

TEACHING GRAMMAR SKILL AS A MAIN CONSTITUENT OF PROFESSIONAL ENGLISH COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE TO WOULD BE SPECIALISTS

Natalia A. Proshyants

The issues of developing grammar skills based on the building professional English language communicative competence are considered in the paper. The analysis of current state of teaching grammar in high and higher schools with the purpose of defining the reasons for grammar skill low level of school leavers and university graduates has been made. The ways of solutions to the challenges in building communicative competence are sought with the reference to the development of learning theories. The use of teaching techniques with the focus on form in the classroom interaction is discussed. The differentiation of grammar forms in the professional oral and written discourses is specified in the paper.

Keywords: teaching grammar skill, professional English language communicative competence, learning theories, focus on form, professional interaction, classroom interaction.

My assumptions on teaching grammar and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) result into more detailed questions. What do we call ESP? Do the teachers of ESP teach grammar? If the answer is ‘Yes’ then how do they teach? What methods of learning/teaching grammar are mainly used by ESP teachers/ students? What teaching methods of developing grammaring (the term of Dianne Larsen-Freeman) are currently developed in the language and language learning theories?

Firstly, I would like to start with teaching ESP. There is currently no doubt among methodologists and practitioners that teaching ESP has its own peculiarities [1, 4, 6]. ESP may be narrowly and broadly defined. Every English course may be considered as ESP since it has its particular goals and objectives, e.g. a school English course can be considered as English for (Special) or Specific Purposes with its specific goals and objectives - to develop English language skills for everyday life or academic study. Nevertheless the narrow definition of ESP is more popular, and it is opposed to General English – English for general use. Thus, ESP is mostly taught in technical, medical, law, economical, maritime universities etc. where English is not a major and the specialists for all the branches of industry, science, technology, social economical and political activity are trained.

My paper on teaching grammar is mostly based on the experience of my ESP classes primarily in the Pacific Naval Institute, and in some humanitarian universities that train specialists for social, economical and law activity. The segment of student population is the first, second, third year both full and part - time students, post graduate students and the students who are trained according to the program for complimentary qualification “Interpreter and Translator in the Sphere of Professional Communication”.

The common viewpoint seems to be that ESP is firstly aimed at teaching to read specialist subject texts and acquire information from these original sources for the professional missions. The needs analysis of professional communication in the spheres of nautical, social, economical, law activity is likely to allow coming to the conclusions. Firstly, every sphere of professional communication has its own peculiarities mostly in terms of special vocabulary. My findings are exemplified with professional communication at sea. The current analysis of international sea cooperation of the ships of Russia and France (2008), Russia and India (2011, 2008, 2007), Russia and the USA, Great Britain (2004); Republic of Korea and Russia (2003), Russia and Japan (2010, 2008, 2000) showed that naval personnel used English for the accomplishment of the professional assignments concerning communication, joint maneuvering and securing safety for merchant vessels, search and rescue, firing exercises. The analysis of

the content of international sea cooperation at sea and in ports revealed that professional communication covers three spheres: protocol in the course of official visit, proper specific professional interaction for accomplishing joint missions and social activities in the foreign ports, scholar exchange, joint research project, conferences etc.

Since the international sea cooperation deals with the crucial matters concerning mainly safety at sea then this interaction requires the high level of English language proficiencies of the personnel that is involved in joint operations in the Asian Pacific region. The need for developing speaking and listening skills to naval students in contrast to the widely spread viewpoint in most Russian Engineering universities that the main goal of teaching ESP is to read specialist subject texts, is obvious. Moreover the requirements of the National Educational Standard for non-English majoring students of higher schools define both reading specialist subject texts with the view of acquiring information and building communicative competence with the purpose of accomplishing missions in professional assignments and settings as the main goal of training would be specialists. So while speaking about focus on grammar in teaching ESP oral and written speech abilities based on developed reading, listening, speaking and writing skills seem to be taken into account.

Some of the teaching grammar issues in Russia seem to be impartial and be beyond teacher's opportunities to strongly affect them.

1. School leaver's low level of grammar knowledge and the high level of requirements to the university graduate English language proficiency.
2. 180 contact hours to be taught ESP to English non-majoring students.
3. Students' professional incompetence – they learn ESP for the first two years and they have classes on their major disciplines later.
4. The requirements of the National Educational Standard are to train students to get ready for professional communication.

This situation is rather challenging and encouraging for teachers and it induces them to seek the solutions. In order to get the answer to the question "Do the teachers of ESP teach grammar?" the questionnaires

for the teachers and students were distributed. The general question whether it is necessary to teach grammar or not and particular questions concerning teaching metalinguistic knowledge, teaching grammar explicitly or implicitly, the use of methods were included in the questionnaire for the teachers. The students were asked the same questions in the comprehensible form for them. The answers to the questions did not seem to be unexpected as it was an evident proof of my personal teaching experience and communication with my colleagues. As D. Larsen – Freeman articulates that most of the teachers argue in favor of teaching grammar. Some of them strongly support teaching the metalinguistic knowledge and explaining grammar rules (teaching grammar explicitly). The others are skeptic about metalinguistic knowledge - they consider it to be inert for the use by the students in future. The latter are the proponents of communicative method of teaching and implicit introduction of grammar material [5]. The ambiguous attitude of the teachers to the issues of teaching grammar is likely to be caused by the evolution of language and language learning theory that resulted from the historical development of society.

Do we use the entire teaching methods inventory to improve the situation? One may start the brief overview of teaching methods that are used by the teachers with traditional grammar instruction – grammar translation method. The foreign language is learned via translation from the first language or vice versa. According to classroom observation I dare to say that this method is currently widely used in technical universities while reading specialist subject texts for training would be specialists and post graduate students. Some of the scholars [4] highlight the main features of grammar translation method “1. Lack of focus on the spoken language, including little emphasis on listening and speaking, neglect of pronunciation teaching, and the use of L1 as the medium of communication. 2. Teaching vocabulary in isolated lists of words that have to be memorized. 3. Teaching grammar by means of rules (stated in the L1) which must be learned by heart. 4. A sentence-based approach to learning grammar. Little use of connected discourse. 5. A predominance of translation as a way of practicing grammar and vocabulary.” [[4], cited in 8:253]

The experience of my colleagues - practitioners and of mine allows concluding that this method is of effectiveness in some particular cases, e.g. while post - graduating students working with great volume of texts the reading is done at the supra-sentential or discourse level with negotiating for the meaning of grammar forms. This practical experience finding seems to be confirmed by the idea of Leo van Lier that “1. Most methodological recommendations over the last few decades have rejected the grammar-translation approach (GT) as possibly the least effective way of all to conduct language teaching. 2. I have suggested that, at least in the historical-geographical context with which I am familiar (the 1960s in the Netherlands), GT cannot be drawn in such a black-and-white manner, and in fact its combination with oral and literary work of various kinds resulted in a practical approach that was effective for a number of learners, and that included a great deal of meaningful and discourse-based work“ [8: 266]. With the advent of Direct and Audio-lingual approach language was seen as a set of verbal behaviors that were learned by imitation, practice and reinforcement. In learning/ teaching a foreign language pattern drills, language labs were mainly used and it results in the lack of speaking skills. Grammar was taught implicitly. This method was very popular in Russia in 70-s. Nowadays some of the text books, especially designed for autonomous work of students in the language labs use this approach. One of the text – books that we use for teaching in our institute is based on this approach. The students come to the computer language lab and listen to and repeat the language patterns that are presented by the native speakers. They are highly motivated to learn language with the use of multi-media technologies and the opportunities to listen to and imitate native speaker’s speech. Judging by the observation of their responses it works well for this particular case and time.

The next comes Situational Approach which supposes that Grammar content was organized on the basis of the forms required for particular communicative or situational activities such as “asking questions” or “at a restaurant” [3].

Commenting on the durability of this approach, Skehan labels it the three Ps: presentation, practice, and production, where the first

stage involves presentation of a single grammar form, the second one requires learner practice within a controlled framework, and the final stage is learner production of the form more spontaneously [cited in 3:3]. Examination of many English as a second language (ESL) /EFL textbooks today reveals that they are often functionally / situationally based, with a dialogue introducing target structures and vocabulary, a formal explanation of the grammar forms covered, practice exercises ranging from controlled to free production of the grammar structures and vocabulary, and perhaps a meaning-focused task or reading that elicits use of the structure during performance. [3]. It proves to be true in terms of the use of this approach in ESP text- books that are used in Russian higher schools. The teachers are likely to be of the opinion that it is a good combination of explicitly and implicitly teaching grammar and developing speaking skills. To tell the truth some doubt remains as the students acquire speaking abilities within strictly subject limited framework that really deprives them the ability to naturally speak.

With the development of Chomskian theories of Universal Grammar in the 1950-s and 1960-s, explicit grammar instruction received renewed emphasis. Grammar teaching and classroom curricula were designed to build on what learners already knew, giving them opportunities to construct new meanings and emphasizing deductive learning. This cognitive view of language learning held that grammar was too complex to be learned naturally and that language requires mental processing for learners to be able to attain linguistic competence [3:4].

So if we look at teaching grammar as a continuum with poles apart where one of them is marked as implicit instruction of grammar the other one is as an explicit one we may notice that the process of teaching grammar moves as a pendulum from one pole to another. And it seems to be very natural as a physical phenomenon does, i.e. the development process of language learning theories is likely to go in the right direction.

After the focus on explicit grammar instruction Communicative Approach is likely logically to have arrived. The assumption was that the learners would acquire the forms and vocabulary naturally, during the process of comprehending and responding to the input, similar to

a way a child learns the first language. The communicative method of L2 teaching does not feature explicit grammar teaching or correcting learner errors. Krashen's Input Hypothesis stipulated that the learning of L2 depends on the presence of "comprehensible input" in the form of meaningful activities, listening and speaking, and reading for enjoyment. Thus, the communicative method of L2 teaching does not feature explicit grammar teaching or correcting learner errors [3:5]. It seems to work well in the context of highly motivated and interested students who are reading much for amusement and joy. Under the instructional circumstances of teaching ESP (the lack of contact hours, professional incompetence of students to read and comprehend ESP texts etc.) in Russian higher technical schools it appears to be beyond the reach of the expected results that are assumed to get while using this method.

L2 researchers, methodologists, and practitioners have commented that grammatical competence is essential for communication but cannot be attained solely through exposure to meaningful input [3:5].

To address these limitations of purely communicative methodology, a new approach to grammar instruction combines formal instruction and communicative language use. Called "focus on form," it is based on the distinction between explicit instruction on grammar forms (with an s) and meaning-focused use of form (no s) in such a way that the learner must notice, then process the target grammar structure in purely communicative input. This concept holds that traditional structural syllabuses that teach specific sequences of grammar forms do not produce communicative competence [3:5], only formal knowledge of grammar rules unless the learners themselves have reached the stage of interlanguage development at which they are psycho linguistically ready to acquire the instructed forms [3:5].

As van Essen has pointed out, 'There is something utterly obscure, if not contradictory, about the relationship between explicit/conscious and implicit/unconscious knowledge' [8: 266]. These distinctions are similar to distinctions between language awareness and metalinguistic knowledge. It is more important for language learning that such language knowledge/awareness moves towards the deep end than towards the explicit end. In other words, explicit language knowledge that can be

verbalized (and measured on tests) but that remains on the surface of language phenomena, is relatively useless, but deeply connected and richly interconnected language knowledge, whether implicit or explicit, is crucial to lasting and continually evolving language development [8: 266]. Here is one example from my pedagogic experience to illustrate this idea. Keeping the right word order of the sentence in the English language is a great problem for Russian students since the sentence word order in Russian is not fixed. My favorite technique is to say to students “Think in English before speaking.” At the first time there comes a meaningful pause and the students ask me “How can we do it?” The answer is quite unexpected for them “Think in English with Russian words!” That means that they should change the order of sentence in Russian according to the rules of English sentence word order. This technique firstly seems to be used as teaching metalinguistic knowledge and is aimed at raising language awareness. Once I raise my finger and say “Think in English!” I feel how the students switch from one code to another and say the right way. The more time passes the less I feel the need of pronouncing this phrase. It is likely to be an evidence of slow but true movement from the explicit knowledge of word order in English sentence to the acquisition of language awareness and the correct use of this form implicitly.

Interaction of various kinds is a major source of learning opportunities. As Long recommends, from a focus on forms the language curriculum moves to a focus on form, in which meaning comes before grammar. But interaction cannot be narrowly defined as information exchange, or as an ‘expert’ providing input to a ‘novice. Long proposes that the informational structure of two-way tasks obliges native speakers or more competent teachers/learners and non-native speakers to negotiate for meaning, and through the negotiation process, to make what they say comprehensible to their interlocutors’ [8: 266].

Leo van Lier provides some common assumptions [8]:

1. Learners benefit most from interacting with native speakers or more competent learners. In Russia this assumption has to be clarified in details. As school leavers have mostly low level of language proficiencies on the whole and of grammar, in particular it is a great

concern how to place students into the groups to better communicate and benefit from more competent learner. Some teachers think that the students should not be placed into the groups with the account of their language knowledge homogeneity and they refer to the idea that weak students will follow the bright ones and finally the former will reach the level of the latter. There is a constant dispute between the teachers on this account. The other teachers (my colleagues and I belong to them) think that it is necessary to distribute freshmen in the homogeneous classes in terms of their language proficiencies. As far as the benefits that the weak students may get from more competent learners is concerned the point is that there are more competent students than the other ones in these homogeneous groups as well and they may be leaders. And one more concern is that the opportunity of communicating with a native speaker at the class rarely occurs. That is why a great emphasis should be laid on a teacher and competent learner while developing communicative competence on the whole and grammar knowledge in particular.

2. Interactions in which information is not shared at the outset, but must be communicated through the interaction, are most effective [8: 266]. This assumption of Leo van Lier seems to be very true judging by the experience of using this technique in both in ESP and ESP for general purposes classes. Recently there was a big problem of English classes in Russian schools concerning the attachment to the so called “topics”. Students pronounced rather boring texts that were memorized in the form of monologues. When they started speaking to foreigners they could hardly say any appropriate or pertinent words except memorized sentences from the topics or they prefer keeping silence. In our classes if the students have to discuss the theme of their native town or the city where they study, namely Vladivostok with their foreign colleagues they are encouraged to do it in the form of a talk the contents of which may be predicted by the teacher and learner in terms of possible interest of the foreigners. Firstly, the learners are asked to make an outline of the possible talk with foreign colleagues proposing the nouns that are written on the board. Everyone is engaged in the discussion of a forecasted talk. The teacher may ask very simple questions, e.g.:

- Teacher (T) -What would you like to know about Vladivostok?
- Student (S) – Hotels.
- T - Which hotel could you reserve for your colleague?
- S - “Vladivostok”
- T - Why would you like to reserve “Vladivostok”?
- S -Near.
- T - Is it near to downtown?
- S -Downtown?
- T - Downtown is the center of the city.
- S -Yes.
- T - So hotel “Vladivostok” is near to downtown.
- S -Yes, “Vladivostok” is near to downtown.

This piece of interaction between a teacher and learners seems to show the process of recasting and repairing of forms and meanings and moreover, it is negotiating for meaning. As Leo van Lier argues negotiation for meaning is the process in which, in an effort to communicate, learners and competent speakers provide and interpret signals of their own and their interlocutor’s perceived comprehension, thus provoking adjustments to linguistic form, conversational structure, message content, or all three, until an acceptable level of understanding is achieved [8].

In the process of negotiating for meaning it is evident that most of class communication is held in the form of a pair or group work. The pair may be formed by the teacher on the basis - a more competent learner and a less competent one, according to the idea of Leo van Lier of arranging interaction to focus on form. Specially designed tasks (e.g., two-way information gap tasks) are more effective than general or casual conversation [8]. The research showed that the students while communicating this way used firstly vocabulary and after that grammar forms came. The proper grammar forms were elicited by the students when the teacher joined their talk as the most competent speaker in the class.

The most important thing in terms of teaching grammar in the context of ESP appears to be the differentiation between oral and written speech. As it was already mentioned the contents of professional communication includes oral and written communication. The contents

of oral communication may be divided into general English for specific purposes (GESP) and proper professional communication to accomplish joint tasks with the foreign colleagues by means of English language.

The examples of GESP may be communication in the situations of everyday interaction: greetings, meetings, self-introduction, tour around the city, reception, presentations etc. Here is an example of a class where the students learn to introduce themselves.

Name of the student	Alex	Peter	Nick	Mike
Home address	302 Svetl.str., apt.38, Zip 690046			
Phone number (cell, home)	8-914-6597639			
Birth date	23.11. 1991			
ID number	5476052			

Table Activities: the use of the verb “to be” and numerals

During this activity the teacher draws this table on the board with quadrants indicating the names of the available students and the items that should be covered in the course of communication. The students draw the similar table in their note-books. After that the students one by one inform the data about themselves while the others fill out the quadrants with the perceived information. Then the teacher asks students to fill out the table on the board. The students turning in write down the data about their mates. The challenge is that some of the students perceive the information incorrectly. The student the information of whom is not right is encouraged to speak and to correct. At this moment the teacher reminds of using the forms of the verb “to be”, numerals, pronouns (personal, possessive) to define age, address, phone numbers etc. If the discussion is held with regard to the families of the students (proper nouns, singular, plural, and the possessive case), adjectives (junior, elder, etc.), and adverbs: comparative degrees are introduced and negotiated for the meanings with the focus on particular form in the process of interaction.

A number of studies have shown that in various communication tasks learners, in interaction with native speakers or other learners, negotiate for meaning frequently, thus focusing on aspects of their own and their interlocutor’s messages that are not clear. It is proposed that such negotiation facilitates language learning [8:256]. This technique

of keeping a talk acquired by the students may be very helpful for them in their future professional language activities when they are expected to communicate with their foreign colleagues. They will negotiate for the meaning by means of recasting in order to achieve professional communicative goals. While communicating with the native speakers or more competent non- native speakers they will have a chance of further development of their speaking skills.

The verb “to be” is completely meaningful in use with regard to the personal introduction, location, and time, and relationship, identity in all aspects (age, name, job title, and nation). That is why it is extremely necessary to focus on the “to be” forms because the use of the verb “to be” seems to be challenging to Russian students. The classroom observation shows that the first year students try to use the form “am” before every other verbal form, e.g. I am read. I am see etc. The point is that they start learning English at school with the conjugation of the verb ‘to be’, in particular the form “I am ...” The first step of learning is so emotionally significant for them that they automatically use the form “am” before the other verbs. In this case fossilization is likely to take place with the regard to the overuse of verb ‘to be’. The teaching experience gives evidence there may be the cases of under use of the verb “to be” by the Russian students i.e. they may omit these forms at all. It is likely to be explained on the evidence of Contrastive analysis of Russian and English languages. The sentences such as - Vladivostok is a sea port - in Russian may be said without linking verb “to be” that is why it is a great challenge to a learner to acquire the form correctly. So the teacher should focus on the form of the verb “to be” in order to eliminate the cases of overuse or under use of these forms. Judging by the experience it takes so much time to gain the positive results.

Diane Larsen-Freeman says that students may give the appearance of having learned the present tense, for example, but when the present progressive is introduced, often their mastery vanishes and their performance declines. This backsliding continues until the grammar they have internalized is restructured to reflect the distinct uses of the two tenses [5].

The second assumption of Leo van Lier [8] is that the learning value of interaction derives primarily from attempts at solving communicative problems through clarification requests, comprehension checks,

confirmations, etc. (i.e., interaction modifications, or negotiated interaction).

As it was mentioned above the contents of professional oral communication includes proper professional communication along with everyday interaction of professionals. Here is the example of the negotiating for the meaning of the verb “to be” to train students for receiving Meteorology Signals at sea

Sea state is

- Calm
- Choppy
- Moderate swell
- Heavy swell
- Rough
- Very rough

And for receiving signals in the situation of replenishment

RS10 . . . Sequence of replenishment (from ship __) is to be __ .

STBD side (in order of call signs)

PORT side (in order of call signs)

ASTERN (in order of call signs)

[EXTAC 1005]

Or commands or orders that are used to steer the ship, for example.

- Half a Port
- Starboard aside
- Full Astern

It seems to be evident from the above examples that grammar for oral professional communication is characterized by the use of simple grammar forms.

Recent studies show that teaching grammar to learners of EFL have to be done in context with discourse [1, 5, 8] as the opposition to the traditional way of teaching grammar at the sentence level. It would be a mistake to teach students grammar only at the sentence and sub sentence levels. Much of the apparent arbitrariness of grammar disappears when it is viewed from a discourse-level perspective. [Larsen-Freeman, D. 2002 :103] The idea of Stubbs that discourse analysis is also concerned with language use in social contexts, and in particular with interaction

or dialogue between speakers is vividly supported by the two dialogues that are borrowed from Thornbury, S. [7: 122].

Dialogue 1

- Anyone fancy a coffee?
- Sure, if you're getting one.
- Get any small change?
- Here Tomorrow it's on me.
- No worries. Milk? Sugar?
- Black. Two sugars.
- Something to eat?
- Get us a chocolate bar, will you?
- OK. Back in a sec.

Dialogue 2

- Would anyone like a hot drink?
- Well, I wouldn't mind a coffee, if it's no trouble.
- Not at all. You wouldn't happen to have a fifty pence coin, would you?
- I think I just might. Here you are.
- Thank you. I'll pay you back.
- Please, I wouldn't hear of it.
- Would you like milk and sugar?
- I'll have it black, with two spoonfuls of sugar, if that's possible.
- Can I get you something to eat?
- Well, a chocolate bar would be nice, if they have any.
- Certainly. I'll be back shortly.

These two conversations may be a good evidence of Thornbury's conclusion that 'we can therefore draw another rule-of-thumb: the greater the social gap, the greater the need for grammar. (Note that a 'social gap' is not necessarily one of 'rank', but also one of familiarity.)' [Thornbury 7:102]. So we can interpret this idea as the less the social gap, the less the need for grammar in terms of oral professional communication.

If the discourse of professional communication can be regarded as language use in social contexts we can particularly consider the professional activity as the kind of the social activity. Therefore, in the discourse of oral professional communication the members of one professional group share the professional notions, categories, goals and objectives and the environment of their interaction. The gap of language understanding is compensated with the background knowledge of the both parties. Consequently, the above given examples of oral professional communication in the situations of receiving meteorological signals, replenishing, giving orders for steering the ship etc. show the minimum of grammar forms that are used by the specialists in the course of professional communication. These examples convincingly seem

to argue for the valid inference that proper professional situation of communication requires minimum of grammar.

So if the grammar is minimal in the discourse of oral professional communication the question rises how grammar is related to lexis. Thornbury articulates the preference for lexis. “A group discussions or communicative games may make learners over-reliant on lexical processes at the expense of developing their grammatical competence. Such learners - that is, those who get stuck at a mainly lexical level of processing - are said to have fossilized.

The greater the processing demands, the more reliance on a lexical system. The fewer demands, the more chance of grammaring” [7: 20] This idea of Thornbury is clearly proved by the examples of the use of lexis and grammar in the discourse of the international sea cooperation where, for example, commands for steering ship, replenishment and others do not require much grammar as the processing mainly occurs by means of sea terminology.

The oral professional communication occurs in the physical environment and mainly in a face-to face contact which can be regarded as a component of situation that contributes to better understanding between the people who use verbal and non - verbal means for holding professional talks. The opportunity of using non-verbal communication between professionals assists to reach the goal of interaction even within the frame of limited language means. Moreover the complex sentences cannot be used by the specialists in most situations as they may complicate the situation because the solution of some professional tasks should be found immediately. The short spoken sentences or phrases are mostly favorable as they promote the immediate actions, for example, orders for steering the ship, telephone talks and the other joint actions that are done by specialists.

If the written professional communication is regarded, for example, business letters, manuals, instruction guide etc. the view of teaching grammar seems to greatly change. Following the idea of Thornbury [7] this is likely to be due to the fact that social distance between interlocutors is great. By mentioning the social distance we

mean integrity of professional and personal relations between the interlocutors that are displayed in the communication. The business letters, instruction guides and manuals being addressed to people who are mostly on formal relationship or are unfamiliar to the addresser originate the environment of social distance between the addresser and addressee along with the lack of face to face contact. Below is the example of instruction guide.

Pre-Exercise Briefing. To ensure that an exercise is completed safely and with a minimum of misunderstanding, it is mandatory that all participants in an exercise attend a face-to-face briefing prior to the conduct of the exercise.

a. The OCE should describe tactical maneuvers to be carried out, initial stationing for the exercise, and methods to be employed for maneuvering. The communication plan should be described in detail. Reports required and the methods of preparing and submitting them should be specified. Every item indicated in the exercise as requiring briefing shall be covered [2].

This example shows that grammar forms are complex that seems to give a clear evidence of focusing on grammar while teaching professional written speech.

I think that all the teachers are unanimous on the point that the historical overview facilitates us to evaluate our teaching practice in terms of pros and cons of grammar instruction. All the methods and approaches are closely related to each other. They deeply contribute into raising language awareness that promotes the language acquisition and learning. All the methods are currently used effectively. It depends on where, when, for what and to whom they should be introduced.

Shall we develop the grammar skill as a main constituent of professional English language communicative competence to would be specialist? The answer could be obviously positive. It is vitally necessary to teach grammar in the discourse of the professional activity with focus on form within interaction and negotiation for meaning.

REFERENCES:

1. Celcia-Murcia M. Why it makes Sense to Teach grammar in Context and Through Discourse/ *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Ed. E. Hinkel and S. Fotos - London, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers 2002, pp.119-135
2. Exercise Tactical Maneuvering (EXTAC) Guide 1005. Brussel, 1998.
3. Fotos S., Hinkel E. From Theory to Practice: A Teacher's View/ *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Ed. E. Hinkel and S. Fotos// London, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers 2002, pp.2-13
4. Johns A. The Current Situation/ *Responses to English for Specific Purposes*. Ed. P. Master- San Jose University 1998, pp 7-12
5. Larsen-Freeman, Dianne *Grammar of Choice/ New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Ed. E. Hinkel and S. Fotos// London, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers 2002, pp.103-119
6. Master P. Reading and Content in ESP/ *Responses to English for Specific Purposes*. Ed. P. Master - San Jose University 1998, pp. 12-17
7. Thornbury S. *Uncovering Grammar// Great Britain: Macmillan Books for Teachers* 2005, p.122.
8. Van Lier L. The Role of Form in Language Learning/ *Reflections on language and language learning: In honour of Arthur van Essen*. Eds. Marcel Bax & Jan-Wouter Zwart// Amsterdam: John Benjamins 2001, pp. 253-266.