

gives students the possibility to shine and feel comfortable in the classroom. The teaching becomes more like a real world and helps students develop their special and sometimes even unique abilities, which is extremely useful when studying foreign languages. Also, it should be noted that teachers must value what students can do and support their strongest intelligences while doing their best to improve weaker ones. Implementing the Multiple Intelligences Theory to the English language classroom can mean a better result for the students mastering the language as well as for the teachers because there is so much variety involved. Used in the English language classroom as an integral part of Communicative Teaching Approach, Multiple Intelligences Theory offers various ways of better assessment where students are greatly involved, thus giving them the opportunity to reflect on their learning and set goals for themselves concerning the intelligences.

### References

1. **Armstrong, Thomas.** 2000. Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, USA
2. **Gardner, Howard** (1999). Intelligence Reframed. Multiple intelligences for the 21st century, New York : Basic Books. 292
3. **Gardner, Howard.** 2006. Multiple Intelligences : New Horizons. Basic books, USA
4. **Kennedy, Teresa.** 2003. Activities for the Language Classroom. <http://www.teresakenedy.com/activities.htm>
5. **Kornhaber, M. L.** (2001) 'Howard Gardner' in J.A. Palmer (ed.) Fifty Modern Thinkers on Education. From Piaget to the present, London : Routledge
6. **Lin, Po-Ying.** 2005. Multiple Intelligences Theory and English Language Teaching. [http://www.52en.com/x1/lunwen/lw\\_3\\_0015html](http://www.52en.com/x1/lunwen/lw_3_0015html)

*Надійшла до редколегії 27.10.2013*

УДК 811.111'07

**Yu. V. Serdechny**

*Oles Honchar Dnipropetrovsk National University*

### THE DILEMMA OF TEACHING GRAMMAR

**У статті дається визначення граматики, розглядаються два підходи до викладання граматики – аналіз та вживання граматичних одиниць, аналізуються стадії заняття з граматики та пропонуються зразки завдань для кожного етапу.**

**Ключові слова:** граMATика, аналіз, вживання, комунікативний підхід, триступенева модель.

**В статье дается определение грамматики, рассматриваются два подхода в преподавании грамматики: анализ и употребление грамматических единиц, анализируются стадии занятия по грамматике и предлагаются образцы заданий для каждого этапа.**

**Ключевые слова:** грамматика, анализ, употребление, коммуникативный подход, трехступенчатая модель.

**The article defines the notion of grammar, considers two approaches in teaching grammar – analysis and usage, characterizes stages of a grammar class and suggests sample activities for each.**

**Keywords:** grammar, analysis, usage, communicative approach, three-stage model.

© Yu. V. Serdechny, 2014

The final goal of teaching English at the university level to students of various majors different from “English Language and Literature” is to enable them to interact in real-world situations in both professional and everyday settings. In case of English students there also arises an additional task of how to teach the language when they become ELT professionals. To achieve these goals, i.e. to make our students develop vocabulary, grammar, stylistic and pragmatic competences, we, the university teachers, should be clear about how to teach all those competences in the most effective way.

Among them grammar takes a very important place since it describes and prescribes how to use word forms and construct sentences in the speech in the correct way. Before deciding how to teach it in the most efficient ways, let us give a brief rundown of different views on the essence and scope of the term “grammar” itself.

Ronald Carter and Michael McCarthy define grammar as the part of language which is concerned with acceptable and unacceptable forms and the distinctions of meaning these forms create [3, 11]. According to Scott Thornbury, grammar is a description of rules for forming sentences, including an account of the meanings these forms convey [11, 8]. For Mary Spratt and her colleagues grammar is that aspect of language which describes how we combine, organize and change words and parts of words to make meaning [10, 12]. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages describes the grammar of a language as the set of principles governing the assembly of elements into meaningful labeled and bracketed strings (sentences) [5, 3].

Even though there are many definitions of grammar, there seems to be an agreement that the term does not only refer to form, but also to meaning.

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century grammar teaching there have been two major approaches regarding the formal instruction of grammar. One of them focused on having students analyze language in order to learn it (analytic grammar translation approach); the other encouraged students to use language in order to acquire it (use-oriented direct method). The proponents of the former (N. Chomsky [4]) argue that a student cannot become a competent user of a language without receiving formal instruction in grammar. Those supporting more communicative approaches emphasize language use over rules of language usage, and the popularity of this approach has constantly been rising in the last 10–15 years.

According to Stephen Krashen and Tracy Terrell, students learn grammar as part of the acquisition process and therefore formal instruction in grammar does not play an important role in developing language competence [6]. However, Krashen’s rejection of formal instruction of grammar in ELT classroom has been questioned by grammarians such as Scott Thornbury, Diane Larsen-Freeman and Rob Batstone, among others.

Scott Thornbury puts forward several arguments in favor of teaching grammar. First, he explains that grammar is a kind of sentence-making machine which offers students the possibility of limitless linguistic creativity. Second, he mentions the “fine tuning” since grammar allows for greater subtlety than just words, formal instruction of grammar would serve to avoid ambiguity. Third, he offers the “fossilization” argument, which claims that learners without formal instruction of grammar may be at risk of error fossilization sooner than those who receive formal instruction. The author’s fourth argument, called the “advanced organizer” argument, suggests that the study of grammar may have a delayed effect because it can help students notice how native speakers use the same grammar structures that they have studied in class. Fifth, he gives the “discreet

item” argument that helps make language “digestible” because students learn discreet items instead of a mass of language. And Thornbury’s sixth argument is the “rule of law” argument: grammar offers a structures system that can be taught and tested in methodological steps [11, 24–25].

Diane Larsen-Freeman also provides a number of arguments in favor of teaching grammar. She mentions that conditions of learning are different when learning a foreign language: students learning English as a foreign language are usually exposed to the new language for only a few hours a week. The author believes that motivation, attitude and aptitude are important aspects to be considered and claims that teaching grammar effectively can help all students [8].

Finally, Rob Batstone believes that “by focusing on particular grammatical forms and their associated meanings, we can help learners to develop their knowledge of the grammatical system, and the meanings which it helps to signal” [1, 39].

Taking these points of view, one can conclude that there is a good case for the argument that formal instruction of grammar does play an important role in the development of the communicative competence.

If we agree on the important role of grammar in the language teaching and the necessity of its formal instruction, then the next question is *how* it should be taught. No fewer than three language teaching methods or approaches, Community language Learning, Suggestopedia, and the Communicative Approach, devote a significant amount of classroom time to promoting communication among students [7]. Moreover, one current approach, the natural Approach, explicitly eschews any class time for grammatical analysis, relegating any which does occur to homework exercises. Proponents of this approach believe that the only sufficient and necessary conditions for successful FL learning are that learners receive comprehensible input somewhat beyond their current stage of development and the learners’ affective state makes them receptive to the input [6].

Rob Batstone proposes a three-stage model that can guide the process of teaching grammar. The three stages are *noticing*, *structuring* and *proceduralization*. The teacher needs to plan each stage carefully to help the learners to become competent in grammar [1, 122–125].

### **Stage 1**

In the noticing stage, the teacher provides opportunities for the learners to see a particular structure and appreciate the relationship between the form and the meaning. To do so, teachers come up with contexts, where there is a real need for communication. According to Lynne Cameron, noticing activities should have the following characteristics: they support meaning as well as form; they present the form in isolation, as well as in discourse and in a linguistic context; and they require active participation from the learners. Noticing activities should be at the level of detail which appropriate to the learners – a series of noticing activities may “zoom in” on specific items. In this stage, students notice the structures but do not yet use them [2].

### **Stage 2**

In the second stage (structuring), controlled practice is introduced. The teacher designs activities in which learners have the opportunity to practice certain grammatical patterns, but which do not ask them to express their ideas freely. As Wendy Scott and Lisbeth Ytreberg put it, activities of this kind provide “the basis for oral work, but do

not always produce “real” language at once” [9, 156]. It is important to give learners sufficient opportunities to practice the new language. However, repetition should be done through different meaningful and motivating activities. Lynne Cameron proposes the use of questionnaires, surveys, quizzes and drills. If the teacher decides to use drills, these must require more than simple repetition [2]. Scott Thornbury advocates adding repetition and variable substitution drills to imitation drills. In repetition drills, one element is replaced each time, and in substitution drills, the response varies according to a series of prompts. This structuring stage is important because students are actively involved in manipulating structures to express meaning [11].

### Stage 3

In the proceduralization stage, the learners can express themselves in a more natural way. The activities must, however, be designed so that the target grammar point is crucial to convey meaning. Activities such as descriptions which require specific grammatical structures provide opportunities for more spontaneous use of grammatical forms to express meaning. Batstone argues that it is through proceduralization that learners organize their knowledge in such a way that it can be activated quickly and efficiently in communicative tasks [1, 207].

Summing it up, grammar is essential to convey meaning. Teachers can help learners become more competent in English by designing activities which move from noticing grammar patterns (and the meanings they convey) to those which practice the structure in controlled conditions and, finally, to activities which require the correct use of the target structure to participate in real-world communication. In this communicative phase, which is the most important of the three in the FL acquisition, less control over grammatical accuracy is exercised than during the practice phase. The prime aim of this stage is to have students use the structures they have been practicing in as natural and fluid way as possible. In many cases, this may result in students’ finding ways to communicate which the teacher has not anticipated and in which the target structures are not always used. The teacher should try to devise these free speaking activities in such a way as to guide the learners into the direction needed. These activities may take the following forms.

- A communicative activity to follow the presentation phase of a lesson on the semantics of prepositions is a direction-giving exercise. One student traces a particular route on a street map while guided by the directions of a partner. (*Walk to the corner. Turn right at the corner. The cinema is near the corner, next to the bank.*)
- Another example of an activity appropriate to this stage, which would complete a three-phase lesson on the semantics of comparatives, might be to have students write a composition discussing their preferences for living either in a big city or in a small town.
- A communicative activity which would fit with the lesson on the pragmatics of using modals for giving advice would be having students write a reply to a letter addressed to a newspaper columnist whose advice was being sought for some personal problem.
- Finally, a communicative activity which would be relevant to a lesson on reported speech might be to have students report what became known at a press conference they were assigned to listen to or to watch.

## References

1. **Batstone R.** Grammar / R. Bartstone. – Oxford : OUP, 1995. – 281 p.
2. **Cameron L.** Teaching Languages to Young Learners / L. Cameron. – Cambridge : CUP, 2001. – 179 p.
3. **Carter R.** Cambridge Grammar of English / R. Carter, M. McCarthy. – Cambridge : CUP, 2006. – 201 p.
4. **Chomsky N.** Syntactic Structures / N. Chomsky. – The Hague : Mouton, 1957. – 245 p.
5. Common European Framework of References for Languages. – Council of Europe, 2001. – 149 p.
6. **Krashen S.** The Natural Approach. Language Acquisition in the Classroom / S. Krashen, T. Terrell. – Oxford-London-New York : Pergamon Press, 1983. – 304 p.
7. **Larsen-Freeman D.** Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching / D. Larsen-Freeman. – Oxford : OUP, 1986. – 233 p.
8. **Larsen-Freeman D.** Teaching language from Grammar to Grammmaring / D. Larsen-Freeman. – Boston : Heinle, 2003. – 198 p.
9. **Scott W. and Ytreberg L.H.** Teaching English to Children / W. Scott, L. H. Ytreberg. – Harlow : Longman, 1990. – 237 p.
10. **Spratt M.** The TKT Course Modules 1, 2 and 3 / M. Spratt, A. Pulverness, M. Williams. – Cambridge : CUP, 2000. – 165 p.
11. **Thornbury S.** How to Teach Grammar / S. Thornbury. – Harlow : Longman, 1999. – 301 p.

*Надійшла до редколегії 18.10.2013*

УДК 378.016:811.111

**О. В. Сердюк**

*Дніпропетровський національний університет імені Олеся Гончара*

## **ІННОВАЦІЇ У МЕТОДИЦІ ВИКЛАДАННЯ ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ У ВИЩИХ НАВЧАЛЬНИХ ЗАКЛАДАХ УКРАЇНИ НА СУЧАСНОМУ ЕТАПІ**

**Розглянуто сучасні тенденції розвитку методів викладання іноземних мов у ВНЗ. Простежено вплив інноваційних методів навчання на підвищення якості викладання іноземних мов.**

**Ключові слова:** інноваційні технології, проектна методика, інформаційно-комунікативні технології, Інтернет-ресурси.

**Рассмотрены современные тенденции развития методов преподавания иностранных языков в вузах. Прослежено влияние инновационных методов обучения на повышение качества преподавания иностранных языков.**

**Ключевые слова:** инновационные технологии, проектная методика, информационно-коммуникативные технологии, Интернет-ресурсы.

**The article is devoted to the analysis of modern tendencies in language teaching in higher education establishments. The author endeavours to trace the influence of innovative methods on the quality of language teaching.**

**Key words:** innovative technologies, project method, informative-communicative technologies, Internet resources.

Вивчення іноземних мов у сучасному суспільстві стає невід'ємною складовою професійної підготовки фахівців різного спрямування, і від якості їх мовної

© О. В. Сердюк, 2014