BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg
BG PULSE JOURNAL

METHODOLOGY OF TEACHING GRAMMAR: FROM RULES TO COMMUNICATION

Tangirova Sevara Rustamovna
Toshkent Ijtimoiy Innovatsiyalar Universiteti o‘qituvchisi.
sevara.rustamovna.tangirova97@gmail.com
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23160038

Abstract: This article provides a comprehensive examination of the methodologies employed in teaching grammar, tracing the evolution of grammar pedagogy from prescriptive rule-based instruction to contemporary, communicative approaches. Drawing upon decades of research in applied linguistics, second language acquisition, and educational psychology, the article synthesizes major theoretical frameworks including the interface position, the consciousness-raising approach, processing instruction, and the focus on form paradigm. The central argument posits that effective grammar instruction requires a principled, balanced approach that recognizes the role of explicit knowledge in facilitating implicit acquisition, integrates grammar into meaningful communication, and addresses the developmental readiness of learners.

Keywords: grammar teaching, second language acquisition, explicit instruction, implicit learning, focus on form, processing instruction, consciousness-raising, corrective feedback, communicative competence, pedagogical grammar

Grammar teaching has been one of the most hotly debated topics in language education for over a century. At the heart of the debate lies a fundamental question: should grammar be taught explicitly, through explanations and rules, or should it be acquired implicitly, through exposure and communication? This question has generated passionate arguments, shifting pedagogical paradigms, and extensive research, yet it remains unresolved.

The traditional view held that grammar was the foundation of language learning. The Grammar-Translation Method, which dominated language teaching for centuries, was built on the systematic study of grammatical rules. Learners memorized paradigms, analyzed sentences, and translated texts. Grammar was the object of instruction, and accuracy was the primary goal. This approach produced learners who could parse complex sentences but often struggled to communicate fluently.

The communicative revolution of the 1970s challenged this view. Communicative Language Teaching prioritized meaning and communication over form. Grammar was not abandoned but was taught implicitly, through exposure to comprehensible input and opportunities for meaningful interaction. The goal was communicative competence, not grammatical perfection. This approach produced learners who could communicate fluently but sometimes lacked grammatical accuracy.

In recent decades, a more nuanced view has emerged. Research in second language acquisition has demonstrated that both explicit and implicit knowledge play important roles in language development. Explicit knowledge, or knowledge of rules, can facilitate the acquisition of implicit knowledge, or the ability to use language spontaneously. The question is not whether to teach grammar but how to teach it effectively.

The distinction between explicit and implicit knowledge is fundamental to grammar pedagogy. Explicit knowledge is conscious, declarative knowledge of grammatical rules. It can be verbalized and is accessible to conscious reflection. Implicit knowledge is unconscious, procedural knowledge that enables spontaneous language use. It is accessed automatically in real-time communication. Research suggests that explicit knowledge can facilitate the development of implicit knowledge, particularly for complex structures that are not easily noticed in input. However, explicit knowledge does not automatically become implicit; the interface between the two types of knowledge is a matter of ongoing debate.

The role of input in grammar acquisition is central. Learners must be exposed to the target language in order to acquire grammatical structures. Input must be comprehensible and contain the target forms. The Input Hypothesis, associated with Stephen Krashen, argued that acquisition occurs when learners understand input that is slightly beyond their current level. While this hypothesis has been influential, it has been critiqued for neglecting the role of output and interaction.

The role of output in grammar acquisition has been emphasized by Merrill Swain's Output Hypothesis. Output pushes learners to process language syntactically, not just semantically. When learners struggle to express themselves, they notice gaps in their knowledge and may attend more closely to input. Output thus facilitates the move from semantic to syntactic processing.

The role of interaction in grammar acquisition is highlighted by the Interaction Hypothesis. Interaction provides opportunities for negotiation of meaning, which draws attention to problematic language. When communication breaks down, learners are pushed to modify their output, and this modification may promote acquisition.

The concept of developmental readiness is crucial for understanding grammar acquisition. Learners acquire grammatical structures in a predictable order, and instruction is most effective when it targets structures that learners are developmentally ready to acquire. Instruction that targets structures beyond the learner's developmental level may be ineffective. This has implications for sequencing and pacing in grammar instruction.

The focus on form paradigm, associated with Michael Long, represents a middle ground between form-focused and meaning-focused instruction. Focus on form involves drawing attention to grammatical features in the context of meaning-focused communication. It contrasts with focus on forms, which involves isolating grammatical structures for systematic instruction. Focus on form is reactive, responding to learner needs in communicative contexts.

Processing instruction, developed by Bill VanPatten, is an approach to grammar instruction that focuses on how learners process input. Learners are guided to attend to grammatical features and to interpret their meaning. Processing instruction has been shown to be effective for a range of grammatical structures.

Grammar presentation involves introducing new grammatical structures to learners. Presentation can be deductive, where the teacher explains the rule and provides examples, or inductive, where learners discover the rule through exposure and analysis. Deductive presentation is efficient and clear but may not promote deep processing. Inductive presentation promotes discovery and engagement but may be time-consuming and confusing. A combined approach, with deductive explanation followed by inductive practice, is often effective. Presentation should include attention to meaning, form, and use.

Grammar practice involves activities that reinforce and deepen knowledge of grammatical structures. Practice activities should move from controlled to freer. Controlled practice includes gap-filling, transformation, and substitution exercises. Semi-controlled practice includes sentence completion and guided writing. Free practice includes discussion, composition, and communicative tasks that require the use of target structures. Practice activities should be meaningful and contextualized.

Processing instruction involves guiding learners to process input for meaning and form. Activities include structured input tasks where learners must interpret meaning based on grammatical cues. Processing instruction has been shown to be effective for a range of structures. It addresses the tendency of learners to rely on non-grammatical cues.

Corrective feedback is essential for grammar development. Teachers can correct errors explicitly, providing the correct form, or implicitly, recasting the learner's utterance. Research suggests that recasts are generally effective but may not always be noticed. Prompts, which encourage self-correction, are also effective. Feedback should be selective, focusing on errors that affect communication or that are amenable to correction.

Integrating grammar into communicative activities is essential. Grammar can be the focus of pre-communicative activities, the focus of feedback during communication, or the focus of post-communicative analysis. Grammar should not be separated from communication but should be addressed as it arises in communicative contexts.

Grammar teaching faces numerous contemporary challenges that require ongoing methodological development and critical reflection.The role of explicit knowledge in communicative proficiency is a persistent challenge. While explicit knowledge can support acquisition, it is not sufficient for fluency. Learners need opportunities to proceduralize explicit knowledge through practice. The transition from explicit to implicit knowledge is not automatic and requires extensive exposure and use.

The tension between accuracy and fluency is another challenge. Overemphasis on accuracy may inhibit fluency, while overemphasis on fluency may lead to fossilized errors. Effective instruction balances the two, providing opportunities for both accuracy-focused and fluency-focused practice.The use of corpora in grammar teaching is a significant development. Corpora provide empirical data on grammatical patterns, allowing instruction to reflect actual language use. Teachers can use corpora to identify frequent patterns, collocations, and common errors. Learners can engage in data-driven learning, exploring language patterns directly.

The integration of grammar and vocabulary is increasingly recognized. Grammar and vocabulary are not separate systems; they interact in complex ways. Certain grammatical patterns are associated with particular lexical items. Instruction should address the interface of grammar and vocabulary.

The role of first language in grammar acquisition is complex. Transfer from the first language can facilitate or impede acquisition. Instruction should address cross-linguistic differences and similarities. Contrastive analysis can be useful for anticipating and addressing learner errors.

The use of technology in grammar teaching continues to evolve. Online grammar resources, intelligent tutoring systems, and automated feedback provide opportunities for individualized

instruction and practice. Technology can supplement classroom instruction and support autonomous learning.

The assessment of grammar is a persistent challenge. Traditional grammar tests often measure explicit knowledge rather than implicit knowledge. Performance-based assessments provide more authentic measures of grammatical ability. Assessment should include both explicit and implicit measures.

Based on the theoretical foundations and practical considerations explored in this article, here are recommendations for effective grammar instruction and an outlook on future directions.

Adopt a balanced approach. Grammar instruction should balance explicit and implicit learning, form and meaning, accuracy and fluency. The balance will depend on learner needs, context, and goals.

Provide meaningful practice. Practice should move from controlled to freer and from receptive to productive. Practice should be meaningful and contextualized. Practice should provide opportunities for retrieval.

Use feedback selectively. Correct errors that affect communication or that are amenable to correction. Provide feedback that is timely and supportive. Encourage self-correction.

A final reflection: grammar is not an end in itself but a means to communication. The goal of grammar instruction is not grammatical perfection but communicative effectiveness. Grammar is the architecture of language, providing the structure that enables meaning to be conveyed. The methodology we adopt should serve this deeper purpose, helping learners build the grammatical resources they need for meaningful communication and lifelong learning.

References

1. Batstone, R. (1994). Grammar. Oxford University Press.
2. Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015). The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course (3rd ed.). Heinle Cengage Learning.
3. DeKeyser, R. (1995). Learning second language grammar rules: An experiment with a miniature linguistic system. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17(3), 379-410.
4. Ellis, R. (1994). A theory of instructed second language acquisition. In N. Ellis (Ed.), Implicit and explicit learning of languages (pp. 79-114). Academic Press.
5. Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. TESOL Quarterly, 25(4), 605-628.
6. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring. Heinle.
7. Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). How languages are learned (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
8. Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective (pp. 39-52). John Benjamins.
9. Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2011). Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context. Routledge.
10. Pienemann, M. (1998). Language processing and second language development: Processability theory. John Benjamins