

Deductive and Inductive Methods in Teaching Tenses

Syaadiah Arifin
(diah.arifin62@gmail.com)

Trisakti University, Jakarta

Teaching English grammar seems easy but difficult to conduct. Some methods have been introduced to answer this problem. Two methods that have been known so far are deductive and inductive methods. Studies have been conducted concerning these methods, with some supporting deductive while the others being in favor of inductive method. This study attempts to investigate which method works better in facilitating students' writing skill. The findings of this experimental study (n=40) taking place in one of English course in Jakarta show that deductive method is more effective in promoting students' writing skill.

Keywords: deductive, inductive, teaching tenses, writing

Mengajar tata bahasa sepertinya mudah namun sebenarnya sulit untuk dilaksanakan. Beberapa metode mengajar tata bahasa telah diperkenalkan untuk mengatasi hal ini. Dua metode yang cukup dikenal adalah deduktif dan induktif. Beberapa studi telah dilakukan terkait dua metode ini dengan hasil yang beragam. Beberapa studi membuktikan bahwa metode deduktif lebih efektif dalam pengajaran tata bahasa, tetapi studi lain membuktikan sebaliknya. Studi ini mencoba mengetahui metode mana yang lebih baik dalam konteks meningkatkan kemampuan menulis. Studi ini dilaksanakan di sebuah kursus bahasa Inggris di Jakarta dengan jumlah sampel sebanyak 40. Hasil studi ini menunjukkan bahwa pengajaran tata bahasa dengan metode deduktif lebih efektif untuk meningkatkan kemampuan menulis siswa.

INTRODUCTION

English Language Teaching (ELT) has expanded fast in the last few years due to the instrumental power of English as an international language and the need for participating effectively in society. Most Indonesians have their first contact with English when learning English at formal schools as a subject which they need to study in order to pass the test and get promoted to higher classes. Unfortunately, not all students can master English well due to

several reasons such as students' self-motivation, lack of practice and exposure to English, lack of facilities and teachers' competence.

Language teachers are inevitably confronted with various productions of errors made by students while teaching the language. One of the major problems is writing, which is one of the four language skills regarded as a difficult skill to learn as well as to practice. When it comes to discuss one's writing proficiency, it is almost likely related to one's mastery of English grammar or structure. Murcia and Freeman (1983) state that, "grammar affects students' performance in all four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing" (p. 2). As English grammar represents the system of the language, learners of English need to start the learning process by mastering the grammar. English grammar rules offer learners with a set of primary systems allowing them to construct acceptable English sentences.

English has several types of tenses, for example, past tense, present tense, and future tense based on the location of time when certain action or event takes place. The tenses, nevertheless, have different rules, especially concerning the form of verbs used in each tense because the form of the verbs helps indicate whether an action or an event happens in the present, past, or future time. Therefore, English learners should know how to use tenses correctly and accurately. It is often believed that without having sufficient knowledge of tenses, learners may find some difficulties to construct grammatically correct English sentences since tenses help them express their ideas in English. Using tenses can create great confusion among Indonesian students because in Indonesian there are not any changes in tenses, whilst in English tenses change depending on the time and situation.

There is no perfect way in presenting grammar rules; teachers can use either deductive or inductive methods. Both methods have some weaknesses as well as strengths. Inductive methods encourage active rather than passive participation. Inductive methods create a context of autonomous and meaningful learning. Decoo (1996) states that "induction is the process that goes from the specific to the general, namely first the real language use, from which will "emerge" patterns and generalization. It evokes natural language learning and variety of direct methods. In contemporary terminology it is easily identified with acquisition" (p. 95). On the other hand, in a traditional way to present grammar - deductive method - rules are given prior to the illustration of examples. Learners have to memorize the rules of grammar, hoping they can apply the rules to make meaningful sentences.

Based on the problems that students might encounter in dealing with tenses in their writing, the researcher poses the following questions:

1. Do deductive methods work more effectively than inductive methods in teaching tenses to improve students' writing?
2. Do students taught by deductive methods have a better understanding in tenses than those taught by inductive methods?
3. What are the students' responses toward deductive and inductive methods in learning tenses which will be implemented in their writing?

The results of the study are expected to be beneficial for the improvement of teaching tenses and its implementation in writing and to give contribution to English teachers and learners. For English teachers, they can use the result of this study to teach grammar effectively, particularly tenses. By knowing the effective method in teaching grammar, hopefully, teachers can overcome students' problems to understand grammar which will be implemented in writing.

Inductive Method

Some studies of the effects of inductive method have been conducted by some scholars such as Bibi (2009), Wang (2002), and Takimoto (2005). Bibi (2009), for example, investigated the comparative effectiveness of teaching English grammar with the help of textbook (deductive method) and by using group work activities (inductive method). She did the research to analyze whether group work activities (inductive method) had a positive effect on the academic achievements of the elementary and secondary students in Pakistan. In Pakistan, English grammar is mainly taught by deductive method in which the principles and rules of different aspects of grammar are first taught and then particular examples are given to the students. No practice is provided to the students in the use of different aspects of grammar. Only casual reference is made to them during teaching the prescribed textbook.

This experimental study was conducted in Government Girls High School No 1 of Dera Ismail Khan city, Pakistan. All the 9th and 6th grade students of Government Girls Secondary and Higher Secondary Schools were included in this study. Of four 9th grade sections, two sections were randomly selected. Similarly, of the four 6th grade sections of the selected school, two sections were randomly selected. The two selected groups at each level, one group was randomly assigned as the experimental and the other as the control group. Each stage was given different aspect of grammar.

There are some important findings from this study. Firstly, teaching English grammar through group work activities (inductive method) plays a positive role in improving the academic achievement of students studying English at the elementary as well as secondary

stage. Secondly, the results of the research lead to the conclusions that group work activities can be used for improving writing and speaking ability, reading and listening comprehension, recalling the use of structures and the application of rules of grammar by the students studying English at both the elementary and secondary stages. Thirdly, the majority of the students have the opinion that the teaching of English grammar through group work activities is a better way of learning grammar as compared to the deductive approach and teaching grammar through textbook reading. Finally, almost all the students at the secondary as well as elementary stage think that not any time is wasted by working in a group.

Wang (2002) investigated the effectiveness of inductive and deductive methods on learning collocation by using concordance. A concordance is a kind of software/system that stores large corpora and can show huge amount of examples at a very fast rate. Besides the comparison of the two teaching approaches, other factors which influenced the learning outcome such as proficiency, aptitude, and the difficulty of grammar patterns were also analyzed. There were eighty-one second-year students from a senior high school in Taiwan participating in this study. The students were divided into two classes. One was classified into an inductive group, while the other was a deductive group. There were three procedures: a pre-test, exercising for each teaching approach, and post-test.

There were three stages for each exercise in the inductive approach: searching for appropriate examples, formulating the underlying patterns, and applying the learned rules in error correction. On the other hand, deductive approach adopted the stages such as consulting the rules provided in advance and applying the rules in error correction. Two types of grammatical patterns, the easy and difficult one, were used as learning exercise. According Wang (2002), the findings show that inductive group outperformed the deductive one and inductive method was more suitable for teaching simple patterns.

Takimoto (2005) conducted the study to probe the effects of deductive and inductive instructions on the learning of English pragmatic. The participants were chosen through the advertisements in the weekly magazine and on the Internet. The participants didn't know that English lexical and syntactic downgrades would be taught in the study. Participants were screened by means of their TOEIC scores, which they were required to submit, and only participants who have TOEIC scores of 500-700 were chosen. The 60 participants had studied English from five to twenty-two years, and their first language was Japanese. They were assigned to one of four groups (three treatment groups and one control group) on a first-come, first-served basis. The three treatment groups were deductive instruction (n=15), inductive instruction with problem-solving tasks (n=15), and inductive instruction with

structured input tasks (n=15). The significant finding of this study is that inductive instruction was more effective than deductive instruction in adult pragmatic learning.

Deductive Method

The study showing the effectiveness of deductive method has been conducted by Erlam (2003). She found out that the deductive approach was more effective in teaching second language grammar. She conducted the study to examine the effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronouns in French as a second language. She developed the teaching materials, a pre-test, a post-test, and a delayed post-test.

The study was conducted in one of New Zealand's largest secondary schools. Three classes of fourth form students (approximately 14 years of age) took part in the study. The students were nearing the end of the second year of their study of French. The school allocates students to classrooms according to timetabling constraints so that there was, in principle, little overall difference in ability among the classes. A one-way ANOVA showed no statistically significant differences in the performance of the three groups on the Test of Scholastic Abilities.

The results obtained from this study provide evidence in support of the effectiveness of deductive language instruction in a teacher-centered classroom language learning environment with school-age learners. The results of this study show that the deductive group did better than the inductive group, and deduction facilitated longer rule retention.

There are differences of findings from previous studies investigating inductive and deductive methods. This study, therefore, attempts to find out which method can give better contribution in teaching grammar, especially tenses in the Indonesian setting.

METHOD

Research Design

The aim of this research was to find out the effects of deductive and inductive methods in teaching tenses to improve students' writing. The design used in this research was quasi-experimental design. There were two groups in this research: the deductive and inductive groups consisting of 20 students for each group taking place at one of English courses in Jakarta.

In this study, the deductive method was assumed to be more effective than the inductive method because this approach is suitable for teaching grammar to EFL (English as a Foreign

Language) students. The concept underlying the rules is mentioned explicitly, and it can avoid student's confusion about tenses that they are learning. The researcher refers to the directional hypothesis because this study analyzed the effects of a deductive method over an inductive method. The statistical hypothesis of this research was:

$$H_0 : \mu_1 \leq \mu_2$$

$$H_a : \mu_1 > \mu_2$$

H_0 = Null-Hypothesis

H_a = Alternate-Hypothesis

μ_1 = Teaching Tenses Deductively

μ_2 = Teaching Tenses Inductively

1. $H_0 : \mu_1 \leq \mu_2$: teaching tenses deductively to improve students' writing is less effective than teaching tenses inductively or teaching tenses deductively to improve students' writing is equally effective to teaching tenses inductively.
2. $H_a : \mu_1 > \mu_2$: teaching tenses deductively to improve students' writing is more effective than teaching tenses inductively

The Variables and Treatments

There were three variables in this research: two independent variables and one dependent variable. The independent variables were variable X_D as the first independent variable (teaching tenses using deductive methods) and variable X_I as the second independent variable (teaching tenses using inductive methods). Both variables influenced the dependent variable (writing). The research focused on the effect of deductive and inductive methods in teaching tenses to improve students' writing.

This research was intended to test the hypothesis about the effects of deductive and inductive methods in teaching tenses to improve students' writing, and to analyze the effects of two different treatments, deductive and inductive methods, given to the experimental classes (deductive and inductive classes). The researcher also conducted pre-test before conducting the treatments for both classes. The experimental design can be demonstrated in the following table:

Table 1: The experimental design

GROUP	PRE-TEST	TREATMENT	POST- TEST
Deductive Class	$X_{D_{pt}}$	T	X_D
Inductive Class	$X_{I_{pt}}$	T	X_I

T : the treatment of the experiment
 $X_{D_{pt}}$, $X_{I_{pt}}$: the observation in the pre-test
 X_D , X_I : the observation in the post-test

The table above shows the result of the pre-test and post-test which were analyzed by using t_{test} to investigate whether there were differences or not between the students getting treatment by using deductive and inductive methods in teaching tenses to improve their writing.

The Procedure of Teaching Tenses Deductively

Deductivemethod means teaching learners rules and then giving them opportunities to apply them through practice. The role of the teacher is to present the rules and organize the practice. There were five stages the researcher did in conducting the lesson using deductive method in the classroom. The first stage was ‘motivation strategies’. The aim was to get the learners interested in the topic and to arouse their curiosity about the new lesson. The second stage was ‘presentation.’ The researcher started presenting the lesson. She gave some comments on the students’ answer which were on the board and corrected the mistakes if any. In this stage, she gave some explanation about the present tense, wrote down the pattern of the simple present tense, explained when to use it and when to add *s* or *es* at the end of the mainverbs, and gave many examples of the usage of the simple present tense. The third stage was ‘skills practice’. The fourth stage was ‘summary’. In this stage, the researcher reviewed the lesson by giving some varied activities such as asking the students to write one of their regular activities on the board and giving them games related to the lesson. The final stage was ‘assessment’. The students had to choose one of the topics provided by the researcher, and wrote a paragraph about it. The topics were about their personal information, their hobbies and their regular activities.

The Procedures of Teaching Tenses inductively

Inductive approach involves getting learners to discover rules and how they are applied by looking at examples. The role of the teacher is to provide language for learners with the need

to discover the rules, to guide them in discovery if necessary, and to provide opportunities to practice. In conducting teaching tenses inductively, the researcher did some stages. In the 'motivation strategies,' she asked students several questions related to the today's lesson, asked students to write daily activities using simple present tense and listed down their answers on the board. In the 'presentation' stage, the researcher asked the students more questions and listed down the sentences on the board. She elicited the grammar rules from the students. In the 'skills practice' stage, the activities were similar to the deductive method. In the stage of 'summary,' the researcher reviewed the lesson. In the final stage, assessment, the students had to choose one of the topics provided by the teacher and wrote a paragraph about it.

Data Collection Methods

The researcher used two data collection methods: a set of writing tests consisting of five tenses and a set of questionnaire consisting of ten items related to deductive and inductive methods. The main instrument that the researcher used was a writing test. The writing test was designed in such a way in order to suit the students' proficiency level. The validity and reliability of the writing tests were checked before given to the students. There were five topics of the writing tests which deal with commonly used tenses such as present tense, present continuous, future tense, past tense, and present perfect.

Another instrument was a set of questionnaire. This instrument was only to support students' preferences in the methods. The questionnaire was a closed questionnaire which probed for students' preference and perception of deductive and inductive methods. There were ten items in this questionnaire. Five questions referred to deductive method, and the others referred to inductive method. The questionnaire was translated into Indonesian to avoid the ambiguity and misconception in understanding and getting the real data. There were 40 respondents who answered the items in the questionnaire.

The Writing Rubric

In determining the students' writing score, the researcher used the writing rubric. This Writing rubric was adopted from Language Center, Asian Institute of Technology, but the researcher modified it in accordance with the objectives of the writing, as can be seen in Table 2. The aim of the writing activities in this study was to determine whether the students were able to use the tenses correctly.

Table 2: The writing rubric

Score	Range	Criteria
4	81-100	Very good writing; the writing fulfils the task in satisfactory. <i>Tenses are used accurately and appropriately. There are no significant mistakes in tenses</i> Tense mistakes: 0
3	68 -80	Good writing; the writing generally addresses the task relevantly, appropriately and accurately. <i>There are only occasional minor flaws in tenses</i> Tense mistakes: ≤ 2
2	50-67	Average; the writing is adequately organized and developed. <i>A few Inappropriate, and inaccurate choices and mistakes of tenses are noticeable</i> Tense mistakes: ≤ 5
1	0-49	Poor writing, <i>low fluency</i> , and significant mistakes in the use of tenses; <i>Students show partial understanding of tenses, and are not able to use appropriate tenses. The text is dominated by tense mistakes</i> Tense mistakes: ≥ 5

Data Analysis

After the data had been collected, they were analyzed by using t_{test} . The data obtained from pre-test were computed to find the mean (\bar{X}) and the standard deviation (SD). The formula used to determine standard deviation was as follows:

$$S = \sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1) S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1) S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}}$$

Note:

S = Standard Deviation

n_1 = Sum of the students in the experimental class

n_2 = Sum of the students the control class

S_1 = Sample standard deviation

S_2 = Standard deviation of the sample

The formula for statistic $t_{\text{distribution}}$ test can be seen as followed:

$$t = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{N_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{N_2}}}$$

Note:

t = t_{distribution}

X₁ = Mean scores of the experimental class

X₂ = Mean scores of the control class

N₁ = Samples of the experimental class

N₂ = Sample of the control class

If the t count is less than t table (t_{count} < t_{table}), both classes have equal average.

The t_{test} was used to find out if the deductive method was more effective than inductive method in teaching tenses to improve students' writing.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings

After giving the pre-test and post-test, the researcher compared the results of those tests. First, the results of the pre-test and post-test of the deductive group were examined whether there was a significant difference. It was expected that after having treatment with deductive methods, the students could improve their ability significantly to use correct tenses in their writing.

Table 3: The result of pre-test and post-test of deductive group

Statistics	Pretest	Posttest
N	20	20
\bar{X}	60.1500	76.1000
S	4.85880	10.78937
Paired differences mean		15.95000
Standard deviation		13.21672
Standard error mean		2.95535
95% Confidence interval		
Of the difference lower		22.13561
Upper		9.76439
t _{test} 5.397		
Df 19		
Sig (2-tailed)	0.000	
α 0.05		
t _{table}	1.729	

From the table above, we can see that the average score (mean) of post-test using deductive methods is greater than that of pre-test. The conclusion is that deductive methods works effectively to improve students' ability to use tenses correctly in their writing because t_{count} was greater than t_{table} .

After comparing the results of pre-test and post-test of deductive group, the researcher also compared the results of pre-test and post-test of inductive group to know whether there was a significant difference. It was also found that after getting treatment using inductive methods, the students could improve their knowledge significantly in using tenses correctly.

Table 4: The result of the pre-test and post-test of inductive group

Statistics	Pretest	Posttest
N	20	20
\bar{X}	51.2500	58.7500
S	4.55233	4.78937
Paired differences mean	7.5000	
Standard deviation	6.17721	
Standard error mean		1.38127
95% Confidence interval		
Of the difference lower	10.39102	
Upper	4.60898	
t_{test}	5.430	
Df	19	
Sig (2-tailed)		0.00
α		0.05
t_{table}	1.729	

Based on the information above, the average score (mean) of post-test using inductive methods is greater than that of pre-test. The conclusion is that inductive methods also works effectively to improve students' understanding to use tenses correctly in writing because $t_{count} > t_{table}$.

The researcher calculated the gain scores of each group. Gain was calculated from the different scores of pretest and posttest. The result of the gain ratio of deductive and inductive methods can be seen on the table below.

Table 5: The result of the gain of students' achievement

Statistics	Deductive	Inductive
N	20	20
\bar{X}	0.3789	0.1479
S	0.33101	0.11810
Paired differences mean		0.23101
Standard deviation		
Standard error mean		1.38127
95% Confidence interval		
Of the difference lower		0.7192
Upper	0.39010	
t_{test} 2.940		
Df		38
Sig (2-tailed)		0.06
α	0.05	
t_{table}	1.70	

The mean of the gain using deductive methods is 0.3789, so the result of post-test (after having treatments) is 37.89% greater than that of pre-test, while the mean of the gain using inductive methods is 0.1479. It can be concluded that the result of post-test (after having treatments) is 14.79% greater than that of the pretest. The next test to know the effects of teaching tenses deductively was through statistical hypothesis:

1. $H_0: \mu_1 \leq \mu_2$: teaching tenses deductively to improve students' writing is less effective than teaching tenses inductively or equally effective to teaching tenses inductively.
2. $H_a: \mu_1 > \mu_2$: teaching tenses deductively to improve students' writing is more effective than teaching tenses inductively.

Table 4.6 shows that t_{count} (2.940) is greater than t_{table} (1.70); as a result, H_0 is not accepted and H_a is accepted, so the second hypothesis is proven. It can be interpreted that teaching tenses deductively is more effective than teaching tenses inductively to improve students' writing.

Based on the result of the questionnaire, the majority of students (97,5%) agreed that grammar (tenses) had to be explained and followed by adequate examples. 75 % of students agreed that the concept underlying the tenses was very important, so it had to be explained to avoid misunderstanding. The majority of students (75%) also agreed that explaining grammar explicitly was more effective to make them understand the lesson.

Discussions

This study found that deductive group outperformed inductive group because there was a significant difference of mean between inductive and deductive groups. The results also indicated that high achievers significantly benefitted more from deductive methods than from inductive methods. Students who got good scores in the pre-test got much better scores in the post-test. Deductive feedback was also appropriate for learning more difficult tenses such as present perfect and the use of present continuous to show future actions. Based on the results of the tests (quantitative) and a set of questionnaire (qualitative), students had the tendencies to understand tenses more easily using deductive methods.

Deductive method helped students to have rule retention, and worked effectively to teach grammar particularly tenses. This research finding is in line with the finding of Erlam (2003). EFL students, especially in Indonesian setting, lack exposure to English. In this situation, deductive method can be an effective way to teach grammar because the learners need to know the basic concept underlying the tenses. However, Hartoyo (2006) states that, “focusing on grammar in translation rather than language function is still perceived as very important in Indonesia” (p. 16). Teachers only explain the rules and patterns of the tenses without giving sufficient practice and exposure to the language. Moreover, they are not used to reviewing the lesson because of limited time. This situation may result in the lesson being teacher-centered, but not challenging in terms of creativity and imagination. The deductive approach encourages the belief that learning a language is simply a case of knowing the rules. In this situation, it is also recommended that induction may serve as an alternative method for grammar instruction.

It is true that when teachers apply inductive methods, learners are trained to be familiar with the rule discovery; learners are more active in the learning process, rather than being simply passive recipients. In this activity, they will be motivated. As a result, this could enhance learning autonomy and self-reliance, but the concepts are given implicitly, so it may cause learners to have the wrong concepts of the rules taught.

However, inductive method might only work effectively if students get adequate exposure to the language, so they don't have to memorize the rules and patterns of the tenses because they use the language every day. This method might be successful if applied in the countries whose second language is English. Bibi (2002) and Wang (2002) have also proved that inductive method is suitable to be applied in countries whose second languages are English.

Deductive method worked effectively in teaching tenses may be because the researcher gave the students clear explanation about the rules and the concepts underlying the tenses explicitly. Thus, it could be interpreted that there are some advantages of teaching tenses deductively. First, deductive method goes straightforwardly to the point and could, therefore, be time-saving. Students are also aware of the tenses that they are learning. Second, a number of rule aspects, for example, form and usage are more simply and clearly explained than elicited from examples. The teacher mentions the rules, the patterns, and the concept or the function of the tenses being taught explicitly. Third, a number of direct practice/application examples are immediately given by the teacher. The teacher could directly give the examples or practice right after he/she finishes giving the rules and the concepts of the tenses.

In this study, the researcher also gave the students opportunities to ask many questions about the lessons. To help students internalize the concept, she provided some activities that the students needed, and she also involved the students' participation. The activities were varied from the easiest ones to the most difficult ones such as drilling them to use the correct form of verbs, identifying the correct sentences, asking and answering questions, writing short sentences on the board, and writing a paragraph individually. These activities may also contribute to the success of deductive method.

Deductive method might be very boring and teacher-centered if the teacher doesn't involve students' participation. Most students may already be familiar with tenses, but they are unable to use them appropriately. Consequently, interesting and varied activities have to be provided.

Inductive method, on the other hand, could be an alternative way of teaching tenses, particularly simple tenses that could be understood easily by students such as present continuous or future tense. The learners are more active in the learning process rather than being simply passive recipients, so in doing the activity, they could be motivated. If the problem-solving activity is done collaboratively, learners can get an opportunity for extra language practice.

However, there are also some weaknesses of this method. The method is time and energy-consuming. When teaching inductively, the teacher doesn't mention the rules, function, and concepts underlying the tenses explicitly. The teacher only provides examples and encourages students to practice, so sometimes students are not really aware of the tenses

being taught if the teacher doesn't mention it. Moreover, when the concepts are given implicitly, it might cause learners to have the wrong concepts and perception of the rules.

Wee (2007) states that when grammatical rules are taught using inductive method, students are not really conscious about the rules they are using; as a result, they cannot recognize the errors. If the tenses are more complicated and need explanation, inductive methods are not suitable and effective to be applied, particularly in Indonesian setting because Indonesian students lack practice and exposure to the language. They only use the language in certain occasions such as at schools or English courses. The learners also have to know the "function" of a particular verb tense. Knowing the function(s) of a tense helps students determine the correct verb tense to be used.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the research findings, there are three major conclusions that can be drawn. Firstly, deductive method works more effectively than inductive method in teaching tenses to improve students' writing. This method is easier to apply and leaves little room for mistakes because the rules and concepts are concisely and clearly stated. It makes students feel secure because they are aware of the tenses they are learning, and the teacher provides them with a tool with which to deal with the tasks at hand. Not only can their confidence be reinforced by many examples, but they can also feel confident by the fact that the scope of what is expected from them is clearly defined. Furthermore, deductive method does not need much preparation on the part of the teacher as long as the teacher provides a comprehensible and clear definition which could be easily applied in the exercises that follow. However, it also has some quite significant disadvantages that could not be overlooked if the teacher only explains the rules and patterns and gives insufficient practice. The most important one is lack of students' involvement which might result in the lesson being teacher-centered and not challenging in terms of creativity and imagination. Teacher's incompetence might worsen the situation if the teacher is incapable of stating the rule explicitly.

Secondly, it can also be concluded that students taught by a deductive method have better understanding in tenses than those taught by an inductive method. If teachers apply the deductive method with the procedures that the researcher offers, hopefully students can overcome their problems to understand tenses and other grammar points. Knowing the concept and functions of the tenses is the most important thing to understand them.

Thirdly, both inductive and deductive methods could increase students' motivation to learn grammar, particularly tenses. Conversely, deductive method works more effectively than inductive method, and it can be proved by the results of the students' writing. The students could comprehend the tenses using deductive methods more than inductive methods because the researcher explains the basic concept of the tenses from the very beginning and provides meaningful practices while in inductive methods the researcher doesn't give any explanation about the concepts and rules. Therefore, the role of teachers is to provide the language that the learners need to discover the rules.

With regard to the limitation of this study, there are some suggestions for the future research. First, in this study, the researcher conducted the research in an English course where the students were considered homogenous in term of proficiency. Future studies may incorporate the procedure of random assignment with more subjects of different educational levels. Second, this study only focused on writing; therefore, future research can focus on other skills such as reading, listening and speaking. Third, the sample was limited; consequently, the results might not be generalized. It is advisable for future research to have more samples in order to find better results. Fourth, the grammar structures examined in this study were only tenses. For future research, other grammar usages deserve attention.

REFERENCES

- Bibi, A. (2009). *The comparative effectiveness of teaching English grammar with the help of text book (deductive approaches) and by using group work activities (inductive approaches)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad. Retrieved March 4, 2009 from <http://eprints.hec.gov.pk/183/1/76.htm>
- Decoo, W. (1996). The induction-deduction opposition: Ambiguities and complexity of the didactic reality. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching (IRAL)*, 34(2), 95-118.
- Erlam, R. (2003). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronoun in French as a second language. *Modern Language Journal*, 63(3), 98-105.
- Hartoyo. (2006). *Grammar in the teaching of EFL in Indonesia*. Semarang: Pelita Insani.
- Language Center, Asian Institute of Technology. (2005). Retrieved July 4, 2009 from <http://www.languages.ait.ac.th/english/test/whatscoremean.htm>
- Murcia, M., & Freeman, D. (1983). *The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's course*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Takimoto, M. (2009). *Effects of deductive and inductive interaction on Japanese learners' pragmatic competence*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Temple University, Japan. Retrieved March 20, 2009 from http://www.aal.org/aaal2006/images/full_program.pdf

- Wang, L. (2002). *Effects of inductive and deductive approach on EFL learning collocation patterns by using concordance*. Unpublished master's thesis, National Yunlin University of Science and Technology, Taiwan. Retrieved April 10, 2009 from http://ethesys.lib.cyut.edu.tw/ETD-db/ETD-search-c/view_etd?URN=etd-0
- Wee, L. (2007). Construction grammar and English language teaching. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 20-32.

