

University of Pardubice  
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Teaching Grammar in the Lower-Secondary Education  
Bachelor Thesis

2023

Adéla Skalická

Univerzita Pardubice  
Fakulta filozofická  
Akademický rok: 2021/2022

# ZADÁNÍ BAKALÁŘSKÉ PRÁCE

(projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení: **Adéla Skalická**  
Osobní číslo: **H20036**  
Studijní program: **B0231A090018 Anglický jazyk**  
Specializace: **Anglický jazyk pro vzdělávání**  
Téma práce: **Výuka gramatiky na druhém stupni ZŠ**  
Zadávající katedra: **Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky**

## Zásady pro vypracování

Studentka se bude ve své práci zabývat výukou gramatiky na druhém stupni základních škol. V teoretické části nejprve zasadí problematiku do širšího kontextu z pohledu komunikační kompetence jako obecného cíle výuky anglického jazyka. Poté definuje gramatiku jako jazykový prostředek a detailně popíše výuku gramatiky, konkrétně se zaměřením na rozdíl mezi induktivním a deduktivním přístupem. V praktické části pak bude vhodně zvolenými výzkumnými nástroji zjišťovat, jakým způsobem je gramatika vyučována v hodinách anglického jazyka na druhém stupni ZŠ.

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:  
Rozsah grafických prací:  
Forma zpracování bakalářské práce: **tištěná/elektronická**  
Jazyk zpracování: **Angličtina**

Seznam doporučené literatury:

1. Council of Europe. 2021. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment. Companion Volume.*
2. Dykes, Barbara. 1933. *Grammar for everyone: practical tools for learning and teaching grammar.* ACER Press.
3. Gavora, Peter. 2000. *Úvod do pedagogického výzkumu.* Brno: Paido.
4. Günter, Herbert Puchta, Thornbury Scott. 2006. *Teaching grammar creatively.* Helbling Languages.
5. Harmer, Jeremy. 1991. *Teaching and learning grammar.* Longman keys to language teaching. London: Longman.
6. Richards, J., Schmidt, R. 2010. *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics (4th ed.).* Harlow: Longman.
7. Rod, Ellis. 2006. "Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective." TESOL Quarterly Vol. 40, No. 1: 83-107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>.
8. Jones, Rodney H., and Graham Lock. c2011. *Functional grammar in the ESL classroom: noticing, exploring and practicing.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
9. MŠMT. 2021. *Rámcový vzdělávací program pro základní vzdělávání.*
10. Nelson, Gerald, and Sidney Greenbaum. 2016. *An introduction to English grammar.* Fourth edition. London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
11. Scrivener, Jim. 2010. *Teaching English grammar: what to teach and how to teach it.* Macmillan books for teachers. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
12. Scott. 1999. *How to teach grammar.* How to. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Vedoucí bakalářské práce: **Mgr. Helena Zitková, Ph.D.**  
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání bakalářské práce: **2. dubna 2022**  
Termín odevzdání bakalářské práce: **30. března 2023**

---

**doc. Mgr. Jiří Kubeš, Ph.D.**  
děkan

---

**Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D.**  
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 30. listopadu 2022

Prohlašuji:

Práci s názvem *Teaching Grammar in the Lower-Secondary Education* jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využila, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.

Byla jsem seznámena s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Beru na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 7/2019 Pravidla pro odevzdávání, zveřejňování a formální úpravu závěrečných prací, ve znění pozdějších dodatků, bude práce zveřejněna prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 30. 3. 2023

Adéla Skalická, v. r.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Mgr. Helena Zitková, Ph.D., for her guidance throughout the process of writing the thesis and her never-ending positive attitude.

I would also like to thank my parents and partner for their support during my studies.

## **ANNOTATION**

The thesis aims to determine whether teachers use a deductive or inductive approach to teach grammar in lower-secondary education and why. First, it describes communicative competence as achieving it is the main goal of English language teaching. Then it follows up with a description of grammar and focuses on the development of grammar teaching, which reflects the development of communicative competence. Consequently, the deductive and inductive approaches are closely described with their advantages and disadvantages. The last chapter of the theoretical part concerns the lower-secondary learner and the teacher, as they are both important in learning and teaching. The practical part includes analyses of nine observed lessons and interviews with three teachers, determining the more used approach.

## **KEYWORDS**

communicative competence, inductive approach, deductive approach, grammar, grammar teaching

## **ANOTACE**

Cílem práce je zjistit, zda učitelé v rámci výuky gramatiky na druhém stupni spíše využívají deduktivní nebo induktivní způsob výuky a z jakého důvodu. V práci je nejdříve popsána komunikační kompetence, protože je to hlavní cíl výuky anglického jazyka. Následuje popis toho, co je to gramatika a dále se zaměřuje na vývoj jejího vyučování, který odráží vývoj komunikační kompetence. Deduktivní a induktivní přístupy jsou detailně popsány, včetně jejich výhod a nevýhod v rámci vyučování. Poslední kapitola teoretické části se zabývá žákem druhého stupně a učitelem, neboť jsou to důležité činitele v procesu učení a vyučování. Praktická část zahrnuje analýzu devíti pozorovaných hodin a rozhovorů se třemi učiteli, na základě kterých je rozhodnuto, který z přístupů je využíván více.

## **KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA**

komunikační kompetence, induktivní přístup, deduktivní přístup, gramatika, vyučování gramatiky

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## LIST OF FIGURES AND CHARTS

## ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
THEORETICAL PART.....	2
1 COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE .....	2
1.1 Development of Communicative Competence .....	2
1.2 Communicative Competences in CEFR.....	3
2 GRAMMAR TEACHING.....	4
2.1 What is Grammar? .....	4
2.2 Development of Grammar Teaching.....	4
2.1.4 Curricular Documents in the Czech Republic .....	7
3 DEDUCTIVE AND INDUCTIVE APPROACHES TO TEACHING GRAMMAR .....	10
3.1 Deductive Approach.....	10
3.2 Inductive Approach.....	11
3.3 Advantages and Disadvantages of the Inductive and Deductive Approaches .....	12
4 LOWER-SECONDARY LEARNER AND TEACHER.....	15
4.1 Lower-Secondary Learner from the Psychological View .....	15
4.2 Lower-Secondary Learner from the Didactic View.....	15
4.3 Teacher.....	17
Conclusion of the Theoretical Part .....	19
PRACTICAL PART .....	21
5 RESEARCH.....	21
5.1 Background of the research.....	22
5.2 Research Methodology.....	24
5.3 Data Collection.....	25
6 DATA ANALYSIS.....	27
6.1 School 1 – Teacher A.....	28
6.2 School 2 – Teacher B .....	31

6.3	School 3 – Teacher C .....	34
6.4	Interviews .....	36
	Conclusion of the Practical Part.....	39
	CONCLUSION.....	40
	RESUMÉ .....	41
	BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	44
	APPENDICES .....	48



## **LIST OF FIGURES AND CHARTS**

Figure 1: Characteristics of deductive and inductive approaches.....	21
--	----

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

CEFR – Common European Framework of Reference

CLC – Communicative Language Competence

CLT – Communicative Language Teaching

EFL – English as a Foreign Language

ELT – English Language Teaching

FEP BE - Framework Education Program for Basic Education

ISCED - International Standard Classification of Education.

IWB – Interactive White Board

SEP – School Educational Program

## **INTRODUCTION**

Language is a complex instrument to communicate, and it concerns many skills and components that wouldn't work without one another. One of the components is grammar, which is the focus of the thesis. The thesis aims to determine whether teachers use a deductive or inductive approach to teaching grammar more and why, focusing on lower-secondary learners, since grammar begins to be more complex throughout lower-secondary education. The thesis could serve for beginner teachers to decide what approach to grammar teaching they would like to apply in their lessons, which was also a concern of the author of the thesis.

The thesis is divided into two main parts – theoretical and practical. The theoretical part serves as a basis for the following research in the practical part. Consequently, the thesis is further divided into chapters and sections.

Firstly, the development of communicative competence is described, followed by the communicative competences in the Common European Framework of Reference, including the current CC concept.

The second chapter briefly introduces grammar and is followed by a description of the development of grammar teaching that reflects the development of CC. Furthermore, the focus on grammar is narrowed down by a description of state and school curricular documents in the Czech Republic and their focus on grammar.

The third chapter describes the deductive and inductive approaches to teaching grammar and their advantages and limitations to make the most precise basis for the following research.

Since the research will take place in lower-secondary education, the last chapter of the theoretical part closely describes the lower-secondary learner from the didactic and psychological point of view because the age also brings certain specifics, especially for the teacher, who is also described in that chapter since the teacher is the one who decides what approach is used to teach grammar in their English classes.

In the practical part, lessons that included grammar were observed, accompanied by an interview with the teachers whose classes were observed. Consequently, methods of data collection and a technique of analysis are briefly introduced, accompanied by the analysis itself. The practical part is closed up by a conclusion that answers the research questions stated in the introduction of the part.

# THEORETICAL PART

## 1 COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

The learners of languages aim to communicate in the target language; therefore, concepts that should help the learners to achieve that were created, developed, and modified throughout the years to accompany learners with the best concepts possible. This chapter will examine the development of the communicative competence and its current realisation.

### 1.1 Development of Communicative Competence

The first mention of the concept of language competence was carried out by Chomsky (1965, quoted in Hedge, 2000,45); however, Chomsky's perception of competence was mainly about the knowledge of the language rather than the ability to use it correctly in different situations. Therefore, Hymes (1967, quoted in Brown, 2000, 246) reacted and presented more complex concept – communicative competence, meaning that by gaining communicative competence, the language speaker will be able to communicate purposefully in different social environments.

Further development of communicative competence was carried out by Canale and Swain (1980, quoted in Brown, 2000, 264 – 247). They divided communicative competence into four categories. Two categories described the knowledge of the linguistic system, and the other two the functional side of language. The categories were *grammatical*, *discourse*, *sociolinguistic and strategic*. Within grammatical competence, the learners should learn how to create correct sentences based on understanding rules. The discourse focused on connecting the previous knowledge into more complex and meaningful utterances. By gaining sociolinguistic competence, the learners could distinguish how to speak in a different social context. Strategic competence helped the learners work with mistakes and their repairs and handle their imperfect language knowledge by using different phrases or simpler words.

Many authors later modified Canale and Swain's communicative competence, for example, Bachman (1990, quoted in Hedge, 2000), who called it *communicative language ability*; however, nowadays, the concept of communicative competence is illustrated in the Common European Framework of Reference.

## 1.2 Communicative Competences in CEFR

To teach effectively, teachers need to know what their students are expected to have learned to achieve a certain level of English. The Council of Europe developed The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages to accommodate that. According to the Council of Europe (2020, 27),

CEFR is concerned principally with learning and teaching. It aims to facilitate transparency and coherence between the curriculum, teaching, and assessment within an institution and transparency and coherence between institutions, educational sectors, regions, and countries.

Council of Europe (2020, 29) indicates that CEFR's methodological message is that language learning is most beneficial when its purpose is to equip learners with the skills necessary to interact in real-life scenarios, convey their thoughts and ideas clearly, and accomplish diverse tasks. To achieve that, the Council of Europe (2020, 28) provides the essential recognition of language qualification and helps learners, teachers, and other educational workers with their learning and teaching efforts. The already mentioned language qualification is outlined by the Council of Europe (2020, 36 - 37) by the *CEFR Common Reference Levels*. They describe six levels, from the basic user to the proficient user. Each level has its descriptive scheme, representing the overall approach of CEFR, which is "to develop a range of competences, both general and in particular communicative language competences."

The communicative language competences illustrated in the CEFR should help learners and teachers to set aims to achieve a particular level of English. To be able to communicate in the target language is, according to Hedge (2000, 44), a goal of ELT. And that is what the CLC facilitates by introducing three competences based on the previously described concepts in the first section: Linguistic competence, Sociolinguistic competence, and Pragmatic competence. They are rather complex, and it is impossible to isolate them; they work hand in hand as in any language. Linguistic competence is about the correct use of language, Sociolinguistic competence is about the ability to use language correctly in terms of social relations or politeness, and Pragmatic competence is about using language precisely in a particular situation. Furthermore, the linguistic competence includes grammar accuracy that will be closely described within the following chapter.

## **2 GRAMMAR TEACHING**

The development of communicative competence has also been reflected in grammar teaching. First, the chapter defines what grammar is to be able to understand the core topic of the thesis. Further, the overview of the development of grammar teaching is illustrated with a basis in the chapter about CC followed by the illustration of grammar in CEFR and Czech curricular documents.

### **2.1 What is Grammar?**

To teach grammar, it is necessary to understand what grammar is. According to Richards and Schmidt (2002, 230), grammar is “a description of language and the process in which linguistic units such as words and phrases are combined to construct sentences in the language. It usually considers the meanings and functions these sentences have in the overall system of the language.” Harmer (1991, 1) interprets grammar as a process in which words change and make groups to create sentences. He adds that because of knowing grammar, we know when to use, for example, present or past tense. Thornbury (1999, 1–2) offers a deeper understanding of grammar by explaining that “a system of rules that cover the order of words in a sentence is called *syntax*, and a system of rules that cover the formation of words is called *morphology*.” Syntax and morphology are used to understand the links between words that create sentences. However, it is important to stress, that according to Council of Europe (2020, 129), grammar is a component of language that cannot be separated from other components, like vocabulary or phonology to make language comprehensive. To conclude, the abovementioned descriptions of grammar have in common that grammar is words or phrases combined according to their meaning and function to produce a coherent sentence. The systems that cover the rules for the word order of a sentence and the formation of single words are syntax and morphology. Grammar is taught because the language would not be clear without it and would not be understood.

### **2.2 Development of Grammar Teaching**

This section will examine several grammar concepts, from the oldest to the newest, reflecting the development of communicative competence. As Rama and Agulló (2012, 179) state, “the way grammar is - or has been - considered has a direct and decisive influence on pedagogical grammars, learning processes and many other areas involved in foreign language teaching.” For example, Larsen – Freeman (2014, 262) points out that some educators have questioned the need for the grammar being taught. She mentions Krashen’s belief “that if

the input is understood and there is enough of it, the necessary grammar will unconsciously be acquired, much as young children learn the grammar of their native language.” Larsen- Freeman (2014, 262) opposes Krashen’s belief and states that teachers shouldn’t expect their students to learn a new language the same way they learned their native language. Overall, teachers cannot expect their students to learn grammar by picking it up from what they hear, which is why other educators came up with teaching approaches that have been developing throughout history.

English grammar teaching has long been studied to find the most convenient teaching approaches and methods for EFL students. According to Lock (1997, quoted in Rama and Agulló, 2012, 180), some divisions arise with grammar teaching, for example, “form vs function, form vs meaning, fluency vs accuracy,” etc. According to Newby (2003, quoted in Rama and Agulló 2012, 180), “these dichotomies have been ‘solved’ by three general ways of approaching grammar throughout ELT history: traditional grammar teaching, communicative language teaching and post-communicative approaches, including the CEFR.” Those ways reflected the changes within the communicative competence. All of them are introduced in the following paragraphs.

The first approach is exact in its form because it involves steps that follow a pre-set pattern and reflects Chomsky’s concept of competence mentioned in the first chapter because it is mainly about the knowledge of the language. According to Rama and Agulló (2012, 180), *traditional grammar teaching* consists of the teacher explaining the rule, form, and meaning, followed by controlled or drilling exercises to practice and understand the rule. A drill is, according to Richards and Schmidt (2002, 170), “based on repetition or practice of one sentence pattern”. In addition, Rama and Agulló (2012, 180) state that the practice aims to produce the grammar rule from the learners. Similarly, according to Yin (1990, quoted in Xia, 2014, 559), a traditional grammar’s characteristic feature is that it is descriptive, aiming to point out the differences in the language and its use. As Larsen-Freeman (2014, 262 - 263) states, this approach is the *present, practice, produce* approach, which leads to automating the usage of the grammar rule so that the students do not have to think about it consciously. Crystal’s (2003, 192) description of traditional grammar teaching introduces the same goal, meaning that the result is that the students master the rule and apply it correctly. Ultimately, the approach focuses mainly on the knowledge of the language and written production and does not encourage the students to use the language spontaneously without thinking about it. The aim is a controlled production of sentences where the grammar rule is used.

The Traditional Grammar approach preceded *communicative language teaching*, concentrating more on spoken production. According to Rama and Agulló (2012, 180), it appeared in the 80s and transformed the world of foreign language teaching by presenting more precise communicative methods. According to Littlewood (1991, 6), the learners should be able to understand grammar but then use it correctly in their speech. Moreover, the importance of the CLT draws on distinguishing the social situation and then using appropriate language forms in different social interactions. Similarly, Celce-Murcia (2014, 8) adds that the goal of the CLT is to be able to communicate in the target language; however, as Rodgers and Richards (2014, 71) state, the communicative language teaching did not focus on grammar as much as the previous traditional grammar teaching. Ultimately, communicative language teaching drew attention to the communicative importance of language; however, grammar was not considered crucial.

Unlike the previous two approaches, *the post-communicative one* connects them together and adds the learner as an inevitable part of the learning process. According to Margaroni and Magos (2020, 1), in the post-communicative era, also called the post-method era, the aim is not only the knowledge about the language and to communicate it correctly, but the learners are also encouraged to be actively involved in the process of their learning; for example, by co-operating together or discovery-based learning. With it agrees Kumaravadivelu (1994, quoted in Celce-Murcia, 2014, 10), who emphasises that teachers should create opportunities for the learners to learn as much as possible themselves and to create opportunities for interaction between the learners. In addition, Harmer (1997, quoted in Rama and Agulló 2012, 185) states that in this era, the role of grammar is also important in the language classroom, but as Brown (2002, quoted in Celce-Murcia, 2014, 10) states, the way it is taught is irrelevant. Ultimately, the post-communicative era focuses on the learners' active involvement in the learning process rather than focusing only on one aim as in the previous eras. The teacher's role in this type of teaching is not to transmit knowledge to the learners but to create the best environment possible for their learning.

However, the post-communicative era describes only the ways how language should be taught. Still, to know what to aim for in terms of teaching grammar, Council of Europe (2020), which is included in the post-communicative era as mentioned in Rama and Agulló (2012, 180), illustrates grammar accuracy, which is demonstrated within the linguistic competence.



According to Council of Europe (2020, 132), the scale describing the aims of individual levels

concerns both the user/learner's ability to recall "prefabricated" expressions correctly and the capacity to focus on grammatical forms while articulating thought. This is difficult because, when formulating thoughts or performing more demanding tasks, the user/learner must devote the majority of their mental processing capacity to fulfilling the task.

The thesis concerns the learners of lower - secondary education in the Czech Republic, where the educational expectations are supported by a Framework Education Program, which will be discussed in the following section. According to the FEP BE (2021, 17), the educational expectations of learners who finish their 9<sup>th</sup> grade should be on level A2. Meaning that according to grammatical accuracy in CEFR, they should know how to use simple structures correctly but still systematically might make some mistakes. However, it should usually be clear what they are trying to say. Based on the CEFR, the Framework Education Program of Czech Basic Education created its criteria for foreign language learning by using the requirements for the level required by the end of Basic Education.

Overall, the development of grammar teaching was described in this section. It reflects the development of communicative competence illustrated in the first chapter. Firstly, traditional grammar teaching was mainly about the knowledge of the grammar rule rather than its usage. Followingly, communicative language teaching emerged and changed the world of ELT in terms of rather communicative way than learning prefabricated expressions. Consequently, the post-communicative era connected both previous approaches and added the learner as an active participant in their process of learning. The aims in the post-communicative era are described in CEFR which is the basis for further frameworks in other countries, as well as in the Czech Republic, which is described in the following section.

#### **2.1.4 Curricular Documents in the Czech Republic**

Without a system of rules and individual aims, the educational system would not be effective because it would not have pre-set aims to achieve. That is why CEFR exists and the Czech Republic Department of Education created the curriculum "Framework Education Program for Basic Education" (FEP BE). As Šimoník (2005, 19) states, a curricular document system in the Czech Republic is created at the state or school level. The FEP BE (2021, 5) defines basic education and its stages on a state level. School educational programmes define the aims of education on a school level and are based on the FEP BE.

The principles of the FEP BE (2021, 6) are, for example, that it includes everything necessary for every learner in the mandatory basic education and specifies the key competencies which learners should achieve by the end of it. It also defines the educational content, as in the educational expectations by the end of the fifth and ninth grade of the basic education.

As a foreign language for Czech learners, English belongs in the FEP BE (2021, 16) to an educational area called “Language and Language Communication” alongside the Czech language and another foreign language. This area mainly aims to support the development of communicative competences and equips the student with knowledge and skills that help them develop in their life. Foreign languages contribute to understanding and discovering facts which exceed the knowledge and experience gained from the native language.

The previously mentioned key competences (FEP BE, 2021, 10 – 13) represent a summary of attainments, skills, attitudes, and values essential for the personal development of every citizen of the society. The key competences are not isolated; they intertwine and are achievable only as a goal of the whole process of education. To achieve the key competencies, the educational content must aim to create alignment within all the educational areas, including foreign language.

The key competencies are *competence to learn, problem-solving, communication, social and personal, citizenship, work and digital*. Those competences are used in the language classes to accompany the curriculum, aiming to achieve educational expectations. Those are divided into four skills – listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Grammar is only briefly mentioned since it is included in all four skills and introduced as it is about developing grammatical phenomena to realise the student’s communication intention. It tolerates elementary mistakes that do not disrupt the message’s meaning and understanding. The individual grammar is mentioned

in SEP, which is more specific for every year of basic education, not only as the education outcome at the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> grade as in FEP BE.

Every basic school in the Czech Republic has its own SEP, a document covering all the areas of primary education. It follows the educational expectations from FEP BE in detail, particularly grammatical phenomena important for the thesis topic. For example, a chosen excerpt of SEP introduces several grammatical items to be mastered during the 7<sup>th</sup> year of basic education, specifically: the gradation of adjectives, and numbers, creation of questions and interrogative pronouns, usage of so and because, adverb, the verb to be in the past tense,

past tense of regular and irregular verbs, present simple vs present continuous, imperative, yes/no questions, questions with interrogative pronouns and adjectives.

Overall, the curricular documents in the Czech Republic are created on a state and school level. Concerning English, the educational outcomes in FEP BE are based on CEFR. SEP introduces specific items to be mastered by the students during a school year to reach the educational outcomes by the end of their basic education.

### **3 DEDUCTIVE AND INDUCTIVE APPROACHES TO TEACHING GRAMMAR**

Because the thesis aims to determine whether teachers tend to use a deductive or inductive approach in lower-secondary education, it is essential to examine each approach first and then demonstrate their advantages and limitations to understand why the teachers might choose to use them.

#### **3.1 Deductive Approach**

This subchapter will examine the deductive approach, also called rule-driven learning. It will give descriptions by different authors and demonstrate a deductive exercise to clarify the definitions and present the practice. To begin, according to Shaffer (189, 395), many foreign language teachers use the deductive approach.

This approach promotes relatively passive than active cooperation of the learners in terms of finding out a new grammar rule. Richards and Schmidt (2002, 146) state that learning by deduction is “an approach to language teaching in which learners are taught rules and given specific information about a language. They then apply these rules when they use the language.” Widodo (2006, 126) shortly summarises the deductive approach by saying that it is from general to specific, meaning that the students are given the rule, followed by presenting examples with the new structures highlighted and a controlled exercise to practice. Similarly, Thornbury (1999, 29) shows the deductive approach as a presentation of a rule followed by an example with the rule applied. In addition, according to Benitez-Correa et al. (2019, 227), the deductive approach is based on traditional grammar teaching. When teaching deductively, the rules are presented to the learners first, followed by examples with the highlighted structures and controlled practice.

To understand how the deductive exercises might be held, Nunan (1991, 160) first presents how the information about the new grammar rule might be given to the learners. The author illustrates a handout which includes rules and examples about past simple. The handout includes loads of similar examples and additional information about language use. Further, the author (1991, 165) demonstrates how the deductive approach might be used to teach “wh-questions.” The teacher requires a correct form of a question from the learner; however, when the learner does not know the correct answer, the teacher tells it to them and wants them to repeat the same question precisely after them and then encourages the learners to ask the same question to each other.

To sum up, the deductive approach is focused on a controlled production of the grammar rule. First, the rule is presented with examples, and then the learners practice it. However, spontaneous usage in a real-life environment might be tricky for learners.

### **3.2 Inductive Approach**

The second approach focused on in the thesis is the inductive approach, also called discovery learning. This subchapter will describe the possible explanations of the approach and present an inductive exercise to show how the inductive approach can be used in practice.

According to Richards and Schmidt (2002, 146), the inductive approach is when “learners are not taught grammatical or other types of rules directly but are left to discover or induce rules from their experience or using the language.” Correspondingly, Ellis (2006, 97) states that when learners are taught inductively, they are asked to find the generalisation of the grammar rules by themselves, which could lead to either a final rule or not. Widodo (2006, 128) adds that this approach requires the active participation of the learners and encourages them to develop their strategies to deal with tasks. According to Benitez-Correa et al. (2019, 227), the practice of the inductive approach does not have to be used only by inducing rules from a written text; it can also be from audio, which helps them to discover the grammar pattern which leads them to the creation of their own examples which means that they practice the language.

It might be tricky to prepare an inductive lesson; therefore, Nunan (1991, 161-163) introduces a classroom interaction between teacher and learners to understand how to hold an inductive lesson. The lesson’s subject is “wh-questions”, and the teacher is asking students several questions about train journeys; the teacher uses wh-questions, and the learners are expected to use the forms in their answers without being explained how to use them. And, in the following task, the students are asked to create their questions in pairs, leading them to use the questions they heard at the beginning of the lesson. According to Harmer (2007, 216 – 217), learners should find out by themselves how the forms of the language are created and used. He gives an example of a teacher who got their students to listen to a dialogue where they heard things being compared. Firstly, the teacher wants the students to pay attention to how the comparative forms of adjectives are created. The teacher then put pairs of adjectives next to each other and gave learners three questions to notice the differences (appendix A). After finishing, the teacher checked their answers to ensure the learners understood individual questions. A practice exercise follows, and it is supposed to help the students create their comparative forms of adjectives; the students are in pairs; one of them is drawing an arrow between two words,

and the other is making a sentence using those two words. Harmer (2007, 217 – 218) emphasises that even though this exercise does not include all the information about comparative forms, it encourages the learners to think about how the language works, which leads back to Widodo's statement about learners creating strategies to deal with those kinds of tasks.

To summarise, when learners learn inductively, they try to understand a rule, for example, from recurrent grammar in examples. Then they use it without the explicit knowledge of the rule, which should lead them to its generalisation. However, as stated, an inductive exercise does not need to lead to the final generalisation. It is supposed to help the learners to understand how the language works and to think about it, therefore, it could be said that it follows the principles of post-communicative era.

### **3.3 Advantages and Disadvantages of the Inductive and Deductive Approaches**

The previous chapters focused on the descriptions of each approach, inductive and deductive; therefore, this chapter will present the advantages and disadvantages of both approaches to realise what they might bring to the classes or what might be tricky.

Firstly, the focus will be drawn on the advantages. According to Widodo (2006, 127), the advantages of the deductive approach are that it is unequivocal because it starts with the rule straight away, which saves time. Followingly, many grammar rules can be easily explained rather than being evoked from examples, and advantageously, many practice examples can be instantly given. Nunan (1991, 154) also suggests that if grammar is taught by grammatical explanation, the learners will know quite a lot about the language. Also, according to Larsen-Freeman (2014, 268), the deductive approach is better when learners' cognitive thinking is not convenient for language analysis.

When inductive approach is used, the advantages are, according to Widodo (2006, 128), that the learners are introduced to rule discovery, leading to their autonomy and self-reliance. As Larsen-Freeman (2014, 268) indicates, students' cognitive depth is utilised, making them more active when learning rather than only receiving the grammar rule. According to Widodo (2006, 128), some learners will enjoy recognising the patterns and problem-solving. Concerning this, Hedge (2000, 163) suggests that even a simple inductive exercise will help the learner gain confidence to learn by discovering. Lastly, Widodo (2006, 128) suggests that problem-solving might be done in groups, leading to more language practising, which is also suggested by Ellis (1998, 49).

There are, however, disadvantages to these approaches. According to Widodo (2006, 127), the cons of the deductive approach are that if the teacher starts the lesson with a rule explanation, it might be disheartening for some learners who do not understand immediately. Subsequently, if the class is for young learners, they might need more help understanding the grammar terminology they were given. The deductive approach might also discourage learners from involving and interacting with the teacher, as this approach often leads to a teacher-fronted teaching style. In addition, the approach advocates the thought that if a language learner knows the rule, it is simply everything they need to be able to use the language. This is refuted by Shaffer (1989, 396), who suggests that if learners try to use a grammar rule that they have been presented with deductively, they need more practice with the usage because their knowledge is often one-dimensional.

On the other hand, the cons of the inductive approach are, according to Widodo (2006, 128), that, unlike the deductive approach, it might need to be more strenuous since it tries to lead the learners to a correct perception of the rule. When the rules are given implicitly, not directly expressed, the learners might misunderstand the rule taught. The lesson planning, in this case, will take the teacher much more time to prepare. The inductive approach might also be something entirely new for the learners, and it might be frustrating for those students, making them to prefer the other approach. Subsequently, Larsen – Freeman (2014, 268) suggests that the problem teachers face when teaching inductively is deciding if they need the learner to create an explicit rule since an actual performance is required and not knowledge of the rule. Moreover, avoiding oversimplifying the rule after induction is crucial because it might need to be clarified for the learners rather than offering them deeper linguistic insight.

As described above, the approaches dispose of their advantages and disadvantages. It is only up to the teacher to decide which of the approach they use because, according to Rutherford and Smith (1988, 133, quoted in Larsen Freeman, 2014, 268), “a combination of induction and deduction produces the best result” and “the old controversy whether one should provide the rule first and then the examples or vice versa, is now seen to be merely a matter of tactics to which no definite answer can be given.” This all depends on the teacher’s teaching style, which according to Rodgers and Schmidt (2002, 544), contrasts because it all depends on how the teacher considers their role in a class and the way they decide to communicate with the learners and of course, what teaching strategies they encourage in their classes. Ultimately, it is up to the teacher to consider all the pros and cons described above and decide whether to use the inductive, deductive or a combination of both approaches because, as mentioned,

different grammar rules might benefit from a different approach to be used and also the learners need to be considered.



## **4 LOWER-SECONDARY LEARNER AND TEACHER**

Teaching lower-secondary learners brings certain specifics. This chapter firstly concerns lower-secondary learners from a psychological point of view, followed by a didactic point of view, meaning the best way to teach learners at this age, not only in English classes. It is followed by a subchapter about a teacher, which describes what the teacher should have acquired to teach effectively.

### **4.1 Lower-Secondary Learner from the Psychological View**

To teach the lower-secondary learners, it is essential to understand the period of their life because it brings certain specifics in their behaviour and, therefore, the way to be taught. According to ISCED (2011, 33), lower-secondary learners are approximately from eleven to fifteen years old, which is the beginning of adolescence. According to Vágnerová and Lisá (2021, 373 - 374), adolescence is a period during which children become adults, which she divides into two phases – early adolescence, which concerns the age of lower-secondary learners and late adolescence. Helus (2018, 281) divides the phases similarly; however, the first phase is called pubescence, and the second is adolescence. Differently, Thorová (2006, 420) presents adolescence in four stages: the first two regard the lower-secondary learners. They are the phase of differentiation and the phase of gaining experience. The only difference is the division; however, Vágnerová and Lisá (2021, 373), Helus (2018, 281 – 283), and Thorová (2006, 414) agree that adolescence is characterised by significant personality and physical changes that begin to be more evident in their surroundings.

During adolescence, individuals start to search for their identity, which their peers impact. Thorová (2006, 420) emphasises identity searching by pointing out a need to differentiate from parents and being more critical of their vicinity, especially their attitude towards adults, which explains Vágnerová and Lisá (2021, 374) according to whom the individual changes their thinking and the pubescents begin to disengage from their parents and spend time with their peers instead. To sum up, the phase of adolescence is challenging in terms of all the changes and brings much uncertainty about their identity.

### **4.2 Lower-Secondary Learner from the Didactic View**

The section about the didactic view follows the psychological one because they are both closely connected, and teachers need to consider the psychology of adolescence when teaching. Obst (2017, 22) characterises early adolescence as a period of vitality, impulsivity, and increased activity, which requires energetic teachers with a positive attitude to learners

and an understanding of these characteristic features. Those learners at the beginning of puberty are still close to the characteristics of a young learner who needs to be, according to Ur (2012, 259), provided with much exposure to the language and learn it by heart. Unlike adolescents, they shouldn't be burdened with abstract explanations, language analysis, or exercises to apply a new rule. Ur states (2012, 264) that adolescents are surprisingly more likely to learn a language than young learners; however, the author's concerns are that most of them learn the language only because they must, which leads to a lack of effort from them. Ultimately, it is crucial to consider these characteristics when teaching to ensure the method used is most effective.

Obst (2012, 22) stresses the need to view the changes described in the previous chapter by the authorities in their lives, like teachers and parents, to succeed in the teaching process. The individuals are somewhat introverted, and if educational interventions are too harsh, it could lead to educational harm rather than prosperity. Scrivener (2005, 74) confirms the thought by stating that trying and progressing with new topics is only effective considering the impact on the learners in the class. To find out what the adolescents need, Ur (2012, 265) shares a reliable source, the adolescents themselves, because, as Scrivener (2005, 74) stresses, feedback not only from the teacher to students but also another way around is essential, especially to take the students' input into account and let it affect the following lessons. Ur (2012, 265 – 266) introduces a questionnaire which includes a series of questions concerning students' opinions on various topics, for example, whether the students want the teacher to be interested in each of them as a person. A questionnaire can be a valuable tool to find out what students think about various approaches already used in classes to be able to teach them effectively.

Even though a questionnaire is a good way of getting feedback, it should not be the only one. According to Scrivener (2012, 77), teachers should vary the feedback, for example, simply asking a question, that can be either small questions, like if any of the activities were difficult that day or big ones, which could ask about a whole course. The time of asking the questions should also vary, as teachers shouldn't ask for feedback only at the end; it can be implemented at any time of the lesson, even at the beginning.

Ultimately, teaching adolescents is challenging. To succeed, teachers should focus on the students' needs and ask them for feedback to apply in the following lessons to keep students

interested in the subject and not let them burn out because of too many new items to learn without adequately discussing it.

### 4.3 Teacher

A teacher from the point of view of teachers' thinking and professional competences will be described in this chapter to understand what teachers should have acquired to teach grammar effectively, especially since teacher is the one who decides about the lesson design. Obst (2017, 156) states that an adequate or good teacher is not defined universally. With it agrees Anderson and Burns (1989, quoted in Průcha 2017, 191), by stating the same thought. Obst (2017, 157) argues that the teacher's personality does not affect the learners' outcomes, but what the teacher does and how in the education process affects the results. Similarly, Harmer (2007, 113) stresses the need for a good relationship between learner and teacher so that their interactions are positive and valuable for learners' further development. Consequently, Benitez – Correa et al. (2019, 226) highlight the importance of a good classroom rapport. The ideal teacher does not exist, but it is important to focus on the way their lessons are conveyed and whether their relationship with the learners is rather positive, because it brings better results in the learning process.

The teachers should be able to think about how to prepare their lessons effectively, which leads to Průcha (2017, 195), who presents *teachers' thinking*, which can be understood as what teachers' attitudes are towards, for example, different teaching approaches and the way they teach. The teachers' thinking mainly focuses on the education process, meaning the classes' aims, what is being taught, its organisation and used teaching methods. It is all connected with how the teacher considers their role in the process and learners. Kyriacou adds (2007, 3) that many studies “viewed teaching as a complex cognitive skill, based on knowledge about how to construct and conduct a lesson, and knowledge about the content to be taught.” Thanks to this skill, the teachers can create lesson plans and quickly decide during the lesson what should be changed according to the circumstances, which is connected to the teachers' thinking.

As mentioned, what the teacher does and how they deliver it affects the outcomes of the learners significantly. Teachers should have acquired some competencies that lead teachers to be as skilful as possible. Obst (2017, 157) describes seven *professional competencies*. According to him, the teacher should know their field, in the case of the thesis, English itself. They should create a positive climate in their classes, so the learners have the most effective place for learning; they should have the ability to communicate with the learners and adults that work

in the school, and they should be able to plan their work and know how to follow up. In their classes, there should be a system and rules applied. Teachers should also be able to diagnose the learners' feelings and why and how to help them, and they should be able to communicate with the parents of the learners and give them recommendations on their children's further development. And finally, the teacher should be able to reflect on work and modify teaching approaches to benefit the learners.

Similarly, Kyriacou (2007,3) mentions *teachers' knowledge about teaching* where he stresses the content knowledge, knowledge of the principles and class management, curriculum knowledge, knowledge about how to prepare different topics, learning about the learners, the context of the education, how to work with groups and with other communities, and lastly, knowledge about the aims and values of education.

To specify, Cambridge University Press & Assessment (2023) created a Framework competency statement to narrow the skills down, which describes what the teacher should have acquired when teaching grammar. According to the Assessment (2023, 6), an expert teacher should have “a sophisticated understanding of principles and techniques for grammar teaching and learning.” Their “lesson plans and classroom practice demonstrate a wide range of techniques, used consistently, for teaching grammar using different lesson shapes to support learners and their learning.”

Overall, the teacher should be able to use their thinking to plan the class, particularly the aims, and to know how to communicate with the learners. It is all connected with the professional competences or the teachers' knowledge about teaching, which directs to what the teacher should have acquired to teach grammar to their learners effectively.

## **Conclusion of the Theoretical Part**

The theoretical part explores grammar teaching to lower-secondary learners and serves as a basis for the following practical part.

Firstly, the development of communicative competence was described because achieving it is the main goal of ELT. The most recent model of CC is illustrated in CEFR and includes linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, and pragmatic competence, which all work hand in hand and cannot be separated.

The development of CC has also been reflected in the development of grammar teaching, which led to a post-communicative era that is characterised as an era in which learners are encouraged to be involved in their process of learning, for example, by cooperating with each other or discovering their ways of learning. The aims that the learning process should achieve are demonstrated in the CEFR, which precisely presents grammar accuracy within linguistic competence—based on CEFR, the Czech Republic created their programmes presenting basic education's educational outcomes. They are created at the state and school levels. The FEP BE describes the outcomes in English based on level A2 from CEFR, and the SEP points out a particular grammar that should be learned during one year of basic education.

Furthermore, the distinction between deductive and inductive approaches was drawn. The deductive approach works as learning from general to specific, meaning the learners are presented with the rule with some examples, and controlled practice follows. On the other hand, the inductive approach works as learning from specific to general, meaning that learners are first presented with some examples. Through practice, they can generalise the rule themselves. Both approaches have advantages and disadvantages; for example, when teaching deductively, the learners know quite a lot about the language but might struggle to use it in real life. Concerning the inductive approach, the learners learn their strategies for understanding the language; however, it might be confusing for some learners since it might not be explicitly said.

Lastly discussed were the learners and the teacher themselves. The learners in lower-secondary education are in the age of adolescents, which brings certain specifics to their education. They all change physically and mentally throughout their adolescents; however, they are the most likely to learn a new language. Hence, they usually do it only because they have to. It is essential to discover their needs and project them into the lesson. Based on the needs of the learners, the teacher should focus on a good rapport in the class because it helps to build motivation to learn.

The teacher should be educated in the field to know how to prepare a lesson, set its aim and the given phenomena, including different ways how to teach it.

In conclusion, all the important aspects that are considered throughout the theoretical part will be applied in the practical part.

# PRACTICAL PART

## 5 RESEARCH

The practical part aims to determine whether teachers use deductive or inductive approaches more in their classes in the lower-secondary education when teaching grammar and why. Based on the theoretical part's findings, the characteristics of the approaches have been set out to support the research.

	<b>Characteristics</b>
DEDUCTIVE APPROACH	Passive learners in terms of not creating the rule themselves.
	The teacher explicitly presents the rule and specific information about the language.
	Examples with the grammar feature are presented.
	Controlled, very structured drill-like exercises to practice followed by production.
INDUCTIVE APPROACH	Active learners in terms of finding the rule themselves with an active help of the teacher
	Learners inducing the rule from examples that can be in the form of written text, listening or said by the teacher.
	The examples include recurrent grammar features.
	Learners practice without an explicit explanation in terms of how to use the grammar rule.

Figure 1: Characteristics of deductive and inductive approaches

To get more specific insight into the problematics, three research questions were raised:

Which one of the approaches is used by the teachers more?

Are the approaches being combined?

What are the reasons for using the approaches?

The research was based on the data collected from observation and interview, later analysed by the technique of open coding. All methods and techniques used throughout the research and analysis are described in the following sections.

## **5.1 Background of the research**

To conduct the research, it was essential to choose teachers allowing the author to observe their English lessons and who would agree to a short interview. The researcher had set out one condition under which the teachers were chosen to be approached initially. The condition was to teach in lower-secondary education because, based on the level the learners are supposed to reach, grammar is included more in their lessons than at a lower level.

The author approached eight different teachers by email, in which she shortly introduced herself, explained the circumstances and asked the teacher for cooperation. The teachers were assured that no data identifying them would be published because, as Švaříček and Šedová et al. (2007, 45) stress, the data should be confidential, and the author needs to reassure the participants that their data will not be published. Only three teachers replied, however, they met the condition set out by the author; therefore, the author decided to conduct the research with them.

Three lessons of each teacher were observed to reassure that the author had been able to see the essentials for the thesis. The chosen teachers teach in three different basic schools in the Czech Republic, so it is crucial to describe each's school background and shortly introduce the teachers.

The first school is located in a township in the Central Bohemian Region. The school has nine grades, each divided into two classes, except sixth grade, which is divided into three. Each class usually has around twenty-five to thirty learners. The school has twenty-five teachers and three teaching assistants. They work with a programme called Step by Step that aims to facilitate learners with the same educational opportunities and educate learners about embracing, respecting, and gaining knowledge from one another. Additionally, the school welcomes collaboration with the learners' families and the community. English is taught from the first grade, and the learners choose a second language in the seventh. They can choose from German and Russian.

Teacher A finished their Master's degree at Masaryk University in Brno focused on English teaching. Now, the teacher teaches English at School 1, from the first to the ninth grade. The author approached the teacher based on previous cooperation.



The second school is in town, also in the Central Bohemian Region. The school consists of more than four hundred learners in eighteen classes. There are twenty-six teachers and four teaching assistants. Some classes specialise in math and science, and the learners in these classes are chosen according to an entrance exam in the fifth grade of basic education. The school focuses on positive negotiations with learners and their parents; the classes are based on environmental education, and the internet is used as an educational technique in many lessons. The school is equipped with free Wi-Fi that helps the teachers to create more up-to-date lessons for the learners. English is taught from the first grade, and learners choose a second language from German and Russian in the seventh grade.

Teacher B's primary focus is science; however, the teacher further studied English teaching remotely, and nowadays, is teaching twelve English classes a week in seventh, eighth, and ninth grade. Teacher B was also contacted by the author based on previous cooperation.

The third school is located in a city in the Pardubice region. The school has seven hundred and thirty learners divided into twenty-nine classes. They are characterised by the learners visiting modernised specialised classrooms, for example, a chemistry classroom or even a therapy studio. Their school program is newly innovated and allows learners to gain a general overview and be prepared for life after basic school. English is learned from the first year, and a second foreign language is from the seventh grade when learners decide whether to learn German or Russian.

Teacher C studied at Technical University in Liberec. The teacher's primary focus is teaching the Czech and the English language, but she also teaches English conversation, citizenship education and work activities. Teacher C teaches classes from fifth to ninth grade.

## 5.2 Research Methodology

For the thesis, observation and interview were chosen as methods to collect data for the research. This chapter will describe these two methods closely to understand why they were chosen.

The first method is observation. The method was chosen because, as Švaříček and Šedová et al. suggest (2007, 75), through observation, it is possible to detect the reality of the situations observed, mainly when the observer is present in the class, leading to that the authors (2007, 143) stress, observation is ideal for classroom research since the class is not disturbed, the observer is silent. This type of observation is called participant observation. According to Gavora (2000, 155), in this type of observation, the observer takes detailed notes that include descriptions of the situations. Švaříček and Šedová et al. (2007, 143) agree with Gavora that the notes should describe critical situations without any unnecessary information that is not credible for the research. Ultimately, the observer has the best chance to collect unbiased data on grammar teaching through participant observation.

To specify the data, structured observation was included. According to Švaříček and Šedová et al. (2007, 145), since the research questions are pre-set, and the aim has been stated, it gave the basis to the researcher of what should be observed. Consequently, the grammar lessons were observed to be able to classify whether the teachers teach inductively or deductively.

To conclude, the first method to collect data for the research is a structured participant observation, which will help the observer to gather credible data for the research and help to conclude research questions and reach the aim.

To get a more complex insight into the observed problematics, Švaříček and Šedová et al. (2007, 158) suggest connecting the observations with an interview. Švaříček and Šedová et al. (2007, 160) and Gavora (2000, 111) present a semi-structured interview that is based on a pre-prepared set of questions. However, the interviewer can ask for further explanations; hence, this type of interview is the most suitable for the research problems. Gathering information concerning grammar teaching is essential, but other explanations might also be desired. This method involves, according to Švaříček and Šedová et al. (2007, 160) and Gavora (2000, 114), preparation of the questions and the interview, that might be recorded, which is, according to Gavora (2000, 114) convenient for the interviewer, because the only focus of theirs becomes the interview. The recorded interview is according to the authors, followed by its transcription, and lastly, the analysis of the collected data.

Before the interview, the researcher asked for permission to record it to be able to collect all the essential data for further analysis. The interview was held in the Czech language not to cause any confusion about different terms that might have been used during the interviews. The interview took about two minutes, and later, the author transcribed the recorded interview and translated it into English, as it is the language of the thesis.

### **5.3 Data Collection**

The data was collected between the 6<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> of February. The researcher observed three lessons of each teacher to collect enough data to be further analysed. To support the data collected from the observations, an interview was carried out. This chapter describes the research instruments via which the data was collected and a pilot observation that helped to modify one of the research instruments.

To analyse data gathered in the research, it was crucial to create a sheet on which the data was recorded. The observation sheet also brings validity to the research because, Gavora (2000, 121) states that if the researchers want good research outcomes, it is necessary to collect accurate, broad and concrete data; therefore, the observation sheet (appendix B) was created to make managing the data straightforward.

The observation sheet included general information. The information about the school, class, date, time, the number of learners, the teacher observed, and the observer. The topic of the class accompanied it and an aim that was said by the teacher to the researcher always before the lesson. To collect data about the class, a table was created. The table included a description of an activity and what exactly the teacher and learners were doing during the activity. Under the table there was a blank space for notes that the observer might have come up with during the lessons observed.

The mentor reviewed the observation sheet before a pilot observation to ensure that all the essential aspects were included, and to make the observation sheet as helpful as possible, it was essential to review it. As Gavora (2000, 69) suggests, to conduct research, it is necessary to find out whether the research instrument works. Therefore, a pilot observation was organised.

The pilot observation took place at school 1 a few days before the observations for the research happened. After the pilot observation, the observer changed a few details. Firstly, a number of learners was added, so the readers of the thesis may imagine what the lessons looked like. The second change was made in the table. Before the pilot observation, the table did not have single brackets, so it was hard to fill it in and make it apparent what activity belonged to what the teacher was doing, and it was time-consuming to organise it; therefore, single brackets were pre-prepared, to make it simple to fill in and to follow for the observer and then for the analysis. As previously mentioned, the observation should be accompanied by an interview. The interview aimed to connect the teacher's assumptions about their grammar teaching with the observations and to find out why they teach grammar the way they do. The mentor reviewed the interview questions to make them comprehensive.

The questions were:

“How do you teach grammar? What is the exact procedure?”

This question accompanied the observation to determine whether the teachers teach inductively or deductively. If they mentioned the exact procedure that was observed in the lessons, the approach they aim to use should be straightforward.

“Why do you teach grammar the way you do?”

The second question aimed to determine why the teachers think their approach is the most appropriate for their learners.

“Have you ever tried a different approach?”

To understand the teachers' perspectives more, a third question was raised to determine whether they have tried different approaches or only the ones they use nowadays.

## 6 DATA ANALYSIS

To be able to analyse data, it was crucial to choose a technique by which the data would be analysed. The research aims to determine which deductive or inductive approach teachers use more when teaching grammar and why. Data was collected on an observation sheet and through an interview, so the extended material must have been analysed carefully to answer the research questions and reach the aim.

Hence, open coding was selected as an analysis technique because, as Švaříček and Šedová et al. (2007, 211) suggest, coding is a technique that helps to parse the data, find similarities, and then connect them in a new manner. The technique is realised by the fact that the text analysed is divided into units, that are not strictly given, it can be either a word, phrase or whole paragraph. Each of the units gets a code, which is, according to Lee and Fielding (2004, cited in Švaříček and Šedová et al., 2007, 212), a word or a short word that represents, for example, a type of attitude or activity in the data collected.

When analysing by open coding, it is important to determine what the unit is about. Flicka (2006, quoted in Švaříček and Šedová et al., 2007, 212) introduces questions that should help the researcher to determine what the units are about, for example, what is the topic of the unit or what phenomena it represents. Throughout the analysis of the data collected, many codes were created and later compared with the characteristics presented in the introduction to determine whether the lessons were deductive or inductive. The lessons were broken down into activities to give the researcher more flexibility in finding detailed information since, as found out in the theoretical part, a combination of both approaches might be used. Some of the lessons were accompanied by a handout provided to the researcher by the teacher to be able to see what the single exercises looked like and were aimed for. One of the analysed lessons is to be found in the appendix C and D.

Another table was created to record how often the approaches were used (appendix H) to determine which ones were used more throughout the lessons. Each lesson was closely analysed. Based on the comparison of the codes and the characteristics, each exercise was decided to be either deductive or inductive, and the decisions are summarised in the following sections. The interview answers were analysed separately to confirm the findings from the observation and to discover the reasons for their grammar teaching and whether the teachers ever taught differently than they do now.

## 6.1 School 1 – Teacher A

**The first lesson** was in the seventh grade, and a new topic was introduced to nine learners present in the class. The lesson aimed to draw a difference between past simple and past continuous, and the learners were supposed to create a sentence pattern for a statement and a question in the past continuous.

To begin, the teacher connected the new topic with a topic the learners already knew – present continuous. The learners were encouraged to find the connection between the present and past continuous; therefore, the teacher actively helped the learners to realise the similarities and to use the knowledge with a new topic. The learners actively participated throughout the process. Hence the codes created for the exercise were active teacher, no explicit rule and active learners, and they reflect the characteristics of the inductive approach.

The following exercise was listening, which was transcribed on the interactive whiteboard (IWB). The transcription included past continuous forms, and the learners were asked to come to the IWB and underline the form they noticed. The learners were working without the rule being explicitly said; they were active in the process of looking up the examples that included recurrent grammar features; therefore, the approach used in this activity is inductive based on the characteristics.

The following activity included the rule being written on the board. However, the teacher did not explicitly state the rule; the learners actively participated in creating rules for statements and questions based on the previous exercise. Thus, the rule creation in this lesson was done by induction.

The lesson continued with the creation of a negative form; however, in this case, the teacher provided learners with the rule and examples, and it continued with a controlled practice in which the learners repeated the phrases after the teacher; therefore, this exercise is reflected in the deductive characteristics.

To conclude, the lesson was inductively led seventy-five per cent of the lesson, with one exception; hence, the induction prevailed.

**The second lesson** observed was in the sixth grade, where there were fourteen learners. The class aimed to understand the difference between conjunctions “and but because” and use them correctly in the exercises given.

At the beginning of the class, the teacher wrote the three conjunctions on the board and asked the learners for their Czech translations. The teacher explicitly said the rules. Ultimately, the lesson began based on deductive characteristics.

The translations were followed by an exercise in which sentences with missing conjunction were displayed on the IWB. The learners were supposed to come to the IWB and choose the correct conjunction. The learners were closely controlled throughout the exercise, which was based on the previous knowledge of the rules, so the lesson continued deductively.

To practice, the learners were given a handout which included three exercises – errors correction of conjunctions, translation of sentences, and creation of the conjunction. The handout was a controlled practice, with exercises, which were very structured and drill-like; therefore, the deductive approach also dominated these exercises.

Ultimately, the lesson was led one hundred per cent deductively, given all the exercises that included the presentation of conjunctions and their usage, followed by controlled, drill-like exercises.

**The third lesson** at school 1 was observed in the ninth grade with twelve learners. The learners were learning about the usage of “will” and the aim of the class to realise the situation in which the will is used and used “will” correctly in required exercises.

At first, the teacher asked the learners for the meaning of the will. They had learned it in the previous lesson. The teacher wrote the meaning on the board; therefore, it was explicitly said, which leads to the characteristics of the deductive approach.

In the following exercise, the learners were given several situations and sentences and were supposed to connect them with situations like future predictions, momentary decisions or promises, requests or commands. The exercise was closely controlled by the teacher and provided learners with much information about the language that was explicitly stated on the board. Based on the characteristics, this exercise was structured and was supposed to present information about the language to the learners; therefore, the exercise was deductive.

The previous activity was followed by an exercise from an activity book in which the learners were supposed to write down five questions they would ask a fortune teller; therefore, they were

asked to create a question using the will. The teacher explained the exercise to them and gave the learners some examples, followed by a controlled production. Reflected in the characteristics, this exercise was deductive.

The fortune exercise was followed by production. The learners were asked a question about what they will do at the weekend, and one by one answered. Based on the previous exercises, the learners could produce sentences; therefore, the exercise was a deductive controlled production.

To finish the lesson, the teacher asked the learners to fill in exercises in their workbook connected with the production of “will” in a sentence. The exercises were very drill-like and structured. Therefore, the lesson was finished deductively.

Ultimately, the last lesson in school 1 was held deductively only.

Overall, based on the outcomes of the lessons illustrated in appendix H, teacher A tends to teach deductively; however, an inductive approach was used in one lesson as well, so it can be said that the teacher attempts to use a mixture of both approaches.



## 6.2 School 2 – Teacher B

**The first lesson** at school 2 was observed in the 9<sup>th</sup> grade with eighteen learners. The lesson aimed to draw attention to differences between present perfect and past simple and correctly recognise them in a text. Both verb forms have already been learned before.

The lesson was based on a handout with three different texts that included present perfect and past simple.

The first exercise that included grammar was true or false. The learners were asked to read the short texts and decide if the given information was true or false. This exercise was supposed to make them realise that there are differences between present perfect and past simple. Because the learners were made to think about the differences actively and were actively asking further questions, that led them to conclusions about the differences in the usage of the verb forms. Since the rules were not explicitly said before that exercise either, the researcher decided to mark that exercise as inductive.

The true or false task was followed by a task that presented the learners with two rules for present perfect and two rules for past simple. The learners were supposed to read a sentence, which included the verb forms under the rules and connect it with them. The teacher read the rules in Czech and added more explanations about the verb forms. This exercise was deductive since it included explicitly written rules and further information about the language.

The following exercises were about finding the past simple and present perfect in the texts. The learners had already been presented with the rules and examples, and the teacher closely controlled it to ensure the forms picked were correct, reflecting in the deductive characteristics.

To sum up, except for one exercise from the handout, the lesson was held deductively.

**The second lesson** observed followed the previous lesson in the ninth grade, this time with seventeen learners—the lesson aimed to be able to use the present perfect and past simple in exercises correctly.

At the beginning of the lesson, the learners were given a set of questions that were supposed to draw back to the previous lesson when they began with the differences between present perfect and past simple.

The warm-up activity was followed by a presentation from the teacher of the differences between the present perfect and the past simple. The rules were written in Czech, and the teacher

read them to the learners who were copying what was written in the presentation into their notebooks. Examples were also included. The teacher explicitly presented the rules; therefore, the learners were passive in terms of not creating the rules themselves; information about the language with examples was included in the presentation. Hence, the presentation was clearly deductive.

After the presentation, the learners were given handouts that were connected to a video about one man. Except for one exercise, it was connected to the practice of the verb forms and their differences. In the first one, the learners were supposed to explain the numbers mentioned in the video using one of the verb forms. It was followed by choosing a correct verb form from both in a sentence to make it correct. The exercises were controlled and very structured and followed the explicit presentation of the rule; therefore, they were deductive.

It followed a practice of typical features of the tenses via Kahoot. The exercise was drill-like and controlled by the teacher, who ensured the learners understood why they chose the answer, providing them with more explanation. The Kahoot was followed by a drill-like and structured handout in which they added, for example, “when, ago, yet,” which are connected to the usage of present perfect or past simple. The teacher closely controlled the exercise. All the features reflect the characteristics of the deductive approach.

In conclusion, the lesson was clearly led deductively – the rules were presented, with some examples and other features that relate to it. It was then followed by controlled exercises, finished by a drill-like exercise.

**The third lesson** in school 2 was observed in the seventh grade with eleven learners. The lesson aimed to create past simple by using “ed” correctly.

The learners had already learned about the past simple, so the teacher began the lesson by asking the learners what the rule was. However, the rule was explicitly written on the board, not induced by the learners. That was followed by turning on Kahoot, which was a very controlled and drill-like practice of the past simple form. Before beginning, the teacher explicitly explained the rule one more time with examples. Creating simple form followed a structured and controlled exercise in which the learners changed the present simple verb form into the past simple. The beginning of the lesson indicates the characteristics of the deductive approach.

One more exercise that included converting present simple to past simple followed. It was also very structured and controlled. The creation of a question followed. The learners were explicitly

told how to create a question; an example was provided in their handout. They created the question based on what they knew from the teacher and the example. It was a very controlled and structured exercise. The lesson was finished with controlled production of the past simple. The learners were divided into groups. Their task was to create a sentence with past simple based on a person and a verb they picked and positive, negative or a question based on a number they threw on a die. The teacher controlled what the learners were saying, and they had a chance to ask for help. Overall, all the exercises mentioned were deductive because they followed the characteristics – learners did not create rules themselves, and examples were presented, followed by very structured and controlled exercises and production.

Ultimately, as analysed above, the lesson was led only deductively.

Overall, based on the outcomes illustrated in the table in appendix H, the lessons of teacher B were rather deductive.

### 6.3 School 3 – Teacher C

**The first lesson** observed was a lesson in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade. The class is usually divided into two groups; however, this time, they had to be altogether; therefore, there were nineteen learners altogether. The lesson aimed to be able to use “so do I” and “neither do I” correctly.

Since the classes were together and the second group already knew the topic, the teacher asked them for the rule; however, the learners did not know it, so the teacher said a first sentence like “I like dogs.” and wanted the learners from the other group to use either “so do I” or “neither do I.” Then she did the same with learners from her group to see if they understood the pattern. Most of them got it and used it correctly. In this case, the teacher was active in helping the learners come up with the correct usage without explicitly saying how to. The learners were also active because they needed to understand the usage, and the rule was not explicitly pronounced; based on the characteristics, the lesson began inductively.

The following exercise was on a handout with many sentences to which the learners should add the grammar they were learning. The teacher asked them one by one for an answer. In the handout, they needed to use other verbs than “do” or in a negative form. Therefore, they were finding out new ways without knowing it beforehand. The practice was done without an explicit explanation of the rule, and the learners were active in terms of finding out the dichotomies and new rules of the new grammar. Therefore, even though the exercise might seem drill-like, the lesson continued inductively.

The teacher asked the learners for rules they observed during the previous exercise to summarise what they learned. Learners summarised the rules themselves with only a bit of help from the teacher. Therefore, they were active in terms of finding the rule. Based on the characteristics, the summation of the rule was inductive.

To finish the lesson, the handout had one more part about somebody else, so they had to use a different pronoun. The learners understood it without any explanation needed, only from reading the sentences and using similar rules they had already known. The researcher decided that this exercise was inductive since the learners were not explicitly explained what to do about the exercise and came up with it actively themselves.

Ultimately, the lesson was led inductively only.

**The second lesson** observed at school 3 was in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade with seventeen learners; two groups were together again. This lesson aimed to be able to understand the difference between “some, any, no and every” and use it in a practice handout correctly.

The lesson started with a song, “Somewhere over the rainbow,” in which the learners got to grips with the usage of the form they were learning for the first time. After the song, the teacher pointed out some examples from the song to the learners that included “some” and added examples including “any.” The learners were encouraged to realise the difference between the two. They succeeded, so the teacher asked them what they would compound some and any with. Learners came up with “where, one, body and thing.” Therefore, they actively realised the forms themselves with the active help of the teacher, so the beginning was inductive.

The beginning was followed by a handout in which the learners were supposed to choose one of the pronouns correctly. The exercises included several dichotomies. The learners asked the teacher about “nothing” and “anywhere.” The teacher drew them to a conclusion about the usage by giving examples. All of this was the learners’ active participation, and the teacher only provided them with further examples with recurrent grammar, so the learners actively realised the rules themselves. Based on the characteristics, the exercise was also held inductively.

To end the lesson, the teacher asked the learners what they had learned in the lesson. It was written on the board, and the learners were asked to copy it into their notebooks. The lesson was also finished inductively because the learners induced the rules from the written texts in the handouts and the previous exercises without their explicit knowledge. Therefore, in this case, the inductive characteristics also dominate.

In conclusion, the whole lesson was led inductively only.

**The third lesson** observed was in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade. The lesson aimed to realise the differences between past simple and past continuous and use past continuous in exercises correctly.

The lesson started with a listening exercise in which past simple and past continuous were used. The learners were asked to notice verb forms and write down what they heard. They already knew the past simple. It was followed by the teacher’s questions about what forms they heard. The teacher wrote them on the board. At this moment, learners’ attention was drawn to recurrent grammar examples. Therefore, the lesson began inductively.

To continue, the teacher asked learners what the past simple was used for because they already knew about it and then about the new verb form that they heard in the listening and whether they knew what to use it for. The teacher connected it to the present continuous, making it easier for them to understand the difference and the usage. The learners actively came up with it with the teacher's active help. The beginning of the lesson was inductive since the teacher did not explicitly say the rule, and the learners realised the usage of past continuous themselves.

To see whether the learners understood the differences, the teacher gave them a handout in which the usage of both forms was required. The learners tried to fill it in with the teacher's active help. Each exercise had examples at the beginning to demonstrate the usage. The creation of questions followed that exercise. During both of these exercises, the learners were actively practising without an explicit explanation of the rule, the examples demonstrated included recurrent grammar, and the teacher was actively helping the learners to fill in the exercises correctly. The lesson continued inductively since most of the characteristics of the inductive approach were reflected in the lesson.

The following activity was about writing down the differences between past simple and past continuous, how to create past continuous and questions in past continuous. The learners were asked what they noticed, and the teacher wrote it on the board to make it comprehensive for them to write the rules in their notebooks. Since the learners were asked to induce the rules themselves from the previous exercises with examples and the teacher actively helped them to find the rule themselves, the lesson finished inductively as well.

Ultimately, the teacher taught the third lesson also inductively only.

Overall, based on the outcomes illustrated in the table in appendix H, the lessons of teacher C were only inductive.

## **6.4 Interviews**

The interviews were also analysed by open coding. The codes aimed to find similarities firstly between the observations and the interview and secondly, in the teachers' opinions.

The first question in the interview was: "How do you teach grammar? What is the exact procedure?" The question aimed to draw back to the observations. All the teachers described the way they teach similarly to the way that was observed during their lessons. For example, teacher A was using mostly deductive approach; however, in one lesson, the inductive approach was also used, which is confirmed by the statement that "When I feel like it is something they

have already done or seen, I do it the other way – meaning that I show sentences to them and let them find the form.” The deductive approach is confirmed by the statement, “we learn the rules and do exercises in the workbook, and the learners are encouraged to try and use the new form.” Hence, the learners are passive in not finding the rule themselves and then do controlled exercises in the workbook followed up by production. Ultimately, when there is an option, the teacher encourages the learners to be active in terms of finding the rule themselves from recurrent grammar; however, as it could be seen in lesson 1 of the observations, the lesson became deductive in the end, and the rest of the lessons were deductive only; therefore, the teacher uses mostly the deductive approach.

Teacher B’s lessons were mostly deductive, except for one exercise in lesson 1, which draws to their answer in the interview, in which they state that “first, we induce it by reading a text or watching a video, so the learners know how to use the grammar rule,” therefore, the learners were encouraged to focus on the recurrent examples actively. However, the rest of the exercises observed were deductive, explained by the statement, “I usually present a summation for them of the rules, so they have an overview of the grammar. Then we begin to practice. First, there is drilling which then must write and train the usage of the rule. Lastly, we convert the rule into speaking so the learners can use it verbally.” The statement from the interview reflects the characteristics of the deductive approach – the learners were passive in terms of not creating the rule themselves since the teacher provided a summation of the grammar rule, and then it was followed by practice. The answer is supported by the observation in which the teacher summarised the rule and added examples. Therefore, all the characteristic features of the deductive approach were used by teacher B.

On the other hand, lessons of teacher C were, based on the observation, only inductive, which is confirmed by the statement from the interview that “most of the time, I want the learners to induce the rules themselves, to make them think,” which means that learners are encouraged to find the rule themselves actively. Consequently, the teacher stated: “we usually start by me saying some examples. Then we practice with many other examples when we realise some deviations.” That confirms another characteristic that learners induce the rule from examples with recurrent grammar features. However, they are also encouraged to find some deviations in the rules themselves, and then they practice without explicitly explaining the rule. All of the statements in the interview confirmed the findings from the observations. However, the teacher also added that “if the grammar is more complex, or they can’t understand it, it is my turn to explain it first to them, and then the practice follows up,” hence, sometimes,

the teacher also used the deductive approach since they explicitly present the rule to the learners. It is followed by practice; however, that cannot be confirmed since all the lessons observed were inductive only.

The second question in the interview was: “Why do you teach grammar the way you do?” Based on the answers, all teachers agreed that they do it because they think it is most convenient for their learners. For example, teacher A said that they teach the way they do because they find it the easiest for the learners while adding that it is quicker for them to prepare, which was the only answer that drew to the teacher’s convenience. Teacher B teaches the way they do because the learners experience and can use the language, which is also centred on the learner. Consequently, teacher C teaches mostly inductively to make the learners think about the language. Ultimately, the learners were the centre of the answers to the second question.

The third question was: “Have you ever tried a different approach?” The question was supposed to find out whether the teachers ever tried the second approach, which could have also been an added reason for using the current approach; however, two out of three teachers answered that they use both deductive and inductive, which was already detected either in the observations or in the first question of the interview. The third teacher has never explicitly used a different approach to the one they are used to from the very beginning; therefore, this question was considered unnecessary since it did not bring any new findings or confirmation.



## **Conclusion of the Practical Part**

The practical part aimed to determine whether teachers in the chosen schools tend to teach inductively or deductively and why. To be able to reach the aim, research questions were posed.

The first question was which of the approaches prevails in the lessons. Based on the observations and interviews, the deductive approach was used more than the inductive approach. Two out of three teachers taught mainly deductively.

The second question aimed to determine whether the teachers use a combination of the approaches. As observed, even though the teachers were teaching mostly deductively, teacher A presented one mostly inductive lesson. Teacher B used the inductive approach only in one of the exercises. Furthermore, even though the lessons observed were only inductive, teacher C stated that some of the lessons that present complex grammar that might be difficult to understand are taught deductively. Ultimately, the teachers use a combination of both approaches.

The third research question was to determine the reasons for using the approaches. Based on the interviews, the answers were very learner-centred. All the teachers teach the way they do because they think it is best for the learners. Teacher A stated that it was the easiest way for the learners to learn, speaking of the deductive approach; however, they added that it is also quick for them to prepare the lesson. According to teacher B, using the deductive approach, the learners can experience the language and then use it. Teacher C, the only one who used only an inductive approach during the observed lessons, stated that the reason for using mostly that approach is to make the learners think about the language.

In connection with the theoretical part, foreign language teachers tend to use a deductive approach more, which was confirmed by the findings in the practical part. Also, a combination of approaches was used, which according to the theory, might bring the best results when teaching grammar. The reasons for teaching the approaches were similar to the advantages mentioned in the practical part, such as the deductive approach being quicker to prepare for the teacher and the inductive approach challenging the learners' thinking. In conclusion, teachers do their best to teach learners effectively. They choose the most convenient approach for their groups of learners.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the thesis dealt with grammar teaching in lower-secondary education, focusing on a deductive and inductive approach. The aim was to determine whether teachers use deductive or inductive approaches when teaching grammar in the lower-secondary education and why. The thesis was divided into two main parts – the theoretical, which created a basis for the following research, in the practical part.

The theoretical part first dealt with communicative competence, which is the overall aim of language teaching. The CC was illustrated from the point of view of its development and followed by the current concept of CC created by CEFR. The development of CC is also reflected in the development of grammar teaching, which was dealt with in the second chapter. First, grammar was described to understand the core topic of the thesis, followed by the development phases, and narrowed down the focus on grammar in the curricular documents in the Czech Republic. Since the aim focuses on the deductive and inductive approaches, the following chapter dealt with both and their advantages and disadvantages. The final chapter concerned the lower-secondary learner from a didactic and psychological view, followed by a description of the teacher since the teacher decides what approach is used in their classes.

The practical part first presented the background of the research, which was conducted with three teachers in three different schools. The research methods used were observation followed by an interview. The observation helped to determine the approach the teachers tend to use during their classes when teaching grammar. It was confirmed by answers from the interview that also detected the reason for using the approaches. The data from the observation was collected on the observation sheet, and the interview was recorded and transcribed. The data collected was analysed by the technique of open coding. The analysis led to the realisation that teachers use the deductive approach more. However, they also use a combination of both approaches based on considering the lesson's topic and the learners.

Ultimately, the aim of the research was fulfilled; however, it was conducted only on a small sample of teachers and lessons; therefore, it does not present a complete picture of most teachers in the Czech Republic. Hence, further research should be conducted.

## RESUMÉ

Výuka gramatiky je nedílnou součástí výuky jazyka. Tato bakalářská práce se zabývá výukou gramatiky žáků na druhém stupni základní školy, konkrétně se zaměřuje na deduktivní a induktivní přístup. Cílem práce bylo zjistit jaký způsob spíše učitelé využívají a z jakého důvodu. Práce je rozdělena na dvě hlavní části – praktickou a teoretickou a v rámci těchto částí na kapitoly a podkapitoly.

Teoretická část čítá celkem čtyři kapitoly. První kapitola se zabývá komunikační kompetencí, konkrétně jejím vývojem, neboť komunikační kompetence je cílem výuky jazyka a její vývoj je reflektován i ve způsobech výuky gramatiky. Nejprve byl termín kompetence zejména o znalosti jazyka, nikoliv o jeho použití. Na tuto skutečnost bylo reagováno představením komplexnějším konceptem komunikační kompetence, který představoval nejen znalost jazyka, ale i jeho správné použití v různých situacích. V současnosti se výukou cizích jazyků zabývá Společný evropský referenční rámec pro jazyky, který zahrnuje i komunikační kompetence, kterou rozděluje dále na kompetenci lingvistickou, která je o správném použití jazyka, sociolingvistickou kompetenci, která zahrnuje správné využití jazyka v odlišných sociálních interakcích a kompetenci pragmatickou, která je o správném využití jazyka v určitých situacích. V rámci těchto kompetencí se nadále rozvíjí i další aspekty, včetně gramatiky.

Druhá kapitola se zaměřuje na gramatiku. Nejprve obecněji popisuje gramatiku jako organizovaný jazykový systém, bez kterého by výuka jazyka nebyla kompletní. Následuje podkapitola, která se zabývá vývojem výuky gramatiky reflektující vývoj komunikační kompetence. Nejprve popsán tradiční způsob výuky gramatiky cílící především na znalost jazyka. Na to navazuje komunikační výuka, která se zaměřuje naopak spíše na mluvenou stránku jazyka. V předposlední části této podkapitoly je popsána nynější post-komunikační éra, propojující dva předchozí přístupy výuky – znalosti jazyka a schopnosti správně a vhodně komunikovat. Dále se tato éra zabývá aktivním zapojením žáků do jejich procesů učení. Cíle výuky gramatiky v rámci post-komunikační éry jsou popsány v již zmíněném evropském rámci, ve kterém se gramatika nachází v rámci lingvistické kompetence jako „gramatická přesnost.“ V České republice je výuka anglického jazyka založena na evropském rámci a stručně popsána v kurikulárních dokumentech, které jsou na státní a školní úrovni. Státním kurikulárním dokumentem je Rámcový vzdělávací program základního vzdělávání (RVP ZV), který popisuje očekávané výstupy v každém předmětu. Stručněji je potom jednotlivá látka přiblížena ve školních vzdělávacích programech, které si každá škola upravuje dle svého uvážení, s ohledem na naplnění očekávaných výstupů popsanych v RVP ZV.

Třetí kapitola se zaměřuje na deduktivní a induktivní přístup k výuce gramatiky. Nejprve je každý z přístupů k výuce popsán samostatně a následně jsou vyzdvihnuty výhody a nevýhody nejen jejich praktického využití ve výuce. Deduktivní přístup k výuce gramatiky vychází z tradiční výuky gramatiky. Z čehož vychází, že nejprve jsou učitelem prezentována gramatická pravidla nového jevu i s doplněnými příklady jeho použití, následuje strukturované procvičování a poté studenti využijí naučená pravidla v mluvené podobě. Induktivní přístup naopak studenty nutí k tomu, aby na pravidlo přišli sami. Jsou jim například prezentovány věty, které obsahují opakující se gramatický jev, na jehož základě se žáci učí používat danou problematiku bez explicitní znalosti jejich pravidel. Jejich úkolem je pravidlo následně generalizovat. K samotnému zobecnění však nemusí dojít. Každý přístup k výuce má své výhody a nevýhody. Deduktivní přístup je přínosný především proto, že pravidla mohou být jednoduše vysvětlena, což snižuje časovou náročnost, ale pokud žáci na začátku pravidlu neporozumí, mohou být touto skutečností odrazeni od následného snažení se mu porozumět. Naopak, pokud pravidlům porozumí, může je to vést k myšlence, že to je to jediné, co k použití jazyka potřebují. Induktivní přístup studenty aktivizuje, nutí je přemýšlet. To, že si i na jednoduché pravidlo dokážou přijít sami, jim může zvednout sebevědomí. Nevýhodou induktivního přístupu je možné chybné porozumění a následné nesprávné užívání implicitně podaného pravidla.

Poslední kapitola se zaměřuje na žáka druhého stupně základní školy a na učitele. Žák je popsán z psychologického a didaktického hlediska, neboť jejich věk přináší určitá specifika, která je třeba zohlednit při volbě způsobu výuky. Žáci druhého stupně jsou v dospívajícím věku, tzv. adolescenti, kteří prochází značnými psychickými a fyzickými změnami. S tím se pojí i proces hledání jejich vlastní identity, během kterého se začínají osamostatňovat. Z didaktického hlediska je potřeba tyto změny brát v potaz. Žáci se v tomto věku začínají uzavírat do sebe a chtějí o sobě rozhodovat především sami. Proto je důležité od nich získávat pravidelnou zpětnou vazbu na výuku. Posledním tématem teoretické části je učitel, neboť ten rozhoduje o tom, jak bude hodina probíhat a jaké postupy budou použity. Učitel by měl ovládat svůj předmět nejen z teoretického hlediska, ale zároveň by měl dokázat připravit a odučit hodinu tak, aby to žáky bavilo a něco se naučili. Co se týče vyučování gramatiky, učitel by měl znát a umět používat různé techniky, vyhovující různým skupinám.

Praktická část je založena na východiscích z teoretické části, na jejichž základě byly vymezeny charakteristiky deduktivního a induktivního přístupu, dále použitých ve výzkumu. Cílem praktické části bylo zjistit, který z přístupů učitelé anglického jazyka spíše využívají v jejich

hodinách a z jakého důvodu. Výzkum probíhal u třech učitelů druhého stupně na různých základních školách. Nejprve, jsou všichni účastníci výzkumu krátce představeni. V následujících částech jsou detailněji popsány metody a nástroje sběru dat. Za metody byly vybrány observace a rozhovor. Observace byly zaznamenány na observační arch a rozhovory byly nahrány a následně přepsány. Před samotnou observací byla zrealizována pilotní observace, na jejímž základě byl upraven observační arch. U každého učitele byly sledovány tři hodiny gramatiky. Po těchto třech hodinách následoval rozhovor, který měl za cíl doplnit informace z pozorovaných hodin a stanovit důvod a motivaci učitele k využívání jimi zvoleného způsobu výuky gramatiky.

Analýza materiálů probíhala formou otevřeného kódování. Nejprve byly analyzovány data z observačních archů. Hodiny byly rozdělené na aktivity a jednotlivým částem z těchto aktivit byly přiděleny kódy, které reflektovaly to, o čem daná část vypovídá. Kódy byly následně porovnány s charakteristikami deduktivního a induktivního přístupu, které byly vymezeny v úvodu praktické části. Na základě toho bylo určeno, zda aktivita byla deduktivního či induktivního rázu. Výsledek byl poté zaznamenán do tabulky. V tabulce se následně sečetl celkový počet aktivit a procentuálně byla zjištěna převaha přístupu. Data z rozhovorů byla analyzována otázkou po otázce. První otázka měla potvrdit či vyvrátit zjištění z observací. Druhá otázka měla za úkol zjistit z jakého důvodu učitelé využívají způsob, kterým vyučují. Následně a byly jejich odpovědi vzájemně porovnány, s cílem najít vzájemné podobnosti a odlišnosti. Poslední otázka byla na závěr vyhodnocena jako nepotřebná, neboť na ni učitelé již odpověděli během první otázky.

Závěr praktické části je věnován odpovědím na výzkumné otázky a následně na celkový cíl práce, který byl splněn. Na základě analýzy bylo zjištěno, že učitelé využívají spíše deduktivní přístup k výuce gramatiky, neboť převažoval u dvou ze tří vyučujících. I když deduktivní přístup převažoval, v pozorovaných hodinách se nacházely oba přístupy dohromady, což bylo následně i potvrzeno ve dvou rozhovorech. V rámci závěru praktické části byla porovnána zjištění s teoretickými východisky, jež se shodovaly.

Poslední částí bakalářské práce je samotný závěr, ve kterém byl opět vymezen cíl této práce a byla zde krátce shrnuta zjištění z teoretické a praktické části. Je však nutné zmínit, že výzkum byl proveden pouze u třech různých učitelů, tudíž ho nelze brát jako obecný předpoklad výuky gramatiky učitelů v České republice.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benitez-Correa, Carmen, Gonzales-Torres, Paul, Ochoa-Cueva. Cesar, Vargas-Saritama Alba. 2019. "A Comparison between Deductive and Inductive Approaches for Teaching EFL Grammar to High School Students." *International Journal of Instruction* 12 (1): 225 – 236.

Brinton, Donna, M. 2014. "Tools and Techniques of Effective Second/Foreign Language Teaching." *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, edited by Marianne Celce-Murcia, Donna M. Brinton, Marguerite Ann Snow, 340 – 361. Fourth edition. Boston: National Geographic Learning.

Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Principles of language learning and teaching*. 4th ed. [New York]: Longman.

Cambridge Assessment English. 2018. "Framework Competency Statements." Accessed February 20, 2023.

<https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/Images/172992-full-level-descriptors-cambridge-english-teaching-framework.pdf>

Celce-Murcia, Marianne. 2014. "An Overview of Language Teaching Methods and Approaches." *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, edited by Marianne Celce-Murcia, Donna M. Brinton, Marguerite Ann Snow, 2 - 14. Fourth edition. Boston: National Geographic Learning.

Council of Europe. 2020. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment*. Companion Volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Crystal, David. 2003. *The Cambridge encyclopaedia of the English language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gavora, Peter. 2000. *Úvod do pedagogického výzkumu*. Brno: Paido.

Harmer, Jeremy. 1991. *Teaching and learning grammar*. Longman keys to language teaching. London: Longman.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2007. *The practice of English language teaching*. 4th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Hedge, Tricia. 2000. *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford handbooks for language teachers. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Helus, Zdeněk. 2018. *Úvod do psychologie*. 2., přepracované a doplněné vydání. Psyché. Praha: Grada.

Kyriacou, Chris. 2007. *Essential teaching skills*. 3rd ed. Cheltenham: Nelson Thornes.

Klein, Wolfgang. 1986. *Second Language Acquisition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 2014. "Teaching Grammar." *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, edited by Marianne Celce-Murcia, Donna M. Brinton, Marguerite Ann Snow, 256 – 287. Fourth edition. Boston: National Geographic Learning.

Littlewood, William. 1991. *Communicative language teaching: an introduction*. New directions in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Margaroni, M., Magos, K. 2020. "L2 Teaching in the post-communicative era: Developing intercultural consciousness, critical awareness and consistent attitudes for social inclusion." *Global Education Review* 7 (4): 1 – 8.

MŠMT. 2021. *Rámcový vzdělávací program pro základní vzdělávání*. Praha: MŠMT.

Nunan, David. 1991. *Language teaching methodology: a textbook for teachers*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Obst, Otto. 2017. *Obečná didaktika*. 2. vydání. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.

Rama, José, L., Agulló, Luque G. 2012. "The Role of Grammar Teaching: From Communicative Approaches to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages" *Revista de Lingüística y Lenguas Aplicadas* 7 (1): 179 – 191.

Richards, Jack C., and Theodore S. Rodgers. 2014. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Third edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J., Schmidt, R. 2002. *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics* (3rd ed.). Harlow: Longman

Rod, Ellis. 2006. "Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective." *TESOL Quarterly* 40 (1): 83 – 107.

Scrivener, Jim. 2005. *Learning teaching: a guidebook for English language teachers*. 2nd ed. Macmillan books for teachers. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Shaffer, Constance. 1989. "A Comparison of Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching Foreign Languages." *The Modern Language Journal* 73 (4): 395 – 403.

Šimoník, Oldřich. 2005. *Úvod do didaktiky základní školy*. Brno: MSD.

Švaříček, Roman, Šed'ová, Klára. 2007. *Kvalitativní výzkum v pedagogických vědách*. Praha: Portál.

Thornbury, Scott. 1999. *How to teach grammar*. How to. Harlow: Pearson Education.



Thorová, Kateřina. 2015. *Vývojová psychologie: proměny lidské psychiky od početí po smrt*. Praha: Portál.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. 2012. *International Standard Classification of Education ISCED 2011*. Montreal: UNESCO.

<http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf>

Vágnerová, Marie, Lisá, Lidka. 2021. *Vývojová psychologie: dětství a dospívání*. Vydání třetí, přepracované a doplněné. Praha: Univerzita Karlova, nakladatelství Karolinum.

Widodo, Handoyo Puji. 2006. "Approaches and procedures in teaching grammar." *English teaching: Practice and Critique* 5 (1): 122 – 141.

Xia, Yanhua. 2014. "Language Theories and Language Teaching – from Traditional Grammar to Functionalism." *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 5 (3): 559 – 565.

## **APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A: Inductive exercise .....	49
APPENDIX B: Blank observation sheet .....	50
APPENDIX C: Illustration of open coding 1 .....	51
APPENDIX D: Illustration of open coding 2 .....	52
APPENDIX E: Interview with teacher A .....	53
APPENDIX F: Interview with teacher B.....	54
APPENDIX G: Interview with teacher C .....	55
APPENDIX H: Figure with the outcomes of the observations .....	56

APPENDIX A: Inductive exercise

Comparative forms of adjectives (Harmer, 2007, 2017)

**Look at this!**

old → older

new → newer

light → lighter

big → bigger

thin → thinner

noisy → noisier

silly → sillier

expensive → more expensive

beautiful → more beautiful

**Now work these out!**

- a) How do we make one-syllable adjectives into comparative adjectives?
- b) Why are *big* and *thin* different?
- c) What has to change when we make words like *noisy* and *silly* into comparative adjectives?
- d) What is different about *expensive* and *beautiful*? Why?

## APPENDIX B: Blank observation sheet

School:
Class:
Date:
Time:
Number of learners:
Teacher observed:
Observer: Adéla Skalická

**TOPIC OF THE CLASS:**

**AIM OF THE CLASS:**

DESCRIPTION OF AN ACTIVITY	WHAT IS THE TEACHER DOING	WHAT ARE THE LEARNERS DOING

## APPENDIX C: Illustration of open coding 1

School: SCHOOL 2
Class: 9 <sup>th</sup>
Date: 17. 2. 2023
Time: 8:55 – 9:40
Number of learners: 17
Teacher observed: TEACHER B
Observer: Adéla Skalická

**TOPIC OF THE CLASS:** Present perfect x past simple

**AIM OF THE CLASS:** By the end of the lesson, the learners will be able to recognise the differences between present perfect and past simple and use them in the exercises correctly.

DESCRIPTION OF AN ACTIVITY	WHAT IS THE TEACHER DOING	WHAT ARE THE LEARNERS DOING
<p><b>Questions</b></p> <p>The learners are supposed to pair up and answer two questions to warm up; it is supposed to draw back to the previous lesson.</p>	<p>Hands out the questions and tells the learners what to do.</p> <p>Asking for answers out loud from some of the learners</p>	<p>They pair up and answer the questions.</p> <p>They answer the questions out loud if asked.</p>
<p><b>Presentation of the differences between present perfect and past simple explicit</b></p> <p>It is written in Czech – the differences. <i>information</i></p> <p>There are examples in English.</p> <p><i>presented examples</i></p>	<p>Reading the presentation, presenting.</p> <p><i>explicit</i></p>	<p>Sit and listen, copying the rules into their English language notebooks.</p> <p><i>passive learners</i></p>

APPENDIX D: Illustration of open coding 2

<p><b>Watching a video about an 80-year-old man</b></p> <p>Put a tick next to a topic discussed (handout ex 6)</p>	<p>Telling them what to do, turning on the video.</p> <p>Asking for the topics mentioned</p>	<p>They watch the video and tick.</p> <p>Answering what was mentioned.</p>
<p><b>Watching the video again and working on ex 7</b></p> <p>They are supposed to explain numbers from the video. Usage of the present perfect and past continuous is acquired. <i>Controlled practice</i></p> <p>It is being watched twice.</p> <p>The video has subtitles.</p>	<p>Telling them what to do and turning on the video.</p> <p>Asking for the answers.</p>	<p>Working on the task alone.</p> <p>Some of them answer questions proposed by the teacher, the rest is checking their answers</p> <p><i>controlled practice</i></p>
<p><b>Ex. 8</b></p> <p>Choosing the correct form of the verb – past simple x present perfect</p> <p><i>drill-like</i></p>	<p>Telling them what to do and turning on the video so they can check it.</p> <p><i>controlled practice</i></p> <p>Checking it together, asking why they chose what they chose.</p>	<p>Doing it and then checking it with the video.</p> <p>Answering when the teacher asks.</p>
<p><b>Kahoot!</b></p> <p>The practice of past simple and present perfect according to the typical features that were mentioned – when, ago, since, yesterday, already, ... <i>drill-like</i></p>	<p>Turning on the Kahoot</p> <p>Explaining the correct answers in Czech.</p> <p><i>information</i></p>	<p>Signing in.</p> <p>Doing it. <i>passive learners</i></p>
<p><b>use past simple or present perfect</b></p> <p>there are sentences that require to fill in either the present perfect or past simple form.</p> <p><i>drill-like, usage, controlled practice</i></p> <p>the rest of it is their hw, so they start with It at the end of the lesson already.</p>	<p>Tells them what to do.</p> <p>Asking for the answers out loud.</p> <p>If the learners say it wrong, she helps them to reach the correct answer. <i>rule</i></p> <p>Asking for the typical words used with <i>information</i></p>	<p>They are filling it in alone.</p> <p>Saying the answers.</p> <p>Looking for the typical words.</p> <p><i>examples</i></p>

APPENDIX E: Interview with teacher A

Translated by the author:

**How do you teach grammar? What is the exact procedure?**

We usually look at grammar tables to see if there are differences between different persons. It is generally more accessible with older learners, but with others, it is the other way around. So, we typically review it, look at the forms, <sup>explicit grammar</sup> how to create it, and how to use it in question and as a negative sentence. When I feel like it is something they have already done or seen, I do it the other way – <sup>active learners</sup> meaning that I show sentences to them and let them find the word form. And it is followed by practice. I use the PPP approach, which is the present practice produce approach. Firstly, we learn the rules and do exercises in the workbook, and the learners are encouraged to try using the new forms. <sup>controlled-exercises</sup>

controlled-practice

explicit practice

passive learners

**So, you teach this way because you think it is the easiest for them?**

Fastest for me and easier for them.

teacher control

learner control

**Have you ever tried to teach grammar differently than this?**

The different one is what I said about the seven graders. If they know the grammar or have learned something similar, I do it the other way around, and they look for the conditions—the so-called inductive approach.

both

APPENDIX F: Interview with teacher B

Translated by the author:

**How do you teach grammar? What is the exact procedure?**

First, we induce <sup>active learners</sup> it by reading a text or watching a video, so the learners know how to use the grammar rule. After that, I usually present a summation for them of the rules, and they write it into their notebooks, so they have an overview of the grammar. Then we begin to practice. First, there is <sup>drill-like</sup> drilling when they must write and train the usage of the rule. We also have an opportunity to go to an ICT room to use computers for exercises and practice. Lastly, we convert the rule into speaking so the learners can use it verbally.

**So the reason why you teach grammar this way is that...**

So they experience it and can use it. <sup>learner centred</sup>

**Have you ever tried to teach it differently, or have you always taught grammar this way?**

I don't remember trying another approach, this one works, so I am using it.

<sup>one</sup>



APPENDIX G: Interview with teacher C

Translated by the author:

**How do you teach grammar? What is the exact procedure?**

Most of the time, I want the learners to induce the rules themselves, to make them think. If the grammar is more complex or they can't understand it, it is my turn to explain it first to them and then the practice follows up. However, we usually start by me saying some examples. Further, I encourage learners to use the language similarly as I do in sentences. Then we practice with loads of examples, which is a time when we also realize some deviations. At the end, the rule is said by the learners, and written on the board by me so they know what we were talking about exactly. I teach with these two approaches. However, I rather use the one when learners realise the rule themselves.

**Why do you teach grammar the way you do?**

I want to make them think about the language. learner centred

**Have you ever tried different approach?**

As I said, I am using these two ways, but I prefer the first one.

both

preparation

APPENDIX H: Figure with the outcomes of the observations

	TEACHER A			TEACHER B			TEACHER C		
	lesson 1	lesson 2	lesson 3	lesson 1	lesson 2	lesson 3	lesson 1	lesson 2	lesson 3
deductive	I	III	IIII	II	IIII	III			
inductive	III			I			III	III	IIII
number of activities concerned	4	3	5	3	5	6	4	3	5
percentage of deductive	25%	100%	100%	66,6	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%
percentage of inductive	75%	0%	0%	33,3	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%
deductive/inductive	inductive	deductive	deductive	deductive	deductive	deductive	inductive	inductive	inductive

deductive
deductive
inductive