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This materials portfolio, composed of Consciousness-Raising (C-R) tasks, presents a new direction for form-focused instruction in an EFL context, utilizing authentic materials and corpus data. Through the review of relevant literature, a new way to teach grammar is introduced and the usefulness of authentic materials and corpus data in pedagogical contexts is supported. Based on the findings from the data collection, which investigated Korean learners’ perceptions on form-focused instruction and the use of authentic materials in language classrooms, the materials were designed to respond to the needs and wants of Korean learners of English. Each set of materials contains C-R tasks of different linguistic features with carefully chosen data (authentic texts or corpus data) and appropriate operations for students to perform. The sample lesson plans suggest ways to make good use of the materials in the language classroom.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

As the world gets more connected in terms of communication and interaction among people around the world, English has become one of the most important languages in the world. Consequently, English education is taken very seriously even in countries where English is neither an official language nor a second language. South Korea is one of these countries with great enthusiasm for learning English. In South Korea, English has been taught as a foreign language at secondary level public schools since the Korean War in the 1950s and now is being taught at elementary schools as well.

Individual students might have different motivations and purposes for learning English, but many students learn English as one of the required subjects and try to get a good grade on English tests. This tendency usually becomes intensified when they enter high schools because English is one of the major subjects in the National University Entrance Exam. The English test, as a part of the National Exam, mainly consists of grammar and reading comprehension. Due to the influence of the National University Entrance Exam, among the most frequently observed methods or approaches in many secondary level English classrooms is the traditional Grammar-Translation method. English teachers tend to place excessive emphasis on reading and grammar: They devote most of class time to teaching reading skills and drilling students on multiple-choice grammar items (Li, 1998; Cho, 2004).

Grammar instruction is thus dominant in many high school English classrooms in South Korea. Even though there have been major changes in the national curriculum to cultivate the communicative competence of Korean learners of English, teaching methods and materials for grammar instruction have remained largely unchanged. Teaching methods are limited to those of
traditional teacher-fronted lessons. In a typical grammar-oriented lesson in South Korea, grammar tends to be treated as fixed patterns to be learned and taught deductively in the first language. Teachers explain explicit rules of English grammar to students and require them to complete subsequent written exercises. These exercises are given in order to ensure that students have understood the particular grammar items that have been instructed. Little attention is given to practical or pragmatic aspects and there is no communication among students in the target language. Furthermore, materials or textbooks for grammar instruction do not reflect the actual use of English because they tend to contain contrived or simplified language, neglecting important information on the use of particular language structures in real language (e.g., the frequency of occurrence of linguistic structures in naturally occurring language, how the use of particular linguistic features varies across different contexts and situations of use, and so forth), which ultimately results in students’ low communicative competence.

To address these problems in relation to grammar instruction in South Korea, this project will develop materials for EFL form-focused instruction using authentic materials and corpus data. Materials will be created with a primary focus on integrating grammar instruction and meaningful language use through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. According to Fotos and Ellis (1991), it is possible to integrate formal instruction and communicative language teaching through the use of grammar tasks designed to foster communication about grammar. Adopting authentic materials and corpus data in materials development will provide learners with an accurate reflection of naturally occurring language. Therefore, this project will be able to contribute to addressing the lack of fit between textbook grammar descriptions and real language use.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Developing teaching materials for language teaching requires language teachers to make an informed decision with a broad understanding of the related topics. Therefore, it is essential to review key research and critical points of the following strands: (1) Form-Focused Instruction, (2) Form-Focused Tasks, and (3) Authentic Materials, and Corpus Data.

1. Form-focused instruction

The place of grammar in the language classroom has been discussed by a significant number of SLA researchers, with a number of controversial issues regarding the teaching of grammar (e.g., what grammar we should teach, when and how we should teach grammar) still remaining. Despite the controversy, grammar has held and continues to hold an integral place in language classrooms through different teaching methods. Here it seems necessary to review how the status of grammar has changed.

Traditionally, grammar was regarded as the starting point for instruction in Grammar-Translation courses, which followed a grammar-based syllabus (Thornbury, 1999). Under the Grammar-Translation method, instructions were given in the students’ mother tongue, and lessons consisted of an explicit statement of the rule to be learned, followed by exercises involving translation into their first language (ibid.). Due to its exclusive focus on written language, Grammar-Translation was later challenged by other methods, such as the Direct Method and Audiolingualism, which gave priority to oral skills (ibid.).

Three decades ago, despite the shift from Grammar-Translation’s focus on explicit grammar knowledge to a focus on implicit knowledge found in the Direct Method and Audiolingualism, the primary goal of language teaching was still to make sure that learners
mastered the grammar (implicitly), pronunciation and vocabulary of the language (Nunan, 2003). The dominant methodology at the time was Audiolingualism, with its underlying principles derived from structural linguistics and behaviorist psychology. In a typical audiolingual lesson, learners may have been presented a new language item to be learned with a clear demonstration of its meaning through nonverbal means such as pictures or actions (without grammatical explanations) with a subsequent substitution drill (ibid.).

In the 1970s, the question “Should we teach grammar?” began to be raised by researchers as they looked at the order in which learners appeared to acquire the grammar of the language. Studies by researchers indicated that learners, irrespective of their language backgrounds, appeared to acquire English grammatical items in the same order, and the order did not appear to be changeable by instruction (reviewed by Krashen, 1981). Krashen (1981, 1982) suggested that grammar teaching was unnecessary for the acquisition of a second language. Grammar instruction was also challenged with the development of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). According to Savignon (2001), grammatical competence, which refers to “the ability to recognize and make use of the lexical, morphological, syntactic, and phonological features of a language,” is merely one component of communicative competence (p. 17). She goes on to say that grammar competence is not demonstrated by stating a rule, but by using a rule in interpretation, expression, or negotiation of meaning.

Unlike the “shallow-end” version of CLT, in which grammar teaching was not rejected and grammar was still the main component of CLT courses, “deep-end” CLT rejected grammar instruction. Proponents of the deep-end approach argued that “the grammar will be acquired virtually unconsciously” through “activities that engage the learner in life-like communication” and regarded studying the rules of grammar as a waste of time (Thornbury, 1999, p.18-19).
Grammar instruction seemed to have no place in the deep-end CLT language classroom, essentially like an immersion experience. However, more recent research suggests that, without some attention to form, learners seem to be at the risk of fossilization (Thornbury, 1999). For example, research in the strong version of CLT programs – no attention to language form – indicated that, without Form-focused instruction (FFI), some language features never emerged in learners’ language and non-target forms remain unchanged for years (Spada, 2006). In addition to the studies that suggest the need for grammar teaching, there also exist empirical studies that compared the success of instructed (instruction plus exposure) and naturalistic (exposure only) learners. Through his research review, Long (1983) concluded that SL instruction did make a difference. Ellis (2006) also stated that instructed learners showed progress more rapidly and generally achieved higher levels of second language ability.

As indicated in the previous research on the role of grammar instruction in SLA, even though grammar instruction cannot change the natural order of acquisition, certain learners appear to benefit from form-focused instruction. As Lightbown and Spada (2006) suggested, there are a number of situations in which form-focused instruction is expected to be especially crucial when learners in a classroom share the same native language with other students.

Unlike those who begin learning English as young children and acquire high levels of second language proficiency (Spada & Lightbown, 2008), many Korean learners of English first begin to learn English in the third grade of elementary school as a foreign language. They learn English only once a week until the fourth grade and twice a week from the fifth grade until sixth grade as indicated in the national basic curriculum of Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. Although the time assigned for English increases as students enter middle school
and high school is up to three to four and four to six periods a week, respectively, English lessons, especially in high schools, are strongly affected by the National University Entrance Examination because other formal and informal examinations are modeled on it (Li, 1998). The English section on the examination consists mainly of listening comprehension, grammar and reading comprehension, which makes teachers and students devote a significant time to grammar instruction and listening and reading comprehension skills (ibid.). When we consider the reality of English education in Korea, it seems evident that Korean learners of English can certainly benefit from grammar instruction. However, the questions as to how to teach grammar and how classroom learners can derive the most benefit from form-focused instruction still remain unaddressed.

The phrase *form-focused instruction* is variously used to refer to the teaching of linguistic forms in isolation, as well as to describe teaching that draws language learners’ attention to forms, meaning, and use (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2001). Researchers have used different labels to distinguish different types of form-focused instruction (e.g., Long, 1991; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2001). For example, Long (1991) has made a distinction between *focus on forms* and *focus on form* and Ellis (2001) also conceptualized FFI in terms of three broad types, according to (a) where the primary focus of attention is to be placed and (b) how attention to form is distributed in the instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of FFI</th>
<th>Primary Focus</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus on forms</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Planned focus-on-form</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Incidental focus-on-form</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* This table is adapted from Ellis (2001, p. 17)
Among the types of form-focused instruction above, which type will work best for Korean high school learners of English? Since no class of learners is the same, a type or method of teaching that works for one group of learners may not necessarily work for another. Thus any classroom activity or task must be evaluated according to criteria of appropriacy (Thornbury, 1999). Among factors to consider when determining appropriacy are:

- the age of the learners
- their level
- the size of the group
- the constitution of the group, e.g., monolingual or multilingual
- what their needs are, e.g., to pass a public examination
- the educational context, e.g., private school or state school, at home or abroad.

Each type of form-focused instruction can play a significant role in promoting language acquisition. In Korea, students receive a good amount of grammar instruction whose primary focus is to learn a preselected form through explicit teaching of grammar rules and deductive activities that aim to practice the form; this is the focus on forms (Type 1) approach described in Table 1 above. Since students already receive a lot of focus on forms instruction in Korea, it seems worthwhile to add some focus-on-form type instruction to the mix. The fact that both types of instruction have been found to be effective (Ellis, 2008) supports this because different students may respond better to different types of instruction.

Furthermore, meaning-focused grammar instruction also makes it possible for learners to notice a target form while their primary focus is on meaning, which can help to draw their attention to practical or pragmatic aspects as well. Therefore, it can be said that planned focus-
on-form (Type 2) can be a great addition to the current grammar teaching in Korea.

Taking the test-oriented nature of Korean English education, it is necessary to ensure that specific structures are targeted because they will be tested on them. In this regard, pre-selection of target structures is important because it allows for the kind of intensive instruction necessary for learning to occur. Reactive focus-on-form (e.g., recasting students’ errors), which is one of the kinds of incidental focus-on-form (Type 3), cannot control selections of what to investigate or teach so it would be impossible to ensure that students received adequate instruction in the target structures.

2. Form-focused tasks

Focus on form (Doughty & Williams, 1998) refers to “the practice of explicitly drawing students’ attention to linguistic features within the context meaning-focused activities” (Nunan, 2003, p. 157). In other words, an engagement in meaning is primary for attention to linguistic features to be effective (Doughty & Williams, 1998). One type of focus-on-form is consciousness raising (Fotos & Ellis, 1991). In these consciousness raising tasks, learners’ attention is drawn to the target grammatical feature through discovery-oriented tasks (Nunan, 2003).

Any teaching techniques and tasks that are based on focus on form and consciousness-raising may successfully direct learners’ attention to form. However, consciousness-raising seems to be a more effective means of achieving focus on grammatical structures here, because consciousness-raising (C-R) tasks are primarily designed to promote explicit learning, i.e. to develop awareness at the level of “understanding” (Ellis, 2003).

As briefly mentioned above, consciousness-raising (C-R) tasks are aimed at drawing learners’ attention to target grammatical features, raising consciousness of them, and therefore,
promoting noticing in subsequent communicative input (Fotos, 1994). In C-R tasks, students are provided with data containing exemplars of the target feature and required to operate on the data (Ellis, 2010). “The desired outcome of a C-R task is awareness of how some linguistic feature works” (Ellis, 2003, p.163). Although some linguistic feature is the focus of the task, learners are invited to talk meaningfully to achieve the outcome of the task using their own linguistic sources, which makes a C-R activity a “task” (Ellis, 2010).

It seems that grammar C-R tasks make it possible for learners to develop grammatical knowledge of a language through a meaning-focused use of the target language. However, it is essential that we discuss the effectiveness of a C-R task in promoting gains in knowledge of a target structure and its usefulness as a pedagogic tool. Fotos (1993, 1994) investigated in her empirical studies whether grammar C-R tasks are pedagogically useful. Her research demonstrated that C-R task performance was as effective as formal instruction in promoting considerable amounts of noticing and yielded quantities of L2 negotiations comparable to the number of L2 negotiations produced by communicative tasks. It was also revealed that different levels and amounts of negotiation occurred depending on the task, and that it was the combination of an information gap and the requirement of single, agreed-upon task solution that produced the greatest amount of interaction through her study. She concluded that grammar C-R tasks can be used as useful pedagogy combining formal instruction on grammar and communicative activities.

Fotos (1994) also discussed pedagogic advantages in having grammar as the task content, particularly in EFL settings where formal, teacher-fronted grammar instruction is more dominant and regarded more seriously than communicative activities. A C-R task can also be advantageous
in an EFL class where learners share the same L1 and avoid use of the target language by requiring them to use and attend to utterances in the target language to solve the task.

As indicated in the review of research, grammar C-R tasks can certainly contribute not only to language learners’ development of grammatical knowledge but also to their meaningful use of the target language, even in EFL contexts by giving the students more responsibility and involvement in their learning process.

In order to make the most of a C-R task, designing a C-R task that suits a particular group of students and learning context should be considered as well here. According to Ellis (2003, 2010), a C-R task can consist of (1) data containing exemplars of the target feature and (2) instructions requiring the learners to study the data in some way. The data options that he listed are (1) authentic versus contrived; (2) oral versus written; (3) discrete sentences versus continuous text; (4) well-formed versus deviant sentences; and (5) gap versus non-gap. The types of operations are:

1. identification (e.g., learners underline the target structure in the data);
2. judgment (i.e., they respond to the correctness or appropriateness of the data);
3. completion (i.e., they are invited to complete a text);
4. modification (i.e., they are invited to modify a text in some way, for example, by replacing one item with another);
5. sorting (i.e., they classify the data by sorting it into defined categories);
6. matching (i.e., they are invited to match two sets of data in accordance with a stated principle); and
7. rule provision (i.e., they may be asked to state the rule they have discovered).
By incorporating data options and types of operations above, it is possible to design a considerable variety of C-R tasks (Ellis, 2010). Since there are a number of options that teachers can choose from, it seems that the design of quality and pedagogically appropriate C-R tasks depends on the teacher’s informed decision, which meets both the goals of the class and the needs of the students. In light of the importance of the C-R task design, the data options of authentic versus contrived will be discussed in more depth in the next section.

3. Authentic materials and corpus data

As one of the several options, Ellis (2010) notes “authentic versus contrived.” Data will be interpreted here as “texts” and the choice of texts to create materials will be discussed. Because grammar is part of the task content in C-R tasks, and texts containing the target language feature can be input for processing, the choice of texts seems to play a major role in the development of a C-R task.

In an EFL situation, there is limited exposure to genuine language use. This is often the case in Korea, where the course books utilized at schools tend to be adapted (or simplified) in lexical selections and grammar structures for ease of understanding and to display specific targeted grammar. Recently, researchers have compared the textbook and grammar descriptions of a target language with the language used in real life by real users (reviewed by Barbieri & Eckhardt, 2007) and the results of the studies exhibit that there can be a great divide between textbook descriptions and real language use. This lack of fit could be addressed by adopting authentic materials and corpus data as texts.

Authenticity has been defined in a number of ways (Gilmore, 2007). Through a review of meanings of authenticity, Gilmore pointed out that “the concept of authenticity can be situated
either in the text itself, in the participants, in the social or cultural situation and purposes of the communicative act, or some combination of these” (Gilmore, 2007, p.98). Among a multitude of meanings associated with authenticity, the term “authentic text” seems to be well specified by this one from Morrow: “An authentic text is a stretch of real language, produced by a real speaker or writer for a real audience and designed to convey a real message of some sort” (Morrow 1977, p.13). This is how the term will be used in this paper.

The use of authentic materials in pedagogical contexts has been discussed and supported by many researchers. For example, Mishan (2005) summed up the implications of SLA research findings for the use of authentic texts as the basis for language learning materials. Among them are:

- Authentic texts provide the best source of rich and varied comprehensible input for language learners.

- Authentic texts impact on affective factors essential to learning, such as motivation, empathy and emotional involvement.

- Authentic texts are suited to a naturalistic, consciousness-raising approach to learning TL grammar.

(Mishan, 2005, p. 41)

Just as Tomlinson (2010) emphasizes the necessity for materials to be coherent and principled applications of theories of language acquisition, he also proposes principles for material development that derive from second language acquisition research and experience. Among them are:

- Expose the learners to language in authentic use.
• Help learners to pay attention to features of authentic input.

(Tomlinson, 2010, pp.82-83)

He contends that learners should be exposed to authentic language in the sense that it presents “how the language is typically used” (Tomlinson, 2010, p.87). According to him, inauthentic language prevents learners from acquiring the ability to use the language typically and effectively.

Researchers also advocate the use of corpus data or corpora as L2 teaching materials. Lawson (2001) contends that corpus linguistics has much to offer foreign language teaching of all languages because it can provide information in relation to essential aspects of the target language. He suggests that there are four areas in which corpus findings can provide valuable insights into grammatical features and functions of a language so that teachers can better target and set priorities on what to teach. According to him, corpora can provide the following information about particular linguistic features: the frequency of occurrence; register and genre variation (i.e., how the use of particular linguistic features varies across different contexts and situations of use); the salience; and the discourse properties of structures and functions (e.g., lexico-grammatical associations).

The usefulness of corpus data is also supported by McGrath (2002), who discusses the value of concordances as a database to examine a specific language item. Concordances can also serve as a basis for awareness-raising activities, in which they can be used to help learners formulate their own rules for the use of a grammar structure. Furthermore, not only learners but also teachers can benefit from incorporating corpora into language courses. According to Granath (2009), teachers can employ corpora in a number of ways, such as, for example, to
create exercises, demonstrate variation in grammar, show how grammar structures are used to indicate differences in meaning and level of style, and give informed answers to student questions. He provides examples of teacher-prepared corpus-based exercises and suggests ways to use corpora to answer student questions.

One reason why teachers adopt texts outside of a coursebook is that they wish to provide learners with more examples and variations of a target language structure. Applying authentic materials and corpus data in C-R tasks will expose learners to richer and more accurate language data as well as bridge the gap between textbook descriptions and real language use. There will also be many benefits to be gained from adopting and using corpora in the language classroom, especially when they are integrated into language classes with clear purposes and through well-developed tasks.

CHAPTER 3: NEEDS ANALYSIS

1. Introduction

The primary purpose of this data collection was to gather information about how to develop useful materials for form-focused instruction based on the perspectives of Korean learners of English and appropriate authentic materials for classroom use. In order to gather information from multiple sources, I adopted three data collection methods: a survey of 20 Korean learners of English studying at the University of Oregon, two classroom observations at the AEI, and follow-up interviews with the instructors whose classes I observed.

Based on the results of this survey and classroom observations followed by interviews, a materials portfolio was developed with the aim of helping Korean learners of English gain a
better understanding about English grammar and its usage through well-developed teaching materials for form-focused instruction.

2. Survey

A survey was adopted as one of the means of collecting data because it is crucial to explore learners’ thoughts, reactions, and attitudes toward the topic that I am interested in, which will help me make informed decisions about materials. Therefore, I decided to conduct an online survey for 20 Korean students studying at the University of Oregon. The survey aimed to gather information about their experiences in Korea with grammar focused teaching and their attitudes towards those approaches. It was also expected to help me see how the future target population of my materials, Korean high school students, might respond to a focus on grammar.

Participants

This particular group of participants was chosen because it was assumed that they had experienced grammar-focused instruction in Korea and had also had opportunities to experience different teaching methods and materials while they studied in an ESL context so that they might have compared the differences between them. In addition, since they were away from the grammar-focused instruction taking place in Korea at that time, it was expected that they might be able to provide more critical views on the methods used.

Instrument

The online survey (see Appendix A) consisted mainly of two types of questions: multiple choice and checkboxes. The first part of the questionnaire asked for brief biodata information, that is, information about their background. The rest of the questionnaire was made up of questions that addressed four main areas as follows:
• Korean learners’ general attitudes toward grammar-focused instruction
• The kinds of grammar instruction Korean learners have experienced
• Korean learners’ thoughts and reactions to different kinds of grammar instruction with reasons for their answers to those questions
• Korean learners’ preferences for different grammar teaching methods and approaches

Procedure

The survey was developed and administered through an online document tool and distributed to 20 Korean learners of English at the U of O through an email so that anyone who was interested could respond to the questionnaire. They were encouraged to participate in the survey, but their participation was voluntary.

Results

Among the 20 students, 15 students participated in the survey research by completing the survey questionnaire. There was no question skipped by the respondents, but the total number of responses to some of the questions may add up to more than 15 as they asked the participants to choose all that apply.

According to the answers to the first question, the number of years of the respondents’ studying English broadly ranged from seven to twenty. The majority of the respondents (11) have learned English for six to 10 years. The rest of the respondents reported over 10 years of learning English, three of them 11 to 15 years and one of them over 15 years as shown in Figure 1.
Figure 1: Years of learning English

When asked whether they found it interesting to learn English grammar structures, as shown in Figure 2, the largest portion of participants, six out of 15, responded that they did not find learning English grammar structures very interesting and three of the participants seemed to have a strong dislike for learning English grammar structures. Therefore, when the number of those who displayed negative responses to learning English grammar was summed up, it reached 60 percent of the total respondents (nine out of 15). On the other hand, six of the respondents showed their interest in learning English grammar structures, two of whom displayed their strong favor in learning English grammar.

As shown in the chart (Figure 2), in response to the perception of usefulness of learning English grammar structures, almost every respondent reported that they found learning English grammar structures useful and no one seemed to think that it is not useful to learn English grammar at all.
**Figure 2:** Korean learners’ perceptions of learning English grammar structures

In response to the question as to whether they have any experience with grammar-focused instruction, all of the respondents reported that they had some experience with grammar-focused instruction and it was revealed that the kinds of grammar-focused instruction that they had been most frequently exposed to were the ones in which (1) teachers present and (or) explain discrete grammar rules or structures; (2) teachers use metalanguage; and (3) teachers have students practice grammar structures though activities or drills. All of these were selected by more than nine respondents, as seen in Figure 3. The kinds of form-focused instruction that were selected by far fewer respondents were the ones in which (1) teachers ask students to discover grammar rules by themselves by studying examples; and (2) teachers give corrective feedback on students’ errors as they arise in the context of performing a task.
Figure 3: The kinds of grammar instruction Korean learners have experienced

With regard to Korean learners' thoughts and reactions to the most useful kinds of grammar instruction, as shown in the chart (Figure 4), 11 respondents selected the grammar instruction in which teachers give correct feedback on students' errors as they arise in the context of performing and 10 respondents also chose the one in which teachers ask students to discover grammar rules by themselves by studying examples.

On the other hand, the smallest number of respondents chose the grammar instruction in which (1) teachers use metalanguage; and (2) teachers present and (or) explain discrete grammar rules or structures as the most useful ones. The former was selected by one and the latter by two respondents.

As for the reasons for their selections, the following answer was most common: When students learn grammar rules through actual use of the language in communication, they can better understand and retain them. Another popular answer was, “I am interested in discovering grammar rules by myself by studying examples.” Some respondents also mentioned that it is
likely that students are more involved in their language learning in those two kinds of grammar instruction.

![Diagram showing learner's thoughts and reactions to different kinds of grammar instruction](image)

*Figure 4: Korean learners’ thoughts and reactions to different kinds of grammar instruction*

The kinds of grammar instruction that were selected as least useful, as seen in Figure 4, were the ones in which (1) teachers use metalanguage; and (2) teachers present and (or) explain discrete grammar rules or structures, both of which were chosen by eight respondents. No respondent chose the grammar instruction in which teachers give corrective feedback on students’ errors as they arise in the context of performing. There was one respondent who considered the grammar instruction in which teachers ask students to discover grammar rules themselves by studying examples to be least useful.

When asked to provide explanations about their selections, the respondents mostly mentioned that it is hard to understand grammar instruction in which the teacher uses metalanguage and they also find it difficult to apply the grammar rules learned in the teacher-
fronted classes, such as the ones chosen to be least useful by the most respondents, in real-life communication or writing.

In response to the question asking to explore what kinds of grammar rules are preferred by Korean learners of English to learn through form-focused instruction, seven respondents chose grammar rules that have many variations in terms of context or register and one third of the respondents (five out of 15) also chose grammar rules that differ from the native language, as shown in Figure 5. Three respondents expressed their preference for grammar rules that are simple to explain and illustrate, and the other kinds of grammar rules presented as options were all chosen by one or two respondents.

![Figure 5: Grammar rules preferred by Korean learners of English to be learned through grammar-focused instruction](image)

As shown in Figure 6, in response to the questions investigating the respondents’ preference for two different types of grammar lessons, almost every respondent showed their preference for learning grammar through communicative activities. Only one respondent wanted
to learn grammar in separate lessons.

Figure 6: Korean learner's preference for different types of grammar lessons

When asked whether they prefer to learn grammar "inductively" (i.e., the teacher presents learners with samples of language and gets them to work out the principle or rule for themselves) or “deductively” (e.g., the teacher gives a grammatical explanation or rule followed by a set of exercises), 11 respondents selected an inductive approach while four chose a deductive one, as in Figure 7.

Figure 7: Korean learners' preference for difficult grammar teaching approaches

Discussion

The average years of learning English of the respondents was about 10, and they all said that they had had some experience with grammar-focused instruction. Therefore, it may be reasonable to assume that the respondents have formed their own views on form-focused instruction and their responses to the questionnaire well reflect their perspectives on the topic.
The survey results revealed several interesting findings that are worth paying attention to for the sake of improving English grammar instruction in Korea. First, most respondents reported that they think grammar instruction is useful although they do not find it interesting to learn English grammar structures. It was also revealed the kinds of grammar instruction that the respondents chose to be least useful were the ones that they had been mostly exposed to. Surprisingly, despite the fact that many of the respondents have not experienced the grammar instruction in which students discover grammar rules or teachers give corrective feedback on students’ errors during communicative activities, more than 10 out of 15 chose them to be most useful.

Taking into consideration the findings above, it is conceivable that one possible reason why the respondents show lack of interest in learning English grammar features can be partly due to the gap between the kinds of grammar instruction that they think are useful and helpful and the ones that they have mostly experienced at schools or institutes, which they also chose as the least useful ones.

As for the kinds of grammar rules that the respondents prefer to learn through grammar-focused instruction, different kinds of grammar rules presented as options (e.g., grammar rules simple to explain and illustrate or ones with many contextual or register variations) were all favored with varying degrees of preference except for the ones that are complex to explain and illustrate.

Interestingly, in response to the questions related to preferences for different grammar lessons and grammar teaching approaches, there was a near-unanimous vote for learning grammar “through communicative activities,” and over two thirds of the respondents chose “an
inductive approach" over "a deductive approach."

There are limitations in generalizing the results of the survey to all the Korean learners of English, since the group of the participants is too small to represent the whole and the responses depend very much on individuals' own perspectives and experiences. However, the findings definitely suggest possible directions for grammar instruction for Korean learners' of English to take, which will not only satisfy learners' interests and needs but also contribute to their development of grammatical knowledge and meaningful use of the language.

3. Classroom observation

Participants

A classroom observation was also chosen as a data collection method because observation is helpful in identifying useful teaching techniques and materials. To get a sense of form-focused instruction in the language classroom and gather information that would guide me in adopting useful authentic materials for form-focused instruction, I observed an intermediate-level grammar class at the AEI. Since my target learners are high school students whose English level ranges from low-intermediate to intermediate in general, observing the equivalent level at the AEI seemed reasonable.

Instrument

To observe the classroom in a guided and focused way, I made and referred to a list of observation points as follows:

- Grammar teaching methods or approaches used in the grammar classroom and students' reaction to those methods or approaches
• Use of materials (textbook, authentic or contrived) and students’ reaction to the materials
• Kinds of activities used in the class and students’ participation
• Teacher’s ways of evaluating students’ learning

Results and discussion

Due to the specificity of my terminal project topic, I could observe only one grammar, reading, writing class at the AEI. The class was composed of international students from different language and cultural backgrounds. It was one and a half hours long. The grammar topic for the day was noun clauses. The teacher used PowerPoint slides she created to show examples of noun clauses. The examples were the sentences from a novel that every student was required to do a certain amount of reading for meaning before class so that they had ideas about the content of the example sentences.

After looking at the exemplars with the teacher together, the students were asked to first work individually on the handout, which was also created by the teacher with example sentences of the target structure from the required book, then check their answers with their classmates and have a discussion in pairs or groups. The handout included several tasks, such as finding the noun clauses in the subsequent sentences and figuring out whether they were the subject or object of the sentence. Afterwards, the teacher checked the students’ answers, had students ask her questions and discuss as a whole class. As a way to evaluate the students’ learning, the teacher had the students produce the noun clauses in their writing.

The class seemed like an ordinary grammar class with nothing special at first sight. However, it turned out to be a somewhat different class in that it integrated authentic materials,
an unsimplified novel, in the grammar instruction so that the students did not just focus explicitly on the target grammar structure, but also relate to the meaning in the context, which they were already familiar with through the reading assignment. The class showed how to utilize authentic materials in a way that integrates grammar with different skills, such as reading and writing, and also speaking through having discussion.

3. Interviews

Follow-up interviews seemed necessary after the classroom observations for two reasons. First, they can provide an opportunity to discuss with the teachers in more detail any questions or issues that arise while observing classes. Second, they also provide a good opportunity for me to listen to the instructors’ experiences and opinions related to the topic of my project.

Participants

As the word, “follow-up” implies, I planned to interview the instructors whose classes I would observe. In all, I had two interviews, one with the teacher whose class I observed and the other one with a teacher who also teaches intermediate-level reading, writing and grammar at the AEI. Both of them said they had taught English grammar for almost twenty years, mostly to intermediate-level learners.

Instruments

For a structured and efficient interview, there were guiding questions (see Appendix B). The interview questions were composed of three major parts: the instructors’ biodata information, their experiences and attitudes toward grammar-focused instruction and their use of materials. General questions about grammar instruction and use of materials were briefly asked first, and
then questions specifically related to form-focused instruction and authentic materials were asked and more detailed answers were elicited.

**Procedure**

The interviews were conducted by appointments with two instructors at the AEI and audio-recorded with their consent in order to later carefully review the information that the participants provided. To make the purpose of the interview clear and give the participants time to think, the interview questions were sent ahead of time.

**Results and discussion**

As stated above, the questions regarding grammar teaching methods and approaches were asked first. In response to the questions asked to gather information about what particular grammar methods and approaches they have used, the two instructors reported slightly different experiences. One teacher particularly preferred and has used an inductive approach more than others, having students discover grammar rules by themselves through reading passages where they have to identify different verb tenses before they talk about them, for example. On the other hand, the other teacher has used all different kinds of methods and approaches in her grammar class.

When asked about what methods and approaches they found most useful in general, both of them reported that integrating grammar into communicative activities and other skills was most useful because most of their students have learned English grammar to the extent that they have adequate knowledge about grammar rules, but they have difficulty in applying them in their speaking and writing. One teacher said that her students showed more interest and involvement in the grammar instruction in which they discuss grammar rules and apply them in productive
skills than in multiple-choice questions or fill-in-the-blank activities. The other teacher also said her students were more involved in studying how grammar rules actually applied and negotiating meaning with others applying the rules they already know.

In response to the questions in relation to the use of materials in their grammar class, both of the instructors strongly favored using authentic materials, especially unsimplified novels. They said that they assign a certain amount reading to their students every day, and create materials (e.g., handouts) using the sentences containing the target grammar structure from the novel. The reason one teacher offered for using novels in teaching grammar was that students can see how grammatical form is connected to meaning and communicated in a broader context and discuss it with other students. The other teacher emphasized the usefulness of novels saying that presenting grammar in a larger context helps students learn grammar in a more meaningful way. In addition, they found novels very useful in that they are authentic, not artificial, and thus show real-life application of language rules.

Regarding the question about the most problematic grammar structures for their intermediate-level students, the teachers unanimously mentioned verb tenses and adjective clauses. The other grammar rules mentioned by either of them were passive voice and articles. One instructor explained that some rules seem simple and easy to internalize, but application is complex, so students often have difficulty in accurately producing them in contexts.

Both of the teachers emphasized the importance of creating materials that are very meaning-based and contextualized and making students apply grammar rules they have learned in some way. One of the teachers also articulated that it is worth trying to connect grammar to authentic texts as a way to show a variety of applications of language rules.
Despite the fact that the interviewees’ teaching context is different from the one that my project is targeting in that their students are mostly adults learning English in an SL context, there are valuable implications from the interviews that can be applied to most teaching contexts. Just as the interviewees emphasized, it seems very important to present grammar in context so that students can make use of the context to relate language forms and meaning. Besides, creating tasks that help students produce language as they apply the rules they have learned, as the teachers interviewed suggested, will certainly benefit Korean learners of English as well.

Based on the result of the survey, the observation and the interviews, a materials portfolio was created. This will be described in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER 4: OVERVIEW OF MATERIALS

1. Rationale

Despite the fact that there are a variety of coursebooks published and available, there are still cases in which language teachers want or need to prepare their own supplementary materials for their classes. For example, a teacher may identify his or her learners’ needs and think they should be fulfilled by materials created by him or her. One of the most notable advantages of creating one’s own materials over adopting published ones can be that they are likely to be more relevant to students’ specific needs and interests. McGrath (2002) supports the idea of preparing one’s own material by stating that, since teachers know their own students, it is possible for them to tune the material to suit their interests and needs, which makes it seem even more meaningful.

As revealed in the needs analysis, most Korean learners of English are likely to think that grammar instruction is useful because it helps them to achieve their goal in the test-oriented
education system – which is to get good grades on English tests, which usually require high level of grammatical knowledge – although they do not find it interesting to learn English grammar structures. As discussed in the needs analysis, one possible source of the lack of interest may be attributed to the gap between the kinds of grammar instruction that they think are useful and helpful and the ones that they have experienced at schools or institutes.

In line with the rationale for designing materials discussed above and the results of the needs analysis, the materials to be designed in this project should be developed in a way that responds to the needs and wants of Korean learners of English.

To fulfill the needs of Korean learners of English identified through the needs analysis, the materials portfolio should be a collection of materials that contains tasks that integrate grammar instruction and communicative activities. Furthermore, the materials should be able to provide opportunities for learners to raise awareness of how some linguistic features work by studying examples and discovering rules for themselves.

As revealed in the literature review, it is possible to integrate formal instruction and communicative language teaching through the use of grammar tasks (Fotos & Ellis, 1991). Grammar tasks that not only draw learners’ attention to a target grammatical feature through discovery-oriented activities but also foster communication about the grammar are consciousness-raising (C-R) tasks. In addition, C-R tasks cater primarily to explicit learning, i.e., developing awareness at the level of “understanding” (Ellis, 2003), which is quite important for Korean learners of English in a test-oriented education system.

Since C-R tasks are highly likely to meet the needs and wants of Korean learners of English and we have observed positive roles of C-R tasks in the foreign language learning
situation through the literature review, it seems appropriate and reasonable to develop materials comprised of C-R tasks in which different grammar features are the content and learners are invited to discover how the linguistic systems work, which can be utilized for form-focused instruction for learners of English in Korea.

It was identified in the literature review that C-R tasks need data containing exemplars of the targeted feature, and one of the data options is contrived versus authentic data. It was also revealed that the use of authentic materials in pedagogical contexts has been discussed and advocated by researchers and that authentic texts can be suitable for a naturalistic, consciousness-raising approach to learning TL grammar in the literature review.

As revealed in the needs analysis chapter, teaching grammar with authentic materials can benefit students since they display a variety of real-life applications of language rules and provide students with an accurate reflection of naturally occurring language. On top of that, they can be more useful in grammar instruction if they provide a broader context in which a target grammar structure is used.

Accordingly, the materials portfolio has been designed using authentic materials with a purpose to expose learners to more accurate and richer language data, in context if necessary and possible. This application will be able to increase learners’ involvement in their learning process.

2. Organization of materials

For materials consisting of C-R tasks to be successfully used in a language classroom in a way that encourages students to be more attentive and more motivated and therefore, actively involved in their learning process, it is necessary for teachers to understand the main constituents of C-R tasks and design materials based on these elements.
According to Ellis (2003, 2010), a C-R task consists of data which illustrate a specific linguistic feature and instructions requiring learners to operate on the data in some way. (See Chapter Two for a list of different types of operations.) Therefore, the materials portfolio will be composed of several separate materials dealing with different linguistic features with carefully chosen data (authentic texts or corpus data) and appropriate operations for students to perform. The selection of linguistic features and data options for the materials will be discussed in some detail below.

Linguistic features

Making a decision as to what grammar features to teach for form-focused instruction is not easy for language teachers and it is easily observed that they often simply adopt a course book that suits the level of the students they teach or use the one adopted by the school or institution they work for and follow its structural syllabus. Since the target students of the materials to be designed here are learning English at high schools in Korea and the materials will be supplementary rather than replacing textbooks, it seems reasonable to take some of the textbooks which were approved by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology of Korea and have been adopted by a large number of schools in Korea and identify what linguistic features are mostly dealt with. However, because the list of grammar features identified through the textbook analysis will be too big to be covered and developed into C-R tasks here, I would like to select some among them based on the result of the needs analysis.

Taking into consideration the grammar features identified in the high school textbooks and the result of the needs analysis, the list of linguistic features that seem to be suitable for C-R tasks for the target learners is as follows:
• Relative clauses (extra information)
• Passive voice
• Tense
• Conditionals
• Participial adjectives
• Inversion

Data selection

Since data illustrating the target feature is one of the major components of a C-R task, the selection of data (i.e., materials) seems to play a key role in designing an effective C-R task. In this regard, it seems necessary to set criteria for the selection of materials for C-R tasks. According to Ellis (2003, 2010), different possible data options are: (1) authentic versus contrived, (2) oral versus written, (3) discrete sentences versus continuous text, (4) well-formed versus deviant sentences, and (5) gap versus non-gap. It is possible to use all the data options listed above. To provide learners with more suitable data, however, it is essential we carefully consider each option here.

(1) Authentic versus contrived

The potential advantages that authentic materials have over contrived ones were discussed in the literature review, and by adopting authentic materials it is possible to provide learners with more typical and useful examples and variations of a target language structure, and thus, expose learners to richer and more accurate language data. For this reason, authentic materials and corpus data will be adopted as data to be studied in C-R tasks. For the sake of convenience and to avoid confusion coming from naming both the worksheets consisting of data
and operations of C-R tasks and the authentic materials to be used in the tasks as materials, authentic materials will be referred as “data” henceforth.

(2) Oral and written

Learners can benefit from being exposed to various modes or registers of language. Adopting both oral and written modes of language will help learners to understand not only the structural rules of English, but also how language is used for communication.

(3) Discrete sentences versus continuous text

A single continuous text is ideal if it contains enough appropriate illustrative examples to promote consciousness-raising in that the target linguistic feature is presented in its context of use. However, discrete sentences can be also useful if they represent typical patterns or particular use of a target linguistic feature well enough to cancel out the downside of being taken out of context.

(4) Well-formed versus deviant sentences

Since the target learners are not equipped with enough knowledge about English to discern between well-formed and deviant sentences, it is likely that they believe that all the sentences in class materials are always appropriate and acceptable in any context. In this sense, adopting data with deviant forms may not be appropriate. However, some authentic data, such as poems and songs, are great sources for some learners to learn language from and add some vitality into language class even though they invariably contain deviant forms to some degree by their nature. Thus, excluding such data for the sake of presenting well-formed sentences in class may not be the best choice. For this reason, I would like to use songs or poems as data, though great care is needed in selection.
(5) Gap versus non-gap

Selecting between the two kinds of data with gap and non-gap will depend highly on the target linguistic feature(s) to be dealt with in the given task and the objectives of the lesson.

Now that all data options for C-R tasks have been discussed in relation to their suitableness and pedagogical appropriateness, the next step is exploring materials based on the discussion. On top of that, there is one more thing to be considered in data selection. It is essential teachers make sure that the data they choose is intelligible for the target learners so that they can be solely engaged in studying and understanding the targeted feature.

Types of operations

The selection of operations that require the learners to operate on the data will depend on each linguistic feature and the type and amount of data. The types of operations are as follows:

(1) identification (e.g., learners underline the target structure in the data);

(2) judgment (i.e., they respond to the correctness or appropriateness of the data);

(3) completion (i.e., they are invited to complete a text);

(4) modification (i.e., they are invited to modify a text in some way, for example, by replacing one item with another);

(5) sorting (i.e., they classify the data by sorting it into defined categories);

(6) matching (i.e., they are invited to match two sets of data in accordance with a stated principle); and

(7) rule provision (i.e., they may be asked to state the rule they have discovered).

(Ellis, 2010)
3. Materials design

The materials design was inspired by the research reported in *Applying corpus-based findings to form-focused instruction: The case of reported speech*, conducted by Barbieri and Eckhardt (2007). The materials were originally created with reference to four different grammar books – *Longman Students Grammar of Spoken and Written English* written (Biber et al. 2010); *Grammar in use: Intermediate* (2nd ed.) (Murphy & Smalzer, 2004); *Practical English Usage* (3rd ed.) (Swan, 2005); and *Explaining English Grammar* (Yule, 2009) – for a clear and accurate description and exemplification of grammar forms and structures, except for one item as indicated in the material.

**CHAPTER 5: MATERIALS PORTFOLIO**

This chapter is composed of two major parts: explanation and a collection of materials.

1. Explanation

*Material 1-a*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
<th>Relative clauses (extra information) – (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>(1) authentic; (2) written; (3) discrete sentences; (4) well-formed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) non-gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source:</td>
<td><em>Count your way through Korea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>(1) identification; (2) sorting; (3) matching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Material 1-b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
<th>Relative clauses (extra information) – (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>(1) authentic; (2) written; (3) discrete sentences; (4) well-formed; (5) non-gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>From various sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) <a href="http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/30/world/middleeast/30diplo.html">www.nytimes.com/2011/01/30/world/middleeast/30diplo.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) <a href="http://oudur.let.rug.nl/usa/P/de34/speeches/de_1960.htm">http://oudur.let.rug.nl/usa/P/de34/speeches/de_1960.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) <a href="http://hackvan.com/etext/galileo-had-problems-because-he-was-a-jerk">http://hackvan.com/etext/galileo-had-problems-because-he-was-a-jerk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) <a href="http://www.americancorpus.org/">www.americancorpus.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Junonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>(1) classification; (2) rule provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Material 2-a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
<th>Passive – (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>(1) authentic; (2) written; (3) discrete sentences &amp; continuous text; (4) well-formed; (5) non-gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Coming distractions questioning movies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>(1) identification; (2) rule provision (adapted); (3) completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Material 2-b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
<th>Passive – (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data</strong></td>
<td>(1) authentic; (2) written; (3) discrete sentences; (4) well-formed; (5) non-gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong></td>
<td><em>Count your way through Korea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td>(1) identification; (2) rule provision; (3) modification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Material 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
<th>-ing phrases (participial adverbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data</strong></td>
<td>(1) authentic; (2) written; (3) discrete sentences; (4) well-formed; (5) non-gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong></td>
<td><em>Junonia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td>(1) identification; (2) modification; (3) rule provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Material 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
<th>Inversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data</strong></td>
<td>(1) authentic; (2) written and spoken; (3) discrete sentences; (4) well-formed; (5) non-gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong></td>
<td>From various sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Junonia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.letutor.ca">www.letutor.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.law.indiana.edu/uslawdocs/declaration.html">http://www.law.indiana.edu/uslawdocs/declaration.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td>(1) identification; (2) classification; (3) rule provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Material 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
<th>Conditionals – I wish I had known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data</strong></td>
<td>(1) authentic; (2) written; (3) continuous text; (4) well-formed; (5) non-gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td>(1) identification; (2) rule provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Material 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic feature</th>
<th>Mixed tenses (present and past tense) (should + have + p.p., use to V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data</strong></td>
<td>(1) authentic; (2) spoken (song); (3) continuous text; (4) well-formed; (5) non-gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
<td><em>I will survive</em> by Gloria Gaynor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td>(1) completion; (2) identification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Collection of materials

✧ Relative Clauses (1)

1-1. Read the following sentences and underline relative clauses in each sentence.

(a) The Korean language is part of a family of language called Altaic, which also includes Turkish and Mongolian.

(b) There are ten vowels in the Korean alphabet, which is called han-gul.

(c) The Korean language contains some vowels that are pronounced differently than in English.

(d) Koreans use two different kinds of numbering systems. One is called Sino-Korean, which means it is influenced by Chinese.

(e) The one building that is most symbolic of Korea is Chomsongdae.

(f) Pagodas are graceful buildings that are like churches.

(g) Three people are required for Korean seesaw, which is a game usually played by girls.

(h) There are seven types of pieces in the board game called changgi, which is a Korean kind of chess game.

(i) Of these sports, archery and judo are the two that have been popular in Korea for many centuries.


1-2. Work in pairs

A. Divide the above sentences into two categories as you note the differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Discuss with your partner how the relative clauses in Type 1 are different from the ones in Type 2. Do the relative clauses in each type give extra information or necessary information?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Below are rules that can be applied either to the relative clauses in Type 1 or to the ones in Type 2. Read them over and indicate which rule is applied to which type.

(a) The relative clauses in these sentences give extra, descriptive information.
(b) The relative clauses in these sentences help to identify or classify the person or thing being talked about.
(c) In writing, this kind of relative clause is usually marked by commas, dashes, or parentheses (separation markers).
Relative Clauses (2) – Extra information

These are more examples of relative clauses which give extra information. Classify the sentences into 3 categories and discuss with your partner when to use them.

1. Mr. ElBaradei, who has not lived in Egypt for years, has little connection to the protesters.
   <From www.nytimes.com/2011/01/30/world/middleeast/30diplo.html>

2. Other countries, some of which I visited last month, have similar needs.
   <From http://odur.let.rug.nl/usa/P/de34/speeches/de_1960.htm>

3. Fifteen states are under heat advisories, which means temperatures are expected to exceed 105 degrees Fahrenheit.
   <From http://hackvan.com/etext/galileo-had-problems-because-he-was-a-jerk>

4. Spring is here, which means lots of young animals are either on the way or already on the planet.

5. Jorge Luis Borges, who wrote his share of detective stories, noted that “the solution of a mystery is always less impressive than the mystery itself.”
   <From www.americancorpus.org/>

6. Throughout the rest of the day – most of which was spent on the beach – Alice tried her best to get used to Ted and Mallory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>When to use relative clauses with extra information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pattern 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pattern 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pattern 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Passive (1)

1-1. Compare the two sentences and tell how the verb “influence” is used differently in each sentence.

(a) Media messages all have one thing in common – they influence us.

(b) There is one way to make sure we aren’t influenced without knowing it.


1-2. Work in pairs – Complete the task using the rules for passive and active voice.

When A does something to B, there are often two ways to talk about it. If we want A (the doer) to be the subject, we use an ___________ verb: ______________ as in (a)/(b). If we want B (the ‘receiver’ of the action) to be subject, we use: __________ verb: ______________ as in (a)/(b).

2-1. Read the following text about “questioning movies” and put the verbs into the correct form.

Who made the message and why?

All movie makers ________ (create) films for a purpose. For most, the purpose is to make money. Most studios are always trying to make the next blockbuster film. But selling tickets isn’t the only way movies make money. Some companies pay to put their products in films. The idea here is that seeing a famous person using the product will make you want to use it too. It ________ (call) product placement. Next time you watch a movie, watch for name brand products to pop up. And know they aren’t there by accident.

Some movies have products placed everywhere. The 2002 movie Spider-Man is one of them. More than 20 products ____________ (place) carefully throughout the film. Company logos like Prudential and Cingular ___ (display) on billboards in the background. Other products ____________ (feature) more heavily. Who knew Spider-Man wore Nike shoes? Dr. Pepper and Tropicana orange juice must be the superhero’s favorite beverages. Look closely the next time you pop Spider-Man into the DVD player. See what other products you can spot.

What is the message for?

Filmmaking is all about making films that people pay to see. But movie makers aren’t dumb. They know that not everyone will ____________ (interest) in every movie. Before a movie ____________ (film), they know exactly who their movie is for.

Testing it out

Once a film ____________ (finish), movie makers ____________ (show) their film to a test audience. This group is made up of people that marketers think fit into the target audience. These people get to see the film before it ____________ (release). In exchange, they ____________ (rate) the film, telling moviemakers what they liked or disliked.

Passive (2)

1-1. Read the following sentences about Chomsongdae in Korea.

(a) It is thought to be the oldest existing observatory in the world.
(b) It is often pictured on travel posters, in guidebooks and on postage stamps.
(c) It stands 29 feet tall and is shaped like the top part of a glass bottle.
(d) The observatory was built in the seventh century during the reign of Queen Sondok.


1-2. It is possible to rewrite (a) and (d) as follows.

(a) People think it is the oldest existing observatory in the world.
(d) They built it in the seventh century during the reign of Queen Sondok.

Now discuss with your partner when we use the passive.

2-1. Rewrite these sentences. Instead of using somebody/they/people, etc., write a passive sentence.

(a) They built this house in 1450.
   →
(b) People don't prefer this product any more.
   →
(c) How do people learn languages?
   →
(d) Somebody accused him of using threatening and insulting behavior.
   →

-ing Phrases (Participial Adverbs)

1-1. Listen carefully to the teacher and fill in the blanks.

(a) Alice ran ahead, __________ the shoreline before her parents.

(b) __________ in bed on the first morning of her vacation, Alice decided her perfect, personal god was female.

(c) It was cold, so she jumped back, __________ just beyond the water’s grasp.

(d) After __________ Munchkitty to Alice’s parents, Mallory helped Alice wash her shells and line them up on the top of the screened porch railing.

(e) She played with the words in her mind, __________ them around like stones.

(f) But she remained in bed a few more minutes longer, __________ Junonia, as the small room filled and brightened with sunshine.

(g) __________ her eyes on a single bird, Alice followed it until it intersected with another bird, and then she followed that one.

(h) "Okay," said Mallory, __________.

(i) "I bet I will," said Mallory, __________ up.

(j) "It’s harder than you think," said Alice, __________ to keep her voice from becoming sharp with irritation.

(k) Alice successfully fought off tears until her family was in their cottage __________ ready for bed.


1-2. What are the similarities and differences of the words for each blank? Discuss it with your partner. (You can talk about their form, position, meaning, etc.)
1-3. Rewrite each sentence without -ing phrases as you think about the intended meaning from context. The first two are done for you.

(a) Alice ran ahead, and then reached the shore before her parents.
(b) As she lay in bed on the first morning of her vacation, Alice decided her perfect, personal god was female.

2. Is it possible to rewrite the following sentences into -ing phrases? If possible, how can you rewrite them? If not, why isn’t it possible?

(a) As Alice and her parents drove away from the cottage, Alice saw the Wishmeiers out the rear window of the car.
(b) After they came to the last trail marker, they paddled out into the bay and then drifted aimlessly in the open water.
(c) While she waited for her parents, Alice read the dates and inscriptions on some of the grave markers.
(d) When Alice got out of the car, Mallory was right there, in a cheerful polka-dot sundress.
(e) She looked away and rubbed her forehead with the heel of her hand.


3. Create rules for “-ing phrases.”
Inversion

1. Read the following sentences and underline the subjects and the verbs in each sentence. How are the sentences different from simple sentences?

(a) To the left of the car and not much higher glided a big, drab, knobby bird.
(b) Into their silence entered the squawk of a bird, the pounding of the waves.
(c) Out from under the cupboard, among swirls of dust, slid the quarter, a piece of dried macaroni, and – the blue gelato spoon.
(d) Only when the ice cream was melted did she eat it.


(e) ... among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness ...

<From http://www.law.indiana.edu/uslawdocs/declaration.html>

(f) But I didn’t really think it was as simple as that, nor did anyone else.

(g) Only then, perhaps, will he reveal his jewels and his bargains.

(f)-(g): from www.lextutor.ca

(h) Here comes the first question.

(i) So badly was he affected that he had to be taught to speak again.

(j) A: We used to watch that on TV.

   B: Yes, so did I.


(k) Rarely do we defeat cancer.


1-2. Classify the sentences into two types of inversion (according to the explanation below) and work on the conditions commonly associated with the inversion.

There are two types of inversion:

- **Subject-verb inversion** or full inversion (the subject is preceded by the entire verb phrase)
- **Subject-operator inversion** or partial inversion (the subject is preceded only by the operator rather than by the main verb or full verb phrase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of inversion</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Conditions commonly associated with this inversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>subject-verb</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subject-operator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I wish I had known... I could [would/might] + have + past participle

1. Read the following sentences as you underline “modals (could, might, would, etc.) + have + past participle)” or “modal + present verb.”

10 Things I Wish I Had Known When Starting Out in Life

“Everything has been figured out, except how to live.” - Jean-Paul Sartre

There are a few things I wish I had known when I was graduating from high school and starting out as an adult in life.

Would I change things? I’m not so sure. I might never have gotten into a mountain of debt, but then I wouldn’t have learned the amazing satisfaction of getting out of it. I might have made better career choices, but then I wouldn’t have all the work experience that makes me the blogger and writer that I am today.

I might not have gotten married that first time, so that I would never have gotten divorced ... but then I wouldn’t have my first two beautiful wonderful incredible children from that first marriage.

I don’t think I would change any of that. However, looking back, there are some lessons I’ve learned that I would probably tell my 18-year-old self. Do I share them now to share my regrets? No, I share them in hopes that younger men and women, just starting out in life, can benefit from my mistakes and my lessons.

From http://zenhabits.net/20-things-i-wish-i-had-known-when-starting-out-in-life/

2. What do you think the writer means by saying “I wish I had known...”?
   When is she talking about? The past, the present, or the future?

3. What is the difference between “modals (could, might, would, etc.) + have + past participle)” and “modal + present verb?” How are the meanings different?
4. Imagine that you were the writer of the previous text and would like to tell others "10 things you wish you had known when starting out in life," and write what you would tell people below.

For example, you could start with "I wish I had known that ... I could have ..."
** Mixed Tenses **

I will survive - Gloria Gaynor

At first I was afraid
I was petrified
Kept thinkin' I could never live
Without you by my side
But then I ________ (spend) so many nights
Thinking how you did me wrong
I ________ (grow) strong
I ________ (learn) how to get along
And so you ________ (be) back
From outer space
I just ________ (walk) in to find you here
With that sad look upon your face
I should have changed my stupid lock
I should have made you leave your key
If I had known for just one second
You'd be back to bother me

** Go on now go walk out the door
Just turn around now
'cause you ________ (be) not welcome any more
________ (be, not) you the one who ________ (try) to
hurt me with goodbye
Did you think I ________ (will) crumble
Did you think I ________ (will) lay down and die
Oh no, not I
I will survive
As long as I know how to love
I know I will stay alive
I've got all my life to live
I've got all my love to give
And I'll survive
I will survive
It ________ (take) all the strength I ________ (have)
Not to fall apart
________ (keep) trying hard to mend
The pieces of my broken heart
And I ________ (spend) oh so many nights
Just feeling sorry for myself
I used to cry
Now I ________ (hold) my head up high
And you ________ (see) me
Somebody new
I ________ (be) not that chained up little person
Still in love with you
And so you ________ (feel) like dropping in
And just expect me to be free
Now I ________ (be) saving all my loving
For someone who ________ (be) loving me

1. Listen to the song first and try to understand the theme of the song.

2. Fill in the blanks using the verbs in the parentheses.

3. Listen to the song again and compare your answers with the original lyrics of the song.

4. What verb tenses can you identify from the song? Indicate one example for each.

   ____________________________
   ____________________________
   ____________________________

   ** Discuss with your partner how the different tenses help you understand the song. **

5. Look at the underlined parts in the song and discuss the meanings conveyed through the particular forms.

   - Should have changed/made:

   ____________________________

   - (If I) had known ... you'd be (back):

   ____________________________

   - used to verb:

   ____________________________

Lyrics from: www.lyricsdomain.com
<The original lyrics>

I will survive  _ Gloria Gaynor

At first I was afraid
I was petrified
Kept thinking I could never live
Without you by my side
But then I spent so many nights
Thinking how you did me wrong
I grew strong
I learned how to get along
And so you're back
From outer space
I just walked in to find you here
With that sad look upon your face
I should have changed my stupid lock
I should have made you leave your key
If I had known for just one second
You'd be back to bother me

** Go on now go walk out the door
Just turn around now
'cause you're not welcome any more
Weren't you the one who tried to hurt me with goodbye
Did you think I'd crumble
Did you think I'd lay down and die
Oh no, not I
I will survive
As long as I know how to love
I know I will stay alive
I've got all my life to live
I've got all my love to give
And I'll survive
I will survive

It took all the strength I had
Not to fall apart
Kept trying hard to mend
The pieces of my broken heart
And I spent oh so many nights
Just feeling sorry for myself
I used to cry
Now I hold my head up high
And you see me
Somebody new
I'm not that chained up little person
Still in love with you
And so you feel like dropping in
And just expect me to be free
Now I'm saving all my loving
For someone who's loving me

Lyrics from: www.lyricdomain.com
3. Sample Lesson plans

Information about the context and purpose of the plan

The lessons are for the first year students who are learning English as a foreign language at a high school in Korea. The proficiency level of the students slightly varies from intermediate to high intermediate. The class meets five times a week and each class is fifty minutes long. It is four skills integrated, but relatively more emphasis is placed on listening, reading and grammar. There is a required textbook, but teachers can adapt the textbook or adopt other materials at their discretion as needed.

Each lesson will focus on a target grammar structure which was prominent in the reading text covered in the previous lesson but only a little attention was drawn to. Since it is likely that the target linguistic feature may confuse learners in terms of its different forms and functions in relation to the forms, it seems worth drawing the students’ attention to the target grammar structure through consciousness-raising tasks so that they can be aware of and notice them in subsequent input as well. Another purpose of the lesson is to provide learners with opportunities for communication in the target language by having them interact with others to solve grammar tasks, and thus the teacher will encourage active participation and cooperative learning among the students.

Lesson plan 1

Objectives

Terminal Objectives

1. Students will be able to distinguish the differences between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses and provide rules for them.

2. Students will be able to identify and verbalize the cases (patterns) in which non-restrictive relative clauses are often found.

Enabling Objectives

1. Students will identify different kinds of relative clauses.

2. Students will classify sentences with non-restrictive relative clauses into three different categories.
Materials and Equipment

1. Textbook
2. A set of handouts with C-R tasks (Relative clauses – extra information)
3. PowerPoint slides (optional)

Procedures

Review (3 min)
The teacher starts class by talking about the last class, which was reading about Food Quiz: World's Healthiest Foods. The teacher checks if students have any questions regarding the reading text.

Introduction (5 min)
The teacher tells students that they are going to learn more about a particular grammar point that was prominent in the reading textbook and has them guess what it will be. After listening to students’ guesses, the teacher presents some of the relative clauses which were in the reading text on the blackboard (or on the screen using PowerPoint) and asks them if those sentences caused them any difficulty figuring out meaning. The teacher also asks if they have any questions and tells them they will be able to answer those questions.

Task 1 (22 min)

Step 1 (5 min): The teacher distributes a set of materials with relative clauses C-R tasks. First, the teacher asks them to read the sentences in 1-1 and underline relative clauses or the ones that look similar to the sentences they have seen in the reading text. These sentences will still be on the board. After they are finished, the teacher asks students to divide the sentences into two categories as they notice the differences.

Step 2 (7 min): The teacher checks how students divided the sentences and asks them what differences they have noticed (1-2-A). Next, the teacher asks them to discuss with their partners how the relative clauses in in type 1 are different from the ones in type 2 (1-2-B). To guide the task, the teacher asks whether they think the relative clauses in each type give extra information or necessary information.
**Step 3 (7 min):** When they are finished, the teacher has them look at the rules in 1-2-C that can be applied to either to the relative clauses in type 1 or to the ones in type 2. Students read them over and indicate which rule is applied to which type. The whole class checks the answer and discusses what they have found.

**Step 4 (3 min):** Before moving on to the next task, the teacher asks students what they would like to name type 1 and type 2 before telling them what they are actually called (i.e., restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses). Since the grammatical terms will be difficult for them to understand and retain, naming them in their own ways may increase the retention of the concept and the rules. The teacher also asks them to draw a picture that represents the difference between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses and compare their drawings. This part is optional and can be skipped if time does not allow.

**Task 2 (15 min)**

As an advanced task, students will discover when (under what conditions) relative clauses containing extra information are used from studying some examples.

**Step 1 (8 min):** First, the teacher asks them to take a look at more examples of relative clauses that give extra information and classify the sentences into 3 categories in terms of the similarities the exemplars show. When they are finished, the teacher asks them to discuss when (under what conditions) they are used with their partners.

**Step 2 (7 min):** Finally, the teacher asks some students to present the patterns they have discovered through the task and also asks other students if they agree with them or they have different ideas. After sharing the students’ answers (discoveries), the teacher gives feedback.

**Wrap-up (5 min)**

The teacher draws students’ attention to the examples of relative clauses they have seen in the reading text and asks them to (1) find more of them in the reading text; (2) classify them into restrictive and non-restrictive categories; and (3) indicate the conditions they are used, as an assignment. The teacher also briefly informs them of the next lesson before concluding the lesson.
**Lesson plan 2**

**Objectives**

**Terminal Objectives**

1. Students will be able to identify participial adverbs in sentences.
2. Students will be able to create rules for participial adverbs.

**Enabling Objectives**

1. Students will distinguish the similarities and differences of participial adverbs in sentences in terms of their form, position, and meaning.
2. Students will rewrite participial phrases into complete clauses.
3. Students will rewrite complete clauses into participial phrases.

**Materials and Equipment**

1. Textbook
2. A set of handouts with C-R tasks (*-ing phrases (Participial Adverbs))

**Procedures**

**Review (3 min)**
The teacher starts class by talking about the last class, which was reading about *Soccer spreads hope*. The teacher checks if students have any questions regarding the reading text.

**Introduction (5 min)**
The teacher tells students that they are going to learn more about “-ing phrases,” which they have already seen in the reading text. The teacher asks them if they have done the reading assigned from the previous class. Students were to read some parts of a book, *Junonia*, for today’s class. The teacher and students talk briefly about the book before going about learning “participial phrases.”

**Activity 1 (2 min)**
The teacher distributes a set of materials and tells them the sentences in 1-1 on the handout are
from the book, Junonia, and they have already read them. The teacher has students listen to the
teacher read each sentence, and fill in the blanks.

**Task 1 (23 min)**

*Step 1 (8 min):* The teacher asks students to discuss with their partners the similarities and
differences of the words for each blank as they examine and think about their forms, positions
and meanings. After students are finished, the whole class talks about what they have found.

*Step 2 (15 min):* The teacher shows students that it is possible to rewrite each sentence in 1-1
without –ing phrases, giving examples of first two sentences. The teacher also explains how it
works and emphasizes it is important they think about the intended meanings to convert –ing
phrases into complete clauses. The teacher has students try to rewrite the rest of the sentences
without –ing phrases. The teacher encourages students to cooperate with their partners and
discuss how they changed each sentence, giving reasons. While students work on the task, the
teacher moves around and monitors their work. When students are finished, the whole class has a
discussion.

**Task 2 (7 min)**

The teacher asks students to look at sentences in Task 2 and discuss with their partners whether it
is possible to rewrite the sentences into –ing phrases. They are to rewrite them if it is possible
and give reasons why they cannot change if it is impossible.

**Task 3 (7 min)**

The teacher asks students to create rules for “–ing phrases” based on what they have found from
Task 2, and the whole class discusses the rules and checks if they are applicable.

**Wrap-up (3 min)**

The teacher asks students to read the book, Junonia, from pp. 41-46 and (1) find more –ing
phrases in the book; and (2) try to rewrite them without –ing phrases as they think about intended
meaning, as an assignment. The teacher also briefly informs them of the next lesson before
concluding the lesson.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

This project aimed at addressing the two problems identified in grammar instruction in South Korea: teaching methods being limited to those of traditional teacher-fronted lessons and the lack of fit between textbook grammar descriptions and real language use. It is expected that the materials portfolio will encourage and foster students’ participation and involvement in learning grammar and expose learners to richer and more accurate language data through C-R tasks and authentic materials.

The final products display an effort to reflect the findings of the literature review and needs analysis to make the materials portfolio theoretically-based and practical as well. The materials were designed based on the theoretical concepts of *focus on form* (Doughty & Williams, 1998) and *consciousness-raising* (Fotos & Ellis, 1991) and the perspectives of Korean learners of English on different kinds of grammar instruction and grammar teaching methods and approaches.

The materials deal with linguistic features that are covered in the textbooks for high school students in Korea approved by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology so they can be utilized as supplementary materials in actual English classrooms to teach grammar. The materials also include data adopted from a variety of sources, such as non-fiction books, novels, news, a popular song and corpus data, with tasks designed in a way that integrates grammar with meaningful language use by inviting students to operate on the data, for example, having them identify a target structure and modify a text in some way. These tasks can be expected to contribute to promoting students’ noticing of the target grammar structures and negotiations in the target language.
Through this project, I could broaden my view of teaching grammar by exploring different types of form-focused instruction and use of authentic materials and corpus data in the pedagogical context. In addition, I freed myself from traditional grammar teaching methods and approaches in which teachers' roles are dominant and students' roles are rather passive and minimized in class.

**Limitations**

One of the biggest limitations of this project is that literature review on materials development is not included due to time constraints. It could have provided useful information about developing the materials in a more systematic and professional fashion. Another limitation is that, although the materials were designed and organized with clearly set guidelines in general, there were no criteria for adopting appropriate authentic materials in terms of the level of difficulty of vocabulary and syntactic structures. The data were selected following my own intuition, which results in questioning the appropriacy of the data.

In addition, despite the effort put into elaborating the instructions for each task, it seems that more work is required to make them concise while keeping all necessary information. The layout of the materials also requires improvement not only to draw students' attention from the beginning but also maintain their interest throughout working on the tasks on the materials.

**Future plans**

The materials have not been pilot tested in class yet and need feedback from both teachers and students to be improved. I plan to use these materials in grammar instruction in Korea and examine how they work in actual classrooms by observing students' participation and
involvement in their learning process and their improvement in the knowledge of English grammar and applying it in productive skills. The materials will also continue to be revised and refined with the feedback and help from my students and colleagues.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Survey

Survey title: Korean learners’ perspectives on grammar-focused instruction and their attitudes towards and preference for grammar teaching methods and approaches

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Sojung Cho, a student from the Language Teaching Specialization Program at the University of Oregon. The study is part of the project I am completing for my Master’s degree. The research will help me understand how we could improve foreign language teaching. All you need to do is complete this short questionnaire, which should take approximately 10-15 minutes. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to participate, simply ignore the questionnaire. Responses will be completely anonymous; your name will not appear anywhere on the survey. Completing and returning the questionnaire constitutes your consent to participate. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact faculty advisers Trish Pashby (6-4302) or Keli Yerian (6-8129). If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the Office for Protection of Human Subjects, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, (541) 346-2510. This Office oversees the review of the research to protect your rights and is not involved with this study. Thank you again for your help.

Survey questions

1. How long have you learned English?

__________________ years

2. Do you find it interesting to learn English grammar structures?

○ Not at all
○ Not very much
○ Sort of
○ Very much

3. Do you find it useful to learn English grammar structures?

○ Not at all
○ Not very much
○ Sort of
○ Very much
4. Do you have any experience of grammar-focused instruction?

- Yes
- No

Questions from 5 to 7 are ONLY for those who have answered "Yes" to question 4.
(If you have no experience in grammar-focused instruction, please go to question 8.)

5. What kinds of grammar-focused instruction you have had? (Choose all that apply.)

- Teacher presents and (or) explains discrete grammar rules or structures.
- Teacher uses metalanguage (i.e., language to talk about language such as grammar terminology).
- Teacher asks students to discover grammar rules themselves by studying examples.
- Teacher has students practice grammar structures through activities or drills.
- Teacher gives corrective feedback on students' errors as they arise in the context of performing.
- Other: ________________________________

6. Among the following kinds of grammar-focused instruction, what do you think is (are) the most useful? (Choose all that apply.)

- Teacher presents and (or) explains discrete grammar rules or structures.
- Teacher uses metalanguage (i.e., language to talk about language such as grammar terminology).
- Teacher asks students to discover grammar rules themselves by studying examples.
- Teacher has students practice grammar structures through activities or drills.
- Teacher gives corrective feedback on students' errors as they arise in the context of performing.
- Other: ________________________________

6-1. Please briefly explain why it (they) was (were) most useful?

____________________________________
7. Among the following kinds of grammar-focused instruction, what do you think is (are) the least useful? (Choose all that apply.)

- Teacher presents and (or) explains discrete grammar rules or structures.
- Teacher uses metalanguage (i.e., language to talk about language such as grammar terminology).
- Teacher asks students to discover grammar rules themselves by studying examples.
- Teacher has students practice grammar structures through activities or drills.
- Teacher gives corrective feedback on students' errors as they arise in the context of performing.
- Other: ____________________________________________

7-1. Please briefly explain why it (they) was (were) least useful:

__________________________________________________________________________

8. What kind of grammar rules do you prefer to learn through grammar-focused instruction?

- Grammar rules that are simple to explain and illustrate
- Grammar rules that are complex to explain and illustrate
- Grammar rules that differ from the native language
- Grammar rules that are not salient in the input I am exposed to
- Grammar rules that have many variations (e.g., contextual or register variations)
- Other: ____________________________________________

Question 9-10. Choose one that applies to you.

9. I prefer to learn grammar “in separate lessons focusing explicitly on grammar structures” or “through communicative activities”.

- In separate lessons focusing explicitly on grammar structures
- Through communicative activities

10. I prefer to learn grammar “inductively” (i.e., the teacher presents learners with samples of language and gets them to work out the principle or rule for themselves) or “ deductively” (i.e., the teacher gives a grammatical explanation or rule followed by a set of exercises).

- Inductively
- Deductively
Appendix B: Interview

Interview Schedules

1. How long have you been teaching English grammar?

2. How long have you taught grammar to intermediate-level students?

Questions regarding grammar instruction

3. What particular methods or approached have you used for grammar instruction?

(e.g., explicit teaching – grammar rules explanations, implicit teaching - discovering grammar rules, teaching grammar in separate lessons focusing explicitly on grammar structures or integrating grammar into communicative activities or other skills)

4. What methods or approaches do you think have been most useful or successful in general or for intermediate-level students?

5. Among the methods or approaches you have used, what do you think your students were more interested or involved in?

- Why do you think so?

Questions regarding the use of materials

6. What kind of materials do you usually use to teach grammar? (e.g., grammar textbook, authentic or contrived materials)

7. Have you adopted or adapted authentic materials (corpus data) for grammar teaching?

- What were they?

- How did you use them?

- How useful were they (in teaching what grammar structures)?

8. What grammar structures do you think your intermediate-level students have difficulty with?

- What advice would you like to give them?

9. Any comments?