

# INVESTIGATING PROBLEMS OF INDUCTIVE APPROACH IN ELT DURING EARLY CAREER OF INDONESIAN EFL TEACHERS

Abdul Majid S. Leky<sup>1\*</sup>, Bambang Widi Pratolo<sup>2</sup>, Ikmi Nur Oktavianti<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Ahmad Dahlan University, Yogyakarta  
(abdul.leky@gmail.com\*)

Received: July 2023; Revised: May 2024; Accepted: June 2024

## ABSTRACT

The controversy of whether the English language should be taught inductively or deductively, implicitly or explicitly, consciously or subconsciously does not seem to arrive at its compromises yet. In the meantime, the methodology for English language teaching in the Indonesian EFL context has been ascribed to the inductive teaching paradigm. However, practical demands seem to have forced the teachers to develop their own teaching strategies. It is a serious problem for English teachers, especially during their early-career teaching. The current study aims to investigate problems in the implementation of inductive approaches along with some key strategies to cope with the problems. The data were obtained through a semi-structured interview involving two EFL teachers. The data was sourced from the participants' stated experiences and documents of their recorded classroom practice. The results yielded numerous contextual problems using an inductive approach, including students' capability, grammar complexity, achievement, and time insufficiency. The study also revealed key strategies teachers take, including re-adjusting their instruction procedures when an inductive approach is applied. The study implies that teachers and educational practitioners should be aware of redesigning existing learning methodologies that can be more contextualized and meet the learners' needs.

**Keywords:** contextual factors; inductive approach; instruction procedure; personal preference; practical demands

## ABSTRAK

Kontroversi apakah Bahasa Inggris harus diajarkan secara induktif atau deduktif, secara implisit atau eksplisit, secara sadar atau tidak sadar tampaknya belum mencapai komprominya. Sementara itu, metodologi pengajaran bahasa Inggris sebagai Bahasa asing dalam konteks Indonesia telah diturunkan dari paradigma pengajaran induktif. Namun, tuntutan praktis tampaknya membuat para guru terpaksa mengembangkan strategi pengajaran mereka sendiri. Ini adalah masalah serius bagi guru Bahasa Inggris terutama selama mengajar di awal karir mereka. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menyelidiki masalah dalam implementasi pendekatan induktif bersama dengan strategi-strategi untuk mengatasi masalah tersebut. Data diperoleh melalui wawancara semi-terstruktur, melibatkan dua orang guru Bahasa Inggris. Data bersumber dari pengalaman guru dan dokumen praktik dalam kelas. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan terdapat berbagai masalah kontekstual dalam penggunaan pendekatan induktif termasuk kemampuan siswa, kompleksitas tata bahasa, prestasi siswa dan kekurangan waktu. Studi ini juga mengungkapkan strategi utama yang diambil guru termasuk modifikasi prosedur pengajaran mereka ketika pendekatan induktif diterapkan. Implikasi dari penelitian ini adalah adanya kesadaran dari para guru dan praktisi pendidikan untuk mendesain ulang metodologi pembelajaran yang ada agar lebih kontekstual dan sesuai dengan kebutuhan siswa.

**Kata Kunci:** Faktor kontekstual; metode induktif; prosedur pengajaran; preferensi pribadi; tuntutan praktis

**How to Cite:** Leky, A. M. S., Pratolo, B. W., & Oktavianti, I. N. (2024). Investigating Problems of Inductive Approach in ELT during Early Career of Indonesian EFL Teachers. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 11(1), 89-104. doi: <https://10.15408/ijee.v11i1.33871>

\*Corresponding author

## INTRODUCTION

A proper adaptation for novice teachers is required since the field of the educational system, at every level of an academic institution, e.g., school, is relatively broader than what the teachers have in mind and what they have been prepared for before they enter the field. In line with this, Musthafa and Hamied (2014) argue that teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Indonesia often demand the development of survival strategies to cope with constantly shifting policies and practical requirements. The reason is that what they have learned during teacher training and what they face is different. Veenman (1984) calls this phenomenon the “transition shock.” Consequently, they have to establish effective teaching methods, which frequently need to be adapted to the change of the curriculum regulations. The educational curriculum has changed at least 11 times in Indonesia from 1947 to 2022 (Ritonga, 2018). The Ministry of Education recently released a new Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar (KMB) curriculum. This curriculum offers more flexibility in teaching strategies and promotes a communicative way of teaching where an inductive teaching approach is used. The inductive approach is a method of teaching English where the teacher starts the lesson by focusing on some contextualized examples before presenting the related language rules (Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Hulstijn, 2005). However, many pre-service English teachers are poorly equipped with the new technique (Hejvani & Farahani, 2018). This is because teachers are mostly treated with the old teaching technique, which emphasizes grammatical aspects during their previous study. Andriani et al. (2021) report that the deductive approach to English teaching is still used in the Indonesian EFL context.

In recent years, some research studies have been conducted regarding the inductive teaching strategy (see Alzu'bi, 2015; Benitez-Correa et al., 2019; Hejvani & Farahani, 2018; Obeidat & Alomari, 2020; Zhao & Lornklang, 2019). In 2015, a study was conducted by Alzu'bi (2015) to see whether the inductive teaching strategy positively impacted the student's academic achievement in elementary school and university. It is reported that the inductive model of teaching “plays a positive role in improving the academic achievement of the students studying English grammar in both levels (university and elementary)” (Alzu'bi, 2015, p.192). A similar study was conducted by Hejvani and Farahani (2018) and Obeidat and Alomari (2020) for a different subject to compare the effect and efficiency of the two other methods (inductive and deductive) based on the student's achievement or performance. Obeidat and Alomari (2020) report a significant difference in favor of the impact of the inductive approach on students' achievements. It differs from the result reported by Hejvani and Farahan (2018), who state that there is no statistically significant difference between the inductive and deductive groups. However, the average score of the inductive group is slightly higher than the deductive group's. It indicates that the inductive model of English teaching is, to some extent, more efficient than the deductive one.

Before going too far, it is necessary to define the inductive approach. The inductive approach has become the most popular approach in English language teaching and is the most frequently discussed by scholars, researchers, and educational practitioners around the world. This teaching approach is perceived as more effective than the traditional deductive one. In teaching and learning English, Hulstijn (2005) specifies that ‘the terms deductive and inductive learning are used in an instructional context’ (p.132). Researchers argued that what makes the two terms (inductive and deductive) contrast is how the order of the language rules and the instances (in which the rules are applied) are presented in the instruction. It is fair to say, then, that the distinction between these two teaching approaches lies in how instructions are given to students or in what Obeidat and Alomari (2020) stated as “the direction of the flow of information” (p.280).

In order to crystalize the understanding of an inductive model in English language teaching, scholars and researchers have tried to provide various conceptions. Herron and Tomasello (1992)

argue that inductive instruction occurs when “the teacher begins with the contextualized oral drill so that the students can induce for themselves the underlying grammatical pattern” (p.710). In the same vein, Hulstij (2005) proposed that in an inductive approach, the instruction starts with introducing examples of the language used in natural communication before particular language rules are presented. The students, therefore, “attend to the grammar structures and attempt to determine the rules based on inference and observation” (Kuder, 2009, p.11). The instructor expects the learners to notice specific rules and derive the way the rule works from the given examples (Obeidat & Alomari, 2020). In the same vein, Shaffe (1989) argues that the main emphasis of the inductive approach is on the students, who “are required to formulate for themselves and then verbalize the underlying pattern” (p.396). Similarly, Farrel (1999, p.2) states that “the communicative approach to the teaching of English suggests the omission of grammar teaching in favor of achieving proficiency in English through communicative type activities in class.” However, it is unclear whether the grammar rules are entirely untouched, given that some learners might be unable to discover the rules or understand to what extent they can be applied. For this ambiguity, Deco (1996, p. 96-98) classifies (refinement in his term) the two opposing methods into 5 modalities as described in table 1.

**Table 1.** The Refinement into Five Modalities by Decoo, (1996, p. 96-98)

Modalities	The principles
Modality A: Actual deduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The grammatical rule or pattern is explicitly stated at the beginning of the learning process and the students move into the application of this grammar (examples and exercises). (Decoo, 1996, p. 97)</li> </ul>
Modality B: Conscious induction as guided discovery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The students first encounter various examples, often sentences, sometimes embedded in a text.</li> <li>The "conscious discovery" of the grammar is then directed by the teacher: on the basis of the examples, he normally asks a few key questions, and the students are led to discover and formulate the rule. (Decoo, 1996, p. 97)</li> </ul>
Modality C: Induction leading to an explicit “summary of behavior”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The learner first practices a certain structure in an intense way.</li> <li>Through this practice, the rule is "somehow" induced and internalized.</li> <li>Then, at the end of the learning segment, the teacher summarizes the rule explicitly. (Decoo, 1996, p. 97)</li> </ul>
Modality D: Subconscious induction on structured material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The students are exposed to language material that has been structured in such a way as to help the inductive process.</li> <li>The principle advocates that through the systematic repetition of the same pattern, through graded variations, through drill and practice, the student will come to an "integrated mastery" of the rule without conscious analysis. (Decoo, 1996, p. 97)</li> </ul>
Modality E: Subconscious induction on unstructured material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is supposed to come as close as possible to "natural acquisition."</li> <li>Only intense language practice is given on the basis of authentic input, without any linguistic structuring or manipulation.</li> <li>"Generalizations" will come naturally, comparable to first language acquisition. (Decoo, 1996, p. 98)</li> </ul>

In terms of the role of the teachers and learners in an inductive approach, Graus and Coppen (2015) confront the two opposing methods in regard to the role of the learners and the teachers, the pedagogical arrangements, and the language input as presented in table 2.

**Table 2.** The Role of Teachers and Learners, adopted from Graus and Coppen (2016, p. 7)

Construct	Learners	Grammar Features (Input)	Pedagogical Arrangements	Teachers
Inductive	Search for a rule	Are used as examples from which to extract a rule	Induce learners to infer the rule themselves	Guide learners to search for rules
Deductive	Are taught a rule	Are used to exemplify a rule that has already been taught	Focus on explaining a rule	Explain the rules

### *Advantages of the inductive approach*

Numerous studies have proved the advantages of the inductive approach (e.g., Alzu'bi, 2015; Hejvani & Farahani, 2018; Nur, 2020; Obeidat & Alomari, 2020; Rismayanti et al., 2021). There are many reasons why the inductive approach is perceived to be superior to the deductive one.

#### *Develop students' communicative competence.*

In the inductive approach, the instruction starts with introducing examples of the language used in natural communication (Hulstijn, 2005). The learners are exposed to contextual instances in an intense way through repetition, drill, and practice (Decoo, 1996). Through these intense communicative activities, the learners will somehow induce the grammatical aspects of the language (Seliger, 1975) as it seems that the emphasis on communicative types of activities is meant to develop students' communicative competence to use the language in meaningful communication.

#### *Develop students' engagement.*

As described (e.g., Decoo, 1996; Hulstijn, 2005; Seliger, 1975), the communicative type of activities requires active engagement from the learners in the classroom process. For example, as shown by Kuder (2009) and Negahdaripour and Amirghassemi (2016), students are involved in role-play to gain active involvement from the learners. The result of an inductive instruction, Huan (2023) confirms in his study that there is a high level of students' enthusiasm and interest in the learning process.

#### *Develop students' critical thinking.*

In inductive instruction, the students are expected to search for the grammatical rules from the given examples (Benitez-Correa et al., 2019; Graus & Coppen, 2015). In such a condition, the learners' capability to notice and think, let alone analyze critically, is vital. In order to stimulate the learners' critical thinking in discovering the language rules, the instructors occasionally help the learners by using a bold lettering strategy (Kuder, 2009) and an underlining strategy (Negahdaripour & Amirghassemi, 2016). It is fair, then, to conclude that inductive instruction is superior in terms of developing students' critical thinking.

### *Disadvantages of Inductive Approach*

Despite the inductive approach being perceived to be more effective, some crucial aspects of this approach are still questionable for many scholars. The following explanations are, therefore, central to challenging the superiority of such an approach.

#### *There is no guarantee that students will induce the language rules.*

It seems that the idea that the learners will somehow, as Obeidat and Alomari (2020) have stated, "notice the way in which the rule works" is quite problematic. The reason is that in the inductive method, "there is no guarantee that the learner will perceive the appropriate

attributes of the language concept that he is inducing a correct concept” (Seliger, 1975, p. 6). He added that for a controlled drill situation, even though the learners can discover the underlying rules, there is no promise that they will be able to apply those rules in meaningful communication.

*Certain language rules are too complex to be taught inductively.*

For some learners, English grammar is too complex, especially those who are non- native speakers. “There are so many obscure rules and exceptions that make it difficult for the learners to understand this aspect of language” (Obeidat & Alomari, 2020, p. 280). Hence, the belief that the learners can induce or internalize those rules without explicit explanation would leave so much confusion about how the rules work.

*Learners with special characteristics might not be suitable.*

There is a belief that the inductive approach is most appropriate for learners whose native language rules are similar or dissimilar but simpler than the foreign language. In contrast, the deductive approach is preferred for learners whose native language rules are dissimilar and equal or have greater complexity (Decoo, 1996). Quir (2002) reports that the Spanish object pronouns are syntactically contra to English pronouns, as they are positioned before the verb. Consequently, for English learners of Spanish, English language structure is, to some extent, problematic.

*It takes more times*

There is a belief that this approach requires extra time for the classroom process (Obeidat & Alomari, 2020). The reason is that the inductive model suggests the concept of repetition in the learning process, where the learners are expected to induce the language rules. In Deco’s (1996) modality D, he conceptualized the induction process in language learning that the students will achieve an integrated mastery of language rules through “systematic repetition of the same pattern, graded variations, drill, and practice” (p.97).

In the Indonesian EFL context, the methodology for English language teaching has been ascribed to the inductive teaching paradigm. This is due to the role of English itself in Indonesia, where it is mainly learned for communicative purposes or for “instrumental reasons such as to get a job, to be involved in business and to establish an international network which requires communicative ability” (Utami, 2021 p. 73). In addition, materials in English learning resources such as textbooks follow the inductive approach. However, the textbooks have received criticism from many teachers and are perceived as less appropriate (Handayani et al., 2018). Research also shows that English teachers in Indonesia tend to use deductive instruction in the classroom (Indriyani, 2021; Rismayanti et al., 2021a). This phenomenon indicates that something is (or many things are) incorrect. Unfortunately, little is known about factors that could influence the teachers’ decisions.

There has been a growing interest in how the inductive approach works in this context. Many investigations have been conducted, and various interesting results have been revealed. An investigation by Ginaya et al. (2019) reported that using an inductive model in learning English for tourists significantly influences students’ communicative competence. This approach is perceived to be very helpful for Indonesian English learners in improving their speaking ability for many reasons, as Hoiruddin and Ulfa (2020) reported. Other reports, however, show slightly different results. It is pretty interesting that the deductive method (even though it is considered an old method) is still being implemented (see Andriani et al., 2021; Indriyani, 2021; Rismayanti et al., 2021; Utami, 2021). This indicated that there might be some issues related to using the inductive

approach. However, attention to any acceptable reasons for using such an old method in the middle of the inductive model “euphoria” is considered limited (Utami, 2021). The study by Utami (2021) revealed that two main factors affecting the teachers’ preferences on deductive instruction were personal and contextual factors, including students’ readiness. Utami (2021), to some extent, seems to address the first problem. However, the results related to students’ readiness were unverifiable since they primarily relied on data from teachers’ perspectives. There was no documented analysis from the student’s perspective, such as students’ worksheets, to prove that the students are indeed not ready yet for inductive instruction.

Given the facts mentioned above, this study was conducted to fill the gaps. This study offered a deep exploration of any possible issues derived from teachers’ and students’ perspectives that might affect the process of English language teaching using the inductive approach in the Indonesian EFL context. The current study is also keen to seek some key strategies to be used as a problem solver for the teachers’ teaching problems. To be precise, the study is purposed to investigate how high school EFL teachers use the inductive approach in their day-to-day teaching, what problems are faced by high school EFL teachers in Alor district (Indonesia) in teaching English using inductive approach during the early days of teaching and how do the high school EFL teachers in Alor district solve their teaching problems.

## METHODS

### *Research Design*

This research was a case study as it tried to closely investigate and describe a phenomenon associated with a particular object (i.e., EFL teachers). Gillha (2000) defined the term ‘case’ as a set of human activities related to a particular context. Understanding the case requires taking the context into account. Mills et al. (2010) exemplify one out of three that characterizes a case study as it focuses on interrelationships of the context of a specific entity (such as an organization, event, phenomenon, or person). The idea behind a qualitative study is that each individual has a different understanding and interpretation of a phenomenon (Heigham & Croker, 2009). In conclusion, a case study with qualitative design attempts to view a case or a phenomenon from the perspective of individuals involved in that case (Gillham, 2000). For the sake of this research, a qualitative design was applied to deepen the investigation regarding the problems that might occur relating to teaching English using an inductive instruction approach. In addition, this study will be carried out to provide a qualitative analysis since there have been some analyses on the topic were quantitative e. g. (Alzu’bi, 2015; Hejvani & Farahani, 2018; Obeidat & Alomari, 2020). Qualitative analysis is meant to provide fruitful and holistic study information as naturally as possible from the participants’ perspectives.

### *Population and Sample*

The current study was conducted in two institutions (a junior high school and a vocational high school). These schools are located in Kayang village, a sub-district of Northwest Pantar, Alor Regency. The sub-district of Northwest Pantar was declared by the government of Alor Regency in 2006, a year after the regulation was established in the form of local regulation number 15/2005. It is a relatively remote area since Kayang village, as its capital, has only one junior high school and one vocational high school (Department of Communication and Information of Alor District, 2020). Hence, regarding the inductive approach, the uniqueness of the participants and their students’ characteristics in this research site could reveal a different story from those reported in the previous studies.

The study involved 2 EFL teachers teaching in two different institutions. The duration of the participant's teaching career ranges from as little as more than 1 year to as many as 5 years. In this regard, two EFL teachers teaching English in Kayang village, Alor Regency, for around 4 years were selected. The first participant was an English teacher at a vocational high school. She has taught English since 2021 (more than 2 years of teaching career). The second participant was an English teacher in a junior high school. He has taught English since 2019 (around 4 years of teaching career). The selection of participants with different characteristics was meant to explore a variety of problems relating to inductive teaching.

### ***Data Collection and Analysis***

The data in this study was gathered through a semi-structured interview. The use of this type of interview offers an alternative since in a structured interview, according to Dornye (2007, p. 135), "there is generally little room for variation or spontaneity in the responses" as well as "there is also very little flexibility in the way questions are asked." In contrast, an unstructured one offers "maximum flexibility to follow the interviewee in unpredictable directions," which might lead to the deviation of the questions raised in the study. In other words, the researcher is keen to develop, and the interviewee is allowed to elaborate more on interesting issues during the conversation. However, some structured questions are pre-set to keep the research's focus. The semi-structured interview is, therefore, suitable when the researcher "has a clear picture of topics that need to be covered" (Heigham & Croker, 2009, p. 186) "but does not want to use ready-made response categories that would limit the depth and breadth of the respondent's story," (Dornyei, 2007, p. 136). To record the data during an interview, Creswell and Creswell (2018) offer three types of data records: handwritten notes, audiotape, and videotape. Considering the aspect of effectiveness, the interview in this study was recorded through audiotape. It aimed to provide complete information from the participants through voice recording since note-taking may be unable to catch all the details and disrupt the interview (Dornyei, 2007). The recording process was done without the participants noticing it since the presence of recording devices in the interview process may have effects on the participants' willingness to open up. Consequently, this may lead to the limitation of the data that the interviewees want to share. For this reason, videotape was not included in this interview. The audio tape of the interview was then converted to text through a manual transcription process. The text form of the interview transcript was then translated from the participants' native language into English—the result of this process. The result of the first cycle is portrayed as a database (Yin, 2011).

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

### ***Findings***

The result of the present study shows that English teachers frequently use the inductive approach in their everyday teaching, mainly due to curriculum demands and teachers' preferences. However, the deductive approach has also been used since numerous problems reportedly emerged from the inductive approach.

### ***Curriculum demand***

The first participant, Able (pseudonym), often uses an inductive approach due to the curriculum requirement. The second participant, Tanty (pseudonym), also confirmed that the curriculum in her school suggests the use of communicative activities in classroom interactions. The participants acknowledge that the learning materials in students' handbooks are in an inductive

model where examples, tasks, and exercises are presented in various communicative activities. This is due to implementing the K13 in all school institutions by the Ministry of Education in Indonesia.

*"... the curriculum demanded us to use the inductive approach because it says we need to increase the communicative-based activities in the classroom, in our lesson plan also, we need to include communicative activities and the learning materials in students' books are also in inductive approach," (Able).*

*"... yes, the curriculum also suggests us to teach using inductive method, and in the books published by the Ministry of Education, there are a lot of materials and exercises that, to me, are more suitable with the inductive method..... There is a lot of role-play, reading practice, group discussion, and many more communicative-based activities. So, I need to design lesson plans in the inductive model" (Tanty).*

### **Teachers' preference**

While Able seems to favor the method for its effectiveness in improving students' activeness in the classroom, Tanty, on the other hand, prefers the method in which her roles as a teacher are simpler.

*"... Yeah, I can say I like it. ... Because in the inductive method, my students are more active and enjoy. ... Moreover, an inductive method can improve students' skills such as speaking, listening, and vocabulary" (Able).*

*"I mean, as a teacher, we can be more relaxed. Our job is simpler. I like it because when I teach, I do not have to explain everything in the classroom. I need to give my students some exercises or group discussion, and my job is to control the class" (Tanty).*

### **Problems of the Inductive Approach in Its Implementation**

An interesting discovery from the interview results was the participants' decision to use the deductive type of instruction in their classroom despite the curriculum demands for using the inductive type. There are, of course, some reasons underlying the participants' choice to use the deductive method.

### **Students' capability**

Both participants worried about their students' understanding of the grammar rules. Able, for instance, even stated that he has to explain the grammar deductively since his students look confused when particular grammar rules occur in the learning process.

*".... I'm afraid students don't understand the lesson. Especially related to grammar. Because in the earlier times of my teaching, when I still used fully inductive, the students didn't seem to understand the lesson they seemed a bit confused; it was like something was not clear from their expressions and the look of their eyes. It is like there is something that they do not understand, so, in that situation, I have to explain the grammar explicitly" (Able).*

An interesting issue in Able's sharing is that most of his students do not understand the grammar aspect. Able added that the confusion is visible not only from the low but also from the good students.

*"I can say all of them did not understand. Even clever students seemed confused, let alone the poor ones" (Able).*

Similarly, Tanty stated that making her students understand grammar rules would be laborious. According to Tanty, this is due to her students' lack of vocabulary mastery.

*".... It is hard for my students when it comes to grammar. Every time we meet in the class, I have to explain the grammar over and over because my students mostly have low ability even though their vocabulary is so minimal. It is really hard, especially since my students are mostly lack vocabulary. So, it is also really hard to explain the grammar and the vocabulary" (Tanty).*

### Grammar complexity

In his statement, Able shared some chapters of his English lesson that he claimed contained complex grammatical features.

*"Yes, in chapter 5, the lesson is about progressive tense. Chapter 6, if I am not mistaken, is about present perfect tense. Those are very heavy lessons. The grammar is so complicated" (Able).*

Able claimed that not only his poor students but also the good ones started to show confusing faces when those lessons were presented. He added that the differentiation of the sentence structures or grammatical features between his students' native language and English is one of the main causes.

*".... Because maybe this is something new to them. It is the consequence of learning another language. Sometimes, aaa, what is it? The grammar or sentence structures are similar to our language, but sometimes they are very different from our language, so yeah, it is difficult to understand them." (Able).*

### Students' achievement

Both participants complained that the inductive type of instruction did not have a significant impact on their students' grammar achievement. They seem to agree that most of their students' grammar performance is still not meeting their expectations.

*".... For example, in chapter 4, the lesson is about procedure text. There is an example of how to make a cake. In that procedure, there are some examples of nominal phrases like two glasses of water in our local dialect, "air dua gelas." When I use the inductive method and give them some assignments to make their procedure text, they translate the whole thing literally from our local dialect of Bahasa Indonesia to English. So, from two glasses of water to water two glasses" (Able).*

Able claimed that poor or good students in his class made numerous grammatical mistakes. In order to correlate the absence of grammatical explanation with his students' performance on some grammatical features, some of his promising students' worksheets are presented. These worksheets confirm the strong impact of the omission of grammar teaching in an inductive approach toward the students' grammatical competencies. They provide clear examples of one problem that emerges in teaching English using an inductive approach. The worksheets are as follows;

**Table 3.** Grammar mistakes of student 1

Intended Sentences	Construction Results
<i>Langkah-langkah dalam membuat kopi</i>	<i>Steps steps deep make coffee</i>
<i>Kopi sebanyak 1 bungkus</i>	<i>Coffee 1 parcel</i>
<i>Gula sebanyak 2 sendok</i>	<i>Sugar ½ tablespoon</i>
<i>Air sebanyak 200 mL</i>	<i>Boiling water 200 ml</i>

**Table 4.** Grammar mistakes of student 2

Intended Sentences	Construction Results
<i>Rebus air menggunakan panci hingga mendidih</i>	<i>Boiled water use pot until boiling</i>
<i>Sambil menunggu, tuang kopi bubuk dan gula ke dalam gelas</i>	<i>While wait, pour coffee powder and sugar to in glass</i>
<i>Setelah air mendidih tuang air ke dalam gelas yang telah berisi kopi dan gula.</i>	<i>After water boiled, pour water to a glass which has containing coffee and sugar</i>
<i>Aduk rata agar kopi dan gula larut</i>	<i>Stir flat so that coffee and sugar late</i>

**Table 5.** Grammar mistakes of student 3

Possible Intended Sentences	Construction Results
<i>Masukan segelas air dan tunggu hingga air mendidih.</i>	<i>Input a glass of water and wait until water mendidih</i>
<i>Masukan gula pasir</i>	<i>Input a sugar sand to taste</i>
<i>Tuangkan air yang sudah dimasak ke dalam gelas hingga penuh.</i>	<i>Pour water that is already cooked into the glass until full</i>
<i>Aduk semua bahan sampai semua bahan tercampur rata.</i>	<i>Stir all the ingredients until all the ingredients are well mixed.</i>

**Table 6.** Grammar mistakes of student 4

Intended Sentences	Construction Results
<i>Panaskan air</i>	<i>Hot water</i>
<i>Tuangkan kopi ke dalam cangkir</i>	<i>Place coffe in cup</i>
<i>Tuangkan 2 sendok gula ke dalam kopi</i>	<i>Place 2 spoon sugar in cup</i>
<i>Tuangkan air panas ke dalam cangkir</i>	<i>Place water hot in a cup.</i>
<i>Aduk hingga merata</i>	<i>Stir until flat</i>
<i>Siap disajikan</i>	<i>Standby in dishes</i>

### ***Students' engagement and time insufficiency***

Both participants complained that they often ran out of time before they finished the lesson. Tanty seems to need some extra time to adapt to the students' low ability and disruptive behavior.

*"... what consumes more time is when there are activities such as group discussions, conversation exercises... Those are usually the most time-consuming. Only one group finished and time is over" (Tanty).*

*"... first, because their average ability is weak, their vocabulary is minimal, let alone grammar. So, they are slow to follow lessons. Second, it is because, in activities like this, students started to disturb each other, mocking each other, not serious anymore. And it is difficult to control them, and sometimes I get overwhelmed. I'm still trying to control them and get them to pay attention and understand the material, but time is running out" (Tanty).*

*".... Because in the inductive method, there are a lot of activities like group discussion, role play, speaking practice, group presentation, and others. These activities are vulnerable because students are often not seriously disturbed, and most are too shy. So, when performed in front of the class, they didn't speak, only silent, and didn't do anything. This really consumes a lot of time, and sometimes I feel frustrated" (Able).*

Both participants seemed to point out that inductive instruction was filled with activities requiring much time. In their case, these activities might not work well since most of their students behave disruptively and are too shy to perform in the classroom.

### ***Problem-solving strategies***

Both participants established some adjustments in their instruction procedures. Able, for instance, decided to modify his lesson plan to adapt to the needs of his students.

*"At the beginning of my teaching, I just let it go because I wanted to see how far they were able to notice the grammar. But after I gave a few assignments, it seemed the results weren't so good. In the end, I thought I had to explain grammar directly again. The sentence pattern for this is like this: this is a subject, a predicate, and a nominal phrase. At least it will help them to recognize the grammar aspects". (Able)*

*"..... First, I tried to combine the methods in one meeting. After explaining the material, giving examples of conversations, and so on, I explain the grammar aspect explicitly. But, the students are rather overwhelmed and tend to be more passive. So, I decided to put activities such as conversation practice and discussion separately in 2 to 3 meetings to improve the student's communicative skills and vocabulary. The rest of the meeting is the time to perform in front of the class or give a presentation. So, after the initial 2 to 3 meetings, I gave them assignments. For example, in chapter 4, the lesson is about procedure text. I give an assignment, usually in groups, to make a food or drink recipe. Their work results must be presented in front of the class in the remaining meetings. After each group presented their work, I gave them feedback mainly related to their grammatical errors". (Able)*

Able can combine inductive and deductive models in most of his class meetings. From his statement, Able seems to try to raise the importance of explicit explanations of grammatical rules. However, he tends to provide explicit grammar explanations at the end of his lesson time instead of presenting them at the beginning. He said it was meant to help his students recognize the grammatical patterns.

### ***The teacher's instruction modification***

Another substantial finding was how Able established the procedures of his lesson meeting to meeting. The interview data indicated that he prefers to apply inductive instruction in his first two to three sessions. He says the primary goal is to improve students' communication skills and vocabulary mastery. For the rest of the meeting, however, he then modified his instruction method. Analyzing the procedures in the teacher's lesson plan showed similar results. Able seemed to dedicate some initial meetings without explicitly explaining the grammatical aspects. On the one hand, this was aimed at improving the students' communicative skills and vocabulary. On the other hand, the student's condition and time insufficiency did not allow him to fully use implicit and explicit instruction simultaneously.

The presence of explicit explanation in Able's instructional sequences occurs after some intense practices of contextual instances in communicative activities. In his procedure, he started his lesson with observation activities where students observed contextual examples of a particular grammar pattern. Then, he followed with oral drill practice, leading the students to practice the given examples through reading practice and conversation practice. After that, he then explains the grammar rules emerging from the given examples. He sometimes required students to perform some exercises in front of the class and provide necessary corrections and feedback on the students' grammatical errors. Supporting Able's method, it is confirmed in Önalas's (2018) investigation

that 57.4% of English teachers believed that grammar focus in instruction sequence should come after communicative tasks.

## ***Discussion***

The frequent use of an inductive method in the Indonesian EFL context is not surprising since the curriculum strongly suggests the method. Perhaps Hammerl (1975, p.15) correctly referred to the induction-deduction controversy as “more to fads than to facts” since the result of the present study indicated that this phenomenon seems to create new problems. The reason is that in a different context, when a particular method might not be working, the teachers of English often, as Musthafa and Hamied (2014, p. 1) stated, are “confronted with ever-changing policy and practical demands.” On the one hand, EFL teachers are required to comply with the policies, but on the other hand, they are demanded to deal with practical issues.

Although the participants’ willingness to use the inductive model of instruction in their lesson is more to curriculum demands, as previously acknowledged, they also showed interest in the method. This is due to the advantages of the inductive method in some key aspects mentioned by the participants. For instance, the method effectively developed students’ communicative skills (Alzu’bi, 2015; Ginaya et al., 2019) and improved students’ enthusiasm and interest in the learning process, Huang (2023).

However, the question that often bothers the participants is whether the students are correctly inducing the grammar rules. The teachers’ doubts about their students’ abilities were also confirmed in a study (Utami, 2021). She reported that one of the teachers (coded as Teacher A) switched his instruction method to deductive mode due to the low ability of his students. Seliger (1975) has raised the teachers’ doubts. Seliger even argued that even though students can discover the underlying rules, or they can, as Obeidat and Alomari (2020, p.280) have stated, “notice the way the rule works, “no promise that they will be able to apply those rules in a meaningful communication.

The complexity of the grammar rules is the core problem that drives the participants’ decision to change their instructional type from the inductive model to the deductive one. Supporting the findings of this study, a teacher in Utami (2021) mentioned the absence of some grammatical features in Bahasa Indonesia, such as verb changes, as one of the challenges of his students’ learning. Perhaps Obeidat and Alomari (2020, p.280) were right to argue that “there are so many obscure rules and exceptions that make it difficult for the learners to understand this aspect of language.” Therefore, in the classroom where the time is limited, the idea that the students will be able to discover, internalize, or verbalize the grammatical rules without conscious analysis or explicit explanation is hardly accepted.

Able then seemed to conclude that lack of grammar knowledge makes his students unable to produce new sentences based on their correct grammatical rules. His students’ grammar errors include word redundancy, incorrect use of imperative words, incorrect word order, incorrect passive voice, incorrect adjectives, and inappropriate selection of vocabulary. Similarly, in Farrells (1999) reflective assignment, Teck Siong, an English teacher, reported his serious problem with the inductive approach. His students did not manage to verbalize the grammatical rules. He was even more insecure when he could not ensure that his students internalized the rules and how they work.

Contrary to what Benitez-Correa et al. (2019) discovered in their experiment, the students’ grammar achievement in inductive instruction is relatively higher than in deductive instruction from the statistical point of view. However, their experiment was conducted to test 5 EFL students

in Ecuador who attended 225 minutes of class time per week. Therefore, it is unsurprising that an inductive approach might work well in such a large amount of class time, unlike Able's students, who attend only 160 minutes of class time per week. Hence, in Able's particular demographic of students, the inductive approach will not work very well. Moreover, Benitez-Correa et al. (2019) assess the students' grammar achievement through a multiple-choice test. In this type of test, students' lucky guesses and the difficulty level of the test questions would very much affect the test results. Therefore, in a particular demographic condition, an inductive approach does not bring any positive impact.

In inductive instruction, students are involved intensively in practicing contextual examples in various activities (Decoo, 1996; Hulstijn, 2005; Seliger, 1975). Thus, students are required to be actively engaged during the classroom process. The question then raised is whether the students will show a positive or negative engagement. The current finding shows that negative engagement leads to the time-consuming lesson. Therefore, the lesson might not be working in a classroom setting when the class time is limited. Moreover, students' weaknesses and disruptive behaviors will make the method even more impossible.

The interview results indicated that instruction adjustment is the main solution for the problems mentioned above. The main change in Able's instruction procedure was the insertion of the grammatical rules. The absence of an explicit explanation of grammar rules in the inductive instruction was perceived as the main cause of his students' confusion and minimum grammar skills. Previous studies legitimating Able's views have shown similar findings. For instance, Al Abri et al. (2022) observed the teachers' instructional practices in Omani secondary schools. They reported that the majority of the teachers prefer explicit explanations of grammar rules.

The question then arises whether Able's method positively impacts students' grammar knowledge. Able claimed that his students' performance on several grammatical issues has improved. Although he did not provide proof from his teaching records, Aydin et al. (2022) confirmed in their study that explicit grammar instruction strongly impacts students' grammar knowledge. In addition, Dalogl (2020) and Shirav and Nagai (2022), in an attempt to explore students' preference toward how they prefer to learn grammar, reported that a large majority of students strongly preferred explicit grammar instruction rather than implicit, inductive rather than deductive.

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION

Some conclusions can be drawn from this study. First, with the massive use of the inductive method through curriculum intervention, teachers in the Indonesian EFL context have to deal with numerous problems in their classroom practices. The problems mostly relate to contextual factors and originate from the students' limitations. Secondly, despite being confronted with the policy requirements and practical demands, English teachers in Indonesia are incredibly capable of demonstrating their unique survival strategies. With the previous-mentioned findings and conclusions, several suggestions need to be addressed. First, teachers of English as a foreign language are required to be aware of the student's needs before a particular teaching methodology is put into practice. Secondly, the current study's results indicated a need to redesign the English teaching methodology. Therefore, teachers and educational practitioners are advised to re-develop English teaching methodology in the curriculum to make the methods more contextualized, effective, and efficient. The implication of the study is clear. First, the findings of this study provide insights into the need for a redesign of English teaching methods. Second, teachers who might experience similar issues can use the participants' modified instruction as a reference in their teaching.

However, like any other research, this study also has some limitations. First and foremost, the current study was conducted using a qualitative design, where the primary data was obtained through interviews with some particular individuals. Consequently, all information produced from this type of methodology was considered a subjective truth. The reason is that the information originated from individuals' perspectives and experiences. Secondly, the primary data in this study were obtained via face-to-face interviews. Hence, the breadth and depth of the information provided by the participants might be limited by the strength of the participants' memory. Therefore, the participants might not have covered other important aspects. In addition, the participants' truths and honesty might be questionable. The reason is that the participants may not be willing to share any information originating from their weaknesses to keep their prestige. For example, the participants might not be sincere that the problem in their inductive teaching is derived from their incapability to manage the learning process using the method. This is also considered the limitation of the study. Moreover, the current research does not provide classroom observation of the participants' teaching practices to verify the participants' reported experiences.

Thirdly, the information provided by the participants in the current study is expressed through the spoken form of some particular language styles (Bahasa Indonesia mixed with the participants' local dialect). The information then can be interpreted and translated from their original language style into a different language style (English, in this case). For that reason, the information's originality and authenticity will consequently be questionable. The question is whether the proper interpretation and an accurate translation have been made or vice versa. However, since the researcher is demographically the same as the participants, the correct interpretation and the precise translation can be trusted and help answer this doubt.

The problems discovered from the existing study derived from the teachers' reported beliefs and experiences. Further research may include direct observation of the teachers' classroom practices to gain more valid and verifiable data, which leads to more convincing and trustworthy results. Additionally, Future studies may include a large number of participants to search for more substantial findings. Lastly, an interesting discovery of the current study is that the teachers' modified instruction procedures are perceived as more appropriate. A future research study may put such instruction methods to the test for their effectiveness as well as their efficiency.

## REFERENCES

- Al Abri, S., Mirza, C., Bellalem, F., & Forouzani, M. (2022). Teachers' Beliefs about Grammar Teaching within a Context of Omani Secondary Schools. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 13(2), 401–411. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/auyjv>
- Alzu'bi, M. A. (2015). Effectiveness of Inductive and Deductive Methods in Teaching Grammar. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.6n.2p.187>
- Andriani, A., Yuniar, V. D., & Abdullah, F. (2021). Teaching English Grammar in an Indonesian Junior High School. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 13(2), 1046–1056. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v13i2.956>
- Aydin, H., Rahmanpanah, H., & Mohseni, A. (2022). Application of Grammatical Judgment Tests to the Measurement of Explicit versus Implicit Knowledge in EFL Classroom. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 13(1), 131–149. <https://doi.org/10.30495/TTLT.2023.699064>
- Benitez-Correa, C., Gonzalez-Torres, P., Ochoa-Cueva, C., & Vargas-Saritama, A. (2019). A Comparison Between Deductive and Inductive Approaches for Teaching EFL Grammar to High School Students. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 225–236. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12i1.15a>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design : Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Daloglu, A. (2020). EFL Students' Beliefs about How They Learn Grammar Best. *English Language Teaching*, 13(10), 158–165. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n10p158>

- Decoo, W. (1996). The Induction-Deduction Opposition: Ambiguities and Complexities of The Didactic Reality. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, XXXIV(2), 95–118.
- Department of Communication and Information of Alor District. (2020). *Kecamatan Pantar Barat Laut*. <https://alorkab.go.id/new/index.php/kecamatan/wilayah-pantar/pbl3>
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies* (1st ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (1999). The reflective assignment: Unlocking pre-service English teachers' beliefs on grammar teaching. *REL C Journal*, 30(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829903000201>
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Case Study Research Methods*. British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data. Ginaya, G., Somawati, N. P., Aryana, I. N. R., & Putra, I. M. A. (2019). Improving Students' Communicative Competence through Inductive Method using Authentic Materials. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(5), 1080–1088. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1005.22>
- Graus, J., & Coppen, P. A. (2015). Student Teacher Beliefs on Grammar Instruction. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(5), 571–599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815603237>
- Hammerly, H. (1975). The Deduction/Induction Controversy. *The Modern Language Journal*, 59(1), 15–18.
- Handayani, S., Suwarno, B., & Dharmayana, J. (2018). Evaluation of Indonesian English Textbook for The Ninth Graders of Junior High School "Think Globally Act Locally" from EFL Teachers' Perspectives. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature*, 3(2), 11–32. [www.dakta.com](http://www.dakta.com).
- Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (2009). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.
- Hejvani, F., & Farahani, M. V. (2018). An investigation into inductive and deductive methods in teaching grammar to German EFL learners: A comparative study. In *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* (Vol. 8, Issue 2). [www.gjflt.eu](http://www.gjflt.eu)
- Herron, C., & Tomasello, M. (1992). Acquiring Grammatical Structures by Guided Induction. *The French Review*, 65(5), 708–718. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/395311>[http://www.jstor.org/stable/395311?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references\\_tab\\_contents](http://www.jstor.org/stable/395311?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)
- Hoiruddin, M., & Ulfa, S. M. (2020). Inductive Approach Used in Teaching Speaking Skill: A Content Analysis. *Linguista: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pembelajarannya*, 4(2), 105–113. <https://doi.org/10.25273/linguista.v4i2.6487>
- Huang, L. (2023). Comparing the Deductive Method and Inductive Method of Grammar Teaching for Chinese Senior High School students. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences EPHHR*, 8(2023), 229–237.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2005). Theoretical and empirical issues in the study of implicit and explicit second- language learning: Introduction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(2), 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050084>
- Indriyani, C. E. (2021). Deductive and Inductive Instructions for Teaching English Grammar in Online Classroom. *Lire Journal (Journal of Linguistics and Literature)*, 5(2), 168–183. <https://doi.org/10.33019/lire.v5>
- Kuder, E. (2009). *Implications of An Inductive Versus Deductive Approach to SLA Grammar Instruction*. University of Delaware.
- Mills, A. J., Durepos, G., Wiebe, E., Weatherbee, M., Boje, D. M., Carr, A., David, M., Davies, A., Doorewaard, H., Eisenhardt, K., Gephart, R. P., Jacobs, D. C., Jacques, R. S., Konrad, A. M., Maitlis, S., Mills, J. H., Mirchandani, K., Rosile, G., & Yin, R. K. (2010). *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research* (A. J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe, Eds.; 1st ed., Vols. 1–2). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Musthafa, B., & Hamied, F. A. (2014). *Theoretical Overview Teaching English as A Foreign Language in Indonesian Schools in The Reform Era: What do Teachers Have to Say?*
- Negahdaripour, S., & Amirhassemi, A. (2016). The Effect of Deductive vs. Inductive Grammar Instruction on Iranian EFL Learners' Spoken Accuracy and Fluency. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 5(1), 8–17. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v5n.1p.8>
- Nur, S. (2020). Students' Perception Toward the Use of Deductive and Inductive Approaches in Teaching English Grammar. *TESOL International Journal*, 15(1).

- Obeidat, M. M., & Alomari, M. A. (2020). The effect of inductive and deductive teaching on EFL undergraduates' achievement in grammar at the Hashemite University in Jordan. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(2), 280–288. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n2p280>
- Önalan, O. (2018). Non-Native English Teachers' Beliefs on Grammar Instruction. *English Language Teaching*, 11(5), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n5p1>
- Quirk, R. J. (2002). A Simplified Method of Teaching the Position of Object Pronouns in Spanish. *American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese*, 85(4), 902–906. <http://www.jstor.orgURL:http://www.jstor.org/stable/4141258>
- Rismayanti, L. A., Utami, I. G. A. L. P., & Suprianti, G. A. P. (2021a). Deductive Teachers' Perception using Inductive Instruction in Teaching English Grammar. *Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation*, 5, 391–397. <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JERE>
- Ritonga, M. (2018). *Politik dan Dinamika Kebijakan Perubahan Kurikulum Pendidikan di Indonesia Hingga Masa Reformasi* (Vol. 5, Issue 2).
- Seliger, H. W. (1975). Inductive Method and Deductive Method in Language Teaching: A Re- Examination. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, XIII(1), 1–18.
- Shaffer, C. (1989). A Comparison of Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching Foreign Languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 395–403.
- Shirav, A., & Nagai, E. (2022). The Effects of Deductive and Inductive Grammar Instructions in Communicative Teaching. *English Language Teaching*, 15(6), 102–123. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n6p102>
- Utami, I. G. A. L. P. (2021). Weighing Up Contextual and Personal Factors in Selecting Grammar Teaching Approaches: A Case Study from Indonesia. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 587, 72–81.
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers. *Review of Educational Research Summer*, 54(2), 143–178. <http://rer.aera.net>
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish*. The Guilford Press.
- Zhao, M., & Lornklang, T. (2019). The Use of Picture Word Inductive Model Focusing on Chinese Culture to Promote Young Learners' English Vocabulary Acquisition. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 10(4), 105. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.10n.4p.105>