

РІВНЕНСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ ГУМАНІТАРНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ФАКУЛЬТЕТ ІНОЗЕМНОЇ ФІЛОЛОГІЇ
КАФЕДРА ПРАКТИКИ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ



АКТУАЛЬНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ СУЧАСНОЇ ІНОЗЕМНОЇ ФІЛОЛОГІЇ

СТУДЕНТСЬКИЙ НАУКОВИЙ ВІСНИК

PHILOLOGY



**РІВНЕНСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ ГУМАНІТАРНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ФАКУЛЬТЕТ ІНОЗЕМНОЇ ФІЛОЛОГІЇ
КАФЕДРА ПРАКТИКИ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ**

**АКТУАЛЬНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ СУЧАСНОЇ ІНОЗЕМНОЇ
ФІЛОЛОГІЇ**

Студентський науковий вісник



Рівне – 2019

УДК 81'243

А 43

Актуальні проблеми сучасної іноземної філології: Студентський науковий вісник. – Рівне: РДГУ, 2019. – 202 с.

Редакційна колегія:

Михальчук Н.О., доктор психологічних наук, завідувач кафедри практики англійської мови, РДГУ;

Воробйова І.А., кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри практики англійської мови, РДГУ.

Рецензент:

Воробйова Л.М., кандидат філологічних наук, професор кафедри теорії та історії світової літератури РДГУ.

Упорядник випуску:

Воробйова І.А., кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри практики англійської мови, РДГУ.

Розглянуто й затверджено на засіданні кафедри практики англійської мови РДГУ (протокол № 4 від 11.04.2019).

Затверджено та рекомендовано до друку на засіданні Вченої ради РДГУ (протокол № 4 від 25.04.2019 р.)

(с) РДГУ, 2019

DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO TEACHING GRAMMAR: INDUCTIVE, DEDUCTIVE, LEXICAL APPROACHES

In fact, there are distinguished an extensive range of different approaches to teaching grammar including the most disputable which are inductive, deductive and lexical approaches

The aim of the article is to make profound analysis of the main principals of different approaches to teaching grammar: inductive deductive and lexical approaches.

The deductive (rule-driven, top-down) 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. When we use deduction, we reason from general to specific principles.

The deductive approach enters the deductive reasoning. In fact, Aristotle started documenting deductive reasoning in the 4th century BC [4, 15].

The deductive approach may refer to a traditional style in grammar teaching because grammatical structures or rules are dictated to students first, a more effective and time saving way under certain circumstances just like teaching a monolingual class.

The deductive approach in grammar teaching is a more teacher-cantered comparing to inductive instruction. This means that the teacher introduces the students a new concept, explains it, and then has the students practice using the concept. According to some researchers (S.Krashen and J.Staatsen) [6, 10], “The deductive method is often criticized because:

1. it teaches grammar in an isolated way;
2. little attention is paid to meaning;
3. practice is often mechanical” [6, 11].

J.Staatsen states that the deductive approach may not be used practically because the inductive approach usually has the most desired learning outcomes [15, 400]. On the other hand, in her study comparing the deductive and inductive approach in teaching foreign languages, P. Shaffer concludes that there is not a clear distinction between the effectiveness of both approaches: “This offers strong evidence against the notion that an inductive approach should not be used for difficult structures” [15, 400].

R.Dekeyser delivers that deductive means that the rules are given before any examples are seen; inductive means that the rules are inferred from examples presented first. Implicit means that no rules are formulated; explicit means that rules are formulated (either by the teacher or the students, either before or after examples/practice) [5].

According to C.Brown, deductive and inductive reasoning are polarized. In deductive reasoning, the learners are moved from a general to definite instances, this means specific frameworks are inferred or deduced from a general principle. Whereas inductive reasoning refers to the fact that a learner stores a number of specific instances and induces a general law or rule or conclusion with the help of these instances [5].

M.Eisenstein [1] suggests that with the deductive approach, the control of the teacher over the learners increases and so learners may have less fear to produce incorrect structures related to how the target language is functioning.

In general, the advantages of the deductive approach are as following:

1. It respects the intelligence and maturity of many and acknowledges the role of cognitive processes in language acquisition.
2. It confirms many students’ expectations about classroom learning, particularly for those learners who have an analytical learning style.
3. It allows the teacher to deal with language points as they come up, rather than prepare for them in advance [14, 16].

In general, the disadvantages of the deductive approach are summarized by K.Chalipa as following [9, 40]:

1. “Starting the lesson with a grammar presentation may be off-putting for some students, especially younger ones. They may not have sufficient met language (for example, the language used to talk about language such as grammar terminology). Or they may not be able to understand the concepts involved.
2. Grammar explanation encourages a teacher-fronted, transmission-style classroom; teacher explanation is often at the expense of student involvement and interaction.
3. Explanation is seldom as memorable as other forms of presentation, such as demonstration.
4. Such an interesting approach encourages the belief that learning a language is simply a case of knowing the rules” [9, 64].

According to M.Stern, “In inductive (example-driven, bottom-up) teaching the teacher gives students the data and lets students draw their own conclusions from the data. The students notice how the concept is used and figure out, and verbalize the rule” [2, 10]. On the other hand, M. Stern gave a figure which showed about this method.

Inductive instruction emerged from “inductive reasoning, cognitive development and constructivist epistemology which was first used by Jean Piaget in 1967” [2, 12]. The origins of inductive grammar instruction can be traced back to a couple of centuries. According to J.Hammerly, even in the sixteenth century, and probably earlier, deductive instruction was criticized for producing learners “who knew about the language but could not speak it” [6, 8]. The reaction against the grammar translation method started in the nineteenth century and moved on to the twentieth century, which mostly advocated total induction in the form of direct method.

In the book “How to teach grammar” S.Thornburry [8, 5] said that inductive approach is often correlated with direct method and natural approach in English teaching. In both methods, grammar is presented in such way the learners experience it. “In direct method, therefore the rules of the language are supposedly acquired out of the experience of understanding and representing examples which have been systematically graded for difficulty and put into a clear context” [13, 5].

In the case of pedagogical grammar, most experts assure that the inductive approach can also be called rule-discovery learning. It suggests that a teacher teaches grammar starting with presenting some examples of sentences. In this sense, learners understand grammatical rules from the examples [4, 21].

The inductive approach starts with subjecting students to examples of language use, engaging them to use target language, and then encouraging students to generalize the rules deduced [9, 46].

The advantages of the inductive approach are:

1. It develops cognitive intelligence which involves the ability to reason, solve problems, comprehend complex ideas and learn from experience.
2. Students are deeply involved in the learning process. They are likely to be more attentive and motivated.
3. This approach is focused on improving problem-solving abilities.
4. It improves the level of self-reliance and encourages learner’s autonomy.

In general the disadvantages of the inductive approach are:

1. The students’ may be misled into believing that the rules are the objective of language learning, rather than means.
2. It takes too much time. The time taken to work out a rule may decrease an ability to put the rule to some sort of productive practice.
3. Students may hypothesis the wrong rule.
4. It requires heavy demands on teachers in planning a lesson. They need to put a lot of afford trying to select and organize the data carefully so as to guide learners to an accurate formulation of the rule, while also ensuring the data is intelligible.
5. An inductive approach confuses and disappoints students who, by dint of their personal learning style or their past learning experience (or both), would prefer simply to be told the rule.

From a student's perspective, an inductive approach enables him/her to think more before formulating some precise ideas about a language item. Learning acquisition should be voluntary. An inductive approach will give students more thinking opportunities than a deductive approach. In addition to this through an inductive approach to learning, students can have various answers throughout peer interactions and independent thinking.

The inductive approach represents more modern style of teaching where the new grammatical structures or rules are presented to the students in a real language context. The students learn the use of the structure through practice of the language in context, and later realize the rules from the practical examples. For instance, if the structure to be presented is the comparative form, the teacher would begin the lesson by drawing a figure on the board and saying: This is Steve. He is tall. Then, the teacher would draw another taller figure next to the first saying: This is Bill. He is taller than Jim. The teacher would then provide the students with many examples and items from the classroom or anything within the normal daily life, to create an understanding of the use of the structure. The students repeat after the teacher, after each of the different examples, and eventually practise the structures meaningfully in groups or pairs. S. Rivers and J. Temperley state that according to this approach, "... the teacher's role is to provide meaningful contexts to encourage demonstration of the rule, while the students evolve the rules from the examples of its use and continued practice" [13, 24].

There are such stages of an inductive lesson:

1. Setting the context.
2. Noticing / establishing the grammar rule.
3. Controlled practice.
4. Freer practice (production) [3].

Inductive language teaching provides opportunities for students' cognitive learning through discussion, discovery and finally understanding. Thus, language study arises out of extensive skills work [3].

The principles of the lexical approach have been around since M. Lewis published "The Lexical Approach" in 1993 [10, 13]. The theoretical background of language teaching is characterized by the claims that many writers laid more emphasis on lexis than has formally been the case in question. R. Carter and S. McCarthy state that: "There have been changing trends – from grammar translation to direct method to the communicative approach – but none of these has emphasized the importance of the learner's lexical competence over structural grammatical competence" [7, 22].

Grammar has been the basis of language teaching for so long because there are a limited number of essential structures. The lexical approach is based on the idea that language is made up of other structural elements besides what we traditionally think of as grammar.

Using the lexical approach requires the investigation of written and spoken language in order to notice structures which are often ignored as they do not fall into the categories determined by the traditional understanding of grammar. The idea is that the students become aware of the structural nature of the language beyond the traditional grammar structures. Once they have some awareness of how language is chunked together, they are more likely to notice how a particular lexical chunk is structured.

Referring to the importance of lexis over grammar, R. Lewis states that "The more one considers the matter, the more reasonable it seems to suppose that lexis is where we need to start from, the syntax to be put to the service of words and not the other way round" [10, 7].

In fact, these ideas are basically different from the position usually taken by language learning which involves the control over the structure of language and vocabulary control should be kept to the minimum. Even, at the present time, many textbooks are designed in accordance with this minimal view of vocabulary. The linguists in Britain accepted this point of view that vocabulary mastery should be less emphasized, unlike to J. Wilkins, who was the first to stress the importance of the vocabulary role in language teaching, and who stated that "...without grammar very little can be conveyed; without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed" [10, 9].

In his new role of lexis, M. Lewis [11, 41] proposed the following major points:

1. Lexis is the basis of language.

2. Lexis is misunderstood in language teaching because of the assumption that grammar is the core of language and that the control over the structured system is a must for effective communication.

3. The key principle of a lexical approach is that "... a language consists of grammaticalized lexis, not lexicalized grammar" [11].

4. One of the central organizing principles of any-meaning-centered syllabus should be lexis.

The lexical approach to second language teaching has received interest in recent years as an alternative one to grammar-based approaches. The lexical approach puts emphasis on developing the learner's competency in lexis, or word and word-combinations. It focuses on the idea that an important part of language mastery is the ability to comprehend and produce lexical phrases as unanalyzed wholes, or chunks and that these chunks become the raw data by which learners perceive patterns of language traditionally thought of as grammar. Instruction focuses on relatively fixed expressions that occur frequently in spoken language, such as, "I'm sorry", "I didn't mean to make you jump" or "That will never happen to me" [11, 45], rather than on traditionally created sentences. In particular, lexical phrases were seen as a productive resource for learners, helping in the production, comprehension and necessary analytical reflection on the forms and meanings of the target language. The lexical fields represent knowledge in a language, but there is much more to vocabulary than simple lists of words, nouns or verbs.

M.Lewis is of the view that vocabulary cannot be differentiated from grammar. S.Nattinger and R. de Carrico consider a lexical phrase or a chunk as "a lexico-grammatical unit which exists somewhere between the traditional poles of lexicon and syntax". Lewis advocates that every word has its own grammar and it is not suggestible to create a distinction between vocabulary and grammar. Instead of viewing language as simply words and grammar, he suggests that language be viewed as consisting of multi-word chunks. He states that language acquisition is faster when it is learnt in chunks rather than in isolated individual words [12, 75].

The lexical approach can be summarized as in the following account: language includes not only traditional grammatical rules, but also certain multi-word prefabricated chunks. The teachers, using the lexical approach will not analyze the target language in the classroom, but will be more inclined to concentrate learner's attention upon these chunks. This new approach is considered as a serious attempt at re-evaluation of the individual teacher and the profession.

The lexical approach consists of three main types of chunks [16, 76]:

- Collocations: words of the four main parts of speech which go together, usually, but not always, two words. For example: *take in, first time, little bit*.
- Fixed expressions: expressions which cannot be changed or can only be changed minimally. Most fixed expressions are idiomatic or are those used in polite speech (e.g., *How's it going?*). For instance: *take the bull by the horns*.
- Semi-fixed expressions: expressions which have at least one slot into which a number of different words or phrases can be inserted. For example: *It didn't take the..., Have you taken into account*.

Teaching grammar is a quite demanding process which can be represented differently. There are three main approaches broadly used while teaching grammar, such as: deductive, inductive and lexical. All of them have their own peculiarities. Deductive approach is when the grammar instruction occurs from general to specific. Inductive approach is when the teacher conducts the grammatical teaching from specific to general. Lexical approach focuses on learning and working with lexical chunks and the grammar is not of any importance.

In our further researches, there will be proposed effective ways and activities to introduce different grammar materials basing on one of the approaches in secondary school.

REFERENCES

1. Brckalo B. Model of Teaching Grammar Based on Applying of an Inductive-Deductive Procedure / B.Brckalo // The Modern Language Journal. – 2010. – №12. – P. 9.

2. Chi H.H. Examining the Effectiveness of Adopting an Inductive Approach to the Teaching of English Grammar / H.H.Chi // Ning Po College. – 2010. – P. 24.
3. Discovering Grammar [Electronic resource]. – URL: http://elt.dinternal.com.ua/index.php?route=product/product&product_id=181.
4. Handoyo P.W. Approaches and Procedures for Teaching Grammar / P.W.Handoyo // English Teaching: Practice and Critique. – Politeknik Negeri Jember: State Polytechnic of Jember, 2006. – P. 122-141.
5. How to teach Grammar [Electronic resource]. – URL: <http://www2.vobs.at/ludescher/pdf%20files/grammar.pdf>.
6. Ingemarsson R. Speaking about Grammar English Teachers' Perspective on Inductive and Deductive Teaching in Upper Secondary Education / R.Ingemarsson. – 2017. – 22 p.
7. Jameel Q.H. The Lexical Approach between Grammar and Lexis: Theory and Practice / Q.H.Jameel. // University of Basrah. – 2008. – №2. – P. 9-33.
8. Ke Z. An Inductive Approach to English Grammar Teaching / Z.Ke // HKBU Papers in Applied Language Studies. – 2008. – №12. – P. 1-18.
9. KÜBRA Ş. Using Inductive or Deductive Methods in Teaching Grammar to Adult Learners of English / Ş.Kübra. – Arabic, 2014. – 130 p.
10. Lackman K. Lexical Approach Activities / K.Lackman. – London: Commercial Colour Press, 2014. – 75 p.
11. Lewis M. The Lexical Approach / Lewis. – London: Commercial Colour Press, 1993. – 213 p.
12. Nguyen H.T. The Use of Lexical Approach in Enhancing Learners' oral Communication Performance at Nguyen Hue University / H.T.Nguyen, B.N.Nguyen // Journal of Science Ho Chi Minh City Open University. – 2014. – №2. – P. 72-80.
13. Nusrat M.K. An Observation on Teaching Grammar Using Inductive Method / M. K. Nusrat. – East Java: BRAC University, 2014. – 135 p.
14. Pajunen N. M. Deductive and Inductive Approaches in Teaching Singular and Plural Nouns in English / N.Pajunen. – 2007. – №4. – 25 p.
15. Shaffer C. A Comparison of Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching Foreign Languages / C.Shaffer // The Modern Language Journal. – 2011. – №73. – P. 395-403.
16. The Use of Lexical Approach in Enhancing Learners' Oral Communication Performance at Nguyen Hue university // NGUYEN HUE University. – 2014. – №4. – P. 72-80.

Науковий керівник: канд. пед. наук, доцент Богачик М.С.

Yulia Kolibek

*Rivne State University of Humanities
Rivne*

TEACHING THE TECHNIQUE OF READING OF ENGLISH IN SECONDARY SCHOOL

Foreign language is a specific subject of study, because the language is the soul of a nation. It reflects the national character, the system of social relations, traditions. Foreign language is an important means of communication between peoples, a better acquaintance with the culture of the country whose language is studied.

Indeed, modern life convincingly proves that knowledge of foreign languages is one of the most important skills that a person of the twenty-first century must have.

ЗМІСТ

ФОНЕТИЧНА, ЛЕКСИЧНА ТА ГРАМАТИЧНА СИСТЕМИ МОВИ І МЕТОДИ ЇХ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ	4
Желуденко М.О., Коваленко М.С.....	4
Кондратюк Д.Г.	5
Лаптева А.В.....	7
Anna Prykhodko.....	10
Стецюк О.М.....	14
Христин І.В.	17
Хром'як М.М.	19
Шевченко І.С.	23
Яблонська О.В.	27
ТЕОРІЯ І ПРАКТИКА ПЕРЕКЛАДУ	31
Горбенко К.С.	31
Liudmyla Diakovska	33
Дудкіна Н.В.....	35
Кононова В.С.....	40
Кривко Ю.А.	42
Кривоносова М.І.....	47
Кривоносова Т.І.....	49
Лазаренко В.С.....	51
Ніколенко К.В.....	53
Петрікеєва О.	55
Плоскіна К.О.....	58
Yana Riabokon.....	61
Цинтарюк А.А.	63
АКТУАЛЬНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВА	66
Зузак І.Ю.	66
Фуштор В.І.....	69
НОВІТНІ МЕТОДИКИ НАВЧАННЯ ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ.....	75
Vira Bohdan	75
Alla Velykodna, Olena Nazarenko.....	78
Веремчук М.О.....	83
Гапонюк О.А., Терещенко Т.В.....	85
Голота А.В.	87
Anastasiia Horenchuk	90
Olha Dyshchakovska.....	92
Iryna Yezerska.....	95

Olena Yerzhykevych	97
Iryna Zaiets	103
Anastasiia Ihnatieva	108
Yulia Kolibek	112
Hanna Kononchuk	115
Svitlana Kudliak	119
Kateryna Kuzmych	124
Лаврик В.В.	128
Myroslava Liashkevych	133
Anastasiia Mazurova	138
Olesia Mazurok	141
Viktoriiia Markovska	145
Iryna Mudryk	146
Ivanna Nedbailo	151
Olha Pavlosiuk	154
Iryna Pavliuk	158
Valeriiia Parfeniuk	162
Nataliia Pylnieva	164
Поліщук А.І., Терещенко Т.В.	167
Посільський Д.В.	170
Khrystyna Prytula	175
Середюк Л.А., Зуй Ю.В.	179
Yuliia Storozhynska	181
Сьомик І.М., Терещенко Т.В.	183
Тимощук М.В.	185
Ткачук Ю.С.	187
Фай Т.М.	190
Oksana Filipchuk	192
Ivanna Khomyshyn	194
Olha Tsiuman	195
Victoria Shymanska	196
ЗМІСТ	200

СТУДЕНТСЬКИЙ НАУКОВИЙ ВІСНИК

АКТУАЛЬНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ СУЧАСНОЇ ІНОЗЕМНОЇ ФІЛОЛОГІЇ

Відповідальний за підготовку збірника до видання *Воробйова І.А.*

Комп'ютерна верстка *Воробйова І.А.*