

**To what extent is a grammar-translation
approach based on consciousness-raising ?**

Paul Moritoshi

1 Introduction

Like other global industries, the Teaching English as a Foreign / Second Language (TEF/SL) profession seems adept at creating jargon, some of which are alternative labels for the same thing. The concept of consciousness-raising (C-R) is a case in point. Terms such as *language awareness* (Hawkins, (1984) cited by Odlin, 1994: 29), *sensitisation*, via the mother tongue (Riley, 1985 *ibid.*) and *discovery learning* (Ellis (1992), cited by Edwards *et al*, 1999: 63) are conceptual labels, albeit rather vague ones. Sharwood Smith (1981, cited by Willis 1997: 98-100) incorporates the concept in to a paradigm of language learning, while *Data Driven Learning* or DDL (Johns, 1991; 1994) and *grammatical consciousness-raising* (Rutherford, 1987) are approaches to TEF/SL which embrace the concept.

Though individual conceptions may differ, there are features common to most or all which can be used to form a 'core conception' of consciousness-raising and it is these elements which the writer will identify through examination of various writers' work on the concept. Having formed a core conception of C-R, the writer will then examine the variables which determine the extent to which a grammar-translation approach is based on consciousness-raising.

2 Creating a core conception of consciousness-raising.

2.1 The underlying assumptions and practical application of consciousness-raising.

This author's core conception of C-R is derived mainly from the elements listed in appendix 1. These are features of the approach which have either been overtly supported by various writers or who's support has been inferred from the literature.

Central to understanding C-R are the theoretical assumptions on which it is based: assumptions of how second language (L2) is acquired, how best to aid that acquisition and the ways in which these assumptions are expressed in its practical application.

2.1.1 Duplicating first language acquisition processes

Perhaps the principle assumption, upon which several of C-R's practices are founded is that it's more effective to mimic a system that is known to work than to attempt to produce equivalent results with an entirely artificial system such as traditional grammar instruction. This is in line with Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991: 324) who point out that target language (TL) is acquired in the same way as a child acquires native speech. For this reason C-R attempts to aid second language acquisition (SLA) by duplicating (as much as possible) first

language (L1) acquisition processes. This duplication is realised in various ways.

For example, it forms the basis of Rutherford's (1987: 151) suggestion that it is necessary only to expose learners to a particular subset of the L2's grammars. From this subset students could attempt to predict or "project" (*ibid.*) the forms and functions of other grammars: grammars to which they have not yet been exposed. He cites various literature in support of his view that this is how L1 is acquired, but does not indicate what the contents of the subset might be.

The same principle assumption underlies the view held by some proponents of C-R that comprehensible input, though necessary, is insufficient "because it does not always provide appropriate evidence" (Yip, 1989: 125). In other words, it often lacks context or suitable feedback, (either positive and negative) to enable the learner to draw appropriate conclusions about the L2's form and/or function.

Further, Stern's (1992: 139) recommendation that both lexis and syntax should be regularly recycled by placing them in contexts different from that of the initial presentation, or by using different exponents of the same structure, is essentially advocating the same viewpoint: that L2 structures should be input in the same varied or 'random' way in which L1 structures are input. This would aid the formation (and where necessary, modification) of what he calls "a network of associations" (*ibid.*), or what many call the student's 'inter-language system' (IL). In C-R this system takes the form of a set of hypotheses or generalisations about the L2's form-function relationships and is discussed briefly in section 2.2

However, it is unclear to what extent the processes by which L1 is acquired are retained from infancy into adulthood and what effect the variation among learners' individual differences (cf. Brown, 1994: 276) may have on SLA in later life. This issue of applicability is dealt with further in section 2.3

2.1.2 Rejection of the 'accumulated entities' view.

With regard to the teaching of grammar, proponents of C-R generally agree that some instruction in L2 grammar is necessary (Yip, 1989: 125-6), though in common with Rutherford (*ibid.*), none are prescriptive on the quantity or choice of required structures. The 'accumulated entities' view of language learning advocated, for example, by proponents of orthodox grammar-translation, assumes that language can be learnt in discrete packets, each distinct and separate from the next and that these 'building blocks' can be learnt sequentially, until the student has amassed sufficient units to produce meaningful target language.

Consciousness-raising rejects this notion, which has been largely discredited (Rutherford, 1987: 5-6 states a particularly cogent case). Instead, C-R recognises that a second language, like a mother tongue, is a vastly more complex phenomenon in which grammars are not discrete but inextricably intertwined. This is corroborated by the author's own study of Japanese in which one grammar often modifies another or can be used in combination with others to convey increasingly more advanced meanings.

2.1.3 Accepting students' prior knowledge and experience.

Inherent in the accumulated entities standpoint is a further assumption that learners have no prior knowledge, either of how a language may be constructed or used. This view of language learners as *tabula rasa* (*ibid.*: 7-8) is clearly erroneous since we are all highly proficient in constructing and using *at least* one language: our mother tongue. While a second language may differ significantly from the first, there is likely to be some commonality, both in structure and strategies for exploitation. Consciousness-raising not only accepts that L2 learners have such prior knowledge and experience of language construction and use but seeks to utilise them to aid second language acquisition.

2.1.4 Grammar instruction.

Although C-R and more traditional approaches both accept that students need to have grammatical structures brought to their conscious attention, C-R differs in its *modus operandi*. Some writers, particularly advocates of consciousness-raising, have expressed doubts as to the teachability (ergo, as Rutherford (1987: 2) would point out, the learnability) of complete and accurate pedagogical grammars (Johns (1991: 3) among others). Rather than undertake what Willis (1993: 90) views as a futile task, consciousness-raising does not attempt to teach grammar, either as 'complete' or through teacher-fronted transmission of sets of rules. Instead, as employed by Hopkins and Nettle (1994: 158), it utilises students' cognitive and linguistic capacities to devise generalisations or hypotheses about L2 structures' forms and/or functions (see section 2.2)

2.1.5 Setting students linguistic and cognitive challenges using authentic data.

This is achieved, for example, through problem-solving or decision-making activities (cf. Rutherford (1987: 160-8), Nunan (1991: 150-1), Johns (1991: 14-16); (1994: 300-311), Ellis and Hedge (1993: 11) and Willis (1993: 91) for examples and explanations of use). A key feature of such activities is the use of authentic target language *in context*, rather than the

contrived examples commonly associated with more traditional approaches to grammar instruction. Authenticity (what Johns, (1991: 4-5) calls "normality") is central to consciousness-raising because it provides what is generally considered to be the best data for illustrating the TL's form-function relationships. This assumption is in turn based on the principal assumption detailed above, that TL should be input and processed, as much as possible, through processes similar to those used to acquire a first language.

2.1.6 Learning through discovery.

Through such activities students "discover" (*ibid.*: 1) aspects of the target language. This is thought to facilitate SLA by leading students from known to unknown, or from familiar to unfamiliar, once again utilising learners' cognitive and linguistic capacities, knowledge and experiences. This is what Shortall (in Edwards *et al*, 1996: 68) meant when he wrote "by using what I know, I can find what is new".

Johns even reports that:

One interesting side-effect of the [DDL] approach seems to be that when grammatical description is the product of the learner's own engagement with the evidence, that description may show a far greater degree of abstraction and subtlety than would normally be allowed for in the type of pedagogical description that is presented as a 'given' ".

Johns (1991: 3-4)

In other words he reports that, through his consciousness-raising DDL approach, students' grammatical explanations of a TL structure can sometimes be more comprehensive, show greater insight or perhaps even be more accurate than those a teacher would provide as standard.

2.1.7 Target language production.

Consciousness-raising is therefore highly student-centred in nature. Rather than the sole source of knowledge, the teacher acts as a facilitator, providing appropriate opportunities and materials (see sections 3.1 - 3.1.3) for students to gain insights into the target language through exploration. Such exploration inevitably results in erroneous TL production but one further feature of C-R appears to be that its practitioners do not demand immediate mastery or accurate output upon instruction. This is because C-R is not the end product but a *means* by which L2 can be acquired (Rutherford, 1987: 18). That is not to say that errors are left untreated, only that it is assumed that learners require time to internalise the new language

and incorporate it into their inter-language system. However, Sharwood-Smith (1981, reported by Willis, 1997: 99) does not go so far, stating only that "articulation of the (L2's) rules is not a necessary element".

He is also the most notable exception to the generally held view that C-R is also largely inductive. While he accepts that this can be the case, he views consciousness-raising as one component of the grammar-translation approach, whereby the teacher uses both explicit (deductive) and implicit (inductive) techniques, the balance depending perhaps on the learner's stage of learning (cf. Sharwood-Smith (1981), reported by Willis, 1997: 99). This exception aside however, the general conception of C-R outlined above conforms to Edwards *et al's* (1999: 63) notion of the term inductive:

a deductive approach implies the explanation of grammar rules before practice and an inductive approach requires students to infer from contextualised practice.

Possibly a better description would also incorporate contextualised *study*, since the activities referenced above can serve simultaneously as both study and practice materials.

These are the theoretical assumptions and practical principles on which a general conception of consciousness-raising operates. Perhaps it is best summarised by Yip's (1989: 124) view that it is a "compromise" between the grammar-translation and communicative language teaching approaches. If this then is consciousness-raising, what are its outcomes ?

2.2 Associated outcomes.

From the available literature it is clear that a consciousness-raising approach has two intended outcomes. Firstly, as indicated above, C-R develops students' strategies for generating, testing, evaluating and modifying hypotheses or generalisations about the TL's form-function relationships by utilising their explicit and implicit knowledge and experience of language form, function and use through specially designed materials and teacher-facilitated opportunities. In this way students can perform what Stern (1992: 139) calls "structural analysis of the target language". It is assumed that these generalisations "feed into production at a later stage" (Willis, 1997: 104), a view shared by Edwards *et al* (1996: 67 and 117).

However, this set of generalisations is more than just a form of inter-language system. When these strategies are sufficiently advanced, the second outcome becomes apparent: that learners achieve a degree of autonomy.

Having worked within the Japanese state TEFL system for several years, the author

has witnessed the perpetuation of out-dated and unquestioned teaching approaches from one generation of teachers to the next: approaches which inherently instil in the student the same sense of dependency upon the teacher for their English education which Rutherford (1987: 149) and Willis (1993: 92) reject. Consciousness-raising breaks that cycle by facilitating students' development of strategies for autonomous learning; skills which are "transferable" (Johns 1994: 295) to learning (and even communication situations) outside the classroom. This outcome is not coincidental to the approach: it is fundamental.

This then is the author's core concept of consciousness-raising. However, several issues relating to C-R's application remain which, though beyond the scope of this paper to discuss in detail, do warrant a brief mention.

2.3 Application concerns.

First is the issue of applicability. The author has already expressed concern as to whether the processes used to acquire L1 during childhood are retained into adulthood. There is also doubt (expressed by Willis *et al* (1997: 67-8) and Ellis, (1992) reported by Willis, 1997: 98) as to whether C-R, in whatever mode of presentation, can be effective in aiding the L2 learning of beginners. Johns gives confusing responses suggesting that it might be applied with most students (1991: 12), though without specifying the possible exceptions, but then that he is unsure of its application "with [near] beginners" (1994: 311).

There is also the issue of to which aspects of L2 consciousness-raising can be applied. Appendix 1 shows that its application may extend to instruction of lexis (Johns, 1991: 2) and error reduction (Yip, 1989: 125-6), though the author is unsure of its efficacy in these areas.

Next is the concern over the time required to prepare C-R materials. While convenient materials are available (cf. Hopkins & Nettle, 1994: 160), Johns (1991: 4) gives preparation times for DDL concordance lists of between 40 minutes to 8 hours plus. While teachers in some teaching contexts may have sufficient time to prepare such materials, the exhaustive workload of Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs) makes Johns' approach prohibitive.

Another issue relates to the dependency of Johns' approach on computer hardware and software. While both are becoming increasingly available (and therefore presumably cheaper), to obtain these in sufficient quantity may be beyond the budget of many academic institutions.

Also, though C-R utilises 'natural' processes to help students acquire TL, for many JTEs (those for whom a transmissive approach is the norm), C-R is far from intuitive. It may even be the antithesis of what they consider appropriate. It would be very hard to persuade

the Japanese state TEFL system, at *any* level, that the benefits of the C-R approach would justify the expense and effort associated with purchasing and maintaining the necessary technology and staff (re)training.

Finally, students' expectations and opinions require due consideration (cf. Willis (1997: 102), Rutherford (1987: 30, 154), Stern (1983: 455) and Johns, 1994: 294). Even at university level, Japanese students of English have difficulty coming to terms with concepts such as Johns' (1994: 297) suggested student-initiated linguistic research.

3 Consciousness-raising as a basis for a grammar translation approach.

That a grammar-translation approach (generally accepted as mechanistic) can be based, at least in part on consciousness-raising (often viewed as more organic) may seem an odd notion. As shown above, the two approaches are founded on conflicting assumptions regarding the nature of SLA and on very dissimilar practices. However, the idea of combining the beneficial features of two or more modes of learning or teaching is not new (cf. Fotos (1994: 343), Johns (1994: 297), Rutherford (1987: 25) and Ellis (1992), reported by Willis, 1997: 96-7) and the specific combination of grammar-translation and consciousness-raising has also previously been proposed (cf. Nunan (1991: 151), Stern (1983: 455), Edwards *et al* (1996: 100), Johns (1994: 311) and Sharwood-Smith (1981) and Faerch *et al* (1984), reported by Stern, 1992: 332-3).

The author believes that because teaching contexts differ from one to the next, that grammar-translation is now being applied in various forms (cf. Stern, 1983: 489), each optimised for its specific context and that the extent to which any particular type of the approach is based on the theoretical assumptions and/or practices of consciousness-raising as presented above, is not an issue that can be answered prescriptively. The solution does not take the form of a fixed point on some grammar-translation - communicative language teaching continuum, but is instead highly variable and often related to the teaching context itself. What then are the determinant variables and who controls them ?

3.1 Determinant variables.

While the C-R approach seeks to hand much of the process of and responsibility for L2 learning over to students by exercising their cognitive and linguistic capacities, it does not require the teacher to relinquish complete control during the lesson. The role of facilitator demands that teachers create the environment and opportunities for students to "learn how to

learn" (Johns, 1991: 1). These opportunities take various forms but are usually realised through the teacher's choice of teaching methods, the chances students have for practice and the type(s) of materials or "instruments" (Rutherford, 1987: 152) used.

3.1.1 Teaching method.

A teacher's methodology is the outward manifestation of various factors relating to how he or she believes the target language should be taught and how it is acquired. Method is also mediated by personal beliefs the teacher holds as to the nature of language and the use(s) to which he or she believes the students will put the target language. It is further modified by the teacher's ability to use the context's first and second languages (Stern, 1992: 286).

These are just some of the factors which contribute to the teacher's rationale for the way he or she teaches and therefore the extent to which consciousness-raising practices will be employed. This extent also depends upon the teacher's level of understanding of consciousness-raising practices and their underlying assumptions. These last two are issues related to teacher training or development and are beyond the range of this paper, however, the author believes that for some Japanese teachers of English the role of facilitator would be quite problematic.

Method is significant because, for better or worse, students generally do as their teachers ask. Teachers therefore need to make a conscious decision as to how this authority will be used because it can be employed to good effect or to the detriment of students' studies. For example, teachers can motivate students and help to elevate their awareness of the TL if they employ:

A discovery rather than a presentational methodology. [The former] is more likely to arouse and harness the learner's curiosity.

Willis (1993: 91)

This reiterates Sharwood-Smith's point made earlier that teachers should have some predetermined policy on the comparative use of explicit and implicit techniques (Stern, 1983: 402). The relative prominence either is afforded will affect the degree to which C-R plays a part in a grammar-translation approach.

Another aspect of method that can facilitate consciousness-raising and which has been pointed out by Hopkins and Nettle (1994: 158) is that of "judicious feedback". They say that it can assist students in understanding how particular structures might be used at some time in

the future. With respect to use within a grammar-translation approach, this may require teachers to break away from the traditional provision of feedback as part of the question-response-feedback cycle often associated with more transmissive techniques and to be more creative and flexible in the ways in which and timing with which feedback is provided.

The balance between presentational (explicit) and discovery (implicit) approaches and the ways in which feedback is provided are just two ways in which teachers' methodology can be used to facilitate or hinder consciousness-raising within a grammar-translation approach.

3.1.2 Opportunities for practice.

One concern over traditional grammar-translation is its reliance upon rote learning and practice tasks: the memorising and recitation of translation equivalents or texts. As McDonough and Shaw (1993: 57-8) note, at best this type of practice activity only checks students' understanding of that particular text but does not provide opportunities for students to develop transferable knowledge or strategies. This is because rote learning or practice does not use "existing cognitive structures [or] the existing conceptual system" (Brown (1994), reported by Willis, 1997: 60) but treats the TL items in isolation (cf. Stern, 1983: 311).

The fundamental point being made is that it's important:

..... to ensure that practice is given in activating these generalisable skills that are believed to represent underlying processes for all language users.

(McDonough and Shaw, 1993: 58)

In other words they recommend that practice develops the cognitive strategies required to form, test, evaluate and (if necessary) reform hypotheses or generalisations of how the TL is constructed and used. The connection between C-R and practice is essential if C-R is to achieve its intended outcomes (see section 2.2). Hopkins and Nettle (1994: 158-9) say this is important, not only because it aids consciousness-raising but because it helps to fulfil certain expectations that students have of what should occur during a L2 lesson.

As noted in section 2.1.7, C-R does not demand immediate mastery or accurate TL production. This is especially true during the practice phase of a lesson, since students would not yet have had time to incorporate the new structure into their inter-language system. Therefore, the more the teacher requires students to reproduce (without error) the items under instruction during the lesson, the less those practice activities resemble opportunities for consciousness-raising. Conversely, by guiding students to an awareness of "what it is they

have ultimately to master" (Ellis and Hedge, 1993: 6) the teacher will be employing C-R to a higher degree.

3.1.3 Materials.

An important aspect of practice activities is the material(s) used. These materials usually reflect the approach to TEF/SL which the teacher advocates. For example, orthodox grammar-translation would use lists of decontextualised translation equivalents or passages of prose or text for translation, either from or to the target language. However, as McCarthy (1990: 36) notes, it is unclear whether this type of practice enhances learners' retention or recall. Instead, they suggest that most teachers attempt to place their input in context to aid understanding. This is the "contextualised practice" of which Ellis (1992, reported by Willis, 1997: 96) wrote, which is assumed to increase the level of consciousness-raising and is line with the point made earlier that use of authentic TL data *in context* is common in C-R materials. The degree to which materials place TL data in context is one measure of the extent to which a grammar-translation approach makes use of consciousness-raising.

The author believes that translation can supplement and complement the aims of a consciousness-raising approach, for example as with Johns' (1994: 311) "parallel concordances". Stern (1992: 295) also makes various suggestions as to how "cross-lingual mediation between L1 and L2" may be used to good effect. This writer believes that translation can be a very powerful tool in helping students to create an effective and accurate inter-language system by overcoming "the problem of meaning" (Stern, 1983: 473). Translation materials may improve students' IL system through the conscious or unwitting use of the contrastive and/or comparative techniques of which Shortall wrote (in Edwards *et al*, 1996: 68) when he related his studies of Portuguese and Japanese. Stern explains concisely how these techniques can aid in raising students' awareness of the L2:

... contrastive [and comparative techniques] are both based on the assumption that the linguist or the learner will not treat a new language independently but in relation to other previously known languages. Therefore, it is possible to use the principles of contrastive linguistics to develop a number of classroom activities. These techniques are specifically intended to encourage learners to relate L2 to L1, to discover the similarities and differences between them and to make use of such comparisons for better language learning.

(Stern 1992: 297)

He goes on to identify various types of activity that would achieve these aims (*ibid.*: 297-8).

The extent to which translation materials make use of such techniques is a second measure of the degree to which C-R is realised through a grammar-translation approach.

If such an approach is to be based on C-R to any meaningful extent it needs to move away from materials which use decontextualised TL in isolation and towards those which:

- a). set cognitive and linguistic challenges (for example through activities of the types referenced in section 2.1.5),
- b). use TL in context,
- c). require students to use comparative or contrastive techniques during study or practice,
or
- d). use combinations of the above.

The more this shift occurs, the less students will be just passive recipients of instruction and the more likely the materials used will achieve C-R's intended outcomes. Such materials are perhaps the best way to link consciousness-raising with practice.

While method and practice are clearly controlled by the teacher, selection of materials is often prescribed by the institution (in the case of the private sector), or by local or central government (in the case of the public sector). While teachers may supplement these with other (perhaps original) materials, these tend to serve only a peripheral or support function for the prescribed course materials and the L2 structures or notions contained within them. Decisions made at institutional and governmental levels therefore are also significant.

3.1.4 The institution.

Institutional policy with respect to curriculum, syllabus, approach or materials often has a major influence on what goes on in the classroom. This is true not only in state education but also in the private sector. Such restrictions obviously have an impact on the degree to which consciousness-raising techniques can be employed. For example, from personal experience the author knows that the Berlitz schools of English adhere very strictly both to a fixed method and prescribed materials, which can sometimes limit the opportunities for consciousness-raising during a lesson, despite an abundance of authentic data. While Berlitz schools use the Direct Method (cf. Richards and Rodgers, 1986: 9-10), the same problem may apply to institutions advocating a grammar-translation approach.

If an institution-initiated curriculum or syllabus facilitates C-R through the opportunities detailed above (method, practice and materials), the resulting lessons should

contain a higher frequency of consciousness-raising events.¹

3.1.5 Local and central government.

Governments generally come under pressure from various parts of society to produce policies in line with prevailing socio-cultural norms and beliefs. It is this pressure which requires Monbusho (Japan's Ministry of Education) to maintain strict control over many aspects of state EFL education. For example, only textbooks written or approved by Monbusho may be used in state schools (Monbusho, 1995: 26), but these books have to be used very creatively by teachers if they are to achieve consciousness-raising's outcomes.

Monbusho policy also deals with the targets set for teachers' productivity. There is a very real demand for JTEs to finish the coursebook on schedule, despite severe time pressures. This results in teaching practices such as consciousness-raising (which is often perceived as more time-consuming), being pushed aside in favour of a quicker, easier and more transmissive approach.

However, perhaps the most pertinent policy relates to testing students' L2 competence. In four years as a team teacher within the state EFL system, only once did the author observe a JTE using a test of *verbal, communicative* competence. It seems that there is little motivation for already overworked teachers to employ techniques, such as consciousness-raising, which are perceived as having a higher associated workload, when governmental policy only requires students to be tested in ways which can be adequately dealt with by a more traditional type of grammar-translation: a form which Richards and Rodgers (1986: 4) note is relatively undemanding.

Although government level decisions may seem very far removed from the classroom, as McDonough and Shaw (1993: 11) point out, they have a very significant influence on what individual teachers do and how they do it.

3.1.6 The student.

While consciousness-raising depends for its success on students' conscious attention, active participation and cognitive effort, it is generally accepted that these are not always present in a (particularly state education) EF/SL classroom. Individual differences in learners' cognitive style (Brown, 1994: 276) also mediate the degree to which students employ consciousness-raising strategies when studying or practising the target language. Although

¹For features of such a curriculum see Rutherford (1987: 154-5) which contrasts the mechanic and organic based grammar curriculum.

these factors in themselves do not contribute directly to the degree to which C-R is used by the teacher, they have a significant effect on learning outcomes, even when C-R is employed extensively.

4 Conclusion.

The core conception of consciousness-raising presented above has brought together the features common to various writers' conception of the approach. While any of the individual contributions may differ slightly in specific details with respect to the underlying theory or practical application, this writer believes the form offered is adequate to provide an understanding of the approach's assumptions, application, outcomes, limitations and advantages.

It was argued that the issue of the extent to which a grammar-translation approach is based on consciousness-raising is not subject to a prescriptive answer because, due to differences in teaching contexts, grammar-translation is being practised in various forms, each one being an adaptation to its associated context. Instead, the solution takes the form of a set of variables which dictate the degree to which consciousness-raising can operate within a grammar-translation approach. These variables arise and are controlled at levels of authority ranging from the teacher up to central government.

The author believes that consciousness-raising can form the basis for SLA within a grammar-translation framework to a potentially large degree, *if* the decisions made at all levels create a teaching context optimally conducive to the application of consciousness-raising techniques and materials. However, for this to occur, there is a need for considered policy at all levels which facilitates rather than hinders the application of consciousness-raising practices. Only then can consciousness-raising truly achieve its intended outcomes: to give students the skills and autonomy necessary and explore and discover the target language for themselves.

Appendix 1 - References demonstrating writers' support for elements of this author's core conception of consciousness-raising (C-R).

	Rutherford's Grammatical Consciousness-Raising.	Sharwood-Smith's Model of CR of language acquisition.	Johns' Data Driven Learning (DDL)	Miscellaneous
Theoretical assumptions				
emphasises the relationship between form and function (meaning).	1987: 8	not stated	1994: 293	Nunan (1991: 149) Richards <i>et al</i> (1992: 78) Fotos (1994: 325)
attempts to mimic the process(es) by which L1 is acquired.	1987: 29	1981, cited by Larsen-Freeman & Long (1991: 324).	not stated	Larsen-Freeman & Long (1991: 324)
accepts that while exposure to comprehensible input is necessary, it is not sufficient.	1987: 25	not stated	this is not overtly stated but seems an assumption inherent in the DDL approach.	Yip (1989: 125)
rejects the 'accumulated entities' and linear sequencing views of second language acquisition.	1987: 5-6 and 23-4	not stated	1991: 3 1994: 311	Nunan (1991: 148-9)
rejects the notion of students as <i>tabula rasa</i> and / or accepts that students have prior knowledge of language construction and use.	1987: 7-8, 13	1981, reported by Willis (1997: 98) (inferred from the term "implicit knowledge").	not stated	Edwards <i>et al</i> (1996: 68)
questions the teachability and learnability of complete pedagogical grammars.	1987: 17, 22-23	not stated	1991: 3	Yip (1989: 124, 125) Nunan (1991: 149) Willis (1993: 90)
Practical application				
accepts the need to have students' conscious attention drawn to the linguistic item under instruction.	1987:153	1981, reported by Willis (1997: 99), (inferred as inherent in Sharwood-Smith's model).	not stated	Yip (1989: 136) Willis (1993: 89) Fotos (1994: 326)
utilises students' cognitive and linguistic capacities.	1987: 8, 149	1981, reported in Willis (1997: 99)	1991: 2	Richards <i>et al</i> (1992: 78) Ellis (1992, reported by Willis, 1997: 97, 105) Willis (1993: 91)
provides students with cognitive and		1981, reported by Willis (1997: 99)		

linguistic challenges through, for example, problem-solving or decision-making activities.	1987: 153	(inferred from his explanation of "Cell B").	1994: 295-6	Ellis (1992, reported by Willis, 1997: 97)
uses authentic language rather than contrived examples.	1987: reported by Willis (1997: 96)	not stated	1991: 4-5 1994: 294, 296, 304, 306	Nunan (1991: 150) Willis (1997: 105)
uses a 'discovery' approach or activities.	1987: 30	1981, reported by Willis (1997: 99) (inferred from his explanation of "Cell B").	1991: 1, 3	Willis (1993: 91)
facilitates SLA by taking students from known to unknown, familiar to unfamiliar.	1987: 18, 21	1981, reported by Willis (1997: 99) (inferred from the explanation of "Cell C").	not stated	Nunan (1991: 149-150)
does not demand mastery or accurate production immediately upon instruction.	not stated	1981, reported by Willis (1997: 99) "articulation of the (L2's) rules is not a necessary element".	not stated	Ellis and Hedge (1993: 5-6) Hopkins & Nettle (1994: 158) Fotos (1994: 326) Edwards <i>et al</i> (1996: 117)
is student-centred rather than teacher-centred.	1987: 153-4, 160	not stated	1994: 297 suggests that DDL can be applied both in student-centred and teacher-fronted contexts.	Richards <i>et al</i> (1992: 78)
is inductive rather than deductive, implicit rather than explicit.	1987: 30	is implicit ("Cell A") and explicit ("Cell D"), (from Willis, 1997: 99).	1991: 4-5 1994: 297	Nunan (1991: 149) Willis (1997: 147-8)
Intended outcomes				
develops the student's ability to generate, test, evaluate and modify hypotheses and generalisations about language form, function and use.	1987: 18, 150, 153-4	1981, reported in Willis (1997: 99)	1991: 2 1994: 295, 297, 311	Willis (1993: 90) Ellis (1992, cited in Willis 1997: 97, point #5) Willis (1997: 101, activity #5) Nunan (1991: 149)
helps students to develop strategies for autonomous learning, rather than a dependency upon the teacher.	not stated	not stated	1994: 295, 297	Willis (1997: 104)
Application concerns				
What is the range of learners to which	1987: 30 raises the issue in activity #2 but doesn't	not stated	1991: 12 that it might be applied with most students, though doesn't specify the possible exceptions.	Ellis (1992, reported by Willis 1997: 98) says DDL may not be appropriate for all learners.

CR can be applied ?	state any firm opinion.		1994: 311 unsure of application with (near) beginners.	Willis <i>et al</i> (1997: 67-8)
Suggested application(s) for CR.	grammar instruction 1987: preface	grammar instruction (1981, reported by Willis, 1997: 99)	to teach grammar and vocabulary via DDL. (1991: 2) 1994: 311 cites Steven (1991) in support of its use for lexis and suggests parallel concordances with translation equivalents for use in classes with a common native language.	grammar instruction Hopkins & Nettle (1994: 158) Yip (1989: 123) Richards <i>et al</i> (1992: 78) Ellis and Hedge (1993: 10-11) Fotos (1994: 342) lexico-grammatical items Willis (1997: 105) error reduction Yip (1989: 125-6)

'not stated' indicates that the present writer found no statement by the indicated author showing support for that feature.

References

- Brown, H.D. (1994) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (3rd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. Prentice Hall.
- Edwards, C. *et al.* (1996) *Language Teaching Methodology*. Centre for English Language Studies, Birmingham University.
- Ellis, R. and T. Hedge (1993) 'Second Language Acquisition research: how does it help ? An interview with Rod Ellis'. *ELT Journal* 47/1: 3-11.
- Fotos, S (1994) 'Integrating Grammar Instruction and Communicative Language Use through Grammar Consciousness-Raising Tasks'. *TESOL Quarterly* 28/2: 323-351.
- Hopkins, D. and M. Nettle (1994) Second Language Acquisition research: a response to Rod Ellis'. *ELT Journal* 48/2: 157-161.
- Johns, T. (1991) 'Should you be persuaded: Two examples of Data Driven Learning' in Johns and King (eds.) *Classroom Concordancing*. Birmingham ELR.
- Johns, T. (1994) 'From printout to handout: grammar and vocabulary teaching in the context of Data Driven Learning' in T. Odlin (ed.) *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. CUP.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and M.H. Long (1991) *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*, Longman.
- McCarthy, M. (1990) *Vocabulary*, OUP.
- McDonough, J. and C. Shaw (1993) *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Oxford : Blackwell.
- An Introductory Booklet on the Main Activities of Monbusho*. (1995) Monbusho.
- Nunan, D. (1991) *Language Teaching Methodology*. Prentice Hall.
- Odlin, T. (1994) *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C, *et al* (1992) *Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics*. Longman.
- Richards, J.C. and T.S. Rodgers. (1986) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rutherford, W.E. (1987) *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching*. Longman.
- Stern, H.H. (1983) *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. OUP

- Stern, H.H. (1992) *Issues and options in Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Willis J.D. (1993) 'Grammar and Lexis: Some Pedagogical Implications'. In Sinclair J.M. *et al* (eds.) *Techniques of Description*. Routledge.
- Willis, D. (1997) *Second Language Acquisition*. Centre for English Language Studies, Birmingham University.
- Willis, D. *et al* (1997) *Pedagogic Grammar*. Centre for English Language Studies, Birmingham University.
- Yip, V. (1989) 'Grammatical consciousness-raising and learnability' in T. Odlin (ed.) *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. CUP.