_____

Garden Path Method in Grammar Instruction

Bernadette A. Cada
Eastern Samar State University, Borongan City,
Eastern Samar, Philippines 6800

dettec1023@gmail.com

Abstract – The teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) are faced with a pressing challenge in finding an effective technique for grammar instruction. This study investigated whether Garden Path Method is responsible for the success in learning English as a foreign language of second year Teacher Education students in order to prepare them for higher-level English courses. The instrument used in the study is a TOEFL Test which consists of four parts: structure; written expression; vocabulary; and reading comprehension. As indicated by the pre-test mean scores of the two groups, the EFL second year teacher education students perform well on structure and vocabulary tests, whereas written expression and reading comprehension are two areas where EFL learners suffer. In order to help EFL students improve their reading comprehension, language teachers will need to provide more written expression and reading comprehension projects and drills, as well as apply a range of reading methodologies. Furthermore, the results indicated that the garden path method is beneficial.

Keywords- English as a Foreign Language, Garden Path Method, Teacher Education, Test

INTRODUCTION

The significance of teaching grammar in English language is a continuous discussion [1]. Language learners and teachers are faced with difficulties in grammar instruction in an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) context. Arroyo [2] explained on the nature of English as a foreign language. She pointed out that primarily, language is important because it is solely a human activity. Language is learned by using it. Fluency in the English language is a skill and must be practiced often. Allaf-Akbary [3] referenced that

teacher should put forth an attempt to discover method of conquering them and give the students effectual grammar instruction.

Cook and Singleton [4] commented, "grammar is just as crucial in a second language: we wouldn't perform well in conversation in a second language if we didn't grasp its basic word order, common inflections, and article system." In spite of the fact that Gass et.al [5] offer the possibility that attention to target structure does not prompt to its accession except if the definition of unequivocal guidelines is introduced. Rosa and Leow [6] stated that if second language learners are just mindful of target structure, they can give the chances to work with the securing of target structures. For the students to be proficient in the English language, language teachers are employing several approaches, methods, strategies and techniques in language teaching, and one of these is the garden path method developed by Tomasello and Herron [7]. This is a teaching strategy whereby students are intentionally urged to form their own overall linguistic principle for the target language and afterward plainly amended. They guarantee that the Garden Path method helps EFL learners' right exchange and overgeneralization blunders. Rectification of overgeneralization blunders and transfer errors is essential. Else, it would take the L2 students too long to even think about the target language. Further, they assert that the Garden Path method helps L2 learners' right exchange and overgeneralization mistakes. Nunan [8] stated that " this exercise is designed to get students to overgeneralize in order to urge them to process the target structure more thoroughly than they might otherwise. As a result, it leads to committing mistakes. This is a method of learning that is based on inductive reasoning."

As posited by Herron [9], the constructive outcome of the Garden Path method on students' written ability was exhibited in three separate experimentations, with the same outcomes. Also, the positive impacts of inducing a student error during a "one-shot," fifteen-minute grammar teaching lasted for several weeks. The third examination, oral and written execution was

assessed, the novel rectification procedure again essentially improved student learning. Despite the fact that learners in each of the three examinations were really instigated to make mistakes a problematic educational practice on a superficial level, these blunders are ones that American understudies are probably going to perform regardless when learning French. The Garden Path technique permits a teacher to normally allow mistakes by inciting them in a setting where quick criticism can be given.

Tomasello and Herron [10] utilized the "garden path" method to confirm it a favorable strategy. This method finishes a rule which the commonplace errors were initiated and promptly remedied. The garden path strategy seems to help students to make a qualification between their own mistaken expressions and the right target language expressions. In the Garden Path technique, grammar lessons are with the goal that the learners are prompted to make a mistake where the teacher rectified quickly. The teacher drives the students in a contextualized oral exercise on another etymological construction where the students are uninformed of the teacher's goal, thereby committing inescapable mistake of overextending. As indicated by Herron [9], through this method, the teacher "leads the students down the garden path" to an error that is likely going to happen normally, giving the teacher the chance to control the event of making a mistake and to address it right away.

There are different manners by which sentence structure are characterized. Farrokhi [11] made an endeavor to decide the chance of incorporating structure centered guidance and open association in regards to mistake revision. The outcomes showed that 'stamped recast' could be viewed as a decent remedial input joining center around structure and spotlight on significance at the degree of mistake rectification.

Another grammar technique was utilized in the study of Gass, et al [5] as cited in Allaf-Akbary [3] analyzed the effect of consideration on the learning of several languages and how this effect is connected with language capability. The consequences of the examination showed that consideration significantly affected language structure learning. The investigation additionally reached this resolution that consideration was generally persuasive during the beginning phases and the most un-powerful during the later stages.

Park [12] examined the inquiry whether remotely made remarkable quality may prompt students' inside created striking nature. The discoveries were that expanding the perceptual striking nature of target

semantic structures didn't bring about students' seeing of structures. Another consequence of the examination was that seeing semantic structures was influenced by such factors as student preparation, information on first language, and second language learning experience.

Moreover, Elkilic and Akca [13] gave a nitty gritty explanation about uplifting perspectives of students learning English language at a private essential EFL homeroom towards examining sentence structure. Somewhat more than half of their members expressed to appreciate syntax without a doubt and just roughly 10% revealed having some trouble in learning and recollecting language structure.

Eun [14] contextualized sentence structure utilizing genuine materials came about that syntax isn't exhausting at everything except it very well may be dynamic and fascinating when true materials are utilized to instruct language.

The inquiry which is left unanswered is whether this grammar techniques can be more compelling than others. And that inquiry would be answered in this paper whether Garden Path method is responsible for the success of EFL learners, before the conduct of the method and after it has been conducted to them. Towards this end, an experiment would be conducted with second year education students learning English as a foreign language. It is deemed necessary that as they progresses to the next year level, they have been exposed in a grammar class through the Garden Path Method. The Garden Path method is an oral error correction approach based on two core second language learning principles. Likewise, the concepts that would be acquired during the treatment would be helpful to the participants as education students and future educators.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of the garden path technique to second-year teacher education students.

Specifically, this research seeks to answer these objectives: to determine the pre-test mean scores of the Test of English as a Foreign Language of both control and experimental groups in terms of structure, written expression, vocabulary, and reading comprehension; to assess the post-test mean scores of the Test of English as a Foreign Language of both control and experimental groups in terms of structure, written expression, vocabulary, and reading comprehension; and to identify if there is a difference between the pre-test and post-test mean scores of the Test of English as

a Foreign Language of both experimental and control groups.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Research Design
This research utilized experimental design. The respondents were grouped into two groups, control and experimental. Both groups were given a prestest, then the treatment was conducted to the experimental group. After the treatment, a post-test for each group was administered to decide its impact.

Respondents of the Study
The second year Teacher Education students who are officially enrolled during the first semester of school year 2018-2019 are the respondents of this study. The result of the test would be the bases to prepare them in taking higher courses in English as they move to the next year level.

Total enumeration was employed since there are only sixteen second year students. With the end goal of the students' homogeneity to be accomplished, a pretest was directed utilizing TOEFL (Teaching of English as a Foreign Language) test. The result of the pre-test was ranked and served as the basis in grouping the second year students based from the scores obtained. On the off chance that two students have a similar score, one was doled out to the experimental group and the other one was relegated to the control group. The same process was observed to all the respondents.

Research Instrument
The instrument used in the study is a TOEFL Test adapted from the study of Liskinasih and Lutviana [15]. The researcher modified the instrument after the validation test was administered in other campus of the same course and year level. It consists of four parts: Part I is a 25-item test on structure; Part II is another 25-item test on written expression; Part III is a 25-item test on vocabulary: and Part IV is a 25-item test on reading comprehension. There are 100 items that students answered completely, and they were given 60 minutes to finish the test.

Data Gathering Procedure
The identified respondents were oriented by the researcher as to the nature and purpose of the study. All the sixteen (16) second year education students were grouped into two, the first group is labelled as control and the second group as experimental, each of which consists of eight (8) learners. The garden path method

were administered to the experimental group where error corrective feedback was given at the onset of committing error, while in the control group, the researcher just go on discussing the rules of grammar without giving immediate correction if learners commit errors. It took ten sessions for each group and each session lasted for 60 minutes. The sixty minutes is intended for the usual class activity using the course book on grammar which focus on the structure, written expression, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. On the tenth session, the post-test was administered to the two groups.

Analysis of Data
The mean was used to compute both the pre-test and post-test mean scores of the Test of English as a Foreign Language of both control and experimental groups, while the t-test was used to identify if there is a difference between the pre-test and post-test mean scores of the Test of English as a Foreign Language of both experimental and control groups.

Ethical Considerations
Before the actual conduct of the test, the researcher sought permission from the Dean of the College of Education and the consent from the respondents. After seeking the necessary approval and permits to conduct the study, the researcher administered the pre-test to the second year Education students to determine their respective group.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Pre-test Mean Scores of the Test of English as a Foreign Language of the Control Group

Respondent	Test of English as a Foreign Language				Total
	ST	WE	VO	RC	
1	10	17	10	15	52
2	17	12	14	12	55
3	17	14	15	14	60
4	16	15	16	13	60
5	20	15	19	15	69
6	20	16	19	16	71
7	20	18	20	15	73
8	22	18	20	15	75
TOTAL	17.75	15.62	16.62	14.38	64.37

Structure (ST); Written Expression (WE); Vocabulary (VO); Reading Comprehension (RC)

Table 1 presents the pre-test mean scores of the TOEFL test of the control group. It shows that of the

eight respondents, structure got a mean of 17.75, followed by vocabulary which is 16.62, while written expression obtained a mean of 15.62, and reading comprehension which is 14.38. And the total mean score is 64.37.

Table 2. Pre-test Mean Scores in the Test of English as a Foreign Language of the Experimental Group

| Respondents | Test of English as a Foreign Language | | | | Total |
	Structure	Written Expression	Vocabulary	Reading Comprehension	
1	10	17	9	15	51
2	12	15	13	14	54
3	18	12	15	15	60
4	17	14	14	16	61
5	18	16	18	16	68
6	17	19	20	15	71
7	21	17	20	17	75
8	20	19	21	16	76
TOTAL	16.62	16.13	16.25	15.5	64.5

Pre-test Mean Scores of the Test of English as a Foreign Language of the Experimental Group. Table 2 presents the pre-test mean scores of the TOEFL test of the experimental group. As gleaned from the table, the eight respondents obtained a mean of 16.62 for structure, 16.25 for vocabulary, 16.13 for written expression, and 15.5 for reading comprehension with a total mean of 64.5.

Table 3. T-test of the Pre-test of Control and Experimental Groups

Groups	n	Mean	p-Value	Interpretation
Control	8	64.38	0.978	Not Significant
Experimental	8	64.50		

T-test of the Pre-test of Control Group and Experimental Group. Table 3 shows the t-test of the pre-test of control group and experimental group. The mean scores of both control and experimental group is 64.38 and 64.50 respectively, with a p-value of 0.978 which is interpreted as not significant.

T-test of the Post-test of Control Group and Experimental Group. Table 4 presents the t-test of the post-test of control group and experimental group. As seen in the table, the control group got a mean of 73.12, while the experimental group obtained a mean of 82.87 with a p-value of .004 interpreted as significant. As revealed in the result, there is a difference between the pre-test and post-test mean scores of the Test of English as a Foreign Language of the two groups.

Table 4. T-test of the Post-test of Control and Experimental Groups

Groups	n	Mean	p-Value	Interpretation
Control	8	73.12	.004	Significant
Experimental	8	82.87		

Based from the TOEFL test scores, the post-test mean scores of the experimental group has a significant difference. It can be seen that the experimental group which received the garden path treatment has a post-test mean score of 82.87, which is higher compared to the post-test mean score of 73.12 of the control group. Hence, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test mean scores of the Test of English as a Foreign Language of both experimental and control groups is rejected.

The result of this study conforms with the study of Allaf-Akbary [3] on the possible effect of garden path technique, where the experimental group had an apparently good impact contrary to the control group.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the results and findings of the study, the EFL second year teacher education students scored fairly in structure and vocabulary tests; the written expression and reading comprehension are the two skills where EFL learners experience difficulties as shown in the pre-test mean scores of the two groups; and the experimental group scored a significant difference after the garden path treatment was administered, which shows that the method is effective.

The following recommendations are based on the study's findings: language teachers should provide additional exercises and drills on written expression and reading comprehension; language teachers should use various reading methodologies to improve EFL learners' reading comprehension; language teachers should explore and employ the garden path method, as it has been proven to be an effective strategy in teaching grammar lessons; and future researchers should explore and employ the garden path method as it has been proven to be an effective strategy in teaching grammar lessons.

REFERENCES

[1] Khasawneh, M. A. S. (2021). The effectiveness of using multimedia in the developing the concepts

of the English language grammar concepts for people with learning difficulties. *Science and Education*, *2*(6), 373-384.

[2] Arroyo, G. M. (2005). "ICT and the Strong Republic." Phil. Education in the Third Millennium:Trends, Issues, Challenges and Concerns. UEP, Catarman: 6 Ns Enterprises.

[3] Allaf-Akbary. O., (2015).The Effect of Garden Path Technique of Grammar Instruction on Learning Superlative and Comparative Adjectives. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. 3(4) 217-221. doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20150304.14

[4] Cook, V., & Singleton, D. (2014). Topic 6: How Do Attitude and Motivation Help in Learning a Second Language?. In *Key topics in second language acquisition* (pp. 89-108). Multilingual Matters.

[5] Gass, S., Svetics, I., & Lemelin, S. (2003). Differential effects of attention. *Language learning*, *53*(3), 497-546. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00233

[6] Rosa, E. M., & Leow, R. P. (2004). Computerized task-based exposure, explicitness, type of feedback, and Spanish L2 development. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(2), 192-216. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00225.x

[7] Tomasello, M., & Herron, C. (1988). Down the garden path: Inducing and correcting overgeneralization errors in the foreign language classroom. *Applied psycholinguistics*, *9*(3), 237-246. doi:10.1017/S0142716400007827

[8] Nunan, D. (2003). Practical english. *Language Teaching. New York: Mc Graw Hill*.

[9] Herron, C., (2012). The Garden Path Correction Strategy in the Foreign Language Classroom Retrieved Jan. 30, 2018 from http://www.academicroom.com/article/garden-path-correction-strategy-foreign-language-classroom

[10] Tomasello, M., & Herron, C. (1989). Feedback for language transfer errors: The garden path technique. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *11*(4), 385-395. doi:10.1017/S0272263100008408

[11] Farrokhi, F. (2005). Revisiting the ambiguity of recasts. *Journal of Faculty of Letters and Humanities* (TABRIZ) 48(195), 61-101, https://www.sid.ir/en/Journal/ViewPaper.aspx?ID=47825

[12] Park, E. S. (2004). Constraints of implicit focus on form: Insights from a study of input enhancement. *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TESOL*, *4*(2). DOI: 10.7916/salt.v4i2.1591

[13] Elkiliç, G., & Catherine, A. K. Ç. A. (2008). Attitudes of the students studying at Kafkas university private primary EFL classroom towards storytelling and motivation. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *4*(1). https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jlls/issue/9927/122838

[14] Eun J.O., (2010). Contextualizing grammar teaching using authentic materials. Retrieved from http://www.fbcinc.com/e/LEARN/e/korean2010/

[15] Liskinasih, A. (2016). The validity evidence of TOEFL test as placement test. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra*, *3*(2), 173-180. https://ejournal.unikama.ac.id/index.php/JIBS/article/view/1513