

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON DEDUCTIVE VS INDUCTIVE APPROACH IN TEACHING REPORTED SPEECH

Ana Rosida

Study Program of English Literature, University Of Fajar

Email: ann.rosyed@gmail.com

Abstract. This research was conducted to find out and to compare the effectiveness of teaching reported speech for the second semester students of English Language and Literature Department of Adab and Humanity Faculty in Alauddin State Islamic University Makassar between deductive and inductive approaches. The research employed quasi experimental design. The subjects consisted of 36 students which divided into two groups; 18 students in deductive group and 18 in inductive group. The researcher used a test of reported speech both in deductive and inductive groups. The data obtained through the test were analyzed by using inferential statistics through SPSS version 15.0 program. In conducting the research, the researcher applied deductive approach for Ag. 1 class and inductive approach for Ag. 2 class to improve the students' reported speech mastery. The research result showed that there was an improvement on the students' reported speech mastery between pretest and posttest to both groups after the treatment. However, inductive approach was more significant than deductive approach. It is concluded that inductive approach gave better contribution to improve the students' reported speech mastery. It was proven by the result of inferential statistics in testing the students' score either in pretest or in posttest. Based on the result of the data analysis, there was a significant difference between the results of posttests of Ag. 1 and Ag. 2 classes, however deductive and inductive approaches showed the improvement well, inductive approach shows greater achievement than deductive ($88.7778 < 81.2778$). The final score of probability value in reported speech was lower than α ($.039 < 0.05$). In other words, H_1 and H_2 were accepted and H_0 was rejected. But to compare the effectiveness, H_2 is accepted and H_0 was rejected.

Key words: Grammar, teaching approach by deductive and inductive, reported speech.

INTRODUCTION

A language is about grammar & syntax, pronunciation, vocabulary and skills. The role of language becomes explicit to reach the mean of the context in any kinds of genre. The context can be any sorts in the language namely written and spoken whether formal or informal. To have the communicative, comprehensive, and writing competences, it is demanded to deliberate the problems which involves the learners to figure out the task.

To figure out the task, it needs the grammar subject to examine the problems. Grammar gains its prominence in language teaching, particularly in English as a foreign language (EFL), inasmuch as without a good knowledge of grammar, learners' language development will be severely constrained.

Practically, in the teaching of grammar, learners are taught rules of language commonly known as sentence patterns. According to Ur (1999: 122), in the case of learners, grammatical rules enable them to know and apply how such sentence patters should be put together.

Further, grammar is thought to furnish the basis for a set of language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. In listening and speaking, grammar plays a crucial part in grasping and expressing spoken language (e. g. expression), whereas in reading, grammar enables learners to comprehend sentence interrelationship in paragraph, a passage, and a text. Lastly in the context of writing, grammar allows the learners to put their ideas into intelligible sentences so that they can successfully communicate in a written form. In other words, Doff (2000: 140) says that

by learning grammar students can express meanings in the form of phrases, clauses and sentences. Long and Richards (1987: 124) add that it cannot be ignored that grammar can play a central role in the four language skills and vocabulary to establish communicative tasks.

For those reasons, it is interested to find out the way to figure out of delivering or conveying grammar knowledge to the students. For educators, teaching grammar revolves effective theoretical approaches to promote this comprehension among the learners. However for the learners, they need some variations to bury out the boredom. To have continuity of educators and learners, this research promotes the two approaches in teaching grammar especially teaching reported speech.

Reported speech is one of the choices from the list of grammar to be used in this research. There are some reasons why the reported speech becomes the instrument to measure the effectiveness of the two approaches. First, it has a big deal in confronting the ideas or opinions whether direct or indirect statements. It derives some changing formation of tenses. Next, it is challenging for the learners to interview and report the message from the information. The last, it hasn't been studied by the sample of the research.

Reported speech is very significant to be observed because it hasn't been researched by another researcher in same concept and also it is the Faculty policy of Adab Faculty of Alauddin Islamic State University where the researcher did the research and the learners simultaneously learn after having the tenses. The previous researcher have conducted this research are Duff, et al. (2005). They did the research about reported speech which was in the different concept. Duff, et al. (2005) in their research is about Talking across time: Using reported speech as a communicative resource in amnesia, used reported speech in which speakers represent thoughts/words from another time and/or place, requires management of two temporal frames, making it an interesting discourse practice in

which to explore the impact of memory deficits on interactional aspects of communication.

In order to meet the needs of diverse learners in the grammar classroom for one subject which is reported speech, it is important to vary the approach to teach the content. One basic grammar related to approaches is that of deductive and inductive approaches.

Deductive approach is one of the strategies to teach grammar in this research to teach reported speech whereas deductive approach is also called direct instruction or conventional or traditional teaching where typically a general concept presents in the beginning class then followed by practicing or demonstrating the sentence patterns. Mastropieri, et. al. (1990: 12) say that students have already been introduced to the idea in their text or in lecture. They know the outcome of the procedure before it is completed. Most "demonstration" or "cookbook" labs are deductive in nature.

Inductive approach is also known as discovery teaching which is built from the learners' experiences. An instructor using an inductive approach begins by exposing students to a concrete instance, or instances, of a concept. Then learners are encouraged to observe patterns, raise questions, or make generalizations from their observations. The teacher's role is to create the opportunities and the context in which students can successfully make the appropriate generalizations, and to guide students as necessary. According to Mastropieri, et al. (1997: 199) state that inductive teaching has close ties with the instructional method called the "learning cycle", where phenomena are explored before concepts are named.

The two approaches above are completely different and simultaneous use of both is impracticable. The rift that divides them finds, obviously, reflection in the results that they produce.

Deductive approach: General rule → Specific examples → Practice

Inductive approach: Specific examples → Practice → General rule

The term deductive and inductive does not just refer to the reading skill which is how to grasp the main idea of each paragraph but also it can be used in grammar. Grammar uses the two approaches by the way to begin the class.

This research is equipped by other researcher. First is “*approaches and procedures for teaching grammar*” by Widodo (2006). In that research, he explains and carries out the broad explanation on the deductive and inductive theoretically. Whereas he doesn’t apply any certain grammar specifically to compare the two approaches, it talks about teaching grammar in general.

The other research, it is written by Chernovaty (1990), *Grammar teaching: the inductive vs deductive issue revisited*. In that paper attempts to show that there is not and cannot be a universal solution to the inductive vs deductive approach problem in teaching the foreign language grammar. It is argued here that the correlation between those two approaches is very dynamic and depends upon a number of factors. The two researches above show that the discussion on deductive and inductive cannot be fallen a part. They explain continuity as differential. To have the relation on those researches, this research deals on the two approaches in deductive and inductive then reported speech as the lesson to measure the effectiveness both of them in the different class

DEDUCTIVE APPROACH

Deductive is not the only term to analyze the reading to get the main ideas. It could be used in applying language teaching and also other sciences. It can be proved by the article “Effectiveness of Inductive and Deductive Teaching Methods in Learning Agricultural Economics: A Case Study” composed by Dameus, et al. (2004). That article is talking about the other way to teach an agricultural economics, which is deductive and inductive, the researchers tried to vary the way of teaching. In fact, it was concluded that inductive way was very effective rather than deductive.

Language was the majority. The researcher tries to apply the concept of deductive and inductive which they would be questioned which part will be effective. For further knowing about the approaches, this part declares deductive approach then the inductive approach in the next discussion. Deductive approach to grammar teaching, which is often called rule-driven learning starts with presentation of rules and is followed with examples. The deductive approach represents a more traditional style of teaching in that the grammatical structures or rules are dictated to the students first (Rivers and Temperley, 1978: 110). Thus, the students learn the rule and apply it only after they have been introduced to the rule. For example, if the structure to be presented is reported speech, the teacher began the lesson by saying, "Today we are going to learn how to report your friend’s opinion". Then, the rules of the reported speech in past was outlined and the students completed exercises, in a number of ways, to practice using the structure. (Goner, et al., 1995: 135) In this approach, the teacher is the center of the class and is responsible for all of the presentation and explanation of the new material.

The lesson begins by confronting the students with a stimulating problem, and they are then told to find out how it can be resolved. The confrontation is initiated first verbally, then the teacher writes a group of words on the board linked to the oral discussion he conducts. As the students react, the teacher draws their attention to the significant points he wants to present through his questioning. When the students become interested in, and committed to the lesson, and begin to offer reasoned interaction amongst themselves and with the teacher, the latter is able to lead them towards formulating and structuring the problem for themselves. Finally, the students analyze the required concept and report their results.

INDUCTIVE APPROACH

In contrast to deductive approach, inductive approach, which is labeled as discovery

learning, starts with examples from which a rule is inferred. The procedure is similar to the process of children acquiring their mother tongue. First, learners are exposed to comprehensible language input and they will acquire the system of the rules subconsciously through peripheral attention to language forms. Automaticity will be accomplished naturally and effortlessly through the process of hypothesis testing cycles along the stages of inter-language.

Brown (2001: 189) says that in most contexts, inductive approach is more appropriate because of several reasons. First, it is more in keeping with natural language acquisition and conforms easily to the concept of inter-language development. Second, it allows learners to get a communicative feel for some aspects of language and builds more intrinsic motivation through discovery learning. Even though inductive approach has several advantages, it is obvious that it will work well only in the setting where there is sufficient language input. In the context of English as a foreign language like in Indonesia, where English is not used outside the English class setting, providing sufficient comprehensible input constitutes a hard challenge.

In addition, the classroom activities tend to focus mainly on meaning not on forms and will lead to task based activities where the learners focus is on the completion of task. This fluency orientation often costs the linguistic accuracy. Richards (2002: 67) said: What is often observed in language classroom during fluency work is communication marked by low level of linguistic accuracy. The problem will certainly worsen when the task-based activities are done by learners of early level of inter-language, where there is still high interference from their mother tongue.

RESEARCH METHOD

This part deals with methodology of the research. It is divided into the following sections: research design, variable and study design, population and sample, instrument of the research, data collection technique, and procedure of

collecting data. In this research, the researcher applied quasi experimental design. Quasi experimental design used when there is not possible to randomly assign individual participants to group, because sometimes to receive permission to use schoolchildren in a study, a researcher often has to agree to keep existing classroom intact (Gay et al.; 2006; Jufri, 2007). For this design, there are three kinds of quasi-experimental design namely; the nonequivalent control group design, the time series design and counterbalanced designs. For this research, it used the nonequivalent control group design where it involves random assignment of intact groups to treatments, not random assignment of individuals. The experiment involved two groups with different treatment. The aim of this research was to compare the two groups of students was treated by deductive approach for Ag.2 class and inductive approach for Ag.1 class. Before making the group above, the researcher did pretest. The test assessed the prior ability of the students. A posttest became a measurement of the treatment effect. This model is adopted from Gay et al. (2006: 254)

The technique of scoring used in this research is “one point for one correct answer” method. Every correct answer is given one score. To find out the students’ grammar mastery in using deductive and inductive approaches, technique the data analyzed quantitatively the data result from test. The steps undertaken in the quantitative analyzed are as follow:

1. Scoring the students’ result test, scoring the students’ correct grammar of pretest and posttest by using this formula:

$$\text{The students' final score} = \frac{\text{student's total point}}{\text{the total score of test}} \times 100$$

2. Classifying the score of the students into the following measurement scale, it uses ordinal scale which based on the rank. It is arranged from the highest scale to the lower scale:

Score:

- 80 – 100 is classified as excellent
- 66 – 79 is classified as good

- 56 – 65 is classified as fairly good
 - 46 – 55 is classified as fair
 - 00 – 45 is classified as poor (Iskandar, 2009)
3. Calculating the mean score, standard deviation, frequency table and t-test between grammar achievement of the deductive and inductive approaches by using inferential statistic through SPSS 15.0 evaluation version for Windows.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This part deals with finding of the findings. The findings present the data to see the students' achievement after being taught the materials of reported speech to the deductive and inductive class.

Students' Reported Speech Achievement

Based on result of measurement, it shows that most of the students' pretest results for Ag.2 were in poor category, it was shown that 13 students or 72% out of 18 students got poor category, 4 students or 22 % were in fair category, and 1 student or 6% was in the fairly good. In Ag.1 class, the data of pretest showed that most of the students were in poor category where 13 students or 72% out of 18 students were in poor category, and some of them 4 students or 22% were in fair category. In deductive group there were not students belong to the two top categories; good and excellent categories. It was also found the same like in the inductive group that there were not students in the two top categories. The inductive and deductive group had slight different the deductive was 13 students whereas 14 students were in inductive group.

The data of posttest showed that the students' achievement in Ag.2 was improving. Since only 2 students were in fairly good category and 6 students were in the good category then no one of them was categorized fair and poor. The score of the students tend to spread evenly in fairly good, good, and excellent categories that were 10 students (56%) in excellent category. Most of them were in excellent category (10 students or 56%), 6 students or 33% were in good category,

and 2 students or 11% were in fairly good category.

In Ag.1 class, there is significant improvement of students' achievement on reported speech because students were mostly in the two top categories, most of them were in excellent (15 students or 83%), and 3 students or 17% were in good category whereas no one in the fairly good, fair, and poor categories. From the description of the reported speech in the pretest and posttest results as shown in Table 1 and 2, it gave clear classification as well on the students' achievement on their reported speech after conducting the treatment by doing deductive approach for Ag.1 and inductive approach for Ag.2 . The tabulation data for the students' achievement in the reported speech can be seen as follows:

Table 1. Students' achievement result in pretest and posttest

	Pretest		Posttest	
	Deduct ive	Inducti ve	Deduct ive	Inducti ve
Respondents	18	18	18	18
Mean	36.833	37.388	81.277	88.777
Std. deviation	3	9	8	8
	12.692	12.348	12.111	8.5098
	05	56	28	9

The data in table 1 above showed that the total number for each group was 18 students. The mean score and standard deviation showed difference in pretest and posttest to both of the groups. The data collected was based on the computation using inferential statistics through SPSS version 15.0. From the data showed in Table 3, the pretest mean score of Ag.1 and Ag.2 was slight different for the score before giving the treatment. After giving the treatment, the posttest score to both of the groups; deductive and inductive groups showed a difference score of mean score. It means that there was an improvement in reported speech of deductive and inductive groups after giving the treatment.

The Calculation of T-Test From Pretest and Posttest For Deductive Group

The following table showed the achievement of the students’ pretest and posttest in deductive group or Ag,2 before and after giving treatment, the result of t-test was calculated using inferential statistics through SPSS program version 15.0.

Table 2. The t-test of the students’ pretest and posttest for deductive group

Variable	α	Probability Value
Pretest and Posttest	0.05	0.00

Table 2 above showed that Probability Value was smaller than α ($0.00 < 0.05$). It is concluded that there is a significant difference before treatment in pretest and after treatment in posttest. In other words, there was an improvement on the students’ reported speech achievement between pretest and posttest in deductive group or Ag. 2 after the treatment.

The Calculation of T-Test From Pretest and Posttest for Inductive Group

The following table showed the achievement of the students’ pretest and posttest in inductive group or Ag.1 before and after giving treatment, the result of t-test was calculated using inferential statistics through SPSS program version 15.0.

Table 3. The t-test of the students’ pretest and posttest for inductive group

Variable	α	Probability Value
Pretest and Posttest	0.05	0.00

Table 3 above showed that Probability Value was smaller than α ($0.00 < 0.05$). It is concluded that there is a significant difference before treatment in pretest and after treatment in posttest. In other words, there was an

improvement on the students’ reported speech between pretest and posttest in inductive group after the treatment.

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students’ Pretest

Before the treatment conducted, both of the deductive and inductive groups were given pretest to know the students achievement on reported speech. The purpose of the test was to find out whether both deductive and inductive group were in the same level or not. The standard deviation was meant to know how close the scores to the mean score.

Table 4. The mean score and standard deviation of students’ pretest

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation
Deductive	36.8333	12.69205
Inductive	37.3889	12.34856

Table 4 above showed that the mean score of students’ pretest of deductive group was 36.8333 and inductive group was 37.3889. Based on the table above, it is concluded that the students mean score of deductive group was statistically the same with inductive group. Gay (2006:124) states that when the variables have equal intervals, the difference between close score was essentially the same to the students mean score between experimental and control group was relatively the same. Those deductive and inductive groups had the same or relatively the same baseline knowledge in reported speech material before the treatment. Further explanation for students’ achievement on the posttest score after the treatment was done in order to find the significant difference, the researcher applied t-test formula to analyze whether or not it is significant. In this case, the posttest score was analyzed at the significant level 0.05 or α equals to 0.05 by using inferential statistics through SPSS version 15.0.

The Calculation of T-Test from Pretest for Deductive and Inductive Group

The data shown in Table 7 below showed the achievement of deductive and inductive group before giving the treatment, the result of t-test was calculated using inferential statistics through SPSS version 15.0.

Table 5. The t-test of the students' pretest

Variable	α	Probability Value
Pretest	0.05	0.89

Based on the statistics test of pretest in significant (2-tailed) column, Probability Value was greater than α ($0.89 > 0.05$). It means that H_0 was accepted and alternative hypotheses were rejected. In other words, there was no significant difference between the students' reported speech of both groups, deductive and inductive groups, before the treatment. Because of the deductive and inductive groups in pretest was the same level in reported speech, the treatment was then conducted to both groups. The deductive group was taught by applying deductive approach and inductive group was taught by applying inductive approach.

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Posttest

In this part, the researcher presents the difference of the students' reported speech subject after treatment. The mean score of the deductive group and the inductive group in pretest was not significantly different. It means that they had the same ability on the test content before treatment. The deductive group was taught by applying deductive approach and inductive group was taught by applying inductive approach. After treatment, the researcher gave posttest both deductive group and inductive group or Ag.1 and Ag.2 to find out the ability of students in reported speech subject whether the same or not and analyzed using inferential statistics through with SPSS 15.0 for windows evaluation version. The result of posttest was showed in table 6 below.

Table 6. The mean score and standard deviation of students' posttest

Group	Mean	Standard Deviation
Deductive	81.2778	12.11128
Inductive	88.7778	8.50989

Table 6 above showed that the mean scores of both groups were different after the treatment implemented. The mean score of deductive group was 81.2778 and the inductive group was 88.7778. It means that the mean score of inductive group is higher than deductive group ($88.7778 > 81.2778$) and the standard deviation for deductive group was 12.11128 and inductive group was 8.50989. It showed that after giving the treatment, the result of inductive group on the mean score was higher than the deductive group. It proved that the inductive group with applying inductive approach is giving significant improvement to students' ability in reported speech than treatment with deductive approach.

The Calculation of T-Test from Posttest for Deductive and Inductive Group

The data shown in table 7 below indicated the achievement of deductive and inductive groups after the treatment. The result of t-test was calculated using inferential statistics through SPSS 15.0.

Table 7. The t-test of the students' posttest

Variable	α	Probability Value
Posttest	0.05	0.04

The data of posttest showed that the statistical hypothesis is based on statistics test in Significant (2-tailed), it is concluded that Probability Value was smaller than α ($0.04 < 0.05$). It means that H_1 and H_2 were accepted and, of course, H_0 was rejected. It is concluded that there was a significant difference between posttest in deductive group and posttest inductive group.

Based on the problem statement to compare the effectiveness for both approaches, H_2

was accepted because inductive approach was more effective than deductive approach. And to know the strictly different both deductive and inductive, it needs statistic hypothesis which shows the numerical differences to the two groups. By looking at the numbers, it indicates that inductive approach was able to give significantly greater contribution than deductive approach. The H_1 : $\mu^1 \neq \mu^2$ deals on this research because the two groups achieve the different achievement ($\mu^1 \neq \mu^2$). So, it stated that the applying of inductive approach is higher than deductive approach (88.7778 > 81.2778) in reported speech mastery.

In this section, the discussion deals with the application of deductive and inductive approaches in teaching reported speech. The application of inductive and deductive approaches in teaching reported speech was conducting to the second semester of English and Language Department of Adab and Humanities faculty of Alauddin Islamic State University improve the students' score. It was proved by the result of the mean score rate pretest and posttest in inductive group was 37.3889 and 88.7778 and the mean score rate pretest and posttest in deductive group was 36.8333 and 81.2778. Thus, the hypothesis for H_1 is accepted and H_0 is rejected which indicates that there is a difference between pretest and posttest.

If both strategies were compared in the implementation of teaching reported speech, the application of inductive approach was better than deductive approach. Although both of them could be applied in teaching reported speech and they gave improvement for the students' achievement, but the applying of inductive approach in teaching reported speech improved significantly.

Based on the result of the students' score in pretest, both groups have the same ability in reported speech subject. It means that there is no significant difference between the students' test result in Ag.1 and Ag.2 classes before giving treatment. But, after giving treatment, the students' achievement taught reported speech by applying inductive approach is higher than deductive approach.

The comparison of the improvement of reported speech ability of both groups could be shown by analyzing the result of posttest. Most of the students' result showed in posttest for inductive group, 15 students or 83% were categorized in excellent and 3 students or 17% were classified in good category. Otherwise, the posttest result of deductive group showed that most of the students also were in excellent (10 students or 56%), there were 6 students or 33% in good category and the two of the rest students got fairly good category or 11%. So, no one of the students got two down categories; fair and poor.

Relating to the previous related studies, inductive approach was a good medium not only to increase students' achievement in studying reported speech but also to improve students' tenses. Reported speech provides some aspect to learn tenses, common expression and also enjoyable material which derives the style to inverted way in the language classroom.

There are some reasons why inductive got higher achievement than deductive approach, namely;

1. The teacher tried to build learners' experiences.
2. Exposing students to a concrete instance, or instances, of a concept.
3. Learners were encouraged to observe patterns, raise questions, or make generalization from their observation.
4. And the teacher's role was to create the opportunities and the context in which students can successfully make the appropriate generalization.
5. Guide the students as necessary.

Comparing to the deductive, inductive approach was effective in giving the students opportunities to practice the language. It promoted a new medium of teaching reported speech since it facilitated the students to be more critical in learning process. Inductive approach gives the students opportunities to express their ability with the prior knowledge and fix them after having the explanation from the lecturer and also it becomes

useful sources of practice and reinforcement in the areas of critical thinking.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the data analysis in the previous chapter, it is concluded that 1) there was significant improvement for the deductive approach, 2) there was also significant improvement for inductive approach, and 3) to measure the effectiveness for both approaches, the data showed that inductive approach was more effective than deductive approach. There are some reasons for the effectiveness of inductive approach rather than deductive approach. They are; the teacher tried to build learners' experiences. Teacher Exposed students to a concrete instance, or instances, of a concept. Learners were encouraged to observe patterns, raise questions, or make generalization from their observation. And the teacher's role was to create the opportunities and the context in which students can successfully make the appropriate generalization. Guide the students as necessary.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Prosedure Penelitian (Suatu Pendekatan Praktik)*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Brown, H. D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles*. San Fransisco: San Fransisco State University.
- Canale, Michael and Swain, Meril. 1980. *Approaches to Communicative Competence*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Center.
- Chernovaty, Leonid. 1990. *Grammar Teaching: the inductive vs deductive issue revisited*. A. H. Gorky University. Kharkov.
- Dameus, Alix, Tilley, Daniel S, Brant, Molly. Sep. 2004. NACTA Journal.
- Doff, A. 2000. *Teach English: A training course for teachers (14th ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, MC, Hengst J, Nolan M, Tranel D, Cohen NJ. 2005. *Language and memory: Analyzing discourse of individuals with amnesia*. Presentation at the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA); San Diego, CA.
- Dulay, Heidi, Burt, Marina, and Stephen Krashen. 1982. *Language Two*. Oxford University Press
- Gay, L., R. 2006. *Educational research competencies for analysis and application and writing*. New Jersey: Prentice hall, Inc.
- Goner, Phillips, and Walters. 1995. *Teaching Practice Handbook: Structures: Grammar and Function*. Heinemann.
- Halim, Alwiyah. 2008. *Using Inductive Learning in Teaching Grammar to Improve Students' Vocabulary Mastery to the First Year Students of SMP Negeri 3 Makassar*. Unpublished Thesis Makassar: Thesis FBS UNM. Makassar.
- Iskandar. 2009. *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan dan Sosial*. Gaung Persada. Press Jakarta.
- Iskandar, Margaret. 2005. *Improving Grammar Mastery through Self-Revision in Graded Writing Activities*. Unpublished Thesis. Makassar: PPs UNM.
- Jufri. 1990. *The Level of Mastery with Regard to the Used of English Tenses*. Unpublished Thesis Makassar: Hasanuddin University Press.
- Jufri, J., 2007. *Metode Penelitian Bahasa, Sastra dan Budaya*.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis. Issues and Implications*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, Stephen D. and Terrel, Tracy D. 1983. *The Natural Approach. Language*

- Acquisition in the Classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Long & J. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL* (pp. 33-44). New Jersey: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Mastropieri, M. A., T. E. Scruggs, and K. Butcher. 1997. *How effective is inquiry learning for students with mild disability? Journal of special Education* 29 (2).
- Nunan, David. 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology*. London: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Omaggio, Alice C. 1986. *Teaching Language in Context*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers Inc.
- Prince, Michael J, Felder, Richard M. 2006. *Inductive Teaching and Learning Methods: Definitions, Comparisons, and Research Bases*. Journal of Engineering Education.
- Richards, J.C. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, USA.
- Rivers, Wilga M., Temperley, Mary S. 1978. *A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Oxford University Press.
- Rubiyati. 1989. *English Mastery of Secondary School Students with Regard to Word Order*. Unpublished Thesis Makassar: Hasanuddin University Press.
- Sammen. 2005. *Grammar Material Evaluation for Elementary Level at Self-Access Center of Tadulako University*. Unpublished Thesis. Makassar: PPs UNM.
- SchrampherAzar, Betty. 1989. *Understanding and using English Grammar, second edition*. United States of America: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Sibali, Hijriah. 1990. *Problem in Using Modal Auxiliary by Students of SMA Ranggong Daend Romo Takalar*. Unpublished Thesis Makassar. Hasanuddin University Press.
- Sugiono. 2008. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Cet. 6. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Supriadi, Kiki. 2008. *Grammatical Errors in English Writing of the Students at SMA Negeri 11 Makassar*. Unpublished thesis. Makassar: PPs UNM.
- Thornbury, Scott. 2001. *How to Teach Grammar*. London: Pearson Education Limited England.
- Ur, P. 1999. *Grammar Practice activities: A Practical guide for teachers (12th ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walpole, Ronals. E. 1997. *Pengantarstatistika*. Edisi ketiga. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Widodo, Handoyo Puji. 2006. *Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar*. The English Program, Politeknik Negeri Jember.
- Wilkins, D. A. 1976. *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.