Effectiveness of an Inductive Approach on the Teaching of Grammar in the Writing Course

Parichart Charernwiwatthanasri [1]

Abstract

The purposes of this research were: 1) to study whether the use of the inductive approach can improve students' grammatical errors in the writing course at Suratthani Rajabhat University 2) to investigate issues in grammatical errors in the texts written by the second year English major students at Suratthani Rajabhat University and 3) to find out students' attitudes towards learning grammar through an inductive approach. The subjects of this study were 80 second year students majoring in English, Faculty of Education at Suratthani Rajabhat University, Suratthani Province. This research was conducted in the first semester of academic year 2009 in the writing course, 182573 Formal Paragraph Writing. They were selected based on their same levels of achievement in English skills and were put into 2 groups: the experimental group and the control group. The experimental group was taught with 17 grammatical items by using the inductive approach, while the control group was taught with the same 17 grammatical items without the inductive approach. The writing skills were also taught in all classes. Four research instruments were used in this study: the pre-test consisting of 100 items of multiple choices grammar test and the writing test for both group; the inductive approach treatment designed in forms of lesson plans for the experimental group; the post-test for both groups and; the questionnaire determining experimental group students' attitudes towards learning grammar through an inductive approach.

The findings showed that the inductive approach positively affected the teaching of grammar in the writing course. The mean scores of the post-test in the experimental and control groups were significantly different at the 0.01 level. This indicates that the students who were trained through the inductive approach had the significantly higher rate of knowledge than did the students who were taught with the common lessons through the regular lectures. After the treatment, there were differences on frequencies of error occurrences between both groups, that is, the experimental groups did significantly better in the post-tests than in the pre-test. This showed that the inductive approach, through the writing classes, could improve learners' grammatical errors. It was also found that there

---

[1]   Lecturer, Faculty of International Studies, Prince of Songkla University, Phuket Campus
Parichart.c@phuket.psu.ac.th

were totally 25 issues of grammatical errors which were frequently produced by the students ranking from sentence to word levels. These issues of errors were about verbs, tenses, the first language interference, the use of pronouns, the use of nouns, possessives, the use of articles, prepositions, agreement of subject and verbs, word order, gerund, subject prominent language, phrasal verbs, conjunctions, infinitives, relative clauses, incomplete sentences, adjectives, modals, there-be, run-on sentences, comparison, voices, if clauses and the use of adverbs. From the findings, students possessed high positive attitudes towards learning English grammar through an inductive approach. Teaching and learning English grammar through an inductive approach was considered satisfactory in the students' opinions.

1. Introduction

According to the Basic Education Curriculum B.E. 2544 (Education: 2001), English is one of the school's compulsory subjects starting from level 1 in the primary education. The role of English in Thailand is quite important as it is in many other developing countries. With the economic downturn in Thailand a few years ago, a large number of Thai companies have embraced cooperation regionally and internationally. Mergers, associations, and takeovers are common and English is used as the means to communicate, negotiate and execute transactions by participants where one partner can be a native speaker of English or none of the partners are native speakers of English. However, Thais' level of English proficiency is low in comparison with many countries in Asia such as Malaysia, Philippines, and Singapore. It can be said that up to now English language teaching in Thailand has not prepared Thais for the changing world.

In Thailand, English language is taught mainly by Thai native teachers and English appears to be taught through the Thai language as the medium of instructions. The lessons are limited to grammatical points and comprehension reading which require heavy explanations in Thai. Moreover, many language teachers have been used to the traditional style of language teaching since the time they themselves were school students and found it too difficult to change. Hence, they often teach with the same way as they were taught. That is, in teaching grammar, a teacher explains rules of the language and tries to make learners understand and memorize them. Puntakerngamorn (as cited in Attapan, 2002) shared the idea that after several years of study, many students know English without being able to use it, even in expressing their own intentions. Due to the fact that the students only study English to pass examinations, they are not well-motivated and are deprived of the opportunities to practice English in real life situations. They are not able to communicate effectively in English due to numerous factors.

Coulter (1983) stated that communications in the target language and production of own sentences, covering both spoken and written languages, are also impracticable without accurate and efficient understanding of language structures, which play a part enhancing students' creation of new sentences that consequently, the attention of the proposed study is placed toward enlargement of students' English language writing, via the improvement of their understandings about how the language works.

Due to the teaching problems mentioned earlier, the inductive approach is one effective approach used in teaching language. Felder & Henriques (1995) mentioned that an inductive approach comes from inductive reasoning stating that a reasoning progression precedes from particulars, such as observations, measurements, or data to generalities, for example, rules, laws, concepts or theories. The inductive approach is defined as an approach to language teaching in which learners are not taught grammatical or other types of rules directly but are left to discover or induce rules from their experience of using the language (Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics, 1997, p. 98-99). According to Brown (2000), an inductive approach is an inductive reasoning storing a number of specific instances and inducing a general law or rule or conclusion that governs or subsumes the specific instances. Learners must infer certain rules and meanings from all the data around them.

With the inductive approach, Winter (1989) stated that it is compared as the Audio-Lingual Method where learning is defined as habit formation. Students learned by rote of numerous examples of a structure until the use of that structure became automatic. They were not consciously aware of what structures they were learning unless at the end of the lesson the teacher gave them the appropriate rule to describe what they had already supposedly learned. The teacher's role is to provide meaningful contexts to encourage demonstration of the rule, while the students evolve the rules from the examples of its use and continued practice (Rivers & Temperley, 1978). Fischer (1979) mentioned that the inductive approach emphasizes on teachers' guidance to help students to formulate the grammar rules from given model sentences and texts. Teachers ask students questions to help induce or prompt the target rules in order to write complete sentences. Thus, with some help from teachers, students can discover the rules on their own. Further, Paradowski (2007) stated that the inductive approach is student centered and allows learners to become deeply involved in the language they are writing and offers potential for reflection. In the process of learning to write (learning-and-doing) they feel more important, are less passive, and do not get bored so easily during the lesson.

Winter (1989) said that the inductive technique can render great service to teachers who have problems with keeping their students disciplined, concentrated and occupied, as it partly obviates these problems. Knowing that they can work out the rules from examples by themselves greatly increases learners' motivation, makes them attentive, more actively involved in-and confident and enthusiastic about-the learning process rather than simply passive recipients, and at the same time contributes to its effectiveness. Thus, the inductive approach may solve those problems because of these reasons. First of all, in an inductive approach, the students learn the use of the structure through practice of the language in context, and later realize the rules from the practical examples. Second, according to Krashen (2002), an inductive approach relates to learning and acquisition in SLA theory. The inductive approach relates to subconscious learning processes similar to the concept of language acquisition. According to this approach, learners learn the system of language, for example, grammar or sentence rules, in the same way as children acquire their first or second language. In this regard, meaningful interaction in the target language or natural communication is more important than the form of the language. For this reason, error correction and explicit teaching of the rule are de-emphasized. Most importantly, utterances are easily understood. Moreover, when the inductive approach is applied, the learners learn the rule unconsciously.

Furthermore, in the case of pedagogical grammar; most experts claimed that the inductive approach can also be called rule-discovery learning. It suggests that a teacher teach grammar starting with presenting some examples of sentences. In this sense, learners understand grammatical rules from the examples. The presentation of grammatical rules can be spoken or written. There are several advantages of an inductive approach applied in the language teaching and learning. Firstly, learners are trained to be familiar with the rule discovery; this could enhance learning autonomy and self-reliance. Secondly, the learners are more active in the learning process, rather than being simply passive recipients. In this approach, they will be motivated. Lastly, the approach involves learners' pattern-recognition and problem solving abilities in which particular learners are interested in this challenge.

There are a number of researches conducted in the area of an inductive approach. Shih (2008) conducted the research to explore the effect of inductive approach in contrast to conventional deductive approach in teaching English relative clauses. Significant proficiency-by-treatment interaction was found; high-achievers, in particular, benefited more from inductive approach than from deductive one. Sun and Wang (2007) studied the relative effectiveness of inductive and deductive approaches to learning collocations by using a concordancer. The results showed that the inductive group improved significantly better than the deductive group in the performance of collocation learning and easy collocations seem to be more suitable in the concordancer learning setting.

In addition, Pongsiriwet (2001) stated that learning writing in English is not a simple task, particularly to non-native learners. ESL/EFL learners have put a lot of time and efforts into acquiring the language and learning to write. In their attempt to master the writing skill, learners inevitably make errors. One of the major difficulties with writing in English lies in the grammar of the language, which has been found to be a major source in writing errors. ESL/EFL learners have committed various types of grammatical errors in their written products. Since grammatical accuracy is an essential feature of standard written English, it will be valuable to ESL/EFL teachers to be familiar with types of errors learners actually make in order that they can help improve learners' grammatical accuracy in writing. Due to the problems stated earlier, the present study is designed to address issues concerning grammatical aspects of English writing. It attempts to examine whether an inductive approach improve students' writing paragraph accuracy, and investigate grammatical errors in student writing in students' English writing.

2. Purpose

The purposes of this research were: 1) to study whether the use of the inductive approach can improve students' grammatical errors in the writing course at Suratthani Rajabhat University, 2) to investigate issues in grammatical errors in the texts written by these second year English major students at Suratthani Rajabhat University and 3) to find out students' attitudes towards learning grammar through an inductive approach.

3. Methodology

Subjects

The subjects of this study were 80 second year students majoring in English, Faculty of Education at Suratthani Rajabhat University, Suratthani Province in academic year 2009. The research was conducted in Formal Paragraph Writing class. The subjects were put into 2 groups: the experimental group and the control group. Each group comprised 40 students.

Instruments

The research instruments of in this study were the pre- test for both groups, the inductive approach treatment designed as seventeen lesson plans for the experimental groups and the post-test for both groups. The pre-test were of 2 parts, the first part was the grammar test. It was built as the 100 items of 4 multiple choices composing of 17 grammatical issues. The second part was the writing test. The subjects were asked to write the 2 compositions: one

was emphasized on the present phase of time, while the other was about the past events. The pre-tests were administered on the experimental and control groups in the first to the second weeks: the grammatical test was in the first week followed by the writing in the second week. The two subject groups were assigned to write a paragraph of one hundred and fifty words within ninety minutes on the same two topics. The grammatical test was designed as proficiency test so the scores from this test were proficiency scores. The scores in the writing test, however, were the collection of errors. The inductive approach treatment was included in teaching materials of the courses constructed by the researcher. Although the same materials were taught to the both groups, only the experimental group was trained with the inductive approach. The pre-test paper was used as the post-test at the end of the semester for both groups to see the differences between the pre-test and the post-test of each group and between the post-tests of two groups. The last was the questionnaire investigating the students' attitudes towards the use of an inductive approach in learning English, which was administered to the experimental group after they had passed the inductive approach treatment and post-test.

4. Data

To determine the effectiveness of learning English grammar through an inductive approach, the mean scores of the grammar test, as the pre-test and the post-test, of the experimental and control groups were compared using the paired sample t-test to find out whether there was any significant difference in the English grammar knowledge of the subjects in each group before and after the experiment.

To investigate issues in grammatical errors in the texts written by the second year English major students at Suratthani Rajabhat University, the issues of grammatical errors were also analyzed from the writing test, as the pre-test and the post-test, of the experimental and control groups were counted to compare the differences of their frequencies of occurrence, the percentage before and after the experiment.

To find out students' attitudes towards learning grammar through an inductive approach, the experimental group's responses to the questionnaire were calculated for means. The ranges of the mean scores for each level on a five point rating scale (Likert-type) were used for interpreting the level of agreement.

5. Findings

To answer the first question asking whether or not the use of inductive approach would improve students' grammatical errors in Formal Paragraph Writing course, the scores of the grammar test in the pre-test of both the experimental and control groups were compared using the paired sample t-test to determine whether there was any significant difference in the English grammar knowledge of the subjects in each group. Table 1 shows the difference of grammatical knowledge of both groups before the experiment.

Table 1 Comparison of Grammatical Knowledge scores between the Experimental in the pre-test

Subject Group	Mean (Total = 100)	S.D	T-values	Two-tailed test
Experimental	42.12	8.11	.156	.877
Controlled	41.82	7.93		N=80

With the respect of data presented in table 1, the pre-test mean score of the experimental group was 42.12 and that of the control group was 41.82. When the mean score of the experimental group was slightly higher than that of the control group, this difference was not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). The pre-test scores of the experimental and the control groups were not significantly different at 0.05 level. This indicates that before the experiment, students in both groups were not operating at the different levels of English grammar knowledge.

A comparison of the pre-test and the post-test scores shows an increase in students' English grammar knowledge in both groups. Table 2 shows the mean scores of both groups on the pre-test and the post-test.

Table 2 Comparison between Pre- test and Post Test Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups

Group	Test	Mean	S.D.	T-values	Two-tailed test
Experimental	Pre-test	42.12	8.11		**.00
	Post test	68.97	11.64	-22.50	N= 40
Control	Pre-test	41.82	7.93		**.00
	Post test	59.80	11.46	-11.73	N= 40

** Significant at 0.01 level

The data in table 2 show the significant difference between the pre-tests and the post-tests mean scores in both groups. The experimental group gained the scores of 42.12 in the pre-test and 68.97 in the post-test. The control group gained the scores of 41.42 in the pre-test and 59.80 in the post-test. Both the experimental and control groups did significantly better in the post-tests than the pre-tests. The pre-test and the post-test mean scores of both groups show that although they learned grammatical items through different teaching procedures (the inductive approach and the regular common lecture), the grammar knowledge of each group was significantly different at 0.01 level. However, to answer the question if inductive approach can improve learners' grammatical errors, it was found that the post-tests of the experimental group and the control group were significantly different as shown in table 3 below.

Table 3 Comparison of Post-Test Scores between Experimental and Control Groups

Test	Subjects' Group	Mean	S.D.	T-values	Two-tailed test
Post-test	Experimental	68.97	11.64	3.49	**.000
	Control	59.80	11.46		N= 40

** Significant at 0.01 level

According to table 3, the mean score of the experimental group (68.97) was much higher than that of the control group (59.80). The mean scores of the experimental and the control groups were significantly different at the 0.01 level. This indicates that the students who learned grammars through the inductive approach really had much more significant differences in their knowledge than did the students who were taught with common lessons through the regular lecture.

To compare the grammatical error issues produced by the students in the experimental and control groups, errors from the pre-test and post-test writing were also analyzed and were counted to compare the differences of their frequencies of occurrence, before and after the experiment. Table 4 shows the comparison between the issues of grammatical errors of both experimental and control groups in the pre- tests and the post-tests.

Table 4 Comparison of Grammatical Errors of the Experimental and Control Groups from the Pre-test and the Post test writing

Issues of Errors	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pre-test	Pre-test	Pre-test	Pre-test
	F	F	F	F
1. Nouns	162	88	180	138
2. Pronouns	179	82	186	154
3. Verbs	416	174	419	216
4. Adverbs	32	0	38	2
5. Adjectives	14	14	16	9
6. Prepositions	109	66	101	88
7. Conjunctions	42	28	36	24
8. Articles	132	95	112	77
9. Gerunds	72	56	80	68
10. Tenses	224	102	268	156
11. Word order	87	49	75	45
12. Modal/Auxiliary	13	8	15	9
13. Voice	6	4	8	5

Issues of Errors	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pre-test	Pre-test	Pre-test	Pre-test
	F	F	F	F
14. There-be	12	5	14	11
15. Infinitives	25	11	27	20
16. If clause	5	1	3	0
17. Possessive ('s)	135	78	142	80
18. Incomplete sentence / fragment	21	2	23	2
19. Phrasal verb	36	16	45	33
20. Relative clause	24	13	26	26
21. Subject prominent language	72	14	66	66
22. Run-on sentences	10	0	11	0
23. Comparison	8	0	10	0
24. Agreement	76	34	88	88
25. First language interference	220	131	216	150
TOTAL	**2132**	**1071**	**2205**	**1476**

According to data in table 4, under the same assumption, with the same instruction and equivalent writing length were believed that students' writing tasks were consisted of the frame total average words. There were twenty-five issues of grammatical errors made by the experimental group differed slightly from those of the control group. That is, the issue of grammatical errors with the highest frequency of occurrence made by the students in both groups was errors in the use of verbs (835). This was followed by errors in the use of tense (492), the first language interference (436), and the use of pronouns (365) and the use of nouns (342). In comparison, the occurrence frequencies of total errors of both groups were not different. The experimental group got 2,132 errors, while the control group got 2,205 errors. It can be said that there was no significant different between two groups before the treatment at 0.219 level.

The comparison of the improvement in the occurrence frequencies of grammatical error issues of each group after undertaking two different teaching methods as shown in table 4, the occurrence frequency of grammatical error issues of the experimental group was lower than that of the control group. The occurrence frequency of grammatical error issues of the experimental group was 1,071, while that of the control group was 1,476. That is, the issue of grammatical errors with the highest frequency of occurrence made by the students in both groups was errors in the use of verbs (390). This was followed by errors first language interference (281), in the use of tense (258), the use of pronouns (236) and the use of nouns (226). Therefore, it can be said that there was significantly different at the 0.03 level. This indicates that the students who learn English grammar through an inductive approach had a significantly lower rate of grammatical errors than did

the students who learned the same lessons through non-inductive approach. As there was no significant difference in the pre-test, a difference in the post-test would be sufficient to establish a difference in grammar knowledge.

To answer the second question asking which issues of grammatical errors there are in the texts written by the second year English major students at Suratthani Rajabhat University, the findings on the issues of grammatical errors found in the texts written by experimental and control groups were presented. There were 25 issues of grammatical errors produced by the students ranging from sentence to word level. These twenty-five issues were divided into two groups; 1) target grammar, and 2) non target grammar. The results presented in table 5 indicate that 17 issues of target grammatical errors were produced by the students ranging from sentence to word level. The findings were shown that there were 17 issues of target grammatical errors produced by the students, which related to the target grammar in the Basic English course that most of the students didn't go through the objectives completely in this course, and the selection of grammatical study investigated from eight commercial books in pre-intermediate level. The results presented in table 5 indicate that 17 issues of target grammatical errors were produced by the students ranging from sentence to word level.

Table 5 Target Grammatical Errors found in the written texts

Types of Errors	Target Grammatical Errors		
	Frequency	Percent	
1. Verbs	835	28.28	
2. Tenses	492	16.66	
3. Pronouns	365	12.36	
4. Nouns	342	11.58	
5. Articles	244	8.26	
6. Prepositions	210	7.11	
7. Gerunds	152	5.15	
8. Phrasal verb	81	2.74	
9. Infinitives	52	1.21	
10. Relative clause	50	1.69	
11. Adjectives	30	1.02	
12. Modal/Auxiliary	28	0.95	
13. There-be	26	0.88	
14. Comparison	18	0.61	
15. Voice	14	0.47	
16. If clause	8	0.27	
17. Adverbs	6	0.20	
TOTAL	2953	100	

It can be seen that five main categories of errors occurred most frequently, namely errors in the use of verbs, tenses, and the use of pronouns, nouns, and articles. Errors in the use of verbs were the highest number of occurrences. Most errors were misuse of verb to be for verb to have, wrong forms of verb to be, unnecessary insertion of verb to be, and misuse of verb to have for verb to be. For example, *"He is a small eyes"* instead of *"He has small eyes."* As for errors in tenses, the percentage of errors was quite high. Most errors were misuse of other tenses for simple present tense, misuse of other tenses for simple past tense and wrong form of verb in past tense. For example, *"My family lived in a small house today"* instead of *"My family lives in a small house today."* Errors in the use of pronouns were found high in students' writing. Most errors found were misuse of object pronouns, misuse of subject pronouns, and omission of object pronouns. For example, *"My live in Surattani"* instead of *"I live in Surattani."* Errors in the use of nouns were also high. Most errors found were misuse of singular for plural nouns, misuse of plural for singular nouns, and misuse of adjective for nouns. For example, *"I have two cousin and two daughter"* instead of *"I have two cousins and two daughters."* As for errors in the use of articles, most of errors were omission of a, an, misuse of a, an for the, and omission *the*. For example, *"We have dinner on a beach"* instead of *"We have dinner on the beach."*

The students not only produced errors shown in table 5, but they also generated ungrammatical sentences, which were not related to the target grammar investigated from eight commercial books in pre-intermediate level. These non target grammatical errors were shown in table 6.

Table 6 Non Target Grammatical Errors found in the written texts

Types of Errors	Non Target Grammatical Errors		
	Frequency	Percent	
1. First language interference	436	33.03	
2. Possessive ('s)	277	20.94	
3. Agreement	164	12.42	
4. Word order	162	12.27	
5. Subject prominent language	138	10.45	
6. Conjunctions	78	5.90	
7. Incomplete sentence	44	3.33	
8. Run-on sentences	21	1.59	
TOTAL	**1320**	**100**	

The finding shown that there were eight issues of non target grammatical errors found in students' writing. The first language interference was the highest number of occurrences in non target grammar items. For example, one student wrote *"I like see my father play football"* in stead of *"I like to see my father playing football".* This is possibly because students didn't emphasize on English sentence structures. They wrote the sentences depended on Thai sentence structures. The use of possessive was also high error occurrence.

Errors in possessive found were omission of 's, omission of possessive adjective, and misuse of possessive adjective. Errors in agreement found were subject-verb agreement. As for errors in word order, most errors were order of adjectives and noun, order of verb and adverb, and order of two nouns. Errors in subject prominent language found were omission subjective. Errors in conjunctions found were misuse and omission. In addition, incomplete and run-on sentences were also found in the students' writing.

To answer the third research question, the scores of each response to the questionnaire were average to determined students' attitudes towards learning English grammar through an inductive approach. The average mean score of these 22 items was 4.08 which falls into level of agree. The findings showed that the students, who learned English grammar in writing course, namely Formal Paragraph Writing, had positive attitudes towards learning English grammar through an inductive approach. Due to the students' responses, an inductive approach created positive attitudes towards learning English.

Most students reflected that they liked the teacher giving examples of phrases or sentences, which were easy to understand. These examples motivated them to realize grammatical rules in these practical examples. The students also liked sequences of questions given by the teacher, which helped them aware of grammatical rules and conclude those rules by themselves. The teacher's questions encouraged them to be enthusiastic to pay more attention to the lessons. The students were satisfied the teacher's identify correction after learning and concluding the rules, which helped them to gain grammatical rules correctly. They also admired the teacher's teaching process starting up from difficult one to easier one which helped them understand the lessons clearly.

6. Discussion

Although the English grammar knowledge of the experimental and control groups before the treatment was similar, the experimental group gained greater knowledge of grammatical issued taught in the lessons better than did the control group. This greater knowledge of the experimental group possibly was a consequence of learning English grammar in writing course through an inductive approach. The difference in English grammar knowledge between the two groups can be explained in five aspects.

Firstly, an inductive approach in the experiment involves questions asked by the teacher in class. The teacher gave sequences of questions until the students were able to aware of grammatical rules and concludes those rules by themselves. The teacher's questions encourage the students to be enthusiastic to pay more attention to the lessons. As Fischer (1979) said, teachers' questions help students induce or prompt the target rules in order to write complete sentences correctly.

Secondly, learning English grammar through an inductive approach continuously by using examples of phrases and sentences for eight weeks can be one factor that helped students in the experimental group to learn the targeted skills better than students in the control group. The students liked it when the teacher gave examples of phrases or sentences which were easy to understand. Those examples motivated them to realize

grammatical rules in these practical examples. Moreover, examples of phrases or sentences helped them to be able to notice their similarity of parallel structures in those examples. According to Winter (1989), with the inductive approach, students learned by numerous examples of a structure until they can use that structure automatically.

Thirdly, teaching process is very important in learning English through an inductive approach. The teacher started the lesson up from difficult one to easier one, so the students were not confused about the lessons. From activities in this class, the students realized that understanding the constituents of sentence structures was more important than memorizing. Assigning to work in pair or group satisfied students because they were more enthusiastic and confident. At the end of the lesson, summarizing grammatical rules by students themselves, which was a new technique in learning process, helped them to understand the grammatical items better. A teacher giving feed back of grammatical errors in phrases or sentences in class helped students to apply those grammatical rules and found a corrected answer by themselves.

Fourthly, lesson conclusion or summary is one factor playing an important role in learning English grammar through an inductive approach. Summarizing grammatical rules from sentence examples by themselves made students got the habit of summarizing the grammar rules whenever being stimulated. The students were able to gain grammatical rules, to correct them and to conclude those grammatical rules by themselves correctly.

Lastly, class participation is one of main activities in an inductive approach which allowed students to gain the knowledge of grammar in class unconsciously. The students had enough opportunities in class participation given by a teacher in classroom. Activities helped them to think and be able to apply grammatical rules for paragraph writing well. An opportunity to read parallel phrases or sentences given by a teacher satisfies students a lot because they could acquire and learned the similarities of those examples. Class participation reflects the acquisition process that children learn by being in contact with the language and using it, then finding rules and applying them to new contexts (Krashen, 2000).

7. Conclusion

It is visible to conclude that the inductive approach is an effective approach applied in language teaching based on the results in this study. The mean scores of the pre-test and the post-test from the grammar test indicate that the students had a significantly improvement. In the writing test, the researcher examined the students individually while marking their writing. The students improved their grammar better because the occurrence frequency of grammatical error issues in their writing was reduced such as errors in the use of verbs, tenses, and the use of pronouns, nouns, and articles. Moreover, students' writing was graded individually to determine their grammatical knowledge. It was found that issues of grammatical errors decreased while students' grammatical knowledge increased significantly.

Thus, on the basis of the findings, the inductive approach is an effective teaching technique in EFL teaching and learning. Learning English grammar through the inductive approach had a positive effect on student's English grammar knowledge in writing course. The inductive approach also creates positive attitudes which can facilitate students' language learning and enhance their chance of success.

8. References

Attapan, K. (2002). *The effects of using games on the enhancement of grammatical competence of M.4 students in science program at Nawaminthrachuthit Taksin school, Songkhla.* Unpublished master's thesis, Prince of Songkhla University, Thailand

Basic Curriculum B.E. 2544. (2001). *Contents and standards of learning for a foreign language.* Bangkok: The Ministry of Education.

Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching,* 4th ed., Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Coulter, S.P. (1983). *Second language learning: Contrastive analysis, error analysis, and related aspects.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Felder, R., & Henriques, E. (1995). Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals,* 28(1), 21-31.

Fischer, A. R. (1979). The inductive-deductive controversy revised. *Modern Language Journal,* 63(3), 98-105.

Goner, Phillips & Walters (1995). *Teaching practice handbook: structures: grammar and function.* London: Heinemann

Jack C. R. (1993). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics.* Singapore: Longman Group UK Limited.

Krashen, S. (2002). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* Retrieved January 11, 2006, from http://www.sdkrashen.com/SL_Acquisition_ and_Learning/

Paradowski, M. B. (2007) *Exploring the L1/L2 interface. A study of Polish advanced EFL learners.* Institute of English Studies, University of Warsaw,

Pongsiriwet, C. (2001). *Relationships among grammatical accuracy, discourse features, and the quality of second language writing: The cause of Thai EFL learners.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. West Virginia University, United State of America.

Puntakerngamorn, P. (1999). *English language education in secondary schools in Thailand : a Thai cultural perspective.* Unpublished master's thesis. Nova Southeastern University, United State of America.

Rivers, W.M. & Temperley, M.S. (1978). *A Practical guide to the teaching of English as a second or foreign language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shih, J.Y. (2008). *Effects of inductive and deductive approaches in grammar instruction for junior high school students of differing English proficiency.* Unpublished master's thesis, Technology in Southern Taiwan, Taiwan.

Sun, Y.C. & Wang, L.Y. (2008). *Concordancers in the EFL classroom: Cognitive approaches and collocation difficulty.* Taiwan: National Chao-Tung University.

Winter. (1989). *A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages.* Modern Language Journal, 73(4), 395-403