'Pedagogic Grammar'
and
'Second Language Acquisition'

Assessment Task 2:

What do you understand by the term consciousness-raising? To what extent is a grammar-translation approach based on consciousness-raising?

Andrew Atkins
0391792

Consciousness-Raising: Then and Now.

Andrew Atkins

November 2000

1.0 Introduction

Most current researchers, it seems, are proponents of grammatical consciousness raising as a means of facilitating second language acquisition. I would like to offer my thoughts and understanding of what grammatical consciousness raising actually is and where it comes from. Research and reform in language teaching have meant that in the last hundred years there have been numerous methods fashionable in the language classroom at one time or another. It appears that the main difference between these methods of choice, is the role of and importance placed upon the teaching or learning/acquiring of grammar.

In this paper, I will discuss contemporary methods of teaching grammar based on second language acquisition research, and how these methods differ from traditional methods. In the first section I will provide some background information looking at 'traditional' methods, then at Krashen's theories of acquisition through comprehensible input, and finally explore grammar consciousness-raising and other related areas, such as noticing. I have chosen to address these theories in this order, not purely for chronological reasons, but because they develop from one another as reactions against the perceived weaknesses of the previous approach.

2.0 The Origins of Modern Grammar Teaching.

The teaching of foreign languages has undoubtedly been around for many for thousands of years. The methods used varied little for most of this time, but in relatively recent history, they have varied greatly. Before the 1800s, it was considered unworthy of a scholar to waste time studying any language other than the classical languages of Latin and Greek. The study of these languages was obviously not for *communicative* purposes, as they were spoken by no one. They were studied for intellectual advancement and as a means to read the 'classics' of Greek and Roman literature in the languages in which they were written.

The development of mass transportation systems and the increase in foreign travel for both business and pleasure led to the realisation that it may be beneficial and/or necessary to study other lesser languages; talking more loudly in one's own mother tongue simply would not do. "Since there was little if any theoretical research on second language acquisition in general, or on the acquisition of reading proficiency, foreign languages were taught as any other skill was taught." Brown (1994a: 16)

The Grammar-Translation method has its origins in the study of these classical languages. Larsen-Freeman (2000) in a recent publication provides us with a concise introduction to what is meant by the Grammar-Translation method (G-T) although she does not differentiate from the Classical Method:

> The Grammar-Translation Method is not new. It has different names, but it has been used by language teachers for many years. At one time it was called the Classical Method since it was first used in the teaching of the classical languages, Latin and Greek (Chastain 1988). Earlier in this century, this method

was used for the purpose of helping students read and appreciate foreign language literature. It was also hoped that, through the study of grammar of the target language, students would become more familiar with the grammar of their native language and that this familiarity would help them speak and write their native languages better. Finally, it was thought that foreign language learning would help students grow intellectually; it was recognized that students would probably never use the target language, but the mental exercise of learning it would be beneficial anyway.

Larsen-Freeman (2000: 11)

It can be seen though that G-T does differ in one important respect from Classical Method in the use of sentences to exemplify a grammatical point instead of passages from classical works. The Grammar Translation method was first known as the Prussian Method in the United States and as the name suggests it originates from Prussia at the end of the eighteenth century. "Grammar Translation dominated European and foreign language teaching from the 1840s to the 1940s" (Richards and Rogers 1986: 4). In its conception it was reformist, developed as a way of teaching large groups of young students in school.

Language learning prior to this had been undertaken mainly on a self-study basis by scholars, trained in classical grammar. These classical methods did not easily adapt to large classrooms of young learners. Howatt (1984: 131) provides a great deal of information about the roots of 'grammar-translation' and as Richards and Rogers (1986: 4) suggest "it was not necessarily the horror that its critics depicted it as." Howatt states:

The grammar-translation method was an attempt to adapt these traditions to the circumstances and requirements of schools. It preserved the basic framework of grammar and translation because these were already familiar both to teachers and pupils from their classical studies. Its principal aim, ironically enough in view of what was to happen latter, was to make language learning easier. The central feature was the replacement of traditional texts by exemplificatory *sentences*. It was the special status accorded to the sentence at the expense of the text that attracted the most outspoken criticism of the reformers later in the century, not the use of grammar as such.

Howatt (1984: 131)

Since G-T still remains popular in many countries around the world, this may be due to a number reasons but I suspect it may be something to do with the skills required to teach it, as "it makes few demands on teachers"(Richards and Rogers 1986: 4). It is also easy to design tests, as the teacher knows exactly what has been taught. Tests are usually entirely written and are marked with accuracy as the most important factor. The time taken to administer and mark these tests is minimal.

2.1 Communicative Language Teaching

It is not practical to analyse all of the various fads and fashions of language teaching over the past century, but I feel it is prudent to look briefly at the communicative approach to teaching as this leads directly into the main theme of this paper.

Presentation, Practice and Produce "has become the dominant model for 'communicative lessons'" Edwards in Willis and Willis (Eds.) (1996: 99). It involves *presentation* of a language point followed by *practice* of the point in a controlled manner, perhaps followed by freer practice, and then finally a *production* stage using the language point. It is usually known by the initials PPP. Ellis (1993) says

this approach is just "presentation, practice and further practice" (Ellis 1993: 4). He suggests also, that this approach is ineffective in achieving what it is intended to do. This is due the controlled nature of the input that students receive. "[We] can do PPP until we are blue in the face, but it doesn't necessarily result in what PPP was designed to do. And yet there is, still, within language teaching, a commitment to trying to control not only input but actually what is learned" Ellis (1993: 4).

These views are echoed by many others including Skehan, who writes:

> The underlying theory for a PPP approach has now been discredited. The belief that a precise focus on a particular form leads to learning and automization (that learners will learn what is taught in the order in which it is taught) no longer carries much credibility in linguistics or psychology (Brumfit and Johnson 1979; Ellis 1985).

> Skehan in Willis and Willis (1996: 18)

PPP often teaches at the expense of real input. GT was criticised mainly because of the use of decontextualised sentences to exemplify a grammar point. Often these sentences were fabricated by the authors of textbooks. An example of a one of these sentences is taken from Ahn (1834) in Howatt (1984: 141) "I have received this horse from my friend". The texts used in PPP are also often manufactured by writers and are far from real. The goals of PPP and G-T are very different but they both teach by presenting a language point, be it grammar or function, and then proceed to practice it. This approach led to a great deal of criticism during the 1980s and the explicit teaching of grammar became taboo, at least in literature, if not actually in the classroom.

PPP is however still very much alive and perhaps this is for much the same reasons that G-T was the method of choice for so long. "These reasons – secure teacher roles and teacher training, and clear accountability – go some way to explaining the persistence of what is essentially a discredited, meaning-impoverished methodology (White 1988)" Skehan (1998: 94). The alternatives will be discussed in the next sections.

2.2 Second Language Acquisition Research

Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is a relatively new field of study; it has existed for little more than 30 years (see Ellis 1993). In this time however, it has had considerable influence on the teaching of grammar. Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis is an attempt to explain how a learner 'acquires' a second language, not 'learns' (see Krashen 1985). He believed that a learner improves and progresses along a natural order when receiving input that is one step beyond the learner's current stage of linguistic competence (i+1), claiming that comprehensible input was not only necessary but also sufficient for successful SLA to take place (Yip 1994: 124). He suggested that natural communicative input was the key to designing a syllabus, giving all learners some i+1 input. Krashen viewed explicit grammar teaching as merely language appreciation or linguistics. He did not say explicit teaching was necessarily bad, but suggested it could only have benefit when certain conditions were met, and even when met both teacher and learner were only deceiving themselves. His views have received considerable criticism in recent years, although few people reject his theories outright. Skehan respectfully suggests:

> Krashen's views have been influential within second language education and have had considerable impact on the nature of pedagogic provision. Not surprisingly, therefore, they have been subjected to searching criticism, and it would now seem that the claims that were made cannot be substantiated.
>
> <div align="right">Skehan (1998: 12)</div>

Further criticism of Krashen's Input Hypothesis can be found in: Doughty (1991), Ellis (1991, 1994), Fotos (1993), VanPatten and Cadierno (1993) and VanPatten (1990).

Skehan himself goes on to provide six reasons why a comprehension only based approach, such as CI, is not sufficient for successful SLA to take place, taken from Swain (1985; 1995). I have summarised his points below:

A   To generate better input – It is often necessary to get better quality input by 'negotiation for meaning' Pica (1994). Negotiating for meaning allows interlanguage to develop more productively.

B   To force syntactic processing – If a learner knows that they will be required to speak at a later point they will be more likely to notice underlying syntactic structure.

C   To test hypotheses – CI relies solely on what is received from others. This input may not come at the right time to answer questions one is forming about a language point. Speaking allows the learner to control feedback on points of uncertainty.

D   To develop automacity – Only by frequent use is the fluency side likely to be improved.

E   To develop discourse skills – Proficiency in discourse skills, such as turn taking, can only be developed by actually practising them.

F   To develop a personal voice – It is important to develop a personal manner of speaking so that one can exert influence on topics of conversation perhaps steering the topic along routes of interest.

<div align="right">Skehan (1998: 16-19)</div>

The use of C-R activities as part of a cognitive based language instruction program addresses the six points above and is consonant with current views of SLA.

3.0 What is Consciousness Raising (C-R)?

I will attempt at this point to define the somewhat slippery notion of C-R. Rutherford (1987: 189) in the glossary of his book defines C-R as simply "the drawing of the learner's attention to features of the target language". This appears to be rather vague and open to wide interpretation, but perhaps this is Rutherford's intention. I believe it is also useful to look at some of the other numerous definitions of the term 'consciousness-raising' to try to put it in perspective. The Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (Richards, Platt and Platt 1992: 78) provides us with a more comprehensive definition of consciousness raising (C-R):

Consciousness raising

An approach to the teaching of grammar in which instruction in grammar (through drills, grammar explanation and other form-focussed activities) is viewed as a way of raising the learner's awareness of grammatical features of the language. This is thought to indirectly facilitate second language acquisition. A consciousness-raising approach is contrasted with traditional approaches to the teaching of grammar, in which the goal is to instill correct grammatical patterns and habits directly.

One of the first authors to define C-R was Sharwood-Smith (1981), and this was seen to directly address Krashen's Monitor Theory (MT) (Willis and Willis 1996), rejecting "the split between conscious learning and subconscious acquisition" Nunan (1991: 149). C-R is a development from Krashen's Input Hypothesis, claiming that comprehensible input is necessary but not sufficient for SLA to take place. "The clearest and most perceptive introductions to grammatical CR are contained in Rutherford (1987) and Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith (1988)." according to Nunan (1991: 149). Let us then look at Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith's (1988) definition of the role of C-R:

> CR is intended to embrace a continuum ranging from intensive promotion of conscious awareness through pedagogical role articulation on the one end, to the mere exposure of the learner to specific grammatical phenomena on the other.
>
> Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith (1988: 3)

So far, there appears to be a number of choices available to the teacher, and in making these choices, the teacher needs to answer some questions:

> Questions having to do with what we choose to bring to consciousness, what motivates the choice, when and how (i.e. by what means) we raise something to consciousness, how often we call attention to it, how detailed is the information revealed . . . and what effect on learner behavior the information is intended to have.
>
> Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith (1988: 3)

Ellis (1993) points out the crucial difference in learner expectations between C-R and previous methods. "[Activities] that will seek to get a learner to understand a particular grammatical feature, how it works, what it consists of, and so on, but not require that learner to actually produce sentences manifesting that particular structure. And that's what I mean by *consciousness raising*." Ellis (1993: 5-6)

Willis and Willis (1996) provide information about their views on C-R, which I will develop further in the next section. "C-R . . . can be seen as guided problem solving. Learners are encouraged to notice particular features of the language, to draw conclusions from what they notice and to organize their view of language in the light of the conclusions they have drawn." Willis and Willis (1996: 64).

3.1 The Role of 'Noticing'

It is very difficult to read about anyone's views on C-R without encountering the word 'notice' or 'noticing'. In the Willis' definition of C-R above (1996: 64), the use of the term noticing seems to be of great importance. "It has been argued that for language-to-language development to occur, learners must 'notice the gap between their own production and that of native speakers (Schmidt and Frota 1986). One function for C-R is to assist learners to 'notice this gap'." Nunan (1986: 150). Batstone (1996) also talks about the role of noticing. He states that noticing is the "intake of grammar as a result of learners paying conscious attention to the input" Batstone (1996). This appears to be congruent with what Ellis calls "an interpretation grammar activity" Ellis (1993: 11). Ellis continues to say:

> [An] interpretation grammar activity . . .a listening activity as opposed to a production grammar activity. . .would provide learners with a very structured input, structured in the sense that the input would have been manipulated to contain examples of the particular grammatical structure that you wanted to teach.

In addition, the task would require learners to listen to this input in order to identify the meaning of the sentences containing this particular structure.

Ellis (1993: 11)

The kind of input received appears to be crucial to 'noticing'. VanPatten (1996) looks in great depth at the kind of input necessary for noticing to occur. Training in C-R activities will cause the learner to focus on an aspect of language input, there by controlling attention. Skehan (1998), commenting on VanPatten's ideas, suggests the importance of "the usefulness of training language learners in effective processing, to make them more able to notice relevant clues in the input so that form-meaning links are more likely to be attended to." Skehan (1998: 47)

Skehan follows on from his comments on input by providing comment on the importance placed on *noticing* by Schmidt (1990). Schmidt (1990) provides six influences which operate on *noticing*, I will attempt further summary of Skehan's perception of these influences, as follows:

1. "Schmidt proposes that, other things being equal, the more frequent a form, the more likely it is to be noticed." Skehan (1998:48). This stresses the need to provide repeated opportunities to notice a form.

2. "The more a form stands out in the input stream, the more likely it is to be noticed." Skehan (1998: 48). This has strong implications for C-R, it may be necessary to 'point out' a particular point or to actually highlight a form within a written text for example. This technique has been suggested by Sharwood-Smith (1988).

3. Instruction, following on from the previous influence, "may play an important role . . . by making salient the less obvious aspects of the input, so that it is the learner who does the extraction and focusing, but as a function of how he or she has been prepared." Skehan (1998: 49). I believe this stresses the importance of pre-task activities and learner training in general.

Influences 4,5 and 6 are all related to individual differences (ID) between learners. These further influences are processing ability, readiness, and task demands.

4. Some people will be more effective at processing input than others, meaning they will be more able to 'notice'.

5. Readiness to notice will be affected by the current state of the learner's interlanguage. What the learner learns is what they ready to attend to at that time. This appears to relate to Krashen's 'natural order'.

6. The demands made on the learner, by the task in hand, will affect the ability to notice. If the task is unfamiliar, this will place higher demands on the learner, making noticing less likely.

3.2 A Summary of C-R

It can be seen that C-R is by its nature difficult to define in concise terms, however, most writers appear to agree on a number of important points, and I feel it is useful to summarise them at this point:

1. C-R is an approach to teaching grammar.

2. There are many techniques available to raise awareness with many focussing on the relationship between form and function.

3. The use of a wide range of techniques is beneficial to the learner.

4. It takes an organic view of learning, rejecting the linear view that once something has been taught it has been learned. Nunan (1991: 149)

5. Learners are encouraged to form hypotheses about the language linking language they have already acquired with the new.

6. Noticing and awareness are fundamental to acquisition.

3.3 Techniques used in C-R

The variety of techniques that can be used in C-R is almost without end. Variety, as we have seen, is important if as teachers we are to provide for all the learning styles of our students. There is only space in this paper to provide a short outline of possibilities. Skehan provides an introductory list:

> Pre-task activities (compare Willis 1996), text exploration activities, for example with the task to provide particular aspects of language or classify some corpus of language, exposure to parallel tasks, perhaps done by others, but with guidance as to what should be focused upon, exposure to material with some aspects highlighted (Doughty 1991) all constitute consciousness-raising activities. So do pre-task brainstorming activities and pre-task discussions.

> Skehan (1998: 139)

Willis (1996) also supplies a list of C-R activities, these include activities which: Identify/consolidate, Classify, Hypothesis build/check, Cross language exploration, Recall and Reference training. Willis, J (1996: 108-109). All of these techniques will raise students' consciousness and facilitate acquisition. I find that the use of examples generated from corpora, such as Cobuild, can be very useful in classification and hypothesis build/check activities.

4.0 Comparison

When one first looks at C-R and traditional teaching methods (e.g. G-T activities) side by side there appears to be a certain superficial resemblance between the two. Their purpose however differs greatly. C-R activities are "derived from genuine interactions and authentic texts" (Nunan 1991:150) and as I mentioned earlier G-T activities are not. C-R activities are also largely communicative in nature. Rutherford provides what he states is the most important distinction between C-R and G-T. "C-R is a means to attainment of grammatical competence in another language (i.e. necessary but not sufficient, and the learner contributes), whereas 'grammar teaching' typically represents an attempt to instil that competence directly (i.e. necessary and sufficient, and the learner is a tabula rosa)." Rutherford (1987: 24)

The comparison of grammar-translation and C-R is not without its problems. Grammar translation was conceived as a complete instructional 'method'. It had goals and was seen as an "end in itself" (Nunan 1991: 150). It was not intended to perfect communicative competence but as a way to become proficient in reading a language and to improve intellectual ability and competence in one's own native language. Sharwood-Smith (1988) however, argues that 'traditional' grammar instruction is one kind of C-R. As we have already seen this is contested by Ellis (1993) amongst others saying that roles given to noticing and practice are quite different.

Bosco and Di Pietro (1970) in Stern (1983:487) provide a framework to compare and analyse different instructional 'strategies'. They identified eleven distinctive features of instructional strategies, divided into eight psychological and three linguistic ones. Stern (1983: 486). This model is not without its critics (see Stern 1983: 511n8) but I believe it to be useful as a tool to highlight the differences between C-R and G-T. I have adapted it to look at C-R in comparison to grammar-translation. I was not able to fit C-R directly into the model and have added another categorisation due to the unrestricted nature of C-R. The position of C-R in the model is based on my own interpretation of C-R. I will provide an explanation of the features after the table.

Table 1. Adaptation of Bosco and DiPietro's Model.

	Strategies	
Psychological features	GT	CR
1. Functional	-	Δ
2. Central	+	+
3. Affective	-	-
4. Nomothetic	+	-
5. Idiographic	-	+
6. Molar	-	+
7. Cyclic	-	+
8. Divergent	-	-
Linguistic features		
1. General	+	-
2. Systematic	-	-
3. Unified	-	+

Key: GT   Grammar-translation
      CR   Consciousness raising
      +   indicates the presence of the feature
      -     indicates its absence
      Δ   indicates possibility for absence or presence of the feature (not in the original model)

Psychological Features:

1. *Functional* versus *non-functional*: The aims of G-T are *non-functional* i.e. it aims only to teach understanding of linguistic structure. C-R aims at understanding of linguistic structure, especially the relationship between form and function, as well as communicative competence in the language as an ultimate goal.

2. *Central* versus *non-central*: Both G-T and C-R appear to be *central*, meaning that teaching is psychologically directed to 'central' cognitive processes rather than 'peripheral' sensorimotor conditioning like the Audiolingual Method.

3. *Affective* versus *non-affective*: Neither G-T nor C-R focuses on developing students' feelings, attitudes or values. A method such as the Direct Method may be seen as doing this.

4. *Nomothetic* versus *non-nomothetic*: In most G-T lessons grammar rules are explicitly brought into focus at the start of the lesson before the practice stage. Brown (1994a: 290) calls this the 'nomothetic tradition' and also uses the term 'behavioristic' as a synonym. In C-R, absolute laws are not sort. Therefore, C-R is non-nomothetic or hermeneutic in tradition. Brown (1994a: 290).

5. *Idiographic* versus *non-idiographic*: G-T is *non-idiographic,* as it does not encourage learners to develop their own unique style of personal expression. By allowing learners to develop their own

understanding of the relationship between form and function of language I believe C-R to be *idiographic*.

6. *Molar* versus *non-molar*: C-R encourages a synthesis or integrated view of language and its expression, whereas G-T presents each language point as an inventory of separate entities. Rutherford (1987), commenting on traditional beliefs, says: "Language learning then, so the conventional view would have it, entails the successive mastery of steadily accumulating structural entities" Rutherford (1987: 4). Stern (1983: 455) also comments: "The major defect of grammar-translation lies in the overemphasis on the language as a mass of rules (and exceptions)".

7. *Cyclic* versus *non-cyclic*: G-T, from my understanding progresses through a text book assuming that once a particular grammar point has been taught it has been mastered. C-R however, does not make this assumption with most advocates believing that a number of chances to notice the form-function relationship are necessary before it is internalised. Many C-R textbooks "'recycle' language points over several units of work" Nunan (1991: 150).

8. Divergent versus non-divergent: Neither G-T nor C-R encourages the acquisition of discrete specific skills.

Linguistic Features:

1. *General* versus *non-general*: G-T tends to analyse a language as an example of universal features. This is the reason so much emphasis is placed on translation into and out of the second language. C-R however, places little or no value on translation per se, but instead focuses on the unique form-function relationship within a language.

2. *Systematic* versus *non-systematic*: C-R encourages learners to interpret and discover language as it is encountered. G-T has a very fixed order to the system of linguistic analysis, but this order is usually random and based on little theory. The order is dictated by the author of the textbook.

3. *Unified* versus *non-unified*: G-T usually deals with one specific rule at a time in an isolated manner. This is in direct contrast to C-R, which encourages learners to view the language as one organic system.

5.0 To what extent is GT based on CR?

From the analysis thus far, it is difficult to conceive that the much-maligned Grammar-Translation method could be based on grammatical consciousness-raising, or vice versa. Richards and Rogers (1986: 4-5) go so far as to say: " it may be true to say . . . the Grammar-Translation Method . . . has no advocates. It is a method for which there is no rationale or justification for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology, or educational theory." I feel this view may be somewhat harsh, but it is useful to keep in mind that it was written in 1986. Krashen and Terrell had only published their 'Natural Approach' three years previously and at that, time people were perhaps impressed by the seeming innovation of their ideas.

Rutherford in contrast suggests that there is something in common between C-R and G-T. "For most of the 2,500-year history of language teaching, the importance of C-R was simply assumed, and for long stretches of this history C-R (in the narrow version called 'grammar teaching') and language pedagogy were even virtually synonymous." Rutherford (1987: 27). This highlights one of the main differences,

that of the 'width' of each method. G-T as we have already seen, employs very little variation in techniques used to raise consciousness. Grammar is always taught in an explicit way with little focus on form. The goals of G-T and C-R are also differ enormously. The modern, wide version of "grammatical consciousness-raising [is/was] conceived as a tool of language learning" and in contrast this 'grammar teaching' was conceived as "the object of such learning." Rutherford (1987: 30).

Nunan suggests Rutherford's (1987) and Sharwood-Smith's (1988) views are different, but I do not see this distinction very clearly:

> Sharwood-Smith (1988) take[s] a rather different line from Rutherford, arguing that 'traditional' instruction is one type of consciousness-raising. He draws attention to the distinction between 'explicit' knowledge and 'implicit' (the former denoting a conscious, analytical awareness of the formal features of the language, the latter referring to an intuitive feeling for what is correct), and suggests that C-R can be both highly explicit or largely implicit.

> Nunan (1991: 150)

Both of these experts on C-R appear to be saying that G-T is based on C-R, but that the way in which each is used and the intended effects or expected results are very different. Modern grammatical C-R is seen by all concerned as a tool in a wider cognitive framework such as task based learning (TBL). TBL is viewed by its critics as PPP upside-down, but is said by Willis (1996) to be PPP the right way up.

An individual difference between learners appears to be totally ignored by G-T, but the broad range of prescribed techniques in C-R would provide a balance of input for different learning styles.

6.0 Conclusion

It now seems easy to differentiate between the grammar-translation method and a modern approach utilising grammatical consciousness-raising. Stern comments on what I perceive to be the main difference. "Making a conceptual distinction between ends (content and objectives) and means is particularly important in language teaching because the confusion between them has been another constant source of trouble in the debate on teaching methods." Stern (1983: 505). G-T is viewed as both a means and an end. Its objectives are simple and few and its means of achieving them are very limited. C-R has in contrast a large variety of techniques to promote awareness of the target language. I do not believe it is intended by any of its advocates to stand-alone but is usually considered to be part of a cognitive, often task-based approach to learning. In G-T the teacher is considered the all-knowing provider of input and grammatical understanding whereas in a C-R approach the teacher's role is to teach the learner how to learn what ever it is he learns. This view is reinforced by Rutherford "If the learner is actually 'taught' anything, we would have to say that he is taught 'how to learn' or better still, 'how to manage his own learning' (Allwright 1984a)". Rutherford (1987: 153).

My personal view of the comparison of G-T and C-R as teaching methods is that it is like comparing a skateboard and a car as methods of transport. The skateboard being G-T i.e. only the seriously dedicated make much progress and that the progress made is usually at performing tricks and stunts. This improvement takes place over a very long period of time and performing these tricks is seen as an end in itself. A car on the other hand has more in common with C-R. It is an effective way to travel

from A to B (i.e. it is a means to an end), and there are usually a choice of different roads by which you can travel. It is not usually driven just for fun, although, some people may enjoy it.

References and Bibliography

Batstone, R. 1996. Key Concepts in ELT: Noticing. ELT Journal Vol. 50/3 Oxford University Press

Brown, H. 1994a. Principles in Language Learning and Teaching. Prentice Hall.

Brown, H. 1994b. Teaching by Principles. Prentice Hall.

Bygate, M. Tonkyn, A. and Williams, E.(eds.) 1994. Grammar and the Language Teacher. Longman.

Ellis, R. 1993. Talking Shop. ELT Journal Vol. 47/1 Oxford University Press.

Howatt, A.P.R. 1984. A History of English Language Teaching. Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. 2000. Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. and Long, M.H. 1991. An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research. Longman.

Nunan, D. 1991. Language Teaching Methodology. Prentice Hall.

Richards, J.C, Platt, J. and Platt, H. 1992. Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics. Longman.

Richards, J.C. and Rogers, T.S. 1986. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press.

Rutherford, W.E. 1987. Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching. Longman.

Rutherford, W.E. and Sharwood Smith, M. (Eds.) 1988. Grammar and Second Language Teaching: A Book of Readings. New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Sharwood Smith, M. 1981. Consciousness-raising and the second language learner. Applied Linguistics 2: 159-168

Skehan, P. 1998. A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning. Oxford University Press.

Stern, H.H. 1983. Fundamental Concepts in Language Teaching. Oxford University Press.

Stern, H.H. 1992. Issues and Options in Language Teaching. Oxford University Press.

Willis, J. 1996. A Framework for Task-Based Learning. Longman.

Willis, D. and Willis, J. 1996. Consciousness Raising Activities in Willis, J. and Willis, D. (eds.) 1996. Macmillan Heinemann.

Yip, V. 1994. Grammatical Consciousness Raising and Learnability in Odlin,T. (ed.) 1994. Cambridge University Press.