Grammar teaching pedagogy has been rigorously reconceptualised as a result of perpetual shift from one teaching method to another. A number of dimensions dichotomizing grammar teaching approach appears in response to the disparate degrees of grammar positioning in second or foreign language teaching. This paper attempts to rationalize that grammar teaching for adult learners in Indonesian non-formal educational context is more appropriately approached through the deductive and explicit teaching. The presented rationale is substantiated from the literature drawing upon theoretical basis of English language teaching (ELT) as well as my professional practice as an English teacher in the referred context. The findings reveal that there is a broad spectrum of variables to determine how grammar teaching is contextually approached. This paper specifically addresses language complexity gap and language needs as two determinants in implementing the deductive-inductive and explicit-implicit grammar teaching for Indonesian EFL adult learners. Two examples of classroom activities are presented as the contextual manifestation of deductive and explicit grammar teaching approach. The implication for EFL grammar teaching indicates the necessity to consider the context-bound determinants prior to putting a particular grammar teaching approach into practice.
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Introduction

The perpetual development of English language teaching methodology in the last five decades has significantly impinged on the positioning of grammar in language teaching and learning. Disparate degrees of the importance of teaching grammar exist across teaching methodologies due to the discrepant pedagogical principles underpinning them. In general, the literatures indicate that there is a split in the conceptualization of the role of grammar in the English as a foreign language (EFL) field. One end of this continuum, which Fotos and Ellis (1991) refers to as the zero position, is regarded as the anti-grammarian. Language teaching methodologists, such as Krashen (1983) and Terrell (1977), taking this stance believe that language learners are able to acquire language naturally without any grammar intervention during language acquisition process.

Krashen (1983), in favour of the natural approach, argues that learners subconsciously acquire mastery of the target language providing that they are sufficiently exposed to comprehensible input. He further maintains that this non-interventionist acquisition process drives forward the development of formal language rules through meaning-rich language exposure in natural communication. In the same vein, Terrell (1977) argues that in the natural approach learners are provided with ample opportunities to acquire foreign language through a wide a range of communicative activities where error correction is avoided and learners are allowed to respond in both their first language (L1) and the target language (L2). Having exposed to the comprehensible input through communicative activities engagement, learners are considered able to proceduralize – being able to operate and function effectively without necessarily being able to state the rules (Hulstijn, 2005) – and subsequently internalize language features facilitated by innate cognitive processing.

In the naturalist view, formal grammar instruction is considered unnecessary for the acquisition of linguistic competence especially grammar competence in a foreign language. However, recent studies reveal that attending largely on comprehensible input and comprehensible input only does not promote language accuracy development. For example is Fotos and Ellis’s (1991) work on juxtaposing the traditional teacher-fronted grammar lesson and the communicative grammar task lesson in terms of language accuracy attainment. Subjects of the study were given a pretest prior to treatments commencement, a posttest at the end of the treatments, and a final test which was conducted two weeks after the treatments. The findings revealed that in terms of language accuracy the former group gained a 14% net increase whereas the latter group gained only 10% net increase after given the treatments. It indicates that exposing learners to comprehensible input does not consequentially impact on learner’s accuracy development, and hence there should be another alternative in approaching teaching grammar.

The other end of the continuum is regarded as the pro-grammarian. From this standpoint grammar is considered to play a central role in foreign language learning. Although fluency-oriented approaches, for example the natural approach and the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach, do promote the target language fluency development, there are certain points where L2 learners are unable to attain high level language accuracy without formal and explicit grammar instruction especially within acquisition-poor environment (Lightbown & Spada, 2008; Nazari &
Allahyar, 2012). Therefore, grammar, which Perez-Llantada and Larsen-Freeman (2007) regard as the fifth skill in addition to the other four productive and receptive language skills, should be formally instructed and should constitute one of the key components in L2 learning.

An example of language teaching methodology epitomizing this view is the grammar-translation method. It is characterized by prioritizing accuracy over fluency and language learning occurring at the sentence level. Proponents taking this side, such as Chastain (as cited in Larsen-Freeman, 2000), have substantiated the importance of grammar teaching in L2 learning. However, there is also a number of evidence that attending only the language form does not accommodate language fluency development inasmuch as L2 learners are unable to proceduralize language form into communicative language use.

For example, a study conducted by Burgess and Etherington (2002) attempted to investigate several challenges and outcomes in the implementation of formal grammar instruction from teacher perspective. The study involved 12 teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) teachers in English for academic purposes (EAP) in British universities. This program was attended by international students whose first language was not English. It was revealed that the subjects of the research affirmed that formal language instruction well-equipped L2 learners only in terms of declarative language knowledge – being able to explicitly verbalize the language rules (Hulstijn, 2005) – but not their procedural knowledge. Krashen (1999) argues that such artificial acquisition experienced by L2 learners leads to consciously learned competence that will eventually fade over time. Inasmuch as the pro-grammarians pedagogy fails to serve the very core of L2 learning which is enabling learners to function fluently and accurately in the target language, there is a need of a reconciliation between the two ends of the continuum.

This study substantiates that the manifestation of grammar teaching in Indonesian EFL context falls somewhere in between the continuum. As illustrated in Figure 1, this positioning is regarded as a determinant-based grammarian in which it is believed that a number of determinants impacts on the practical application of grammar teaching. Proponents standing for this side, for example Corzo (2013), Fotos (1993), Fotos and Ellis (1991), and Widodo (2010), argue that formal grammar instruction is potential in providing both direct and indirect effects to L2 acquisition. Celce-Murcia (1985, 1991) has attempted to offer a framework of reference from which language teachers can determine to what extent grammar is appropriately and proportionally approached in L2 teaching and learning. It consists of two classifications of variables which are the learner variables and the instructional variables. The former encompasses age, proficiency level, and educational background whereas the latter encompasses language skills, register, and language needs. These specific variables, in line with Kumaravadivelu’s (2006) conceptualization on particularity parameter of post-method pedagogy, are fundamental to consider before putting grammar instruction into classroom practice.

![Figure 1. Positioning of determinant-based grammarian](image-url)
This study primarily draws attention to theoretical bases, empirical findings as well as professional practices in the EFL discipline. The scope of context, in accordance with my professional practice in EFL teaching, is the non-formal educational institutions in the municipality of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Firstly, it presents the broad spectrum of dimensions in the teaching of grammar, and afterwards limits its scope to the deductive-inductive and explicit-implicit dimensions of grammar teaching. Secondly, it substantiates two determinants in approaching grammar teaching. They are the language complexity gap and the language learning needs. Thirdly, it exemplifies two activities manifesting deductive and explicit grammar teaching approaches. Finally, it provides the summation and implications to EFL teaching as well as direction for future research.

Dimensions of EFL Grammar Teaching

The manifestation of grammar teaching in EFL is presumably differently interpreted across contexts. Even if two contexts share similar pedagogic fundamentals, grammar teaching is highly likely to be approached in different ways. Proponents in the EFL discipline have attempted to pinpoint the broad spectrum of grammar teaching dimensions as illustrated in Figure 2. For example, Ellis (2006) identifies that in its practice grammar can be approached through the intensive-extensive dimension (cf. Corzo, 2013), the mass-distributed dimension, and the integrated-separated dimension (cf. Afsar & Rasheed, 2010). Ghabanchi (2010) and Hulstijn (2005) further add the incidental-intentional dimension. However, a myriad of discussions on the grammar teaching approach has been addressed to the deductive-inductive dimension (see Felder & Henriques, 1995; Fischer, 1979; Haight, Herron & Cole, 2007; Krashen, 1975; Mohamed, 2004; Mohammed & Jaber, 2008; Seliger, 1975; Shaffer, 1989) and the explicit-implicit dimension (see Burgess and Etherington, 2002; Corzo, 2013; DeKeyser, 1997; Doughty, 2008; Fotos, 1993; Fotos & Ellis, 1991; Garrett, 2003; Lightbown & Spada, 2008; Mohammed & Jaber, 2008; Montgomery & Eisenstein, 1985; Scott, 1989, 1990; Widodo, 2010).

![Figure 2. Dimensions of grammar teaching approaches](image-url)
The study is directed to cater the deductive-inductive and explicit-implicit dimensions of grammar teaching especially in Indonesian context. Majority of empirical studies on EFL grammar teaching in relevant dimensions have been conducted, yet only a little has been framed within the Indonesian EFL context. Therefore, this study supplements the concurrent discussions and enlightens the role of particular determinants in the applicability of the deductive-inductive as well as the explicit-implicit grammar teaching approaches in the Indonesian EFL context. At this point, it is useful to set bases on some terminologies that are used throughout this study.

With regard to deductive-inductive dimension of grammar teaching and learning, Seliger (1975) substantiates the former as the direct abstraction of rules that occurs at the beginning of the lesson whereas the latter as formulating abstraction through inferencing that takes place at a later stage of the lesson. In addition, Haight, Herron and Cole (2007) characterizes that the former features the emphasis on formal grammar component and its analysis before comprehension of meaning and, if there is at all, communicative practice. They typify that the latter, on the contrary, prioritizes comprehension of meaning and communicative language practice over grammar focus at the level of sentence. Inasmuch as the inductive approach allots more time comprehension of meaning and communicative practice, abstraction of grammar rules through inferencing tends to be more holistic than that of the deductive approach.

As for the explicit-implicit dimension of grammar teaching and learning, Scott (1990) argues that an explicit approach is a ‘deliberate study of grammar rule … in order to organize linguistic elements efficiently and accurately’ (p. 779) whereas an implicit approach ‘suggests that students should be exposed to grammatical structures in a meaningful and comprehensible context in order that they may acquire, as naturally as possible, the grammar of the target language’ (p. 779). Furthermore, Corzo (2013) typifies in the explicit approach that the use of metalinguistic terminologies is prerequisite and that controlled practice using the target structure is present at certain phase during the lesson in the explicit approach. She additionally maintains that in the implicit approach, on the contrary, the use of metalanguage is avoided and learners are encouraged to deploy free use of language form.

**Language Complexity Gap Determinant**

Determining the inclination of deductive-inductive and explicit-implicit dimensions in the case of Indonesian EFL context takes into account the complexity gap between the English and Indonesian languages. Either deductive or inductive approach is applicable depending on the learner proficiency, yet explicit grammar teaching is integral in the case of Indonesian EFL learning. The explicit grammar teaching is vital due to a number of English linguistic features that lack of direct correspondences in the Indonesian language system. Twaddell (1962) identifies this as ‘conflicts between the learner’s native language and that of the foreign language’ (p. 19). He contends that the conflicts are sourced from the differences in grammar category and grammar machinery of the languages.

Table 1 exemplifies several gaps that exist between the English and Indonesian languages. The lack of corresponding lexico-grammatical items and the dissimilar syntax of sentence formation pose potential negative transfer from L1 to L2. This is due to that the L1 does not provide a readily applicable language template to that of
L2. Relying predominantly on how L1 works in order to infer the way L2 works, learners are prone to overgeneralizing grammar rules from their implicit language processing (Lightbown & Spada, 1993). Implicit abstraction of grammar rules through the absence of these correspondences at some points becomes exhaustive and less analytical. Even worse, learners can arrive at the inaccurate formulation of language regularities and subsequently internalize these erroneous conceptualization giving direct impacts on their overall fluency in the language production. No matter how effortful learners attempt to infer the grammar of the foreign language, explicit language instruction is essential to fill this gap. In other words, the absence of corresponding linguistic components as well as their functions in sentence formation call for an explicit grammar teaching approach in which learner’s attention to specific language regularities is deliberately drawn (Batstone & Ellis, 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indonesian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammatical Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary Verbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Be is, am, are, was, were, been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Modals can, could, may, might, etc.</td>
<td>Lack of correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 do, does, did</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 have, has, had</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verb Forms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Base/Inf.</td>
<td>jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Present</td>
<td>jump/jumps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Past</td>
<td>jumped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Past Part.</td>
<td>jumped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pres. Part.</td>
<td>jumping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural Markers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 -s pens, lamps, books, etc.</td>
<td>Lack of correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 -es glasses, boxes, watches, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammatical Machinery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject and Verb Agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 I eat.</td>
<td>1 Aku makan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 They eat.</td>
<td>2 Mereka makan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 He eats.</td>
<td>3 Dia makan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenses Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Present simple tense</td>
<td>1 Present form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She eats.</td>
<td>Dia makan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Present continuous tense</td>
<td>2 Present (on going) form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is eating.</td>
<td>Dia sedang makan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Past simple tense</td>
<td>3 Past form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She ate (yesterday).</td>
<td>Dia makan (kemarin).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive Voice</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
She wrote the book.
The book was written by her.

I bought the flowers.
The flowers were bought by me.

He has watered the tree.
The tree has been watered by him.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Indonesian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She write the book.</td>
<td>Dia <em>menulis</em> buku itu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The book was written by her.</td>
<td><em>Buku itu ditulis oleh dia.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I bought the flowers.</td>
<td>Aku <em>membeli</em> bunga itu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The flowers were bought by me.</td>
<td><em>Bunga itu dibeli oleh aku.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He has watered the tree.</td>
<td>Dia telah <em>menyiram</em> pohon itu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tree has been watered by him.</td>
<td><em>Pohon itu telah disiram oleh dia.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Contrastive analysis of grammatical category and grammatical machinery between English and Indonesian

One example from Table 1 is the passive voice sentence formation. The basic formulaic pattern of English passive voice requires the presence of copula *be* and the past participle verb form. This pattern is also subject to the changes of English tenses. As seen in the example of English passive voice sentence 2, in which the simple past tense is used, the corresponding copula *be* is *was*, in agreement with subject *he*, followed by the irregular past participle form of *take* which is *taken*. In the case of example sentence 3, in which the present perfect simple is used, the corresponding copula *be* changes into *been* and this is mandatory preceded by perfect tenses auxiliary *has* which is in agreement with the subject of the passive sentence *the car* instead of *they*. Here L2 learners often mistakenly use the perfect tenses auxiliary *have* which is in agreement with *they* instead of *the car*. However, as *they* is replaced by *the car* as the subject in the passive sentence, the correct present perfect auxiliary verb is *has* instead of *have*.

In comparison to the Indonesian passive voice formation, the Indonesian syntax does not necessitate the subject and verb agreement in its sentence structure as there is only one verb form which is the base form. Additionally, Indonesian syntax does not correspond to English grammatical category of auxiliary verbs. Even though the position of subject and object is swapped, there is no need to bother putting the correct auxiliary verb in accordance with the tenses used in the passive sentence formation. Accordingly, the formation of passive voice only requires an alteration of prefix *me-* into prefix *di-* on the base verb, regardless of the tenses changes, and is optionally followed by the word *oleh* indicating the doer of the action after the action verb.

From the outlined example above, it is observable that language complexity gap between English and Indonesian is considerably significant. The absence of certain linguistic features and formulaic patterns in Indonesian language insists on the presence of explicit and conscious English grammar learning. Fischer (1979) plainly puts it that:

> If the foreign language rule is of equal or greater complexity than the native language rule, it should be presented in a setting in which the student is prevented from using his knowledge of the native language, since the native language rule will be of little help, and, in fact, can be an obstacle in his attempt to understand the foreign language rule. (p. 100)
Moreover, attending formal language features through the explicit grammar teaching approach ensures that learners comprehend the foundation of language declarative knowledge which is utilized in the productive language skills at the later stage of the lesson. Such emphasis prevents the erroneous concept formation of the declarative language knowledge which results in the fossilization of inaccurate language use (Lightbown & Spada, 2008).

However, as the learners gradually accumulate the structure of a language as a whole (Wilkins, 1976, as cited in East, 2012) and develop a set of proficient language skills and fluent communicative competences, grammar teaching moves away from deductive to inductive manner. Relying on their previously acquired declarative knowledge through deductive and explicit manner, learners with higher language proficiencies are able to inductively make distinctions on language irregularities conflicting with former learning. Provided with the substantial foundation of syntactical structure constructing the formation of a language through explicit approach, learners acquire the grammatical feature of the language in a more manageable chunks. Moreover, they are prevented from overgeneralizing certain rules as they are aware of particular irregularities where the rules do not apply.

Language Needs Determinant

In the referred context, language learning is identified to serve several purposes. To name a few, it can be directed towards attaining performance indicators emphasizing language fluency development such as conversational programs, it can accommodate the development of language fluency as well as language accuracy through general English classes, and it can also be strictly intended for preparing learners to attain certain thresholds of standardized sit-in assessments such as TOEFL, IELTS, and other independent institutional testing. This is not to mention several other language learning orientations requiring English for specific purpose (ESP) course designs. In Littlewood’s (2004, 2007) conceptualization, as illustrated in Figure 3, these learning orientations fall somewhere along the continuum of focus on form and focus on meaning. The apparent identification that language learning serves various purposes calls for different approaches in the teaching of grammar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus on forms</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>Focus on meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-communicative learning</td>
<td>Pre-communicative language practice</td>
<td>Communicative language practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on the structures of language, how they are formed and what they mean, e.g., substitution exercises, ‘discovery’ and awareness-raising activities</td>
<td>Practising language with some attention to meaning but not communicating new messages to others, e.g., ‘question-and-answer’ practice</td>
<td>Practising pre-taught language in a context where it communicates new information, e.g., information-gap activities or ‘personalized’ questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. The continuum of focus on forms and focus on meaning
For example, we can draw attention to general EFL classes requiring the learners to attain performance indicators on both language fluency and language accuracy. In reference to Littlewood’s continuum, the nature of the language learning needs fall between the pre-communicative language practice and the structured communication. Inasmuch as the focus is to balance the development of language fluency and accuracy, the teaching of grammar is more appropriately approached through explicit induction. In classroom practice, this can be operationalized from the classic presentation-practice-production (PPP) procedure (see Klapper, 2003; Harmer 2015). The inductive approach is intended to develop learner’s language fluency in that they are given opportunities to use the target structure in a semi-controlled setting. As for promoting learner’s language accuracy development, the intervention of explicit approach is regarded essential to raise consciousness on particular target structures. Learner’s meta-inventory development resourcing from the explicit instruction is then proceduralized in the language production phase where teacher intervention is at minimal level and the use of the target structure is not strictly restricted.

This is in accordance with a study conducted by Montgomery and Eisenstein (1985) which investigated the impacts of formal instruction and communicative exposure to learners’ language performance. The study involved twenty-eight participants who were divided into two groups. The first one, the control group, was a traditional teacher-fronted English as a second language (ESL) class. Its emphasis was developing grammatical accuracy through the implementation of grammar-based syllabus. The second one, the experimental group, was treated under the combination of the traditional ESL class and the oral communicative course (OCC). In addition to having exposed to the grammar-based procedure in the ESL class, the OCC participants were also exposed to the task-based learning framework characterized by the pre-task, on-task, and post-task phases. At the end of the treatments, pretest and posttest covering five separate items which were accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension were used as instruments of analysis.

The results indicated that both the OCC group and the traditional ESL class performed relatively equal in terms of comprehension, vocabulary and fluency development. Interestingly, the traditional ESL class was outperformed by the OCC group in grammatical accuracy development. It signifies that the explicit grammar teaching approach in the ESL class serves as input for the meta-inventory from which the learners are able to retrieve and self-monitor their performance during OCC sessions. Furthermore, the inductive nature of the OCC sessions functions as a validation of the previously learned target structures in the form of language production. This strengthens the retention of concepts for later retrieval and leads to automatization (DeKeyser, 1997). In other words, the explicit inductive approach is potential to foster EFL class of which language learning needs necessitate the development of not only language fluency but also language accuracy.

**Contextualized Grammar Game**

Grammar point presentation through contextualized grammar game serves a range of functions. First, the fact that there is a number of lacks of correspondence between the native and the foreign languages in a way overwhelms the learners’ state of anxiety. As language anxiety significantly prevents learners from acquiring a new language (Boarcas, 2014), the deployment of grammar games strategy is intended to lower the
learners’ anxiety level impacting on learners’ perception about learning the new language. Dornyei and Csizer (2005, as cited in Thekes, 2011) further emphasize the importance of creating a relaxed and entertaining atmosphere in order to maintain learners’ learning motivation nurturing the sustainability of learning over a period of time.

Secondly, the deployment of contextualized grammar games strategy is intended to anticipate the predisposition that explicit grammar teaching is predominantly characterized by greater inclination towards teacher-centredness. In fact, classroom games are designed to foster students’ engagement in learning and to break the teacher-learner and learner-learner gaps where learners are given the opportunities to be cognitively, socially, and at times physically, involved in the activities. It means that they are able to collaborate and contribute more to their own learning. Furthermore, Marsh, Clarke and Pittaway (2015) identify several advantages in utilizing games as one teaching strategy; they promote more students’ engagement; they encourage students’ self-development; they enable the students to communicate more confidently; and they allow concepts to be more easily understood. In other words, taking some considerations on the frequency, variety and communicative purposes, contextualized grammar teaching promotes effective language learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Inventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language points</td>
<td>Passive voice: Simple past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Paired utterances race</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Language prerequisites | • Past participle verb forms (regular and irregular)  
• Passive voice formation (question and answer) particularly using the simple past tense |
| Prior knowledge | General knowledge about major and popular inventions nationally and internationally |
| Aims | • Raise awareness on:  
  a. Form  
  S + be + Verb III (+ doer)  
  b. Meaning  
  Reporting historical events  
  c. Use  
  Inventions  
• Exemplify the real-world application of the target language use |
| Target learners | Adults |
| Proficiency level | Lower intermediate (CEFR A2 or B1) |

Table 2. Example of contextualized grammar game

Having presented the target language explicitly in the initial stage of the lesson, this contextualized grammar game (refer details to Table 2) gives opportunities for the students to mobilize their declarative knowledge of the target language into procedural knowledge. In general, the nature of this activity manifests Paulston’s (1971) structural pattern drill. On one hand, the nature of the game resembles Paulston’s mechanical drill in which the degree of control of students’ responses is considerably convergent and, therefore, it makes the responses using the target language containing particular syntactical pattern and lexical items predictable. On the other hand, this game also exhibits characteristics of meaningful drill in which language is not presented in isolation of context. Instead, it contextualizes the language into real-world setting which promotes a higher degree of retention by
associating the presented target language into its context. Directing the students to attend the two orientations, students are enabled to notice, internalize and automate the presented target language and proceed to a more communicative language practice utilizing the target language as one chunk of the broader language use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s questions</th>
<th>Students’ responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Do you usually watch quiz programmes on TV?</em></td>
<td>The expected answer is: Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Can you name some of the programmes?</em></td>
<td>• <em>Family Feud</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Who Wants to be a Millionaire</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and so forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>What sort of questions are being asked?</em></td>
<td><em>General knowledge</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Examples of guided questions leading students to the intended context

As for the procedure, this activity is conducted in groups and, therefore, is competitive in nature. Before assigning the students into groups, the teacher gives guided questions leading to intended context about invention. Some examples of the guided questions are presented in Table 3. The teacher then refines using further leading questions to arrive at the intended context which is a quiz about world inventions. After the students understand what they are about to do, the teacher assigns them into groups for the competition. In order to ensure the competition flows as expected, the teacher gives an example from the slides (see Appendix 1). For example, from the slide in Figure 4 students are expected to generate a pair of utterances consisting of a question and its corresponding answer. The expected question is ‘*Who was the Romeo and Juliet written by?*’ and the expected answer is ‘*It was written by William Shakespeare.*’ The students are expected to produce sentences that are syntactically correct and in correspondence to general knowledge truth.

Figure 4. Example of slide for the past simple passive invention game

**Grammar Contrast Practice**

As learners accumulate manageable chunks of language through the explicit deductive approach, the learners are prepared to engage meaningful analysis of the language
through a more inductive approach (Celce-Murcia, 1985). Explicit explanations are present only when necessary, especially when erroneous structural formation occurs, as the learners have noticed and developed the sense of awareness on formal language features. Activating their formal language awareness enables them to analyze the contrast of similar grammar points serving different communicative functions. Therefore, the learners are expected to perceive the language holistically, in which they focus predominantly on meaning (Huang, 2010), and analytically, in which they are enabled to break down the formal language rule rooting from the previously acquired explicit learning (Fischer, 1979), at the same time.

In this activity (refer details to Table 4), it is mandatory that the language prerequisites are met. The language prerequisites not only raise the awareness on contrasted forms but also attend the communicative meanings of the formal language forms. The future simple using ‘will’ in this case serves as the sudden decisions and unsure predictions communicative functions whereas the present continuous ‘be going to’ serves as the future intentions and sure predictions communicative functions. The blend of mechanical and meaningful analytical drilling shifts the students’ focus merely on attending the formal language features being practiced to the contextual meaning of the sentences (Wolfe, 1967, as cited in Strain, 1968). Consequently, both language accuracy and fluency which become the fundamental goal of language learning are accommodated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language points</th>
<th>Future simple and present continuous tenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Sentence completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prerequisites</td>
<td>Previous learning on the meaning of simple future and present continuous tenses covering:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>a. Sudden decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prerequisites</td>
<td>b. Future intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>c. Unsure predictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prerequisites</td>
<td>d. Sure predictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Raise awareness on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Forms</td>
<td>Future simple ➔ will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present continuous ➔ be + going to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Meanings</td>
<td>Sudden decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure predictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sure predictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exemplify the real-world application of the target language use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target learners</td>
<td>Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>Intermediate (CEFR B1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Example of grammar contrast practice

As for the procedure, the teacher begins with a review on the language prerequisites. This is intended to check students’ conceptualization on the target languages by assigning them to inductively infer and re-articulate the formal language rules. It is essential that explicit explanations, either from the teacher or from peer elicitation, are
present when there are misconceptualizations on certain features. After activating students’ prior knowledge, the teacher proceeds to drawing the students’ attention to the two contrasted language forms serving four communicative meanings represented in Table 4. The teacher then elicit some examples representing one or two of the practiced communicative functions.

One example is as the following:

7. There is a blind man walking towards a hole. He ____________.

From the item presented above, the students analyze which of the two language forms is more appropriate to continue the sentence in the given context. After deciding which language form is more appropriate, the students are expected to be aware of the communicative function it elicits. The students attempt to infer that the sentence following the presented item is ‘He is going to fall into the hole.’ Furthermore, the students are expected to be able to provide a brief explanation on the use of the present continuous form serving as a sure prediction communicative function.

**Conclusion**

In summary, this study has attempted to enlighten the conceptualization of grammar teaching in the EFL discipline especially in the light of different teaching methodologies. It is revealed that the pedagogical tenets of these methodologies position grammar at certain degrees of importance in its practical realization. In a continuum, the anti-grammarians end, for example the natural approach, maintains that grammar focus is less, even the least, of significance in language acquisition. It views that consciously attending grammar is not an integral part in acquiring a target language. On the other end, the pro-grammarians maintains that grammar constitutes one of the language fundamentals. Hence, it defends that deliberate attention drawn to the formal language features significantly contributes to the acquisition of a fluent and accurate target language. This study, however, argues that the practical realization of grammar teaching falls somewhere in between the continuum where there are a number of determinants coming into play.

Two, out of many other, determinants affecting the deductive-inductive and explicit-implicit realization of grammar teaching for adult EFL learners in Indonesia are substantiated in this study. The first is the language complexity gap between L1 and L2. In Indonesian EFL context, the lack of direct correspondences in the grammar category and grammar machinery between Indonesian and English necessitates the presence of explicit grammar teaching approach. As for the deductive-inductive dimension, it essentially depends on the learner proficiency level. The second determinant is the language learning needs. Inasmuch as EFL learning serves a range of different purposes in Indonesian non-formal educational context, these purposes call for different approaches in order to meet their language output expectations.

This study has implication in the EFL teaching and learning practice. Examining two determinants affecting the implementation of deductive-inductive and explicit-implicit grammar teaching approach in the Indonesian EFL context, this study can be a useful reference especially for teachers, practitioners, and researchers in the EFL discipline. It contributes to enlightening how grammar is conceptualized and
positioned in teaching practice across contexts. Language teachers, who become intermediaries between theories and practice, are expected to observe, analyze, implement, and evaluate certain practices of grammar teaching approaches from which they can accelerate the acquisition of a foreign language. Being aware of the extensive context-bound particularities, such as the presented determinants, interplaying in the teaching and learning process, teachers are enabled to make well-informed decisions with regard to the sole purpose of learning a language.

Further literature research in the light of determinant-based grammar teaching can be directed towards exploring whether other determinants such as learning culture, learner educational background, language skills, and language register play a role in grammar teaching approach decision making. The scope can also be broadened to cater the broad spectrum of intensive-extensive, intentional-incidental, integrated-separated, and massed-distributed grammar teaching dimensions. In addition, inasmuch as this work grounds basis on secondary data analysis, further research can also be navigated towards conducting empirical investigations. The empirical research is intended to validate whether the outlined determinants affect the learner’s language comprehension and production and to what extent they affect the acquisition of a foreign language.
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Appendix 1 Contextualized grammar game [PowerPoint slides]
All the images in the PowerPoint slides were sourced from google image search database.

Slide 1

INVENTIONS

Slide 2

WRITE/BY?

ROMEO+JULIET
Slide 7

WRITE BY?

Slide 8

COMPOSE BY?

Indonesia Raya

Do = G
4/4 Wacita Con Breuna

[Music notation]

[Text transcription]
Appendix 2 Contextualized grammar game [Key answers]

Slide 1 Title : INVENTION
Slide 2 Question : Who was the Romeo and Juliet written by?
Answer : It was written by William Shakespeare.
Slide 3 Question : Who was the telephone invented by?
Answer : It was invented by Alexander Graham Bell.
Slide 4 Question : Who was the light bulb invented by?
Answer : It was invented by Thomas Alfa Edison.
Slide 5 Question : Who was the Apple Inc. established by?
Answer : It was established by Steve Jobs.
Slide 6 Question : Who was the gravity theory formulated by?
Answer : It was formulated by Isaac Newton.
Slide 7 Question : Who was the ‘Habis Gelap Terbitlah Terang’ written by?
Answer : It was written by Raden Ajeng Kartini.
Slide 8 Question : Who was the Indonesia Raya anthem composed by?
Answer : It was composed by Wage Rudolf Supratman.
Slide 9 Question : Who was the evolution theory stated by?
Answer : It was stated by Charles Darwin.
Slide 10 Question : Who was the Facebook created by?
Answer : It was created by Mark Zuckerberg.
Slide 11 Question : Who was the relativity theory formulated by?
Answer : It was formulated by Albert Einstein.
Slide 12 Question created by?
Answer : They were created by Walt Disney.
Slide 13 Question : Who was the Windows software created by?
Answer : It was created by Bill Gates.
Slide 14 Question : Who was the telescope designed by?
Answer : It was designed by Galileo Galilei.
Slide 15 Question : Who were the jeans engineered by?
Answer : They were engineered by Levi Strauss.
Slide 16 End : GAME OVER
1. I’m too tired to walk home. I think I __________ a taxi.
    B: Don’t worry. I __________ an aspirin for you.
3. It’s too late to give Tom a ring. I think ________ him tomorrow.
4. A: It’s a bit hot in this room.
    B: Is it? ________ turn on the AC then.
5. A: Did you write that letter to Jack?
    B: Oh, I forgot. Thanks for reminding me. I __________ it this evening.
6. A: Why are you filling that bucket with water?
    B: __________ wash the car.
7. The man is blind. There is a hole in front of him. He __________.
8. A: Have you phoned Tony?
    B: Not yet. I ____________ after lunch.
9. A: Tom has just bought a new painting.
    B: Really? Where ____________ hang it?
10. Ann is driving. There’s only a little petrol in the tank. The nearest gas station is long way away.
    I think she ____________.
11. Your palm says that you __________ marry young.
12. I think the house is on fire. I __________ the fire brigade.
13. A: Do you want to go to the park?
    B: I’m sorry I can’t. I __________ my grandparents.
14. Look at those black clouds! It ____________.
15. A: Have you bought a present for Sally?
    B: Yes, I have. I __________ her a perfume.
16. I feel a bit hungry. I think ________ something to eat.
17. I think Brazilian ________ win the match tomorrow.
18. A: Why do you want to sell your flat?
    B: I ________ move to Madrid
19. Have you heard the news? Jane ________ a baby!
20. A: Have you finished your report?
    B: No, I ________ stay late and finish it.
21. A: My bicycle has got a flat tyre. Can you fix it?
    B: Okay, but can’t do it today. I ________ tomorrow.
22. A: Why are you turning on the TV?
    B: I ________ watch the news.
23. Why don’t you change your hairstyle? You ________ look much better.
24. A: This box is very heavy.
    B: I ________ carry it for you.
25. Stop worrying about the exam. You ________ pass it easily.