



Research into Pre-Service English Teachers' Perceptions regarding Deductive and Inductive Teaching Approaches to Teaching Grammar to Young Learners

Gülten Koşar

*Department of English Language Teaching, Faculty of Education, Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Turkey,
gulten.kosar@mku.edu.tr*

Corresponding Author: Gülten Koşar

Article Type: Research Article

To Cite This Article: Koşar, G., (2021). Research into pre-service English teachers' perceptions regarding deductive and inductive teaching approaches to teaching grammar to young learners. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 17(2), 58-68. doi: 10.17244/eku.994483

Ethical Note: Research and publication ethics were followed. In this study, the data were collected before 2020, and voluntary participation of study group was observed during the data collection period.

Çocuklara Dilbilgisi Öğretiminde Tümdengelim ve Tümevarım Yaklaşımları: İngilizce Öğretmen Adaylarının Gözünden

Gülten Koşar

*İngilizce Öğretmenliği Anabilim Dalı, Eğitim Fakültesi, Hatay Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi, Hatay, Türkiye,
gulten.kosar@mku.edu.tr*

Sorumlu Yazar: Gülten Koşar

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

Kaynak Gösterimi: Koşar, G., (2021). Research into pre-service English teachers' perceptions regarding deductive and inductive teaching approaches to teaching grammar to young learners. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 17(2), 58-68. doi: 10.17244/eku.994483

Etik Not: Araştırma ve yayın etiğine uyulmuştur. Bu çalışmada veriler 2020 yılı öncesi toplanmış olup, veri toplama sürecinde katılımcıların gönüllü katılımı gözlemlenmiştir.



Research into Pre-Service English Teachers' Perceptions regarding Deductive and Inductive Teaching Approaches to Teaching Grammar to Young Learners

Gülten Koşar

Department of English Language Teaching, Faculty of Education, Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Turkey
gulten.kosar@mku.edu.tr, ORCID: [0000-0002-4687-4382](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4687-4382)

Abstract

How grammar should be taught is a topic that has been explored in a plethora of studies as well as the one concerning the weight attached to grammar teaching and learning by teachers and students in foreign/second language teaching programs. This qualitative study aims to add to the literature on grammar teaching by unlocking pre-service English teachers' views on the use of deductive and inductive teaching in teaching grammar to young learners. The findings obtained from the inductive content analysis of the data gathered from qualitative surveys indicated that the pre-service English teachers favoured inductive grammar teaching over deductive grammar teaching in young learners' classes due to their belief in permanent grammar learning enabled by the facilitative power of inductive grammar teaching. In addition, the findings based on one-on-one semi-structured interviews revealed that the participants' prior grammar learning experiences had an overwhelming influence on their preference for inductive grammar teaching in teaching grammar to young learners. In view of the likelihood of the influence of pre-service English teachers' perceptions of deductive and inductive grammar teaching on their prospective teaching practices, the findings in this current research could be thought-provoking for pre-service English teacher educators and prompt them to investigate the viewpoints of the pre-service teachers they train on deductive and inductive grammar teaching.

Article Info

Keywords: Deductive grammar teaching, inductive grammar teaching, pre-service English teachers, teaching grammar, young learners

Article History:

Received: 12 September 2021
Revised: 7 November 2021
Accepted: 7 November 2021

Article Type: Research Article

Çocuklara Dilbilgisi Öğretiminde Tümdengelim ve Tümevarım Yaklaşımları: İngilizce Öğretmen Adaylarının Gözünden

Öz

Yabancı/ikinci dil öğretim programlarında öğretmen ve öğrencilerin dilbilgisi öğretimine verdikleri önemin yanı sıra dilbilgisinin nasıl öğretilmesi gerektiği pek çok çalışma vasıtasıyla araştırılmıştır. Bu nitel çalışma, İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının çocuklara dilbilgisi öğretiminde tümdengelim ve tümevarım öğretimi kullanımıyla ilgili fikirlerini araştırarak literatüre katkı sağlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Nicel anketten elde edilen verinin tümevarımsal içerik analizinden elde edilen bulgular İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının tümevarımsal dilbilgisi öğretiminin kalıcı dilbilgisi öğrenimini mümkün kılacağına inandıklarından tümevarımsal dilbilgisi öğretimini tümdengelim dilbilgisi öğretimine tercih ettiklerini göstermiştir. Bunun yanı sıra, bire bir yapılandırılmış mülakatlardan elde edilen bulgular katılımcıların önceki dilbilgisi öğrenme tecrübelerinin tümevarımsal dilbilgisi öğretimi tercihleri üzerinde önemli bir etkisi olduğunu göstermiştir. İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının dilbilgisi öğretiminde tümdengelim ve tümevarımsal dilbilgisi öğretimi ile alakalı görüşlerinin gelecekteki öğretim uygulamaları üzerindeki olası etkisi göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, bu çalışmadan elde edilen bulgular, İngilizce öğretmen adayı yetiştiricileri için ilgi çekici olabilir ve onları kendi yetiştirdikleri öğretmen adaylarının tümevarımsal ve tümdengelim dilbilgisi öğretimi hakkındaki fikirlerini araştırmaya sevk edebilir.

Makale Bilgisi

Anahtar kelimeler: Çocuklar, dilbilgisi öğretimi, İngilizce öğretmen adayları, tümevarımsal dilbilgisi öğretimi, tümdengelim dilbilgisi öğretimi

Makale Geçmişi:

Geliş: 12 Eylül 2021
Düzeltilme: 7 Kasım 2021
Kabul: 7 Kasım 2021

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

Introduction

The teaching of grammar, which is defined by Huddleston and Pullum (2002) as ‘... the principles or rules governing the form and meaning of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences’ (p. 3), could be deemed to have a continuing popularity in the field of foreign and second language teaching in view of the vast literature on it (Atai & Shafiee, 2017; Bell, 2016; Borg, 2003; Burgess, Turvey & Quarshie, 2000; Criado 2016; Harun, 2017; Keen, 1997; Macrory, 2000; Marsden, 2005; Swierzbis & Reimer, 2019; Wach, 2016; Wright, 1999). Considering the role grammar performs in the formation of accurate sentences and having effective communication, both recognition of the importance of grammar and the investigations into the effect of a variety of approaches and methods on grammar teaching make more sense.

Two teaching approaches extensively employed in the teaching of grammar are inductive grammar teaching (IGT) and deductive grammar teaching (DGT). The latter follows the sequence of the presentation of the target grammar rule and then providing examples involving it while the former is based on the sequence of working on the examples containing the target grammar rule first, which is, then, supposed to be inferred by students (Thornbury, 2002). The selection of the kind of teaching to be conducted to teach grammar shows a variation in agreement with a set of variables like learners’ ages, needs, level of proficiency and the complexity of the target linguistic form. In view of the characteristics of young learners (YLs), the way grammar is taught to them should be different from the one used to teach grammar to adult learners.

The review of related literature unveils that though it is rich in the studies on exploring English teachers’ beliefs about the teaching of grammar and how grammar should be taught, no research has been undertaken to date with an eye to investigating pre-service English teachers’ (PSETs) views on the use of deductive and inductive teaching in teaching grammar to young learners (TGYLs). Hence, this research is highly likely to broaden the extant literature on grammar teaching by scrutinizing PSETs’ views about the use of DGT and IGT in TGYLs. Looking into the perceptions PSETs have regarding DGT and IGT in TGYLs could be deemed to be invaluable because it may open a window into their prospective grammar instruction. Associated with that, the findings to be presented in this research might encourage pre-service English teacher educators to unearth the conceptions the PSETs they train hold of the use of DGT and IGT in TGYLs and lead them to get their students to delve into the instructional practices related to DGT and IGT in YL classes.

Practicing Teachers’ Beliefs about Grammar Teaching

English teachers’ beliefs regarding the teaching of grammar, which are likely to change as a consequence of employing diverse pedagogies in the teaching of the same linguistic item as was reported in the study by Robertson, Macdonald, Starks and Nicholas (2018), shape their grammar instruction. Allford (2003) claims that explicit grammar teaching, notwithstanding its deficiencies such as its decontextualized nature, is justifiable. For example, English teachers’ beliefs of grammar teaching were examined in the study by Andrews (2003), the findings of which revealed that the participating secondary school teachers of English used explicit grammar teaching and focused on form by conducting mechanical activities due to the obligation they felt to help students prepare for examinations. Burgess and Etherington’s (2002) study indicated that teachers of the EAP course at universities preferred explicit grammar teaching yet they favoured more real-life tasks for practice. Opposing explicit teaching of grammar, Dahl (2004) asserted that it could not support students in preparing for future situations in which they would need to use the learned grammar rules. The findings of the research undertaken by Phipps and Borg (2009) showed the disparity between practicing English teachers’ core and peripheral beliefs about grammar teaching and the core ones affected teachers’ classroom practice relating to the teaching of grammar more than the others. The study by Underwood (2012) showed that the practicing study participants did not favour teaching grammar through communication-based teaching, in other words IGT, putting forth the existence of high-stakes exams, and inadequate resources, time and training.

The modern foreign language teachers taking part in the research by Liviero (2017) employed disparate approaches to the teaching of grammar as while some reported they adopted inductive teaching approach, the others stated they taught grammar explicitly. Furthermore, that study reported the incongruence between the requirements of the national curriculum, teacher practices and assessment of modern foreign language learning in that grammar teaching was prioritized in the curriculum and teachers’ instructional practices while assessment aimed to measure modern foreign language learners’ level of proficiency in skills. Watson (2012) also investigated teachers’ beliefs concerning grammar teaching, and the results indicated that viewing it as out-date, the participating teachers had negative feelings about teaching grammar. However, it was suggested that provided teachers were trained in how to teach grammar, their negative feelings about the teaching of grammar could be converted into positive ones. Davis (2015, pp. 69-70) stated the teachers informed about how grammar enables carrying out good communication taught grammar through below-mentioned steps:

- Use judiciously selected authentic discourse in preference to manufactured and isolated sentences;

- collect and highlight (input flood and input enhancement) examples of less frequent patterns, so that the learner is exposed to rich input, particularly those examples that are most instructive of the role of form and meaning;
- engage in consciousness-raising tasks that are informed by an understanding of the workings of grammar; and
- when appropriate, provide instruction that is form-focused, meaningful, and clear.

The way grammar is assessed in tests influences how it is taught in the classroom. The research by Safford (2016) showed that the statutory test in England led to the explicit teaching of grammar and the class time allocated to teaching grammar increased significantly. Sanchez's (2014) research showed that teachers' self-perceived knowledge about grammar was a determinant of how they taught grammar and the instructional decisions they made while teaching grammar. Similarly, the results of the study by Sanchez and Borg (2014) revealed teachers' perceptions of their knowledge of grammar, the merit they gave to grammar teaching and the context in which they taught impacted on how they taught grammar. The research by Helmantel, Bazhutkina, Steringa, Hummel and Suhre (2016) demonstrated that explicit deductive and explicit inductive teaching was both effective in the teaching of grammar while the explicit deductive instruction group performed better in grammaticality judgments tests. Grammar exercise types in textbooks produced for foreign language teaching were explored in the research by Maijala and Helmantel (2019), which revealed that filling in the blanks activity was the most commonly used exercise type and presentation-practice-production approach was the one employed in the teaching of grammar, indicating that deductive approach was adopted.

Student Teachers' Beliefs about Grammar Teaching

Graus and Coppen (2015) carried out a study to investigate PSETs' beliefs about grammar teaching and the overall findings demonstrated that the study participants preferred form-focused, explicit, inductive instruction and focus on forms over meaning-focused, implicit, deductive instruction and focus on form. Another striking finding in that research was that the higher the year of study the participants were the more inclination they had to prefer implicit, meaning-focused and focus on form instruction. PSETs' preparedness to teach grammar was explored in a recent study by Merisi and Pillay (2020), which reported that they were not feeling ready for teaching grammar due to the reasons encapsulating prior grammar learning experiences and the emphasis placed on pedagogical knowledge in the teacher education programs they were enrolled in.

How pre-service teachers gain their knowledge of grammar has been investigated as well as their and practicing teachers' perceptions of the impact of divergent methods on effective teaching of grammar. Student-teachers' knowledge of grammar was assessed following the end of a postgraduate certificate of education course in the study by Cajkler and Hislam (2002), the findings of which demonstrated that despite the increase in pre-service teachers' grammatical knowledge, their high level of anxiety about their understanding of grammar sustained after the course. The courses offered in pre-service teacher education programs and field placement could play a significant role in the formation of student teachers' knowledge and beliefs of grammar teaching as was demonstrated in the research by Cooke (2019). Farrell (1999) emphasised the probable mismatch between how grammar was taught to pre-service teachers in their prior schooling and what was preached in the program pertaining to grammar teaching.

Students' Views on Grammar Teaching

Students could feel enthusiastic about learning grammar if they use their understandings of grammar and get feedback from their teachers (Yarrow, 2007). Agudo (2015) conducted research to explore EFL learners' perceptions of grammar instruction, the findings of which indicated that the participants valued communicative use of language more as opposed to controlled grammar practices and the corrective feedback provided by the teacher was found by the participants to be highly significant in grammar instruction. Teachers and students' objectives for grammatical improvement may change as was revealed in the study by Zhou, Busch and Cumming (2014). In that study, whereas students' goals were learning formal grammatical features, teachers either did not have the goal of improving students' grammatical knowledge or their knowledge of grammatical complexity.

The views of Japanese-as-a-foreign language learners on grammar teaching were explored in the research by Fujino (2019), and the findings indicated that students valued detailed grammar explanations. Jean and Simard (2013) undertook a study to investigate the effectiveness of deductive and inductive instruction in teaching grammar to high schoolers, reporting that students had a preference for deductive instruction even though they found both types of instruction as equally effective.

How YLs Learn

Before stating how YLs learn, it is important to explicate what is meant by YLs. According to Ellis (2014, p. 75), 'Young learners' ... is a generic term that encompasses a wide range of learners who as a group share commonly accepted needs and rights as children but differ greatly as learners in terms of their physical, psychological, social,

emotional, conceptual, and cognitive development, as well as their development of literacy Understanding how YLs learn necessitates raising one's awareness of their characteristics.

A variety of age ranges have been advanced to specify who YLs are. For instance, Harmer (2007) argues the children between the ages of 2-14 are YLs. In this research, YLs is also used as a term referring to the learners who are 2-14 years old. Aside from determining the age range of YLs, it is also necessary to have a clear understanding of their characteristics as they can exercise influence on how grammar should be taught to them. According to Cameron (2005, p. 1),

- they are enthusiastic and lively as learners.
- they want to please their teachers rather than their peer groups.
- they have the desire to carry out an activity even if they do not understand why and how.
- they do not have inhibitions.
- they have a tendency to learn by playing, their explorations, and talking to others.
- they learn indirectly and holistically.
- they lose interest quickly and are less able to remain motivated while working on difficult tasks.
- it is difficult for them to use language to talk about language.
- they have limited world knowledge.

Piagetian and Vygotskian theories of learning provide insights into how YLs learn. For Piaget, children are active learners in a world of objects and learning occurs as a result of interacting with that world, whereas for Vygotsky, learning takes place in a social context through interacting with others. Taking into account how learning occurs, YLs, scaffolded by their teachers, more proficient peers and parents, learn English through songs, games, stories and fun activities and by assuming an active role in lessons rather than just listening to the teacher (McKay, 2008; Pinter, 2017). As could be understood from the literature review, there is no research examining PSETs' viewpoints on DGT and IGT in TGYLs though there exists a range of research on exploring practicing teachers' views about grammar teaching. Considering the stated-gap in the literature, this research is likely to contribute to the related literature by seeking answers to the following research questions:

- 1) What do PSETs think about the use of DGT and IGT in TGYLs?
- 2) Is there any influence of PSETs' lived grammar learning experiences on their preference for DGT and/or IGT in TGYLs?

Methodology

Research and publication ethics were followed. In this study, the data were collected before 2020 (Academic year 2018/2019), and voluntary participation of study group was observed during the data collection period.

Research Design and the Context

As is maintained by Creswell (2012), qualitative research which is conducted with an eye to gaining a thorough understanding of a phenomenon is based on study participants' views on it. Since the purpose of this research is to unearth the views of PSETs about implementing DGT and IGT in TGYL, the present study was carried out as a qualitative study.

In the context of this study, PSETs take Teaching English to YLs I course in the fall term of the third academic year and Teaching English to YLs II course in the spring term of the same academic year in the initial English language teacher education program. These two courses help equip PSETs with the knowledge of the characteristics of YLs, diverse approaches to teaching English to them, how to teach language skills and systems to them and developing, evaluating and adapting materials to use in young learner classes. The study participants took the Teaching English to YLs I and II courses taught by the researcher, and in the last week of the spring term and Teaching English to YLs II course, the qualitative survey was emailed to the participants who were allocated one week to email it back to the researcher. All the participants responded to the survey. Although the researcher taught the study participants, which could be considered to endanger participants' objectivity, the findings indicate that they sincerely stated their beliefs with regard to the use of DGT and IGT in TGYLs in that they expressed the advantages and disadvantages of both teaching approaches and there were participants favouring either DGT or IGT in TGYLs. After reading the participants' responses to the survey, interviews were administered on the phone.

Participants

The research participants were 80 junior PSETs studying a state university in Turkey and in the selection of whom convenience sampling was used. Whilst 21 participants were male, the rest were female. The mean age of the participants was 21.7. The purpose of the study was explained to the participants in the e-mail and it was also pointed out that participation was based on voluntariness. No personal information about the participants will be mentioned throughout this study to preserve their anonymity.

Data Collection Tools and Analysis

Qualitative Survey

A qualitative survey comprised of two parts was developed by the researcher. The first part was used to gain personal information about the participants. The second part of the survey involves three open-ended questions that were created so as to learn about PSETs' views about DGT and IGT in TGYLs. The open-ended questions are as follows:

- 1) What do you think about the use of deductive teaching in TGYLs?
- 2) What do you think about the use of inductive teaching in TGYLs?
- 3) Which one do you favour in TGYLs, deductive or inductive teaching? Why?

The questions in the survey were sent to two pre-service English language teacher educators to ensure they could help find answers to the first research question and were precise. Taking account of the feedback provided by them, necessary changes were made in the wording of the questions. Then, three senior PSETs who were not among the study participants were asked to respond to the survey to make sure the questions were understandable and clear on the part of student teachers. After making the last changes in the survey questions by taking into consideration the comments of the student teachers, it was finalized.

The data gathered from the survey were analysed adopting inductive content analysis following the steps of coding process proposed by Creswell (2007, p. 244), stated below:

- All the responses were read to get an overall sense of them.
- One of the surveys was randomly chosen and what was meant in the responses was written down in the margin.
- Coding commenced.
- Similar codes were grouped to avoid redundancy.
- Students' responses were read again to not leave a code behind.
- Themes were created.

Coding was conducted by two coders, one of whom is the researcher. They coded the data and created categories individually. Thereafter, the coders checked each other's codes and categories to eliminate the discrepancies between them. Finally, themes were created by the coders from the categories. Member checking was realized by sharing the findings with ten of the participants to ensure they reflected what they had in their minds about the survey questions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

One-on-One Semi-Structured Interviews

One-on-one semi-structured interviews were carried out with ten randomly chosen participants, who accepted to attend the interview. An interview protocol involving the name of the interviewee, the date of the interview and interviewees' answers to the questions was kept for each interviewee. The interviews, each lasting for 5-7 minutes, were conducted on the phone. Two questions were posed in the interview:

- Did your English teachers use deductive or inductive teaching to teach you grammar when you were a YL?
- What do you think about the relationship, if any, between your preference for a particular way of grammar teaching and your lived grammar learning experiences?

The data collected from the interviews were used to seek answers to the second research question. The questions to be asked in the semi-structured interviews were sent to the same teacher educators mentioned in the subsection of qualitative survey to guarantee they were clear and could offer answers to the second research question. The interviewees did not have difficulties in remembering how English grammar was taught to them when they were YLs because they could answer them without feeling the need for asking for time to recall their past English grammar learning experiences.

Findings

Findings as to PSETs' Views about the Use of DGT and IGT in TGYLS

Findings with respect to the first research question of what PSETs' views on DGT and IGT in TGYLS are will be presented under the subheadings of the use of deductive teaching in TGYLS and the use of inductive teaching in TGYLS.

The Use of Deductive Teaching in TGYLS

The participants stated in their answers to the first question in the survey that the use of DGT in TGYLS had both advantages and disadvantages. The analysis of the data led to the development of the following themes within the framework of the advantages of the use of DGT in TGYLS.

Enabling efficient use of the limited class time

According to the participants, teaching grammar deductively to YLs enabled using the limited class time efficiently. They argued that the class time was just 40 minutes and learning objectives other than learning target grammar rules should be accomplished, thus, explaining the rule overtly at the beginning of the lesson and getting students to engage in controlled practice activities could transcend the limitations of the class time. Another point made by the participants as explicating the advantages of the use of DGT was YLs' attention span. They highlighted in their responses that given the fact that YLs' attention span was short, it was laborious to make them work on a number of activities till they discovered the target grammar rule. In addition, DGT was viewed to be advantageous in crowded classrooms. The participants asserted that it would be a hard task to implement IGT in crowded classrooms because of the limited class time considering the obstacles that could be posed by the teacher's inability to monitor students as they carried out activities and to make sure students noticed the target linguistic item.

I believe I can have some problems with limited class time. YLs are really lively and walk around the classroom. Keeping them focused on the lesson is really difficult. I guess teachers need a lot of time in a lesson to control them. Because of that, I think DGT is more appropriate for TGYLS. (PSET 11)

Similar to PSET 11, PSET 34 stated: *"I guess DGT is more suitable because there are 35-40 YLs in a classroom. IGT cannot guarantee all the students have learned the target rule, but DGT can."*

Develops low-proficiency YLs' understandings of grammar

The participants emphasized that DGT could be more effective in teaching low-proficiency YLs because they might face difficulties in discovering the rules through working on the activities exemplifying target grammar rules. According to the participants, low-level of proficiency could hinder taking advantage of IGT. They elucidated their point of view by stating that making inferences about the rules required a certain level of proficiency in English. PSET 54 noted in the survey: *'I do not think beginners can benefit from IGT. It is better for them to learn grammar through DGT. The more proficient students are in English, the more useful inductive teaching is for them.'*

The inductive content analysis revealed that the participants thought using DGT in TGYLS had a number of disadvantages as well as its advantages. Below are the themes that developed from the analysis of the disadvantages of the use of DGT stated by the participants and the explanations they provided about them.

Forcing YLs to remain teacher-dependent

Putting forward its teacher-fronted nature, the participants claimed that DGT made YLs more teacher-dependent. They stated since the teacher explained the rule before students began to carry out the activities, they deemed it as an impediment to autonomous learning. It was emphasized in the participants' responses that YLs did not take responsibility for discovering grammar rules in DGT, and therefore, the probability of promoting autonomous learning was reduced. The statements extracted from one of the participants' responses exemplify those of others who also believed the employment of DGT increased teacher-dependency among YLs.

As teachers, we need to do our best to help YLs become autonomous learners. How can we achieve this? By giving more responsibility to them for their learning but DGT is teacher-centred. We should let YLs discover grammar rules themselves. (PSET-62)

Inappropriate for YLs due to their characteristics

The participants underscored that the use of DGT was not appropriate in YL classes due to YLs' lively nature. They claimed that DGT made YLs inactive; that is to say, they listened to the teacher while the teacher served as the transmitter of grammar rules in DGT. Linked with this point, it was also asserted that DGT could make lessons dull, which they perceived to be clashing with YLs' short attention span. Participant 47 noted that *"YLs are energetic and get bored easily, and therefore, they can lose their concentration easily, too"*. Likewise, participant 53 expressed: *"YLs are not*

like adult learners. Their attention span is short. Because of that, English teachers need to plan and teach enjoyable lessons, but DGT is boring.” DGT is like a lecture. I do not believe it is useful for them.’ Moreover, it was emphasized in the responses that teachers implementing DGT used metalanguage, nevertheless, YLs lacked metalinguistic awareness and abstract thinking, and hence, the participants posited that it would not work with YLs.

If the teacher teaches present simple tense saying “to make positive sentences, the pattern is S+V+O”, YLs probably won’t understand the teacher’s explanations because they do not have metalinguistic knowledge. Because of the same reason, if the teacher tells YLs “for the third person singular pronoun, we add –s to the verb”, they can’t understand the rule. (PSET-72)

The Use of IGT in TGYLs

Similar to the findings with respect to the participants’ views on the use of DGT in TGYLs, the analysis of the responses of the participants to the second survey question of what they thought about the use of IGT in TGYLs revealed that it also had some advantages and disadvantages. The inductive conduct analysis led to the development of the below-stated theme within the framework of the advantages of implementing IGT in TGYLs.

Facilitates YLs’ grammar learning

According to the participants, IGT enabled YLs’ permanent grammar learning. They stated that because YLs were active in discovering grammar rules when they were taught inductively, they would be able to retrieve them when they needed to use them, which would be less likely for the grammar rules that were taught deductively. They stressed DGT made YLs memorize the rules, which were doomed to be forgotten, nonetheless, IGT enabled learning by doing, which contributed to permanent learning. Participant 21 wrote down in the survey: “In IGT, YLs take responsibility for discovering target grammar rules by doing the activities and they can remember it for a longer period of time.” In the same vein, participant 69 stated: “YLs’ retention rate can be increased by using IGT as they learn grammar by discovering grammar rules.”

Another point emphasized by the participants is that YLs were more autonomous in lessons in which IGT was used, enabling permanent learning. The participants also argued that working collaboratively with peers and the teacher to discover rules could help them retain the newly learned grammar rule/s. According to the participants, DGT did not promote the collaboration among YLs, their peers and the teacher, and therefore, forgetting what was learned in the short term was more likely. Another point made by the participants relating to boosted grammar learning as a result of IGT was encouraging YLs’ critical thinking, which was necessary for working out rules.

YLs think critically when we use IGT to teach grammar to them because they need to work on the examples and think critically together with their deskmates or in small groups to discover the rules. I believe this is the biggest advantage of the use of IGT in TGYLs. (PSET-37)

Nine of the participants resembled the process of discovering grammar rules in IGT and how a first language is acquired to each other. The statements of PSET 9 as regards this metaphor typify the statements of the other participants having the same opinion.

I think using IGT is like learning the grammar of our mother tongue because no one deductively teaches us our mother tongue’s grammar rules at home when we acquire it, and the teacher does not directly present grammar rules to students in IGT, either. (PSET-52)

Though the number of points in the advantages of IGT is higher as against that of its disadvantages, the participants also stated few disadvantages. The analysis of the data on the disadvantages of IGT led to the emergence of the theme of learning grammar rules is not guaranteed.

Learning grammar rules is not guaranteed

The concern voiced by the participants about the use of IGT was the risk YLs might face in not being able to work out grammar rules themselves through working on examples. It was maintained that notably low-proficiency YLs might not notice the rules in grammar lessons taught inductively. Associated with that, the participants also emphasized the need for a long time YLs needed to work out rules, which they might not fulfil in lessons with limited time. They believed that discovering rules while and/or after carrying out activities required more time in comparison to learning them in DGT, and thereof, DGT could be more efficient than IGT in TGYLs. PSET 56 claims: “I do not think YLs can discover grammar rules themselves especially YLs whose level of proficiency in English is low. A lesson lasts only for 40 minutes and it may not be enough for them to discover the rules.”

Findings as to the Influence of PSETs' Lived Grammar Learning Experiences on Their Preference for DGT and/or IGT in TGYLs

The analysis of the participants' answers to the survey question of which teaching approach, deductive or inductive, they preferred in TGYLs revealed that 75 participants valued IGT over DGT while the remaining five participants did not favour one of them, but both. Wandering the effect of past grammar learning experiences on their substantial preference for IGT, the researcher conducted interviews with ten participants to gain insights into this issue. The content analysis revealed that participants' prior grammar learning experiences exerted tremendous impact on their preference for the use of IGT in TGYLs. All the interviewees stated that their past English teachers used DGT to teach grammar when they were YLs. They underscored that they just memorized the rules presented by the teacher yet could not use them for communicative purposes. They stated in the interviews that since they experienced DGT in their prior educational lives, they knew that it would not help YLs learn and internalize grammar rules, and produce utterances by using them in novel situations. The statements of interviewee 3 epitomize the thoughts of the other interviewees on this issue.

When I was at primary school, my English teacher used to teach grammar deductively. For example, she said we would learn past simple tense and wrote the rule for positive and negative sentences and questions on the board. We memorized lists of verbs and did fill-in exercises but I could not remember the rule after a short time or use the rules to make sentences.

Discussion

The findings of the study indicated that though the participants did not deem DGT as effective in TGYLs, they pointed out a number of advantages such as enabling efficient use of limited class time teachers and students had in a lesson and being more effective than IGT in teaching grammar to low proficiency YLs. The literature review also shows that there exist both teachers and students preferring DGT. The high-schoolers taking part in the research by Jean and Simard (2013) favoured deductive teaching over inductive teaching. The teachers favouring DGT over IGT might base their preference on their belief concerning the probability that students exposed to DGT could get higher scores on tests. For instance, the practicing teachers in the study by Andrews (2003) employed explicit teaching of grammar due to the impact of the responsibility they had for getting students to prepare for high-stakes tests. The research in Helmantel, Bazhutkina, Steringa, Hummel and Suhre (2016) reported that the students taught grammar deductively outperformed the one taught inductively in the grammaticality judgment tests. However, the common conception regarding the use of DGT among the study participants in this research was the incompatibility between YLs' characteristics and how teaching was conducted in DGT, which is promising considering the importance attached by the participants to making instructional decisions by keeping in sight YLs' characteristics instead of applying one single teaching approach to all students. Emphasizing the diversity among students' needs, Fujino (2019) also underscored the significance of formulating a teaching methodology to cater for the students of various needs. The reason for not supporting explicit grammar teaching was reported in Dahl's (2004) study to be the issue that the students being subjected to explicit grammar teaching could not use the grammar rules in new situations.

Participants believed that IGT could facilitate YLs' grammar learning owing to the responsibility taken on by them in the learning process. When YLs were given responsibility for learning grammar rules, they would be more motivated and engaged in grammar lessons and that was the thing that would make them learn target grammar rules. According to the participants, IGT enabled permanent learning because YLs learned by being involved in the learning process. Similar to the beliefs of the PSETs with regard to IGT, the participating students in the research by Agudo (2015) preferred communicative use of language in grammar instruction over controlled practice, which may be interpreted as the participants' tendency towards IGT.

The findings also demonstrated that all the participants preferred IGT over DGT while five participants stated that DGT alongside IGT could be employed in TGYLs. Interview findings revealed that participants' past grammar learning experiences exerted overwhelming influence on their preference for IGT. Because they were taught grammar deductively when they were YLs and they had first-hand experience in the negative effect of DGT on YLs' grammar learning, they opted for IGT rather than DGT. Additionally, they explicated their preference by putting forth that DGT directed children to memorize the grammar rules presented in teacher-centred lessons, which did not end up with permanent learning, that is to say, YLs could not remember and use them in situations in which they would need them for carrying out successful communication. In the same vein, the impact of past grammar learning experiences on PSETs' beliefs on grammar teaching was also demonstrated in Merisi and Pillay's (2020) study. The participants highlighted the significance of the active student participation in grammar lessons and valued the talk between the teacher and students in discovering grammar rules. Considering the lack of research exploring PSETs' views about DGT and IGT in TGYLs, this research stands as a candidate for filling that gap in the literature and could encourage pre-

service English language teacher educators in different contexts to investigate the viewpoints of their PSETs on the use of DGT and IGT in TGYLs.

Conclusions

This study targeted uncovering PSETs' views on the use of DGT and IGT in TGYLs. The findings indicated that an overwhelming majority of the research participants favoured IGT over DGT. Additionally, it set out to explore whether the PSETs' past English grammar learning experiences exerted impact on their viewpoints on IGT and DGT in TGYLs. The findings pointed to the profound effect their past English grammar learning experiences had on their preference for DGT and IGT in TGYLs. The findings could be used to make projections about their future instructional practices in TGYLs. The emphasis recursively placed by the participants on the necessity of bearing in mind YLs' characteristics in making decisions about which approach to implement to teach grammar is encouraging in that once they start to teach, they will presumably plan and teach grammar lessons in light of how YLs learn. The follow-up of this study will be carried out when the participants of this study commence to teach YLs to explore the changes, if any, in their perceptions of teaching grammar deductively and inductively to them and to examine if they can put their beliefs about TGYLs in practice.

Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research

This study was conducted with the participation of 80 third-year students studying at the same university, and for this reason, the findings cannot be generalized to broader population. In addition, the results were based upon the views of the participants in this research. In future studies, PSETs may be invited to conduct microteaching in which they will teach grammar to their classmates pretending to be YLs to see whether or not their microteaching reflects their conceptions of the use of IGT and DGT in TGYLs. Further research could also be carried out to investigate whether PSETs' views on effective ways of TGYLs change according to their year of study. Furthermore, a larger scale study could be undertaken with PSETs studying at different universities to explore their beliefs about the use of DGT and IGT in TGYLs so that the results to be obtained from it can be extended to wider population.

Contributions of the Researchers

The author has carried out all parts of the manuscript by herself.

Financial Support and Acknowledgment

The author declared that this research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest

The author has disclosed no conflict of interest.

References

- Arisaka, H. (b.t.). *Shoshikaihyou "Iroha" no onshu ni tsuite [Eserledeki Iroha'nın sesletimi hakkında]*. Erişim: https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/gengo1939/1950/16/1950_16_1/_pdf
- Dündar, A. M. (2006). *Panislamizmden'den Büyük Asyacıliğa*. İstanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat.
- Egloos. (2021, 02 23). Erişim: <http://egloos.zum.com/>: <http://egloos.zum.com/gil092003/v/9681168>
- Erkin, H. C. (2007). *Edo döneminde Hollandalıların Shogunluğa sundukları yıllık raporlar* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Esenbel, S. (2012). *Japon Modernleşmesi ve Osmanlı - Japonya'nın Türk Dünyası ve İslam Politikaları*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Fumitaka, K. (2010). A new study of Ringotaihou, comparing with Tyoosengoyaku stored in the Hattori Collection. *Kaken*. Erişim: <https://kaken.nii.ac.jp/en/grant/KAKENHI-PROJECT-19320061/>
- Gencer, Z. (2017). İki dilli sözlükler ilk Japonca-Türkçe Türkçe-Japonca Sözlük. *Sözmer Bülten* (s. 8).

- Gençer-Baloğlu, Z. (2020). II. Abdülhamit Dönemine ait iki farklı Japon Alfabesi ve Türkçe transliterasyonlarındaki sorunlar üzerine. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, (44), 275-294.
- Huffman, J. L. (2020). *Japonya Tarihi* (Çev. C. Yücel). İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi.
- Ikegami, M. (Çev.). (1993). Nihongo Shoubunten [Japon Dili üzerine]. *Iwanami Shoten*. Erişim: <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BN09397907>
- İrim, N. B., & Özbek, A. (2018). *İkinci Dünya Savaşı ve öncesi Japon Dili Eğitimi Tarihi*. İstanbul: Paradigma.
- Küçükyalçım, E. (2013). *Dönüm Noktalarıyla Japon Tarihi - Samuraylar Çağı*. İstanbul: İnkılap.
- Kölürbaşı, N. S. (2017). *Modern bir imparatorluğun anatomisi*. İstanbul: Kusura Yayınları.
- Kuşçulu, A. (2007). Japonya'da hristiyan misyoner hareketleri (1542-1587) (Ed. İ. Görener). *Bilimname*, 2(8), 139-151.
- Kyung, S. H. (1991). A comparison in the style of a manuscript with two printed books of "Wagorukai": A reconstruction of the original of the "Naeshirogawa Manuscript". *Touhoku Daigaku Bungakubu Nihongogakka Ronshuu*, 1, 92-106.
- Lee, D.-W. (2002). On the notation of the "Yotsu-Gana" that appear in Japanese learning books of the chosen period. *Hiroshima Daigaku Daigakuin Kyouikugaku Kenkyuuka Kiyou*, 2(51), 401-410.
- Masahide, B., & Kadowaki, T. (1995). *Shin-nihonshi B [Yeni Japon Tarihi]*. Tokyo: sūkenshuppan.
- National Hangeul Museum. (2014). Hangeul History (Part 2: Easy to learn and use). Erişim (27.12.2020): <https://www.hangeul.go.kr/lang/jp/html/traceHangeul/traceHangeul238.do>
- National Institute of Korean Language. (b.t.). [특집] 국어사 자료로 만나는 선인들의 삶 왜학서로 만나는 선인들의 삶정승혜 수원여자대학교 비서과 교수 [Ataların yaşamları Kore tarihi materyalleri aracılığıyla bir araya geldi]. Erişim: https://www.korean.go.kr/nkview/nklife/2014_1/24_0104.pdf
- Nihongo Kyouiku Gakkaihen. (2005). *Nihongo Kyouiku Jiten [Japon Dili Eğitimi Ansiklopedisi]*. Nihongo Kyouiku Gakkaihen.
- Özşen, T. (2020). Modern Japon Eğitim Sisteminin tarihi temelleri üzerine değerlendirme: Meiji'den Shōwa'ya 1868-1950 arası döneme bakış. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 16(1), 36-52.
- Ringo Daihou (隣語大方). (b.t.). Online Journal "Studies in Japanese Literature and Culture". Erişim: http://base1.nijl.ac.jp/iview/Frame.jsp?DB_ID=G0003917KTM&C_CODE=0006-024709&IMG_SIZE=&PROC_TYPE=null&SHOMEI=%E3%80%90%E9%9A%A3%E8%AA%9E%E5%A4%A7%E6%96%B9%E3%80%91&REQUEST_MARK=null&OWNER=null&BID=null&IMG_NO=1
- Saeki, K. (2014). Japanese-Korean and Japanese-Chinese relations in the Sixteenth Century. In J. B. Lewis, *The East Asian Wars, 1592-1598: International Relations, Violence and Memory* (p. 402). London: Routledge.
- Seki, M. (2008). Nihongo Kyouikushi Kenkyuu Josetsu [Japonca eğitimi]. *3anet*.
- Shudan Houjin Nihongo Kyouiku Gakkai . (2005). *Encyclopedia of Japanese Language Education*. Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Takamizawa, H. (2004). Nihongo Kyouikushi (1) Gaikokujin to Nihongo [Japon dili eğitim tarihi - Yabancılar ve Japonca]. *Gakuen*, 1-7. Erişim: <http://id.nii.ac.jp/1203/00003409/>

- Takamizawa, H. (2005b, 9). Nihongo Kyouikushi (3), Edo Jidai no Gaikokujin Nihongo Gakushuusha [Edo dönemi yabancı uyruklu Japonca öğrenenler]. *Gakuen*, 2-9. Erişim: <https://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/40006925340>
- Thegoo. (b.t.). *Thegoo.net*. Erişim: <https://thegoo.net/square/1100542883>
- Understanding Korea Materials. (b.t.). *CEFIA*. Erişim: http://cefia.aks.ac.kr:84/index.php?title=Understanding_Korea_materials_-
- Yurdusev, A. N. (2013). Japonya'nın Avrupa uluslararası toplumuna entegrasyonu. A. M. Tunçoku içinde, *Japon dış politikası-Sistemik ve bölgesel aktörlerle ilişkiler* (ss. 5-22). Ankara: Nobel.
- Zheng, G., Pe , S., & Jin Yu, Z. (2016). *Wagorukai Kenkyuu [Japonca eşanlamlı sözcükler araştırması]*. (online) Rinkawa Shoten Book Depository.