



POSTGRADUATE STUDIES-SECOND CYCLE

THESIS:

**A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INDUCTIVE AND
DEDUCTIVE INSTRUCTION IN THE L2 ENGLISH CLASSROOM – A STUDY WITH
HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN FERIZAJ - KOSOVO**

Mentor:

Prof. Dr Brikena Xhaferi

Candidate: Arta Selmani

December, 2021

DECLARATION

I declare that this master's thesis and the work done in this paper, has a completely original composition. The information is obtained in books, scientific journals, various publications or other information, which are quoted in the text and references are given in the list of sources.

Arta Selmani

2021

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study would have been much more difficult without the help of my colleagues and family. In these lines I want to stop for a moment to remember and express my deep gratitude to these collaborators who have helped me during this challenging process.

First of all, I would like to thank my Thesis Mentor, Prof.Dr.Brikena Xhaferi for her help, encouragement, support, and dedication. Thoughts and suggestions have been very helpful and helpful to me while conducting this research process.

I would like to dedicate this study to my family, my life support.

ABSTRACT

Grammar is considered the “sentence-making machine” of a language, and knowledge of grammar gives the learner the ability to create a countless number of original sentences. It is, furthermore, essential as it provides the basis for communicative competence in writing, speaking, reading, and listening. “Grammatical competence,” after all, is “one of communicative competence”. Current discussions in the field of second language grammar teaching, therefore, no longer centre on whether grammar should be taught or not, but rather on questions such as “How do we go about teaching grammar items in the most effective way?”

This MA thesis is organized as follows. It first provides a brief overview of recent developments in the field of language teaching and goes on describing the methodology of this study, which attemptsto examine the effectiveness of deductive and inductive approach in teaching grammar. This current study was conducted at the Gymnasium "Kuvendi i Arberit" Ferizaj - Kosovo. It then answers the following research question through a data-driven approach: Is the deductive or inductive method the most effective grammar teaching method in the context of high school students learning English?

The study results showed that the inductive method is the most convenient and easiest approachto learn the grammar of the English language.

Key words: *Grammar, inductive approach, deductive approach, teaching methods*

PËRMBLEDHJE

Gramatika konsiderohet si "makineria e bërjes së fjalive" të një gjuhe dhe njohuritë e gramatikës i japin nxënësit aftësinë për të krijuar një numër të panumërt të fjalive origjinale. Për më tepër, është thelbësore pasi siguron bazën për aftësitë komunikuese në të shkruar, të folur, lexuar dhe dëgjuar. "Kompetenca gramatikore", në fund të fundit, është "një nga kompetencat komunikuese".

Diskutimet aktuale në fushën e mësimdhënies së gramatikës në gjuhën e dytë, pra, nuk përqendrohen më në atë se a duhet të mësohet gramatika apo jo, por më tepër në pyetje të tilla si "Si mund të shkojmë për të mësuar artikujt gramatikorë në mënyrën më efektive?" Kjo tezë është e organizuar si më poshtë. Së pari jep një përmbledhje të shkurtër të zhvillimeve të fundit në fushën e mësimdhënies së gjuhës dhe vazhdon për të përshkruar metodologjinë e këtij studimi, duke u përpjekur të shqyrtojë efektivitetin e udhëzimit deduktiv dhe induktiv.

Ky studim aktual hulumtoi metodat aktuale të mësimdhënies së gramatikës angleze në Gjinnazin "Kuvendi i Arbërit" Ferizaj - Kosovë. Më pas ajo i përgjigjet pyetjes së mëposhtme kërkimore përmes një qasje të drejtuar nga të dhënat: A është metoda deduktive ose induktive më efektive në mësimdhënien e gramatikës në kontekstin e nxënësve të shkollës së mesme që mësojnë anglisht?

Rezultatet e studimit treguan se metoda induktive është metoda më e përshtatshme dhe më e lehtë për të mësuar gramatikën e gjuhës angleze.

Fjalët kyçe: *Gramatika, casja inductive, casja deduktive, metodat e mësimdhënies*

Contents

ABSTRACT.....	4
PËRMBLEDHJE	5
CHAPTER ONE	6
1.1 Introduction	6
1.2 Aims of the study	8
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 Historical Overview of Language Teaching Methodologies	10
2.2. The Role of Grammar in Second Language Teaching	11
2.3 What is Grammar? Types of Grammar	13
2.5 Inductive Method	14
2.6 Deductive Method	15
2.7 Acquiring a Grammatical Structure	16
2.11 The main differences between Inductive and Deductive grammar instructions	20
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	22
3.1 Statement of the problem	22
3.2 Significance and Objectives of the Study	22
3.3 Participants	23
3.4 Materials	23
3.3 Sample of this study	24
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF RESULTS	25
4.1 Analysis of results	25
4.2 Interview results	31
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS	36
5.1 Conclusion	36

REFERENCES	40
Appendices	52

List of figures

Figure 1: Question 1 result.....	27
Figure 2: Question 2 result.....	27
Figure 3: Question 3 result.....	28
Figure 4: Question 4 result.....	28
Figure 5: Question 5 result.....	29
Figure 6: Question 6 result.....	30
Figure 7: Question 7 result.....	31
Figure 8: Question 8 result.....	32
Figure 9: Question 9 result.....	32
Figure 10: Question10 result.....	33
Figure 11: Question11 result.....	34
Figure 12: Question12 result.....	34

CHAPTER ONE

1.1 Introduction

Learning a second language is a hobby for some and a necessity for the others. Opinions on the right approach to learning and teaching a language differ as widely as the languages themselves. Independent self-study is a crucial task for any language learner but is often complemented by formal language instruction as part of a study programme. De Graaff and Housen (2009) define second language instruction as any deliberate attempt to promote language learning by manipulating the mechanisms of learning and/or conditions under which these operate. They contrast the interventionist position, those who believe that L2 instruction can have a positive impact on L2 learning, with the non-interventionist view, according to which L2 instruction can have no effect on the rate or manner of L2 acquisition. This paper assumes the former viewpoint, that studying language instruction may help instructors identify the best approach for achieving more effective and faster progression in their students. There are a number of dimensions across which the approach to second language acquisition can be analyzed. The theoretical analysis of existing knowledge below aims to provide a well-informed model of the best approach to a given learning task. It also seeks to highlight existing gaps in the literature and those aspects which remain unclear.

Whilst the approach taken by individual language students may differ widely, they all share a common goal of achieving full linguistic proficiency in the target language. Most scholars agree that such proficiency is attained when sufficient implicit knowledge has been acquired (Ellis, 2006). Implicit knowledge is a kind of unconscious skill that enables us to comprehend and produce the target language without conscious effort. In contrast, explicit knowledge has its basis in some conscious understanding that can be articulated by the student.

The role of implicit and explicit language instruction in the acquisition of both forms of knowledge has been researched and discussed to a great extent historically. Implicit techniques tend to adopt a naturalistic approach to language acquisition and rely to a greater degree on associative forms of learning (DeKeyser, 2005) Explicit methods encompass a wide-range of approaches but all focus on raising-awareness of some grammatical feature, typically involving

some form of rule-learning (Ellis, 2010). Whether the acquisition of sufficient implicit knowledge required for full language proficiency can be achieved by means of explicit instruction has been much disputed and has led some scholars to question the effectiveness of formal language instruction. Proponents of the naturalistic teaching methods, such as Krashen (1993), are the most critical of explicit language teaching. According to his input hypothesis, explicit teaching methods can never lead to the acquisition of implicit knowledge and therefore cannot help the learner to achieve second language proficiency. He argues that implicit knowledge can solely be acquired through sufficient exposure to and comprehension of the target language without conscious effort being made to acquire an explicit understanding of the grammar. Similarly, some critics of grammar-oriented instruction believe that learners are unable to apply their explicit knowledge when engaged in real-time communication (Hwu & Sun, 2012).

In contrast to this stand the weak and strong interface hypotheses (Ellis, 2010). These differ in the respect whether implicit and explicit knowledge are viewed as being the same or different kinds of knowledge. Ellis argues for the weak interface hypothesis, in which explicit and implicit knowledge are considered distinct entities and therefore the former cannot possibly be converted into knowledge of the implicit kind. However, this hypothesis does acknowledge that explicit knowledge may facilitate implicit knowledge (Ellis, 2010). For example, explicit teaching can raise awareness of non-salient features in the target language, prompting the learner to induce their own set of grammar rules and effectively priming them for the acquisition of implicit knowledge (R. Ellis, 1990, 1994, 1997, cited in de Graaff & Housen, 2009). The key here is the idea that explicit knowledge functions as an awareness-raising device. It draws the learner's attention to non-salient linguistic forms, which they might otherwise overlook by making these more noticeable (Ellis, 2010). This is related to Schmidt's (1994) 'Noticing the gap' hypothesis, according to which heightened awareness of the grammatical feature prompts the learner to compare their own inter-language, i.e. their cognitive representation of the L2, with the target language itself. Explicit understanding may therefore be used by the learner in order to accelerate his implicit learning. Hwu and Sun (2012) indicate that findings from numerous psychological studies imply that "prior knowledge influences future learning, that is, those who know more learn better".

The strong interface hypothesis differs from the weak interface hypothesis in respect to its notion of implicit and explicit knowledge. According to this view, implicit and explicit knowledge are considered as opposite ends of a single continuum and therefore explicit knowledge may be converted to implicit knowledge through a process of automatization given sufficient practice. This belief underpins the traditional classroom approach of present - practice-produce (PPP) that assumes declarative knowledge can be converted into procedural knowledge by a process of proceduralisation (DeKeyser, 1998). From this perspective some have argued, rather than try to teach implicit knowledge directly, it is better to present the learner with explicit knowledge in order to equip them with the means to practice the language. In doing so, explicit knowledge can be converted into implicit by a process of proceduralisation.

1.2 Aims of the study

This thesis seeks to investigate one of the most researched methods of teaching grammar: the deductive and inductive method. A deductive approach to teaching grammar items is teacher-centered. The teacher offers rules first and then examples and practice materials. An inductive approach, on the other hand, focuses on the student 'noticing' the grammatical rule him or herself without being made explicitly aware of it. The teacher provides students with examples showing how the concept is used after which they analyze and notice how the concept works for themselves. In particular, it focuses on the context of teaching English grammar to Kosovo secondary school students.

This thesis is organized in the following way. It first provides a brief overview of the topic being investigated and the research aims. Then it provides some recent developments in the language teaching field. Afterwards, it goes on with the outline the methodology of this study, attempting to examine the effectiveness of deductive and inductive instruction. In the end, it presents the study results and conclusions.

Research questions

The study aims to answer the following research questions

1: What are the students' attitudes towards learning grammar?

2: Is Inductive/ explicit learning more effective in overall language acquisition than deductive learning strategy?

3: What are the main learning outcomes using deductive and inductive methods in teaching grammar?

Additionally, the study aims to explore the current methods of grammar teaching of English in Kosovo secondary schools and attempts to answer the following research question through a data-driven approach. The research was carried out at the Gymnasium "Kuvendi i Arbërit" in Ferizaj, Kosove with teachers and students learning EFL.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Historical Overview of Language Teaching Methodologies

This section uses a historical approach in reviewing some of the most widely known language teaching methods: the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method, the Audiolingual Method, and, lastly, the Communicative Approach.

To begin with, the Grammar-Translation Method is one of the oldest language teaching methods that dates back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. It was originally used to teach extinct languages such as Greek and Latin, which explains why students were taught grammar and vocabulary through decontextualised translations, thus focusing on the written language and neglecting spoken language. A significant period in the history of language teaching methods and approaches took place from the 1950s to the 1980s (Richards and Rodgers. 2001).

This period gave rise to the so-called Direct Method and the Audiolingual Method. The former came into existence as a response to the Grammar-Translation Method, as it integrated more use of the target language in the classroom. Students had to speak and think solely in the target language. This method attempted to imitate the conditions under which a first language is most effectively learned: by means of total immersion. This could, however, never be achieved as students were only immersed in an L2 environment at school for about two hours a week. The Audiolingual Method, on the other hand, emphasized repetition and was influenced by the principles of Behaviourism: proponents of this method viewed language learning as habit formation resulting from ‘Stimuli, Responses, and Reinforcement.’ Dialogues and drills were used to achieve accurate pronunciation and grammar. However, mainly because Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory was also widely accepted as a learning theory in those days, people began to see interaction as essential to the learning process (Saville-Troike. 2006).

Because of that, the theoretical framework of the Audiolingual Method became questioned, and the effectiveness of the method itself was put in doubt as well. From the 1970s onwards, the traditional methods mentioned were replaced by the so-called Communicative Approach, which in one form or another is still the predominant method used in foreign language classrooms today. Unlike previous approaches which “did not properly deal with meaning,” (Swan, 1999)

the Communicative Approach builds on the notion of language as means of real communication, and its goal is to achieve ‘communicative competence.’ The approach is built on the belief that “linguistic theory need[s] to be seen as part of a more general theory incorporating communication and culture” (Richards and Rodgers.2001).

Historically, from the 1970s onwards, this new belief called for new syllabuses that illustrated the idea of communicative competence. As a result, syllabuses were developed that focused on ‘functions’ rather than ‘grammatical structures’ (Richards and Rodgers. 2001). Classroom activities that involved real communication became the norm as they were believed to boost learning. Group work was also stimulated as the Communicative Approach built on activities that involve real communication and “could be used as the basis of a communicative methodology” (Richards and Rodgers. 2001, p.25). On the whole, classroom activities had to involve meaningful tasks since it was believed that “language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process” (Richards and Rodgers. 200, p.25).

The approach promoted learning activities that engaged students in meaningful and authentic use of language rather than activities that only mechanically practiced language structures. Consequently, classroom activities were designed to focus on “completing tasks that are mediated through language or involve negotiation of information and information sharing” (Richards and Rodgers. 2001, p.85). They further argue that Communicative Language Teaching should be considered an approach rather than a method as it “refers to a diverse set of principles that reflect a communicative view of language and language learning and that can be used to support a wide variety of classroom procedures”(p.86).

Since students are now regularly exposed to authentic materials and motivating and 8 captivating exercises which have replaced the rather boring fill-in exercises common in traditional methods, it could be argued that language teaching has made some significant progress under the influence of the Communicative Approach.

2.2. The Role of Grammar in Second Language Teaching

Separate from teaching methods, the role of grammar in language teaching is also an interesting topic. According to Ellis (2002, p.167) two issues have dominated the language teaching field for many years. First, “[s]hould we teach grammar at all?” and second, “[i]f we teach grammar, how

should we teach it?” Naturally, there has been little agreement on both issues. As for the first question, R. Ellis brings in Krashen who holds the view that grammar teaching does not bring about acquired knowledge and language instruction, thus, seems rather pointless. R. Ellis himself, on the other hand, claims that grammar instruction guides and facilitates second language acquisition though not “in the way teachers often think it does:” it has a “delayed” effect, he argues, rather than an “instant effect” (2002).

There are still plenty of fallacies when it comes to the role of grammar in language teaching. In ‘Second Language Teaching Pedagogy,’ Kwakernaak (2009) lists five misconceptions regarding grammar instruction. First of all, he argues that teachers often think grammar makes up the fundamental part of a language although grammatical elements in fact carry very little meaning (Kwakernaak. 2009). Second of all, it is a misconception to believe that grammar lays the foundation of language teaching. Teachers often think that without knowledge of basic grammar, students can do nothing with a foreign language (Kwakernaak. 2009).

Third of all, it is wrongly believed that the more grammar you offer, the more thorough your teaching is. The opposite is, however, true. The quantity of grammar instruction has in fact decreased since communicative relevance has gained importance and students are required to apply grammatical rules rather than learn them, and particular attention is drawn to other skills such as listening, speaking, as well as learning strategies (Kwakernaak. 2009). Fourth of all, it is often misunderstood that one can only learn grammar by learning and practicing grammatical rules (Kwakernaak.2009).

As a reaction, Kwakernaak points out that input of language use constitutes the “engine” of language acquisition rather than providing grammatical rules; the rules themselves only facilitate the acquisition of grammar. Lastly, many teachers think they should prevent students from writing or speaking in the foreign language too soon as this would result in making mistakes that are hard to unlearn. They forget, however, that making mistakes is part of the learning process (Kwakernaak. 2009).

On the whole, the rise of the Communicative Approach has had a significant impact on the nature of language teaching and learning and the role of grammar teaching in particular had to be revised. The focus on meaning rather than form suggests that grammatical accuracy could be considered less essential in communicative competence. As a result, the esteemed importance of

grammar has changed over the last century. There is now a general consensus that grammar must never be a goal in itself; it must instead be seen as a building blocks of a language, a tool facilitating listening, reading, speaking, and writing (Kwakernaak. 2009).

The basic idea is that in order to use a language for communicative purposes, one must acquire linguistic as well as communicative competence. Saville-Troike (2006) defines the first as “knowledge of specific components and levels of a language” and the latter as “everything that a speaker needs to know in order to communicate appropriately within a particular community”. It means, in short, that one does not only need to know about linguistic structure such as grammar and phonology, but also what, when, and how to use that knowledge appropriately. Grammatical competence is viewed as a building block for acquiring communicative competence. Especially in developing productive skills such as speaking and writing, grammar plays a significant role. As a result, the boundary between ‘grammar as a tool’ and ‘grammar as a goal in itself’ is often very vague in reality (Kwakernaak 2009).

2.3 What is Grammar? Types of Grammar

Grammar is generally thought to be a set of rules specifying the correct ordering of words at the sentences (Nunan 2003). According to the previous statement, the importance of grammar discussed many years ago. The sentences of any language are accepted if they follow the rules of that language (Nunan, 2003). Grammar, according to Cook (2001), is the central area of the language around which other areas such as pronunciation and vocabulary are centered. Grammar relates sound and meanings which is called sometime the computational system. Grammar is a unique aspect of language that has features which don't occur in any mental process and aren't found in animal languages. Also, grammar is learnt in many different ways. Nunan (2003) believes that grammar has recursive rules allowing one to generate grammatically correct sentences over and over. Bruder and Paulston (1976) define grammar as the possible forms and arrangements of words in phrases and sentences. Grammar is not separated from other language skills and aspects. ©Research Institute for Progression of Knowledge It will be found in listening comprehension, pronunciation, reading and writing. English grammar has been divided by many grammarians into different types. The main popular grammar types that Nunan (2003) finds out are Prescriptive grammar and Descriptive grammar. Prescriptive grammar lays down the law,

telling what is right and what is wrong. Whereas, Descriptive grammar describes the way that people actually use languages.

Teaching grammar is rooted in the formal teaching of Latin and Greek which used in many schools in Europe for many centuries. In that time, the Grammar-Translation Approach was developed in order to analyze the languages and their complicated rules. Latin and Greek was the key to the thought and literature of a great and ancient civilization, so the reading and translation of texts was important as writing exercises in imitation of these texts. This approach aims at creating an understanding of the grammar of the language, expressed in traditional terms, providing the students with a wide literary vocabulary, and training the students to extract the meaning from foreign texts by translating it into the native language (Rivers, 1968). Grammar, in the Grammar Translation Approach, is taught deductively. This means that rules, principles, concepts or theories are presented first, and then the applications of them are treated. In other words, start from general to specific principles (Widodo, 2006). In addition to the deductive method, the inductive method is used to teach grammar. Inductive means moving from the specific to the general. The learners are exposed to instances of language use, and then emerge patterns and generalizations. The learners in the inductive method directly attend to particular forms and try to arrive at metalinguistic generalizations on their own (Erlam, 2003).

2.5 Inductive Method

Inductive approach comes from inductive reasoning, stating that a reasoning progression proceeds from particulars which are observations, measurements and data, to generalities which are rules, laws, concepts and theories (Widodo, 2006). According to Nunan (2003), Inductive is presenting the learners with samples of language and, through a process of guided discovery, get the learners to find out the principle or rule for themselves. This method is most close with the Audio-lingual Approach in teaching languages (Gollin, 1998). This approach, according to Brinton, Celce-Murcia and Snow (2014) was driven from the reform movement. The audio-lingual approach appeared in the United States during World War II.

Some features of this approach are:

- Lessons begin with dialogues.

- Grammatical structures are sequenced and rules are taught inductively.
- Skills are sequenced.
- A great effort is made to prevent learner errors.
- Vocabulary is severely controlled and limited in the initial stages (Brinton, Celce- Murcia & Snow, 2014).

Inductive, according to Celce-Murcia and McIntosh (1979), presents examples by which the learner induces the relevant second language rule. In the audio-lingual approach, inductive is dominant although the learner is never required to state the rule. Hulstijn (2005) says that students see the structure embedded in instances where it is naturally used, which later leads to an explicit definition of the grammar rule.

In 1942, Gullette, Keating and Viens agreed that the presentation of new material should be presented inductively whenever possible. Also psychologists agree that material which is learned through long use is easier to retain than that which is memorized. Inductive analysis of sentences will present variants of the already familiar material, and this will help students to pay closer attention and force them to work out new principles for themselves. Inductive method has learners participating actively in their own instruction. This method encourages learners to develop their mental set of strategies for dealing with tasks. This method tries to highlight grammatical rules implicitly in which the learners are encouraged to conclude the rules given by the teacher (Widodo, 2006). Schmidt (1990) says that inductive method has involved implicit awareness. That means learning without intention or awareness.

2.6 Deductive Method

Widodo (2006) says that the deductive method is derived from the notion that deductive reasoning from general to specific. That means rules, principles, concepts or theories are presented first, and then their application is treated. In this method, learners study grammar rules before applying the rules in doing exercises. That means the learners work from the general to the particular (Fortune, 1992). Krumboltz and Yabroff (1965) define deduction as giving the generalizations to the students, then they are asked to deduce specific applications; whereas,

deductive method according to Schmidt (1990), has involved explicit awareness, which means learning with intention and awareness.

Erlam (2003) defines the deductive method as a process that moves from general to specific. The learners are exposed to the general use, and then they apply the rule to particular instances of language use. And this method is most close with the Grammar-Translation approach (Gollin, 1998). This approach, according to Brinton, CelceMurcia and Snow (2014) was used as a way to teach Latin and other languages.

This Approach has some elements, which are as follows:

- The focus is on grammatical parsing.
- Using the native language of the students.
- Little use of the target language for communication.
- Atypical exercise is to translate sentences from the target language into the mother tongue.

The Deductive method is related to conscious learning. This method tries to place a great emphasis on error correction and presentation of explicit rules. The deductive method is often used with adult learners. The teacher in this method teaches the rule explicitly to learners, and they are ready to cope with exercises given (Krashen, 2002).

2.7 Acquiring a Grammatical Structure

Second language teaching centres on four skills: reading, listening, writing, and speaking. These activities can in turn be classified into two groups: “receptive versus productive skills, and as conveyed by written versus oral modes of communication” (Saille-Troike. 2006). As mentioned before, grammar is nowadays viewed as a tool for carrying out communicative activities. But what does it actually mean for a student ‘to be able to apply a grammatical rule’? In order for him to do so, he does not actually have to be able to explicitly name the rule. He may well have not even seen or heard of the rule before. Kwakernaak (2009) argues that a grammatical structure has been acquired when it is produced “unconsciously, automatically, and correctly in speech” (N. Ellis. 2006).

Hence, the main goal of teaching grammar for most teachers is “to help learners internalise the structures taught in such a way that they can be used in everyday communication” (N. Ellis. 2006). The problem is, however, that L2 teachers are easily satisfied with the level of proficiency of their students. He argues that once a student is able to apply the grammatical structure in mechanical practice, teachers already continue teaching another grammatical structure.

He illustrates this point clearly with the following scheme, distinguishing five levels of proficiency regarding grammatical structures (N. Ellis. 2006).

- 1) Receptive proficiency: a student understands the meaning of the structure.
- 2) Productive proficiency in written form-focused situations: a student can correctly produce the grammatical rule in a written fill-in-the-gap exercise.
- 3) Productive proficiency in oral form-focused situations: a student can correctly produce the grammatical rule in an orally fill-in-the-gap exercise.
- 4) Productive proficiency in written content-focused situations: a student can correctly produce the structure when writing a letter.
- 5) Productive proficiency in orally content-focused situations: a student can produce the grammatical structure when speaking.

Kwakernaak (2009) mentions that the contrast between form-focused and content-focused is important to notice. Form-focused exercises draw particular attention to the linguistic form of a structure, with or without paying attention to the content. Content-focused exercises, on the other hand, approximate real-life situations: a student's attention is drawn to the message he or she wants to convey rather than the linguistic form of a structure. The leap from form-focused exercises to content-focused exercises is rather difficult. This can be noticed when students are able to produce a grammatical structure correctly in a gap-filling exercise, but they fail to do so when writing a letter (Kwakernaak). This leap should, thus, be facilitated.

Another significant difference between these two approaches is the fact that learners are taught grammar passively through the deductive approach whereas the inductive approach is active as they need to discover the rules themselves. Therefore, it can be inferred that the inductive approach is an experiential process of learning whereas the deductive approach is more

traditional and descriptive. As stated by Thornbury (1999), teaching grammar inductively ensures a motivating environment and helps students feel at ease. He also emphasises that more profound knowledge is supplied through the inductive approach as rules are studied cognitively in order to be discovered. This view is supported also by Hinkel and Fatos (2002) who point out that learners can evolve their autonomy and become good language learners through the inductive approach. Alternatively, Shaffer (1989) suggested that teaching grammar deductively can help learners comprehend the written and spoken forms of language more easily as they become aware of grammatical rules, however, it sacrifices the meaning.

The role of the teacher is another vital distinction that needs to be addressed. The teacher is the authority in the classroom whose main role is to present the new grammar structure deductively to the learners. The subsequent step is based on the teacher's preparation of exercises for the students. Furthermore, the teacher needs to organise and control the classroom. In contrast, in inductive grammar teaching, the teacher's role is to guide and help students identify the rules by themselves. Therefore, the inductive approach is student-centred whereas the deductive approach is teacher-centred. Another significant difference between the inductive and deductive approaches is that the former avoids using terminology as the learners discover the rules whereas the latter focuses on grammar presentation through metalanguage, for instance, the name of the tense, verb, subject or object.

Moreover, Freeman (2003) states that consciousness-raising awareness is related to students' awareness of grammatical features and this can be done through the means of metalanguage. Based on the definition provided by Rutherford and Smith, consciousness-raising awareness is "the deliberate attempt to draw the learner's attention specifically to the formal properties of the target language" .

The concept of consciousness-raising awareness will be analytically discussed in the following sections. Nevertheless, Brown (1994) argued that raising learners' awareness through the usage of terminology might create confusion during the lesson as it leads to stressing mostly on these particular forms instead of understanding the rules, function and use of the language efficiently. Furthermore, Rutherford and Smith (1988) believe that using language terminology makes language too descriptive which might lead to the impression that language is just an instrument for deriving descriptions.

Therefore, it can be concluded that learners learn grammar consciously in a deductive approach and subconsciously in an inductive approach. The inductive approach seems to be more natural and similar to the language acquisition process. Additionally, another important aspect that needs to be highlighted is that the decision to use the deductive or the inductive approach relies on students' needs and styles. Learners have their own individual styles and requirements when it comes to learning. Therefore, the teacher needs to consider other variables such as age, educational background and different levels of language proficiency to select the appropriate suitable teaching strategies.

A considerable amount has been written on how grammatical rules should be presented. One issue concentrates on whether rules should be presented deductively or inductively; in other words, whether students are presented with the rules directly (deductive approach) or whether they have to figure out the rule for themselves (inductive approach). For many scholars and teachers, Krashen (1985) argues, the deductive approach seems “much more reasonable – why make students guess the rule?”. Teachers should “present a clear explanation and have [students] practice until the rule [is] internalised” (Krashen, 1985).

Proponents of the deductive approach, however, have argued that the best way to teach grammatical structures is for students to discover the rule for themselves. Within this approach, the learner is given several examples, “a corpus,” and has to discover “the regularities” (Krashen, 1985). The inductive approach bears strong resemblances to first language acquisition though the language is not acquired subconsciously. But which approach is believed to be most effective in teaching grammatical structures? Teachers and scholars have a wide range of views on whether the inductive or deductive approach is most effective. It has been suggested that some structures “are most amenable to a deductive approach while others ... can be learned very well by an inductive approach” (Hammerly, 1975).

This view has been supported by Brown, who states that “both inductively and deductively oriented teaching methods can be effective, depending on the goals and contexts of a particular language teaching situation”. In general, some scholars argue that there is no difference in effectiveness at all, while others argue that either the deductive or inductive approach is most effective (Hammerly, 1975).

For example, Staatsen states that the deductive approach should be discouraged because the inductive approach usually has desired learning outcomes. On the other hand, in her study comparing the deductive and inductive approach to teaching foreign languages, Shaffer concludes that there is no significant difference in the effectiveness of both approaches, “this offers strong evidence against the notion that an inductive approach should not be used for difficult structures”. She also found that the “correlation between ability and approach was not significant” which refutes the idea that an inductive approach would be too difficult for weak or slow students. In the final part of her study, Schaffer concludes that teachers should not only apply the inductive approach in their lessons but instead vary. On the other hand, an advantage of the inductive method is its “active participation” of students and the fact that grammar is presented in “meaningful contexts” (Hammerly, 1975).

2.11 The main differences between Inductive and Deductive grammar instructions

Teaching grammar explicitly or implicitly is another distinction between different types of grammar instruction. Donate and Adair-Hauck (1992) associate the inductive approach with implicit learning by the student and, furthermore, the deductive approach with the explicit explanations by the teacher. Chaudron (1988) emphasises that many studies investigating the effects of explicit and implicit grammar instruction on achievement have been conducted, defining implicit strategy as “pattern practice or inductive”. Besides, in another investigation, Scott (1990) describes the explicit strategy as the “deliberate study of a grammar rule, either by deductive analysis or inductive analogy.” Moreover, age is related to the type of grammar instruction being implemented as discussed by educators.

Rivers (1975) believes that the deductive approach is more beneficial for mature students who are highly motivated or for adults in intensive courses. He emphasises that the inductive approach is more suitable for younger learners. The exact ages to choose between the two approaches are not known as suggested by Rivers (1975). Additionally, time is another vital component which distinguishes between the two approaches.

Younie (1974) claims that the deductive approach can be considered an effective way of teaching a sizeable number of facts and concretes as it is strictly to the point and saves time. Explaining the rules at the beginning of the lesson saves time compared to encouraging learners to discover the rules by themselves. Consequently, the learners attain more time to practise the targeted grammatical item. The students' involvement is another factor distinguishing between both types of grammar instruction. Shaffer (1989) relates the inductive approach to an active learning process and the deductive approach with passive leaning.

Other researchers and educators have also concluded that teaching grammar deductively minimises learners' participation and interaction (Thornbury, 1999; Younie, 1974). Alternatively, the inductive approach allows students to be actively involved in the learning process instead of merely being passive recipients. Therefore, learners obtain the opportunity to participate while they are taught grammar deductively by using their metalinguistic knowledge, which actually takes learning to a completely different level as they have to reflect upon various linguistic properties. The controversial terms "easy" or simple and "difficult" or complex can also be associated with different types of grammar instruction.

More specifically, the teacher needs to consider the similarity and dissimilarity between the rules in L1 and L2. The focal point of deductive instruction by tradition is to teach and control grammar efficiently and easily, however, using this method repeatedly could demotivate and make the learners disinterested. Alternatively, the inductive approach is challenging and rewarding, but more effort and time is required to teach grammar. Fischer (1979) claims that the inductive approach is most appropriate if the targeted grammatical rule is simpler compared to the native language rule. On the other hand, the deductive approach is preferable if the foreign language is more complex than the native language rule.

A combination of these two approaches will be discussed in this section along with its pros and cons with respect to grammar teaching. Several studies have revealed (Jean, and Simard, 2013; Chalipa, 2013; Jaber and Abu, 2008) that a combination of these two approaches might be the solution to this concern. However, there is no definite response based on the question of which is more useful in teaching grammar; the diversity of teaching and learning settings is the primary reason for the same.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1 Statement of the problem

English grammar teaching is a big challenge to both, teachers and students. To teach English grammar, the teacher follows different methods in order to meet the students' needs, levels and abilities. And these different methods affect negatively or positively students' achievement level, especially in grammar and on learning English generally. Also, that will effect on the students' attitudes toward learning English as a foreign language. As teachers-participants in the teaching process, the researchers need to know the effectiveness of using the inductive and deductive methods in grammar and their attitudes toward EFL.

This thesis, therefore, seeks to investigate one of the most researched methods of teaching grammar: the deductive and inductive method. A deductive approach to teaching grammar items is teacher-centered. The teacher offers rules first and then examples and practice materials. An inductive approach, on the other hand, focuses on the student 'noticing' the grammatical rule him or herself without being made explicitly aware of it. The teacher provides students with examples showing how the concept is used after which they analyse and notice how the concept works for themselves. In particular, it focuses on the context of teaching English grammar to Kosovo secondary school students.

3.2 Significance and Objectives of the Study

A complex and continuous problem of educators is to determine the most effective method of teaching grammar. This problem is complicated by the consideration of various instruction techniques under different titles such as discovery, problem-solving, expository, inductive and deductive methods of teaching. Most theories of instruction deal with one of these methods, but they don't share a common interpretation.

One of the most interesting and important debates in education revolves around the relative efficacy of inductive and deductive methods of teaching. Research on the effectiveness of these two methods of teaching has not adequately demonstrated the superiority of either one of these teaching approaches. For the purpose of the current study, the following research questions were developed:

Q1: What are the students' attitudes towards learning grammar?

Q2: Is Inductive/ explicit learning more effective in overall language acquisition than deductive learning strategy?

Q3: What are the main learning outcomes using deductive and inductive methods in teaching grammar?

3.3 Participants

The participants of the study were two groups of EFL students of a Gymnasium "Kuvendi I Arberit" Ferizaj - Kosove. Sixty male and female students ranged from 15 to 17 years of age, were randomly selected and assigned to two groups of thirty students. There were also 5 EFL teachers included and they were interviewed about several issues important for the Thesis topic.

3.4 Research Methods

The methods which were used for the purpose of this research were: student questionnaire (Appendix 1) and teacher interview (Appendix 2). The questionnaire contained 12 questions and they were focused on students' attitude towards learning grammar. The second research instrument, the teacher interview, contained 10 questions. It investigated teachers' opinions about the main learning outcomes using these two approaches in learning grammar.

3.3 Research procedure

The research participants were first introduced with the purposes of the research. The researchers explained to them that this research results will be confidential and the participant identity will not be revealed. Some questions were translated to the participants on the spot and they were explained what is deductive and inductive approach in teaching grammar. The teachers of the same school, were also asked for their agreement to participate in the research and in this regard, five teachers agreed to take part and be interviewed.

In conclusion, it can be stated that the overall research procedure went without major difficulties and it is hoped that the results of the study will serve to give some innovative teaching ideas related to teaching grammar of EFL.

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

This chapter outlines the research results which were collected at the gymnasium "Kuvendi i Arbërit". The data we obtained during the research were processed with the SPSS statistics program.

4.1 Analysis of results

The first research instrument used was the questionnaire done with the students during their English classes. The results are presented in the tables below.

1.It is difficult to learn English

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	21	35.0	35.0	35.0
	Agree	26	43.3	43.3	78.3
	Undecided	5	8.3	8.3	86.7
	Disagree	7	11.7	11.7	98.3
	Strongly Disagree	1	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Figure 1: Question 1 results

When the students asked if it is difficult to learn English, respondents answered with Strongly Agree 35%, Agree 43.3%, Undecided 8.3%, Disagree 11.7%, Strongly Disagree 1.7%. From the results we obtained it is clear that the students stated that English grammar is difficult to learn.

2.The most difficult thing in foreign language learning is learning grammar

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	4	6.7	6.7	6.7
	Agree	4	6.7	6.7	13.3
	Undecided	7	11.7	11.7	25.0
	Disagree	29	48.3	48.3	73.3
	Strongly Disagree	16	26.7	26.7	100.0

Total	60	100.0	100.0
-------	----	-------	-------

Figure 2: Question 2 results

Regarding statement 2''The most difficult thing in foreign language learning is grammar learning'', the respondents answered: Strongly Agree 6.7%, Agree 6.7%, Undecided 11.7%, Disagree 48.3%, Strongly Disagree 26.7%. Therefore, from these results we can conclude that students do not consider it difficult to learn the grammar of foreign languages. But some of them pointed out that it is very difficult to learn grammar.

3. Grammar is the most important part of language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	33	55.0	55.0	55.0
	Agree	22	36.7	36.7	91.7
	Strongly Disagree	2	3.3	3.3	95.0
	Disagree	3	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Figure 3: Question 3 results

Regarding statement 3''Grammar is the most important part of language'', the respondents answered with Strongly Agree 55.0%, Agree 36.7%, Strongly Disagree 3.3%, Disagree 5.0%. From these results we came to the conclusion that grammar is the most important part to learn a foreign language in this case English.

4. I learn grammar by studying the rules only

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	15	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Agree	34	56.7	56.7	81.7
	Undecided	4	6.7	6.7	88.3
	Disagree	6	10.0	10.0	98.3
	Strongly Disagree	1	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Figure 4: Question 4 results

For statement 4 ‘‘I learn grammar by studying the rules only’’, the respondents answer as follows: Strongly Agree 25.0%. Agree 56.7%, Undecided 6.7%, Disagree 10.0%, Strongly Disagree 1.7%. So a considerable number of students claimed that they learn grammar through rules and this is more practical and more acceptable to them. Only a small percentage of them do not learn grammar through rules, the rest of them learn according to certain rules.

5. Before teaching the grammatical rule, if the instructors provide example sentences, I learn the structure better

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	23	38.3	38.3	38.3
	Agree	32	53.3	53.3	91.7
	Undecided	2	3.3	3.3	95.0
	Disagree	1	1.7	1.7	96.7
	Strongly Disagree	2	3.3	3.3	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Figure 5: Question 5 results

Regarding statement 5 ‘‘Before teaching the grammatical rule, if the instructors provide example sentences I learn the structure better’’, the respondents answered as follows: Strongly Agree 38.3%, Agree 53.3%, Undecided 3.3%, Disagree 1.7%, Strongly Disagree 3.3%. So from these answers it is clear that students prefer to learn more with examples because this serves to remember the lessons more easily.

6. I like grammar classes more than vocabulary and listening classes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	2	3.3	3.3	3.3
	Agree	18	30.0	30.0	33.3
	Undecided	2	3.3	3.3	36.7
	Disagree	31	51.7	51.7	88.3
	Strongly Disagree	7	11.7	11.7	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Figure 6: Question 6 results

For statement 6 ‘‘I like grammar courses more than vocabulary and listening courses’’, respondents answered: Strongly Agree 3.3%, Agree 30.0%, Undecided 3.3%, Disagree 51.7%, Strongly Disagree 11.7%. From these results we can conclude that students like vocabulary and listening courses more than grammar courses.

7. Grammar is fundamental in foreign language learning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	16	26.7	26.7	26.7
	Agree	30	50.0	50.0	76.7
	Undecided	6	10.0	10.0	86.7
	Disagree	7	11.7	11.7	98.3
	Strongly Disagree	1	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Figure 7: Question 7 results

Regarding statement 7 ‘‘Grammar is fundamental in foreign language learning’’, respondents answered as follows: : Strongly Agree 26.7%, Agree 50.0%, Undecided 10.0%, Disagree 11.7%, Strongly Disagree 1.7%. From these results which the students have answered, we came to the conclusion that grammar is essential for learning foreign languages, so it is the basis for learning.

8. We do not need grammar rules to speak a language

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	4	6.7	6.7	6.7
	Agree	8	13.3	13.3	20.0
	Undecided	4	6.7	6.7	26.7
	Disagree	32	53.3	53.3	80.0
	Strongly Disagree	12	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Figure 8: Question 8 results

Results for
statements 8
“ We do not

need grammar rules to speak a language”, are as follows: Strongly Agree 6.7%, Agree 13.3%, Undecided 6.7%, Disagree 53.3%, Strongly Disagree 20.0%. From these results we can conclude that students have well understood that the best way to learn English is to learn grammar properly.

9.I learn better when the instructors teach the grammatical rules in forms

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	2	3.3	3.3	3.3
	Agree	10	16.7	16.7	20.0
	Undecided	6	10.0	10.0	30.0
	Strongly Disagree	33	55.0	55.0	85.0
	Disagree	9	15.0	15.0	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Figure 9: Question 9 results

Regarding statement 9 “I learn better when the instructors teach the grammatical rules in forms” the respondents answered as follows: Strongly Agree 3.3%, Agree 16.7%, Undecided 10.0%, Strongly Disagree 55.0%, Disagree 15.0%. In this question it can be noticed that students do not like when instructors teach grammar in forms, so it is not their preferred way.

10.I prefer the inductive method for learning English

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	21	35.0	35.0	35.0
	Agree	26	43.3	43.3	78.3
	Strongly Disagree	7	11.7	11.7	90.0
	Disagree	6	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Figure 10: Question 10 results

For statement 10''I prefer the inductive method for learning English'', 35.0%, Strongly Agree, Agree 43.3%, Strongly Disagree 11.7%, Disagree 10.0%. From this results we can conclude that students prefer the inductive way of learning, because they consider it as the most efficient and easiest way to learn.

11. I learn better when the instructors provide examples about the grammatical rules

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	16	26.7	26.7	26.7
	Agree	29	48.3	48.3	75.0
	Undecided	4	6.7	6.7	81.7
	Strongly Disagree	7	11.7	11.7	93.3
	Disagree	4	6.7	6.7	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Figure 11: Question 11 results

For statement 11 “I learn better when the instructors provide examples about the grammatical rules”, the respondents answered as follows: Strongly Agree 26.7%, Agree 48.3%, Undecided 6.7%, Strongly Disagree 11.7%, Disagree 6.7%. So students like the way they learn grammar with examples, because this method was the method that served them to remember the lessons more easily.

12. I prefer the deductive way to learn English grammar

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	3	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Agree	7	11.7	11.7	16.7
	Undecided	3	5.0	5.0	21.7
	Strongly Disagree	32	53.3	53.3	75.0
	Disagree	15	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Figure 12: Question 12 results

Regarding statement 12 “I prefer the deductive way to learn English grammar”, 5.0% Strongly Agreed, Agree 11.7%, Undecided 5.0%, Strongly Disagree 53.3%, Disagree 25.0%. From the results we have obtained in this question it can be concluded that the deductive method is not the preferred method of students. It seems that students interested in learning grammar with the deductive method.

4.2 Interview results

The second phase of the research was teacher interview where 5 teachers of EFL were interviewed. The questions were related to grammar teaching in a High school.

Q1: Do you think grammar is important for someone who learns English? Why?

R1: Yes, of course it is very important because grammar is the basis of learning a foreign language, in this case English

R2: definitely yes, if a student knows a lot of words but is grammatically weak he can never speak English fluently.

R3: definitely very important, because it enables students to recite words better

R4: it matters a lot because grammar is the basis of language.

R5: students who know grammar, are able to speak better and make a difference, for example, from the past, present, etc.

Q2: What is your experience with teaching grammar?

R1: In terms of my experience with grammar, students mostly prefer when grammar is taught based on examples.

R2: from my experience I can say that students prefer heroin more then examples.

R3: from my experience I can say that students prefer to learn grammar with examples, because this method was the method that served them to remember the lessons more easily.

R4: students are not very interested in learning when it comes to grammar.

R5: grammar is considered the most difficult part for students to learn.

Q3: Do you believe that you teach grammar correctly? Why?

R1: yes, because I explain it in the simplest way and with different examples.

R2: I think so, because most students can write and formulate sentences correctly.

R3: yes, because I try to make it as simple as possible.

R4: yes, only sometimes there are some grammatical parts when they have to be memorized and this can often be a problem for students, because there is no other form of explanation.

R5: yes, because I try to teach students the basics of grammar well, when the basics are taught the other parts are easier

Q4: Do you think that the teacher should present the rules (deductively) and explain at the beginning of the lesson or just to give/provide examples (inductively) without explaining the rules?

R1: in fact it should be explained in both ways, both by showing the rules and by giving examples, but the most active students are when they learn with examples.

R2: both ways have their importance. But it is more important when it is explained with examples because it is the most effective way.

R3: without explaining the rules, you can not give examples.

R4: both modes have their importance although I think the inductive mode is more effective.

R5: students should be explained in both ways, because some prefer the inductive way some the deductive way. But I personally think that the inductive mode is more efficient

Q5: Do your students feel insecure when you do not explain the grammatical rules?

R1: yes, very insecure, because you feel some insecurity in yourself.

R2: very often, because they are not sure they can remember

R3: it is a fact that even the best students feel insecure and have some insecurity from this part.

R4: no they do not feel insecure because they do not like this method of learning.

R5: I do not think they feel insecure, but they do not prefer this way of explanation

Q6: Do your students get confused by learning the grammatical rules ?

R1: yes very often this happens

R2: sometimes, but I can not say that it happens often, but they are often confused, especially with irregular verbs when they have to memorize

R3: it happens very often, because they have no self-confidence when it comes to grammar

R4: are getting confused especially when formulating sentences

R5: sometimes, not often

Q7: Do your students get confused by learning the grammar in context?

R1: yes they often get confused in context.

R2: very rare

R3: sometimes it happened, but the more they practice the more they reinforce the grammar and do not get confused.

R4: this fact happens, but not often

R5: yes of course, but I try to avoid this phenomenon.

Q8: Do you believe that students can improve grammar through practice?

R1: yes, practice is very important in teaching grammar.

R2: practice is very important, because it enables students to remember the lessons better.

R3: yes of course it matters, students much prefer this method.

R4: this method is the most preferred method of students

R5: yes, but the theory is also very important. So both practice and theory are very important

Q9: Do you believe that the best way to learn grammar is by analyzing a text?

R1: is a good method, but not very effective.

R2: I do not think it is an adequate method to learn.

R3: I think it is adequate, but students do not prefer it.

R4: no, because it does not work.

R5: maybe it's a good way, but I do not prefer this method.

Q10: Do you think that grammar has an important place in learning English?

R1: Yes, it is very important because the basis for learning a foreign language is grammar.

R2: Anyway, grammar plays the main role.

R3: this is indisputable.

R4: Yes of course, grammar is the basis of learning English.

R5: Definitely yes.

In conclusion, from the answers we received from the respondents in this case the teachers came to the conclusion, that both students and teachers consider grammar as the basis of learning. So it is not very important how many words students know, but how much they are able to memorize those words in the right way. From this research we also came to the conclusion that

the inductive method is the most preferred method of students to learn, because they learn more from the examples, also the teachers emphasized that the inductive method is more appropriate to explain and more effective, they prefer to explain grammar to students through this method because they consider it to be much more efficient. Finally, the inductive method is the best and most adequate method to teach students the grammar of the English language.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Conclusion

Over the years the role of grammar has been one of the most controversial issues in the field of second and foreign language teaching. Nowadays, grammar has gained a prominent position in the second and foreign language classroom. The controversy over methods of teaching grammar has developed in the recent past, but the question remains as to the relative effectiveness of different method. Grammar is considered to be the most important part in learning foreign language, without a good knowledge of grammar, learners' language development will be severely constrained" (Richards and Renandya, 2002).

The inductive approach refers to the style of introducing language context containing the target rules where students can induce such rules through the context and practical examples. In other words, the sequence in this approach goes from creating a situation and giving examples to the generalization where students should discover such generalization by themselves or with the teacher's help. With an inductive approach, teachers show their students a series of examples and non-examples, then guide them toward noticing a pattern and coming up with the generalization or concept rule.

The inductive approach, in its turn, moves from specific to general. The learners are first shown many examples that contain a certain grammatical structure in different contexts and they have to work out the rules by themselves. Next the learners apply the rules with various exercises and in different contexts to learn how they actually work in real language use. Students Perception in Foreign Language Learning Several researchers have found that there was a correlation between learners' attitude and perception (whether it is positive or negative).

Their motivation to learn another language and achievement in foreign language learning (Horwitz, 1988) has identified several factors, which encourage and motivate an individual's second language learning by supporting communication with speakers of the target language, and which furthermore, have an influence on the attainment of the necessary information to learn another language. Moreover, a great emphasis has been put on motivation in relation to foreign

language learning since it is said to have a significant impact on the perceived importance of language learning and its achievement (Kouritzin et al., 2009).

One of the current discussions in the second language teaching field is centered on the effectiveness of grammar instruction methods. This debate has revolved around the question of how grammar should best be instructed. The present study was designed to determine the effect of two of the most well-known language teaching methods: the inductive and deductive method. In the deductive method students are presented with the rules after which they practice them. In the inductive method, on the other hand, students are presented with ‘data’ after which they have to figure out the rule for themselves. This study has shown that both methods generate positive learning outcomes, however, the inductive method turned out to be most effective at least for the long-term.

Overall, the current findings add to a growing body of literature on language teaching methods. In addition, this thesis adds substantially to teachers’ understanding of grammar teaching. Taken together, this thesis has some implications for teaching practices.

This study has thrown up some questions in need of further investigation. R. Ellis has claimed that grammar instruction has a “delayed effect” rather than an instant one, and results showed that the deductive approach turned out to have an effect in the long-term. However, because this investigation was limited to only two groups of 60 pupils in total who were not familiar with the inductive method, further work will need to be done to determine whether the inductive method will be effective when teaching English tenses to students who are already familiar with the approach, or whether the inductive approach is simply not effective when teaching tenses but is when teaching other grammatical aspects. Since pupils were already taught the English tenses before but appeared to have forgotten everything at the time of testing, it would be interesting for further research to determine whether the deductive method can also have an effect over a longer period of time when teaching the past simple and present perfect or whether Dutch pupils in general simply have too many difficulties regarding English tenses and will never fully internalize both structures.

Regarding the first research question: *What are the students' attitudes towards learning grammar?, it can be concluded that students actually like grammar and want to learn it. But they have some insecurities in themselves, because they often can not memorize the rules, so they want to learn more through grammar when learning grammar, because it allows them to remember the lessons for a long time.*

Regarding the second research question: *Is Inductive/ explicit learning more effective in overall language acquisition than deductive learning strategy?, the results showed that students prefer more inductive method because Inductive is presenting the learners with samples of language and, through a process of guided discovery, get the learners to find out the principle or rule for themselves.*

Regarding the third research question, *What are the main learning outcomes using deductive and inductive methods in teaching grammar? In fact, both methods of learning have their importance, because these methods enable students to learn English grammar adequately. However, from this study we understood that the inductive method is the preferred method of students, while the deductive method they see as a formal method of learning and difficult to understand.*

Based on the questionnaire results we have obtained we must emphasize that students prefer the inductive method to learn so the results also showed the T-Test so from this we can conclude that Inductive explicit learning strategies are significantly more effective in overall language acquisition than deductive learning strategies when both accuracy and reaction times are taken into account. Students' responses made us realize that this method was more efficient and had shown higher results in student achievement.

The result of the questionnaire indicates that students like the inductive approach; it means students' perception toward inductive approach is positive and they are satisfied of being taught using inductive approach. It is also found that students like the approach, even though it is difficult for them to memorize the pattern and understand the meaning, but once they found the pattern and understand the meaning they can memorize and use it.

Students' perception toward deductive approach it had oversimplified explanation especially for those who got lower score and for those who get high score like the approach but they did not really understand the meaning. While in experimental groups perceive that inductive approach is hard to understand because they do not know the pattern especially for those who got low score

but once they found its pattern they can remember it and for those who get high score they really like the approach because the approach is challenging and unforgettable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Teachers should vary the method used in teaching grammar to avoid the students' boredom. Some teachers used to implement deductive approach in teaching grammar.
- They can vary their teaching approach by using inductive approach so that the students are not bored when they learn a new grammar rule.
- The teacher should be creative in teaching grammar so that the students do not have any difficulties in memorizing the grammar pattern and understanding the meaning of the sentences.
- Having these limitations, the writer realizes that this study is far from being perfect. The writer hopes that his study can give some contributions in teaching English, especially in teaching grammar to vocational high school.

Study limitations

The generalisability of the results of the current study is subject to five Limitations. To begin with, the time frame of the treatment was only four weeks due to schedule constraints. Four weeks might not be an adequate length of time to observe the effects of different teaching approaches. A limited amount of treatment might hinder the effects of the approaches.

Furthermore, the sample size was limited to 60 participants. Therefore, the results of this study might not be applicable to the whole population. If there had been more participants, clearer results could have been obtained.

REFERENCES

- AbuSeileek, A.F (2009). The effect of using an online-based course on the learning of grammar inductively and deductively. *ReCALL*. 21(3), 319 - 336. doi: 10.1017/S095834400999005X
- Bourke, J.M. (1996). In praise of linguistic problem-solving, *RELC Journal*, 27(2), 12-29.
- Brown, Douglas H. *Principles of Language Learning And Teaching*. White Plains: Pearson Longman, 2007. Print.
- Corder, S. (1988) Pedagogic grammars. In: Rutherford, W. and Smith, M. (eds.) *Grammar and Second Language Teaching*. New York: Newbury, 123–145.
- De Graaff, R. Housen, A (2009) Investigating the Effects and Effectiveness of L2 Instruction. In Long, M.H. & Doughty, C.J. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Teaching* (pp.726-755). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (1998). Beyond focus on form: cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty, J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42–63). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (2003). Implicit and Explicit Learning. In C.Doughty and M.Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language learning*. (pp. 313-348). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- DeKeyser, R.M. (2005). What Makes Learning Second-Language Grammar Difficult? A Review of Issues. *Language Learning*. 55(1), 1–25.

Doughty, C. J. (2003). Instructed SLA: Constraints, compensation, and enhancement. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 256–310). Oxford: Blackwell.

Ellis, Nick C. “Optimizing the Input: Frequency and Sampling in Usage-Based and Form- Focused Learning.” *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Ed. Michael

H. Long and Catherine J. Doughty. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing, 2009. 139-158. Web.

Ellis, Rod. “Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective.” *TESOL Quarterly*. 40.1 (2006): 83-107. Web.

Ellis, Rod. “Grammar Teaching – Practice or Consciousness-Raising?” *Methodology in Language Teaching*. Ed. Jack C. Richards. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 167-174. Web.

Hammerly, H. “The Deduction/Induction Controversy.” *Modern Language Journal*. LIX (1975): 15-18. Web.

Krashen, Stephen D. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. 1st Internet Ed. Pergamon Press, 1982. Web.

Kwakernaak, Erik. *Didactiek van het Vreemdetalenonderwijs*. Bussum: UitgeverijCouthino, 2009. Print.

Larsen-Freeman. “Teaching and Testing Grammar.” *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Ed. Michael H. Long and Catherine J. Doughty. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing, 2009. 518-542. Web.

Md. Zain, SitiRohani. Teaching of Grammar : Teachers' Beliefs, Instructional Contexts and Practices. PhD Thesis University Sains Malaysia, 2007. Web.

MacIntyre, P.D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The Subtle Effects of Language Anxiety on Cognitive Processing in the Second Language. *Language Learning*, 44, pp. 283-305. doi. 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x

Nahavandi, N. Mukundan, J. (2013). The Impact of Textual Input Enhancement and Explicit Rule Presentation on Iranian Elementary EFL Learners' Intake of Simple Past Tense. *English Language Teaching*; 6(1), 92-102. doi: 10.5539/elt.v6n1p92

Norris, J. M., Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta analysis. *Language learning*, 50(3), 417-528.

Rast, R. (2010). The Role of Linguistic Input in the First Hours of Adult Language Learning. *Language Learning*. 60(2), 64–84.

Robinson, P. (1997). Individual differences and the fundamental similarity of implicit and explicit adult second language learning. *Language learning*, 47(1), 45-99.

Rosa, E. O'Neill, M.D. (1999). Explicitness, Intake, and the Issue Of Awareness, *SSLA*, 21, 511–556.

Quirk, Randolph and Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Pearson Longman, 1985.

Richards, Jack C. and Willy A. Renandya. "Approaches to Teaching." *Methodology in Language Teaching*. Ed. Jack C. Richards. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 5-8. Web.

Richards, Jack C. and Willy A. Renandya. "Teaching Grammar." *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Web.

Richards, Jack C. and Theodore S. Rodgers. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Print.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Print.

Shaffer, Constance. "A Comparison of Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching Foreign Languages." *The Modern Language Journal*. 73.4 (1989): 395-403. Web.

Skehan, Peter. *Individual Differences in Second-Language Learning*. New York: Routledge, 1989. Print.

Staatsen, Francis. *Moderne Vreemde Talen in de Onderbouw*. Bussum: Uitgeverij Coutinho, 2009. Print.

Swan, Michael. "A Critical Look at the Communicative Approach (1)." *ELT Journals*. 39.1 (1985): 2-12. Web.

Tabullo, A., Arismendi, M., Wainseboim, A., Primero, G., Vernis, S., Segura, E., Zanutto, S. & Yorio, A. (2012). On the learnability of frequent and infrequent word orders: An artificial language learning study, *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*.

Toth, P.D., Wagner, E. Moranski, K. (2012). 'Co-constructing' Explicit L2 Knowledge with High School Spanish Learners through Guided Induction. *Applied Linguistics*. doi. 10.1093/applin/ams049

Van Lier, L. (2008). 'Agency in the classroom.' In Lantolf, J. P. Poehner, M.E. (Eds.): *Sociocultural Theory and the Teaching of Second Languages*. Equinox Press, 163–86.

Van Patten, B. & Borst, S. (2012). The Roles of Explicit Information and Grammatical Sensitivity in Processing Instruction: Nominative-Accusative Case Marking and Word Order in German L2, *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(1), 92–109. doi. 10.1111/j.1944- 9720.2012.01169.x

Zhang, Jianyun. "Necessity of Grammar Teaching." *International Educational Studies*. 2.2 (2009): 184-187. Web.

APPENDIX 1

Student questionnaire

Dear student, please take some time to answer the questionnaire which can help me with my research. Thank you very much.

1.It is difficult to learn English language	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
2. The most difficult thing in foreign language learning is learning grammar					
3. Grammar is the most important part of language					
4. I learn grammar by studying the rules only					
5. Before teaching the grammatical rule, if the instructors provide example sentences, I learn the structure better					
6. I like grammar classes more than vocabulary and listening classes					
7. Grammar is fundamental in foreign language learning					
8. We do not need grammar rules to speak a language					
9. I learn better when the instructors teach the grammatical rules first					
10. I prefer the inductive method for learning English					
11. I learn better when the instructors provide examples and then the grammatical rules					
12. I prefer the deductive way to learn English grammar					

APPENDIX 2

Interview questions:

1. Do you think grammar is important for someone who learns English? Why?
2. What is your experience with teaching grammar?
3. Do you believe that you teach grammar correctly? Why?
4. Do you think that the teacher should present the rules (deductively) and explain at the beginning of the lesson or just to give/provide examples (inductively) without explaining the rules?
5. Do your students feel insecure when you do not explain the grammatical rules?
6. Do your students get confused by learning the grammatical rules ?
7. Do your students get confused by learning the grammar in context?
8. Do you believe that students can improve grammar through practice?
9. Do you believe that the best way to learn grammar is by analysing a text?

