

## THE PERSPECTIVES OF KRASHEN'S IDEAS CONCERNING GRAMMAR TEACHING

Salomova Makhbuba

MA student of TSPU named after Nizami

**Abstract:** this study examines the implications of Krashen's views for grammar instruction, highlighting the tension between traditional pedagogical approaches that emphasize explicit grammar teaching and Krashen's advocacy for a more immersive, context-driven learning experience. Key issues addressed include the effectiveness of explicit grammar instruction in fostering language proficiency, the potential impact of anxiety and motivation on learners' engagement with grammar, and the necessity of balancing communicative competence with grammatical accuracy.

**Keywords:** the affective filter, the monitor hypothesis, the input hypothesis, acquisition-learning hypothesis and the natural order hypothesis.

For the long period the scholars have discussed the challenges associated with grammar teaching within the framework of Stephen Krashen's Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory, particularly, his Input Hypothesis and the distinction between acquisition and learning. Krashen posits that language acquisition occurs naturally through meaningful communication rather than explicit instruction, leading to significant debates about the role of grammar in language education. Krashen [1982] has been a vocal opponent of conventional grammar-based teaching approaches, contending that grammar training has little

bearing on learning. His views are primarily grounded on his monitor model, input hypothesis, and larger theoretical framework, all of which have sparked discussions among other pedagogy scholars.

In addition to being ineffective in fostering language acquisition, Krashen contends that explicit grammar instruction in which students get formal instruction and have their mistakes corrected may also impede the development of their native tongue. His belief is founded on the idea that, given enough motivation and access to understandable information, students including those in the classroom would naturally follow their predetermined curriculum. Teaching grammar may help students learn, but since communicative capacity was dependent on acquisition, this was not very useful. He claims that an excessive focus on grammatical rules can impede fluency and confidence, and that relevant, context-rich information is more helpful than explicit grammar training. “Implicit knowledge” is “knowledge that learners are only intuitively aware of and that is easily accessible through automatic processing”, whereas “explicit knowledge” consists of “knowledge that learners are consciously aware of and that is typically only available through controlled processing” [Ellis 2006, p. 340]. Similarly, Bitchener & Storch state that implicit knowledge “can be used automatically and without conscious attention” whereas explicit knowledge “involves the learner in a controlled, conscious consideration of what constitutes target-like accuracy and appropriateness” [Bitchener & Storch 2016, p. 12]. Stephen Krashen expresses that implicit knowledge is more significant than explicit information because students who possess more explicit knowledge are more likely to pay close attention to what they say, which might result in miscommunication.

Furthermore, *the reliance on explicit rules* may create cognitive overload, especially for younger learners who often require more contextually rich learning experiences. In order to address the complex issues involved in language acquisition, this critique shows that, although explicit grammar instruction may have a role in educational settings, it must be balanced with methods that promote intrinsic motivation and communicative ability. Ultimately, developing a more efficient and captivating learning environment that values fluency above mechanical precision requires acknowledging and resolving these pedagogical dilemmas.

Krashen's primary *concern with traditional teaching methods* lies with its heavy dependence on conscious learning, when compared to subconscious acquisition that he sees as an essential tool for fluency and confidence in a language. This approach frequently prioritizes accuracy over fluency, leading to anxiety and disengagement among learners. Fearful of making mistakes in their speech, learners do not speak in front of others. This is against Krashen's emphasis on the importance of a *low effective filter* for productive language learning.

The Role of Input in Language Acquisition is valuable for educational aims. In exploring the complexities of language acquisition, particularly through Krashen's perspective, the significance of input becomes evident in its role in developing grammatical competence. Krashen emphasizes that comprehensible input is essential for effective language learning, as it allows learners to gradually assimilate grammatical structures in context. However, this input must be adequately matched to the learners' current proficiency levels, a concept further

supported by research demonstrating the disconnect between explicit grammatical instruction and actual language use.

To conclude, the natural approach to language learning, which prioritizes comprehension and conversation above formal grammar instruction, is emphasized by Stephen Krashen's viewpoint on grammar instruction. He contends that meaningful engagement and context-based language learning are more effective than mindless memorizing of grammatical rules. Teachers may create a more productive and interesting language learning environment by emphasizing understandable input and real conversation.

## References

1. Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). Written Corrective Feedback for L2 Development London: Multilingual Matters.
2. Ellis R. (2006). Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective, TESOL Quarterly, 40. Pp. 83-107.
3. Krashen, S. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982.