

PRACTICAL ANALYSIS OF GRAMMAR IN PRACTICAL LESSONS

Mamadaliyeva Burayma Sabitaliyevna

Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology Teacher of “Foreign Languages”
Department

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10059040>

Abstract: Teaching grammar is becoming very debatable issue in recent days, because as Stephen Krashen (1982) said “ there is a great deal of effect on the language use of the learner and this effect is peripheral and fragile”. It is known that there are three different approaches to teaching grammar and they are teaching grammar as a product, teaching grammar as a process and the last one is teaching grammar as a skill, below we will focus on each separately.

Keywords: Grammar as Product, grammar as process, grammar as skill, deductive teaching, integrated skills.

ПРАКТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ ГРАММАТИКИ НА ПРАКТИЧЕСКИХ ЗАНЯТИЯХ

Аннотация: Преподавание грамматики в последние дни становится очень дискуссионным вопросом, потому что, как сказал Стивен Крашен (1982), «на использование языка учащимся оказывается большое влияние, и это влияние является периферийным и хрупким». Известно, что существует три разных подхода к обучению грамматике: обучение грамматике как продукту, обучение грамматике как процессу и последний – обучение грамматике как навыку, ниже мы остановимся на каждом отдельно.

Ключевые слова: Грамматика как продукт, грамматика как процесс, грамматика как навык, дедуктивное обучение, интегрированные навыки.

INTRODUCTION

Teaching grammar as a product is also considered deductive teaching as well, and these both approaches mainly focus on form and structure rather than meaning or other aspects of the language. According to Huang (2005) “ teaching grammar as a product concentrates on basically giving learners a clear framework of the language”. The chosen two activities in the first and second appendix can highlight the approach and its features as well. The first activity (*Appendix 1*) is a gap filling exercise, which is a set of exercises related to Present Continuous Tense. It is clear that the activity did not go beyond grammatical formulas and rules and did not require the learner’s personal opinion or creativity, so this activity that illuminated this approach in itself. By analyzing this activity it can be said that there are several “noticing” features. The instruction of the first exercises asks using Present Continuous Tense, in the second exercises there are key word and time expressions that in which tense is the sentence and the learners can easily notice the tense by the above mentioned clues, besides that “self-discovery” feature also emphasized in the activity. In terms of advantages of this approach can be several as it provides strong grammatical basis by giving main focus on grammar. And later on the learners will use their language in their future life without grammatical errors.

Like the first activity, this activity almost focuses on form and little bit meaning as well (*Appendix 2*). Some key words, auxiliary verbs and time expressions reveal the tense of the sentence and it makes the feature of “ noticing”. The learners are expected to discover the right tenses and there are clues to limit any suggestions by the learners. This approach to teaching grammar can be helpful as Batstone (1994) mentioned “by doing such kind of activities learners improve their grammatical patterns and their associated meaning.

GRAMMAR AS PROCESS

Unlike the product approach teaching grammar as process is not mainly focus on only grammatical forms of the language. As Batstone (1994) defined this approach to grammar teaching as increasing integrated skills of learners to express their opinions efficiently. Product teaching approach only focuses on grammatical competence of the learners while process teaching involves learner's personal involvement as well as grammar competence. Huang (2005) argues that "teaching grammar as process emphasizes the use of language by the learner". The activities in appendixes 3 and 4 are clearly highlight the process teaching approach. In the first activity (*Appendix3*) students are asked to use future perfect tense structure including their own weekly schedule, which means grammar structure and personal opinion. In this activity the opportunity to use language is partly limited, because they are asked to use mostly future perfect tense within the given time. Besides teacher gives 5 minutes to get ready and jot down some sentences in order to support the students. By utilizing this approach the students will be motivated to pay more attention to meaning and purposeful production.

The next activity (*Appendix 4*) also a good example of the teaching grammar as a process. In this activity language use is almost limited. In the instruction part the learners are asked to use past tense in their speech and they are allowed to speak some part of the whole story giving others turn. There are some advantages of this approach such as this approach can be challenging to some students but they are not forced, besides learners personality and attitudes are centralized. Moreover learners will be certain while choosing the strategies to express their ideas. In terms of some suggestions to improve this activity that it would be better if each of the students write their own whole story by using past simple tense.

Grammar as Skill Different from both previous approaches this way of teaching grammar is completely independent way of using grammar structures without any borders. In the article (*Appendix 5*) the learners all taken into reflection and the grammatical competence of the learners is taken into consideration as well as their active speech. Regarding the following activity (*Appendix 6*) the learners are asked to speak about the important person hat has influence on their life. As it is obvious learners are expected to use mainly Present Perfect Tense. Hence this is not mentioned in the instruction thus, it has reflection of all the students. Coming to the advantages of this approach, there are several good sides that can be mentioned. There is no any limitations or further requirements like usage certain type of the tenses or using topic related vocabulary and so on, that is why students creativity will be encouraged.

All chosen activities clearly reflects the approaches regardingly and for this reason I have decided to choose them. If there are opportunities teaching grammar a process is more acceptable, because it is neither only grammar-focused nor forms-focused only, as this approach holds balance between two approaches I would prefer to use this approach in my future grammar lessons.

CONCLUSION

In addition to the above understanding, below it can be seen a comparison of the controversial views of several scholars regarding the types of grammar activities instruction and development of these instructions. According to Asghar. Et al. (2014) a linguistically, conceptually, and culturally oriented text not only helps the reader to perceive the world in a schematic background, but also provides them with the skills to be autonomous thinkers. Unlike Asghar, Allan,R. (1989) continues his views on the independent reader as follows: by allowing readers to be involved in learning process, by providing effective contexts for reading, by creating a supportive atmosphere for learners, they should be provided with such chances and

demonstrations that will give students the opportunity to be independent thinkers, readers and learners. Another researchers, Cequena, Song, Joeseeph M., Hannah et. al. (2016) argue that contextualization is another common critical reading strategy that requires the student to place text in historical, biographical, and cultural contexts where students may not have enough information to implement contextualization while reading. Contrary to the above views, according to Nichols W.D. (2000), critical reading instructions should be intended to provide students with the right direction, taking into account their background culture, their first language accent, and their cultural values, and he addsthat much of the current successful methods are largely based on the European American paradigms.

REFERENCES:

1. Batstone, R. (1994). Teaching grammar as a product. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
2. Huang, Z.-W. (2005). Grammar teaching as product or as process. Sino-US English Teaching 2.
3. Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and Practices in Second Language Acquisition. New York: Pergamon Press.
4. Penny Ur., Andrew W., (1992). Five Minute Activities: *a recourse book of short activities*. Cambridge University Press
5. Penny Ur, (2006). Grammar practice activities: *a practical guide for teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
6. <https://www.google.com/url?sa=i&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwiz5vKs1ozwAhWsIYsKHczDAVAQjhx6BAGBEAI&url=https%3A%2F%2Fen.islcollective.com%2Fenglish-esl-worksheets%2Fmaterial-type%2Ftests-and-testing%2Fmultiple-choice-review-tenses>
7. <https://en.islcollective.com/english-esl-worksheets/grammar/present-continuous-progressive-tense/present-continuous-gap-filling-exercis>