

The Effects of Vietnamese High School Teacher's Utility of Google Forms on Eleventh Graders' Grammatical Knowledge

Vu Phi Ho Pham¹, Van Da Tran^{2*}

¹ Van Lang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

² Ton Duc Thang University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

*Corresponding author: Van Da Tran, Ton Duc Thang University; Email: englishmylife@gmail.com

Abstract

In Vietnam, grammar has been taught with conventional teaching methods such as the Grammar Translation Method and Audio Lingual Method, which still focus on paper-based grammar exercises in high schools. These traditional methods demotivate students' learning interest and motivation and fail to increase their independent learning and the effectiveness of grammar instruction. The purpose of this study is to explore the effects of Vietnamese high school teachers' utilization of Google Forms on eleventh graders' grammatical knowledge and their perceptions of Google Forms in learning English grammar. The study results emphasized the intervention of eleventh-grade students' knowledge of grammar and their perceptions of this treatment. The study's findings indicated that the integration of Google Forms successfully aided students in enhancing their achievement of grammatical knowledge. Furthermore, students have a positive attitude towards this application into grammar teaching.

Keywords: grammar instruction, grammatical knowledge, Google Forms.

1. Introduction

Thanks to ICT development, the implementation of Google apps and the application of blended learning in grammar instruction, in particular, have proliferated for a few decades. Such ICT-based alternatives in language instruction have been affirmed advantageous for both language teachers and students with statistical analysis and reliable evidence in a multitude of noticeable studies. These alternatives can not only improve the effectiveness of teachers' teaching in grammar instruction but also enhance learners' interest, autonomy, and concentration on grammar learning (e.g., Garrison & Vaughan, 2008; Do & Nguyen, 2014; Isti'anah, 2017; Khalil, 2018; and Pham, 2018a).

On the other hand, according to Bilonozhko and Syzenko (2020), learners belong to Generation Z or Gen Z. It refers to those born after 2000. It is also called the digital generation or digital natives. Their lifestyles are established in the basement of the

environment where the Internet, mobile phones, social media, Youtube, and instant messenger are dominated. Because they were born and have grown up in such an environment, they have a knack for adopting digital gadgets like computers, laptops, ipads, tablets, mobile phones, and ICT applications smoothly. They are also experts for adapting to ICT innovations. Harmanto (2013) identifies that it is the growth of ICT that creates Generation Z's styles of learning. They enjoy learning by interacting with ICT devices. They can utilize the Internet to discover new things and study what they are not familiar with, and the Internet and digital tools are integral parts of their learning process. They pioneer to take in new knowledge and skills with new ICT tools and innovative ICT apps. Some studies, such as Pham (2021) and Pham D. T. T., Technology is a helpful tool to help students improve their English, and the students have positive attitudes towards technology. To be a good teacher for Generation Z, teachers should incorporate more technologies into their lesson plans. They must make use of ICT to modernize their instructional methods. They can use more technology-based activities, including visual content, and offer ways for students to provide and receive their feedback in learning and teaching. Furthermore, in a case study, Van et al.. (2021) highlighted that more than three-quarters of students used educational apps and smartphones to learn the language, and over 81% of students agreed that technology could enhance the effectiveness of their language learning.

However, in her study, Pham (2015) points out that Grammar-Translation Method still plays a dominant role in teaching English grammar throughout Vietnam because many English teachers are in favor of adopting it in their teaching practice. Likewise, Khuong (2015) claims that many English teachers are still faithful to Audio Lingual Method (ALM) in instructing grammar because they get used to this method and are unwilling to adopt a new one. These conventional approaches to teaching grammar do demotivate students' interests in learning English grammar and minimize teachers' efficiency (Pham, 2015). Also, on utilizing these traditional teaching methods, teachers miss an excellent opportunity to assist students in their autonomous learning, and students find the language lessons boring (Khalil, 2018). Furthermore, teachers can not exploit the benefits of blended learning, the combination of activities inside the classroom and outside the classroom, in instructing grammar. In other words, teachers only focus on the process of learning and teaching inside the classroom and ignore it outside the classroom (Khuong, 2015). Tackling these notable problems will bring practical benefits to both teachers and students in teaching and learning English grammar.

Google Forms combined with blended learning in grammar instruction is one notable recommendation to deal with these issues. Google Forms is defined by Haddad and Kalaani (2014) as an interactive web-based platform with a user-friendly application programming interface for producing online surveys, questionnaires, and quizzes. Blended learning refers to an educational curriculum that combines online sources with conventional learning in a classroom (Graham, 2000).

To unravel the effects of Vietnamese high school teachers' utilization of Google Forms on 11th graders' grammatical knowledge, a quasi-experimental study is first undertaken. Then the questionnaire and the interview are utilized to clarify the Vietnamese 11th graders' perceptions of Google Forms in learning English grammar.

2. Literature review

2.1 Grammar instruction

Grammar teaching is an important part of language teaching in high school. According to Fromkin, Rodman, and Hyams (2017), grammar instruction is helpful for learners who learn English because it can guide them to acquire and use how language is produced. He also suggests that form-focused language will be necessary if learners promote levels of accuracy in the target language. Pham and Nguyen (2014) claimed that the teachers at high school often employed the Grammar Translation Method in teaching grammar. DeKeyser (1996) believes that grammar teaching is essential to enhance language learning since it provides learners with several basic ways to create language. He also points out that the consciousness of target structures and forms is essential to second language learning.

Another significant point demonstrated by Zhang (2009) is that grammar instruction is fundamental in second language teaching because grammar is the basic background of the English language. Without grammar, learners find it impossible to learn a language. In addition, the most important goal for learning a language is to help learners communicate effectively and appropriately in social contexts. Thus, grammar teaching can assure this goal because it empowers students to know how to combine vocabulary to make a meaningful sentence used for their communicative purposes. Besides, he discusses that grammar learning does not occur naturally, but it needs teaching by teachers who can improve learners' grammar learning effectiveness and accuracy. Learners themselves can indeed learn other skills such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Still, they are not capable of learning grammar autonomously, and they need to be supported by teachers in learning grammar.

From what has been discussed so far, it is obvious to summarize that grammar teaching is an integral part of language teaching because it is considered a core part of a language and has a decisive effect on second language learning success.

2.2 ICT-based alternatives of teaching English grammar

With the integration of ICT into language teaching, the last decade has seen rapid innovation in teaching English grammar. Google-app-based alternatives and blended learning are two of the most leading trends for teaching English grammar at present.

Google-app-based alternatives

Al-Harbi and Alshumaimeri (2016) highlight that language teacher should integrate technology into teaching grammar in the era of technology because this can prompt students to direct their learning and offer them opportunities to practice the target language and develop their autonomous learning language learning outside the classroom. This view is supported by Saeedi (2016) and Keshta and Harb (2013), who points out that interactive technological platforms serving as a motivator should be utilized in grammar teaching. Thanks to this, students are able to have access to endless online input sources and be more active in their language learning. In the same vein, Khalil (2018) notes that Google apps offer teachers considerable ways to conduct English grammar lessons in the digital age. Such

Google-app-mediated alternatives in grammar instruction can promote learners' autonomy and enhance their willingness.

Blended Learning

According to Isti'annah (2017), thanks to the never-ending innovation of technology and the Internet, blended learning has prevalently been used as an effective approach to teaching English grammar. Online classes can be combined with offline ones in English grammar instruction. This integration can improve the effectiveness of teachers' grammar teaching and better students' learning outcomes and interests in learning grammar. Concurrent with this research trend, Ngo (2018) points out that blended learning, the combination of conventional and technology-mediated methodologies in the language classroom, has become prevalent in grammar instruction. He found that employing blended learning enhanced students' English grammar knowledge and encouraged their autonomy. More importantly, learners had a positive view toward the utilization of blended learning in instructing grammar.

Overall, these suggestions provide important insights that teaching English grammar with the aids of technology-based learning platforms can be a leading model which may be advantageous for both language teachers and students.

2.3 The ways technology applied in grammar teaching and learning

Technology does support grammar teaching and learning in a wide range of ways. According to An and Williams (2019), one of the noticeable ways is that videos and films can be used in the presentation stage or input. Some short videos and movies can raise students' awareness of grammatical structures, and teachers can use them to help students understand how structures are utilized in real-life situations communication. In line with this, Chau (2021) points out that ICT plays a key role in supporting students to get access to real input and diverse sources of contemporary materials of learning. Another way is the use of apps and online games (Busyteacher, n.d.). Thanks to online apps and games, students can practice grammatical points and memorize the rules better. More significantly, with funny games, students have great opportunities to experience edutainment, the combination of education and entertainment. This can help students enhance the effectiveness of grammar learning and increase their excitement and interest in grammar acquisition. In line with this, Busyteacher (n.d.) points out that one more way for technology to be integrated into grammar teaching is Web Quests. Such technological tools are adopted as a virtual classroom in which students are required to complete a grammar exercise, and teachers can visit and give feedback on students' task completion. Finally, the technology-based class should be exploited to use the time outside the classroom for students to practice and memorize grammatical points because regular practice outside the class does increase students' efficiency and activeness in the process of English grammar learning (Nguyen, 2021).

2.4 Google Forms and its uses in language instruction

According to Pham (2018a), Google Forms is one of the products developed by Google. Along with Docs, Sheets, and Slides in G Suite, Google Forms is designed for the education area. The initiative aim of Google forms is to create various kinds of forms to

gather information and data for surveys or to enroll in a particular event.

Google Forms can be used to create language quizzes or exercises. Pham (2018a) highlights that Google Forms can provide teachers and students with different types of questions utilized as quizzes in language teaching such as (i) Multiple choice, (ii) Checklists, (iii) Text – for short answers, (iv) Paragraph text – for longer answers, (v) Choose from a list, (vi) Scale – a customizable Likert scale question, and (vii) Grid – select an answer from a rubric-style grid.

What is more, thanks to Google Forms, tests can be designed for language assessment. In the educational context, Google Forms is considered a useful technological tool in the classroom. In his online article, Catapano (n.d.) suggests several ways for utilizing Google Forms in learning and teaching. Google-Forms-based exercises can be used as formative assessments. Google Forms offers teachers a convenient tool for assessing students' understanding quickly and accurately. Teachers are able to create and adopt Google-Forms-based tests in their language teaching in time-saving and convenient ways because Google Forms can set up a time allowance for the tests and score students' answers automatically.

Last but not least, teachers can adopt Google Forms for setting up homework/assignments for language teaching. According to Pham (2018a), Google Forms can be utilized for teachers to set up homework or assignments which students have to complete inside and outside the classroom. Besides, the teachers can give a deadline for the assignments or homework and give comments and evaluate students' work thanks to Google forms. From what has been discussed so far, a vast number of functions of Google Forms presented in this section are provided for the teacher in language instruction, and Google Forms can be notable recommendations for a teacher to adopt in instructing English grammar.

2.5 Research Questions

Due to the aims, the research makes efforts to seek answers to two primary questions as follows:

- a) What are the effects of Vietnamese high school teachers' utilization of Google Forms on eleventh graders' grammatical knowledge?
- b) What are Vietnamese eleventh graders' perceptions of using Google Forms in learning English grammar?

3. Methods

3.1 Pedagogical Setting and Participants

The current study was conducted at a rural upper secondary school in An Giang province. This school was established in 1998, and currently, 73 teachers are teaching at it, and 1241 students are attending it. Along with other school subjects, English is compulsory for all students from grade 10 to grade 12. The English classes consist of 3 forty-five-minute periods every week. The primary goal for English high school education is to create and develop students' communicative competence. In other words, students are expected to use English as an effective tool of communication and achieve the proficiency level of B1 in the

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) when they finish grade 12.

Eighty-nine eleventh graders from class 11A4 and 11A5 in the academic year of 2020 - 2021 were non-randomly chosen out of three hundred and thirty-four students from a pool of eleventh-grade students of a high school in An Giang province. The rationale for selecting participants for the study is due to the researcher's convenience. This choice can help the researcher save time and energy because the participants are authentic class groups, so they are easily accessible and available. Participants are all between 17 and 18 years old, and all of them are native speakers of Vietnamese and learn English as a foreign language. They were divided into two equal groups. Class 11A4 consisting of 25 female students and 19 male students, serves as the experimental group, and class 11A5, including 25 female students and 20 male students, plays the role of the control group.

3.2 Design of the Study

The quasi-experimental research with pretest-posttest control-group design will be adopted to investigate the impacts of Vietnamese high school teachers' utilization of Google Forms on 11th graders' grammatical knowledge in the first phase of the research.

The design of the study is described in Table 3.1:

Table 3.1: The design of the study

Group	Pre-test	Intervention	Post-test
Experimental group	X	X	X
Control group	X	O	X

In this study, the pre-test and post-test were employed for both the experimental and control groups. However, only the experimental group received the intervention of employing Google Forms in grammar instruction, while conventional approaches were still adopted for teaching grammar to the control group.

3.3 Data collection and analysis

Four typical instruments, such as the pre-test, the post-test, the questionnaire, and the interview, were adopted to collect adequate data for the research. The pre-test was a paper-based test that requires students to answer grammar questions. In the pre-test, there were twenty-five items. The content of the pre-test centered on seven grammatical points such as the sequence of tenses, reduced forms of relative clauses, question tags, if clauses, reported speech with to infinitives and gerunds, wish clauses, and perfect participles in the curriculum of Tieng Anh 11 – Volume 2 textbook. The post-test was similar to the pre-test in terms of time allowance, the number of questions, the grammatical points, question forms, and question levels to make the data gathered for the study more valid and reliable. The questionnaire included fifteen Likert questions with five points (strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, strongly disagree). These questions explored the participants' perceptions of enjoyment, engagement, convenience, perceived learning, concentration, motivation,

satisfaction, effectiveness, and autonomy toward utilizing Google Forms in learning English grammar. Since all participants are EFL students, the questionnaire was employed in Vietnamese to ensure that all respondents understood and answered the questions accurately. It was designed in the basement of Google Forms. The semi-structured interview comprised six open-ended questions on six themes such as (i) the level of interest and motivation students achieved through learning English grammar with the integration of Google Forms, (ii) the level of effectiveness on students' learning English grammar with Google Forms exercises, (iii) the extent of convenience that Google Forms offered students in learning English grammar, (iv) the extent that Google-Forms-based lessons supported students' independent learning, (v) the difficulties students confronted when they learned English grammar with Google Forms, and (vi) students' recommendations for improving the effectiveness of integrating Google Forms into grammar instruction.

The procedures for gathering adequate data for the study are described in the following table.

Table 3.2: Procedures for data collection

Step	Research instrument	Group of participants	Type of data collected
1	Pre-test	Experimental group and control group	Quantitative data
2	Post-test	Experimental group and control group	Quantitative data
3	Questionnaire	Experimental group only	Quantitative data
4	Interview	Experimental group only	Qualitative data

It can be seen from the data in table 3.2, procedures for data collection of the study included four steps. First and foremost, the quantitative data of the pre-test conducted with both the experimental and control groups were collected prior to the intervention. Second, the data of the post-test for both groups were gathered after the treatment. Two first steps were undertaken to help the researcher collect efficient data for the first research question. Third, the in-depth information of the questionnaire from only the experimental group was quantitatively brought together. Finally, qualitative information in the interview from participants of the experimental group was elicited. Two latter steps were carried out in an attempt to seek the answer to the second research question.

The descriptive data collected from the pre-test, the post-test, and the questionnaire for the current study were processed and analyzed through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) of version 22.0 for Windows. Then the textual data gathered from the interview was scrutinized.

Data analysis procedures followed the phases in the table below.

Table 3.3: Procedures for data analysis

Phase	Research instrument	Type of data analysis	Values of analysis
1	The pre-test	Descriptive data	Frequency, mean, standard deviation, and Independent Samples T-test of both groups' means
2	The post-test		
3	The questionnaire	Descriptive data	Mean, standard deviation
4	The interview	Textual data	Textual analysis

From the table above, it can be shown that four major phases were included in the procedures for data analysis. In the first phase, the pre-test data had been descriptively analyzed with several values, namely, frequencies, means, standard deviations before independent Samples T-test of both participant groups' means were calculated. These analyses were undertaken to ensure that the level of the experimental group was similar to that of the control group prior to the treatment. In the second phase, the post-test data were descriptively processed with the same values as the pre-test to check whether the treatment had statistically significant effects. In the third phase, the data from the questionnaire were quantitatively analyzed with two sub-stages. To analyze the descriptive data, the frequencies of each scale in each item were first calculated. Then, each of the five scales in the items of the first part of the questionnaire was coded a value (namely, strongly agree = 1, agree = 2, uncertain = 3, disagree = 4, and strongly disagree = 5). Following this, the data had been converted into means for analysis. In the fourth phase, textual data from the interview was translated into English and transcribed into words. Next, the data was organized and classified into question-based themes to analyze the data more quickly and accurately. Finally, to process qualitative data from the interview, in each question, answers were put into tables so that the researcher could discover similar answers, collect diverse answers and be aware of the overall trends of the data. In short, the primary purpose of data analysis from the interview was to better understand the participants' answers to the questions in the questionnaire.

4. Findings and discussion

4.1 Research question 1: What are the effects of Vietnamese high school teachers' utilization of Google Forms on eleventh graders' grammatical knowledge?

To answer the first research question, the findings from the pre-test and the post-test are described.

Findings from the pre-test

In the table below, the results of the pre-test for both groups are presented.

Table 4.1: Summary of pre-test results

Group	N	M	S.D.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Experimental	44	6.21	.9664	.146	.885
Control	45	6.24	1.0354		

As seen from Table 4.1, the statistical values of the two groups are very much the same. The first feature being recognized was a fair equivalence between the means of both groups (**6.21** for the experimental group and **6.24** for the control group). Moreover, the two standard deviation values (**.966** for the experimental and **1.03** for the control groups) were nearly equal. Thus, it could be asserted that both groups shared an approximate similarity: their grammatical knowledge was at the same level.

Also shown in this table, the value *sig* (2-tailed) of **0.885** were much bigger than the alpha **0.05**, which meant there was no significant disparity between the two means, and two sets of scores were of equivalent means. Hence, it can be concluded that the students in both groups had equal grammatical knowledge before the experiment.

Findings from the post-test

Like the pre-test, the post-test's scores of the two groups were also analyzed in the following table.

Table 4.2: Summary of post-test results

Group	N	M	S.D.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Experimental	44	7.045	.8636	.416	.0005
Control	45	6.520	.8447		

Table 4.2 informed that after the intervention, the mean score of the experimental group (M= 7.045) was higher than that of the control group (M=6.520). In other words, there was a disparity of .5255 of the mean scores of both groups. This result indicated that the students in the experimental group had considerably improved their grammatical knowledge during the time of experimental teaching.

Also seen from this table, the sig. value (2-tailed) = **0.005** which was smaller than alpha **0.05**. This result indicated that there was a significant difference in terms of studying achievement between the experimental and control group after ten weeks of experimental teaching.

So far, the data from the pre-test and post-test have been analyzed and interpreted. The analysis suggested that the grammatical knowledge of both groups was initially almost similar at an average level. Yet, this similarity was no longer remained after the teaching intervention but substituted by a statistically significant difference. This difference was in favor of the experimental group experiencing Google Forms in learning English grammar. Indeed, this

group really made great achievements when the students obtained substantial progress in their scores by integrating Google Forms into teaching grammar.

4.2 Research question 2: What are Vietnamese eleventh graders' perceptions of using Google Forms in learning English grammar?

In order to answer the second research question, data from the questionnaire and interview were analyzed and discussed.

Findings from the questionnaire

The results from the questionnaire provided the researcher with students' perceptions concerning the implementation of the teaching alternative, Google Forms, into teaching English grammar to eleventh students in a high school. The findings from the questionnaire are laid out on two major themes as follows:

Table 4.3: Students' perceptions of Google Forms integration into grammar instruction

	M	S.D.
Interest and motivation		
I am interested in doing English grammar exercises with Google Forms.	2.18	0.54
I enjoy learning more English grammar with Google Forms.	2.18	0.66
I feel more motivated to learn English grammar through Google-Forms-based exercises.	2.29	0.70
Engagement and Concentration		
Google-Forms-based exercises can make me more engaged in learning English grammar.	2.40	0.84
Google-Forms-based exercises can help me enhance my concentration in learning English grammar.	2.34	0.79
Convenience		
I feel comfortable completing English grammar exercises with Google Forms.	2.38	0.84
I am convenient to do English grammar exercises with Google Forms.	2.31	0.80
Usefulness		
I can get more useful strategies for learning English grammar from Google-Forms-based exercises.	2.22	0.68
Google Forms is a useful tool for learning English grammar.	2.09	0.64

As shown in the above table, the means of items ranging from 2.09 to 2.40 (smaller than 3.00) have revealed that students felt more interested, motivated, engaged, concentrated, and useful in learning grammar due to the application of the Google-Forms-based grammar exercises.

Table 4.4: The effectiveness of Google Forms integration and its support for students' autonomy

	M	S.D.
Effectiveness		
Google-Forms-based exercises can help me understand English grammar better.	2.27	0.66
Google-Forms-based exercises can help me review English grammar knowledge more effectively.	2.22	0.64
Autonomy		
Google-Forms-based exercises can support my autonomy in learning English grammar.	2.27	0.73
Satisfaction		
I would like to learn Google-Forms-based lessons for my learning English in the future.	2.25	0.78
I am satisfied with the application of Google Forms in learning English grammar.	2.20	0.67
Google Forms should be integrated into grammar instruction.	2.06	0.62

From the above table, the means of items ranging from 2.06 to 2.27 (smaller than 3.00) indicated that effectiveness in learning grammar was enhanced, and students' autonomous learning was supported when Google Forms was merged into teaching grammar. Collectively, this integration of Google Forms into grammar instruction has left a good impression and a positive effect on the students under treatment.

Findings from the interview

Of the questionnaire population of 44 participants, only ten of these (6 females and four males) took part in the semi-structured interview. They can be ciphered as F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, M7, M8, M9, and M10. As discussed earlier, six open-ended questions in the interview were administered to clarify participants' answers in the questionnaire.

About students' interests and motivation, a wide range of responses were elicited. One student stated that *"I think doing Google-Forms-based exercises are similar to playing online games where I can combine learning with entertainment, which makes me feel more interested and motivated in my grammar learning"* (F1).

One more interviewee added that *"well, I enjoy interacting with electronic devices (i.e., smartphone and laptop), so when I do Google-Forms-based exercises, I feel really interested in learning English grammar."* (M10)

In regard to the new approach's effectiveness, the majority commented that *"Doing Google-Forms-based exercises can help them remember the grammar points because I can do them as many times as they would like."* Other responses to this question included: *"I can do and share Google-Forms-based exercises with my classmates, which assists me better understand the grammar structures."* (M9) and *"I think Google-Forms-based exercises can help me enhance my strategies for autonomous learning, which can assist me to enhance the effectiveness of learning grammar."* (F5)

Regarding convenience, a common view against the interviewees was that *"completing Google-Forms-based exercises is convenient because they can do grammar exercises anytime and anywhere they like, and they find really easy to have access to learning materials."* Talking about this issue, an interviewee said: *"I can do Google-Forms-based exercises with my smartphone, which is convenient for me in my learning English. Moreover, I do not need to bring a lot of learning materials when I do Google-Forms-based exercises."* (F6)

In the aspect of autonomous learning, several interviewees argued that *"Google Forms supports our autonomous learning in learning English grammar because we can do Google-Forms-based exercises as many times as possible, which assists them to revise the grammatical lessons and remember the grammatical knowledge better."* While others stated: *"We can set up a proper plan for our independent learning outside the classroom with the aids of Google-Forms-based exercises because the contents of these exercises are in line with those of the lesson we learned inside the classroom and we can review the grammar knowledge better through Google-forms-based exercises."* Another interviewee said: *"I do Google-Forms-based exercises, and then I can check the answers with their clear and detailed explanations by myself, which can encourage my self-studying. What is more, I can do Google-Forms-based exercises outside the classroom, or anywhere I like."* (F6)

About the problems, half of the interviewees responded that they had no problems when they did Google-forms-based grammar exercises. However, other participants have confronted several issues as follows:

F2 said: *My internet connection is not stable, so I have to go to the coffee house for a more stable Internet connection.*

M7 stated: *One day, when I was going to complete my Google-forms-based exercise, but there was a power cut, I had to do the whole exercise again the next day because I could save what I have completed.*

F4 considered: *"Some exercises were designed too long with too many items, my eyes were tiring when I read them, so I feel tired after completing these exercises."*

In response to recommendations, participants provided a variety of responses. One interviewee said: *"More and more Google-Forms-based exercises should be created and sent to students so that they can have more opportunities to practice them."* (M8). Mentioning this aspect, one interviewee argued that *"Google Forms should be integrated into not only grammar instruction but also other fields like vocabulary, phonetics, listening, reading, and*

so on.” One more student commented: *“to be more effective and useful for students to learn grammar, the teacher ought to design the answer keys with more detail explanations.”* Finally, another interview participant recommended that *“the number of questions in each exercise should be limited from twenty to thirty because if the content of the exercises is too lengthy, it can make me tired of reading and answering the questions. Moreover, doing an exercise with reasonable length can assist me in avoiding some technical problems such as a power cut or a weak internet connection.”*

All responses to the questions in the interview indicated that the participants had a positive attitude towards the merge of Google Forms into grammar instruction.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Conclusion

As mentioned in the introduction, the current study was designed to determine the effect of Google Forms' utilization on eleventh-grade students' grammar knowledge and discover these students' perceptions of this application. The findings from the study have shown as follows.

Regarding the first research question, Vietnamese high school teachers' utilization of Google Forms on eleventh graders' grammatical knowledge is that Google Forms merged into grammar instruction to eleventh-grade students has greatly helped improve students' grammatical knowledge. The students from the experimental group have developed from having average scoring points to achieving a lot of fair and good scores. Their progress is much more meaningful when compared to the modest improvement of their partners who received the conventional method of grammar instruction. Besides, the difference in the score improvement of the two groups has been proved to be statistically significant, which indicated the effectiveness of the trial alternative of Google Forms when it was implemented to teaching English grammar to 11th graders. Last but not least, students perceived that Google Forms exercises were likely to scaffold the effectiveness of their grammar learning.

In response to the second research question, what Vietnamese eleventh graders' perceptions of using Google Forms in learning English grammar are, students' perceptions of the teacher's utilization of Google Forms in English grammar instruction showed a positive attitude toward the new approach. Specifically, learners thought that they felt more interested, motivated, engaged, convenient, and concentrated on learning grammar with the merge of Google Forms. More significantly, their autonomous learning could be stimulated thanks to this fusion effectively.

In short, the Google Forms alternative does avail students in terms of grammatical knowledge and their attitudes towards this approach.

5.2 Limitations

Although this study may be of value in an EFL high school in Vietnam, several significant limitations need to be considered. Firstly, in comparison with a true experiment, this study, a quasi-experiment, may undergo some limitations related to the generalization to the whole population (the 11th graders) though the subjects (44 students) have some similar

matching characteristics (i.e., age, level, and background) to those of the population. Secondly, this approach was applied to the 11th graders only. Therefore, it does not ensure that it has positive effects on other high school graders. Thirdly, the current experiment confirmed the effectiveness of the new approach on grammar instruction only. Its effects on other language aspects or skills of language teaching have not been discovered yet. Finally, the experimental duration was limited in time and was probably not long enough to determine whether the improvement can be consistent and sustainable over a longer period or not.

5.3 Suggestions for further studies

From the limitations mentioned above, there are several suggestions for further studies. First and foremost, it is expected that future studies will expand the subjects of study to ensure the generalization of the results for students of the same grade. Second, the process genre approach has proved its effectiveness on the 11th graders; therefore, it is suggested that further studies be implemented on the 10th and 12th graders to depict a more comprehensive picture of applying the process genre approach to teaching English writing to high school students. Next, the current study is affirmed to be successful on grammar instruction. Therefore, future research should concentrate on investigating Google Forms integration's effects on other language fields (i.e., vocabulary & pronunciation) and other language skills (i.e., listening & reading). Finally, to testify the approach's effectiveness over time, future studies should also be conducted in a bigger length of time, for example, an academic year instead of one semester.

References

- An, Y. & Williams, K. (2010). Teaching with Web 2.0 technologies: benefits, barriers and lessons learned. *International Journal of Instructional Technology & Distance Learning*, 7(3), 41-48.
- Bilonozhko, N., & Syzenko, A. (2020). Effective Reading Strategies for Generation Z Using Authentic Texts. *Arab World English Journal: Special Issue on the English Language in Iraqi Context*. 121- 130. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/elt2.8>.
- Busyteacher (n.d.). *10 Modern Ways to Use Technology in ESL Instruction*. Retrieved from <https://busyteacher.org/13732-using-technology-esl-instruction-10-modern-ways.html>
- Chau, K. G. (2021). The Effect of ICT on Learners' Speaking Skills Development. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 1(1), 22–29. Retrieved from <https://i-jte.org/index.php/journal/article/view/4>.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (1995) Learning second language grammar rules: An experiment with a miniature linguistic system. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17(3), 379–410.
- Do, T. H., & Nguyen, H. T. N. (2014). An exploratory study of ICT use in English language learning among English university students. *Teaching English with Technology*, 14(4), 32-46.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2017). *An introduction to language* (11th Ed.). The United States: Cengage Learning, Inc.

- Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2), 95–105. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2004.02.001
- Graham, C. R. (2006). *Blended learning systems: definition, current trends, and future directions*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer Publishing.
- Haddad, R. J. & Kalaani, Y. (2014). Google Forms: A Real-Time Formative Feedback Process for Adaptive Learning. *The 121st ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition*, 6(2), 902-911. DOI: 10.18260/1-2-20540.
- Harmanto, B. (2013). Teaching English to Generation Z students (New concept of young learners). *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 6(1), 74-81.
- Isti'anah, A. (2017). The effect of blended learning to the students' achievement in grammar class. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 4(1), 16-30. doi:10.15408/ijee.v4i1.5697.
- Khalil, M. Z. (2018). English students' perceptions towards using Google docs and Google classroom as online collaborative tools in learning grammar. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 2(2), 33–48. Doi: 10.14744/alrj.2018.47955.
- Khuong, T. H. C. (2015). Teaching English grammar communicatively: theories, principles, and implications in English teaching in Vietnam. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*. 2(2), 62-68.
- Nguyen, V. M. (2021). English language-learning environments in COVID-19 era: EFL contexts, English-language environments, technology-based approach, English language learning. *AsiaCALL Online Journal*, 12(3), 39-46. Retrieved from <https://asiacall.info/acoj/index.php/journal/article/view/21>
- Pham, Vu Phi Ho (2021). The Effects of Lecturer's Model e-comments on Graduate Students' Peer e-comments and Writing Revision. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(3), pp. 324-357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1609521>
- Pham, D. T. T. (2021). The effects of Audiovisual Media on Students' Listening Skills. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 1(1), 13–21. Retrieved from <http://i-jte.org/index.php/journal/article/view/3>
- Pham, Vu Phi Ho & Nguyen, The Binh (2014). The Effects of Communicative Grammar Teaching on Students' Achievement of Grammatical Knowledge and Oral Production. *English Language Teaching (ELT)*, 7 (6), pp. 74-86, DOI: [10.5539/elt.v7n6p74](https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n6p74)
- Pham, D. T. (2018a). Application of Google Forms in the English classroom. *The 2018 International graduate research symposium Proceedings*, 3rd, 131-137.
- Pham, D. T. (2018b). Integration of technology-enhanced language learning tools into teaching English for English students. *The 2018 International graduate research symposium proceedings*, 640-650.

- Pham, P. K. M. (2015). *Changes in teaching grammar in the world and in Vietnam* (Matser's thesis). Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/16700372/Changes_in_teaching_grammar_in_the_world_and_in_Vietnam.html.
- Van, L. K., Dang, T. A., Pham, D. B. T., Vo, T. T. N., & Pham, V. P. H. (2021). The Effectiveness of Using Technology in Learning English. *AsiaCALL Online Journal*, 12(2), 24-40. Retrieved from <https://asiacall.info/acoj/index.php/journal/article/view/26>.
- Zhang, J. (2009). Necessity of grammar teaching. *International Education Studies*, 2(2), 184-187.

Biodata

(1) Assoc. Prof. Pham Vu Phi Ho, Ph.D., Faculty of Foreign Languages, Van Lang University, Vietnam. He used to be a Vice-President of Ba Ria – Vung Tau University, and Vice-President and Dean of Faculty of Foreign Languages of Van Hien University, Vietnam. Pham has been published 47 research articles in both local and International Journals (ISI/Scopus-indexed), and 8 books and course-books, 2 course-books were used for undergraduate students at HCMC Open University, Vietnam, and one course-book was used for both the undergraduate and graduate level at Lourdes College, Higher Education Department, Cagayan de Oro City, the Philippines. He is the Vice President for Administrative Affairs of the AsiaCALL and the managing editor of its Online Journal. He is now the Editor-in-chief of the International Journal of TESOL & Education. He is also an editor for the Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics (Scopus-indexed), an editor for the World Journal of English Language (scopus-indexed), and a peer reviewer for some international Journals indexed in ISI/Scopus such as Computer Assisted Language Learning, Open Sage, International Journal of Instruction. His main interests include academic writing, peer responses, translation, teaching methodologies, and technology-enhanced learning.

(2) Tran Van Da is a teacher of English at Thanh My Tay Junior High School, An Giang Province, Vietnam. He has a twelve-year experience of teaching English to junior high school students. The fields he is interested in are English Teaching Methodology and ICT integration into language learning and teaching.