

The TLCIC Framework: Innovating Grammar and Vocabulary Instruction in EFL Classrooms

Ayad Chraa^{1*}, Abdessamad Ouali², Kamal El Abidi², Samira El Morabit², Souad Nidbrka²

¹Centre Régional des Métiers de l'Education et de la Formation- Souss Massa, Agadir, Morocco

²FLSH- Ibn Zohr University, Agadir, Morocco

*Corresponding Author

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.906000233>

Received: 01 June 2025; Accepted: 05 June 2025; Published: 09 July 2025

ABSTRACT

In the field of English Language Teaching (ELT), instructional models play a critical role in enhancing pedagogical effectiveness and learner engagement. This article introduces the TLCIC framework—**Try, Learn, Correct, Incorporate, Create**—as a novel, learner-centered model designed to improve the teaching of grammar and vocabulary in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Grounded in second language acquisition theory and supported by principles of constructivist pedagogy, the TLCIC framework offers a structured yet flexible approach that prioritizes autonomy, discovery learning, and communicative application. The study first presents a critical review of established frameworks such as PPP, TTT, POHE, and ECRIF, highlighting their strengths and limitations. It then articulates the theoretical foundation and practical stages of the TLCIC model, illustrating its application through a detailed grammar lesson plan on the Present Perfect Simple tense. By integrating behavioral, cognitive, and sociocultural learning theories, the TLCIC framework fosters deeper processing, learner agency, and real-world language use. The article concludes that TLCIC is a forward-thinking, adaptable pedagogical model that aligns with the demands of 21st-century ELT practices.

Keywords: TLCIC framework; grammar instruction; English as a Foreign Language (EFL); learner-centered pedagogy; instructional models; ELT Framework.

INTRODUCTION

Planning and organization are foundational principles in English Language Teaching (ELT). Effective language instruction requires a systematic approach guided by well-structured procedures. In the pre-method era, teaching was often based on teachers' intuition and personal experiences with language acquisition. However, contemporary advances in second language acquisition theories have highlighted the critical role of structured teaching practices in fostering meaningful and effective learning outcomes. As a result, various instructional models have been developed to systematize and enhance teaching methodologies. Among the most influential are frameworks such as **PPP** (Presentation, Practice, Production), **TTT** (Test, Teach, Test), **POHE** (Preparation, Observation, Hypothesizing, Experimentation), and **ECRIF** (Encounter, Clarify, Remember, Internalize, Fluency). These models have significantly shaped language teaching practices over the past decades.

Despite their recognized benefits, there remains a pressing need to continually adapt teaching strategies to address evolving educational demands. In response to this need, the **TLCIC** framework—**Try, Learn, Correct, Incorporate, Create**—is proposed. This approach emphasizes learner-centered instruction and seeks to meet contemporary pedagogical requirements, including fostering learner autonomy and supporting task- and project-based learning.

This article is structured into two main parts. The first provides a critical review of widely used teaching frameworks in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, specifically PPP, TTT, POHE, and ECRIF. The

second introduces and discusses the **TLCIC** framework, with a focus on its application to the teaching of grammar and vocabulary

Critical Review of the Commonly Used Frameworks in ELT

Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP) Framework

Grammar and vocabulary are fundamental components of second language teaching and learning, and as such, they are often given considerable emphasis in language education programmes. Effective instruction of these elements requires the implementation of a well-structured pedagogical framework. Over time, various models have been developed to support the teaching of grammar and vocabulary. Among the most widely adopted frameworks in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms is the PPP model—Presentation, Practice, Production—which provides a structured and sequential approach to language instruction. Aslan (2016) observes that the Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) model integrates various pedagogical approaches. Specifically, it adopts techniques from Situational Language Teaching (SLT) during the presentation phase, incorporates principles of behaviorism in the practice phase, and aligns the production phase with the tenets of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Numerous scholars maintain that the PPP model remains effective for teaching grammar and vocabulary, as it supports the systematic acquisition of linguistic forms—particularly during the presentation stage (Hedge, 2000)—and promotes the development of automaticity in language use during the practice and production stages (Skehan, 1998).

The Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) model has been endorsed by numerous researchers for its perceived pedagogical advantages. Carless (2009) argues that the PPP framework clearly delineates the roles of both teachers and learners while effectively balancing attention to language form and meaning. In his study, teachers reported that the model is easier to comprehend and more manageable to implement in classroom settings. Moreover, the model's emphasis on explicit instruction—a core component of PPP—has been demonstrated to be more effective than implicit instruction in promoting language acquisition (Norris & Ortega, 2000). Astria (2016) identified three major benefits of the PPP model in language teaching and learning: it offers a well-structured framework for lesson planning, enabling teachers to select appropriate procedures and activities; it facilitates a smooth and comprehensible progression for students in processing new information; and it enhances learners' motivation and attentiveness by integrating noticing and consciousness-raising activities.

Despite these advantages, the PPP model has also faced significant criticism. Detractors argue that the model is inherently teacher-centered, placing minimal emphasis on the learner's active role in the learning process. It has been criticized for presenting linguistic structures in a decontextualized and isolated manner, thereby limiting learners' ability to apply knowledge communicatively (Scrivener, 1994; Woodward, 1993). Furthermore, Willis (1993) contends that PPP prioritizes accuracy at the expense of fluency. As a result, the model may suppress learner creativity and limit student engagement, given the teacher's dominance over the instructional process.

In response to these limitations, several alternative instructional frameworks have emerged, including Presentation-Observation-Hypothesis-Experiment (POHE), Test-Teach-Test (TTT), and Encounter-Clarify-Remember-Internalize-Fluently use (ECRIF), all of which aim to address the pedagogical gaps inherent in the PPP approach.

POHE Framework

In response to the limitations of the PPP model, Lewis (1993) introduced the POHE framework—an instructional model rooted in the lexical approach. POHE, which stands for Preparation, Observation, Hypothesizing, and Experimentation, seeks to shift the focus from teacher-led instruction to learner-centered exploration. In the Preparation phase, teachers may employ warm-up activities to energize learners, activate prior knowledge, review previous content, or introduce new language items through contextualization. The Observation phase encourages students to use their receptive skills—reading and listening—to notice the target forms or structures. This stage fosters awareness through comparison, as learners identify patterns, similarities, and differences within the input. During the Hypothesizing phase, learners engage in inductive tasks that promote rule formulation through self-discovery, allowing them to construct linguistic knowledge

independently. Finally, the Experimentation stage offers opportunities for learners to test their hypotheses, validate their understanding, and take ownership of their learning, often through peer collaboration and communicative practice.

The POHE framework has been praised for promoting educational benefits such as learner autonomy, deeper cognitive engagement, and enhanced problem-solving skills (Lewis, 1993). However, it has also drawn criticism. Thornbury (1998) questions the validity of the lexical approach underpinning the model, arguing that it lacks a coherent theoretical foundation regarding the nature of language. This theoretical gap, he claims, leads to ambiguity in its implications for syllabus design. Similarly, Swan (2006) critiques the model for overemphasizing formulaic language at the expense of grammatical competence. He contends that excessive reliance on memorized lexical chunks may limit learners' communicative flexibility, particularly when these chunks are inadequate for generating novel or complex expressions. In sum, although the POHE model offers innovative strategies for language instruction, these criticisms suggest that it falls short of providing a comprehensive framework capable of fostering the communicative competencies required in the 21st century.

TTT Model in Language Teaching

Testing and teaching are intrinsically interrelated processes. Tests not only inform learners about their progress and development but also highlight how their learning differs from that of their peers. Furthermore, tests provide valuable feedback regarding the effectiveness of instructional materials and teaching methods. In this sense, assessments serve a dual purpose, informing both learners and educators. Learners may be assessed through various types of test items, each designed for distinct pedagogical objectives. One such framework is the Test-Teach-Test (TTT) method, which assesses learners' current knowledge, identifies specific learning challenges, and addresses them through targeted instruction.

The TTT approach begins with an initial diagnostic task, in which learners are asked to complete a task or activity independently, using their existing knowledge. This stage functions much like action research, enabling the teacher to identify gaps and misconceptions in learners' understanding. Based on the outcomes of this preliminary task, the teacher then delivers focused instruction to address the identified issues. Learners engage in various knowledge-building activities that facilitate more profound understanding and active participation. The final stage involves administering a follow-up task to evaluate the learners' acquisition of the target language and their overall progress.

Distinct from other instructional models, the TTT framework emphasizes the importance of assessing learners' prior knowledge of the target language for two key reasons: to determine their current level of language proficiency and to diagnose specific learning needs. This diagnostic insight enables teachers to tailor their instruction more effectively. Moreover, the TTT model aligns with Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1983), which posits that optimal learning occurs when learners receive comprehensible input slightly beyond their current level ($i+1$) in a low-anxiety environment. By focusing on learners' actual needs, TTT minimizes unnecessary repetition of known content and raises learners' metacognitive awareness of their knowledge gaps.

Nevertheless, the TTT model is not without limitations. One significant critique is that learners may feel overwhelmed if they are unable to perform the initial task, potentially leading to anxiety and disengagement. Additionally, the approach can be time-consuming, particularly if the diagnostic tasks are overly lengthy or not well-calibrated to the learners' proficiency levels.

ECRIF Framework

Kurzweil and Scholl (2007) introduced the ECRIF Framework in their seminal work, *Understanding Teaching through Learning*, written between 2004 and 2005. The acronym ECRIF encapsulates five progressive stages of language learning: Encounter, Clarify, Remember, Internalize, and Fluency. This framework holds significant pedagogical value as it delineates how learners acquire language, emphasizing a shift from traditional teacher-centered instruction to a more learner-centered approach. As outlined in Kurzweil and Scholl (2007), each stage represents a distinct phase in the learner's cognitive and linguistic development (see Table 1 below). Specifically, ECRIF fosters student collaboration and autonomous practice, thereby promoting

active engagement in the learning process. Lin (2016) further emphasizes that ECRIF supports educators in reflecting upon their instructional strategies, which enables them to better address the diverse needs of their students.

Table 1 ECRIF Language Learning Strategies

| Stage | What the students are doing | What they may be thinking |
|---|---|--|
| E ENCOUNTER | =Students see or hear new language and realize they don't know something | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What's this?</i> • <i>I don't know this?</i> |
| C CLARIFY | = Students distinguish the meaning and use of the new knowledge or skill. They ask questions and think about what is correct. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Oh I see what it means.</i> • <i>Oh I see how to do this.</i> • <i>What's the difference between this and that?</i> • <i>Is this right?</i> |
| R/I REMEMBER & INTERNALIZE | = Students have a chance to move the knowledge or skill from short-term to long-term memory. They then can begin to personalize it and use it in different contexts. They connect it mentally to prior experiences with images, sounds, and feelings. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Okay. I'm starting to remember this.</i> • <i>Okay. I've got it in this activity.</i> • <i>I'm making connection to my own life</i> |
| F FLUENTLY USE | = Students have a chance to use the new language to communicate their ideas. Ss work toward being able to spontaneously use the language in different contexts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cool. I can use this skill or knowledge automatically.</i> • <i>This is for real-world purposes.</i> • <i>I don't have to consciously think about this.</i> |

Tosuncuoğlu (2017) offers a detailed examination of these stages. The Encounter stage introduces learners to new linguistic forms and concepts, aiming to lay the foundation for accurate and meaningful communication within and beyond the classroom. The Clarify stage offers learners opportunities to deepen their understanding through the elaboration and explanation of target language features. In the Remember stage, repetition and structured practice—such as guessing games, gap-filling exercises, flashcards, and short-answer tasks—are employed to reinforce memory retention. The Internalize stage assumes that the language forms have been retained in long-term memory and involves learners in cognitively demanding activities such as information gap tasks, debates, and discussions. Ultimately, the Fluency stage enables learners to apply their knowledge in spontaneous, communicative scenarios, including role-plays, storytelling, and open discussions.

Empirical studies further support the efficacy of the ECRIF framework. AlSaleem (2018) asserts that ECRIF substantially enhances vocabulary acquisition and retention among learners. Similarly, Paredes (2019) posits that ECRIF not only increases learners' motivation but also boosts their confidence and spontaneity in using English, making it a highly effective instructional model in language classrooms. Indeed, ECRIF stands out as a learner-centered framework that prioritizes how learners acquire language, in contrast to traditional models like PPP, which focus on how teachers deliver instruction. This shift in focus has proven influential in deepening teachers' understanding of the language learning process from the learner's perspective (Al-Mobayed, 2016).

While the ECRIF framework offers a dynamic and learner-centered model for language instruction, it is not without limitations. One notable challenge lies in its heavy reliance on teachers' ability to accurately assess

learners' progression through each stage in real-time, which may be difficult for less experienced educators. Additionally, the framework assumes a high degree of learner autonomy and classroom interaction, which may not be feasible in large classes or in contexts where students are unaccustomed to participatory learning. The flexibility of ECRIF, while a strength, can also lead to inconsistency in implementation if teachers lack adequate training or conceptual clarity about each phase. Furthermore, the absence of prescriptive content guidelines may pose difficulties for curriculum alignment or standardized assessment. Therefore, while ECRIF enriches pedagogical practice, its effective application requires careful scaffolding, teacher preparation, and contextual adaptation.

The Proposed TLCIC Model: A Novel Framework for Teaching Grammar

Grammar is widely recognised as one of the most challenging components of language instruction. Despite the availability of diverse pedagogical frameworks aimed at facilitating grammar learning, many students continue to struggle with both understanding and applying grammatical structures. Learners often demonstrate limited comprehension and reduced engagement in grammar classes, frequently perceiving grammar as inherently difficult and inaccessible. Several factors may contribute to this issue:

1. **Lack of L1 equivalence:** Certain grammatical structures in the target language may not have direct equivalents in the students' native language, making cross-linguistic comparisons and comprehension more difficult.
2. **Perceived irrelevance:** Students may fail to see the practical relevance of the grammar point they are learning, which can lead to disinterest and lack of motivation.
3. **Cognitive difficulty:** If learners find grammatical rules overly complex or abstract from the beginning, they may disengage early in the learning process.
4. **Inconsistent learning trajectory:** While some students may exhibit initial progress, they often struggle to maintain consistent improvement over time.
5. The proposed framework is designed to address common learning obstacles by incorporating a set of pedagogical principles aimed at enhancing student engagement and grammatical competence. These principles are as follows:
6. **Objective Transparency:** The teacher should clearly articulate the learning objectives and, when applicable, highlight whether the target grammatical structure has a counterpart in the students' first language. This promotes linguistic awareness and facilitates cross-linguistic comparisons.
7. **Creating Cognitive Demand:** Instruction should begin with a problem-solving task that implicitly necessitates the use of the target structure. This strategy fosters curiosity and motivates learners to engage meaningfully with the material.
8. **Contextualized Presentation:** New grammatical structures should be introduced within short, coherent texts or dialogues. The initial emphasis should be placed on both form and meaning, ensuring learners grasp the functional role of the structure within context.
9. **Progressive Continuity:** Lessons should maintain a smooth pedagogical progression, linking new grammatical concepts to previously acquired knowledge to reinforce continuity and cumulative learning.
10. **Comparative Awareness:** When feasible, students should be guided to contrast newly introduced structures with those they have previously learned. This comparative approach enhances metalinguistic awareness and deepens grammatical understanding.
11. **Authentic Application:** Learners should be provided with opportunities to use the target structure in various authentic and communicative contexts, both spoken and written.
12. **Significance Realization:** Students should come to appreciate the functional and communicative value of the structure. Emphasis should be placed on how it enables self-expression and real-world communication beyond the classroom setting.

Building on the aforementioned principles, the proposed instructional framework is encapsulated in the acronym "TLCIC", representing **Try, Learn, Correct, Incorporate, and Create**. Each phase is designed to guide learners through a dynamic, reflective, and communicative process of grammar acquisition. The procedures for each stage are outlined below:

Try : This is the introductory stage of the lesson, which follows a brief warm-up activity. Students are given a short, controlled or semi-controlled task—such as gap-filling, matching, or sentence completion—to be completed within a limited time frame (ideally under seven minutes). These tasks are intended to assess students’ prior knowledge of the target grammatical structure before any formal instruction is provided. Learners then compare and discuss their answers in pairs. The primary aim of this stage is to gauge familiarity with the structure and stimulate curiosity. Crucially, students are expected to produce errors, which serve as diagnostic tools and learning opportunities. The teacher’s role at this stage is not to correct mistakes but to facilitate timing and observe learner performance. Correction is deferred until the subsequent “Correct” phase.

Learn: In this stage, the teacher introduces the grammatical structure within a meaningful context and uses guided questions to elicit rules and patterns from students. The instructional focus is placed on **form, meaning, and usage**. To facilitate conceptual understanding, the teacher encourages comparison between the target structure and previously learned forms (e.g., simple past vs. present perfect; subject pronouns vs. reflexive pronouns; simple present vs. present continuous). The “Learn” stage consists of three interrelated sub-stages:

INTRODUCTION OF THE STRUCTURE

Explanation of form and meaning

Comprehension check, often through error identification and correction exercises. Student participation is emphasized, ensuring that understanding is both collaborative and contextualized.

Correct: Following the instructional phase, students revisit the initial task from the “Try” stage and correct their earlier responses. They once again compare their revised answers with peers before sharing them with the whole class. This stage enables students to reflect on their learning and self-identify progress. It also provides the teacher with critical insight into learners’ current understanding and highlights areas that may require further clarification or reinforcement.

Incorporate: In this phase, students engage with structured practice activities that progressively move from **semi-controlled to less-controlled exercises**. These activities serve as a bridge between guided learning and free application. Students are encouraged to integrate the target structure into meaningful tasks, thereby reinforcing internalization through active use. This stage prepares learners for the open-ended communicative tasks in the final “Create” stage.

Create : The culminating phase of the framework encourages students to apply the target grammatical structure in authentic and creative contexts. Learners participate in communicative tasks such as role-plays, debates, simulations, or project-based assignments related to the thematic content of the unit. The emphasis here is on fluency, spontaneity, and real-world application, allowing students to consolidate their grammatical competence through purposeful communication.

The table below shows the objectives and techniques of the TLCIC framework

Table 2. TLCIC Teaching Framework

| Stages | Objectives | Possible tasks and techniques |
|-------------------|---|--|
| 1. Try | Assess prior knowledge | Controlled tasks: gap filling, matching, ordering, etc. |
| 2. Learn | "Introduce and clarify the new structure. | Elicitation, texts, stories, dialogues, highlighting, CCQs, structure comparison |
| 3. Correct | Review and correct | Controlled tasks, Self-correction, |

| | initial mistakes. | peer correction |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| 1. Incorporate | Apply the structure in semi-controlled practice. | Semi-controlled tasks: dialogue completion, information gap, sentence transformation, crossword puzzles |
| 2. Create | Use the structure in creative, real-life contexts. | Interviews, surveys, role-play, debates, presentations, poems, stories, etc. |

The TLCIC framework is grounded in multiple theoretical perspectives from second language acquisition (SLA). The “Try” and “Correct” stages reflect principles of the behaviorist theory, particularly the *trial-and-error* mechanism, which emphasizes learning through attempting and revising language use (Skinner, 1957). These stages also align with Error Analysis Theory (Corder, 1967), which posits that error correction plays a critical role in the interlanguage development of second language learners.

Furthermore, the framework incorporates insights from the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (Lado, 1957), particularly in drawing distinctions between the grammatical features of the target language and the learner’s first language. The framework promotes heightened grammatical sensitivity by encouraging learners to identify and compare structural differences.

The “Learn” stage is informed by both the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990) and Consciousness-Raising approaches (Rutherford & Smith, 1985). These models suggest that language acquisition is enhanced when learners consciously attend to linguistic features. In this stage, teachers facilitate learner engagement with the form, meaning, and use of the target structure, encouraging deeper cognitive processing through guided discovery and elicitation.

The “Incorporate” stage draws from Information Processing Theory (McLaughlin, 1987), which underscores the gradual automatization of linguistic knowledge through progressive practice. Here, students engage with increasingly complex tasks that transition from controlled to freer forms, supporting the internalization of grammatical structures.

The final stage, “Create,” aligns with the upper levels of Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), particularly the “Creating” phase, wherein learners are expected to apply acquired knowledge in novel, real-life communicative contexts. This promotes not only fluency but also functional grammatical competence.

Additionally, the framework incorporates Krashen’s (1982) Input Hypothesis, emphasizing that language input should be comprehensible yet slightly beyond the learner’s current level ($i+1$). In this model, this principle is operationalized through a “builds-on strategy,” wherein each new grammar lesson is explicitly linked to prior instruction to scaffold learning and maintain continuity.

Importantly, the TLCIC framework is learner-centered, enabling students to construct grammatical knowledge autonomously through the teacher’s elicitation techniques. This is consistent with the socio-constructivist approach (Vygotsky, 1978), which posits that learners construct understanding through interaction, reflection, and guided support. Table 3 below presents a lesson plan structured according to the TLCIC framework, demonstrating its practical application in the classroom.

Table 3. Grammar Lesson Plan: Teaching the Present Perfect Simple Using the TLCIC Framework

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------|---|--------------------|
| 1. Try Stage – Initial Task | | | | |
| Objective: Assess students’ existing knowledge of the Present Perfect Simple and stimulate curiosity through controlled exposure to the form. | | | | |
| Activity: | Gap-Filling | Exercise | + | Think-Pair-Reflect |

Timing: 5–7 minutes

Procedure:

- **Task:** Distribute a short worksheet containing 6–8 gap-fill sentences that may include both correct and intentionally challenging uses of the Present Perfect.

Examples:

- "She ____ (write) that letter yesterday."
- "We ____ (visit) Italy twice."
- "They ____ (finish) their homework."
- "I ____ (never/see) that movie."

- **Instructions:**

- Students work individually, using intuition and prior knowledge.
- After completion, students compare answers in pairs or small groups.
- Encourage metacognitive talk: *"Why did you choose this verb form?"*

- **Follow-up:**

- The teacher monitors silently, noting recurring errors for later discussion, but refrains from correction.
- Use a digital tool (e.g., Padlet, Mentimeter) to collect anonymous sample responses if tech is available.

2. Learn Stage – Instruction and Clarification

Objective:

Facilitate formal understanding of the Present Perfect Simple form, meaning, and usage, and distinguish it from similar tenses.

Activity: Guided Discovery + Rule Formation

Timing: 15 minutes

Procedure:

- **Contextual Introduction:**

- Use a short dialogue (oral or video) between two friends discussing recent events.

Example: "I've just come back from Paris." "Really? I've always wanted to go!"

- Provide a transcript for textual reference and underline the target structures.

- **Guided Elicitation:**

- Ask questions to elicit the rule:
 - "What words do you notice before the verbs?"
 - "What is common among all these sentences?"
 - "Are we talking about a finished or ongoing time?"

- **Explanation:**

- Present the form: **have/has + past participle**
- Highlight the meanings:
 - Life experiences (*"Have you ever...?"*)

- Recent actions with relevance to the present (“*I’ve just arrived.*”)
- Unspecified past time (“*She has lost her keys.*”)
- **Contrast with Simple Past:**
 - Use timeline visuals to contrast:
 - “She visited Rome last year.” vs. “She has visited Rome.”
- **Understanding Check:**
 - Provide incorrect sentences for peer correction:
 - “I have saw that movie.” → “I have seen that movie.”
 - “He has eat lunch yesterday.” → “He ate lunch yesterday.”

3. Correct Stage – Guided Correction

Objective:

Enable students to reflect on their learning by revising earlier responses and consolidating correct usage.

Activity: Correction and Justification

Timing: 5–10 minutes

Procedure:

- **Task:** Students return to their original gap-fill task from the Try stage and revise their answers.
- **Pair Work:** Compare revisions with a partner, justifying each choice.
- **Whole-Class Review:** Share common corrections; the teacher addresses misconceptions with brief explanations.
- **Optional Add-on:** Use color-coded self-assessment rubrics (✓ = confident, ? = unsure, X = needs review).

4. Incorporate Stage – Semi-Controlled Practice

Objective:

Reinforce Present Perfect usage in meaningful, scaffolded tasks that promote fluency and form-focused accuracy.

Activities:

- **Transformation Task**
- **Information Gap**
- **Dialogue Building**

Timing: 15–20 minutes

Procedure:

- **Sentence Transformation:**
 - Convert past simple sentences to the Present Perfect.
 - Add time markers to provoke contrast awareness: *yesterday, just, ever, never.*
- **Information Gap:**
 - Student A receives experiences (e.g., “ride a horse,” “meet a celebrity”).
 - Student B asks, “Have you ever...?” and records answers.
 - Switch roles after 5 minutes.

- **Dialogue Building:**
 - Provide prompts for structured pair dialogues:

“Have you ever broken a bone?”

“Yes, I have. It happened when I...”
- **Focus:** Teachers circulate to monitor grammatical accuracy, note authentic use, and scaffold where necessary.

5. Create Stage – Free Practice and Application

Objective:

Promote spontaneous, creative use of the Present Perfect Simple in real-life communicative settings.

Activities:

- **Role-Plays**
- **Mini-Debates**
- **Project-Based Writing**
- **Classroom Surveys**

Timing: 20 minutes

Procedure:

- **Role-Plays:**
 - Scenario: “Meeting a travel blogger at a party.”
 - Students share experiences: “I’ve been to...”, “I’ve tried...”, “I’ve never...”
- **Debates:**
 - Topic: “Have new experiences shaped your personality?”
 - Encourage use of the Present Perfect when supporting arguments.
- **Personal Story Writing:**
 - Prompt: “Describe three important things you’ve done in your life.”
 - Students write diary entries or blog posts using 5–6 present perfect sentences.
- **Survey Project:**
 - Create a class survey using “Have you ever...?” questions.
 - Compile and present results orally or visually (bar charts, posters).
- **Feedback & Reflection:**
 - Students reflect on what they used correctly and what they found difficult.
 - Teacher collects final artifacts and provides formative feedback.

CONCLUSION

In the evolving landscape of English Language Teaching (ELT), the integration of structured pedagogical frameworks remains vital for enhancing the effectiveness of grammar instruction and overall language acquisition. Established models such as PPP, TTT, POHE, and ECRIF have each contributed valuable insights by offering systematic approaches to instruction. However, as 21st-century educational contexts demand greater learner agency, adaptability, and communicative competence, there is a growing need for instructional paradigms that reflect these priorities.

The TLCIC framework—Try, Learn, Correct, Incorporate, Create—emerges as a timely and responsive model that addresses these evolving needs. Grounded in principles from second language acquisition theory and constructivist pedagogy, TLCIC prioritizes student-centered learning, task engagement, and meaningful language use. By guiding learners through a sequence that begins with exploratory diagnosis and culminates in authentic production, the framework supports deeper cognitive processing, encourages self-correction, and fosters both fluency and accuracy.

Unlike traditional models that often emphasize teacher-led instruction, TLCIC shifts the focus toward learner autonomy, contextualized practice, and creative application, making grammar instruction more relevant and impactful. The incorporation of noticing, consciousness-raising, and communicative tasks ensures that learners not only understand grammatical forms but also internalize and transfer them to real-world contexts.

Ultimately, the TLCIC framework represents a forward-thinking, adaptable approach to grammar pedagogy—one that aligns with contemporary educational goals and empowers learners to become active, reflective, and confident language users.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Mobayed, A. (2016). Investigating development in pedagogical knowledge and teaching skills among PCELTers at Al-Azhar (Unpublished master's thesis). Al Azhar University, Gaza, Palestine.
2. AlSaleem, B. I. A. (2018). The effect of ECRIF strategy on EFL seventh graders' vocabulary learning and retention. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(2), 64–80. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no2.5>
3. Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives: Complete edition. Addison Wesley Longman.
4. Aslan, A. (2016). Language teaching models in teacher training programs. *Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching (TOJELT)*, 1(3), 135–143.
5. Astria, N. (2016). The use of PPP technique in teaching English to eleventh grade of MA Miftahul Ulum Ngraket Balong Ponorogo in academic year 2015/2016 (Bachelor's thesis). STAIN.
6. Byrne, D. (1976). *Teaching oral English*. Longman.
7. Carless, D. R. (2009). Revisiting the TBLT versus PPP debate: Voices from Hong Kong. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 19, 49–66.
8. Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5, 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>
9. Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman.
10. Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford University Press.
11. Howatt, A. P. R. (2004). *A history of English language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
12. Krashen, S. D. (1983). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press. (As cited in Schutz, 2014)
13. Kurzweil, J., & Scholl, M. (2007). *Understanding teaching through learning*. McGraw-Hill.
14. Lado, R. (1957). Contrastive analysis: An overview. *Academia of Education. Language Acquisition*, 33, 305–328.
15. Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and a way forward*. Language Teaching Publications.
16. Lin, C. C. (2016). Encounters of the collaborative kind: When SIOP meets ECRIF. *Idiom*, 46(3), 7–10.
17. McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second-language learning*. Edward Arnold.
18. Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417–528. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00136>
19. Paredes, N. (2019). Comparing two methods for teaching productive skills of the English language. *Red Investigación Santo Domingo*.
20. Rutherford, W. E., & Smith, M. S. (1985). Consciousness-raising and universal grammar. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(3), 274–282.
21. Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129–158.
22. Scrivener, J. (1994). *Learning teaching: A guidebook for English language teachers*. Macmillan.

23. Skinner, B. F. (1957). Verbal behavior. Prentice Hall.
24. Skehan, P. (1998). A cognitive approach to language learning. Oxford University Press.
25. Swan, M. (2006). Chunks in the classroom: Let's not go overboard. *The Teacher Trainer*, 20(3), 5–6.
26. Thornbury, S. (1998). The lexical approach: A journey without maps. *Modern English Teacher*, 7(4), 7–13.
27. Tosuncuoglu, I. (2017). ECRIF framework system. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5(3), 130–134. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v5i3.2176>
28. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society. Harvard University Press.
29. Willis, J. (1993). Teaching English through English: A course in classroom language and techniques. Macmillan.
30. Woodward, T. (1993). Planning lessons and courses: Designing sequences of work for the language classroom. Cambridge University Press.