

Research Supporting Grammar Instruction	
Source	Citation
<p><i>Tesol: Quarterly Vol.27</i> #1 Spring 1993 <i>The Structural Syllabus and</i> <i>Second Language Acquisition</i> ROD ELLIS <i>Temple University Japan</i></p>	<p>This research suggests the following conclusions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. <p>Grammar instruction results in faster learning and in higher levels of L2 grammatical accuracy (see Long, 1983; Pica, 1983). Grammar instruction directed at a grammatical feature that learners are not ready to acquire as implicit knowledge does not succeed (see Felix, 1981; Pienemann, 1984, 1989). Grammar instruction directed at a grammatical feature that learners are ready to acquire as implicit knowledge is successful (see Harley, 1989; Pienemann, 1984, 1989).</p>
	<p>Explicit knowledge can help learners to notice features in the input and also to notice the meanings that they realize. For example, if learners know that plural nouns have an -s, they are more likely to notice the -s on the ends of nouns they hear or read in input and also more likely to associate the -s morpheme with the meaning more than one. In a sense, then, as Terrell (1991, p. 58) suggests, explicit knowledge can function as a kind of “advance organizer” that helps the learner to comprehend and segment the input and also as a “meaning-form focuser” that enables the learner to establish meaning-form relationships.</p>
	<p>It is hypothesized that learners who know about a grammatical feature because they have learned about it through grammar instruction are in a better position to heed this feature when it subsequently occurs in the input and also are better able to notice the difference between the input and their own production.</p>
<p>Improving Education for English Learners: Research-Based Approaches Excerpt from Chapter 1: Research to Guide English</p>	<p>ELD instruction should explicitly teach elements of English (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, grammar, functions, and conventions). 6. ELD instruction should integrate meaning and communication to support explicit teaching of language.</p>

<p>difference? Ernesto Macaro and Liz Masterman University of Oxford, UK</p> <p>** Article highlights implicit vs. explicit grammar knowledge</p>	<p>Explicit Grammar Definition: Establishing as the prime objective of a lesson the explanation of how morphosyntactic rule or patter works, with some reference to meta-linguistic terminology, and providing examples of this rule in a linguistic, though not necessarily a functional context.</p>
	<p>...there has been research that despite immersion in a language, learners continue to make grammatical errors (Harley, 1989) make insufficient progress with competence in low-input, and certain grammatical aspects can not be acquired solely on the basis of comprehensible input (White, 1987).</p>
<p>A Description of Grammar-Based Teaching <i>by Betty Azar</i></p>	<p>As its name implies, GBT uses grammar as the base, the starting point and foundation, for the development of all language skills — speaking, listening, writing, and reading. GBT provides information about English grammar accompanied by numerous and varied practice opportunities.</p>
	<p>Communicative practice is usually centered on the students' own lives: their opinions, experiences and real-life situations, including the fact that they are in a classroom trying to learn English. GBT often uses the classroom as context, building language practice around the people and objects and activities in the here-and-now classroom. In GBT, communicative practice means that real people are communicating in real time about real things in a real place for a real purpose.</p>
	<p>Understanding how a structure works helps many students formulate how to say what they mean and helps lead to successful communication experiences, the building blocks of second-language acquisition.</p>
	<p>Students are taught the concepts underlying such basic grammar terms as noun, verb, sentence, and preposition — without ever defining those terms. Parsing or student use of metalinguage to complete language-learning tasks is very rare, done only for specific, pragmatic purposes in particular circumstances.</p>
	<p>Communicative interaction with grammar as the topic is seen as a valuable language-learning experience in GBT, as equally valuable as talking about</p>

	<p>follow the same order of acquisition of a set of English grammatical morphemes (Krashen, 1977), but this research has been challenged on a number of grounds (see Hatch, 1978b). In particular, it is difficult to maintain the view that L2 acquisition involves the systematic mastery of discrete grammatical items, as this research appears to assume.</p>
	<p>A third problem is that structural syllabus treat each item as discrete and separate. It has been shown, however, that the acquisition of a new form can affect the organization of the learner's entire mental grammar (see Huebner, 1983). The rules that make up this grammar are interrelated in complex ways, so any change may involve not just an addition of a new form but the restructuring of the whole system (McLaughlin, 1990).</p>
	<p>Pienemann argues that the developmental sequence through which learners pass reflects the gradual mastery of a series of processing operations responsible for language production.</p>
	<p>Perhaps the most obvious one is to make use of the criteria which have been traditionally used. Widdowson (1968) identifies two general principles that syllabus designers have drawn on: (a) relative difficulty and (b) usefulness (i.e., the coverage value of an item and the classroom value of the item).</p>
	<p>To sum up, the aim of a structural syllabus for explicit knowledge is to raise learners' consciousness about how the target language grammar works. As Larsen-Freeman (1991) has pointed out, this will involve (a) drawing attention to how grammatical forms are formed, (b) developing an understanding of how particular grammatical forms signal particular grammatical meanings, and (c) helping learners realize what constitutes appropriate use of the forms in context.</p>

Saunders and
Goldberg,
Research to Guide
English Language
Development
Instruction
December 1, 2008

instruction is problematic. There is little research that focuses on instruction for the population of U.S. students that concerns us "language learners" (formerly, "limited English proficient," or LEP) research directly based on the population of interest leads to see whether it is better to use research based on different types of students (second language) or to say there is no research on a particular type of student to teach specific grammatical forms). We address these and other

English Language Development instruction is designed specifically to help learners' knowledge and use of English in increasingly sophisticated ways. We focus on the larger effort to help ELs succeed in school, ELD instruction is designed to engage English to a level of proficiency (e.g., Advanced) that maximizes engagement successfully in academic studies taught in English. To put it another way, instruction is designed to help ELs learn and acquire English to a level of proficiency that minimizes the language barriers they face when engaging in academic studies in English classrooms. Clearly, one would hope that ELD instruction also helps ELs acquire English in order to maximize their capacity to engage successfully in school with peers and adults inside and outside of school and in other kinds of pursuits.

Table 1. Guidelines organized by level of supporting evidence

Practices or Guidelines for Which There is Relatively Strong Supporting Evidence
1) ELD Instruction is better than no ELD instruction
2) Interactive activities can be productive, but they must be carefully planned and carried out.
Practices or Guidelines Based on Hypotheses Emerging from Recent EL Research
3) A separate, daily block of time should be devoted to ELD Instruction
4) The ELD block can incorporate reading and writing but should emphasize listening and speaking.
5) ELD instruction should explicitly teach elements of English (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, grammar, conventions).
6) ELD instruction should integrate meaning and communication to support explicit teaching of language
7) ELD instruction should provide students with corrective feedback on form.
8) Use of English during ELD instruction should be maximized; L1 should be used strategically
9) Teachers should attend to communication and language learning strategies and incorporate them into ELD instruction.
10) ELD Instruction should emphasize academic language as well as conversational language
11) ELD instruction should continue at least until students reach level 4 (early advanced) and possibly through level 5 (advanced).
Guidelines Applicable to ELD but Grounded in Non-EL Research
12) ELD Instruction should be planned and delivered with specific language objectives in mind.
13) ELs should be carefully grouped for ELD Instruction, not in classrooms segregated by language proficiency, but by language proficiency for specific ELD Instruction.
14) The likelihood of establishing and/or sustaining an effective ELD Instructional program increases when schools and districts make it a priority.

5) ELD instruction should explicitly teach elements of English (e.g., vocabulary, syntax, grammar, conventions).

In an informative recent review, Spada and Lightbown (2008) have pointed out that exposure to a second language in meaning-based school programs designed to promote second language learning (e.g., content-based second language instruction) can lead to the development of comprehension skills, oral fluency, self-confidence, and communicative abilities in a second language. However, second language learners can still experience difficulties with pronunciation and morphological, syntactic, and pragmatic features (Spada & Lightbown, 2008). Spada and Lightbown conclude that explicit instructional attention to these features (referred to as "forms" the second language literature) is likely to facilitate students' second language learning in a way that solely relying on meaning- and communication-oriented instruction alone will not. explain the language element and did not direct students' attention to the language target. On average, explicit instructional approaches were more than twice as effective--in terms of student learning--as implicit approaches, that is, where teachers did not draw students' attention to targeted language features.

7) ELD instruction should provide students with corrective feedback on form.

Providing ELs with feedback on form is probably not a matter of whether but how to do it. During ELD instruction wherein the primary objective is studying and learning language, corrective feedback can be beneficial. Russell and Spada (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of fifteen experimental and quasi-experimental studies that examined the effects of corrective feedback specifically on grammar. The studies include a mixture of Foreign Language, Second

