

**L.Remchukova**

Mykolayiv State Pedagogical University

### **Comparative Analysis Of Native And Foreign Methods And Approaches Of Teaching English Grammar And The Necessity Of Their Correlation**

Grammar is an integral part of language. By gaining familiarity with grammar children discover how to speak and write more effectively, efficiently and precisely. Such knowledge results in the child's becoming a more confident speaker and writer.

From time to time there are public debates about the teaching of grammar in schools. There are sound arguments for teaching about language in general and the English language in particular. An understanding of the nature and functioning of language is a part of the general knowledge that we should have about ourselves and the world we live in. In this respect, linguistics deserves a place at all levels of the curriculum at least as much as history, geography or biology. For language is the major means by which we communicate with others and interact with them and our attitudes to our own variety and the varieties of others affect our image of ourselves and of others. Linguistics is a central discipline that has bearings on many other disciplines.

Grammar is generally regarded, as central to linguistics and it should therefore be included in a linguistic curriculum on its own terms. Many educationists have denied that a study of grammar can improve the ability to speak and write English correctly and effectively but it depends on what is taught and how is taught. Different grammatical systems have been devised to classify or categorize the working of the English language. Traditional, structural and transformational generative grammars have all influenced the way grammar has been taught in schools in the 20th century.

Nowadays there are a good many methods and approaches both by native and foreign grammarians for teaching English grammar. They vary in their coverage. In this article an attempt to compare them and point out the necessity of their correlation was done.

What methods and approaches do native scientists suggest? G.V. Rogova points out only one main method of teaching a foreign language – Conscious-

Practical and five general principles of grammar teaching. She offers such a method because the distinguishing features of this method are a conscious approach to language learning and the acquisition of the language through pupils' practice in using it.

General principles of grammar teaching are Conscious Approach, Practical Approach, Structural Approach, Situational Approach and Different Approach.

O.I. Vishnevsky distinguishes three main methods in the foreign language teaching: System-language, Conditionally Communicative and Communicative.

All these methods can be used separately but more often they are closely connected and their elements are crossed.

Now, let's point out the main methods and approaches in teaching grammar suggested by foreign methodologists.

The majority of them are sure that we are to teach our pupils grammar only in a context because grammar structures by themselves are rather useless and like road signs they take on meaning only if they are situated in connected discourse. The most well known methods are Audiolingual and Audiovisual ones. On the base of the mental activity a new approach appeared – the Cognitive Approach.

Methods of teaching grammar suggested by foreign authors vary in coverage. Educationists choose different methods for their work, which are most suitable for them. And now we are naturally inclined to compare the methods and approaches suggested by native and foreign methodologists. What do they have in common and in what way do they differ? Most of our school textbooks are based on the Conscious-Practical Method, that's why let us compare the Conscious-Practical Method with the Audiolingual Method because it is one of the oldest methods, which gave the impetus to the appearance of other methods.

At first sight the Conscious-Practical Method and the Audiolingual Method are quite different, and there are not any common features in them because the main principles of these methods differ greatly.

The Audiolingual Method is based on the various kinds of mimicry and memorization. Pattern drills are based on analogies, whereas the Conscious-Practical one is based on the Conscious Approach. The main instruments of

the Audiolingual Method are repetition and memorization through the repetition, and the Conscious-Practical Method tries to teach the learners to think and analyse but not only to repeat and memorize. The differences between the two methods begin with the first step i.e. the introduction of the new grammar material. But inspite of all these differences some common features can be seen in these methods. One of the main principles of the Audiolingual Method declares that the teacher should teach his pupils the language, but not the facts about it and this principle has something in common with the Practical Approach of the Conscious-Practical Method. Both methods use visual aids and tapes, which are of great importance in the process of teaching.

If we compare the Cognitive Method and other methods connected with it we shall find more common features with the Conscious-Practical Method because the Cognitive Method resembles the Conscious-Practical Method and both of them are based on the mental activity of the students. But the distinctive features of the Cognitive Approach are the use of silence in the student's work and greater attention is paid to the group work and individual instruction. The Cognitive Methods is preferable with the pupils of higher verbal activity and is more successful with the senior pupils, whereas the Conscious-Practical Method is more preferable with the pupils of all ages and almost all abilities.

The next method to be compared with the Conscious-Practical one is the Audiovisual Method, based on the use of media and classroom attributes playing the role of the audiovisual aids as well. The Audiovisual Method makes the process of introduction and training grammar items more vivid and interesting, its lessons leave a visual impression of the situation associated with the language, and if the material is exciting pupils memorize it almost at once. But the mentioned above non-traditional introduction of the grammar material may be considered a disadvantage of this method for pupils, who have the deductive kind of thinking.

Having compared different methods, we finally come to the conclusion that each method has its own advantages and disadvantages in the process of teaching grammar. But what method is preferable? The choice of the method is one of the most difficult tasks for every teacher because he always wants to make the process of teaching more interesting, exciting and understandable.

That is why every teacher has to work out his own set of methods, but there is no method, immutable, universal, eternal. And here we come to the idea of correlation. It provides more profound knowledge and makes the process of learning not too tiresome due to the usage of several methods instead of one, definite and traditional.

The best course design will be one that will promote a positive social climate in the classroom, enhance student motivation and make teaching enjoyable for the teacher – all indispensable if successful language learning is to be accomplished.

### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

1. Rogova G.V. *Methods of Teaching English*. Ленинград «Просвещение», 1975.
2. Вишневецький О.І. *Діяльність учнів на уроці іноземної мови*. Київ «Радянська школа», 1989.
3. Farris Pamela J. *A Process Approach*. Wm. Brown and Benchmark, Inc, 1993.
4. Greenbaum Sidney. *The Oxford English Grammar*. Oxford University Press, 1996.
5. Celce-Murcia Marianne, McIntosh Lois. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Newbury House Publishers, Inc. Rowley, Massachusetts, 1979.