

**Lopatiuk N. I.**  
*Candidate of Philological Sciences,*  
*Associate Professor at the Department of English*  
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University

**Lukashchuk M. V.**  
*Assistant Professor at the Department of English*  
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University  
Chernivtsi, Ukraine

## **TEACHING GRAMMAR AT A UNIVERSITY LEVEL**

Teaching grammar syllabus at a university level for 1 and 2 year students necessitates the mastery of basic grammatical structures and fundamental concepts of grammar and being able to use these grammatical means in the process of communication.

Educators at this point face a number of challenges. First, the students have different levels of their vocabulary and grammar competence, and the objective is to bring their levels to a common denominator. B. Tosun said that “grammar and vocabulary, in this sense, constitute two indispensable aspects of language. While grammar forms the skeleton of a language, vocabulary at this point can be resembled to flesh that covers this skeleton” [4, p. 325].

To meet these ends, we can provide students with samples of material so that they can implicitly acquire structures from the sets of examples. K. Lichtman pays attention to the fact that “internal factors such as age also play a large role in facilitating implicit and explicit learning: children tend to use more implicit learning mechanisms, and adults more explicit mechanisms. This may be because adults’ capacity to learn language implicitly is limited by cognitive maturation, or because children’s capacity to understand explicit grammar rules has not yet developed” [3, p. 2].

Students are young adults who may benefit from both explicit and implicit instruction. The use of implicit instruction may be facilitated by the use of online corpora such as COCA where students can find sufficient material across registers of the constructions under study. R. Kasproicz, and E. Marsden share their experience of explicit learning. They report that “even in a low-input environment, like many Anglophone FL classrooms, a relatively short, input-based intervention (five 50-minute sessions) can result in substantial, durable gains in both comprehension and production of morphosyntax” [2, p. 903]. In other words, according to the study, students showed much better success rate after short classes of presenting relevant grammatical constructions.

Another way to facilitate grammar competence acquisition is presenting the students with patterns of use of specific grammatical constructions. Patrick Hanks states that “he came to realize that the meaning of any utterance can best be understood by analysing the phraseological patterns associated with the main verb in each clause and then sorting the different nouns into lexical sets according to their meaning” [1, p. 2].

To promote learning a special kind of learner corpora have been developed. Educators compare learner texts with those created by native speakers and it allows them to draw the necessary conclusions in development of teaching theory. A. Zareva suggests using corpora in teaching is beneficial, so that educators are able to make their own study of corpus data to apply in teaching ESL/EFL. She proposed the following points for corpus awareness of ESL/EFL teachers: “1) understanding what a corpus is; 2) knowing what can and cannot be accomplished with a corpus; 3) being able to analyse concordances; and 4) understanding how to draw conclusions about language use trends from corpus data” [5, p. 70].

Corpus linguistics can make it easier for students to achieve grammatical competence by going over a substantial amount of sample structures that will help them memorize the new structures, and later facilitate their active use in their own speech and writing.

And the last, but also important stage is assessment. Z. Gan and C. Leung share their study of formative assessment that is applied according to new approach to curriculum in which learning is viewed as a way when students “construct their knowledge through trying out and practising knowledge” [6, p. 10]. They add that “in addition to the provision of feedback on performance, formative assessment research has emphasized empowering students to understand learning objectives and become aware of strategies and steps to be undertaken to move their own learning forward” [6, p. 11].

Therefore, to help students acquire grammatical competence in English, we use explicit and implicit learning strategies, pattern learning and apply corpus linguistics learning strategies to facilitate students’ progress in learning and using grammatical structures. On the first stage, students learn grammatical structures on the level of substitution exercises, and on later stages students apply learned structures in their own speech and writing. And as a last stage, students are trying to generate their own sentences with the studied grammatical constructions used in their own written tasks.

## References:

1. Hanks, P., Ma, W. (2020). Meaning and Grammar in the light of Corpus Pattern Analysis. *International Journal of Lexicography*. 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijl/ecaa027>.
2. Kasprowicz, R., Marsden, E. (2018). Towards Ecological Validity in Research into Input-based Practice: Form Spotting Can Be as Beneficial

- as Form-meaning Practic. *Applied Linguistics*. 39(6). 886–911. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amw051>.
3. Lichtman, K. (2020) What About Fluency? Implicit vs. Explicit Training Affects Artificial Mini-Language Production. *Applied Linguistics*. 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amaa054>.
  4. Tosun, B. (2018). From Students' Viewpoint: Integrating Contextual Micro-Grammar Revision with Contextual Vocabulary Teaching Consistent with Constructivism. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*. 14(3). 325–335.
  5. Zareva, A. (2017). Incorporating Corpus Literacy Skills into TESOL Teacher Training. *ELT Journal*. 71(1). 69–79. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw045>.
  6. Gan, Z., Leung C. (2020). Illustrating Formative Assessment in task-Based Language Teaching. *ELT Journal*. 74(1). 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccz048>.

**Мищенко Т. В.**  
*кандидат філологічних наук,*  
*старший викладач кафедри германської філології*  
*та методики викладання іноземних мов*  
Ніжинський державний університет імені Миколи Гоголя  
м. Ніжин, Чернігівська область, Україна

## **ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЗМІВ В АНГЛОМОВНОМУ НОВИННОМУ ДИСКУРСІ: СТВОРЕННЯ РИТОРИЧНИХ ЕФЕКТІВ**

Медіадискурс як створена засобами масової інформації реальність [3, с. 7], сконструйована за посередництва візуального (преса), аудіального (радіо), аудіо-візуального (телебачення) [6, с. 38] та цифрового (Інтернет) [9, с. 158] каналів, характеризується відсутністю миттєвого зворотного зв'язку від аудиторії й зорієнтований на масового читача, слухача або глядача, які знаходяться на значній відстані від творців повідомлень [10]. Одним із найбільш поширених жанрів медіадискурсу є його новинний різновид, основне завдання якого поряд з інформуванням про події та їх аналізом є здійснення сугестивної дії на аудиторію, що серед іншого здійснюється за допомогою фразеологічних одиниць (далі ФО), котрі в текстах новин реалізують акцентувальну функцію [2, с. 195].

Дослідження ролі ФО як засобів впливу на адресатів новинних текстів зумовлює звернення до риторики як мистецтва переконування [11, с. 275]. Разом з тим, античне вчення, яке зосереджувалось на ораторському красномовстві, зазнало трансформації, що виявилось у формуванні