

GRAMMAR GLEAMING: TOWARD A HUMANISTIC APPROACH

Dr. Nemat Zamani VISROODI
University of Isfahan
Faculty of Foreign Languages
IRAN

ABSTRACT

Although the bulk of the research in second language acquisition has highlighted the significance and necessity of grammar instruction in EFL contexts, fertility of challenges, debates and grammar methods concerning how to teach grammar more effectively has put EFL teachers in a state of dilemma and confusion. The current paper historically and critically examined grammatical perspectives and approaches from 1950 to 2014 with the aim of empowering EFL teachers to get rid of monotony, repetition, memorization and frustration of grammar classes as often quoted by students. Being aware of there is no size to fit all, the researcher suggested that more humanistic approach is needed to teach grammar due to peculiarity of grammar classes compared with other classes. Teachers are suggested to be primarily sensitive to the students' affective factors and their positive emotions in a learner-centered setting to stimulate enjoyment and relaxation. Unlike traditional methods which mainly dealt with grammar instruction with respect to cognition, current views on teaching grammar emphasize a high correlation between grammar and affection. Meanwhile, teachers should also be cautious and autonomous in selecting and integrating grammar techniques due to mediating effect of contextual factors so that they can teach all the students.

Key Words: EFL grammar instruction, critical and historical overview, humanistic approach.

INTRODUCTION

After twenty years of teaching English in Iran, I am frequently interrupted by questions from my learners: 'Is it grammatically correct, teacher?' 'Could you introduce me a good grammar book?' What is the difference between 'who' and 'whom'? Some learners are also afraid of producing language in my classes due to the fear of committing grammatical errors. In fact, they are right. Without grammar, sentences become meaningless and confusing. Ellis (2006) argued that teachers still need to resolve the issue of grammar instruction. Ur (1994) stated that grammar- manipulating and combining words to builds larger units of meaning- is essential for mastery of language. Thornbury (1999) argued that grammar governs sentences and it communicates meaning. Azar (2007) pointed out the grammar mastery is inevitable and essential since it allows learners to discover the nature of language. Lightwon (1391) & Ellis (2006) suggested teaching grammar even in initial stages of SLA help learners to develop a basis for later learning. The debate between to teach or not teach grammar is no longer valid. Therefore, very few studies deny the invaluable role of grammar instruction for successful mastery of second language acquisition. The debate is how to teach grammar?

Grammar is not only the concern of EFL learners but also a serious concern of EFL teachers as well. There has always been debate about the most effective way to teach grammar. Gladys Jean & Daphnee Simard (2011) argued that grammar teaching and learning in EFL contexts are necessary but boring. Teachers have been surrounded by different methods to teach grammar. The majority of these methods have dealt with the cognition of the learners and neglected the affective dimension of grammatical competence. As quoted by the learners, the most exhausting and boring classes are grammar classes in EFL contexts.

While grammar classes are often associated with tiredness, frustration and lack of concentration, affect and emotion have received little attention in such classes. To develop a grammar competence, learners have to go through some developmental stages. They tend to backslide to previous stages. It implies that learners in grammar classes make frequent errors as they are inevitable part of the grammar growth. Although these

errors help both teachers and learners in the processes of learning, they may demoralize learners. In fact, the pernicious effect of grammatical errors should not be neglected on the learners' affections and emotions. They may shape the wrong perceptions that they are not making progress. Grammar teachers are suggested to pay special attention to the generations of positive emotions and feelings. Garret & Young (2009) asserted that 'affect and emotion are terms that have been in the shadows of discussions of foreign language learning, where the primary focus has been on the development of knowledge and the use of new knowledge.

Grammar misconceptions

The widespread misconceptions about grammar are not rare. May be, grammar is one part of language that has experienced many ups and downs. The simple one is that language is an area of knowledge rather than skill. Some think that grammar is just accuracy while grammar means using language accurately, meaningfully and appropriately. (Celece Murcia, 2001). A number of EFL teachers wrongly claim that explicit grammar teaching is not needed since language is acquired implicitly. This may be true for the contexts where learners are sufficiently exposed to daily use of language. Another misconception is that there is always one correct answer without considering the context and circumstances under which the sentence has been used. (Larsen Freeman, 2003). A big mistake was also made by Krashen in his so called 'non interface position' that grammar is not needed at all!

Grammar and the dualism problem

Grammar theories, like the majority of SLA theories, suffer from the issue of dichotomy which reduces the complexity of the issue. Prescriptive grammars were concerned with formality-informality debate. Generative grammarians dealt with core-peripheral dichotomy, Halliday's systemic functional grammar detected form-function bipolarity. Van Patton's input processing model stressed form-meaning connection. Tomasello's usage based grammar emphasized item by item grammar instruction. Debates between explicit vs. implicit; and inductive vs. deductive methods of grammar instruction are further examples of the dualism problem. The dualistic nature of the grammar reduces its complexity in that it restricts grammar into two distinct categories. This notion is incompatible with the principles of pedagogical grammar, the kind of grammar used in applied linguistics, describing how grammar should be taught in EFL classrooms.

Grammar and continuity of an 'inert knowledge' problem (1920)

EFL learners often find it difficult to transfer the grammar they perform in formal settings to communicative settings in and outside the classroom. Alfred North Whitehead in 1929 coined, 'inert knowledge', the kind of explicit passive grammar knowledge that learners have in mind but unable to put into use in different contexts. Related to this notion is Jack C. Richards's (2014) distinction between grammatical *knowledge* from grammatical *ability*. The former is judgment made about the grammaticality of sentences while the latter refers to using grammar as a communicative resource in spoken and written discourse. Larsen Freeman (2003) argued that grammar instruction involves integration of form, meaning and use. Declarative Knowledge of grammatical rules without application in context of use is not the goal of grammar instruction. How, when and under what conditions explicit declarative knowledge grammar converts to implicit procedural knowledge is a controversial issue. Anderson (1993) suggested 'communicative practice', Swain (1995) attributed it to 'output practice', Frodeson (2001) proposed 'transformation drills' and Nunnan (1998) emphasized the role of 'contextualization'.

Focus-on-forms: accuracy (1950s)

Focus-on-forms is associated with traditional grammar-based classes which is consistent with PPP (presentation, practice and production) model of language instruction. It highlighted the importance of explicit grammar teaching during grammar translation in 1950s, cognitive code approach and audio-lingual method in 1960s. Learners were assumed to accumulate grammar in teacher-oriented classes through a deductive technique (rule based) without making grammatical mistakes. (Rutherford, 1987). Aside from taking a building block view of language, focus-on-forms sacrificed fluency at the expense of accuracy. The emphasis was on grammar competence rather than grammar performance. That is, knowing about grammar was more important than knowing grammar. Focus-on-forms has been criticized for being teacher-centered, artificial,

boring and for not allowing meaningful communication, which is essential to language acquisition (Long, 2000). Besides, no attention was paid to the learners' affection.

Focus-on-meaning: fluency (1980s)

Focus-on-meaning, on the other hand, which was introduced by Krashen and Terrell's (1983) Natural Approach to second language (L2) acquisition, completely rejected any direct instruction on grammar, explicit error correction, or even consciousness-raising, as L2 is claimed to be naturally acquired through adequate exposure to language or 'comprehensible input' (Krashen, 1982:64; Krashen, 1985:2). According to this view (non-interface position), explicit knowledge about language and error correction is unnecessary and even harmful as it may interfere with the natural acquisition process. Thus, this position claimed that there was no interaction between explicit and implicit knowledge. Similar to Krashen's view, deep version of CLT and early version of Task Based Language Teaching, although it didn't last long, were criticized for taking anti-grammar position. Focus on meaning was also criticized in that mere exposure to language input along with zero grammar instruction was a large number of grammatical errors in production which finally led to fossilization (Lightbown & Spada, 1994; Skehan, 1996; Swain, 1985; Swain & Lapkin, 1995; White, 1987). Later, two influential theoretical concepts focus-on-form and consciousness raising, contributed to revitalization of grammar. (Thornbury, 1999).

Focus-on-form: fluency and accuracy (1990s)

Long (1991) initiated focus-on-form as a reconciliation of form and meaning. Focus-on-form can be defined as "any pedagogical effort that is used to draw the learners' attention to language form either explicitly or implicitly". (Spada, 1997). Learners are involved in communication but occasional shift of stress is given to formal features of language. Doughty (2001) defined focus-on-form as paying attention to the form without going back to traditional grammar based teaching. Although early Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and strong version of CLT were criticized due to exclusion of focus-on-form activities, weak versions of both TBLT and CLT accept that some focus-on-form activities are necessary for developing communicative competence. Simply speaking, they value both fluency and accuracy. Focus-on-form activities like underlining, coloring, highlighting and italicizing within a written text make certain target structures more salient and help students to notice them. This is what Sharwood Smith (1993) called *input enhancement*. A second means of calling attention to form is through *input flooding*. For example, talking about historical events would give learners abundant opportunities to notice the past tense. Focus-on-form can also be done through an implicit negative corrective feedback known as *recast* (Long & Robinson, 1998). The benefits of focus-on-form over other approaches like focus-on-forms and focus-on-meaning have been widely accepted (Spada & Lightbown, 2008), but again, there was no attention to the generation of positive emotions, feelings, motivation of the learners which are crucial in grammar classes.

Consciousness raising (CR)

Related to the notion of focus-on-form is consciousness raising initiated by Rutherford (1987) and Sharwood Smith (1981). It is based on the assumption that grammar forms are best learned if we raise the awareness of learners to notice particular linguistic structures while maintaining a focus on meaning. CR is often associated with Schmitt's noticing hypothesis arguing conscious awareness of grammatical details is necessary (early version) and helpful (later version). Ellis (2002) asserted that CR tasks, unlike practice, develop explicit declarative knowledge rather than procedural knowledge. He added that CR contribution to L2 acquisition is indirect and delayed. Such noticing or CR contributes to second language in three ways: "learning will be faster". The quantity of production will be greater and it will extend the context in which the rule can be applied (Rutherford, 1987). CR activities like 'input flood' can be easily criticized for the large amounts of intellectual efforts they place on young learners. Sharwood Smith (1993) later replaced the term 'input enhancement' as a better term for CR since the former referred to internal state of the learner. Again, we can see no trace of affective factors in this approach.

Significance of form-focused instruction (1990s)

Both focus on form and consciousness raising together comprised paying-attention-to-form argument. (Thornbury, 1999). Long (1991) emphasized the beneficial effects of using explicit form focused instruction without worrying about learners' age, gender and proficiency levels. He added that formal instruction is more useful than exposure. Ellis (1990) stipulated this claim by saying that this was right if there were opportunities for informal language use. He, moreover, demonstrated that explicit form focused instruction contributed to declarative knowledge. In fact he believed in indirect and delayed effect of form focused instruction in second language acquisition. Moreover, Norris & Ortega's (200) meta-analysis of 49 studies proved that explicit grammar instruction has a better and long lasting effect on target structures. Benati (2008) argued that explicit instructions, although speeded up the rate of acquisition, could not alter the route of acquisition. Another benefit of grammar instruction is that it helps students 'notice the gap' between new features in a structure and those in learners' interlanguages (Schmidt & Frota, 1986). Grammar instruction can also help students to generalize their knowledge to new structures (Gass, 1982). Finally, Baker (2006) noted that advanced learners benefited form-focused instruction more because they could notice the structures and feedback more than intermediate learners.

GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION

Deductively, inductively, abductively, explicitly or implicitly?

Proponents of explicit techniques simply use L1 to explain grammar rules while implicit techniques expose learners to target features so that they struggle to discover the rules by themselves (For Rutherford (1988). Charles Sanders Peirce at the end of 19th century questioned deductive (rule driven) and inductive (data driven) in favor of abduction (experience driven) -making sense of new experiences, working with possibilities in context. Leo Van Lier (2007) asserted that hypothesis testing and grammar learning in second language learning are neither inductive nor deductive but abductive. Krashen's (1981) 'non-interface hypothesis' suggested that teachers should teach only simple structures explicitly while de Graaff (1997) stated that complex structures should be taught explicitly to make them more noticeable. Robinson (1996) stated that explicit instruction was more effective with adult English learners in simple structures while implicit learners did not outperform explicit learners with complex structures. Pienemann (1984) claimed that some structures, like question formation, do not need any instruction at all since they follow fixed developmental stages. The aforementioned statements reveal that effectiveness of a grammar technique is mediated by contextual factors such as learners' age learning style preferences, developmental readiness, proficiency levels and nature of the target structures since there is no size to fit all. Therefore, teachers should not only be reflective and cautious enough to select and integrate techniques during grammar instruction but should also create a friendly atmosphere in grammar classes to reduce anxiety, tiredness and frustration associated with such classes.

From PPP model to III model

The linear PPP (*presentation-practice-production*) took a building block view of the grammar within structuralism framework. It targeted to help learners to avoid errors. Johnson (1996) correlated PPP model to Anderson's ACT model of skill learning in which the (P1) equals declarative knowledge and (P2 & P3) played the role of procedural knowledge. Due to the nature of practice (mechanical vs. communicative practice), this comparison may not be, from my point of view, plausible. With the decline of audio-lingual method, PPP model came under sever attack. Lewis (1993) noted that PPP model says nothing about the nature of language learning. Although this model benefited the merits of noticing and awareness due to production element (p3), it was, however, deficient to fulfill needs of the grammar let alone those of the term 'grammaring' which was pedagogically more demanding. It was in 1995s that McCarthy III Model (*illustration, interaction, and induction*) replaced PPP model. Illustration phase means examining real data presented in terms of choices of form with respect to context and use. Interaction, here, highlights the importance of negotiation of meaning and form in discourse sensitive activities. In the induction stage, learners were encouraged to draw conclusion about the interpersonal functions of lexico-grammatical choices and finally develop a capacity for noticing these features.

These two models, although contributed to teaching grammar, refused to notice the crucial role of affective and emotional factors in grammar classes.

Grammar as an organic process

Unlike the traditional linear based view of grammar which can be likened to building a wall by individual bricks, the organic view considers grammar development as a hierarchal process (Rutherford, 1987 & Larsen Freeman, 2001). A strong evidence of organic view is the concept of U-shaped learning (Ellis, 2008) during acquisition irregular verbs. (went - goed-wanted - went). These stages show that learners moves from accuracy to fluency to accuracy in a zig zag fashion. The organic view supported by U-shaped learning implies that grammar learning is developmental and nonlinear. In addition, this view of grammar learning which fluctuates between learning and unlearning reveals restructuring since more efficient rules are replaced with existing rules. This notion is in line with Benati's (2008) argument that explicit instructions, just speeds up the rate of acquisition rather than route of acquisition.

Grammaring: accuracy, fluency and appropriacy (2003s)

The term 'grammaring' coined by Larsen Freeman (2003), saw grammar as the fifth dynamic skill rather than a mere component of language. It necessitates using grammatical structures accurately, meaningfully and appropriately. This notion criticized dichotomies like Van patten's form-meaning connection or Halliday's form-function approach in favor of form-meaning-function (use) approach. These three dimensions of teaching grammar are consistent with Celece Murcia's notion of grammar pie chart, involving syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Renandya (2002: 152) also introduced comprehensibility and acceptability as main components of grammatical competence. The terms 'appropriacy', 'acceptability' and 'pragmatics' in above definitions display the significance of utterance meaning (intended meaning) which is, unlike sentence meaning, is context dependent. Moreover, viewing grammar as a skill necessitates following cognitive, associative and autonomous stages of skill learning by the use of communicative practice for the purpose of proceduralization (Anderson, 1983). Larsen Freeman's grammaring is more sophisticated than former approaches to teaching grammar, it, however, did not address the vital role of humanistic factors in grammar classes.

Input-based grammar instruction

Input can be defined as the language "that learners hear or see to which they attend for its propositional content or message" (VanPatten, 1996: 10). In other words, it is the sample of language that the learners are exposed to and attempt to process for meaning. Input can be both oral and written. Input based grammar construction is based on the assumption that grammar can be noticed and learned through designing activities which provide comprehension and exposure of target structures. Van Patton's input processing, textual enhancement, input flood and grammar contextualization are subsumed under input-based grammar instruction.

I. VanPatton's input processing model

The input processing model has tried to show how learners process input in their mind and how they derive intake from input while their focus is on meaning. Central to this theory are the following questions: (1) How does the learner process the input to which he or she is exposed? (2) What is it that makes some input more difficult to process than other input? and (3) What are the processes that impede or delay the acquisition of input?

Input processing model uses processing instructions through 'structured input' activities to help learners to make form-meaning connections and thus overcome the faulty input processing strategies. For example, an investigation showed that learners usually have difficulty detecting the agent of action in causative construction due to default processing strategy that the first noun in the sentence is the doer of the action. The following structured input activity designed to make learners aware of this misconception.

- **Listen and decide who has done the action.**

John had his student write an essay.

Then, teacher asks:

1. Who wrote the essay? a. John b. student

Van Patton's input processing model in grammar instruction can be easily questioned in that it neglected the invaluable role output played in noticing the target structures and syntactic processing (Swain, 1995). Some learners tend to benefit output more than input or some target language structures may be less frequent and salient to be acquired merely through comprehension. Another shortcoming of his input based model to teaching grammar was lack of attention to affective factors needed to process and internalize the input.

II. Textual enhancement

Sharwood Smith (1993) argued that visual enhancement (color-coding, underlining, boldfacing, and enlarging the font) of target structures within written texts helps learners to notice them because visual enhancement or even audio enhancement of some parts of the input make them more salient. Unlike processing instruction which seeks form-meaning connection and is often integrated with explicit instruction, textual enhancement attempts to make the forms salient in the text (Vanpatton, 2002).

III. Input flooding

Input flood is based on the premise that frequency of occurrence of specific target structures in a text makes them more salient, which helps learners to notice the target structures. For example, exposing learners to texts related to habitual daily activities provides learners with abundant opportunities to notice simple present tense. Aside from making certain features in the input more frequent and thus more salient, another function of input flooding is that it might prime the production of a certain structure.

Grammar and contextualization

Discourse based view of grammar instruction raises awareness of grammar teaching to functional and contextual consideration. Tugrul Mart (2013) asserted that teaching grammar in context helped learners to understand the nature of language which would facilitate their understanding of language. There are several reasons to teach grammar in the context. The first reason is that teaching grammar via isolated sentences is in line with PPP model which has restricted grammar merely to pure accuracy of different forms. The second is that contextualization helps learners to discover the relationship between form, meaning and function, so it leads to more retention. (Nunan, 1998). The third reason is that decontextualized grammar instruction will not provide opportunities for the application of grammatical knowledge. Frodeson (2001) argued that the purpose of grammar instruction is not recognition of ungrammaticality but application of rules in communicative context. Utterance meaning, an important element of grammatical competence, is context dependent. One way of teaching grammar in the context is the use of dialogues. Thornbury (1999) spoke of using a recorded dialogue chosen from a textbook as a useful tool to teach adverbs of frequency in simple present tense.

Grammar and output

Believing the inadequacy of comprehensible input in second language acquisition, Swain (1985) suggested 'comprehensible output'. According to Swain, comprehensible output moves learners from semantic to syntactic processing, offers opportunities for learners to notice target structures, facilitates automaticity, generates better input and tests their hypotheses. The significance of output is multiplied when it is done collaboratively because learners scaffold each other through feedback while engaging in social interaction. (Vygotsky, 1978). Collaboration allows learners to negotiate within their Zone of Proximal Development, and move from their actual development to their potential development (Nassaji & Swain, 2000). Swain and Lapkin (2001) noted that, through collaborative output, not only is meaning jointly constructed but the language itself is improved as well. Dictogloss and jigsaw tasks are examples of collaborative output tasks. This approach to teaching grammar also failed to consider the essential role of affections and emotions in grammar for development of grammar competence.

I. Dictogloss

It is a collaborative output task in that learners hear the text as it is read by the teacher. Then, they talk, reconstruct, analyze, reflect and negotiate the accuracy of the text collaboratively. This task raises the

awareness of the learners because it pushes the learners to generate output and see the gaps in their grammatical competence.

I. jigsaw tasks

Pica, Kang, and Sauro (2006) described the steps in designing such tasks. First, the teacher reads the original passage to students. Pairs of students receive the modified versions of the passage, with one student receiving version A and the other version B. Next, students attempt to choose the correct order of individual sentences as they appear in the original version. Then, students attempt to choose between different sentences in versions A and B and find those that are the same in terms of grammatical accuracy as those in the original text. They also attempt to justify their choices. Finally, students compare their assembled passage with the original passage and identify any possible differences.

Grammar and teachers' cognition

Borg (2006) has classified language teacher cognition in grammar teaching in terms of three major areas: 1) teachers' declarative knowledge about grammar 2) teachers' stated beliefs about grammar 3) teachers' cognition as expressed through their grammar teaching practices. Grammar instruction is influenced by the teachers' grammar cognition. According to Borg (1999a: 25), "grammar teaching is a multi-faceted decision making process". Teachers are expected both to know grammar and to know about grammar. They are, in addition, expected to know the complexity of form, complexity of meaning and complexity of form-meaning connections. They should be competent enough to make sound decisions like how much emphasis to place on grammar, what techniques to use and how individual differences and nature of target structures affect grammar instruction. Hatch (1974) distinguished between two different types of learners: rule formers with analytic mind and data gatherers with memorization ability. Pienemann (1984) demonstrated that some structures followed fixed developmental stages, implying that grammar instruction is irreverent for such structures while other structures may be easily acquired through form focused instruction. Moreover, the other frequent and salient structures will be mainly acquired through meaning focused activities. (Doghty 2003; Lightbown; 2004; Ellis, 2008; Van patten 2002). Therefore, grammar teachers should be aware of the roles different variables play like style preferences, age, gender, motivation, emotions, attitude and developmental readiness of the students play in grammar instruction while choosing and integrating different grammar techniques.

Grammar and humanistic psychology

More important than teachers' cognition is the learners' affection in grammar classes. In fact, the most serious shortcoming of grammar approaches has been the negligence of humanistic psychology, which is not only person-centered but also learner-centered. It considers individual differences and is based on 'whole person learning'. At the heart of humanistic psychology is the concern for affective and emotional factors. Simply speaking, it allows learners to share and verbalize their thoughts and feelings together. This stress free approach can be a resolution for grammar classes which are often boring, confusing and burdensome. This is due to the cognitive burden such classes put on the learners without giving learners much freedom, cooperation and self-initiation. Learners are needed to process complex abstract rules, make a connection between form, meaning and use together, and finally restructure target structures in their minds. In addition, explicit declarative knowledge of grammar cannot be immediately converted into implicit procedural knowledge. Mastering each of these tasks involves committing a large number of grammatical errors on the part of the learners. In simpler terms, grammar classes are often replete with various grammatical errors. Although these errors are an inevitable process of developing grammatical competence from the pedagogical point of view, they jeopardize the stress free environment which is an essential condition for mastering a grammar competence. These errors hurt learners' positive feelings, emotions, motivation and attitude so that they may wrongly shape the perception that they are not going in the right direction. Regardless of the techniques used, teachers should always cultivate learners' curiosity and maintain their motivation while teaching grammar. In other words, aside from possessing theoretical and pedagogical knowledge of grammar, teachers should be sensitive to their learners' affective factors in grammar classes.

Gladys Jean & Daphnee Simard (2011) demonstrated that grammar teaching and learning in EFL contexts are necessary but boring. It seems that syntactic processing of target structures more than any other concept of language needs attention, concentration, positive emotions, relaxation and interest. The key to start grammar instruction successfully is to clearly establish interest and motivation (Dkhissi, 2014). Grammar classes are often, as quoted by the students, associated with frustration and tiredness. So it is plausible to claim that a much learner centered class which stimulates interest, positive feelings, motivation and positive attitude are crucial in grammar instruction. Teaching grammar through techniques like games, music, videos, pictures, visualization and languaging helps teachers to provide a stress free environment. This facilitates to grab the learner attention for more efficient syntactic processing. Neurological research has also shown that musical and lingual processes take place in the same section of the brain. Affective oriented techniques in teaching grammatical structures can help EFL teachers to convert students' nervousness into excitement in grammar classes.

Languaging

Language learners may be engaged in verbalization about language. By languaging, Rattya (2013) refers to a procedure where students speak out their thinking processes and strategies they use when doing an exercise. The languaging verbalizes the procedure for the students themselves, for their co-students and for their teachers (Swain, Lapkin, Knuzi, Suzuki & Brooks, 2009). They defined languaging as self-reflection in language 1 about language 2. Languaging also consists of paraphrasing in the L1, inferencing, analyzing, self-assessment, and rereading (Swain et al, 2009). Form-focused instruction promotes languaging by making target forms more conspicuous to both ESL and EFL learners. (Nassaji, 2009). Swain (2009) defines languaging as a "dynamic never ending process of using language to make meaning". Swain et al (2009) developed a text explaining voice in French and asked participants to read it loudly and explain. They, then, classified their subjects, based on their explanation of the text into five languaging unites (analysis, inference, rereading, self-assessment and paraphrase) .Next, they divided their students into low, middle, and high languagers based on their quality of performance on the languaging units. The findings of the study revealed that languaging has facilitative effect on understanding of voice by French learners. In another study, Negueruela (2008) asked the participants to explain the grammatical concepts taught in class to themselves six times over 16 weeks. The outcome of the study showed the effectiveness of verbalization on the development of grammatical structures.

TTT approach

Vitta (2013) introduced a TTT approach (Task-Teach-Task) to teach grammar to young learners as a replacement of traditional PPP approach (presentation- practice –production). The purpose of this approach is to create grammar structures in enjoyable activities. The TTT approach in teaching grammar allows students to have a voice over what is done and taught in the classroom. It has three advantages. First, it is better applicable in student centered classes. Second, it makes sure that teachers do not spend time on what students already know. It seeks variety rather than monotony associated with traditional teacher oriented PPP approach. Third, it shares agency and offer opportunities for the self-expression. Fourth, this approach creates more collaboration and interaction among the students. Meanwhile, this model of teaching grammar gives priority to affections and emotions in EFL classes.

Games

Often the grammar classes are complicated and create fear and frustration for the EFL learners. One way to eliminate fear and anxiety arising from grammar classes is using exciting games. Researchers universally agree that using a variety of grammar games in grammar classes provides a friendly and cooperative participation and interaction among students to master grammatical points. Schwartz, (2012) argued that " The more people play, the more positive emotions are generated, which in turn make the play easier and thus helps to generate even more positive emotions". Thomas's (2005) study of using various games and electronic activities like *grammar gories* and *bingo set* proved to reinforce grammar in a college writing classroom. He further asserted that games helped to build foundational grammar skills. Margaret (2007) used a game '*sentence survivor*' to increase and reinforce accuracy of writing skill via using long compound-complex sentences. Students in small groups were asked to delete at least three words per turn so that the rest of the words remained a complete sentence, no matter if the meaning changed. A typical example was: *Barking loudly at the mailman, the big*

black dog sacred the children playing nearby, so they ran quickly to their mother in the yellow house in the corner.“ Teaching grammar through games is a successful and effective approach”.(Musilova, 2010). Unlike the previous study, he utilized a single game, named “*lost treasure game*’ to teach grammar. The participants of the study were fifth grade English students. They had to solve grammatical exercises in order to find the hidden treasure. The findings showed that the game exposed learners to different grammatical elements in one activity. Tengku & Yussof’s (2012) investigation revealed the significant role the *Board game* played in retention of grammar rules .Besides, Yolageldili & Arikan (2013) explored the effectiveness of using games to teach grammar to young EFL Turkish learners. The findings indicated the significant effect of the games on the learners’ grammar, motivation and participation. All aforementioned studies concluded that a properly organized game in grammar classes not only increases the grammatical accuracy of EFL learners but also automatically stimulate interest, enjoyment and relaxation. So, games are not considered marginalized activities by effective grammar teachers.

Music

Trollinger (2010) asserted that there is a strong correlation between musical perception and language processing. Neurological research has also shown that musical and lingual processes take place in the same section of the brain. If we accept that music and popular songs enhance the concentration and quality of attention in grammar classes, it can be concluded that processing and accuracy of grammatical structures improve as well. In addition, Kara & Aksel’s (2013) experimental survey analysis showed that majority of learners preferred popular music and songs mainly in grammar classes . The rationality behind this preference, also quoted by the students, was to overcome monotony, repetition and memorization arising from grammar classes.

Visualization

Visualizations in the form of pictures, videos and posters help language teachers to contextualize target grammatical features. Scarcella & Oxford (1992) stated that simultaneous use of linguistic elements and pictures fosters comprehension of grammar points. Similarly, Bardos (2000) asserted that visualization in the form showing pictures to the students helps students learn grammatical structures implicitly. Implicit instruction of grammar through pictures makes the students engaged and motivated. It also provides enjoyable and entertaining education which gives them a sense of accomplishments. (Thekes, 2011). A study done by Ghapanchi & Sabouri (2012) provided statistical evidence that implicit grammar instruction through specially designed pictures improved Iranian EFL learners’ speaking and writing abilities. Moreover, video as a widespread multimedia too enjoys both visual and audio content. Zhu (2012) focused on the ‘diversity’ aspect of videos, arguing stimulating curiosity and interest via ‘sound, image, color and shape’. Meanwhile, findings of the research conducted by Ibrahim’s (2014) concerning the effect of video presentation technique on the use of grammatical structures among senior secondary students in Nigeria revealed a statistically significant difference between experimental and control group. The results of the posttest in this study indicated that video clips of grammar not only made the treatment class enjoyable but also helped learners to utilize noun, adjectival and adverbial phrases in the right contexts. Finally, Zhu (2012) focused on the ‘diversity’ aspect of videos, arguing stimulating curiosity and interest via ‘sound, image, color and shape’.

Visualization and languaging

The method of languaging and visualization have been trialed during the years 2010-2013. This method combines concepts from constructivism, socio-cultural language learning theories, metacognition and metacognitive experiences as well as conceptual change theory. In simpler terms, they combine metalinguistic elements, verbal and visual elements. While learning grammar, students find it difficult to mix different grammatical categories. Problems may also appear in the form of reduced definitions of concepts. Languaging and visualization help learners to make the meaning clear and express their grammatical thinking through different modes: speaking, writing and drawing. Grammatical concepts are made visible by charts and hierarchies, which contribute to learners to comprehend the ontological differences between the categories.

CONCLUSION

Development of grammatical competence is the necessary part of second language acquisition. The present article has historically and critically examined different approaches and techniques of grammar instruction, aiming at raising the awareness of EFL teachers to give special attention to affective factors in teaching grammar. Traditional grammar instruction failed to detect the peculiarity of grammar classes which are often, as quoted by the students, boring, frustrating and demanding and are often associated with grammatical errors. These errors hurt the healthy emotions, feelings, motivation and attitude of the learners toward language learning. The current paper targeted at highlighting the vital role of affective factors (i.e. relaxation, enjoyment, motivation, positive emotions and attitudes etc.) in teaching grammar. The position taken here is that development of grammatical competence requires affective oriented techniques, humanistic teachers, learner centered classes and a funny atmosphere. Techniques of teaching grammar like games, pictures, videos, languaging and visualization are suggested to be utilized by EFL teachers to stimulate interest and generate positive feelings. This helps EFL learners to overcome the psychological frustrations and barriers arising from grammar classes.

Moreover, teachers are suggested be quite eclectic, cautious and systematic while selecting and integrating grammar techniques. Different approaches of teaching grammar may negatively or positively correlate with individual differences (e.g. proficiency level, developmental readiness and learning style preferences etc.) and nature of grammatical structures. In simpler terms, different learners benefit the same grammar techniques differently or some target structures may not need instruction at all.

Acknowledgement: I would like to sincerely appreciate Dr Ketabi, an associate professor in the University of Isfahan, for his constructive comments and suggestions. My appreciation also goes to my dear classmates for their creative ideas during the term.

BIODATA AND CONTACT ADDRESS OF AUTHOR



(Dr. Nemat Zamani VISROODI). I was born in a tiny village in Rasht, Iran. I am always interested in foreign language teaching and learning. I graduated from Urmia University at the BA level, from Iran University of Science and Technology at the MA level in Tehran, Iran. Now, I am studying at the University of Isfahan, Iran. My field of study has been applied linguistics in the domain of EFL instruction throughout my life. I have published some articles and books in this area.

Dr. Nemat Zamani VISROODI
University of Isfahan
Faculty of Foreign languages
IRAN
E. Mail: n_zamani2011@yahoo.com

REFERENCES

Azar, B. (2007). Grammar-Based Teaching: A Practitioner's Perspective. *TESL-EJ*. 11(2). 1-12 Retrieved September 12, 2012 from <<http://www.tesl-ej.org/ej42/a1.pdf>>.

Borg, S. (2003b). Teacher cognition in grammar teaching: A literature review. *Language Awareness*, 12(2), 96-108.

Benati, A., & Lee, J. (2008). Grammar acquisition and processing instruction: Secondary and cumulative effects. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(3), 459–477.

Celce-Murcia, M., and Larsen-Freeman, D.(1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle

Ellis, R. (2002). Grammar Teaching: Practice or Consciousness-raising? In J. c. Richards, W. A. Renandya (Ed.), *Methodology in Language Teaching* (pp. 167- 174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, N. 2005. 'At the interface: dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 27/2: 305–52.

Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 83-107. Retrieved from <http://faculty.weber.edu/tmathews/SLI/Readings/Ellis%202006.pdf>. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/402645>

Ellis, R. (2008). Grammar in language teaching. In E. Hinkle, & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 13-15). New York: Routledge.

Frodesen, J. (2001). Grammar in writing. In M. Celce Murcia. (Ed). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. (3rd ed).(pp. 233-248). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. Oxford: Pearson Longman.

Jean & Simard .(2011). Grammar Teaching and Learning in L2: Necessary, but Boring? *Foreign Language Annals*· VOL. 44, NO.3.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford, England: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, England: Pergamon.

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2004). Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 126–45.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Heinle: Newbury House.

Long. (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In R. D. Lambert, & E. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 179–92). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research and practice. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom language acquisition* (pp. 15–41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramersch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (Eds.). (2006). Pushing the methodological boundaries in interaction research (special issue). *Studies in second language acquisition* (Vol. 2)

Margaret Tomlinson Rustick (2007). Grammar Games in the Age of Anti-Remediation. ProQuest Education Journals.

Nassaji.H (2009). Effects of recasts and elicitations in dyadic interaction and the role of feedback explicitness. *Language Learning*, 59, 411–52. Musilova L. (2010). Grammar Games in ELT. Bachelor Thesis. Retrieved on 20 August 2012 from http://is.muni.cz/th152741pedf/Grammar_Games_in_ELt.pdf.

Nassaji H, Fotos S. (2011.) *Teaching Grammar in Second Language Classrooms*. New York: Routledge.

Nunan, D.(1998). Teaching grammar in context. *ELT Journal*, 52, 101–9.

Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6, 186–214.

Richards, J. C. (2002). Accuracy and fluency revisited. In E. Hinkel, & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 35–50).

Rutherford, W. (1987). *Second language grammar: Learning and teaching*. New York: Longman.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.

Sharwood Smith, M. A. (1981). Consciousness-raising and the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 159-168.

Sharwood Smith, M. A. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15(2), 165-179

Spada, N. (1997). Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language Teaching*, 29, 1–15.

Spada N & Lightbown PM 2008. Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(2):181-207. Available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40264447>. Accessed 13 January 2014.

Swain, M., Lapkin, S., Knouzi, I., Suzuki, W., & Brooks, L. (2009). Linguaging: Students learn the grammatical concept of voice in French. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 5–29.

Tammenga-Helmantel, Arends & Canrinu (2014). The effectiveness of deductive, inductive, implicit and incidental grammatical instruction in second language classrooms. *Journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/system*. 45, 198-210.

Tengku Paris & Rahmah Lob Yussof. (2012). *Enhancing Grammar Using Board Game*. Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia. Elsevier Ltd.

Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar?* Harlow: Pearson Education.

Mart, T. (2013). *Teaching Grammar in Context: Why and How?* Department of Languages, Ishik University, Erbil, Iraq

Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar practice activities: A practical guide for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

VanPatten, B. (2002). Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning*, 52, 755–803.

VanPatten, B. (1993). Grammar teaching for the acquisition of rich classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26, 435–50.

YolageliL & Arikan. A. (2011). Effectiveness of Using Games in Teaching Grammar to Young Learners. *Elementary Education Online*, 10(1), 219-229, <http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr>

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.