

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter presents the conclusion of the study, the recommendation and suggestion for teaching and further research of conditional sentences.

5.1. Conclusion

Several relevant methods and approaches can be applied to teach English grammar. There are two approaches which are opposing each other in term of teaching English grammar. They are deductive and inductive approaches. Some studies found that deductive teaching approach is more effective than inductive approach. On the other hand, some studies found that inductive approach is more effective than deductive approach. 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 questionnaire is also confirmed by interview. 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.

Two reasons might account for this finding. First, inductive approach is the new technique for students to learn, even though they are always taught by using deductive approach but students were not really confused when they were taught using inductive approach. Second, they may feel secure to discover English rules by themselves. Thus, the factor of culture does not play a very important role in discussing the effect of foreign language learning. Secondly, it is not too difficult for Indonesian learners to distinguish and generalize English grammatical features, since English sentence structures are different from Indonesia structures.

5.2. Suggestions

In this study, the writer would like to give some suggestions for the English teacher, and further research.

5.2.1. Suggestions for Further Research

In this study the writer compares and examines the effect of deductive and inductive approach but this study was done only in six meeting, first meeting the teacher gave the students pre- test and the next day students

received the treatment for four days, then post test was given in a week. This study needs more meetings so the students really could master their conditional sentences, and also to get the valid data from students. There is no retention for post test in this study, so the writer suggest further research to conduct post test then retention test. Retention test is needed to make sure that students can remember the lesson for long term memory. Then, the reliability of the test were not really analyzed well, for further research should be careful in analyzing the reliability of the test.

Moreover, this study and those conducted by Kuder (2009) and Haight (2007) mainly focus on grammar. However, the effect of deductive and inductive approach on students speaking and reading abilities were not examined and remains unknown. Researcher can explore these two English skills in follow –up studies to elucidate the effect of deductive and inductive approach on speaking and reading abilities.

Further qualitative inquiry is needed for exploring students' perspective and perception of grammar with regard to deductive and inductive approach. This study only interviewed the students who got highest and the lowest score, the writer did not interview the middle achiever. Therefore, further research can find out the student's perception on inductive and deductive approach to get the valid data on student's perception.

5.2.2. Suggestions for Teachers

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.
- Batstone, R. (1994). *Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Block, D. (1994). A day in the life of a class: *Teacher/learner perceptions of task purpose in conflict*. *System*, 22 (4), 473-486.
- Borg, S. & Burns, A. (2008). *Integrating grammar in adult TESOL classrooms*. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(3), 355-388.
- Brown, Douglas H. 1984 and 1987. *Teaching by principles : An interactive Approach to language pedagogy* . New Jersey : Prentice Hall Regents
- 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.
- Carroll, J. B. (1964). *Language and thought*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Carr, T. H., & Curran, T. (1994). *Cognitive factors in learning about structured sequences: Applications to syntax*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 205-230
- 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 Tests*. New York : prentice Hall, Inc.
- Gronlund, Norman E. 1985. *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching*. New York Macmillan Publishing Company
- Heining-Boyton, A.L., & Haitema, T. (2007). *A ten-year chronicle of student attitude toward foreign language in the elementary school*. The Modern Language Journal, 91 (ii), 149- 168.
- 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:
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language learning* (2nd). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindsay, P. H., & Norman, D. A. (1977). *Human information processing*. New York: Academic Press.
- Laffort, B. A. (2000). *Spanish applied linguistics in the twentieth century: A retrospective and bibliography* (1900-99). *Hispania*, 83(4), 711-732.
- 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.
- MCMillan J.H (2008.) *Educational Research*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Nunan, D. (1986). *Communicative Language Teaching: The learner's view*. [Paper presented at the RELC Regional Seminar]. Retrieved from: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED273092.pdf>
- 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. & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*(2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C, & Platt J.H (1992). *Language Teaching and Applied Linguistic* (2nd ed.). Longman
- 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 approached 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* (12th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wang, P. (1999). *English Grammar Instruction in Taiwan: Student and teacher attitudes*. Unpublished thesis. (UMI 9960674).