

Make a detailed evaluation of a coursebook or set of materials that is used in your own working context. You should consider both the syllabus followed and the methodology employed.

1. Introduction

With the variety of textbooks available on the market, each with a different methodology and syllabus, it can be difficult to choose the best for a particular teaching situation. Unless the teacher is developing materials for a class, choosing the “right” textbook is one of the most important decisions the teacher can make. While virtually all claim to promote a “communicative” approach, some advocate a more traditional approach with an emphasis on structure and grammar, others may provide meaningful tasks which are goal-oriented, some are centered on vocabulary using a lexical approach, and still others claim to use only the real language of native speakers in real situations. The authors of *American Headway 2* (AH2) feel it essential that students build a fundamental understanding of the structure of English and endorse a grammatical syllabus. With the acknowledgement that there is no single “best” way to learn a second language, AH2 attempts to use an eclectic approach with a combination of traditional and more recent methods. The authors write: “American Headway adopts a balanced approach to teaching English by combining the best of traditional methods with current approaches.”

In this paper I will outline some current methodologies whose advocates might be critical of AH2 for its emphasis on grammar and forms, including a traditional Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP) approach. Based on the readings I will consider possibilities for improvement of AH2. I will also endorse its credibility for adopting both current and traditional methods, the latter having shown a reemergence in recent years supported by current research. I will argue that AH2 is an adequate text for both students and teachers, and, although AH2 could be improved by including more task-based activities, collocations and real language, I will defend its traditional approach and argue that its overall eclectic approach is comprehensive and well suited for my working context. I would highly recommend AH2 to teachers starting out teaching ESL at the intermediate college level.

2. Working Context

My current working context is at Hanyang Women’s College, a private college in Seoul, Korea. Students in my class are enrolled in a two-year English course consisting of several classes, two of which are English Conversation 1 & 2. Class size is generally between thirty and forty students with day students consisting mostly of recent high school graduates, and night classes of full-time working women. Students have had at least six years of English education in public middle and high school. Students have different reasons for enrolling in the current course: some are preparing for further

university study; others realize the necessity of oral communication for obtaining or maintaining a good job; while others are planning to study overseas.

2.1 Course Description

In the course outline, the Department of English describes the two-year English course as such: “The educational goal of the department is to produce a professional qualified in communicating with foreigners in English...to develop students’ English proficiency as well as their ability to understand socio-cultural backgrounds of English speaking peoples. On the theoretical side, the curriculum consists of English Grammar, English Phonetics, and English Composition. On the practical side, there are various English conversation courses, such as Elementary and Intermediate English Conversation, Practical English Conversation, Speech and Business English Conversation. Emphasis is put on obtaining a practical ability of speaking and writing proper English.”

2.2 The Conversation Class

Classes are once a week for three hours, with a total of about thirty to forty classroom hours for one semester. There is no syllabus or course materials offered by the administration. The only guideline to work with is the short description in the course outline which reads: Practical English Conversation: “Developing the ability of oral communication based on the elementary English conversation; the illustrated situations and dialogues are followed by oral exercises and drills.” Although I was told that I’d have autonomy for choosing appropriate materials and adopting my own methodology, I was encouraged by the Department Head to choose a textbook. Because I wanted the class to have a general academic theme, I chose AH2. There are twelve classes in a semester, and I generally cover four or five chapters. Supplementary materials are also used to create more interest or to enhance target language use, but generally the textbook is followed.

3. American Headway Initial Impressions

AH2 contains a variety of real life photos, humorous cartoons, and colorful, aesthetically pleasing artwork which ties in well with the activities and exercises and makes for a positive overall image. It offers a broad socio-cultural perspective with stories from several English-speaking countries, including the USA, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, as well as several other countries where English is a second language. The stories and articles in AH2 are augmented by photos of real people which help to personalize the text. The images are intermingled well with a broad assortment of language activities including: role plays, tasks, collocations, fill in the blanks, matching exercises, consciousness raising exercises, comprehension and

discussion questions, tables, questionnaires, grammar boxes containing both inductive and deductive type questions, charts etc. It is clear that AH2 attempts to approach language learning from several angles by using a variety of different methodologies and activities.

The AH2 package includes a student book, writing workbook, tapes, teacher's guide and supplementary materials book. There are student reference sections at the back of the book, including tape scripts for all the listening exercises, a thorough grammar reference, verb form reference, and phonetic symbols. There is also a section "Getting Information" which contains tasked based activities for partner or group work. The table of contents identifies the theme of each unit and the "Scope and Sequence" section goes into the details of each unit (see appendix: A). I will now look more closely at the latter section as it reveals the syllabus and methodology engaged.

4. The Syllabus

Dave Willis (1990:1) states simply that a "syllabus specifies what is to be learned." Sincalir and Renouf in Carter and McCarthy (1988) describe an EFL Syllabus more elaborately:

"a set of headings indicating items which have been selected, by a language planner or materials writer...The syllabus may be a simple list or it may have a more complex structure. The list may be prioritized according to some notion of importance or usefulness; or it may be graded according to some notion of difficulty; or hierarchically ordered."

(Sinclair and Renouf, 1988: 40)

The Authors of AH2 are upfront with the fact that grammar is given prominence as it can be found in the first major column after the theme in the syllabus. The grammatical syllabus is carefully graded to what the authors perceive as structures simpler in form and meaning to be taught before more complex structures. The authors write that the syllabus of AH2 "combines language input (Grammar, Vocabulary, and Everyday English) with skills work (Reading, Speaking, Listening, and Writing)." This is what Ellis would refer to as a Type A syllabus, one which "contributes directly to *analytic* L2 knowledge, which is the kind of knowledge involved in knowing *about* the language – its parts, rules and organization" (Ellis in White, 1988: 46). The type A syllabus, which White defines as focusing on what is to be learned, "focuses on content, the traditional domain of the syllabus, and both the traditional structural as well as the more recent notional-functional syllabuses belong to this class" (White, 1988: 59). White, (1988: 95) explains that the type A syllabus is traditionally content and teacher led and that the content for the course is selected and organized by the teacher.

In contrast, the Type B syllabus, as White (1988: 95) explains, is learner led and "will take the direction of the learners" with tasks and topics as the focus, rather than form and functions. Language is utilized and learned through the completion of tasks. Willis

(2000: 20) explains that a Type B syllabus views the language more holistically, focus on form is secondary, and that the best way to learn the language is by using it. The role of the teacher is to “facilitate language use” and focus on form, if taught, should be taught only incidentally as problems arise. “Through language use, both productive and receptive, learners become aware of language form and gradually adjust and develop their own language in light of this.” (Willis, 2000: 20).

AH2 combines a structural syllabus (grammar, with a functional syllabus) with communicative language use (everyday language) in addition to skills work (reading, speaking, listening and writing). Therefore, AH2 uses a Type A syllabus and attempts to embody an eclectic approach to language learning by utilizing both traditional and present-day approaches. Current approaches are adjoined by having students take “responsibility for their own learning” and “to work out rules for themselves.” Real life situations are rehearsed in the classroom with the use of a variety authentic material. Language is viewed “as a whole” and learners acquire the language through communicative activities.

5. Methodology - PPP

The authors state that AH has been designed for both effective teaching and learning. “The units provide a balanced, cohesive timetable for the presentation, practice, and personalization of the language in a variety of exercise types, relevant vocabulary work, extensive skills work, and practical everyday situational English.” This falls into the traditional methodology of Presentation, Practice, Production (PPP). In the PPP methodology, pre-communicative exercises are presented for controlled practice to increase students’ confidence, while the final production phase is to allow students to use the forms they’ve learned with more freedom.

5.1 PPP Criticized

Although not all, some of the lessons in AH2 follow the traditional PPP model which would be criticized by some including Jane Willis who writes that it is “abundantly clear” that we can do without PPP altogether (Jane Willis, 1996: 62). Peter Skehan in Willis and Willis (1996) points out that the “underlying theory for a PPP approach has now been discredited.” Michael Lewis goes further by stating “One methodological conclusion is inevitable – any paradigm based on, or remotely resembling, Present – Practice – Produce (PPP) is wholly unsatisfactory, failing as it does to reflect either the nature of language or the nature of learning...the fact is the PPP paradigm is, and always was, nonsense.” (Lewis in Willis and Willis, 1996: 11).

There is debate to whether or not PPP enables students the opportunity to truly communicate. Dave Willis states that “true communication involves the achievement of some outcome through the use of language, and demands that the language used should be determined by the attempt to achieve that outcome” (Willis, 2000: 5). Oral exercises which practice forms, then, are considered restrictive and, therefore, not enough for acquisition to take place. Willis writes about the tension created in a coursebook between having a grammatical or structural syllabus and communicative methodology:

“A grammatical syllabus demands a methodology which focuses on the correct production of target forms. It is form-focused. A communicative methodology, if it involves real communication, demands that learners use whatever language best achieves the desired outcome of the communicative activity.” (Willis, 1990: 5)

Although AH2 advocates a PPP approach, it doesn't strictly adhere to it in all units. Some lessons start with providing students with the opportunity to use the language they already possess with somewhat open ended questions before being introduced to forms. For example, chapters nine, ten and twelve begin with the questions: What are you afraid of? Why? What will you do if the weather is nice this weekend? Which famous person would you like to meet? What would you talk about? What country would you like to visit? What would you do there? If you had a lot of money, what would you buy? How much would you give to friends? Other chapters start out with, matching broken sentences or cloze exercises before the presentation of forms. In Chapter Four, students can experiment with the target language by playing the alphabet game before forms are introduced.

6. Criticism of Traditional Approach

Prabhu (1987) and Rutherford (1987) in Willis (1990) point to the ineffectiveness of pedagogical grammars and argue that “we cannot begin to offer anything like an adequate description of the language on which to base a pedagogical grammar.” According to Willis, despite the fact that several researchers and teachers have concluded the input of traditional teaching methods bears only a flimsy relationship to the intake of learners, coursebook writers (including the authors of AH2) continue to break down the language in an arrangement of patterns to be presented to, and absorbed by learners in presumable sequence. He believes that a syllabus based on ordering is likely uneconomical (Willis, 1990: v). He concludes that learners likely learn more from reading and listening and do not need the teacher's detailed account of what is learnt.

The traditional approach which AH2 utilizes has been challenged by several alternative syllabuses such as the notional, functional, lexical, task based, and in general more natural communicative approach. But in addition to its traditional approach, AH2 adopts several methodologies. Also, in recent years, new research has provided for a re-emergence in the credibility of the traditional approach.

7. New Support for Form-Focused Instruction

Penny Ur (2003) says that after three decades of strongly communicative methodology in reaction to the obsolete grammar translation and audiolingual methods, there has been a resurrection of non-communicative components in effective language programs. “Current research and thinking is beginning to stress the importance of the inclusion of ‘non-communicative’ components within an effective foreign-language teaching program.” The pendulum has begun to swing in the opposite direction, and she points to recent findings stating that there is something to be said for...

1. Explicit form-focused instruction with stress on accuracy. (Ortega and Norris, 2001, Doughty and Williams, 1998).
2. The use of rules. (Ellis, 2001).
3. The use of form-focused practice exercises, (Dekeyser, 1998).
4. The use of non-authentic texts (Cook, G. 2001).
5. A traditional grammar-and-vocabulary syllabus based program, integrating meaningful practice and communicative activities. (This would aptly describe the approach of AH2).

During her lecture Ur asked her audience of approximately three hundred language teachers, “Do you feel that grammar practice helps you to learn a second language?” The overwhelming majority (clearly over 95%) answered affirmatively. When asked, “Do you find that you can, on the whole, pick up grammar intuitively or do you need explanations? Again over 95% answered that they benefited from explanations. She stated that the age of a methodology doesn’t disqualify it and that grammar-based lessons can be beneficial if they bridge the gap between being: *form* focused to being *meaning* focused; making sure it’s *correct* to making sure you *communicate*; *controlled* to *free*; and *decontextualized* to *contextualized*. AH2 bridges the gap by being meaning focused, allowing for free practice, concentration on communication, and the use of mostly contextualized material. However, it refuses to completely “burn the bridge” by offering some more traditional exercises with forms. Penny Ur outlines three adequate models for an effective language program:

7.1 Models for an Effective Language Program

1. A traditional grammar-and-vocabulary syllabus based program, integrating meaningful practice and communicative activities.
2. A communicative methodology, with occasional “time out” for explanations and conscious-raising (Ellis, 2001).

3. Task-based learning, including form-focused ('reactive' instruction) (Long and Robinson, 1998).

AH2 prescribes to the first model, but also contains activities and approaches which would fall into the latter two. Considering that there is no single best approach, AH2 has the advantage of being flexible and utilizing an eclectic approach. All three of these approaches can be used with AH2.

8. Task Based Language Learning

Proponents of task-based language learning might criticize AH2 for its emphasis on grammar and forms and lack of real tasks and real communication in the classroom. Allright (1973) in Willis and Willis (1996) challenges the emphasis on language instruction and underscores the importance of language use. Prabhu 1983; 1987 in Willis and Willis (1996) used problems and information/gap activities exclusively, and argued that language learning was actually impeded by a focus on form. Beretta and Davies' (1985) in Willis and Willis (1996) evaluation of Prabhu's project revealed that using the language as a natural process was more effective for learners than using the traditional approach. However, Long (1983) & Skehan (1992) in Willis and Willis (1996) show that learners achieve higher levels and advance more quickly if focus on form is advocated.

Jane Willis (1996) explains that in a task-based framework the communication task is the most important part of the framework, and the focus on form should come at the end of the lesson, only after the learners have an opportunity to use what they already know. She stresses the importance of "task" by defining it as "a goal-oriented activity in which learners use language to achieve a real outcome." Such things as problem solving, puzzles, games, or comparing experiences are good examples of tasks. Although she might consider AH2's conversation activities as mostly display or practice, AH2 does contain some activities for sharing and personalizing information and, therefore, are true tasks according to her definition. For example, students having to devise questions and fill in information gap activities (see appendix: B).

But Peter Skehan (1996) notes that there is a danger in doing only tasks as learners tend to gain fluency at the expense of accuracy, as well, they become adept at completing tasks with very limited use of the target language.

"These strategies provide an effective incentive for learners to make best use of the language they already have. But they do not encourage a focus on form. They do not provide an incentive for structural change towards an inter-language system with greater complexity....Such learners ...may rely on prefabricated chunks to solve their communication problems. But such solutions do not lead them to longer-term progress." (Skehan in Willis and Willis, 1996: 22)

Solving tasks with the minimum of language possible is fine for native speakers who already possess the hardwiring for complex language but may not necessarily need it to complete a task. Second language speakers need form practice to initially develop such circuitry.

9. Role Play

The authors of AH2 write that current approaches are employed and state that “real-life situations are rehearsed in the classroom, with role plays, situational activities, authentic material, extracts from newspapers and magazines, and interviews with real people.” Several of the chapters in AH2 offer opportunities for role play. For example, in chapter seven, a segment on famous singers ends with a role play in which students are journalists and interview other students who are a famous band. Information points are provided as guidance for journalists to make questions ahead of time, as well as for the band members to think about how to answer the questions (see appendix: C). Willis (1990) is skeptical of the benefit of role play if it doesn’t involve problem-solving or genuine language use. He sees most role play as merely a display of the language which does not lead to language acquisition.

“If a role play involves actual problem solving then it involves genuine language use. But a role play in which learners are simply required to act out a situation merely simulates language use. There is no outcome except for the performance itself. Learners are displaying rather than using language.”
(D. Willis , 1990:5)

This may be true for pre-written dialogues which students practice simply by reading, memorizing, and then speaking. But even these dialogues can, at least, give students an opportunity to practice pronunciation, vocabulary and sentence structure. They can also provide confidence for students who have a difficult time with free conversation. I would characterize the role plays in AH2 as semi-task/controlled in which students are given some information to work with to create and personalize conversation (see appendix: D).

Jane Willis (1996: 54) criticizes role play because in enacting the rules there is no real end result and that it is doubtful learners “exchange real meaning.” I have noticed in my class that students have more conviction in doing role plays which are task-based rather than situation role plays in which students are to use their imagination. Although my students are generally motivated and need little prompting , it is evident that for less motivated students, interest wanes while doing situational role plays and students often fall back into using their first language. However, there are some students who thrive on creating dialogues for their own role plays, especially if it can be personalized.

10. Grammar Spots

Each chapter in AH2 contains one or two “grammar spots” in which the target language can be looked at more closely in its grammatical form. The grammar spots are implicit and designed to challenge the students to discover the rules for themselves before checking with the grammar reference at the back of the book. For example, a comparison is made between Past Simple and Present Perfect in chapter seven:

1. Find examples of the Past simple in the four sentences above.
Find examples of the present perfect.
2. Complete the rule.
We make the present perfect with the auxiliary verb _____+_____.
3. Why are different tenses used in these sentences?
Nat King Cole **recorded** more than 600 songs.
Natalie Cole **has recorded** 17 albums.

The grammar box above would be considered by the Author’s of AH2 as a “current approach” as students work out grammar rules and take responsibility for their own learning. But this specific example of comparing the Simple Past and Present Perfect would be criticized by Dave Willis:

“It is difficult to see how one might justify contrived texts which are designed to present a precise contrast between past simple and present perfect, when we know that very often the contrast is not precise but a matter of choice. A procedure which focuses on a clear cut contrast and ignores cases in which choice operates, obscures the fact that very often no such contrast exists objectively. Language use is not a matter of conforming to a restrictive set of rules. It is a matter of exploiting the language system to achieve communicative intentions.”
(Willis, 1990: 126)

However, students at this level need some sort of grounding before presented with the subtleties of making choices between tense to use. If they can understand the difference that Nat King Cole has died and no longer records music (he **recorded** - past simple), and Natalie Cole is still recording music (she **has recorded** - present perfect - as there is a connection to the present), then they can understand a fundamental difference in usage between the two. Indeed, the clear explanation and use of timelines in the teacher’s manual helped me to clarify the difference for my own awareness.

11. Three Part Exchanges

Ronald Carter (1998: 44) points out that three part exchanges such as A: “What time is it?” B: “A quarter past six.” A: “Is it? I thought it was later.” are more prevalent in materials derived from real conversation such as the Collins *Cobuild English Course* (Willis and Willis 1998) and that in some textbooks two-part exchanges are more

common. In review of the exchanges in AH2, the majority are based on two-part exchanges. This may be something the authors might take into consideration for improvement on future texts. Lewis (1993) in Carter (1998) calls these third part exchanges ‘lexical chunks’ or fixed phrases.

12. Lexical Chunks

Michael Lewis in Willis and Willis (1996) argues that language is made of prefabricated chunks and that the best way for learners to learn a language is by exposing them to collocations. He suggests that learners go wrong with grammatically possible frameworks which would be dismissed as highly unlikely by native speakers. For example: “I desire the salmon” or “It’s forty past five.” He argues for an elimination, or at least, reduction in the role of understanding grammar rules and a more prominent role for memory. He claims that “any attempt to isolate one structure for the purpose of study inevitable distorts the language” (Lewis, 1996 in Willis and Willis: 11). I would not agree with the latter assertion unless the context in which the structure was taken was denied to the learners. However, I would agree that more exercises on word collocations, and phrasal chunking would be greatly beneficial for learners and would improve AH2.

13. Vague Language

According to Carter (1998: 44), vague language such as “there were about twenty *or so* people at the dinner” or “See you *around* six” or the use of “*you know*” is prevalent throughout the research data but is often omitted in coursebooks. He also points out that in real spoken English discourse such things as the discourse marker ‘right’ as an acknowledgement; the use of hedges as in “‘just’ black thanks”; ungrammatical forms ‘a tea’; and the use of ‘tend to’ to describe typical actions and events are very prevalent and are left out of textbooks. He notes that, in contrast to real spoken English discourse, the interaction in some course books is...

“generally smooth and problem free, the speakers co-operate with each other politely, the conversation is neat, tidy, and predictable, utterances are almost as complete sentences, no-one interrupts anyone else or speaks at the same time as anyone else, and the questions and answers are sequences rather in the manner of a quiz show or court-room interrogation.”

(Carter, 1998: 47)

His points are certainly consideration for improvement of the spoken discourse scripts in AH2 as it avoids using discourse markers, hedges, ungrammatical forms, interruptions, and background noise (all associated with natural discourse). However, he acknowledges that some successful course books take the view that linguistic elements are more important than real dialogue: “...rather than the dialogue taking precedence over the linguistic features to be learnt, the language teaching points take precedence over the

reality of the dialogue” (Carter, 1998: 46). He explains that material writers often forgo natural language to provide more practice of, for example, modals or the vocabulary surrounding the target language. Informal conversations are often lacking in rich lexicon and the same words are reused.

Although the dialogues in AH2 are not real discourse in the strictest sense, they are natural enough to successfully provide ample practice for the target language and surrounding language without sounding awkward. Indeed, before reading Carter’s article, I was mistakenly under the impression that the scripts were perfectly natural. He notes that although an unreal script may not be used in actual contexts “it is easier to comprehend and more real pedagogically.” Carter also points out that considering 80% of spoken interaction is between non-native speakers, and because interaction with native speakers is the exception, it is impractical and even an imposition to expect learners to attain native like language when they don’t really require it (Prodromou 1990, Rampton 1990, Phillipson 1992 in Carter, 1998: 50). I agree with this, and believe the dialogues in AH2 are creative, and successful in providing practice in forms, while at the same time being communicatively efficient and even superior to some “real” language. Consider the example in Chapter 2 of a teacher and student meeting (appendix: E). In this lesson students are encouraged to make conversation by: asking questions, showing interest, not just answering yes or no, trying to add a comment, and not letting the conversation stop.

14. Discussion

The combination of traditional and more current approaches suit my students well as their familiarity with structure and forms enhances their confidence for oral communication, while current approaches simulate real-life situations. They may only understand grammar enough to explain it in their own language, but AH2 provides ample practice in the target language, as well as exercises and explanations of structure for students to begin to have a better feel of the language. The traditional exercises are beneficial in consolidating and reinforcing what they’ve previously learned. The communicative type activities including role plays, interviews, situations and tasks help them to practice what they’ve learned in the lesson and to activate what they already know.

Michael Lewis and Willis and Willis make good points in their attempt to debunk PPP, and I must admit that an awareness of this alternative view is good after having being trained in the PPP method during the four week CELTA course. Although, I’m not convinced that the PPP method has been debunked, the awareness of potential inadequacies has enabled me to alternate my presentation of material according to students’ needs, and I now tend to give students a freer reign with what they know, rather than providing them with forms or material in the beginning that they may or may not be familiar with. My expectations for students to accurately practice and produce after presentation have been drastically lowered.

The readings on task-based learning, collocations, uses of reality have certainly given me reason to question the methodology of AH2, and has lead me to explore other types of approaches. In fact, I've become more interested in the lexical approach and I'm now supplementing my class with lexical activities from John Flower's text American Vocabulary Program 2 and have become more intrigued by this approach.

I agree with Dave Willis (1990: 5) that "we best learn a language by using that language rather than simply by producing samples of it for the teacher's inspection and correction." With that in mind, and considering the schools policy that "emphasis is put on the practical ability of speaking," my new approach to AH2 is to allow students to do the written grammar, structure and form exercises for homework and to concentrate more on oral communicative activities in class. AH2 provides ample opportunities for controlled and freer type communication. If students have questions on form, and I think an explanation is beneficial for the whole class, I can provide a brief explanation. Students need as much class time communicating as possible. Unless I hear the same mistakes being repeated, I don't feel the need to point out their individual mistakes. As I become aware of repeated mistakes, I can then later review them as a class.

Because I teach both conversation 1 and 2 with the same classes, I give the students, at the end of Conversation 1, the choice of continuing with American Headway 2 or opting for another textbook. So far, all classes have chosen to continue with AH2. If the students are enjoying the book, then I conclude that they must be learning from it. In an informal evaluation, I asked students to write comments about AH2, and generally, comments were positive (see appendix: F).

15. Conclusion

I believe that the traditional method, with a concentration on structure and form, grammar exercises, PPP, and some drilling in AH2 is beneficial for language learning. If we see learning a language as analogous to most other complex skills, then we can more clearly understand the benefits of, for example, a musician having a profound understanding of music theory or diligently playing scales - it may not help directly in playing a classical piece, but it will provide grounding for future success in that direction. In addition, AH2 depends not on a single current approach, but explores a wide assortment of contemporary approaches with a vast array of activities and exercises. Every student has his/her own unique way of learning a language, with some methods more efficacious to some than to others. This makes AH2 advantageous for virtually all students. I endorse AH2's eclectic approach to language learning and would highly recommend it for teachers teaching in an academic setting at the college/university level.

References

- Allwright, D. (1973). *What do we need teaching materials for?* ELT J Vol XX.
- Carter, R. (1998). *Orders of Reality: CANCODE, Community and Culture*. In ELT Journal 52/1.
- Cook, V. (2001). *Using the first language in the classroom*. Canadian Modern Language Review 57 (3).
- Dekeyser, R. M. (2001). *Automaticity and automatization*. In Robinson, P. (Eds). *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*. Cambridge University Press. 125-151.
- Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on Form in the Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. 2001. *Grammar teaching – Practice or consciousness-raising?* In Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (Eds). *Methodology in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 167-174.
- Lewis M. (1996) *Implications of a lexical view of language*. In Willis, D. and Willis, J. *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Oxford, Heinemann: 10-16.
- Long, M. H. & Robinson, P. 1998. *Focus on form: theory, research and practice*. In Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (Eds). *Focus on form in the Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 15-41.
- Norris, J. M. & Ortega, L. (2001). *Does type of instruction make a difference? Substantive findings from a meta-analytic review*, *Language Learning* 51, Supplement 1. 157-213.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: University Press.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*, OUP.
- Prodromou, L. (1990). *English as a cultural action*. In R. Rossner and R. Bolitho (eds). *Currents of Change in English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rampton, M.B. 1990. *Displacing the native speaker: expertise, affiliation, and inheritance*. ELT Journal 44/2: 97-106.
- Rutherford, W. E. (1987). *Second Language Grammar: Learning and Teaching*. Longman.

- Sinclair, J. and Renouf, A. (1988). *A Lexical Syllabus for Language Learning*. Longman.
- Skehan, P. (1996). *Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction*. In Willis, D. and Willis, J. *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Oxford, Heinemann: 17-30.
- Ur, P. (2003). *Teaching Grammar*. Lecture. Hanyang University, Seoul Korea. August 31st, 2003. Cambridge University Press.
- White, R. V. (1988). *The ELT Curriculum*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Willis, D. (1990). *The Lexical Syllabus: a new approach to language teaching*. London: HarperCollins.
- Willis, D. (2000). *Syllabus and Materials*. Birmingham, The Center for English Language Studies.
- Willis, D. and Willis, J. (1996). *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Macmillan.
- Willis, J. (1996) *A Flexible Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Heinemann.
- .
- .

Appendix A: Syllabus (Scope and Sequence)

Appendix B: Getting Information

Appendix C: Role Play

Work in groups of four.

Student A and **Student B** You are members of a band.

Student C and **Student D** You are journalists who are going to interview the band.

Ask and answer questions about:

- the name of the band
- what kind of music the band plays
- who plays what instrument
- what has influenced their music
- how long they have been together
- the records they have made
- the places they have visited

Appendix D: Semi-Controlled & Freer Role Play

1) Read Ruth's diary. Work with a partner. One of you is Ruth. It's Friday evening and one of you has called the other to talk.

Ruth: "Hi, there. I'm exhausted.
I've had a terrible week!"

You: "What have you been doing?"

Ruth's Diary June 11-17

Monday 11

Had lunch with Rick. He didn't get that job. Worked late.

Tuesday 12

Work is crazy right now! No lunch. Went for a drink with Maria. Rick called. We argued.

Wednesday 13

Rushed home from work. Rick came over. Too tired to cook him the dinner I promised. Rick was upset! He's still looking for a job. It's three months now.

Thursday 14

Good news – I got the pay raise I wanted. Bad news – I had to work until 8:00 again. Rick furious.

Friday 15

I'm exhausted. Rick and I are finished. This week has been hell !!

2) Work with a partner. It is Friday evening. One of you has decided to call the other to talk. Ask and answer questions about what you've been doing this week.

Appendix:E Teacher (Alice)/student(Sergio) greeting.

A Hello. What's your name?

M Sergio. And what's your name?

A Alice. Where are you from, Sergio?

M I come from Rio de Janeiro in Brazil, one of the most beautiful places in the whole world. And you, Alice, where do you come from?

A I come from Canada. What do you do in Rio?

M I'm an architect.

A Oh, really?

M Yeah. I design beautiful buildings for people with lots of money. I'm very expensive.

A How interesting.

M And how long have you been a teacher, Alicia?

A Actually, my name is Alice.

M I am so sorry. Alicia is the way we say it in Brazil – Alice, I mean.

A Don't worry. I like the name Alicia. I've been working here for five years.

M How interesting! Do you enjoy it?

A Yes, very much. You meet a lot of people from lots of different countries, and I like that very much. Are you enjoying it here?

M Very, very much. I'm learning a lot of English. I'm making a lot of friends. And even the weather's not so bad! Well, I haven't frozen to death yet, and I've been here for five weeks. Alice, can I get you a coffee?

A Well, I've got a few minutes before my next class, so that would be nice. Thank you very much.

M Why don't we ...

Appendix: F Student comments on coursebook.

Students were asked to evaluate AH2 after completing four units. They were simply asked to note the good and bad points of the book. This is a synopsis of their comments:

Good points

- a variety of contents and suitable pictures
- a lot of grammar examples
- good grammar reference, well detailed
- lots of colorful pictures
- useful expressions, and conversation examples
- can learn different cultures
- transcripts available
- good exercises and practice examples
- a lot of vocabulary to pick up easily (adjective, verb, noun, adverb etc)
- topics are current

Bad points

- small characters – difficult to read
- too much content on one page – too busy, complex
- not enough space to write
- not exciting, somewhat tedious
- no cd offered (only tapes)
- no explanations of difficult vocabulary