

# THE EFFECT OF USING DEDUCTIVE APPROACH AND INDUCTIVE APPROACH IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO STUDENTS ON THEIR CONDITIONAL SENTENCE MASTERY

Limris Gorat<sup>7</sup>  
V. Luluk Prijambodo<sup>8</sup>

## **Abstract.**

*This study investigates the effect of using deductive and inductive approach in teaching English to students on their conditional sentence mastery. This study also intends to describe the students' perception toward deductive or inductive teaching approach. This study was a queasy experimental study which compares the effectiveness of deductive and inductive approach in teaching conditional sentences. The sample of this study is 64 SMK students in the academic years of 2012-2013. The students consist of two classes and each class comprises 32 students. The findings indicate that inductive teaching approach is more effective than deductive approach when used to teach conditional sentences. The result of the questionnaire indicates that students like the inductive approach and they are satisfied taught using inductive approach.*

**Keywords:** *effect, deductive approach, inductive approach, conditional sentences, perception.*

## **Background**

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).

In Indonesia teaching grammar is not easy because the term of English and Indonesia are different. Since grammar is not easy to learn, this paper tries to offer two different approaches-deductive and inductive approaches. These approaches were used to teach grammar, and the focus of this paper is teaching conditional sentences. Based on the curriculum of vocational high school, conditional sentences are taught in the second

---

<sup>7</sup> Limris Gorat *adalah* Mahasiswa S2 MPBI Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya.

<sup>8</sup> V. Luluk Prijambodo *adalah* Dosen Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris di FKIP Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya.

semester after the students do their mid-term of odd semester. However, students are required to master their grammar because most of the test in their national examination is grammar test. Part of the grammar that is difficult to explain conditional sentences.

Based on the problem above, the writer was interested to overcome the difficulties by using inductive and deductive teaching method to teach conditional sentences. The reason why the writer chooses Vocational high school is, because grammar is the most important part in their language learning for most the test in their national exam is grammar. The reason why the writer choose accountancy the first graders of accountancy as a sample is based on vocational high school syllabi no 7.3 academic year of 2012/2013. Thus study focuses on the effectiveness of deductive and inductive approach to teach conditional sentences. This study also investigates the students' perception toward the two approaches.

### **The Conditional Sentences in English**

Conditional sentences are used to show that the action in the main clauses (without if) can only take place if a certain condition (in the clause with if) is fulfilled. According to (Eastwood, 1994:333) conditional sentences can be classified into four types of commonly used conditionals in English that are differentiated on the basis of the degree of possibility implied by each conditional.

#### **a. Zero conditionals.**

The zero conditional discusses an absolute certainty; the result of the condition is always true. The most common types of zero conditionals are scientific facts, like:

If you cool water to zero degrees, it turns into ice.

If you heat iron, it expands.

#### **b. Conditional Type 1**

This conditional is used to talk about future events that might happen. It uses the present tense to discuss the possible future event.

For example:

If it rains, we will have to cancel the picnic.

If you visit Paris, you must see the Eiffel Tower.

#### **c. Conditionals Type 2**

This type of conditional is used to talk about unreal possibility or impossible events; they establish the course of action that would follow, something to happen hypothetically.

For example: If I had a million dollars, I would buy a penthouse on Park Avenue.

#### **d. Conditional Type 3**

This conditionals talks about the past, unlike the first and second which discuss events in the real or unreal future. These conditions, too, are therefore impossible, because they have either already occurred or might have occurred but will not anymore. For example:

For example:

If I had known that you were coming, I would have met you at the airport. (But I didn't know, so I did not meet you at the airport)

### **The Method of Teaching Grammar**

There are various teaching methods that can be applied to the teaching of grammar. However, in this chapter the writer restrict to fundamental aspect of subject which are called deductive and inductive method to pedagogy. According to Nunan (15: 2005), there are two basic ways to introduce new grammar item, deductively and inductively. In inductive method, the teacher presents the grammar rule and then gives student exercise in which they apply the rule. In inductive approach, the teacher present sample of language, and the student have to come to an intuitive understanding of the rule. More detailed discussion on the two teaching approaches presented below.

#### **Deductive Approach**

The deductive approach of teaching English grammar refers to the style of teaching students by introducing the grammatical rules first, and then applying them by the students. This means that a teacher works from the more general to the more specific in a deductive approach called informally a "top down" approach. Decoo (1996) understands education as a process that goes from the general to the specific. In the deductive approach a grammatical rule is first presented explicitly by the teacher and examples applying the rule will follow. Next the students practice the rule with various kinds of exercises, for example drills and translation into and out of the target language. That is to say, that it moves from general to more specific information. The deductive approach is also often compared with other more traditional methods of grammar teaching. It aims at teaching various grammatical rules one at a time through presentation and explanation by the teacher. Moreover, it is seen to facilitate the learners' acquisition by "making learners notice structures that they might not otherwise have noticed" (Ellis 1993, 1995, as quoted by Ruin 1996:104). This is done by giving the learners explicit interpretations and time to internalize the rule instead of making them to use or produce structures they cannot yet fully master. Also, as the approach gives the teacher a simple and quick way for teaching the rules, there will be more time for practicing the structure.

#### **Inductive Approach**

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. Mautone (2004) says that 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).

### **Previous Research**

There was a recent study which investigated the effectiveness of deductive and inductive method. This study was done in Utrecht University, Netherland by Esther Berendse in 2012. The participants who were involved in her study were 54. Pre and post test design was implemented in her study, but the pre-test was different from post test. T-test was used to determine whether any significant difference that could be found between the effectiveness of the deductive and inductive approach in learning the English past simple and present perfect tense by Dutch teenagers. The result of her study was the deductive approach was more effective when teaching English tenses and it had an effect in long-term memory.

The second research examined the outcome of deductive and inductive approach in teaching direct object pronoun. This study was done by Kuder E in 2009 in Spain. The participants were 44 college students. The results of his study indicated that there was a slightly higher level of achievement as well as a higher level of satisfaction in the group exposed to the inductive lesson in comparison to the group exposed to the deductive lesson. Although this difference was not found to be statistically significant, it suggests that the inductive approach may have a more positive effect on learners than the traditional deductive approach.

The last previous study was done by Prisma P in 2010. Her study was aim to investigate the students' perception on inductive approach. The title of her study was the effectiveness of inductive approach to grammar learning for writing course. The subject of her study was 80

second-years students majoring in English. The research instrument she used in her study were pre test, post test and questionnaire. Pre test and post test was used to compare between inductive approach and regular method. The questionnaire was used to elicit student's perception whether the use of inductive approach was positive or negative. In analyzing the data she used rating point Liker Scale to find out the mean score for the students answer on the questionnaire. The findings of her study that using inductive approach teaching writing to students was positive.

### **The Methodn**

This study was a quasi-experimental study that applies a non-randomized pre test and post test design (Mc Millan, 1992:174). The writer applies a non randomized group because it was impossible to randomize the subjects. Two intact classrooms were used. This study employed two groups using pre-test and post test design; it intended to investigate the effectiveness of deductive and inductive approach and to find out students' perception toward these two teaching approach.

**The** populations of this study were 102 students of Mahardihka vocational school; they are the first graders majoring Accountancy. The sample of this study is 50 SMK Mahardhikha students in their academic years of 2012-2013. The students consist of two classes, one class consists of 26 and the other class consists of 24 students. The writer took the intact classes (Accountancy B and Accountancy C).

The instrument of this study was students' answer on conditional sentence test. There were two parts of pre-test and post test. They are objective test and subjective test. Objective test consist of 30 questions and the subjective test contains 35 questions. Some of the items were taken from Betty Schrampers (348-358, 20013) and some of test was constructed by the writer. These tests were taken because they were completely appropriate to test student's mastery of conditional. The Post-test is the same with pre test. To answer the 2<sup>nd</sup> research question ( the student perception toward teaching approach, the questionnaire and interview were administered. *The questionnaire* is used to get the students perceptions of inductive and deductive method. The content of the questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part is to classify students' perception on deductive or inductive approach whether it negative or positive. The second part, is to get the students satisfaction of learning through deductive or inductive approach. *Interview* is used to clarify their perception towards inductive and deductive teaching method and also to confirm the questionnaire that strengthen their answer to the questionnaire.

## The Result

### *Linear Relationships between Pretest and Post Test*

This steps is to determine the linear relationship between *covariate* (Pre test) and *dependent variable* (Post test). The effect of treatment is eliminated to determine the relationship between the pretest and posttest, or treatment is done by eliminating the learning approach using the following hypothetical assumptions:

**Table 1**  
**Linear relationship between covariate and dependent variable**

Test	Mean cont-Exp	Degrees of Freedom			Critical F-Value For		F-Ratio	Sig	Note
		Between	Within	Tot.	0,05	0,01			
Pretest	31,28	1	48	49	4.04	7.19	56,531	0,000	Sig
Posttest	69,87								

From the table above it can be seen that the number of significance between covariate and independent variable is 0,000. Because the value of Sig. <0.05 then H0 is rejected .This means that 95% can be said that there is linear relationship between the pretest with the score obtained by the students. This statement indicates that an ANCOVA assumption is met. The test is performed by eliminating the effect of different methods of learning.

### *Statistical Analysis between Experimental Group and Control Group*

To determine whether there is a significant different between experimental and control group the data are analyzed as follows:

**Table 2**  
**Statistical Analysis between Experimental and Control**

Group	Mean	Degrees of Freedom			Critical F-Value For		F-Ratio	Sig	Note
		Between	Within	Tot.	$\alpha = 0,05$	$\alpha = 0,01$			
Experiment	751,167	1	48	49	4.04	7.19	31,422	0,000	Sig
Control	650,769								

The ANCOVA with critical F- value for  $\alpha = .05$  was employed to analyze whether there is a significant difference on the mastery of conditional sentences between the students taught using deductive approach and those taught using inductive approach. The result of counting process was summarized in table 4.3. As stated in the table, F-ratio was 31.422, while the critical F- value for  $\alpha = .05$  was 4.04. The finding showed that the F-ratio was greater than the required F- value for  $\alpha = .05$ . It means that there is a significant difference between control group and experimental group. As described in the above table 4.2, the mean score of the experimental group's pre test and post test were 30.23

and 75.18 while control group's pre test and post test were 31.28 and 65.08. Comparing the mean score of the two groups, the experimental group had higher score than control group. It can be concluded that teaching conditional sentences using inductive approach is more effective than deductive approach.

From the findings above it can be concluded that the Null Hypothesis of this study which is says "there is no significant difference on the mastery of conditional sentences between the students taught using deductive approach and those taught using inductive approach" was rejected. To answer the research problem which is asks "Is there any a significant difference on the mastery of conditional sentences between the students taught using deductive approach and those taught using inductive approach?" the statistical of ANCOVA proved that there is a significant difference on the mastery of conditional sentences between the students taught using deductive approach and those taught using inductive approach. ANCOVA also indicate that inductive teaching approach is more effective than deductive approach.

### Findings on the Students' Perception

#### 1. Students Perception on Deductive or Inductive Approach.

**Table 3**  
**Students' Perception on Deductive or Inductive Approach.**

Question 1	Scale	Control Group		Question 1	Experimental Group	
		F	%		F	%
I love learning English when the teacher gives the form first, then followed by the example.	SD	3	12%	I love learning English when the teacher gives the examples, then I am asked to analyze the pattern.	3	13%
	D	5	19%		1	4%
	N	3	12%		2	8%
	A	12	46%		11	46%
	SA	3	12%		7	29%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>
	<b>SD=Strongly Agree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Disagree, F=Frequency</b>					

Based on the table above it can be concluded that within the control group, 12 out of 26 students (46%) agreed that they liked the deductive approach. In the experimental group, 11 out of 24 students (46%). This finding indicates that students like inductive approach or deductive approach.

#### 2. Question on the Students' Perception on Deductive or Inductive Approach

**Table 4**  
**Students' Preference on Deductive Approach or Inductive Approach**

Question 2	Scale	Control Group		Question 2	Experimental Group	
		F	%		F	%
I like it when the teacher explain the rule and give examples of sentences so I can imitate the example well.	SD	1	4%	I like when the teacher asks me to summarize grammatical rule from examples by myself is a new technique in learning grammar. I really like the technique.	1	4%
	D	5	19%		0	0%
	N	7	27%		1	4%
	A	13	50%		18	75%
	SA	0	0%		4	17%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>
	<b>SD=Strongly Agree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Disagree, F=Frequency</b>					

\Based on the table above it can be concluded that half of the control groups, 13 out of 26 students (50%) chose agree. In the experimental group, 17 out of 24 students (75%) agreed with the inductive approach. This indicates that students prefer inductive approach.

3. Students Perception toward Teachers Guidance

**Table 5**  
**Teacher's Guidance in Learning Conditional Sentences**

Question 3	Scale	Control Group		Question 3	Experimental Group	
		F	%		F	%
I like teachers' guiding grammatical errors by correcting every sentence that I made. So I know which part that should improve.	SD	1	4%	I like the teacher's technique to teach us by asking us to analyze the form and decide pattern by myself because I become a problem solver.	1	4%
	D	3	12%		1	4%
	N	4	15%		3	13%
	A	17	65%		11	46%
	SA	1	4%		8	33%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>
	<b>SD=Strongly Agree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Disagree, F=Frequency</b>					

\Based on the table above it can be concluded that the control group, from 26 students there are 17 students or 65 % of students agreed that they liked the deductive approach. In the experimental group, from 24 students there are 11 students or 46% agreed. This finding indicates that students like deductive approach or inductive approach.

4. Question on learning through detail explanation or analyze the example.

**Table 6**  
**Learning through detail explanation or analyze the example**

Question 4	Scale	Control Group		Question 4	Experimental Group	
		F	%		F	%
I like when the teacher gives me detail and clear explanation about the differences between main and subordinate clause by showing the rule first	SD	7	27%	I like the teacher's technique in asking me to analyze the main and subordinate clause by myself. It was very challenging in learning.	1	4%
	D	5	19%		0	0%
	N	3	12%		4	17%
	A	11	42%		14	58%
	SA	0	0%		5	21%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>
	<b>SD=Strongly Agree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Disagree, F=Frequency CG=</b>					

Based on the table above it can be concluded that the control group, 14 out of 26 students (65 %) agreed with the deductive approach. In the experimental group, 14 out of 24 students (58%) agreed with inductive approach. This finding indicates that students like inductive approach.

5. Question on students' satisfaction

**Table 7**  
**Student's Perception on Learning Satisfaction with Deductive or Inductive Approach**

Question 6	Scale	Control Group		Question 6	Experimental Group	
		F	%		F	%
When the teacher gave me and explained the rule of conditional sentences was satisfying because its explanation was clear and I can remember it until now.	SD	1	4%	When I had to find out the rule of conditional sentences, even though it was hard, but it was satisfied me because I can remember it until now.	0	0%
	D	10	38%		3	13%
	N	9	35%		7	29%
	A	6	23%		9	38%
	SA	0	0%		5	21%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>
	<b>SD=Strongly Agree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Disagree, F=Frequency</b>					

Based on the table above it can be concluded that the control group, 6 out of 26 students (23 %) agreed with deductive. In the experimental group, 9 out of 24 students (38%) agreed with inductive approach. This finding indicates that students like inductive approach.

6. Question on the Effectiveness of Deductive or Inductive Approach

**Table 7**  
**Students' Perception toward the Effectiveness of Deductive or Inductive Approach**

Question 7	Scale	Control Group		Question 7	Experimental Group	
		F	%		F	%
Teacher's technique to teach us by giving clear explanation of rule and meaning of conditional sentences is very effective for me, so I can imitate the rule easily. It was very useful for me.	SD	0	0%	Teacher's technique to teach us by asking me to find out the rule and meaning of conditional sentences is very effective for me, so I can understand and remember the rule easily. It was very useful for me.	1	4%
	D	7	27%		3	13%
	N	6	23%		4	17%
	A	11	42%		11	46%
	SA	2	8%		5	21%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>
	<b>SD=Strongly Agree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Disagree, F=Frequency</b>					

Based on the table above it can be concluded that the control group, 11 out of 26 students (42 %) agreed with deductive approach. In the experimental group, 11 out of 24 students (46%) agreed with inductive approach. This finding indicates that learning with inductive approach is unforgettable.

7. Question on time Consuming Learning with Deductive and Inductive Approach.

**Table 9**  
**Students' perception whether learning through Deductive or Inductive is time consuming.**

Question 8	Scale	Control Group		Question 8	Experimental Group	
		F	%		F	%
It was very time consuming in learning conditional sentences by imitating every sentences.	SD	0	0%	Even though it was time consuming in learning conditional sentences by analyzing every sentence. But the result of the technique is unmemorable.	2	8%
	D	7	27%		2	8%
	N	8	31%		2	8%
	A	10	38%		14	58%
	SA	1	4%		4	17%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>
	<b>SD=Strongly Agree, D=Disagree, N=Neutral, A=Agree, SA=Strongly Disagree, F=Frequency</b>					

Based on the table above it can be concluded that the control group, 10 out of 26 students (38 %) agreed with deductive approach. In the experimental group, 14 out of 24 students (58%) agreed with inductive

approach. This finding indicates that learning with inductive approach is unforgettable.

## **Discussion**

This study found that inductive approach is more effective than deductive approach in teaching conditional sentences. Findings of this study were the opposite of findings of other studies related to teaching grammar by using deductive and inductive approach. Some studies found that deductive approach was significantly different than inductive approach such as Berendse E (2012), Wang (2012) found that deductive approach is more effective than inductive approach.

On the other hand some studies found that inductive approach was more effective than deductive. This finding is supported by Kuder's findings in 2009 in Spain. The results of his study indicated that there was a slightly higher level of achievement as well as a higher level of satisfaction in the group exposed to the inductive lesson in comparison to the group exposed to the deductive lesson. The next findings which support this study was by Haight in 2007 in France. The results indicated a significant difference between participants' mean immediate test scores favoring with inductive approach. Findings of this study also indicated a strong trend in favor of guided induction on the long-term learning of grammatical structures.

There are also some researches that support the findings of this study. Piaget (1974) claimed that learners need to be involved in the interaction between their innate structures of the mind and the outside learning environment. Piaget suggested that rote memory cannot be equated with comprehension. He asserted that if students fail to comprehend the meaning underlying numerous linguistic structures and transform them into internalized intake, then those structures are meaningless and cannot become instinctual for later use. In his opinion, when people discover underlying patterns for themselves, the learned knowledge lasts longer in human memory.

Garrett (1989) criticized that although the deductive approach may offer explanations of linguistic rules, it does not help students connect the form with the meaning in their cognitive mechanism. Both approaches are opposing each other for which is more effective in teaching grammar. The possible reason which found that deductive approach is more effective; first, students were drilled by their teacher using deductive approach, they did not feel secure when they had to find the rules by themselves. Therefore, when they were taught by using inductive approach they are confused because they are not used to it. This possibility was found by Wang (2012). The second possible reason might cause that deductive approach more effective than inductive are: it was not easy for rural students to comprehend inductive approach, and their prior knowledge about grammar was less. So when the students were asked to find the rule

of grammar they are confused. It was also found that deductive approach is easier to understand than inductive approach.

There are some reasons why inductive approach is better than deductive approach. Students felt secure and attracted when they have to find the rule themselves with teacher's guidance. Herron and Tomasell (1992) compared the learning of French grammatical structures by 26 beginning level American college students in the guided inductive and deductive teaching conditions. In the guided inductive teaching, the teacher first gave students some contextualized oral drills, and students induced for themselves the underlying grammatical rules. Then the students were requested to complete a model sentence on the board with structure equivalent to the ones practiced orally. On the other hand, in the deductive teaching condition, the teacher stated the rule and illustrated it with a written model. After that, students practiced the rules through some contextualized oral drills. In deductive approach when students were given the pattern of conditional sentences or the linguistics rule, it does not help the students connect to the meaning with their cognitive mechanism or the students did not really comprehend the meaning of the sentences. Some research argued that inductive approach is too difficult for weak learner to study. On the other hand, this study found that inductive approach is almost appropriate for all level including weak students. This can be proven from their score in post test and the answer of the questionnaire.

## **Conclusion**

This study investigates whether there is a significant difference on the mastery of conditional sentences between the students taught using deductive approach and those taught using inductive approach. This study found that there is a significant difference between the mastery on conditional sentences of the student taught using deductive approach and those taught using inductive approach. It is found that inductive approach is more effective than deductive approach to teach conditional sentences. This finding is also supported by student's answers on the questionnaire.

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. The result of interview indicates that 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.

### Suggestion

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.

### References

- Al-Kalbani, Nora Rashed (2004). *Omani English Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of the Role of Grammar Instruction in EFL Teaching and Learning Unpublished Thesis*. Sultan Qaboos University.
- Arikunto, Dr. Suharsimi. 1990. *Dasar -Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- Barkhuizen, G.P. (1998). *Discovering learners' perceptions of ESL classroom teaching/learning activities in a South African context. TESOL Quarterly*, 32 (1), 85-108.
- Brumfit, C. J. & K. Johnson. (2000). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Brown, James Dean. 1996. *Testing in Language program*. New Jersey Prentice Hall regents.
- Christison, M.A., & Krahnke, K.J. (1986). *Student perceptions of academic language study. TESOL Quarterly*, 20 (1), 61-81.
- Corder, S. (1988). Pedagogic grammar. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood-Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching* (pp. 123-145). New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.
- Doff, A. (2000). *Teach English: A training course for teachers* (14th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Decoo, W. 1996. *The induction-deduction opposition: Ambiguities and complexities of the didactic reality. IRAL – International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 34(2), 95-118
- Ellis, R. (1999). Input-based approaches to teaching grammar: A review of classroom oriented research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 64-80.
- Eastwood, J. (1994) *Oxford Guide to English Grammar*. Oxford University Press.

- Emily Kuder. 2009 . *Implication an inductive and deductive approach to SLA grammar instruction.*
- Garrett, N. (1989). The role of grammar in the development of communicative ability. *Applied Language Learning*, 1 (1), 15-32.
- Green, J.M. (1993). *Student attitude toward communicative and non-communicative activities: Do enjoyment and effectiveness go together?.* The Modern Language Journal, 77 (i), 1- 10.
- Goner, Philips, and Walter. 1995 *Teaching Practice handbook: Structures : Grammar and Functions.* Heinemann
- Gronlund, Norman E. 1982. *Constructing Achievement Tets.* New York : prentice Hall, Inc.
- Horwitz, E.K. (1988). *The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students.* The Modern Language Journal, 72 (3), 283-294.
- Johnson, R.B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004). *Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come.* Educational Researcher, 33 (7), 14-26.
- Kouritzin, S.G., Piquemal, N.A., & Renaud, R.D. (2009). *An international comparison of socially constructed language learning motivation and beliefs.* Foreign Language Annals, 42 (2), 287-317.
- Krashen, S.D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* [First Internet Edition: December 2002]. Retrieved from:
- Mohammed, Azmi Adel, Jaber, Hanna Abu, *College Student Journal*, 01463934, Jun2008 Part B, Vol. 42, Issue 2
- Mountone, P. (2004). *How to Use Examples Effectively: Deductive vs. Inductive Approaches*, University of California, Santa Barbara, Email: [Shirly@id.ucsb.edu](mailto:Shirly@id.ucsb.edu).
- Nunan, D. (1986). *Communicative Language Teaching: The learner's view.* [Paper presented at the RELC Regional Seminar].
- Peacock, M. (1998). *Exploring the gap between teachers' and learners' beliefs about 'useful' activities for EFL.* International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 8 (2), 233-250.
- Piaget, J. (1974). The future of developmental children psychology. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 3 (2), 87-94.
- Richards, J., & Renandya, W. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Ruin, I. 1996. *Grammar and the Advanced Learner. On Learning and Teaching a Second Language.* Uppsala: Uppsala University

- Shaffer, C. (1989). A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 395-403.
- Shanks, D. R., & St. John, M. F. (1994). *Characteristics of dissociable human learning systems*. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 17, 367-395.
- Sugiyono. 2007. *Metode Penelitian Administrasi*. Bandung, Alfabeta.
- Thornbury, S. 2004. *How to Teach Grammar*. Harlow: Pearson Education
- Ur, P. (1999). *Grammar practice activities: A practical guide for teachers* (12<sup>th</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, P. (1999). *English Grammar Instruction in Taiwan: Student and teacher attitudes*. Unpublished thesis. (UMI 9960674)