

Students' Perception Toward the Use of Deductive and Inductive Approaches in Teaching English Grammar

Serliah Nur

Alauddin State Islamic University

serliah.nur@uin-alauddin.ac.id

Abstract

This study investigated the perception of students of the use of deductive and inductive learning approaches. The subject of the study involved a program named PIBA (Program Intensifikasi Bahasa Asing) in UIN Alauddin, Makassar where 2 English classes were purposively taken as samples to be treated using deductive and inductive approaches in teaching grammar with integrative skills. The research method employed was mixed method with quantitative and qualitative data taken from the control and experimental classes using an ARCS (Attention, Relevance, Confidence, Satisfaction) motivational model questionnaire, with in depth interviews and classroom observations utilized as research instruments. Based on the questionnaire and interviews, students gave positive perceptions on both learning approaches.

Keywords: English grammar teaching, deductive and inductive approach, ARCS motivation model.

Background

English competency is a skill that must be achieved by a graduate from an educational institution particularly from university level. This target of achievement has now become compulsory for many higher educational institution considering the importance of a graduate being equipped with this skill to be able to compete for a better chance of employment in the new emerging world globalization or an opportunity to continue further education even in obtaining possible scholarships.

However, a number of studies have reported that Indonesian students in general South Sulawesi in particular are still low in English competencies. Rahman, (2005) had investigated the fluency of university students and discovered that only 40,15% possess the grammar skills generally achieved which means they are classified as low in grammar mastery. This situation has made Indonesian graduates less competitive in the global working environment.

Furthermore, Yassi (2012, 2013) found that the average English language proficiency of English Literature students in the first year at Hasanuddin University is at the lower intermediate level. This illustrates the low competency of students in the classroom at university level. The phenomenon of the low English competence of college graduates in Indonesia will affect their competitiveness both nationally and internationally. Therefore, students' opportunity in obtaining scholarships are low due to the English requirement of the scholarship supporter. Hermayawati, (2010), in her research, explored the difficulties of students learning English and found several factors responsible for this. Among them are less-endorsement from their environment and less-chance to practice. The findings suggested that the language institutions should facilitate and provide high motivation for their students' English learning process.

As a lecturer at Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN- State Islamic University) Makassar, Indonesia, the researcher has been teaching English in several English studying institution since 2005. Before becoming a lecturer at UIN, she taught English courses in Makassar and, during those experiences of teaching, she observed the phenomenon that many of the English language learners have been spending a lot of money for an inefficient way of learning English, due to the lack of information and motivation. Many of them join English courses but due to the unfavorable learning atmosphere and inappropriate teaching and learning approach, the learners end up just continuing at their same level without gaining competency in English.

Having this English teaching and learning output situation, on the other hand, English teaching and learning aspects and processes must be reviewed to see to what extent they contributed the recent output. Among the factors involved mentioned earlier, are the content of the learning material or what to teach and the learning approach or how the teaching and learning delivered. For this particular research, grammar teaching is important to view as one of the most essential materials for the students to cover.

This research emerged from one program at The Language Center at the Islamic State University, Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar (UIN AM). This program was designed to encourage the mastery of English at the very beginning of the university study by students after their enrollment. This program is known as PIBA (Program Intensifikasi Bahasa Asing), translated in English as Foreign Language Intensification Program. During years of teaching English in UIN, especially at PIBA, it was observed that many students are still lacking in motivation to learn English. Their lack of motivation to learn English can be seen through the low level of their participation in class activities. Thus, it is not surprising that students' ability to read, to speak and to write in English is also low. This is based on previous research findings in 2009 that has not now been improved and became the concern of the PIBA programs (Nur, 2009).

The researcher was interested in investigating why this phenomenon has happened. It is believed that the main cause in educational process is students' motivation but nevertheless other factors can also contribute. One of the factors this study explored was the learning approach used in this program classes. How do the students perceive the deductive and inductive learning approaches is the question being researched.

Review of Related Literature

This chapter elaborates the review of related literature on the teaching of grammar using deductive and inductive approaches.

Previous Research Findings on Deductive and Inductive Approach.

English teaching as a foreign language has been an essential topic of research in the area of instructional pedagogy. Teaching grammar in general uses theoretical approaches to develop and promote the students success in the learning environment. Among the approach, method and learning strategies, deductive and inductive term have been used. Yassi (2014) in his research stated that the topic of grammar teaching or focus on forms in the field of second language education has become an interesting issue in the last decade. DeKeyser in Yassi (2014) notes that "grammatical teaching that focuses on form or forms is beneficial for certain situations, and certain learners". A number of research on English Language Teaching (ELT) have shown that there is no conclusive approach on how to teach grammar best to the learners. Therefore, choosing the proper teaching approach between deductive and inductive grammatical teaching is very significant.

Research on this deductive and inductive approach had been debated since the era of early stages of English learning. One of the most interesting controversies in second language teaching is the question of whether deduction or induction should be used in the teaching of grammatical structures (Hammerly, 1975).

In line with Hammerly, Fischer (1979) confirmed that many foreign language expert and teachers have long debated the value of a deductive or inductive approach in the teaching of grammatical structures. Many of them stated that a deductive approach in which the explanation of a grammatical principle precedes its application is more logical and leads to a higher degree of certainty of grammatical knowledge while others claimed that an inductive approach in which the students discovers the grammatical principle for themselves has a greater impact and leads to longer retention.

Furthermore, the theoretical approach is both deductive and inductive approach developed by Rivers and Temperley, (1990). Deductive approach applied by Rivers and Temperley represents a more traditional style of teaching in the grammatical structure or teacher-centered approach. On the other hand, the inductive approach seems to be more modern style of teaching where the grammatical rules are presented in the real language context or learner-centered approach. Below are some research investigations using deductive and inductive approach and some tried to compare which is more suitable for English grammar teaching. They are divided into research in favor of deductive, inductive, or both approaches. The ones in favor of deductive approach are Asriany (2013), Mallia (2014), Petraki and Gunawardena (2015), Sik (2015), and Hendriani (2018) while in favor inductive approach are Kuder (2009), Astrid (2011) and Akram (2015). Research in favor for both approaches are Behjat (2008), Chalipa (2013), Yassi (2014), Eriksson (2014), and Mahjoub (2015).

The general assumption indicates that both approaches has its own advantage and disadvantage with different affecting factors, level and students' age as well as the local content of the learning environment. Some experts even mentioned that the two approaches can be used to complement each other in English grammar teaching.

Theoretical Approach on Deductive and Inductive Grammar Teaching

Grammar is a set of finite rules by which we can construct infinite sentences. Chomsky (1955) believed that language is innate, or in other words, we are born with a capacity for language. Language rules are influenced by experience and learning, but the capacity for language itself exists with or without environmental influences. Chomsky believed that language is so complex, with an unlimited combination of sounds, words, and phrases, that environmental learning is not able to account for language acquisition alone. It would take a lifetime to teach someone all the rules of language, but even small children.

Recently, there are many open-ended concepts about teaching English Grammar (Ellis, 2008). Even linguistics separate into two groups about this subject. In teaching grammar, there are two approaches: deductive and inductive. A deductive approach is a technique that works from general to the specific. An inductive approach is a technique that works from specific to general. These approaches are very important because one of them is convenient for certain grammar subjects and certain type of students while the other is convenient for different ones. There are lots of researches that were conducted on these approaches (Eisenstein, 1987; Krashen, 2002).

There is not a consensus about the effectiveness of a specific method in grammar teaching. Indeed, grammar teaching is an essential part of classroom activities and adopting the most appropriate way to teach grammar according to student profile is an important issue. Teachers' transform their technical knowledge to practice may vary significantly. There are modernist or traditional approaches in grammar teaching. Lecturers may talk about many advantages and disadvantages of these traditional and modernist approaches. According to some researchers the main shortcoming of the traditional approach is lack of context (Petrovitz, 1997 in Sik, 2015) while others argue that traditional approaches are more successful (Robinson, 1996 in Sik, 2015). In grammar teaching modern approaches are labeled as inductive approach and traditional approaches are described as deductive approach.

Silvia (2006) in her research elaborated two instructional approaches, inductive and deductive. Both approaches can offer certain advantages. The deductive approach derives from deductive reasoning where the concept goes from general to specific. Rules, patterns, principles are presented first, and then moves to the examples. Deductive approach which is also known as rule-driven teaching enjoys the following advantages: 1. The deductive approach goes straightforwardly to the point and can, therefore, be time-saving. 2. A number of rule aspects (for example, form) can be more simply and clearly explained than elicited from examples 3. A number of direct practice/application examples are immediately given. 4. The deductive approach respects the intelligence and maturity of many adult learners in particular and acknowledges the role of cognitive processes in language acquisition. 5. It confirms many learners' expectations about classroom learning particularly for those who have an analytical style.

On the other hand, deductive approaches have some disadvantages: 1. Beginning the lesson with a grammar presentation may be off-putting for some learners, especially younger ones. 2. Younger learners may not able to understand the concepts or encounter grammar terminology given. 3. Grammar explanation encourages a teacher-fronted, transmission-style classroom, so it will hinder learner involvement and interaction immediately. 4. The explanation is seldom as memorable as other forms of presentation (for example, demonstration). 5. The deductive approach encourages the belief that learning a language is simply a case of knowing the rule.

Moreover, the deductive method is often criticized because: a) it teaches grammar in an isolated way; b) little attention is paid to meaning; c) practice is often mechanical. This method can, however, be a viable option in certain situations; for example, when dealing with highly motivated students, teaching a particularly difficult concept, or for preparing students to write exams (Bilash 2009).

From numerous statements about learning approach above it shows that a variety of ways to implement effective and efficient learning. Therefore, through these approaches the researcher recommends one appropriate learning approach that can be adopted by PIBA teachers and students based on the needs of students in the conditions that exist today. The researcher assumes if the teacher is able to adjust to the situation in the classroom and the mood of the students in the learning process, students' motivation and achievement can accurately and continuously be maintained.

Motivational Learning Model (ARCS)

"Motivation consists of the amount of effort a person is willing to exert in pursuit of a goal; hence, motivation has magnitude and direction. Consequently, motivational design is concerned with connecting instruction to the goals of learners, providing stimulation and appropriate levels of challenge, and influencing how the learners will feel following successful goal accomplishment, or even following failure"(Keller, 2006).

An effective instructor must not only gain a learner's attention but hold it throughout a course or lesson. John Keller synthesized existing research on psychological motivation and created the ARCS model (Keller, 1987). ARCS stands for Attention, Relevance, Confidence, and Satisfaction.

1. Attention: Perceptual attention-getters, as the instruction begins and continuing throughout such as colors, style, sound, humor, interaction, and involvement are essential.
2. Relevance: The use of meaningful examples to create contextual links between the learner and the context of what the teacher are teaching. Utilize the results of the needs assessments to get an understanding of the learners and their reason for seeking or requiring the teacher's instruction.
3. Confidence: success as the learner moves through the instruction will keep the learner engaged and will increase students' positive response to the experience. Design the instruction with small steps, self-pacing if possible, and immediate feedback to provide confidence-building experiences.
4. Satisfaction. Appropriate acknowledgment of instructional content and developing the desire to continue the pursuit of similar goals.

Research Methodology

This research used mixed research methodology. Mixed methods research is a style of research that uses procedures for conducting research that are typically applied in both quantitative and qualitative studies. The purpose of these designs is to build upon the synergy and strength that exists between quantitative and qualitative methods in order to more fully understand a given phenomenon than is possible using either quantitative or qualitative methods alone.

The study population was taken from a program called PIBA in UIN Makassar. These programs are language courses that aim to meet the English language learning needs of students at the higher education level in the State Islamic University. In this research, the writer used purposive sampling taken from the first year students. There were 2 classes chosen as the subject of the research. The first class was from Physics Department Faculty of Science and Technology treated using deductive approach and acted as a control group. The other class was from Islamic Guidance and Counseling Department Faculty of Communication treated using inductive approach and acted as an experimental group. Both classes were taught Present Tense and Past Tense from The Essential Grammar book of Raymond Murphy for Elementary students. The control class was slightly higher in number of students of 36 and the experimental class consist of 24 students.

The research instrument used in this study were questionnaires, class observations and interview. Quantitative data was collected from students using motivational questionnaires based on question types developed by Keller (1987). Following the quantitative method, qualitative data were collected from interviews and class observations.

Findings and Discussions

This chapter discusses the findings from the research implementation and identifies the results of the data analysis based on the research question designed in the early chapters.

Findings

Data collected through questionnaires

Below are the presentation of data after being analyzed through the statistical software in a sequence of The Control Class followed by The Experimental Class. Each of the ARCS motivational aspects discussed is based on the statistical data analysis classified based on each of the approaches. The questionnaire consists of 32 questions designed to meet the four aspects proposed in ARCS Model. Below, each aspect will be displayed based on the frequency and percentage of the scoring from the questionnaire. The Likert scale was used to classify the response from strongly agree (SA), agree (A), undecided (UN), disagree (D) and strongly disagree (SD). Each of the motivational aspect were classified based on the total mean score accumulated for the number of questions given in the questionnaire for which category they belong to. The 5 categories in the range of motivation score were highly unmotivated, unmotivated, moderately motivated, motivated and highly motivated.

a. Deductive class

1) Attention aspect

Table 1. Question items and total mean result of the attention aspect.

Q	Statement	Maen
Q1	I feel interested if the explanation material of Simple Present and Past Tense given at the beginning of the lesson	4.41
Q2	I am interested if teacher varies the learning method by group discussion or pair interaction.	4.29
Q3	I actively participate if Teacher gives games related to the learning material.	4.24
Q4	Too much exercises in the class about Simple Present and Past Tense makes bored.	3.88
Q5	I feel excited when the teacher varies the practices of past simple and present perfect.	4.35
Q6	Explanation of The Simple Present and Past Tense is easier if I can use the sentences through exercises.	4.18
Q7	If teacher directly explains the formula of Simple Present and Past Tense, I will memorize the lesson	3.32
Q8	I get burden if the teacher asks me to make Simple Present and Past Tense sentences	3.79
Total		4.06

Table 1 above shows the total mean score achieved by the students for each question on the attention aspect. This total mean score of **4.06** result indicated that all the questionnaires in this attention aspect reached high score and the total classified as motivated category. Notice that question No.7 has the lowest among the others, **3.32**. The highest mean score was from question No.1, **4.41**. This reflected the approach used for this control class and the response was very high.

2). Relevance aspect

Table 2. Question items and the total mean result of the relevance aspect.

Q	Statement	Mean
Q9	I am pleased if Teacher begins the class by reviewing briefly what have been learned in the previous meeting.	4.44
Q10	I am interested to learn The Simple Present Tense and Past Tense because it is useful for me.	4.56
Q11	The Simple Present Tense and Past Tense material doesn't meet my needs because it is too easy for me.	4.38
Q12	I am pleased to make my own Simple Present and Past Tense sentences	3.97
Q13	I need more than 1 meeting to understand The Simple Present Tense and Past Tense.	4.09
Q14	I feel anxious if the teacher asks many questions during the presentation of Simple Present and Past Tense	2.97
Q15	I feel satisfied if I can use the Simple Present and Past Tense because it will be useful to make a correct and good sentences.	4.53
Q16	I feel satisfied if I get the lesson of Simple Present and Past Tense directly from the teacher	4.38
Q17	I am pleased if teacher gives many examples and exercises after	4.65

	explaining the formula of Simple Present and Past tense	
Total		4.22

Table 2 shows the relevance aspect, the total mean score was **4.22** which categorized as motivated in the motivation rating. The highest score was question No.17 (**4.65**), and the lowest score was question No.14 (**2.97**). It showed that learners like it if they have many exercises in the classroom so they can understand better.

Confidence aspect

Table 3. Question items and mean result of the confidence aspect.

Q	Statement	Mean
Q18	After teacher explains the formula of Simple Present and Past Tense in the beginning , I am confident to be able to do all the exercises	3.74
Q19	Teacher explanation about the material of Simple Present and Past Tense at the beginning of the lesson fits my learning expectation	4.03
Q20	The exercises related to Simple Present and Past Tense provided by the teacher do not fit my expectation	4.00
Q21	During the lesson, I feel confident from the exercises given.	3.65
Q22	After learning Simple Present and past Tense, I am confident doing any exercises using this material.	3.74
Q23	I cannot use Simple Present Tense and Past Tense in communication if I only do the written exercises.	3.24
Q24	I do not understand many terms in teacher explanation about Simple Present and Past Tense	3.76
Q25	I think the material of The Simple Present and Past Tense was difficult	3.41
Total		3.69

In the confidence aspect, the total mean score was **3.69**, the highest score was question No. 19, with mean score of **4.03**, and the lowest score was question No. 23 with total mean score of **3.24**. The result indicated that although students might not be quite confident when they learn the lesson for the first time, but afterwards their confidence could grow positively after the learning approach was implemented.

Satisfaction aspect

Table 4. Question items and total mean result of the satisfaction aspect.

Q	Statement	Mean
Q26	Understanding the formula of Simple Present and Past Tense in the beginning of the lesson made me satisfied in learning.	4.06
Q27	I am pleased to learn The Simple Present and Past Tense and would like to learn more.	4.44
Q28	I don't like the teaching method of Simple Present and Past given by the teacher.	4.12
Q29	I am pleased joining the PIBA Program	4.53
Q30	I cannot understand Simple Present and Past Tense if the teacher does not give opportunity to make my own sentences.	3.47
Q31	The way of teacher explains the rules at the beginning of the lesson before giving the examples fits my learning expectation.	4.26
Q32	I feel satisfied if I can give my opinion related to examples given	4.26
Total		4.16

Questions No.26-32 represented the satisfaction aspect. In The satisfaction aspect, the total mean score was **4.16**, the highest score was item No. 29, mean score of **4.53**. The lowest score was item No. 30 with total mean score of **3.47**. This result indicated that students were overall satisfied with the material and their sense of satisfaction would be higher if they could have longer time for the lesson.

Inductive class

Inductive class is the experimental class with inductive approach treatment to the students. From the questionnaire given after the treatment, below are the result summarized in the table for each response category for each question for the four motivational aspects. Below are the findings.

1). Attention Aspect

Table 5. Question items and total mean score result of the attention aspect.

Q	Statement	Mean
Q1	I feel interested if the explanation material of Simple Present and Past Tense given at the end of the lesson	3.69
Q2	I am interested if teacher varies the learning method by group discussion or pair interaction.	4.08
Q3	I actively participate if Teacher gives games related to the learning material.	4.73
Q4	Too much exercises in the class about Simple Present and Past Tense makes bored.	3.73
Q5	I feel excited when the teacher varies the practices of past simple and present perfect.	4.38
Q6	Explanation of The Simple Present and Past Tense is easier if I can use the sentences through exercises.	4.69
Q7	I can understand easier if teacher gives exercises in the beginning of the lesson and explain the formula at the end of the lesson.	3.77
Q8	I get burden if the teacher asks me to make Simple Present and Past Tense sentences	3.58
Total		4.08

Table 5 displays the total mean result of the response to each question from 32 questions in the questionnaire distributed to the 26 students in the inductive class. For the attention aspect, the total mean score was **4.08** with the minimum score of **3.58** for question No.8 and maximum total mean score of **4.73** for question No.3. This is the highest response score given by the students for one particular statement achieved from the questionnaire.

2).Relevance aspect

Table 6. Question items and total mean result of the relevance aspect.

Q	Statement	Mean
Q9	I am pleased if Teacher begins the class by reviewing briefly what have been learned in the previous meeting.	4.50
Q10	I am interested to learn The Simple Present Tense and Past Tense because it is useful for me.	4.58
Q11	The Simple Present Tense and Past Tense material doesn't meet my needs because it is too easy for me.	4.12
Q12	I am pleased to make my own Simple Present and Past Tense sentences	4.15
Q13	I need more than 1 meeting to understand The Simple Present Tense and Past Tense.	4.23
Q14	I feel anxious if the teacher asks many questions during presenting	2.92

	Simple Present and Past Tense	
Q15	I feel satisfied if I can use the Simple Present and Past Tense because it will be useful to make a correct and good sentences.	4.50
Q16	I feel satisfied if I can understand the formula after doing the exercises	4.38
Q17	I am pleased if teacher gives many examples and exercises before explaining the formula of Simple Present and Past tense	4.19
Total		4.18

Table 6 above displays the question items and mean result of the relevance aspect. The total mean score was the highest among the 4 aspects of the motivational questionnaire, **4.18**. Question No. 10 got the maximum score of **4.58**. Meanwhile, the minimum score registered was from question No.14 with the total mean score of **2.92**.

3). Confidence aspect

Table 7. Question items and total mean result of the confidence aspect.

Q	Statement	Mean
Q18	After Teacher give exercises on the material in the beginning of the lesson, I am confident to be able to discover the formula at the end of the lesson	3.85
Q19	Teacher explanation about the material of Simple Present and Past Tense at the end of the lesson does not fit my learning expectation	3.35
Q20	The exercises related to Simple Present and Past Tense provided by the teacher do not fit my expectation	3.77
Q21	During the lesson, I feel confident the exercises given.	3.92
Q22	After learning Simple Present and past Tense, I am confident doing any exercises using this material.	3.73
Q23	I cannot use Simple Present Tense and Past Tense in communication if I don't do the written exercises.	3.81
Q24	I do not understand many terms in teacher explanation about Simple Present and Past Tense	3.96
Q25	I think the material of The Simple Present and Past Tense was difficult	3.62
Total		3.75

Table 7 shows the confidence aspect responded by the students from the 8 questions designed for this category. The total mean score of this satisfaction aspect was **3.75**. The maximum mean score responded was **3.96** of question No.24, which showed 97% of the total students understood the explanation of the material. The minimum score was in question No.19 with mean score of **3.35**.

4). Satisfaction aspect

Table 8. Question items and total mean result of the satisfaction aspect.

Q	Statement	Mean
Q26	Discovering the formula of Simple Present and Past Tense after doing the exercises made me satisfied in learning.	3.69
Q27	I am pleased to learn The Simple Present and Past Tense and would like to learn more.	4.31
Q28	I don't like the teaching method of Simple Present and Past given by the teacher.	3.92
Q29	I am pleased joining the PIBA Program	4.54
Q30	I cannot understand Simple Present and Past Tense if the teacher does not give opportunity to make my own sentences.	3.42

Q31	The way of teacher explains the rules at the end of the lesson after given the examples fits my learning expectation.	4.04
Q32	I feel satisfied if I can give my opinion related to examples given.	4.35
Total		4.04

Table 8 shows the satisfaction aspect responded by the students from question No.26 to No.32 designed for this category. The total mean score of this satisfaction aspect was **4.04**. The maximum total mean score responded was **4.54** of question No.29 which showed 97% of the total students like to join this PIBA program. The minimum score was in the statement No. 30 with a mean score of 3.42.

Findings from interview

a. Deductive class

There were five students who were interviewed in the deductive class; DE 10, DE 16, DE 18, DE 19 and DE 29. All of them have been studying English for approximately 7-8 years, since they were in Junior high school. The interview questions were based on the questionnaire of ARCS model which consist of four aspects: attention, relevance, confidence and satisfaction.

1) Formula is presented at the beginning (attention aspect)

All of the students mentioned that they like if the formula is presented first because it is easier for them to make the sentences. DE 29 stated that “for me, if the formula is at the beginning, it’s better because it is understandable, it’s easier also to form the sentences, and it’s more interesting to know the tenses.”

Furthermore, DE 16 said that “based on my experience in learning English, this is very helpful because in learning tenses, the formula should be presented first so it’s easier for students to make the sentence, especially for myself. DE 18 also had the same opinion, she said that when the formula is at the beginning, it’s easier to make a sentence.

2) The lessons meet the students’ needs (Relevance aspect)

Five of them said that the lessons of Simple Present Tense and Past Tense meet their needs. They need it for communication with friends and foreigners, looking for a job and research. DE 29 mentioned that she needs it in her daily life. She usually talks with her room-mates and her cousin who studies at The English department. Furthermore she said that “we really need it, because in Physics Department we do not only use Bahasa Indonesia, but we also use English in our research. If it’s a research, there are scientific terms in the article, the abstract is usually in English.”

Meanwhile DE 18 mentioned that she uses it in the near future, when she happens to meet a foreigner, she will not be hesitant to communicate. DE 19, who realizes that in his department there is a requirement to achieve 450 TOEFL score, stated that he needs English to apply for a job.

3) Students ability to do the assignment (Confidence aspect)

Among the 5 students chosen as the interviewees, 4 of the students said that they are confident but one said that she is not sure. DE 29 said that the teacher teaches well, it’s easy to understand, and the structured formula is given so she is confident to do the assignment. DE 18 has the same opinion. She’s sure to be able to do the assignment if the formula is highlighted.

Whereas DE 16 felt that she’s not really sure because sometimes she forgot the formula. Furthermore she said that the formula might be different for example Simple Present, that’s why it’s more difficult.

4) Teacher’s method of teaching in the classroom (Satisfaction aspect)

All of the students felt satisfied with the teacher. DE 19 mentioned that he’s satisfied because the lesson is easy to understand and there’s interaction between teacher and students. In line with that, DE 18 said that the teacher’s explanation is easy to understand, not that complicated, the material is given step by step.

Moreover, DE 29 added that “when the class starts, the teacher joins with the students, knowing what they need, giving examples of words, sentences, and also the games. What she taught, it’s easier to understand.” DE 29 also stated that she is satisfied because her expectation in learning English is fulfilled, she got the lessons which she needed. She added that the learning process is also fun and creative, it’s not boring and it’s enjoyable. Lastly, DE 10 said that he’s satisfied with teacher’s method but he’s never satisfied to learn.

b. Inductive class

For Inductive class, there were also five students interviewed. They were IN 2, IN 3, IN 20, IN 17 and IN 23.

1). Formula is presented at the end of the class (Attention aspect)

Three students mentioned that they liked if the formula is presented at the end because they can discover the formula at the end. IN 2 even mentioned that it's her first time like studying English. She said "I'm happy I get to know it, for example in the beginning I didn't know but then it's corrected then I know. Furthermore she said "when I was at junior and senior school I seldom give attention to English lesson because I don't like it, this is the first time in PIBA, I've started to like English".

In line with IN 2, IN 3 also stated that even though it is the first time for her learning English where the formula is given at the end, she likes it. Furthermore, IN 17 said that he likes it because from the examples given, we can guess the formula, so when the formula is explained at the end, the formula can be understood.

On the contrary, IN 20 disliked it, she said "I don't like it if the formula is given at the end because that makes it hard to understand, in the beginning is better. Furthermore she said that "It's hard at the end, because usually we don't understand it in the end, if it's in the beginning it's better when we see it in our notes"

Another student, IN 23, prefers if the formula is given both at the beginning and the end of the lesson. He said, "actually I like if the formula is presented at first and repeated again at the end of the lesson because the formula won't be forgotten at the end of the lesson".

2). The lessons meet with the students' needs (Relevance aspect)

All of the students said that the lessons meet with their needs. They know that English as an International language and they need it for communicating with their friends, tourists and most of them want to go abroad to continue their study.

IN 3 who has been interested in English since she was a child said that she sometimes practices English in her daily conversation because her roommate is an English student. IN 20 said that she needs English to communicate with friends, tourist and her dream is going abroad.

IN 2 on the other hand, stated that "we need English actually because here in Bimbingan Penyuluhan Islam (BPI) specialized in preaching, we're not going to be here forever, we must go out, overseas, wherever, we need English, an international language, so we need it." IN 17 also mentioned that "I need it because I plan to continue my study abroad".

3). Students ability to do the assignment (Confidence aspect)

It seems that some of them still felt unsure doing the assignment. IN 3 said that sometimes she is not sure of the formula because there are many formulas that has to be learned. She said that in the English general subject, the lesson is Present Perfect. That's why she's confused with the formula of present tense, past tense and present perfect. IN 20 also said "Uh...I'm not sure because I don't master the formula, so I'm not sure if it's fully correct".

However, IN 17 who started to like English since studying English at PIBA mentioned that he's confident doing the assignment because the lessons have been explained so he knew it already. IN 23 also said that he's confidence because the lecturer explained it clearly and the lesson is not boring.

4). Teacher's method of teaching in the classroom (Satisfaction aspect)

All of the students felt satisfied with the teacher's method because the class is fun, enjoyable, and there are many exercises given. As IN 2 said the teacher was fun and the exercises improved her knowledge. IN 23 also mentioned that the teacher's method is fun, there were games, and it's more enjoyable in the classroom.

Furthermore IN 17 said "The teacher's method is different, what I mean, when we study in the previous lesson, we studied tensely. We used to think that English is difficult but now it's easier." It's in line with IN 3's opinion who is satisfied because the teacher explained the lesson clearly.

Discussion

The questionnaire used in this study was intended to unveil the students' motivation in relation how the learning process was presented by the teacher. This is supported by Keller (1987) with his motivational design called ARCS. Motivation is essential when it comes to student learning. Motivation involves helping a learner want to learn as well as providing opportunities for the learner to develop in ways that is authentic and satisfying. Keller's theory suggests that if teachers utilize his four categories of learning (attention, relevance, confidence, and satisfaction) and incorporate a design system which links the instructional content to this theory student motivation will increase positively.

For the deductive class the first aspect was attention which based on the result in the findings the total mean

score as well as the total sum of the questionnaires fit in the motivated category, 4.06. This is the same as relevance (4.22), confidence (3.69) and satisfaction (4.16) aspects which happened to fall in the motivated category among. The average total mean score of the overall questions was **4.03**.

On the other hand, for the inductive class, the score for each of the motivational aspects were as follow; attention (4.08), relevance (4.18), confidence (3.75) and satisfaction (4.04). The overall average of the total questions in this class was **4.01**. This condition happened to be the same for both the deductive and the inductive classes. This finding indicated that after being taught using either deductive or inductive approach, the students motivation were significantly high or in the motivated category.

However, based on the total mean score for each aspect, the highest scoring aspect was relevance and the lowest was confidence. This result showed that relevance aspect contributed as the most significant aspect.

This is in line with question in the deductive class questionnaire No.17 which acquired the highest mean score (4.65), "I am pleased if teacher gives many examples and exercises after explaining the formula of Simple Present and Past Tense". Thirty four students or all of the students in this class responded strongly agree and agree. It showed that the students would like to know more about English so they can master it well.

Moreover, the highest mean score for relevance in the inductive class was question No. 10 (4.58). The question was "I'm interested to learn the Simple Present Tense and Past Tense because it is useful for me". This showed that from 26 students in the inductive class, all of them answered strongly agree and agree to this statement and indicated that most students wanted to study English because it is important for them and the treatment given to them was relevant to their needs.

On the contrary, the confidence was the lowest aspect indicated that the students were still lack of confidence because they felt they needed more time to practice not only in written exercise but also their conversation in spoken English. This reflected from the Question No.23 with the lowest mean score of 3.24 in the deductive class questionnaire stated that "I cannot use Simple Present Tense and Past Tense in communication if I only do the written exercise". Meanwhile in the inductive class, the confidence aspect from Question No.26, "I think the material of The Simple Present and Past Tense was difficult", the mean score was 3.65. This reflected the fact that with basic grammar of Simple Present Tense and Past Tense, the students still found it difficult to understand. Hence It shows that the students' confidence were still low

The result of the questionnaire was supported by the result of the interview. In the relevance aspect, most of the students from the deductive class responded that they needed English for communication with their friends, foreigners, looking for employment and conducting research. Meanwhile, the students in the inductive class thought that English as an International language can help them to pursue their study in abroad. This finding indicated that relevance had strong impression to the students while attention and satisfaction aspects had a slightly lesser impression from the treatment.

The low confidence aspect of the students in the interview indicated that they still need more lessons in giving them more confidence. Specifically in the interview the student (DE 16) mentioned that she was not really sure because sometimes she thought there were many formulas that she had to learn and that has made her difficult to remember all them the formulas and this made her less confident. This finding also showed that some of the students felt unsure because they did not master the formula.

In the inductive class, one student (IN 20) also had the same opinion that she found in English lesson there were so many formulas that she had to learn that made her less confident. This confirms Fries (1945) and Lado's (1975) hypotheses which stated that the errors made in second language learning are due to differences between first and second language. The difference would create difficulties in learning the second language thus this would make students less confident.

From the result of the questionnaire given to the deductive and the inductive classes, it showed that the students' responses toward the approaches were positive. This can also be seen from some particular questions such as question No. 1 in the deductive class which stated "I feel interested if the explanation material of Simple Present and Past Tense given at the beginning of the lesson". The mean score for this item was the highest, **4.41**. On the other hand in the inductive class Question No.1 "I feel interested if the explanation material of Simple Present and Past Tense given at the end of the lesson" acquired mean score **3.69**. Both score fell in the motivated category of the motivation rating score. This suggested the students' perception of the learning approach were positive.

Based on the findings from the interview, in the deductive class, among the 5 students interviewed, all of them mentioned that they liked the deductive learning approach because if they were given the formula in the beginning, it

is easier for them to make sentences. On the other hand, in the inductive class there were three students responded that they liked when the formula was given at the end because they could discover the formula at the end. There was one student has no preference of when the learning approach to be implemented in her class either the formula is explained in the beginning of the class or at the end while there was one student preferred the formula was taught in the beginning which against the common trend of his friends in the inductive class.

In any experimental class, there is always a percentage of deviation that does not fit the general outcome of the experiment. In this instance, in the inductive class, 3 out of 5 students preferred the inductive approach, one chose deductive approach while the other one chose both approaches. Based on the class activities joined by this particular sample (IN 23), he mentioned that it was hard for him to understand, in the beginning is better. Furthermore he said that "It's hard at the end, because usually we don't understand it in the end, if it's in the beginning it's better when we see it in our notes".

Students' perception could also be seen from their response in the questionnaire such as question No.3 in the inductive class. The question "I actively participate if teacher gives games related to the learning material" had the highest mean score, **4.73**. This is in line with the interview result of student IN 20 who stated that, "the teacher's method was fun, and there are games. It is more enjoyable in the classroom". This suggested that the students enjoy the class if the teacher gives them varieties of games because the class would be interesting. This confirmed the previous research of Guerero (2001) and Tengku Paris and Yusuf (2012) who stated that playing games will reduce fear in learning and enhance students' confidence and in turn will improve students' mastery of English grammar.

In line with the behaviorism theory, language learning is related to the interaction between stimulus and response with the strengthening process. Strengthening is reinforced by situations that are conditioned repeatedly. This situation fits with the idea of the deductive approach. On the other hand, the constructivism theory stated that students who learn foreign language try to construct and discover their own knowledge. This condition is categorized as the inductive approach.

The result of the study indicated that students had positive perceptions and both approaches can be used in the classroom depends on the students' need.

Conclusions and Implications

Students perception on both learning approach were considered positive indicated by the result of the questionnaire where both approaches scored in the motivated category and this is supported by the result of in depth-interview where in deductive class all respondents responded that they preferred the deductive approach to be used in their classes while in the inductive class most of the respondents also liked the inductive approach. This study indicated that both learning approaches can be used to improve students' motivation as far as the learning environment is convenient for the students to learn.

The pedagogical implication of the study is the teachers and students are supposed to fully motivated to use the deductive and inductive approaches in the grammar class. Hopefully, these approaches can increase students' motivation and grammatical competence in learning English grammar.

References

- Akram Alzu'bi, M. (2015). Effectiveness of Inductive and Deductive Methods in Teaching Grammar. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6 (2): 187-193.
- Asriany, R. A. G., Arafah, B., & Yassi, A. H. (2013). *Deductive and Inductive Methods in Teaching Passive English Construction (A Study at STKIP YPUP Makassar)*. Pasca Sarjana Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Astrid. (2011). Pembelajaran Tata Bahasa Inggris Secara Komunikatif dengan Penyajian Induktif dan Pengintegrasian Keterampilan Berbahasa: Studi Kasus di Kelas Bahasa Inggris I di IAIN Raden Patah Palembang. *TA'DIB*, 16(2). Retrieved from <http://jurnal.radenfatah.ac.id/index.php/tadib>
- Behjat, F. (2008). Inductive vs. Deductive Grammar Instruction and the Grammatical Performance of EFL Learners. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 1(Inaugural Issue), 1–13. Retrieved from http://jal.iaut.ac.ir/article_524175.html
- Bilash. (n.d.). Inductive and Deductive Instruction. Retrieved November 2, 2018, from [https://sites.educ.ualberta.ca/staff/olenka.bilash/Best of Bilash/inductivedeductive](https://sites.educ.ualberta.ca/staff/olenka.bilash/Best%20of%20Bilash/inductivedeductive)
- Chalipa, S. (2013). The Effect of Inductive Vs. Deductive Instructional Approach in Grammar Learning of ESL

- Learners. *Deccan International Journal of Advanced Research Studies DIJARS*, 1(1). Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/6631462/The_Effect_of_Inductive_Vs._Deductive_Instructional_Approach_in_Grammar_Learning_of_ESL_Learners
- Eistensein, M. (1989). *The Dynamic Interlanguage: Empirical Studies in Second Language Variations*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>
- Eriksson (2014) The Effectiveness of Modified Inductive Versus Deductive Teaching, Thesis, Umea Universitet, Sweden.
- Fischer, R. A. (1979). The Inductive-Deductive Controversy Revisited. *The Modern Language Journal*, 63(3), 98–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1979.tb02433.x>
- Guerrero, L.A, Ochoaa, S and Collazo, C. (2010) A mobile learning tool for improving grammar skills *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2 pp. 1735–1739.
- Hammerly, H. (1975). The Deduction/Induction Controversy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 59(1–2), 15–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1975.tb03619.x>
- Hendriani, S. (2018). Grammar Teaching Method Preferred by Indonesian Students. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 20 (11): 83-96.
- Hermayawaty. (2010). Analisis Kesulitan Belajar bahasa Inggris Mahasiswa. *Jurnal Sosio-Humaniora*, 1(1), 1–14.
- Keller, J. M. (1987). Development and Use of the ARCS Model of Instructional Design. *Journal of Instructional Development*, 10(3), 2–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02905780>
- Khaeruddin. (2015). *Effect of Inductive Teaching on Students' Modal Auxiliaries Achievement: A quasi Experimental Study at Politeknik Informatika Nasional LP3I Makassar*. Hasanuddin University of Makassar.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kuder, E. (2009) *Implications of an Inductive versus Deductive Approach to SLA Grammar Instruction*. University of Delaware, USA.
- Mahjoob, E. (2015). A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Inductive vs. Deductive Instruction of Grammar to EFL Students. *Journal of Language, Linguistics and Literature*, 1(5), 164–169. Retrieved from <http://www.aiscience.org/journal/j31http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>
- Mallia, J. G. (2014). Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching English Grammar. *Arab World English Journal*, 5(2), 221–325. Retrieved from <https://awej.org/index.php/volume-5-2014/49-2014-06-25-04-23-28/495-joseph-george-mallia>
- Murphy, R. (2010). *English Grammar in Use* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Nur, S. (2009). *Language Learning and Motivation in Indonesia*. Monash University.
- Petraki, E and Gunawardena, M. (2015). The Key Ingredients of an Effective Grammar Lesson: Perceptions From High School ESL Students. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 17 (3): 59-84.
- PIBA. (2012). State Islamic University. Makassar.
- Rahman, M. A. (2005). Gambaran Tingkat Penguasaan Materi Kurikulum Bahasa Inggris Lulusan Sekolah Menengah Umum di Sulawesi Selatan. *Bahasa Dan Seni*, 33(118–128). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242616706_GAMBARAN_TINGKAT_PENGUASAAN_MATERI_KURIKULUM_BAHASA_INGGRIS_LULUSAN_SEKOLAH_MENENGAH_UMUM_DI_SULAWESI_SELATAN
- Rivers, W. M., & Temperley, M. S. (1990). *A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Oxford University Press.
- Sik, K. (2015). Tradition or Modernism in Grammar Teaching: Deductive vs. Inductive Approaches. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 2141–2144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SBSPRO.2015.07.340>
- Silvia, A. (2006). Deductive and Inductive Grammar Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1). Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/2344319/Deductive_and_Inductive_Grammar_Teaching
- Tengku Paris, T. N. S., & Yussof, R. L. (2012). Enhancing Grammar Using Board Game. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 68, 213–221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SBSPRO.2012.12.221>
- Yassi, A. H. (n.d.). *Toward Local Culture Integrations in EFL Classrooms in Indonesia*. Retrieved from <http://english.stkipbjm.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Abdul-Hakim-Yassi.pdf>

- Yassi, A. H. (2012). Ancangan Model Pembelajaran Gramatika Bahasa Inggris Berbasis Interaktif, Paired Interaction Model, Untuk Meningkatkan Profisiensi Bahasa Inggris Mahasiswa: Kajian Quasi Eksperimental. Makassar: Laporan Hasil Penelitian Unggulan Program Studi Tahun I. LP2M Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Yassi, A. H. (2013a). Pengembangan dan Uji-Efektifitas Ancangan Model Pembelajaran Gramatika Bahasa Inggris Berbasis Interaktif, "Pair Interaction Model". *CELEBES. Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu Sosial, Ekonomi, Hukum Dan Budaya. Universitas Hasanuddin*, 1(1), 1–23.
- Yassi, A. H. (2013b). Uji Efektifitas Ancangan Model Pembelajaran Gramatika Bahasa Inggris Berbasis Interaktif, Paired Interaction Model, dalam Rangka Meningkatkan Profisiensi Bahasa Inggris Mahasiswa terhadap Model Pembelajaran Berbasis Interaktif Lainnya dalam Kelompok Kerja. Makassar: Laporan Hasil Penelitian Unggulan Program Studi Tahun II. LP2M Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Yassi, A. H. (2014). Uji Efektifitas Ancangan Model Pembelajaran Bhs Inggris, Paired Interaction, dalam rangka meningkatkan Profisiensi Bhs Inggris Mahasiswa terhadap dua jenis pendekatan pembelajaran Gramatika Bhs Inggris, Deduktif dan Induktif. Laporan Hasil Penelitian Unggulan Program Studi Tahun III. LP2M Universitas Hasanuddin

About the Author

Serliah Nur is a lecturer at Alauddin State Islamic University. Her research interests are teaching English as a foreign language, and second language acquisition. She may be contacted at serliah.nur@uin-alauddin.ac.id