UNMAS DENPASAR

USING INDUCTIVE AND DEDUCTIVE CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING TASKS TO PROMOTE LEARNERS' AWARENESS OF CONDITIONAL SENTENCES

Jonathan Tanihardjo[1], Rex Stardy[2]

The English Department
Bunda Mulia University
Tangerang, Indonesia
jtanihardjo@bundamulia.ac.id[1], rexstardy@yahoo.com [2]

Abstract

Teaching grammar has been a challenge for English teachers as it is viewed as complex, and unimportant in a communication. In order to make the process of teaching and learning effective, many language practitioners, teachers, lecturers have been trying to devise a variety of approaches, methods, techniques and tools. In this study, Consciousness-Raising Tasks (CRTs) were proposed as a tool to help teachers in grammar instructions and students to become fully aware of the target grammar feature. The researcher had a comparison of the inductive and deductive methods in the teaching of specific language rule, that was mixed conditional sentences. In the inductive method, learners used the noticing strategies. In the deductive method, however, learners were given a list of grammatical rules and examples. A total of 28 students from the English department, which were then categorized into two groups, were involved in this study; the first group used the inductive methods, and the second used the deductive method. The instruments used in this study were pre- and post-tests. There were three steps that were taken. First of all, the pre-test was administered to both groups. Next, the different treatment was given. Finally, the post-test was given after the treatment was finished. The results show that consciousness-raising tasks with the inductive and deductive methods were both effective to promote awareness and give better understanding of the target language rules, since the results of the post-tests for both groups demonstrated significant difference compared to the results of the pre-tests.

Keywords – *Inductive Consciousness-Raising Tasks, Deductive Consciousness-Raising Tasks, effectiveness, conditional sentences, awareness*

Introduction

One of the most difficult aspects of language for language learners is grammar. Many language learners are reluctant to memorize a language's rules by heart and understand them because learners believe that vocabulary plays more important role than grammar. However, grammar is important to prevent misunderstandings of the intended meaning.

According to Gewerhr (1998), grammar is significant; hence, the main focus of a language classroom should be on teaching grammar. The subject of how to teach grammar has always been debated among language instructors. This is the reason why opinions on grammar instruction methods are still divided.

Many teachers and researchers conduct studies to determine the methods, approaches, and techniques in the teaching of grammar because they recognize that students need to be proficient in the language in order for them to use it correctly. Despite the fact that many teachers have been teaching grammar in a variety of ways, students' performance still contains errors in terms of grammatical accuracy.

Realizing this, the researcher would like to have Consciousness-Raising Tasks (CRTs) as tools to help teachers in grammar instructions. The consciousness-raising strategy has been utilized worldwide to instruct students in a particular linguistic element. Raising consciousness is a technique for making students aware of language usage, regardless of whether they were previously aware of it subconsciously.

Tanihardjo (2016) conducted research comparing the instruction of the participial phrase using deductive and inductive methods. His research had two goals: 1) to determine whether the students could identify the use of the participial phrases, and 2) to see whether they could actually use the target grammar rules. He claimed that the deductive teaching method, which is extensively and frequently used in grammar instruction, did not turn out as planned. To put it differently, the student-centered method outperformed the teacher-centered method.

Next, the simple present tense was taught using inductive consciousness-raising exercises by Nugroho (2018). His study sought to determine whether the tasks could raise students' understanding of the relevant grammar rules. The outcomes demonstrated that these kinds of tasks were effective and might produce superior overall outcomes between the pre- and post-tests. After receiving the treatment, the students were able to identify and become conscious of the errors they had made on the pre-test and fixed them on the post-test.

In a similar study, Nugroho (2020) examined the efficacy of inductive consciousness-raising exercises in the instruction of the simple future tense. The aim of the study was to determine the impact of the exercises on the students' knowledge of the structure and comprehension of the meaning of "will," "be going to," and "the present continuous" form. The findings showed that the inductive consciousness-raising exercises were superior to PPP (the conventional teaching method) in terms of enhancing students' comprehension of the meaning differences among the three forms, as well as their knowledge of the simple future tense structure. In this study, there are two methods compared, namely deductive and inductive methods. In the inductive method, learners are expected to use the noticing strategies, where learners discover the rules by themselves. In the deductive method, however, learners are given a list of grammatical rules and examples.

This research is aimed to discover which of the two methods -inductive and deductive- with Consciousness-raising tasks as the tools shows more satisfying results, promotes awareness and gives better understanding of the grammatical rules, specifically mixed conditional sentences to language learners.

Methods

The instruments used in this study are pre- and post-tests. The pre-test assesses students' prior knowledge of particular grammatical rules, while the post-test evaluates the effect of the treatment on students' understanding of the grammar rules. Students must identify the target language in both assessments.

In both pre- and post-tests, the test items were in particular about mixed conditional sentences, of which forms were in the present, past, and future. The mixed conditional sentences are used to show unreal situations which are in contrast to reality. In order to see whether or not the students had the knowledge of the target language rules, and were able to identify the correct applications of the rules, 10 multiple-choices questions in which various situations were brought about were addressed. Both tests were carried out by utilizing Google forms, with which the students' performances were automatically assessed and

scored after they were done. The participants in this study were 28 English Department students in the English Grammar 3 course in total. Two groups of students were formed, and each group was given different methods of instruction. Treatment was through inductive consciousness-raising tasks to the first group consisting 13 participants and deductive consciousness-raising activities to the second with 15 participants.

Conditional sentences were the target language rules. The teacher distributed task sheets to the groups of students with deductive consciousness-raising tasks without providing an explanation to the rules. The tasks provided instances of syntactic or grammatical rules together with the target language rules. The instructor acted as a facilitator, allowing the students to have a discussion over the topic, learn and understand the exposed target rules. On the other hand, the group that completed the inductive consciousness-raising tasks received distinct grammatical instruction as part of the treatment. The learners were tasked with creating an explicit rule that defines the grammatical property indicated by the language data within the tasks. In this specific treatment, the instructor also served as the facilitator, allowing the students to think, identify, analyse, present their points of view, and formulate the rules.

In the process, there were three steps that were taken. First of all, the pre-test was administered to both groups. Next, the different treatment to both groups with Inductive and Deductive consciousness-raising tasks were given. Finally, the post-test was given after the treatment was finished for both groups. The time allotment for each test was about 25 minutes, and each treatment for 60 minutes.

Finding and Discussion

According to Constance (1989), an inductive approach requires students to come up with the form or pattern on their own and places more emphasis on the structure that is being learnt. Similarly, according to Ellis (2002), Consciousness-raising task activities can be inductive in nature, asking learners to create the explicit rule based on supplied data. Furthermore, Richard (1992), as cited in Roza (2014), states that inductive language teaching requires students to learn grammar rules by their own use of the language rather than having the teacher teach them. Some researchers (e.g., Felder & Henriques, 1995; Haight, Herron, & Cole, 2007) contend that an inductive approach is a more effective way to teach grammar.

In contrast to inductive approach, Fortune (1992) and Widodo (2006) define the deductive teaching as a traditional approach in which information about target language and rules are driven at the beginning of the class and continued with examples. They further claim that the deductive approach, in which the rule is explicitly given to the learners to complete a task, is the most effective strategy.

Numerous studies have examined the effectiveness of Consciousness-raising tasks (Fotos, 1994; Mohamed, 2004). Mohamed (2004) has also investigated the effectiveness of both deductive and inductive Consciousness-raising tasks activities from the viewpoint of the students. The results show that learners see both types of tasks as equally beneficial and do not have a clear preference for one over the other. These results imply that, when specific instruction is required, both deductive and inductive Consciousness-raising tasks are useful learning aids and could be applied to improve learners' knowledge of language forms.

PROCEEDINGS
INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR
LITERATES
LINGUISTICS, LITERATURE, CULTURE, AND ARTS
e-ISSN : 3025-9002
UNMAS DENPASAR

Ten mixed conditional sentence questions connecting past, present, and future occurrences were included in the pre- and post-tests. These questions depict hypothetical (imagined or not necessarily real or true) circumstances. The students had to choose the appropriate use of IF conditional on a variety of scenarios that were presented to them.

Table 1. Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Inductive_Pretest	38.46	13	24.443	6.779
	Inductive_PostTest	80.77	13	11.875	3.294
Pair 2	Deductive_Pretest	45.33	15	23.258	6.005
	Deductive_PostTest	80.00	15	17.321	4.472

The average results of the pre- and post-tests for the two groups with a total of 28 test-takers are displayed in the table above: 1) Thirteen participants in one group that completed inductive consciousness-raising tasks; 2) fifteen participants in another group that completed deductive consciousness-raising tasks.

The group which completed the inductive consciousness-raising tasks showed the pre- and post-test averages of 38.46 and 80.77 respectively. On the other hand, the average of the pre- and post-tests for the group which completed the deductive consciousness-raising tasks were 45.33 and 80.00 respectively. The findings demonstrate that both the inductive and deductive methods improved students' comprehension and scores: the group using the inductive method showed an increase in post-test scores of 42.11 points, while the group using the deductive method displayed an improvement in scores of 34.67 points.

Table 2. Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Inductive_Pretest - Inductive_PostTest	-42.308	23.149	6.421	-56.297	-28.319	-6.589	12	.000
Pair 2	Deductive_Pretest - Deductive_PostTest	-34.667	21.336	5.509	-46.482	-22.851	-6.293	14	.000

A paired sample t-test is used to assess how well consciousness-raising tasks with the two methods -the inductive and deductive- work in this study.

The t-value is 6.589 as can be seen in the paired sample test of pair 1 (pre- and post-test of the inductive technique). The t-value of 1% significance is 3.055, and the t-value of 5% significance is 2.179 from the t-distribution table, with a degree of freedom of 12. When

the t-value of pair 1 is compared to the t-values of both 5% and 1% significance from the t-distribution table, the data show that 6.589 > 2.179 and 6.589 > 3.055 respectively. The results show that either the alternative hypothesis is accepted or the null hypothesis is entirely rejected, which means that there is a substantial difference between the pre- and post-test results at both statistical significance levels. To put it differently, the teaching method using the inductive consciousness-raising tasks was successful to promote the students' awareness of the forms and functions.

Conversely, the t-value in pair 2 (the deductive method's pre- and post-tests) is 6.293. The t-value of 1% significance is 2.977, and the t-value of 5% significance is 2.145, based on the t-distribution table, with 14 degrees of freedom. When the t-value of pair 2 is compared to the t-values of both 5% and 1% significance from the t-distribution table, the data show that 6.293 > 2.145 and 6.293 > 2.977. The results show that the alternative hypothesis is accepted or the null hypothesis is fully rejected, which is identical to the outcomes of the prior method. With the hypothesis being accepted, it shows that there is a significant difference between the results of the pre- and post-tests for both statistical significance level. In other words, the teaching method using the deductive consciousness-raising tasks worked effectively in promoting the students' awareness of the language forms and functions.

From the findings, it can be concluded that both inductive and deductive consciousness-raising tasks methods were successful in significantly raising the average scores of the pre- and post-test for both groups, and promoting the students' awareness. However, the group that applied the inductive method received scores in the post-tests that were obviously higher -42.11 points- than the group that applied the deductive method -36.47 points.

The study's findings were unexpected because Tanihardjo (2016), Nugroho (2018), and Nugroho (2020) asserted that the inductive method, in which students are encouraged to observe, reflect, and draw their own conclusions, is more effective in teaching grammar than the deductive method or traditional way in which the teaching process focusses more on the role of teachers. However, the results of this study demonstrate that consciousness-raising tasks can be learned using both deductive and inductive methods, with the results being equally effective to promote awareness and give better understanding of the target language rules.

Conclusions

According to Paul (1990), educators should emphasize problem solving over memorization and encourage collaborative work in the classroom. Additionally, he critiqued teacher-centered learning since it does not provide students with the ability to collect, evaluate, synthesize, or analyze data. On the other hand, the findings of this study demonstrate that consciousness-raising tasks utilizing deductive and inductive methods were both effective. Mohammed (2004) supported this notion by finding that the consciousness-raising tasks with both deductive and inductive are equally useful. This implies that both kinds of tasks are useful teaching tools that can be applied to improve students' understanding of language forms. Moreover, it may be deduced that variations in circumstances, unique attributes of every pupil, and additional potential factors could lead

PROCEEDINGS
INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR
LITERATES
LINGUISTICS, LITERATURE, CULTURE, AND ARTS
e-ISSN : 3025-9002
UNMAS DENPASAR

to disparate outcomes. Both methods are equally successful in this study, but other investigations with similar methods will possibly produce different outcomes.

References

Constance, S. (1989). A Comparison of Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching Foreign Langauges. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(4), 395-403.

Ellis, R. (2002). Does Form-focued Instruction Affect the Acquisition of Implicit Knowledge? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24*(2), 223-236. doi:https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263102002073

Felder, R., & Henriques, E. (1995). Learning and Teaching Styles in Foreign and Second Language Education. *Foreign Language Annals, 28*(1), 21-31.

Fortune, A. (1992). Self-study Grammar Practice: Learners Views and Preferences. *ELT Journal, 46*(2), 160-171.

Fotos, S. S. (1994). Intergrating Grammar Instruction and Communicative Language Use Through Grammar Consciousness-raising Tasks. *28*(2), 323-351.

Gewehr, W. (1998). *Aspects of Modern Language Teaching in Europe.* New York: Routledge.

Haight, C. E., Herron, C., & Cole, S. P. (2007). The Effects of Deductive and Guided Inductive Instructional Approaches on the Learning of Grammar in the Elementary Foreign Language College Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 40*, 288-310.

Mohamed, N. (2004). Consciousness-raising Task: A Learner Perspective. *ELT Journal, 58*(3), 228-237.

Nugroho, A. (2018). Using Inductive Consciousness-Raising Tasks to Teach the Simple Present Tense. *The Internasional English Language Teachers and Lecturers (iNELTAL) Conference* (pp. 183-188). Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.

Nugroho, A. (2020). Investigating the Effectiveness of Inductive Consciousness-Raising Tasks to Teach the Simple Future Tense. *Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya (KOLITA) 18* (pp. 50-55). Jakarta: Unika Atma Jaya.

Paul, R. C. (1990). *Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapildly Changing World.* Rohnert Park, California: Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique, Sonoma State University.

Roza, V. (2014). Using Inductive Concsciousness Raising Tasks to Teach Grammar at the College. *Proceedings of ISELTS FBS Universitas Negeri Padang.* Retrieved from http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/selt/article/view/6742

Tanihardjo, J. (2016). Analysis of the Effectiveness of Deductive and Inductive Method in the Teaching of Participial Phrase: A Case Study. *Twelfth Conference on English Studies* (pp. 149-152). Jakarta: Atma Jaya Catholic University.

Widodo, H. P. (2006). Approaches and Procedures for Teaching Grammar. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 5*(1), 122-141.