; Individual learning preferences; EFL undergraduates

**How to Cite:** Anisah, S. (2025). Unveiling the Preferred Methods in Grammar Learning: Beliefs from EFL Undergraduates, *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 5(2), 405-426. doi: <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v5i2.2855>



<https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v5i2.2855>

Copyright© 2025, Anisah  
This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) License.



## INTRODUCTION

In some countries whose first language is not English, understanding grammar and making effective use of it is obligatory. Thus, the importance of grammar in academic settings has been extensively explored from different contexts and perspectives. Findings from existing literature show that teachers and students have the shared belief that grammar is essential to learn at any level. Aman (2020) found that teachers agree to let students be exposed to grammar from the primary age. Arguably, its importance is solid for EFL students in higher education since they are required to produce good grammar in spoken and written communication (Saengboon et al., 2022; Alzahrani, 2024). Moving forward to the Indonesian context, where students often face challenges while learning grammar (Komara & Tiarsiwi, 2021), determining which methods will work best in grammar class becomes a significant concern for teachers.

Key contributors in second language acquisition (SLA) have proposed methods that may help teachers select appropriate ways of teaching grammar. To make it clear, Graus and Coppen (2015) organized the distinct methods into meaning- versus form-focused instruction (MFIS), FonF versus FonFs (FFS), implicit versus explicit

instruction (IES), and inductive versus deductive instruction (IDIS). Unlike meaning-focused instruction, which puts aside the grammar or focus on form (FonF), which aims to deal with grammar only when urgently needed, form-focused instruction provides students with a deep explanation of rules and sentence structures, similar to focus on forms (FonFs).

Out of many methods implemented in grammar classes, Vakili and Mohammed (2020) state that teachers typically use explicit and implicit grammar instructions in their practices. According to Alzahrani (2024), explicit instruction encourages the teacher to explain grammatical rules directly and leads students to the consciousness of learning the formation of correct sentences. In contrast, implicit instruction is when students learn grammar unconsciously through receptive or productive language exposure (Alzahrani, 2024; Pusparini et al., 2021; Aman, 2020; Storch, 2018). The last instructions are inductive and deductive, which fall under explicit grammar learning (Alzahrani, 2024). Both of them are almost similar with only one slight difference on the way the teacher approaches students to learn grammar, whether it is top-down or bottom-up approaches. In inductive instructions, the teacher guides students to discover grammar rules through specific examples; meanwhile, in deductive instructions, students are taught the rules before going further to the sentence creation (Graus & Coppen, 2015).

Despite those ready-to-use methods that teachers can adopt or adapt to, Qiao (2024), through the framework established by Lightbown and Spada, renowned contributors in second language acquisition, argues that identifying students' beliefs in language learning holds significant value as it can influence whoever involve in the classroom, such as teachers, students, and surroundings. It is aligned with Li (2022) that in addition to grammar, beliefs from the students can predict how the grammar learning strategy implemented in the classroom will be. It indicates that students' beliefs in grammar learning deserve the attention and cannot be overlooked when finding the best practices used in the clasroom.

Alzahrani (2024) in his study raised an issue of learners' beliefs in grammar learning, emphasizing its importance and the preferred methods. He tapped the beliefs from normative and metacognitive approaches introduced by Ellis in 2008. Therefore, he applied a mixed-method design with a questionnaire and focus-group interview as the methods to collect the data. His study involved 172 EFL undergraduates at Jubail English Language and Preparatory Year Institute, Saudi Arabia. All of them are male since they were not allowed to be in one class with female students as it is the regulation from the institution. However, they were diverse in terms of age and received the same hours in learning grammar. Despite various methods used in grammar classes, Alzahrani (2024) narrowed the research focus down only to two significant issues: whether grammar is important to be learned and which one learners preferred between explicit and implicit grammar instructions. Responding to the ongoing debate of individual differences (ID), learners' beliefs in second language teaching and learning is always become a worth-discussing topic. Gradually, this article is composed as a critical review to the previous empirical research conducted by Alzahrani (2024).

Related to the above-mentioned issues, the researcher identified some gaps in the existing literature. Ling (2015) stated that English classroom practices begin to undergo the absence of grammar teaching. On the other hand, recent research by Vakili and Mohammed (2020) reports that second-language grammar acquisition has been widely discussed by scholars. It is aligned with what is happening now in the Indonesian EFL

context, where many researchers perceive grammar learning as the main topic they want to deal with (Komara & Tiarsiwi, 2021). However, their studies are often limited to several aspects, such as student-teacher perceptions, strategies used, and challenges they face in grammar teaching and learning. Pawlak (2019), a research contributor in language acquisition, proposed research agendas that future researchers could address. One of his proposals is to investigate learners' beliefs about grammar instruction. To the best of the researcher's understanding, this research focus is sparsely happened in Indonesia and needs further discussion to address the current body of knowledge. Second, learners' preferences in language learning are commonly neglected. Samperio (2017) reports that sometimes, teachers are not aware of what learners want to experience in the classroom. Therefore, incongruency between teachers' and learners' beliefs on their preferred methods in the EFL context emerges in many cases, which can leave drawbacks to academic success (Manivannan & Nadesan, 2023).

In regards to filling these gaps, the researcher draws attention to the issues raised by Alzahrani (2024) about learners' beliefs on the importance of grammar and the preferred methods. Comparing his ideas in the Indonesian EFL context, the role of grammar and its importance cannot be denied (Hendriani, 2018). Many Indonesian scholars report the urgency to learn grammar at any level as it will contribute to the process of mastering the four English skills (Fauzi et al., 2024; Sabita et al., 2024; Nur, 2020). As this case is already well-documented by prior researchers, this study strives to expand Alzahrani's (2024) idea to unveil undergraduate EFL learners' beliefs on the preferred methods they use to learn grammar through some pedagogical distinctions: meaning- versus form-focused instruction (MFIS), FonF versus FonFs (FFS), implicit versus explicit instruction (IES), and inductive versus deductive instruction (IDIS), simplified by one primary research question: which grammar learning method do EFL undergraduates prefer?

## RESEARCH METHOD

### Research Design

This study employed a cross-sectional survey design (Gay et al., 2012) to investigate the current beliefs of EFL undergraduate students regarding grammar learning. To be practical in terms of time and data source accessibility, the survey was distributed virtually by means of network-mediated support to reach a larger target sample of research participants. By using a questionnaire, this survey intended to reveal undergraduates' preferred methods that they believe will work best for their learning in the grammar classroom.

### Research Participants

Forty-five undergraduate students of the English language education department at five different universities across East Java, Indonesia, participated in this study, including regions such as Jember, Malang, and Lamongan. They were selected using purposive sampling (Fraenkel et al., 2012), considering a similar characteristic that when this study is conducted, they are currently taking or recently have taken grammar classes such as basic English grammar, standard English grammar, intermediate English grammar, advanced English grammar, or other names of grammar courses as a required subject in their institutions. The participants' profiles can be further seen in the table below.

Table 1. Demographic Information of Participants

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	13	29%
	Female	32	71%
Age	18-21 years old	26	58%
	22-25 years old	19	42%
Academic year	First year	6	13%
	Second year	11	24%
	Third year	7	16%
	Final year	21	47%
English proficiency level	Beginner	3	7%
	Pre-intermediate	5	11%
	Intermediate	14	31%
	Upper-intermediate	16	35%
	Pre-advanced	3	7%
	Advanced	4	9%

To maintain the credibility of the current investigation, the researcher asked for participants' consent and willingness to be involved in this study. Additionally, they were informed that their identity and responses would remain confidential and be used only for research purposes. Then, they were assigned to fill out the survey, which consisted of several statements that would later represent their preferences for the method used while learning grammar in the classroom.

### Data Collection Method

To address the research aims, this study adapted a questionnaire developed by Graus and Coppen (2015), which consists of scales representing four construct pairs such as (1) meaning-focused and form-focused instruction, (2) focus on form and focus on forms instruction, (3) implicit and explicit instruction, also (4) inductive and deductive instruction. From the four scales, Graus and Coppen (2015) composed a total of twenty-two items that were already statistically measured for validity and reliability using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Since the original items were in Dutch, the English version of the questionnaire needs to be linguistically validated.

### Pilot test

Pilot tests involved undergraduate students who did not belong to the research participants to ensure that all items included in the questionnaire were valid and reliable. Subsequently, the researcher also considered any reviews and suggestions during the test to refine the questionnaire for better clarity. The results of the first pilot test were statistically analyzed and showed that only sixteen items were considered valid from twenty-two items. One of the participants commented that several items were not necessarily included and seemed like repetition. These items confused the participants when answering the questions. As a result, the researcher removed the repetitive items and revised some of them. At the end, eighteen questions were ready for the second pilot test that was conducted to different participants from the previous one. The findings indicated that all eighteen items are valid with a  $\text{Sig. (2-tailed)} < 0.05$ . In addition, the reliability statistics using Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) revealed 0.869 total score, which means that all items are highly reliable to be used as a research instrument. Below is the detailed information on the final items included in the questionnaire.

Table 2. Scales and Items in the Questionnaire

Scale	Pole	Items	Sample item
Meaning- versus Form-focused instruction (MFIS)	Form-focused Meaning-focused	1, 2, 3 4, 5, 6	Grammar should be taught in English class In English class, it is not necessary to discuss grammar; the focus should only be on learning how to communicate
Focus on form versus Focus on forms (FFS)	Focus on forms Focus on form	7, 8 9, 10	Grammar should be the main focus of English class Teachers should only pay attention to a grammar feature if students experience difficulties with it
Implicit versus Explicit instruction (IES)	Explicit Implicit	11, 12 13, 14	When teaching grammar, the teacher must discuss explicit grammar rules Students can acquire grammar easily by learning through many examples of sentences (without explanation of the rule)
Inductive versus Deductive instruction (IDIS)	Deductive Inductive	15, 16 17, 18	The teacher should directly explain the grammar rules instead of asking students to find the rules by themselves Learning grammar through examples helps students understand the rules better than direct explanation from the teacher

Henceforth, the final version of the questionnaire which consisted of both positive and negative worded items as presented in the table 3, was administered using *Google Forms*. The research participants can select only one of four options, varying from Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Agree (A), and Strongly Agree (SA) and or vice versa for each scale.

Table 3. The Distribution of Questionnaire's Items

Category	Item number
Positive worded items	1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18
Negative worded items	4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14

### Data Analysis Method

Since the purpose of this study is to identify the learners' beliefs concerning the issue defined previously, without establishing any predictions nor hypothesis, data from the questionnaire were analyzed descriptively (Boone & Boone, 2012) using a statistical program named IBM SPSS 25. The researcher converted the responses into numerical data, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). However, for some negatively worded items in the questionnaire, the value will be reversed into an inverted scale, ranging from the highest score (4 for strongly disagree) to the lowest (1 for strongly agree). After the data were organized, the statistical package was run to collect the approximate number of respondents who selected the same option in each item. The calculation went further to find the mean score for accurate and precise data interpretation, following the scale convention from Lindner and Lindner (2024) as presented in the table below.

Table 4. Interpretation Guidelines

Values	Interpretation			
	Positive worded items		Negative worded items	
4.0 – 3.51	Strongly agree			Strongly disagree
3.5 – 2.51	Agree			Disagree
2.5 – 1.51	Disagree			Agree
1.5 – 1.00	Strongly disagree			Strongly agree

The guidelines above allowed the researcher to summarize the overall result of each item without misinterpreting it. In addition, the scale is reversed for the negatively worded items in the questionnaire to maintain the consistency of the analysis results.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

This section presents statistical results regarding EFL undergraduates' beliefs on their preferred method while learning grammar. The reports are classified into four pedagogical distinctions: meaning- versus form-focused instruction (MFIS), FonF versus FonFs (FFS), implicit versus explicit instruction (IES), and inductive versus deductive instruction (IDIS).

#### Meaning versus Form-Focused Instruction (MFIS)

The first analysis reports participants' responses on which one between meaning and form-focused instruction they believe is more effective to be implemented while learning grammar, as shown in the table below.

Table 5. Meaning versus Form-Focused Instruction (MFIS)

Item	Statement	Frequency				Mean	Data Interpretation
		SD	D	A	SA		
<b>Form-focused instruction</b>							
1	Grammar should be taught in English class	2	1	13	29	3.53	Strongly agree
2	Teachers should pay attention to grammar in English class	2	5	14	24	3.33	Agree
3	English grammar should be addressed in coursebooks	2	1	20	22	3.38	Agree
<b>Meaning-focused instruction</b>							
4	English grammar should not be addressed in coursebook	24	9	9	3	3.20	Disagree
5	In English class, it is not necessary to discuss grammar; the focus should only be on learning how to communicate	12	18	12	3	2.87	Disagree
6	The focus of English lessons should lie solely on learning how to communicate (without grammar teaching)	13	20	11	1	3.00	Disagree

The numerical data revealed some variability in participants' responses. Item numbers 1, 2, and 3 indicated that most undergraduates had positive beliefs toward form-focused instruction (FFI). Meanwhile, the variability is gaining more diversity for items 4, 5, and 6 representing meaning-focused instruction (MFI). However, when the

mean score of each item was interpreted using the previously mentioned guidelines, it was clearly stated that participants generally prefer to experience FFI instead of MFI.

### FonF versus FonFs (FFS)

The second analysis results show participants' preference concerning focus on form (FonF) and focus on forms (FonFs) instruction. An interesting finding was discovered in items 7 and 8 as statements correspond to FonFs instruction. The former mean score is 2.44, meanwhile the latter is 3.40. These results demonstrate a significant gap in that although both statements fall under the same instruction, the data interpretation showed contrasting responses, where most participants expressed a negative attitude toward grammar as the main focus of English class, as concluded in the table below.

Table 6. FonF versus FonFs (FFS)

Item	Statement	Frequency				Mean	Data Interpretation
		SD	D	A	SA		
<b>FonFs instruction</b>							
7	Grammar should be the main focus of English class	5	20	15	5	2.44	Disagree
8	English coursebooks should provide clear and comprehensive explanations on all aspects of grammar	1	3	18	23	3.40	Agree
<b>FonF instruction</b>							
9	Teachers should only pay attention to a grammar feature if students experience difficulties with it	10	26	5	4	2.93	Disagree
10	If students do not make any mistakes in a particular grammar feature, teachers should not explain the underlying grammar rule	16	20	4	5	3.04	Disagree

Accordingly, most participants agreed with item number 8, indicating that English coursebooks should provide clear and comprehensive explanations of all aspects of grammar. In contrast, the majority disagreed with items 9 and 10, which were associated with focus-on-form (FonF) instruction. This discrepancy may be attributed to several underlying factors, which will be elaborated upon in the discussion section.

### Implicit versus Explicit Instruction (IES)

The third analysis results are intended to document empirical data on what participants believe is the most preferable method of implicit and explicit instruction in grammar learning, as shown in the following table.

Table 7. Implicit versus Explicit Instruction (IES)

Item	Statement	Frequency				Mean	Data Interpretation
		SD	D	A	SA		
<b>Explicit instruction</b>							
11	When teaching grammar, the teacher must discuss explicit grammar rules	0	2	27	16	3.31	Agree
12	Clear and detailed explanation of grammar rules are essential for	1	2	21	21	3.38	Agree

students to learn grammar effectively						
<b>Implicit instruction</b>						
13	The best way to learn grammar is by having a lot of practice in speaking, writing, reading, or listening, without trying to learn the rules directly from the teacher's explanation	7	16	13	9	2.47
14	Students can acquire grammar easily by learning through many examples of sentences (without explanation of the rule)	5	15	18	7	2.40

The data above showcase students' agreement to explicit and implicit instruction. While participants did not appear strongly concerned about the implementation of either approach, a comparison of mean scores suggests a slight preference for explicit instruction, with scores of 3.31 and 3.38, compared to 2.47 and 2.40 for implicit instruction.

#### Inductive versus Deductive Instruction (IDIS)

The last analysis revealed participants' beliefs on other grammar instructions, inductive and deductive. The statistical results can be seen in the table below.

Table 8. Inductive versus Deductive Instruction (IDIS)

Item	Statement	Frequency				Mean	Data Interpretation
		SD	D	A	SA		
<b>Deductive instruction</b>							
15	The teacher should directly explain the grammar rules instead of asking students to find the rules by themselves	1	11	18	15	3.04	Agree
16	It is effective for the teacher to explain the rules first and then ask students create examples	2	5	16	22	3.29	Agree
<b>Inductive instruction</b>							
17	It is effective for the teacher to provide the sample sentences first and then ask students to find the grammar rules of those sentences	3	7	22	13	3.00	Agree
18	Learning grammar through examples helps students understand the rules better than direct explanation from the teacher	2	5	19	19	3.22	Agree

Based on the mean scores, participants responded positively to both deductive and inductive grammar instruction. However, the mean scores for items 15 and 16, which represent deductive instruction (3.04 and 3.29), were slightly higher than those for items 17 and 18, which represent inductive instruction (3.00 and 3.22). These results suggest that most participants showed a slight preference for learning grammar through the deductive approach.

#### Discussion

Departing from Alzahrani's (2024) study, this paper tends to address the research aim and further discusses the findings in unveiling undergraduate EFL learners' beliefs on the preferred methods they use to learn grammar within larger coverage of pedagogical distinctions: meaning-versus-form-focused instruction (MFIS), FonF versus FonFs (FFS), implicit versus explicit instruction (IES), and inductive versus deductive instruction (IDIS).

Regarding individual learning preferences, most EFL undergraduates believe in form-focused instruction (FFI), which is used to expose grammar in formal instruction, instead of meaning-focused instruction (MFI), which emphasizes fluency over accuracy. Grammar is difficult to learn but crucial to activate students' ability to handle appropriate communication or pass the academic exam (Komara & Tiarsiwi, 2021). Vahili and Mohammed (2020) argue that even Americans whose first language is English face difficulties learning and using grammar in context. It is even more important in Indonesia, where English does not have status as an L1 but as a foreign language. The current finding is also relevant to Daloglu's (2020) study, which found that university students prefer FFI to MFI. This does not mean Indonesian EFL learners are not genuinely concerned about their speaking ability. Many of them put so much effort to train their speaking skills in particular situations, making them automatically adjust their speaking style according to specific contexts such as formal or informal, academic or casual, and more. However, grammar is another important bullet. Since they are required to speak appropriately in a professional setting, learning grammar becomes necessary, and FFI can provide students with a central focus on grammar.

Aligning with the previous finding, this study also reveals undergraduate students' preference between focus on form (FonF) and focus on forms (FonFs) instruction, in which they are more likely to follow FonFs instruction. Here, grammar is taught in a structured way instead of being integrated with other skills. Interestingly, students expressed disagreement about whether grammar would become the primary focus of English class. It might be because of the dual focus students should achieve, as mentioned before, as they need both fluency and accuracy. However, undergraduates believe grammar should be addressed in the course book, providing clear and comprehensive explanations about all grammar features reported by previous studies (e.g., Komara & Tiarsiwi, 2021; Daloglu, 2020). Despite the errors or mistakes they probably make in using grammar or the difficulties they encounter while learning grammar, they still demand a lecturer's explanation of the underlying grammar rules.

Then, following Alzahrani's (2024) study to discover students' preferences in grammar learning, he concluded different findings. Even though some students preferred explicit grammar, he found that Arabian EFL undergraduates prefer to learn grammar implicitly. In this study, students agree with explicit and implicit grammar instruction. However, students are more likely to be into explicit grammar learning. Students who believe in explicit grammar were the ones who stipulated clarity in grammar explanations that later contributed to their test preparation (Alzahrani, 2024). In his study, Alzahrani (2024) found that those who preferred the implicit way of learning grammar believed that learning uses language and not even grammar. What is essential to be highlighted here is the context of the study. Alzahrani's (2024) study involved EFL undergraduates who implicitly received grammar lessons 14 hours a week as part of language skills and another 3 hours during which the lecturer taught them grammar explicitly. Meanwhile, EFL undergraduates in this study only learn grammar explicitly for around 100 minutes a week in approximately two to three semesters. With such different exposure, it is understandable if Indonesian EFL undergraduates in this study prefer to learn grammar as a standalone course to maximize the time in building a strong understanding of grammar knowledge.

Moreover, Alzahrani (2024) reports that learners prefer implicit grammar learning because they were taught the same way in their previous schooling. It indicates that their experience influences their beliefs on their preferred grammar learning method. Bringing his findings to the Indonesian context, Indonesian EFL learners almost always received explicit grammar learning since they were in lower education, as for decades, the educational curriculum in Indonesia has emphasized grammar seeing that students need to pass the final exam. It can be one of the factors why Indonesian EFL undergraduates slightly prefer to learn grammar directly through explicit instruction. While going deeper into the learners' background, although English is not the L1 in both countries, Saudi Arabia and Indonesia have different contexts in learning English as a foreign language. They differ in the curriculum, educational policy, and system they implement.

Moving forward, as students prefer explicit grammar instruction, they demonstrate positive responses to inductive and deductive grammar learning, similar to previous studies (e.g., Paskarna & Mukti, 2024; Ismail et al., 2023; Nur, 2020). Both emphasize grammar in their practices but have different ways of approaching students. In the inductive approach, students can learn grammar through thousands of examples of sentences, promoting critical thinking because they are encouraged to discover the underlying rules by themselves. In contrast, students who believe in the deductive approach will be more comfortable to listen to the lecturer's explanation, understand the rules, and then practice using grammar in written and oral form. Even though students believe that inductive and deductive approaches will be practical, they slightly prefer deductive approaches. It is consistent with the previous one, where students are likelier to have explicit, focused forms and form-focused instruction.

Discussing learners' beliefs as a slice of the topic under individual learning differences will never end. No different than trying to discover EFL undergraduates' beliefs on the preferred method among meaning- and form-focused instruction, FonF and FonF instruction, implicit and explicit, or inductive and deductive approach they think is effective to assist them in learning grammar. It is even more challenging since they experience and get exposed to different methods right before they pursue higher education; their preference might change and evolve over time. It is not enough to identify their preferred method since learners expect teachers' creativity and ability to implement interactive media, technology, or group learning (Komaria & Tiarsiwi, 2021). In addition, the background where students come from, in which part they are raised, or in which community they belong influences their preference for language learning, and therefore, further study should extensively address why learners believe that way in a more comprehensive procedure.

## CONCLUSION

Issues related to grammar teaching and learning frequently become controversial in second language acquisition (SLA), and there are ongoing debates among scholars. Grammar has always been a topic in academic settings when people discuss accuracy versus fluency. In higher education, particularly for EFL undergraduates, mastering grammar is necessary to enhance the appropriateness of communication in spoken and written form. Thus, to reach the goal, teachers must pay attention to what they prefer to learn grammar. This study revealed that students are more likely to be conscious of grammar learning. They prefer to implement methods which have greater emphasis on grammar rules, such as form-focused, focus on forms, explicit, and deductive instructions. Instead of using meaning-focused instruction, they demonstrate a stronger preference to have a class where they can dedicate their time and effort to learning grammar explicitly without being integrated with other skills. In this case, considering students' preferred grammar instructions will lead teachers to create effective classroom

practices and possibly assist students for better linguistics achievement. However, teachers still need support from education stakeholders to provide them with professional training and development on how to implement those methods in instructional practices.

## RECOMMENDATION

Despite the significance addressed by the researcher in contributing to the existing body of knowledge in language pedagogy, this study has some constraints. There are some important notes that future researchers should be aware of. First, as a survey study, this research is limited in terms of participants, which causes the results to be less favorable for generalization to a larger population. Second, this research focuses only on discovering what grammar methods or instructions EFL undergraduates prefer. Other areas, such as why they believe in such a strategy or how they implement it, are not covered. As belief is something abstract that cannot be measured or discovered by only numerical data, the prospective researchers can expand the research findings and ideas using different designs to investigate why undergraduate students believe in particular grammar techniques and to what extent their belief influences their learning achievement. It is also interesting to conduct a longitudinal study with a larger sample of participants to know their evolving beliefs and preferences in grammar teaching and learning.

## REFERENCES

Alzahrani, I. H. (2024). Exploring learners' beliefs on grammar learning: Importance and preferred methods. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(5), 1475-1485. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1405.20>

Aman, N. (2020). Teaching grammar: Issues and challenges. *Journal of English Language Teaching Innovations and Materials (JELTIM)*, 2(1), 1-13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26418/jeltim.v2i1.40032>

Boone Jr, H. N., & Boone, D. A. (2012). Analyzing likert data. *The Journal of extension*, 50(2), 48. <https://open.clemson.edu/joe/vol50/iss2/48/>

Daloglu, A. (2020). EFL students' beliefs about how they learn grammar best. *English Language Teaching*, 13(10), 158-165. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n10p158>

Fauzi, K. R. R., Munawaroh, H., & Sulistyaningsih (2024). Improving students' English grammar through incorporating games. *ETERNAL (English Teaching Journal)*, 15(1), 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v15i1.322>

Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Pearson.

Graus, J., & Coppen, P. A. (2015). Student teacher beliefs on grammar instruction. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(5), 571-599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815603237>

Hendriani, S. (2018). Grammar teaching method preferred by Indonesian students. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(11), 83-96.

Ismail, D. A. I., Basthom, Y., & Karmina, S. (2023). Students' perceptions and experiences about the combined inductive-deductive approach in intermediate grammar class. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(1), 66-78. <https://doi.org/10.31763/ijele.v5i1.1046>

Komara, C., & Tiarsiwi, F. (2021). Exploring Indonesian EFL learners' perception of English learning grammar. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 6(2), 459-470. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v6i2.564>

Li, S. (2022). On the role of English as a foreign language learners' individual differences in their use of grammar learning strategies. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.853158>

Lindner, J. R., & Lindner, N. J. (2024). Interpreting likert-type scales, summated scales, unidimensional scales, and attitudinal scales: I neither agree nor disagree, likert or not. *Advancements in Agricultural Development*, 5(2), 152-163.

Ling, Z. (2015). Explicit grammar and implicit grammar teaching for English major students in university. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 12(8), 556-560. <https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8072/2015.08.002>

Manivannan, M. L., & Nadesan, N. K. (2023). Match or mismatch? Differentiation strategies preferred by students and applied by teachers. *Proceedings of International Conference of Research on Language Education (I-RoLE 2023)*, 13-14 March, 2023, Noble Resort Hotel Melaka, Malaysia, 7, 250–263. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epes.23097.23>

Nur, S. (2020). Students' perception toward the use of deductive and inductive approaches in teaching English grammar. *TESOL International Journal*, 15(1), 6-19. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1257213>

Paskarena, M. I., & Mukti, T. W. P. (2024). Students' voices on effective teaching methods for grammar learning in peer tutoring program. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 11(2), 849-875. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v11i2.2904>

Pawlak, M. (2019). Grammar learning strategies as a key to mastering second language grammar: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 53(3), 358-370. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000314>

Pusparini, R., Widiati, U., & Susanti, A. (2021). Pre-service teachers' beliefs about English language teaching and learning in EFL classroom: A review of literature. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 6(1), 147-154. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v6i1.1212>

Qiao, C. (2024). Factors influencing second language learning based on the research of Lightbown and Spada. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1347691>

Sabita, M., Pujiawati, N., & Miftakh, F. M. F. (2024). An analysis of teacher beliefs and practices in grammar teaching: A case study of EFL high school teachers. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 833-846. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.8.4.p.833-846>

Saengboon, S., Kosin, P., & Toomaneejinda, A. (2022). The roles of grammar in English language teaching: Local viewpoints. *Pasaa*, 63(1), 179-204. <https://digital.car.chula.ac.th/pasaa/vol63/iss1/7/>

Samperio, S. N. (2017). Discovering students' preference for classroom activities and teachers' frequency of activity use. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 19(1), 51–66. <https://doi.org/10.14483/calj.v19n1.9292>

Storch, N. (2018). Meaning-focused versus form-focused instruction. *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0690>

Vakili, P., & Mohammed, R. (2020). "Grammar scares me": An exploration of American students' perceptions of grammar learning. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(12), 124-135. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt>