Teaching Grammar to Bilingual Learners

Olga Andreevna Bezuglova[1], Liliya Galievna Ilyasova[1] & Zhanargul Beisembayeva[2]

[1]Kazan Federal University

[2]L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

Correspondence: Olga Andreevna Bezuglova, Kazan Federal University. E-mail: mega.sppa@mail.ru

Abstract

This article deals with an inductive way of English language teaching. This acquisition process can help bilingual students to learn, find rules and apply them to new contexts. The objective of the paper is to propose a model of teaching that promotes student-centered approach where a teacher guides learners in discovery and provides more opportunities to practice, particularly in grammar. Basis of such approach is a training environment, in which the student is not an object to whom knowledge is transferred in a ready-made form but the subject of training process therefore knowledge, abilities, skills for the student are the result of his researches, decisions and creativity. The model of teaching and student-centered activities has been explored through the action research. Based on the experiment, it can be emphasized that a progressive way of teaching grammar moves the focus away from the teacher as the information provider and enables students to focus on use. Finally, the inductive approach as more effective for achieving learning goals and outcomes, is presented in the article from the perspectives of the bilingual learners.

Keywords: bilingual students, inductive approach, a learning process, student\teacher-centered approach

1. Introduction

In the period of modernization of educational system new tasks are set for the teacher, such as achievement of personal, metasubject and subject results allowing the student to act in a new situation on a qualitatively high level. In this regard the main task of a foreign language teacher nowadays is organization of educational activity in order to form student's needs for creative transformation of a training material for the purpose of mastering new knowledge as a result of his own research.

An integration of cultures causes the urgent necessity to learn English as the language of international communication. There are some problems of teaching a foreign language in a bilingual country (Kharisov, F. F., & Kharisova, Ch. M., 2014). The difficulties can be connected with the introducing and drilling of new material, and development of grammar skills.

Thought-activity pedagogy is one of the leading national approaches to the construction of new educational content. In the framework unique proprietary technology has been developed which aim is to improve the quality of the educational process through the work with the abilities of the student. "The correct understanding of bilingual (polylingual) processes will help to understand process of our society, and also to plan new steps on forming relations in multinational society, in elaboration of new strategy of language policy" (Safin, I. K., Gimranova, T. A., (Bychkova), & Kolosova, Y. I., 2016). The work opens new opportunities for the teacher to come in contact with the child. Forming ability, the teacher organizes the student educational movement in different fields of knowledge. "The student has now become an active informational architect, procuring, rearranging and displaying information, instead of a passive sponge soaking up knowledge" (Sirazieva, L. M., Fakhrutdinova, R. A., Kamasheva, J. L. Mark Leikin, 2017).

The induction means the form of conclusion generalizing the separate facts and characterizing the movement of knowledge from the particular to the general. In the technique of foreign languages training, the essence of induction is that the grammatical phenomena are observed in a graphic text or sounding speech; they are learnt from specially selected examples and generalized in rules.

The inductive way has the following advantages: it is more pictorial, as the studying of grammatical material is realized in a language context; the induction promotes development of cogitative activity since it assumes existence at learners of attention, observation and active participation (Biggs, J., 2003) (Reece, I., & Walker, S., 2000). Besides, it provides

fast memorization, because due to supervision over a context and independent conclusion of the rule, primary fixing is exercised already at acquaintance stage.

Foreign scholars have reviewed the role of a learner and a learning process. In their empirical research they focus on the interaction between students and teachers and students' approaches to tasks. These approaches to a learning process have been classified as deep or surface. The surface approach can be defined as a way where a student concentrates only on certain skills such as memorization, rotting or just getting information whereas, the deep one is focused on exploration, analyzing and reflecting (Biggs, J. , 2003)(Entwistle, N., 1981)(Ramsden, P., 2003).

2. Methods

According to many foreign researchers, it is more important what learners do rather than a teacher does. Thus they state that "Inductive teaching methods come in many forms, including discovery learning, inquiry-based learning, problem-based learning, project based learning, case-based teaching, and just-in-time teaching" (Biggs, J. , 2003) (Light, G., &   Cox, R., 2001)(Joyce, B., & Calhoun, E., & Hopkins, D., 2009). Thus, they suggest inductive teaching with a student centered approach in which a strategy known as "noticing" makes the students become aware of the process of their learning. In the classroom a teacher should try to create supportive environment, promote positive students motivation, provide students with opportunities for noticing and develop students' noticing skills further. In other words, the methods are different but what they have in common is that students are encouraged to find solutions to problems and acquire knowledge in any areas by themselves just with the teachers' assistance (p. 18). Inductive approach of teaching is one of the ways where the teacher guides students to learn on their through motivation.

3. Results and Discussion

As practitioners we wish to improve understanding of our teaching practice particularly for bilingual students. "Education efficiency and effectiveness remain relevant issues at all stages of developing pedagogics both nowadays and in future, as continual intellectual and technological development provides new challenges and discoveries" (Antonova, N. V., Vassilieva, V. N., & Kononeko, M. V., 2016). For the students of our university who are future teachers of the Tatar and English languages, who will teach in schools and colleges applying different modern and effective strategies, English grammar is important. There is no surprise that students think that grammar is rather boring and "dry". Therefore, an inductive approach to English grammar teaching can help our students to bring their grammar knowledge, and show how it can be applied in the classroom. Having analyzed the above discussed methods our attention was drawn to inductive model NUFU (Noticing, Understanding, Forming and Using). We conducted the action research in order to investigate how NUFU could be implemented into teaching and whether it would be effective or ineffective.

The aim of the action research is to find out the appropriate way of teaching grammar to bilingual students.

According to our lesson plan we had to present and deliver the theme "Causatives" for a second-year students. Though Causative constructions exist in both the Tatar and Russian languages the realization of them in speech is quite different from English. Thus we as researchers find this   theme interesting to study in term of learners' comprehension.

Fifty two students who had pre-intermediate English proficiency took part in the action research; all the students were of the same age, the same educational and social background.

•   Gender: forty are female students, and twelve are males.

•   Nationality: thirty five students are Tatars and seventeen are Russians (nationality and gender were taken into consideration)

•   Cultural background: some students came from modern families and some had an old-fashioned outlook at life.

•   Types of Intelligences: mostly visual, interpersonal, kinesthetic students; four are intrapersonal; several are logical learners.

•   Participation: active and shy students.

Table 1. Educational and Social Background of the Students

Gender	*sixteen are female students, and eight are males*
Nationality	fourteen students are Tatars and ten are Russians
Cultural background	some students came from modern families and some had an old-fashioned outlook at life.
Purposes	eleven students wanted to go to the university and develop their English language and study skills and thirteen came just to improve their English skills
Types of Intelligences	mostly visual, interpersonal, kinesthetic students; four are intrapersonal; several are logical learners
Participation	active and shy students

4. Summary

The action research had been carried out in the collaborative team. Our team gathered together several times in order to discuss the effectiveness of both (traditional and NUFU) methods, define the stages, discuss further planning and implement proper actions. We can admit that the planning was the most difficult, energy and time consuming part.

Finally, two lesson plans were designed for two groups. Traditional method (Forming, Noticing, Using and Understanding) was used for introducing the new material "Causatives" to the students of group A. In contrast, group B followed model NUFU (Noticing, Understanding, Forming and Using).

Next, we were involved in the process of peer observation of our team colleagues. Through the observations and communications, we shared learning and collaborative development and made evaluations focusing on solutions to practical problems in order to enhance our teaching performance and improve outcomes for learners (Reece, I., & Walker, S., 2000)(Parvizian, F., Ghojavand, K., & Niknejadi, F., 2015)(Jaramillo, L. E. S., 2018). Furthermore, we received the students' feedback both in written and oral forms which helped to plan the most effective strategies and techniques work best for our bilingual students (Luo, C., Li, M., Peng, P., & Fan, S., 2018)(Tambunan, H., 2019).

We had to cooperate and worked as a team to study all these models theoretically and after that to choose one of them and apply it in our teaching. We worked with colleagues who teach at university. Our team gathered together several times in order to understand how these methods work, define the stages of these methods and discuss further planning. Finally, two lesson plans were designed for two groups described above.

Our colleagues were observers at the lessons of our team mates. In their opinions the lessons were successful and the students gave positive feedback both in written and oral forms which helped us to understand their reaction. Generally, they liked the way the lessons were led but almost all students did not pay attention to the way the lessons were conducted.

Table 2. The Description of the Lesson Using the Model NUFU

Stages	Element of NUFU	Comments
The teacher showed the students some pictures and told them that those pictures were related to one of her unlucky days and elicited from them how they might be connected. The students listened to the description of the teacher's day.	**Noticing**	At that stage everything went well. One or two students managed to give some right answers about how the pictures were connected with the teacher's unlucky day.
The students were given the text in written form. They read the description and underlined the constructions which described the shown pictures. The Students read aloud the underlined constructions while the teacher wrote the Causative structures on the board.	**Understanding**	The students' answers showed they understood that the constructions were used to express the actions done by somebody else for the subject of the sentence.
The teacher asked the students the questions to check the model's concept. (Did I do these actions myself? Did I ask somebody else to do them for me?). By means of questions the teacher wanted them to form the Causative pattern.	**Forming**	Most of the students succeeded in it.
The students do some exercises using the construction. The students got the home task to consolidate the knowledge.	**Using**	Most of the students managed to fulfil this task. Only one of the students had problems in making a sentence about her picture and others had to help her. Students managed to fulfil the task successfully

Table 3. The Description of the Lesson Using the Model FNUU

Stages	Element of FNUU	Comments
The teacher wrote some sentences with the Causative structure and introduced the students with the forming rules of this grammatical phenomenon.	**Forming**	At this stage the students listened to the teacher, made notes. Some students asked questions to clarify the form of the verb used in this pattern.
The students were given the written text. They were to scan the text and underlined the Causative structures in it.	**Noticing**	Some students at first had a problem doing the task. They mixed up the structure with Passive Voice. However, they managed to do the task well. The students' answers showed they didn't understand that the constructions were used to express the actions done by somebody else for the subject of the sentence.
The students do some exercises using the construction.	**Using**	Most of the students managed to fulfil this task connected with filling the gaps, but found it difficult to use it in the connected text. Only some students succeeded in it.
Teacher had to explain the material once more. Teacher asked the students the questions to check the model's concept. (Did I do these actions myself? Did I ask somebody else to do them for me?). By means of questions the teacher wanted them to form the Causative pattern. The students got the home task to consolidate the knowledge.	**Understanding**	Minority students succeed in it.

At the end of the classes the students of both groups were taken a short quiz (30 questions) on the studied material in order to analyze and record student comprehension about "Causatives". The following results were indicated:

Table 4. Data Collection Procedures

Grammar\ Structure	Group A (traditional approach) marks	Group B (NUFU) marks
Poor (more than 15 grammatical errors)	27	19
Fair (5-14 grammatical errors)	21	21
Good (4 or fewer grammatical errors)	4	12

According to the results we can assume that the majority of the students in both groups coped with the provided quiz. We revealed no significant comprehension difference between two groups; however, the mean score of the traditional approach is slightly lower than the NUFU group with 48% and 63 % accordingly.

5. Conclusions

The action research indicated that the NUFU model is more effective than the FNUU model. The students comprehend the material easier when the stages go in the following order – Noticing, Understanding, Forming and Using. Thus noticing as the process of students becoming aware of something in particular is an essential part of learning and teaching process. That time students were more motivated in the process and the role of the teacher was not only to be "an information giver", but a facilitator. Noticing as the process of students becoming aware of something in particular is essential part of learning and teaching process. We got the feedback forms with positive comments from our students; they easily succeeded in the task.

We can conclude that conducting the grammar material in the FNUU model order we saw that the students came across some difficulties in Understanding and Using the Causative pattern. But when students were asked to use the causative construction some of the students were confused and could not do the given exercises. Although most students managed to handle the tasks, the teacher had to go back to the previous stage – Forming and explain the Causative structure again. Next time some students need further explanation or additional practice.

In the NUFU model the students are not passive observers, they are involved in the process of teaching/learning, they interact with the teacher and the fellow students trying to guess the meaning of the structure. It helps to involve students in their own learning process. Instead of being just "the information provider", the teacher monitors the progress of the students carefully and gives the feedback at appropriate points to raise their level of thinking. So, the inductive teaching method is more efficient, valuable and has the potential to involve more students in the depth learning.

Acknowledgements

References

Antonova, N. V., Vassilieva, V. N. & Kononeko, M. V. (2016). The Problem of Quality of Education in Foreign Language Teaching, *Journal of Language and Literature, 7*(2), 159-162.

Biggs, J. (2003). Teaching for Quality Learning at University", 2nd ed. SHRE and OUP.

Entwistle, N. (1981). *Styles of learning and teaching; an integrated outline of educational psychology for students, teachers and lectures*. Chrichester: John Wiley.

Jaramillo, L. E. S. (2018). Malware Detection and Mitigation Techniques: Lessons Learned from Mirai DDOS Attack, *Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management, 3*(3), 19.

Joyce, B. & Calhoun, E. & Hopkins, D. (2009). *Models of Learning Tools for Teaching*. 3d ed. London: OUP.

Kharisov, F. F. & Kharisova, Ch. M. (2014). Bilingualism and multilingualism in a globalized society, *Life Science Journal, 11*(11s), 439-443.

Kurmanali, A., Suiyerkul, B., Aitmukhametova, K., Turumbetova, Z. & Smanova, B. (2018). Analysis of the proverbs related to the lexemes" tongue/language", *Opci ón, 34*(85-2), 97-115.

Luo, C., Li, M., Peng, P. & Fan, S. (2018). How Does Internet Finance Influence the Interest Rate? Evidence from Chinese Financial Markets, *Dutch Journal of Finance and Management, 2*(1), 01.

Light, G. & Cox, R. (2001). *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education.* London: Sage Publication.

Reece, I. & Walker, S. (2000). T*eaching Training and Learning. 4th ed*. Great Britain: Business Education Publishers Limited.

Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge Falmer.

Safin, I. K., Gimranova, T. A., (Bychkova) & Kolosova, Y. I. (2016). *Specifics of teaching grammar in the bilingual education conditions. Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, Special Issue (December 2016), 111-115

Sirazieva, L. M., Fakhrutdinova, R. A. & Kamasheva, J. L. Mark Leikin, (2017). Self-Regulated Learning in Higher Education, *Revista Publicando, 13*(1), 691-699.

Tambunan, H. (2019). The Effectiveness of the Problem Solving Strategy and the Scientific Approach to Students' Mathematical Capabilities in High Order Thinking Skills, *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 14*(2), 293-302. https://doi.org/10.29333/iejme/5715