

Addis Ababa
University
(Since 1950)



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES, JOURNALISM
AND COMMUNICATION
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
(GRADUATE PROGRAM)

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF INDUCTIVE VERSUS
DEDUCTIVE GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION ON STUDENTS'
COMPREHENSION OF ENGLISH VERB TENSES:
GRADE NINE IN FOCUS

BY
THOMAS FEREDIGN

June, 2013

**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF INDUCTIVE VERSUS
DEDUCTIVE GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION ON STUDENTS'
COMPREHENSION OF ENGLISH VERB TENSES:
GRADE NINE IN FOCUS**

**BY
THOMAS FEREDIGN**

**A THESIS PRESENTED TO
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
(GRADUATE PROGRAM)**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
AWARD OF DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING
ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (TEFL)**




**June, 2013
ADDIS ABABA**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES, JOURNALISM
AND COMMUNICATION

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF INDUCTIVE VERSUS
DEDUCTIVE GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION ON STUDENTS'
COMPREHENSION OF ENGLISH VERB TENSES:
GRADE NINE IN FOCUS

BY
THOMAS FEREDIGN

APPROVED BY:

ADVISOR	DATE	SIGNATURE
Dr. <u>Melaku Wakuma</u>	<u>03 July 2013</u>	
Examiner Dr. Anteneh Tsegaye	<u>03/07/2013</u>	
Examiner Ato Tibebe Alemayehu	<u>3rd July, 2013</u>	

DECLARATION

This is to certify that thesis entitled "Comparative Study of the Effect of Inductive Versus Deductive Grammar Instruction on Students' Comprehension of the English Verb Tenses " which is submitted by me in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of MA degree in TEFL to Addis Ababa University, College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and Communication, Addis Ababa, comprises only my original work and due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other materials used.

Name: Thomas Feredeegn

Signature: _____

Place: Addis Ababa University/ College of Humanities,

Language Studies, Journalism and Communication

Departments of foreign languages and literatures

Submission Date: _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all I am indebted to my advisor, Dr. Melaku Wakuma, who devotedly gave me invaluable comments and suggestions which kept me in the right track in accomplishing this study.

My heartfelt compliments also go to my colleagues, Kassahun Maleto and Birhanu Addis, who voluntarily pretested and post tested the subjects of the study. Kassahun Maleto also deserves my acknowledgments for furnishing the students with relevant instructional treatment while the experiment was in progress.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the students of Higher 12 Secondary School and Kokebe Tsibah Preparatory and Secondary School for their participation in the study. Besides, I would like to thank the administration of both schools for allowing me to conduct this study in their respective schools.

I am grateful to w/r Meseret Lakew, w/r Beletu Lelenaw and w/r Almaz G/Michael who helped me in typing and editing all the material I used in the *study*.

Finally, I am rather indebted to my beloved wife, Yirbebu Asaminew, my mum, Mulu Haile, and brother, Solomon Wendimu, who gave me morale and material support during my study.

Table of Contents

Page

Acknowledgments	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	v
Abstract	vi
CHAPTER ONE: Introduction	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statements of the Problem	3
1.3. General Objective of the Study	5
1.4. Research Questions	5
1.5. Significance of the Study	7
1.6. Scope of the Study	7
1.7. Acronyms	8
CHAPTER TWO: Review of Related Literature	9
Introduction	9
2.1. Historical Overview of Language Teaching Methods and Approach	9
2.2. Controversies over the Need for Teaching Grammar	13
2.3. Explicit Grammar Instruction	20
2.3.1. Forms of Explicit Grammar Instruction	23
2.3.1.1. Deductive Approach	24
2.3.1.1.1. Advantages of Deductive Approach	25
2.3.1.1.2. Disadvantages of Deductive Approach	25
2.3.1.2. Inductive Approach	26
2.4.1.2.1. Advantaged of Inductive Approach	27
2.4.1.2.2. Disadvantaged of Inductive Approach	27
2.4. Arguments in Favor of Deductive Grammar Instruction and Findings on its Effectiveness	27
2.5. Arguments in Favor of Inductive Grammar Instruction and Findings on its Effectiveness	31

5.3. Conclusions	60
5.4. Recommendations.....	61
REFERENCES	62
APPENDICES	68
Appendix-A Subjects' 2012/13 Academic Year First Semester Score.....	68
Appendix-B Raw Pre-test and Post-test Scores (Pilot Study).....	72
Appendix-C Pre-test and Post-test Raw Scores of Experimental and Control Groups (Main Study).....	73
Appendix-C1 Pre-test and Post-test Raw Scores of High Achievers in Experimental and Control Groups.....	74
Appendix-C2 Pre-test and Post-test Raw Scores of Low Achievers in Experimental and Control Groups	85
Appendix-D Pre-test	76
Appendix-E Post-test	79
Appendix-F Teaching Material for Experimental Group.....	82
Appendix-G Sample Teaching Materials for Control Group) Taken from Grade Nine Textbook).....	101

LIST OF TABLES**PAGE**

Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test 1 and Pre-test 2 (Pilot Study).....	45
Table 4.2: Test Retest Correlation of Pre-test 1 and 2(Pilot Study)	46
Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics of post-test 1 and post-test (Pilot Study).....	46
Table 4.4: Test Retest Correlation for Post-test	47
Table 4.5: Group Statistics of WEXPG and WCONG in pre-test	49
Table 4.6: Independent sample t-test of WEXPG and WCONG in Pre-test	49
Table 4.7: Group Statistics of HAEXPG and HACONG in Pre-test	50
Table 4.8: Independent samples t-test of HAEXP and HACON in Pre-test	51
Table 4.9: Descriptive statistics of LAEXPG VS LACONG in pre-test	52
Table 4.10: Independent samples t-test of LAEXP VS LACON in pre-test	52
Table 4.11: Group Statistics of WEXPG and WCONG in post-test	54
Table 4.12: Independent sample t-test of WEXPG and WCONG in post-test	54
Table 4.13: Group Statistics of HAEXP and HACON in post-test	55
Table 4.14: Independent samples t-test of HAEXP and HACON in post-test	56
Table 4.15: Descriptive statistics of LAEXP VS LACON in post-test.....	56
Table 4.16: Independent samples t-test of LAEXP VS LACON in post-test	57

ABSTRACT

While there is generally great controversy over how a target language is taught in the contemporary language classrooms, the question arises as to what type of grammar instruction is deemed effective is inevitable. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to examine whether inductive grammar instruction is more effective than deductive one in enabling students to comprehend the English verb tenses. To this end, experimental research design was used, and it was conducted during second semester of 2013 academic year.

The subjects of the study were 64 grade nine students of Higher 12 Secondary School which was chosen out of five High Schools in Yeka-Sub-city via convenient sampling technique. The subjects of the study were put in to two groups: the experimental group and the control group. The former was taught 5 English verb tenses with inductive approach, whereas the latter was administered the same items like the experimental group but subjected to deductive approach.

As for research instruments, three devices were mainly employed: the inductive approach treatment designed in the form of lesson plans for the experimental group, pre-test and post-test which both consisted of 20 items of multiple choices, yet with different purposes the . The pre-test was used to confirm the homogeneity of the two groups from the outset, while the post-test was employed to compare the significant difference of the group at the end of the experiment.

At the beginning of the experiment, the mean scores of the pre-test of the experimental and the control groups revealed that the two groups were significantly homogenous on their comprehension level of the English verb tenses at $P < 0.05$ significance level. After instructional treatment, however, the mean scores of the post-test revealed that experimental group statistically outperformed the control group at the given significance level. In other words, the findings of the study showed that inductive approach is exceedingly effective than deductive one in enabling students to get grasp of English verb tenses.

It was also found that the high and low achievers in the experimental group outperformed their counterparts in the control group. This is meant that inductive approach not only handy for high achievers, but it is also helpful for low achievers, too. Therefore, it is recommended that all stakeholders who directly or indirectly engage in language teaching should encourage inductive grammar instruction and other innovative language teaching approaches so that our students deservedly benefit from them.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

The debate of grammar teaching has been lasting for ages (Howatt, 1984). Grammar teaching has gone through three stages namely the prosperous stage (the first half of the twentieth century); the period of recession (1950-1960); and the period of revival (1980- to date). During the prosperous stage, the Grammar-Translation Method, which laid emphasis on linguistic analysis and translation ability, was the main approach to English teaching, especially in the study of Latin and Greek literature (ibid).

With the passage of time, the increased contact among Europeans required English communication competence. English teaching methods changed to (e.g. the Direct Method) stressing English usage instead of mechanical grammatical drills and pattern practices. During World War II, people needed to learn the target language in a short time for military purposes (Rutherford, 1987).

The Audio-Lingual Method, which focused on the development of listening and speaking skills, became commonly accepted. Thus, the importance of grammar teaching declined and teaching approaches (e.g. The Silent Way, Suggestopedia, Community Language Learning, and The Total Physical Response Method) ignored teaching grammar rules. These approaches paid much attention to student communication skills.

Nevertheless, student communication was grammatically inaccurate or insufficient. Therefore, after the 1980s, the teaching approaches (e.g. the Communicative Approach) emphasized combining functions, meanings, and forms of English (Freeman, 1986). Communicative approach, however,

was liable to scrutiny and criticism since it encouraged exclusively implicit grammar instruction which curtails opportunities for language learners to be aware of how L2 sounds and works (Pica, 2000).

Therefore, its adherents set apart into two categories. One of the categories entails researchers who consider CLT as a total departure from grammar in favor of focusing on the meaning i.e., implicit language teaching. The other group is comprised of theorists who favor both grammar and communication (Chen, 2003).

These views triggered Howatt (1984) to coin strong and weak versions of CLT. Being against strong version of CLT Di Pietro (as cited in Girma, 2005) contends that there can hardly be justification for assisting our students to develop functional proficiency while allowing them to make serious errors in grammar and pronunciation.

Pica (2000) also argues that implicit communication experience weakens opportunities for learners to notice how L2 (second language) sounds and structures relate to the meanings they interpret, how social norms are observed and maintained linguistically and how concepts such as time, space etc expressed lexically and morphologically.

Although the proponents of implicit and explicit grammar instruction try showing the effectiveness of their respective methods, there are still other researchers who reconcile adherents of implicit and explicit instruction. For instance, Ellis (2003) contends that even methods that are more communicative in nature, such as task-based language teaching, resort to explicit techniques which encompass inductive and deductive grammar instruction. Therefore it is worth assessing which version of explicit grammar instruction significantly better than the other in teaching particular language aspect.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The existing Grade Nine English textbook, Grade 9 English for Ethiopia (2011) is designed with a view to enhancing the macro skills—reading, writing, speaking and listening – of students. In addition, it is aimed at furnishing students with comprehension as well as application of English grammar rules (Bailey, 2011).

To pursue the second aim of the text book –helping students to be aware of and to make use of English grammar rules – explicit grammar instruction is inevitably advised in lieu of implicit instruction since the former focuses primarily on furnishing learners with grammar rules so that they comprehend them; whereas, the latter (implicit instruction) hardly has a room for such purpose. In this regard Ellis (2008: 75) clearly pinned down the aim of both explicit and implicit instruction as follows:

Explicit instruction involves some sort of rule being thought about during the learning Process. In other words, learners are encouraged to develop metalinguistic awareness of the rule. This can be achieved deductively, as when a rule is given to the learners or inductively as when the learners are asked to work out a rule for themselves from an array of data illustrating the rule. On the contrary, implicit instruction is directed at enabling learners to infer rules without awareness. Thus it contrasts with explicit instruction in that there is no intention to develop any understanding of what is being learned.

Besides, Richard and Rodgers (2001) elaborated on the significance of focusing a learner's attention on form, a prominent aspect of an explicit grammar lesson. The concept that he refers to as "noticing" suggests that conscious attention to form is an essential condition in SLA. Geremew (1994) also recognized the value of explicit grammar instruction with his experimental study in which he shed light on the effectiveness of consciousness raising activities in teaching grammar.

Strengthening the importance of explicit instruction, Norris and Ortega (2000) published an article which examined the efficacy of L2 teaching in 49 studies. The result of the studies suggested that explicit instruction has resulted in more successful learning of the targeted structures compared to implicit instruction.

The literatures that have been dwelled hitherto reveal that explicit grammar instruction is preferred to implicit teaching so that language learners get to understand the language item in focus. Therefore, the question that seems inevitably to be addressed is which version of explicit grammar teaching – inductive or deductive grammar instruction-- is opted for teaching a given language item better than the other.

In this connection, Norris & Ortega (2000) point out that there is a need for systematic exploration of subtypes of L2 instruction, posing the question as to which variants of explicit approach achieve a better level of acquisition as well as understanding of the targeted grammar structure.

Revealing the existence of argument about which version of explicit grammar instruction is better for particular grammatical structure, Wu (2008) contends that deductive and inductive approaches have been the most controversial issues in the field of language teaching.

Comparative studies carried out by various researchers have shown the effectiveness of one form of explicit grammar instruction than the other in teaching particular grammar item. For instance, Kuder (2009) explored the efficacy of inductive approach in teaching direct object pronouns. Prisna & Premin (2010) also found out the effectiveness of this method in alleviating grammatical errors that students commit in their writing.

On the other hand, Seyed (2009) brought to light that deductive approach is successful in teaching English relative clauses.

By and large, the aforementioned studies depict that one of the methods is better than the other for a given grammar aspect and so forth.

Despite this controversy, however, the researcher in his preliminary study noticed that the existing grade nine English textbook barely gives a room for inductive grammar instruction which is a version of explicit instruction. In other words, all grammar items like modal verbs, relative pronouns, question words, adverbs of frequency etc. solely presented deductively. The researcher also observed that ELT teachers, at his respective school, were accustomed to teaching grammar deductively irrespective of the targeted language item.

Therefore, controversy over the role of the two versions of explicit grammar instruction in aiding students to get grasp of grammar rules (one of the aims of the course book in focus) as well as the result of the preliminary study has triggered the researcher to carry out this comparative study.

This study was different from the previous ones since it exclusively focused on the English verb tenses.

1.3. General Objective of the Study

The main objective of this study was, therefore, to explore whether or not inductive grammar instruction, as compared to deductive grammar instruction had statistically significant effects upon students' comprehension of English verb tenses.

1.4. Research Questions

The study specifically sought answers to the following research questions:

1. Does inductive explicit grammar instruction have significant effects upon the ability of grade nine students to comprehend English verb tenses?

2. Do high achievers in experimental (inductive) group outperform their counterparts in control (deductive) group in comprehending English verb tenses?

3. Do low achievers in experimental (inductive) group outperform their counterparts in control (deductive) group in comprehending English verb tenses.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The finding of this study is believed to benefit various stakeholders who directly or indirectly engage in language teaching areas.

First and for most, it helps EFL teachers to be flexible whenever they happen to teach a particular grammar aspect no matter how it is presented in an ELT material.

The finding is also believed to benefit syllabus designers who can employ it as a spring board while they are designing how to be taught a given language item. In other words, it can help them to revise the grammar lesson they are supposed to prepare.

Furthermore, it can trigger other would-be-researchers to carry out comparative studies on other areas of grammar as I have done on English verb tenses.

1.6. Scope of the Study

This comparative study was delimited in light of different facets. First the study exclusively focused on shading light on the effect of a couple of explicit grammar instruction, namely deductive and inductive grammar instructions. The methods were employed to show their effects in teaching English verb tenses on grade nine students' comprehension of the tenses. The targeted tenses which were intended to be taught were particularly

those incorporated in grade 9 English textbook. These were simple past, present continuous, present perfect simple, present perfect continuous and future tense. The researcher chose only tenses in his study owing to two reasons. For one thing, they accounted for the major part of the textbook in question. For another, it was insurmountable for the researcher to include all language aspects to experiment at a time.

Second, this experimental study comprised only of grade nine students of Higher 12 Secondary School where the researcher has been teaching English for the last four years. The school is situated in the north outskirts of the capital city, Addis Ababa. Kokebe Tsibah secondary and preparatory school was used as a center where the reliability of pretest and posttest were piloted.

1.7. Acronyms

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELT: English Language Teaching

L2: Second Language

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Science

WEXPG: Whole Experimental Group

WCONG: Whole Control Group

HAEXPG: High Achievers in Experimental Group

HACONG: High Achievers in Control Group

LAEXPG: Low Achievers in Experimental Group

LACONG: Low Achievers in Control Group

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In this section issues related to the topic of the study will be dealt with. First, a historical overview will be carried out to review the most widely known language teaching methods: the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method, the Audio-lingual Method, and the Communicative Approach. Second, controversy over the need for grammar teaching in second language pedagogy will be dealt with. Third, the aims of explicit grammar instruction will be discussed. In addition, forms of explicit grammar instruction and their pros and cons will briefly be pinned down. Finally, the chapter presents arguments in favor of inductive and deductive grammar instructions and findings on their effectiveness.

2.1. Historical overview of Language Teaching Methods and Approach

Language teaching has gone via different eras of language teaching methods. The grammar translation method, the direct method, the audio lingual method and the communicative approach are by far the most common ones. Let's take a look at each of them in turn only briefly.

To begin with, the Grammar-Translation Method was one of the most traditional second language teaching methods that dates back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. It was originally used to teach extinct languages such as Greek and Latin, which explains why students were taught grammar and vocabulary through decontextualised

translations, thus focusing on the written language and neglecting spoken language (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

According to Richards & Rodgers (2001), grammar translation method is aimed at pursuing a couple of aims. One is to develop students' reading ability to a level where they can read literature in the target language. The other is to develop students' general mental discipline.

Besides, the method is based on three principles (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The first principle says that translation is the best way to figure out words and group of words of the target language. The second principle contends that the 'phraseology' and idioms of the language in focus can be well digested while they are being interpreted. As for the third principle, the structures of a foreign language can be best taught as long as their differences and similarities studied with respect to those of the mother tongue.

Grammar-Translation classes were usually conducted in the students' native language. Grammar rules were learned deductively; students learn grammar rules by rote, and then practice the rules by doing grammar drills and translating sentences to and from the target language. More attention was paid to the form of the sentences being translated than to their content. When students reach more advanced levels of achievement, they may translate the entire texts from the target language (ibid).

The method is not free from criticism. According to Richards & Rodgers (2001) the method did not usually give rooms for any listening or speaking practice. They also contented that very little attention was placed on pronunciation or any communicative aspects of the language. The skill exercised is reading, and then only in the context of translation.

Richards and Rodgers (2001: 60) also said that the grammar-translation has been rejected as a legitimate language teaching method by modern scholars:

Though it may be true to say that the Grammar-Translation Method is still widely practiced, it has no advocates. It is a method for which there is no theory. There is no literature that offers a rationale or justification for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology, or educational theory.

A significant period in the history of language teaching methods and approaches, thus, took place from the 1950s to the 1980s bridging the gaps noticed in grammar translation method. This period gave rise to the so-called Direct Method and the Audio-lingual Method (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

The direct method came in to being as a response to the Grammar-Translation Method, as it integrated more use of the target language in the classroom. Students had to speak and think solely in the target language. This method attempted to imitate the conditions under which a first language is most effectively learned: by means of total immersion. This could, however, never be achieved as students were only immersed in an L2 environment at school for about two hours a week (ibid).

The Audio-lingual Method, on the other hand, emphasized repetition and was influenced by the principles of Behaviorism: proponents of this method viewed language learning as habit formation resulting from 'Stimuli, Responses, and Reinforcement.' Dialogues and drills were used to achieve accurate pronunciation and grammar (Saville-Troike, 2006).

However, since people began to see interaction as essential to the learning process (Saville-Troike, 2006), the theoretical framework of the Audio-lingual

Method became questioned, and the effectiveness of the method itself was put in doubt as well.

From the 1970s onwards, aforementioned methods were replaced by the Communicative Approach, which in one form or another is still the predominant method used in foreign language classrooms today (Saville-Troike, 2006). Unlike previous approaches which "did not properly deal with meaning," the Communicative Approach builds on the notion of language as means of real communication, and its goal is to achieve communicative competence (Swan, 1985).

The approach is built on the belief that linguistic theory needs to be seen as part of a more general theory incorporating communication and culture (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Historically, from the 1970s onwards, this new belief called for new syllabuses that illustrated the idea of communicative competence. As a result, syllabuses were developed that focused on 'functions' rather than 'grammatical structures'. Classroom activities that involved real communication became the norm as they were believed to boost learning.

Group work was also stimulated as the Communicative Approach built on activities that involve real communication and could be used as the basis of a communicative methodology (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). On the whole, classroom activities had to involve meaningful tasks since it was believed that language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process (ibid).

The approach promoted learning activities that engaged students in meaningful and authentic use of language rather than activities that only mechanically practiced language structures. Consequently, classroom activities were designed to focus on completing tasks that are mediated

through language or involve negotiation of information and information sharing (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Since students are now regularly exposed to authentic materials and motivating and captivating exercises which have replaced the rather boring fill-in exercises common in traditional methods, it could be argued that language teaching has made some significant progress under the influence of the Communicative Approach (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

This view is supported by Swan (1985) who argues that we are now able to give our students a better and more complete picture than before of how language is used. Characteristics of the Communicative Approach are nowadays "largely accepted as self-evident and axiomatic throughout the profession" (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, 173). Richards and Rodgers even argue that "in some sense, almost all of the newer teaching proposals [...] could claim to incorporate principles associated with Communicative Language Teaching" (173).

In agreement with this, Brown (2007) mentions that the Communicative Approach in fact captures many of the most recent trends in research and teaching.

2.2. Controversies over the Need for Teaching Grammar

Controversy over the need for teaching grammar has been the most debatable issue in the history of language teaching. In this connection, Thornbury (1999:14) claims that "no other issue has so preoccupied theorists and practitioners as the grammar debate, and the history of language teaching is essentially the history of the claims and counterclaims for and against the teaching of grammar.

Some scholars are in favor of the total exclusion of grammar teaching (Prabhu, 1987), other researchers, on the other hand, focus on the need for including grammar teaching in EFL context (Lightbown & Spada, 1990), (Nassaji, 2000) and (Spada & Lightbown, 1993). Still other theorists like Krashen (1982, 1985) favor the need to focus merely on meaning excluding explicit form-focused grammar instruction.

The adherents of the aforementioned claims regarding grammar teaching put forward their own justification to substantiate their beliefs. Let us begin with those who oppose the need to teach grammar.

One of the major arguments against grammar teaching was sprung from the deep-approach-to communicative language teaching. This approach is based on the belief that "grammar is acquired unconsciously during the performance in communicative situations, so it would be useless to teach grammar previously and explicitly" (Thornbury, 1999:18-19).

Deep-end-approach to communicative language teaching (CLT) claim's against grammar teaching has advocated by Krashen's (1983) Natural Approach which is widely popular as an acquisition-oriented model. This model has had a great influence on ELT, and there is still a belief that the teaching of grammar might be harmful for communicative competence, as it claims that conscious reflection about grammar affects negatively input processing and performance.

This excluding view of grammar in deep-end approach was also strongly influenced by a rejection of traditional methodologies in which grammatical competence was acquired with the approach of the rule plus drilling methodology typical of Audio-lingual or traditional grammar methods (Lock, 1997).

Another major argument that discredits the weight given for grammar teaching comes from the goal of language learning. As frequently heard, communicative competence is the end goal of second language learning. Here linguistic competence is considered as one element of communicative competence among other components. As to the learning process, scholars who are the leading followers of the strong version of CLT believed that L2 learners can acquire a language by communicating or by using the language. In other words, some call it, learning by doing or experiential learning. Due to such belief, explicit grammar teaching is believed to be 'unhelpful' and a 'waste of time' (Thornbury, 1999).

The other source of the argument against grammar teaching is linked to the theory of first language acquisition. Thornbury(1999:19),for instance, asked , "The fact that we all learned our first language without being taught grammar rules has not escaped theorists. If it works for the first why shouldn't it work for the second?" The origin of this view comes from the well known applied linguist Stephen Krashen. Krashen has made the distinction between learning and acquisition. For him, learning is achieved through tutored/ formal/ instruction, like learning grammar rules, which is incapable to make L2 learners use the target language for communication. However, acquisition is a natural process that can be achieved through the communicative interaction made with the speakers of the language, as what happen in the process of first language acquisition. Therefore, acquisitions (the sole means of L2 success) can occur when learners are exposed to a rich variety of comprehensible input in a stress-free environment which can trigger learners' innate capacity (Thornbury, 1999)

Similarly, Prabhu (1987) as cited in Richards and Renandya (2002:67) argued, "classroom learners can acquire an L2 grammar naturalistically by participating in meaning focused tasks."

The last argument that favors the exclusion of grammar from second language pedagogy is associated with the theory of universal grammar. The famous linguist, Noam Chomsky believed that language ability is not a learned/habituated behavior. Rather it is through an innate human capacity that one can acquire a language. Chomsky (1995) as cited in (Thornbury, 1999) argued, "Human beings are 'hard-wired' to learn a language. That is to say, there are universal principles of grammar that we are born with. According to Chomsky, formal grammar teaching has nothing to do with language acquisition as there is the natural order of acquisition of grammatical items. The grammar that L2 learners learn in language classroom can not replace the 'mental grammar' and so that formal classroom's grammar instruction is a waste of time (Thornbury, 1999).

Despite all these opposite views and arguments against the relevance and the inclusion of grammar in second language pedagogy, there are also a number of strong arguments in favor of the inclusion of grammar and its centrality in the entire foreign language learning and teaching process.

To begin with, contrary to the deep approach to CLT, the shallow-end approach to communicative language teaching favors the need for grammar teaching in second language pedagogy. The latter approach is based on the thought that "to make the learner use language in a communicative situation it is necessary first to learn the grammatical rules and then apply them in that communicative situation" (Thornbury, 1999, 18-19).

In the shallow-end to CLT, grammar is taught in a way that we can define as inductive. That is to say, learners are not furnished with a list of grammatical rules that they have to learn by heart (presentation practice- production cycle) but rather, the teacher provides them with examples from which the learners will have to infer the rules by themselves (Rutherford, 1996).

Adherents of the weak version of CLT also support the need for grammar teaching. They suggest that we learn a language in order to use it and accordingly, language learners should learn the rules first and then engage themselves in a life like communication in order to apply what they have learned (ibid).

Hallidayan concept of grammar, forerunner of functional syllabus, also appears to advocate grammar teaching. Halliday (1997) contends that grammar is the study of linguistic forms (wordings) realizing functions or meanings; both wordings and functions are studied by grammar.

Ellis (2006: 102), another steadfast fan of inclusion of grammar teaching in language pedagogy, claims that "grammar has held and continues to hold a central place in language teaching. The zero grammar approach has been flirted with but never really taken hold, as is evident in both the current textbook materials emanating from publishing houses and in current theories of L2 acquisition."

The adherents of Zero grammar approach have also been strongly criticized by (Azar, 2007). He argues that those who were prominent in the naturalist approach such as Krashen were mistaken in advocating zero grammar. Similarly, Cunningsworth (1984), Cecle-Murcia (1991), Widdowson, (1990) and Lock (1996) noted that the question whether to include grammar in second language teaching pedagogy is hardly a contentious issue. It is inevitable since it is one of the key elements necessary for effective communication to take place. As Cook (2001:19) depicted, "Grammar is sometimes called the computational system that relates sound and meaning trivial in its own right but impossible to manage without."

Fossilization argument has also given rise to the need for teaching grammar in second language pedagogy. In this connection, Thornbury (1999: 24) said that ""More recent researches suggest that without some attention to form,

learners run in to the risk of fossilization." By the same token, Larsen-Freeman (1992) notes that excluding the teaching of syntax is to open the door for linguistic competence fossilization.

Azar (2007), in a similar way, states that there is nothing difficult than trying to explain certain grammatical structures and rules for students who knows nothing about the ideas of grammar. Such students' speaking and listening ability may be considered as fluent; however, their written English is full of ungrammatical.

Furthermore, the argument that favors the inclusion of grammar instruction in second language teaching setting comes also from the notion of "noticing." As the diary of Richard Schmidt (Researcher) has showed, the grammar lesson he had learnt previously helped him to become fluent Portuguese speaker while he was interacting with Brazilians. This is because he was noticing certain grammar features while communicating naturally. As a result, Schmidt concluded that noticing is a pre-requisite for acquisition (Thornbury, 1999; Ellis, 2004).

So far we have seen the arguments that have been put forward by different researchers and theorists are against or for the inclusion of grammar instruction in second language pedagogy. Despite the controversy, however, recent studies witness the role of grammar in the context in question (Nassaji & Fotos, 2004).

For instance, Ellis (2006) stipulated that grammar teaching can help students enhance both their language proficiency and accuracy, facilitate the internalization of the syntactic system of the second or foreign language, and also supplement the development of fluency. Moreover, grammar instruction can contribute to both "acquired knowledge as well as learned knowledge" (ibid). In addition, celce-murcia (1991) claims that explicit,

direct grammar elements are gaining significance in teaching communicative abilities and skills (as cited in Li, 1998).

According to Corder (1988), grammar is thought to furnish the basis for a set of language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. In listening and speaking, grammar plays a crucial part in grasping and expressing spoken language (e.g. expressions) since learning the grammar of a language is considered necessary to acquire the capability of producing grammatically acceptable utterances in the language.

In reading, grammar enables learners to comprehend sentence interrelationship in a paragraph, a passage and a text. In the context of writing, grammar allows the learners to put their ideas into intelligible sentences so that they can successfully communicate in a written form (ibid).

Lastly, in the case of vocabulary, grammar provides a pathway to learners how some lexical items should be combined into a good sentence so that meaningful and communicative statements or expressions can be formed (Widodo, 2006).

Generally, grammar teaching appears to be unavoidable in language teaching pedagogy even in CLT context, at least in shallow-end approach to communicative language teaching. The major issue that should be considered is making use of it as a means to an end. It should not be an end in its own right.

2.3. Explicit Grammar Instruction

Explicit grammar instruction is believed to develop two kinds of knowledge: explicit and implicit knowledge in language pedagogy. According to Ellis (2004), explicit instruction can have a couple of aims to pursue: to develop

learners' implicit knowledge of a grammatical structure and/or to develop their explicit knowledge. What does each type of knowledge mean then?

Ellis (2004) characterized explicit knowledge as "conscious, declarative, accessible only via controlled processing, verbalizable, learnable, and typically employed when learners experience some kind of linguistic problem." Implicit knowledge, in contrast, "is unconscious (i.e. we are not aware of what we know implicitly) , procedural, accessible for automatic processing, not verbalizable (except as an explicit representation) "acquirable (i.e. can be internalized implicitly) and typically employed in unproblematic, free-flowing communication.

Although explicit grammar instruction believed to have developed the two kinds of knowledge (Ellis, 2004), there are some disagreements as to whether these two types of knowledge are distinct and separate – as Paradis (1994 and Nick (1994) claim –or whether there are degrees of explicitness and implicitness. For instance, Lee (2004) argued for the former position--a view lent support by the growing evidence that the two types of knowledge are located in different neurological structures in the brain.

Krashen (1981) also claims that explicit and implicit knowledge are entirely separate in that they involve different learning processes what he calls "acquisition" and "learning" . He added explicit knowledge does not convert into implicit knowledge no matter how much and what kind of practice is provided. Krashen (1981) draws on SLA studies that show the acquisition of implicit knowledge is gradual process, involving transitional constructions that learners cannot avoid. He also argues that explicit instruction is powerless to alter the natural order and sequence of acquisition. Such an argument amounts to a more or less total rejection of

explicit grammar teaching and support for some form of implicit instruction (e.g. Krashen & Tracy (1983 "Natural Approach").

Needless to say, the aforementioned theorists like Krashen & Tracy (1983); Lee (2004) claim the weak relationship between the explicit and implicit knowledge. Nevertheless, there are others who counter argue this claim.

DeKeyser (1998: 46), for example, contented that "the stated or unstated aim of explicit grammar teaching is to develop learners' implicit knowledge (i.e. to enable them to use grammatical features accurately in fluent, communicative language use)". There is an assumption that providing learners with explicit knowledge will create a foundation for the development of implicit knowledge.

The main basis for such an assumption is skill-learning theory, which strengthens the omnipresent PPP approach to teaching grammar. This adopts a strong interface position by claiming that explicit knowledge can be proceduralized (i.e. converted into implicit knowledge) if learners are first provided with explicit knowledge of a grammatical feature and then engage in controlled and communicative practice. As DeKeyser (1998:49) put it:

... proceduralization is achieved by engaging in the target behavior or procedure –while temporarily leaning on declarative crutches ... Repeated behaviors of this kind allow the restructuring of declarative knowledge in ways that make it easier to proceduralize and allow the combination of co-occurring elements into larger chunks that reduce the working memory load.

In his series of publications Ellis (1993; 1994; 1997) claims that although explicit knowledge hardly converts directly in to implicit knowledge, it functions as a facilitator of implicit knowledge.

In addition, drawing on Schmidt's(1994) notions of "noticing" and "noticing the gap", one can propose that explicit knowledge of grammatical features will assist the processes that are responsible for developing implicit knowledge. Explicit knowledge enables learners to pay attention to linguistic forms in the input that they might otherwise ignore and also to carry out a cognitive comparison of their own interlanguage and the target language. Further, through using explicit knowledge to monitor their output in planned language use, learners can strengthen the procedures needed to produce target forms in unplanned language use.

A very similar position has been advanced by Nick (2005: 340). He affirms "the functional and anatomical separations of systems of conscious attended processing and systems of implicit processing " but then goes on to say that "conscious and unconscious processes are dynamically involved together in every cognitive task and every learning episode and provides an impressive range of evidence from psychology, neurolinguistics, and SLA to support this claim.

However, what Nick argues is that it is impossible to direct this dynamic involvement when learners are constructing the connectionist networks that house their implicit knowledge.

Thus, instruction should (1) aim to equip learners with explicit knowledge (through explicit instruction) and (2) provide ample opportunities for the mechanisms responsible for the development of implicit knowledge to function.

Ellis (2005) argued that "communicative competence", while reliant primarily on implicit knowledge, also requires some explicit knowledge in

order to cope with the demands of decontextualised language use such as that required by most types of writing.

To sum up, despite the disagreements among different scholars about the relationship between explicit and implicit knowledge, it is less likely to deny the contribution of the former to one's language proficiency. This is due to the fact that language proficiency is an amalgamation of explicit and implicit knowledge (Ellis, 2005).

2.3.1. Forms of Explicit Grammar Instruction

According to DeKeyser (1995: 190) , "explicit instruction involves some sort of rule being thought about during the learning process." In other words, learners are encouraged to develop metalinguistic awareness of the rule. This can be achieved deductively, as when a rule is given to the learners or inductively as when the learners are asked to work out a rule for themselves from an array of data illustrating the rule.

Based on Dekeyser's definition of explicit grammar instruction it is possible to say that deductive and inductive grammar instructions are forms of explicit instruction. Broadly speaking, in explicit grammar teaching, there are two approaches that can be applied: deductive and inductive. This section, briefly highlights the nature of the two methods and their pros and cons.

2.3.1.1. Deductive Approach

A deductive approach is derived from the notion that deductive reasoning works from the general to the specific. In this case, rules, principles, concepts, or theories are presented first, and then their applications are treated (Dekeyser, 1995).

In short, when we use deduction, we reason from general to specific principles. Dealing with the teaching of grammar, the deductive approach can also be called rule driven learning. In such an approach, a grammar rule is explicitly presented to students and followed by practice applying the rule. This approach has been the bread and butter of language teaching around the world and still enjoys a monopoly in many course books and self-study grammar books (Fortune, 1992).

Fortune maintains that a teacher teaches grammar by presenting grammatical rules, and then examples of sentences are presented. Once learners understand rules, they are told to apply the rules given to various examples of sentences. Giving the grammatical rules means no more than directing learners' attention to the problem discussed. Eisenstein (1987) suggests that with the deductive approach, learners be in control during practice and have less fear of drawing an incorrect conclusion related to how the target language is functioning.

To sum up, the deductive approach commences with the presentation of a rule taught and then is followed by examples in which the rule is applied. In this regard, learners are expected to engage with it through the study and manipulation of examples.

In the case of the application of the deductive approach, therefore, Michael Swan (cited in Thornbury, 1999) outlines some guidelines abided by when the rule is presented. Among them are the rules should be true, clear, simple and relevant. In addition, they need to show clearly what limits are on the use of a given form. They should also make use of concepts already familiar to the learners.

Most importantly, when the rules are presented in the deductive approach, the presentation should be illustrated with examples, be short, involve

students' comprehension and allow learners to have a chance to personalize the rule. Nonetheless, the deductive approach has its own advantages and disadvantages as summarized below (Fortune, 1992).

2.3. 1.1.1. Advantages of Deductive Approach

The deductive approach goes straightforwardly to the point and can, therefore, be time-saving. In addition, a number of rule aspects can be more simply and clearly explained than elicited from examples. The approach also respects the intelligence and maturity of many adult learners in particular and acknowledges the role of cognitive processes in language acquisition. It addresses many learners' expectations about classroom learning particularly for those who have an analytical style.

2.3.1.1.2. Disadvantages of Deductive Approach

Deductive approach begins a lesson with a grammar presentation, so it may be boring for some learners, especially younger ones. Furthermore, they may not be able to understand the given grammar terminology. The method encourages a teacher-fronted instruction, so it will hinder learner involvement and interaction immediately. The explanation is seldom as memorable as other forms of presentation, for example, demonstration. The deductive approach encourages the belief that learning a language is simply a case of knowing the rule.

2.3.1.2. Inductive Approach

Inductive approach comes from inductive reasoning stating that a reasoning precedes from particulars (that is, observations, measurements, or data) to generalities (for example, rules, laws, concepts or theories) (Felder

& Henriques ,1995). In short, when we use induction, we observe a number of specific instances and from them infer a general principle or concept.

In the case of pedagogical grammar, most experts argue that the inductive approach can also be called rule-discovery learning. It suggests that a teacher teaches 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.

Eisenstein (cited in Long & Richards, 1987) maintains that the inductive approach tries to use the very strong reward value of bringing order, clarity and meaning to experiences. This approach involves learners' participating actively in their own instruction. In addition, the approach encourages a learner to develop her/his own mental set of strategies for dealing with tasks. In other words, this approach attempts to highlight grammatical rules implicitly in which the learners are encouraged to conclude the rules given by the teacher.

Similar to the deductive approach, the inductive approach offers advantages and disadvantages as presented below (Fortune, 1992).

2.3.1.2.1. Advantages of Inductive Approach

In inductive grammar instruction, learners are trained to be familiar with the rule discovery; this could enhance learning autonomy and self-reliance. The method also helps Learner to exploit their cognitive ability and to be active participant rather than passive recipients. The approach involves learners' pattern-recognition and problem solving abilities in which particular learners are interested in this challenge. If the problem-solving activity is done collaboratively, learners get an opportunity for extra language practice.

2.3.1.2.2. Disadvantages of Inductive Approach

Inductive approach is time and energy-consuming as it leads learners to have the appropriate concept of the rule. The concepts given implicitly may lead the learners to have the wrong concepts of the rule taught. The approach can place emphasis on teachers in planning a lesson. It encourages the teacher to design data or materials taught carefully and systematically. The approach may frustrate the learners with their personal learning style, or their past learning experience (or both) would prefer simply to be told the rule.

In the above section we have seen the nature of deductive as well as inductive grammar instruction. In addition, their pros and cons are touched upon. The next sub section of the review literature presents arguments in favor of the methods and findings on their effectiveness.

2.4. Arguments in favor of Deductive Grammar Instruction and Findings on its Effectiveness

Some scholars equate deductive grammar instruction to grammar translation-method which used once predominately to teach the grammar of a given language. In this regard Mohammed & Jaber (2008) define deductive method of grammar instruction in light of teaching English grammar as the style of teaching students by introducing the grammatical rules first, and then applying them by the students. They also contend that this approach is similar to the grammar-translation method in which teacher's explanation often dominates classroom activities and student involvement and interaction is often minimized.

The results showed that the deductive group had significant better performance than both the inductive and the control groups on the two tests. Some studies conducted in Taiwan also demonstrated that the deductive approach was more efficient than the inductive approach in assisting student grammar learning. For example, in Lin's study (2007), he recruited 64 students from one elementary school in Taiwan. The subjects were assigned to either the inductive group or the deductive group and received a 12-week English modal verb lesson. In the inductive group, teacher did not explain the rules explicitly. Instead, students had to induce the rules from the materials with the target grammatical sentences and shared their findings with peers. In the deductive group, the teacher explained the rules directly, and asked students some related questions to check students' understanding of the grammatical rules.

Two post-tests were used to measure student grammar comprehension achievements. Results indicated that the deductive group significantly outperformed the inductive group in acquiring grammar rules; however, no significant difference existed between the two groups of modal verb retention. In addition to the aforementioned studies, some theorists put forward some of the benefits of the method.

For instance, Boyle (1994) & Ruin (1996) believe that if learners do not receive explicit-inductive instruction, their errors might fossilize in their interlanguage. On their part, Krashen (1985) & Terrell (1991) pointed out that when learners talk, they hear and process their own output. Thus, learner output inputs to the acquisition process. If the output is grammatical, then acquisition of the output will lead to increased grammatical speech. However, the output will be incorrect if the learner has not learned a rule correctly.

Some scholars (e.g. Ausubel, 1974; Higgs, 1985; Mohammed & Jaber, 2008) suggested that teacher instruction speeds up the acquisition process of adult language learners. They criticized that only gifted students are capable to generalize the rules from examples, and that most average students need teacher guidance to help them confirm, modify, or add new rules to their innate hypothetical rules.

Terrell (1991), likewise, contended that explicit-deductive instruction helps learners make sense of individual words in input utterances, and also draws their attention to specific language structure. In their opinion, when learners know little about the target language, it is very difficult for them to understand non-salient grammatical, meaning-forming relationships, such as participles and inflections.

Mohammed (2008), as cited in (Gass, 1991: 59), stated that "Explicit grammar teaching makes learners aware of the discrepancies between what they themselves have constructed for their second language and the system which becomes apparent to them for the target language data they are confronted with. In other words, it acts as a selective attention device".

Some researchers like Carr & Curran (1994) and Shanks & John (1994) believe that an inductive approach might only be effective for teaching relatively simple grammatical structures. In their opinion, some complicated rules are difficult for learners to comprehend.

So far we have seen the nature of deductive grammar instruction, its effectiveness in teaching some targeted structures like direct object pronouns and modal verbs as well as the benefit language learners earn from the method. Now let me move on to the next sub topic – explicit inductive grammar instruction.

2.5. Arguments in favor of Inductive Grammar Instruction and Findings on its Effectiveness

What does inductive imply? What studies related to this method do say? And how do language learners benefit from the method? These are some of the questions to be addressed in this sub-section of review of related literature. First, let us have a look at definition of the approach:

According to Mohammed & Jaber (2008), inductive approach refers to the style of introducing language context containing the target rules where students can induce such rules through the context and practical examples. In other words, the sequence in this approach goes from creating a situation and giving examples to the generalization where students should discover such generalization by themselves or with the teacher's help.

Experimental studies both in western countries and in Taiwan have shown that inductive grammar teaching strategies are more beneficial to learners. For example, Herron&Tomasell (1992) compared the learning of French grammatical structures by 26 beginning level American college students in the guided induction and deduction teaching conditions.

In the guided induction teaching, the teacher first gave students some contextualized oral drills, and students induced for themselves the underlying grammatical rules. Then the students were requested to complete a model sentence on the board with structure equivalent to the ones practiced orally. Thus, students could check their hypotheses to the target structure were correct or not.

On the other hand, in the deduction teaching condition, the teacher stated the rule and illustrated it with a written model. After that, students practiced the rules through some contextualized oral drills.

As to the studies conducted in Taiwan, Wang (2002) investigated 81 senior high school Taiwanese students' performance in learning collocation patterns. Her study revealed that the inductive group improved more significantly than did the deductive group, especially in the condition of easy patterns. As to the difficult patterns, there were no significant differences between the two groups.

Although some deductive adherents assume that the inductive approach is too difficult for weak students (e.g. Ausubel, 1974; Carroll, 1964), Shaffer (1989) argued that the inductive approach is valuable for all levels of students, but especially for weak students.

In his study, Shaffer chose three structures for the French class and four structures for the Spanish class. These structures were chosen because the concepts of the structures do not exist in English, and because they are considered difficult to learn. The subjects of this study were 319 students from three different high schools, who were divided into inductive group and deductive group. His study findings showed that the inductive groups of all ability levels scored higher for all structures than the deductive students, but the difference did not achieve significant level. Next, the weak students benefited most from using the inductive presentation.

Shaffer's study (1989) not only confirmed the finding of the cognitive psychologist Bruner (1961) that "Students do better when having to discover underlying patterns themselves rather than being told about them" (Shaffer, p. 400), but also provided evidence that the inductive approach can be used to teach difficult structures. Another benefit of using the inductive approach is that it increases the motivation of students to study L2. Some study findings (e.g., Swaffar & Woodruff, 1978) also show this tendency.

The deductive approach has received much criticism from the perspective of cognitive psychology, which stresses that learners should actively contribute to their own learning. Piaget (1974) claimed that learners need to be involved in the interaction between their innate structures of the mind and the outside learning environment. Piaget suggested that rote memory cannot be equated with comprehension. He asserted that if students fail to comprehend the meaning underlying numerous linguistic structures and transform them into internalized intake, then those structures are meaningless and cannot become instinctual for later use.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the research design employed in the main study. It also discusses the subjects, measurements, sampling procedure of the pilot study. The instructional treatments for experimental and control groups also dwelled on here.

3.1. The Research Design

As mentioned earlier the main objective of this study was to explore whether or not inductive-explicit grammar instruction does help students better than deductive-explicit grammar instruction in understanding English verb tenses. To this end, experimental research design was chosen. Such kind of research design is believed to show a comparative outcome of an intervention up on the subjects of the experiment. In this regard, Leedey (1997) says that an experimental study is a type of evaluation that seeks to determine whether a program or intervention has the intended causal effect on program participants.

3.2. Sampling Procedure

Higher 12 Secondary School was opted for the center of the main study. The researcher selected the school because of various reasons. For one thing, he has been teaching there for the last four years. Hence, he managed to get access any sort of data he would like to procure for his study. In addition, he believed to have secured valuable aid from the management as well as his colleagues. For another, it was the school where he conducted his preliminary study from which he unearthed handy data that used as

spring board for his present study. In short, the researcher chose convenient sampling technique to select the setting for the study.

The rationale of the researcher opting for this sampling technique substantiated by (Kumar, 1996) that convenient sampling is preferred whenever a researcher has easy access to information.

At the school fifteen 9th grade sections were available. Out of these sections four sections were selected due to the fact that the students in these four sections were taught by prospective masters' holders and who had nearly the same teaching experience. This was believed to have avoided the effect of teacher' variables upon the validity of the finding of the study. The subjects of the study were 64 grade nine students Higher 12 Secondary School.

Avoiding possible experimental mortality, which is believed to be one of threatening factors that put at risk the validity of a research findings (Campbell& Stanley, 1963), the researcher invited to the study those students who were in the habit of attending classes almost regularly. In addition, the instructional treatments were conducted in regular classes.

The subjects in the four sections were grouped into experimental and control group after they pretested. The pretest was employed to make sure whether the participants in each group were homogenous in the light of their performance on the language aspect in focus.

The subjects in each group which was comprised of 32(16 high achievers and 16 low achievers) were supposed to be taught in their respective classes. According to Leedeey (1997), in experimental study design, a general rule of thumb is that each group ought to have at least 30 participants while the size of the sample ought to be determined by specific scientific

methods. Thus, the researcher decided the number of subjects in each group based on this rule of thumb.

As mentioned earlier, both groups were taught by teachers who were soon to be master holders as well as almost having the same working experience in teaching English. The experimental group was taught by the researcher who used inductive grammar instruction, whereas the control group was taught by his colleague who was accustomed to teaching grammar via deductive method. Teaching material used for each group attached in **(Appendix-F and Appendix-G)**

As noted previously, each group is comprised of high and low achievers. The high achievers and low achievers of each group were decided based on what they scored (out of 100%) in their first semester English results of 2012/2013 academic year.

3.3. The Research Methods

The researcher employed various data gathering tools which served to collect qualitative and quantitative data.

The devices which were used to gather the data were students' roster and grade nine students' English text book. Pre-test and post-test were also used to elicit quantitative data from the subjects of the study.

3.3.1. Document Analysis

On conducting document analysis, the researcher used students' roster and grade nine students English textbook.

3.3.1.1. Students' Roster

This tool was used to categorize the subjects into high and low achievers based on their first semester English result of 2012/2013 academic year accompanied by teachers.

The maximum score of the high achievers was 95%, while the minimum score was 81 which went down to have 32 participants. The low achievers labeled ascending from minimum score 41 up to maximum score 50. The raw data is attached to **(Appendix-A)**

3.3.1.2. Grade Nine Students' Text Book

The text book helped the researcher to have a ground for his current study. In his assessment of the book he noticed that the book barely gave a room for inductive grammar instruction. In other words, the researcher in his preliminary study found out that the book in question presented all grammar items either via explanation or furnishing students with the rule that governs a language aspect.

The researcher also observed that his colleagues were accustomed to teaching grammar deductively although various studies discussed in chapter two shed light on that inductive grammar instruction is equally important in teaching grammar.

3.3.2. Experiment

The experiment which lasted for 8 weeks and was held during the main study was comprised of different components. Let us take a look at each of them in turn.

3.3.2.1. Language Items

The language items treated during the experiment were exclusively English verb tenses: simple past, present continuous, future tense, present perfect simple and present perfect continuous. The tenses were treated differently in experimental and control group. In the former group they were presented inductively, but in the latter one they were handled deductively as presented in grade nine English textbook (**Appendix-G**).

3.3.2.2. Instructional Treatment

3.3.2.2.1. Instructional Treatment and Material for Experimental Group

During all treatments in this study, the experimental group received an explicit-inductive instruction that advocated by a number of researchers (Al-Kharrat, 2000; Erlam, 2003; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Seliger, 1975; Shaffer, 1989) and more specifically designed and modified by Ellis (2006).

The teacher hardly gave the experimental class any rule explanations about the target structure at the beginning of the treatments. In addition, to control the variable of teacher's behavior and bias in the experiment, the teacher was not used for teaching the lessons in the experiment. The essential role of the teacher in the experimental class was simply giving the class in question an explicit corrective feedback about the rule explanations or patterns found by the students in order to help students reformulate their rules or patterns of the target structure.

As for instructional material for experimental group,(see **Appendix-F**), it had as many number of examples as possible from which the students were supposed to explore rules that govern simple past tense, present continuous, future tense, present perfect tense and present perfect

progressive. The material was designed to have included tasks that engage the subjects in practicing and producing the tenses in focus.

3.3.2.2.2. Instructional Treatment and Material for Control Group

The control group received an explicit-deductive instruction from their teacher in their respective classes. This method has been traditionally used as instructional approaches to L2 grammar in the EFL countries (Shaffer, 1989).

The treatment used for the control group was similar to the deductive method designed by a number of researchers (Al-Kharrat, 2000; Erlam, 2003; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Seliger, 1975; Shaffer, 1989).

This method is characterized by the step-by-step rule-first presentation of the language rule before language practice is held. The explicit-deductive group received teacher-fronted instruction and rules which were explained by the teacher.

Instructional material that presented the targeted language items was hardly prepared for control group. In other words, students belong to this group were taught the language items in such a way that treated in grade nine students' text book. Nonetheless, tasks that used for practice and production stage for this group resembled the tasks used for experimental group.

Here it is worth noting that the two groups had the instruction in their respective and regular classes. Therefore, they had an equal amount of instruction (45 minutes per lesson), during the same hours of the weekdays, from comparatively the same teachers in terms of experience and

qualification. The two groups also had same materials to at practice and production stages.

In a nut shell, it was hoped that learners developed knowledge of English verb tenses specifically simple past tense, present continuous, simple future tense, present perfect simple, and present perfect continuous.

They also became more aware of the feature in communicative input afterwards - a process that Sharwood (1993) also see as essential for language acquisition. Similarly, according to Schmidt's (1990) Noticing Hypothesis, awareness of specific linguistic items in the input is necessary for language learning to occur.

3.3.3. Measurements

To collect quantitative data, two tests were used: pretest and posttest. The tests having different purposes were designed and administered to the study and the control groups before and after the experimental instruction. Pretest and posttest are widely used, primarily for the purpose of comparing groups and/or measuring change resulting from experimental treatments (Dimiter, 2003).

3.3.3.1. Pre-test

The purpose of the pre-test (see **Appendix-D**) was to see whether there was statistically significant difference between the study and the control groups in light of their comprehension of the English verb tenses before they went through instructional treatment. In other words, it aimed to confirm the homogeneity of experimental groups on dependent variable at the very beginning of the experiment. Provided that the two groups are different from the outset on dependent variable, it leads to what is technically called

"differential selection" which in turns threatens the validity of the findings of an experimental research design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963).

An attempt was also made to cover most of the English verb tenses included in grade nine students' textbook. The contents, however, were taken from what the students learnt particularly during second semester of 2013 academic year. The test items like the post test items were multiple-choice items so as to alleviate the question of subjectivity of scoring. The test comprised of 20 questions which each was amounted to 2 points. In short, the test was marked out of 40 and each tense was equally weighed.

3.3.1.2 Post-test

The post test (see **Appendix-E**) likened to the pre-test content wise. It was also similar to the pre- test in terms of the number of items, test format and marking. The purpose of post-test was, however, different from the pre-test. This test was designed with a view to showing whether there was a significant variation occurred between the comparison and experimental group at the end of the instructional treatment which lasted for 8 weeks.

To sum up, both tests, as mentioned previously, comprised of 20 multiple questions of simple past, present continuous, simple future, present perfect and present perfect progressive. Each tense was examined by 4 questions. The full test score was 40 (2 points per question). These instruments were self-designed English tense comprehension test based on the teaching materials in grade nine text book. The tenses were taken from chapter 10(page 184), chapter 11(page 196) and chapter 12 (page 210) of the course book.

3.4. Pilot Study

The pilot study was carried out with a view to confirming the qualities of the pretest and posttest used for the main study. Put differently, the pilot study was aimed at verifying the reliability and validity of research tools utilized during the study.

3.4.1. Sampling Procedure (pilot study)

As indicated before, Kokebe Tsibah Preparatory and Secondary School was selected using convenient sampling technique. This technique was chosen due to the fact that the researcher could easily select subjects based on their relative ease of access (Kumar, 1996) and the school is also situated only a stone throw from the work place of the researcher and his residence as compared to other schools in Yeka-Sub-City.

The school had 19 grade 9 sections during 2012/2013 academic year. Among these sections two sections were selected randomly for the pilot study. The students in one of the sections were chosen to take the pretest, whereas those in another section selected to be post tested. The subjects that had been involved during the pilot study were 56, 27 for pretest and 29 for the posttest. The subjects took the tests twice in a fortnight interval. The scores secured from the tests computed via SPSS to assess their test-retest reliability.

3.4.2. Reliability and Validity

It is evident that the concept of reliability and validity is central when considering a research quality. According to Selinger and Shohamy (1989:184), "reliability provides information on the degree to which the procedure elicits accurate data; validity provides information on the extent

to which the data collection procedure really measures what it is supposed to measure."

In testing comprehension, a test should be reliable as a measuring tool. Therefore, the researcher endeavored to confirm the reliability of the tests he used in his present study: the pre test and post test. He, hence, considered test-retest-reliability appropriate for both tests which were prepared and administered before the experiment commenced.

In addition, the face and content validity of the tests was checked by getting feedback from research advisors and colleagues. The comments made were employed to improve the tests.

In this connection, weir (1990) maintains a pilot test should undergo a further validation at this stage by inviting professionals in the field to comment on the suitability of texts, formats and item. Besides, in preparing the tests the researcher has looked up different references.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.1. The Pilot Study

Introduction

This sub-section of Chapter Four is devoted to present and analyze data obtained from the pre-test and post-test administered during the pilot study. Therefore, first the test retest reliability results of the tests will be presented in tables. Then, the results will be discussed textually. Finally, summaries of the results of the pilot study will be presented.

4.1.1. Test-Retest-Reliability

Test-retest is a method for assessing the reliability of an instrument by administering the same test at different points in time. The correlation between the scores across the two test administrations should be high (Feldt, & Brennan, 1993). To this end, pairs of scores of the subjects in their pre-test and post-test statistically analyzed. In this study, Pearson product moment correlation coefficient (r) was employed.

A correlation coefficient of zero indicates no relation at all. A score of 1 shows perfect uniformity in scores. A correlation coefficient -1 shows lack of relationship (Cohen & Manion, 1998).

As mentioned earlier, during the pilot study the researcher studied the test retest reliability of the pre-test and post-test. For this one government school, situated in Yeka Sub City, was selected. The school was Kokebe Tsibah Preparatory and Secondary School.

There were 19 grade nine sections. Out of these sections two sections were randomly selected for pre and post tests. The subjects in both sections took the tests twice in a fortnight interval.

Afterwards, the test scores were marked by the researcher and his colleagues. And then, the correlation coefficients were computed with SPSS. The subjects of the pre test and post tests were 27 and 29 correspondingly.

The raw scores of the tests of the subjects of the pilot study displayed in **(Appendix-B)**. The test-retest correlation coefficient, Pearson moment correlation coefficient which was computed using SPSS, however, presented as follows:

Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test 1 and Pre-test 2 (Pilot Study)

Pretest	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
pretest1	10.4	3.92	27
pretest2	10.00	4.44	27

Table 4.1 shows the group statistics of pre-test1 and pre-test2. That is to say, the mean scores of pre-test 1 and pre-test 2 of the subjects (N=27) found to be rather similar 10.4 and 10.0, and their corresponding standard deviation was 3.92 and 4.44. Never the less, this descriptive statistics hardly shows the degree of significance of their relationship. Therefore, inferential statistics is deemed inevitable. Table 4.2 displays this:

Table 4.2: Test Retest Correlation of Pre-test 1 and pre-test 2(Pilot Study)

Pre-test	Pre-test 1	Pre-test 2
Pre test 1 Pearson Correlation Sig (2-tailed)=P N	1 27	0.72 0.000 27
Pre test 2 Pearson Correlation Sig (2-tailed) N	0.72 0.000 27	1 27

Correlation is significant at 0.01level (2-tailed)

Table 4.2 depicts that the test retest correlation of pre-test 1 and pre-test 2 which were administered in two weeks interval during pilot study. Pearson correlation of pre-test1 and pre-test2 of examinees (N=27) is ($r=.72$), and ($P=0.000$). This implies that the consistency of the pretest at least in two instances ($r = 0.72$), and that the correlation coefficient is highly significant at ($P < 0.01$).

Table 4.3 : Descriptive Statistics of post-test1 and post-test2 (Pilot Study)

Post-test	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Post-test 1	11.9	3.57	29
Post-test 2	10.8	3.19	29

As can be seen from table 4.3, the mean score of 29 subjects who took the post-test at first occasion was 11.9, and standard deviation 3.57. The mean score and standard deviation in the second instance was 10.8, and 3.19. According to this descriptive statistics it is possible to say the post-test had nearly the same average score across time. To make sure its reliability, however, it was needed to compute its test retest correlation coefficient as presented in table 4.4 below:

Table 4. 4: Test Retest Correlation for Post-test in two Occasions (pilot study)

Posttest	Post-test 1	Post-test 2
Post-test Pearson correlation	1	0.79
Sig.(2 tailed) =P		0.000
N	29	29
Post-test 2 Pearson correlation	0.79	1
Sig.(2 tailed)	0.000	
N	29	29

Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

As shown in table 4.4, the Pearson correlation coefficient for the post-test which was administered to 29 subjects in two different instances was ($r=0.79$), and its (p -value =0.000) ($p=0.000 <0.01$). Since r approaches 1 and p is less than 0.01, the post-test can be deemed steady across time.

4.1.3. Summary of the Results of the Pilot Study

As indicated at the beginning of this sub-section of chapter four, the pilot study was aimed at showing the reliability of the pre and post tests. To this end, a center for the study was chosen and they were administered twice to compute their test retest reliability. The results of the computation revealed that the two tests were significantly consistent at least in two occasions respectively. Because, the pre-test and post-test had ($r= 0.72$ & 0.75) test retest correlation coefficient which approach to 1. Therefore, it is possible to claim that the pre-test and post-test were reliable to employ as data gathering tools for the main study.

4.2. The Main Study

Introduction

This section presents exclusively results from pre-test and post-test which were administered to the subjects of the main study for distinct purposes. Data solicited via document analysis and grade 9 students' English textbook have already been analyzed in the previous chapter. Here, therefore, the

results of the pre-test and post-test will be presented correspondingly. Independent samples t-test of both tests was computed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science). Finally, the results of main study will be summarized.

Here, it is worth stating what governs the significance of an independent samples t-test of two groups that treated differently. P-value tells us whether or not two condition Means are statistically different.

Therefore, if P is greater than 0.05, one can conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between two groups in two different conditions and that the differences between condition Means are likely due to chance and not likely due to a manipulation.

On the contrary, if the value (p-value) is less than or equal to 0.05, it is possible to deduce that the mean scores of the two groups in two distinct situations is significantly different. But the difference hardly arises from a chance. Rather it is due to a manipulation/intervention.

The sig value in Levenen's test for equality of test variances column also dictates us which row in an independent samples t-test table to read from. If sig value exceeds 0.05, one reads figures in the first row. If it is less than 0.05 one reads the second row.

4.2.1. Results of the Pre-test

The purpose of this test, during the main study, was to assess whether or not the experimental and control groups were found roughly at the same level of language performance prior to the intervention. To this effect, the subjects of the study were pretested, and their scores (see pre-test scores in **Appendix- C, C1, and C2**) were computed. The following series of tables (4.5, - 4.11) present data obtained from the pretest result.

Table 4.5: Group Statistics of WEXPG and WCONG in Pretest

Pre-test Result	Group	N	Mean	Std.Dev.
	Experimental	32	11.5	4.16
	Control	32	11.9	5.34

WEXPG: Whole experimental group **WCONG:** Whole control group

Table 4.5 shows that the mean scores of the experimental and control groups in pretest are 11.5 and 11.9 respectively. Correspondingly, the standard deviations of the two groups are 4.16 and 5.34. This means, the mean scores of the two groups are almost the same. Nevertheless, since these scores barely indicate their significant similarity, independent samples t-test is inevitably needed. Let's take a look at table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Independent sample t-test of WEXPG and WCONG in Pre-test

		Levenen's test for equality of test variances		t-test for equality of mean			
		F	Sig.	t	df.	P-VALUE	EXM-COM
Pre-test	Equal Variance Assumed	3.09	0.08	-.366	62	0.716	-0.44
	Equal Variance Not Assumed			-.366	58.5	0.716	-0.44

**P significant at 0.05 level

WEXPG: whole experimental group:
WCONG: whole control group

EXM= Experimental group mean
COM= Control group mean

As clearly depicted in table 4.6, the sig value (0.08) exceeds (the significant level, 0.05). Hence, data in the first row are scrutinized. Accordingly, the mean difference between the experimental and control groups with degree of freedom (df. 62) found to be -0.44 and p-value (0.716) which much more greater than 0.05(the level of significance).

Based on these stated statistical data of pre-test results, it is possible to claim that the experimental and control groups were not significantly different. In other words, both groups were found almost at the same level before they had been treated differently. In addition to the whole group, achiever groups in experimental and control groups were also compared against their counterparts to confirm whether they had been homogeneous on the language aspect in question before the intervention.

First, table4.7 presents group statistics of high achievers in the experimental group and their counterparts in the control group in pretest. In addition, table 4.8 displays an independent samples t-test of the subjects in question.

Table 4.7:Group Statistics of HAEXPG and HACONG In Pre-test

	Sub Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.
Pre-test Result	HAEXPG	16	14.9	2.83
	HACONG	16	16.5	3.46

HAEXPG: High Achievers of Experimental Group

HACONG: High Achievers of Control Group

Table 4.7 indicates that the mean and the standard deviation of high achievers in the experimental group are 14.9& 2.83 respectively. Likewise, their counter parts in the control group scored 16.5 mean &3.46 standard deviation. This group statistics depicts that the high achievers in control group exceed their equals in other group only slightly in their mean score.

To make sure the groups significant homogeneity, their independent samples t-test was computed and presented in table 4.8 as follows:

Table 4.8: Independent samples t-test of HAEXPG and HACONG in Pre-test

		Levenen's test for equality of test variances		t-test for equality of mean			
		F	Sig	t	Df.	P-value	HAEM-HACM
Pre-test	Equal variance Assumed	1.124	.297	-1.454	30	0.156	-1.63
	Equal variance not Assumed			-1.454	28.8	0.156	-1.63

**P Significant at 0.05 level

HAEXPG and HACONG: High Achievers of Experimental & Control Group
HAEM and HACM: High Achievers Mean In Experimental & Control Group

As clearly indicated in table 4.8, the sig value is grater than the level of significance (0.05), with degree of freedom 30. The table also shows that the mean difference between HAEXP and HACON is -1.63. The negative sign indicates the latter exceeds the former in their average mean score in the pre-test which was administered before the treatment. It is also displayed in the table that the p-value (0.156) exceedingly greater than the level of significance (0.05). In short, independent samples t-test of high achievers in each group has confirmed the average mean scores of the two groups were statistically insignificant, (where p-value 0.156 which exceeds 0.05, mean difference -1.63 and degree of freedom 30). This means the high achievers in both groups were statistically alike in light of language performance in focus.

Table 4. 9: Descriptive Statistics of LAEXP VS LACON in Pre-test

Pre-test Result	Sub Group	N	Mean	Std. dev.
	LAEXP	16	8.1250	1.86
	LACON	16	7.3750	1.59

LAEXG: Low Achievers of Experimental Group

LACONG: Low Achievers of Control Group

As shown in table 4.9, the mean score of the low achievers in the experimental group (8.13) is somewhat greater than the mean score of low achievers (7.36) in the control group before the instructional treatment was intervened. Their corresponding standard deviation (1.86 & 1.59) has also confirmed this slight difference. Table 4.10 shows this insignificant difference

Table 4.10: Independent samples t-test of LAEXPG VS LACONG in Pre-test

		Levenen's test for equality of test variances		t-test for equality of mean			
		F	Sig	t	df.	P-value	LAEMG-LACMG
Pre-test	Equal variance Assumed	0.02	0.89	1.228	30	0.229	0.75
	Equal variance not Assumed			1.228	29.3	0.229	0.75

**P Significant at 0.05 level

LAEXPG: Low Achievers of Experimental Group

LACONG: Low Achieves of Control Group

LAEMG: Low Achievers Mean of Experimental Group

LACMG: Low Achievers Mean of Control Group

Table 4.10 reveals no significant comprehension disparity between the low achievers in the experimental group and their equivalents in the control group before the subjects received English verb tenses instruction. In fact,

the two subgroups were statistically homogenous. However, the mean score of the former group (table 4.9) was slightly greater than the latter. The above deduction is put forwarded due to the fact that the p-value (0.299) of the t-test result found to be much greater than (level of significance $p < 0.05$), with 30 degree of freedom.

4.2.3. Results of Post-test Study

The main purpose of the post-test was to explore whether or not inductive grammar instruction had significant effect on the subjects of the study as compare to deductive grammar instruction in teaching English verb tenses.

In another words, the test was used to answer the research questions stated in chapter one:

1. Does inductive explicit grammar instruction have significant effects upon the ability of grade nine students to comprehend English verb tenses?
2. Do high achievers in experimental (inductive) group outperform their counterparts in control (deductive) group in comprehending English verb tenses?
3. Do low achievers in experimental (inductive) group outperform their counterparts in control (deductive) group in comprehending English verb tenses?

To this end, the researcher computed descriptive statistics and independent samples t-test of the posttest scores (see raw data for post-test in **Appendix-C, C1, and C2**) of the subjects using SPSS (statistical package for social science. This subsection, therefore, presents the descriptive statistics and independent samples t-test of the post-test correspondingly.

Table 4.11: Descriptive Statistics of WEXPG and WCONG in post-test

Post-test Result	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	WEXPG	32	25.9	7.51
	WCONG	32	20.2	7.05

WEXPG: Whole Experimental Group

WCONG: Whole Control Group

Table 4.11 depicts that the whole experimental group which comprises of both high achievers and low achievers scored 25.9 mean and 7.51 standard deviation. The table also shows that high and low achievers in control group secured 20.2 mean and 7.05 standard deviation. The mean scores of these groups were almost the same in their pre-test as indicated in table 4.5, but their post-test mean score which was administered to both groups at the end of the experiment, as shown in table 4.11 above, reveals the experimental group scored bigger mean than the control group. However, since descriptive statistics hardly show significant difference, independent samples t-test of both groups were computed and presented in table 4.12 as follows

Table 4.12: Independent samples t-test of WEXPG and WCONG in Post-test

		Levenen's test for equality of test variances		t-test for equality of mean			
		F	Sig.	t	df.	P-VALUE	WEXM-WCOM
Post-test	Equal variance assumed	0.031	0.861	3.123	62	0.003	5.69
	equal variance not assumed			3.123	61.7	0.003	5.69

**P significant at 0.05 level

WEXPG: Whole Experimental Group
WCONG: Whole Control Group

WEXM= Experimental Group Mean
WCOM= Control Group Mean

As can be seen in table 4.12, the mean score difference between the whole experimental group and control group ($WEXM - WCOM$) is 5.69, with 62 degree of freedom. It also shows that the p-value of the groups in their posttest is 0.003 which is well below the level of significance level ($p < 0.05$). Put differently, the mean score of the whole experimental group, in the posttest, is significantly higher than the control group after both groups were subjected to inductive and deductive approach correspondingly. In short, the experimental group outperformed the control group in understanding the English verb tenses.

Table 4.13: Group Statistics of HAEXPG and HACONG in Post-test

Post-test Result	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	WEXPG	16	31.5	4.98
	WEXPG	16	25.4	5.15

HAEXPG: High Achievers in Experimental Group

HACONG: High Achievers in Control Group

Table 4.13 displays the mean scores and standard deviation of high achievers in experimental and control groups. Accordingly, the mean and standard deviation of the former are 29.6 and 6.25, whereas the latter group scores 24.1 and 5.34. In their pre-test, the high achievers in control group secured slightly higher mean score than their counterparts in experimental group as can be seen in (table 4.7). Nevertheless, after the two groups being treated via different approach and post tested, the high achievers' mean in the experimental group exceeded their counterparts' mean in the control group by about 5. This implies, the former did better than the latter in getting grasp of the English verb tenses owing to inductive grammar instruction which the experimental group was subjected to during the experiment.

Whether or not the mean score difference of the groups in question was significant, their post-test independent samples t-test was calculated. Take a look at table 4.14 below and the analysis that ensues:

Table 4.14: Independent samples t-test of HAEXPG and HACONG in Post-test

		Levenen's test for equality of test variances		t-test for equality of mean			
		F	Sig.	t	df.	P-VALUE	HAEMG-HACMG
Post-test	Equal variance assumed	0.072	0.79	3.42	30	0.002	6.13
	equal variance not assumed			3.42	29.9	0.002	6.13

**P significant at 0.05 level

HAEXPG & HACONG: High Achievers of Experimental Group & Control Group

HAEMG & HACMG: High Achievers Mean In Experimental and Control Groups

Table 4.14 discloses that, in their post-test, the high achievers of experimental group significantly scored higher mean than their equals in the control group, with 30 degree of freedom. As clearly put in the table, their mean difference is 6.13 and p-value (0.002) which is less than the significance level ($p < 0.05$).

Table 4.15: Group Statistics of LAEXPG and LACONG in post-test

Posttest Result	Sub Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	LAEXPG:	16	20.3	4.95
	LACONG	16	15.0	4.32

LAEXPG: Low Achievers of Experimental Group

LACONG: Low Achieves of Control Group

Table 4.15 shows that the mean score of low achievers of the experimental group exceeds the mean score of their corresponding achievers of the

control group (20.3 >15.0). It also depicts that the corresponding standard deviation are (4.95 and 4.32). This group statistics, however, hardly shows whether or not the mean score difference is statistically significant. Therefore, the t-test of these subgroups was computed. Table 4.16 presents the independent samples t-test of low achievers of the experimental and control groups as follows:

Table 4.16: Independent Samples t-test of LAEXPG VS LACONG in Post-test

		Levenen's test for equality of test variances		t-test for equality of mean			
		F	Sig	t	df.	P-value	LAEM-LACM
Post-test	Equal variance Assumed	0.085	0.772	3.198	30	0.003	5.25
	Equal variance not Assumed				29.5	0.003	5.25

**P Significant at 0.05 level

LAEXPG&LACONG: Low Achievers of Experimental & Control Group

LAEM&LACM: Low Achievers Mean In Experimental and Control Groups

The data in table 4.16 show the significant difference between the low achievers in experimental and control groups in posttest. The low achievers in the former group suppressed their counterparts in the latter group by 5.25 mean score. In addition, their mean scores were significantly different at 0.05 since the p-value was only 0.003 ($p < 0.05$). This brings to light, in comprehending the English verb tenses that the low achievers who were subjected to inductive grammar instruction outperformed their equals who were taught through deductive one. This result refutes the assumption of the proponents of deductive approach (e.g. Ausubel, 1974; Carroll, 1974) who claimed that inductive approach solely valuable for high achievers. On the contrary, it proves the finding of Shaffer (1989) who argued that the inductive approach is valuable for all levels of students.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Summary

This study attempted to explore whether or not the use of inductive grammar instruction significantly affects students' comprehension of English verb tenses.

Specifically, the study sought answers to the following questions:

1. Does inductive explicit grammar instructions have significant effects upon the ability of grade nine students to comprehend English verb tenses?
2. Do high achievers in experimental (inductive) group outperform their counterparts in control (deductive) group in comprehending English verb tenses?
3. Do low achievers in experimental (inductive) group outperform their counterparts in control (deductive) group in comprehending English verb tenses?

An experimental design, especially called pre-and-posttest design was applied to the study. Up on the approval of the principal of Higher 12 Secondary School, 64 grade nine students of 2012/2013 academic year were selected and considered the subjects of the study. Since the study was double groups design, the subjects put in to experimental and control groups. Correspondingly, they were subjected to inductive and deductive methods in their respective classes.

The study was carried out at the school in focus during the second semester of 2013 academic year. As major research instruments, teacher-made tests, namely pretest and posttest were prepared, piloted and administered to the subjects of the study in both groups. The pretest was used to make sure the homogeneity of the subjects in the experimental and control groups from the out set, whereas t-test for the independent sample means was compared the posttest mean scores of the subjects who were taught English verb tenses under the inductive and deductive methods. The information obtained from the pretest and posttest was analyzed through descriptive as well as independent samples t-test. Hence, the result of the study summarized below:

5.2. Major Findings

As indicated previously, this study was aimed to show whether or not inductive grammar instruction significantly affects students' ability to comprehend English verb tenses.

The group statistics of the subjects, in their post-test, show that those who were subjected to inductive method scored higher mean (25.9) than those who were taught via deductive method (20.2). Put differently, the mean score difference between the groups in their post-test was amounted to 5.6. Further, the post-test result reveals that there was significant difference between the groups in question in understanding the English verb tenses after being taught differently—inductively and deductively—at 0.05 ($p=0.003<0.05$).

As for the second research question, the finding proves that there was significant difference in the mean scores of high achievers who were taught inductively (31.5) and their counterparts who were treated deductively (25.4) in their posttest. The independent samples t-test depicts that the post

test mean score of the former statistically higher than the latter at alpha (0.05) with p-value (0.002)and mean difference 6.13.

As far as the third research question of the study is concerned, the study points out that those low achievers who were under inductive grammar instruction significantly outperformed their equals who were under deductive method. Correspondingly, the mean scores of these groups in their post test were (20.3) and (15.0) with mean score difference 5.25 and p-value (0.003).

5.3. Conclusions

Based on the above discussion and findings, the following conclusions are drawn.

- Students who were subjected to inductive grammar instruction significantly suppressed those who were instructed English verb tenses through deductive grammar teaching method. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that inductive approach is significantly more effective than deductive approach in enabling students to comprehend the English verb tense.
- High achievers and low achievers who were assigned to the experiment group and taught with inductive grammar instruction also exceedingly outperformed their counterparts in the control group and treated with deductive method. Thus, it is possible to deduce that inductive approach not only statistically better than deductive one in teaching English verb tenses, but also it is rather handy for all kind of students with different level of achievements.
- The finding of the study, therefore, negates the finding of (Ausubel, 1974; Carroll 1964) who claimed that inductive approach solely

valuable for high achievers. On the contrary, it proves the finding of Shaffer (1989) who argued that the inductive approach is valuable for all levels of students.

5.4. Recommendations

In the light of the foregoing conclusions, it is recommended that school administrators should inform the result of the study to the whole EFL teachers and the people who work in the educational environment to convince and encourage them to apply this method to English Grammar for the maximum benefits of their students. Furthermore, they may organize seminars and other in-service training for language teachers who have no training in teaching English Grammar.

It is also recommended that material designers may take in to account innovative method of teaching and leaning styles in designing language materials as to address the demand of the learners.

Teachers should try to be flexible in employing different grammar instruction in teaching various language aspects rather than being stick to what is prescribed in the course book they teach from. They should not be oblivious of adapting the material they working with as per it is deemed necessary.

It is further recommended that parallel studies should be undertaken to gain more and deeper insight about using the Inductive Method to teach grammar as well as to negate or affirm the findings of this study.

REFERENCES

- Al-Kharrat, M.Y. (2000). **Deductive & Inductive Lessons for Saudi EFL Freshmen Students**. Retrieved October 23, 2013 at <http://itesli.org/Techniques/Al-KharratDeductive/>.
- Ausubel, D. (1974) "Adults versus Children in Second-Learning." *Modern language Journal* 58 1974: 420-23.
- Azar, B. (2007). **Grammar-Based Teaching: A Practitioners Perspective**. *The Internet TESL-EJ*. 11/2. 1-15
- Bailey, D. (2011). **English For Ethiopia: Teacher Guide Grade Nine**. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- Boyle, E. M. (1994). **This is the dictionary of Ivan Petrovich: Balancing the role of grammar in the Russian Communicative classroom Theory into Practice**, 33 (1), 10-15.
- Brown, D., H. (2007). **Principles of Language Learning And Teaching**. White Longman
- Bruner, J. S. (1961). **The act of discovery**. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58, 420-423.
- Campbell, D & Stanley, J (1963). **Factors That Threaten the Validity of Research Findings**: Handbook of research on Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carr, T. & Curran, T. (1994). **Cognitive factors in learning about Structured . studies in second language acquisition** ,16,205-230
- Carroll, B. (1964). **Language and Thought**. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1988). **Techniques and Resources in Teaching Grammar**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Celce . (1991). **Grammar Pedagogy in Second and Foreign Language Teaching**. *TESOL Quarterly*. 25/2.
- Chen, T. (2003). **In Search of an Effective Grammar Teaching Model**. *English Teaching Forum*, Vol.33 No. 3. pp 58-60.
- Cook, V. (2001). **Second Language Learning and Language Teaching**: New York. Oxford University Press.
- Corder, S.P. (1988). **Pedagogic grammars**. In W. Rutherford et al. (Eds.), *Grammar and Second Language Teaching*. New York: Newbury.

- Cummins, J. & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in education: Aspects of theory, research and practice*. London: Longman.
- Cunnings worth, A. (1984). **Evaluating and Selecting EFL Teaching Materials**, Heinemann
- DeKeyser, R. (1995). **Implicit and explicit learning of L2 grammar**: A pilot Study *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 188-194.
- DeKeyser, Robert M. (1998). **Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar**. In: Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams (eds.), 42-63.
- Dimiter, M. (2003). **Pretest-Posttest Designs and Measurement of Change**. Kent : Kent State University.
- Di pietro, R.T. (1990). **Selected articles from English teaching forum**, 1989.
- Doughty, C. (1991). **L2 instruction does make a difference evidence from an empirical study of L2 relativisation**. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13, 431-469.
- Eisenstein, M. (1987). **Grammatical explanations in ESL: Teach the student, Not The way**. New Jersey: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Ellis, R. (2004). **The definition and measurement of L2 explicit knowledge**. *Language Learning* 54: 227-275.
- Ellis, R. (2006). **“Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA Perspective”**, *Tesol Quarterly* 40/1: 83-107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/40264512>.
- Ellis, R. (2008). **Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective**. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- Erlam, R. (2003). **The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronouns in French as a second language**. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(2), 242-
- Felder, R., & Henriques, E. (1995). **Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education**. *Foreign Language Annals* 28(1), 21-31.
- Feldt, L.S., & Brennan, R.L. (1993). **Reliability**. In R.L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational Measurement* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Fortune, A. (1992). **Self-study grammar practice: Learners views and preferences**. *ELT Journal* 46(2), 160-171.

- Freeman, D. (1986). **Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching**. Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- Gass, S. (1991). **Grammar instruction, selective attention and learning processes**. In Philipson, E. Kellerman, L.
- Geremew Semu.(1994).“**The Effectiveness of Teaching English as a Foreign Language through Grammar Consciousness-Raising Activities to Ninth Grade Students**” M.A. Thesis. (unpublished).Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Garrett , N.(1989). “ **Communicative Ability**” **Applied Language Learning**.
- Girma Gezahegn.(2005). **A study of Secondary School English Language Teachers' Implementaton of Methodological innovation: The Teaching of grammar in focus**. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Addis Ababa : Addis Ababa University.
- Halliday, M. A. (1997). **An Introduction to Functional Grammar**. London: Arnold.
- Herron, C., & Tomasello, M. (1992). **Acquiring grammatical structures by guided induction**. *The French Review*, 65(5), 708-718.
- Higgs, T. V.(1985).*Teaching grammar for proficiency*. *Foreign Language Annals* ,18(4), 289-296.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944->
- Howatt,A.(1984).**A History of English Language Teaching**.Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hu,G.(2002).**Psychological Constraints on the Utility of Metalinguistic Knowledge in Second Language Production**. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 347–386.
- Jia-Yuan Shih (2008). **Effects of Inductive and Deductive Approaches in Grammar Instruction for Junior High School Students of Differing English Proficiency** .M.Athesis in DepartmentApplied ForeignLanguages, Technology in Southern Taiwan.
- Kim,J(2007).**Comparative Study of the Effects of Explicit Instruction Versus Explicit - Inductive/Individualistic on the Second Language Acquisition of English Relative Clauses** In Korean University Level EFL Learners Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University.
- Krashen,S.(1981).**Second language acquisition and second language learning**.Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1982). **Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition**. Oxford: Pergamon.

- Krashen, S & Tracy T.(1983).*The natural approach: Language acquisition in the Classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985).**The Input Hypothesis: Issues and implications**. London: Longman.
- Krashen,S.(2002).**Second language acquisition and second language learning**. Retrieved January 11,2013.availableathttp://www.sdkrashen.com/SL_Acquisition&Learning.
- Kuder ,E.(2009). **Implications of an Inductive Versus Deductive Approach to SLA Grammar Instruction**. M.A. Thesis. University of Delaware.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1991). “**Teaching grammar**”, in M. Celce-Murcia (ed.) *Teaching English as a Second Language*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 279-283.
- Lee, N.(2004). **The Neurobiology of learning: Perspectives from second language Acquisition**, 39–66. Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Leedy, P.D. (1997). **Practical Research: Planning and Design (6th ed.)**. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., p. 232-233.
- Lessow-Hurley, J. (2009). **The foundations of dual language instruction**. Upper Saddle River,NJ: Allyn & Bacon.
- Li,D.(1998).**It’s always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers’ perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea**. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677-703.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). **Focus on Form and Corrective Feedback in Communicative Language Teaching: Effects on L2**.*Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 42912,-448.
- Lock, G. (1997): **Functional English Grammar**. U.S.A, Cambridge University Press.
- Long, M. (1991). **Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology**. InK. de Bot, R. Ginsberg.
- Long, M.,&Crookes,G.(1992).**Three approaches to task-based syllabus design**. *TESOL Quarterly* 26, 27–56.
- Mohammed & Jaber.(2008). “**The Effects of Deductive and Inductive Approaches of Teaching on Jordanian University Students' Use of the Active and Passive Voice in English**.” *College Student Journal*. 01463934, Jun2008 Part B, Vol. b 42, Issue 2.
- Nassaji, H.(2000). **Towards integrating form-focused instruction and communicative interaction in L2 classroom:Some pedagogical possibilities**. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(2), 241–250.

- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2004). **Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar.**
- Nick, E.(1994).**Introduction: Implicit and explicit language learning-an overview.** In: Nick Ellis (ed.) , 1–31.
- Nick,E.(2005).**At the interface:Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge.** *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 27: 305–352.
- Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). **Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis.** *Language Learning*.
- Paradis,M.(1994).**Neurolinguistic aspects of implicit and explicit memory: By** Implications for bilingualism and SLA. In Nick Ellis (ed.) , 393–419.
- Piaget, J. (1974). **The Future of Developmental Children Psychology.***Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 3 (2),87-94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02215168>.
- Pica,T.(2000).**Tradition and Transition in English Language Teaching Methodology.** *System*, 28, 1–18.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). **Second Language Pedagogy.**Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Prisna ,p. &Premin ,K.(2010).**Effects of Inductive Approach on Teaching Grammar in the Writing Course.**
- Richards. J. C and Renandya, W.A (2002).**Methodology In Language Teaching.** U.S.A. Cambridge University Press..
- Richards, J.C., and Rodgers, T.S. (2001). **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.**Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruin, I. (1996). **Grammar and the advanced learner: On learning and teaching a second language.** Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Rutherford, W.(1987). **Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching.** Harlow: Longman.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2006). **Introducing Second Language Acquisition.** New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, M.(1990). "**Explicit and implicit grammar teaching strategies: New empirical data.**" *The French Review*, 63: 779-789.
- Seliger, H. W. (1975). **Inductive method and deductive method in language teaching: A re-examination.** *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*.

- Seyed, J. (2009). **A Comparative Study of the Effect of Explicit-inductive and Explicit-deductive Grammar Instruction in EFL Contexts.**
- Shaffer, C. (1989). **A Comparison Of Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching Foreign Languages.** *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 395-403.
- Shanks, D. R., & St. John, M. F. (1994). **Characteristics of dissociable human learning systems.** *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 17, 367-395. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00035032>
- Sharwood, S. M. (1993). **Input Enhancement in Instructed SLA: Theoretical bases.** *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(2), 165-179.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). **The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning.** *Applied Linguistics*.
- Spada, N. & Lightbown, P. M. (1993). **Instruction and the development of questions in the L2 classroom.** *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 205–221.
- Swaffar, J. K., & Woodruff, M. S. (1978). Language for comprehension: Focus on reading: A report on the University of Texas German Program. *The Modern Language Journal*, 60, 27-32.
- Swan, M. (1985). **Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development: *Input in second language acquisition*** , (pp. 235–256). New York: Newbury House.
- Terrell, T. D. (1991). **The Role of Grammar Instruction in a Communicative Approach.** *The Modern Language Journal*, 75 (1), 52-63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1991.tb01083.x>
- Thornbury, S. (1999). **How to teach grammar.** Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Wang, L. Y. (2002). **Effects of Inductive and Deductive Approach on EFL Learning Collocation Patterns by Using Concordancers** (Unpublished master's thesis). National Yunlin University of Science and Technology, Taiwan.
- Widodo, H. (2006). **Approaches and Procedures for Teaching Grammar.** *English Teaching: Practice and Critiques*, 5(1), 122-141.
- Williams, J. (1995). **Focus on form in communicative language teaching: findings Research and the classroom teacher.** *TESOL Journal*, 4(4), 12–16.
- Wu, M. J. (2008). **Principal Approaches of Grammar Instruction.** *US-China Foreign Language*, 6 (11), 29-

Appendix-A

Subjects' 2012/2013 Academic Year English First Semester Raw Scores (out of 100%)

9th 04 and 9th 10 Low Achievers (Control Group)

NO	SUBJECTS' CODE	Section	SUBJECTS' FIRST SEMESTER SCORE OUT OF 100%	SEX	AGE
1	B17	9 th 04	48	F	16
2	B18	-	46	F	15
3	B19	-	49	F	15
4	B20	-	50	F	15
5	B21	-	48	F	15
6	B22	-	48	F	16
7	B23	-	47	F	15
8	B24	-	45	M	16
9	B25	-	49	F	16
10	B26	9 th 10	46	F	16
11	B27	-	47	F	15
12	B28	-	50	F	15
13	B29	-	50	F	16
14	B30	-	44	M	15
15	B31	-	47	F	16
16	B32	-	48	F	15

9th 04 and 9th10 High Achievers (Control Group)

NO	SUBJECTS' CODE	SECTION	SUBJECTS' FIRST SEMESTER SCORE OUT OF 100%	SEX	AGE
1	B1	9 th 04	86	F	15
2	B2	-	88	M	16
3	B3	-	91	M	15
4	B4	-	86	M	16
5	B5	-	90	M	15
6	B6	-	87	M	15
7	B7	-	94	F	15
8	B8	-	95	F	16
9	B9	-	84	F	16
10	B10		90	F	15
11	B11	-	81	M	15
12	B12	-	85	F	15
13	B13	9 th 10	83	F	16
14	B14	-	92	F	16
15	B15	-	89	F	15
16	B 16	-	91	M	16

9th 05 and 9th 15 Low Achievers (Experimental Group)

NO	SUBJECTS' CODE	SECTION	SUBJECTS' FIRST SEMESTER SCORE OUT OF 100%	SEX	AGE
1	A17	9 th 05	47	F	15
2	A18	-	48	F	16
3	A19	-	50	F	16
4	A20	-	47	F	16
5	A21	-	44	M	15
6	A22	-	43	M	15
7	A23	-	50	F	16
8	A24	-	49	F	16
9	A25	9 th 15	48	F	16
10	A26		49	F	16
11	A27	-	50	F	15
12	A28	-	45	F	16
13	A29	-	50	F	15
14	A30	-	48	F	16
15	A31	-	47	F	16
16	A32	-	46	M	15

9th 05 and 9th 15 High Achievers (Experimental Group)

NO	SUBJECTS' CODE	SECTION	SUBJECTS' FIRST SEMESTER SCORE OUT OF 100%	SEX	AGE
1	A1	9 th 05	85	F	15
2	A2	-	87	M	15
3	A3	-	90	F	15
4	A4	-	86	M	15
5	A5	-	91	M	15
6	A6	-	89	F	16
7	A7	-	95	F	15
8	A8	-	94	M	15
9	A9	9 th 15	83	F	15
10	A10		92	F	15
11	A11	-	79	F	15
12	A12	-	86	M	15
13	A13		80	M	15
14	A14	-	94	F	15
15	A15	-	88	M	15
16	A15	-	91	F	16

Appendix-B

Raw Pre-test and post-test scores (pilot study)

No	Subjects' Code	Pre-test scores		No	Subjects' Code	Post test scores	
		Pre-test1	Pre-test2			Post-test1	Post-test2
1	Pre1	18	12	1	Post1	20	14
2	Pre2	14	14	2	Post2	16	16
3	Pre3	14	14	3	Post3	16	16
4	Pre4	16	12	4	Post4	18	14
5	Pre5	18	14	5	Post5	16	12
6	Pre6	10	12	6	Post6	12	14
7	Pre7	12	16	7	Post7	14	12
8	Pre8	10	16	8	Post8	12	14
9	Pre9	12	14	9	Post9	10	12
10	Pre10	12	14	10	Post10	10	10
11	Pre11	12	12	11	Post11	10	10
12	Pre12	12	10	12	Post12	14	12
13	Pre13	14	12	13	Post13	16	14
14	Pre14	8	10	14	Post14	10	12
15	Pre15	14	12	15	Post15	16	14
16	Pre16	10	18	16	Post16	12	10
17	Pre17	8	4	17	Post17	10	6
18	Pre18	8	4	18	Post18	12	8
19	Pre19	8	8	19	Post19	10	10
20	Pre20	10	8	20	Post20	12	10
21	Pr21	8	6	21	Post21	10	8
22	Pre22	6	6	22	Post22	8	8
23	Pre23	6	4	23	Post23	8	6
24	Pre24	4	6	24	Post24	6	8
25	Pre25	4	4	25	Post25	6	6
26	Pre26	6	4	26	Post26	8	6
27	Pre27	6	4	27	Post27	8	6
				28	Post28	14	12
				29	Post29	12	14

Appendix-C

Pre-test and Post-test Scores of Experimental and Control Groups (Main Study)

No	Experimental Group			No	Control Group		
	Subjects code	Pretest score	Posttest score		Subjects code	Pretest score	Posttest score
1	A1	20	26	1	B1	14	22
2	A2	16	28	2	B2	16	34
3	A3	16	30	3	B3	16	22
4	A4	18	36	4	B4	14	24
5	A5	20	38	5	B5	16	26
6	A6	12	28	6	B6	14	28
7	A7	14	32	7	B7	18	26
8	A8	12	38	8	B8	18	30
9	A9	14	28	9	B9	22	28
10	A10	14	36	10	B10	22	24
11	A11	14	32	11	B11	22	34
12	A12	14	40	12	B12	12	14
13	A13	16	28	13	B13	14	26
14	A14	10	30	14	B14	12	24
15	A15	16	32	15	B15	14	26
16	A16	12	22	16	B16	20	18
17	A17	10	20	17	B17	6	16
18	A18	10	22	18	B18	6	20
19	A19	10	26	19	B19	10	16
20	A20	12	20	20	B20	10	16
21	A21	10	16	21	B21	8	12
22	A22	8	16	22	B22	8	10
23	A23	8	24	23	B23	6	12
24	A24	6	18	24	B24	8	18
25	A25	6	10	25	B25	6	8
26	A26	8	12	26	B26	6	16
27	A27	8	20	27	B27	6	20
28	A28	8	22	28	B28	8	14
29	A29	6	26	29	B29	6	20
30	A30	8	26	30	B30	10	18
31	A31	6	20	31	B31	6	6
32	A32	6	26	32	B32	8	18

Appendix-C1

Pre-test and post-test Raw scores of High Achievers in Experimental and Control Groups

Experimental Group High Achievers				Control Group High Achievers			
No	Subjects Code	PRETEST SCORE	Posttest Score	No	Subjects Code	PRETEST SCORE	Posttest Score
1	A1	20	26	1	B1	14	22
2	A2	16	28	2	B2	16	34
3	A3	16	30	3	B3	16	22
4	A4	18	36	4	B4	14	24
5	A5	20	38	5	B5	16	26
6	A6	12	28	6	B6	14	28
7	A7	14	32	7	B7	18	26
8	A8	12	38	8	B8	18	30
9	A9	14	28	9	B9	22	28
10	A10	14	36	10	B10	22	24
11	A11	14	32	11	B11	22	34
12	A12	14	40	12	B12	12	14
13	A13	16	28	13	B13	14	26
14	A14	10	30	14	B14	12	24
15	A15	16	32	15	B15	14	26
16	A16	12	22	16	B16	20	18

Appendix-C2

Pre-test and post-test Raw scores for Low Achievers in Experimental and Control Group

Experimental Group Low Achievers				Control Group Low Achievers			
No	Subjects code	Pretest Score	Posttest Score	No	Subjects code	Pretest score	Posttest Score
1	A17	10	20	1	B17	6	16
2	A18	10	22	2	B18	6	20
3	A19	10	26	3	B19	10	16
4	A20	12	20	4	B20	10	16
5	A21	10	16	5	B21	8	12
6	A22	8	16	6	B22	8	10
7	A23	8	24	7	B23	6	12
8	A24	6	18	8	B24	8	18
9	A25	6	10	9	B25	6	8
10	A26	8	12	10	B26	6	16
11	A27	8	20	11	B27	6	20
12	A28	8	22	12	B28	8	14
13	A29	6	26	13	B29	6	20
14	A30	8	26	14	B30	10	18
15	A31	6	20	15	B31	6	6
16	A32	6	26	16	B32	8	18

Appendix-D

Pre-test

Direction: The Test consists of 20 multiple Question Items. Each Item Has Four Options. Circle the Best Answer that Makes Each Sentence Grammatical and Meaningful (2 Points for an item).

Name _____ Section _____ Roll No _____ time allowed:

Time Allowed: 30 Munities

1. **A:** "Hurry up! We're waiting for you. What's taking you so long?"
B: "I ___ for an important phone call. Go ahead and leave without me."
A. waited B. will wait C. am waiting D. have waited
2. **A:** "Martha is going to be famous someday. She ___ in three movies already."
B: "I am sure she'll be a star."
A. has appeared B. will appear C. is appearing D. appeared
3. **A:** "Where's Paulos now?"
B: "He ___ in his study room."
A. will study B. has studied C. studied D. is studying
4. **A:** "When is Mr. Fish planning to stop working?"
B: "Soon, I think. He ___ here for a long time. He'll probably stop working either next year or the year after that."
A. will work B. worked C. has been working D. is working
5. **A:** "Why did you buy all this sugar and chocolate?"
B: "I ___ a tasty food for dinner tonight."
A. make B. am going to make C. made D. have made
6. **A:** Robel and I _____ to that new Indian restaurant last night.
B: You mean the one in Haile G/Silassie Road? **A:** That's right
A. have gone B. will go C. are going D. went

7. Fish are among the earliest forms of life. They ___ on earth for ages since the time of unmemorable.
- A. existed B. have existed C. will exist D. are existing
8. The phone ___ since Jemal announced his candidacy for president this morning.
- A. has been ringing B. rang C. will ring D. is ringing
9. I don't feel good. I am afraid I ___ work tomorrow.
- A. didn't go to B. haven't been going to
C. haven't gone to D. won't go to
10. In the last two decades, space exploration ___ great contributions to weather forecasting.
- A. is making B. made C. has made D. will make
11. On July 20, 1696, Astronaut Neil Armstrong ___ down onto the moon. He was the first person ever to set foot on another celestial body.
- A. is stepping B. stepped C. has stepped D. will step
12. **A:** "When are you going to ask your manager for increase in pay?"
B: "I ___ to her twice already! I don't think she wants to give me one."
- A. have talked B. will talk C. am talking D. talked
13. Genet, could you please turn off the stove? The potatoes ___ for at least thirty minutes.
- A. are boiling B. will boil C. have been boiling D. boiled
14. **A:** "Could someone help me lift the machine into the pickup truck?" **B:** "I am not busy. I ___ you."
- A. helped B. will help C. have helped D. am helping
15. Jimma, why don't you take some time off? You ___ too hard since last October. Take a short vacation.
- A. worked B. will work C. are working D. have been working

16. The little girl ____ at the moment. She has lost her toy, and no one is able to find it for her yet.
A. has cried B. will cry C. is crying D. cried
17. I ____ four books on gardening the last time when I had gone to the library.
A. borrowed B. have borrowed C. will borrow D. is borrowing
18. We ____ to Hawassa on the coming Saturday.
A. have flown B. are flying C. flew D. have been flying
19. I have never been to Lalibela. Oh, I ____ there last summer. I did a language course there, and made a lot of new friends, too.
A. will go B. am going C. have gone D. went
20. **A:** "Les's go home! What's taking you so long?"
B: "I ____ there as soon as I get my keys."
A. will be B. was C. have been D. am

Appendix-E

Post-test

Direction: The Test consists of 20 multiple Question Items. Each Item Has Four Options. Circle the Best Answer that Makes Each Sentence Grammatical and Meaningful (2 Points for an item).

Name _____ Section _____ Roll No _____

Time Allowed: 30 Munities

1. **Mum:** "What the hell are you doing?" The phone is ringing.

Daughter: Sorry mum, I _____ a shower.

- A. took B. will take C. am taking D. have taken

2. **A:** "Have you ever seen this film?" **B:** "Definitely, I _____ it at least five times so far."

- A. have seen B. will see C. am seeing D. saw

3. **A:** "I wonder if you lend me your mobile?"

B: "I am sorry, I _____ for a phone call from the USA."

- A. will wait B. have waited C. waited D. am waiting

4. **A:** "Where is the woman from?"

B: "She is from Australia. She is travelling round the world at the moment. She _____ for the last three months."

- A. will travel B. travelled
C. has been travelling D. is travelling

5. **A:** "What are you doing tonight?"

B: "I _____ the football match on TV."

- A. have been watching B. am going to watch
C. watched D. have watched

6. **A:** "Have you heard about your mother yet?"

B: "Yes, she _____ me a call yesterday."

- A. has given B. will give C. is giving D. gave

7. **A:** "I haven't seen Fanos for about two weeks?"
B: "She _____ to Hawasa to visit Aunt Keneni. She will be back next week."
 A. went B. has gone C. will go D. is going
8. **A:** "How long _____ you _____?"
B: "For about fourteen years, I guess."
 A. have/ been driving B. did/drive
 C. will /drive D. are/ driving
9. **A:** "It is raining."
B: "I _____ you my umbrella."
 A. lent B. have been lent you C. have lent D. will lend
10. The girl is very friendly. She -----a lot of friends in the last few days.
 A. is making B. made C. has made D. will make
11. **A:** "How is your wife doing?" **B:** "She is ok. By the way, she ----- birth to twins only two days ago."
 A. is giving B. gave C. has given D. will give
12. **A:** "Is it still raining?"
B: "No, it _____ already _____."
 A. has/ stopped B. will/ stop
 C. is/ stopping D. has /been stopping
13. **A:** "Where have you been?"
B: "We _____ tennis since the day break."
 A. are playing B. will play C. have been playing D. played
14. **A:** "It is too much hot in here?"
B: "Oh sorry! I _____ the widow."
 A. opened B. will open C. have opened D. have been opening
15. They _____ that house for more than a year and they haven't still finished it.
 A. built B. will build C. are building D. have been building

16. **A:** "Is Saba still living with her parents?"

B: Of course not, she _____ on her own in Bale.

- A. has lived B. will live C. is living D. lived

17. I _____ bear last night for the first time. I have never seen it before.

- A. saw B. have seen C. will see D. is seeing

18. **A:** "We _____ a meeting at 10 am tomorrow morning at teachers' stuff. Can you make it?"

B: Sure.

- A. have had B. are having C. had D. have been having

19. They _____ in 1983 at a party and were befriended, but they are still best friends.

- A. will meet B. am meeting C. have met D. met

20. **A:** "How old is Betty?"

B: "Now she is eighteen but this time next week she _____ nineteen."

- A. will be B. was C. has been D. is

Appendix-F

Teaching Material for the Experimental Group

NO	LESSON TITLE	TIME	METHOD	EVALUATION
1	Simple past present continuous,		-Brainstorming -individual/pair work -Group discussion -	-Home take assignment - tasks completion -peer feedback
2	Talking about future (future tenses)		-Brainstorming -individual/pair work -Group discussion	-Home take assignment - tasks completion -peer feedback
3	Present perfect simple and present perfect continuous		-Brainstorming -individual/pair work -Group discussion	-Home take assignment - tasks completion -peer feedback

Lesson Plan Pro Forma

Introduction

Grade 9 English for Ethiopia focuses on the development of listening, speaking, reading and writing for communication. It also focuses on the understanding and application of English grammar rules. This material, therefore, aims to meet the latter objective. In other words, the material is designed with a view to helping students to comprehend and be familiar with particular aspects of English grammar rules and their application. Among English grammar rules are English

verb tenses. Thus, this material includes: simple past, present continuous, future tenses, present perfect simple and present perfect continuous.

Objectives

- Students will analyze sentences and synthesize a "rule" governing the behavior of these sentences.
- Students will correct grammar mistakes in the sentences.
- Students will create dialogue with various verb forms to engage in conversation

Activities

Speaking

- Discuss about the rules that govern each verb tense in their respective group
- Present the rules they discover to the class
- Engage in dialogues being in pairs

Reading

- Read the material (hand out) to find out differences among the tenses in focus

Writing

- Write short paragraphs using the tenses in focus
- Complete dialogue-cloze, paragraph cloze, with appropriate verb forms

Mode of presentation

- Individual, pair, small group work

Evaluation

- Teacher observes student answers and conversations in tasks, exercises, tests

Materials

- Handouts: dialogue -- cloze, analyze sheet, exercises - Chalk board, chalk----

Lesson 1: Present Continuous and Simple Past

TASK 1: Read to Comprehend

Notice the differences between sentences in each column and row of the table below. Then answer comprehension questions that follow. Focus on the highlighted words and phrases. The Time Signifiers also help you to comprehend the difference.

Present continuous	Simple past
A: Where are you going? B: I am going to a supermarket.	A: Where did you go yesterday ? B: I went to a supermarket.
A: What is your mother doing now ? B: She is making the bed up.	Last week , Semira made new friends at my birth day .
A: You and your wife frequently go to Harar. What are you up to there? B: we are building a new house.	We built a new house in Harar two years ago .
Betty is writing a letter for her mother. She is living with her aunt, Keneni, in Bale.	Betty wrote a letter for her mother last Sunday . She lived in Addis Ababa as a child .
I am living in Arsi at the moment .	I lived in Arsi as a child .
The Ethiopian national team is having a match with its Nigerian counterpart. The match is being aired on ETV. The home side is leading by a goal to nil.	The Ethiopian national team had a match with its Nigerian counterpart two hours ago . The home side won the match by a goal to nil.
A: Dad, please help me with my homework? B: Now , I am preparing a report for tomorrow's meeting. I will help you later on.	I prepared a report an hour ago for tomorrow's meeting, but I find it too scanty (insufficient).
A: Where are you? B: I am in a train. I am travelling to Harar. I am going to visit a friend of mine there.	Last year , at this time, I was in Harar. I travelled there to visit a friend of mine.
A: May I come in? B: just a few minutes. My sister is sweeping the living room.	A: The living room looks tidy. B: my sister swept it only a few minutes ago .
Stop where ever you are! The students are singing the national anthem of our country.	The students sang the national anthem of our country, and went to their respective classes.

Comprehension Questions

1. Which sentences do show events or actions which are in progress or not complete yet?
2. Which sentences do show events or actions which happened in the past or which are complete or not in progress?
3. Write at least 3 sentences that express what is going on in your respective class.

Example: We are discussing the difference between simple present and present continuous tenses.

1. _____.
2. _____.
3. _____.

4. Write at least three sentences that show what you did yesterday before/after school.

Example: I made my bed up.

1. _____.
2. _____.
3. _____.

Task 2: Understanding the Grammar Point

Analyze the sentences in the table above. Then, write rules to describe patterns you find out:

Rule 1: Based On Sentences under the Left Column

Rule 2: Based On Sentences under the right Column

Task 3: Checking

Look at the underlined part in the following sentences. If the sentence contains an error, correct and re-write. If it does not contain any errors, write Correct. To do this task you should use the rules you have discovered in task 2 in your respective group. First do it on your own then compare your answer with a partner

1. I am visiting my grandparents last weekend.

2. I worked at the Addis Ababa Sheraton Hotel at the moment. I really like it there.

3. At present, Saba taught at Higher 12 Secondary School. She enjoys herself in there. Most of her colleagues are friendly and hardworking.

4. A: What are you doing in here? B: I looking for my bed room key.

5. My grandmother lived in Hawasa in 1980's. Now she is here in Addis Ababa with us.

6. Abebe broken his leg when he was playing football yesterday.

7. She written me a letter only last year. I haven't heard anything about her since then.

Task 4: Rationalizing

In task 3 you were supposed to decide whether the underlined part in each sentence is correct or not. Here you are required to justify your decision by giving reasons. Thus, in your group prepare a report to be presented to the class.

Task 5: Trying out

Use the following prompts to prepare dialogues for conversation with a partner. You can act as an interviewer or an interviewee. As an interviewer, ask your partner the following questions or more:

- when he/she was born
- when he /she started/ graduated from her elementary school
- when he /she joined the school attending now
- where his /her parents/sister /brother are living
- which school his / her brother / sister /nephew/ niece etc are attending now

Lesson 2: Talking About Future

Dialog - The Party

Task 1: Read to Comprehend

Read the Dialogue Being In Pairs and Answer the Comprehension Questions that Follow.

Tsion : What horrible weather today. I'd love to go out, but I think it will continue raining.

Helen : Oh, I don't know. Perhaps the sun will come out later this afternoon.

Tsion : I hope you're right. Listen, I'm going to have a party this Saturday. Would you like to come?

Helen : Oh, I'd love to come. Thank you for inviting me. Who is going to come to the party?

Tsion : Well, a number of people haven't told me yet. But, Dave and Thomas are going to help out with the cooking!

Helen : Hey, I will help, too!

Tsion : Would you? That would be great!

Helen : I will make lasagna!

Tsion : That sounds delicious! I know my Italian friends are going to be at the party. I'm sure they will love it.

Helen : Italians? Maybe I will bake a cake...

Tsion : No, no. They're not like that. They will love it.

Helen : Well, if you say so... Is there going to be a theme for the party?

Tsion : No, I don't think so. Just a chance to get together and have fun.

Helen : I'm sure it will be lots of fun.

Tsion : But I'm going to hire a comedian !

Helen : A comedian! You're kidding me.

Tsion: No, no. As I child, I always wanted a comedian. Now, I'm going to have a comedian at my own party.

Helen: I'm sure everyone will have a good laugh.

Tsion: That's the plan!

Comprehension Questions

1. What do they think about the weather?
2. What does Tsion have to share?
3. What are Dave and Thomas going to do?
4. What does Helen offer to do?
5. How does Helen react to the news about the Italian friends?
6. What special plan is there?
7. Why does Tsion want a comedian?
8. Does Tsion know exactly how many people are going to come? If yes, how many. If not, why not?
9. How does Helen think people will react to the comedian?
10. Is there a theme for the party?

Task 2: Guessing

Now go through the dialogue once again. This time pay attention to those words and phrases which are highlighted and underlined. As used in the dialogue, one of them is used to show immediate decisions and predictions. On the other hand, the second one is used to express one's future plan. Here you are required to find out which is which.

"Will" is used to express	"am/is/are/going to" is used to express...

Task 3: complete the following dialogues with "will" or "going to". Beware of taking in to account the function of these words and notice as they are used in the previous dialogue.

1. **A:** I've got a terrible headache. **B:** Have you? Wait there and I _____get an aspirin for you.
2. **A:** Has George decided on what to do when he leaves school?
B: Oh yes. Everything is planned. He _____have a holiday for a few weeks.
3. **A:** We need some bread for lunch.
B: Oh, do we? I_____ go to the shop and get some. I feel like a walk.
4. **Ted:** It is so hot in here!
Sarah: I _____(turn) the air-conditioning on.
5. **A:** I'm about to fall asleep. I need to wake up!
B: I _____(get) you a cup of coffee. That will wake you up
6. **A:** Why are you wearing your best suit?
B: I _____(have)lunch with my biggest customer.
7. **A:** What are your plans for the holidays?
B: I _____ visit my parents for a few days. Then go walking in Gondar.
8. **A:** Do you want me to help you?
B: No thanks. John _____ help me.
9. **A:** Would you like to come to my house for dinner and talk about this?
B: Good idea. I _____ bring some wine.
10. **Saba:** What are your plans for the week-end?
Betty: mum phoned. We _____go on a picnic.

Task 4: try out the forms

Use the following prompts to make sentences for conversation with a partner.

Prompt: tell me about your future plans for study.

1. **A:** what do you plan to study in the future?
B: I am going to study medicine at the Addis Ababa University.

- Tell me about your future plans for work or study.
- What important event do you think will happen soon?
- Your friend needs some help with some homework. What do you say?
- Tell me about your plans for this coming summer.
- Complete these sentence: If I don't understand this exercise ...
- What do you think future English lessons will be about?

Task 5: Applying the Rule

Based on the following model paragraph write a paragraph in which you answer the question you are asked.

Our school is going to celebrate culture day next Sunday. Opening the holiday, the director of the school will make a speech. As usual, I will join in the culture day. After school, I am going to visit my elder brother who is living only a stone throw from my school. I will spend the night there. Before I go to bed, however, I will do my home work. If I find today's lesson difficult, I will ask him for help .

(What does your school plan to do next Sunday? What are you going to do after school today? What will you do if you don't understand this lesson?)

(Where are you going to travel on your next vacation? whom do you travel with? what are you going to do?)

Lesson 3: Present Perfect Simple and Present Perfect Continuous

Task 1: list of sentences are given below. Take a close look particularly at the underlined words and answer the questions that follow. Pay attention also to those highlighted parts in both groups of sentences.

3.1. PRESENT PERFECT SIMPLE

1. I graduated from a university in 1990 as a film producer. I have made **five films since** then.
2. The Ethiopian national team has won **two times** out of three matches.
3. I have already finished writing the letter.
4. Come quickly! Your father has broken his arm.
5. I have already written to him, but he hasn't replied me **yet**.
6. She has never worked in a factory.
7. Is it still raining? No it has already stopped.
8. She has never been to Lalibela.
9. I have watched the match **ten times**.
10. He doesn't like travelling by bus. So, He has never travelled by bus.
11. I would like to help you, but I have just eaten, and I need to take a nap.
12. Is John in?" "No, I'm afraid he has gone out.
13. The next door neighbor's dog has just bitten the postman. It's the **third time** that it has bitten him.
14. Mr. Mohammed has been fishing all morning. He has caught **fifteen fish so far**.
15. They all look tired. Oh, they have just arrived from the USA.

3.2. PRESENT PERFECT CONTINUOUS

1. Thomas has been reading a book **for six hours**. He finds it very interesting, and he doesn't seem to put it aside.
2. Rahel has been travelling **for three months**.
3. They have been living in the same house **for ages**. The owner of the house must be kind-hearted.
4. We have been playing tennis **since 1990**. However, we are still crazy about it.
5. It has been raining **since dawn**. We can't go work.
6. We have been studying English **for the last 10 years**. Nevertheless, we can't express our idea well in it.
7. I have been waiting the bus **for about an hour**.
8. She has been weeding the garden **since this morning**, but she doesn't look tired.
9. I have been driving **for hours**. I would rather have a rest now.

10. Oh, have you woken up? You have been sleeping **for more than ten hours**.
11. Fantu has been working **since early this morning** and she hopes to finish soon.
12. A: How long have you been playing the guitar? B: **For ten years**.
13. I have been teaching **for more than 20 years**. I feel like fed up with it.
14. A: Why are your hands dirty? B: Oh I have been working in the garden.
15. I have been thinking **for a long time**. Finally, I have decided that you need to give up your job.

Comprehension questions

1. Which tense emphasizes on the duration or the amount of time an event or an activity has been in progress? In other words, which tense does express how long the current activity has been going on?
2. Which one emphasizes on the amount activity that has been done or express how many or how much has been accomplished?
3. Identify the differences of the tenses in terms of
 - 3.1. their verb patterns(forms)

3.2. their meaning

4. Which tense do you use or (do you think appropriate) if you are supposed to express how long you have been staying in class since the very first period? Just write what you are supposed to say:

5. Which tense do you use or (do you think appropriate) to express the number of periods you have spent in class since the very first period? Write the sentence compare with your partner:

Task 2: Making Correction

Go through the following sentences and correct the sentences with errors. In correcting the errors you should have in mind the rules you have already found out. If the sentences correct put (✓). If they are wrong re-write them. The underlined items give you clues.

1. I **have been writing** a lot of books since I graduated from the university.

2. She **has** already **been sending** the letter to mum.

3. **A: Have you been finishing** writing the letter yet? **B: Of course not.**

4. Our team **has been wining** three matches so far in the championship.

5. **A: Why don't we make arrangements for the party?**
B: Abel and Bonsamo have already **made** the arrangements.

6. Betty **has been washing** her clothes the whole day, but she doesn't feel like tired.

7. Betty **has washed** a lot of clothes since the day break.

8. The man **looked for** his lost daughter for the last ten years, but he seems like he never gives up searching for her until his last breath.

9. I **have driven** lots of cars since I started driving in 1990's. The one I am driving now is the best though.

10. We were at school together. I **didn't seen** her for years though.

Task 2: Cloze –dialogue

Here you are given a dialogue that some of its elements are extracted out on purpose. Therefore, you are required to fill the gaps with correct forms of the verbs in bracket. The verbs should be either in present perfect simple or present perfect continuous tenses.

Tom: Hi Henry, it's been a long time since we saw each other last. What have you been up to?

Henry: Hi Tom! It's great to see you again. I _____(be)away on business.

Tom: Really, where did you go?

Henry: Well, first I flew to New York for two meetings. After that, I flew to Atlanta, where I had to make a presentation at a company conference.

Tom: It sounds like you've been busy.

Henry: Yes, I _____ (be) very busy. It's good to be home again. What _____you _____(do) lately?

Tom: Oh, nothing much. I _____(work)in the garden for past few days. Alice also has been away. She _____(visit) her relatives in Chicago for the past two weeks .

Henry: I didn't know she has family in Chicago.

Tom: Yes, that's right. We met at a university in California. She was born in Chicago and lived there until she went to college.

Henry: How long have you been living here in Colorado?

Tom: We _____(live) here for over 10 years. We moved here in 1998 because I had a new job as a sales representative.

Henry: Have you lived in the same house since you arrived?

Tom: No, first we lived in a condo in downtown Denver. We moved here four years ago. We've lived on the street for four years and they've been the happiest years of our lives.

Henry: Yes, my wife Jane and I love this neighborhood.

Tom: And how long_____you _____(live) in your house?

Henry: We _____(live) here for two years.

Tom: That's strange; it seems like you have been living here longer than that.

Henry: No, we moved here in 2006.

Tom: How time flies!

Henry: I have to agree with you on that. It seems like yesterday that I graduated from college. I can't believe I _____(work) for more than 10 years!

Tom: I _____(work) more than 30 years! I'm going to retire soon.

Henry: Really? You don't look a day over 40!

Tom: Thank you. You're a great neighbor!

Henry: No, really. Well, I have to get going. Work is waiting for me. Have a good day.

Tom: You, too. Glad to have you back in the neighbor!

Task 3: Writing

For each situation, write two sentences using the words in brackets. First do the writing individually then compare with a partner.

1) Eden started reading a book two hours ago. She is still reading it and now she is on page 44.

(read / for two hours)

1a) _____

1b)

(read / 44 pages so far)

2. Mila is from Spain. She is travelling round Ethiopia at the moment. She began her trip three months ago.

(travel / for three months)

2a) _____

(visit / six countries so far)

2b) _____

3. Mary is a tennis player. She began playing tennis when he was ten years old. This year she is national champion again – for the fourth time.

(win / the national championships / four times)

3a) _____

(play / tennis since she was ten)

3b) _____

4. When they left college, Mohammed and Semira started making films together. They are still making films.

(make / five films since they left college)

4a) _____

(make / films since they left college)

4b) _____

Appendix-G

Sample Teaching Material of the Control Group (Taken from Grade Nine English Textbook)

B 2.5 Language Focus: The Present Perfect Tense

The present perfect tense is formed by using has or have with the past participle (that is -ed or -d added to the infinitive form). Irregular verbs have irregular past participles, sometimes the same as, sometimes different from, and their past simple form:

	Infinitive	Past simple	Present perfect
Regular :	Work	I worked	I have worked
Irregular :	Run	I run	I have run
	see	I saw	I have seen
	Think	I thought	I have thought

We use the present perfect tense to describe an action which finished at some time in the past, but we don't know exactly when, for example:

We've often eaten doro wot. (But we are not told exactly when)

She has already arrived. (The action is finished, but no time information is given). Remember in the present perfect tense, we use has for one person, and have for more than one and change the form of the verb.

Forming the present perfect tense

Remember, we use the past simple if we know when the past action finished. We use the present perfect when the action has finished but we don't know when. A negative form of the present perfect uses not between has and have and past participle:

She has not worked all day.

To ask a question in the present perfect, we put has or have before the noun or pronoun:

Has she seen the new film?

Write the past tense forms of the following verbs:

lose make play ring think sweep write give sing visit
ask clean feed go tell wipe choose listen eat

B7.4 Language Focus : Talking About The Future

We use going to show that we have a clear plan in mind. We intend to do something in the future for example:

1. I'm going to do my homework before football.(future plan)
2. I'm not going to watch the film on TV tonight.(future plan)
3. Are you going to buy anything at the market today.(future plan)
4. He is going to buy new shirt.
5. I'm going to visit my sister next weekend.

We use will to show prediction about future/immediate decision

1. Cities will be cleaner.(prediction about the future)
2. We will not have a good crop of maize this year.(what we think will happen)

B9.7 Language Focus : Using Ago Simple Past

The word ago is a use way of expressing an infinite point in time in the past. It is placed after the period, for example a long time, a week ago, three years ago, a minute ago.

Example

Liben left home five minutes ago.

I played football a week ago.

I passed my swimming exam eight years ago.

B10.1 Language Focus : Past , Present and Future

How well do you know your tenses? You have minutes to complete the following tables.

	Past simple	Present continuous	Future
to go	bought		
to buy			
to sing		am singing	
to travel			will travel
to think			
to sweep			
to study			
to write			

Now work with your partner to make sentences with each form of these verbs.

Example: to go I went to a party last week. I am going to a party today. I will go to a party tomorrow.

A12.7 Language Focus: The Present Perfect Continuous Tense With for and since

Using the present perfect (continuous)

We use the present perfect tense:

1. To talk about actions which may or may not be finished, for example: I've been doing my homework.
2. To show how long something has been going on, for example: I have been playing the guitar for a long year.
3. To show that actions are temporary, for example: we've been living with my uncle for few months.

Sample exercise

Look at this table and work in pairs to make sentences:

I You We They	have	been	running	since 10 o'clock
He She It	has		studying	for an hour

Using since and for

These are often used with the present perfect tense

<p>Since is used before a time when something happened , for example :</p> <p>Since + yesterday + five o'clock + last year + January + I came to this school</p>	<p>For is used before a period of time ,for example</p> <p>for + a week + two hours + a long time + five</p>
--	--

Make five different sentences from this table. Write them in your exercise book.

I Halima Almaz The boys My parent and I	has have	been	doing washing writing studying making	the clothes stew this exercise an essay geography	for two hours. since last year. since I got home. for an hour. for half an hour. for a few minutes.
--	-------------	------	---	---	---