ЎЗБЕКИСТОН РЕСПУБЛИКАСИ ОЛИЙ ВА ЎРТА МАХСУС ТАЪЛИМ ВАЗИРЛИГИ

ЎЗБЕКИСТОН ДАВЛАТ ЖАҲОН ТИЛЛАРИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТИ

ИНГЛИЗ ТИЛИ ЛЕКСИКОЛОГИЯСИ КАФЕДРАСИ

Алиева Шахрибону Валиқул қизи

инглиз тили 2- факультети 409 гуруҳ

A2 даражадаги грамматикани ўрганувчилар учун фойдали услубларнинг аҳамияти

5120100 – филология ва тиллар ўқитиш (инглиз тили) таълим йўналиши бўйича бакалавр даражасини олиш учун

БИТИРУВ МАЛАКАВИЙ ИШИ

“ҲИМОЯГА ТАВСИЯ ЭТИЛАДИ”
Инглиз тили лексикологияси кафедраси
мудири_____ Ж. Матякубов
2016 йил “____” _____

ИЛМИЙ РАҲБАР:
_____ Г.Турсунова
2016 йил “____” _____

Тошкент – 2016

MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

THE UZBEK STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY

THE ENGLISH LEXICOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Aliyeva Shaxribonu Valiqul qizi

English faculty- 2 group- 409

QUALIFICATION PAPER

Effective methods and principles in teaching grammar for A2 level learners

5120100-Philology and teaching languages (The English Language) for granting the bachelor's degree

THE QUALIFICATION PAPER IS ADMITTED TO DEFENSE
The head of the English Lexicology Department _____ Matyakubov J.

2016 "____" _____

SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR:
_____G.Tursunova
2016 "____"_____

TASHKENT-2016

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

On December 10, 2012 President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov signed a decree “On measures to further improve foreign language learning system”.

According to this decree, it is noted that in the framework of the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On education" and the National Programme for Training in the country, a comprehensive foreign languages’ teaching system, aimed at creating harmoniously developed, highly educated, modern-thinking young generation, further integration of the country to the world community, has been created. During the years of independence, over 51.7 thousand teachers of foreign languages graduated from universities, English, German and French multimedia tutorials and textbooks for 5-9 grades of secondary schools, electronic resources for learning English in primary schools were created, more than 5000 secondary schools, professional colleges and academic lyceums were equipped with language laboratories.

Conditions of reforming of all education System the question of the world – assistance to improvement of quality of scientific-theoretical aspect of educational process is especially actually put. As president Islam Karimov has declared in the Program speech “Harmoniously development of generation a basis of progress put today before us, noble aspiration it is necessary for updating society, today when we celebrating the 20 anniversary of the National Independence of our Motherland”. The effect destiny of our reforms carried out in the name of progress and future, results of our intentions are connected with highly skilled, conscious staff the experts who are meeting the requirements of time.[1]

Most familiar approaches to language teaching divide the language into manageable chunks, bite-sized grammar rules, which the teacher must somehow convey to the learner. Not everyone agrees that the best way to teach language

[1] И.А. Каримов Гармонично развитое поколение-основа прогресса Узбекистана. Ташкент.IWX.erp 156-168

is to cut it up into discrete items in this way, and some people even question the usefulness of teaching 'grammar' at all.

But, with few exceptions, teachers have a little choice in the matter. End-of-year examinations are often oriented towards an evaluations of the students' knowledge. Many students embark on a language learning course expecting to be taught the rules of grammar – similar to the rules of grammar that they studied their own language. Many, if not most, course books follow a clear grammar syllabus. Most teachers are trained to structure their teaching around these same rules of grammar. And if you go to any English language teaching website or online discussion, you will find that a large proportion of the questions are about teaching grammar.

Like it or hate it, grammar is a big part of most language teachers' jobs. The way that they present this grammar - the way they get it across to their students – will reflect their understanding of what is useful for their students. But there are many different way of presenting grammar, and need to select an approach that is right for a particular group of students on a particular day. No single method and no single course book can provide all the answer all the time. A number of English language teaching experts have made critical comments on grammar instruction. Byrd, Petrovitz and Nunan highlight the importance of contextualizing grammar. Collins, Hollo and Mar's critical analysis of English grammar books and language books used in Australia revealed a low level of awareness of developments.

The actuality of the grammar teaching has always been one of the most controversial and least understood aspects of language teaching. So during the years many experts are working on how to present grammar.

The novelty of the qualification is defined by concrete results of the investigations, special emphases is laid on different approaches, types of tests and new ways of teaching.

The aim of the qualification paper is to present grammar rules in a simple and

understandable way. As developed today, second language acquisition theory can be viewed as a part of "theoretical linguistics", i.e. it can be studied and developed without regard to practical application. As the case with any scientific theory, it consists of a set of *hypotheses*, or generalizations, that are consistent with experimental data. These hypotheses are arrived at using any of a variety of means. And In this research work how to teach English grammar and its significance aspects are analyzed.

According to this general aim the following tasks are put forward:

- English Teaching Experts' Opinion and Comments on Grammar Instruction
- The Role of Grammar Translational Methodology
- Current Approaches to Grammar Teaching
- Teaching Grammar Using Texts and Games
- Context Grammar Teaching
- How to Choose Texts
- Types of testing to Evaluate Students' Knowledge
- Test Items

The value of this paper is that it can be used as a theoretical material for teaching grammar and improve the students' knowledge, new methods can be used on the education system.

The structure of the given qualification paper consists of introduction, main part, conclusion and bibliography. Introduction tells us about the brief pilot of the paper and structure of the work. The main part of the work includes three chapters in it.

1.0. CHAPTER I Different Approaches to Teaching Grammar

1.1. Sophisticated Linguistics' Strategies about Grammar Instruction

English is perhaps the most studied language as far as the natural order hypothesis is concerned, and of all structures of English, morphology is the most studied. Brown (1973) was a language teaching expert. He reported that children acquiring English as a first language tended to acquire certain grammatical morphemes, or functions words, earlier than others. For example, the progressive marker *ing* (as in "He is play*ing* baseball".) and the plural marker /s/ ("two dog*s*") were among the first morphemes acquired, while the third person singular marker /s/ (as in "He live*s* in New York") and the possessive /s/ ("John'*s* hat") were typically acquired much later, coming anywhere from six months to one year later. de Villiers and de Villiers (1973) confirmed Brown's longitudinal results cross-sectionally , showing that items that Brown found to be acquired earliest in time were also the ones that children tended to get right more often. In other words, for those morphemes studied, the difficulty order was similar to the acquisition order. Brown's results were published, Dulay and Burt (1974, 1975) reported that children acquiring English as a second language also show a "natural order" for grammatical morphemes, regardless of their first language. The child second language order of acquisition was different from the first language order, but different groups of second language acquirers showed striking similarities. Dulay and Burt's results have been confirmed by a number of investigators (Kessler and Idar, 1977; Fabris, 1978; Makino, 1980). Dulay and Burt used a subset of the 14 morphemes Brown originally investigated. Fathman (1975) confirmed the reality of the natural order in child second language acquisition with her test of oral production, the SLOPE test, which probed 20 different structures.

"Grammar", a term which will use as a synonym for conscious learning, has two possible roles in the second language teaching program. First, it can be used with some profit as a Monitor. We will discuss this use in more detail in the section that follows. A second use for grammar is as subject-matter, or for "language appreciation"

(sometimes called "linguistics").

Neither role is essential, neither is the central part of the pedagogical program, but both have their functions.[2]

Several issues will be discussed in relation to teaching grammar for Monitor use: *when* rules can be used, *which* rules should or can be learned, what the *effects* of Monitor use are, and what we can expect in terms of Monitor efficiency.

According to the Monitor model for performance, conscious learning acts as an editor, as a Monitor, "correcting" the errors, or rather what the performer perceives to be errors, in the output of the acquired system. This can happen before the sentence is spoken or written, or after. Conscious knowledge of rules is therefore not responsible for our fluency, it does not initiate utterances. A very important point that also needs to be stated is that leaning does not "turn into" acquisition. The idea that we first learn a new rule, and eventually, through practice, acquire it, is widespread and may seem to some people to be intuitively obvious.

There is no necessity for previous conscious knowledge of a rule. (The trivial sense in which a conscious rule might "help" language acquisition is if the performer used a rule as a Monitor, and consistently applied it to his own output. Since we understand our own output, part of that performer's comprehensible input would include utterances with that structure. When the day came when that performer was "ready" to acquire this already learned rule, his own performance of it would qualify as comprehensible input at "*i + 1*". In other words, selfstimulation!) In addition to the fact that the theory does not directly predict that learning needs to precede acquisition, there are very good reasons for maintaining this position that emerge from observing second language performers.

We often see acquisition in cases where learning never occurred. There are many performers who can use complex structures in a second language who do not

---

[2] Stephen D Krashen Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. University of Southern California. p.89

know the rule consciously and never did. There have been several case histories in the second language acquisition literature that illustrate this phenomenon.

Evelyn Hatch's students, Cindy Stafford and Ginger Covitt, interviewed one such second language performer, "V", an ESL student at UCLA, who exhibited considerable competence in English, but who admitted that he had conscious control of very few, if any, rules. The following exchanges come from an interview with "V", which takes place while one of the authors is reviewing his composition errors (from Stafford and Covitt, 1978; also quoted in Krashen, 1978):

Interviewer: (When you write a composition)... do you think of grammar rules?

Do you think "Should I have used the present tense here or would the present continuous be better..."

V: "I don't refer to the books and all that, you know. I just refer it to this, uh, my judgment and... sensing if I'm writing it right or wrong. Because I really don't know... what where exactly how... the grammatical rules work out.

Later in the interview, one investigator asks:

Interviewer: Do you think grammar rules are useful?

V: Useful? Yeah. When you want to write they are very useful.

Interviewer: But you don't use them when you write.

V: Yeah, I know. I don't use them... I don't know how to use them.

Another good example of an "under-user" of the conscious grammar is Hung, studied by Cohen and Robbins (1976), who stated:

"I never taught any grammar. I guess I just never learned the rules that well. I know that every time I speak it's pretty correct, so I never think about grammars. I just

write down whatever I feel like it. Everytime I write something I just stop thinking. I don't know which (rule) to apply".

Not only is what Hung says revealing, but so is *how* he says it. There are, for sure, errors in this passage, but there is also control of fairly complex syntax and a real ability for self-expression. (Not all under-users succeed, of course; see, for example, Schumann's description of Alberto in Schumann (1978a).) If conscious rules have to come first, how can we explain cases such as V, Hung, and others? (For other case histories, see Krashen, 1978; Stafford and Covitt, 1978; Kounin and Krashen 1978.) Unless all cases such as these can be shown to be instances of the use of the first language or routines and patterns the existence of such cases show that previous conscious learning is not necessary for language acquisition.

We also see learning that never seems to become acquisition. Many fine ESL performers, while they have acquired a great deal of English, also know many conscious rules. They nevertheless make what they consider to be "careless" errors on rules that are linguistically quite straightforward. This occurs when the performer has learned a rule, but has not acquired it. This happens typically with late-acquired items, such as the third person singular ending on regular verbs in English ("He goes to work every day."). What is particularly interesting is that these performers may have known the rule and have practiced it for many years. Even after thousands of correct repetitions, and with a thorough understanding of the rule, such performers still make "careless" mistakes on certain items. A case history that illustrates this situation very well is that of "P" (Krashen and Pon, 1975). P was an excellent Monitor user (an optimal user), an adult with a BA in Linguistics with honors, whose written English appeared nearly native-like. In casual conversation, however, P made occasional "careless" errors on "easy" rules that she had known consciously for twenty years. Thus, even well-learned, well-practiced rules may not turn into acquisition. An explanation of P's problem is that the items she missed in casual conversation were those that are late-acquired, and her acquisition, while very advanced, had simple not gone the final few steps in syntax and morphology. She had learned the rules well,

however, and was able to supply them under conditions where she could Monitor. A third reason for doubting that acquisition requires previous learning is the fact that even the best learners master only a small subset of the rules of a language. Even professional linguists admit that their conscious knowledge of even the best studied languages is imperfect, and discoveries of new rules are reported with every issue of technical journals in linguistic theory. Linguists often succeed in describing, after years of analysis, what many second language performers have already acquired. My explanation for these phenomena is that while learning may often precede acquisition, it need not, and in fact may not even help directly. Rather, we acquire along a fairly predictable natural order, and this occurs when we receive comprehensible input. Occasionally, we learn certain rules before we acquire them, and this gives us the illusion that the learning actually caused the acquisition. Professional language teachers, with their fascination for the structure of language, and with the pleasure they derive from the mastery and use of conscious rules, are often not even aware that acquisition without prior conscious learning is possible. This was my unexamined assumption as well. The procedure described earlier seemed right and reasonable to me at one time: language learning, in the general sense, occurred when one first consciously grasped a rule, then practiced it again and again until it was "automatic".(This is actually deductive learning; there is another possibility, namely, "inductive" learning; see discussion below.) The great contribution of linguistics was to discover and describe rules, which "applied linguists" could transmit to language teachers, who, in turn, could tell students about them.

Krashen said: “One experience that helped to change my thinking occurred when I was teaching English as a second language to an "advanced" adult education class at Queens College. As a member of a team, my responsibility was "structure". Since I was, at the time, the director of the English Language Institute at Queens, I felt obliged to present an impressive series of lessons that demonstrated my control of the subject. I therefore chose to concentrate on the verb system, and presented a complete

survey of all tenses".[3]

The first lesson of the session was focused on the present progressive tense. My objective was to inform my students that the present progressive had three meanings: (1) a current, on-going action that would soon be completed, (2), an action that began some time ago in the past and may or may not be taking pace at the moment, and would end sometime in the future, and (3) future tense." He illustrated this using the familiar time flow diagram and by showing that sentences such as

John is playing the violin.

There were three ways ambiguous:

(1) What is that noise from the other room? (John is playing the violin.)

(2) What's John doing this summer? (He is playing the violin for the local symphony.)

(3) What's John doing tomorrow? (He's playing the violin in the talent show.)

He said that none of his advanced ESL students knew this rule consciously. In fact, very few people do. He had presented this example several times at lectures to practicing ESL teachers, and I often asked those who consciously "know" the rule that the progressive was three ways ambiguous to raise their hands. Very few did, and those that do claim they know it have usually just finished teaching it in class. What was very interesting was that a significant number of students had a "Eureka" experience. After he had explained the rule, they would remarked: "That's right... it *is* three ways ambiguous... how about that!", or would made similar comments. His interpretation was that these students had already subconsciously acquired the progressive tense and its three meanings, and were confirming that their acquisition

[3] Stephen D Krashen Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. University of Southern California. p.28.

was correct. he had, in other words, succeeded in providing learning where acquisition was already presented.

Krashen: “I would like to point out several things about this phenomenon. First, my students had apparently acquired the rule without having first learned it. (It could be argued that they knew it once but had forgotten it, and that this temporary learning had been essential, or at least useful, in acquiring the rule. This is possible, but unlikely, as all three functions are not usually taught. Another unlikely possibility is transfer from the first language. Most of the first languages of my students that semester did not have the progressive tense.) Second, those who learned what they had already acquired thought they were gaining a great deal from the class. This sort of knowledge is very satisfying to many people (including me). It is not, however, language teaching, even though it is of some value.

Learning sometimes precedes acquisition in real time: A rule that is eventually acquired may have been, at one time, learned only. As I have maintained elsewhere (Krashen, 1977), this certainly does occur, but by no means establishes the necessity of prior learning for acquisition. Just because event A preceded event B does not demonstrate that A caused B. We see many cases of acquisition without learning, learning (even very good learning that is well practiced) that does not become acquisition, and acquired knowledge of rules preceding learning.”

1.2. The Role of Grammar translational methodology

This “grammar” functions without the individual’s awareness of technical nomenclature; in other words, he has no idea of the system of the language, and to use all the word-endings for singular and plural, for tense, and all the other grammar rules without special grammar lessons only due to the abundance of auding and speaking. His young mind grasps the facts and “makes simple grammar rules” for arranging the words to express curious thoughts and feelings. This is true because sometimes little children make mistakes by using a common rule for words to which that rule cannot be applied. For example, a little English child might be heard to say Two mans comed instead of Two men came, because the child is using the plural “s” rule for man to which the rule does not apply, and the past tense *-ed* rule for *come* which does not obey the ordinary rule for the past tense formation. A little Russian child can say *ножов* instead of *ножей* using the case-ending “*ов*” for *ножи* to which it does not apply.

Such mistakes are corrected as the child grows older and learns more of his language. By “grammar” we also mean the system of the language, the discovery and description of the nature of language itself. It is not a natural grammar, but a constructed one. There are several constructed grammars: traditional, structural, and transformational grammars. Traditional grammar studies the forms of words (morphology) and how they are put together in sentences (syntax); structural grammar studies structures of various levels of the language (morpheme level) and syntactic level; transformational grammar studies basic structures and transformation rules.

Grammar practice is usually divided into;

MECHANICAL PRACTICE involves activities that are aimed at form accuracy. By doing mechanical practice, the students pay repeated attention to a key element in a structure. Substitution and transformation drills are most frequently used in mechanical practice.

In MEANINGFUL PRACTICE the focus is on the production, comprehension or exchange of meaning through the students “keep an eye on” the way newly learned structures are used in the process. Meaningful practice usually comes after mechanical practice.[4]

Using prompts for practice (meaningful practice)

1) Using picture prompts.

2) Using mime or gestures as prompts.

3) Using information sheet as prompts.

4) Using key phrases or key words as prompts.

5) Using chained phrases for story telling.

What we need is simplest and shortest grammar that meets the requirements of the school syllabus in foreign languages. This grammar must be simple enough to be grasped and held by any pupil. We cannot say that this problem has been solved. Since graduates are expected to acquire language proficiency in aural comprehension, speaking and reading grammar material should be selected for the purpose. There exist principles of selecting grammar material both for teaching speaking knowledge (active minimum) and for teaching reading knowledge (passive minimum), the main one is the principle of frequency, i.e., how frequently this or that grammar item occurs. For example, the Present Simple (Indefinite) is frequently used both in conversation and in various texts. Therefore it should be included in the grammar minimum. For selecting grammar material for reading the principle of polysemia, for instance, is of great importance.

Pupils should be taught to distinguish such grammar items which serve to express different meanings. Plurals of nouns the 3d person singular of Present Simple

[4] www.google.com

(Indefinite) For example, -s (es) í The selection of grammar material involves choosing the appropriate kind of linguistic description, i.e., the grammar which constitutes the best base for developing speech habits. Thus the school syllabus reflect a traditional approach to determining grammar material for foreign language teaching, pupils are given sentences patterns or structures to translate into their mother tongue and through these structures they assimilate the English language, acquire grammar mechanisms of speech. The content of grammar teaching is disputable among teachers and methodologists, and there are various approaches to the problem, pupils should, whatever the content of the course, assimilate the ways of fitting words together to form sentences and be able to easily recognize grammar forms and structures while hearing and reading, to reproduce phrases and sentences stored up in their memory and say or write sentences of their own, using grammar items appropriate to the situation.

A Brief Review of the Major Methods of Foreign Language Teaching, The grammatical systems of Uzbek, Russian and English are fundamentally different. Uzbek is a synthetic language, the grammatical structure of the words are formed by prefixes and suffixes. English is an analytical language, in which grammatical meaning in largely expressed through the use of additional words and by changes in word order. Russian is a synthetic language, in which the majority of grammatical forms are created through changes in the structure of words, by means of a developed system of prefixes, suffixes and ending. (p. 121, Brown C. and Jule “Teaching the spoken language”, Cambridge, 1983) No one knows exactly how people learn languages although a great deal of research has been done into the subject. Many methods have been proposed for the teaching of foreign language. And they have met with varying degrees of success and failure. We should know that the method by which children are taught must have some effect on their motivation. If they find it deadly boring they will probably become de-motivated, whereas if they have confidence in the method they will find it motivating.

Child learners differ from adult learners in many ways. Children are curious, their

attention is of a shorter duration, they are quite differently motivated in, and their interests are less specialized. They need frequent of activity; they need activities which are exciting and stimulating their curiosity; they need to be involved in something active. We shall examine such methods as “The Grammar – Translation Method”, ”The Direct Method”, “The Audio-lingual Method”. And we pay attention to the teaching grammar of the foreign language.

In applied linguistics, the grammar-translation method of foreign language teaching is one of the most traditional methods, dating back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It was originally used to teach 'dead' languages (and literatures) such as Latin and Greek, and this may account for its heavy bias towards written work to the virtual exclusion of oral production. This method was widely used in teaching the classics, namely Latin, and it was transferred to the teaching of modern languages when they were introduced into schools. In the grammar-translation mode, the books begin with definitions of the parts of speech, declensions, conjugations, rules to be memorized, examples illustrating the rules, and exceptions. Often each unit has a paragraph to be translated into the target language and one to be translated into native one. These paragraphs illustrate the grammar rules studied in the unit. The major characteristic of the grammar-translation method is, precisely as its name suggests, a focus on learning the rules of grammar and their application in translation passages from one language into the other. Vocabulary in the target language is learned through direct translation from the native language, e.g. with vocabulary tests such as:

a house - uy

this book - bu kitob

While there is some variation, grammar-translation usually consists of the following activities:

(1) Explanation of a grammar rule, with example sentences.

(2) Vocabulary, presented in the form of a bilingual list.

(3) A reading selection, emphasizing the rule presented in (1) above and the vocabulary presented in (2).

(4) Exercises designed to provide practice on the grammar and vocabulary of the lesson. These exercises emphasize the conscious control of structure ("focus on", in the sense of Krashen and Seliger, 1975) and include translation in both directions, from L1 to L2 and L2 to L1.

Most grammar-translation classes are designed for foreign language instruction and are taught in the student's first language. Grammar-translation violates nearly every component of the Input Hypothesis, and it is therefore predicted that this method will have the effect of putting the student "on the defensive". Students are expected to be able to produce immediately, and are expected to be fully accurate. Anxiety level, it has been pointed out, is also raised for some students who are less inclined toward grammar study (under-users), as pointed out by Rivers, 1968.

Grammar-translation makes no attempt, explicitly or implicitly, to help students manage conversations with native speakers. Grammar-translation implicitly assumes that conscious control of grammar is necessary for mastery. In other words, learning needs to precede acquisition. This assumption necessitates that all target structures be introduced and explained. There is, therefore, no limitation of the set of rules to be learned to those that are learnable, portable, and not yet acquired. There is no attempt to account for individual variation in Monitor use, nor is there any attempt to specify when rules are to be used, the implicit assumption being that all students will be able to use all the rules all the time.

The method requires students to translate whole texts word for word and memorize numerous grammatical rules and exceptions as well as enormous

vocabulary lists. The goal of this method is to be able to read and translate literary masterpieces and classics. Throughout Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries, the education system was formed primarily around a concept called faculty psychology. In brief, this theory dictated that the body and mind were separate and the mind consisted of three parts: the will, emotion, and intellect. It was believed that the intellect could be sharpened enough to eventually control the will and emotions. The way to do this was through learning classical literature of the Greeks and Romans, as well as mathematics. Additionally, an adult with such an education was considered mentally prepared for the world and its challenges. In the 19th century, modern languages and literatures began to appear in schools. It was believed that teaching modern languages was not useful for the development of mental discipline and thus they were left out of the curriculum. As a result, textbooks were essentially copied for the modern language classroom. In America, the basic foundations of this method were used in most high school and college foreign language classrooms and were eventually replaced by the audio-lingual method among others.

Classes were conducted in the native language. A chapter in a distinctive textbook of this method would begin with a massive bilingual vocabulary list. Grammar points would come directly from the texts and be presented contextually in the textbook, to be explained elaborately by the instructor. Grammar thus provided the rules for assembling words into sentences. Tedious translation and grammar drills would be used to exercise and strengthen the knowledge without much attention to content. Sentences would be deconstructed and translated. Eventually, entire texts would be translated from the target language into the native language and tests would often ask students to replicate classical texts in the target language. Very little attention was placed on pronunciation or any communicative aspects of the language. The skill exercised was reading, and then only in the context of translation.

The method by definition has a very limited scope of objectives. Because speaking or any kind of spontaneous creative output was missing from the curriculum,

students would often fail at speaking or even letter writing in the target language. A noteworthy quote describing the effect of this method comes from Bahlsen, who was a student of Plötz, a major proponent of this method in the 19th century. In commenting about writing letters or speaking he said he would be overcome with "a veritable forest of paragraphs, and an impenetrable thicket of grammatical rules." Later, theorists such as Vietor, Passy, Berlitz and Jesperson began to talk about what a new kind of foreign language instruction needed, shedding light on what the grammar translation was missing. They supported teaching the language, not about the language, and teaching in the target language, emphasizing speech as well as text. Through grammar translation, students lacked an active role in the classroom, often correcting their own work and strictly following the textbook.

The Grammar Translation Method is the oldest method of teaching. A number of methods and techniques have evolved for the teaching of English and also other foreign languages in the recent past, yet this method is still in use in many part of India. It maintains the mother tongue of the learner as the reference particularly in the process of learning the second/foreign languages. The main principles on which the Grammar Translation Method is based are the following:

1. Translation interprets the words and phrases of the foreign languages in the best possible manner.
2. The phraseology and the idiom of the target language can best be assimilated in the process of interpretation.
3. The structures of the foreign languages are best learned when compared and contrast with those of mother tongue.

In this method, while teaching the text books the teacher translates every word and phrase from English into the learner’s mother tongue. Further, students are required to translate sentences from their mother tongue into English. These exercises in translation are based on various items covering the grammar of the target language. The method emphasizes the study of grammar through deduction that is through the

study of the rules of grammar. A contrastive study of the target language with the mother tongue gives an insight into the structure not only of the foreign language but also of the mother tongue. The student is expected to apply the rules on his own. This involves a complicated mental manipulation of the conjugations and declensions in the order memorized, down to the form that might fit the translation. As a result, students are unable to use the language, and they sometimes develop an inferiority complex about languages in general. Exceptionally bright and diligent students do learn languages by this method, or in spite of it, but they would learn with any method. (R.Lado) The major characteristics of GT are listed. - Classes are taught in the mother tongue, with little active use of the target language. - Much vocabulary is taught in the form of lists of isolated words;

1. The grammar-translation method is the easiest for a teacher to employ. It doesn't require a teacher to speak good English or make good lesson preparations.
2. Exercises of a class using this method;

*Translation of a Literary Passage

Students translate a reading passage from the target language into their native language.

*Reading Comprehension Questions

Students answer questions in the target language based on their understanding of the reading passage.

*Antonym / synonyms

Students are given one set of words and are asked to find antonyms in the reading passage.

*Fill-in-the-blanks

Students are given a series of sentences with words missing.

*Deductive Application of Rule

Grammar rules are presented with examples. Once students understand a rule, they are asked to apply it to some different example.

3. Lesson Time!

4. Frequency adverbs

- When do we use them?
- We often went camping when we were children.
- I will always love you.
- Different positions
- Anvar sometimes visits us on Sundays.
- She is often ill in winter.

5. The following list shows the most common adverbs of frequency , with the one that refers to things that happen most often at the top, and least often at the bottom:

Never, Hardly, Ever, Rarely, Occasionally, Sometimes, Often, Frequently, Usually, Always

6. Exercises: Complete the gaps with the adverbs. Example: He _____ plays on the computer. (He always plays on the computer). 1. He _____ listens to the radio. 2. They _____ read a book. 3. Pete _____ gets angry. 4. Tom is _____ very friendly. 5. I _____ take sugar in my coffee. 6. Rahmon is _____ hungry. 7. My grandmother _____ goes for a walk in the evening.

7. Translate this sentences.

1. I rarely get up late on weekends.

_____

2. Men har kuni onamga yordamlashaman.

_____

3. I am sometimes late for class.

_____

4. I hardly ever go running on Saturday mornings.

_____

5. U ba'zida kinoga dam olish kunlari boradi.

_____

Advantages of the Grammar Translation Method:

1. The phraseology of the target language is quickly explained. Translation is the easiest way of explaining meanings or words and phrases from one language into another. Any other method of explaining vocabulary items in the second language is found time consuming. A lot of time is wasted if the meanings of lexical items are explained through definitions and illustrations in the second language. Further, learners acquire some short of accuracy in understanding synonyms in the source language and the target language.

2. Teacher's labor is saved. Since the textbooks are taught through the medium of the mother tongue, the teacher may ask comprehension questions on the text taught in the mother tongue. Pupils will not have much difficulty in responding to questions on the mother tongue. So, the teacher can easily assess whether the students

have learned what he has taught them. Communication between the teacher and the learner does not cause linguistic problems. Even teachers who are not fluent in English can teach English through this method. That is perhaps the reason why this method has been practiced so widely and has survived so long.

Disadvantages of the Grammar Translation Method:

1. It is an unnatural method. The natural order of learning a language is listening, speaking, reading and writing. That is the way how the child learns his mother tongue in natural surroundings. But in the Grammar Translation Method the teaching of the second language starts with the teaching of reading. Thus, the learning process is reversed. This poses problems.

2. Speech is neglected. The Grammar Translation Method lays emphasis on reading and writing. It neglects speech. Thus, the students who are taught English through this method fail to express themselves adequately in spoken English. Even at the undergraduate stage they feel shy of communicating through English. It has been observed that in a class, which is taught English through this method, learners listen to the mother tongue more than that to the second/foreign language. Since language learning involves habit formation such students fail to acquire habit of speaking English. Thus, they have to pay a heavy price for being taught through this method.

3. Exact translation is not possible. Translation is, indeed, a difficult task and exact translation from one language to another is not always possible. A language is the result of various customs, traditions, and modes of behavior of a speech community and these traditions differ from community to community. There are several lexical items in one language, which have no synonyms/equivalents in another language. For instance, the meaning of the English word ‘table’ does not fit in such expression as the ‘table of contents’, ‘table of figures’, ‘multiplication table’, ‘time table’ and ‘table the resolution’, etc. English prepositions are also difficult to translate. Consider sentences such as ‘We see with our eyes’, ‘Bombay is far from Delhi’, ‘He died of cholera’, He succeeded through hard work’. In these sentences ‘with’, ‘from’,

'of', 'through' can be translated into the Hindi preposition 'se' and vice versa. Each language has its own structure, idiom and usage, which do not have their exact counterparts in another language. Thus, translation should be considered an index of one's proficiency in a language.

4. It does not give pattern practice. A person can learn a language only when he internalizes its patterns to the extent that they form his habit. But the Grammar Translation Method does not provide any such practice to the learner of a language. It rather attempts to teach language through rules and not by use. Researchers in linguistics have proved that to speak any language, whether native or foreign, entirely by rule is quite impossible. Language learning means acquiring certain skills, which can be learned through practice and not by just memorizing rules. The persons who have learned a foreign or second language through this method find it difficult to give up the habit of first thinking in their mother tongue and then translating their ideas into the second language. They, therefore, fail to get proficiency in the second language approximating that in the first language. The grammar translation method stayed in schools until the 1960s, when a complete foreign language pedagogy evaluation was taking place. In the meantime, teachers experimented with approaches like the direct methods in post-war and Depression era classrooms, but without much structure to follow. The trusty grammar translation method set the pace for many classrooms for many decades.

1.3. Current approaches to Grammar Teaching

Three approaches to the teaching of grammar. The first is by the most widespread approach: the teaching of grammar as product. As its name implies, this approaches takes a product perspective on grammar, with teaching structured round a careful specification of language forms which provide the target language for each lesson. The teacher might, for instance, spend a lesson two concentrating on the past

tense, because she or syllabus designer has decided that this is a form which learners need. Two key stages in the learning process can be promoted through product teaching. One is noticing new language input. The aim here is to make certain specified forms as possible by carefully drawing the learner's attention to them. Secondly, product teaching can help learners to structure their knowledge of the language system: learners are given opportunities to manipulate forms, changing them and recombining them in order to discover more about how grammar works.

Having assessed the strengths and weaknesses of product teaching, we will move on to consider process teaching. Process teaching engages learners in language use, formulating their own meanings in contexts over which they have considerable control, and in so doing grammar as an going resource. It is only through extended practice in language use that learners can proceduralize their knowledge, learning to deploy grammar while for the most part concentrating their attention on meaning.[5]

Product and process teaching are radically different from each other: the former requires a careful control of form for the learner, the letter emphasizes the use of language by the learner. But it is not a matter of being either a 'product teacher' or 'process teacher'. In most circumstances it makes sense to combine the two, encouraging noticing and structuring with product teaching, and employing process work to develop proceduralization and practice in the multiple skills of language learning use. Both approaches, however, need sensitive handling. In product teaching we must avoid doing everything for the learner, because language learning requires the learner's active engagement and involvement, fashioning contexts which promote not just participation of grammar.

Yet the more we release control over learner activity, the more we must accept that the learner can go her own way, and this may well mean that she frequently abandons grammar. So the grammar which we teach in product lessons may never emerge or develop in process work, and thus it may never get properly proceduralized by the learner. These is, then, a kind of critical gap between a product and a process

---

[5] Rob Batstone Grammar. Oxford University Press.1994. p. 51

approach. It is to fill this gap that we came to the third approaches, teaching grammar as skill. The aim here is to help learners make the leap from the careful control of grammar as product the effective use of grammar as process. When we teach grammar as skill, the learner is required to attend to grammar, while working on tasks which retain an emphasis on language use. For example, the learners may work in groups reflecting on quality of the language they have just used in a process task. O they may be working on task which requires attention to grammar in order to properly interpret the text. Such tasks can make learners more aware of how their own use of grammar can be moulded and improved for effective communication. Teaching grammar as skill means striking a balance between product teaching (because there is still means emphasis on grammatical forms), and process teaching (because learners work with tasks which involve a measure of self-expression and focus on meaning).

Taking together, these three approaches provided a comprehensive basis for effective grammar teaching. Each approach has own advantages, and weaknesses of one approach can be measured against the strengths of another. Product teaching allows us to focus explicitly through a process approach can we begin to shape the learners' handling of the whole complex of skills required for language use. Through teaching grammar as skill we can guide learner activity and learner language without releasing control to the extent that is necessary for process work.

Teaching grammar as product

Initially, learners have to notice features of grammar before they can do anything with them. So if our aim is specifically to help learners to notice, then we should consider doing just that, without always prodding the learner into flurry of activity by also activity is sometimes adopted in 'presentation stage' materials, but it runs the risk that learners will be overwhelmed by the demands made on them, particularly where it is their first real encounter with the forms being focused on. Here , in contrast, we are concerned with 'noticing activities'. These encourage amore introspective engagement with language, calling for quiet observation which is un hampered by the

simultaneous need to manipulate language. In other words, a noticing activity aims to make a certain form salient to the learner, and is intended to do no more than that.

PASSIVE VOICE

Active *An editor chooses the lead stories*.

Passive *The lead stories are chosen by an editor*

The passive is used a lot when you describe a process.

The passive consists of:

verb to be + the past participle

To change the tense, you change the tense of the verb *to be:*

This cartoon	was has been is will be	drawn by Justin

These cartoons	were has been are will be	drawn by Justin

It is perfectly plausible that either of these extracts will, occasion, help the letter notice something which had not previously been evident to her. Yet as opportunities for noticing, they take very different tasks indeed. One extract explains basic features of the passive for the learner. The other simply offers two examples, and invites the learner to make of them what she will. There is an important distinction here between providing clear information for the learner, providing only the briefest hint while calling for active participation by the learner. The two are not to opposite extremes – one covert and implicit, the other overt and explicit – and in between these two extremes we have considerable choice in how far we ask learner to work things out for themselves, through leading questions and other forms of guidance.

Teaching grammar as process

Process teaching engages learners directly in the procedures of language use. But we do not simply throw them in at the deep end, letting them do whatever they like with no control or guidance whatsoever. We use, though, a very different kind of guidance from product teaching. Instead of targeting specific features of the grammar for the learner's attention, now we are explicitly aiming to develop the skills and strategies of the discourse process, constructing tasks which learners can use to

express themselves more effectively as discourse participants. In process teaching we do not only want them to achieve the self-discovery which is facilitated by consciousness-raising, but also the self-expression of language use.[6]

The kind of process teaching discussed here is sometimes referred to as 'task-based'. Candlin(1987) offers a detailed taxonomy for the qualities of 'good' tasks, including trie following:

— they encourage learners to attend to meaning and to purposeful language use

— they give learners flexibility in resolving problems their own way, calling on their own choice of strategies and skills

__they *involve* learners, with their own personalities and attitudes being central

__they are challenging, yet not excessively demanding

__they raise learners' awareness of the processes of language use, and encourage them to reflect on their own language use.

This is not an example of process teaching, but merely of process activity. The teacher had given no thought to the effects of the task on the learners' performance. She had thought only that it was time to release control and to 'see what happens'. Process *activity,* then, refers to the unregulated production of language by learners who are unaware or unsure of the purpose underlying their performance. It may, as with the Freddie story, result from an activity which is poorly or inconsiderately constructed. Alternatively, it may involve an absence of any attempt to regulate what learners are doing and why they are doing it, as would be the case with free conversation. Process *teaching,* in contrast, requires careful attention to task design, so that we can make principled decisions about the effects of the task on

[6] Rob Batstone Grammar. Oxford University Press.1994. p. 74.

learner language. In particular, we will want learners to take every opportunity to deploy grammar in their talk, stretching their linguistic resources so that they use language which is grammatically rich. This procedure is sometimes referred to as 'interlanguage stretching', and it requires learners to 'operate at the outer limits of their current abilities' (Long 1989:13).

Interlanguage stretching requires a careful regulation of task design. Without such regulation, we will be involved not in principled process teaching, but in unprincipled process activity. The danger of the lattet is that learners will consistently fail co stretch their language, ultimately procedural zing a very limited language system.

Regulating language use

We begin with a fundamental premise: that language use is not one skill but many. Competent language users manage to cope with this because some of these skills have become automatic. In particular, they have learned to proceduralize their language knowledge so they can use it without giving it undue attention, paying more heed instead to meaning. Learners, though, will not be able to achieve this level of skill without considerable practice and guidance. Human beings are limited in their capacity to consciously attend to more than one task at a time (Shiffrin and Schneider 1977). So it will be difficult for learners to attend simultaneously both to the quality of their language and to the meanings they are expressing. Something has to give way, and very often it is grammar which is the first thing to be surrendered. So, what kinds of factors can help us to regulate learner language to prevent features of the grammar being abandoned in this way?

Regulation in process teaching is a much more subtle kind of control than that which is exercised in product teaching. Instead of simply blocking out major aspects of language use, we are influencing and shaping certain features of context more indirectly, in the hope that this will lead ro a corresponding effect on the grammar which learners use. Interestingly enough, airline pilots are given a similar

kind of regulation. Long before they climb into the cockpit and take several hundred lives into their hands, they spend hundreds of hours in a simulator, where specific features of the context are deliberately varied: speed, weather conditions, the amount of competing air traffic. All these are factors which computers regulate so that trainee pilots can learn to cope with them simultaneously in real-time flying conditions. In aviation this skill is known as 'time-sharing'.

Carefully regulated process work can give learners repeated opportunities to notice and restructure their working hypotheses about language, as well as to progressively proceduralize this knowledge. But the very fact that they are deploying their own language, with its inevitable inconsistencies, means that there must be limits to the accuracy of their restructuring process, and therefore to the accuracy of the language which they proceduralize. We should not, then, hold unreasonable expectations of process teaching. Our objective is not to carefully control the learner's accurate production of grammatical forms—this is the domain of product teaching. Rather, it is to develop the skill of exploiting grammar to ' express meanings as clearly as possible in language use. This in itself is a major objective, and it takes time to accomplish. The culture of the process classroom is a very different one from the product classroom, with learners having much greater responsibility for their own language production. We cannot legislate in advance about which particular forms will be used in a task, or about the precision with which they are deployed. If we think of process teaching as a risky and time-consuming way of getting learners to formulate specific forms which can be focused on much more economically in product work, then we are misrepresenting the very nature of process teaching. Learning is learner-centred, and it follows that whatever we do in the classroom is conditioned by the learner's individual motivation and need to use grammar.

In many ways the objectives of product and process teaching are complementary. The focus in process teaching is on the learner's own self-expression, and

consequently we cannot directly intervene to focus on this or that grammatical form. In product teaching exactly the reverse situation applies. Effective grammar teaching is likely to involve a combination of both approaches.

We now need to consider how to implement process teaching. We will concentrate for the most part on speaking tasks, where communicative pressure is likely to be at its grearest, and where effective re-structuring and proceduralization will therefore be difficult to achieve.

Regulating time pressure

We have all experienced the dislocation that pressure can bring to bear on our language production. Attending an interview for a job we want very much, we may find ourselves struggling unimpressively to get our language out—slips of the tongue and endless 'urns' and 'ers' clutter our performance. When it's all over, we re-run crucial moments in our mind's eye with the thought 'If only I'd said this instead of that'. How much more strenuous the whole experience of spontaneous language use must be for the learner, and particularly for those learners whose personality does not incline them towards self-expression under the critical gaze of a teacher and fellow students.

One solution is disarmmgly simple: give learners, quite explicitly, time to plan what they are going to produce. In one study on this subject, it was found that giving learners planning time led them to produce language with a much wider range of vocabulary and more varied grammatical patterns than was the case when no planning time was permitted (Crookes 1989). In another study, reported by Ellis (1987), learners were given three kinds of task: a planned writing task, a planned speaking task, and an unplanned speaking task. The study found that learners used grammar to signal regular past with greatest accuracy in the planned writing task, less accurately in the planned speaking task, and least of all in the unplanned speaking task. Of course, the process of writing generally provides much more opportunity to pause for thought than does speaking, so it is not surprising that the

planned writing task led to the most accurate production. Here, again, there is evidence that planning time reduces pressure and so allows learners time to collect their thoughts and to bring grammar under more effective control.

Teaching grammar as skill

Through a combination of product and process teaching, teachers can give their learners both a focus on specific grammatical forms and opportunities to deploy these forms in language use. The two approaches have complementary functions. In product teaching, we focus the learner's attention on forms. But, aware that much of this knowledge can remain delicate and transitory unless the learner can put it to use in a meaning-focusedcontext, we turn to process teaching. However, as we have just seen, process teaching requires a delicate touch, and many of these forms may never emerge at all, or not at all adequately. So, we can easily find ourselves facing a kind of critical gap between process teaching and product teaching. Many features of the grammar will be lost—focused on and practised in product teaching, yet never emerging adequately in process work.

A learner focus on grammar

To deal with this, we will need an approach which allows a focus on grammatical forms, but which at the same time retains a measure of self-expression and meaning-focus. If we can achieve such a balance, then we can help guide the learner to appreciate and use grammar as a communicative device, encouraging a richer deployment of grammar in more subtly regulated process tasks. But this focus on form will have to be by, rather than for, the learner, and the attention to meaning and self-expression will have to involve the learner quite directly. This approach, then, means guiding the learner's own attention ro grammar, and designing tasks which help us to teach learners the skill of using and attending to grammar in language use. It is for this reason that the approach is called 'teaching

grammar as skill'. Its objectives are complementary to those of product and process teaching.

We will look at three different ways of teaching grammar as skill. First, we consider how listening and reading activities can combine a focus on meaning with attention to grammar (9.3). Second, we consider how learners can be guided to make their own decisions about how to deploy grammar in tasks where they are provided only with words (9.4). Finally, we consider how learners can be guided to reflect more explicitly on the quality of their own grammar, and to consider ways in which it might be improved.

Noticing as skill

Listening and reading tasks furnish rich opportunities for learners to notice grammar in context, as part of the wider skill of making sense of written and spoken discourse. Let us say, for example, that we want the class to think about tense and time, and the way in which different tenses signal different time references. We could use a tape of a dialogue such as the following:

Bill: Hi Jane. How's life?

Jane: Terrible, since you ask. I didn't get that job I applied for—the one I told you about—and my cat has started eating the carpet again. Oh, and my sister Denise arrived recently and decided to stay with me without even asking if it was OK or not. I don't really like her very much, but at least we have the same taste in music, so we're both going out to a lot of concerts. I don't talk to her, though...

Of course, this text is a specially constructed one, but for a good reason. It includes a lot of time references which are signaled almost entirely through the grammar: 'I *didn't get* that job' (past), '.., and my car *has started eating,..*' (recent, including and up to the present), and so on. In fact, the text has been specifically designed to ensure that it is grammar, and not lexis, which does this

signaling. In other words, lexical clues such as 'I went for that job interview *yesterday'* (where 'yesterday' reinforces the past meaning) have been deliberately avoided. This makes it difficult for the learner to process the language top-down. If we want learners to attend to the grammar, and to demonstrate that they have really noticed it, then we have to construct tasks which require them to notice and to process grammar in order to complete the task successfully. This is the aim of the following task (which is based on the above dialogue about Jane and her sister).

TASK

1 As you listen to the dialogue, decide whether each of the events in the list: a) happened in the past; (b) began in the past but is still going on; (c) is planned for the future.

2 How might you adapt the activity to make the target grammar more explicit, i.e. to vary the type of consciousness-raising? In what circumstances might you follow this up with further work on the tenses involved?

Increasingly, learners are given listening and reading tasks which encourage them to listen and read in a top-down way, formulating predictions about what the text might be about, taking bearings from the lexis, and gliding over much of the grammar: see the discussion of top-down processing in pedagogy in Cook: *Discourse,* pages 79-86. In one sense this is all to the good, because it is exactly what competent language users do: they process top-down, only giving direct attention to the grammar when all else fails. But they can only do this because much of their systemic knowledge, including knowledge about the grammar, has been automated and proceduralized. They rarely notice the grammar because they can follow its signposting more or less automatically. Learners, though, are in a different position altogether. They need to notice grammar, because if they do not, they will never learn it very effectively. The question is: how much do we make noticing

grammar a necessary condition for completing the task? We can, as with the task about Jane, make it very necessary indeed.

Activity

THE PAST PERFECT TENSE

Presentation

Read the passage below, which is the beginning of a novel, and answer the questions.

Julia Stretton was late. The Tartan Army had planted a bomb at Heathrow, and Julia, who had gone the long way round past the airport to avoid the usual congestion on the approach roads to the M3, had been delayed for two hours by police and atmy checkpoints. When she finally joined the motorway further down, she put thoughts of Paul Mason out of her mind, and concentrated on her driving. She drove quickly for an hour, breaking the speed limit all the way, and not particularly concerned about being spotted by one of the police helicopters.

She left the motorway near Basingstoke, and drove steadily down the main road towards Salisbury. The plain was grey and misty. It had been a cool, wet summer in Britain, and, although it was still only July, there had been reports of snow along the Yorkshire coast, and flooding in parts of Cornwall. A few miles beyond Salisbury, on the road to Blandford Forum, Julia stopped at a roadside cafe for a cup of coffee, and as she sat at the plastic-topped table she had time at last for reflection. It had been the surprise of seeing Paul Mason that had probably upset her more than anything else; that, and the way it had happened, and the place…

(Adapted from *A Dream of Wessex)*

In what order do you think the five events below happened?

Julia was stopped at army checkpoints.

Julia stopped for coffee.

Julia saw Paul Mason.

Julia joined the motorway.

The Tartan Army planted a bomb.

Summary

It is hard to say whether any of the studies actually meet the description of condition since in all cases the subjects knew they were being tested and that the focus of the investigation was the quality and accuracy of their speech.The most important contribution is its insistence that both deductive and inductive approaches are learning-oriented. The "practice" used for rule practice (deductive) or rule-searching (inductive) will not be optimal input for acquisition, since the students' focus will be primarily on form rather than on the message. In my interpretation, the results of method comparison studies using audio-lingual, grammar-translation, and cognitive code are quite consistent with the theoretical analysis of these methods presented in the previous section: according to this analysis, none of these methods does a particularly effective job in encouraging subconscious language acquisition.

Despite some commentators' opposition to explicit grammar teaching in the 70s and 80s, grammar instruction has came back into prominence. Those who are in favour of grammar teaching argue that some grammatical forms cannot be acquired merely on the basis of comprehensible input and that formal instruction is necessary for learners to acquire those forms. They make a distinction between the learning of the firs language in natural contexts where the amount of time and exposure to learning is great that there is no necessity for formal instruction and for the learning of a language in a second\ foreign learning environment where the time available and motivation are much less, and organized grammar teaching is essential to acquiring the language. A number of text books surveyed failed to provide adequate treatment of fundamental relationships between form and meaning and between class function. All teachers need to cultivate a critical stance in assessing the quality of grammar presentation when selecting using textbooks.

2.0. CHAPTER II. Teaching Grammar Using Texts and Games for A2 level learners

2.1. Grammar in context for elementary levels

Language is context-sensitive. This means that, in the absence of context, it is very difficult to recover the intended meaning of a single word or phrase. This is true words taken out of the context of sentences. It is also true of sentences taken out of texts. The following sentences are almost meaningless out of context.[7]

1. The ones that don't, seem to think so.
2. It's a drink.

There has been quite a bit of debate about how to best teach students grammar and have them be the best writers that they can be. Evidence from fifty years of research seems to point to the attitude that grammar taught in isolation (worksheets where students are asked to pick out nouns and verbs, having no actual connection to student writing) has no effect on student writing, and may in fact be harmful to student writing. This begs the question then, why do so many teachers persist in using exercises such as DOL (Daily Oral Language) or grammar worksheets? Teaching grammar in context is not always an easy task. But, when mini-lessons were done on issues of craft and grammar, student writing is better.

Teaching grammar in context requires a commitment to teaching (and reading) student writing. It also requires a commitment, in part, to a writing workshop approach in which you are able to conference with students and identify the issues in their writing that most need to be addressed. Grammar mini-lessons should be targeted to trends that you see in general, and then specific instruction would be given to individual students.

[7] Scott T. How to Teach Grammar. Printed in Malaysia, PP. p.69

The following are some links to research advocating for the teaching of grammar in context:

- The Role of Grammar in Improving Student Writing-by Beverly Ann Chin, which provides an over-view of research and several activities to help teachers implement grammar-in-context.

- The Role of Grammar in the Language Arts Classroom-Nancy Patterson
- Grammar: Meaning and Contexts-Nancy Patterson
- Writing Next: Effective Strategies to Improve the Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools-A 77-page pdf research report from the Carnegie Corporation of New York which includes a section on grammar instruction, showing that traditional grammar in isolation produces a statistically significant negative effect on student writing.
- Grammar Resources from the National Writing Project-A collection of links to articles published in NWP journals.
- Teaching Grammar in Context: A Summary of the Research-Lisa Segrue and Susan Bruce's work for the Fox Valley Writing Project. They provide an overview of the research as well as activities for the teaching of grammar in context in a 10 page Word Document.
- Teaching Resource Center /Grammar-NCTE's page on the teaching of grammar. There are links to activities to use in your classroom, as well as links to pdf files that are articles and chapters of books published on the teaching of grammar in context.

Working with Grammar in Conferences with Student Writers-at Richmond University

Here are the contexts from which these sentences were taken:

1 Is it important that a gin comes from London? The ones that don't, seem

to think so. Because, though they all have 'London Dry Gin' on their labels, only one premium gin is actually distilled in London, the city of great gin making.

2 'Are you going to that Hodders party?'

I said that I didn't know anything about it.

'It's for that boring woman who writes picture books about Nash terraces.

Every twit in London will be there.'

'So are you going?'

'It's a drink,' Musprat said, meaning yes.

(from Theroux, P. *Lady Max,* Granta 40)

The meaning of sentence 1 depends on references to the sentence immediately preceding it. The meaning of *It's a drink* in the second example depends on our expectation that what people say is relevant to what Jjas just been said. In this case, the question *Are you going?* requires a relevant answer, which is likely to be either *yes* or *no.* It is more likely that *It's a drink* means *yes* rather than *no,* but notice that the author feels the need to make this interpretation explicit.

As decontextualised words and decontextualised sentences lose their meaning, so too do decontextualised texts. That is, texts divorced from their context may become difficult to interpret. Here are three short texts. Each is complete, in the sense that they are not extracts from larger texts, on which they might depend for sense (unlike the *It's a drink* example above). Nevertheless, in the absence of context, they are either ambiguous or . unintelligible.

Port does not exist.

Only in Berkshire.

Ken Stark, Leeds, Yorks.

To Wee Pig from Big Pig. Grunt! Grunt!

Number 1 is an instruction my computer gave me when I was trying to install a new printer. Number 2 is the response to a letter to the *Notes and Queries* section of *The Guardian* newspaper. (The original query was *Do dogs bark ivith regional accents?)* The third text also comes from *The Guardian:* it is a Saint Valentines Day message printed on February 14th. In order to become fully intelligible all three texts require some knowledge of where, and even when, the text was originally placed. We need to distinguish, therefore, between the context of die surrounding **text** (as in the Paul Theroux extract) and the context of the surrounding situation. The first kind of context is sometimes called the co-text. The **co-text** is the rest of the text that surrounds and provides meaning to the individual language items in the text. The second kind of context is called the **context** of situation. Factors in the context of situation that are important to consider when interpreting the meaning of a language item are the roles and relationships of the speakers and the mode of communication (is it a public notice, a letter, a recorded message etc?). Finally, notice that the third text (the St Valentine's Day greeting) requires some understanding of the **culture** in which on a certain day of the year newspapers print messages of love from people pretending to be animals; this kind of context is called the **context of culture.** Lack of familiarity with features of the culture can seriously inhibit understanding.

One more point needs to be made before we look at the implications of these factors on the teaching of grammar. Although language has traditionally been analysed and taught at the level of the sentence, real language use seldom consists of sentences in isolation, but of groups of sentences (or, in the case of spoken language, groups of **utterances)** that form coherent texts. The term **text** will be used from now on to refer to both written and spoken English. Texts take many forms - postcards, novels, sermons, football commentaries, street signs, jokes, and air safety instructions arc just a few. In real life we generally experience texts in their entirety and in their

contexts of use. That is to say, we experience the whole joke and we usually experience it in a situation where joktng is appropriate. It is a feature of classrooms, however, that language becomes detached from both its co-text and its context of situation. But, as we have seen above, once you start breaking texts up and relocating them, it becomes increasingly difficult to make sense of them.

The problem is that, just as it is easier to examine a fish out of water than in its natural habitat, so in order to lookat grammar it is often easier to use examples taken out ot context. This is particularly the case with beginner or elementary learners, for whom a natural context might be difficult to understand. But, as we have seen, taking words, sentences and texts out of context threatens their intelligibility. Taking individual grammar structures out of context is equally perilous. You might think you know what *He's playing tennis* means, that is, he is doing it now, as I speak. But only one of the foDowing examples is consistent with that interpretation:

'Where's Tony?' 'He's playing tennis.'

He never wears his glasses when he's playing tennis.

Tomorrow morning he'll be in the office but in the afternoon he's playing tennis.

He's playing tennis a lot these days. Do you think he's lost his job?

There's this friend'Of mine, Tony. He's playing tennis one day. Suddenly he gets this shooting pain in his chest...

What's more, the decontextualising of grammar often results in practice exercises that are of doubtful value. For example:

1 Choose the correct form of the verb:

A Do you work/Are you working every weekend?

B Cigarette?' 'No thanks, I'm not smoking/1 don't smoke.'

C 'What do you eat/are you eating?' 'Cake.'

2 Which of these sentences are grammatically correct?

A I'm planning to go to India for my holidays.

B 'The phone's ringing!' 'I'm going to get it!"

C They will have a party next week.

D I'm tired. I think I'm going to bed.

The point here is that none of these examples has a clear 'right answer' and a clear 'wrong' one. They are all well-formed sentences (that is, they are grammatically accurate), even though we recognize some choices as being more likely than others. But it is possible to imagine a context where, for example, *'Cigarette?' 'No thanks, I'm not smoking* is perfectly appropriate. Questions of correctness are often irresolvable in the absence of context, and a lot of classroom time can be wasted arguing the toss over disembodied sentences. As someone once said: 'The confusions that occupy us arise when language is like an engine idling, not when it is doing work.' A text-based approach involves looking at language when it is 'doing work'.

Teaching grammar using games

Grammar acquisition is increasingly viewed as crucial to language acquisition. However, there is much disagreement as to the effectiveness of different approaches for presenting vocabulary items. Moreover, learning grammar is often perceived as a tedious and laborious process. In this report some traditional techniques are examined and compared with the use of language games for grammar presentation and revision, in order to determine whether they are successful in presenting and revising grammar than other methods.

From some experts' experience they have noticed how enthusiastic students are about practicing language by means of games and the grammar games are not only fun but they help students learn without a conscious analysis or understanding of the learning process while they acquire communicative competence as second language users.

There are numerous techniques concerned with grammar presentation. However, there are a few things that have to be remembered irrespective of the way new lexical items are presented. If teachers want students to remember new grammar it needs to be learnt in the context, practiced and then revised to prevent students from forgetting. Teachers must take sure of that students have understood the new words, which will be remembered better if introduced in a "memorable way". Bearing all this in mind, teachers have to remember to employ a variety of techniques for new grammatical presentation and revision.

The following types of grammar presentation techniques are suggested:

1 Visual techniques. These pertain to visual memory, which is considered especially helpful with the grammar retention. Learners remember better the material that has been presented by means of the visual aids. The visual techniques lend themselves well to presenting concrete items of grammar. They help students to associate the presented material in a meaningful way and incorporate it into their system of the language units.

2. Verbal explanation. This pertains to the use of illustrative situations connected with the grammar material studied.

The advantages of using games.

While most ESL teachers agree that games are excellent learning activities for children. A lot of experienced textbook and methodology manuals writers have argued that games are not just time-filling activities but they have a great educational value.

We hold that most grammar games make learners use the language instead of thinking about learning the correct forms.[8]

The grammar games should be treated as central, not peripherical to the foreign language teaching programme. Games, as Richard Amato thinks, are to be fun, but he warns against overlooking their pedagogical value, particularly in foreign language teaching programmes. There are many advantages of using games in grammar.

1. Games can lower anxiety, thus making the acquisition of input more likely.

2. Games are highly motivating and entertaining, and they can give shy students more opportunities to express their opinions and feelings.

3. They also enable learners to acquire new experience within the foreign language that are not always possible during a typical lesson.

4. Games add diversion to the regular classroom activities, break the ice and introduce the new ideas.

5. In the easy, relaxed atmosphere which is created by using games the students remember things faster and better.

6. Grammar games are a good way of practicing the language, for they provide a model of what learners will use the language for in real life in future.

7. Grammar games encourage, entertain, teach, and promote fluency.

If not for any of these reasons they should be used just because they help students to see beauty in a foreign language and not just problems, and this is the main reason to use games when studying English grammar.

Choosing appropriate games

[8] Marianne C. Sharon H. Techniques and Resources in Teaching Grammar. Oxford Press.1988. p.132.

There are many factors to consider while discussing games, one of which is appropriacy. Teachers should be very careful about choosing games if they want to make them profitable for the learning process. If games are to bring desired results, they must correspond to either the students' level, or age, or the materials that are to be introduced or practiced. Not all of the games are appropriate for all students irrespective of their age. Different age groups require various topics, materials and modes of games. For example, children benefit most from games which require moving around, imitating a model, competing between groups, and the like. Furthermore, structural games that practice or reinforce a certain grammatical aspects of language have to relate to students' ability and prior knowledge. Games become difficult when the task or the topic is unsuitable or outside the students' experience.

Another factor influencing the choice of a game is its length and the time necessary for its completion. Many games have time limits but according to Siek Piscozub, the teacher can either allocate more or less time depending of the students' levels, the number of people in a group, or the knowledge of the rules of a game, etc.

When to use games.

Games are often used as short warm-up activities or when there is some time left at the end of the lesson. As Mr. Lee observes, a game should not be regarded as a marginal activity filling in odd moments when the teacher and class have nothing better to do. Games ought to be at the heart of teaching foreign languages. Mr. Rixon suggests that games should be used at all stages of the English lesson, provided that they are suitable and carefully chosen. At different stages of the lesson, the teachers' aims connected with a game may vary:

1. Presentation. It presents and provides a good model making its meaning clear.

2. Controlled practice. It elicits a good imitation of the language and appropriate responses.

3. Communicative practice. It gives to the students a chance to use a foreign language.

Grammar games also lend themselves well to revision exercises helping learners to recall a grammar material in a pleasant, entertaining way. All authors referred to in my report agree that even the grammar games resulted only in noise and entertained students, they are still worth paying attention to and implementing in the classroom since they motivate learners, promote the communicative competence, and generate the fluency. However, can they be more successful for presentation and revision than other techniques? Teaching practice proves that the answer to this question is absolutely affirmative.[9]

Ways of getting students involved in the grammar explanation stage include: getting them to give you example sentences from their imaginations, previous conversations or the textbook; eliciting the names of grammatical forms; getting them to match grammatical names, example sentences and meanings; getting students to prepare grammar presentations for the class for homework; using guided discovery tasks they work through in pairs; and deliberately making mistakes they can correct you on.

[9] www.longman.com

2.2 How to Choose Texts

The most obvious and traditional, but nonetheless useful, text-based grammar exercises are dictation and dicto-comb.

There are at least two implications to this text-level view of language. The **texts** first is that if learners are going to be able to make sense of grammar, they will need to be exposed to it in its contexts of use, and, at the very least, this means in **texts.** Secondly, if learners are to achieve a functional command of a second language, they will need to be able to understand and produce not just isolated sentences, but whole texts in that language. But a text-based approach to grammar is not without its problems. These problems relate principally to the choice of texts. There are at least four possible sources of texts: the **coursebook; authentic** sources, such as newspapers, songs, literary texts, the Internet, etc; the **teacher,** and the **students** themselves.

Advocates of authentic texts argue that not only are such specially written EFL texts uninteresting - and therefore unmotivating - but they misrepresent the way the language is used in real-life contexts. On the other hand, the problems associated with authentic texts cannot be wished away, either, as any teacher who has attempted to use a dense newspaper article with low level students will have discovered. The linguistic load of unfamiliar vocabulary and syntactic complexity can make such texts impenetrable, and ultimately very demotivating.

One kind of authentic text — and one that has been largely under-exploited in conventional classroom practice — is the teacher's text. The teacher's story, the teacher's travel plans, the teacher's New Year resolutions, are likely to be of much more interest to the students than those of a character in a course book. The teacher has the added advantage of being able to talk to students in language they can understand, and to monitor their understanding 'on-line'. [10]

And, finally, the students themselves are capable of producing text. The students' texts may be the most effective, since there is evidence to support the view that the

[10] Scott T. How to Teach Grammar. Printed in Malaysia, PP. p.73

topics that learners raise in the classroom are more likely to be remembered than those introduced by either teachers or course books.

In the following sample lessons, we will see an example of how to deal with each of the four text sources (the course book, authentic texts, the teacher, the students)..

Sample lesson: **Using a scripted dialogue to teach the present simple (Beginners)**

The teacher has chosen the following recorded dialogue from a coursebook to use as a vehicle for introducing the present simple with adverbs of frequency {e.g. *usually, a/ways)* to a group of beginners.

JOE: What do you do on weekends?

DAVID: Well, that depends. During the school year, I usually have to study on Saturdays.

J: And how about on Sundays?

D: Well, we always have lunch together, you know, the whole family. Then after lunch, I sometimes go to the park and meet my friends.

J: Oh? What do you do there?

D: We play soccer, take a walk, or just talk. After that, I go out. I usually go to the movies.

J: HOW often do you go out of the city?

D: About once a month. My uncle has a small farm in the mountains, so

I sometimes drive up there.

The first rule in using a text for the introduction of a new grammatical form is that the structure understand the text. In this case, The teacher has chosen a text that she has estimated is within the students' range. But simply giving the students the chosen text is no guarantee that they will understand it. Steps 1 to 3 are the checking stage, during which the teacher guides the learners to a clearer understanding of the general gist of the text through a carefully staged series of tasks. Note that it is absolutely critical that the students realise that David is describing routine activities, as opposed to past or future ones. Unless this is checked, students might be misled into thinking that the target structure (present simple) is typically used to talk about the past or the future.

From Step 4 on she prepares students to home in on the target language: the instances in the text of present simple with adverbs of frequency. You will notice how, from Steps 1 to 5, each successive listening to the conversation requires learners to attend more and more closely to form. As a rule of thumb, listening tasks should generally move from a **meaning-focus** to a **form-focus.**

Having isolated and highlighted the structure in Steps 5 and 6, she then sets tasks that require learners to demonstrate their understanding of both the form and the meaning of the new item. Notice that at this production stage, the progression is from form-focus to meaning-focus. It is as if, having taken the language item out of its natural habitat (its context), the sooner it gets put back into a context, the better.

Evaluation. The **efficiency** of this kind of presentation depends very much on the text being within the learners' comprehension capacity, which is not always easy jo gauge. It is also essential that the examples of the target language are both intelligible by reference to the context, and prominent or frequent enough in the text to be easily noticed. If such texts are unavailable they may have to be scripted and recorded by the teacher. This detracts from the **ease** of preparation. If texts are too long or too difficult,

unpacking their meaning will require a lot of classroom time, reducing the **economy** factor. A further problem with texts tailored for language presentation is that they start to lose touch with reality, and fail to represent real language use. Course book texts have often been criticized on these grounds. However, assuming the texts are well chosen or well written, the contextual support they provide makes learning relatively easy, and this approach therefore scores highly in terms of **efficacy.**

Many learners will be familiar with materials that use texts to introduce and contextualize new items of language. Also, the use of dialogues generally matches learners' expectations of how language is used in the real world: people use language primarily to talk to each other. In this sense a text-driven approach is usually culturally appropriate. However, learners who experience difficulty in understanding recorded texts may find this approach frustrating. And, as with any inductive approach (see Chapter 4), discovering meaning in texts favours learners who are good at picking out patterns from examples. Learners who prefer a rule-driven approach may, however, feel that the use of texts is a rather roundabout route.

Sample lesson: Using an authentic text to teach the passive (Intermediate)

This teacher has chosen the following authentic text, i.e. a text that was not written specifically for language teaching purposes, as a vehicle for introducing the passive:

DOG ATTACK

Jessica Johnson was out walking with her husband when she was attacked by an unsupervised Alsatian dog. Jessica's leg was bitten, and she had to have stitches in two wounds. Two days later, because the wounds had become infected, Jessica was admitted to hospital. Even after she was discharged, she needed further treatment from her GP - and she was told to rest for two weeks.

Jessica is self-employed and her business was affected while she was sick. Also, the trousers and shoes she'd been wearing at the time of the attack were ruined by bloodstains, and had to be thrown away.

Jessica told us, 'I'm now trying to get compensation from the owners of the dog.'

Step 1

Before handing out the text, the teacher tells the class the title of the article (DOG ATTACK) and asks the students in groups to think of and list vocabulary items that they might expect to find in such a text. These are written on the board, and the teacher uses this stage to feed in words from the text that might not have been mentioned by the students, e.g. *stitches, 'mounds, infected, bloodstains.*

Step 2

The teacher asks the class to read the text silently with a view to answering these questions: *Who was attacked? Where? How badly? Who was to blame?* The students check their answers in pairs before the teacher checks in open class. The teacher asks further questions about the text, such as *How long was she off work? What other losses did she suffer?*

Step3

The teacher asks the class to turn the text over and then writes these two sentences on the board:

1 An unsupervised Alsatian dog attacked

2. *She* was attacked by an unsupervised Alsatian dog.

He asks the class if they can remember which of these two sentences was used in the text. He allows them to check the text if they cannot remember. He then elicits from the students a description of the difference in form between the two sentences, identifying 1 as an active construction and 2 as passive. He points out that while in 1 the subject of the verb (the dog) is the agent, or actor, in 2 the subject of the verb (she) is the person who is affected by the action. He elicits the structure of the passive sentence: subject + auxiliary verb *to be* + past participle. He then asks the students to study the text again and decide why sentence 2 was considered appropriate in this context. He elicits the answer: *Became the woman is the topic, or theme, of the story, not the dog.* (Themes typically go at the beginning of sentences.)

Step 4

The teacher asks the students to find other examples of passive constructions in the text, to underline them, and to discuss in pairs or small groups the rationale for the use of the passive in each case. In checking this task in open class, the following points are made:

- The passive is typically used:

1 to move the theme to the beginning of the sentence, and/or
2 when the agent is unimportant, or not known.

- Where the agent is mentioned, *'by* + agent' is used.

Step 5

The teacher asks the students to cover the text and, working in pairs, to try and reconstruct it from memory. They then compare their versions with the original.

Step 6

The teacher asks students if they (or people they know) have had a similar experience. Having recounted their stories in English they are asked to write their story (or one of their classmate's stories) and this is checked for appropriate use of passive structures.[11]

Discussion

The teacher has chosen a text which is both authentic and rich in examples of the passive. (It is not always the case, however, that grammar structures cluster in this way.) Because it is authentic rather than simplified, the teacher has to work a little harder to make it comprehensible, but, for the sake of presenting language in its context of use, this is an effort that is arguably worth making. As was pointed out above, authentic texts offer learners examples of real language use, undistorted by the heavy hand of **the** grammarian.

In Steps 1 and 2 the teacher aims to achieve a minimum level of understanding, without which any discussion of the targeted language would be poindess. As in Example 1, the shift of focus is from meaning to form, and it is in Step 3 that this shift is engineered. But even while the focus is on the form of the passive, the teacher is quick to remind students how and why it is used. To consolidate this relation between form and use he directs them back to the text (Step 4), which they use as a resource to expand their understanding of the passive. Note that there are one or two slippery examples in the text: is, for example, *the wounds had become infected* an example of the passive? In fact, strictly speaking, it is passive in meaning but not in form. Is *Jessica is self-employed* passive? This looks like a passive, but here *self-employed* is being used as an adjective. It is often the case that authentic materials throw up examples that resist neat categorization. The teacher's choices here include: **a** removing these from the text, or rephrasing them; b explaining why they are exceptions; c enlisting a more

[11] Scott T. How to Teach Grammar. Printed in Malaysia, PP. p.78

general rule that covers all these uses. Most experienced teachers would probably opt for plan b, in this instance.

Step 5 tests the ability of learners to produce the appropriate forms in context. The teacher has chosen a writing task rather than a speaking one, partly because the passive is not used in spoken English to the extent that it is in written English, but also because a writing exercise allows learners more thinking time, important when meeting relatively complex structures such as the passive. They then have a chance to personalize the theme through a speaking and writing activity (Step 6): the writing also serves as a way of testing whether the lesson's linguistic aim has been achieved.

Evaluation: This approach is **economical** only if the texts are neither too difficult nor too long, and if they contain typical examples of the target item. Therefore the time spent finding the right text, and, having found it, designing tasks to make it comprehensible, detracts from the **ease** of this approach. However, assuming the texts are available, this approach must rate highly in terms of **efficacy** for, apart from anything else, the experience of successfully learning grammar from authentic texts provides the self-directed learner with a powerful tool for independent study.

Moreover, even if some learners are already familiar with the targeted item, authentic texts are usually so language-rich that the student is likely to come away from the lesson having gained in some other way, such as learning new vocabulary. Students in many cultures will be familiar with text-based approaches to language study, and for many students the sense of achievement experienced from cracking an authentic text will be motivating. But others, especially at lower levels, may find them daunting. It may be better, in such cases, to use simplified texts. The technique on which this lesson is based is variously called **die to gloss, dictocomp,** or **grammar dictation.** Unlike traditional dictation, where the text is read and transcribed clause-by-clause or sentence-by-sentence, the dictogloss technique requires learners to process the whole text at once. To do this, they have to capture the meaning of the text,

although they may not be able to recall the exact forms in which that meaning is conveyed. That is, they understand the teacher's account of his holidays, but they don't have a word-for-word memory of exactly what he said. So, when it comes to reconstructing the meaning of the text, they tend to draw on forms which they are already familiar with (e.g. *we drove* rather than *we'd drive).* When they compare their version of the text with the original version, they are well-positioned to notice the difference between how they expressed the meaning and how the teacher himself expressed it. The difference between *ive drove* and *we'd drive* is one instance of the difference between their grammar and the teacher's (or target) grammar. It is important for the learner to notice the differences for themselves, as we have seen before, in order for them to make the necessary adjustments to their mental grammar. It is essential, therefore, that the text should be short, and within their general level of competence — apart, that is, from the inclusion of the targeted language form. For this activity, therefore, prepared texts will probably work better than authentic ones. But the delivery should aim for authenticity, and, if possible, the teacher should try to 'tell' the text at Step 1 rather than simply read it aloud, in order to engage the students' attention more directly. It may be necessary to re-tell the text once or twice: the teacher will need to monitor his students carefully in order to assess their comprehension.

It is also important that learners are given a chance to collaborate on the reconstruction task at Steps 2 and 3: the discussions they have at this stage about the appropriacy and accuracy of language forms are a valuable aware ness-raising opportunity.

Step 4 is facilitated by the use of an overhead projector, but this is not essential. The teacher could write up his own version, or distribute it in the form of a handout. It is important that learners are clear as to the nature of the differences between their own text and the original. That is, their version may include acceptable alternatives *(a beacb which we liked* for *a beach we liked),* or parts of it may be unacceptable *(we usedto go to*

camping for *ive used to go camping).* Learners should be encouraged to ask questions about their texts in order to clarify the nature of these differences.

The role of **noticing** as a prerequisite for learning has been emphasised in the recent literature on second language acquisition (see page 16), and the dictogloss technique provides a useful means for guiding learners towards **noticing the gap** between their present language competence and their target competence. It also allows learners at different levels to notice different things. Therefore, on the grounds of **efficacy** it rates high. It is also relatively **easy** to set up, although not all structures can be worked into a short text so naturally. In terms of **economy** the activity makes good use of time, and ensures learners are working collaboratively on language production tasks at an early stage in the lesson.

Some learners find the challenge of reconstructing texts from memory forbiddingly difficult, especially if they view it as a test rather than a learning exercise. Such learners need to be prepared gradually for dictogloss tasks, by means of using very short texts (even single sentences), or texts that they have already seen in their written form. The teacher can also allow them repeated hearings and can give them some explanation as to the purposes of the task, and suggests strategies they can use to perform it.

Summary

Most grammar instruction in the ESL classroom focuses on the sentence level, reading and writing activities engage the students at the “text” level. Context grammar teaching is also useful for second language students. And using texts is interesting, through texts students can take different interesting information and they learn grammatical rules: tenses, voices, word order and other…

3.0. CHAPTER III Evaluation of A2 level learners through Testing

3.1. Types of testing to Evaluate Learners' Knowledge

Until about 1926, most colleges and universities used locally developed essay tests to evaluate the readiness of applicants to undertake and successfully complete collegiate study (Whitney, 1993). In response to the need for a more efficient and standardized method for screening, the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) created the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) in efforts to provide college officials with comparable test results for all candidates. As World War II ended and servicemen took advantage of the GI Bill, an even greater need arose to evaluate the readiness of large numbers of applicants for entrance into university systems across the United States. More recently, admissions-test scores have been used extensively to recruit students into specialized programs of study.[12]

We can test the students' ability to speak or write. We can test students' reading or listening comprehension skills. Many tests include all these elements, especially public exams like those from the University of Cambridge or the Oxford Delegacy, for example, which have four or five separate papers. But because marking written tests is easier than marking oral tests - and because written tests take less time and are easier to administer - most tests are based on the written skills, especially when they are designed for individual schools and colleges. Many teachers feel that this is unsatisfactory since so much teaching in the classroom is based on oral work, but as yet no one has come up with a practical solution to the problems of time and administration with oral tests for large numbers of students.[13]

Public exams test how good a student's overall command of English is. In this chapter, however, we will look at tests which are given in schools and classes to find out how well students have done. These are often called *achievement* tests and are given after four or six weeks' study, or after three or four units of a course book, or after a semester or year's work. The aim of such tests

[12] www.google.com
[13] Jeremy H. Teaching and Learning Grammar. Cambridge,UK.1986.p.57.

is to see if students have learnt and acquired the language they have been studying or have been exposed to. Tests are usually written by heads of departments or by teachers of individual classes.

Writing achievement tests

Writing a test is an important job that demands skill and patience. Good tests show both teacher and students how well they are all doing. They do not fail students unnecessarily and they give everyone a chance to show how much they have learnt.

Tests can often go wrong, not just because of the students' lack of knowledge,but also because of problems in the writing of the tests themselves. When writing tests teachers should bear in mind the following five 'rules'.

1. Don't test what you haven't taught

The purpose of an achievement test is to find out how well students have achieved what they have been studying. In such a test, then, it is not fair to test things that they haven't been exposed to. Stick to the language that you have been studying unless you are testing reading or listening comprehension (where the students' ability to understand unfamiliar words is one of the things you will be looking at). Of course, where students are being asked to write freely, they can be encouraged to be as ambitious as you want them to be (see 4 below).

2Don't test general knowledge

Test writers should remember that they are testing the students[1] knowledge of *English,* not their knowledge of the world. For example, a test item like this would not be acceptable.

Picasso was a famous___

It is, after all, quite possible that your students have never heard of Picasso, especially if they are young or come from non-European cultures. The problem is that if students get this item wrong, you don't know if it is because they don't know about Picasso or because they don't know the word *painter* (or *artist).*

3Don't introduce new techniques in tests

One thing that confuses students in tests, is the presence of item types and techniques that they have never seen before. In other words, if students are given a set of jumbled words and asked to reorder them to make a sentence, we would expect them to have seen this type of activity before in class. If the sentence-ordering activity is completely new to them, they may have difficulties understanding how to do the question which have nothing to do with their knowledge of English (or lack of it).

4Don't just test accuracy

Although we will be looking mainly at items which test grammatical accuracy in this chapter, it is vital that an achievement test examines the students' ability to use language, not just their knowledge of grammatical accuracy. In other words students must be given a chance to write a letter, a description or an essay (for example) at some stage in the test. The teacher marking the test can then see if the students are able to express themselves freely, as well as being able to do questions about speci6c language items. Items which only test one thing (e.g. a verb form or a question word) have been called *discrete* items. Test items which test the students' whole knowledge of the language - like essay writing - have been called *integrative.*

5Don't forget to test the test

It is extremely unwise to write a test and give it straight to the students. Often unforeseen problems arise. Perhaps you forgot to write clear instructions. Perhaps there are some mistakes. Perhaps the test is far too difficult - or far too

easy. But especially if the test is important for students (and most tests are) you must try to ensure that it works[14].

The first thing to do when you have just written a test is to show it to colleagues. They will often spot problems that you have not thought of - and they may be able to suggest improvements. At the very least they should spot misprints! If possible you should try your test out with a class of students similar to your own. Sometimes the best way to do this is to get a class of a slightly higher level than your own to try it out. If they can do it fairly comfortably then you've probably got the level about right. But even if you can't try out your test on other students, you must get other people to read it to spot any obvious mistakes or problems.

[14] Jeremy H. Teaching and Learning Grammar. Cambridge,UK.1986.p.59

3.2 Test Items for Low levels

A notable concern of many teachers is that they frequently have the task of constructing tests but have relatively little training or information to rely on in this task. The objective of this article is to set out some conventional wisdom for the construction of multiple-choice tests, which are one of the most common forms of teacher-constructed tests. The comments which follow are applicable mainly to multiple-choice tests covering fairly broad topic areas.

Before proceeding, it will be useful to establish our terms for discussing multiple-choice items. The *stem* is the introductory question or incomplete statement at the beginning of each item and this is followed by the options. The *options* consist of the answer -- the correct option -- and *distractors*--the incorrect but (we hope) tempting options.

General Objectives

As a rule, one is concerned with writing stems that are clear and parsimonious, answers that are unequivocal and chosen by the students who do best on the test, and distractors that are plausible competitors of the answer as evidenced by the frequency with which they are chosen. Lastly, and probably most important, we should adopt the attitude that items need to be developed over time in the light of evidence that can be obtained from the statistical output typically provided by a measurement services office (where tests are machine-scored) and from "expert" editorial review.

Planning

The primary objective in planning a test is to outline the actual course content that the test will cover. A convenient way of accomplishing this is to take 10 minutes following each class to list on an index card the important concepts covered in class and in assigned reading for that day. These cards can then be used later as a source of test items. An even more conscientious approach, of course, would be to construct the test items themselves after each class. The advantage of either of these approaches is

that the resulting test is likely to be a better representation of course activity than if the test were constructed before the course or after the course, when we usually have only a fond memory or optimistic syllabus to draw from. When we are satisfied that we have an accurate description of the content areas, then all that remains is to construct items that represent specific content areas. In developing good multiple-choice items, three tasks need to be considered: writing stems, writing options, and ongoing item development. The first two are discussed in this article.

Writing Stems

We will first describe some basic rules for the construction of multiple-choice stems, because they are typically, though not necessarily, written before the options.

1. Before writing the stem, identify the one point to be tested by that item. In general, the stem should not pose more than one problem, although the solution to that problem may require more than one step.

2. Construct the stem to be either an incomplete statement or a direct question, avoiding stereotyped phraseology, as rote responses are usually based on verbal stereotypes. For example, the following stems (with answers in parentheses) illustrate undesirable phraseology:

What is the biological theory of recapitulation? (Ontogeny repeats phylogeny)

Who was the chief spokesman for the "American System?" (Henry Clay)

Correctly answering these questions likely depends less on understanding than on recognizing familiar phraseology.

3. Avoid including nonfunctional words that do not contribute to the basis for choosing among the options. Often an introductory statement is included to enhance the appropriateness or significance of an item but does not affect the meaning of the problem in the item. Generally, such superfluous phrases should be excluded. For example, consider:

The American flag has three colors. One of them is (1) red (2) green (3) black versus

One of the colors of the American flag is (1) red (2) green (3) black

In particular, irrelevant material should not be used to make the answer less obvious. This tends to place too much importance on reading comprehension as a determiner of the correct option.

4. Include as much information in the stem and as little in the options as possible. For example, if the point of an item is to associate a term with its definition, the preferred format would be to present the definition in the stem and several terms as options rather than to present the term in the stem and several definitions as options.

5. Restrict the use of negatives in the stem. Negatives in the stem usually require that the answer be a false statement. Because students are likely in the habit of searching for true statements, this may introduce an unwanted bias.

6. Avoid irrelevant clues to the correct option. Grammatical construction, for example, may lead students to reject options which are grammatically incorrect as the stem is stated. Perhaps more common and subtle, though, is the problem of common elements in the stem and in the answer. Consider the following item:

What led to the formation of the States' Rights Party?

a. *The level of federal taxation*

b. *The demand of states for the right to make their own laws*

c. *The industrialization of the South*

d. *The corruption of federal legislators on the issue of state taxation*

One does not need to know U.S. history in order to be attracted to the answer, b.

Other rules that we might list are generally commonsensical, including recommendations for independent and important items and prohibitions against complex, imprecise wording.

Writing Options

Following the construction of the item stem, the likely more difficult task of generating options presents itself. The rules we list below are not likely to simplify this task as much as they are intended to guide our creative efforts.

1. Be satisfied with three or four well constructed options. Generally, the minimal improvement to the item due to that hard-to-come-by fifth option is not worth the effort to construct it. Indeed, all else the same, a test of 10 items each with four options is likely a better test than a test with nine items of five options each.

2. Construct distractors that are comparable in length, complexity and grammatical form to the answer, avoiding the use of such words as "always," "never," and "all." Adherence to this rule avoids some of the more common sources of biased cueing. For example, we sometimes find ourselves increasing the length and specificity of the answer (relative to distractors) in order to insure its truthfulness. This, however, becomes an easy-to-spot clue for the test wise student. Related to this issue is the question of whether or not test writers should take advantage of these types of cues to construct more tempting distractors. Surely not! The number of students choosing a distractor should depend only on deficits in the content area which the item targets and should not depend on cue biases or reading comprehension differences in "favor" of the distractor.

3. Options which read "none of the above," "both a. and e. above," "all of the above," _etc_., should be avoided when the students have been instructed to choose "the best answer," which implies that the options vary in degree of correctness. On the other hand, "none of the above" is acceptable if the question is factual and is probably desirable if computation yields the answer. "All of the above" is never desirable, as one recognized distractor eliminates it and two recognized answers identify it.

4. After the options are written, vary the location of the answer on as random a basis as possible. A convenient method is to flip two (or three) coins at a time where each possible Head-Tail combination is associated with a particular location for the answer. Furthermore, if the test writer is conscientious enough to randomize the answer locations, students should be informed that the locations are randomized. (Test wise students know that for some instructors the first option is rarely the answer.)

5. If possible, have a colleague with expertise in the content area of the exam review the items for possible ambiguities, redundancies or other structural difficulties. Having completed the items we are typically so relieved that we may be tempted to regard the task as completed and each item in its final and permanent form. Yet, another source of item and test improvement is available to us, namely, statistical analyses of student responses.

Summary

In this chapter a number of exercises, grammar tests and rules have been written. The appropriateness of testing procedures used in educational settings is based on the intended uses of test results. The high technical quality that characterizes most published standardized achievement tests is accomplished by involving content area specialists in the production of content specific test items, and conducting national pilot studies that provide statistics that psychometricians review to determine item acceptability. Standardized achievement tests are advantageous for making admission decisions that require comparable results for large and diverse groups of individuals. According to Whitney (1993), a combination of both standardized test scores and prior academic record (i.e., high school grades based on classroom assessments) are the best predictors of college success. Information from both testing formats provides good information about a student achievement. When considered collectively both types of assessments offer a much more complete picture of a student's capabilities then when considered in isolation.

Conclusion

In this research work I try to notice what makes a good presentation as well as factors to take into account when deciding how to explain and present grammar. This work included a grammar presentation toolkit – suggestions and tips for different ways to present grammar that we can incorporate into our teaching.

What is grammar? There is more than one answer to this question, What grammar is depends on how you choose to look at it, so we can regard it as a formal mechanism, as a functional system for signaling meanings, or as a dynamic resource which both user and learners call on in different ways at different times.

You have to teach entirely in English if the members of your class don't speak the same language. A multilingual class can be both an advantage and a disadvantage. GT is a 'pre-theoretical' approach, in that it developed before the age of theory-formation in the linguistics, psychology and pedagogy which have informed later approaches such as audio-lingualism, the communicative approach, suggestopedia and so on. But this is no reason to discredit it. After all, there's more to language teaching than applying theory. One of the pioneers of modern English language teaching (Palmer 1922) looks forward to a time when scientific progress will have led us the most effective way of teaching. Well, it hasn't happened yet, and there's not much sign of it happening. Suggestopedia, community language learning and total physical response are all based on principles that can make at least some claim to be scientific, but they could hardly be more different from each other.I looked up using contexts in teaching grammar and try to explain advantages and disadvantages of using texts. I noticed similarities and differences among the contexts and compared them to our experiences and common since. Telling stories provide a realistic context for presenting grammar points and holds and focus students' attention in away that no other technique can. Although some teachers are better at telling stories then others, almost any of us can tell stories with energy and interest. Students naturally like to listen to stories, and most are remembered long after lesson is over. Also grammar games role-plays, dialogs, conversation are

important in teaching grammar. In addition to facilitating a match between structure social factors and diagnosing gaps in grammatical knowledge, these activities provide meaningful contexts for integrating writing, reading, pronunciation listening and grammar.

Testing is important thing to know about students' knowledge. This way is useful for students and teachers. Because teacher know about learners' level and how well they have done their lessons. If the teacher wants her students to be perfect, she should use different types of tests: written and oral tests. Some kinds of test explore the students' knowledge of syntax; some tests test their knowledge on grammar.

5.0. Bibliography:

1. И.А. Каримов Гармонично развитое поколение-основа прагресса Узбекистана. Ташкент.
2. O’zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti I.A.Karimov. Ta’lim va tarbiya sohasiga bag’ishlangan asarlari va maqolalari.
3. Ta’lim haqidagi qonun. T. 1997. 153 b.
4. Kadrlar tayyorlash milliy dasturi. T. 1997. 113 b.
5. Buranov G.B. Ingliz va o’zbek tillari qiyosiy grammatikasi.T. 1973. 125 b.
6. Buranov G.B. Buranova M. Toshboyeva M. Ingliz tili grammatikasi. Ma’lumotnoma. Toshkent. 1978. 245 b.
7. Boyqo’ziyev X.B. Ingliz va o’zbek tillari sodda gaplarida so’z tartibi. T. 1974. 152 b.
8. Jalolov J. D. Chet tili o’qitish metodikasi. T.1996. 215 b.
9. Zaripov R.A. Chet tili o’qitish metodikasidan qo’llanma.T. 1986. 215 b.
10. Zaripov R.A. O’zbek o’rta maktablarida chet tilini o’qitish metodikasining asosiy yo’nalishlari. T. 1979. 254 b.
11. Tsetlen B.S. O’rtya maktablarda chet tilini o’qitish kursi. T.1978. 152 b.
12. Xakimov I. O’rta maktablarda nemis tili grammatikasini o’qitish metodikasi. T. 1978. 254 b.
13. Sharipov G.V. O’qitishning texnik vositalari. T. 1974. 251 b.
14. O’rta maktablarda chet tilini o’qitishning umumiy metodi. T. 12974. Miralyubov A.A. Raxmonov I. V. taxriri ostida. 215 b.
15. Ualbert G.M. Klementenko A.B. Ingliz tili og’zaki nutqini o’stirish. T. 1977. 245 b.
16. Murphy R. English Grammar in Use. Cambridge University Press. 1997. 181 p.
17. Scott Thornbury. How to Teach Grammar. (2003) Malaysia. 182 p.

18. Jeremy Harmer. Teaching and Learning Grammar. (1986) Cambridge, UK. 71 p.

19. Rob Batstone. Grammar. (1994) Oxford University Press. 146 p.

20. Marian Celce-Mmurcia, Sharon Hilles. Techniques and Resources in Teaching Grammar. (1988) Oxford University Press. 184 p.

21. Lindsay Clandfield, Philip Kerr. The Straightforward Guide to Presenting Grammar. 34 p.

22. Penny Ur. Grammar Practice Activities: A Practical Guide for Teachers., Cambridge Handbooks for Language Teachers 1988. 85 p.

23. Peter Watcyn Jones Grammar Games and Activities for Teachers. How to Teach English. Jeremy Harmer, Penguin Books 1995. 185 p.

24. Tokareva L.N. Ingliz tilidan fakultativ mashqlar uchun xrestomatiya. T. 1976.

25. Hoshimov U. Yoqubov I. O'rta maktablarda ingliz tili o'qitish metodikasi. T 1993. 164 b.

26. Madsen H. Techniques in Testing. New York: Oxford University Press. 1983. 182 p.

27. Wright A. Games for Language Learning. Cambridge University Press. 1984. 124 p.

28. Rutherford W.S. Second Language Grammars: Learning and Teaching. New York: Longman. 1987. 184 p.

29. Richards J. The Context of Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press.1985. 155 p.

30. www.macmillanenglish.com/strightfofward

31. www.google.com