Form and Meaning: Multiple Perspectives

James F. Lee and *Albert Valdman*
Editors

HH **Heinle & Heinle**
Thomson Learning™

United States / Australia / Canada / Denmark / Japan / Mexico / New Zealand
Philippines / Puerto Rico / Singapore / Spain / United Kingdom

ERIC

Acquisition Editor: Wendy Nelson
Marketing Manager: Stephen Frail
Manufacturing Supervisor: Marcia Locke
Production Editor: Sarah Cogliano
Cover Designer: Sue Gerould/Perspectives
Compositor: Roberta Landi
Printer: Odyssey Press, Inc.

COPYRIGHT © 2000 Heinle & Heinle, a division of Thomson Learning.
The Thomson Learning Logo is a registered trademark used herein under license.

All rights reserved. No part of this work covered by the copyright hereon may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means, graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping, or information storage and retrieval systems, without the written permission of the publisher.

For permission to use material from this text, contact us:

web www.thomsonrights.com
fax 1-800-730-2215
phone 1-800-730-2214

Heinle & Heinle Publishers
20 Park Plaza
Boston, MA 02116

UK/EUROPE/MIDDLE EAST:
Thomson Learning
Berkshire House
168-173 High Holborn
London, WC1V 7AA, United Kingdom

AUSTRALIA/NEW ZEALAND:
Nelson/Thomson Learning
South Melbourne
Victoria 3205 Australia

CANADA:
Nelson/Thomson Learning
1120 Birchmount Road
Scarborough, Ontario
Canada M1K 5G4

LATIN AMERICA:
Thomson Learning
Seneca, 53
Colonia Polanco
11560 México D.F. México

ASIA (excluding Japan):
Thomson Learning
60 Albert Street #15-01
Albert Complex
Singapore 189969

JAPAN:
Thomson Learning
1-1-1 Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100 0003, Japan

SPAIN:
Thomson Learning
Calle Magallanes, 25
28015-Madrid
Espana

ISBN: 0-8384-0846-X

Printed in the United States of America
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 03 02 01 00 99

Toward a Pedagogical Discourse Grammar: Techniques for Teaching Word-Order Constructions

Carl S. Blyth

University of Texas at Austin[1]

Introduction

During the past decade, scholars in foreign language pedagogy have increasingly urged teachers to reexamine their commonly held practice of teaching grammar based on examples of decontextualized sentences taken primarily from the written language (Barnes 1990; Blyth 1997; Celce-Murcia 1990; Celce-Murcia et al. 1997; Fox 1993; Garrett 1986; Hatch 1992; Hershensohn 1988; Kramsch 1981, 1983, 1984; Lee and VanPatten 1995; Long 1991; McCarthy 1991; Riggenbach 1990; Rutherford 1987). In place of the traditional sentential approaches to grammar, these scholars have advocated a concept of grammar in terms of connected discourse, that is, actual language use, multipropositional speech and writing, so-called "real communication" (Cooreman and Kilborn 1990). Such a functional or discourse-oriented approach to grammar instruction requires a radical shift in perspective from traditional approaches: "[In functional approaches] grammar is not a set of rigid rules that must be followed in order to produce grammatical sentences. Rather, grammar is a set of strategies that one employs in order to produce coherent communication" (Givón 1993, p. 1).

According to Tomlin (1994), what sets functional grammars apart from other types of grammar is what he calls the "communicative imperative," the premise that "linguistic form generally serves to code or signal linguistic function and that shapes taken by linguistic form arise out of the

198

demands of communicative interactions" (p. 144). Like all grammars, functional grammars pursue description and explanation of language patterns. However, the main focus of functional linguistics is the interaction of form and function. One of the best examples of form-function interaction is pragmatically conditioned word order. Consider the following set of word-order constructions from which English speakers may choose in (1):

(1)
a. John kissed Mary.
b. Mary was kissed by John.
c. It was John who kissed Mary.
d. It was Mary who was kissed by John.
e. What John did was kiss Mary.
f. Who John kissed was Mary.
g. Mary, John kissed her.
(Brown and Yule 1983, p. 127)

The same information or propositional content is expressed in each sentence. So why does English, or any other language, need so many ways to say the same thing? The reason is that speakers and listeners use language forms to communicate, and communication is a tricky business. Speakers need to package (and sometimes repackage) information so that the intended message gets through. Consider the following exchange in (2):

(2)
"So, Mary kissed John, did she?
"No, you got it backwards. It was JOHN who kissed Mary!"

In (2), the second speaker corrects the erroneous assertion by repackaging the information using word stress and syntax to highlight more clearly who did what to whom. Thus the choice of form follows communicative function.

Despite repeated calls for textbooks to include more information about how language works above the level of the sentence, most authors and publishing companies have been slow to incorporate the notion of discourse into their pedagogical materials. Such reluctance is understandable given the difficulties of describing grammar as "communicative practice" (Hanks 1996) in ways that are transparent to students and teachers. Authors can hardly be blamed for not wanting to open the Pandora's box of discourse with its competing concerns and approaches (see Schiffrin

ERIC

1994 for an overview). For example, an author who wishes to give an explanation of a grammatical form in terms of discourse must decide what kind of contextual information to include: the illocutionary force of the utterance in which the form is embedded (speech act theory), the rules for turn-taking (conversation analysis), the expressive quality of the message (interactional sociolinguistics), the Gricean maxims at play (pragmatics), the power relationships manifest in the interaction (ethnography of speaking), and so on. If all these discourse-pragmatic notions, and many others, are potentially relevant to the understanding of a form-in-context, what is the textbook author to do? Suddenly, the teaching of grammar begins to resemble the teaching of culture, a subject notoriously difficult to delimit. Kramsch and Andersen (1999) describe the enlarged scope of grammatical analysis entailed by a discourse perspective:

> *From a discourse or anthropological perspective, linguistic structures, as they are used in communicative situations, are embedded in the whole social and historical context of culture (e.g., see Gumperz, 1982; Malinowski, 1923; Sapir, 1949); they are but one system of signs among many that people use to give meaning to their environment (p. 32).*

Rather than attempt to discuss the enormous diversity of phenomena encompassed by the discourse perspective, this chapter will focus on a set of linguistic forms called *pragmatically conditioned word-order constructions* as exemplified in (1), for example, dislocations, clefts, passives, and so on. I choose to focus on word order for two reasons. First, word order has been the object of much linguistic study, and, as a consequence, a solid body of descriptive research is readily available for the creation of pedagogical materials (Givón 1993; Lambrecht 1994). Second, word-order constructions are formal units, much like other grammar items found in textbooks. According to Rutherford (1987), traditional grammar instruction is predicated "on a solid, stable, fixed piece of the total language product—something with edges to it . . . in other words, a language construct" (p. 56).[2] Thus I see word-order constructions as a bridge between the sentential grammars embodied in today's textbooks and the more discourse-oriented grammars of the future. By demonstrating techniques for teaching word-order constructions, an important piece of discourse grammar, I hope to encourage textbook authors and publishing companies to begin exploring the implications of discourse for their pedagogical materials.

ERIC

This chapter is divided into four main sections. In the first section, the obstacles to the teaching of the spoken language are discussed. In the second section, the ongoing grammar debate is put into historical perspective. It is argued that both the traditional, structural approach to grammar and the newer, comprehensible input approach are both inadequate for teaching grammar. A middle ground will be advocated; that is, pedagogical interventions embedded in primarily communicative activities. Following Long (1991), this middle ground is referred to as Focus on Form. In the third section, various pedagogical techniques for teaching word-order constructions will be discussed. These techniques come from three different sources: studies in Focus on Form methodology, discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics. The fourth section will briefly explore the implications of discourse-oriented language teaching for TA training.

Obstacles to Teaching Oral Language

There have been a few, well-known attempts to link form and function in pedagogical materials, namely the functional/notional curriculum of Wilkins (1976) and of Breen and Candlin (1980), and the interaction-based programs of Kramsch (1981, 1983) and Bragger and Rice (1985). Yet these early attempts have had relatively little impact on how grammar is taught in today's classrooms and conceptualized in today's textbooks. Why is the grammar of speech still so foreign in foreign language programs? One of the major obstacles to the teaching of pragmatically conditioned word order, or any other "form" of the spoken language, lies in the evanescent nature of speech itself. Naturally occurring speech is fleeting, making it exceedingly difficult to represent accurately. In fact, an accurate transcription is often difficult for the uninitiated to read because of the multiple ellipses, interruptions, repairs, sentence fragments, and speech signals that have no conventional spelling. It is not uncommon for students learning the intricacies of transcription to "correct" recorded samples of speech unconsciously in order to make them conform to written norms. Ironically, such an unconscious grammatical cleansing ends up eliminating the very items that a discourse grammar purports to illuminate. While audio and video technology has allowed speech to be captured accurately and thus to be studied and taught in context (Altman 1989), relatively few foreign language materials make extensive use of authentic interaction; scripted dialogues and scripted videos still rule the day.[3] And therein lies much of the problem. If accurate transcription requires an apprenticeship,

ERIC

it should be obvious that scripted dialogues are often heavily influenced by written norms, resulting in much artificiality.

Lambrecht (1987) notes that artificiality in grammatical materials is not a recent phenomenon. He points out that grammars have relied on artificial, decontextualized sentences as far back as the classical times of Greece and Rome. As evidence of this, he cites the Latin grammarians' common practice of *oratio perfecta*, a practice that required the subject and object position of sentences to be filled with nouns in order to express a "complete" and thus more perfect thought. Sentences containing pronouns apparently seemed incomplete to Latin grammarians and were thus deemed inappropriate for grammatical analysis. Through the centuries, grammarians have rarely seemed to notice (or to care) that such sentences were virtually nonexistent in real spoken discourse (Ashby and Bentivoglio 1993). After two thousand years, it is understandable that the "fictional sentences" still prevalent in many grammar books no longer strike teachers as anomalous; educators have come to expect as much.

The gap between oral proficiency goals and the inadequate materials used to accomplish those goals has not gone unnoticed (Walz 1986). Since the advent of communicative language teaching and the oral proficiency movement, teachers and applied linguists have been questioning the legacy of the *oratio perfecta* tradition, that is, the preference for constructed examples based on the written language. After all, how is one supposed to teach the spoken language with materials that do not reliably reflect typical speech patterns? In fact, textbooks frequently fail even to mention or exemplify constructions that are prevalent in the spoken language. This is due, in part, to textbook authors' prescriptive attitudes toward language; oral norms of usage are generally marginalized or stigmatized vis-à-vis the written norms (Valdman 1992). The widespread bias against orality in higher education is nowhere more noticeable than in language departments where course content and pedagogical practices have traditionally been tied to the goals of literary studies. However, the lack of attention paid to oral grammar in pedagogical materials is not attributable only to the literary bias of the profession—ignorance plays an important role, too. Many teachers who have never taken classes in the related fields of sociolinguistics, pragmatics, or discourse studies are simply unaware of the patterns found in spoken discourse.

Given this state of affairs, it seems unlikely that grammar textbooks will radically change in the near future. Nevertheless, Kramsch and Andersen (1999) claim that multimedia technology is uniquely qualified

to overcome many of the obstacles currently facing a pedagogical discourse grammar. The key to teaching language as communicative practice, they argue, is to capture real, interactional events and to turn them into multimedia "texts" that can be easily objectified, juxtaposed, annotated, explored, and manipulated by students. In other words, multimedia technology makes the textualization of oral language possible in a way that has never before existed, certainly not in the traditional textbook format, nor even in more recent video formats.[4]

> *The problem with learning a language from live context is that context itself cannot be learned, it can only be experienced, or apprenticed in. Therefore in order for context to be made learnable, especially in an academic setting, it has to be transformed into analyzable text. As an educational tool, multimedia technology opens up immense possibilities of contextualization by textualizing knowledge through its representational capabilities, that is, its endless reproducibility (Kramsch and Andersen 1999, p. 33).*

To make their notion of textualization more concrete, they describe an innovative CD-ROM for the teaching of Quechua, *Ucuchi: Quechua Live and in Color!* (Andersen 1987, 1996; Andersen and Daza 1994; Andersen et al. 1994). The CD-ROM is based on two hours of ethnographic video filmed on location in Bolivia. To understand a given scene, students have access to many sources of information: "spoken and written glosses and commentaries, transcriptions, translations, written ethnographies, and official documents, including interviews with the participants after the fact, not to mention the filmmaker, expert anthropologists and ethnographers" (Kramsch and Andersen 1999, p. 34). If pedagogical sentential grammars were largely made possible by the technology of the printing press, then perhaps the grammar of oral interaction will finally become possible thanks to the development of multimedia technology.

Communicative Language Teaching and Discourse Grammar

Celce-Murcia et al. (1997) claim that a significant shift in language teaching methodology has been occurring over the past decade and that communicative language teaching (CLT) is reaching a turning point. After its

ERIC

appearance in the early '70s and subsequent spread during the '80s, CLT began to encounter increasing criticism during the '90s. Much of the criticism centered on the insufficient and ineffective treatment of linguistic form in CLT. In 1990, Richards observed that the language teaching profession was divided into two camps favoring differing approaches to teaching oral language: the indirect camp versus the direct camp. Celcia-Murcia et al. (1997) describe CLT methodology as indirect: "The typical teaching practice for CLT in the late 1970s and the 1980s involves setting up and managing lifelike communicative situations in the language classroom (e.g., role plays, problem-solving tasks, or information-gap activities) and leading learners to acquire communicative skills incidentally by seeking situational meaning" (p. 141). Teachers who favored the direct approach (not to be confused with the direct method) never really adopted CLT's innovations, but instead remained faithful to the traditional structural syllabus and its related practices: First present new grammar explicitly, next practice grammar via drills, and finally have students produce the targeted grammar item in a quasi-communicative situation ("the three Ps"—Carter and McCarthy 1995, p. 155).

While the profession as a whole increasingly emphasized the role and importance of communication, teachers who were wedded to the traditional practices of direct grammar instruction simply adapted them to the teaching of conversation. In fact, Lee and VanPatten (1995) claim that for all the innovation associated with CLT, grammar instruction has changed very little in foreign language education. Blyth (1997) contends that "the presentation of grammar in foreign language textbooks and classrooms continues to be based on an outdated combination of behaviorism, structuralist linguistics, and versions of audiolingualism and cognitive-code theory" (p. 51). By the '90s, research was beginning to confirm what many of the traditionalists had feared all along: Entirely experiential and meaning-focused language learning resulted in less than perfect results. (Of course, so did traditional methods.) In particular, the studies on French immersion programs showed that despite years of meaningful input and opportunities for interaction, students still had not mastered many parts of French morphosyntax (Harley 1992; Harley and Swain 1984).

Rather than reject CLT and return to traditional grammar instruction, many researchers and practitioners began developing the outlines for a third kind of approach, a middle ground that seeks to focus learners' attention on forms within a meaningful context. This movement has come

ERIC

to be known as Focus on Form following an influential article by Long (1991). The central tenet of this middle ground is the belief that "making learners aware of structural regularities and formal properties of the target language will greatly increase the rate of language attainment" (Celce-Murcia et al. 1997, p. 146). Advocates of this new middle ground are quick to point out that it does not imply a return to traditional grammar instruction with its emphasis on sentential grammar. According to Dörnyei and Thurrell (1994), the major shifts that are occurring in language teaching today are threefold: (1) adding specific language input to communicative tasks, (2) raising learners' awareness of the organizational principles of language use within and beyond the sentence level, and (3) sequencing communicative tasks more systematically in accordance with a theory of discourse-level grammar. In a similar vein, Doughty and Williams (1998b) note that Focus on Form studies have expanded the definition of the term "form" beyond that of the "linguistic code features" that have been the traditional content of grammatical syllabi: ". . . It is important to see the term *form* in the broadest possible context, that is, that of all the levels and components of the complex system that is language" (p. 212).

Pedagogical Applications

Given the dearth of discourse-oriented foreign language materials, many teachers may wonder how it is possible to participate in the pedagogical and curricular shifts that Dornyei and Thurrell describe. How are teachers supposed to "raise learners' awareness of the organizational principles of language use beyond the sentence level" without materials that support such a goal? And how can teachers "sequence tasks more systematically in accordance with a theory of discourse-level grammar" if they have never been exposed to such a theory? It seems unrealistic to expect teachers to participate in such major shifts without a body of pedagogical materials that put these new ideas into practice. To that end, this section is devoted to the exemplification of various practices for teaching spoken grammar that may easily be incorporated into today's foreign language materials and programs. These techniques are rather eclectic since they derive from three separate, albeit related, sources: Focus on Form research, discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics.

ERIC

Applications from Focus on Form Research

The goal of this section will be to exemplify different activities and techniques that have received mention in the Focus on Form literature and to see how these activities might be adapted to the teaching of pragmatically conditioned structures. First, teachers must ask themselves whether discourse constructions are amenable to explicit instruction and, if so, to what kind of grammatical instruction. It is interesting that even among researchers who advocate the relevance of discourse grammar for language education, there is a certain skepticism about the "teachability" of such structures. In a cogent article on the application of discourse analysis to French language education, Barnes (1990) seems to question the efficacy of explicit instruction of these structures:

> Il est évident que l'usage de ces structures ne pourra pas s'apprendre par une approche structurale, c'est-à-dire, par une description formelle des structures accompagneé d'exercices du type transformationnel... Il me semble que l'acquisition de ces structures, ou plus exactement l'acquisition des intuitions des francophones sur leurs fonctions, se fait le mieux par une certaine expérience communicative. Cela veut dire qu'il faut que l'élève entende ces tournures dans des situations communicatives. Etant donné la difficulté de formuler des règles relativement simples sur l'emploi de ces structures, il semble plus approprié d'adopter une approche par "l'acquisition" que par "l'apprentissage" pour employer les termes de Krashen (p. 104).
>
> *It is obvious that the usage of these structures can't be learned by a structural approach, that is, by a formal description of the structures accompanied by transformational drills . . . It seems to me that the acquisition of these structures, or more precisely the acquisition of French-speakers' intuitions about their functions, is best accomplished by a certain communicative experience. This means that the student must listen to the structures in communicative situations. Given the difficulty of formulating relatively simple rules concerning the usage of these structures, it seems most appropriate to adopt an "acquisition" rather than a "learning" approach, to use Krashen's terms.*

ERIC

While I agree with Barnes that students undoubtedly need lots of "communicative experience" before they can build up intuitions about pragmatic functions, I disagree with several of her assumptions. Barnes seems to assume that grammar instruction comes in only two varieties as described and promulgated by Krashen. The first variety is the traditional grammar-as-object approach that favors an explicit rule accompanied by decontextualized example sentences followed by mechanical production exercises. Since the rules that govern the selection of syntactic structures in oral discourse are difficult to state in simple terms, she reasonably assumes that these structures are not amenable to "explicit" instruction. The second approach that Barnes refers to largely spurns explicit grammar instruction as irrelevant to acquisition and emphasizes the importance of lots of comprehensible input. Fortunately, the dichotomous conception of grammar instruction illustrated in Barnes (1990) has increasingly given way to a middle ground called Focus on Form. This new approach combines elements from the other two approaches but is qualitatively different from either. In essence, Focus on Form activities attempt to create the ideal conditions for grammar learning, the "teachable moment" as it were, when the student has a communicative need that can be fulfilled only by a particular linguistic form, in other words, the moment when a form becomes communicatively salient. As such, Focus on Form activities differ crucially from traditional grammar exercises by their "prerequisite engagement in meaning before attention to linguistic features can be expected to be effective" (Doughty and Williams 1998a, p. 3).

How to focus a student's attention may be accomplished by a wide variety of innovative techniques. Doughty and Williams (1998b) note that one way to understand the differences between techniques is to place them "along a continuum reflecting the degree to which the focus on form interrupts the flow of communication, that is to say, on the basis of obtrusiveness" (p. 258). In obtrusive tasks, communication comes to a complete halt while the teacher focuses attention on the linguistic code in explicit ways. In unobtrusive tasks, linguistic code features are never mentioned explicitly. Rather, the grammar feature is carefully embedded in a communicative activity in such a way that the learner attends to the form while simultaneously attending to meaning. Following Doughty and Williams' (1998b) discussion of task obtrusiveness, five techniques will be presented here from the most to the least obtrusive: garden pathing, input processing, dictogloss, input enhancement, and task-essential language.

ERIC

Table 1
Degree Obtrusiveness of Focus on Form Activities

	Obtrusive ◄			► Unobtrusive	
1. Garden Pathing	X				
2. Structured Input		X			
3. Dictogloss			X		
4. Input Enhancement				X	
5. Task-Essential Language					X

Source: Adapted from Doughty and Williams (1998b, p. 258).

Garden Pathing

In this technique, the instructor purposefully leads students down the grammatical garden path with the goal of getting them to commit errors (Tomasello and Herron 1988). More precisely, this technique requires the instructor to present a grammatical pattern or rule in such a way that students overgeneralize the rule. The resulting errors are promptly corrected by the instructor. For example, the garden path technique could be used to help focus learners on the limits of productivity for the rule for deriving comparative adjectives in English: [adjective] + [er]. Students could be given a set of of adjectives from which to derive the comparative adjective by simply adding the comparative morpheme, for example, [-er]. After having firmly established the "rule," the instructor next presents an exceptional adjective, for example, *beautiful*. Invariably, the students will attempt to produce the comparative form using the same derivational rule as shown in (3):

(3)

fast	> faster
big	> bigger
tall	> taller
beautiful	>beautifuler*

*nongrammatical

The basic goal of garden pathing is to render the exceptions to a rule more salient thereby making them easier to learn. The technique can be used on any linguistic rule that is easy to overgeneralize, including syntactic-pragmatic rules. Katz (Forthcoming) describes extending the technique to teach the pragmatic differences between the French *c'est* cleft constructions[5] given in (4a) and (5a) and their so-called canonical counterparts in

ERIC

(4b) and (5b):

(4)

a. C'est Vladimir Horowitz qui va jouer.	(French cleft construction)
b. Vladimir Horowitz va jouer.	(French canonical construction)
c. *Vladimir Horowitz is going to play.*	(English canonical construction)

(5)

a. C'est le patron qui veut te parler.	(French cleft construction)
b. Le patron veut te parler.	(French canonical construction)
c. *The boss wants to speak to you.*	(English canonical construction)

Katz points out that the pragmatic functions of these word-order constructions present particular difficulty for English speakers because both the French cleft constructions in (a) and the canonical constructions in (b) can be translated felicitously into English using only the English canonical structure (c). Katz claims that English speakers often fail to recognize the function of the French cleft construction because they erroneously assume, based on their L1, that the canonical construction is permitted in both contexts. Katz argues that negative evidence is thus required for English speakers to overcome the inevitable effects of transfer and overgeneralization: ". . . students need to know that it is not possible to use the French and English constructions in the same environments. It is doubtful that they will come to this conclusion through input alone."

Katz's contention is supported by data from Trévise (1986) which indicate that other kinds of discourse constructions are transferable from one language to another. To remedy this state of affairs, she proposes a translation exercise that leads students down the garden path. The exercise in (6) helps students discover that the canonical construction cannot be transferred to both contexts in French.

(6)

Translate the following pairs of questions and answers.

"How old are your parents?"

"My mother is 65 and my father is 67."

Correction translation: "Ma mère a 65 ans..."

ERIC

"Where does your family come from?"
"My mother is from Paris and my father is from Montreal."
Correct translation: "Ma mère est de Paris..."

Where did your father buy the car?
My mother bought it.
Correct translation: "C'est ma mère qui l'a achetée."

Note that all the replies to the questions in (6) begin with the same noun phrase (My mother/Ma mère). Invariably, students fail to notice that the referent of the noun phrase "My mother" in the last response is not pragmatically equivalent to the same noun phrases found in the earlier responses. In the first two, the question itself evokes the referent in the mind of the listener by setting up a parent or family frame in which a mother would be given information. However, in the last question-and-answer pair, the reply corrects the assumption of the question, namely that the father bought the car. In such a communicative situation, French discourse prescribes a *c'est* cleft in order to highlight the unexpected or "new" information. In other words, the last question identifies the car as having been purchased but incorrectly identifies the father as the buyer. The *c'est* cleft construction is used to correct this faulty assumption.

In most garden pathing exercises, students are primed to make overgeneralizations by repeating the pattern several times as in the example with comparative adjectives. In the example of the French *c'est* cleft, little priming is needed since the students are likely to mistranslate solely on the basis of L1 transfer.

From these examples of garden pathing, it is clear that this technique can be highly obtrusive. In fact, many teachers may feel that such an exercise amounts to nothing more than teaching grammar through translation and therefore does not count as communicative or meaningful at all. Doughty and Williams (1998b, p. 240) point out that highly obtrusive tasks and techniques always run the risk of violating the fundamental principle of Focus on Form activities, that is, a prerequisite engagement in meaning, before the attention to linguistic features should occur. Thus the earlier translation exercise would need to be embedded into a communicative or meaningful context for it to count as a Focus on Form technique.

ERIC

Structured Input

Another obtrusive technique is the structured input activity as described by Lee and VanPatten (1995) and VanPatten (1996). Based on studies of how learners derive meaning from input, VanPatten (1996) suggests that instruction be based on "structured input activities in which learners are given the opportunity to process form in the input in a 'controlled' situation so that better form-meaning connections might happen compared with what might happen in less controlled situations" (p. 60). "Structured input" is the centerpiece of "processing instruction," an approach to grammar instruction that advocates combining explicit explanations of grammatical rules with structured input and output activities. The main goal of this kind of grammar instruction is to "alter the processing strategies that learners take to the task of comprehension and to encourage them to make better form-meaning connections than they would if left to their own devices" (p. 60).

Processing instruction is distinguished from traditional approaches to grammar by an emphasis on input activities that precede all output activities. Lee and VanPatten (1995) criticize traditional grammar instruction for forcing students to produce before they have internalized any connection between the grammatical forms and their meanings:

> *While practice with output may help with fluency and accuracy in production, it is not "responsible" for getting the grammar into the learner's head to begin with. In short, traditional grammar instruction, which is intended to cause a change in the developing system, is akin to putting the cart before the horse when it comes to acquisition; the learner is asked to produce when the developing system has not yet had a chance to build up a representation of the language based on input data (1995, p. 95).*

To give students the chance to build up the necessary mental representations of grammar, Lee and VanPatten propose involving the student in a series of "structured input activities" that do not require the student to produce the targeted forms. Instead, these activities force the student to attend to the grammar within a meaningful context and to demonstrate comprehension in some nonlinguistic way. Since structured input activities are absent from most commercially produced foreign language textbooks, teachers must either learn how to develop their own or learn how

to adapt their current textbook activities. To help teachers do this, Lee and VanPatten (1995) give specific guidelines for developing such activities:

a. Present one thing at a time.
b. Keep meaning in focus.
c. Move from sentence to connected discourse.
d. Use both oral and written input.
e. Have the learner "do something" with the input.
f. Keep the learner's processing strategies in mind.
(1995, p. 104)

It is important for beginning teachers to learn how to adapt commercially produced materials to suit the particular needs of their classrooms. Using the guidelines, TAs can learn how to create "structured input activities" from traditional production activities. For example, the recently published beginning French textbook *Chez Nous* (Valdman and Pons 1997) devotes an entire page to left dislocation as a grammatical feature.[6] While the explanation of this word-order construction and its function is admirably succinct and accessible, it is followed by several production exercises that oblige the student to begin producing left dislocations immediately. These production activities may be easily transformed into structured input activities. Compare the original activity given in (7) with its revised structured input counterpart in (8).

(7) Original Output Activity

Points de vue. Donnez un commentaire pour chaque sujet proposé.
modèle: L'union libre,....
>L'union libre, je pense que c'est une bonne idée.
ou L'union libre, c'est mieux acceptée aujourd'hui.

1. l'union libre
2. le mariage
3. les enfants
4. les femmes au foyer
5. les hommes au foyer
6. les pères absents
7. le divorce
8. la fidélité

ERIC

Viewpoints. Make a comment for every proposed topic.
modèle: living together
>Living together, I think it's a good idea.
or Living together, it is more accepted today.

1. *living together*
2. *marriage*
3. *children*
4. *housewives*
5. *househusbands*
6. *deadbeat dads*
7. *divorce*
8. *monogamy*

(Valdman and Pons 1997, p. 347)

(8) Revised Version—Structured Input Activity

Points de vue. Indiquez si vous êtes d'accord ou pas avec les commentaires suivantes?

modèle: L'union libre, c'est assez acceptée aujourd'hui.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
1. L'union libre, c'est très pratique.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
2. Le mariage, c'est une institution dépassée.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
3. Les enfants, c'est trop de travail.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
4. Les femmes au foyer, c'est bien pour la famille.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
5. Les hommes au foyer, ce n'est pas l'ordre naturel.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
6. Les pères absents, c'est une honte.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
7. Le divorce, c'est un mal nécessaire.	D'accord	Pas d'accord
8. La fidélité, c'est impossible pour les hommes.	D'accord	Pas d'accord

***Viewpoints.** Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following comments.*

Model: Living together is fairly accepted today.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
1. Living together is very practical.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
2. Marriage is an outdated institution.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
3. Children are too much work.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
4. Housewives are good for the family.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
5. Househusbands violate the natural order.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
6. Absent fathers are a disgrace.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
7. Divorce is a necessary evil.	*Agree*	*Disagree*
8. Monogamy is impossible for men.	*Agree*	*Disagree*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teachers who have been trained in communicative methods tend to associate the term "input" with natural language. The input in processing instruction, however, is highly structured for specific purposes as is evident in (8). The most obvious differences between the original exercise in (7) and its revised version in (8) are the differing demands placed on the student. The original exercise requires the student to attend to form and meaning simultaneously while producing a brand new linguistic structure. By not requiring any production, the structured input activity lessens the load on the student's attentional resources. As a consequence, the chances of successfully focusing on both form and meaning are increased; the learner is better able to attend to both the left dislocated structure as well as the meaning of each comment. Of course, attending to form and meaning simultaneously is possible only if the vocabulary is relatively transparent and the sentences do not contain ambiguous or confounding grammar. This is what Lee and VanPatten (1995) mean when they remind teachers to keep the learner's processing strategies in mind when developing these activities. Note how the structured input activity eliminates distracting and extraneous detail by restricting the grammatical variation (a. "Present one thing at a time"). Note, too, how all the sentences repeat the same basic word-order pattern making them even easier to understand:

[topicalized noun phrase] +	[c'est] +	[predicate adjective/nominative].
[Le mariage]	[c'est]	[une institution dépassée]
[Marriage]	*[is]*	*[an outdated institution]*

Ideally, the structured input activity given in (8) should be followed by other input activities that require greater stretches of discourse (c. "Move from sentences to connected discourse"). The responses to structured input activities also lend themselves to follow-up output activities. For instance, survey responses can be compiled and briefly analyzed as a class activity or as pair work. Are there gender differences in the responses? What statements received the highest levels of agreement and/or disagreement? What statements were found to be patently absurd? Students could also be asked how they would contradict the statements with which they disagreed. Whenever a speaker makes a provocative assessment in a natural conversation, the interlocutor is typically obliged to express agreement or disagreement (Pomerantz 1984) as in (9):

(9)
Les enfants, c'est trop de travail.
->Oui, mais...c'est aussi un grand plaisir.
Children are too much work.
->Yes, but they're also a joy.

Le mariage, c'est une institution dépassée.
->Ah non, c'est toujours important! Difficile, peut-être, mais toujours important.
Marriage is an outdated institution.
->Oh no, it's still important. Difficult, maybe, but still important.

Dictogloss

A technique that is slightly less obtrusive than either structured input activities or garden pathing is the dictogloss. The dictogloss is a procedure that requires students to listen to a short text and then reconstruct the text as best they can. By requiring students to reproduce the text as faithfully as possible, students turn to each other to negotiate forms that they have not yet mastered. The main goal of the activity is metalinguistic: to oblige students to reflect on their own output so that they will come to know their areas of grammatical and pragmatic strength and weakness. Swain describes the procedure well:

> *. . . a short, dense text is read to the learners at normal speed; while it is being read, students jot down familiar words and phrases; then the learners work together in small groups to reconstruct the text from their shared resources; the final versions are analyzed and compared. The initial text, either an authentic or constructed one, is intended to provide practice in the use of particular grammatical constructions (1998, p. 70).*

The dictogloss is well suited for teaching discourse constructions because it includes both an oral and a written component that allows the teacher an opportunity to demonstrate how written norms of a language affect the perception of the oral language. The first step in preparing a dictogloss activity is to select a text. The oral text should include several examples of the targeted grammar item. If naturally occurring speech is unavailable, teachers can use commercially produced recordings, provided they are not too stilted. Consider the following recorded dialogue,

taken from the beginning French textbook, *Parallèles: Communication et Culture* (Allen and Fouletier-Smith 1995). While it is constructed, the dialogue in (10) comes close to real spoken data in many ways, particularly in its use of left and right dislocated noun phrases (left and right dislocations are indicated by boldface).

(10)

Marchand:	Et alors, ma petite dame, elles vous tentent, **mes tomates**? A 7 francs le kilo, c'est une bonne affaire!
Claudine:	Hmmm....D'accord. Donnez-moi un kilo de tomates, s'il vous plaît.
Marchand:	Très bien. Et avec ça?
Claudine:	Eh bien...et deux laitues.
Marchand:	Voilà. Ce sera tout?
Claudine:	Oui, ce sera tout. Ça fait combien?
Marchand:	Alors, **les tomates**, ça fait 7 francs. Et puis, **deux laitues à 3 francs 50**, ça fait 7 francs. Bon, ça nous fait 14 francs. Oh là là! c'est pas possible, ça, **un billet de 500 francs**! Vous n'avez pas la monnaie?
Marchand:	*So, ma'am, my tomatoes look pretty tempting to you? At 7 francs per kilo, they're a bargain.*
Claudine:	*Hmmm...OK, give me one kilo, please.*
Marchand:	*All right. And what else?*
Claudine:	*Ahh...two heads of lettuce.*
Marchand:	*There you go. Will that be all?*
Claudine:	*Yes, that's it. How much is that?*
Marchand:	*Well, the tomatoes come to 7 francs. And two lettuces at 3 francs 50 each comes to 7 francs. OK, that makes 14 francs. Oh no! I can't handle that, a 500 franc bill. Don't you have anything smaller?*

(Allen and Fouletier-Smith 1995, p. 204, adapted from the original)

Before the students listen to the dialogue, the teacher should quickly review the form and function of dislocations in spoken language (for a good example of an explanation of dislocation accessible for beginning language students, see Valdman and Pons 1997, p. 346). Swain (1998) comments that the goal of this form-focused minilesson is to "heighten students' awareness about an aspect of language that would be useful to

ERIC

them in carrying out the dictogloss" (p. 73). In other words, the lesson need not include much in the way of a traditional grammatical explanation. Presumably, for this reason, Doughty and Williams (1998b) find it less obtrusive than garden pathing and input processing, which typically include explicit rules. If students are aware of a grammatical item, it is believed that they will be able to perceive it more easily in speech and, consequently, that they will talk about it during groupwork. During the minilesson, the teacher may wish to review vocabulary items that students are not likely to know. After the minilesson, the teacher reads the dialogue or plays the audio recording several times. The first time, the students do nothing more than listen. The second time, however, students should be encouraged to take notes. Next, the students work in groups to reconstruct the text from their notes. When they have finished, a group of students is selected to compare their reconstructed text with the original text. The comparison can be facilitated by using an overhead projector; the teacher would need to make a transparency of the original text before class, and the students would need to write their reconstruction on a transparency as well.

Swain (1997) argues that based on her study and others, there is growing evidence that the dictogloss procedure helps students notice the "gap" between what they want to say in the target language and what they know how to say. Swain hypothesizes that noticing this gap will trigger a search for solutions *if the conditions are right.* She claims that research indicates that teachers can improve the conditions for successful metalinguistic analysis by carefully attending to three things: (1) selection of text (some texts seem to elicit more metatalk than others), (2) preparation of students for all aspects of the task so that they understand what they should do and why, and (3) correction of the final product. Concerning the last point, Swain notes that collaborative metatalk occasionally results in students positing erroneous hypotheses. It is up to the teacher to monitor the metatalk as much as possible and to correct any faulty hypotheses concerning the targeted grammar item.

Input Enhancement

Input enhancement refers to the various ways features of the linguistic code may be made more perceptually salient. As a technique, it is not particularly obtrusive because it neither requires nor implies any explicit grammatical explanation. A common form of input enhancement is the use of typographical conventions (italics, boldface, underlining, etc.) in a

passage to highlight vocabulary words. A good example of this technique can be found in White (1997), a recent study on the effects of typographical input enhancement on the acquisition of French possessive adjectives. While typographical conventions are probably the most widespread kind of input enhancement, there are other techniques commonly used as well. For example, teachers often "double code" a linguistic feature in speech by drawing attention to it with iconic hand signals and other paralinguistic cues, for example, pointing backwards to index pastness when using a past tense morpheme ("She went on vacation"), pointing up to indicate maximum degree when using superlative constructions ("He is the tallest"), pointing to oneself to highlight reflexivity ("I talk to myself"), and so on.

Teachers looking for ways to enhance discourse constructions and any other spoken phenomena could benefit enormously from learning more about transcription practices (Edwards and Lampert 1993). In a very real sense, the most sophisticated examples of "input enhancement" are transcripts produced by discourse analysts who use complex representational systems for indicating features of talk-in-interaction: pitch, rhythm, turn taking, overlapping, interruptions, and so on. Edwards (1993) contends that because transcription plays such a central role in the study of spoken language, discourse analysts must be very aware of the impact transcription principles and conventions have on interpretation: ". . . choices made concerning . . . how to organize and display the information in a written and spatial medium can all affect the impressions the researcher derives from the data" (p. 3). Although Edwards' remarks are intended for discourse researchers, they are equally pertinent for textbook authors interested in the effects of various input enhancements in their pedagogical materials. As White (1997) points out, more research is needed to determine the effects of different visual enhancement options. Of course, transcription principles and typographical conventions are only a beginning. The growing field of multimedia holds much promise for exploring the pedagogical and research implications of input enhancement. The multiple combinations of sound, text, and image permit the learner to attend to characteristics of the input in ways that were unimaginable only a few years ago (Chapelle 1998).

Task-essential Language

One of the most unobtrusive ways for getting students to focus on form within a meaningful context is to involve students in a communicative task

that obliges them to either produce or comprehend the form. Long and Crookes (1992) argue that tasks provide one of the most pedagogically sound vehicles "for the presentation of appropriate target language samples for learners—input which they will inevitably reshape via applications of general cognitive processing capacities—and for the delivery of comprehension and production opportunities of negotiable difficulty" (p. 43). The literature on task-based language teaching includes both real-world tasks encountered in everyday experience and pedagogical tasks designed for the classroom. Whatever the task—real-world or pedagogical—the overriding focus should be on meaning. Unfortunately, it is not always possible to devise a "natural" task that requires the production of a specific grammar item for its successful completion. In their discussion of the inherent difficulties of task-based methods, Loschky and Bley-Vroman identify three degrees of linguistic involvement in a task: naturalness, utility, and essentialness:

> *In task-naturalness, a grammatical construction may arise naturally during the performance of a particular task, but the task can often be performed perfectly well, even quite easily, without it. In the case of task-utility, it is possible to complete a task without the structure, but with the structure, the task becomes easier. The most extreme demand a task can place on a structure is essentialness: The task cannot be successfully performed unless the structure is used (1993, p. 132).*

Task essentialness is even more elusive when it comes to dealing with the grammar of spoken discourse. While discourse constructions such as dislocations correlate with specific pragmatic functions, it remains arguable whether they can be considered obligatory or essential in specific contexts. Simply put, the choice of discourse constructions is probabilistic and never absolutely clear-cut, although the usage patterns in most corpora are easy to demonstrate statistically (Ashby and Bentivoglio 1993).

Katz (Forthcoming) demonstrates a clever activity for eliciting cleft constructions. Noting that French *c'est* clefts are primarily used to serve a contrastive function, that is, to highlight a piece of information in opposition to another piece of information, Katz develops a referential communication task based on contradicting misinformation as in (11).

(11)
T'as vu ça?! Marie, elle a embrassé Jean! (Did you see that?! *Mary kissed John.*)

ERIC

Mais non, c'est Jean qui a embrassé Marie! (*No, it was John who kissed Mary.*)

Referential communication is essentially the exchange of information between two speakers. Yule (1997) notes that the information exchanged in these kinds of communicative acts implicates the grammar of reference "whereby entities (human or nonhuman) are identified (by naming or describing)" (p. 1). To set up conditions favorable for eliciting such clefts, Katz has her students watch a short video clip of a movie. After viewing, she discusses the clip with her students, but in so doing, she makes several referential mistakes. In other words, she creates multiple "opportunities" within a communicative context for students to use the cleft construction by introducing a communicative problem. Yule (1997) gives several principles for designing "problematicity" into a communicative task such as the incorrect identification of a referent. In one such task, students are given what appears to be the same scene or map as the basis for some kind of decision-making task. It turns out that the scenes or maps are slightly different, thus creating a "referential mismatch" that leads to contradiction.

Applications from Discourse Analysis

While the Focus on Form techniques detailed in the last section derive from classroom-based research on second-language acquisition, the pedagogical applications in this section derive from discourse analysis, a branch of descriptive linguistics. McCarthy (1991) points out that "discourse analysis is *not* a method for teaching languages; it is a way of describing and understanding how language is used" (p. 2, original emphasis). Nevertheless, many applied linguists have advocated adapting the tools and techniques of discourse analysis for pedagogical purposes (Carter and McCarthy 1995; Celce-Murcia 1990; Hatch 1992; Kramsch 1981, 1984; Riggenbach, 1990). The proponents of integrating discourse analysis into the foreign language curriculum differ as to how it should be done, but they all seem to agree that making students responsible for collecting and analyzing linguistic data would help raise linguistic awareness. In a nutshell, the goal is to change the role of the student into that of a language researcher who works to discover patterns and induce rules from authentic data. Riggenbach (1990) outlines several activities that require the student to observe and record native-speaker speech. In all of these activities, the communicative event (e.g., an interview, a conversation, a narrative) is not the pedagogical end in itself as is normally the

ERIC

case with classroom communicative activities. Rather, Riggenbach advocates that communicative activities be used as means to an altogether different end—to generate data in the form of audio recordings that are subsequently transcribed and studied. For beginning students who are unable to elicit and transcribe authentic speech, Riggenbach suggests the use of news broadcasts or other sources of authentic speech such as documentaries or talk shows.

Aimed at language teachers and language-acquisition researchers, Hatch (1992) does not offer specific activities for teaching discourse to language students. Rather, the goal of her book is to teach language professionals, including language teachers, how to do discourse analysis. Hatch does claim that the same activities she has developed for the benefit of language educators can be adapted for the classroom: "This book will not tell you 'how to teach discourse' to language learners. Nevertheless, if you believe that language learners are, in the best sense of the term, 'language researchers,' you will find that many of the practice activities can be used with language learners to heighten their awareness of the system behind discourse." Similarly, Carter and McCarthy (1995) offer no specific exercises for integrating discourse grammar into the language classroom. Instead, they outline a general pedagogical approach to guide teachers:

> *Our mnemonic would be the "three Is" (Illustration—Interaction—Induction): where illustration stands for looking at real data—which may be the only option since the grammar books and current materials so often fall short; interaction stands for discussion, sharing of opinions and observations; and induction stands for making one's own, or the learning group's, rule for a particular feature, a rule which will be refined and honed as more and more data is encountered . . . One only needs an initial curiosity, some real data, and the feeling that there is a lot to be discovered to get started (1995, p. 155).*

While general pronouncements may be enough encouragement for some teachers to give discourse analysis a try, the majority undoubtedly need concrete exercises to get them started, especially since most teachers have so little training in the field. Fortunately, there are a few manuals that offer pedagogical exercises adapted for the college language classroom (McCarthy 1991; McCarthy and Carter 1994). These introductory texts

on the "pedagogy of discourse" supply teachers with a wealth of exercises based on spoken and written discourse covering a full range of discourse topics: speech acts, rhetorical analysis, coherence relations, deixis, discourse syntax, discourse prosody, discourse and culture, and so on. Moreover, these books also include helpful annotations to all exercises. These notes often give insightful hints about what discourse patterns to look for in the data and what problems students may have apprehending the patterns. Unfortunately, both books are written for ESL teachers and exemplify discourse phenomena with English (mainly British) texts. Nevertheless, both books are excellent sources for foreign language teachers looking for ideas about how to develop discourse-oriented grammar activities.

An excellent resource for the French and German instructor interested in discourse analysis is Kramsch (1981, 1984). These manuals not only give a theoretical argument for teaching communicative practices in the foreign language classroom, but they also supply an abundance of interesting activities that develop skills for managing conversations. Kramsch (1981) also includes transcriptions of authentic German and French conversations with annotations pointing out various discourse strategies (topic initiation, floor taking, topic redirection, polite interruption, etc.).

In order to help students discover how word order constructions are employed in discourse, McCarthy (1991) proposes that teachers begin by using pragmatically odd written texts. It may be advisable to use English texts initially, even in the foreign language class, in order to help students grasp the pragmatic concepts more easily. Beginning and intermediate foreign language students lack the pragmatic intuitions necessary to analyze pragmatic anomaly in target language texts. Once the concept of pragmatic anomaly is established, students can begin to explore texts in the target language. First, students read an anomalous text (aloud, if possible). Next, they must explain as precisely as possible where the problem arises, that is, why the text sounds so odd. McCarthy claims that students do not need to know any special metalanguage in order to analyze the pragmatic anomalies in (12) and (13).

(12)

Q: What time did you leave the building?
A: What I did at five-thirty was leave the building.
(McCarthy 1991, p. 53)

ERIC

(13)
Dear Joan,
Me, I'm sitting here at my desk writing to you. What's outside my window is a big lawn surrounded by trees and it's a flower bed that is in the middle of the lawn. When it was full of daffodils and tulips was in the spring. Here you'd love it. It's you who must come and stay sometime; what we've got is plenty of room.
Love, Sally
(McCarthy 1991, p. 53)

When helping students analyze these texts, it is important for teachers to point out that the text's oddity is not due to "grammar errors" since all the sentences are grammatically correct. In other words, teachers need to make clear at this stage of analysis that non-nativelike texts may be constructed from grammatical or nativelike sentences, or, put differently, grammaticality does not assure good communication. From this simple fact, students become aware that communicative competence entails much more than grammatical competence (Canale and Swain 1980). In (12), the reply is pragmatically odd because the given information—leaving the building—is foregrounded by the cleft construction rather than the new information—five-thirty—which is presented as though it were presupposed. The text of (13) is recognizable as a letter or postcard, but one that violates many pragmatic constraints. As McCarthy (1991) explains, "it sounds as if the postcard writer is answering questions nobody has actually ever asked such as 'Isn't it a pond that's in the middle of the lawn?' 'No, it's a flower bed that's . . .'; or else implicit contrasts are being suggested without any apparent motivation: 'here you'd love it,' as opposed to 'somewhere where you might hate it' " (p. 53). Once the students have sufficiently analyzed what structures are problematic and given reasons for their oddity, they must then rewrite the text to make it sound more natural. McCarthy gives an example of a rewritten postcard in (14):

(14)
Dear Joan,
I'm sitting here at my desk writing to you. A big lawn surrounded by trees is outside my window and a flower bed is in the middle of the lawn. It was full of daffodils and tulips in the spring. You'd love it here. You must come and stay sometime; we've got plenty of room.
Love, Sally
(McCarthy 1991, p. 53)

While the rewritten version is hardly elegant, the pragmatic oddity is gone. In the final step of the exercise, students compare the two versions and posit hypotheses about the pragmatic constraints on the distribution of certain word-order constructions. These hypotheses can be tested and refined on other sets of similarly odd-sounding texts. It is at this final stage of hypothesis-formulation that the teacher should introduce the metalanguage of discourse grammar to help students name the phenomena that they have just "discovered," for example, cleft constructions, dislocations, and so on.

Once students have realized that the distribution of certain syntactic structures is governed by principles of interaction, they are ready to analyze discourse "staging," the process of assigning relative importance to any bit of information within discourse. The metaphor of staging is meant to capture how speakers arrange the parts of a discourse for certain rhetorical effects (Brown and Yule 1983; Grimes 1975). Brown and Yule (1983) emphasize that every text, spoken or written, complex or simple, is built in the same linear fashion—one word after another. The linearity of communication coupled with the speaker's need to assign relative prominence to all information results in various predictable discourse patterns. Some of the most striking patterns involve the ways speakers introduce new information into a discourse, such as the introduction of a new character into an oral narrative. Similar to the actors of a play who enter a scene, move around the stage, and then depart, most complex oral narratives contain multiple participants who enter and exit the storyworld.

To be an effective communicator in speech or in writing, it is crucial to consider the audience. And just like directors or playwrights who must always consider the play from the audience's vantage point, speakers must be aware of the listener. Is the listener paying attention when a new topic is introduced into the conversation? Speakers who wish their listeners to attend to new information will typically place it "front and center" in what discourse analysts refer to as the "topic" or "theme" slot, the discursive equivalent to the stage's foreground. It is quite common in unplanned discourse for speakers to use left dislocations as a way to focus the listener's attention on a new participant who will become the topic of subsequent talk. Givón (1993) notes that the need for keeping track of multiple participants in discourse, what he calls "the grammar of referential coherence," invariably centers on the pragmatic use of word order.

Givón (1993) gives several simple techniques for examining the dynamics of discourse reference and topicality. According to Givón, topicality is conceived of as a gradable property of nominal participants (nouns and pronouns) within discourse. In other words, nouns and pronouns can be considered more or less "topical" depending on their relative importance to the overall discourse. Givón explains that different constructions code different levels of topicality as well as perform different pragmatic functions. One simple way for students to discover the correlations between sentence constructions, pragmatic functions, and topicality of nominal referents is to list every noun or pronoun used by the speaker to index the same referent. For example, in (15) the letter writer refers to other parties in different ways, or in the jargon of discourse analysts, "codes" the third-person referents using different devices:

> (15)
> Dear Abby,
> There's (a) this guy I've been going with for near three years. Well, the problem is that (b) he hits me. (c) He started last year. (d) He has done it only four or five times, but each time it was worse than before. Every time (e) he hits me it was because (f) he thought I was flirting (I wasn't). Last time (g) he accused me of coming on to (h) a friend of (i) his. First, (j) he called me a lot of names, then (k) he punched me...
> Black and blue
> (Givón 1993, p. 206)

Here is the list of referring devices for third-person referents in the order in which they appear in (15):

a. this guy
b. he
c. He
d. He
e. he
f. he
g. he
h. a friend
i. his
j. he
k. he

What is there to say about such a simple list? What patterns could there possibly be? Students will probably feel hesitant since the data seem too simple, too intuitive to require any analysis. The first observation that students are likely to make is that pronouns greatly outnumber nouns in this list. The second observation is that all referring devices except (h) refer to the same person, the abusive boyfriend. After stating the obvious, most students are likely to lapse into silence. At this point, students should be led to look at discourse reference from a functional perspective by a series of questions: Why did the writer choose a full noun phrase in (a) and a pronoun rather than a noun in (b)? What is the difference between the two noun phrases (a) and (h)? Which referent (a or h) is the "topic" of the letter? Students should be helped to state a hypothesis along these lines: Pronouns are used to talk about the topic of conversation whereas nouns are used to refer to things that aren't the topic but that may become the topic in later talk.

Another simple technique that is particularly effective for demonstrating the pragmatic functions of topic-coding devices such as dislocations and pronouns is called "referential lookback" or "referential distance." In this exercise, students must count the number of clauses between the appearance of a noun phrase and its closest antecedent. Nouns in right dislocations typically code referents with antecedents found in the immediately preceding clause, whereas nouns found in left dislocations tend to have a greater "referential distance." In other words, to find the antecedent of left dislocated nouns, students must search through many more clauses than is the case with right dislocated nouns (Givón 1993, p. 211). When the statistical pattern is uncovered, students must posit a plausible hypothesis to explain the phenomenon. To do so, students should be encouraged to see how left and right dislocations are used by speakers for interactional purposes. Duranti and Ochs (1979) were the first analysts to highlight how speakers use left dislocations as tools to manage the system of conversational turn taking. They pointed out that any speaker who wishes to change the topic of conversation must first fight to gain the floor. They also noted that speakers often gain the right to speak by repeating a topic, typically a noun phrase, until the other speaker or speakers cede the floor ("My boyfriend . . . my boyfriend . . . my boyfriend, he got a new job.") Thus students can be led to see the correlation between new topics (i.e., referents without antecedents) and the left dislocation construction.

The major drawback to most of the techniques discussed in this section is that they go well beyond the expertise of the vast majority of foreign language teachers who have little if any formal training in discourse analysis. Teachers are likely to agree with Barnes (1990) who objects that this kind of linguistic analysis will unduly complicate language study for most students, especially for beginning language students. Such discourse analytic techniques risk introducing more metalinguistic terminology than ever before into the language classroom with traditional terms simply exchanged for new ones: "topicality," "presupposition," "referentiality," and so on. It would seem wise then to consider most of these techniques more appropriate for more advanced levels of language study, such as a fifth-semester composition or conversation class as suggested by Valdman (1997).

Another problem with such techniques that Barnes (1990) points out is the difficulty students are likely to have formulating simple rules for complex discourse phenomena. Teachers interested in exploring the application of discourse analytic techniques need to remind themselves that language awareness develops with lots of practice and exposure to authentic input. Moreover, cognitive skills, such as inducing patterns from data and building testable hypotheses, requires much practice, too. Only after considerable time will students begin to understand how to do discourse analysis, that is, how to draw nuanced inferences about the correlation of form and function in discourse from seemingly insignificant texts.

Applications from Corpus Linguistics

Corpus linguistics shares many of the same goals as discourse analysis but differs primarily in its methods of analysis. As its name implies, corpus linguistics refers to the analysis of large databases of real language examples stored on a computer (Biber et al. 1998; McEnery and Wilson 1996; Sinclair 1991; Thomas and Short 1996). While most corpus linguists do not have a pedagogical orientation, the field has nonetheless given rise to applications for language learning. One of the most recent and most promising pedagogical applications is called Data-Driven Learning (DDL). DDL relies on inductive methods of grammatical analysis made possible by large and easy-to-manipulate databases of authentic language called linguistic corpora (also referred to as corpuses):

> *What distinguishes the DDL approach is the attempt to cut out the middleman as far as possible and to give direct access to the data so*

that the learner can take part in building up his or her own profiles of meaning and use. The assumption that underlies this approach is that effective language learning is itself a form of linguistic research, and that the concordance printout offers a unique resource for the stimulation of inductive learning strategies—in particular the strategies of perceiving similarities and differences and of hypothesis formation and testing (Johns 1994, p. 297).

The impetus for introducing corpus data into the classroom grew out of the dissatisfaction with artificial examples found in language textbooks. Johns argues not only that artificial examples are of dubious value for teaching language function, but that they generally are less interesting than the real thing. Furthermore, he questions the use of "simplified texts" because they run the risk of destroying the very features that account for the choice of one form over another in the first place. In general, those calling for the use of corpora in language education have argued that the study of form and function "entails a far more extensive use of authentic, unmodified data than has been traditional in language teaching" (Johns 1994, p. 294).

Induction in grammar instruction is not a particularly new idea. Inductive methods based on corpora and concordances, however, is an innovation. Hadley (1996) recounts an anecdote that illustrates the potential of a corpus printout to teach form-function correlations: "In Japan, language learners still memorize sentences such as 'The food was eaten by me.' . . . Instead of trying to explain to learners why it is odd simply from insight, we can direct our students to look at tangible examples from the corpus. Using the corpora/concordancer package, they find that *eaten* does in fact collocate most commonly with the word *food*." According to Hadley, his Japanese ESL learners were provided with the following language samples taken from COBUILD's Bank of English as shown in (16):

(16)

. . . and a wide selection of **food** will be eaten. Prepared Softbill **food** is a good st . . .

. . . inger **foods** and any **food** that can be **eaten** seductively are in! Accomplished fl . . .

. . . an excellent **food** and should be **eaten** in plentiful quantities. Now to make . . .

... test with an extract of a commonly eaten food, we are likely to provoke a pos ...
... asing the amount and variety of food eaten. Problems could include failure to e ...
... ition to the amount and type of food eaten, the frequency of meals may be an im ...
... ollowing: Reduce the amount of food eaten, but not by sacrificing nutritious f ...
... and the kids. No charge except for the food eaten. Big fuss made of birthday child.
... Another reason why hot food gets eaten in hot countries is that chillies an ...
... bused by overeating it. If a food is eaten in any form once in three days, or m ...

An enormous corpus, the Bank of English includes hundreds of millions of words taken from books, radio and television broadcasts, newspapers, and spoken English (informal and formal registers). In (16), the concordancer program has searched the database for collocations of [eaten+food], extracted them from their discourse content, and displayed them separately in a Key Word In Context (KWIC) format. These examples can be printed out and made into a classroom handout. Most concordance programs allow the user to control the amount of contextualization desired—anywhere from an item in its immediate context as shown in (16) to an item embedded in a paragraph. After examining the examples in (16), students understand the anomaly of such artificial sentences as "The sandwich was eaten by me." In real language, the agent of the passive form of the verb "to eat" is almost always omitted because it is either irrelevant or understood or both.

Johns (1994) categorizes DDL methods as either reactive or proactive. The reactive use of a corpus is always in response to a query or a learning problem that arises during teaching. Johns gives the example of a student who asked him one day for the difference between *therefore* and *hence*. Proactive uses, on the other hand, refer to materials or lessons that have been created by teachers who preselect and arrange data to aid induction. To teach about article selection, a central element of discourse grammar, Johns uses corpus data arranged by a concordance as shown in (17). The goal of the handout is to help students discover the tricky semantic/pragmatic restrictions on the choice of definite article versus zero article in

English. The first part of the handout presents contrasting examples of definite and zero article from which students induce the rule(s) governing article selection. In the second part of the handout, students fill in the blanks with the correct article.[7]

(17)

Definite Article	Zero Article
1. In Gwynedd, a bedrock of the Welsh language, there are 25 film-making companies.	1. The research also showed increases in the frequency of bad language and sex on TV.
2. We must accept that the salvation of the French language involves learning one or more of the languages in neighbouring countries.	2. Inspectors said behaviour was generally good, but features "such as free use of language and nonattendance at lessons are tolerated much more than in conventional schools.

1. . . . proud of their command of _____ English language and engage in quite of lot of patting . . .
2. . . . but it does not mean that _____ everyday language is bad: it is simply the way of thin . . .
3. . . . that cerebral dominance for _____ language is established before the age of five.
4. . . . is one thing and _____ technical language is another, Vocabulary is words, lists of . . .
5. . . . Slavic speakers. Orthodoxy and _____ Greek language remain the two markers of . . .
6. . . . up an emaciated child, and in _____ sign language asked me to vaccinate the baby.
7. . . . of a computer system for _____ Chinese language. In another move, Computer Applications . . .
8. . . . the splendid hope that _____ scientific language could provide a model for cultural discourse . . .
9. . . . writers attempted to free _____ poetic language from the prevailing romantic imitations . . .
10. . . . phoneticized version of _____ Tsimshian language. To someone such as I, who had the . . .
11. . . . be able to understand _____ natural language. The truth is that is a much more...

ERIC

12. ...was French. "Le own goal" entered _____ language. New Scientist, in an article by...

Language teachers interested in incorporating DDL techniques into their curriculum face a major obstacle—finding a computerized corpus in the target language. Unfortunately, access remains a problem since corpora are still largely the reserve of researchers. Nevertheless, there are ways of getting around such formidable obstacles. Tribble (1997) offers several helpful "quick-and-dirty" ways for developing corpora for language teaching. He suggests that commercially available CD-ROM encyclopedias constitute more than enough electronic data for most successful applications of DDL techniques. Furthermore, many CD-ROM materials have built-in search functions that may be used like concordance programs.

Another idea that has gone relatively unexplored is the use of the World Wide Web as a corpus; after all, it is by far the world's largest electronic database of searchable text in most of the major languages. Based on the same principles as a concordancer searching a corpus, an Internet search engine may be used to find thousands (sometimes millions!) of examples of grammatical structures embedded in authentic target language texts (Blyth 1999, p. 116). And similar to a concordancer, many search engines will even display the search results with the embedded key word or phrase in boldface. At the University of Illinois' Division of English as an International Language (DEIL), an innovative website called "Grammar Safari" has been developed to show teachers and students how to transform the Internet into an enormous grammar database.[8] The rationale is explained on the web site's homepage:

> *Grammar books tend to make things fairly simple and there is some value in that. Nevertheless, for the serious student of English, it's worthwhile also to broaden your horizons and explore the jungle out in the real world. The World Wide Web (WWW) is an excellent place to begin experiencing English as it occurs in its natural surroundings—not only are there millions of English texts readily available, but also most of them can be electronically searched for those elusive yet fascinating English grammar structures.*

The basic concept is applicable to any language that is available on the Internet. Instead of using content words for key words, learners or teachers use the foreign language grammatical words to locate examples of target

language structures. Using the Spanish version of the popular search engine Yahoo!, I conducted a search using the Spanish phrase "todo lo que" ("all that") A small sample of the results are given in (18).

(18)
CARABANCHEL - Esta es la pagina de Carabanchel donde encontraras arte, cultura, ocio, musica y todo lo que quieras saber sobre nuestro barrio
<http://www.carabanchel.com/>

Prólogo al alumno - En la Academia de Peluquería Michi podés encontrar todo lo que necesitás para formarte como peinador.
<http://www.michi.adad.net/alumno.html>

QTPD.com - QTPD.com tu sitio de entretenimiento venezolano en la red, con todo lo que querías, chat, postales, amor, humor, y mucho mucho más.
<http://www.qtpd.com/>

As useful as Web pages may be for providing thousands of grammatical examples, it is important to remember that they are written texts and may not be particularly useful for exemplifying spoken constructions. On the other hand, because of the enormous size of the Internet and because of the informality of discourse in cyberspace, even the most typical oral expressions are liable to turn up. As proof, consider a small sample of the results from a Yahoo! search that I conducted for the French expression "et patati et patata" ("and so on and so on"), a phrase usually restricted to informal speech, given in (19). The first text is strikingly paratactic in nature and rife with indexes of informal spoken French: discourse markers (Allons bon [OK]), left dislocated topics (la culture, c'est...[culture, it's...]), omission of obligatory complementizer "que" (je sais ø la culture... [I think ø culture]).

(19)
J'ai oublié ma confiture - CULTURE Allons bon, Cyrille qui fait une page sur la culture, c'est à
hurler de rire. Oui, je sais, la culture c'est comme la confiture moins on en a et patati et patata.
C'est vrai, ce n'est peut être pas la page qui va s'enrichir le plus. A moins.
<http://www.mygale.org/00/udt1138/jaioubli.htm>

ERIC

> Chant choral - Le Courrier du Choeur - Belgique Le jeu de rôle du chef de choeur Les pouvoirs de la polyphonie (César Geoffray) Un bon chef pense à son successeur L'humour de Gustave (A Coeur Joie Belgique) Et patati, et patata.. Le bavardage dans nos chorales Le moine et l'habit -
> <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/Michel_Lion/ccho>

Although the vast range of data in electronic form available via the Internet is impressive, the fact remains that corpora of transcribed spoken language are hard to come by. Teachers committed to teaching spoken syntax should give serious thought to creating their own materials. This is not as impossible as it may seem. First of all, a corpus need not be overwhelmingly large. A ten-minute sample from a recorded, naturally occurring conversation will produce enough data to exemplify many of the most common discourse structures—repairs, dislocations, discourse markers. Moreover, recorded conversations or interviews do not need to be transcribed in their entirety. Teachers should transcribe only those sections that contain pertinent grammar items. While these materials are not as onerous to produce as teachers may think, they still take time and effort. Ultimately, publishing companies should consider providing samples of recorded authentic oral discourse with transcriptions along with traditional materials, that is, studio recorded scripted dialogues. Even a small corpus of short interactions would greatly help an instructor trying to teach grammar as communicative practice.

As with the applications from discourse analysis, the pedagogical applications of corpus linguistics appear rather limited for several reasons. First, searching databases and inducing patterns from large sets of data require a level of linguistic sophistication well beyond most beginning and intermediate students. Most reports of the applications of DDL have been on advanced learners who already possessed a rather sophisticated knowledge of grammar and lexis. It remains to be seen how DDL may be adapted for beginning levels. Second, students and teachers not proficient with concordance software may find that such techniques require too much time spent learning a new computer program rather than learning the target language. And third, logistical problems such as access to computerized corpora loom large. Therefore rather than letting beginning and intermediate students discover form/function correlations on their

own, teachers may find it more profitable and efficient to use a corpus to produce their own handouts as suggested.

TA Education

A recent survey of graduate TAs in French departments around the country discovered that TAs lacked important metalinguistic knowledge despite a strong emphasis on grammatical analysis throughout their own language learning experience (Fox 1993). In particular, Fox's survey revealed that the model of language with which TAs begin their careers ignores discourse competence as a distinct level of grammatical organization. As a result, TAs are prone to conceive of grammar as comprised of distinct entities that are adequately described at a sentential level. To fill the knowledge gap, Fox suggests that TAs receive an introduction to linguistic description of the target language as part of their curriculum to raise their awareness about discourse grammar. Besides gaining greater awareness of discourse competence and discourse grammar, TAs need to become more aware of the vast differences between the written and spoken languages and how those differences are often masked or distorted in the classroom.

One of the best ways to discover the particularities of spoken language is to transcribe it. TAs can benefit immensely by transcribing a short stretch (five minutes is usually sufficient) of any naturally occurring conversation as part of their methods course. TAs can transcribe the same stretch of dialogue and then compare their transcriptions in class, or they may prefer to work on different interactions. TAs may also benefit from conducting with native speakers interviews that they can later transcribe. These transcriptions not only provide the TAs with a better awareness of the complexities of spoken language, but may also serve as potential materials to be used in language classes. The recordings and transcriptions may even be collected and used to start a departmental corpus of spoken language.

In keeping with a constructivist approach to TA education, the role of the TA educator is not so much to teach teachers how to teach discourse syntax, but rather to facilitate and guide TAs' own construction of teaching practices (Blyth 1997). The goal is not so much to "train" the new TA in a set of pedagogical practices that he or she must import into the classroom as it is to help the apprentice teacher raise questions about the

ERIC

instruction of language from a discourse perspective. If beginning teachers are to be convinced of the importance of the teaching of discourse grammar using the pedagogical practices discussed here (Focus on Form activities, discourse analytic techniques, and corpus linguistics), they must first experience these new practices as a learner would. By experiencing these practices during a methods class, TAs not only gain greater awareness about discourse, but they also come to understand what the practice feels like from the learner's perspective. There is only so much, however, that any methods instructor should expect to accomplish in a single methods course. Even though a constructivist approach will help TAs to understand a discourse-oriented approach to foreign language teaching, it is crucial that TAs have materials that support such an approach if they are to be successful in the classroom.

Conclusion

In the past decade, discourse-oriented linguists have made much progress in their description of noncanonical grammatical forms encountered in authentic contexts, for example, clefts, dislocations, agentless passives, and so on. The importance of such descriptions for language teaching has not been lost on applied linguists. As Sinclair (1991) puts it: "There are signs of a growing recognition that the comprehensive study of language must be based on textual evidence. One does not study all of botany by making artificial flowers" (p. 6). Sinclair is right. There is no reason that students of language should be restricted to studying artificial sentences, especially not today. Thanks to the growing fields of discourse analysis and corpus linguistics, today's teachers have better descriptions than ever before of the patterns of spoken language. The question for language educators is no longer *whether* we should teach language as discourse, but *how.*

Some foreign language scholars have expressed reasonable doubt about the "teachability" of word-order constructions and other discourse phenomena (Barnes 1990). It was argued that this doubt stems from a traditional concept of grammar instruction. After years of neglect, pedagogical grammar has recently come to the forefront again in the foreign language teaching profession. Fortunately, this renewed interest does not indicate another alarming swing of the pendulum but rather a reasonable attempt to integrate the goals of grammatical accuracy and communicative fluency. The Focus on Form activities described in this chapter have

ERIC

all been developed with those double imperatives in mind—to improve accuracy and to improve fluency—in a manner consonant with current research in second language acquisition. The Focus on Form methods for teaching word-order constructions all meet (to a greater or lesser degree) the central tenet of this approach: A prerequisite engagement in meaning is established before a focus on linguistic form is attempted.

The same can not be said for the techniques derived from discourse analysis and corpus linguistics. That is not to say that these techniques do not have their place. Rather, these techniques are aimed more at establishing a sophisticated awareness of how discourse is organized than at improving communicative fluency. While they hardly constitute a program for teaching discourse grammar by themselves, they could readily be integrated into the teaching of more advanced levels of language where textual analysis is already commonplace. Valdman (1997) claims that envisioning language as discourse may prove useful in rethinking many of our pedagogical practices, including curriculum development and course articulation. He argues that the artificial but widespread division between conversation and composition courses could be partially eliminated by putting discourse grammar at the core of the intermediate language curriculum. He also states that a focus on discourse grammar in the intermediate and advanced courses might provide relief from the ad nauseam review of sentential grammar structures presented in the beginning courses.

While most of the activities and techniques described in this chapter are new and relatively untested, there is no reason to assume that they should not be as effective for teaching discourse grammar as they are for teaching sentential grammar: "[A]lthough there is, as yet, little evidence of the efficacy of attention to the form of language at the discourse and pragmatic levels, we believe that the principle will still apply" (Doughty and Williams 1998b, p. 212). As promising as the techniques in this chapter may be, they are virtually nonexistent in today's pedagogical materials. It is hoped that future foreign language textbook authors will incorporate these ideas into their materials. Without such textbooks, it is highly unrealistic to expect that TAs (or seasoned teachers for that matter) will be very successful at teaching discourse grammar. TAs would greatly benefit from a teacher's edition of a textbook that included background information about how the foreign language is organized at the discourse level. And spoken, recorded texts of naturally occurring interaction

ERIC

should be included in textbooks to illustrate more accurately the various discourse structures to be learned. All of this needs to be integrated into a fully articulated, discourse-oriented program, preferably aimed at the intermediate level in order to help our students move from producing sentences to producing discourse.

Notes

1. I would like to acknowledge my apprecation to Kevin Lemoine and three anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on earlier versions of this chapter.

2. The term *construction* is based on the notion developed in Construction Grammar (Fillmore 1991; Fillmore and Kay 1995; Fillmore, Kay, and O'Connor 1988; Goldberg 1995; Jackendoff 1997; Lambrecht 1994; Lambrecht and Lemoine 1996; Michaelis and Lambrecht 1996). In this approach to grammar, a *construction* is the basic unit of grammatical form. Essentially, a construction is any structure with a conventional mapping of form with semantic structure and pragmatic function. Fillmore and Kay (1995) describe a *construction* as a "structured set of conditions determining a class of actual constructs of a language" (p. 4). Thus, a construction can be lexical, morphological, or, like the examples considered in this article, syntactic.

3. *Portes Ouvertes* (Haggstrom et al. 1998) is a recent example of a first-year foreign language program that makes liberal use of authentic, unscripted video.

4. Altman (1989) cites video's qualities of *maximum contextualization* and *maximum control* as the reason the medium is particularly "well suited to display the connections between language and the real world upon which comprehension depends" (p. 8). While maximum contextualization remains analog video's claim to fame, the medium can no longer be said to afford maximum control. That honor now goes to multimedia software in which digitized files may be randomly accessed at the click of a computer key.

5. In a cleft sentence the copula (the conjugated form of "to be") is preceded by "it" in English and "c'est" in French and followed by a noun phrase and a relative clause, for example, *It is Horowitz who is going to play. C'est Horowitz qui va jouer.*

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

6. The term *left dislocation* used here refers to a specific word-order construction in which an extraclausal pronoun or noun is placed immediately to the left of the clause, for example, [Mary], John kissed her.

7. This exercise and many more DDL materials are available online at Tim Johns' Virtual DDL Website <http://sun1.bham.ac.uk/johnstf/def_art.htm>.

8. The Grammar Safari web site's address is <http://deil.lang.uiuc.edu/web.pages/grammarsafari.html>.

Works Cited

Allen, W., and N. Fouletier-Smith. 1995. *Parallèles: Communication et culture.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Altman, R. 1989. *The Video Connection: Integrating Video into Language Teaching.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Andersen, R. W. 1987. *The Real McCoy: A Model for an Authentic Text-based Language Curriculum.* Unpublished report, UCLA, Department of TESL/Applied Linguistics.

______. 1996. *The Sociocultural Content of a Discourse-centered Multimedia Language Curriculum.* Unpublished manuscript, UCLA, Department of TESL/Applied Linguistics.

Andersen, R. W., and J. L. Daza. 1994. *Ucuchi: Quechua Live and in Color!* CD-ROM. Los Angeles: UCLA, Authentic Discourse Research and Development Project.

Andersen, R. W., J. L. Daza, and R. E. Robison. 1994. Learning Quechua Language and Culture from Interactive Videodisc. In *Language in the Andes,* edited by P. Cole, G. Hermon, and M. Daniel, 379–400. Newark, DE: Latin American Studies Program, University of Delaware.

Ashby, W., and P. Bentivoglio. 1993. Preferred Argument Structure in Spoken French and Spanish. *Language Variation and Change* 5: 61–76.

Barnes, B. 1990. Apports de l'analyse du discours à l'enseignement de la langue. *The French Review* 64 (1): 95–107.

Biber, D., S. Conrad, and R. Reppen. 1998. *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language, Structure, and Use.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

ERIC

Blyth, C. 1997. A Constructivist Approach to Grammar: Teaching Teachers to Teach Aspect. *Modern Language Journal* 81: 50–66.

______. 1999. *Untangling The Web: Nonce's Guide to Language and Culture on the Internet.* New York: Nonce Publishing.

Bragger, J., and D. Rice. 1985. *Du Tac Au Tac: Managing Conversations in French.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Breen, M., and C. Candlin. 1980. The Essentials of a Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching. *Applied Linguistics* 1: 89–112.

Brown, G., and G. Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M., and M. Swain. 1980. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1: 1–47.

Carter, R., and M. McCarthy. 1995. Grammar and the Spoken Language. *Applied Linguistics* 16: 141–159.

Celce-Murcia, M. 1990. Discourse Analysis and Grammar Instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 11: 135–151.

Celce-Murcia, M., Z. Dörnyei, and S. Thurrell. 1997. Direct Approaches in L2 Instruction: A Turning Point in Communicative Language Teaching? *TESOL Quarterly* 31 (1): 141–152.

Chappelle, C. 1998. Multimedia CALL: Lessons to Be Learned From Research on Instructed SLA. *Language Learning and Technology* 2 (1): 22–34. <http://polyglot.cal.msu.edu/llt/vol2num1/article1/index.html>

Cooremen, A., and K. Kilborn. 1990. Functionalist Linguistics: Discourse Structure and Language Processing in Second Language Acquisition. In *Crosscurrents in Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theories,* edited by T. Huebner and C. Ferguson, 195–224. Amsterdam and Philadephia: John Benjamins.

Dörnyei, Z., and S. Thurrell. 1994. Teaching Conversational Skills Intensively: Course Content and Rationale. *ELT Journal* 48: 40–49.

Doughty, C., and J. Williams, eds. 1998a. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., and J. Williams. 1998b. Pedagogical Choices in Focus on Form. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition,*

edited by C. Doughty and J. Williams, 197–261. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Duranti, A., and E. Ochs. 1979. Left Dislocation in Italian Conversation. In *Discourse and Syntax*, edited by T. Givón. New York: Academic Press.

Edwards, J. 1993. Principles and Contrasting Systems of Discourse Transcription. In *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*, edited by J. Edwards and M. Lampert, 3–32. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Edwards, J., and M. Lampert, eds. 1993. *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fillmore, C. J. 1991. *On Grammatical Constructions*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.

Fillmore, C. J., and P. Kay. 1995. *Construction Grammar*. Unpublished manuscript, Stanford, CA, CSLI Publications.

Fillmore, C. J., P. Kay, and M. C. O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and Idiomaticity in Grammatical Constructions: The Case of 'Let alone.' *Language* 64 (3): 501–538.

Fox, C. 1993. Communicative Competence and Beliefs about Language among Graduate Teaching Assistants in French. *Modern Language Journal* 77: 313–324.

Garrett, N. 1986. The Problem with Grammar: What Kind Can the Language Learner Use? *Modern Language Journal* 70: 133–148.

Givón, T. 1993. *English Grammar: A Function-Based Introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goldberg, A. E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grimes, J. 1975. *The Thread of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.

Gumperz, J. J., ed. 1982. *Discourse and Social Identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hadley, G. 1996. Sensing the Winds of Change: An Introduction to Data-Driven Learning. <http://sun1bham.ac.uk/honstg/winds.htm>

Haggstrom, M., J. Frommer, C. M. Jones, M-F. Bunting, and L. Patenotte. 1998. *Portes Ouvertes: An Interactive Multimedia Approach to First-year French*. Orlando, FL: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

ERIC

Hanks, W. 1996. *Language and Communicative Practices.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Harley, B. 1992. Patterns of Second Language Development in French Immersion. *Journal of French Language Studies* 2: 245–260.

Harley, B., and M. Swain. 1984. The Interlanguage of Immersion Students and Its Implications for Second Language Teaching. In *Interlanguage,* edited by A. Davies, C. Criper, and A. Howett, 291–311. Edinburgh, Scot.: Edinburgh University Press.

Hatch, E. 1992. *Discourse and Language Education.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Herschensohn, J. 1988. Linguistic Accuracy and Textbook Grammars: The Determiner System in French. *Modern Language Journal* 72: 409–414.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1997. Twistin' the Night Away. *Language* 73 (3): 534–559.

Johns, T. 1994. From Printout to Handout: Grammar and Vocabulary Teaching in the Context of Data-Driven Learning. In *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar,* edited by T. Odlin, 293–313. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Katz, S. Forthcoming. A Functional Approach to the French *C'est* Cleft. *The French Review.*

Kramsch, C. 1981. *Discourse Analysis and Second Language Teaching.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

______. 1983. Discourse Function and Grammar Rules: Topic Construction in German. *Modern Language Journal* 67 (1): 13–21.

______. 1984. *Interaction et discours dans la classe de langue.* Paris: Hatier-Crédif.

Kramsch, C., and R. Andersen. 1999. Teaching Text and Context Through Multimedia. *Language Learning & Technology* 2 (2): 31–42.<http://polyglot.cal.msu.edu/llt/vol2num2/article1/index.html>

Lambrecht, K. 1987. On the Status of SVO Sentences in French Discourse. In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse,* edited by R. Tomlin, 217–261. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

______. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

ERIC

Lambrecht, K., and K. Lemoine. 1996. Vers une grammaire des compléments zéro en français parlé. *Absence de marque et représentation de l'absence: Travaux du CerLiCO.-9.* Rennes, France: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Lee, J., and B. VanPatten. 1995. *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Long, M. 1991. Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. In *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective*, edited by K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, and C. Kramsch, 39–52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M., and G. Crookes. 1992. Three Approaches to Task-Based Syllabus Design. *TESOL Quarterly* 26: 27–56.

Loschky, L., and R. Bley-Vroman. 1993. Grammar and Task-based Methodology. In *Tasks and Language Learning,* edited by B. Crookes and S. Gass, 123-167. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Malinowski, B. 1923. The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages. In *The Meaning of Meaning*, edited by C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, New York: Harcourt Brace.

McEnery, T., and A. Wilson. 1996. *Corpus Linguistics.* Edinburgh, Scot.: Edinburgh University Press.

McCarthy, M. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, M., and R. Carter. 1994. *Language As Discourse: Perspectives for Language Teaching.* London and New York: Longman.

Michaelis, L., and K. Lambrecht. 1996. Toward a Construction-based Theory of Language Function: The Case of Nominal Extraposition. *Language* 72 (2): 215–247.

Pomerantz, A. 1984. Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some Features of Preferred/Dispreferred Turn Shapes. In *The Structures of Social Action*, edited by J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. 1990. *The Language Teaching Matrix.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

ERIC

Riggenbach, H. 1990. Discourse Analysis and Spoken Language Instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 11: 152–163.

Rutherford, W. 1987. *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching.* New York: Longman.

Sapir, E. 1949. The Selected Writings of Edward Sapir. In *Language, Culture, and Personality,* edited by D. G. Mandelbaum. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Schiffrin, D. 1994. *Approaches to Discourse.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. 1998. Focus on Form through Conscious Reflection. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition,* edited by C. Doughty and J. Williams, 64–82. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, J., and M. Short, eds. 1996. *Using Corpora for Language Research: Studies in the Honour of Geoffrey Leech.* London and New York: Longman.

Tomasello, M., and C. Herron. 1988. Down the Garden Path: Inducing and Correcting Overgeneralisation Errors in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 9: 237–246.

Tomlin, R. 1994. Functional Grammars, Pedagogical Grammars, and Communicative Language Teaching. In *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar,* edited by T. Odlin, 140–178. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Trévise, A. 1986. Is it Transferable, Topicalization? *In Crosslinguistic Influence in L2 Acquisition,* edited by E. Kellerman and M. Sharwood Smith. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Tribble, C. 1997. Improvising Corpora for ELT: Quick and Dirty Ways of Developing Corpora for Language Teaching. <http://sun1.bham.ac.uk/johnstf/biblio.htm>

Valdman, A. 1992. Authenticity, Variation, and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom. In *Text and Context: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Language Study,* edited by C. Kramsch and S. McConnell-Ginet, pp. 79–97. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

______. 1997. Letter from the President. *AATF National Bulletin* 23 (1): 1.

Valdman, A., and Pons, C. 1997. *Chez Nous: Branché Sur le Monde Francophone.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

VanPatten, B. 1996. *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction in Second Language Acquisition.* Norword, NJ: Ablex.

Walz, J. 1986. Is Oral Proficiency Possible with Today's French Textbooks? *Modern Language Journal* 70: 13–20.

White, J. 1997. Getting the Learners' Attention: A Typographical Input Enhancement Study. In *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, edited by C. Doughty and J. Williams, 85–138. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkins, D. A. 1976. *Notional Syllabuses.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Yule, G. 1997. *Referential Communication Tasks.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

ERIC