



INDUCTIVE AND DEDUCTIVE METHOD OF TEACHING GRAMMAR IN THE EFL CLASSROOM

Igamberdiyeva Shakhnoza, Shokirova Marxabo, Abdullayeva Nigora
Teachers of Applied English department

Introduction.

It is known that grammar is difficult and complicated process in both learning and teaching procedure in the English class. However, now not many people are paying attention to learning grammar method. Because it is regarded as old and traditional approach. According to Krashen, (1993) Grammar translation method is unimportant and fragile for learning English. However, the importance of Deductive and inductive approaches for learning and teaching grammar are very important for learners.

According to Krashen (1993), the effect of teaching grammar is inessential and delicate. There are various controversial opinions over the usage of inductive or deductive methods in conducting grammar classes. We accomplished to gain sufficient knowledge of two stood ideas –common ones are inductive and deductive methods. Various teachers choose various methods for grammar teaching according to their experiences. Some instructors select deductive grammar teaching and others inductive grammar teaching.

Inductive or Deductive method.

Teaching English grammar is one of the complicated processes that EFL and ESL instructors struggle with learners of English in the current teaching world. Having analyzed the article written by S. Chalipa (2013) on the “Effect of Inductive and Deductive approach”, two main insights caught my attention to read the article from the onset to the end. The content of the inductive approach and the dominance of the deductive approach are the reasons that arouse curiosity to flip through the pages. The inductive approach was a domineering approach rather than a deductive one, yet the results of the research showed the vice-versa outcome. Another startling idea was wider ranges of merits in the usage of the inductive approach. Inductive learning requires a certain level of skill from the learner, because inductive techniques create a debatable environment and an activity environment like problem solving. of course in the process freshmen or young learners may come to the wrong conception. However, if this is done in the native language or the target language, depending on the level of the student, an effective result can also be achieved.

Moving to the criticisms about deductive and inductive grammar teaching, we would agree that inductive teaching is time-consuming for beginners of the language, yet it can be applied only for adult learners who are independent in analyzing and thinking critically in different situations. In addition to that, a teacher who is using the inductive method should be experienced and competent to manage the class effectively. Otherwise, the teaching process will fail at greater rates.

Advantages of both approaches.

In terms of the strength of the deductive approach, it is time-saving unlike the inductive way of educating. In deductive grammar method, teachers can be considered main role and they can provide with grammar examples to their learners. In addition, the background knowledge is important in this method. Hence, the learners are told the grammatical rules with examples during



the classes. Whereas in the inductive learners are provided with example before the pattern then learners generalize grammar rules based on the example they have been supplied with by teachers in the lessons. Looking at the strong points of the Inductive approach, it helps to boost critical thinking, problem-solving and memorization skills since it is student-centered.

According to Stoller (1997), teachers should involve students into the teaching process actively in order to reach optimal learning and fortify their problem-solving and critical thinking skills. Another researcher Chaudron (1988) accentuated that the involvement of the students into learning procedures can result in higher outcomes in the future. Therefore, modern classes are requiring to change teacher-centered into student-centered approach in order to prepare competent users of grammar in a plausible future.

Conclusion.

All in all, the inductive approach is more advantageous than deductive regarding its positive effects on language teaching and learning. It is true that the lesson happens to be student-centered and the issue of meaning rather than structure is superior in inductive method which points to the strength of the very approach. Moreover, we agree with that the main demand of the current world is to create student-centered approach so as to reshape concrete competence in grammar among language learners.

References.

1. Alimardon, T., Sherzod, L., & Umida, H. (2022, December). UTILIZING DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 45-47).
2. Abdulkhay, K., Shaxriyor, X., & Nasibullo, Q. (2022, December). LISTENING AND NOTE TAKING SKILLS IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES*" *PLATFORM* (pp. 38-40).
3. Abduolimova, M., & Ibrokhimova, M. (2022, February). EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES OF LEARNING INDEPENDENTLY. In *International journal of conference series on education and social sciences (Online)* (Vol. 2, No. 2).
4. Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classroom*, Cambridge Applied Linguistics.
5. Gafforov, I., & Kosimov, A. (2022, September). LANGUAGE ENVIRONMENT, LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY AND PREJUDICE IN UZBEKISTAN. In *INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE" THE TIME OF SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS"* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 82-86).
6. Gafforov, I., & Abdulkhay, K. (2022). The Role of Assessment in Language Teaching. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION*, 1(4), 31-34.
7. Jurayeva, K., & Shakhnoza, I. (2022). IMPLICATIONS OF MACRO AND MICRO LANGUAGE PLANNING IN UZBEKISTAN. *BARQARORLIK VA YETAKCHI TADQIQOTLAR ONLAYN ILMYIY JURNALI*, 2(12), 330-333.
8. Krashen, S 1993b. The effect of formal grammar study. Still peripheral.
9. Kosimov, A., & Latipov, S. (2022). THE IMPORTANCE OF LANGUAGE EDUCATION POLICY AND PRACTICE IN STATE EDUCATION SYSTEMS. *Involta Scientific Journal*, 1(9), 23-27.



10. Haydarova, U. (2022). THE TRANSLATIONS AND MEANINGS OF METAPHORS THAT USED IN "HOJOKI". *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 2(Special Issue 22), 54-57.
11. Haydarova, U., & Umarova, M. (2022). YAPON MUTOZ MANBALARIDA QO'LLANGAN METAFORALARNING TURLARI TASNIFI. *Science and innovation*, 1(B3), 599-603.
12. Munajat, U., Xurshida, U., & Sevara, S. (2022, December). CHALLENGES IN USING MODERN TECHNOLOGIES IN LANGUAGE TEACHING. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES* " PLATFORM (pp. 30-33).
13. Mashrabovna, U. M., & Mohlaroyim, E. (2022). Individual differences in foreign language learning. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(5), 751-757.
14. Mashrabovna, U. M., & Mirzamahmudovna, U. S. (2022). Ingliz Va O 'zbek Ijtimoiy Tarmoqlarida Ilmiy Terminlarning Qo 'Llanilishining Ahamiyati. *Miasto Przeszłości*, 28, 453-454.
15. Qurbonov, N. X. U. (2022). EXPRESSION OF THE PHENOMENON OF INTENSIFICATION/DEINTENSIFICATION AT THE PHONETIC LEVEL. *Central Asian Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies (CARJIS)*, 2(4), 271-275.
16. Ravshanovna, T. M. (2022). DIFFERENT TYPES OF IRONY IN LITERATURE. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, 3(4), 331-337.
17. Sevara, U., Muhayyo, U., & Maftuna, A. (2022, December). THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DIGITAL LITERACY IN THE EFL CLASSROOM. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES* " PLATFORM (pp. 41-44).
18. Sevara, U., & Jurayeva, K. (2022). LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY AND LANGUAGE PREJUDICE IN UZBEKISTAN. *BOSHQARUV VA ETIKA QOIDALARI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 2(12), 16-18.
19. Sevara, S., Shakhriyor, K., & Kosimov, A. (2022, December). IMPLEMENTATION OF DIGITAL TOOLS IN THE EFL CLASSROOM. In " *ONLINE-CONFERENCES* " PLATFORM (pp. 34-37).
20. Sotvoldievich, T. A. (2022). Linguistic and Didactic Factors of Improving the Writing Competence of Future English Language Teachers. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS*, 1(3), 1-9.
21. Stoller, F. L.,(1997)Project Work: A Means to Promote Language Content. *English Teaching Forum*. Vol. 35/4.
22. Shokirova, M. (2021). Paragraph-syntactic compositional unit. In *НАУКА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ, ИННОВАЦИИ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ И СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ* (pp. 124-126).
23. Shavkatovna, A. N., & Sharifovna, S. M. (2022). The Role of Electronic Resources in English Language Teaching. *International Journal of Discoveries and Innovations in Applied Sciences*, 2(4), 79-83.
24. Sharifovna, S. M., & Maksudovna, J. H. METHODOLOGICAL OPPORTUNITIES TEACHING ENGLISH IN NON-PHILOLOGICAL HIGHER EDUCATION. *ЎЗБЕКИСТОНДА ИЛМИЙ ТАДҚИҚОТЛАР: ДАВРИЙ АНЖУМАНЛАР: 10-ҚИСМ*, 66.
25. Sultanovna, U. S., & Dilnavoz, Y. (2022). DANIEL DEFOE'S CREATION IN ENGLISH LITERATURE. *IJTIMOY FANLARDA INNOVASIYA ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 2(12), 9-11.



-
26. Sultanovna, U. S., & Dilnavoz, Y. (2022). DANIEL DEFOE'S CREATION IN ENGLISH LITERATURE. *IJTIMOIIY FANLARDA INNOVASIYA ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 2(12), 9-11.
 27. Turdimatova, M. (2021). SEMANTIC NOTION OF DIMINUTIVES IN THE FORMATION OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH. *Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики*, 2(2).
 28. Umarova, M. (2022). THE IMPORTANCE OF STUDENTS OPTIONS WHILE LEARNING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN THE UZBEK EDUCATION SYSTEM. *Involta Scientific Journal*, 1(4), 239-251.
 29. Usmanova, S. (2022). Interpretation of the Image of Woman in English Enlightenment Literature. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE*, 3(4), 19-24.
 30. Усманова, С. С. (2021). ЧЎЛПОН ВА С. РИЧАРДСОН РОМАНЛАРИДА БАДИИЯТ МУАММОЛАРИ. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 4(1-1).