Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar

HANDOYO PUJI WIDODO
The English Program, Politeknik Negeri Jember (State Polytechnic of Jember)
East Java, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: Teaching grammar has been regarded as crucial to the ability to use language. For this reason, this article introduces a five-step procedure for teaching grammar. I have developed this procedure, which incorporates the notions of practice and consciousness-raising, explicit and implicit knowledge, and deductive and inductive approaches for teaching grammar. This procedure has been derived from my great interest in innovative grammar teaching and my teaching experience in grammar. The proposed steps are expected to be an alternative pathway for English teachers to teach grammar, particularly teaching tenses and modals at college-university levels or even in secondary schools.

KEYWORDS: Practice and consciousness-raising, explicit/implicit knowledge, deductive/inductive approaches, English grammar, teaching procedures.

Grammar gains its prominence in language teaching, particularly in English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a second language (ESL), inasmuch as without a good knowledge of grammar, learners' language development will be severely constrained. Practically, in the teaching of grammar, learners are taught rules of language commonly known as sentence patterns. According to Ur (1999), in the case of the learners, grammatical rules enable them to know and apply how such sentence patterns should be put together. The teaching of grammar should also ultimately centre attention on the way grammatical items or sentence patterns are correctly used. In other words, teaching grammar should encompass language structure or sentence patterns, meaning and use.

Further, grammar is thought to furnish the basis for a set of language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. In listening and speaking, grammar plays a crucial part in grasping and expressing spoken language (e.g. expressions) since learning the grammar of a language is considered necessary to acquire the capability of producing grammatically acceptable utterances in the language (Corder, 1988; Widodo, 2004). In reading, grammar enables learners to comprehend sentence interrelationship in a paragraph, a passage and a text. In the context of writing, grammar allows the learners to put their ideas into intelligible sentences so that they can successfully communicate in a written form. Lastly, in the case of vocabulary, grammar provides a pathway to learners how some lexical items should be combined into a good sentence so that meaningful and communicative statements or expressions can be formed. In other words, Doff (2000) says that by learning grammar students can express meanings in the form of phrases, clauses and sentences. Long and Richards (1987) add that it cannot be ignored that grammar plays a central role in the four language skills and vocabulary to establish communicative tasks.

In the context of EFL, teaching grammar has traditionally been dominated by a grammar-translation method where the use of mother tongue is clearly important to elicit the meaning of target language by translating the target language into native languages. For example, according to Larsen-Freeman (2000) and Richards and Rodgers (2002), in such a method learners are required to learn about grammar rules and vocabulary of the target language. In the case of grammar, it is deductively taught; that is, learners are provided the grammar rules and examples, are told to memorize them, and then are asked to apply the rules to other examples.

Many teachers think that teaching grammar separately is not favorable to learners since learners only learn the way language is constructed, and very often when they are given grammatical rules, the learners work well on such cases. However, when they write or speak, the learners make grammatical mistakes or even unnecessary ones. Helping learners apply grammatical rules into communicative tasks (for example, writing and speaking) is very challenging. Therefore, teachers, especially in the context of EFL, could benefit from learning some alternative teaching approaches for teaching grammar so that they can integrate grammar or structure into other language skills in such a way that the goal of learning language is ultimately achieved.

Therefore, in this paper, I would like to propose a five-step procedure for teaching grammar that I have developed. This procedure incorporates the notions of practice and consciousness-raising, explicit and implicit knowledge, and deductive and inductive approaches for teaching grammar. These concepts will be reviewed before the description of the teaching procedure.

PRACTICE AND CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING

For most teachers of English, the priority of teaching grammar is to assist learners to internalize the structures/rules of language, taught in such a way that they can be used for communication both written and spoken (Ellis, 2002). For this reason, the two terms practice and consciousness-raising are important to define in this paper since they play an important play in successful grammar teaching, especially in the case of EFL.

Practice

To begin with, it is claimed that practice is one of the keys to learning incorporated into a methodology with the following features:

1. a specific grammatical feature is isolated for focused attention;
2. the learners are required to produce sentences or statements comprising the targeted feature;
3. the learners will be provided with opportunities for repetition of the targeted feature;
4. there is expectation that the learners will perform the grammatical feature correctly; and

5. the learners receive feedback (immediate or delayed) on whether their performance of the grammatical structure is correct or incorrect (Ellis, 2002; Richards, 2002).

It is generally accepted that practice can facilitate accuracy and fluency. In this regard, accuracy focuses on correct use of language (for example, rules of language). This can be achieved through controlled and semi-controlled activities or practice of grammar, for example. In fluency, after learners master the rules of language, they are required to apply the rules of language in the form of spoken or written language. A number of linguists recommend that at this stage errors or mistakes be tolerated since making mistakes or errors is not disgraceful, but natural and common practice. During fluency-oriented activities, a teacher is required to help learners to self-notice or self-correct. It is important to keep in mind that both accuracy and fluency are interdependent.

Consciousness-raising

Ellis (2002) defines consciousness-raising as an attempt to equip learners with an understanding of a specific grammatical feature, to develop declarative (describing a rule of grammar and applying it in pattern practice drills) rather than procedural (applying a rule of grammar in communication) knowledge of it. Richards, Plat, and Plat (1992) define consciousness-raising as follows:

> It is an approach to the teaching of grammar in which instruction in grammar (through drills, grammar explanation, and other form-focused activities) is viewed as a way of raising learner's awareness of grammatical features of the language. This is thought to indirectly facilitate second language acquisition. A consciousness-raising approach is contrasted with traditional approaches to the teaching of grammar in which the goal is to instill correct grammatical patterns and habits directly (p. 78).

The main characteristics of consciousness-raising activities proposed by Ellis (2002) involve:

1. there should be an effort to isolate a specific linguistic feature for focused attention;
2. the learners are provided with data which illustrate the targeted feature and an explicit rule description or explanation;
3. the learners are expected to utilize intellectual effort to understand the targeted feature;
4. misunderstanding or incomplete understanding of the grammatical structure by the learners leads to clarification in the form of further data and description or explanation; and
5. learners are required (though not crucial) to articulate the rule describing the grammatical feature.

In short, in consciousness-raising, learners are required to notice a certain feature of language (that is, sentence patterns), but there is no requirement to produce or communicate the certain sentence patterns taught.

To summarize, practice is directed at the acquisition of implicit knowledge of a grammatical structure. That is the sort of tacit knowledge required for applying the

structure effortlessly for communication. Consciousness-raising is geared for the formation of explicit knowledge: the kind of intellectual knowledge which we are able to gather about any subject (Ellis, 2002).

EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT KNOWLEDGE

In the case of teaching grammar to EFL learners, a teacher may feel frustrated when learners are taught grammatical items separately. Students may become good at grammar; however, when told to write and speak, they often make grammatical mistakes. This case is very challenging to solve.

When facing this problem, particularly with adult learners, it is useful to be aware that there are two kinds of knowledge necessary to gain proficiency in a second language. These are known as explicit (conscious learning) and implicit (subconscious acquisition) knowledge (Klein, 1986).

Explicit knowledge

According to Ellis (2004), in a practical definition, explicit knowledge deals with language and the uses to which language can be put. This knowledge facilitates the intake and development of implicit language, and it is useful to monitor language output. Explicit knowledge is generally accessible through controlled processing. In short, it is conscious knowledge of grammatical rules learned through formal classroom instruction. In this respect, a person with explicit knowledge knows about language and the ability to articulate those facts in some way (Brown, 2000). For instance, Achmad knows every rule about present tense, but he frequently makes mistakes in speaking and writing. However, such knowledge is easy for him while having time to think of the rule and apply it (that is, in the context of a grammar exercise or a writing assignment). Thus, on the basis of Achmad's case, explicit knowledge is learnable; for example, when grammatical items are given to learners, they learn the items first in a controlled learning process. Explicit knowledge is also obtained through the practice of error correction, which is thought to help learners come to the correct mental representation of a rule. This works if there is enough time to operate it; the speaker is concerned with the correctness of her/his speech/written production; and s/he knows the correct rules (Krashen, 1987).

Implicit knowledge

Implicit knowledge is automatic and easily accessed and provides a great contribution to building communicative skills. Implicit knowledge is unconscious, internalized knowledge of language that is easily accessed during spontaneous language tasks, written or spoken (Brown, 2000). Implicit knowledge is gained in the natural language learning process. It means that a person applies a certain grammatical rule in the same way as a child who acquires her/his first language (for example, mother tongue). According to Brown (2000), the child implicitly learns aspects of language (for example, phonological, syntactical, semantic, pragmatic rules for language), but does not have access to an explanation of those rules explicitly. As an example, Jack speaks and writes English with good use of present tense, although he has no idea about the grammatical rule behind it. To sum up, implicit knowledge is gained

through a sub-conscious learning process. This is illustrated by the fact that native speakers of a certain language do not always "know" (consciously) the rules of their language (Krashen, 1987).

In comparing the two terms: explicit and implicit knowledge, Noonan (2004) proposes a challenging question: "May explicit grammar knowledge become implicit knowledge in the context of EFL learners?" In response to this, there are two answers. First, in Krashen's view, explicit knowledge can never be implicit knowledge inasmuch as the two are located in dissimilar parts of the brain. In contrast, the interface position claims that explicit knowledge can have some impact on implicit knowledge. This position has two views. The first maintains that explicit knowledge becomes internalized through practice or frequent exposure to target language similar to the acquisition of other skills. The second goes along with the Krashen's view.

TWO CORE APPROACHES IN GRAMMAR PRESENTATION

Broadly speaking, in teaching grammar, there are two approaches that can be applied: deductive and inductive. In this section, I would like to briefly highlight the two, and then I link both approaches to the theory of second language acquisition (SLA).

Deductive approach

A deductive approach is derived from the notion that deductive reasoning works from the general to the specific. In this case, rules, principles, concepts, or theories are presented first, and then their applications are treated. In conclusion, when we use deduction, we reason from general to specific principles.

Dealing with the teaching of grammar, the deductive approach can also be called rule-driven learning. In such an approach, a grammar rule is explicitly presented to students and followed by practice applying the rule. This approach has been the bread and butter of language teaching around the world and still enjoys a monopoly in many course books and self-study grammar books (Fortune, 1992). The deductive approach maintains that a teacher teaches grammar by presenting grammatical rules, and then examples of sentences are presented. Once learners understand rules, they are told to apply the rules given to various examples of sentences. Giving the grammatical rules means no more than directing learners' attention to the problem discussed. Eisenstein (1987) suggests that with the deductive approach, learners be in control during practice and have less fear of drawing an incorrect conclusion related to how the target language is functioning. To sum up, the deductive approach commences with the presentation of a rule taught and then is followed by examples in which the rule is applied. In this regard, learners are expected to engage with it through the study and manipulation of examples.

In the case of the application of the deductive approach, therefore, Michael Swan (cited in Thornbury, 1999, p. 32) outlines some guidelines for when the rule is presented. Among them are:

1. the rules should be true;
2. the rules should show clearly what limits are on the use of a given form ;

3. the rules need to be clear;
4. the rules ought to be simple;
5. the rules needs to make use of concepts already familiar to the learners; and
6. the rules ought to be relevant.

Most importantly, when the rules are presented in the deductive approach, the presentation should be illustrated with examples, be short, involve students' comprehension and allow learners to have a chance to personalize the rule.

Nonetheless, the deductive approach has its own advantages and disadvantages as shown in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1. Advantages and disadvantages of the deductive approach to teaching grammar

Advantages	1.The deductive approach goes straightforwardly to the point and can, therefore, be time-saving.
	2. A number of rule aspects (for example, form) can be more simply and clearly explained than elicited from examples
	3. A number of direct practice/application examples are immediately given.
	4. The deductive approach respects the intelligence and maturity of many adult learners in particular and acknowledges the role of cognitive processes in language acquisition.
	5. It confirms many learners' expectations about classroom learning particularly for those who have an analytical style.
Disadvantages	1. Beginning the lesson with a grammar presentation may be off-putting for some learners, especially younger ones.
	2. Younger learners may not able to understand the concepts or encounter grammar terminology given.
	3. Grammar explanation encourages a teacher-fronted, transmission-style classroom, so it will hinder learner involvement and interaction immediately.
	4. The explanation is seldom as memorable as other forms of presentation (for example, demonstration).
	5. The deductive approach encourages the belief that learning a language is simply a case of knowing the rule.

Inductive approach

An inductive approach comes from inductive reasoning stating that a reasoning progression proceeds from particulars (that is, observations, measurements, or data) to generalities (for example, rules, laws, concepts or theories) (Felder & Henriques, 1995). In short, when we use induction, we observe a number of specific instances and from them infer a general principle or concept.

In the case of pedagogical grammar, most experts argue that the inductive approach can also be called rule-discovery learning. It suggests that a teacher teach grammar starting with presenting some examples of sentences. In this sense, learners understand grammatical rules from the examples. The presentation of grammatical rules can be spoken or written. Eisenstein (cited in Long & Richards, 1987) maintains

that the inductive approach tries to utilize the very strong reward value of bringing order, clarity and meaning to experiences. This approach involves learners' participating actively in their own instruction. In addition, the approach encourages a learner to develop her/his own mental set of strategies for dealing with tasks. In other words, this approach attempts to highlight grammatical rules implicitly in which the learners are encouraged to conclude the rules given by the teacher.

Similar to the deductive approach, the inductive approach offers advantages and disadvantages as seen in the Table 2 below.

TABLE 2. Advantages and disadvantages of the inductive approach to teaching grammar

Advantages	1. Learners are trained to be familiar with the rule discovery; this could enhance learning autonomy and self-reliance.
	2. Learners' greater degree of cognitive depth is "exploited".
	3. The learners are more active in the learning process, rather than being simply passive recipients. In this activity, they will be motivated.
	4. The approach involves learners' pattern-recognition and problem-solving abilities in which particular learners are interested in this challenge.
	5. If the problem-solving activity is done collaboratively, learners get an opportunity for extra language practice.
Disadvantages	1. The approach is time and energy-consuming as it leads learners to have the appropriate concept of the rule.
	2. The concepts given implicitly may lead the learners to have the wrong concepts of the rule taught.
	3. The approach can place emphasis on teachers in planning a lesson.
	4. It encourages the teacher to design data or materials taught carefully and systematically.
	5. The approach may frustrate the learners with their personal learning style, or their past learning experience (or both) would prefer simply to be told the rule.

Relating deductive and inductive approaches to SLA theory

Deductive and inductive approaches relate to learning and acquisition in SLA theory. Firstly, the deductive approach is related to the conscious learning process in which this approach tries to place a great emphasis on error correction and the presentation of explicit rules (Krashen, 2002). Such an approach is applied for the reason that it is an efficient and elegant way to organize and present the rule that is already understood. The deductive approach is often used with adult learners. Through the deductive approach, a teacher tries to teach the rule explicitly to the learners so that they are ready to cope with exercises given. The explicit rule presentation can enhance the learners' confidence in doing certain tasks. To be successful in applying the approach, the teacher needs to provide numerous exercises.

Secondly, the inductive approach relates to subconscious learning processes similar to the concept of language acquisition. According to this approach, learners learn the system of language (for example, grammar or sentence rules) in the same way as

children acquire their first or second language. In this regard, meaningful interaction in the target language (that is, natural communication) is more important than the form of the language. For this reason, error correction and explicit teaching of the rule are de-emphasized. Most importantly, utterances are easily understood. In other words, when the inductive approach is applied, the learners learn the rule unconsciously.

Adapted from Krashen's acquisition/learning hypothesis (1987, 2002), I draw some conclusions in respect of the two approaches – deductive and inductive as listed in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Relationship of deductive and inductive approaches to Krashen's (1987, 2002) theory

Deductive	Inductive
Learn the rule in the context of formal instruction	Learn the rule as a child acquires her/his first or second language
Know about the rule	"Pick up" the rule
Learn the rule consciously	Learn the rule subconsciously
Learn the rule explicitly	Learn the rule implicitly

Of the two approaches above, which is best? This question relates to a long-standing debate among language teachers in the context of EFL/ESL, since the two have their own significances for particular learner progress. For example, a study of various language learners shows that some learners achieve better in deductive language classes; on the other hand, others perform better in more inductive classes. This difference in cognitive styles may be associated with different neurological mechanisms in learners (Eisenstein, 1987).

Whether grammatical rules are taught inductively or deductively relies upon certain structures, since some are more amenable to a deductive approach, while others can be learned very well by an inductive approach. To sum up, both deductive and inductive presentations can successfully be applied depending on the cognitive style of the learner and the language structure presented (Eisenstein, 1987; Brown, 2000). Nevertheless, whether a teacher employs a deductive or inductive approach, s/he should consider the notion that language learning, particularly in the context of EFL (for example, grammar) is a largely conscious process that involves formal exposure to rules of syntax and semantics followed by specific applications of the rule, with corrective and encouraging feedback reinforcing correct usage and discouraging incorrect usage.

PROPOSED PROCEDURE FOR TEACHING GRAMMAR

In this section, I would like to share a procedure consisting of five steps for teaching grammar, particularly in the context of EFL. This procedure is based upon my teaching experience at secondary school, college, and university level, and makes reference to various theoretical frameworks outlined above (that is, deductive and inductive approaches). I expect this procedure could provide an alternative framework

for teaching grammar, especially in teaching tenses and modals. In describing my procedure, I will provide model teaching materials based on teaching the present perfect tense as an example to shed light on the each of the five steps.

Before describing the five steps, first let me outline four concerns which led to the development of this procedure:

1. The proposed procedure was derived from the notion that in teaching grammar, in the context of EFL in particular, teachers conventionally start explaining the rule without commencing to encourage learners to be involved in communicative tasks both written and spoken. In other words, the teachers generally explain the rules along with the examples. Even though such a way is economical and straightforward, I believe this activity hinders the learners from communicating the rules actively. For example, if the teacher would like to present continuous tense, s/he may directly explain the verb form of the tense along with examples. When this approach is used, I think that the learners will feel that the rules are separated from the communicative tasks (that is, speaking and writing). They may think that making mistakes in speaking or writing is tolerable as long as the messages or utterances are easily understood. This perception could hinder the learners from learning grammar intensively and applying the rule in the communicative tasks.

2. Further, on the basis of my teaching experience and peer classroom observations at public colleges and schools, I have seen that teachers have relied heavily upon self-study grammar and grammar course books. In other words, the teachers followed activities presented in books. They seemed to think that such books could meet students' needs and expectations about learning the system of language (that is, grammar). My view is that teachers themselves should re-design and develop the materials from books, since self-study grammar and grammar course books have some strengths and weaknesses. By doing this, teachers are required to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the materials themselves and to design innovative and continuallyy evaluated materials. In this way, the teachers can creatively select the materials so that the rules can be taught without separating the rules from the context of communicative purposes.

3. I am also concerned with the fact that most English teachers, for example in Indonesia, treat grammar separately and teach it as part of local and national examination preparation, particularly at secondary schools. They give some grammar lessons to the students since this component is tested in the local or even final national examinations. For this reason, the teachers teach the rule intensively along with passive exercises (such as choosing correct answers in the multiple questions). Consequently, students are used to doing multiple choice-based grammar exercises; when they are faced with complicated grammatical items, the students feel frustrated. I think such an activity is monotonous and boring for them.

4. Furthermore, when teaching writing and having an interview with the students in English, I have witnessed the fact that the students often wittingly or unwittingly make mistakes about the use of tenses. For example, when talking about their experience, they use present tense, or when expressing continuous activity, the students use simple present tense. The students feel confused about applying the rules when writing and speaking, although they have been

learning English since secondary school. In addition, they feel that grammar (that is tense and modality) is very complicated or hard to apply.

Besides my four concerns above, the proposed procedure has been developed using the concepts of SLA theory, particularly related to acquisition and learning, practice and consciousness-raising, and deductive and inductive approaches as previously discussed.

In the first instance, in the context of the acquisition and learning, grammar (that is, the rules) needs to be taught implicitly and explicitly. This means, to begin with, that teachers encourage the learners to discover the rules by themselves without teacher's help to tell them the rule directly. After the learners go through discovering it, the teachers may consolidate the rule to avoid student's wrong conclusion about it. Second, in the case of practice and consciousness-raising, practice is a medium for exploiting a learner's understanding about the rule and of assisting him or her to apply it. From this concept, I have designed various activities so that learners have plenty of chances to work on the rule in the form of exercises. Practice is not enough to equip the learner with a good mastery of the rule. For this reason, the proposed procedure tries to also include consciousness-raising. In this case, the learners need to be carefully aware of certain features of the rule. This activity can be carried out through a passage and a text. For example, when teaching simple past tense, the teacher might ask the students to identify or notice sentences in the passage or text using the simple past tense. Even though the learners are recipients of the rule, this activity is useful to internalize the rule into their comprehension about it. Lastly, after exploring the concept of deductive-inductive approaches, I feel that it is indispensable to combine the two approaches into an innovative procedure for teaching grammar.

To sum up, the proposed procedure trains the students in the rule related to word, phrase, clause and sentence problems in which the target sentence pattern is well introduced to the students through exercises from form to function. In this case, understanding meaning and using the rule automatically are of great concern.

Five-step procedure

On the basis of the rationales above, I would like to propose a procedure for teaching grammar in which the activities involve five steps:

1. building up students' knowledge of the rule or rule initiation;
2. eliciting functions of the rule or rule elicitation;
3. familiarising students with the rule in use through exercises or rule practice;
4. checking students' comprehension or rule activation; and
5. expanding students' knowledge or rule enrichment.

I will describe each step and give model classroom materials relating to teaching the present perfect tense to students at pre-intermediate level as an example.

Step 1: Building up students' knowledge of the rule or rule initiation
The proposed procedure starts with teaching grammar by some leading questions and providing model sentences in which the grammatical item to be taught is underlined. Such activities are geared to build up learners' knowledge of the grammatical items

taught. At this stage, a teacher is required to ask students to respond to the questions orally. This can stimulate students' self-confidence in using the grammatical item learned communicatively. The teachers should not tell students what grammatical item s/he is going to explain. Some leading questions can be asked in the form of yes/no and information (w-h) questions (see Table 4 for an example). It is crucial to note that the students need to be asked the questions in a complete statement. As explained in the inductive approach, in this step, the teacher implicitly directs the students to the whole form of the sentences using the grammatical item in focus. More importantly, this activity encourages students to communicate in a spoken form; thus building the students' confidence in using the rule and the students' awareness of using it in the context of communicative tasks (for example, speaking). At more advanced level, this activity can be carried out through short conversations using the rule learned. For examples of Step 1 relating to teaching present perfect tense, see Tables 4 and 5 below.

TABLE 4. Step One: Yes/No question input

> 1) **Have** you **had** breakfast?
> 2) **Has** your sister **been** abroad?
> 3) **Have** you **finished** your homework?
> 4) **Has** your teacher **corrected** your work?
> 5) **Have** you ever **gone** climbing?
> 6) **Has** your father **worked** for more than 20 years?

TABLE 5. Step One: Information question input

> 1) How many times **have** you **read** this book?
> 2) How many years **has** your father **lived** in this town?
> 3) How long **have** you **learned** English?
> 4) How many times **have** your sister and brother **been** to Bali?
> 5) How long **has** your teacher **taught** you?
> 6) How many years **have** you **known** me?

In addition to providing the leading questions, model sentences are presented. To assist the students to easily focus on the rule targeted, the crucial elements (that is, verb form, time signals, and so on) should be underlined so that they can guess what the grammatical item is that they are going to learn. This activity is a reinforcement for the leading questions in which the goal is to enable the students to internalize the rule easily in a written form. In other words, building up the students' knowledge of the grammatical items that will be taught provides apperception and motivation to them so that they are ready to learn the grammatical item given by the teacher. For an example of the noticing activity, see Table 6 below.

TABLE 6. Step One: Noticing model sentences

> 1) We have gone to Singapore.
> 2) He has recently written some letters.
> 3) They have seen the movie "The World Is Not Enough" four times.
> 4) My brother has been here for five years.
> 5) I have learned Dutch since 1999.
> 6) My daughter has broken that Chinese vase.

At the end of Step 1, the teacher can tell the students the name of the grammatical item learned. Essentially, the students are involved in communicative grammar teaching. This concept also breaks the folklore that teaching grammar must be separated from a communicative task.

Step 2: Eliciting functions of the rule or rule elicitation

Step 2 aims to elicit the functions of the grammatical item taught accompanied with examples. This step furnishes the students with clear descriptions of the language focus uses so that students can apply the language focus appropriately in communicative settings. In this step, the teacher explicitly tells the students some features of the sentence, such as the verb form, commonly used time signals, and functions of the present perfect tense, so that students are well prepared for the exercises following the presentation/explanation. In addition, this step consolidates the students' comprehension about what they have guessed in Step 1 so that the students' wrong conclusion about the rule can be avoided. In other words, Step 2 enhances students' confidence in applying the rule communicatively. Any teaching media and aids could be used for eliciting the functions of the grammatical item (that is, the present prefect tense) taught. See Table 7 for a sample explanation of the present perfect tense.

TABLE 7. Step Two: Functions and examples of the present perfect tense

Functions	Examples
To grammarians, *Present Perfect* can be used to :	
Express an action/event that happened at unspecified/ indefinite time in the past. In this case, we do not know when this action/event occurred. In other words, the exact time is unimportant.	- She **has climbed** a mountain. - They **have seen** this movie. - I **have complained** about the traffic before.

Express an action/event that has recently occurred, and it often may have a result in the present.	- He **has broken** the glass.
	- We **have cleaned** the floor.
	  (Now, the floor is clean)
	- I **have washed** the car.
	  (Now, It looks lovely)

Express an action/event that began in the past and continues up to the present (often used with 'for' or 'since'). In this instance, the action/event is incomplete. Note that when using time signals *for* and *since*, both are different in use. The former denotes length of time, while the latter indicates a certain period of time.	- John **has lived** in New York for four years.
	  (He still lives in New York)
	- I **have learned** German since 1990.
	  (I still learn German)
	- I **have worn** glasses for ten years.
	  (I still wear glasses)

Express an action that happened repeatedly before now. In other words, such an action/event occurred more than once in the past. It may be repeated in the present or future. Note that this function should be differentiated from that of *simple present tense* indicating present habits.	- We **have seen** this movie twice.
	  (We may see it again)
	- She **has been** here many times.
	  (She may be here again)
	- John **has visited** Ohio four times.
	  (He may visit it again)

Step 3: Familiarizing students with the rule in use through exercises or rule practice

Step 3 focuses upon familiarizing the students with the grammatical item in use. The process followed in this step is that the teacher presents some exercises, checks for students' comprehension, and encourages active student involvement. The forms of the exercises used in Step 3 may vary according to the particular grammatical item being taught. For example, in the materials that I designed for teaching present perfect

tense, I use a series of seven exercises. I start by providing the exercise in the form of written question input (see Table 8). The students are required to write their answers using complete sentences on the basis of the questions asked. The reason for having the students write their answer in a complete sentence is that this ensures they are trained to make a complete sentence using the rule given.

TABLE 8. Step Three, Exercise 1: Written question input

> ***Answer the following questions in a complete sentence.***
> 1. How many letters has she written this month?
> 2. Where have you put my book?
> 3. How long have you studied here?
> 4. How many times has she been to Bali?
> 5. With whom has Maria spoken?
> 6. How long have they cleaned the floor?
> 7. How many years has your mother lived in a town?

The next exercise is a correct verb form completion problem. Students are required to fill out the appropriate grammatical item in the bracket based on the rule taught (see a present perfect tense example in Table 9). This exercise trains the students to be more familiar with the verb form used. Being familiar with the verb form is crucial because the verb form identifies the rule and its meaning.

TABLE 9. Step Three, Exercise 2: Correct verb form completion

> ***Change the words in the bracket with an appropriate form.***
> 1. She has not (attend) any meetings since she worked here.
> 2. Bill (be) (be) here since four hours ago.
> 3. I have never (see) snow before.
> 4. Bill's parents have (grow) rice crops since he was a child.
> 5. We have not (take) the TOEFL test.
> 6. Maria and Anna have (live) here for ten years.
> 7. I (not be) (see) you for a long time.
> 8. He (not be) (be) here since Christmas.

The third exercise given in Step 3 is a sentence transformation problem. For example, the students have to change sentences using simple present tense into those using the present perfect tense (see Table 10). In this respect, the students are challenged to write a correct sentence using the present perfect tense, and students are trained to be alert to using time signals as well.

Fourthly, a sentence composition problem using the time signals is given (see Table 11). In this case, the data are given, and the students are required to write sentences on the basis of the data available. The sample answer is provided to help the students to do this exercise easily. The students are also trained to apply the commonly used time signals (for example, *for* and *since*) in the case of using a certain rule (that is, the present perfect tense). For a more challenging activity, the time signals can be extended (that is, the use of *already* and *yet*; *during the four past years, over a few*

years, and so on). In other words, the time signal-based exercise is given since in some cases, tenses are much influenced by certain time signals.

TABLE 10. Step Three, Exercise 3: Tense-based sentence transformation

Change the following sentences into the present perfect form. You may include a certain time signal if required.
1. She does not go to school yet.
    _____ .

2. We drink coffee.
    _____ .

3. They read these books.
    _____ .

4. He has breakfast.
    _____ .

5. My mother boils much water.
    _____ .

6. I still learn English.
    _____ .

TABLE 11. Step Three, Exercise 4: Sentence composition 1

Make a sentence using time signals: "for" and "since" based on the following data.
Number 1 has been done for you as an example.

No	Participant	Activity	A Period of Time	Length of Time
1	Pusporini	Take an English course	January 1996	10 years
2	Maria's Father	Work for a shoes company	1968	25 years
3	John and Bill	Study at college	Three months ago	3 months
4	We	Attend a workshop	9 o'clock	7 hours
5	They	Teach Javanese	Seven days ago	7 days
6	Jolene	Do this work	11 o'clock	A few hours
7	Sondak	Stay in a village	Some weeks ago	Some weeks

1. a. Pusporini has taken an English course since January 1996.
   b. Pusporini has taken an English course for 10 years.
2. a. _____ .
   b. _____ .
3. a. _____ .
   b. _____ .
4. a. _____ .
   b. _____ .
5. a. _____ .
   b. _____ .
6. a. _____ .
   b. _____ .
7. a. _____ .
   b. _____ .

In the fifth exercise, like the fourth, the students are required to write sentences using the time signals in which the data in the form of time expressions are provided (see Table 12). This exercise is intended to check students' progress in using the time

signals (for example, *for* and *since*). In this respect, the teacher can monitor students' progress in such a form of exercise.

TABLE 12. Step Three, Exercise 5: Sentence composition 2

Make a sentence using the following key words. Number 1 has been done for you as an example.

No.	Linking Verbs	Main Verbs	Adverb Signals
1.	Have	Be	Seven months
2.	Has	Visit	Lately
3.	Have	Write	Many years
4.	Has	Arrive	Just
5.	Have	Speak	Four years ago
6.	Has	Have lunch	Four times
7.	Have	Do the dishes	A couple of hours

1. They have been here for seven months.
2. _____.
3. _____.
4. _____.
5. _____.
6. _____.
7. _____.

The sixth exercise focuses on error recognition and correction. In this sense, the students have to identify and correct the mistakes in the sentences given. In the case of present perfect tense, error problems include verb form and time signals (see Table 13). This exercise checks students' comprehension about the application of the rule (that is, the present perfect tense). Moreover, the exercise trains the students to carefully notice inappropriate features of the rule (for example, the present perfect tense).

TABLE 13. Step Three, Exercise 6: Error recognition and correction

Correct the sentences below.
1. They has moved into a new apartment.
2. She has already saw this movie.
3. Maria and Anna have flown on an airplane since many times.
4. Mr. Regan has working for his company for 1977.
5. I have waited for you for three hours ago.
6. The lift has broke down.
7. We have clean this floor two times.
8. John Smith has wrote a number of short stories.
9. There has been some climatic changes lately in my town.

The final exercise is sentence construction or composition based on the tense functions (see Table 14). The exercise enables the students to practise with both form and function-based exposure. Furthermore, the function-based exercise can assist students to apply the rule in communicative tasks (that is, speaking and writing).

TABLE 14. Step Three, Exercise 7: Rule-function based sentence composition

> ***Make two sentences using present perfect tense indicating:***
> 1. An action that began in the past and is still occurring now with "for"
> 2. An action that happened more than once in the past, and may occur again in the future
> 3. An action that happened at indefinite time in the past
> 4. An action that began in the past and is still occurring now with 'since'
> 5. An action that has recently occurred, and it often may have a result in the present.

To sum up, in Step 3, a set of exercises are oriented towards form-function exposure so that the students have many opportunities to get closer to both forms and functions of the grammatical item learned. The aim is to enable students to use the grammatical item correctly in communicative tasks. I suggest that the model exercises given in Tables 8-14 relating to teaching the present perfect tense be developed into various forms of exercises relevant to specific grammatical items.

Step 4: Checking students' comprehension or rule activation
This step is geared to check students' comprehension of the grammatical item being taught. At this stage, the teacher provides an assessment of student comprehension to gauge whether the students completely grasp what they have been taught. The form of the evaluation can be in the form of sentence construction. This is used in order to have the students apply the concept of the grammatical item learned productively, not receptively. In this case, the students are required to work individually. This step can help the teacher redesign her or his further grammar teaching to facilitate the students' progress in applying the rule taught. An example of Step 4 relating to present perfect tense can be seen below in Table 15.

TABLE 15. Step Four: Students' comprehension of rule-based sentence construction

> Make a sentence using the *present perfect tense* with time signals: *already,*
> *recently, for, during the past years, since, just, twice,* and *many times.*
> 1. _____ .
> 2. _____ .
> 3. _____ .
> 4. _____ .
> 5. _____ .
> 6. _____ .
> 7. _____ .
> 8. _____ .

Step 5: Expanding students' knowledge or enrichment
The last step is focused on expanding students' comprehension of the grammatical item being taught. In this phase, the teacher employs other activities to reinforce some concepts and even to relate new ones. S/he gives the students opportunities to do independent work and can set certain activities or tasks from the lesson as homework or an assignment. In the example of materials designed for teaching present perfect tense, I propose two tasks: pattern identification in a passage or a text (see Table 16) and inter-pattern comparison in meaning (see Table 17). Pattern identification in a passage or text provides students with an opportunity to do noticing or consciousness-

raising. In this respect, the students are expected to be expert in applying the rule on the basis of their cognitive capacity. Inter-pattern comparison encourages the students to differentiate between the concepts they already know and the newly introduced grammatical item. This task can train students to think analytically.

TABLE 16. Step Five: Pattern identification in the passage or the text

Identify the clauses or sentences using present perfect in the following passage, and underline the verbs.

The whale is the largest animal that has ever lived. Some species grow to a length of over 30 meters and weigh up to 90 metric tons, or 90,000 kilos. Millions of years ago, whales lived on land and walked on four legs. Before recorded history, however, they went into the sea. It was really a return to the sea; the remote ancestors of all animals had originated in the sea. The remains of the whale's hind legs still exist inside its body, and there is other evidence that it was once a land mammal. It is warm-blooded, for example, and has respiratory, digestive, and reproductive systems somewhat like those of other mammals.

For hundreds of years, people have killed some whale species for their blubber or whalebone. In recent years, it has become evident that the great sperm whale is especially in danger of becoming

TABLE 17. Step 5: Inter-pattern comparison in meaning

Differentiate a couple of sentences based on aspect of meaning below.
1. A. She has had breakfast.
   B. She had breakfast.
2. A. We have visited Bali four times.
   B. We visited Bali four times a year.
3. A. They have lived in a remote area.
   B. They lived in a remote area.
4. A. He has broken the cup.
   B. He broke the cup.
5. A. I have studied Japanese for five years.
   B. I studied Japanese for five years.
6. A. She has had breakfast.
   B. She had breakfast.
7. A. George and Anna have waited for you for three hours.
   B. George and Anna waited for you for three hours.
8. A. Pusporini has washed her motorbike.
   B. Pusporini washed her motorbike.
9. A. Mary and Shirley have seen this movie.
   B. Mary and Shirley saw this movie.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE PROPOSED PROCEDURE

After describing and discussing the proposed five-step procedure for teaching grammar, it is wise to highlight some advantages and disadvantages over the existing approaches to teaching grammar. The advantages of the proposed procedure are:

1. the procedure tries to encourage the students' involvement in communicative tasks (that is, Step 1: Question Input);
2. learners are trained to be accustomed to rule discovery, which could enhance learning autonomy and self-reliance as shown in Step 1 (that is, sentence noticing);
3. learners have a chance to apply their greater degree of cognitive depth;
4. the procedure respects the intelligence and maturity of many adult learners in particular and acknowledges the role of cognitive processes in language acquisition;
5. learners are more active in the learning process, rather than being simply passive recipients of exercises;
6. the procedure involves learners' pattern-recognition and problem-solving;
7. the procedure attempts to measure the learners' progress in mastering the rule through an individual evaluation as part of the learning process; and
8. the procedure tries to reconnect what the learners already know with something new (that is, new rules of the grammar).

Although the proposed procedure offers some advantages, I should acknowledge its disadvantages. Among them are:

1. the procedure is an intense activity that is time and energy consuming;
2. the procedure places an emphasis on teachers in designing data and materials;
3. the procedure requires the teacher to have extensive knowledge of the grammatical rule being taught, since s/he not only tells her/his students the formula, but s/he also attempts to lead the students to have comprehensive knowledge and application of the rule taught; and
4. the procedure may frustrate learners who would prefer simply to be told the rule.

CONCLUSION

The ultimate goal of teaching grammar is to provide the students with knowledge of the way language is constructed so that when they listen, speak, read and write, they have no trouble applying the language that they are learning. Language teachers are, therefore, challenged to use creative and innovative attempts to teach grammar so that such a goal can successfully be achieved. In other words, whatever exercises are given, the most crucial thing is that the teacher provide the students with an opportunity to be able to produce the grammatical item making use of syntactically and semantically correct examples of sentences comprised of appropriate and relevant vocabulary. I believe that the five-step procedure for teaching grammar described in this article achieves this end.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Allen, W. (1995). *Living English structure*. London: Longman.

Azar, B. (1989). *Understanding and using English grammar*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Ballin, W. (1990). *Perfect your English*: *The easy way*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International Ltd.

Brown, H. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley Longman, Inc.

Corder, S. (1988). Pedagogic grammar. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood-Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching* (pp. 123-145). New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.

Doff, A. (2000). *Teach English*: *A training course for teachers* (14th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eisenstein, M. (1987). Grammatical explanations in ESL: Teach the student, Not the method. In M. Long & J. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL* (pp. 282-292). New Jersey: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Ellis, R. (Speech Notes). Options in grammar teaching. Retrieved November 30, 2005 from
    http://www.tki.org.nz/r/esol/esolonline/teachers/prof_read/Rod_ellis_e.php.

Ellis, R. (2002). Grammar teaching-practice or consciousness-raising? In J. Richards & W. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching*: *An anthology of current practice* (pp. 167-174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2004). The definition and measurement of L2 explicit knowledge. *Language Learning 54*(2), 227-275.

Felder, R., & Henriques, E. (1995). Learning and teaching styles in foreign and second language education. *Foreign Language Annals 28*(1), 21-31.

Fortune, A. (1992). Self-study grammar practice: Learners views and preferences. *ELT Journal 46*(2), 160-171.

Hewings, M. (1999). *Advanced grammar in use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klein, W. (1986). *Second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S. (1987). Applications of psycholinguistic research to the classroom. In M. Long & J. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL* (pp. 33-44). New Jersey: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Krashen, S. (2002). *Second language acquisition and second language learning* (1st Internet ed). Retrieved January 11, 2006 from
    http://www.sdkrashen.com/SL_Acquisition_ and_Learning/

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language learning* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murphy, R. (1998). *English grammar in use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Noonan, F. (2004). Teaching ESL students to notice grammar. *The Internet TESL Journal 10(7)*. Retrieved November 30, 2005 from http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Noonan- Noticing.html.

Richards, J. (2002). 30 years of TEFL/TESL: A personal reflection. *RELC Journal 33*(2), 1-35.

Richards, J., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Longman.

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J., & Renandya, W. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching*: *An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sysoyev, P. (1999). Integrative L2 grammar teaching: Exploration, explanation, and expression. *The Internet TESL Journal 5*(6). Retrieved November 30, 2005 from http://iteslj. Org/Articles/Sysoyev-Integrative.html.

Thomson, A., & Martinet, A. (1995). *A practical English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Ur, P. (1999). *Grammar practice activities*: *A practical guide for teachers* (12th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widodo, H. (2004). Kemampuan mahasiswa Bahasa Inggris dalam menganalisis kalimat bahasa Inggris. *Fenomena, 3*(2), 27-38.

Wishon, G., & Burks, J. (1980). *Let's write English*. New York: Litton Educational Publishing, Inc.