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Introduction
During the past decade, scholars in foreign language pedagogy have increasingly urged teachers to reexamine their commonly held practice of teaching grammar based on examples of decontextualized sentences taken primarily from the written language (Barnes 1990; Blyth 1997; Celce-Murcia 1990; Celce-Murcia et al. 1997; Fox 1993; Garrett 1986; Hatch 1992; Hershenson 1988; Kramsch 1981, 1983, 1984; Lee and VanPatten 1995; Long 1991; McCarthy 1991; Riggenbach 1990; Rutherford 1987). In place of the traditional sentential approaches to grammar, these scholars have advocated a concept of grammar in terms of connected discourse, that is, actual language use, multipropositional speech and writing, so-called "real communication" (Cooperman and Kilborn 1990). Such a functional or discourse-oriented approach to grammar instruction requires a radical shift in perspective from traditional approaches: "[In functional approaches] grammar is not a set of rigid rules that must be followed in order to produce grammatical sentences. Rather, grammar is a set of strategies that one employs in order to produce coherent communication" (Givón 1993, p. 1).

According to Tomlin (1994), what sets functional grammars apart from other types of grammar is what he calls the "communicative imperative," the premise that "linguistic form generally serves to code or signal linguistic function and that shapes taken by linguistic form arise out of the
demands of communicative interactions” (p. 144). Like all grammars, functional grammars pursue description and explanation of language patterns. However, the main focus of functional linguistics is the interaction of form and function. One of the best examples of form-function interaction is pragmatically conditioned word order. Consider the following set of word-order constructions from which English speakers may choose in (1):

(1)

a. John kissed Mary.
b. Mary was kissed by John.
c. It was John who kissed Mary.
d. It was Mary who was kissed by John.e. What John did was kiss Mary.f. Who John kissed was Mary.g. Mary, John kissed her.

(Brown and Yule 1983, p. 127)

The same information or propositional content is expressed in each sentence. So why does English, or any other language, need so many ways to say the same thing? The reason is that speakers and listeners use language forms to communicate, and communication is a tricky business. Speakers need to package (and sometimes repackage) information so that the intended message gets through. Consider the following exchange in (2):

(2)

"So, Mary kissed John, did she?"
"No, you got it backwards. It was JOHN who kissed MARY!"

In (2), the second speaker corrects the erroneous assertion by repackaging the information using word stress and syntax to highlight more clearly who did what to whom. Thus the choice of form follows communicative function.

Despite repeated calls for textbooks to include more information about how language works above the level of the sentence, most authors and publishing companies have been slow to incorporate the notion of discourse into their pedagogical materials. Such reluctance is understandable given the difficulties of describing grammar as “communicative practice” (Hanks 1996) in ways that are transparent to students and teachers. Authors can hardly be blamed for not wanting to open the Pandora’s box of discourse with its competing concerns and approaches (see Schiffrin 1994 for an overview). For example, an author who wishes to give an explanation of a grammatical form in terms of discourse must decide what kind of contextual information to include: the illocutionary force of the utterance in which the form is embedded (speech act theory), the rules for turn-taking (conversation analysis), the expressive quality of the message (interactional sociolinguistics), the Gricean maxims at play (pragmatics), the power relationships manifest in the interaction (ethnography of speaking), and so on. If all these discourse-pragmatic notions, and many others, are potentially relevant to the understanding of a form-in-context, what is the textbook author to do? Suddenly, the teaching of grammar begins to resemble the teaching of culture, a subject notoriously difficult to delimit. Kramsch and Andersen (1999) describe the enlarged scope of grammatical analysis entailed by a discourse perspective:

From a discourse or anthropological perspective, linguistic structures, as they are used in communicative situations, are embedded in the whole social and historical context of culture (e.g., see Gumperz, 1982; Mulinowski, 1923; Sapoř, 1949); they are but one system of signs among many that people use to give meaning to their environment (p. 32).

Rather than attempt to discuss the enormous diversity of phenomena encompassed by the discourse perspective, this chapter will focus on a set of linguistic forms called pragmatically conditioned word-order constructions as exemplified in (1), for example, dislocations, defts, passives, and so on. I choose to focus on word order for two reasons. First, word order has been the object of much linguistic study; and, as a consequence, a solid body of descriptive research is readily available for the creation of pedagogical materials (Givón 1993; Laitin-drech 1994). Second, word-order constructions are formal units, much like other grammatical items found in textbooks. According to Rutherford (1987), traditional grammar instruction is predicated “on a solid, stable, fixed piece of the total language product—something with edges to it . . . in other words, a language construct” (p. 56). Thus I see word-order constructions as a bridge between the sensational grammars embodied in today’s textbooks and the more discourse-oriented grammars of the future. By demonstrating techniques for teaching word-order constructions, an important piece of discourse grammar, I hope to encourage textbook authors and publishing companies to begin exploring the implications of discourse for their pedagogical materials.
This chapter is divided into four main sections. In the first section, the obstacles to the teaching of the spoken language are discussed. In the second section, the ongoing grammar debate is put into historical perspective. It is argued that both the traditional, structural approach to grammar and the newer, comprehensible input approach are both inadequate for teaching grammar. A middle ground will be advocated; that is, pedagogical interventions embedded in conversational communicative activities. Following Long (1991), this middle ground is referred to as Focus on Form. In the third section, various pedagogical techniques for teaching word-order constructions will be discussed. These techniques come from three different sources: studies in Focus on Form methodology, discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics. The fourth section will briefly explore the implications of discourse-oriented language teaching for TEA training.

Obstacles to Teaching Oral Language

There have been a few, well-known attempts to link form and function in pedagogical materials, namely the functional/notional curriculum of Wiliams (1976) and of Brown and Candlin (1980), and the interaction-based programs of Kramsch (1981, 1993) and Bragg and Rice (1985). Yet these early efforts have had relatively little impact on how grammar is taught in today’s classrooms and conceptualized in today’s textbooks. Why is the grammar of speech not in foreign language programs?

One of the major obstacles to the teaching of pragmatically conditioned word order, or any other "form" of the spoken language, lies in the evanescent nature of speech itself. Naturally occurring speech is fleeting, making it exceedingly difficult to represent accurately. In fact, an accurate transcription is often difficult for the uninhibited to read because of the multiple ellipses, interruptions, repairs, sentence fragments, and signal phrases that have no conventional spelling. It is not uncommon for students learning the intricacies of transcription to "correct" recorded samples of speech unconsciously in order to make them conform to written norms. Ironically, such an unconscious grammatical cleansing ends up eliminating the very items that a discourse grammar purports to illuminate. While audio and video technology has allowed speech to be captured accurately and thus to be studied and taught in context (Altman 1989), relatively few foreign language materials make extensive use of authentic interaction; scripted dialogues and scripted videos still rule the day. And therein lies much of the problem. If accurate transcription requires an apprenticeship, it should be obvious that scripted dialogues are often heavily influenced by written norms, resulting in much artificiality.

Lambrecht (1987) notes that artificiality in grammatical materials is not a recent phenomenon. He points out that grammars have relied on artificial, decontextualized sentences as far back as the classical times of Greece and Rome. As evidence of this, he cites the Latin grammarians’ common practice of curiose, a practice that required the subject and object position of sentences to be filled with nouns in order to express a "complete" and thus more perfect thought. Sentences containing pronouns apparently seemed incomplete to Latin grammarians and were thus deemed inappropriate for grammatical analysis. Through the centuries, grammarians have rarely seemed to notice (or to care) that such sentences were virtually nonexistent in real spoken discourse (Ashley and Bentivoglio 1993). After two thousand years, it is understandable that the "fictional sentences" still prevalent in many grammar books no longer strike teachers as anomalous; educators have come to expect as much.

The gap between oral proficiency goals and the inadequate materials used to accomplish those goals has not gone unnoticed (Waltz 1986). Since the advent of communicative language teaching and the oral proficiency movement, teachers and applied linguists have been questioning the legacy of the arato perfeo tradition, that is, the preference for constructed examples based on the written language. After all, how is one supposed to teach the spoken language with materials that do not reliably reflect typical speech patterns? In fact, textbooks frequently fail even to mention or exemplify constructions that are prevalent in the spoken language. This is due, in part, to textbook authors' prescriptive attitudes toward language; oral norms of usage are generally marginalized or stigmatized vis-a-vis the written norms (Valdman 1992). The widespread bias against orality in higher education is nowhere more noticeable than in language departments where course content and pedagogical practices have traditionally been tied to the goals of literary studies. However, the lack of attention paid to oral grammar in pedagogical materials is not attributable only to the literary bias of the profession—ignorance plays an important role, too. Many teachers who have never taken classes in the related fields of sociolinguistics, pragmatics, or discourse studies are simply unaware of the patterns found in spoken discourse.

Given this state of affairs, it seems unlikely that grammar textbooks will radically change in the near future. Nevertheless, Kramsch and Andersen (1999) claim that multimedia technology is uniquely qualified
toward overcoming many of the obstacles currently facing a pedagogical discourse grammar. The key to teaching language as communicative practice, they argue, is to capture real, interactional events and to turn them into multimedia "texts" that can be easily objectified, juxtaposed, annotated, explored, and manipulated by students. In other words, multimedia technology makes the textualization of oral language possible in a way that has never before existed, certainly not in the traditional textbook format, nor even in more recent video formats. The problem with learning a language from live context is that context itself cannot be learned, it can only be experienced, or apprenticed in. Therefore in order for context to be made learnable, especially in an academic setting, it has to be transformed into analyzable text. As an educational tool, multimedia technology opens up immense possibilities of contextualization by textualizing knowledge through its representational capabilities, that is, its endless reproducibilities (Kramsch and Andersen 1999, p. 33).

To make their notion of textualization more concrete, they describe an innovative CD-ROM for the teaching of Quechua, Utsuchi Quechua Live and in Color (Andersen 1987, 1996; Andersen and Daza 1994; Andersen et al. 1994). The CD-ROM is based on two hours of ethnographic video filmed on location in Bolivia. To understand a given scene, students have access to many sources of information: spoken and written glosses and commentaries, transcriptions, translations, written ethnographies, and official documents, including interviews with the participants after the fact, not to mention the filmmaker, expert anthropologists and ethnographers (Kramsch and Andersen 1999, p. 34). If pedagogical sentential grammars were largely made possible by the technology of the printing press, then perhaps the grammar of oral interaction will finally become possible thanks to the development of multimedia technology.

Communicative Language Teaching and Discourse Grammar

Celcia-Murcia et al. (1997) claim that a significant shift in language teaching methodology has been occurring over the past decade and that communicative language teaching (CLT) is reaching a turning point. After its appearance in the early 70's and subsequent spread during the 80's, CLT began to encounter increasing criticism during the 90's. Much of the criticism centered on the insufficient and indirective treatment of linguistic form in CLT. In 1990, Richards observed that the language teaching profession was divided into two camps favoring differing approaches to teaching oral language: the indirect camp versus the direct camp. Celcia-Murcia et al. (1997) describe CLT methodology as indirect: "The typical teaching practice for CLT in the late 1970s and the 1980s involves setting up and managing lifelike communicative situations in the language classroom (e.g., role plays, problem-solving tasks, or information-gap activities) and leading learners to acquire communicative skills incidentally by seeking situational meaning" (p. 141). Teachers who favored the direct approach (not to be confused with the direct method) never really adopted CLT's innovations, but instead remained faithful to the traditional structural syllabus and its related practices: First present new grammar explicitly, next practice grammar via drills, and finally have students produce the targeted grammar item in a quasi-communicative situation ("the three Ps")—Carter and McCarthy 1995, p. 155).

While the profession as a whole increasingly emphasized the role and importance of communication, teachers who were wedded to the traditional practices of direct grammar instruction simply adapted them to the teaching of conversation. In fact, Lee and VanPatten (1998) claim that for all the innovation associated with CLT, grammar instruction has changed very little in foreign language education. Blyth (1997) contends that "the presentation of grammar in foreign language textbooks and classrooms continues to be based on an outdated combination of behaviorism, structuralist linguistics, and versions of audiolingualism and cognitive-code theory" (p. 51). By the 90's, research was beginning to confirm what many of the traditionalists had feared all along: Entirely experimental and meaning-focused language learning resulted in less than perfect results. Of course, so did traditional methods. In particular, the studies on French immersion programs showed that despite years of meaningful input and opportunities for interaction, students still had not mastered many parts of French morphology (Harley 1992; Harley and Swain 1984).

Rather than reject CLT and return to traditional grammar instruction, many researchers and practitioners began developing the outline for a third kind of approach, a middle ground that seeks to focus learners' attention on forms within a meaningful context. This movement has come
to be known as Focus on Form following an influential article by Long (1991). The central tenet of this middle ground is the belief that "making learners aware of structural regularities and formal properties of the target language will greatly increase the rate of language attainment" (Cebes-Murcia et al. 1997, p. 146). Advocates of this new middle ground are quick to point out that it does not imply a return to traditional grammar instruction with its emphasis on sentential grammar. According to Dornyei and Thurrell (1994), the major shifts that are occurring in language teaching today are threefold: (1) adding specific language input to discourse teaching, (2) raising learners' awareness of the organizational principles of language use within and beyond the sentence level, and (3) sequencing communicative tasks more systematically in accordance with a theory of discourse-level grammar. In a similar vein, Doughty and Williams (1998b) note that Focus on Form studies have expanded the definition of the term "form" beyond that of the "linguistic code features" that have been the traditional content of grammatical syllabi: "... it is important to see the term form in the broadest possible context, that is, that of all levels and components of the complex system that is language" (p. 212).

**Pedagogical Applications**

Given the dearth of discourse-oriented foreign language materials, many teachers may wonder how it is possible to participate in the pedagogical and curricular shifts that Dornyei and Thurrell describe. How are teachers supposed to "raise learners' awareness of the organizational principles of language use beyond the sentence level" without materials that support such a goal? And how can teachers "sequence tasks more systematically in accordance with a theory of discourse-level grammar" if they have never been exposed to such a theory? It seems unrealistic to expect teachers to participate in such major shifts without a body of pedagogical materials that put these new ideas into practice. To that end, this section is devoted to the exemplification of various practices for teaching spoken grammar that may easily be incorporated into today's foreign language materials and programs. These techniques are rather eclectic since they derive from three separate, albeit related, sources: Focus on Form research, discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics.

**Applications from Focus on Form Research**

The goal of this section will be to exemplify different activities and techniques that have received mention in the Focus on Form literature and to see how these activities might be adapted to the teaching of pragmatically conditioned structures. First, teachers must ask themselves whether discourse constructions are amenable to explicit instruction and, if so, to what kind of grammatical instruction. It is interesting that even among researchers who advocate the relevance of discourse grammar for language education, there is a certain skepticism about the "teachability" of such structures. In a cogent article on the application of discourse analysis to French language education, Barnes (1990) seems to question the efficacy of explicit instruction of these structures:

Il est évident que l'usage de ces structures ne pourra pas s'apprendre par une approche structurale, c'est-à-dire, par une description formelle des structures accompagnée d'exercices du type transformationnel... Il me semble que l'acquisition de ces structures, ou plus exactement l'acquisition des intentions des francophones sur leurs fonctions, se fait le mieux par une certaine expérience communicative. Cela veut dire qu'il faut que l'élève entende ces tournures dans des situations communicatives. Étant donné la difficulté de formuler des règles relativement simples sur l'emploi de ces structures, il semble plus opportun d'adopter une approche par l'"acquisition" que par "l'apprentissage" pour employer les termes de Krahen (p. 104).

It is obvious that the usage of these structures cannot be learned by a structural approach, that is, by a formal description of the structures accompanied by transformational drills... It seems to me that the acquisition of these structures, or more precisely the acquisition of French-speakers' intuitions about their functions, is best accomplished by a certain communicative experience. This means that the student must listen to the structures in communicative situations. Given the difficulty of formulating relatively simple rules concerning the usage of these structures, it seems most appropriate to adopt an "acquisition" rather than a "learning" approach, to use Krahen's terms.
While I agree with Barnes that students undoubtedly need lots of "communicative experience" before they can build up intuitions about pragmatic functions, I disagree with several of her assumptions. Barnes seems to assume that grammar instruction comes in only two varieties as described and promulgated by Krashen. The first variety is the traditional grammar-as-object approach that favors an explicit rule accompanied by contextualized example sentences followed by mechanical production exercises. Since the rules that govern the selection of syntactic structures in oral discourse are difficult to state in simple terms, the reasonably assumes that these structures are not amenable to "explicit" instruction. The second approach that Barnes refers to largely spurs explicit grammar instruction as irrelevant to acquisition and emphasizes the importance of lots of comprehensible input. Fortunately, the dichotomous conception of grammar instruction illustrated in Barnes (1990) has increasingly given way to a middle-ground called Focus on Form. This new approach combines elements from the other two approaches but is qualitatively different from either. In essence, Focus on Form activities attempt to create the ideal conditions for grammar learning, the "teachable moment" as it were, when the student has a communicative need that can be fulfilled only by a particular linguistic form, in other words, the moment when a form becomes communicatively salient. As such, Focus on Form activities differ crucially from traditional grammar exercises by their "prerequisite engagement in meaning before attention to linguistic features can be expected to be effective" (Doughty and Williams, 1998a, p. 3).

How to focus a student's attention may be accomplished by a wide variety of innovative techniques. Doughty and Williams (1998b) note that one way to understand the differences between techniques is to place them "along a continuum reflecting the degree to which the focus on form interrupts the flow of communication, that is to say, on the basis of obtrusiveness" (p. 258). In obtrusive tasks, communication comes to a complete halt while the teacher focuses attention on the linguistic code in explicit ways. In unobtrusive tasks, linguistic code features are never mentioned explicitly. Rather, the grammar feature is carefully embedded in a communicative activity in such a way that the learner attends to the form while simultaneously attending to meaning. Following Doughty and Williams' (1998b) discussion of task obtrusiveness, five techniques will be presented here from the most to the least obtrusive: garden pathing, input processing, dictogloss, input enhancement, and task-essential language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Obtrusiveness of Focus on Form Activity</th>
<th>Obtrusive</th>
<th>Unobtrusive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Garden Pathing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Structured Input</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dictogloss</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Input Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Task-Essential Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Adapted from Doughty and Williams (1998b, p. 258).

**Garden Pathing**
In this technique, the instructor purposefully leads students down the grammatical garden path with the goal of getting them to commit errors (Tomasello and Herron, 1988). More precisely, this technique requires the instructor to present a grammatical pattern or rule in such a way that students overgeneralize the rule. The resulting errors are promptly corrected by the instructor. For example, the garden path technique could be used to help focus learners on the limits of productivity for the rule for deriving comparative adjectives in English: [adjective] + [er]. Students could be given a set of adjectives from which to derive the comparative adjective by simply adding the comparative morpheme, for example, [-er]. After having firmly established the "rule," the instructor next presents an exceptional adjective, for example, beautiful. Invariably, the students will attempt to produce the comparative form using the same derivational rule as shown in (3):

\[(\text{3}) \quad \text{fast} \rightarrow \text{faster} \quad \text{big} \rightarrow \text{bigger} \quad \text{tall} \rightarrow \text{taller} \quad \text{beautiful} \rightarrow \text{beautifuler}\]

The basic goal of garden pathing is to render the exceptions to a rule more salient thereby making them easier to learn. The technique can be used on any linguistic rule that is easy to overgeneralize, including syntactic-pragmatic rules. Knez (Forthcoming) describes extending the technique to teach the pragmatic differences between the French s'est d'eff construction given in (4a) and (4b) and their so-called canonical counterparts in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 1</strong> Degree of Obtrusiveness of Focus on Form Activity</th>
<th><strong>Obtrusive</strong></th>
<th><strong>Unobtrusive</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Garden Pathing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Structured Input</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dictogloss</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Input Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Task-Essential Language</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Where does your family come from?"
"My mother is from Paris and my father is from Montreal."
Correct translation: "Ma mère est de Paris..."

Where did your father buy the car?
My mother bought it.
Correct translation: "C'est ma mère qui l'a acheté."

Note that all the replies to the questions in (6) begin with the same noun phrase (My mother/Ma mère). Invariably, students fail to notice that the referent of the noun phrase "My mother" in the last response is not pragmatically equivalent to the same noun phrases found in the earlier responses. In the first two, the question itself evokes the referent in the mind of the listener by setting up a parent or family frame in which a mother would be given information. However, in the last question-and-answer pair, the reply corrects the assumption of the question, namely that the father bought the car. In such a communicative situation, French discourse prescribes a c'est cleft in order to highlight the unexpected or "new" information. In other words, the last question identifies the car as having been purchased but incorrectly identifies the father as the buyer. The c'est cleft construction is used to correct this faulty assumption.

In most garden pathing exercises, students are primed to make overgeneralizations by repeating the pattern several times as in the example with comparative adjectives. In the example of the French c'est cleft, little priming is needed since the students are likely to mistranslate solely on the basis of the LI transfer.

From these examples of garden pathing, it is clear that this technique can be highly obtrusive. In fact, many teachers may feel that such an exercise amounts to nothing more than teaching grammar through translation and therefore does not count as communicative or meaningful at all. Doughty and Williams (1998b, p. 240) point out that highly obtrusive tasks and techniques always run the risk of violating the fundamental principle of Focus on Form activities, that is, a prerequisite engagement in meaning, before the attention to linguistic features should occur. Thus the earlier translation exercise would need to be embedded into a communicative or meaningful context for it to count as a Focus on Form technique.
Structured Input

Another obtrusive technique is the structured input activity as described by Lee and VanPatten (1995) and VanPatten (1996). Based on studies of how learners derive meaning from input, VanPatten (1996) suggests that instruction be based on "structured input activities in which learners are given the opportunity to process form in the input in a 'controlled' situation so that better form-meaning connections might happen compared with what might happen in less controlled situations" (p. 60). "Structured input" is the centerpiece of "processing instruction," an approach to grammar instruction that advocates combining explicit explanations of grammatical rules with structured input and output activities. The main goal of this kind of grammar instruction is to "alter the processing strategies that learners take to the task of comprehension and to encourage them to make better form-meaning connections than they would if left to their own devices" (p. 60).

Processing instruction is distinguished from traditional approaches to grammar by an emphasis on input activities that precede all output activities. Lee and VanPatten (1995) criticize traditional grammar instruction for forcing students to produce before they have internalized any connection between the grammatical forms and their meanings:

"While practice with output may help with fluency and accuracy in production, it is not 'responsible' for getting the grammar into the learner's head to begin with. In short, traditional grammar instruction, which is intended to cause a change in the developing system, is akin to putting the cart before the horse when it comes to acquisition; the learner is asked to produce when the developing system has not yet had a chance to build up a representation of the language based on input data" (1995, p. 95).

To give students the chance to build up the necessary mental representations of grammar, Lee and VanPatten propose involving the student in a series of "structured input activities" that do not require the student to produce the targeted forms. Instead, these activities force the student to attend to the grammar within a meaningful context and to demonstrate comprehension in some nonlinguistic way. Since structured input activities are absent from most commercially produced foreign language textbooks, teachers must either learn how to develop their own or learn how to adapt their current textbook activities. To help teachers do this, Lee and VanPatten (1995) give specific guidelines for developing such activities:

a. Present one thing at a time.
b. Keep meaning in focus.
c. Move from sentence to connected discourse.
d. Use both oral and written input.
e. Have the learner "do something" with the input.
f. Keep the learner's processing strategies in mind.

(1995, p. 104)

It is important for beginning teachers to learn how to adapt commercially produced materials to suit the particular needs of their classrooms. Using the guidelines, TAs can learn how to create "structured input activities" from traditional production activities. For example, the recently published beginning French textbook Chez Nous (Valdman and Pons 1997) devotes an entire page to left dislocation as a grammatical feature. While the explanation of this word-order construction and its function is admirably succinct and accessible, it is followed by several production exercises that oblige the student to begin producing left dislocations immediately. These production activities may be easily transformed into structured input activities. Compare the original activity given in (7) with its revised structured input counterpart in (8).

(7) Original/Output Activity
Points de vue. Donnez un commentaire pour chaque sujet proposé.
modelé: L'union libre,...
> L'union libre, je pense que c'est une bonne idée.
ou L'union libre, c'est mieux accepté aujourd'hui.

1. l'union libre
2. le mariage
3. les enfants
4. les femmes au foyer
5. les hommes au foyer
6. les pères absents
7. le divorce
8. la fidélité
Viewpoints. Make a comment for every proposed topic.

Model: living together

> Living together, I think it's a good idea.

or

Living together, it is more accepted today.

1. living together
2. marriage
3. children
4. housewives
5. househusbands
6. deadbeat dads
7. divorce
8. monogamy

(Valdman and Pons 1997, p. 347)

(8) Revised Version—Structured Input Activity

Points de vue. Indique si vous êtes d'accord ou pas avec les commentaires suivants!

Model: L'union libre, c'est assez accepté aujourd’hui.

1. L'union libre, c'est trop pratique.
   D'accord
   Pas d'accord

2. Le mariage, c'est une institution dépassée.
   D'accord
   Pas d'accord

3. Les enfants, c'est trop de travail.
   D'accord
   Pas d'accord

4. Les femmes au foyer, c'est bien pour la famille.
   D'accord
   Pas d'accord

5. Les bonnes au foyer, ce n'est pas l'ordre naturel.
   D'accord
   Pas d'accord

6. Les pères absents, c'est une honte.
   D'accord
   Pas d'accord

7. Le divorce, c'est un mal nécessaire.
   D'accord
   Pas d'accord

8. La fidélité, c'est impossible pour les hommes.
   D'accord
   Pas d'accord

Viewpoints. Indicate if you agree or disagree with the following comments.

Model: Living together is fairly accepted today.

1. Living together is very practical.
   Agree
   Disagree

2. Marriage is an outdated institution.
   Agree
   Disagree

3. Children are too much work.
   Agree
   Disagree

4. Housewives are good for the family.
   Agree
   Disagree

5. Househusbands violate the natural order.
   Agree
   Disagree

6. Absent fathers are a disgrace.
   Agree
   Disagree

7. Divorce is a necessary evil.
   Agree
   Disagree

8. Monogamy is impossible for men.
   Agree
   Disagree

Teachers who have been trained in communicative methods tend to associate the term "input" with natural language. The input in processing instructions, however, is highly structured for specific purposes as is evident in (8). The most obvious differences between the original exercise in (7) and its revised version in (8) are the differing demands placed on the student. The original exercise requires the student to attend to form and meaning simultaneously while producing a brand new linguistic structure. By not requiring any production, the structured input activity lessens the load on the student's attentional resources. As a consequence, the chances of successfully focusing on both form and meaning are increased; the learner is better able to attend to both the left dislocated structure as well as the meaning of each comment. Of course, attending to form and meaning simultaneously is possible only if the vocabulary is relatively transparent and the sentences do not contain ambiguous or confounding grammatical variation ("a. Present one thing at a time"). Note, too, how all the sentences repeat the same basic word-order pattern making them even easier to understand:

{topicalized noun phrase} [s'ent] + [predicate adjective/nominative].
[Le mariage] [s'ent] [une institution dépassée].

Ideally, the structured input activity given in (8) should be followed by other input activities that require greater stretches of discourse ("Move from sentences to connected discourse"). The responses to structured input activities also lend themselves to follow-up output activities. For instance, survey responses can be compiled and briefly analyzed as a class activity or as pair work. Are there gender differences in the responses? What statements received the highest levels of agreement and/or disagreement? What statements were found to be patently absurd? Students could also be asked how they would contradict the statements with which they disagreed. Whenever a speaker makes a provocative assessment in a natural conversation, the interlocutor is typically obliged to express agreement or disagreement (Pomerantz 1984) as in (9):

"Sorry, but that's not true. It's much more complex than that."
Les enfants, c'est trop de travail.
> Oui, mais... C'est aussi un grand plaisir.
Children are too much work.
> Yes, but they're also a joy.

Le mariage, c'est une institution dépassée.
> Ah non, c'est toujours important! Difficile, peut-être, mais toujours important.
Marriage is an outdated institution.
> Oh no, it's still important. Difficult, maybe, but still important.

**Dictogloss**

A technique that is slightly less obstructive than either structured input activities or garden pathing is the dictogloss. The dictogloss is a procedure that requires students to listen to a short text and then reconstruct the text as best they can. By requiring students to reproduce the text as faithfully as possible, students turn to each other to negotiate forms that they have not yet mastered. The main goal of the activity is metalinguistic to oblige students to reflect on their own output so that they will come to know their areas of grammatical and pragmatic strength and weakness. Swain describes the procedure well:

> ... a short, dense text is read to the learners at normal speed; while it is being read, students jot down familiar words and phrases; then the learners work together in small groups to reconstruct the text from their shared resources; the final versions are analyzed and compared. The initial text, either an authentic or constructed one, is intended to provide practice in the use of particular grammatical constructions (1998, p. 70).

The dictogloss is well suited for teaching discourse constructions because it includes both an oral and a written component that allows the teacher an opportunity to demonstrate how written norms of a language affect the perception of the spoken language. The first step in preparing a dictogloss activity is to select a text. The oral text should include several examples of the targeted grammar item. If naturally occurring speech is unavailable, teachers can use commercially produced recordings, provided they are not too stilted. Consider the following recorded dialogue, taken from the beginning French textbook, *Parallèles: Communication et Culture* (Allen and Fouletier-Smith 1995). While it is constructed, the dialogue in (10) comes close to real speakers data in many ways, particularly in its use of left and right dislocated noun phrases (left and right dislocations are indicated by boldface).

**Extract from dialogue:**

Marchand: Et alors, ma petite dame, elles vous tentent, mes tomates! A 7 francs le kilo, c'est une bonne affaire!
Claudine: Hmm... D'accord. Donnez-moi un kilo de tomates, s'il vous plaît.
Marchand: Très bien. Et avec ça?
Claudine: Eh bien... et deux laitudes.
Marchand: Voilà. Ce sera tout!
Claudine: Oui, ce sera tout. Ça fait combien?
Marchand: Alors, les tomates, ça fait 7 francs. Et puis, deux laitudes à 3 francs 50, ça fait 7 francs. Bon, ça nous fait 14 francs. Oh là là! c'est pas possible, ça, un billet de 500 francs! Vous n'avez pas la monnaie?
Marchand: So, m'l’am, my tomatoes look pretty tempting to you? At 7 francs per kilo, they’re a bargain.
Claudine: Hmm... OK, give me one kilo, please.
Marchand: All right. And what else?
Claudine: Ahh... two heads of lettuce.
Marchand: There you go. Will that be all?
Claudine: Yes, that’s it. How much is that?
Marchand: Well, the tomatoes come to 7 francs. And two lettuces at 3 francs 50 each comes to 7 francs. OK, that makes 14 francs.
Oh no! I can’t handle that, a 500 franc bill. Don’t you have anything smaller?

(Allen and Fouletier-Smith 1995, p. 204, adapted from the original)

Before the students listen to the dialogue, the teacher should quickly review the form and function of dislocations in spoken language (for a good example of an explanation of dislocation accessible for beginning language students, see Valdman and Pons 1997, p. 346). Swain (1998) comments that the goal of this form-focused minilesson is to "heighten students' awareness about an aspect of language that would be useful to
them in carrying out the dictogloss" (p. 73). In other words, the lesson need not include much in the way of a traditional grammatical explanation. Pre-
sumably, for this reason, Doughty and Williams (1998b) find it less obstruc-
tive than garden pathing and input processing, which typically include explicit rules. If students are aware of a grammatical item, it is believed that they will be able to perceive it more easily in speech and, consequently, that they will talk about it during groupwork. During the minilesson, the teacher may wish to review vocabulary items that students are not likely to know. After the minilesson, the teacher reads the dialogue or plays the audio recording several times. The first time, the students do nothing more than listen. The second time, however, students should be encouraged to take notes. Next, the students work in groups to reconstruct the text from their notes. When they have finished, a group of students is selected to compare their reconstructed text with the original text. The comparison can be facili-
tated by using an overhead projector; the teacher would need to make a transparency of the original text before class, and the students would need to write their reconstruction on a transparency as well.

Swain (1997) argues that based on her study and others, there is growing
evidence that the dictogloss procedure helps students notice the "gap" between what they want to say in the target language and what they know how to say. Swain hypothesizes that noticing this gap will trigger a search for solutions if the conditions are right. She claims that research indicates that teachers can improve the conditions for successful metalinguistic analysis by carefully attending to three things: (1) selection of text (some texts seem to elicit more metatalk than others), (2) preparation of students for all aspects of the task so that they understand what they should do and why, and (3) correction of the final product. Concerning the last point, Swain notes that collaborative metatalk occasionally results in stu-
dents posting erroneous hypotheses. It is up to the teacher to monitor the metatalk as much as possible and to correct any faulty hypotheses con-
cerning the targeted grammar item.

Input Enhancement
Input enhancement refers to the various ways features of the linguistic code may be made more perceptually salient. As a technique, it is not par-
ticularly obtrusive because it neither requires nor implies any explicit grammatical explanation. A common form of input enhancement is the use of typographical conventions (italics, boldface, underlining, etc.) in a passage to highlight vocabulary words. A good example of this technique can be found in White (1997), a recent study on the effects of typograph-
ical input enhancement on the acquisition of French possessive adjectives.

While typographical conventions are probably the most widespread kind of input enhancement, there are other techniques commonly used as well. For example, teachers often "double code" a linguistic feature in speech by drawing attention to it with iconic hand signals and other paralinguistic cues, for example, pointing backwards to index pastness when using a past tense morpheme ("She went on vacation"), pointing up to indicate maxi-
mum degree when using superlative constructions ("He is the tallest"); pointing to oneself to highlight reflexivity ("I talk to myself"), and so on.

Teachers looking for ways to enhance discourse constructions and any other spoken phenomena could benefit enormously from learning more about transcription practices (Edwards and Lampert 1993). In a very real sense, the most sophisticated examples of "input enhancement" are tran-
scripts produced by discourse analysts who use complex representational systems for indicating features of talk-in-interaction: pitch, rhythm, turn
taking, overlapping, interruptions, and so on. Edwards (1993) contends that because transcription plays such a central role in the study of spoken language, discourse analysts must be very aware of the impact transcrip-
tion principles and conventions have on interpretation: "... choices made concerning... how to organize and display the information in a written and spatial medium can all affect the impressions the researcher derives from the data" (p. 3). Although Edwards' remarks are intended for dis-
course researchers, they are equally pertinent for textbook authors inter-
ested in the effects of various input enhancements in their pedagogical materials. As White (1997) points out, more research is needed to deter-
mine the effects of different visual enhancement options. Of course, tran-
scription principles and typographical conventions are only a beginning.

The growing field of multimedia holds much promise for exploring the pedagogical and research implications of input enhancement. The multi-
ple combinations of sound, text, and image permit the learner to attend to characteristics of the input in ways that were unimaginable only a few years ago (Chapelle 1998).

Task-essential Language
One of the most unobtrusive ways for getting students to focus on form
within a meaningful context is to involve students in a communicative task
that obliges them to either produce or comprehend the form. Long and Crookes (1992) argue that tasks provide one of the most pedagogically sound vehicles "for the presentation of appropriate target language samples for learners—input which they will inevitably rephase via applications of general cognitive processing capacities—and for the delivery of comprehension and production opportunities of negotiable difficulty" (p. 43). The literature on task-based language teaching includes both real-world tasks encountered in everyday experience and pedagogical tasks designed for the classroom. Whatever the task—real-world or pedagogical—the overriding focus should be on meaning. Unfortunately, it is not always possible to devise a "natural" task that requires the production of a specific grammar item for its successful completion. In their discussion of the inherent difficulties of task-based methods, Lorchky and Bley-Vroman identify three degrees of linguistic involvement in a task: naturalness, utility, and essentialness:

In task-naturalness, a grammatical construction may arise naturally during the performance of a particular task, but the task can often be performed perfectly well, even quite easily, without it. In the case of task-utility, it is possible to complete a task without the structure, but with the structure, the task becomes easier. The most extreme demand a task can place on a structure is essentialness: The task cannot be successfully performed unless the structure is used (1993, p. 132).

Task essentialness is even more elusive when it comes to dealing with the grammar of spoken discourse. While discourse constructions such as dedications correlate with specific pragmatic functions, it remains arguable whether they can be considered obligatory or essential in specific contexts. Simply put, the choice of discourse constructions is probabilistic and never absolutely clear-cut, although the usage patterns in most corpora are easy to demonstrate statistically (Ashby and Bentivoglio 1993).

Katz (forthcoming) demonstrates a clever activity for eliciting cleft constructions. Noting that French c'est clefts are primarily used to serve a contrastive function, that is, to highlight a piece of information in opposition to another piece of information, Katz develops a referential communication task based on contradicting misinformation as in (11).

(11) T’as vu ça? Marie, elle a embrassé Jean! (Did you see that? Mary kissed John.)

Mais non, c’est Jean qui a embrassé Marie! (No, it was John who kissed Mary.)

Referential communication is essentially the exchange of information between two speakers. Yule (1997) notes that the information exchanged in these kinds of communicative acts implicates the grammar of reference "whereby entities (human or nonhuman) are identified (by naming or describing)" (p. 1). To set up conditions favorable for eliciting such clefts, Katz has her students watch a short video clip of a movie. After viewing, she discusses the clip with her students, but in so doing, she makes several referential mistakes. In other words, she creates multiple "opportunities" within a communicative context for students to use the cleft construction by introducing a communicative problem. Yule (1997) gives several principles for designing "problematicity" into a communicative task such as the incorrect identification of a referent. In one such task, students are given what appears to be the same scene or map as the basis for some kind of decision-making task. It turns out that the scenes or maps are slightly different, thus creating a "referential mismatch" that leads to contradiction.

Applications from Discourse Analysis

While the Focus on Form techniques detailed in the last section derive from classroom-based research on second-language acquisition, the pedagogical applications in this section derive from discourse analysis, a branch of descriptive linguistics. McCarthy (1991) points out that "discourse analysis is not a method for teaching languages; it is a way of describing and understanding how language is used" (p. 2, original emphasis). Nevertheless, many applied linguists have advocated adapting the tools and techniques of discourse analysis for pedagogical purposes (Carter and McCarthy 1995; Celce-Murcia 1990; Hatch 1992; Kramsch 1981, 1984; Riggenbach, 1990). The proponents of integrating discourse analysis into the foreign language curriculum differ as to how it should be done, but they all seem to agree that making students responsible for collecting and analyzing linguistic data would help raise linguistic awareness. In a nutshell, the goal is to change the role of the student into that of a language researcher who works to discover patterns and induce rules from authentic data. Riggenbach (1990) outlines several activities that require the student to observe and record native-speaker speech. In all of these activities, the communicative event (e.g., an interview, a conversation, a narrative) is not the pedagogical end in itself as is normally the
case with classroom communicative activities. Rather, Riggenbach advocates that communicative activities be used as means to an altogether different end—to generate data in the form of audio recordings that are subsequently transcribed and studied. For beginning students who are unable to elicit and transcribe authentic speech, Riggenbach suggests the use of new broadcasts or other sources of authentic speech such as documentaries or talk shows.

Aimed at language teachers and language-acquisition researchers, Hatch (1992) does not offer specific activities for teaching discourse to language students. Rather, the goal of her book is to teach language professionals, including language teachers, how to do discourse analysis. Hatch does claim that the same activities she has developed for the benefit of language educators can be adapted for the classroom: "This book will not tell you 'how to teach discourse' to language learners. Nevertheless, if you believe that language learners are, in the best sense of the term, 'language researchers,' you will find that many of the practice activities can be used with language learners to heighten their awareness of the system behind discourse." Similarly, Carter and McCarthy (1995) offer no specific exercises for integrating discourse grammar into the language classroom. Instead, they outline a general pedagogical approach to guide teachers:

"Our mnemonic would be the "three l's" (illustration—interaction—induction); where illustration stands for looking at real data—which may be the only option since the grammar books and current materials so often fall short; interaction stands for discussion, sharing of opinions and observations; and induction stands for making one's own, original, rule for a particular feature, a rule which will be refined and honed as more and more data is encountered . . . One only needs an initial curiosity, some real data, and the feeling that there is a lot to be discovered to get started (1995, p. 155).

While general pronouncements may be enough encouragement for some teachers to give discourse analysis a try, the majority undoubtedly need concrete exercises to get them started, especially since most teachers have so little training in the field. Fortunately, there are a few manuals that offer pedagogical exercises adapted for the college language classroom (McCarty 1991; McCarthy and Carter 1994). These introductory texts on the "pedagogy of discourse" supply teachers with a wealth of exercises based on spoken and written discourse covering a full range of discourse topics: speech acts, rhetorical analysis, coherence relations, deixis, discourse syntax, discourse prosody, discourse culture, and so on. Moreover, these books also include helpful annotations to all exercises. These notes often give insightful hints about what discourse patterns to look for in the data and what problems students may have apprehending the patterns. Unfortunately, both books are written for ESL teachers and exemplify discourse phenomena with English (mainly British) texts. Nevertheless, both books are excellent sources for foreign language teachers looking for ideas about how to develop discourse-oriented grammar activities.

An excellent resource for the French and German instructor interested in discourse analysis is Kramsch (1981, 1984). These manuals not only give a theoretical argument for teaching communicative practices in the foreign language classroom, but they also supply an abundance of interesting activities that develop skills for managing conversation. Kramsch (1981) also includes transcriptions of authentic German and French conversations with annotations pointing out various discourse strategies (topic initiation, floor taking, topic redirection, polite interruption, etc.).

In order to help students discover how word order constructions are employed in discourse, McCarthy (1991) proposes that teachers begin by using pragmatically odd written texts. It may be advisable to use English texts initially, even in the foreign language class, in order to help students grasp the pragmatic concepts more easily. Beginning and intermediate foreign language students lack the pragmatic intuitions necessary to analyze pragmatic anomaly in target language texts. Once the concept of pragmatic anomaly is established, students can begin to explore texts in the target language. First, students read an anomalous text (aloud, if possible). Next, they must explain as precisely as possible where the problem arises, that is, why the text sounds so odd. McCarthy claims that students do not need to know any special metalanguage in order to analyze the pragmatic anomalies in (12) and (13).

Q: What time did you leave the building?
A: What I did at five-thirty was leave the building.

(McCarthy 1991, p. 53)
(1) I'm sitting here at my desk writing to you. What's outside my window is a big house surrounded by trees. It's a lovely day. I hope you love it. I hope you love your day. I hope you love your lovely day.

(2) I'm sitting here at my desk writing to you. What's outside my window is a big house surrounded by trees. It's a lovely day. I hope you love it. I hope you love your day. I hope you love your lovely day.

(3) I'm sitting here at my desk writing to you. What's outside my window is a big house surrounded by trees. It's a lovely day. I hope you love it. I hope you love your day. I hope you love your lovely day.

(4) I'm sitting here at my desk writing to you. What's outside my window is a big house surrounded by trees. It's a lovely day. I hope you love it. I hope you love your day. I hope you love your lovely day.

(5) I'm sitting here at my desk writing to you. What's outside my window is a big house surrounded by trees. It's a lovely day. I hope you love it. I hope you love your day. I hope you love your lovely day.
Givón (1993) gives several simple techniques for examining the
dynamics of discourse reference and topicality. According to Givón, topical-
ity is conceived of as a gradable property of nominal participants (nouns
and pronouns) within discourse. In other words, nouns and pronouns
can be considered more or less "topical" depending on their relative im-
portance to the overall discourse. Givón explains that different construc-
tions code different levels of topicality as well as perform different
pragmatic functions. One simple way for students to discover the corre-
lations between sentence constructions, pragmatic functions, and topical-
ity of nominal referents is to list every noun or pronoun used by the
speaker to code the same referent. For example, in (15) the letter writer
refers to other parties in different ways, or in the jargon of discourse an-
alysts, "codes" the third-person referents using different devices:

(15)
Dear Abby,
There's a (a) this guy I've been going with for near three years.
Well, the problem is that (b) he hits me. (c) He started last
year. (d) He has done it only four or five times, but each time
it was worse than before. Every time (e) he hits me it was be-
cause (f) I thought I was flirting (I wasn't). Last time (g) he
accused me of coming on to (h) a friend of (i) his. First, (j) he
called me a lot of names, then (k) he punched me ... 
Black and blue
(Givón 1995, p. 206)

Here is the list of referring devices for third-person referents in the order
in which they appear in (15):

a. this guy
b. he
c. He
d. He
e. he
f. he
g. he
h. a friend
i. his
j. he
k. he

What is there to say about such a simple list? What patterns could there
possibly be? Students will probably feel hesitant since the data seem too
simple, too intuitive to require any analysis. The first observation that stu-
dents are likely to make is that pronouns greatly outnumber nouns in this
list. The second observation is that all referring devices except (h) refer
to the same person, the abusive boyfriend. After stating the obvious, most
students are likely to lapse into silence. At this point, students should be
led to look at discourse reference from a functional perspective by a series
of questions: Why did the writer choose a full noun phrase in (a) and a
pronoun rather than a noun in (b)? What is the difference between the
two noun phrases (a) and (b)? Which referent (a or h) is the "topic" of the
letter? Students should be helped to state a hypothesis along these lines:
Pronouns are used to talk about the topic of conversation whereas nouns
are used to refer to things that aren't the topic but that may become the
topic in later talk.

Another simple technique that is particularly effective for demonstrat-
ing the pragmatic functions of topic-coding devices such as dislocations
and pronouns is called "referential lookback" or "referential distance." In
this exercise, students must count the number of clauses between the ap-
pearance of a noun phrase and its closest antecedent. Nouns in right dis-
locations typically code referents with antecedents found in the
immediately preceding clause, whereas nouns found in left dislocations
tend to have a greater "referential distance." In other words, to find the an-
tecedent of left dislocated nouns, students must search through many
more clauses than is the case with right dislocated nouns (Givón 1993, p.
211). When the statistical pattern is uncovered, students must posit a
plausible hypothesis to explain the phenomenon. To do so, students
should be encouraged to see how left and right dislocations are used by
speakers for interactional purposes. Duranty and Ochs (1979) were the
first analysts to highlight how speakers use left dislocations as tools to
manage the system of conversational turn taking. They pointed out that
any speaker who wishes to change the topic of conversation must first
fight to gain the floor. They also noted that speakers often gain the right
to speak by repeating a topic, typically a noun phrase, until the other
speaker or speakers cede the floor ("My boyfriend ... my boy-
friend ... my boyfriend, he got a new job!"). Thus students can be led to
see the correlation between new topics (i.e., referents without an-
tecedents) and the left dislocation construction.
The major drawback to most of the techniques discussed in this section is that they go well beyond the expertise of the vast majority of foreign language teachers who have little or any formal training in discourse analysis. Teachers are likely to agree with Barnes (1990) who objects that this kind of linguistic analysis will unduly complicate language study for most students, especially for beginning language students. Such discourse analytic techniques risk introducing more metalinguistic terminology than ever before into the language classroom with traditional terms simply exchanged for new ones: "topicality," "presupposition," "referentiality," and so on. It would seem wise then to consider most of these techniques more appropriate for more advanced levels of language study, such as a fifth-semester composition or conversation class as suggested by Valdman (1997).

Another problem with such techniques that Barnes (1990) points out is the difficulty students are likely to have formulating simple rules for complex discourse phenomena. Teachers interested in exploring the application of discourse analytic techniques need to remind themselves that language awareness develops with lots of practice and exposure to authentic input. Moreover, cognitive skills, such as inferring patterns from data and building testable hypotheses, requires much practice, too. Only after considerable time will students begin to understand how to do discourse analysis, that is, how to draw nuanced inferences about the correlation of form and function in discourse from seemingly insignificant texts.

Applications from Corpus Linguistics

Corpus linguistics shares many of the same goals as discourse analysis but differs primarily in its methods of analysis. As its name implies, corpus linguistics refers to the analysis of large databases of real language examples stored on a computer (Biber et al. 1998; McEnery and Wilson 1996; Sinclair 1991; Thomas and Short 1996). While most corpus linguists do not have a pedagogical orientation, the field has nonetheless given rise to applications for language learning. One of the most recent and most promising pedagogical applications is called Data-Driven Learning (DDL). DDL relies on inductive methods of grammatical analysis made possible by large and easy-to-manipulate databases of authentic language called linguistic corpora (also referred to as corpora).

What distinguishes the DDL approach is the attempt to cut out the middleman as far as possible and to give direct access to the data so that the learner can take part in building up his or her own profiles of meaning and use. The assumption that underlies this approach is that effective language learning is itself a form of linguistic research, and that the concordance printout offers a unique resource for the stimulation of inductive learning strategies—in particular the strategies of perceiving similarities and differences and of hypothesis formation and testing (Johns 1994, p. 297).

The impetus for introducing corpus data into the classroom grew out of the dissatisfaction with artificial examples found in language textbooks. Johns argues not only that artificial examples are of dubious value for teaching language function, but that they generally are less interesting than the real thing. Furthermore, he questions the use of "simplified texts" because they run the risk of destroying the very features that account for the choice of one form over another in the first place. In general, those calling for the use of corpora in language education have argued that the study of form and function "entails a far more extensive use of authentic, unmodified data than has been traditional in language teaching" (Johns 1994, p. 294).

Induction in grammar instruction is not a particularly new idea. Inductive methods based on corpora and concordances, however, is an innovation. Hadley (1996) recounts an anecdote that illustrates the potential of a corpus printout to teach form-function correlations: "In Japan, language learners still memorize sentences such as 'The food was eaten by me,'... Instead of trying to explain to learners why it is odd simply from insight, we can direct our students to look at tangible examples from the corpus. Using the corpora/concordancer package, they find that eats does in fact collocate most commonly with the word food. According to Hadley, his Japanese ESL learners were provided with the following language samples taken from COBUILD's Bank of English as shown in (16):

(16) ...and a wide selection of food will be eaten. Prepared Softbill food is a good start... ...inger foods and any food that can be eaten seductively are in! Accomplished if... ...an excellent food and should be eaten in plentiful quantities. Now to make...
An enormous corpus of text, the Bank of English includes hundreds of millions of words taken from books, newspapers, and formal and informal sources. In (1), the information in a newspaper article is presented separately in a Key Word in Context (KWIC) format. This format is useful because it allows the examiner to control the amount of input required. A simple program allows the user to control the amount of input required. A simple program allows the user to control the amount of input required. A simple program allows the user to control the amount of input required. A simple program allows the user to control the amount of input required.
12. ...was French. "Le seul but" entered ______ language. New Scient-
ist, in an article by...

Language teachers interested in incorporating DDL techniques into their curricula face a major obstacle—finding a computerized corpus in the target language. Unfortunately, access remains a problem since corpora are still largely the reserve of researchers. Nevertheless, there are ways of getting around such formidable obstacles. Tribble (1997) offers several helpful "quick and dirty" ways for developing corpora for lan-
guage teaching. He suggests that commercially available CD-ROM ency-
clopedias constitute more than enough electronic data for the most successful applications of DDL techniques. Furthermore, many CD-ROM materials have built-in search functions that may be used like concordance programs.

Another idea that has gone relatively unexplored is the use of the World Wide Web as a corpus; after all, it is by far the world's largest electronic database of searchable text in most of the major languages. Based on the same principles as a concordance searching a corpus, an Internet search engine may be used to find thousands (sometimes millions) of exam-

ple of grammatical structures embedded in authentic target language texts (Blyth 1999, p. 116). And similar to a concordance, many search en-
gines will even display the search results with the embedded key word or phrase in boldface. As the University of Illinois' Division of English as an International Language (DEIL), an innovative website called "Grammar Safari" has been developed to show teachers and students how to transform the Internet into an enormous grammar database.5 The rationale is explained on the web site's homepage:

Grammar books tend to make things fairly simple and there is some value in that. Nevertheless, for the serious student of English, it's worthwhile also to broaden your horizons and explore the jungle out in the real world. The World Wide Web (WWW) is an excellent place to begin experiencing English as it occurs in its natural sur-
rroundings—not only are there millions of English texts readily available, but also most of them can be electronically searched for.

The basic concept is applicable to any language that is available on the Inter-

et. Instead of using content words for key words, learners or teachers use the foreign language grammatical words to locate examples of target

language structures. Using the Spanish version of the popular search engine Yahoo!, I conducted a search using the Spanish phrase "todo lo que" ("all that") A small sample of the results are given in (18).

(18) CARABANCHEL - Esta es la pagina de Carabanchel donde encontras arte, cultura, ocio, musica y todo lo que quieres saber sobre nuestro barrio
<http://www.carabanchel.com>

Prólogo al alumno - En la Academia de Peluquería Michi podés encon-
trar todo lo que necesita para formarte como peinador.
<http://www.michi.adam.net/alumno.html>

QTPD.com - QTPD.com tu sitio de entretenimiento venezolano en la
red, con todo lo que quieras, chat, postales, amor, humor, y mucho
mucha más.
<http://www.qtpd.com/>

As useful as Web pages may be for providing thousands of grammati-
cal examples, it is important to remember that they are written texts and
may not be particularly useful for exemplifying spoken constructions. On
the other hand, because of the enormous size of the Internet and because of the
infrastructural incompleteness of discourse in cyberspace, even the most
typical oral expressions are liable to turn up. As proof, consider a small sample of the results from a Yahoo! search that I conducted for the French expression "et patait et patait" ("and so on and so on!") a phrase usually restricted to
informal speech, given in (19). The first text is strikingly paratactic in

nature and rife with indexes of informal spoken French: discourse mark-
ers (Allons bon [OK]), left dislocated topics (la culture, c'est...[culture, it's...]), omission of obligatory complementizer "que" (je sais o la cul-
ture... [I think o culture]).

(19) Fai oublié ma confiture - CULTURE Allons bon, Cyrille qui fait une
page sur la culture, c'est à

hurler de rire. Oui, je sais, la culture c'est comme la confiture moins on
en a et patait et patait.

C'est vrai, ce n'est peut être pas la page qui va s'enrichir le plus. A

moins.
<http://www.mygale.org/00/udti1138/iosioub.htm>
Chant choréal - Le Courrier du Chœur - Belgique Le jeu de rôle du chef de chœur Les pouvoirs de la polyphonie (Cézary Geoffray) Un bon chef pense à son successeur L'humour de Gustave (A Coeur Joie Belgique) Et patatou, et patata - Le bavardage dans nos chœurs Le moine et l'habit

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homespages/Michel_Lion/echo>

Although the vast range of data in electronic form available via the Internet is impressive, the fact remains that corpora of transcribed spoken language are hard to come by. Teachers committed to teaching spoken syntax should give serious thought to creating their own materials. This is not as impossible as it may seem. First of all, a corpus need not be overwhelmingly large. A ten-minute sample from a recorded, naturally occurring conversation will produce enough to exemplify many of the most common discourse structures—reparis, dislocations, discourse markers. Moreover, recorded conversations or interviews do not need to be transcribed in their entirety. Teachers should transcribe only those sections that contain pertinent grammar items. While these materials are not as numerous to produce as teachers may think, they still take time and effort. Ultimately, publishing companies should consider providing samples of recorded authentic oral discourse with transcriptions along with traditional materials, that is, studio recorded scripted dialogues. Even a small corpus of short interactions would greatly help an instructor trying to teach grammar as communicative practice.

As with the applications from discourse analysis, the pedagogical applications of corpus linguistics appear rather limited for several reasons. First, searching databases and inducing patterns from large sets of data require a level of linguistic sophistication well beyond most beginning and intermediate students. Most reports of the applications of DDL have been on advanced learners who already possessed a rather sophisticated knowledge of grammar and lexis. It remains to be seen how DDL may be adapted for beginning levels. Second, students and teachers not proficient with concordance software may find that such techniques require too much time spent learning a new computer program rather than learning the target language. And third, logistical problems such as access to computerized corpora loom large. Therefore rather than letting beginning and intermediate students discover form/function correlations on their own, teachers may find it more profitable and efficient to use a corpus to produce their own handouts as suggested.

TA Education

A recent survey of graduate TAs in French departments around the country discovered that TAs lacked important metalinguistic knowledge despite a strong emphasis on grammatical analysis throughout their own language learning experience (Fox 1993). In particular, Fox's survey revealed that the model of language with which TAs begin their careers ignores discourse competence as a distinct level of grammatical organization. As a result, TAs are prone to conceive of grammar as comprised of distinct entities that are adequately described at a sentential level. To fill the knowledge gap, Fox suggests that TAs receive an introduction to linguistic description of the target language as part of their curriculum to raise their awareness about discourse grammar. Besides gaining greater awareness of discourse competence and discourse grammar, TAs need to become more aware of the vast differences between the written and spoken languages and how those differences are often masked or distorted in the classroom.

One of the best ways to discover the particularities of spoken language is to transcribe it. TAs can benefit immensely by transcribing a short stretch (five minutes a usually sufficient) of any naturally occurring conversation as part of their methods course. TAs can transcribe the same stretch of dialogue and then compare their transcriptions in class, or they may prefer to work on different interactions. TAs may also benefit from conducting with native speakers interviews that they can later transcribe. These transcriptions not only provide the TAs with a better awareness of the complexities of spoken language, but may also serve as potential materials for students in language classes. The recordings and transcriptions may even be collected and used to start a departmental corpus of spoken language.

In keeping with a constructivist approach to TA education, the role of the TA educator is not so much to teach teachers how to teach discourse syntax, but rather to facilitate and guide TAs' own construction of teaching practices (Blyth 1997). The goal is not so much to "train" the new TA in a set of pedagogical practices that he or she must import into the classroom as it is to help the apprentice teacher raise questions about the
these developments with those already in place — to improve accuracy and coherence in second language teaching. The focus on form accuracy, for example, is absent from many second language classrooms, where focus is on communicative interaction. The same can be said for the techniques, including testing, developed by the school of natural language teaching. "The artificial but widespread division between form and meaning, between conversation and composition courses, could be partially eliminated by a more systematic integration of these areas, with a focus on communicative interaction," Williams (1977) argues. He also states that the focus on communicative language use should be extended to include oral language assessment. The artificial but widespread division between form and meaning, between conversation and composition courses, could be partially eliminated by a more systematic integration of these areas, with a focus on communicative interaction. Williams (1977) argues. He also states that the focus on communicative language use should be extended to include oral language assessment.

In the past decade, discourse-oriented linguists have made much progress in their description of nonmanual grammatical forms encountered in natural language. These developments have been fostered by the work of linguists such as Henry Hymes and the York School of Speech Communication, which has been concerned with the role of language in social interaction. As Sinclair (1994) puts it: "Our understanding of language as a social institution is growing. This understanding, in turn, is leading to new insights about the teachability of word-order contractions and other discourse markers, and the extent to which they should be taught in the classroom."
should be included in textbooks to illustrate more accurately the various
discourse structures to be learned. All of this needs to be integrated into
a fully articulated, discourse-oriented program, preferably aimed at
the intermediate level in order to help our students move from producing
sentences to producing discourse.

Notes
1. I would like to acknowledge my appreciation to Kevin Lemoine and
three anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on earlier
versions of this chapter.
2. The term construction is based on the notion developed in Construc-
tion Grammar (Fillmore 1991; Fillmore and Kay 1995; Fillmore, Kay,
and O’Connor 1988; Goldberg 1995; Jackendoff 1995; Lambrecht
In this approach to grammar, a construction is the basic unit of gram-
matical form. Essentially, a construction is any structure with a con-
tentional mapping of form with semantic structure and pragmatic
function. Fillmore and Kay (1995) describe a construction as a “struc-
tured set of conditions determining a class of actual constructs of a
language” (p. 4). Thus, a construction can be lexical, morphological,
or, like the examples considered in this article, syntactic.
3. Portes Ouvertes (Haggstrom et al. 1998) is a recent example of a first-
year foreign language program that makes liberal use of authentic, un-
scripted video.
4. Altman (1989) cites video’s qualities of maximum contextualization
and maximum control as the reason the medium is particularly “well
suited to display the connections between language and the real world
upon which communication depends” (p. 8). While maximum contextu-
alization remains analog video’s claim to fame, the medium can no
longer be said to afford maximum control. That honor now goes to
multimedia software in which digitized files may be randomly accessed
at the click of a computer key.
5. In a cleft sentence the copula (the conjugated form of “to be”) is pre-
ceded by “it” in English and “c’est” in French and followed by a noun
phrase and a relative clause, for example, It is Horowitz who is going
to play. C’est Horowitz qui va jouer.

6. The term left dislocation used here refers to a specific word-order con-
struction in which an extracausal pronoun or noun is placed immedi-
ately to the left of the clause, for example, (Mary, John kissed her.
7. This exercise and many more DDL materials are available online at
Tim John’s Virtual DDL Website <http://sun1.lsham.ac.uk/johnst/def_art.htm>.
8. The Grammar Safari web site’s address is
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