

Teaching English determiners through a Contrasting Approach to speakers of L1 language with no determiners

Rosemeen Mohiyoddin Shaikh
Supervisor: Dr. Isabel Oltra-Massuet
Universitate Rovira i Virgili University
(Tarragona, Spain)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to develop a new teaching plan through a contrastive approach to teach English language determiners to the speakers of a determinerless L1. The study seeks to answer the research question - Is teaching and learning English grammar through the proposed grammar teaching lesson plan helps to minimize fossilized errors in learning English grammar to the speakers of determinerless L1. The goal of the study is to design a communicative approach to teach English language determiners to speakers of determinerless L1. In addition, this study provides some important suggestions for EFL/ESL teachers and curriculum makers in order to enhance English Grammar in the EFL/ESL classroom. Further, I interviewed twenty five English language teachers of India and examined a few English language grammar books and textbooks used in India to teach English Language at schools to know their method of teaching English language grammar. Moreover, I have also searched the Web to find those websites that teach English language grammar online.

Keywords: determiners, English grammar, EFL/ESL classroom, communicative language teaching approach.

1. INTRODUCTION

As pointed out in Crystal (1997, 2003), the English language has attained the position of a global language. In India, the English language serves as a language of wider communication among people (Kachru 1986), and it is displacing local languages, so that registers, such as the international business, science and technology communities have started connecting only through English (Swales 1997). It has now become a vital language of international cooperation at the United Nations and the European Union (Mc Arthur 1998); also for international communication and business (Hyrkstedt and Kalaja 1998), as well as for local commerce and media in such countries as India and Kenya (Kachru and Nelson 2001). Further, due to the globalization, English has emerged as a global common language which makes it a very important tool for any country to develop its international relations and growth. Although, English is not L1 in most of the countries, but nowadays due to its growing importance it is being taught as an L2, L3 or foreign language; it is also essential to teach English grammar using a communicative approach by developing an efficient

lesson plan in which learners are actively engaged in the learning process rather than teaching grammar using the traditional method. As pointed out in Chang (2011:14) “the communicative approach makes language teaching as in real-world situation”. In contrast, The traditional method primarily uses the technique where students do not get enough opportunity to practice and actively involve in learning and this leads to rote memorization by the students and hence, they do not remember it for the long-term due to lack of practical and correct use of the target grammar topics.

In addition, it is difficult to learn determiners of the English language when L1 grammar has no determiners.

Considering Hindi and other South Asian Languages, Swan and Smith (2001:237), pointed out that South Asian languages including Hindi have no definite article and only the number *one* is used instead of the indefinite. In Hindi the number *one* is used instead of *a* and *an*, for example, *a banana* is said as *ek kela* ‘one banana’ in Hindi. Consequently, confusions occurs to use determiners in the English language, where learners often omit the articles, especially *the*, or substitute *one* for the indefinite article.

In addition, The National Curriculum Framework (2005) of India stresses to teach only reading and writing skills of the English language and does not even mention the knowledge of grammar. This kind of ignorance of the L2 grammar causes fossilized errors in the process of L2 learning. According to Selinker (1972) where L2 learners fail to reach the target language competence or they stop acquiring the knowledge of L2, it causes obstacles in using the L2 is called as fossilization. To avoid these kinds of fossilized errors, Cately (2012) suggests three stages to be considered while teaching L2, those are - reflection, correction and raising awareness. This process of getting rid of from fossilized errors is called as defossilization. I believe these stages play an important role to avoid fossilization and hence, I am proposing a lesson plan using the communicative language teaching approach and the Presentation Practice Production (PPP) method to teach English grammar to the speakers of the determinerless language in order to avoid their fossilized errors while using English determiners.

Furthermore, while discussing about second language acquisition, the linguist, Mukattash (1986) proposed that certain error types are not susceptible to being defossilized. Tanaka (2000) contends, however, that perhaps fossilization can be remedied if a consciousness- raising approach was used, and Brown (1994) argues that fossilization could be reversed and should not be viewed as some sort of terminal illness. According to Han & Selinker (1999), fossilization is irreversible. However, Johnson (2002) argues and suggests to find out the reasons of fossilization occurrence, so that we would understand foreign language acquisition process better and we may prevent its occurrence by finding out the solutions. Likewise, Wangdong (2005) suggested that the language researcher needs to discover how to prevent the occurrence of fossilized errors in learners individual interlanguage. He also added that the language teacher must have a goal to prevent the occurrence of fossilization rather than to defossilize existing errors.

Hence, I would like to suggest that the English language teachers must teach and explain grammar, raise grammar awareness and conduct sessions with an effective

teaching method so that students can learn the grammar of the English language without fossilization. This way there will be no issue about fossilization and de-fossilization in the ESL/EFL classroom.

2. JUSTIFICATION

Why teaching grammar (determiners) through The CLT Approach is necessary for the ESL/ EFL classroom:

While discussing the Communicative Language Teaching approach, Howatt (1984) mentioned that the CLT approach stresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to use English for communicative purposes and attempts to integrate such activities into a wider program of language teaching. Whereas, Howatt (1984) mentioned the Communicative Language Teaching approach provides opportunities for the learners to use English language for communicative purpose. Similarly, Chang (2011:16) added, “according to the communicative approach, teaching and learning are for communication. It presupposes that language always occurs in a social context, and it should not be divorced from its context when it is being taught”. Learning in order to communicate is now commonplace.

Moreover, Liu & Shi (2007) mentioned, American and British proponents observe the communicative approach's aims:

- (i) To make communicative competence as the goal of language teaching
- (ii) To develop procedures for the teaching of the four language skills.

In addition, Larsen-Freeman (1986) stated the role of a teacher is as the active facilitator of her/his student's learning in the Communicative Language Teaching Approach.

Furthermore, it is believed that learning occurs as learners are actively involved in a process of meaning and knowledge construction as opposed to passively receiving information. Learners are the makers of meaning and knowledge. Hence, teaching through the Communicative Approach is always advantageous in the EFL/ESL Classroom.

3. ELITERATURE RVIEW

Yamada and Matsura's study (1982) found that Japanese students' use English articles randomly and most of the time they don't use it at all due to the influence of their L1. Further, Kachru (1976) added that article use in Indian English is missing and dispossessed articles. The use of article *a*, *an*, and *the* in Indian English provide a good example of the grammar of Indian English Shekhar and Hegde (1996). Similarly, Agnihotri, Khanna and Mukherjee (1984), Lukmani (1992), Jacob (1998) pointed out that Indian English speakers tend to delete English articles and in some cases drop where necessary and add where not necessary. This mainly happens because of the absence of the article system in Indian languages, i.e. Hindi, Urdu, Marathi, Gujarathi, Punjabi, Tamil, Telugu, Bengali, Kannada, Malayalam, Odia, Assami etc. In addition, Rinnert and Hansen (1986) mentioned that article is not only a problem for

determinerless L1 speakers, but this is also a problem of those who's L1 has determiner but the use of determiner is not similar as the English language. They also added that all EFL/ESL textbooks have included articles, but only a few books have used a systematic approach or enough exercises are given to practice the grammar. They also suggested that teachers perceived the need for a better understanding of the system and many advanced learners have requested help with articles. Thus, I believe a systematic approach to teaching English articles has a significant, although limited place in EFL/ESL pedagogy.

Furthermore, Agnihotri, Khanna and Mukherjee (1984) point out that some teachers do not make the distinction clear and what the students are generally taught is just that *an* is used before the letters *a, e, i, o, u*. In addition, in teaching the definite article *the*, teachers generally concentrate on specification due to the use of superlative degree or retrospective reference. Leech and Svartvik (2003) suggested to EFL/ESL teachers that while teaching determiners in the EFL/ESL Classroom, teachers should explain that the use of *a* and *an* depends on pronunciation, not on spelling for instance, we use *a* before a consonant sound and *an* before a vowel sound.

Moreover, Kannan (2009) stated about the Indian students that they learn basic grammar only for passing the exams and their aim is not to face any real life situations. He also added that Application-oriented advanced grammar is not taught in the schools and the Examination system does not stress on testing student's analytical and creative skills, in this process, students only memorize lessons and reproduce them in exams it leads to rote memorization rather than learning the language for a communication purpose. Furthermore, after closely examining few English language textbooks and grammar books of Indian regional boards (Maharashtra, Tamilnadu) and National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT), I found out that a very short introduction of determiners and few exercises are given for the use of determiners. In addition, I have also asked twenty five Indian English language teachers about their methods of teaching determiners and learnt that teachers give only a short introduction of determiners as given in the grammar books and explain it with examples.

However, as the researchers mentioned above, highlights only about the problems in teaching, learning and usage of articles in English language by the non-native English language learners. In fact, neither the researchers nor the textbooks and grammar books offer exercise based on the communicative approach. Whereas, there is a need of a lesson plan and teaching technique that efficiently solves all the problems mentioned by the researchers mentioned above and includes communicative approach.

4. HYPOTHESIS

- 1) Raising awareness of determiners for speakers of determinerless L1 in the EFL/ESL Classroom.

5. GOALS

- 1) To analyze the problems posed in teaching determiners to speakers of determinerless languages.

- 2) To make a proposed grammar teaching lesson plan using the combination of communicative language teaching approach and the PPP method to teach the English grammar in the EFL/ESL classroom.
- 3) To test the proposed lesson plan on experimental group and control group to check its efficiency in order to raise grammar awareness in speakers of determinerless L1.

6. METHOD

This research study aims to find a communicative approach grammar teaching lesson plan in the EFL/ESL Classroom for nonnative speakers of the English language in order to avoid de-fossilization in English as second language learning. I have searched few English language textbooks and grammar books which are referred to teach English

grammar in the Indian English language classroom, they are as follows–

- i) Vikas Golden Grammar Book: 1 (page no: 10)
- ii) Vikas Golden Grammar Book: 4 (page no: 21)
- iii) English textbook, standard 6: term 1 (page no: 80)
- iv) The New Grammar Tree: class 7 (page no: 48)
- v) English Course Communicative: Interact in English for class x (page no: 161)
- vi) Marigold Textbook in English for class v (page no: 143)
- vii) Honeycomb Textbook in English for class vii (page no: 67)
- viii) Honeydew Textbook in English for class viii (page no: 18-19)
- ix) First flight Textbook in English for class x (page no: 25)
- x) Kaleidoscope Textbook in English (Elective) for class xii (page no: 189)

Furthermore, I have also examined the following online course materials from the web:

- 1) Meritnation website for Std X -
(http://www.meritnation.com/tamilnadu/class10/studymaterial/english-grammar/english-grammar/13_10_7_182)
- 2) LearnNext: Online course material for Std IX –
(<http://www.learnnext.com/CBSE/Class-9/English-Grammar/Articles-and-Determiners/Indefinite-Article-Usage/L-2069081.htm#container>)

I have found that they provide a short description of the article in the audio-video resources which has also been considered in my study.

I have selected English language textbooks and grammar books for different age groups from primary to secondary, to know the teaching patterns of the English language grammar in India with respect to the teaching of determiners. Moreover, twenty five primary and secondary Indian teachers were asked via internet about their teaching style for teaching English grammar in the EFL/ESL classroom. Whereas some prefer to use the Traditional Explanation Method or the Deductive Method; none of them answered that they teach using the Communicative Language Teaching Approach. They also

added that after giving a short introduction of the topic, students are given exercises to solve from textbooks or grammar books i.e. Put *a* or *an* before each name, Fill in the blanks with appropriate articles etc. The English language teachers neither explain the grammar rule and use of it in detail nor give a topic to discuss in pair or groups to practice the target grammar in their own sentence. Hence, learners do not get any opportunity to practice the target language and grammar in their own sentences to use in real life situations in the EFL/ ESL classroom. As suggested by Catelly, there is lack of practical use of the target grammar in the classroom. This seems to be the major problem in the second language grammar teaching and learning process in the ESL/EFL classroom. Further, if there is an oral practice in the EFL/ESL classroom, the students can practice the grammar topic and the teacher can detect their grammar errors if they make mistakes. In addition, students can also learn from each other's mistakes when the teacher corrects their mistakes by eliciting right answers from the students in the classroom and their doubts can be clarified by the teacher. This kind of a communicative approach is essential to practice grammar in a real situation for the concrete learning of grammar rules. In fact, neither teachers motivate students to practice the grammar topic orally in the classroom, nor do they involve students in the grammar learning process as mentioned in the teacher's feedback, they give only a short description of the topic and ask students to solve the grammar exercises from the grammar books. Forming grammatical correct sentences and use them in conversations are lacking in the grammar translation method. Hence, these teaching methods cause fossilization in learning grammar and creates confusion for the learners whose L1 grammar is different from the L2 grammar (English language).

In addition, with the help of the English language teacher, I have conducted an experiment on two groups of 12 participants e.i. control group and experimental group. These participants are 13-15yrs old students and they were selected randomly in both the groups. There are three steps in the experiment.

Firstly, the pre-test was conducted on both the groups in India. In this test, the teacher distributed worksheets to all the participants and asked to solve the exercises given in the worksheets on the basis of their previously acquired knowledge of the determiners.

Secondly, teaching sessions were conducted. In this step, the English language teacher taught to the control group by using the traditional grammar teaching method, in which she gave an introduction of the articles provided in the textbook and then she asked students to solve the exercise given in the workbook individually. Further, I taught to the experimental group online via Skype using my proposed grammar teaching lesson plan. In which, I mixed the Presentation Practice Production method with the communicative language teaching approach to facilitate students by giving the detailed introduction about the topic and then asked to solve the exercises by discussing in pairs. The grammar exercise is extracted from Walker & Elseworth (2000).

In the production stage, I asked students to make a conversation in pairs between a fruit/vegetable seller and a buyer using the suitable determiners in the sentences. In the further stage, each pair was asked to play a role of a seller and a buyer in the classroom and if any pair made a mistake, I elicit the use of a suitable determiner from the students to correct their mistakes.

Lastly, the English language teacher asked students of both the groups to solve the post-test in which the grammar exercises on the use of determiners were given.

7. FINDINGS

The results obtained of all the six participants of the control and the six participants of the experimental group for pre-test and post-test has been indicated in the tables 1, 2, 3 &4

Pre-test results		
Control Group	Score Max 20	Percentage
Student 1	10	50
Student 2	9	45
Student 3	11	55
Student 4	10	50
Student 5	8	40
Student 6	8	40
Average	9.33	46.67

Table 1: Pre-test results of the control group

Table 1 clearly show the performance of the students from the control group in the pre-test and the average score of the control group is 9.33/20 with 46.67%.

Pre-test results		
Experimental Group	Score Max 20	Percentage
Student 1	11	55
Student 2	8	40
Student 3	11	55
Student 4	9	45
Student 5	9	45
Student 6	8	40
Average	9.33	46.67

Table 2: Pre-test results of the experimental group

Table 2 clearly show the performance of the students from experimental group in the pre-test and the average score of the control group is 9.33/20 with 46.67% as per the expectation.

Post-test results		
Control Group	Score Max 24	Percentage
Student 1	18	75
Student 2	17	70.83333333
Student 3	18	75
Student 4	17	70.83333333
Student 5	16	66.66666667
Student 6	18	75
Average	17.33	72.22

Table 3: Post-test results of the control group

Table 3 clearly show the performance of the students from the control group in the post-test and the average score of the control group is 17.33/24 with 72.22% after undergoing the undergoing the traditional teaching method.

Post-test results		
Experimental Group	Score Max 24	Percentage
Student 1	22	91.66666667
Student 2	23	95.83333333
Student 3	22	91.66666667
Student 4	21	87.5
Student 5	22	91.66666667
Student 6	23	95.83333333
Average	22.17	92.36

Table 4 clearly show the performance of the students from the experimental group in the post-test and the average score of the control group is 22.17/24 with 92.36% after undergoing the contrasting teaching method as proposed in the thesis.

Table 4: Post-test results of the experimental group

After conducting the pre-test and the post-test and analyzing the results, I found out that while solving the pre-test, all the participants including the control group and the experimental group were confused with using *an* before a noun which starts with a vowel sound and using *no articles* was not in their knowledge. Moreover, they were confused with using *the* and all participants used *the* or *a* instead of using *no article*.

In addition, after conducting the post-test, it is found out that participants of the control group were still confused in using *an* before a noun which starts with a vowel sound and their concept of use of *no article* was not clear while solving the test. However, participants of the experimental group showed in the test that their concept of using *an* before a noun which starts with a vowel sound and the use of *no article* is also clear while solving the post-test.

Furthermore, it can be clearly seen from the table: 1 and table: 2, that the pre-test results are well balanced and the average marks shows the knowledge of the target grammar topic of the control and the experimental groups is in equilibrium i.e. 9.33/ 20.

Moreover, after teaching the control group using the traditional grammar teaching method and the experimental group implementing the proposed grammar teaching lesson plan, the difference can be easily compared from the table: 3 & table: 4.

The control group improved up to 72.22% from 46.67% (average percentage), whereas, the experimental group showed excellent results by scoring 92.36% from 46.67% (average percentage). Hence, it is proved that it has been checked and verified experimentally that the proposed grammar teaching lesson plan is the most effective for teaching and learning the English grammar in the EFL/ ESL classroom.

8. CONTRAST BETWEEN A TRADITIONAL LANGUAGE TEACHING METHOD, THE COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING APPROACH AND THE PPP APPROACH

Traditional language teaching method:

According to Novak (1998), the teacher is a source of knowledge and students are considered as a knowledge holes which are needed to be filled up with the information. The teacher becomes the controller and the classroom becomes a teacher centered.

Johnson & Johnson (1991) added that the content and delivery of the lesson are the most important thing in the traditional method and students master knowledge through drill and practice such as rote learning. In addition, Nazzal (2014) pointed out that traditional teaching method has a lack of collaborated learning as well as group learning and more emphasis is given on examination rather than the understanding of the concepts. Further, only teacher's role is active in the traditional method, whereas, students become passive learners. The traditional approach follows one-way communication that is from teacher to students. The traditional methods focus and emphasis mainly on the learning of grammar rule and vocabulary and as such do not pay much attention to Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing.

The communicative language teaching approach:

The CLT is based on a theory that language is communication. Hymes (1972) stated that the goal of language teaching is communicative competence. According to Nunan (1991), in the communicative language teaching approach, an emphasis is given on learning through interaction in the target language, the opportunity is given to learners to focus on language and their personal experiences is an important contributing element in the learning process. In this method, the teacher becomes a facilitator and classroom becomes a student-centered.

Following are some principles of CLT approach:

- i) Learners learn the content through communication.
- ii) Authentic and meaningful communication is the goal of the classroom activities.
- iii) Fluency is an important dimension of communication.
- iv) Communication involves the integration of different language skills.
- v) Learning is a process of creative construction and involves trial and error.

Furthermore, Richard (2005) pointed out that the CLT approach develops a different reaction from a grammar focused approach to teach and give priority to accuracy and to the sentence as the unit of presentation and practice in the classroom. He also added that language is the byproduct of using language to communicate. I agree with the above discussion and I believe, unless the learners communicate with each other, they can not be fluent in the target language and the teacher must correct their grammar mistakes to have accuracy in the target language. Hence, accuracy and fluency are goals of my lesson plan. In contrast, I found that the communicative language teaching approach lacks of drill work in the teaching learning session. The practice of solving grammar exercises is missing in the CLT approach.

Presentation Practice Production (PPP) method:

The PPP method includes three stages- Presentation, Practice and Production.

Presentation: in this stage, the teacher introduces a topic in context. The grammar topic is presented deductively by the teacher using the target language from the syllabus. Further, according to Hart (2015), the teacher talking time is 75% as he/ she is presenting the topic and the teacher demonstrates and works on correct pronunciation and highlights stress and intonation patterns.

Practice: this is a controlled practice phase. At this stage the teacher asks students to solve exercises to practice the topic by discussing the grammar rule and its application in pair or in groups but in a controlled way. Hart (2015) stated that in practice stage, student's talking time is 60% and the teacher talking time is 40%. He also added that the teacher monitors the class but does not corrects when mistakes occurs in student's answers.

Production: in this stage, the teacher designs activities for a less-controlled practice. According to Doff (1998), Students try to use the structure they have learnt to express themselves freely. Further, according to Hart (2015), the teacher talking time is 10% and students talking time is 90%.

In addition, Ur (1996) mentioned that the PPP approach is based on the behaviorist theory and learning language is similar to learning any skill. In contrast, I found that the PPP method does not provide peer correction in the EFL/ ESL classroom.

Furthermore, after studying the CLT approach and the PPP method, I found that the grammar practice by solving the exercises is missing in which students discuss the grammar rules and its applications in the given sentences. Whereas, the PPP method has the grammar exercises solving part but lacks of peer correction in the EFL/ESL classroom. Hence, I mixed both the methods to create more efficient grammar teaching lesson plan by using the contrasting approach.

9. RATIONALE FOR USING THE COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING APPROACH AND PPP APPROACH

According to Harmer (2013), in CLT approach the teacher should correct the mistakes her/ his students in the EFL/ ESL classroom. He added that the teacher should consider some points while correcting the mistakes of the students i.e. was the student wrong, what was wrong in his sentence, should I correct it or should I ask somebody else from the classroom to correct the mistake. Moreover, Richard (2005) stated that CLT approach is not a grammar focused approach but it gives a priority to accuracy and to the sentence as a unit of presentation in the practice stage in the classroom. He also added that in the CLT approach, a communicative competence is developed through making the communication. The language is a byproduct of using language to communicate. Furthermore, he mentioned some important advantages of CLT approach:

- i) Authentic and meaningful communication is the goal of classroom activities in the CLT approach.
- ii) Learners learn through communication using the target language.
- iii) Fluency is the important dimension of communication.
- iv) Communication involves the integration of different language skills.

- v) Learning is a process of creative construction and involves trial and error.

Contrasting, I found lack of practice the grammar exercises in CLT approach which facilitate learners to apply their grasped knowledge of grammar in a controlled way as PPP method is providing the grammar practice in the practice stage to practice the target grammar in a worksheet. If the learners will practice the target grammar in worksheets and apply the grammar rules in solving the grammar exercises, the probability of making mistakes in the discussion stage of the CLT will be reduced.

Hence, keeping the advantages of CLT approach and the Presentation Practice Production (PPP) Method, I mixed some part of the CLT approach and some part of the PPP method to come up with more advantageous and more influential grammar teaching lesson plan to teach and learn the English language grammar in EFL/ ESL classroom.

Moreover, I have extracted following stages from both language teaching methods–

Stage I: Warm up/ Brainstorming- this stage is taken from the CLT approach to give hints to the students to guess the targeted grammar topic. In this stage, the teacher elicits the prior knowledge from the students by asking topic related basic questions.

Stage II: Introduction / Presentation- this stage is common in both the methods. At this stage the teacher provides the knowledge of the target grammar to the students and students hear the explanation. For grasping the student's continued attention, the teacher should use PPT slides and highlight the grammar rule and important words used by applying the grammar rules and ask students to read the text given in the PPT slide simultaneously while she is explaining the grammar rules and its application in the sentences. With the help of this method of explaining the grammar topic with the use of the PPT slides, the teacher would be successful to grasp the learner's continual attention without interruptions.

Stage III: Practicing the target grammar- This stage is taken from the PPP method to make learners practice the target grammar to reduce probability of making mistakes in the production stage. At this stage, I suggest the English teacher to ask students to solve the exercises from the workbooks or worksheets in pairs or groups according to the number of students in the classroom by discussing the grammar rule in the target language.

Stage IV: Checking and discussing the answers- this stage is taken from the PPP method, but I have added the discussion part in this stage. Here, the teacher asks every pair or group of students to give their discussed answers one by one. While checking the answers of the worksheets, if any student makes mistakes, the teacher asks the other students to detect the grammar error in the sentence and rectify the error by explaining the rationale behind their suggested answers. In this manner students will be able to practice the grammar rule and explanations of the suggested answers will provide the concrete learning of the grammar rules and they will practice the English language in their real communication.

Stage V: Production- this stage is common in both the methods. At this stage, the teacher provides a topic to discuss in pairs or groups according to the number of the

students by using the target language. Students will discuss the topic in the target language and will make their own sentences, conversation, story etc. and the teacher asks to present their answers, role-play or read their stories etc.

Stage VI: Feedback- this stage is again common in both the methods, but I have added students' discussion in this stage. At this stage, the teacher asks students to give the answer of their discussions one by one and if any pair or group makes mistakes, the teacher asks the other students to detect the grammar error and suggest the suitable answers with the rationale of their suggestions.

10. PIEPHO'S OBJECTIVES FOR A COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING APPROACH

Piepho (1981:8) discusses the following objectives for a communicative language teaching approach

1. An integrative and content level (language as a means of expression)
2. A linguistic and instrumental level (language as a semiotic system and an object of learning);
3. An affective level of interpersonal relationships and conduct (language as a means of expressing values and judgments about oneself and others);
4. A level of individual learning needs (remedial learning based on error analysis);
5. A general educational level of extra-linguistic goals (language learning within the school curriculum).

Richards & Rodgers (1987) explained the above objectives as these are few general objectives which are applicable to any teaching situation. The communicative approach assumes that language teaching reflects the particular needs of learners. These needs may be of listening, speaking, reading and writing each of these can be approached from a communicative perspective. The objective of a course would reflect specific aspects of communicative competence according to the learner's proficiency and communicative needs.

11. PROPOSED COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING LESSON PLAN TO TEACH DETERMINERS IN ESL/EFL CLASSROOM

11.1 OBJECTIVES FOR TEACHERS

- 1) To explain the term Determiners with suitable examples.
- 2) To explain the change of determiner for the same noun in detail.
- 3) To involve learners in the learning process.
- 4) To make students understand and practice the English language grammar using the Communicative Language Teaching Approach in the EFL/ESL Classroom.

- 5) To avoid fossilization in the learning process of Second Language Acquisition by correcting learner's error in the classroom.
- 6) To avoid English language grammar re-teach sessions for the same topic in the same classroom.
- 7) To motivate and encourage learners to use the target language and the grammar.

11.2 LESSON PLAN FOR THE ADOLESCENT LEARNERS

Subject: English language

Topic: The Best Christmas Present in the World

Language focus: Listening, Speaking, Writing & Grammar

Level: Grade 8 (Intermediate)

Age: 13/14yrs old

No of Students: 40

Diversity: 2 Students with a low level of English

Time required: 60 minutes in two sessions (45'+15')

Teaching Methods: Presentation Practice Production + Communicative Approach

TIME	AIMS/ OBJECTIVES	INTERACTIONS & SKILLS	ACTIVITIES	RESOURCES	ATTENTION TO DIVERSITY
5	To introduce the topic to the students and eliciting rationales of using articles in the conversation.	Tr- Sts & Sts –Tr / (L, S, R)	<p>i) Warm up/ Brainstorming The tr. introduces a short conversation to Sts. and asks questions related to the articles used in the sentences and by pointing out the articles in the conversation, the tr. asks-</p> <p>Q1) Students, do you remember what are these?</p> <p>Q2) What does each of them indicates in the sentences?</p> <p>Q3) Can we use all the three articles interchangeably?</p>	PPT	All Sts including a low level of the English language can read the sentences in the PPT slides.
10	To learn & interpreting the changed meanings of the sentences due to the important	Tr –Sts / (L, R)	<p>ii) Introduction: The tr. explains the use of articles with their intentions/ meanings in the conversation and asks sts to read the conversation simultaneously.</p>	PPT	Students hear the explanation and simultaneously read the slides.

	changes of using the articles				
20	To practice the grammar.	Sts-Sts and St-Tr / (S, L,W,G)	<p>iii) Practicing the target grammar: The tr. asks sts to discuss & solve the worksheet in pairs.</p> <p>iv) Checking and discussing the answers: The teacher asks sts to answer the question one by one and verifies the answer from the other sts. If any pair of sts makes mistakes, the tr. asks the other sts, whether the answer is correct or not. If the answer is incorrect, sts have to identify the mistakes & correct it by giving the rationale behind their suggestions. In case sts are unable to provide correct answer or rationale behind the use of the correct article, the tr. provide a hint to elicit the correct answer from the sts. and at last she confirms the correct answer. If still sts can not give the correct answer, the tr. announces the correct answer.</p>	Worksheet	All the sts will be solving exercises in pairs and sts with low level of the English language will also be discussing with their partners and listen/ become a part of the discussion.
25	To produce the grammatical correct sentences and practice it in st's real conversation in the classroom through a role-play.	Sts – Sts – Tch/ (L, S, G, W)	<p>v) Production: The Tr. asks sts to prepare a conversation by using the target grammar between a fruit/ vegetable seller and a buyer and after that perform a role-play in pairs in the classroom.</p> <p>vi) Feedback: While giving feedback, the tr. verifies the grammatical incorrect sentences, whether they are right or not from the other sts and again asks where did the pair makes mistakes and to suggest the grammatically correct sentence or use of articles with the rationale and finally the tr. confirms the correct answer.</p>	Notebook	Every st. including the sts with the low level of English language will produce their own sentence and participate in the role play.

- i) In the above lesson plan, the teacher uses the following short conversation in the introduction stage.

Mother: Which fruit would you like to eat now?

'Tum abhi kaunsa fal khana chahogi?'
(you now which fruit like to eat?)

Daughter: I would like to eat an apple.

'mujhe seb khana hai.'
(I apple would like to eat.)

Mother: Shall I bring a red apple or a green?

'lal seb ya hara seb lau?'
(red apple or green apple shall I bring?)

Note: a) In the above example, there are many red and green apples, hence article *a* is used.

b) If there is only one red and one green apple, *the* will be in use. Students may get confused and make mistakes by using *the* if there are more than one apple and *a/an* if there are only one red and one green apple.

Daughter: Please bring the green apple which has a leaf.

'Kripaya hara seb laiye jiske sath patta laga he.'
(Please green apple bring which has a leaf)

Explanation: In the above example the noun 'apple' is the same in all the sentences but determiner has changed due to the meaning or mentioning the specific noun – 'green apple'. Here, the daughter has a wish to eat only the 'green apple which has a leaf' and not the red one. Hence, she used *the* to specify the 'green apple with a leaf'.

Note: If the daughter wishes to have two apples without any preference of red or green apples, *no article* will be in use. She would say–

Bring me two apples, please.
'laiye mere liye do seb, krupaya.'
(Bring for me two apples, please)

Note: Not every ESL/EFL teacher explains the above reason of changing the article due to mentioning the specific thing in the sentence.

- ii) The exercises of worksheet is extracted from Walker & Elseworth (2000).

11.3 ADVANTAGES OF THE LESSON PLAN

1) Practical examples are used in the ESL/EFL Classroom, which will help students to apply the rule of determiners in real life situations.

2) The Communicative Language Teaching Method is easy to teach and beneficial in the learning process for the teacher and learners in the ESL/EFL Classroom. Because, in the above lesson plan, the teacher explains the grammar rules with examples by using PPT. Students will read the PPT slides and listen to the explanation simultaneously.

Moreover, in the practice part, students will discuss the grammar rules in pairs. While asking answers, the teacher will ask the other students to verify the answer and suggests the correct one. If they make a mistake, the teacher announces the correct answer with the explanation. Here, the teacher involves students in communication and students actively participate in the language learning.

3) This type of teaching facilitates all types of learners to understand and practice it in the classroom through discussing the answers, the grammar rules and make conversation in the classroom.

4) This method gives concrete learning to the students by using the target grammar for making their own sentences in real life situations.

5) This learning remains in the learner's mind for the long-term because of the practical use of the grammar and its rules in the EFL/ESL classroom. Because when the teacher would explain the grammar rule with example in detail, the students will read it simultaneously and if they get an opportunity to use the grammar rule in their own sentences, it would help them to remember their sentences in real life situations for a long – term in the future.

6) Students use the target language while discussing the practice and production part of the learning in CLT Method.

7) The learners are actively involved in the learning process.

8) The learning process is interactive and student-centered.

9) The teacher encourages learners to correct their classmate's grammar error. This opportunity to peer correction motivates all the learners to keenly listen and understand the sentences uttered by their classmates, if the students are unable to correct the error, the teacher corrects and hence, the learners learn from their classmate's mistakes.

10) The teacher facilitates a process of learning in which students are motivated and encouraged to be responsible and autonomous.

11.4. LIMITATIONS OF THE LESSON PLAN

1) To follow this lesson plan, the teacher has to make topic related PPT slides.

2) The teacher has to prepare or bring worksheets to make students practice the grammar topic.

3) The overhead projector is required to use PPT slides in the classroom.

4) The teacher has to give an introduction of the topic in detail. If the target grammar topic is not provided in detail in the English textbooks or grammar books, the teacher has to gather extra knowledge of the topic to make available the knowledge in detail of the grammar topic to the students in the English language classroom.

5) This lesson plan is time consuming but allows students to practice the target grammar and produce their own sentences using the target grammar.

- 6) Students talking time is more as compared to the teacher talking time.
- 7) The teacher should have the patience to ask students to detect the mistakes and suggest the correct answer with rationale. Moreover, she has to elicit the answer from the students by giving clues.

12. CONCLUSION

Summarizing, it is essential to teach the L2 grammar using a communicative approach where learners are actively engaged in the learning process and get an opportunity to use the target language and its grammar by making their own sentences in real life situations rather than teaching grammar using the traditional method. Students should also understand the rationale behind using the grammar and if they make mistakes, the meaning of their sentences would be changed. Further, the traditional method causes students for rote memorization which makes them to memorize the grammar and its rules for the short term just to pass the exam and not to remember it for the long term or use it properly in real life communication. In addition, it is difficult to learn determiners of L2 if not well explained by the teacher and lack of use it in the real life communication when the grammar of L1 of the learner has no determiners. Moreover, English language teachers must pay attention that her/his student's learning should not be fossilized because of confusion, negative data transfer from L1 of the students or the lack of a grammar rule explanation in detail and practice it in the learner's own sentences. If her/his students have fossilized learning of the English language grammar, she/he must conduct re-teach sessions with the suitable teaching techniques to their students because, if the learners will make mistakes in using determiners, the meaning of their sentences could be misunderstood in real life situations.

13. REFERENCES

1. Agnihotri, R. K., Khanna, A. L., & Mukherjee, A. (1984). The use of articles in Indian English: Errors and pedagogical implications. *IRAL*, 22(2), 115-29.
2. Avgi. V. (2011). What are the underlying principles giuding the PPP model when teaching grammar?. Retrieved from - https://www.academia.edu/5551947/What_are_the_underlying_principles_guinding_the_PPP_model_when_teaching_grammar.
3. Baswan, B.S. (2004) National Curriculum Framework. New Delhi: National Council of Education Research and training.
4. Basweti, N. O., Shroeder, H., Hamu, H. J., & Omwenga, L. M. (2014). The Ekegusii Determiner Phrase Analysis in the Minimalist Program. *International journal of linguistics and communication*, 2(4), 85-105.
5. Cately, Y. M. (2012). Towards interlanguage defossilizing—a language learning and using strategy based model. *Synergy*, (1), 7-20.
6. Check out the solution for English-grammar Tamilnadu class10 Board Paper at Meritnation. (n.d.). in *meritnation.com*. Retrieved from (http://www.meritnation.com/tamilnadu/class10/studymaterial/english-grammar/english-grammar/13_10_7_182)

7. Collins Cobuild student's grammar: self-study edition with answer key:[reference and practice through real English]. HarperCollins, 1992.
8. Doff. A. (1988). Teach English. (Glasgow: CUPP).
9. ESL worksheet. (n.d.). ESL resources. Learnenglishfeelgood.com. Retrieved from- <http://www.learnenglishfeelgood.com/articles-the-a-an1.pdf>.
10. ESL worksheet. (n.d.). ESL resources. Learnenglishfeelgood.com. Retrieved from- <http://www.learnenglishfeelgood.com/articles-the-a-an2.pdf>.
11. ESL worksheet. (n.d.). ESL resources. Learnenglishfeelgood.com. Retrieved from- <http://www.learnenglishfeelgood.com/article-or-no-article1.pdf>.
12. ESL worksheet. (n.d.). ESL resources. Learnenglishfeelgood.com. Retrieved from- <http://www.learnenglishfeelgood.com/article-or-no-article2.pdf>.
13. English Course Communicative: Interact in English. (2004). New Delhi. Publication division- National Council of Research & Training.
14. First flight. (2007). New Delhi. Publication division- National Council of Research & Training.
15. Galloway, A. (1993). Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction and Sample Activities. ERIC Digest.
16. Harmer. J. (2013). ISTEK ECT 2013 Concurrent keynote – “Does correction work? It depends who you ask!”. Retrieved from - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AlGc1ZDnxgA>.
17. Hart. G. (2015). Guidelines for New English Teachers- What is PPP?. Retrieved from <http://www.eslteachersboard.com/cgi-bin/articles/index.pl?read=3639>.
18. Honeycomb. (2007). New Delhi. Publication division- National Council of Research & Training.
19. Honeydew. (2008). New Delhi. Publication division- National Council of Research & Training.
20. Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A History of ELT*. Oxford University Press.
21. Hua, C., & Li, B. (2015). Bringing fun and meaning into grammar learning: A case study of a secondary-level EFL class in Hong Kong. *Cogent Education*,2(1), 1111039.
22. Indra, C.T. (2015), English textbook Std Six- Term I. Chennai, Tamilnadu tnschools.co.in, Tamil Nadu Textbook Corporation.
23. Indefinite Article – Usage. (n.d.). In *CBSE Board Class 9 English Grammar , Video Lessons and Tests*. Retrieved from (<http://www.learnnext.com/CBSE/Class-9/English-Grammar/Articles-and-Determiners/Indefinite-Article-Usage/L-2069081.htm#container>)
24. Ionin, T., & Montrul, S. (2009). Article use and generic reference: Parallels between L1-and L2-acquisition. *Second language acquisition of articles: Empirical findings and theoretical implications*, 147-173.
25. Jacobs, G. M., & Farrell, T. S. (2003). Understanding and Implementing the CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) Paradigm. *RELC journal*, 34(1), 5-30.
26. Johnson D, Johnson R. (1991) *Learning Together and Alone* ed3.; Allyn & Bacon, Sydney

27. Kaleidoscope. (2007). New Delhi. Publication division- National Council of Research & Training.
28. Kannan, R. (2009). Difficulties in learning English as a Second Language. *ESP World*, 8(5), 1-4.5
29. Lecturing: Advantages and Disadvantages of the Traditional Lecture Method. (n.d.). In Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching and Learning Network. Retrieved from <http://www.cirtl.net/node/2570>.
30. Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
31. Liu, Q. X., & Shi, J. F. (2007). An Analysis of Language Teaching Approaches and Methods—Effectiveness and Weakness. *Online Submission*, 4(1), 69-71.
32. Lowther, M. (1983). Fossilization, pidginization and the Monitor. *Language across cultures*. Dublin: Irish Association for Applied Linguistics, 127-39.
33. Maftoon, P., & Sarem, S. N. (2015). A critical look at the presentation, practice, production (PPP) approach: Challenges and promises for ELT. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 3(4), 31-36
34. Marigold. (2008). New Delhi: Publication division-National Council of Research & Training.
35. Martin, H. (2013). *Advanced Grammar in Use. A Self-study Reference and Practice Book for Advanced Learners of English, with Answers*.
36. Master, P. (2003). Acquisition of the zero and null articles in English. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 14(1).
37. Mayo, M. D. P. G., & Hawkins, R. (Eds.). (2009). *Second language acquisition of articles: Empirical findings and theoretical implications* (Vol. 49). John Benjamins Publishing.
38. Mukattash, L. (1986). Persistence of fossilization. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 24(1-4), 187-204.
39. Narvekar, S. S. (2014) *Vikas Golden grammar book: 1, Dantali, Gujarat: Navneet Education Limited.*
40. Nazzal. (2014). Teaching methods a look at the teaching method being adhered to in schools. *Gulf news*. Retrieved from <http://gulfnews.com/news/uae/education/modern-vs-traditional-teaching-methods-1.1418127>.
41. Novak, J. (1998) *Learning, Creating and Using Knowledge: Concept Maps as Facilitative Tools in Schools and Corporations*; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc; New Jersey, pp 24-25
42. Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
43. Richards, J.C. y T.S. Rodgers (1987). *Communicative Language Teaching. En Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (pp. 64-86). Reino Unido: Cambridge University Press.
44. Rinnert, C., & Hansen, M. (1986). *Teaching the English Article System*.
45. Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(1-4), 209-232.

46. Sharma, D. (2005). Dialect stabilization and speaker awareness in non-native varieties of English1. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(2), 194-224.3)
47. Sharma, Suresh, Anand, Khanna, Manuja, Jain (2010), English Course communicative Interact in English Class X. Delhi: NCERT Publication
48. Singh, S., & Kumar, R. (2014) Sociolinguistics of English in India. *Global Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, G.J.I.S.S.,Vol.3(4):128-135.
49. Smith, B. (2001). Learner English: A teacher's guide to interference and other problems. M. Swan (Ed.). Ernst Klett Sprachen.
50. Sugathan, Gilani, Kaul, Paul (2013), The New Grammar Tree Class 7. Delhi: Oxford University Press Publication Pvt. Ltd.
51. Swales, J. M. (1997). English as Tyrannosaurus rex. *World Englishes*, 16(3), 373-382.
52. The communicative approach. (2011). Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0XFQZZL7eXQ>.
53. Thomas, M. (1989). The acquisition of English articles by first-and second-language learners. *Applied psycholinguistics*, 10(03), 335-355.
54. Uddin, M. A., & Alam, M. S. A Contrastive Analysis of Bangla and English Determiners.
55. Ur, P. (1996). A course in language teaching practice and theory. Cambridge Teacher Training and Development.
56. Walia, D. N. (2012). Traditional teaching methods vs. CLT: A study. *Frontiers of language and teaching*, 3, 125-131.
57. Walker, E., & Elsworth, S. (2000). Grammar practice for intermediate students.
58. Walker, E., & Elsworth, S. (2012). Grammar practice for upper intermediate students.
59. Wangdong, W., & Baitian, H. (2005). Prevention is more significant than defossilization—on possible causes of fossilized errors in the individual interlanguage and relevance of EFL education in China.
60. Zhao, A. H. Q., & Morgan, C. (2004). Consideration of age in L2 attainment-children, adolescents and adults. *Asian EFL Journal*, 6(4), 1-13.