



**University of Zawia**

**Faculty of Arts**

**Department of English**

**Postgraduates Studies and Training Centre**

**Investigating Zawia EFL Secondary School Teachers' Attitudes towards  
Deductive and Inductive Approaches of Teaching Grammar**

**A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for MA Degree  
in Applied Linguistics**

**Submitted by**

**Esra Ali Salem Nasrat**

**Supervised by**

**Dr. Turkeya Burka Ali Burka**

**November, 2025**

## **Abstract**

This study investigates secondary school teachers' attitudes towards deductive and inductive approaches to teach English grammar, with the aim of understanding their preferences and identifying the challenges they face in implementing their preferred approach. A mixed-methods sequential explanatory design was employed, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection. In the first phase, a questionnaire was administered to 49 secondary school English teachers to gather broad insights into their attitudes. In the second phase, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 teachers who participated in the survey to explore their views in greater depth. The quantitative findings revealed that while teachers generally held positive attitudes towards grammar instruction, they showed a stronger preference for the deductive approach. However, this did not indicate a rejection of the inductive method, as many teachers expressed openness to combining both approaches depending on the context. The qualitative data supported these findings and provided further insight into the practical challenges teachers encounter, such as limited time, large class size, and lack of training or resources. The study concludes that while teachers value grammar instruction and recognize the benefits of both deductive and inductive methods, systemic and contextual constraints often limit their ability to implement their preferred approach effectively. These findings have implications for teacher training programs and curriculum development in the Libyan context.

## **Declaration**

I declare that I am the sole author of this dissertation entitled: "Investigating Zawia EFL Secondary School Teachers' Attitudes towards Deductive and Inductive Approaches of Teaching Grammar". I affirm that this dissertation is the result of my own independent work and that no part of it has been plagiarized.

All sources and materials used that are not my own have been properly cited and referenced. Furthermore, I confirm that this work has not been submitted, in whole or in part, for any other degree, qualification, course, or subject at this or any other institution.

Signature.....

Date.....

## **Dedication**

Alhamdulillah, all praise is due to Allah alone — the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful — who granted me the strength, guidance, and patience to complete this work. Without His mercy and support, none of this would have been possible.

This work is lovingly dedicated to the memory of my beloved parents, whose souls departed this world before witnessing the completion of this journey. Your love, values, and prayers have always been a source of strength and inspiration, and I carry your spirit in every step I take.

This work is also dedicated to my dear husband. Thank you for your endless support, patience, and encouragement. Your faith in me was a light during the most challenging times, and this achievement is as much as it is mine.

I also dedicate this dissertation to my dear sisters and brothers, whose presence and love have been a constant source of comfort and motivation.

Finally, I dedicate this work my wonderful friends, especially Amel — your encouragement and understanding throughout this journey, and your friendship have meant the world to me. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

## **Acknowledgments**

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Turkeya Burka Ali, for her continuous support, guidance, and valuable feedback throughout the course of this study.

I am also deeply thankful to all my professors who inspired and encouraged me to give my best, especially Dr. Salama and Dr. Osama, whose wisdom, motivation, and kindness have had a lasting impact on my academic journey. Thank you all for being a part of this meaningful chapter in my life.

## Table of Contents

<b>Title</b> .....	<b>page.No</b>
Abstract.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables .....	ix
Abbreviations.....	x
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY:.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study .....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Aims of the Study.....	4
1.4 Research Questions.....	4
1.5 Significance of the Study .....	5
1.6 Research Methodology .....	5
1.7 Organization of the Study .....	6
CHAPTER TWO:LITRATURE REVIEW .....	7
2.0 Introduction.....	7
2.1 Definition of Grammar .....	7
2.2 Theories Related to Deductive and Inductive Approaches .....	8
2.3 English Grammar Teaching .....	11

2.3.1 Importance of Grammar in Teaching English Language .....	11
2.3.2 Role of Grammar in Language Learning .....	13
2.4 Approaches of Teaching Grammar .....	14
2.4.1 Deductive Approach .....	15
2.4.1.1 Advantages .....	16
2.4.1.2 Disadvantages .....	16
2.4.2 Inductive Approach .....	17
2.4.2.1 Advantages .....	17
2.4.2.2 Disadvantages .....	18
2.4.3 Implicit V.S Explicit Instructions .....	19
2.5 Attitude .....	20
2.5.1 Definition of Attitude .....	20
2.5.2 Positive Attitudes .....	21
2.5.3 Negative Attitudes .....	21
2.5.4 Attitude Formation .....	22
2.6 Challenges of Implementing Deductive/Inductive Approaches to Teach Grammar	24
2.7 Previous Related Studies .....	26
2.7 Summary .....	31
<b>CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>32</b>
3.0 Introduction .....	32
3.1 Research Design .....	32
3.2 Sampling Method .....	33
3.3 Participants of the Study .....	33
3.4 Data Collection Instruments .....	34
3.4.1 Questionnaire .....	34
3.4.2 Semi-Structured Interviews .....	34
3.4.3 Piloting the Instruments .....	35
3.5 Reliability and Validity .....	35
3.5.1 Validity .....	36
3.5.2 Reliability .....	37

3.6 Ethical Considerations .....	38
3.7 Data Analysis Procedures: .....	39
3.8 Summary .....	41
CHAPTER FOUR:DATA ANALYSIS .....	43
4.0 Introduction.....	43
4.1 Analysis of the questionnaire .....	43
4.1.1 Interpretation Scale .....	45
4.2 Analysis of the interview .....	54
4.2.1 Attitudes towards the Importance of Teaching Grammar .....	55
4.2.2 Preferred Teaching Approach.....	55
4.2.3 Effectiveness of the Preferred Approach .....	57
4.2.4 Teachers' Attitudes towards Students' Preference .....	57
4.2.5 Challenges.....	59
4.2.6 Combining both Approaches .....	60
4.3 Summary of Findings.....	61
CHAPTER FIVE:DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION .....	63
5.0 Introduction.....	63
5.1 Discussion Related to the Findings of the Questionnaire .....	63
5.2 Discussion Related to the Findings of the interview .....	69
5.3Integration of the Questionnaire and the Interview Findings .....	70
5.4 Recommendations.....	72
5.4.1 Recommendations for Teachers .....	72
5.4.2 Recommendations for Educational Institutions and Administrators .....	73
5.5. Limitations of the Study.....	74
5.5.1 Sample Size and Representation.....	74
5.5.2 Reliance on Self-Reported Data .....	74
5.5.3 Contextual Influences .....	74
5.6 Suggestions for Further Research .....	75
5.6.1 Wider Geographic and Institutional Scope .....	75

5.6.2 Students' Perspectives .....	75
5.6.3 Experimental Studies on Effectiveness.....	75
5.6.4 Longitudinal Studies .....	75
5.6.5 Studies Focused on Teacher Training Programs.....	76
5.6.6 Teachers' attitudes in relation to teaching experience.....	76
5.7 Conclusion of the Whole Study .....	76
References.....	77
Appendices.....	92
Appendix A: Teachers' questionnaire.....	
Appendix B: Invitation Letter for Interview Participation .....	
Appendix D: Samples Interview Transcripts .....	
Appendix E: Ethical Approval Letter .....	

## List of Tables

Table 3. 1: Cronbach`s Alpha Level Reliability Values .....	37
Table 3. 2: Teachers` Interview Schedule .....	40
Table 4. 1: Personal Information .....	43
Table 4. 2: Interpretation Scale.....	45
Table 4. 3: Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Attitudes .....	46
Table 4. 4: Descriptive Statistics of the Deductive Approach.....	48
Table 4. 5: Descriptive Statistics of Inductive Approach.....	51

## **Abbreviations**

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

EEC: Experimental English Class

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ESL: English as a Second Language

L2: Second Language

SLA: Second language Acquisition

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Science

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

### 1.0 Introduction

This study focuses on the secondary school teachers' attitudes towards deductive and inductive approaches to teach grammar, specifically at Zawia secondary schools. This chapter aims to introduce the research briefly by presenting a background of the study, in addition to the problem, aims, significance and questions of the study. It also contains a brief account of the methodology and outlines the organization of the study.

### 1.1 Background of the Study

At all levels of education in Libya, many learners face considerable challenges in studying and mastering grammar. These difficulties stem not only from the inherent complexity of grammar but also from the teaching methods employed. In many foreign language classrooms, grammar instruction often becomes monotonous and disengaging, particularly when delivered through explicit methods (Borg,1999, Ellis,2006). Lambert and Tucker (1972) suggest that grammar acquisition is more effective when students are immersed in a target-language-rich environment. Learners who receive meaningful input regularly are more likely to apply grammar correctly. However, Libyan classrooms often lack the intensity of such meaningful input, raising questions about how grammar is taught and learned in these settings.

To start diving down into these wonderings, it is necessary to mention such a definition for Grammar by Richards and Reppen (2014, p. 5 as cited in Blaskovic, 2022) who describe it as both knowledge of “rules for sentence formation and text

compilation" and as a skill, focusing on how grammar is applied in spoken and written communication. Another definition by Larsen-Freeman (2001) considered "Grammar [as] a system of meaningful structures and patterns that are governed by particular pragmatic constraints". The diversity of definitions surrounding grammar complicates its teaching. These varying perspectives highlight the need to explore how grammar instruction is approached in different contexts, including Libyan schools. Ellis (2006, p. 84) emphasizes that effective grammar instruction involves providing corrective feedback during communicative tasks. His research defines grammar teaching broadly as "any method that draws learners' attention to specific grammatical forms, helping them process these forms both metalinguistically and through comprehension and production". Such approaches aim to enable students to internalize grammatical rules. Consequently, many researchers stress the importance of teaching grammar effectively, which will be discussed in details in later sections of this study.

In Libyan classrooms, grammar instruction predominantly follows a deductive approach, where rules are presented first, followed by practice exercises often lacking authentic context. Although this method has its advantages, it requires supplementation with ample comprehensible input to enhance students' understanding and retention. A key challenge lies in determining how to introduce grammar rules effectively to build a solid foundation for long-term acquisition. This also involves addressing the fundamental question: What does it mean to teach, learn, and understand grammar?

In the field of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education in Libya, grammar instruction remains a topic of debate. Researchers such as El-Hemri (2020) have examined the balance between grammar-focused instruction and

communicative approaches. In his article "*Grammar in Language Teaching: The Missing Balance*," El-Hemri argued for an equilibrium between these methods, recognizing that both played an essential role in effective language learning. Additional studies by Mallia (2014) and Burgess & Etherington (2002) have investigated adult learners' preferences and teachers' effectiveness with inductive and deductive teaching approaches. While some learners preferred deductive instruction, performance differences between these approaches remained minimal, suggesting that cultural and contextual factors played a significant role.

Teachers' attitudes are widely recognized as a critical factor influencing the effectiveness of grammar instruction. These attitudes can shape pedagogical decisions and significantly impact student engagement and achievement. Positive attitudes are generally associated with more dynamic and student-centered instruction, while negative attitudes may contribute to less effective teaching practices. Blašković (2022) investigated high school EFL teachers' attitudes towards deductive and inductive approaches to grammar instruction. The study revealed that although many teachers reported a preference for inductive methods in principle, deductive instruction remained predominant in actual classroom practice. This discrepancy was largely attributed to contextual challenges, including time constraints, the complexity of grammatical content, and low levels of student motivation. Such findings underscored the importance of examining not only teachers' stated preferences but also the practical limitations that may impeded their implementation. Accordingly, the present study aims to explore the attitudes of Libyan secondary school teachers towards deductive and inductive approaches to grammar instruction. It further seeks to examine how these attitudes influence

instructional practices and student learning, as well as to identify the contextual factors that may hinder the application of preferred teaching method.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Teachers' attitudes towards grammar instruction reflect their feelings and beliefs about different teaching approaches. In Libyan secondary schools, the curriculum emphasizes Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which promotes the inductive approach to develop students' communicative competence (Orafi & Borg, 2009; Tauhiduzzaman, 2018). However, teachers hold different attitudes towards deductive and inductive approaches in grammar instruction.

This study explores secondary school teachers' attitudes towards deductive and inductive approaches, focusing on how they view the advantages, challenges, and effectiveness of each approach in enhancing students, grammatical and communicative competence. Teaching grammar confronts many challenges. The matter is that the textbooks encourage teachers to follow the communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which influences the quality of English language teaching.

## **1.3 Aims of the Study**

This study aims to:

1. investigate the teachers' attitudes towards deductive and inductive approaches to teach Grammar.
2. identify the challenges teachers face in implementing their preferred approaches

## **1.4 Research Questions**

This study aims to answer the following two questions:

1. What are the Zawia secondary school teachers' attitudes toward deductive and inductive approaches to teach Grammar?
2. What are the challenges that Zawia EFL secondary school teachers face in implementing their preferred approaches (deductive /inductive) in teaching Grammar?

### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

The present study holds significance for both the ministry of education and secondary school teachers. The importance of the study is outlined as follows:

1. It encourages teachers to reflect on their own beliefs and assumptions about Grammar instruction, which may lead to the enhancement of their teaching practices.
2. The research contributes to the field of educational pedagogy by shedding light on effective approaches to grammar instruction.
3. It provides valuable insights for designing and improving both pre-service and in-service training program.
4. The findings may support efforts to revise and improve the examination model for third year secondary school students.

### **1.6 Research Methodology**

The research utilized both quantitative and qualitative methods. To collect the data required for this study, a questionnaire and semi structured interviews were conducted. The research sample included 49 Libyan EFL secondary school teachers working in different schools. Moreover, semi structured interviews were conducted with 10 Libyan EFL teachers. The data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively.

## **1.7 Organization of the Study**

This study contains five chapters. The first chapter is the introductory chapter which presents the background of the study, states the research problem, outlines the aims of the study, and formulates the research questions. It also highlights the significance of the study, explains the research methodology, and describes the organization of the entire study. The second chapter critically reviews previous research and relevant literature on grammar teaching approaches and teacher attitudes. It discusses key concepts, theories related to deductive and inductive approaches, and identifies the research gap that this study seeks to address. The third chapter describes the research design, sampling methods, participants, data collection instruments, and procedures. It also discusses the reliability, validity, and ethical considerations of the study, as well as the data analysis procedures. The fourth chapter, entitled Data Analysis, presents the results of both quantitative and qualitative data analysis. It includes statistical findings, thematic analysis, and a summary of the key results. Finally, the last chapter is the Discussion and Conclusion, which discusses the findings in relation to the research questions and the reviewed literature. It outlines the study's limitations, offers suggestions for further research, and provides some recommendations. The chapter concludes with a conclusion drawn from the study's results.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.0 Introduction**

This chapter reviews literature on teachers' attitudes towards teaching grammar in general, specifically towards deductive and inductive approaches. It begins by presenting the definition of Grammar following by some theories related to deductive and inductive approaches, discussing various perspectives that support each approach of grammar instruction, along with the underlying rationale for these preferences. The next section discusses the importance of Grammar and its role in learning the English language. The last section consists of details about deductive and inductive approaches, their advantages and their disadvantages in addition to teachers' attitudes and challenges. Next to this, there is a section which discuss some previous related studies. And the last section is a summary of the chapter.

#### **2.1 Definition of Grammar**

Grammar has been crucially defined by several linguists. According to Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2001, p.619), grammar was “The rules by which words change their forms and are combined into sentences, or the study or use of these rules.” Further, Thornbury agreed with Longman dictionary, and emphasized the necessity of meaning by stating that “grammar is a description of the rules for forming sentences, including an account of the meanings that these forms convey” (1999, p.13). In addition, grammar has been defined as “the rules of a language that is a system of meaningful structures and patterns that are governed by particular pragmatic constraints” (Larsen-Freeman, 2001, p. 521). His definition obviously moved beyond rigid rules, acknowledging meaningful patterns and constraints in use. Furthermore, Crystal (2004, p. 100) claimed that “Grammar is the

business of taking a language to pieces, to see how it works”, which suggested that grammar is a tool for linguistic analysis rather than just a set of prescriptive rules. Similarly, Akar (2010) explicitly categorized grammar into three main components by saying that grammar is the set of rules that explain how the words of a language change themselves (morphology), how they combined to form sentences of various kinds (syntax), and how these sentences conveyed meaning and social function (semantics). But alternatively, grammar could be described as the structure and system of a language, usually consisting of sounds, vocabularies, words, sentences, phrases, etc., and those were combined into sentences by rules to express the meaning (Britannica, 2025). Moreover, Widdowson (1990) highlighted its practical and communicative function by viewing grammar as liberating, enabling clearer expression beyond mere context. In addition, Doff (2000) added that by learning grammar students could express meaning in phrases, clauses, and sentences. This understanding shapes how grammar contributed to communication and informs the teaching methodologies that follow (Cullen, 2008). These varied perspectives made grammar instruction a complex and multi-faceted endeavor.

## **2.2 Theories Related to Deductive and Inductive Approaches**

This section explores key theories that have shaped teaching and learning of English as a second language. A significant voice in this debate was Krashen (1982), who differentiates between acquisition, a subconscious process akin to first-language learning, and learning, which involves conscious, formal instruction. On the other hand, proponents of Connectionism (e.g. Ellis, 1998) argued that both processes are similar, as they relied on the brain's ability to recognize patterns through repeated exposure. This raised a critical question in the Libyan context: Was English a foreign language that was acquired naturally, or should it be learned

through explicit instruction? The ongoing discussion revolved around whether learning and acquisition were fundamentally different or merely complementary aspects of the same cognitive process, especially in the context of teaching grammar in EFL settings. The discussion led to what was known as Naturalism theory, as discussed by Lenneberg (1967) in his work *Biological Foundation of Language*" which posited that language acquisition was a natural process that occurred through exposure and interaction in a way similar to first language learning. This theory supported the idea that language learning should be as natural and intuitive as possible, minimizing formal instruction and focusing on meaningful communication.

Various influential theories in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) have shaped the understanding of grammar instruction, particularly in relation to deductive and inductive teaching approaches. Firstly, Skinner in his Behaviorist Theory (1953), emphasized learning through reinforcement and repetition. In behaviorist approaches, deductive methods, which focused on explicit grammar teaching and practice, are prevalent. However, critics argued that language should be generated, not merely memorized. A major shift occurred with Chomsky's introduction of Universal Grammar in 1959, which posited that humans had an innate capacity for language learning, even in the face of imperfect input. Chomsky's ideas challenged behaviorism and paved the way for inductive methods that emphasized developing linguistic competence beyond rote memorization.

Furthermore, Sweller's Cognitive Learning Theory (1988) later emphasized the value of explicitly teaching grammar rules to help learners internalize structures before applying them. While internalization was important, it might limit communication in real-world situations. In contrast, Hymes's concept of

Communicative Competence (1972) focused on the practical use of language, supporting inductive methods that encourage learning through communication and application. Similarly, Piaget's Constructivist Theory (1976) emphasized that learners build knowledge through experience, advocating inductive approaches that encourage exploration and discovery of grammatical rules. Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1982) also supported inductive methods, emphasizing the role of comprehensible input, where learners deduce rules from context, making grammar learning more accessible. These were theories of earlier decades, while a more recent and influential perspective was offered by Ellis, a prominent British linguist specializing in second language acquisition. Ellis was widely recognized for his contributions to language teaching methodology and for advocating the concept of principled eclecticism, which he introduced in 2006. This approach emphasized the importance of drawing on both deductive and inductive methods in grammar instruction, depending on the teaching context and learner needs. According to Ellis, teachers should not rigidly adhere to a single method but should, instead, make informed and flexible choices that promoted the development of both explicit (rule-based) and implicit (formulaic) knowledge. He argued that effective grammar instruction should balance form and meaning and be adaptable to different stages of learning. For example, a lesson might begin with a concise deductive explanation—particularly useful in exam preparation—followed by inductive tasks that allowed learners to discover rules through contextualized examples. Ellis's model of principled eclecticism continues to influence modern language teaching by encouraging teachers to blend approaches in a thoughtful and evidence-based manner.

## **2.3 English Grammar Teaching**

Every language learner needs to acquire the abilities of speaking correctly and accurately. Consequently, the knowledge of grammar is required (Lugolobi-Nalunga, 2017). Accurate understanding of the language structure is a significant part in foreign language learning, which makes the aspect of teaching grammar essential in English Language instruction. Grammar teaching refers to systematic methods of teaching that are used to help learners build competence in unfamiliar grammar. Such methods include the description and analysis of forms and structures of a language. Grammar instruction also includes learning aids, exercises, and a kind of language used by the teacher for teaching in the classroom (Mesthrie, 2009). In the following subsection, the significance of English grammar teaching is mainly discussed with relevance to the topic of the definition of grammar and its importance, in addition to its role in learning the English language.

### **2.3.1 Importance of Grammar in Teaching English Language**

Learning a new language inevitably involves learning its grammar. Grammar has long been regarded as central to language learning because it provides the rules and patterns needed for constructing meaningful sentences. Especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts, grammar is often seen as the pillar of effective communication. Without a good command of grammar, learners' language development remains limited, making it difficult for them to communicate clearly and accurately.

Grammar instruction typically involved teaching sentence structures and language patterns (Savage, 2010). It also supported the development of the four key language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In listening and speaking,

grammar helped learners understand and produce accurate sentences. In reading, it aided comprehension by clarifying the relationships between ideas within texts. In writing, grammar enabled learners to express their thoughts in coherent and intelligible ways (Juny, 2007; Widodo, 2006).

Moreover, grammar guided learners in combining vocabulary into meaningful sentences, ensuring that their expressions were both correct and communicative (Mukminatien, 2008). Doff (2000) emphasized that through grammar, students could express meaning in phrases, clauses, and sentences. Palmer (1972) also noted that grammar was at the heart of language and should be of interest to any educated person (Wang, 2010). In addition, beyond practical usage, grammar allowed us to analyze and talk about language itself. Knowing about grammar enhanced our ability to understand what made sentences clear, precise, and effective (Webb, 2004). It also played a role in literature and critical reading, where close attention to sentence structures could deepen interpretation.

Furthermore, many scholars stressed that grammar instruction supported both communication skills and overall language competence. Ellis (2009) pointed out that effective grammar teaching helps learners internalize language, while Azar (2007) noted that grammar provided predictable patterns that made communication meaningful. Grammar-Based Teaching (GBT) offered structured ways for learners to understand complex language without overwhelming them with technical terms.

Richards and Renandya (2002) highlighted two main reasons for teaching grammar: ensuring comprehensibility in communication and promoting acceptability within social norms. Mulroy (2003) further argued that grammar knowledge enhances writing skills and language proficiency. Research consistently

showed that formal grammar instruction improves learners' performance, particularly in writing and comprehension, compared to relying solely on exposure.

However, the role of grammar in language teaching is not without challenges. In the Libyan EFL context, studies such as Diaab (2016) has shown a dominant reliance on traditional grammar-focused instruction. Teachers often prioritized grammatical accuracy and rules, frequently at the expense of communicative practice and active language use. This overemphasis on grammar has contributed to Libyan learners' struggles with oral communication and real-life language use. Diaab's findings highlighted the urgent need for teaching methods that balanced grammar instruction with opportunities for meaningful interaction and communication.

In conclusion, grammar is a foundational element of language learning that supports the development of all language skills. Yet, it should not be taught in isolation. Achieving language competence requires a balanced approach that integrates grammar with communicative practice, enabling learners not only to understand language rules but also to use them effectively in real-world situations.

### **2.3.2 Role of Grammar in Language Learning**

Grammar instruction remained a debated topic in language education. While some researchers advocated for explicit grammar teaching, others proposed alternative approaches: DeKeyser (1998), Doughty (1991), Harley (1998), Long (1988), Long and Robinson (1998), Schneider (1993), and Terrell (1991) argue that grammar instruction is necessary for language proficiency. Lightbown (1998) opposed traditional methods that focus solely on grammatical rules without context. Krashen (1993) dismissed explicit grammar instruction in second language

acquisition, advocating for more natural, input-based learning. Moreover, Carter et al., (2000) supported an inductive approach, arguing that students should discover grammar patterns through meaningful language exposure rather than rigid drills. Despite critiques, grammar remained an essential tool for language learning. Tantani's (2012) study on Libyan EFL teachers highlighted how diverse instructional methods affect grammar teaching. The research revealed that teachers' knowledge did not always align with their teaching practices, emphasizing the need for enhanced teacher training programs. The study also found that contextual factors significantly influenced how grammar is taught, suggesting that no single method is universally effective.

To sum up, grammar plays an important role in language learning but the method that is applied at the Libyan context should be improved consequently, making grammar learning process more natural.

#### **2.4 Approaches of Teaching Grammar**

The teaching process is not being haphazard, but it is a process where every step should be settled carefully. This what encouraged Sudharshana (2021), to conduct her paper *Teaching Grammar in the EFL/ESL Context: Changing Perspectives and Current Trends*", which emphasized that teachers should be familiar with a variety of methods and techniques for teaching grammar, rather than adhering to a single "best" approach. The dynamic nature of EFL classrooms, influenced by learner personality, motivation, educational beliefs, and socio-economic context, complicates the selection of a teaching methodology. While form-focused approaches were currently favored in research, no single method could be deemed universally superior due to the diverse needs of adult ESL learners. Sudharshana (2021) argued that teachers were best positioned to evaluate and select

appropriate methods that allowed them to tailor instructional materials to meet their students' specific needs. Furthermore, Nunan (2005) claimed that there were two basic ways to present a new grammar item, deductive and inductive. The following subsections discuss those approaches briefly.

#### **2.4.1 Deductive Approach**

The Deductive Approach was defined as a process that proceeded from the presentation of a rule by a teacher to the provision of examples in which the rule was applied followed by language practice that students can engage in (Thornbury, 1999; Norris and Ortega, 2000; cited in Erlam, 2003). It involved applying a general rule to specific instances (Gollin, 1998). The explicit transmission of information required was usually provided by the teacher or the textbook (Thornbury, 1999). According to Ellis (2009), explicit instruction meant that learners were made aware of language rules during the language learning process. Moreover, Rod Ellis (2002), cited in Nick Ellis (2015, p.19), stated that “Language acquisition can be speeded by explicit instruction”. He then continued to show that several investigations into the effectiveness of instruction and feedback on error have concluded that explicit types of instruction are more effective than implicit instructions and that this effect was durable. Decoo (1996) understood education as a process that went from the general to the specific. In the deductive approach, a grammatical rule was first presented explicitly by the teacher and examples applying the rule would follow. Then, the students practiced the rule with various kinds of exercises such as drills and translation. The deductive approach also involved the development of a hypothesis grounded in existing theory, followed by the design of a strategy.

It is normal to find that every approach has advantages as well as disadvantages. Widodo (2006) claimed some advantages and disadvantages for the deductive approach as follows:

#### **2.4.1.1 Advantages**

1. The deductive approach is direct and gets to the point quickly, making it a time-efficient method.
2. Certain aspects of rules, such as grammatical forms, can often be explained more clearly than inferred from examples.
3. This approach provides immediate, direct practice and application examples.
4. It respects the intelligence and maturity of many adult learners, acknowledging the importance of cognitive processes in language acquisition.
5. The deductive method aligns with many learners' expectations about classroom learning, particularly for those who prefer an analytical approach.

#### **2.4.1.2 Disadvantages**

1. Starting a lesson with a grammar presentation may be discouraging for some students, particularly younger ones.
2. Younger learners might struggle to comprehend the concepts or the grammatical terminology presented.
3. A focus on grammar explanations tends to create a teacher-centered, transmission-style classroom, which can inhibit learner engagement and interaction. Such explanations are often less memorable compared to other teaching methods, like demonstrations.
4. The deductive approach may foster the misconception that learning a language is merely about understanding the rules (Widodo, 2006).

## **2.4.2 Inductive Approach**

The inductive approach to grammar instruction emphasizes exposing students to examples of the target language, encouraging them to discover grammatical rules through observation and analysis rather than direct explanation. Learners move from specific examples to general rules, often with guidance from the teacher. According to Mautone (2004), this method involves presenting examples - and sometimes non-examples - to help students notice patterns and formulate rules independently.

In addition, Thornbury (1999) defines the inductive approach as one where students study language use first and then derive rules based on their observations, which promotes active thinking and learner involvement. Similarly, Purpura (2004) states that students are led to discover the underlying organizational principles of language to form their own understanding of grammatical rules.

This approach is often linked to methods like the Direct Method and the Natural Approach, where grammar is introduced implicitly through context and practice (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). By analyzing varied examples, students infer rules and then apply them in different contexts, making the learning process more meaningful and engaging. Similar to the deductive approach, the inductive approach has advantages and disadvantages as well. Thornbury (1999) outlined them as follows:

### **2.4.2.1 Advantages**

1. The inductive approach will bring about a greater learning outcome as students have been intensively working on the rule for a rather long time.

2. Students, however, are activated and become familiar with inductive reasoning which is beneficial for future learning.
3. Induction stimulates an 'active and independent' attitude towards grammar.
4. Students will become less dependent on instruction and eventually will no longer think grammar is hard, and only a teacher can tell them how to do it.
5. Making mistakes also occurs in learning a language naturally.
6. Students learn how to deal with linguistic concepts, though not specifically with the terms related to it. It is incorrect to think that the abstract form is the real rule.
7. Linguistic terms can be given after the induction process has been completed, and the rule will then make sense to students.

#### **2.4.2.2 Disadvantages**

1. The inductive approach is rather time consuming; the deductive approach is faster.
2. The inductive approach takes a lot of needless effort (students will think just give us the rule).
3. The teacher will make himself or herself redundant in the long run when applying the inductive approach.
4. Teachers constantly have to be aware of incorrect rules that students can come up with inductively.
5. Students are not familiarised with linguistic terms when using the inductive approach. (Thornbury,1999).

In the following section, explicit and implicit instruction are briefly discussed. Although these types of instruction are often associated with deductive

and inductive approaches, they differ in terms of the level of learners' awareness and consciousness involved (Ellis, 2009; DeKeyser, 2003; Norris & Ortega, 2000).

### **2.4.3 Implicit V.S Explicit Instructions**

Many researchers have emphasized the importance of grammar and its central role in language teaching and learning. Consequently, the question of how grammar should be taught remained widely debated. Within this debate, the effectiveness of implicit and explicit instructional approaches continued to receive considerable attention (Ellis, 2006; Nassaji & Fotos, 2011; DeKeyser, 2003). For instance, White (1987) emphasized that direct grammar teaching is necessary as some structures cannot be learned naturally. According to Krashen (1982), grammar is acquired naturally and must not be explicitly taught. By stimulating conservative observations of grammar teaching, Larsen-Freeman (1995) suggested that instruction was essential to enhance the acquisition of grammar and to speed up the process, even if grammar was naturally acquired. In addition, it was pointed out that an implicit approach, in which learners were encouraged to look for consistencies in the target language forms and formulate rules for themselves, was a more successful method. Some teachers believed that students acquired the second language the same way children learn their mother tongue, without explicit instruction, which resulted in poor language accuracy (Rhalmi, 2012). On the other hand, some other researchers emphasized the need for explicit instruction. However, this did not mean that grammar instruction was not helpful. It has been noted that if learners received communicative exposure to grammar forms that have already been introduced explicitly, they would have a longer-lasting awareness of the form, and their accuracy would improve (Nassaji & Fotos, 2004).

To conclude, teaching grammar is controversial in English language teaching and teaching methodology. Explicit understanding may be used by the learners in order to speed up their implicit learning. According to this view, Freeman (2003) stated that implicit and explicit knowledge were opposite paths of the same ends. Therefore, explicit knowledge might be transformed and changed anytime to implicit knowledge through adequate practice. From this perspective, he argued that rather than teaching implicit knowledge directly, it was better to present the learner with explicit knowledge to provide them with the means to practice the language.

## **2.5 Attitude**

One important feature while studying any field of social science is attitude; it is the feelings and opinions that affect our actions and reactions. Teachers' attitudes are crucial to the educational landscape, fulfilling numerous roles that include guiding students in their career paths, instilling moral and social values, conveying academic knowledge, and fostering essential skills. The traits considered vital for effective teaching are influenced by societal views on education, human nature, culture, and the specific context of the times (Işık et al., 2010; Wimberly et al., 1978). Consequently, the following subsections briefly discuss definitions of attitude, negative and positive attitudes and the attitude formation.

### **2.5.1 Definition of Attitude**

Attitude is defined as "a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor and disfavor" (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993, p.1), while Fazio viewed Attitude as "an association in memory between a given object and a given summary evaluation of the object" (Fazio, 1995,

p.247). Attitude is also known as "a general and enduring positive and negative feeling about some person, object and issue" (Petty and Cacioppo,1981, p.7).

### **2.5.2 Positive Attitudes**

Attitudes serve important roles in individuals' lives, acting as internal representations that include emotional responses and cognitive elements like thoughts and beliefs (Baron & Byrne, 1991). Teachers' beliefs are often linked to the broader belief systems of their society, shaped by their environment and experiences (Schechtman & Or, 1996). Therefore, attitudes possess cognitive, emotional, and observable behavioral components. For effective teaching, particularly for learners with special educational needs, teachers need not only knowledge and skills but also positive emotional qualities. Thus, fostering positive attitudes is crucial for achieving favorable teaching outcomes.

### **2.5.3 Negative Attitudes**

Negative attitudes can be obtained after a bad experience or circumstances. Consequently, it affects negatively and may cause uselessness or ignorance of some method. Kahveci (2023) explored the dual impact of teacher attitudes and behaviors on student progress, identifying both positive and negative dimensions. Positive behaviors, such as effective communication, empathy, and a fair classroom environment, significantly enhances students' academic, emotional, and social development. Conversely, negative behaviors, including verbal and physical aggression, create fear and hinder student engagement, leading to long-term detrimental effects on self-esteem and academic performance. This study underscored the critical role of teacher conduct in shaping student experiences and

outcomes, highlighting the necessity for educators to foster supportive and equitable learning environments.

To conclude, attitudes are significant for learning process. This what encourages Krashen (1982) and Ellis (2009) to highlight its role in language learning, especially in second language acquisition. Firstly, Krashen (1982) argued that a positive attitude was crucial for successful language acquisition, as it influences motivation and receptivity to input. His Affective Filter Hypothesis suggested that learners with low anxiety, high motivation, and positive attitudes towards the target language were more likely to acquire language effectively. In contrast, negative attitudes, such as fear of making mistakes or lack of interest, could raise the affective filter, block language input and hinder learning.

#### **2.5.4 Attitude Formation**

Many factors play a role on setting the formation of attitudes. At first, experience is considered to be the main factor (Allport, 1937). While Glasman and Albarracin (2006) claimed that direct experience promoted greater attitude-behavior consistency than those based on indirect experience. As Allport (1929) argued that attitudes served as a key component of personality and significantly impact behavior. He also highlighted their cognitive, affective, and behavioral components, suggesting that attitudes involve beliefs, emotions, and tendencies to act in particular ways. Furthermore, he stressed that attitudes were relatively stable but can changed over time due to new experiences, persuasion, or shifts in social context.

There were social perspectives that influence forming attitude. For instance, Hymes (1974) and Fairclough (1989) discovered language attitudes from sociolinguistic perspectives, emphasizing their connection to social structures and

power dynamics. Hymes (1974) viewed language attitudes through an ethnographic lens, arguing that they were shaped by cultural norms, social interactions, and the functional roles of language within communities. He highlighted how language served as a marker of identity and group membership.

Fairclough (1989), on the other hand, observed language attitudes through a critical perspective, emphasizing how they were influenced by institutional power. He argued that dominant language ideologies, reinforced by education, media, and government policies, created linguistic hierarchies that privileged certain varieties while marginalizing others. This perspective highlights how language attitudes were not merely personal opinions but shaped by broader social and political forces. While Rmali (2017), who cited Franzoi and Oswald (2001), Smith and Mackie (1999), and Jonas et al., (1997), approved that attitudes were developed from three sources: first, beliefs about the object's positive or negative characteristics, second, feelings and emotions towards it and, third. past and current behaviors towards it.

Ellis (2009) also highlighted the importance of attitude in language learning, emphasizing its role in shaping motivation and engagement with different teaching methods. He discussed how learners' attitudes toward communicative versus grammar-based approaches influence their success in acquiring a second language. Additionally, he noted that attitudes could be shaped by past learning experiences, cultural background, and social factors, which in turn affected learners' willingness to participate in language learning activities.

## **2.6 Challenges of Implementing Deductive/Inductive Approaches to Teach Grammar**

The education sector in Libya, much like other national sectors, continues to face considerable difficulties due to shifting educational systems and policy reforms (Tamtam et al., 2011). Numerous studies have investigated these obstacles, especially those that hindered teachers from adopting more natural and effective approaches to grammar instruction, such as the research by Ibrahim (2020, as cited in Omar, 2020), who identified several key issues that impeded grammar teaching in Libya. These included insufficient teacher training, a lack of essential teaching materials and infrastructure, and students' negative attitudes towards grammar, which often results in anxiety when the subject is introduced. His findings also indicated that grammar lessons were still heavily influenced by traditional methods, particularly the Grammar Translation Method. Many educators preferred using a deductive method, where grammatical rules were presented before any practice or application. Teaching was typically based on repetition and memorization to reinforce learning. At the same time, teachers acknowledged the need to make grammar more engaging and accessible for students. Ibrahim also reported that graduates from Faculties of Education were generally more competent in teaching grammar than those from Faculties of Arts, emphasizing the importance of tailored teacher education programs. Despite the dominance of explicit methods, a number of teachers showed openness to incorporating inductive techniques, allowing students to discover rules themselves while still maintaining a focus on direct instruction.

Another study conducted by Abrahmses (2016), who examined implicit grammar instruction in Dutch EFL classrooms by analyzing teachers' beliefs and

practices through surveys, interviews, and classroom observations. Her research found that teachers did not strongly favor either implicit or explicit methods; both were generally viewed positively. However, grammar was often seen as less important than other language skills. Teachers used various techniques for implicit instruction, including inductive strategies and emphasizing grammatical forms through speech patterns. Nevertheless, many found these methods time-consuming and demanding, requiring greater effort and creativity. Some also felt that basic grammar explanations were necessary, especially for students with lower proficiency. Additionally, Abrahmses pointed out that limited class time and rigid educational systems posed significant challenges to applying theory-based approaches-issues that closely resemble those were faced in Libyan schools. Despite these constraints, the study showed that teachers were capable of developing effective grammar strategies and becoming more reflective in their teaching, suggesting that innovative practices can still be implemented even within limiting environments.

Moreover, Alahresh (2024) investigated the beliefs and practices of EFL secondary school teachers in Zawia, Libya, regarding explicit and implicit grammar instruction. The study involved 20 teachers from six secondary schools and employed a qualitative approach using semi-structured interviews. The findings revealed a discrepancy between teachers' beliefs and their actual classroom. While most participants expressed positive beliefs about implicit grammar teaching, emphasizing exposure and practice over memorization. Approximately all reported using explicit instruction in their classrooms. The primary reasons for this inconsistency included students' low proficiency levels, their reliance on direct instruction, difficulties understanding the teacher's book instructions, time

constraints, large class sizes, and inadequate facilities in public schools. Additionally, three participants favored explicit teaching, arguing that it helped improving students' accuracy. In other words, in spite of believing that grammar teaching was a straightforward task, teachers encountered several challenges that prevented them from fully implementing implicit approaches.

Together, these studies highlighted the complex realities teachers face when attempting to apply either deductive or inductive grammar instruction. They emphasized the critical role of professional training, resource availability, and flexible teaching methods. Therefore, this study seeks to further explore the obstacles secondary school teachers encounter in using their preferred instructional approaches and to offer practical suggestions for enhancing grammar teaching in the Libyan educational contexts.

## **2.7 Previous Related Studies**

Understanding teachers' attitudes towards deductive and inductive approaches to teach grammar is a decisive topic that helps to enhance student's outcome and give new depth to the insights or views towards these approaches especially about teaching grammar. The topic of teaching grammar has undergone a considerable debate by many researchers especially of whether to teach grammar explicitly or implicitly or both ways as has been mentioned in the previous sections. These approaches have enthused many scholars at the international level. For instance, Ezzi (2012) conducted a study about Yemeni teachers' beliefs of grammar teaching. He reported that when teachers were asked about their approach of teaching grammar, inductive, deductive, or both approaches, they claimed having a set of beliefs. However, those beliefs were not reflected in their classroom's practices. The study also revealed that pre-service education alone is not adequate to

prepare qualified teachers for a lifetime teaching. Therefore, professional teaching development needed to be continued, and teachers needed on-going training workshops to keep their knowledge and beliefs updated of the new techniques for teaching grammar.

Another study was conducted by Mallia (2014), who explored how adult learners perceive inductive and deductive approaches to teaching English grammar while comparing their written performance under each method. The study involved two groups of students who were randomly assigned to one of the approaches and were tested on their understanding of the past perfect tense immediately after instruction and again ten days later. Although most learners favored the deductive method, the differences in performance between the two groups were minimal. The findings suggested that using a deductive approach with clear explanations and culturally relevant examples met learner expectations and can be effective. However, inductive techniques that encouraged grammar awareness were also successful, particularly when adapted to the learners' cultural background. The study concluded that teachers should not feel obligated to rely solely on a deductive approach, as both methods could be effective depending on the teaching context.

Furthermore, Machila, et al., (2018) examined secondary school social science teachers' understanding and attitudes towards inductive and deductive teaching methods, focusing on history and civic education. The study was conducted in Zambia and employed a qualitative approach using focus group discussions and interviews. Findings revealed that while teachers understood the principles behind both methods, many struggled to apply them correctly. Some teachers incorporated both approaches, while others did not use them effectively. Additionally, there was a general preference for the inductive method, with some teachers holding negative

perceptions of the deductive approach. The study highlighted the importance of using varied teaching strategies to enhance learning outcomes and emphasized the need for teachers to integrate both horizontal and vertical discourse in social science education.

Another motivating study was conducted by Harutyunyan (2012), who investigated teachers' beliefs and learners' attitudes towards inductive and deductive approaches to grammar instruction in an Experimental English Class (EEC) setting at the American University of Armenia. The study employed a multiple-case study design, including five teacher-learner groups. Data were collected through semi-structured teacher interviews, learner questionnaires, and classroom observations over eight weeks. Findings revealed that while some teachers used a mix of both methods, others relied solely on inductive instruction. Teachers generally believed that inductive grammar teaching fostered higher motivation and engagement among learners. However, learners' attitudes varied: while oral responses indicated a preference for deductive teaching due to its clarity and rule-based structure, questionnaire results suggested no strong preference for either approach. Classroom observations, however, contradicted both teachers' and learners' self-reported views, showing that students generally understood grammar structures better when taught deductively. The study highlighted the complexity of aligning instructional methods with learner perceptions and actual learning outcomes.

Moreover, Khoshimova (2023) conducted an empirical study to compare the effectiveness of inductive and deductive methods in teaching grammar at the elementary level. The research involved two groups of 15 fifth-grade students, with their grammar performance assessed through pre-tests and post-tests. The findings indicated no significant statistical difference in the grammar performance of students

taught using either method. However, students showed a slight preference for the deductive approach, as it provided clear and direct grammar rules without requiring them to infer patterns independently. The study suggested that both methods could be effective in elementary language learning, with student preferences playing a minor role in instructional outcomes.

One of the most interesting studies was conducted by Ellis (2006), who explored key issues in grammar instruction from a second language acquisition (SLA) perspective, addressing whether, what, when, and how grammar should be taught. He emphasized that while explicit grammar instruction alone was insufficient for developing the implicit knowledge required for fluent communication, grammar teaching remains essential. The article outlined several principles for effective grammar instruction. Ellis argued that grammar teaching should integrate both form and meaning, prioritize problematic structures, and be more beneficial for learners with some prior language proficiency. He also supported both explicit and implicit teaching methods, advocating for a combination of focus-on-forms (explicit instruction) and focus-on-form (incidental grammar instruction during communication). Additionally, he highlighted the importance of corrective feedback, suggesting a mix of implicit and explicit techniques to facilitate learning. Ellis concluded that there was no single best approach to grammar instruction; instead, a variety of methods should be used to accommodate the complexities of L2 acquisition. He called for further research, particularly longitudinal studies, to examine how grammar instruction contributes to the development of implicit knowledge over time.

Deductive and inductive approach were becoming researchable locally as well. For instance, Sohoub (2023) in her study explored grammar teaching

approaches used by English and Arabic teachers in preparatory and secondary public schools in Misurata, Libya. The study, based on semi-structured interviews with 21 female teachers, found that traditional grammar teaching approaches remained dominant. However, the deductive approach was more commonly used by English teachers than Arabic teachers. The findings highlighted the need for improvement in grammar instruction, emphasizing the importance of teacher training programs, enhanced instructional methods in teacher preparation courses, and encouraging reflective teaching practices. These measures were identified as the most effective techniques for improving language teachers' approaches to grammar instruction.

In his study, Mohammadi (2021) investigated the attitudes of newly qualified English teachers towards implicit grammar teaching. The research emphasized the importance of grammar for learners and the increasing popularity of implicit methods, which aligned with Krashen's natural acquisition hypothesis suggesting unconscious language learning. Using a questionnaire of 25 items, the study gathered teachers' positive and negative perceptions. The findings showed that 70% of the participant teachers viewed implicit grammar instruction favorably, while 30% had a negative opinion, though explicit teaching methods were not entirely dismissed. In conclusion, the study detailed the significance of grammar in language learning and the commonality of implicit teaching due to its emphasis on intuitive learning. Implicit learning as described by Cleeremans et. al., (1998), occurred without conscious awareness. The research highlighted the strategies teachers used for implicit grammar instruction and the challenges they faced, such as limited teaching time and traditional education expectations. Despite these constraints, teachers developed effective implicit strategies, suggesting the potential for broader application in other educational contexts.

As the literature review indicated, comparing deductive and inductive approaches to grammar instruction uncovered benefits in both methods. Deductive strategies provided clear and structured rules that enhance immediate comprehension, while inductive techniques encouraged learners to derive rules from context, fostering deeper understanding. This synthesis highlighted the importance of integrated approaches to grammar teaching.

## **2.7 Summary**

Grammar is a fundamental aspect of learning English or any other language, especially to improve language accuracy. This chapter has shed light on the definitions of grammar, its importance and its role in learning the English language in general. It has also focused on the core of this study which is deductive and inductive approaches, and discussed their advantages and disadvantages. Then, the chapter presented the definition, the formation and the kinds of the attitudes as well as the challenges. Finally, some related studies were briefly reviewed with some focus on the differences and similarities among findings related to different geographical areas around the world.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.0 Introduction**

This chapter outlines the methodology adopted in this study, including the research design, sampling methods, participants, and data collection instruments. Validity is ensured through content, face, and construct validity, while reliability is measured using Cronbach's Alpha. Ethical considerations are informed and carefully observed. Finally, the chapter presents the data analysis procedures, including descriptive statistics for quantitative data and thematic analysis for qualitative responses.

#### **3.1 Research Design**

A critical step in any research is selecting an appropriate research design, which serves as a framework or blueprint for collecting, measuring, and analyzing data to answer specific research questions. Creswell (2014, p.3) defined research design as "the plan or proposal to conduct research, involving the intersection of philosophy, strategies of inquiry, and specific methods." This definition highlighted that research design encompasses philosophical perspectives, methodological choices, and data collection techniques that shape the entire study. This research has employed a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design, which involved collecting and analyzing quantitative data first, followed by qualitative data to further elaborate on quantitative results (Creswell & Clark, 2011). Mixed methods combined the strengths of both approaches, offering complementary insights. Creswell and Clark (2011, p.5) described mixed methods as an approach that involved "collecting, analyzing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in

a single study or series of studies”. This approach is particularly suitable for exploring complex issues like teachers’ attitudes towards deductive and inductive grammar teaching approaches, as it provides diverse perspectives and greater depth of analysis.

### **3.2 Sampling Method**

Sampling involved selecting a subset of individuals from a larger population to analyze and generalize findings to the broader group (Kumar, 2011). According to Cohen et al., (2007), the choice of sampling method significantly influenced the quality and applicability of research outcomes. Due to limited access to the entire population, this study employed a non-probability sampling method, specifically volunteer sampling. Participants were selected based on their willingness to take part in the study (Dillon et al., 1994). Teachers were informed about the study and given time to decide whether they wished to participate, ensuring ethical engagement and informed consent.

### **3.3 Participants of the Study**

The study involved 49 secondary school EFL teachers from 11 different schools in Zawia, who volunteered to complete the questionnaire. These schools were: Soad Al-Hengari School, Dai Al-Hilal School, Shuhada February School Al-Fajr Al-Jadeed School, Judaem Boys School (Joodaem Baneen), Judaem Girls School (Joodaem Banat), Bir Mamer School, Al-Zawiya Secondary School, Al-Beknas School, Al-Diaa School. Of these, 10 participants were willing to join the semi-structured interviews to provide in-depth qualitative data. Previous studies suggested that 10 to 25 interviews were sufficient to gather comprehensive data (Kumar, 2011). All participants had teaching experience ranging from 3 to over 12 years, making them

well-qualified to provide insights into their attitudes towards deductive and inductive grammar teaching.

### **3.4 Data Collection Instruments**

Two instruments were used for data collection: a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews.

#### **3.4.1 Questionnaire**

A questionnaire was a standardized set of questions designed to collect individual data on specific topics (Lavrakas, 2018; Ahmad, 2012). In this study, the questionnaire was used to gather quantitative data and was divided into three sections. The first section sought to obtain Personal Information as a basic demographic detail of participants. The second section was related to teachers' attitudes towards grammar in general. The third section was about teachers' attitudes towards deductive teaching of grammar and asked them about their opinions regarding how this kind of teaching is effective, beneficial and suitable. The last section was about inductive teaching of grammar to understand teachers' attitudes towards this approach, and the challenges they faced in implementing their preferred approach. The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'Totally Agree' to 'Totally Disagree'. To ensure clarity, the questionnaire was translated into the participants' native language, and definitions of deductive and inductive approaches were provided for those unfamiliar with the terminology (See appendix A).

#### **3.4.2 Semi-Structured Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews were guided conversations that allow flexibility while maintaining a clear structure (Bhattacharya, 2017). They were more organized

than unstructured interviews but still permitted the exploration of unanticipated topics (Brinkmann, 2013). In this study, face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 participants. The interviews were recorded and later transcribed. The interview protocol mirrored the questionnaire structure, covering the same questionnaire sections to ensure alignment and depth.

### **3.4.3 Piloting the Instruments**

A pilot study was conducted to test the validity and reliability of the questionnaire and interview protocols. According to the American Psychological Association (APA, 2021, p.724), a pilot study is "a small-scale, preliminary study conducted in order to evaluate feasibility, time, cost, adverse events, and effect size". Pilot testing can help researchers to identify and address any issues with the instruments, such as unclear questions, confusing instructions, or inappropriate response options. In the present study, three teachers volunteered to participate in the pilot phase, providing feedback on clarity, structure, and relevance. This process ensured the instruments were well-suited to the research objectives.

### **3.5 Reliability and Validity**

To ensure the quality and accuracy of the data collected through the questionnaire and interviews, both instruments were evaluated for validity and reliability. As Devellis (2017) explained that reliability referred to the extent to which a measurement instrument produced consistent results over time or across different observers. In other words, it reflected the stability and consistency of the tool, minimizing measurement error and allowing for dependable outcomes.

### **3.5.1 Validity**

Validity referred to the degree to which an instrument measured what it was intended to measure (Robson, 2011). In this study, three forms of validity were considered: content validity, face validity, and construct validity.

#### **1. Content Validity**

Content validity ensured that the items in the questionnaire adequately represent the domain being studied (Haynes, Richard, & Kubany, 1995). To achieve this, the questionnaire was carefully designed by the researcher in alignment with the research questions and objectives. It was then reviewed by the research supervisor and two experienced instructors in the field of English language teaching. Their feedback helped confirm that the questionnaire items covered all necessary aspects of teachers' attitudes towards grammar teaching, including both deductive and inductive approaches. Modifications were made based on their comments to improve clarity and coverage.

#### **2. Face Validity**

Face validity referred to the extent to which the instrument appeared, on the surface, to measure what it was intended to measure (Holden, 2010). In this study, the questionnaire and interview questions were shared with two instructors who reviewed the items for clarity, relevance, and overall appearance. Their suggestions led to adjustments in wording and structure, ensuring that the items were appropriate and understandable for the target participants.

### 3. Construct Validity

Construct validity assessed whether the instrument truly measured the theoretical construct it was intended to measure (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955). In this research, construct validity was supported by aligning questionnaire items with the conceptual framework derived from literature on grammar teaching approaches. Each item was designed to reflect a specific aspect of either deductive or inductive teaching, as identified in previous studies. Furthermore, piloting the questionnaire with a small group of teachers allowed the researcher to refine the constructs and verify whether the items behaved as expected.

#### 3.5.2 Reliability

The reliability of the questionnaire was measured using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, a common indicator of internal consistency, especially for Likert-type scales. According to Gliem and Gliem (2003), Cronbach's Alpha measured how closely related a set of items are as a group, and it was an indication of the scale's reliability.

*Table 3. 1: Cronbach's Alpha Level Reliability Values*

<b>Cronbach's Alpha Level Reliability Statistics</b>	<b>Number of Statements</b>	<b>Cronbach Alpha</b>
<b>Attitudes towards grammar</b>	4	0.642
<b>Attitudes towards deductive approach</b>	9	0.676
<b>Attitudes towards inductive approach</b>	9	0.717
<b>All statements</b>	22	0.821

As shown in the table above, the Cronbach's Alpha values for each section of the questionnaire ranged from 0.642 to 0.821. According to general statistical guidelines, an alpha value above 0.70 was considered acceptable, while values between 0.60 and 0.70 are considered moderate but still acceptable for exploratory research (George & Mallery, 2003).

The overall reliability of the full questionnaire (22 items) was 0.821, indicating a high level of internal consistency. The subscale measuring attitudes towards the inductive approach had an alpha of 0.717, showing acceptable reliability. The deductive approach subscale scored 0.676, and the grammar attitudes subscale scored 0.642, both reflecting moderate but acceptable reliability, especially given the relatively small number of items per subscale.

### **3.6 Ethical Considerations**

Ethics are moral principles that govern the way we think or act in a particular situation. Research ethics were the ethics of how researchers carried out their studies (Maylor & Blackmon, 2005). Ethical issues are one of the most important parts of the research. If this part was missing, then the study would be bound to fail. That was to say, the consequences of being unethical in research would entail negative points for the research (Maylor & Blackmon, 2005). Therefore, the researcher obtained official approval from the university and the Educational Monitoring Administration to ensure compliance with institutional and legal requirements. (See appendix E)

As the research design required participants, ethics could become guidelines for researchers to conduct their study without causing any harm to those participants (Anwar, 2015). Avoiding harm to participants was one of the ethical principles stated

by Bryman and Bell (2007). Researchers have to be careful and pay more attention to their actions in order not to cause harm to their participants. Hence, a consent letter form was prepared by the researcher that provided the participants with the needed information about the study (See appendix C). In addition, it contained the purpose of the study and explained to the participants that their identity and data will be kept anonymous and their participation in the research is voluntary. They are free to withdraw at any time. Another ethical issue that was taken into consideration by the researcher is the participants' privacy. Their names, both in the questionnaire and the interview, were kept anonymous (Bryman, 2012; Mukherjee, 2020). In addition, all the audio recordings and transcripts of the participants' interviews were securely saved on the researcher's computer with a password and only the researcher can access these files.

Another ethical issue about participants who completed the questionnaire and expressed interest in the study were invited for interviews at their convenience. They were given the option to use their native language, informed that interviews would be recorded, and assured of confidentiality.

### **3.7 Data Analysis Procedures:**

This study employed both quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods. For the quantitative data, a printed questionnaire was distributed to 49 English language teachers from various secondary schools. To ensure clarity and accessibility, the questionnaire was translated into Arabic and included key definitions (See Appendix A). The researcher was available during the distribution to clarify any unfamiliar items. The data collection process spanned approximately a month and a half.

Once the data were collected, they were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and submitted to a statistician for analysis. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were calculated to examine the teachers' attitudes towards inductive and deductive approaches to grammar teaching. The analysis focused on each questionnaire item individually, and then grouped according to the approach type, to identify trends and differences in attitudes. For the qualitative phase, at the end of the questionnaire, participants were asked if they would be willing to participate in a follow-up interview. Ten teachers responded positively. The researcher contacted them individually and arranged interview times and locations based on their availability (See appendix C). The table below presents the schedule of interviews, including dates and durations of the interviews that were conducted.

***Table 3. 2: Teachers' Interview Schedule***

<b>Interviewee</b>	<b>Interview Date</b>	<b>Length (minutes)</b>
<b>Teacher 1</b>	22 <sup>nd</sup> -Jan-2025	00:11min
<b>Teacher 2</b>	22 <sup>nd</sup> -Jan-2025	00:10min
<b>Teacher 3</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> -Jan-2025	00:10min
<b>Teacher 4</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> -Jan-2025	00:15min
<b>Teacher 5</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> -Jan-2025	00:15min
<b>Teacher 6</b>	24 <sup>th</sup> -Jan-2025	00:11min
<b>Teacher 7</b>	25 <sup>th</sup> -Jan-2025	00:12min
<b>Teacher 8</b>	25 <sup>th</sup> -Jan-2025	00:11min
<b>Teacher 9</b>	25 <sup>th</sup> -Jan-2025	00:12 min
<b>Teacher 10</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> -Jan2025	00:15min

The interview data were analyzed using thematic analysis, following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-step. Braun and Clarke (2006) claimed that the first

qualitative method should be learnt as it provides core skills that would be useful for conducting many other kinds of analyses. The steps included:

1. Familiarization with the data
2. Generating initial codes
3. Searching for themes
4. Reviewing themes
5. Defining and naming themes
6. Producing the report

The researcher transcribed and coded all of the recorded information including the participants' answers for each question. According to Dornyei (2007), coding was the classification of data into distinct groups. Throughout the interviews, the interviewees' responses were classified and labelled (See Appendix D). The steps of coding the data themes included transcribing the semi structured interviews, familiarizing with the data collected in relation with the questionnaire and the data emerged from the questionnaire, highlighting the data obtained and generating themes accordingly. Also, reviewing the emerged themes and defining and naming the themes. This approach allowed the researcher to identify recurring patterns and insights related to the teachers' preferences regarding inductive and deductive grammar teaching approaches.

### **3.8 Summary**

This chapter detailed the methodology employed in this study, including the research design, sampling methods, participants, data collection instruments, and ethical considerations. A mixed-methods sequential explanatory design was chosen to provide a comprehensive understanding of secondary school EFL teachers'

attitudes towards deductive and inductive grammar teaching approaches. The combination of quantitative data from questionnaires and qualitative insights from semi-structured interviews ensured that diverse perspectives were captured, enhancing the richness and reliability of the findings. Careful attention was given to the sampling techniques, instrument development, piloting, and ethical considerations to ensure the validity and reliability of the study. Overall, the methodology presented in this chapter forms a robust framework for investigating the research questions and laying the groundwork for analyzing and interpreting the data, which is discussed in the following chapters.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **DATA ANALYSIS**

#### **4.0 Introduction**

This chapter presents the data obtained from the questionnaire and semi structured interviews. The data is divided into two sections: the first section presents the analysis of the questionnaire with interpretations, and the second section presents the analysis of the interview. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

#### **4.1 Analysis of the questionnaire**

The data collected from participants were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The study addressed two primary research questions through frequency and descriptive statistical analyses. The first research question examined the attitudes of secondary school teachers in Zawia towards deductive and inductive approaches in grammar instruction. The second research question explored the challenges these teachers encounter when implementing either approach. Notably, the questionnaire items placed greater emphasis on the challenges related to the inductive approach. This focus aligns with insights from the existing literature, which indicate that many teachers perceive the deductive method as more straightforward and easier to implement in classroom settings.

##### **Section 1: Personal Information:**

The first section of the questionnaire aimed to collect background information about the participants, including teaching experience and educational qualifications.

**Table 4. 1: Personal Information Table**

<b>1-Teaching experience</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Less than 4 years	4	8%
1-3years	2	4%
4-7years	8	16%
8-10years	4	4%
+10years	31	66%
Total	49	100%
<b>2- Education level</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percent</b>
BA	35	73%
Master	7	14%
Others	7	14%
Total	49	100%

According to the table above regarding teaching experience, the majority of participants (64%) have over 10 years of experience, indicating that the sample consists largely of seasoned teachers. Their responses are likely to reflect well-informed and practical perspectives shaped by years of classroom teaching. A smaller proportion of teachers (28%) reported having less than 7 years of experience, reflecting a diverse range of professional backgrounds within the group. This enhances the credibility and relevance of their responses, as their insights are likely informed by extensive classroom practice. A smaller percentage of teachers (28%) reported having less than 7 years of experience, showing a range of professional backgrounds within the group.

In terms of educational qualifications, most participants (71%) hold a Bachelor's degree, while 14% hold a Master's degree, and another 14% reported having other qualifications. This distribution suggests that the sample reflects a typical profile of English teachers in Libyan secondary schools, where a bachelor's degree is the standard qualification.

Overall, this demographic information provides useful context but is not expected to significantly influence participants' attitudes or perceived challenges towards the deductive and inductive approaches to grammar instruction.

#### 4.1.1 Interpretation Scale

To interpret the participants responses, a five -point Likert scale was used. The scale was categorized into five levels based on the mean score ranges, as shown in the table below:

*Table 4. 2: Interpretation Scale*

<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Mean Range</b>	<b>Weight/Scale</b>
Strongly agree (SA)	4.51-5.00	5
Agree(A)	3.51-4.50	4
Neutral(N)	2.51-3.50	3
Disagree(D)	1.51-2.50	2
Strongly disagree (SD)	1.00-1.50	1

As seen in the table above, the scale provides a framework for interpreting the mean scores derived from participants' responses to the questionnaire items.

Each numerical range corresponds to a descriptive category that reflects the general tendency of the participants' attitudes. For example, a mean score between 4.51 and 5.00 is interpreted as "Strongly Agree", indicating a high level of agreement with a particular statement. A score within 3.51 to 4.50 is labeled "Agree", suggesting a positive but less intense agreement. Scores between 2.51 and 3.50 are classified as "Neutral", implying uncertainty or mixed responses. Meanwhile, scores between 1.51 and 2.50 indicate "Disagree", and scores from 1.00 to 1.50 reflect "Strongly Disagree" response, showing strong opposition to the statement. This interpretation scale allows for a more meaningful analysis of the collected data by translating numerical results into clear qualitative insights about the participants' sentiments.

## Section 2: Attitudes Towards the Role of Grammar in Language Teaching:

This section presents an analysis of the participants' attitudes regarding the role and importance of grammar in English language instruction. Understanding these attitudes is crucial, as they influence teaching methods and priorities in the classroom. The data were collected through Likert-scale items, and the mean scores were interpreted using the scale outlined previously.

**Table 4. 3: Descriptive Statistics of Teachers' Attitudes towards the Role of Grammar in Language Teaching**

<b>Item 1. Grammar is a framework for the rest of language- a basic system to build everything.</b>					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
Responses							
SD	D	N	A	SA			
1 2%	1 2%	4 8%	21 42%	22 44%	4.27	0.86	Agree
<b>Item 2. Grammar is considered as the building blocks of language, which are combined to form a whole.</b>					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
Responses							
SD	D	N	A	SA			

1 2%	3 6.1%	6 26.5%	16 33%	23 46.9%	4.17	1.01	Agree
<b>Item 3. Grammar is something which is added on to language proficiency: a refinement of more basic language knowledge.</b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
1 2%	1 2%	4 8.2%	25 51%	18 37%	4.25	693.00	Agree
<b>Item 4. Grammar is seen as an equal pillar in supporting language proficiency.</b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
4 8%	1 2%	2 4%	27 55%	15 31%	4.10	0.823	Agree

The results in Table 3 show that the participant teachers hold consistently positive attitudes towards the role of grammar in English language instruction. For the first item, '*Grammar is a framework for the rest of the language, a basic system to build everything.*' 21 participants (42%) agreed and 22 (44%) strongly agreed, while only 2 teachers (4%) disagreed or strongly disagreed. The mean score was 4.27, interpreted as 'Agree'.

Similarly, for item two, '*Grammar is considered as the building blocks of language, which are combined to form a whole.*' 16 teachers (33%) agreed and 23 (46.9%) strongly agreed, with a mean score of 4.17. Only 1 teacher (2%) strongly disagreed, and 3 (6.1%) disagreed.

In item three, '*Grammar is something which is added on to language proficiency: a refinement of more basic language knowledge.*' the majority of teachers (51% agreed and 37% strongly agreed) supported the idea, resulting in a mean of 4.25. Only 2 teachers (4%) disagreed, and 4 (8.2%) were neutral.

The fourth item, '*Grammar is seen as an equal pillar in supporting language proficiency.*' also showed positive attitudes as 27 teachers (55%) agreed and 15

(31%) strongly agreed, with a mean of 4.10. A small percentage (10%) disagreed or strongly disagreed.

Overall, these results indicate a strong consensus among participants regarding the importance of grammar as a fundamental part of language learning. Grammar is not seen as a separate or additional aspect, but rather as an essential component that supports reading, writing, speaking, and listening. The responses reflect a belief that grammar plays a vital role in language proficiency, likely influenced by curriculum standards and exam-oriented teaching approaches.

### Section 3: Teachers' Attitudes towards the Deductive Approach

This section examines teachers' attitudes towards the deductive approach to grammar instruction, which involves presenting rules explicitly before providing examples. The goal is to explore whether teachers perceive this approach as effective, practical, and aligned with student needs.

**Table 4. 4: Descriptive Statistics of the Deductive Approach**

<i>Item 1. Grammar is best taught deductively (i.e., presenting the rule first)</i>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
3 6.1%	10 20.4%	8 16.3%	10 20.4%	18 36.7%	3.6122	1.33567	Neutral
<i>Item 2. The deductive instruction leads to quicker student comprehension of grammar rules</i>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
15 30.6%	15 30.6%	7 14.3%	8 16.3%	4 8.2%	3.735	.09525	Neutral
<i>Item 3. The deductive approach helps students to produce grammatically accurate sentence</i>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
1 2%	5 10.3%	12 24.5%	19 38.8%	11 22.9%	3.8980	0.98414	Neutral

<b>Item 4. My experience suggests that students benefit more from a deductive approach</b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
2 4.1%	5 10%	12 24.5%	19 38.8%	11 22.9%	3.6531	1.07143	Neutral
<b>Item 5. The deductive approach helps students pass the exams</b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
0 0%	11 22.4%	10 20.4%	20 40.8%	8 16.3%	3.5102	1.02312	Neutral
<b>Item 6. The deductive approach to grammar teaching contributes positively to language development</b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
0 0%	5 10.2%	15 30.6%	26 53.1%	3 6.1%	3.5510	0.76543	Neutral
<b>Item 7. Deductive approach is suitable because grammar lessons in the textbook are presented deductively.</b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
2 4.1%	13 26.5%	11 22.4%	21 42.9%	4 8.2%	3.2449	1.10925	Neutral
<b>Item 8. The deductive approach to grammar teaching has its disadvantages</b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
3 6.1%	10 20.4%	11 22.4%	17 34.7%	6 12.2%	3.2653	1.07578	Neutral
<b>Item 9. Practice of structures is important for learning grammar</b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
0 0%	1 2%	5 10.2%	21 42.9%	21 42.9%	4.3061	0.74173	Agree

The data in Table 4.4 illustrates that teachers' attitudes towards the deductive approach are generally neutral to slightly positive. In the first item, '*Grammar is best taught deductively (i.e., presenting the rule first),*' 10 teachers (20.4%) agreed and 18 (36.7%) strongly agreed, while 10 (20.4%) disagreed and 3 (6.1%) strongly disagreed. The mean score was 3.61, indicating a neutral stance.

For the second item, *'The deductive instruction leads to quicker student comprehension of grammar rules,'* 15 teachers (30.6%) strongly disagreed and another 15 (30.6%) disagreed, while only 8 (16.3%) agreed and 4 (8.2%) strongly agreed, resulting in a neutral mean score of 3.73.

In item three, *'The deductive approach helps students to produce grammatically accurate sentences,'* the majority of teachers (19 or 38.8%) agreed, and 11 or 22.9% strongly agreed, while only 6 teachers (12.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed. The mean was 3.89, still falling under a neutral interpretation.

For the fourth item, *'My experience suggests that students benefit more from a deductive approach,'* 19 participants (38.8%) agreed and 11 (22.9%) strongly agreed, while 7 (14.1%) disagreed and 2 (4.1%) strongly disagreed, resulting in a mean of 3.65.

In item five, *'The deductive approach helps students pass the exams,'* 20 teachers (40.8%) agreed and 8 (16.3%) strongly agreed, while 11 (22.4%) disagreed and 10 (20.4%) were neutral; the mean score was 3.51.

Item six, *'The deductive approach to grammar teaching contributes positively to language development,'* received 26 (53.1%) agreements and 3 (6.1%) strong agreements, while 5 (10.2%) disagreed, yielding a mean score of 3.55.

For item seven, *'Deductive approach is suitable because grammar lessons in the textbook are presented deductively,'* 21 teachers (42.9%) agreed and 4 (8.2%) strongly agreed, while 13 (26.5%) disagreed and 2 (4.1%) strongly disagreed, giving a mean of 3.24.

Item eight, *'The deductive approach to grammar teaching has its disadvantages,'* had 17 teachers (34.7%) who agreed and 6 (12.2%) who strongly agreed, while 13 (26.5%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, leading to a mean of 3.26.

Lastly, item nine, *'Practice of structures is important for learning grammar,'* had the highest agreement: 21 teachers (42.9%) agreed and other 21 (42.9%) strongly agreed, with no disagreement, resulting in the highest mean score of 4.30 and the only item rated as 'Agree.'

Overall, the mean scores across the items ranged from 3.24 to 4.30, indicating that while teachers see some benefits in the deductive approach—particularly in fostering accuracy and exam readiness—their attitudes remain mostly neutral. The consistent neutrality across most items suggests that although teachers recognize its practicality, they do not perceive the deductive approach as wholly effective or suitable in all teaching context.

#### **Section 4: Teachers' Attitudes towards the Inductive Approach**

This section focuses on the inductive approach to grammar teaching, where students are encouraged to infer grammatical rules from contextualized examples. The aim is to evaluate teachers' preference to this approach and the challenges they face in implementing it.

**Table 4. 5: Descriptive Statistics of Inductive Approach**

<b><i>Item 1. Grammar is best taught inductively (i.e., having students discover the rule through examples and tasks</i></b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
15 30.6%	15 30.6%	7 14.3%	8 16.3%	4 8.2%	2.4082	1.30573	Disagree
<b><i>Item 2. The inductive approach encourages a deeper understanding of grammar Rules</i></b>							
Responses					Mean		

SD	D	N	A	SA		Std. deviation	Level of attitude
12 24.5%	15 30.6%	13 26.5%	8 13.6%	1 2%	2.4082	1.09769	Disagree
<b><i>Item 3. I find that students are more motivated when they solve grammar problems inductively</i></b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
12 24.5%	14 28.6%	7 14.3%	9 18.4%	7 14.3%	2.8980	1.27875	Disagree
<b><i>Item 4. The inductive approach helps students to improve their focusing on the context and their critical thinking</i></b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
11 22.3%	14 28%	10 20.4%	10 20.4%	4 8.2%	2.6327	1.26974	Neutral
<b><i>Item 5. The inductive approach reflects the training I received in grammar instruction</i></b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
3 6.1%	31 63.3%	10 20.4%	3 6.1%	2 2.1%	2.3878	0.86160	Disagree
<b><i>Item 6. I prefer inductive approach but I think it is time consuming</i></b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
3 6.1%	6 12.2%	81 6.3%	21 42.9%	11 22.4%	2.9796	1.31482	Disagree
<b><i>Item 7. Lack of experience affects my ability to implement the inductive method in the classroom</i></b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
4 8.2%	10 20.4%	9 18.4%	14 28.6%	12 24.5%	2.7551	1.33121	Neutral
<b><i>Item 8. Self-confidence is an outcome of implementing the inductive method to make the teaching and learning process successful</i></b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
6 12.2%	4 8.2%	7 14.3%	19 38.8%	13 26.5%	3.5918	1.30573	Neutral
<b><i>Item 9. I adapt my teaching approach based on the specific grammar topic being taught</i></b>							
Responses					Mean	Std. deviation	Level of attitude
SD	D	N	A	SA			
11 22.4%	10 20.4%	8 16.3%	21 42.9%	11 22.4%	2.9184	1.42649	Agree

This section focuses on the inductive approach to grammar instruction, which emphasizes student discovery of grammatical rules through examples and problem-solving. Table 4.5 presents the descriptive statistics of teacher responses to nine related statements. The results indicate that teachers generally hold negative or neutral attitudes towards this approach.

In item 1, '*Grammar is best taught inductively*,' 15 teachers (30.6%) strongly disagreed and other 15 (30.6%) disagreed, while only 8 (16.3%) agreed and 4 (8.2%) strongly agreed, resulting in a low mean of 2.41.

A similar pattern appeared in item 2, '*The inductive approach encourages a deeper understanding of grammar rules*,' with 27 participants (55.1%) disagreeing or strongly disagreeing and only 9 (15.6%) agreeing or strongly agreeing, producing the same mean score of 2.41.

In item 3, '*Students are more motivated when solving grammar problems inductively*,' 26 teachers (53.1%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, 9 (18.4%) agreed, and 7 (14.3%) strongly agreed, resulting in a mean of 2.89.

In item 4, '*The inductive approach helps students focus on context and develop critical thinking*,' 25 teachers (50.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, while 14 (28.6%) agreed or strongly agreed, and the mean was 2.63.

Regarding teacher preparation, item 5, '*The inductive approach reflects the training I received*,' revealed that 31 participants (63.3%) disagreed, and only 5 (8.2%) agreed or strongly agreed, leading to a mean of 2.39.

For item 6, '*I prefer inductive approach but it is time-consuming*,' responses were more divided, with 21 (42.9%) agreeing and 11 (22.4%) strongly agreeing, while 9 (18.3%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, resulting in a mean of 2.97.

Item 7, *'Lack of experience affects my ability to implement the inductive method,'* also revealed mixed views: 14 teachers (28.6%) agreed, and 12 (24.5%) strongly agreed, while 14 (28.6%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, producing a mean of 2.76.

In item 8, *'Self-confidence is an outcome of implementing the inductive method,'* 19 participants (38.8%) agreed and 13 (26.5%) strongly agreed, while only 10 (20.4%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, giving a higher mean of 3.59.

Finally, item 9, *'I adapt my teaching approach based on the grammar topic,'* received the most favorable responses, with 21 teachers (42.9%) agreeing and 11 (22.4%) strongly agreeing, leading to a mean of 2.91.

Overall, most items had mean scores below 3.00, indicating general disagreement or uncertainty. The overall average mean was 2.67, suggesting that while a few teachers recognize certain benefits of inductive grammar instruction—such as its contribution to student motivation, contextual learning, and adaptability—most prefer more structured and rule-based (deductive) teaching. These attitudes are likely influenced by teachers' training backgrounds, time limitations, and the perceived difficulty of applying inductive methods effectively in real classroom settings.

#### **4.2 Analysis of the interview**

The data collected through semi-structured interviews were analyzed using a thematic analysis approach, which enabled the identification of recurring patterns and key ideas within participants' responses. This method is particularly effective for exploring participants' views in depth and gaining insights into their experiences, beliefs, and emotional reactions. By closely examining the teachers' responses,

several key themes emerged that reflect their attitudes- whether favorable or unfavorable- toward grammar instruction, particularly deductive and inductive approaches. The following sections present and discuss these themes in details.

#### **4.2.1 Attitudes towards the Importance of Teaching Grammar**

Based on teachers' responses when they were asked about their opinion concerning the importance of teaching grammar, all of them agreed that teaching Grammar is essential for secondary school students. T2, T3, T4, T5, T6 insisted to give grammar the largest amount of care because they considered grammar as a core of the language and the curriculum as well, in addition to their believing that grammar plays a role on improving other skills like reading, writing, listening and speaking. For instance, T4 claimed that *Grammar is very important for secondary school students because they need it for their next stage at college.*"Furthermore, T8, T9, T10 advocated that grammar has great effects on developing language accuracy. For instance, T9 claimed that *In my opinion grammar is very important to produce sentences correctly in the suitable situation and that what does grammar do to help use grammatical rules accurately."*

However, T1 and T10 disagreed with the idea that grammar should be considered as the most important subject to teach the language. T1 explained this by saying that *Other skills are more important than Grammar and they can acquire grammar inductively."*

#### **4.2.2 Preferred Teaching Approach**

When they were asked about their preferred method for teaching grammar, several teachers expressed a clear preference for the deductive approach. Specifically, T3, T5, T7, T8, and T9 indicated that they favor this method because it

is clear, easy to understand, and effective—particularly in improving students' outcomes. T7 for example, added that *"I prefer deductive more than inductive approach and thus it is sometimes commonly used for me"* whereas T3 said that *"I prefer the direct approach when I write the rule on the board and explain it then go to the lesson. I mean the deductive approach"*. However, T8 expressed satisfaction with the results it yields in the classroom by saying that *"Deductive approach by presenting the rule then give the students the chance to practice and give their own examples but I use inductive approach to revise the previous lesson that is given inductively that happens rarely because I see it helps with the easy rules to be revised so I can bring a paragraph and let the students conclude and revise,"* and recommended the benefit of inductive approach during revisions.

On the other hand, T2, T4, and T6 reported a preference for the inductive approach, describing it as more indirect and persuasive in engaging learners. For instance, T6 said that *"I prefer the inductive one because it is indirect approach"*. In addition, T2 emphasized that the deductive approach is more suitable for students with weaker language proficiency. She commented *"I prefer inductive approach because it encourages the students to draw a conclusion but we can't depend on it completely because it is not suitable for our weak level students."* Meanwhile, T1 and T10 offered more nuanced views. T1, for example, stated, *"I am forced to use the deductive method because, as I told you, the curriculum focuses heavily on grammar—especially since I teach third-year students, and the final exam is always full of grammar questions."* This highlights how curricular demands can influence instructional choices, even when a teacher may personally favor a different approach.

#### 4.2.3 Effectiveness of the Preferred Approach

This theme supports the analysis of the previous theme as participant teachers preferred deductive approach and considered it as more effective than the inductive one because of several reasons. T3, T5 and T7 insisted that the deductive approach is effective because of its simplicity and clarity. For instance, T3 said that *"It is very effective 100%, and the students are satisfied because they will understand first then when moving to the practice they already know how to answer."* T8 acknowledged that *"at the end of the year the students had a good outcome."* Moreover, one teacher (T9) claimed that it effects positively by helping students to figure out the rule. T9 said that *"It is very effective that make students to figure out the rules from the text but inductive I feel it is better to be used for the earlier stages."* On the other hand, participants T1, T2, T4, T6, T10 argued that their preferred approach is the inductive approach because it is indirect and modern. For example, T6 said that *"Inductive approach is very effective because it lets the students to understand the lessons indirectly and make them removing their bad feelings or their bad idea about the difficulty of the grammar. so, it is easier."* Even though T2 believed that *"inductive approach is more suitable for private schools but I don't recommend it for any teachers in public schools because we lack language labs and visual aids."*

#### 4.2.4 Teachers' Attitudes towards Students' Preference

The data obtained showed that all participants teachers T2, T3, T5, T7 preferred the deductive approach and acknowledged that students prefer the deductive approach because it is easy, direct and clear. T5 said that *"Once I used to explain the rule then go to the lesson, I feel comfortable and interested and they feel comfortable and better understanding."* T8 claimed that from her experience she

noticed that the deductive approach leads to good student outcomes. She stated that *"Yes I think they prefer the deductive approach because I see at the end of the year how good the outcomes of the students are."* On the other hand, T6 claimed that students prefer the inductive approach because it is indirect and modern, whereas T2 insisted that most of Libyan students do not prefer it. She noted that *this is because of two reasons: this approach needs strong vocabularies and most of our students are dependent on memorization than understanding so they will find it difficult. just clever students will be interested."* Moreover, T1 insisted that students are always afraid and confused about learning grammatical rules, and the inductive approach can lead to reduce these feelings and learn smoothly. She believed that *I think the students prefer this approach as well because the students are always afraid from grammar and consider this subject as hard and always feel that they aren't able to distinguish between many grammatical structures and many tenses, so they like to learn inductively even psychologically if you tell them that you are going to give them a grammatical rule, they feel afraid and confused so it is better for them to follow the inductive approach."* Furthermore, T10 thought that students are not aware about which approach they are studying by but felt that students prefer the inductive approach because it is more collaborative, not like the deductive approach. She said that *I think the students aren't aware of the way that they have been taught by. but I think they will prefer the inductive method because they will think and collaborate with the teacher not like the deductive one where the teacher is only the one who speaks and explains, and students listen."*

#### 4.2.5 Challenges

Based on the data collected, it is clear that most of the participant teachers who prefer the deductive approach insisted that they do not face any challenges in implementing their preferred approach. T7 and T8 added that deductive teaching is suitable for the big number of students in their classrooms maintaining that implementing the inductive approach could be impossible in this case. T8 believed that *"The class has many students more than necessary and the levels of the students are different. So deductive teaching can help to control the class and suitable for all levels."* On the other hand, T1 acknowledged that final exam is forced her to implement the unpreferred approach which is the deductive approach and which does not have an effect on developing speaking skill. She said that *"Actually, I used my preferred approach twice this year. I didn't find much difficulties just only the final exam is forced me to follow the deductive approach which doesn't have an effect on developing the speaking skill."* Moreover, T10 added that time is restricted and the inductive approach is unhelpfully time consuming by saying that *"The challenge is the time,"* whereas T6 disagreed with this point and indicated that teachers can control the time very well and claimed that she does not have any challenges to implement the inductive approach and she said that, *"The time is controlled by the teacher and should have a strong personality to control the lecture."* Furthermore, T2 insisted that *"Students are used to follow GMT method and it is hard to change it and it needs much effort to be developed or changed in addition to the lack of resources of visual aids and language labs."* T4 agreed with her in this point blaming the teachers of the earlier stages for following poor methods. She clarified that, *"Yes I face many challenges because the students have no strong foundation about the*

*grammar because of the wrong techniques that they used to study the language, so I see the problem comes from the teachers of the earlier stages."*

#### **4.2.6 Combining both Approaches**

One of the most important themes that emerged from the data analysis is combining both deductive and inductive approaches. T1, T4, T5, T9, T10 agreed with combining both approaches to get a better result. T1 thought that combining them could be better by presenting grammatical rules inductively and then switching to the deductive approach in case of noticing any difficulties. She said that, "*I believe in combining both and it may enhance grammar teaching by starting the lesson inductively so the students will think about the grammatical rule and then if it is stopped in any point, the teacher switches to the deductive approach. But in my opinion, it takes a long time which will be a challenge for that*". In spite of her deductive preference T5 claimed that "*I feel the inductive approach is more suitable for the rules that are familiar to the students and the deductive one is more suitable for new rules*". Moreover, T7 agreed about combining deductive and inductive approaches if the students have a good background and a foundation, and she said that, "*It may work if the students have a good background about the rules*". T2 and T6 insisted that there is no need for combining the approaches and the inductive approach is sufficient, while T3 believed that the deductive approach is sufficient and she said that "*I don't believe in combining both approaches because the inductive approach is not suitable for all students. They will face difficulty to understand the lesson*". But T8 has a different opinion and claimed that "*Combining both approaches or implementing just one depends on some factors like students' level, the environment of the class and the mood of the students and teachers as well*".

### 4.3 Summary of Findings

This chapter presented a detailed analysis of the data collected from both the questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The responses of 49 secondary school English teachers in Zawia were analyzed using SPSS to answer the two main research questions. First of all, teachers demonstrated a clear and consistent belief in the importance of grammar in language teaching. All statements in this section received high mean scores (above 4.0), reflecting agreement. Grammar was viewed as a core component of language proficiency, not just a supplementary element. Teachers agreed that grammar provides the framework and foundation for other language skills. Secondly, the overall mean score for items related to the deductive approach was 3.65, indicating a generally neutral to slightly positive stance. Teachers acknowledged the practical value of presenting rules before practice, particularly when preparing students for exams or when following textbook formats. However, responses did not strongly favor the approach across all dimensions. While they valued structured grammar practice and believed students benefit from deductive instruction, there was also recognition of the method's limitations. Some responses reflected uncertainty about its ability to promote deep understanding or faster comprehension. Thirdly, the average mean score for the inductive approach was 2.67, reflecting an overall disagreement to neutral attitude. Teachers expressed skepticism about the effectiveness and practicality of inductive grammar teaching. They disagreed that it aligns with their training or is effective in improving student motivation. Although some responses acknowledged potential benefits such as encouraging critical thinking and boosting learner confidence, these were not strong enough to suggest widespread support. The most common concerns included the

approach being time-consuming and the teacher's lacking confidence or experience in implementing.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

#### **5.0 Introduction**

This research was conducted to investigate secondary school teachers' attitudes towards deductive and inductive approaches to teach grammar and identify challenges that prevent them from implementing their preferred approach, specifically the inductive approach. In this chapter, the results which emerged from the analysis are interpreted and discussed. The interpretation is focused on linking the findings of the quantitative data (teachers' questionnaire) with the qualitative data (semi-structured interview) of the study. Therefore, the discussion is divided into three main sections: discussion related to the findings of the questionnaire, discussion related to the findings of the interview, and integration of both questionnaire and interview findings. Additionally, the results are discussed in light of the literature reviewed in chapter two. Moreover, this chapter provides recommendation and suggestions for further studies. Finally, limitations of the research are presented before giving a final conclusion at the end of the study.

#### **5.1 Discussion Related to the Findings of the Questionnaire**

It is evident from the findings obtained from the questionnaire that secondary school teachers generally hold positive attitudes towards grammar and its role in English language instruction. The overall mean score for the four items measuring attitudes towards grammar was 4.10, reflecting an agreement among respondents on the importance of grammar in teaching and learning English.

Specifically, the data show a strong consensus regarding grammar as a fundamental component of language learning. For instance, in the statement

*'Grammar is a framework for the rest of the language, a basic system to build everything,'* 86% of teachers either agreed or strongly agreed, yielding a high mean score of 4.27. Similarly, 80% of teachers endorsed the view that grammar represents the building blocks of language, with a mean of 4.17. These responses reflect teachers' belief that grammar underpins all language skills- reading, writing, speaking, and listening- and is not simply an add-on to language knowledge. The third item, which framed grammar as a refinement of more basic language knowledge, received a high level of agreement as well, with a mean score of 4.25, supported by 88% of participants. The final item, *'Grammar is seen as an equal pillar in supporting language proficiency,'* also reinforced this trend, with 86% of participants in agreement and a mean score of 4.10. These findings indicate that grammar is viewed not just as a structural tool, but as an integral part of overall language proficiency. This strong support may be attributed to the influence of curriculum standards, assessment practices, and the traditional emphasis on grammar instruction in many educational contexts. It also suggests that teachers see grammar instruction as necessary for success in high-stakes exams and for the mastery of other language skills.

Furthermore, regarding the deductive approach to grammar instruction, participant teachers are generally neutral to slightly positive. The overall trend suggests that while teachers recognize certain practical benefits of the deductive method- particularly in relation to exam preparation and grammatical accuracy- they do not view it as universally effective or appropriate for all instructional contexts. First of all, for the first item, *'Grammar is best taught deductively (i.e., presenting the rule first)'*, a combined 57.1% of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed, while 26.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This yielded a mean score of 3.61,

which indicates a neutral stance, although leaning slightly toward agreement. This suggests that while many teachers are open to rule-based instruction, a notable percentage remains uncertain to approve it as the best method. The second item, *'Deductive instruction leads to quicker student comprehension of grammar rules,'* revealed more divided views. Here, 61.2% of participants disagreed or strongly disagreed, compared to only 24.5% who agreed or strongly agreed. Despite these diverged responses, the item had a mean of 3.73, again interpreted as neutral. This contradiction in numbers and mean reflects mid-scale selections by some participants, indicating uncertainty or situational flexibility in their beliefs. However, stronger support was seen in the third and fourth items. For the statement *'The deductive approach helps students to produce grammatically accurate sentences,'* 61.7% of the respondents were in agreement, while only 12.3% disagreed. This item had a relatively high mean of 3.89, suggesting moderate approval of the deductive method's role in promoting grammatical accuracy.

Similarly, 61.7% of teachers agreed that *'students benefit more from a deductive approach,'* with a mean score of 3.65, further reinforcing the idea that teacher experience plays a role in shaping slightly favorable views. Moreover, teachers also perceived the deductive approach as beneficial for exam success. In item five, *'The deductive approach helps students pass the exams,'* 57.1% agreed or strongly agreed, while 22.4% disagreed. This produced a mean of 3.51, showing that exam-oriented teaching partly explains the method's continued use. However, attitudes were less decisive in relation to broader language development. In item six, although 59.2% of the teachers supported the statement that *'The deductive approach contributes positively to language development,'* the mean score remained moderate at 3.55. Similarly, in item seven, which stated that *'Deductive approach is suitable*

*because grammar lessons in the textbook are presented deductively,'* only 51.1% agreed or strongly agreed, while 30.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This item received a lower mean of 3.24, suggesting that alignment with textbooks did not necessarily translate into strong support for the method itself.

Teachers were also divided regarding the limitations of the deductive method. In item eight, *'The deductive approach has its disadvantages,'* 46.9% agreed or strongly agreed, while 26.5% disagreed. The mean of 3.26 inferred that teachers acknowledged its drawbacks, even if they still use it in practice.

In addition, the strongest consensus appeared in item nine, *'Practice of structures is important for learning grammar,'* where 85.8% of the participants agreed or strongly agreed, resulting in the highest mean of 4.30. This finding reinforces the importance teachers put on practice and reinforcement, which are often associated with deductive teaching practices.

Overall, while the mean scores for items related to the deductive approach ranged from 3.24 to 4.30, most fell within the neutral range. Interestingly, this suggests that some participant teachers do not fully endorse the deductive approach as the only or ideal approach for teaching grammar. Such neutrality reflects a partial preference for the inductive approach, a recognition of the contextual relevance of both approaches, or uncertainty resulting from limited training or experience with the inductive approach.

The findings also suggest that some teachers prefer a balanced or flexible approach, selecting their approach based on the grammar topic or students' needs rather than relying solely on the explicit presentation of rules. Despite this, many teachers value the clarity, efficiency, and alignment with exams and textbooks that

deductive instruction offers. Their moderate support for this approach indicates an awareness of its limitations, implying that while deductive instruction is useful, it is not seen as a universal solution. This preference appears to be influenced by contextual and systemic factors, such as the familiarity of the method, its alignment with standardized assessments, and the structured nature of the Libyan curriculum.

On the other hand, the findings related to the inductive approach to grammar instruction generally reveal negative or uncertain attitudes among teachers, with most mean scores falling below 3.00 and an overall average of 2.67. For instance, 61.2% of the teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement '*Grammar is best taught inductively*,' resulting in a low mean score of 2.41. A similar low mean of 2.41 was reported for the belief that inductive instruction encourages a deeper understanding of grammar rules, with 55.1% expressing disagreement.

Although a minority of teachers acknowledged potential benefits- such as student motivation (mean = 2.89), contextual learning (mean = 2.63), and adaptability (mean = 2.91)- the data indicate that the majority are hesitant to adopt this approach in practice. Consequently, this indecision appears to stem from several significant challenges. Particularly, 63.3% of teachers disagreed that the inductive approach reflects the training they received, resulting in a mean of 2.39. Concerns about time constraints were also prominent, with 42.9% agreeing and 22.4% strongly agreeing that inductive teaching is time-consuming (mean = 2.97). Furthermore, 28.6% agreed and 24.5% strongly agreed that lack of experience affects their ability to apply this approach effectively, as reflected in a mean of 2.76. These results suggest that many teachers feel unprepared or lack the confidence to facilitate discovery-based grammar learning, especially in classrooms with limited time or resources.

Although some teachers expressed positive views towards specific aspects of inductive instruction- such as its potential to enhance students' self-confidence, which received a relatively higher mean score of 3.59- such responses were limited and did not reflect the general trend.

Overall, the findings indicate that while some teachers acknowledge the theoretical benefits of inductive grammar instruction, such views are not widely held. Instead, practical barriers- such as insufficient training, lack of teaching experience, and limited feasibility in typical classroom settings- continue to prevent its effective integration. These challenges appear to outweigh the perceived advantages, making inductive teaching a less preferred option. In contrast, teachers expressed more favorable, though still moderate, attitudes toward the deductive approach, suggesting that most educators feel more confident and comfortable with structured, rule-based instruction than with exploratory, student-centered methods. Accordingly, these are the answers of research questions regarding the teacher attitudes towards deductive and inductive approaches, and the challenges that prevent them from implementing the inductive approach.

These findings are consistent with Ibrahim (2020), who argued that grammar instruction in the Libyan context was shaped by structural syllabi and exam-focused objectives. Similarly, Ambarahasse (2023) observed that teachers perceived the deductive method as more flexible and manageable. However, these results contrast with those of Blaskovic (2002), who reported a stronger preference for inductive approaches aimed at fostering student autonomy and active engagement. This discrepancy reflects the influence of differing educational environments; while inductive instruction is more feasible in learner-centered systems with adequate time and resources, Libyan teachers tend to gravitate toward deductive methods due to

systemic constraints, including limited training opportunities and lack of institutional support (See section 2.3.3.5).

Remarkably, many teachers agreed with statements supporting both deductive and inductive approaches, and some participants expressed the belief that relying exclusively on either approach did not fully address the diverse needs of their students. The data indicated a general preference for the deductive approach; however, this did not imply a rejection of inductive strategies. Instead, the responses reflected a recognition of the value in combining both methods based on contextual needs.

## **5.2 Discussion Related to the Findings of the interview**

In order to achieve higher levels of validity and reliability, semi-structured interviews were conducted to complement the quantitative findings from the questionnaire. These interviews provided deeper insights into teachers' attitudes towards deductive and inductive approaches to grammar instruction. A total of ten teachers, who had already completed the questionnaire and expressed willingness to participate further, were interviewed. The open-ended nature of the interviews allowed participants to express their opinions freely, providing richer data and helping the researcher to more clearly identify underlying beliefs and attitudes. The qualitative data emphasized the results of the questionnaire about the necessity of teaching grammar and its big role to develop the language. Moreover, it appeared that the majority of teachers focused on the importance of giving grammar the largest amount of care more than other skills. On the other hand, T1 and T10 argued about this. T1 highlighted that grammar should be taught implicitly and it was important but other skills were ignored and only grammar was given the biggest care by teachers, which led students to memorization and lack of communicative

competence. T1 also insisted that the final exam style of third year at secondary schools forced teachers to put emphasis heavily on teaching grammar and skip other language skills. This supports findings made by Diaab (2016), who examined teaching practices and found similar results. The researcher emphasized the need for integrating and balancing teaching approaches (See section 2.2.2).

The interviewed teachers presented a range of attitudes. Five participants expressed a clear and confident preference for the deductive approach, highlighting its structure, clarity, and effectiveness in preparing students for grammar-heavy final exams. These teachers also believed that students themselves favor the deductive method due to its familiarity and predictability. On the other hand, several participants expressed a preference for the inductive approach. Notably, two teachers mentioned that although they personally preferred inductive methods, they were forced to adopt deductive instruction due to curriculum demands. This mismatch between preference and practice supports previous findings made by Rismayanti, et al., (2015), which indicated that external constraints often limit teachers' ability to apply their preferred teaching methods. Moreover, one teacher (T1) clearly articulated this tension, stating: *'I am forced to use the deductive approach because the curriculum, as I told you, focuses a lot on grammar- especially since I teach third-year students and the final exam is full of grammar questions'*. This highlighted how the explicit grammar demands of final examinations at the secondary school level could render inductive approaches impractical or even irrelevant in such high-stakes contexts (See section 2.3.3.5).

### **5.3 Integration of the Questionnaire and the Interview Findings**

The integration of the questionnaire and interview results provides a clearer picture of teachers' attitudes toward deductive and inductive approaches to grammar

instruction. The questionnaire findings showed generally negative or uncertain attitudes toward the inductive approach, with the majority of mean scores falling below 3.00. Teachers expressed concerns related to limited training, lack of experience, and time constraints, which reduced their confidence in applying discovery-based instruction. These concerns were echoed in the interviews, where several participants stated that although they recognized the theoretical advantages of inductive teaching, they felt unprepared to implement it effectively in real classrooms.

The interview data further reinforced the questionnaire trend: most interviewed teachers described the inductive approach as difficult to manage within the constraints of the Libyan educational context. Issues such as exam-oriented curricula, large class sizes, and institutional expectations made inductive teaching appear impractical. For example, teachers noted that the heavy focus on grammar in final examinations pressures them to rely on direct explanation rather than exploratory learning. This perspective aligned with the questionnaire finding that a significant proportion of teachers disagreed with statements suggesting that inductive instruction matches their training or fits their teaching conditions.

Nevertheless, both data sets indicated that teachers did not reject inductive instruction entirely. A few questionnaire items—particularly those related to student motivation and confidence—received moderately positive responses, and some interviewees acknowledged using inductive elements when circumstances allowed. This suggested a recognition of the potential value of the approach, even if its full application was perceived as challenging. At the same time, the consistent preference for deductive instruction found in the survey was confirmed by interview

participants, many of whom emphasized its clarity, efficiency, and alignment with curriculum demands.

Overall, the integration of questionnaire and interview findings showed that teachers' preference for deductive instruction was shaped not only by pedagogical beliefs but also by contextual realities of the Libyan educational system. While some value aspects of inductive learning, practical barriers—such as inadequate training, limited time, and exam-driven policies—prevent its systematic use. Together, the two data sources revealed a tendency among teachers to combine aspects of both approaches, when possible, while relying primarily on deductive instruction to meet institutional expectations and student needs.

#### **5.4 Recommendations**

It is encouraging to find that many secondary school teachers hold positive attitudes toward the inductive approach to grammar instruction. This suggests a growing openness among educators to move beyond traditional, rule-based methods and consider more learner-centered strategies. In the light of the study's findings, the following recommendations are made for teachers, school administrations, and educational institutions.

##### **5.4.1 Recommendations for Teachers**

###### ***1. Embrace Both Approaches Flexibly***

Teachers are encouraged to balance both inductive and deductive approaches in their grammar instruction. Instead of relying exclusively on one method, they should consider the nature of the grammar point, the learning objectives, and the specific needs of their students.

## ***2. Be Open to Innovation***

Teachers should remain open to adopting new teaching strategies and methodologies. Using inductive techniques such as guided discovery and problem-solving tasks can enhance student engagement and promote deeper understanding of grammatical structures.

## ***3. Embrace Instruction Based on Learner Needs***

Teachers should strive to adapt their grammar teaching to suit the varying levels, learning styles, and preferences of their students. This can involve using visual aids, real-life examples, interactive tasks, or collaborative activities to meet diverse classroom needs.

## ***4. Seek Professional Development***

Teachers are encouraged to attend training sessions and workshops that expose them to modern grammar teaching practices, including how to effectively implement inductive techniques in their lessons.

### **5.4.2 Recommendations for Educational Institutions and Administrators**

#### ***1. Provide Training and Resources***

Educational institutions should offer continuous professional development programs that focus on both inductive and deductive grammar instruction. These programs should provide teachers with practical tools, materials, and examples for classroom application.

#### ***2. Support a Balanced Curriculum***

Curriculum designers and school administrators should ensure that grammar instruction in English language programs incorporates both inductive and deductive

approaches. This balance can help address the varied learning preferences of students and promote more effective grammar acquisition.

### ***3. Encourage Reflective Teaching Practices***

Institutions should create an environment that encourages teachers to reflect on and evaluate their own teaching methods. This can be achieved through peer observations, feedback sessions, and collaborative planning, which foster a culture of continuous improvement.

## **5.5. Limitations of the Study**

Although the findings of this study are meaningful and provide valuable insights, some limitations must be acknowledged.

### **5.5.1 Sample Size and Representation**

The study included a relatively small number of participants, which may not fully represent the diversity of teacher's attitudes across Libya.

### **5.5.2 Reliance on Self-Reported Data**

Although self-reporting is appropriate for capturing internal states such as beliefs and feelings, responses may still be influenced by factors like social desirability bias or personal interpretation of the questions. As a result, the reported attitudes may not fully reflect participants' true feelings.

### **5.5.3 Contextual Influences**

Some teachers reported being forced to follow certain approaches due to exam requirements or curriculum constraints, which may have influenced their responses. Thus, their attitudes may not fully reflect their preferences in a more flexible teaching environment.

## **5.6 Suggestions for Further Research**

Based on the findings and limitations of the current study, several recommendations can be made for future research in this field.

### **5.6.1 Wider Geographic and Institutional Scope**

This study was limited to a small sample of secondary school teachers in a specific region. Future studies should include a broader range of schools across Libya, including rural and urban areas, public and private institutions, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of teacher attitudes countrywide.

### **5.6.2 Students' Perspectives**

Future research could explore students' attitudes towards deductive and inductive approaches. Understanding learners' preferences and perceptions could provide a more complete picture of grammar teaching effectiveness and help align teaching methods with student needs.

### **5.6.3 Experimental Studies on Effectiveness**

While this study focused on teachers' attitudes, experimental or quasi-experimental research could be conducted to measure the actual impact of each approach (or a combination of both) on grammar learning outcomes.

### **5.6.4 Longitudinal Studies**

A longitudinal approach could help track changes in teacher beliefs and practices over time, particularly after receiving training or teaching experience with both methods.

### **5.6.5 Studies Focused on Teacher Training Programs**

Research could evaluate how well pre-service and in-service teacher training programs in Libya prepares teachers to use both inductive and deductive approaches effectively, and how this training influences classroom practice.

### **5.6.6 Teachers' attitudes in relation to teaching experience**

Future studies are recommended to examine teachers' attitudes towards grammar instruction in relation to their teaching experience. Exploring how experience influences their preferences for deductive or inductive methods may provide valuable insights for teacher education and professional development.

### **5.7 Conclusion of the Whole Study**

This study explored Libyan secondary school teachers' attitudes toward the deductive and inductive approaches to teaching grammar. The findings revealed that while the deductive approach is more widely practiced and preferred by the majority of participants, the inductive approach is also positively perceived by some, particularly in terms of promoting student discovery and engagement. The data also showed that many teachers believe that combining both approaches can lead to more effective grammar instruction, especially when guided by student needs and curriculum goal.

The study contributes to the field by filling a gap in the Libyan context, where limited research has been done concerning the attitudes. It highlights the need for greater flexibility in grammar instruction and the importance of teacher training programs that support a balanced, context-sensitive use of both methods. Moreover, the findings open the door for further research into effective grammar teaching strategies that align with both student needs and educational objectives in Libya.

## References

- Abrahamse, R. (2016). *Implicit grammar teaching: An explorative study into teacher attitudes and classroom implementations* [Bachelor's thesis, Utrecht University].
- Abukhattala, I. (2016). The effectiveness of deductive and inductive approaches in teaching grammar in EFL contexts. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(1), 1–10.
- Ahmad, I. (2012). *Research methodology in social sciences*. Global Publications.
- Akar, H. (2010). The components of grammar: A framework for understanding language. *Journal of Linguistic Theory*, 12(3), 123-137.
- Alahres, W. K. A. (2023). *Explicit vs implicit grammar teaching: Zawia EFL secondary schools teachers' beliefs and practices* [Master's thesis, The Libyan Academy of Graduate Studies].
- Alenezi, S. M. (2019). Exploring explicit and implicit grammar teaching. *Arab World English Journal*, 8(1), 221–235.
- Allport, G. W. (1929). The composition of political attitudes. *American Psychological Association*.
- Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. Holt.
- Anwar, M. (2015). *Ethics in research: Principles and practices*. Academic Press.
- Awaj, C. (2018). Examining the collocational knowledge of Libyan Arabic- speaking learners of English in different learning environments: Classroom learning vs. naturalistic learning. *Languages*, 3(2), Article 16.  
<https://doi.org/10.3390/languages3020016>
- Azar, B. S. (2007). Grammar-based teaching strategies for language learners. *Language Education Research*, 21(2), 112-125.

- Azar, B. S. (2007). Grammar-based teaching strategies for language learners. *Language Education Research*, 21(2), 112-125.
- Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (1991). *Social psychology: Understanding human interaction* (6th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.
- Benati, A. G. (2013). *Issues in second language teaching*. Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- Benninga, J. S., Guskey, T. R., & Thornburg, K. R. (1981). The relationship between teacher attitudes and student perceptions of classroom climate. *Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology Faculty Publications*. University of Kentucky. [https://uknowledge.uky.edu/edp\\_facpub/1](https://uknowledge.uky.edu/edp_facpub/1)
- Bhattacharya, S. (2017). *Qualitative research methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Blašković, L. (2022). Inductive and deductive approaches to teaching EFL grammar: Teachers' attitudes. [Master's thesis, University of Zagreb]. <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:462378>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brinkmann, S. (2013). *Qualitative interviewing: Understanding qualitative research*. Oxford University Press.
- Britannica. (2025). Grammar. In Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/grammar>
- Borg, S. (1999). Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching. *Language Awareness*, 8(2), 98–110.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2007). *Business research methods* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

- Burgess, J., & Etherington, S. (2002). Focus on grammatical form: Explicit or implicit? *System*, 30(4), 433–458.
- Carter, R., Hughes, R., & McCarthy, M. (2000). Discovering grammar patterns through context-based exposure. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 22(4), 300–315.
- Chairit, K. (2021). Attitudes of Thai primary students toward deductive approach in English grammar teaching [Master's independent study, Thammasat University].
- Chomsky, N. (1959). Review of B. F. Skinner, *Verbal Behavior*. *Language*, 35(1), 26–58.
- Cleeremans, A., Destrebecqz, A., & Boyer, M. (1998). Implicit learning: News from the front. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 2(10), 406–416.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(98\)01232-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(98)01232-7)
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Cowan, R. (2008). *Grammar: A linguistic introduction* (3rd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Cronbach, L. J., & Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52(4), 281–302. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040957>

- Crystal, D. (2004). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Cullen, R. (2008). The role of grammar in communication and teaching methodology. *Journal of Language Education*, 22(3), 235-250.
- Decoo, W. (1996). *Systemization in foreign language teaching: Monitoring content progression*. Routledge.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (1998). Beyond explicit rule learning: Implicit knowledge in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 48(2), 248-271.
- Devellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Diaab, S. (2016). Role of faulty instructional methods in Libyan EFL learners' speaking difficulties. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232, 338–345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.032>
- Dillon, W. R., Kumar, A., & Mulani, N. (1994). *Sampling techniques in social research*. McGraw-Hill.
- Doff, A. (2000). Grammar as a tool for teaching English. *Language Teaching Today*, 12(4), 45-58.
- Doff, A. (2000). *Teach English: A training course for teachers* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Dorji, J. (2023). Teaching grammar: A survey of teacher's beliefs and attitudes in Bhutan. *Journal of Asia TEFL*. <http://journal.asiatefl.org/>
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
- Doughty, C. (1991). Second language instruction: Focus on form and meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 145-167.

- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Elabbar, A. (2011). Learners' preferences and performance in grammar instruction: A comparative study of deductive and inductive approaches. *Libyan Journal of Education*, 5(2), 45–60.
- El-Hemri, N. M. (2020). *Grammar in language teaching: The missing balance* (p. 283). Faculty of Languages, Benghazi University.
- Ellis, N. C. (1998). Emergentism, connectionism and language learning. *Language Learning*, 48(4), 631–664. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00063>
- Ellis, N. C. (2015). Implicit and explicit language learning: Their dynamic interface and complexity. In P. Rebuschat, *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 3–23). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.48.01ell>
- Ellis, N. C. (2015). Implicit and explicit learning of languages. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams, *Theories in second language acquisition* (2nd ed., pp. 14–39). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2002). Does form-focused instruction affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24(2), 223–236. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263102002073>
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83–107.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction. In R. Ellis, S. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philp, & H. Reinders, *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching* (pp. 3–25). Multilingual Matters.

- Endris, D. K. (2018). Teachers' attitude towards using deductive approach to the teaching of English grammar: Two preparatory schools in focus [Master's thesis, Debre Berhan University].
- Erlam, R. (2003). Evaluating the relative effectiveness of structured input and output-based instruction in foreign language learning: Results from an experimental study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25(4), 559–582.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310300024X>
- Ezzi, N. A. A. (2012). Yemeni teachers' beliefs of grammar teaching and classroom practices. *English Language Teaching*, 5(8), 170–184. Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.
- Fazio, R. H. (1995). Attitudes as object-evaluation associations. In R. S. Wyer & T. K. Srull, *Handbook of social cognition* (Vol. 1, pp. 247–282). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fazio, R. H. (1995). Attitudes as object–evaluation associations: Determinants, consequences, and correlates of attitude accessibility. In R. E. Petty & J. A. Krosnick, *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences* (pp. 247–282). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Fitori, H. S. O. (2019). Difficulties in teaching and learning English grammar in Libyan universities [Doctoral thesis, Liverpool John Moores University].
- Franzoi, S. L., & Oswald, D. L. (2001). *Social psychology* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glasman, L. R., & Albarracín, D. (2006). Forming attitudes that predict future behavior: A meta-analysis of the attitude–behavior relation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(5), 778–822. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.5.778>
- Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. *Proceedings of*

*the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education*, 82–88.

Gollin, J. (1998). Deductive vs. Inductive language learning. *ELT Journal*, 52(1), 88–89. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/52.1.88>

Harley, B. (1998). The role of grammar instruction in second language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 572-588.

Harmer, J. (1987). *The practice of English language teaching*. Longman.

Harutyunyan, L. (2012). Inductive or deductive methods of grammar teaching: Teachers' beliefs and learners' attitudes [Master's thesis, Yerevan State University].

Hassan Hassan, W. A., Ghabanchi, Z., & Al-Mamoory, S. M. A. (2025). Explicit vs. implicit instruction of phonotactic constraints: Enhancing pronunciation and sensitivity in Iraqi EFL learners. *Journal of New Trends in English Language Learning*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.57647/jntell.2025.0401.02>

Haynes, R. M., Richard, D. C. S., & Kubany, E. S. (1995). Content validity in psychological assessment: A functional approach to concepts and methods. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 238–247. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.238>

Holden, R. R. (2010). *Face validity*. In I. B. Weiner & W. E. Craighead (Eds.), *The Corsini encyclopedia of psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 637–638). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470479216.corpsy0341>

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In *Sociolinguistics*.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Ibrahim, K. K. (2020). Challenging the teaching of grammar at Libyan schools: Case study on English language teachers at secondary schools in Marij. In Y. Z. Omar (1st ed.), *Pedagogical issues in teaching and learning EFL in Libyan schools' various settings*. University of Benghazi.
- Işık, A. N., Işık, Ş., & Işık, C. (2010). Attitudes of prospective teachers towards the teaching profession. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 5(9), 533–539.
- Issa, H. (2013). The effectiveness of deductive and inductive approaches in teaching English grammar: An experimental study on the first secondary grade students in Hama public school [Master's thesis, Damascus University].
- Jonas, K., Broemer, P., & Diehl, M. (1997). Attitude formation: The case of belief importance and valence. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 27(3), 307–323. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0992\(199705\)27:3<307:AID-EJSP824>3.0.CO;2-](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199705)27:3<307:AID-EJSP824>3.0.CO;2-)
- Jonas, K., Broemer, P., & Diehl, M. (1997). Attitudinal ambivalence. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European review of social psychology* (Vol. 8, pp. 35–74). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Juny, A. (2007). The role of grammar in developing listening and speaking skills. *Language Education Journal*, 14(3), 102-116.
- Kahveci, H. (2023). Exploring the impact of teacher attitudes and behaviors on student progress: A dual perspective. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 8(3), 130–145. <https://doi.org/10.24331/ijere.123456>
- Khoshimova, K. O. Q. (2023). Effectiveness of deductive and inductive methods in teaching grammar in language learning classrooms at the elementary level. *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations*, 5(5), 48–51. <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume05Issue05-09>
- Koşar, G. (2021). Research into pre-service English teachers' perceptions regarding deductive and inductive teaching approaches to teaching grammar to young

learners. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 17(2), 58–68.

<https://doi.org/10.17244/eku.994483>

- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). *Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). *Second language teacher education*. In R. Carter & D. Nunan, *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* Cambridge University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Lavrakas, P. J. (2018). *Encyclopedia of survey research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lenneberg, E. H. (1967). *Biological foundations of language*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Lightbown, P. M. (1998). The role of grammar in second language teaching: A critical review. *Language Learning Journal*, 16(3), 219-234.
- Long, M. H. (1988). Interaction, comprehensible input, and second language acquisition. In S. Gass & L. Selinker, *Language transfer in language learning* (pp. 145-175). Newbury House.
- Long, M. H. (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In R. D. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honor of A Ronald Walton . John Benjamins*.

- Long, M. H., & Robinson, P. C. (1998). *Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Longman. (2001). *Longman dictionary of contemporary English* (3rd ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Lugoloobi-Nalunga, J. (2017). The role of grammar in language learning. *Journal of Language Education*, 15(3), 200-215.
- Macaro, E., & Masterman, L. (2006). Does intensive explicit grammar instruction make all the difference? *Language Teaching Research*, 10(3), 297–327.  
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr197oa>
- Machila, N., Sompa, M., Muleya, G., & Pitsoe, V. (2018). Teachers' understanding and attitudes towards inductive and deductive approaches to teaching social sciences. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Language and Social Sciences Education*, 1(2), 1–10.
- Mallia, J. G. (2014). Inductive and deductive approaches to teaching English grammar. *Arab World English Journal*, 5(2), 221–235.
- Mautone, D. (2004). Discovering grammar through patterns and non-examples. *Journal of Language Education*, 12(3), 145-160.
- Maylor, H., & Blackmon, K. (2005). *Researching business and management*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mesthrie, R. (2009). *Introducing sociolinguistics* (3rd ed.). Edinburgh University Press.
- Moeen, A. A., Nejadansari, D., & Dabaghi, A. (2019). The impact of implicit vs explicit grammar teaching through scaffolding on Iranian learners' speaking achievement: Focusing on fluency, accuracy, and complexity. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 11(4), 800–813.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-01-2019-0021>

- Mohammadi, K. (2021). The attitudes of EFL teachers towards the effect of implicit grammar teaching approach. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Studies*, 3(1), 109–112.
- Mukherjee, S. (2020). *Research ethics in practice: Guidelines and case studies*. Sage.
- Mukminatien, R. (2008). The role of grammar in building meaningful sentences. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 20(3), 210-225.
- Mulroy, D. (2003). Enhancing writing skills through grammar instruction. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 18(2), 102-118.
- Nagaratnam, R. P., & Al-Mekhlafi, A. (2013). Attitudes towards EFL grammar instruction: Inductive or deductive? *Attitudes Towards EFL Grammar Instruction*, 1–11.
- Nunan, D. (2005). *Practical English language teaching: Grammar*. McGraw-Hill.
- Nurusus, E., Samad, A. A., Syed Abdul Rahman, S. Z., Noordin, N., & Md. Rashid, J. (2015). Exploring teachers' beliefs in teaching grammar. *The English Teacher*, 44(1), 23–32.
- Obeidat, M. M., & Alomari, M. A. (2020). The effect of inductive and deductive teaching on EFL undergraduates' achievement in grammar at the Hashemite University in Jordan. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(2), 280–289. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n2p280>
- Omar, Y. Z. (Ed.). (2020). *Pedagogical issues in teaching and learning EFL in Libyan schools' various settings* (1st ed.). Democratic Arab Center: Strategic, Political & E Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Omolara, S. R., & Adebukola, O. R. (2015). Teachers' attitudes: A great influence on teaching and learning of social studies. *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization*, 42, 131–138. <https://www.iiste.org>

- Orafi, S. M. S., & Borg, S. (2009). Intentions and realities in implementing communicative curriculum reform. *System*, 37(2), 243–253.
- Palmer, F. R. (1972). Grammar and its significance in language theory. *Linguistics Review*, 8(2), 133-146.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1981). *Attitudes and persuasion: Classic and contemporary approaches*. Wm. C. Brown.
- Piaget, J. (1976). *The grasp of consciousness: Action and concept in the young child*. Harvard University Press.
- Purpura, J. E. (2004). *Assessing grammar*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rao, P. S. (2019). The role of grammar in English language teaching (ELT) techniques. *Research Journal of English (RJOE)*, 4(2), 1–10.  
<http://www.rjoe.org.in>
- Rasul, S. S.-u., Ahmad, M., & Iqbal, M. (2021). Teaching grammar through inductive approach and competence of prospective teachers. *Journal of Contemporary Teacher Education*, 5, 1–14.
- Rauf, A., Hamid, S., & Khan, W. A. (2023). Effect of inductive and deductive teaching on learning English grammar for undergraduate students. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 10(2), 212–228.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.22555/joeed.v10i2.836>
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Reppen, R. (2014). *Towards a pedagogy of grammar instruction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rismayanti, L. A., Utami, I. G. A. L. P., & Suprianti, G. A. P. (2021). Deductive teachers' perception using inductive instruction in teaching English grammar. *Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation*, 5(3), 391–397.  
<https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JER>
- Rmali, I. (2017). *The influence of teachers' attitudes on students' learning motivation in secondary schools in Libya* [Master's thesis, University of Tripoli].
- Robson, C. (2011). *Real world research* (3rd ed.). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Şahinkaya, H. A. (2023). Explicit vs. Implicit grammar teaching in EFL classroom: A literature review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Education*, 9(1), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.17985/ijare.1369773>
- Savage, M. (2010). *Grammar instruction in the classroom: A practical guide*. Pearson Education.
- Schechtman, Z., & Or, A. (1996). Applying counseling methods to challenge teacher attitudes toward integration. *Educational Counseling*, 7(2), 171–188.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129–158.
- Schneider, E. W. (1993). The role of grammar in second language learning and teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 100-115.
- Scott, V. (1990). Explicit and implicit grammar teaching strategies: New empirical data. In R. Dekeyser, What makes learning second language grammar difficult? A review of issues. *Language Learning*, 55(1), 1–25.
- Shihiba, S. (2011). The effectiveness of inductive and deductive approaches in teaching grammar. *Libyan Journal of Education*, 6(1), 33–45.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Verbal behavior*. Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Smith, E. R., & Mackie, D. M. (1999). *Social psychology* (2nd ed.). Psychology Press.

- Sohoub, N. M. (2023). Grammar teaching approaches: Exploring current practices and techniques for improvement. *Scientific Journal of Faculty of Education, Misurata University-Libya*, 9(23), 308–327.
- Sudharshana, N. P. (2021). Teaching grammar in the ESL/EFL context: Changing perspectives and current trends. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 63(6), 21–28.
- Swart, E., Engelbrecht, P., Eloff, I., & Pettipher, R. (2002). Implementing inclusive education in South Africa: Teachers' attitudes and experiences. *Acta Academica*, 34(1), 175–189.
- Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science*, 12(2), 257–285.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4).
- Talbi, N. (2019). Adopting a deductive approach to grammar teaching: Case of 3rd year pupils at Ain Skhouna Secondary School, Saida [Master's dissertation, University of Tiaret].
- Tamtam, A., Gallagher, F., Olabi, A. G., & Naher, S. (2011). Higher education in Libya, system under stress. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 742–751. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.305>
- Tantani, A. S. N. (2012). Significant relationships between EFL teachers' practice and knowledge in the teaching of grammar in Libyan secondary schools [Doctoral thesis, University of Sunderland].
- Tauhiduzzaman, M. (2018). Teachers' attitudes towards grammar teaching in ESL/EFL classrooms. [Unpublished Master's thesis, East West University, Dhaka].
- Teka, M. (2020). Secondary school teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching in Ethiopia. *ResearchGate*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344781838>

- Terrell, T. D. (1991). The role of grammar instruction in the communicative approach to language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 283-298.
- Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar*. Longman.
- Wang, X. (2010). Grammar: A central component of language education. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 28-41.
- Webb, S. (2004). *The importance of grammar in language learning*.
- Wegscheider, B. (2019). What Austrian EFL teachers think about grammar teaching. *CELT Matters*, 3, 1-12.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Widodo, H. P. (2006). Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 5(1), 122-141.
- Widodo, H. P. (2006). Grammar instruction in context: An Indonesian perspective. *Teaching English as a Second Language*, 9(1), 33-47.
- Wimberly, C., Reed, R., & Wu, J. (1978). Teachers' attitudes: Their role in school effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Research*, 71(6), 325-330.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Teachers' questionnaire

#### Questionnaire: Teachers' Attitudes Towards Deductive and Inductive EFL Grammar Teaching

**Researcher:** Esra Ali Nasrat, MA Student

**Department:** Department of English, University of Zawia

#### To the Participant,

I am conducting research for my MA thesis on the attitudes of secondary school EFL teachers in Zawia towards deductive and inductive grammar teaching methods.

Your expertise and perspective are incredibly valuable to this study. I would be very grateful if you could take 10-15 minutes to complete this questionnaire. Your participation is completely voluntary, and all responses will be kept confidential and anonymous.

Thank you for your time and important contribution.

#### Key Definitions

Term	Definition
<b>Deductive Approach</b>	Grammar rules are presented explicitly by the teacher, followed by examples and practice activities. النهج الاستنتاجي: يتم عرض قواعد النحو بشكل واضح مع الأمثلة والممارسات
<b>Inductive Approach</b>	Students are provided with examples, texts, or tasks and are guided to discover the grammar rules for themselves. النهج الاستقرائي: يتم تزويد الطلاب بالمهام أو النصوص أو الأمثلة ويتم تشجيعهم على اكتشاف القاعدة النحوية بأنفسهم

#### Section 1: Personal Information

القسم الأول: المعلومات الشخصية

(Please tick the appropriate box or fill in the blank.)

## 1. How many years have you been teaching English?

كم عدد السنوات التي قمت فيها بتدريس اللغة الإنجليزية؟

- Less than 1 year  
 1-3 years  
 4-7 years  
 8-10 years  
 More than 10 years

## 2. Highest Educational Qualification:

أعلى مؤهل علمي:

- BA (بكالوريوس)  
 Master's (ماجستير)  
 PhD (دكتوراه)  
 Other (أخرى): \_\_\_\_\_

## Sections 2, 3, & 4: Attitudes Towards Grammar Teaching Approaches

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by ticking (✓) one box for each statement.

	<b>Strongly Agree</b> أوافق بشدة	<b>Agree</b> أوافق	<b>Neutral</b> محايد	<b>Disagree</b> لا أوافق	<b>Strongly Disagree</b> لا أوافق بشدة
<b>Section 2: The Role of Grammar in Teaching Language</b> القسم الثاني: دور القواعد في تدريس اللغة					
<b>1.</b> Grammar is the basic system to build everything else on. القواعد هي إطار لبقية اللغة - نظام أساسي لبناء كل شيء آخر عليه	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2.</b> Grammar is the building blocks of language. تعتبر القواعد بمثابة اللبنات الأساسية للغة	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Grammar is a refinement of more basic language knowledge. القواعد هي شيء يضاف إلى إتقان اللغة، وهو تحسين للمعرفة اللغوية الأساسية.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Grammar is an equal pillar in supporting language proficiency. يُنظر إلى القواعد باعتبارها ركيزة متساوية في دعم إتقان اللغة.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Section 3: Attitudes Towards the Deductive Approach</b> القسم الثالث: الاتجاهات نحو النهج الاستنتاجي					
1. Grammar is best taught deductively (presenting the rule first). من الأفضل تدريس القواعد استنتاجياً (تقديم القاعدة أولاً).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The deductive approach leads to quicker student comprehension. التعليم الاستنتاجي يؤدي إلى فهم أسرع لقواعد النحو لدى الطلاب.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The deductive approach helps students produce grammatically accurate sentences. النهج الاستنتاجي يساعد الطلاب على إنتاج جمل دقيقة نحويًا.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. My experience suggests students benefit more from a deductive approach. تشير تجربتي إلى أن الطلاب يستفيدون أكثر من النهج الاستنتاجي.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The deductive approach helps students pass exams. النهج الاستنتاجي يساعد الطلاب على اجتياز الامتحانات.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The deductive approach contributes positively to language development. يساهم النهج الاستنباطي في تدريس القواعد بشكل إيجابي في تطوير اللغة.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. The deductive approach is suitable because our textbook presents grammar deductively. النهج الاستنتاجي مناسب لأن دروس القواعد في الكتاب المدرسي تُقدّم بطريقة استنتاجية.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The deductive approach has significant disadvantages. إن الأسلوب الاستنتاجي في تدريس القواعد له عيوبه.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Practice of grammatical structures is important for learning. ممارسة التراكيب النحوية مهمة لتعلم القواعد.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Section 4: Attitudes Towards the Inductive Approach</b> القسم الرابع: الاتجاهات نحو النهج الاستقرائي					
1. Grammar is best taught inductively (letting students discover the rule). من الأفضل تدريس القواعد استقرائياً (جعل الطلاب يكتشفون القاعدة بأنفسهم).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The inductive approach encourages a deeper understanding of grammar. يشجع النهج الاستقرائي على فهم أعمق لقواعد اللغة.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Students are more motivated when they discover grammar rules inductively. أجد أن الطلاب يكونون أكثر تحفيزاً عندما يكتشفون القواعد بطريقة استقرائية.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The inductive approach improves students' critical thinking. النهج الاستقرائي يساعد الطلاب على تحسين التفكير النقدي لديهم.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. The inductive approach reflects the training I received. النهج الاستقرائي يعكس التدريب الذي تلقّيته في تدريس القواعد.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. I prefer the inductive approach, but I find it is too time-consuming. أنا أفضل النهج الاستقرائي، لكنني أجد أنه يستغرق وقتاً طويلاً.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

النهج الاستقرائي، ولكن أعتقد أنه يستهلك الكثير من الوقت.					
7. Lack of experience affects my ability to use the inductive method. قلة الخبرة تؤثر على قدرتي على تطبيق الطريقة الاستقرائية في الفصل الدراسي.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Self-confidence is an important outcome of using the inductive method. الثقة بالنفس هي نتيجة مهمة لتطبيق الطريقة الاستقرائية.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. I adapt my teaching approach based on the specific grammar topic. أقوم بتكييف أسلوبتي في التدريس بناءً على موضوع القواعد الذي يتم تدريسه.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Follow-up Participation (Optional)

The next phase of this research may involve follow-up interviews to discuss these topics in more detail. Would you be willing to be contacted for a potential interview?  
هل توافق على أن يتم الاتصال بك لإجراء مقابلة متابعة محتملة؟

Yes, I am interested. (نعم)

No, thank you. (لا)

If you answered "Yes" and are willing to be contacted, please provide your contact information below. This information will be kept confidential and used only for the purpose of this research.

**Name (Optional):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Email or Phone Number (Optional):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank You for Your Cooperation!**

شكراً لتعاونكم

**The Researcher,**

Esra Ali Nasrat

[nosratesra@gmail.com](mailto:nosratesra@gmail.com)

0922488995

## **Appendix B: Invitation Letter for Interview Participation**

**Dear [Teacher's Name.....]**

I hope this message finds you well. I am Esra Ali Nasrat, a postgraduate student at the Faculty of Arts, University of Zawia, conducting research for my master's thesis in Applied Linguistics. My study focuses on secondary school EFL teachers' attitudes in Zawia toward deductive and inductive approaches to teaching grammar.

I would like to invite you to participate in a semi-structured interview as part of this research. The purpose of the interview is to gain insights into your experiences and perspectives regarding teaching grammar, particularly your views on deductive and inductive methods. The interview will take approximately [time duration] and will remain entirely confidential.

Your participation is highly valued and will contribute significantly to understanding effective grammar teaching strategies and their impact on students' outcomes. Please let me know a convenient time for you to conduct the interview.

Thank you for considering this request. I look forward to your response.

**Sincerely,**

**Esra Ali Nasrat**

**Faculty of Arts, University of Zawia**

**nosratessra@gmail.com**

**phone number :0922488995-0919646134**

## Appendix C: Interview questions

Investigating Zawia EFL Secondary School Teachers' Attitudes towards Deductive and Inductive Approaches of Teaching Grammar"

This study aims to:

1. Investigate the teacher's attitudes toward deductive and inductive approaches to teach Grammar .
2. Identify the challenges teachers face in implementing their preferred approaches

Questions of semi structured interview:

1. What is your opinion about the importance of teaching grammar to secondary school students ?
2. Which approach do you prefer for teaching grammar: deductive or inductive?-  
2
3. What is your opinion about the effectiveness of this approach for secondary school students?
4. Do you think students prefer this approach? Why or why not-
5. What are the main reasons for your preference?
6. In your experience, which approach leads to better student understanding and retention of grammar rules?
7. Have you encountered any challenges when implementing your preferred approach? If so, how have you addressed them?
8. Do you believe that combining both deductive and inductive approaches enhances grammar teaching? Why or why not?!

## **Appendix D: Samples Interview Transcripts**

### **Sample Interview Transcript – Teacher T1**

1. What is your opinion about the importance of teaching grammar to secondary school students ?

Although I notice that grammar is the most important thing in this curriculum, I feel that not that important for secondary school students to focus on the grammar as I don't like to teach grammar deductively because I feel that other skills is more important than grammar and they can acquire grammar inductively.

2. Which approach do you prefer for teaching grammar: deductive or inductive?

For what I prefer is inductive approach but what I am forced to is deductive approach because the curriculum as I told you focuses a lot at grammar specially I am teaching the third year and the final exam always full of grammar questions and I am always trying to cover everything that is why forced me to follow deductive approach .

3. What is your opinion about the effectiveness of this approach for secondary school students?

In my opinion Inductive approach is very beneficial and students are used to like it. Once I gave the lesson for the student about past simple and I started by the paragraph and I did the first one and told them to do the rest so they automatically they filled the gap using the past simple and I feel it is more effective and better than deductive

4. Do you think students prefer this approach? Why or why not?

I think the students prefer this approach as well because the students are always afraid from grammar and consider this subject as hard and always feel

that they aren't able to distinguish between many grammatical structure and many tenses to they like to learn inductively even psychologically if you tell them that you are going to give them a grammatical rule ,they feel afraid and confused so it is better for them to follow the inductive approach.

5. In your experience, which approach leads to better student understanding and retention of grammar rules?

Inductive

6. Have you encountered any challenges when implementing your preferred approach? If so, how have you addressed them

Actually, I used my preferred approach twice this year. I didn't find much difficulties just only the final exam is forced me to follow the deductive approach which doesn't affect on developing the speaking skill .

7. Do you believe that combining both deductive and inductive approaches enhances grammar teaching? Why or why not?

Yes, I believe in combing both and it may enhance the grammar teaching by starting the lesson inductively so the students will think about the grammatical rule and then if it is stopped in any point teacher switches to the deductive approach. But in my opinion, it takes long time which will be a challenge for that.

### Sample Interview Transcript – Teacher T4

1. What is your opinion about the importance of teaching grammar to secondary school students?

It is very very important to teach grammar for secondary school students as they will move to the higher stage which is the colleges, so the students should be aware to the highest amount of the rules to not face any challenges at the language in the future

2. Which approach do you prefer for teaching grammar: deductive or inductive?

Inductive approach

3. What is your opinion about the effectiveness of this approach for secondary school students?

Inductive approach is better if it is followed correctly way because it enhances the understanding of the language and make them draw a conclusion.

4. Do you think students prefer this approach? Why or why not?

I think we can make them prefer it by letting them familiar to studying by inductive and it will help them to enhance listening and consequently write and connect essays

5. In your experience, which approach leads to better student understanding and retention of grammar rules?

Inductive leads them to improve other skills like listening reading and writing.

6. Have you encountered any challenges when implementing your preferred approach?

7. If so, how have you addressed them.

Yes, I face many challenges because the students have no strong foundation about the grammar because of the wrong techniques that they were studied the language by so I see the problem comes from the teachers of the earlier stages

8. Do you believe that combining both deductive and inductive approaches enhances grammar teaching? Why or why not?\*

Yes I agree

### Sample Interview Transcript – Teacher T8

1. What is your opinion about the importance of teaching grammar to secondary school students?

In my opinion grammar is very important to produce sentences correctly in the suitable situation and that what does grammar do to help use grammatical rules accurately.

2. Which approach do you prefer for teaching grammar: deductive or inductive?

Deductive approach by presenting the rule then give the students the chance to practice and give their own examples but I use inductive approach to revise the previous lesson that is given inductively that happens rarely because I see it helps with the easy rules to be revised so I can bring a paragraph and let the students conclude and revise.

3. What is your opinion about the effectiveness of this approach for secondary school students?

4. Do you think students prefer this approach?

5. Why or why not?

Yes I think they prefer the deductive approach because I see at the end of the year how good the outcome of the students are

6. In your experience, which approach leads to better student understanding and retention of grammar rules?

Deductive approach

7. Have you encountered any challenges when implementing your preferred approach? If so, how have you addressed them

The class has many students more than necessary and the level of the students are different. So deductive can help to control the class and suitable for all levels

8. -8-Do you believe that combining both deductive and inductive approaches enhances grammar teaching? Why or why not?'
9. It depends on the class and students as I said weak students should be taught by deductive. Inductive is rarely used so it depends on many factors like students' level, the environment of the class and the mood of the students as well.

## Appendix E: Ethical Approval Letter

حكومة الوحدة الوطنية  
+3088°E+ +00C1+ +°8V°0°1+  
agasu nduronnu numii  
Government of National Unity

وزارة التربية والتعليم  
MINISTRY OF EDUCATION  
مراقبة التربية والتعليم بالزاوية

اشارة: 4383  
التاريخ: 9، 12، 2024 ق

**السادة مديرو المدارس بالتعليم الأساسي والثانوي**

**بمقتضى التوجيه**

**بناء على طلب السيد/ مدير إدارة الدراسات العليا والتدريب بجامعة الزاوية**  
بمساعدة الطالبة **إسراء علي سالم نصيرات** التي هي احد طالبات الدراسات العليا  
بالحصول على بيانات تخص دراستها العليا

**عليك**

**يطلب منكم منح التعاون للطالبة المذكورة أعلاه للحصول على**  
**البيانات التي تخص دراستها و لكم خالص الاحترام والتقدير**

وزارة التربية والتعليم بالزاوية  
رقم: 4383 / 9 / 12 / 2024 ق

**أ عادل محمد الكاسح**  
مراقب التربية والتعليم بالزاوية المركز

رئيس قسم شؤون المراقب  
عبد الكريم السلوقي