

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Кам'янець-Подільський національний університет імені Івана Огієнка
Факультет іноземної філології
Кафедра англійської мови

Дипломна робота
магістра

з теми: **«НАВЧАННЯ ГРАМАТИКИ УЧНІВ СЕРЕДНЬОЇ ШКОЛИ НА
УРОКАХ ІНОЗЕМНОЇ МОВИ В ЗАГАЛЬНООСВІТНІХ ЗАКЛАДАХ»**

Виконала: студентка 2 курсу Ang1-M22 групи
спеціальності 014.02 Середня освіта
(Мова і література (англійська))

Комарніцька Анастасія

Керівник: **Литвинюк О.М.**,
кандидат філологічних наук,
ст. викладач кафедри англійської мови

Рецензент: **Гуменюк І.І.**,
кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент кафедри англійської мови

Кам'янець-Подільський – 2023

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER I. LINGUISTIC BASIS OF GRAMMAR TEACHING.....	8
1.1. Overview of grammar teaching methods and approaches.....	8
1.2. Identifying learning challenges (form, meaning, use).....	16
1.3. Exploring grammar presentation techniques.....	20
CHAPTER II. PEDAGOGICAL BASIS OF GRAMMAR TEACHING.....	29
2.1. The role of grammar practice.....	29
2.2. Selecting and structuring grammar practice activities.....	35
2.3. The basics of task-based language teaching.....	40
2.4. CLIL approach in teaching grammar.....	46
2.5. Error correction and giving feedback.....	50
CHAPTER III. EXPERIMENTAL IMPLEMENTATION OF GRAMMAR TEACHING STRATEGIES.....	54
3.1. Implementation of grammar teaching methods at school.....	54
3.2. Practicing communicative approach while teaching grammar.....	63
CONCLUSION.....	79
REFERENCES.....	85

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CALLA – The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach

CCQs – Concept-Checking Questions

CLIL – Content and Language Integrated Learning.

CTL – Communicative Language Teaching

EFL – English as a foreign language

EMI – English as a Medium Instruction

ESL – English as a second language

FFL – Foreign language learners

GTM – Grammar-Translation Method

L1 – First language

L2 –Second Language

PPP – Present Practice Produce

TBL – Task-based learning

TBLT – Task-Based Language Teaching

INTRODUCTION

The relevance of the master degree project. Language is a developed system which makes communication possible among people. Language which provides communication among people is a developed, alive system and the fundamental function of the language is to provide information. Since communicational adequacy is to know how to use the grammar of the language in social order to reach communicational goals, it is primary of communicational adequacies [55]. Therefore the rules that take place in the functioning of the language require grammar and teaching grammar.

Grammar rules lead the individual use the language s/he can already speak in a more correct and conscious way. Besides the theories and applications that focus teaching grammar for ages in the field of language education have gained importance [47]. School firstly takes language learning in a system; then slowly implicating the rules of the language gives them the conscious to use the language according to its rules appropriately [46].

A great number of studies were carried out on the beliefs of teachers about teaching grammar, and it was seen that some of them defined it as teaching rules, some defined as a form that provide a basis for use, and some of them as a tool in expressing the meaning [1; 4]. At this point no matter what our intention is for realizing grammar teaching, this situation does not change the place and importance of grammar in language teaching. It is thought that it is not probable for students to learn and use the language well without good grammar knowledge [8].

Recent research shows that secondary schools teachers have insufficient knowledge they needed to teach it, though. Teachers' knowledge about grammar remains problematic. Why should we care about whether our teachers are well equipped to teach grammar? In the first instance, we should because they have to. It is crucial that teachers have the knowledge and confidence to support students through language acquisition.

A growing body of evidence also shows that teaching grammar may enhance students' language competences. This is because knowledge about concepts such as active and passive voice may allow for more precise and productive conversations between teachers and students about textual effects and possibilities. And it may enable students to shape their prose more consciously.

Furthermore, it is well known that teachers experience more stress than other professionals. In this context it may not be reasonable to expect them to have to independently procure and work through professional development materials in a subject area of such importance.

Our baseline argument is that when it comes to recognizing the importance of grammar, the curriculum is on point. However, the government should equip its teachers to teach it. It needs to commission research into the exact nature of the gaps in their knowledge. And it should get academic grammarians on board in developing appropriate support materials and training.

The object of the master degree project. It is the process of teaching grammar to the students of secondary school and its peculiarities.

The subject of the master degree project is methods and techniques of teaching grammar to the students of secondary school at foreign language lessons.

Aim. The purpose of this study is to determine the views of students regarding grammar learning in school secondary stage English lessons. For this general purpose it is aimed to determine the views on text based grammar teaching, grammar activities in workbook, enriching the vocabulary of the students, acquiring orthographic skills. In order to fulfil the aim, it is necessary to solve the following specific **tasks**:

- to give a review of grammar teaching issues;
- to describe those kinds of grammar acquisition problems which are employed by secondary school teachers and students;
- to characterize how grammatical items can be applied in each types of lessons at school;

- to find out how communicative method can help in order to gain efficient grammar skills;
- to investigate teachers and students' attitude toward the grammar teaching issues.

The following research methods were used to achieve the goal of the research and to solve the tasks:

- 1) theoretical: analysis of methodical, linguistic, psychological and psycholinguistic literature on the researched problem;
- 2) general scientific: analysis, generalization, systematization, classification, analogy and synthesis;
- 3) empirical: observation of the educational process at school, conversations with English language teachers, with students, collection of materials.

The structure of the master degree project. The research consists of all necessary constitutional parts: the introduction, three chapters, general conclusion and the list of references.

The theoretical significance of the master degree project lies in the analysis and generalization of the main methods of English grammar teaching in school education. There was overview of textbooks which are used at English lessons.

The practical value of the master degree project consists of the results of the research which were obtained after questioning, the exercises developed and the conclusions presented. Findings can be used in the practice of teaching English grammar.

There were 40 fifth and sixth graders from school No. 15 who took part in the empirical study in the period from 09/10/2023 to 11/01/2023 in the city of Kamianets-Podilsky. There were 10 teachers who were interviewed from the same school.

Approbation of the research. Approbation of the master degree project was conducted at 2 conferences. The first one was the bachelor and master degree students conference after the results of their scientific and research work which took place on the 4-5th April 2022 in Kamianets-Podilsky Ivan Ohienko National

university, where I presented a report “Teaching grammar to secondary school students at English lessons”. The second conference was on-line under the title The Eleventh Student International Internet Conference “Language in interdisciplinary context of life-long education” which was held on April 3-7th, 2023 and there was a publication of the article “Teaching grammar in context: determining features of approaches and methods in learning materials for secondary school students at foreign language lessons”

The structure of the research work consists of introduction, 3 chapters and conclusions.

CONCLUSION

In the theoretical part of the master degree project we have taken a closer look at relevant research in the area of study, defined grammar and shed light on its pedagogical aspects. It was investigated how grammar has historically been taught in that way showed the connections to current grammar teaching. On the practical level, we have attempted to break new ground by analyzing the books which are currently most used in Ukrainian schools, we have found out how grammar is treated and what teachers' attitudes to it are.

Moreover, we hope to have come up with evidence indicating that the type of grammar exercises and their quantity in the textbooks that are most used in the English lessons vary greatly from those activities developed by me in lesson plans.

Another objection is that the treatment of grammar in textbooks is unsystematic. Finally, through the field investigation, we have revealed that workbooks, and particularly grammar books, are rarely used in current teaching; that linguistic competence is too little emphasized in the teaching and often interpreted differently by the teachers; and that the practice of teaching grammar, both quantitatively and qualitatively, varies to a great extent from class to class. Another hypothesis which has been verified is that learners think that grammar is dull judging by comments from the learners and teachers.

This may be an ongoing shift of the teacher generation by decreasing time spent on teaching grammar explicitly and a view of grammar as a "tool", seem to be true with respect to teachers. Furthermore, other significant reasons given for not using a grammar book in addition to teachers using the material offered in the text- and workbooks are that they do not see the demand in national syllabus, the Internet offers grammar activities, the school makes the decision on behalf of the teachers, and, last but not least, there are economic reasons.

Is it right to say that Ukrainian learners today have such good English skills that grammar teaching is unnecessary? Only if grammar is considered to be merely a tool for learning a new language. But if improving and raising one's awareness of the language are seen as further goals, then explicit grammar teaching should be a

natural part of the teaching. Explicit grammar teaching helps students notice features of language (cf. consciousness-raising), including what is not possible, and it highlights contrasts between the target language and the L1. The position of grammar in today's foundation course is gaining strength, though it varies depending on the teacher's education, the learner group concerned, and the teaching material used.

Questions could be raised as to what could have been done differently and what could have been done more extensively in the practical part of the thesis. Any choice with respect to methodology is of course my own, and other researchers may have chosen to focus on other aspects. A more comprehensive comparative approach in the analysis of English books could have been interesting, e.g. comparing the grammar in the books approved by the Ministry of Education in Ukraine with a selection of books from the lower, compulsory, levels.

It might have been fruitful to do a thorough analysis of grammar books in use and thus find out to what extent the various exercises stimulate learners' grammar. Finally, carrying out a similar study after the implementation of the new syllabus and the introduction of new books should indeed be of great interest, both to sense the changes over time, and to get an idea of the status quo.

Even though it has been essential to bring forth teachers' views, the other vital party in the context of teaching and learning of grammar is definitely the learners. They were interviewed about their attitudes to grammar. Or, for the further investigation it would be more interesting to do the following: learners' written productions could be analyzed with the aim of finding out what types of grammatical mistakes are the most common, and maybe comparing the results with the syllabus and/or the textbooks' treatment of grammar. This research work has focused on linguistic competence. Sociolinguistic and discourse competence are related to the teaching and learning of grammar. One could study the extent of grammar involved in these competences and do a practical investigation connected with it.

Nevertheless, what is certain is that these and other related questions are outside the scope of this study, and are thus left for others to investigate in the future. We will try to predict the future of the teaching and learning of grammar by referring to the exiting and forthcoming syllabi and discussing a couple of major recent changes in the educational system.

Learning grammatical terminology and learning to use a monolingual dictionary are major and important steps towards increasing the learners' metalinguistic knowledge. A situation of *laissez-faire* with extended teacher autonomy can be beneficial if teachers have the necessary competence and experience, both at a theoretical level, i.e. the subject(s) they teach, and at a practical level, i.e. various teaching methodologies. If teachers manage this great task they are being given in a sensible way, both they and their students may benefit from it.

These changes are of special interest since the interviews in this research confirm differences in attitudes, teaching methods etc. according to the teachers' level of education. Thus it remains to see whether the new teacher training program will have any consequences for the teaching and learning of English grammar.

The research, which was in experimental pattern, indicates that computer based activities are effective in terms of students' superior visuality, increasing self-confidence, being for several senses. The usage of visual materials appropriate for the content of the lesson and subject make the learning concrete and permanent. Also the negative views regarding the activities are not prepared according to the children, the rules that belong to the language cannot go beyond being abstract are remarked. It was stated that with the wrong method preference the grammar skills are tried to be comprehended with an exam based approach and because of rote learning education learning is not performed exactly. At this point since a lot of teachers possess teacher based perspectives in which students participation does not exist they feel worried in terms of teaching grammar.

Since it is the student who is expected to realize learning s/he must take a more active role within the process and learning must be performed with students based approach. Not including activities regarding central tests in the workbooks is another criticism mentioned. Apart from all these views there are positive statements expressing that the activities are qualified, and they simplify grammar teaching. The attitude of constructivist approach to grammar; is to use students based teaching and learning activities that make students active. The questions in the activities given according to the text; must be such as to motivate the students, draw their attention, direct to studying, clear the subject taught in mind and develop language and mental skills. Since language skills mostly carried out through texts the grammar rules that will develop and complete language skills must be related with the text.

Within the research it was stated that the activities did not include all orthographic skill, the words of which writing is confusing were not included adequately, and from this point of view the activities must be included in the workbooks after expanding each year, test based and rote education and also the abstractness of the orthographic rules lead to learning difficulties from time to time.

It was stated that within the books existing writing mistakes cannot be accepted and the books must be prepared more attentively. Some recommendations were determined regarding the teaching orthography skills in integration, teachers' showing model behaviors, the activities' being qualified and adequate. The punctuation marks; have an important place in language education since they provide determining establishing an exact communication, simplifying the comprehension of writing, parts of speech, distinguishing inner sentence, parenthetical sentence and clause, tune, emphasis and pauses.

In the acquisition of orthography skill emphasizing the writing learning domain, the students must be let see their mistakes on the texts they write and they must be provided to learn the correct uses instead of the wrong ones. Writing the words correctly and using punctuation marks in the right places the skill of

expressing emotions and ideas by writing effectively must be acquired. If the teachers analyze the mistakes systematically they know what is learned, which strategies are used; and the students can know their weak points analyzing their mistakes.

Within the research during the training of grammar skills, which is one of the language education learning aims it was determined that there were some problems in some issues. It was stated that the reading and listening texts that take place within the course books were not appropriate for the children and they were not chosen among the qualified examples of the literature in addition these texts were not adequate at the point of teaching new words to the children.

Language education must be carried out through desirable texts for reading that reflect the rich vocabulary of our language. Also the words, which can be used in daily life, that are appropriate for every grade must be determined and through these texts the vocabulary of the child must be enhanced. To achieve this use dictionary must be encouraged and the use of the new words learned in the speaking and writing activities must be promoted. Since grammar teaching is carried out through texts the quality of the activities depends on the text. The activities must be qualified enough to reinforce the subject learned. Otherwise the teacher performs a grammar based lesson apart from the workbooks making alternative studies. This situation causes an independent grammar teaching apart from reading, listening, speaking and writing education. Whereas, grammar must be taught considering all learning competences integrated instead of seeing it as a distinct lesson.

In grammar teaching the deficiencies of the students regarding speaking and writing skills must be determined. The child, who learns word, word type and sentence structures, must be provided to learn all these correctly. In addition the usage properties of punctuation marks can be acquired together with writing skill. After examining the children's errors regarding writing and punctuation feedback must be given. The activities that take place in the workbooks regarding writing and punctuation skill must be given together and their number must be increased.

The purpose should not be raising individuals who memorize definition/example but cannot separate and apply what they learn on an independent sentence or text. Grammar teaching must be planned in a way that the child will learn actively by intuition and out of being abstract.

The results presented in this master degree project suggests that grammar teaching is still a matter of discussion when being addressed by teachers, and that even though most of the practitioners in the study see it as an important part of language teaching, it is not treated consistently properly. Since grammar instruction is viewed as a complex process, many teachers find it difficult to engage students in the class when it comes to presenting a grammar point, as well as to motivate them to construct meaningful information based on previous instruction. Therefore, teachers find themselves prompted to take the easy road and not to apply effective approaches and techniques that may help their grammar instruction be functional, which results in not obtaining the desired outcomes from students.

Moreover, the majority of the teaching experiences observed are not providing the training teachers need in order to improve their grammar instruction specifically. This paper indicates that principals and coordinators have not raised awareness among their teachers regarding grammar instruction; that is one of the reasons why the outcomes, as presented in the findings of this study, are not felt to be satisfactory and it suggests action needs to be taken to lower the lack of accuracy in grammar teaching. Lastly, although there are limitations to the outcomes of the study, the results obtained are representative of how grammar is taught in a local school in its different situational contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Acheson, K. and M. Gall. 1987. Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers. New York: Longman. (2nd. ed.) pp. 139-150.
2. Ahmed, S. & Alamin, A. (2012). The communicative approaches revisited and the relevance of teaching grammar. English Language Teaching. www.ccsenet.org/elt Vol. 5, No.1; January 2012.
3. Azar, B. (2007). Grammar-based teaching: A practitioner's perspective. TESL-EJ: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Volume 11, Number 2, September 2007.
4. Bartlett, L. 1990. Teacher development through reflective teaching. In Second Language Teacher Education. eds. J. Richards and D. Nunan. New York: Cambridge University Press.
5. Beare, K. "Grammar Chants to Learn English". Thought Co. December 30, 2014. <https://www.thoughtco.com/grammar-chants-to-learn-english-1211063> (Links to an external site.) accessed on November 1, 2022
6. Bowen, T. "Teaching approaches: task-based learning". Onestopenglish. <http://www.onestopenglish.com/methodology/methodology/teachingapproaches/teaching-approaches-task-based-learning/146502>. Accessed on November 15, 2023.
7. Brock, M., B. Yu, and M. Wong. 1992. "Journaling" together: Collaborative diary- keeping and teacher development. In Perspectives on second language teacher development. eds. J. Flowerdew, M. Brock, and S. Hsia. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong. pp. 295-307.
8. Carr, W. and S. Kemmis. 1986. Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research. London: Falmer Press.
9. Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J.M. (1994). The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive-academic language learning approach. Reading: MA: Addison Wesley.

10. Corzo, C. C. (2013). Formal grammar instruction: theoretical aspects to contemplate its teaching. *PROFILE: Issues in Teachers' Development*. ISSN 1657-0790 (printed), 2256-5760 (online). Vol. 15, No. 2, October 2013.
11. Cuéllar, M. T. A. (2013). Process writing and the development of grammatical competence. *HOW, A Colombian Journal for Teachers of English*. ISSN 0120-5927. October 2013, pp. 11-35.
12. Day, C. 1993. Reflection: A necessary but not sufficient condition for teacher development. *British Educational Research Journal*, 19, 1, pp. 83-93.
13. DeCarrico, J., D. Larsen-Freeman (2002) Grammar. In: Schmitt, N. (ed.) *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. London: Arnold.
14. Dewey, J. 1933. *How we think*. In *Mental Discipline in Modern Education*. ed. W. Kolesnick. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
15. Edge, Julian, et. al. (2000) "When and how should I correct my students?"
16. Edge, Julian. (1989) *Mistakes and Correction*. Harlow: Pearson.
17. Fanselow, J. 1987. *Breaking rules*. New York: Longman. Farrell, T. 1995. Second language teaching: Where are we and where are we going? An interview with Jack Richards. *Language Teaching: The Korea TESOL Journal*, 3, 3, pp.94-5.1996.
18. Fearn, L. & Farnan, N. (2007). When is a verb? Using functional grammar to teach writing. *Journal of Basic Writing*. Vol. 26, No. 1, 2007.
19. Feng, Zhiwen (2013). Functional grammar and its implications for English teaching and learning. *English Language Teaching*. ISSN 1916-4742, E-ISSN 1916-4750. Vol. 6, no. 10.
20. Francis, D. 1995. The reflective journal: A window to preservice teachers' knowledge. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 2, pp. 229-241.
21. Fuller, F. 1970. Personalized education for teachers: An introduction for teacher educators, Report No. 001. Austin, Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

22. Golby, M. and R. Appleby. 1995. Reflective practice through critical friendship: Some possibilities. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 25, 2, pp. 149-160.
23. Gore, J. and Zeichener, K. 1991. Action research and reflective teaching in preservice teacher education: A case study from the United States. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7, pp. 119-136.
24. Hatton, N. and D. Smith. 1995. Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11, 1, pp. 33-39.
25. http://www.eltnews.com/columns/thinktank/2000/05/when_and_how_should_i_correct.html Accessed on 1 December 2022.
26. <https://eltguide.com/9-techniques-for-presenting-grammar/>
27. Killon, J. and G. Todnew. 1991. A process of personal theory building. *Educational Leadership*, 48, 6, pp. 14-16.
28. Kong, N. (2011). Establishing a comprehensive English teaching pattern combining the communicative teaching method and the grammar-translation method. *English Language Teaching*. www.ccsenet.org/elt Vol. 4, No. 1; March 2011.
29. Lange, D. 1990. A blueprint for a teacher development program. In *Second Language Teacher Education*. eds. J. Richards, and D. Nunan. New York: Cambridge University Press.
30. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003) *Teaching Language: From Grammar to Gramming*. Boston: Heinle.
31. Li, Z. & Song, M. (2007). The relationship between traditional English grammar teaching and communicative language teaching. *US-China Education Review*. ISSN1548-6613, USA. Volume 4, No. 1 (Serial No. 26), Jan. 2007.
32. Long, M. (2015) *Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching*. Malden: WileyBlackwell.

33. McFee, G. 1993. Reflections on the nature of action-research. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 23, 2, pp. 173-183.
34. Mohan, B. (1986). "Language and content." Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
35. Myhill, D. (2005). Ways of knowing: writing with grammar in mind. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*. December. 2005, Volume 4, Number 3, pp. 77-96.
36. Nias, J. 1987. Learning from difference: A collegial approach to change. In *Educating Teachers*, ed. J. Smyth. Barcombe: The Falmer Press.
37. Nunan, D. (2013) *Research Methods in Language Learning* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 246 p.
38. Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
39. Nunan, D. (1998) "Teaching Grammar in Context". In: *ELT Journal*, 52/2, 101-109.
40. O'Malley, J.M., & Valdez Pierce, L. (1996). "Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers." New York: Addison Wesley.
41. Oxford, R. (1990). "Language learning strategies. What every teacher should know." Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
42. Oxford, R. (1996). "Language learning strategies around the world. Cross-cultural perspectives." Manoa: University of Hawaii Press.
43. Peng, Y. (2017). A survey of grammar instruction from scholastic perspective. *English language teaching*. ISSN 1916-4742, E-ISSN 1916-4750, Vol. 10, No. 5; 2017.
44. Pennington, M. 1992. Reflecting on teaching and learning: A development focus for the second language classroom. In *Perspectives on Second Language Classroom Teacher Education*. eds. J. Flowerdew, M. Brock, and S. Hsia. Kowloon: City Polytechnic of Hong Kong. 52 ---. 1995. The teacher change cycle. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 4, pp. 705-731.

45. Peregoy, S.F., & Boyle, O.F. (2001). "Reading, writing, and learning in ESL." New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
46. Rättyä, K. (2013). Linguaging and visualisation method for grammar teaching: a conceptual change theory perspective. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*. December, 2013, Volume 12, Number 3, pp. 87-101.
47. Richards, J. 1990. Beyond training: Approaches to teacher education in language teaching. *Language Teacher*, 14, 2, pp. 3-8.
48. Russell, J., Spada, N. (2006) The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. In: Norris, J., Ortega, L. *Synthesizing Research on Language Teaching and Learning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 133-164.
49. Scarcella, R., & Oxford, R. (1992). "The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom." Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
50. Schon, D. A. 1983. *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books. – 1987. *Educating the reflection practitioner: Towards a new design for teaching and learning in the profession*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Publishers.
51. Schulman, L. 1987. Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, pp. 1- 22.
52. Singaravelu, G. (2014). Impact of gadget based learning of grammar in English at standard II. *i-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*. Vol. 4, No. 2, April-June 2014.
53. Stephen Krashen *Explorations in Language Acquisition and Use* (Heinemann 2003).
54. Tedick, Diane J. (1998) "Research on Error Correction and Implications for Classroom Teaching". In: *The Bridge, From Research to Practice*, University of Minnesota
<http://carla.umn.edu/immersion/acie/vol1/Bridge1.3.pdf> Accessed on 15 December 2022.

55. Thakur, V. S. (2015). Using supplementary materials in the teaching of English: pedagogic scope and applications. *English Language Teaching*. ISSN 1916-4742, E-ISSN 1916-4750. Vol. 8, No. 12; 2015.
56. Thornbury, S. "R is for Repetition". *An A-Z of ELT*. December 5,
57. Thornbury, S. (1999) *How to Teach Grammar*. Harlow: Pearson.
58. Ur, P. 1983. Teacher learning. In *Building on strength. 2. The proceedings of the ACTA/ ATESOL (NSW) National Conference and 8th Summer School*. Sydney, Australia: ATESOL, NSW.
59. Willis, D. (2010). "Doing Task-Based Teaching". In: *International House Journal of Education and Development*, Issue 28. <http://ihjournal.com/doing-task-based-teaching-2>. Accessed on March 8, 2023.
60. Willis, D. J. Willis (2007). *Doing Task-Based Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
61. Willis, J. (1996). *A flexible framework for task-based learning*. Oxford: Addison Wesley Longman.
62. Willis, J. "Making time for task and still covering the syllabus". *Teaching English*. July 2008. <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/making-time-tasks-still-coveringsyllabus>. Accessed on November 15, 2023.
63. Zeichner, K. and O. Liston (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *HER*, 57, 1, pp. 22-48.