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CHAPTER 2

A LITERATURE REVIEW ON DIFFERENT METHODS OF TEACHING GRAMMAR

2.1 Introduction

One of the most controversial topics while learning a second language is learning its grammar. Different types of research have been conducted on how grammar should be taught and whether it should be taught as a separate subject or should it be taught at all? In this chapter, the researcher has tried to clarify some grammar-related concepts. Then, an outline of teaching methodologies and their relation with grammar is given. The focus of this chapter will be on how grammar should be taught in a communicative way, for making sense, and meaning.

The definition of grammar strongly depends on the current view of language and learning. As per the definition of Oxford Dictionary, Grammar can be defined from the structural aspects only, or it can be defined from semantics and functional aspects. Grammar can be referred as “the whole system and structure of a language or languages in general, usually taken as consisting of syntax and morphology (including inflections) and sometimes also phonology and semantics” ("definition of grammar in English", n.d.).

There is a pendulum swing shift on the views of grammar teaching. In the beginning, teaching functions and forms of grammar were considered as the primary aim of instruction. On another hand, there are some views that grammar should have little or no place in language teaching. These views have been replaced by each other throughout the history of language teaching. These shifts can be seen in Ur’s (1988) view on grammar during a time span of 20 years. Earlier, he defined grammar as follows;

Grammar may be roughly defined as the way a language manipulates and combines words (or bits of words) in order to form longer units of meaning (…) There is a set of rules which govern how units of meaning may be constructed in any language: we may say that a learner who ‘knows grammar’ is one who has mastered and can apply these rules to express him or herself in what would be acceptable language forms (Ur, 1988, p. 4).
Here, some trace of the importance of meaning can be seen, but the emphasis is on rules and forms of grammar. Later, Ur (2009) defined grammar as;

The way a language manipulates and combines words (or bits of words) so as to express certain kinds of meaning, some of which cannot be conveyed adequately by vocabulary alone. These include the way ideas are grouped and related, and the purposes of utterances (statement, question, request, etc.). Grammar may also serve to express time relations, singular/plural distinctions and many other aspects of meaning. There are rules which govern how words have to be manipulated and organized so as to express these meanings: a competent speaker of the language will be able to apply these rules so as to convey his or her chosen meaning effectively and acceptably (Ur, 2009, p. 3).

In the above-mentioned definition, Ur (2009) considered grammar as a mean to convey the meaning in acceptable and appropriate manner. According to Summer (2011), the second definition of Ur (2009) implies that “we are moving towards a perception of a meaning-oriented concept of pedagogical grammar that considers rules as an aid to expressing meaningful language” (p. 22). Learning of the grammar by students depends on the way it is taught to them.

2.2 Some Concepts in Grammar Teaching

2.2.1 Form and Function

According to Chalker and Weiner (1994), ‘form’ can be defined as ‘the external features of the language.' Larsen-Freeman (2001), believed that in the formal grammar, ‘form’ refers to the fundamental rules of traditional methods of teaching a language where much attention is not paid to pragmatics (use and context), and semantics (meaning). Eisenmann and Summer (2012), claimed that many people think that learning a language is equal to learning its grammar. Rutherford and Smith (1988) believed; focus on grammar is an essential part of learning a language and they claimed that only learning the grammar of a language is sufficient to become successful in learning that language.

If a classroom is based on formal grammar, the focus is on language form rather than real communication and the language functions. The opposite point of form and formal grammar is function and functional grammar. Functional grammar
focuses on communicational and social interactions. Hence, it is the reason why some forms are more appropriate to use than the others. Larsen-Freeman (2001) claimed that considering language as a set of rules is not as important as the use of the language.

Methods, which are used for teaching grammar, can have different starting points, for instance, grammar can be explained in term of meaning, and language use or it can be defined in term of fundamental rules. According to Chalker and Weiner (1994), function emphasizes on the way in which language functions socially and pragmatically and the semantic role of sentences. Teaching grammar rules should be done through creating lifelike situations, where learners can learn the best use of the grammar.

2.2.2 Meaning

Grammatical forms are the means that express specific types of functions and meaning-notions. We communicate through languages. In Cognitive and Communicative Approaches, meaning happens before form; it means speakers use grammatical forms to convey their meanings. In the 1970s, the syllabus based on the function-notion had a broader view on language as compared to syllabus based on structure. Nunan (1988) demonstrated that the structural syllabuses did not have many advocates as their focus was only on formal grammar. In the 1970s, more emphasis was given to functions of the language and its purposes, and notional syllabuses were used in order to achieve communicative competence. During this period of time, grammar textbooks focused on notional style rather than formal style. According to Nunan (1988), functions can be referred as “the communicative purposes for which we use language,” and notions as “the conceptual meanings expressed through language” (p. 35). Notions can be categorized according to time, location, space, movement, and duration.

Chalker and Weiner (1994) demonstrated that:

“notional categories included three parts: semantico-grammatical (e.g. time and space), modal meaning, and functions (e.g. how to express disapproval, persuasion, or agreement). (…) In later developments in foreign language teaching, the term notional tended to be restricted to the first category (general
concepts of time and space, etc.) which were explicitly contrasted with functions, such as agreement or suasion” (p. 266).

The Meaning-Based Approach in grammar teaching is about the use of grammar in lifelike situations. It integrates grammar and context. In this method, the learner’s mind is engaged in the learning process. It provides the learners, the opportunity to learn from each other and focus on language meaning.

2.2.3 Discourse and Pragmatics in Teaching Grammar

Pragmatics and discourse are emphasized in communicative competence and functional grammar style because pragmatics is concerned with language use in sociocultural contexts. It is about the users’ choices of the language in social interactions and the effects of their choices on the other participants in communication. There are many possibilities in communication, to convey facts and meanings. Using the language appropriately which is called pragmatics, is an important part of communicative competence in a language. Beside mastery over the correct use of grammar, knowing how to use grammar appropriately plays a significant role in the language proficiency. Pragmatic features depend on grammatical and lexical structures. Knowledge of pragmatics provides access to many possible ways of uttering something for learners, and it helps them to understand the significance of cultural, contextual, and social aspects of communication (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011).

A Discourse-Based Approach focuses on grammatical forms as well as on the meaning and the use of contextual forms. According to Nassaji and Fotos (2011), one of the significant functions of grammar is finding out the pragmatic meaning of a context. In grammar teaching, Discourse-Based Methods are related to pragmatics. The majority of grammatical rules depend on context, and they cannot be explained in isolation to the context. Discourse in communication is about what has already been mentioned and what is likely to be mentioned next.

Celce-Murcia (as cited in Hinkel and Fotos, 2002), claimed that grammar should be taught “through context-embedded discourse rather than through abstract, context-free sentences” (p. 122). The Discourse-Based Approach focuses more on pragmatic conditions, linguistic forms and their interaction rather than just analyzing of grammatical structure (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). The Discourse-Based Approach
emphasizes on the communicative use of the grammar, i.e. understanding and using of grammar in communicative contexts.

2.2.4 Grammatical Performance and Grammatical Competence

The knowledge of grammatical forms, meanings and the ability to use them is called grammatical competence. Grammatical performance can be defined as the ability to use grammar correctly and in an appropriate manner (Newby, 1998).

According to Newby (as cited in Beaugrande, Grosman, & Seidlhofer, 1998) competence happens in the head and performance is about what comes out of the mouth. Performance is the final purpose of the language teaching. Sentence-based tasks develop the grammatical competence. Performance tasks are communicative in nature. In the early 1990s, Larsen-Freeman (2003) challenges the traditional view of grammar. She stated that grammar is more than memorizing rules. She invented the term grammaring. She defined grammaring as “the ability to use grammar structures accurately, meaningfully, and appropriately” (Larsen-Freeman, 2003, p. 143). She claimed that grammar is about accuracy as well as meaning and appropriateness.

2.2.5 Deductive and Inductive Teaching

In teaching grammar through the deductive approach, in the beginning, a rule is given by the teacher or the textbook, and then this explicit knowledge (conscious) is considered as a basis for practice and internalizing the rule. In teaching grammar, when the inductive approach is used, a grammatical fact is studied for example a text, and then it may be followed by a task that helps the learners to outline generalization about the language. The deductive approach was mostly used in traditional grammar teaching whereas inductive approach is used recently as well as in, direct method of teaching grammar (Haight, Herron, & Cole, 2007).

2.3 Traditional Grammar

In traditional approach of teaching, grammar refers to a set of rules and structures, which is also considered as the main focus of the textbook syllabus. In this approach, the sentence is the fundamental part of the analysis, and the grammar is decontextualized. Accuracy is very important in traditional grammar because the focus is on the correct form of the sentences. In this approach, Grammar is taught deductively, and learning is a conscious process. Here the teacher plays an important
role and controls the practices. In traditional grammar, the Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) Method is used, where the emphasis is given on presentation and practice (Nunan, 1996). In traditional grammar, the exercises are such as fill in the blanket type and pattern drills. There are three traditional approaches to grammar, i.e. the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method, and the Audio-lingual Method which can be explained as follows:

2.3.1 The Grammar-Translation Method

In the early ages, Latin was the living language, and it was used as a basis for teaching other subjects in the schools. Latin was the living language of that era because it was used as a communication tool in government, religion, and trade. It was taught to stimulate intellectuality of people. While teaching Latin, a particular importance was given to its grammar. It was considered as a mental exercise but, after sometimes it lost its function (Simsen, 1998, p. 24). Latin was considered as the most prestigious language in that era. The Latin grammar teaching included the teaching of eight parts of the language, i.e. verbs, pronouns, nouns, participles, prepositions, articles, conjunctions, and adverbs.

Richards and Rodgers (1986) stated that “in the sixteenth century, however, French, Italian, and English gained in importance as a result of political changes in Europe, and Latin gradually became displaced” (p. 1). Foreign languages such as French, English, and German were taught in the same manner used for teaching Latin. Hinkel and Fotos (2002) also stated that the same teaching approach like Latin was later used as a template for teaching the English language from seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries.

According to Richards and Rodgers (1986), “Grammar-Translation Method is a way of studying a language that approaches the language first through a detailed analysis of its grammar rules followed by application of this knowledge to the task of translating sentences and texts into and out of target language” (p. 3).

Grammar-Translation Method was strongly influenced by the methods of teaching Latin. The prominent purpose of Grammar-Translation Method was to learn foreign literature in order to develop the learners’ intellectuality. Larsen-Freeman (1986) believed that one of the remarkable ideas in Grammar-Translation Method is that learners get more acquainted with the grammar of the target language as well as
the grammar of their mother-tongue. This method can help the learners to become good writers and readers.

Some people were also against Grammar-Translation Method because they believed that in this method, teacher translates every word and sentence of English into the native language and learners also translate sentences from their mother-tongue into the English language. This process leads to losing of learner’s free expression of thoughts. The Grammar-Translation Method emphasizes on learning the rules which create problem for the learners. Using this method leads to word to word translation which is not completely possible in learning procedure of any language. In the past, Grammar-Translation Method was used prominently in India, and even now it is still used in some parts of India. This method is not a natural way of learning a language. Herron (as cited in Hinkel & Fotos, 2002) believed that this model “could not be used effectively to analyze a language in which word order and syntax produced grammatical function and where rules often had multiple exceptions” (p. 2).

By using Grammar-Translation Method, students will become entirely dependent on their native language and even they may carry on with this habit to the upper classes also because the emphasis in this method is only on learning the grammar rules. This method binds the language into rules of grammar. The main aim of any language is communication, and this method fails in it. In Grammar-Translation Method, there is no emphasis on oral work such as speaking and pronunciation, so the students cannot speak fluently in the target language, and they may fail to communicate properly. Therefore, this method has proved to be incomplete in learning the English language (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

2.3.2 The Direct Method

In the mid-nineteenth century, many factors led to the rejection of the Grammar-Translation Method. Richards and Rodgers (1986) believed that need for communication among Europeans created a demand for oral proficiency in foreign languages. Linguists and teachers who believed in the need for new approaches to language teaching were called reformers. They emphasized on phonetics training as a mean to form good pronunciation habits. In the late 19th century, phonetics was received as a science and the significance of speech was emphasized. According to
Simensen (1998), formulation of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) helped teachers a lot while teaching pronunciation because IPA became a tool for teaching pronunciation. The primary focus of the direct method was on speech (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Unlike Grammar-Translation Method, where mother-tongue was used as the medium of the class while teaching a foreign language, in the Direct Method, mother tongue was not used in the classroom, and this method did not demonstrate the meaning of a word rather than explaining. Larsen-Freeman (1986) claimed that vocabulary could be acquired more efficiently when it is used in the sentences rather than being memorized in isolation. The Direct Method concentrates on communication, especially conversation, and pronunciation. In the Direct Method, grammar is taught inductively, i.e. first, learners study a grammatical fact in a text and then try to formulate the rule from what they have studied. Particular importance is given to activities like dictation which helps the learners to focus on pronunciation and spelling. It assists in perception English by forming a direct association between the word and its meaning, and it aids the student to grasp the sentence patterns he/she hears or reads in English. The learner can state his/her thought and feelings directly in English. It improves the fluency of speech and competence in writing. There are some disadvantages of Direct Method which can be stated as follows; (I) this method does not pay attention to all aspects of language teaching. The emphasis is on speech and other skills like reading, writing and hearing are neglected. Students who are taught by this method make spelling errors because they have not practiced writing and reading effectively. (II) Many English teachers have an incorrect pronunciation of English. Sometimes their knowledge of English is limited and imperfect. So, the paucity of good English teachers was one of the reasons of failure of this method. (III) Some of the schools are not able to provide adequate equipment and other facilities that are necessary to follow this method. (IV) Some schools do not have proper standard textbooks in respect of grammar and composition.

Richards and Rodgers (1986) claimed that teaching through Direct Method is hard to apply in public secondary schools because it does not reflect the practical realities of the classroom. This method requires native-speaker teachers, and it is very dependent on teacher’s proficiency. This method became popular in Europe for quite sometimes, but not everyone had accepted it devotedly.
2.3.3 The Oral and Situational Language Teaching

Between the 1930s and the 1960s, the Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching (SLT) developed by British applied linguists. It had a high influence on language courses till the 1980s. Hartley and Viney (1979) designed textbooks such as Streamline English based on the SLT approach principles. The Oral Approach established its base on the structural view of language which includes structure, speech, and a focus on a set of vocabulary. The opinion of SLT is similar to American structuralists. However, what makes The Situational Language Teaching Approach distinct is its emphasis on the presentation of structures in situations. Two major features categorize the SLT; (I) focus on vocabulary, and (II) reading, are the most prominent features of SLT. In fact, mastery over a series of high-frequency vocabulary items was considered to be helpful in developing reading skills. It was believed that situational tables assist learners to internalize grammatical rules. The behavioristic view of language learning established the foundation of Situation Language Teaching. This approach contributed priority to the processes over the conditions of learning. The objectives of Situational Language Teaching included correct use of vocabulary items and grammar rules to attain a practical mastery of the four basic skills. Learners must be able to make correct use of pronunciation and grammar. The ultimate aim of this approach is the capability to reply rapidly and correctly in speech situations with an automatic control of primary structures and sentence patterns. The syllabus of Situational Language Teaching is based on a word list and structural activities. In SLT, grammar teaching includes the situational presentation of new sentence patterns and drills to practice the patterns. The practice of structures in SLT moves from the controlled ones to free ones by the teacher. The practices of SLT move from oral use of sentence structures to their automatic use in speech, reading, and writing. Situational Language Teaching Approach begins with a lesson of stress and intonation exercise followed by a review and a presentation of new material (mainly structures or vocabulary). The teacher then carries on the oral practices and drilling of the features presented. Ultimately, the lesson ends with reading activity or written exercises.

The Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching, besides, developing rational principles for vocabulary selection, focus on the grammatical content of a language course. Palmer (2003) was one of the British applied linguists. He
considered grammar as the underlying sentence patterns of the spoken language (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

SLT is still interesting for many teachers who believe in the structural practice of language. The practicality of teaching grammar patterns is the reason for the survival of the approach until now. Besides, the emphasis of SLT on oral practice attracts support among language teachers. Many principles of this approach have been criticized, for example, Chomsky (1957) stated that the structural and the behavioristic approaches to language are not correct as they do not describe the fundamental characteristics of language learning: the ability to create unique sentences. Children do not acquire their mother tongue through repetition and habit formation. There should be, however, an inherent tendency that leads them to a particular type of linguistic competence (Chomsky, 1957).

2.3.4 The Audio-lingual Method

During World War II, it was very important for soldiers to learn a foreign language rapidly for military purposes. So, the Audio-lingual Method was established in the United States. Earlier, this method was known as the Army method. This method was under the influence of American structuralism that strongly emphasized on syntax, phonology, and morphology and they described the languages as they were spoken. This method focuses on formal features of the language rather than the semantic features (Chalker & Weiner, 1994). Communication is the most important aim of this method, therefore most of the attention is given to oral skills. Structural linguistics was against traditional grammar in which grammar was taken as a part of logic, and the ideal categories in language were the grammatical categories of Indo-European languages and positivism and empiricism led to the reaction against the traditional grammar (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Structural linguists believed that speech is the language, and the primary medium of any language is oral.

Larsen-Freeman (1986) demonstrated that the Audio-lingual Method was under the influence of behavioral psychology in which the emphasis of learning was on the habit formation. In this method, the conversation is taught as habit formation, and the learning of the language is mechanical. The Audio-lingual Method considers drills and memorization as a significant tool for learning. This method focuses on imitation and practices of daily conversation and its structures.
Simensen (1998) demonstrated that “in the Audio-lingual inspired approaches, grammar teaching normally consisted of pattern practice drills only, and had no explicit explanation of grammar, at the time this was usually called an implicit approach to the teaching of grammar” (p. 50).

One experiment carried out in Sweden, the GUME (Goteborg, Undervisnings Metod i Engelska-Gothenburg) project to find out whether there is any difference in learning specific grammatical rules by teaching them explicitly or implicitly. According to Simensen (1998), “On the whole, the results of these experiments were significantly better for the group that had an explicit treatment of grammar” (p. 51). In this experiment, the learners learned English in a better way when the instruction was more explicit than normally encouraged in the Audio-lingual Method (Simensen, 1998).

Although, there is a stronger focus on conversation and communication in the Direct and Audio-lingual Method, but these methods are somehow similar to the traditional Grammar-Translation Method as these methods also emphasized on accuracy and drills. The Audio-lingual Method is based on repetition; here speech is standardized, and students turn into parrots that can imitate many things but never create anything new or spontaneous. The Mechanical drills of this approach were criticized as being boring and mindless and sometimes even counter-productive, and there was a tendency to use the audio-visual materials as a teaching method in them, not as a teaching aid. This method could only aid in the presentation of new materials.

2.3.5. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

In mid-1960s Audio-lingualism was rejected in the United States (US) (Richards & Rodgers, 1986, p. 66). Chomsky (1957) in his book Syntactic Structures, stated that the fundamental characteristics of language such as creativity and uniqueness of individual sentences were neglected in the current standard structural theories of language. During this time, “linguists saw the need to focus on language teaching on communicative proficiency rather than on mere mastery of structures” (Richards & Rodgers, 1986, p. 64).

Linguists believed that comprehensiveness of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) made this approach different from any other approach. Littlewood
(as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 1986) stated that “one of the most characteristic features of Communicative Language Teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language” (p. 66).

In the late 1960s, there was a shift from formal approaches of language and grammar teaching towards alternative teaching methods. Due to the advent of the concept of communicative competence and its development in the following years, new approaches to language teaching which can be gathered under the term Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) have emerged. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), CLT “marks the beginning of a significant paradigm shift in language teaching in the twentieth century, one whose ramifications continue to be felt today” (p. 151).

There are two versions of CLT; the ‘strong’ version of CLT and the ‘weak’ version of CLT. According to Simensen (1998), the weak version simply refers “to learn to communicate in the target language, (...) communicative activities are integrated into both grammatically and functionally based teaching programs” (p. 117).

Nassaji and Fotos (2011) stated that the strong version of CLT emphasized on communication in the target language in order to learn it. It hints Krashen’s theories that a language can be learned through the exposure to the target language and use of it. The weak version of CLT emphasizes on providing opportunities for learners to use their language for communicative intentions. The strong version of CLT emphasizes on using Language to learn it. It demonstrated that the language is acquired through communication, so it is not about activating the language but of stimulating the development of the language system itself (Krashen, 1995).

According to Richards and Rodgers (1986), the characteristics of CLT can be stated as follows:

(I) Meaning in CLT is very important

(II) Dialogs focus on communicative purposes. They are not normally memorized. Contextualization is stressed in CLT.

(III) The main aim of CLT is effective communication.

(IV) Drilling may happen but incidentally.
Use of any device that can help the learner to communicate is acceptable in CLT approach.

Drilling can be used, but peripherally pronunciation drills are sought.

The native language also can be used, for example when students need translation, they can use it.

The ultimate goal of CLT is communicative competence.

Teachers motivate the learners to engage with the target language.

Learning is done through trial and error.

Canale and Swain (1979) identified four dimensions of communicative competence; (I) grammatical competence, (II) sociolinguistic competence, (III) discourse competence and (IV) strategic competence.

“Grammatical competence refers to what Chomsky calls linguistic competence and what Hymes intends by what is formally possible” (Richards & Rodgers, 1986, p. 71)

2.3.6 Communicative Competence

The concept of communicative competence has emerged in the 1960s, and since then it has been redefined many times. According to Hymes (1972), communicative competence can be defined as the knowledge of “when to speak, when not to, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner” (p. 60). In 1966s, Hymes proposed this term (communicative competence) in reply to Chomsky’s views about language learning which was published the year before. Richard and Rodgers (2001) defined communicative competence as the essential knowledge of speakers to communicate effectively. Competence is about the knowledge of a language and the ability to use it properly. In order to become a component speaker, one should develop grammatical competence as well as acceptable performance. Children while learning a language, develop knowledge of grammar and acceptability in that language.

To become a component speaker, grammatical competence and acceptable performances are necessary (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

According to Hymes (1972), additional distinctions were required in order to acceptability and stated these specifications:
i. Whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible;

ii. Whether (and to what degree) something is feasible in virtue of the means of implementation available;

iii. Whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated;

iv. Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done, actually performed, and what it is doing entails (p. 63).

It is important that a sentence must be grammatically or formally possible, feasible, and appropriate and occurrence must also be considered. Although, grammatical competence is essential, but the other aspects such as cultural, social, and situational should be considered as well (Hymes, 1972).

2.4 Communicative Grammar

Grammatical competence can be defined as the capability to understand and express meaning by generating and identifying phrases and sentences according to these principles (being against memorizing and imitating them as fixed principles). It can be seen that both knowledge and the ability to use grammar are important. The significance of meaning on the subject of grammar is emphasized. While teaching grammar, memorizing and reproducing grammar should not be stressed but being meaningful should be emphasized and the overall aim should be the development of communicative competence.

According to Newby (1998), in communicative grammar, language is considered as a way of communication in actual contexts. Here, grammar is a mean, by which people can express their meaning. In communicative grammar, less attention is paid to formal accuracy, and more emphasis is on contextual appropriacy and being meaningful. Newby (1998) presented a model in communication that describes how a language happens (p. 186).

Figure 2.1: How a Language Happens (Newby, 1998)
In this model, we can see that the form (grammar) is the final stage of interaction in communicative grammar approach whereas; in traditional grammar approach form (grammar) is the first stage of interaction. Communicative grammar begins with context, the speaker, and the message, and here speaker communicates the message through grammar. Grammar is essential for conveying the intended meaning.

According to Newby (1998), communicative grammar failed to integrate grammar in a clear and coherent way, and it leads to widespread grammar and communication dichotomy which is not a correct view. Since the 1970s, Communicative grammar has influenced second language teaching.

In 2001, The Council of Europe made a new specification of the concept communicative competence in the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). The CEFR is a common basis for language syllabuses, national guidelines, textbooks, etc. across Europe. In 2001, the concept of communicative competence had been redefined many times. According to the CEFR (2001), students have to learn a language in order to be able to communicate, and also they need to develop their knowledge and skills to act effectively. Grammatical competence can be defined as the knowledge and ability to use, the grammatical phenomenon of a language. Formally, grammar can be referred as the set of rules regulating the gathering of components into meaningful sentences (CEFR, 2001).

CLT includes activities that engage learners in lifelike situations. These activities are selected according to how good they engage the learner in meaningful and correct language use. The exercise types and activities that can be employed in CLT are unlimited, and these exercises help the learners to achieve the communicative objectives of their curriculum. Classroom activities focus on accomplishing the tasks that are mediated through language. According to Littlewood (1981), there are two major activity types in CLT; ‘social interaction activities’ and ‘functional communication activities.’

Social interaction activities include “conversation and discussion sessions, dialogues and role plays, stimulations, skits, improvisations, and debates and functional communication activities includes such tasks as learners comparing sets of pictures and noting similarities and differences” (Richard & Rodgers, 1986, p. 76).
2.4.1 The Silent Way of Teaching

Silent Way was invented in the early 1970s. The three basic principles of the approach are that learning is simplified if the learner learns rather than remembers or repeats. Physical objects that assist learning and problem-solving are central to learning in this approach. It is called “Silent” Way because it is established on the principle that the teacher should be as silent as possible in the classroom to encourage the learner to use language as much as possible. The Silent Way implemented a very structural approach. In this method, the language is taught through sentences in a sequence according to grammatical complexity. This approach is called as ‘building-block’ also (Bowen, 2010). The teacher taught structural patterns of the target language, and the learners learn the grammar ‘rules’ of the language inductively. To demonstrate meaning, physical objects such as Cuisenaire rods (small colored blocks) are often used. The teacher adds new things in moderation, and learners use them as far as they can in their communication until they need the next new items. The teacher then presents these new things by demonstrating them very clearly just once. Then the learners are left to employ the new items and to combine them with their knowledge of the language, again taking it as far as possible until the next item is needed and so on. This simple role of the teacher has led some critics to describe Silent Way teachers as ‘aloof’ and, undoubtedly, this apparently extreme degree of self-restraint can be seen as such. In fact, the role of the teacher in Silent Way is to teach, test, and get out of the way (Stevick, 1974). There is a lack of real communication in this approach which has been criticized. It is believed that it is hard to use this approach in the advanced level of the language learning. The fact that, it is limited to relatively small groups of learners, is also seen as a weakness. Like other methods and approaches, however, traces of Silent Way can be seen in many lessons in the modern classroom. In the 1980s and early 90s, for example, the argument about the unnecessary ‘teacher talking time’ was fashionable and it was something to be discouraged. Some teachers use Cuisenaire rods which can be used very creatively for various purposes like teaching pronunciation and story-telling. Modeling a new structure or item of vocabulary inspires learners both to listen more carefully and then to experiment with their own production of the utterance. Finally, the problem-solving feature of Silent Way has directed both to the idea of Task-based
Learning and to the widespread use of problem-solving activities in language classrooms indirectly.

2.4.2. Natural Approach

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the Natural Approach was developed by Krashen and Terrell (2000). This approach intends to promote naturalistic language acquisition in a classroom setting, and to achieve this aim; it focuses on communication. This approach pays less attention to the significance of conscious grammar study and explicit correction of students’ errors as compared to other approaches. It tries to make the environment of the classroom as stress-free as possible. In the natural approach, language output is not imposed, but it emerges spontaneously after students have listened to significant amounts of comprehensible language input. The natural approach has become closely connected with Krashen's (2000) monitor model, and it is often considered as the use of the theory to language teaching. Regardless of this view, there are some differences, especially in Terrell's (2000) view that some degree of conscious grammar study can be beneficial. The focused on activities syllabus, promoted subconscious language acquisition (Terrell, 2000). He categorized these activities into four main parts:

(I) Content activities, for example, learning a new subject in the target language;

(II) Activities that emphasize on personalizing languages, such as students sharing their desired music

(III) Games

(IV) Problem-solving activities.

The goal of the natural approach is to improve communicative skills, and it is mostly meant to be used for beginners. It is proposed as a set of principles which can be applied to many teaching situations, learners and, concrete objectives depending on this particular context in which it is used. Terrell (2000) summarized three basic principles of the approach that can be stated as follows;

• The focus of instruction is more on communication rather than its form.

• Speech production comes slowly and is never forced.
• The Early speech goes through natural stages that include yes or no response, one-word answers, and lists of words, short phrases, and complete sentences (Terrell as cited in Dhority, 1991, p. 32).

According to Dhority (1991), when these principles are applied in the classrooms by the teacher the emphasis will be on interesting and comprehensible input and low-anxiety situations. Lessons in the natural approach emphasize on understanding messages in the foreign language and paying less or no attention to error correction, drilling or conscious learning of grammar rules. Learning a broad range of vocabulary is preferred to learning new grammatical structures (Ohmaye, 1998). Besides, teachers that use the natural approach try to create situations in the classroom that are naturally motivational for students. According to Terrell (2000), learners go through three phases in their acquisition of speech such as (I) comprehension, (II) early speech, and (III) speech emergence. In the comprehension stage, He emphasized on students' vocabulary knowledge. His goal was to help the vocabulary, go into the students' long-term memory, a process that he called as binding. Terrell (2000) believed that students' speech would only improve after being exposed to communicative input when this happens, the learners enter the early speech stage. In this stage, students answer simple questions, use single words, and set phrases. In the speech appearance stage, students contribute in activities demanding more advanced language, such as role-plays and problem-solving activities. The Natural Approach helps learners to acquire the concerned language in a natural and easy way. Teaching materials of this approach are designed very well. This approach assists the learners in acquiring language from easy to difficult, from simple to complex, and from concrete to abstract. One of the problems of applying this approach is that Students may employ the target language fluently, but they are unable to use it accurately. Teachers should bring together many teaching aids and use them appropriately, and special teaching designs are necessary for the students (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

2.4.3 Total Physical Response Approach

Asher (1969) established the Total Physical Response (TPR) approach. This approach can be learned through the same way that children learn their mother tongue for example; Parents communicate through ‘body language conversations' with their children, the parents instruct, and the child physically responds to this (Frost, n.d.).
These conversations carry on for months before the child starts to speak it. Although, the child is unable to talk during the early stages of his life, but he is acquiring all parts of the language such as; the sounds and the patterns. Ultimately, when it has decoded sufficiently, the child imitates the language quite spontaneously. TPR tries to mirror this effect in the learning a language in the classroom. The teacher takes the place of the parents in the classroom, she/he says a word (smile) or a phrase (close the door) and then acts for an action. The teacher then asks the students to do the action. When the learners feel confident with the word or phrase, then the teacher can request the students to guide each other or the whole class. It is better if the students stand in a circle around the teacher. TPR is used to teach and practice vocabulary connected with actions (laugh, cry, etc.), tenses (past/present/future), classroom language (Open your books) imperatives/instructions (Stand up, close your eyes) and storytelling. This approach creates much fun; students enjoy it. It is very unforgettable. It aids students to remember phrases or words. It can be applied in large or small classes. The physical actions communicate the meaning efficiently so that all the students can understand and practice the target language.

It does not require a lot of preparation or materials. As long as the person is clear about what he/she wants to practice (a rehearsal beforehand can help), TPR does not take much time to get ready. It is very useful and efficient with teenagers and young learners. It comprises both left and right-brained learning. This approach also has some disadvantages which can be stated as follows; it may seem embarrassing to some students that are not used to such things. This method is only suitable for beginner levels. Although, it is clear that it is far more useful at lower levels because the target language lends itself to such activities. Learners need to become accustomed the language accordingly. Teaching everything with TPR leads to unnecessary repetitive.

2.5. Acquisition-Based Approaches

In the 1980s, various methodologists became interested in the idea that a second language or a foreign can be learned through the same learning process of the mother tongue. The difference between learning and acquisition can be stated as follows: learning is about the explicit focus on grammar and acquisition is about the unconscious learning process. According to Newby (1989), during this time there
was an anti-grammar movement which led to abandoned of formal grammar teaching in some places.

2.5.1. Acquisition versus Learning

Krashen (1985) believed that there is a distinction between language acquisition and language learning. According to him, there are two ways of picking up a language: acquiring or learning. He demonstrated that learning is about knowing the rules and having a conscious knowledge of grammar. Krashen (1985) claimed that the communicative abilities in a second language could not be achieved just by the help of formal language. Krashen was an advocate of language acquisition. Krashen and Terrell (2000) stated that “acquiring can be defined as picking up a language and developing ability in a language by using it in natural, communicative situations” (p. 18). Acquiring is similar to the way in which children learn to speak their mother-tongue. Krashen and Terrell (2000) believed that adult learners cannot acquire a language as well as children, but it seems that acquisition is one of the most prominent means for the achievement of linguistic skills even for an adult. Krashen (2000) did not deny the importance of learning, but he stressed that its use is limited.

Krashen and Terrell (2000) stated that “We use acquisition when we initiate sentences in second languages and bring in learning only as a kind of after-thought to make alterations and corrections” (p. 18). Language learning can be beneficial only as a monitor or an editor. It should be used as a supplement for acquisition. So to use learning and acquisition, there should be sufficient time for the speaker to review the word or statement before it is spoken. The speaker must be consciously concerned about accuracy and has to know the rule. All these elements seldom meet in ordinary conversation, where the emphasis is most likely on what is being said, not how it is being said. Nevertheless, these factors can be useful in tests and preparation. Acquisition can be done in a better way when people are exposed to comprehensible inputs and experience with the target language. The acquisition can be done when the learner understands what is being said in the target language and the communication is meaningful. Being exposed to comprehensible input leads to the ability to speak fluently and also it may result in an increase of grammatical accuracy. Approaches that follow this view would have little or no explicit grammar teaching. Others have claimed that grammatical competence is vital for communication and the meaningful
input is insufficient for achieving this competency. Some specific aspects of the language are difficult to learn just by the use of purely communicative approach because they escape the process of naturalistic learning. Hence, advanced levels of expertise in a language might need explicit instruction (Hinkel & Fotos, 2002).

2.5.2 Language Awareness

Carter (2003) defined Language awareness as “the development in learners of an enhanced consciousness of and sensitivity to the forms and functions of language” (p. 64). Language awareness encompasses a stronger emphasis on language. In the 1980s, language awareness included a reaction to more prescriptive approaches to language teaching with methods such as Grammar-Translation, drills, and pattern practice. It was also associated with response to the neglected attention to forms in some strong versions of CLT.

According to Rutherford and Smith (1988), consciousness rising, is a “deliberate attempt to draw the learner’s attention specifically to the formal properties of the target language” (p. 107). Language awareness in grammar teaching highlights specific language features such as capitalizing or underlining a specific grammatical feature in a text. The significant difference between language awareness and the prescriptive approaches is that it helps learners to know about certain grammatical features. Ellis (as cited in Richards & Renandya, 2002) defined consciousness-raising as “an attempt to equip the learner with an understanding of a specific grammatical feature – to develop declarative rather than procedural knowledge” (p. 168). Although the main intention is to improve explicit knowledge, this does not certainly include metalanguage, i.e. grammatical terminology. In the 1980s, some of the scholars and the teachers believed that no explicit grammar instruction was essential.

Rutherford and Smith (1988) claimed that Language awareness offers learners a sense of security. Simensen (1998) demonstrated that consciousness or awareness could lead to explicit knowledge, which again can lead to automatization and implicit knowledge. Approaches to grammar teaching that are based on language awareness can be a prospective facilitator for language acquisition. Approaches to the teaching of grammar that are based on language-awareness are more inductive, as the learners must find out rules for themselves. The advantages of cognitive approaches can be stated as follows: The learners are more involved in the language learning process,
and they are given more time and space to develop their own efficient and experimental responses to language (Carter, 2003).

### 2.6 Cognitive Approaches to Grammar

The term cognitive learning can be achieved through approaches that are concerned with the relationship between language and the human mind. All the cognitive approaches follow the belief that there is a significant difference between first and second-language acquisition processes, and a conscious focus on grammar is beneficial. The cognitive approaches are against theories that are extremely concerned with the way in which children acquire their first languages and state that people are born with an inherent set of language rules in their minds (e.g. Chomsky).

The cognitive approaches are against the view that learning is inherited from the traditional methods of grammar teaching and learning. Language awareness approaches support ways of instruction in which the learners are guided towards an emphasis on aspects of the language and assisted them to use various cognitive strategies to discover how language works. Newby (1989) demonstrated that The cognitive approaches have extended in the ways that the emphasis is on grammatical meaning in which theoretical support is given to the notional grammar available in CLT. The analysis of the cognitive developments motivate learning and leads to a theoretical foundation that can be used in the design of grammar tasks. The cognitive stage model has the capability of filling the gap between competence and performance. A cognitive view of learning focuses on the pupils’ perspective. It emphasizes on the tasks that should be done in the human brain at every stage in order to internalize the grammar. According to, Newby (2006), cognitive approach, consider grammar both in terms of competence and performance, which is like the communicative model in which language is seen in both terms of knowledge and skills. Other approaches to grammar comprise the idea of stage-wise development as well (e.g. presentation – practice – production in traditional approaches; input – intake – output in naturalistic acquisition approaches). Newby (2006) demonstrated that the stages in the cognitive approach are termed differently because they focus on the learner’s perspective rather than the teacher’s perspective and the emphasis is on the tasks that must be achieved in mind of the learner, in order to internalize the grammar. The four stages between the inputs can be stated as follow: the materials are given by
the teacher or the textbook and the pupils’ existing knowledge, and the output, i.e. what the students say or write. It should be mentioned that the stages are not separate, but rather overlapping because learning is an in progress process. Nevertheless, it is convenient to show them as distinct stages to enable a systematic analysis of learning procedures and corresponding pedagogical activities (Newby as cited in Fenner & Newby, 2006).

According to Newby (as cited in Fenner & Newby, 2006), the input includes both inputs from the teacher and the textbook, besides the learner’s existing knowledge. The cognitive stages are necessary for the learning procedure. Each stage depends on the aim of the grammar lesson. Newby (as cited in Fenner & Newby, 2006) believed that the cognitive view on learning has more desire towards awareness-raising tasks and learning by performing tasks because these encourage reflection and help learners in the right direction of performance, which is the final goal of language learning. At the awareness stage, the learners concentrate on and perceive the new grammar, as the attention is brought to a grammatical feature. At this stage, it may involve extraction of attention from some aspects, in order to focus the attention on other issues. At the conceptualization stage, the learners recognize a grammar rule; they formulate generalizations, and they internalize the rules. This stage focuses on the acquisition of new knowledge, and this knowledge is naturally conscious.

In the proceduralization stage, competence is connected to performance. Procedural knowledge achieved primary declarative knowledge. The attention that was paid to grammar is reduced here. The learners should not only know but also use grammar in tasks without a strong focus on rules. These tasks are done under controlled conditions. Tasks which are required to create utterances, which encode their own ideas, are typically at this level of cognition. This stage should be supported by both the oral and written tasks, as the learners learn to use grammar in practice. At the final stage, performance, the learners are capable of using grammar in open contexts with the focus of their attention being on the overall message. The output is not a cognitive stage, but rather the language employed by the learners. The output can work as evidence of the cognitive processes, and the feedback on what the learners utter or write can lead to the cyclical stage wise process to continue (Newby, 2006).
2.6.1 Newby’s Communication + Cognitive Approach (C+C)

The communication + cognitive (C+C) approach in grammar and language learning gathers the communicative and the cognitive view on language and learning together. This approach considers grammar as both a mental process (cognitive) and a dynamic process (communicative). According to Newby (2006), the communicative approach supports discourse and context-based approaches, while the cognitive supports psychological, mind-based approaches. Newby (as cited in Fenner & Newby, 2006) demonstrated that CLT approaches could be effective if they are supplemented with insights from cognitive learning theory. He believed that the cognitive, together with a communicative view of language, have the potential to offer a theoretical outline with significant applications in grammar teaching. In the C+C approach, grammar is considered as a process, rather than a product, implementation and knowledge, as well as performance and competence, are involved. This approach reduces the potential misconception of previous methods which is the tendency to focus on either performance or competence or use or knowledge. In this approach, language is considered as a tool for expressing meaning into form. The basic language tasks are interaction and communication, and the functional use of the language is reflected in its structure. Also, this model includes discourse, as a significant feature of the language. Thus, grammar cannot be viewed as detached from it (Newby as cited in Fenner & Newby, 2006).

2.7 Grammar Teaching in Second Language Acquisition

In the 1840s and 1940s centuries, Grammar-Translation Method was a dominant method of teaching a foreign language (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The status of formal teaching (the teaching of language forms) was strongly well-known for a long time. When other language teaching methods appeared and de-emphasized grammar, the significance of formal instruction began to fade. According to Celce-Murcia (2001), at the end of the nineteenth century, the Direct Method, which emphasized the ability to use the language instead of the analyzation of it as the objective of language instruction, and it began to function as a feasible alternative to Grammar-Translation Method. Language teaching approaches that developed later did not put too much emphasis on grammar either. The Audio-lingual Method and the Situational Method emerged during the 1950s and 1960s. Richards and Rodgers
(2001) stated that during the same period, other approaches drew lesser attention but had equally enthusiastic followers, including the Silent Way, Natural Approach, and Total Physical Response.

The Communicative Approach, which was broadly practiced in the 1970s and 1980s, emphasized the significance of meaningful communication, thus relegating attention to language forms placed at the secondary position. The Task-Based Approach has become popular from the 1990s, and it emphasized the importance of meaning over form. Nevertheless, everything has gone in favor of meaning, and the researchers and practitioners started to reflect on the wisdom of neglecting form. After sometimes, again the interest in formal instruction renewed. Numerous research has been conducted, not only to validate the explicit teaching of grammar but also to find out several ways of applying form-focused instruction or achieving a focus on form.

2.7.1 Explicit versus Implicit Teaching of Grammar

The explicit teaching of grammar is a radical concept to the history of grammar teaching. The teaching of grammar without qualification is often considered as a kind of explicit teaching, especially in earlier research where the focus is on whether grammar instructions play any role in the acquisition of grammar. Many of the recent studies in the 1990s were about the issues of whether grammar should be taught explicitly or implicitly, or deductively or inductively, or whether declarative or procedural knowledge should be given more importance. The difference between the explicit knowledge of grammar and implicit knowledge of grammar has been investigated in several studies. The notion of ‘explicit versus implicit learning’ is often associated with ‘deductive versus inductive learning’. DeKeyser (1995) believed that these two pairs of words are related. Explicit learning synchronized with awareness of what is being learned; implicit learning happens without concurrent awareness of what is being learned. Explicit learning is casually related to the concept of deductive learning, which implies that "rules are presented before examples are encountered" (p.380). Implicit learning is frequently associated with the notion of inductive learning, which means that examples are given before rules are suggested. Explicit and implicit learning are also related to the notion of declarative and procedural knowledge. According to Ellis (1990), explicit knowledge is
conscious, and its notion is declarative. Implicit knowledge is subconscious and procedural, even though it does not need to be fully automatic. A few number of researchers like Krashen (1985) believed that it is "acquired" (implicit) knowledge which leads to communication. Implicit knowledge can only be obtained through exposure to comprehensible and clear input. The use of formal instruction and the development of explicit knowledge is limited in language acquisition. According to several studies conducted on the topic of explicit versus implicit or deductive versus inductive learning, it can be said that explicit learning is beneficial in some ways. Based on the study conducted by DeKeyser (1995) explicit-deducive learning is favorable for the learning of simple rules. For more complex rules the implicit-inductive learning is more useful, and his ideas and results of the study have been supported by Robinson’s study (1996) that indicated explicit learning is beneficial for learning simple rules, while implicit learning is not visibly superior in learning complex rules. In 1997, DeKeyser did another study which examined the automatization of explicitly learned rules of morphosyntax in second language acquisition. According to the results of this study, the learning of second language grammar rules can progress considerably in the same way as learning in other cognitive domains. So, the systemic practice of particular rules for achieving specific skills is beneficial in the second language curriculum. Some studies have investigated different ways of explicit teaching such as deductive and inductive teaching.

Ellis (2006) stated that in deductive teaching, at first grammatical structures are presented, and then they are practiced in one way or another. However, in inductive teaching initially, the learners are exposed to examples of the grammatical structures and then are requested to make a metalinguistic generalization on their own. Many studies have investigated the comparative effectiveness of the deductive and inductive approaches. Erlam (2006) conducted some investigations on the relative effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronouns in French.

The participants of this study were students of three secondary classes. Three different types of instructional treatment were given to them: the deductive group was given explicit instruction on direct object pronouns; the inductive group was requested to do practice activities without receiving any rule explanation or explicit metalinguistic information; the control group was given no exposure to the target
structure outside the testing episodes. Evaluation of the pre-test and post-test scores offered evidence in support of the superiority of deductive instruction over inductive instruction. The scores also showed that the inductive group did better on measures of language production that rated the morphological rather than the syntactical characteristics of the target structure which implies that inductive instruction is more likely to simplify the learning of morphological rather than syntactical aspects of language. Recently investigations on explicit or implicit learning/knowledge of grammar have discovered how this two complement or influence each other.

Ellis (2005) studied various psychological and neurobiological processes by which explicit knowledge of form-meaning associations impacts upon implicit language learning. He recommended that implicit and explicit knowledge can be both dissociable and cooperative. Gasparini (2004) reflected the significance of implicit learning in education. He believed that it is possible to re-direct implicit learning through some kind of formal instruction/explicit learning. He disputed for the validity of constructivist models in which the implicit dimension of learning establishes the primary step of an acceptable educational approach in the second language (L2) learning/teaching, such as the academic model of task-based learning, which systematically attempts to use the implicit learning dimension to improve the structure of effective L2 learning environments. According to Gasparini, implicit learning can be employed in other educational disciplines as well. Ellis (2006) demonstrated that although there is ample evidence that explicit instruction is effective in learning the second language but, there was no published study that directly tested or shown whether explicit knowledge transforms directly into implicit knowledge or simply assists its development. Many aspects of the connection between the two are still mostly unknown, indicating the need for further research to form a clear relationship.

2.7.2 Can Grammar be Taught Explicitly?

The debate over formal instruction began with different Opinions held by two opposing groups relating to whether the teaching of grammar is useful to second language teaching and learning. According to some researchers, the formal instruction can facilitate acquisition in some way while others considered exposure to appropriate language input is the most essential for second language learning. Krashen (1985) illustrated the significance of language by the use of the Input
Hypothesis. According to the Input Hypothesis, humans acquire language in only one way - by understanding messages, or by receiving comprehensible input. Krashen (1985) distinguished between the conscious process of acquisition and the subconscious process of learning. Krashen believed that the main goal of language teaching is to supply comprehensible input in order to facilitate acquisition. He claimed that formal instruction is not valuable because it can only promote learning and never promote acquisition, although it can enable the learner to monitor their own language. Besides, only limited subdivisions of the simple rules of a language are learnable and complex rules cannot be learned by most of the learners. Many researchers have consequently disputed Krashen's views. In the 1970s and 1980s, many research about the effect of formal instruction on second language acquisition were conducted. Long (1983) went through eleven studies that examine the effect of formal instruction on the rate/success of second language acquisition. According to Long (1983), six of these studies revealed that instruction helps, two produced ambiguous results, while the other three showed that instruction does not help, although each of these contained some hints of an advantage for instruction. These studies were based on the comparisons between learners receiving instruction and learners who experience exposure with or without instruction. Based on this review, Long (1983) came to the conclusion that there is substantial evidence that shows formal language instruction does make a difference. These findings are especially helpful in the early stages of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and in acquisition-poor environments. Besides the studies revised by Long, several other studies were also conducted which showed similar results, while some presented new insights. Spada (1986) conducted a study about the comparison of the effects of instruction with the effects of exposure. His investigation was about whether there is any relation between the type of informal contact with the target language outside the classroom and the type of instruction.

Spada (1986) investigated the effects of instruction and exposure of adult learners joined in a six-week English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) course in Canada which revealed contact was a less influential predictor of differences in learners' second language (L2) abilities than instruction. Furthermore, Spada also realized that the type of instruction interacted with the amount of contact each learner experienced. She came to a conclusion that where grammar and literacy are concerned, direct
involvement in form-focused instruction works better than indirect intervention which is less form-focused. The result that elicited from this study was that learners need both formal instruction and informal exposure and these two work together better than either on its own.

Ellis (1990) also went through some studies about the impression of instruction on the process of L2 acquisition. These studies tracked the effects of instruction in two ways which can be stated as follows; (I) by means of classroom experiments planned to find out whether teaching specific items effects the acquisition of that language and (II) by comparing classroom and naturalistic acquisition. Research that placed in the first category focused on a number of process features: errors of the second language (L2), the sequence of acquisition of grammatical morphemes and the sequence of development of syntactical structures such as relative clauses and word order. Experimental findings in the second category fall into three groups which can be stated as follows; (I) accuracy studies that assess the effects of instruction by finding out whether there are any improvements in the accuracy with particular structures that are performed after the treatment; (2) sequence of acquisition studies which investigates whether formal instruction can influence the natural sequence for the acquisition of grammatical rules; and (3) "projection" studies which assess whether instruction can activate the projection device which allows the acquisition of one rule to trigger the acquisition of all the other rules that come together with it.

On the basis of his review, Ellis (1990) claimed that form-focused instruction does help the acquisition of linguistic competence. In some cases, the instruction can have an immediate effect that is dependent on the nature of the target structure and when the intervention takes place. In other cases, the formal instruction might have a delayed effect, and it provides more or less explicit grammatical concepts for the learner, which will later help the learner to use these features in the input and so acquire them procedurally. However, the results drawn from these studies should be treated with caution.

According to Ellis (1990), the research that they reviewed was psycholinguistic in nature. This research was quantitative and, in many instances, experimental in nature. The studies on the influences of formal instruction have been
product-oriented rather than process-oriented. One feature of the product-orientation is that formal instruction is treated as an indistinguishable phenomenon. The kind of formal instruction which was used in the studies was not clear, and also it was not well-defined whether there was any consistency in the intensiveness of the attention to form. Later research on formal instruction has attempted to address this gap. Instead of emphasizing on the matter of whether formal instruction truly helps, mainly through statistical measurements of proficiency achieved after formal instruction, studies have diverged into different aspects of how formal instruction from both linguistic and cognitive perspectives can be practiced.

2.8. Input-Oriented versus Output-Oriented Approaches

Several research have also been conducted on input-oriented versus output-oriented approaches and also on whether attention to language input form or language output form should be emphasized more. Input and output can play a major role in the classroom interaction and language learning. Ellis (1990) made a distinction between reception-based theories and production-based theories. The emphasis of reception-based theories of L2 acquisition is on the importance of input, as opposed to learner output. Krashen was one of the fans of the reception-based theories. He advocates the Input Hypothesis. According to Krashen (1985), the “comprehensible input” that the learner is exposed to is the main element for language acquisition. He believed that learners improve their L2 competence by “understanding input that includes of structures that are a little beyond their current knowledge” (Krashen, 1985.p .2). Nevertheless, other researchers claimed that the input which a learner obtains does not necessarily turn into a part of his/her knowledge of the language at his/her disposal. Input is referred as the language that a learner is exposed. Gass and Selinker (1994) defined the intake as “the process of assimilating linguistic material” (p. 302). Corder (1967) made a distinction between ‘input’ and ‘intake’. According to Gass and Selinker (1994), several researchers think that comprehension is only achievable when ‘input’ is changed into ‘intake’. When input becomes intake, and the latter becomes a part of a learner's knowledge at his disposal, then learner is ready to engage in communication. It is clear that input processing plays a major role in the formation and development of the learner's linguistic system because acquisition depends on whether input can become intake. To turn input into the intake, the emphasis should be on the former and the language structure. Several studies have
been performed on the effectiveness of processing or improving the input, for example, those conducted by VanPatten (1990; 1993; 1996). White, Spada, Lightbrown and Ranta (1991) also studied the form-focused instruction and corrective feedback, which they implied to as ‘input enhancement’ presented within a primarily communicative language program (for French speakers learning English as a second language) would lead to learners' accuracy in question formation. Based on the achieved results the instruction influenced the syntactic accuracy, and learners exposed to input improvement activities extensively outperformed the concerned groups. Takimoto (2008) conducted an experimental study on 60 Japanese learners of English. He studied the effects of various types of input-based form-focused instruction on learners' ability to understand and make polite requests in English, involving different kinds of deductive and inductive instruction, ranging from teacher-fronted explicit explanation of forms to structured input tasks and problem-solving task. The results show that the three groups performed considerably better than the control group, signifying that in this investigation explicit input-based instruction was effective both deductively and inductively for learners’ comprehension and production of polite requests in English. It is implied that inductive treatment may be superior in the longer term, as the inductive tasks offer learners opportunities to employ the target features significantly. This indicates that effective learning takes place when the tasks provide the opportunities to process both the form and the meaning of the target forms for the learners. Besides, input processing, other research has investigated the processing of output, for easing the change of input into the intake. Therefore, a distinction can be made between input-based and output-based theories, or what some researchers like Ellis (1990) termed ‘reception-based theories’ and ‘production-based theories’. Paying attention to the significance of intake has led to the emergence of theories that shift gradually from the reception side to the production side. Modification of the interactional structure of conversations when communication problems arise leads to comprehensible input which is a part of Interaction Hypothesis. According to Interaction Hypothesis, comprehensible input is a result of modification which is a result of negotiation of meaning that refers to a situation in which the participants require to interrupt the flow of the conversation so that both parties understand the concept and intention of the conversation (Gass & Selinker, 1994, p. 208). In a similar way, several types of research have been conducted with a focus on the production process of language learning. Swain (as
cited in Gass & Madden, 1985) placed the Output Hypothesis forward which claimed that learners require the opportunity to produce language in order to acquire native-speaker levels of grammatical proficiency. Swain (as cited in Gass & Madden, 1985) defined comprehensible output as the language they produce which refers to the need for learners to be "pushed toward the delivery of a message that is not only conveyed, but that is conveyed precisely, coherently and appropriately" (p.249).

More of recent studies have focused on studying the comparative effectiveness of processing the input or the output. The research by Izumi and Izumi (2004) studied whether providing learners opportunity for oral output has any affirmative effect on the L2 learners’ acquisition of a grammatical form. The outcomes showed that opposing to their expectations, the output group, which involved in a picture description task that included input comprehension and output production, failed to out-perform the non-output group, which involved in a picture sequencing task that needed input comprehension only. Amazingly, it was the non-output group that indicated greater overall gains in learning. Izumi and Izumi (2004) suggested an acceptable explanation regarding the cognitive processes entailed as the two groups of learners engaged in their respective tasks. They believed that the Output-Task might have failed to employ the genuine production mechanisms. Instead, it may have worked just as a mechanical production drill for learners, which caused a little significant impact on language development. The outcomes of this study suggest that using the output to ease grammatical acquisition can be effective only if valid and authentic syntactic processing is engaged. This is achievable if learners focus on significant form-meaning relationships in meaningful production, instead of only memorizing and repeating the presented input. This has implications for task design in output-oriented activities. Whether the input should receive attention or the output or whether both are required is still a matter of controversy. No certain result has been received from the research that has been performed. These Input-Based and Output-Based views frequently include complex cognitive processes for which less research have performed comprehensively. Some of the contemporary researchers even stated that this comparison of the relative effectiveness of Input-Based or Output-Based instruction is unnecessary. According to Ellis (2006), “in the classrooms this comparison is eventually meaningless because, in practice, both options are expected to involve input-processing and production” (p. 99). What
matters most is the engagement with both form and meaning in processing the input and the output which can often be successfully achieved through task design and implementation.

2.9. Noticing and Consciousness-Raising (CR)

In recent research on the cognitive aspects of form-focused instruction whether in the processing of language input or language output, lots of attention is paid to ‘noticing’ and ‘Conscious-Raising.’ Rutherford and Smith (1985) defined the term ‘Consciousness-Raising’ as “the deliberate attempt to draw the learner's attention specifically to the formal properties of the target language” (p.274). The notions of Noticing or Consciousness-Raising have their roots in the learning theories of cognitive psychology and psycholinguistics. Bialystok (as cited in Rutherford & Sharwood-Smith, 1988) developed the cognitive theory of L2 learning, and he has provided a framework for placing the role of conscious knowledge in second language acquisition. Bialystok (as cited in Rutherford & Sharwood-Smith, 1988) supported the theory that language is processed by the human mind in the same way as other kinds of information. Language proficiency can be defined with reference to two dimensions: an analyzed factor and an automatic factor. The analyzed factor is about the language learner's awareness of the structure of his/her linguistic knowledge. Although, Bialystok (as cited in Rutherford & Sharwood-Smith, 1988) emphasized that the degree of analyticity is not linked to consciousness and is not explicitly signified in the learner’s mind, she believed that analyzed knowledge does make articulated knowledge and metalingual knowledge possible. Its real importance is in the fact that it can be conducted by the learner and it is available for language uses which are required in formal instruction.

In fact, the notion of consciousness-raising is nothing original. It is fostered from the Krashen's (1985) concept of the Input Hypothesis and the subsequent theorizing and studies on input and output processing. Schmidt (1990) as one of the proponents of the concept of noticing, stated that not all input have the same value for a learner; only the input which is noticed will become available for intake and effective processing. He also stated three other components that influence individual differences in processing input: ability, readiness, and task demands. The research conducted on the capability of processing or improving input such as those by
VanPatten (1990; 1993a; 1996) were in fact also investigations on consciousness-raising, as they suggested it is through input processing (drawing attention to form in the language input), that input can be transformed into intake to ease language acquisition. One of the primary investigations on grammatical consciousness-raising was conducted by VanPatten (1990) to answer the question that whether the learners can consciously focus on both form and meaning while processing the input. There are three levels of experiments in which the learners contributed in an experiment which comprised processing information under four different conditions: concentration on meaning alone; concurrent focus on meaning and the important lexical item; simultaneous concentration to the meaning and a grammatical function; and simultaneous attention to the meaning and a verb form. The outcome implies that learners, in certain early-stage, face great difficulty attending to both form and content. As the conscious focus on form in the input contests with conscious attention to the meaning, it is only when the input is effortlessly apprehended that learners can focus on the form as part of the intake process.

Numerous investigations were done in the early 1990s using a task-based approach for attaining grammatical consciousness-raising (Fotos, 1993, 1994; Fotos & Ellis, 1991).

From the 1990s to the 2000s, the notion of grammatical consciousness-raising obtained increasing attention in TBLT as a significant tool for focusing on form. Fotos and Ellis (1991) proposed a different type of grammatical consciousness-raising tasks as compared to the previous researcher. According to Fotos and Ellis (1991), consciousness-raising tasks proposed by previous researchers, because grammatical structures are not considered as the medium of communication as in most communicative tasks; they are in fact the content of the communication itself.

The research by Fotos and Ellis (1991) implemented a Task-Based Approach for grammatical consciousness-raising. The efficiency of using grammar tasks was compared to teacher-fronted grammar lessons with regard to the acquisition of grammatical knowledge and the production of discussion of meaning in classroom interaction. The outcome implies that the grammar task inspired communication about grammar and assisted EFL learners to enhance their knowledge of a difficult rule of L2. As a pursue to the previous investigation in 1991, Fotos (1993) performed
another study to find out the quantity of learner’s noticing produced by two types of grammatical consciousness-raising treatments designed to improve formal knowledge of complicated grammar structures: teacher-fronted grammar lessons and interactive, grammatical problem-solving tasks. The outcomes showed that the task performance was as efficient as formal instruction in the improvement of considerable amounts of noticing. It is revealed that some learners who acquired knowledge about grammatical structures, in the end, continued to notice those structures in communicative input subsequently after their consciousness had been raised. In a similar way, another research by Fotos (1994) explored the proficiency of grammatical consciousness-raising tasks which combined the progress of formal knowledge about problematic L2 grammatical characteristics with the term of meaning-focused use of the target language. Three grammatical Consciousness-Raising tasks coped with word order were investigated. The results showed that the tasks effectively enhanced both proficiency gains and L2 communicative interaction in the participants. This implies that grammatical Consciousness-Raising tasks can be recommended as one way to add a formal instruction into a communicative framework.

In another debate, Ellis (1995) assessed an approach to grammar teaching which is based on interpreting input. His approach stressed on helping learners to become aware of grammatical features in the input, understand their meanings, and compare the forms present in the input with those occurring in learner output. Leow (2001) presented a brief summary of the study in the 1990s which intended to draw learners’ attention to targeted linguistic forms in the L2 data or input. He appraised many investigations that have been conducted, including input flooding, input enhancement, implicit/explicit learning conditions, processing instruction, explicit/implicit feedback, and classroom-based tasks. The theoretical hypothesis related to these studies was that some sort of attention (and awareness) to linguistic data is essential for learning L2, but they failed to state the hypothesis methodologically. Leow (2001) tried to fill this gap by his research. He assessed the role of awareness and its potential influence on learners' immediate behavior on both a recognition and written production task, and he asked the research question as follow: How do different levels of awareness of morphological forms in a problem-solving task influence learners' mental representations and subsequent recognition and
accurate written production of such forms. His experimental studies pursued first to establish methodologically and the attention was certainly paid to targeted forms in the input before the impression of such attention, and consequently awareness could be statistically analyzed. The results of this study delivered empirical support to facilitate the effects of awareness in foreign language acquisition behavior. Other researchers have attempted to discover the types of Consciousness-Raising tasks suitable for task-based teaching. Thornbury (1997) intended to fit the reformulation and reconstruction tasks into a Task-Based model of instruction concentrating learners’ attention on form, using both the meaning-driven and form-focused potential of both task types. According to him, the two general types of task for focusing learners’ attention on the form have received little attention. In a reformulation task, based on its content, the teacher reformulates the text constructed by the learner but recasts it to present a language model that can be compared with the learner's original draft. In a reconstruction task, at first, the learner reads a text which is given by the teacher and then reconstructs it by using his or her own language for matching with the original.

According to Thornbury (1997), tasks comprising reformulation and reconstruction allow Consciousness-Raising at a complete range of discourse, syntactic, lexical, and phonological levels. In the 1990s and 2000s, the effort of integrating formal instruction into a communicative framework was improving as the researchers found various ways of integrating formal instruction into communicative language teaching and task-based language teaching. More investigation about the concept of Consciousness-Raising has also been improved by Ellis (2003), who defined Consciousness-Raising tasks as one type of focused task for promoting attention to form. He explained the differences between Consciousness-Raising tasks with two other types of focused tasks which can be stated as follows; structure-based production tasks and comprehension tasks. Although the other types of focused task are intended to cater primarily to implicit learning, Consciousness-Raising tasks are designed to cater mainly to explicit learning. CR tasks turn the language itself into the content while other types of tasks are constructed about the content of a general nature. As a conclusion to his discussion on this topic, Ellis said it again that "communication" is still the primary focus of TBLT.
According to Ellis (2003), the value of CR tasks are not just about whether they are effective in progressing explicit knowledge and then stimulating noticing, but it is also about the opportunities they provide for learners to communicate. Ellis (2003), in addition to his previous comment, again highlighted that "consciousness-raising is not an alternative to communication activities, but a supplement" (p. 167).

Conclusion

With the above mentioned facts, it can be concluded that traditional methods of teaching grammar seems out of date nowadays and they are not very effective to be applied in the classrooms. In this modern era, being able to communicate plays an important role. So, TBLT and CLT are becoming more attractive all over the world. Research concern in the investigation of the relationship between grammar teaching and task-based language teaching has remained unabated in the contemporary era. This complicated relationship between form and meaning will be studied more in the next section.
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