Consciousness-raising versus deductive approaches to language instruction: a study of learner preferences

James M. Ranalli, University of Birmingham, July 2001

1 Introduction

From the days of grammar translation, the deductive approach to language learning, in which a grammar rule is explicitly presented to students and followed by practice applying the rule, has been the bread and butter of language teaching around the world and still enjoys a monopoly in many course books and self-study grammar books (Fortune, 1992). However, low levels of attainment associated with this type of teaching, plus an ever-developing awareness of the complexity of language brought about by corpus linguistics, have pointed out problems with deductive instruction. Rules as given by teachers and textbooks are often seen, at best, as helpful but over-simplistic generalizations; and at worst, as fallacious distortions of real language which contribute little or nothing to learner's productive mastery of linguistic forms.

A number of alternatives have been proposed, including inductive learning, discovery learning, noticing and consciousness–raising. They vary in some ways but all share the feature that they do not start with explicit presentation of a rule. Rather, the learner is prompted in some way to discover for him or herself how the language works.

The final item in the list, consciousness-raising, will be the focus of this paper. In the C-R approach, the emphasis is not on explicit rule-giving and immediate practice, but instead on drawing learners' attention receptively to formal and semantic features of linguistic forms, with the goal of eventual, versus immediate, mastery.

While consciousness-raising is firmly based in Second Language Acquisition research and currently enjoys much popularity with theorists, it does not yet seem to have gained widespread acceptance among practitioners. In important ways it goes directly counter to many traditional educational ideas: it puts more responsibility on learners, posits a less central role for the teacher, and makes no promises about when (or whether) students will master the content. In a country like Korea, therefore, where the education system remains rooted in conservative Confucian beliefs (Gray, 1998), one would expect to face resistance to consciousness-raising in the classroom. This report describes an action research project to investigate whether this expectation has any basis in fact.

Specifically, the focus was whether learners prefer a C-R approach over a more traditional deductive approach. Firstly, a problem structure was identified and two instructional treatments, one C-R and the other deductive, were devised to deal with it. Next, two questionnaires were created to survey student attitudes before and after the lesson treatments. The battery of materials was then administered to two different groups of learners. Contrary to expectations, no clear winner

emerged. Instead, many learners took a practical approach by expressing a preference for a teaching method which incorporates a judicious mixture of the two. While acknowledging that the C-R approach is more interesting, some learners felt its effectiveness might depend on the particular form or language point being taught. Also, there was unanimous support for productive practice activities of the type usually associated with deductive learning.

2 Background to the study

2.1 Consciousness-raising and grammar learning

Consciousness raising, like many innovations in ELT, originated from dissatisfaction with ideas that preceded it. One of these ideas is PPP, the "presentation, practice, production" sequence for organizing activities in a lesson (Ellis, 1993). In a PPP lesson, the teacher introduces a new linguistic form to learners via a focused presentation, which often includes contextualization of the new form, a deductive explanation or "elicitation" of how it works, and some tightly controlled production activities (e.g. repetition drills). Next, the teacher relaxes control somewhat and the learners are given practice activities which allow them to "gain confidence" with the new language, while still focusing on form over meaning. Finally, in the production stage, control is relaxed even more in "freer practice" activities which prompt the learners to engage in meaningful exchanges via tasks which elicit use of the target form. Implicit in this sequence, some would say, is the idea that learners can move from zero knowledge to productive mastery of a new form in the span of a single lesson (though nowadays most practicing teachers, based on their experience, would disagree).

PPP has enjoyed, and still enjoys today, great popularity among teachers and teacher trainers but it has come under heavy criticism recently. The basis of much of this criticism is the notion that an important gap exists between teaching and learning. Students may be able to demonstrate a good grasp of a particular form during classroom activities but later, when once again operating under the pressures of real-time communication, they no longer exhibit the same control. Theories for the origin of this gap center on the idea of the internal syllabus, the natural order of acquisition of linguistic structures which people must go through when learning a language. PPP is seen as a clumsy attempt to ignore or contravene this natural order. Learners cannot be taught structures they are not ready to acquire, so it begs the question: should teachers even try?

Another major flaw in PPP, some claim, is its excessive emphasis on productive practice. Asking students to use new grammar immediately may not only be unnecessary but "counterproductive, in that it may distract attention away from the brain work involved in understanding and restructuring" of the learner's interlanguage (Thornbury, 1999: 105). Rather than production, teachers should aim

only at drawing learners' attention to important features of the form under study – in other words, consciousness raising. A language learning program, says Ellis,

> should seek to draw out learners' conscious attention to problematic grammatical features, not with the expectancy that they would master these features and use them in communication immediately: but, rather, the expectancy would be that they learn what it is that they have ultimately to master (Ellis 1993: 6).

There are a variety of ways in which C-R might achieve this. Willis and Willis (1996: 69) list seven categories of consciousness-raising activity types:

- identify and consolidate patterns or usages;
- classifying items according to their semantic or structural characteristics;
- hypothesis building, based on some language data, and then perhaps checked against more data;
- cross-language exploration;
- reconstruction and deconstruction;
- recall;
- reference training.

What becomes of production activities? With consciousness raising, is there any role left for the drills and other controlled practice exercises so beloved of PPP?

Writing about a broader task-based learning framework, Willis notes that production activities could perhaps follow on from C-R activities in a lesson, but teachers should keep them in perspective.

> On their own are unlikely to give learners deeper insights into the meaning and use of grammatical patterns, or speed up their acquisition of these patterns, but they may provide confidence and a sense of security. They may also be a good way – for some students at least – to learn typical lexical phrases (Willis 1996: 110).

Now, while applied linguists and many teachers may have doubts about the benefits of deductive presentations and controlled practice activities, the question remains whether learners feel the same way. For example, students who have been learning English according to a PPP framework may be quite accustomed to productive practice and consider it a useful, perhaps necessary, element of classroom instruction. Indeed, Hopkins and Nettle assert that learners come to the classroom expecting to be able to use new language and skills by the time the lesson is over. "Many learners will experience frustration in a situation where they are exposed to language and expected to understand it without being given an opportunity to use it" (1994: 159).

Of course, whether students do experience such frustration will depend on their prior educational experience and preferred ways of learning. It is to these matters that we now turn.

2.2 Cultural context

The deductive approach is deeply ingrained in the Korean psyche, not only in the field of language teaching but in education in general. One of the most common compliments given to a favorite teacher – of language or anything else – is that he or she "explains things well." While alternatives such as inductive learning are made known to teachers in their professional training, resistance to using them in the classroom is seen arising from several quarters. Not least of these is the devolution of power from teachers to students implied by inductive learning, which contradicts Confucian notions of hierarchy, deference and respect for the teacher's knowledge and status. Also, public exams play a role: deductive learning is widely regarded as the best way to ensure that students are adequately prepared for these very important Korean social institutions.

Evidence for the ingrained influence of deductive teaching can be found in the national English curriculum. Korean students in primary and secondary schools learn grammar through "exemplary sentences" – that is, sentences chosen as models of those linguistic forms deemed necessary for communication (Kwon, 2000). Typically, in a middle school textbook, for example, an exemplary sentence is presented in a dialogue or reading text to establish a context and later isolated in a grammar section. Students read or hear a grammar explanation and then do practice activities involving the structure.

Mention of consciousness raising or inductive learning is very rare. A survey of the scholarly journals devoted to teaching English in Korea will reveal a great deal of debate about whether and how to implement Communicative Language Teaching in the state schools. As a result, the nature of the discussion about grammar focuses not on how best to teach it, but rather on whether it should continue to be emphasized to the degree it has been or else relegated to a lower status in deference to communication skills. In the few cases where C-R is cited, it is usually as part of a special experimental study conducted in a tertiary educational institution. (See, for example, No, 2000.)

Grammatical knowledge, then, is widely regarded in Korea as a matter of knowing "the rule." The idea that you can make up your own rules – or rather, hypotheses – about language, would appear to be something quite new and foreign.

This is not to suggest, however, that all Korean learners of English can therefore be expected to prefer deductive learning when offered a choice. Individual learning styles will undoubtedly have some bearing. If, for example, we consider the implications of cognitive style theory – in particular, the idea of field independence-dependence – we might expect that some learners will find C-R activities more to their liking. Abraham (1985) found correlations between field independence and a

preference for deductive approaches, and field dependence and a preference for inductive learning. These findings might be relevant here insofar as the particular type of C-R activity chosen for this study took the form of an inductive search-the-examples type exercise.

Beyond the notion of simple preference, it may also be worth asking exactly *how* a particular form of instruction or learning style helps a person learn. Some assert that inductive learning is better for transfer of knowledge to new situations, while deductive learning is better for simple retention of rules (Hermann, 1969). As will be seen, the results of the present study seem to support these claims.

3 The nature and aims of the study

3.1 The informants

The study was conducted with two classes of upper-intermediate learners in a private language institute attached to a university. The courses are in general English and are not for university credit. Most of the students who attend the institute come from the university population but a large number are also professional people, housewives and children. Both groups in the study were on 60-hour courses which met four times a week for 90 minutes. The early morning class ran from 7-8:30 a.m. and the afternoon class from 4:30-6 p.m..

The afternoon class was clearly the more homogenous of the two, consisting of nine female undergraduates who were all between the ages of 21-25. The early morning class was more diverse. Although made up mostly of undergraduates, it also included one graduate student and three working adults in their thirties. Four of the students were male and five female.

3.2 Principal aims

The main aims of the study were to ascertain student preferences for C-R versus deductive instruction methods and to collect and interpret their views on this question, as well as related questions about the perceived importance and efficacy of productive language practice.

3.3 The structure

The linguistic form chosen as the focus of this study was:

***This/It/That was/is the first/second/etc. time I* + present perfect/past perfect.**

It can be typified in the sentence: *This is the first time I've eaten Japanese food.*

This structure was chosen for a number of reasons. First, it arose out of a semi-authentic reading encountered in the course book; while not appearing in the text itself, one of the post-reading questions elicits answers that often incorporate it. Secondly, it will be familiar to many English teachers in Korea as a "problem" structure: Korean English speakers are likely to say things like, "It is the first time for me to eat Japanese food" or "It is the first time that I eat Japanese food." And finally, the availability of a ready-made deductive presentation in a commercially produced grammar book made the structure an attractive choice. The material was organized in such a way that it made possible the creation of a consciousness-raising treatment that paralleled it neatly.

3.4 The lesson treatments

Before discussing the details, it should be emphasized that the materials used for this study were regarded as lesson "treatments," not lesson plans *per se*. As such, they fell somewhere between a proper classroom lesson and a self-study exercise. Care was taken to remove the teacher from the process so that student preferences would not be influenced by his style or personality. In both treatments, the teacher's role was limited mostly to facilitator.

The deductive treatment came from a page in Swan and Walter's grammar practice book, *How English Works* (1997). It consisted of a rule for present tense sentences given in a box, followed by some sentences with verbs in brackets which students were asked to change into the correct forms, presumably by either writing or speaking aloud. A second box containing the rule for past tense sentences followed, and this in turn was complemented by more productive practice in the form of a paragraph-length story, which students were to use as stimulus for a transformation drill. (See Appendix 1.)

For the consciousness-raising treatment, an original worksheet was created using data from the Bank of English. Examples were identified and grouped in such a way so as not to contradict the rule presented in the deductive treatment. Preceding the sentences were a number of questions designed to direct the learners' attention to semantic and syntactic features of the examples;

namely, which words were used to start the sentences, how the sentences were used, and which verb tenses were found in the first and second clauses. (See Appendix 2.)

Interestingly, the corpus generated many examples that flouted the rule given in the deductive treatment. Some of these counter-examples were included in a pilot worksheet but it was found in pre-testing that they rendered the material too confusing for students to make any hypotheses. In the end, a single non-conforming example was included in hopes that this would provide a richer, more realistic experience of the language while preserving the pedagogical efficacy of the material.

3.5 The instruments

To test the hypothesis of this study, two questionnaires were devised. The first sought to gauge general attitudes about the importance of learning grammar in an overall program of language study; the importance of grammar for effective communication; and preferences for either a deductive or inductive approach to instruction. (See Appendix 3.) This questionnaire was to be completed by the informants *before* they were exposed to the two lesson treatments. Following Fortune (1992), it was anticipated that the experience of working through the materials might cause some learners to change their minds.

The second questionnaire was lengthier and more detailed. In addition to giving learners the choice between a consciousness-raising or a deductive approach, a third alternative was offered: a teaching method incorporating both. This was thought to be relevant since it has been proposed that this is what many teachers in fact already do (Hopkins and Nettle, 1994). The informants were also asked to rate both treatments as to their relative interest, difficulty and usefulness for learning. Finally, questions seeking to discover learners' views on the possibility of learning new language by C-R activities alone, and on the role and efficacy of productive language practice, were also included. (See Appendix 4).

To bolster the quantitative results, a discussion and group interview were conducted immediately after the administration of the second questionnaire. The learners discussed their responses in small groups and then with the teacher in a whole-class plenary, which was videotaped. The tape was partially transcribed and analyzed.

3.5 Research considerations

Obviously, this study cannot make any claims about external reliability since no control group was used and the same structure was studied twice by the same learners. However, because preferences were the focus of the investigation (as opposed to another construct, such as attainment), it was

important that the informants be exposed to two treatments that were similar enough to facilitate a proper comparison.

A different but related concern was whether the notion of interest would be negatively affected by the organization of the study. For example, the newness of the C-R treatment, which students were given first, might benefit from a "novelty" effect and conversely the deductive treatment might suffer by virtue of its language point being already familiar. Unfortunately, this arrangement was unavoidable.

To ameliorate the situation, the learners were instructed as to the focus of the study and were asked to consider each treatment as an independent entity; in other words, to approach each one as if they were not going to be exposed to the other. It is difficult to say to what extent this may have influenced the results. As will be seen, there were in the end a significant number who indicated a preference for deductive learning even *after* saying initially that they liked the inductive approach – this despite the fact that overall the informants found the C-R approach more interesting.

It must also be acknowledged that the concept of productive practice was not clearly defined for the respondents. Researchers looking further into the topic would do well to investigate exactly which type of practice activities learners have in mind when they talk about their importance for language learning.

Additionally, the respondents' level of ability must be considered. All the participants in this study were upper-intermediate, which means they have achieved a higher level of success than the average English language learner around the world. As a sample, therefore, they are not representative. Attempting the same study with learners from across a spectrum of abilities would help to make the findings more credible.

4 Findings

4.1 Questionnaire #1 (Pre-treatment)

A majority of learners initially expressed a preference for an inductive approach over a deductive approach.

- 15 **(83 per cent)** said they preferred deriving the rule for themselves from examples;
- 3 **(17 per cent)** said they favored being given the rule first.

In terms of the relative importance of grammar to language learning:

- 4 **(22 per cent)** said grammar was very important for learning a language;
- 12 **(67 per cent)** said grammar was important;
- 2 **(11 per cent)** said grammar was useful but not very important;

- none said grammar was unimportant.

On the question of the importance of grammar for successful communication, learner responses fell evenly into two categories:

- 9 **(50 percent)** said grammar was important;
- 9 **(50 percent)** said grammar was useful but not very important;
- none said grammar was either very important or unimportant.

4.2 Questionnaire #2 (Post-treatment)

On the question of which approach they would prefer to be used in the classroom:

- 6 **(33 per cent)** said they would prefer to learn mostly by C-R;
- 5 **(28 per cent)** said they would prefer to learn mostly by the deductive approach;
- 7 **(39 per cent)** said they would prefer a combination of the two.

On the relative interest, difficulty and usefulness of the two treatments, the results were as follows:

Interest

	Very interesting	Somewhat interesting	Somewhat boring	Very boring
C-R	5 **(28%)**	10 **(55%)**	3 **(17 %)**	0
Deductive	0	7 **(39%)**	8 **(44%)**	3 **(17%)**

Difficulty

	Very difficult	Somewhat difficult	Somewhat easy	Very easy
C-R	7 **(39%)**	8 **(44%)**	3 **(17%)**	0
Deductive	0	3 **(17%)**	11 **(67%)**	4 **(22%)**

Usefulness

	Very useful for learning	Somewhat useful for learning	Not very useful for learning	Useless for learning
C-R	8 **(44%)**	9 **(50%)**	1 **(5%)**	0
Deductive	5 **(28%)**	7 **(39%)**	6 **(33%)**	0

On the question related to the **possibility of learning new grammar through consciousness raising alone**, the responses were as follows:

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
2 **(11%)**	6 **(33%)**	1 **(5%)**	9 **(50%)**	0

On the question related to the **necessity of productive practice for learning to use new grammar naturally in real communication,** the responses were:

Strongly agree	Agree	Not sure	Disagree	Strongly disagree
13 **(72%)**	5 **(28%)**	0	0	0

5 Discussion of the findings

I shall remark briefly on the findings from both questionnaires and use the learners' spoken and written comments to illustrate my assertions.

First of all, it is interesting to note that at the beginning of the study, an overwhelming majority indicated a preference for inductive learning (akin to consciousness raising). Clearly, just because one style of instruction is the norm in a country does not mean that learners will therefore opt for that style when given a choice. Korean learners, at least in theory, appear to like the idea of learning things for themselves.

By the end of the study, however, the distribution had changed dramatically and the number of learners favoring a strictly deductive approach actually *increased*. The experience of working through the materials apparently brought the issues into sharper focus for some. Also, the addition of a third option strongly affected preferences, as the following tables show.

Pre-treatment

Prefer inductive approach	Prefer deductive approach
15 **(83%)**	3 **(17%)**

Post-treatment

Prefer to learn mostly by C-R	Prefer to learn mostly by deductive approach	Prefer a combination of approaches
6 **(33%)**	5 **(28%)**	7 **(39%)**

Among those learners who expressed a clear preference for the C-R approach, several cited its motivational effect and the perceived benefits it offers to memory and understanding.

> I think it stays in my head for a long time and [there's] a kind of feeling of achievement, also. You put your energy into it, so you remember it longer.
> (Soyoung, female undergraduate, afternoon class)

> I think that most of people in this type of institute want to develop their speaking ability. In case of speaking I think lesson B [the deductive treatment] is not so good because I think lesson B is best method for exam … I usually learn the grammar like this method from the high school but when I have a chance to speak I cannot remember (sic).
> (Cheol-woo, male graduate student, early morning class)

Some comments seemed to lend credence to Hermann's claim (1969) that deductive learning is good for remembering rules, while inductive learning helps with the transfer and application of learning to new situations.

> I like type of lesson A [the C-R lesson] because if I study type of lesson B, I can understand the theory. But theory and practice is different. And though I have theory, I don't know the situation how can I use that. (sic)
> (Nasung, male undergraduate, early morning class)

On the other hand, those who preferred the deductive approach cited its clarity and familiarity as deciding factors. Written comments included things like: "It is easy to understand."; "I want to know what I'm learning when I learn something."; "Most grammar books consist of type B. I am familiar with type B."

One learner, echoing others, pointed out that particularly in cases where the language point in question is complicated in terms of form or concept – for example, the present perfect tense or modal verbs of deduction – a C-R lesson "might be very confusing, because we're not sure if our rule is right or wrong. As for me, [the deductive lesson] was easier." (Hae-won, female undergraduate, afternoon class).

Several considered productive practice the key factor in their preference for the deductive treatment. "I had a chance to write some examples and speaking (sic) so I think it's more interesting and effective." (Shinji, female undergraduate, early morning class).

Indeed, the issue of practice seemed to be of great importance to all the informants. While they may have been divided in their preferences for C-R versus deductive approaches, clearly all felt that practice is a vital, perhaps necessary, element of language learning. In addition, more than half the group expressed doubts about the possibility of acquiring new language through consciousness-raising activities alone.

Jay, another female undergraduate student in the afternoon class, explained that practice is especially necessary for students in an EFL environment.

> If I live in American or an English culture I can get it because through the TV or radio stations everywhere they speak English, right? … So I can get it in time. But I live in Korea so nobody going to use English (sic) Without practice I can't get it, I think.

6 Some concluding remarks

Based on the results of this limited investigation, we can perhaps draw one cautious conclusion: to the degree that C-R activities forego or radically de-emphasize forms of productive practice, students may indeed be expected to respond negatively to classrooms where consciousness raising is the sole means of grammar instruction. As has already been noted, they come to class expecting opportunities to use what they have learned and may feel frustrated if these are not provided.

The question is raised: should a teacher who believes in consciousness raising try to persuade his or her learners that productive practice is less important than they think? Or should some accommodation be made to student preferences and some time allotted to these traditional methods?

We might consider, for example, a combination of approaches like that suggested in this study: a teacher introduces a new linguistic form via a C-R approach and reinforces it with productive practice exercises. This, as has been noted, is thought to be what many teachers already do. Hopkins and Nettle say that what often occurs in classrooms today is "the linking of consciousness-raising and practice, often within the same lesson." (1994: 158). An alternative might be to use practice exercises for revision in subsequent lessons. In the absence of conclusive evidence showing that consciousness raising by itself leads to higher levels of attainment, such compromises seem quite reasonable.

One would not expect to hear too many complaints from the learners. They seem to appreciate variety, as this study has shown. They are also quite practical in their beliefs about learning, which suggests that teachers should be also. Perhaps the way to think about consciousness raising, then, is not as a blueprint for a new paradigm of grammar teaching, but rather as one more very useful tool we can add to our toolboxes.

(APPENDIX 1)

… the first time …

We use a simple present perfect tense in sentences with ***this/it/that*** *is the* ***first/second/third/only/best/worst*** etc.

This is the first time that I've heard her sing.
(NOT ~~This is the first time to hear her sing~~.)

This is the fifth time you've asked me the same question.
(NOT ~~This is the fifth time for you to ask me~~ …)

That's the third cake you've eaten this morning.

It's one of the most interesting books I've ever read.

1. Complete the sentences correctly.

a This is the first time I (*see this film*).
b That's the eighth time you (*sing that song*) today.
c This is the only time this week I (*feel happy*).
d This is the third serious mistake you (*make)* in this job.
e This is the only time I (*ever see*) her cry.
f That's the tenth cup of coffee you (*drink*) since breakfast.
g It's the first time all the family (*be together*) since Sue's wedding.
h This is the best meal I (*eat*) this year.
i 'Excuse me.' 'That's the first thing you (*say*) to me all day.'
j These are the first clothes I (*buy*) myself since Christmas).

When we talk about the past, we use a past perfect tense in these structures.

It was the third time he had been in love that year.
(NOT ~~It was the third time he was in love~~ …)

2. Read the text and make sentences beginning with It was the first time.

Example:
It was the first time he had been away from home.

John didn't enjoy his first week in the army. he had never been away from his home before; he had never worn uniform; he had never had to make his own bed; he had never cleaned his own boots; he had never fired a gun, and he hated the noise; he had never walked more than a mile.

Can you make some more examples?

from *How English Works*, Swan and Walter, OUP, 1997

… the first time …

1. When talking about personal experiences and important events, we often use sentences with **the first time, the second time,** etc. like the ones below.

   *It was the first **time** I'd been out shopping since having the baby.*

   *This is the eighth **time** a team has won the League and FA Cup in the same season.*

   Study the following examples. Which words are used to start such sentences? Which verb tenses usually come after the word *time*? When are these tenses used?

a *This is the first **time** the Bulls have ever played for the championship.*
b *This is not the first **time** this has happened.*
c *That was the first **time** footprints had been used as evidence in a criminal trial.*
d *That was the third **time** she had been arrested.*
e *It appears to be the first **time** that they have ignored the diplomatic status of a former head of state.*
f *It is the third **time** that Iraq has complained of a violation of its airspace.*
g *This will be the third **time** I've played against him.*
h *This is the first **time** in the history of the nation that it's ever been done.*
i *This is the second **time** the college has been involved in a drugs scandal.*

2. Consider some more examples. How are they similar to the sentences above? How are they different?

   It was the most exciting game I had ever played.
   This is the best surprise I've had since I left.
   This is the only murder investigation I've been involved in.
   It was the worst accident I had ever seen.
   This is the best fight I've seen in a British ring.
   That was the best haircut I'd ever had.

3. Now complete the following sentences using the words in brackets.

   - It was the first time I ____ [*eat Italian food*].
   - This is the worst movie I ____ [*ever see*].

(APPENDIX 3)

Student Questionnaire #1

1. How important do you think it is to do grammar practice exercises in order to learn English?

   Please tick (✔) the appropriate response.

   _____ very important
   _____ important
   _____ useful, but not very important
   _____ unimportant

2. How important do you think it is to have correct grammar in order to communicate effectively with other people?

   Please tick (✔) the appropriate response.

   _____ very important
   _____ important
   _____ useful, but not very important
   _____ unimportant

3. Write (a) or (b) in the space alongside: _____

   "When learning new grammar in class, I prefer …"

   a. to read or listen to a grammar explanation first and then do an exercise; or
   b. to look at some examples (e.g. some sentences or a text) and try to discover a grammar rule for myself.

(APPENDIX 4)

Student Questionnaire #2

1. In Lesson A, you studied a list of examples and tried to discover a grammar rule for yourself by reading and answering questions about sentences. For each category below, please tick (✔) the most appropriate response.

   "I think Lesson A was …"

[interest]	**[difficulty]**	**[usefulness]**
_____ very interesting	_____ very difficult	_____ very useful for learning
_____ somewhat interesting	_____ somewhat difficult	_____ somewhat useful for learning
_____ somewhat boring	_____ somewhat easy	_____ not very useful for learning
_____ very boring	_____ very easy	_____ useless for learning

   In Lesson B, you were first given a rule and then asked to apply the rule by producing correct sentences. For each category below, please tick (✔) the most appropriate response.

   "I think Lesson B was …"

[interest]	**[difficulty]**	**[usefulness]**
_____ very interesting	_____ very difficult	_____ very useful for learning
_____ somewhat interesting	_____ somewhat difficult	_____ somewhat useful for learning
_____ somewhat boring	_____ somewhat easy	_____ not very useful for learning
_____ very boring	_____ very easy	_____ useless for learning

1. Select one of the choices below by ticking (✔) the response which is most appropriate for you. Also write a short explanation for your answer.

   "When studying grammar in class, I prefer …"

   _____ to learn new grammar mostly by method A, because _____
   _____
   _____

   _____ to learn new grammar mostly by method B, because _____
   _____
   _____

   _____ to learn new grammar sometimes by method A, and sometimes by method B, because _____
   _____
   _____

1. Consider the following opinions about learning English. Indicate whether you agree or disagree by ticking (✔) the most appropriate response in each case.

   "It is possible to learn new grammar by simply noticing (while reading or listening) new grammatical structures and forming mental rules about how they work. It is not always necessary or helpful to practice new grammar in speaking or writing."

   _____ strongly agree
   _____ agree
   _____ not sure
   _____ disagree
   _____ strongly disagree

   "To learn to use new grammar naturally and correctly in conversation, it is necessary to practice it in speaking (e.g. through a drill or communicative activity) or in writing (e.g. sentences or a composition). It is very difficult to learn without practice."

   _____ strongly agree
   _____ agree
   _____ not sure
   _____ disagree
   _____ strongly disagree

References

Abraham, R. G. (1985). "Field independence-dependence and the teaching of grammar." TESOL Quarterly **19**: 689-702.

Ellis, R. (1993). "Talking shop: Second language acquisition research: how does it help teachers? An interview with Rod Ellis." ELT Journal **47**(1): 3-11.

Fortune, A. (1992). "Self-study grammar practice: learners' views and preferences." ELT Journal **46**(2): 160-171.

Gray, R. (1998). Confucian Conundrums: Higher Education and ESL Teaching in Korea and Japan. 1998 Korea TESOL Conference, Seoul, South Korea, Korea TESOL.

Hermann, G. (1969). "Learning by discovery: a critical review of studies." Journal of Experimental Education **38**(1): 58-72.

Hopkins, D. and M. Nettle (1994). "Second language acquisition research: a response to Rod Ellis." ELT Journal **48**(2): 157-161.

Kwon, O. (2000). "Korea's English Education Policy Changes in the 1990s: Innovations to Gear the Nation for the 21st Century." English Teaching **55**(1): 47-91.

No, G. (2000). "Development of the Progressive Form in English and Pedagogical Implications." English Teaching **55**(4): 213-229.

Swan, M. and C. Walter (1997). How English works. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Thornbury, S. (1999). How to teach grammar. Harlow, Pearson Education Limited.

Willis, D. and J. Willis (1996). Consciousness-raising activities. Challenge and change in language teaching. D. Willis and J. Willis. Oxford, Heinemann**:** 63-76.

Willis, J. (1996). A framework for task-based learning. Harlow, Longman.