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ABSTRACT

This paper documents the development and preliminary implementation of a functional-lexicogrammatical (FL) syllabus, and reports on an experiment conducted to test its effectiveness for increasing student awareness of lexicogrammatical (LG) patterns and grammatical word order. Following a communicative, social-semiotic view of language, and attempting to fill the gap that exists between corpus linguistics methodology and classroom practice, the FL syllabus focuses on both the products (texts, LG patterns) and the processes (communicative tasks, consciousness-raising) of language learning by integrating pedagogic corpora (Willis, 1990, 2003), corpus-driven pattern grammar (Hunston & Francis, 1998, 2000) and data-driven learning (Johns, 1991, 1994) within a functional task-based framework. A comparative analysis was conducted between the FL syllabus, a structural-grammatical (SG) syllabus, and a post-methods control, with all three syllabuses based on the same texts and communicative tasks. The statistical analysis revealed that the FL syllabus ($p = 0.0028$) was superior to the SG syllabus ($p = 0.0262$) and the control ($p = 0.1038$) for raising awareness of LG patterns, including collocation, colligation, and sentence frames. However, the SG syllabus was also more effective than the control for raising LG awareness and was the most effective for improving grammatical word order scores ($p = 0.017$). These results suggest that the FL syllabus is worthy of further research and development, but should incorporate a focus on core grammar structure, as well as LG patterns.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Innovation in ELT syllabus design

Several major paradigm shifts in English language teaching (ELT) have occurred over the years which have been duly reflected in syllabus design trends, periodically swaying back and forth between a focus on the products (e.g. grammar structures, functions, and words) and a focus on the processes (e.g. tasks, consciousness-raising) of language learning (Hadley, 2001). Recent developments in the broad field of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) however, have seen a call by language experts for a shift towards the middle of the product-process continuum (Wilkins, 1981; Long, 2000; Willis, 2003; Ellis, 2006) and this has resulted in numerous communicative hybrid syllabuses of various forms being proposed. While this is seen as a positive development for ELT syllabus innovation, two questions remain to be answered: 1) While it is generally agreed that there is a need for process (i.e. communicative tasks) in the syllabus (Robinson, 1998), what is the most effective product to focus on for language learning and hybrid syllabus design? 2) With innovative corpus linguistics (CL) research now driving a large proportion of linguistics and applied linguistics, how can these innovations be more fully integrated into ELT syllabus design? Evidently, it will be argued that the second question can provide the answer to the first: By integrating corpus-driven pattern grammar and data-driven learning (DDL) methodology into the syllabus, the lexicogrammatical (LG) pattern can be exploited as an effective product of language learning.

1.2 Corpus Linguistics and syllabus design

Modern CL has played a major role in reshaping our view and understanding of how language operates within real social communication and has influenced almost every area of linguistics, applied linguistics and language related resources. This is evident in that it is now quite unusual to find a major dictionary or reference grammar that does not claim to be ‘corpus-based’ or ‘corpus-informed’ (O’Keeffe, McCarthy, & Carter, 2007: xi). However, the use of corpora by teachers and learners in the classroom is increasing at a surprisingly slow and disproportionate pace (Gavioli, 2005), and although efforts are being made to communicate the benefits of CL in the classroom (e.g. Johns, 1994; Sinclair, 2004a; Gavioli, 2005; O’Keeffe et al., 2007), there is a “frequent mismatch between corpus linguistics research and what goes into..."
materials and resources, and what goes on in the language classroom” (O’Keeffe et al., 2007: xi). This discrepancy can be attributed to a lack of communication between corpus linguists and teachers (O’Keeffe et al., 2007), and the basic principle of supply and demand. Presently there are very few requests for pedagogically oriented corpus tools and materials; many teachers and students are either unaware of the benefits of using corpora in the classroom, fail to see their relevance for teaching and learning (Gavioli, 2005), or believe that working with corpora is only useful for advanced learners with access to computer laboratories (Boulton, 2008).

1.3 Lexicogrammar in the syllabus

Perhaps the most detrimental mismatch between CL research findings and classroom practice can be found in the treatment of lexicogrammar. With only a few exceptions, most notably Halliday’s Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), grammar and vocabulary have traditionally been treated as separate entities. This distinction is most poignant within the field of language teaching and learning where coursebooks and syllabuses often include separate sections for grammar and vocabulary (Hunston, Francis, & Manning, 1997). A large and growing body of research however, much of it CL based, now provides evidence supporting what Halliday (1961, 1977, cited in Hasan 1996) has long argued: The grammar/vocabulary dichotomy is invalid – lexis and grammar are better understood as a single system to convey meaning (Willis, 1990; Sinclair, 1991; Hasan, 1996; Hunston & Francis, 2000).

Although ELT publishers have recently begun adapting to a more lexical view of language by including LG chunks in their materials, the process of selecting lexical phrases for coursebooks is highly subjective, and often conducted without reference to corpus data, resulting in “an unprincipled and careless selection process” (Koprowski, 2005: 328). Further compromising their pedagogic usefulness, the LG patterns included in coursebooks are often organized simply by listing a number of lexical phrases by type, or in relation to specified grammar structures (Koprowski, 2005). This latter organizational feature reinforces the critical mismatch between research and practice: Despite strong evidence in favour of an LG, meaning-based view of language, structural-grammatical (SG) syllabuses, which by their very nature separate grammar and lexis (Sinclair & Renouf, 1988), continue to be widely used (Groom, 2009).
1.4 **Aim and organization**

This paper aims to bridge the gap between CL research and classroom practice, specifically ELT syllabus design, by outlining the development and subsequent evaluation of a corpus-driven, functional-lexicogrammatical (FL) syllabus that focuses on both the process and the products of social communication. The FL approach incorporates and synthesizes elements of notional-functional (Wilkins, 1976), lexical (Sinclair & Renouf, 1988; Willis, 1990; Lewis, 1993), text-based (Farghal, 1993; Feez, 1998), and task-based (Long & Crookes, 1992; J. Willis, 1996; Skehan, 1996, 1998) syllabuses, realized through pedagogic corpora (Willis, 2003), corpus-driven pattern grammar (Hunston & Francis, 1998, 2000), and data-driven learning (DDL) (Johns, 1991, 1994).

In the next chapter, the term *syllabus* is defined and contextualized from a CLT perspective, and the product-oriented/process-oriented syllabus classification scheme is introduced, followed by an analysis of four prominent syllabus types and the more recent hybrid syllabuses. In Chapter 3, the corpus-driven FL approach is proposed as an effective product-process hybrid syllabus and its constituent elements are explained in detail. Chapter 4 reports on an experiment conducted to compare the FL syllabus with a more traditional SG approach to text analysis, measuring its effectiveness for increasing student awareness of common LG patterns and grammatical word order. In Chapter 5, the implications and limitations of the experiment are considered followed by a discussion on future research and application of the FL syllabus. Chapter 6 concludes with a final overview and reflection on the study.
CHAPTER 2 SYLLABUS, METHODOLOGY, AND APPROACH

2.1 Defining syllabus

The term *syllabus* is generally defined as “a description of the contents of a course of instruction and the order in which they are to be taught” (Richards & Schmidt, 2002: 532). There is some disagreement, however, concerning the role of methodology and its relationship with syllabus design, resulting in two diverging approaches. The *narrow approach* views syllabus and methodology as clearly and necessarily distinct: The syllabus consists of the selection and grading of content while the methodology consists of the selection of teaching practices and procedures. Proponents of the *broad approach* on the other hand, argue that the emergence of CLT has invalidated the idea that syllabus and methodology can be developed separately (Nunan, 1988). In some cases, such as in task-based language teaching (TBLT) (discussed further in 2.3.1), there is no clear boundary between the syllabus content and the classroom procedures and activities. In other cases, it is argued that combining certain syllabuses with certain methodologies creates conflict, such as communicative methodology paired to a structural-grammatical syllabus (Willis, 1990).

The FL syllabus proposed and evaluated in this paper, falling within a CLT framework, necessarily adheres to the broad view of syllabus design. The core content, if isolated from the methodology would simply consist of a collection of texts selected for a particular group of learners (i.e. a pedagogic corpus). The FL syllabus is only realized through the interaction between the pedagogic corpus and the corpus-driven methodology, which is applied to identify further content (e.g. LG patterns) found in the texts. Thus, the content and the methodology are interdependent and cannot be separated.

Further expanding on this broad approach to syllabus design, the content and the methodology selected for any syllabus will reflect the views of language and language learning held by the syllabus designer. The FL syllabus proposed in this study is based on a communicative, social-semiotic view of language in which no distinction is made between learning a language and using a language. In Halliday’s terms, we ‘learn how to mean’ (1975, 1993). Meaning, which is realized through language, cannot be separated from its particular context of culture and situation, and serves three purposes or metafunctions: ideational, interpersonal, and textual (Halliday &
Hasan, 1985). This view has obvious implications for grammatical description and syllabus design: Rather than treating grammar and vocabulary as isolated bodies of knowledge that can be learned separately, Halliday’s functional theory of language sees learning as a social process and treats lexis and grammar as a unified system, a lexicogrammar used to construct social meaning. Returning then to the task of defining syllabus, for the purpose of this paper, a syllabus will be broadly defined as the interaction between pedagogic content and methodology within a specific approach to language and language learning.

2.1.1 Classifying syllabus types

Several schemes for classifying syllabus types feature prominently in the literature, and although each differs somewhat in its point of reference, they all generally overlap and parallel in their main dichotomies as outlined in Table 2.1. Here, Nunan’s (1988) terms ‘product-oriented’ and ‘process-oriented’ will be used, as they are the most transparent in terms of relevance to the present study. A *product-oriented syllabus* focuses on the learner acquiring specific knowledge and skills (Nunan, 1988). The learner is presented with a series of isolated linguistic features, such as grammatical structures, vocabulary, or speech acts, taught individually in a linear sequence and is required to synthesize the individual parts to develop the complete system (Wilkins, 1976). This parallels the theory of language learning that Rutherford (1987) terms ‘accumulated entities’ (discussed in 2.2.2). A *process-oriented syllabus*, on the other hand, focuses on the learning experience itself (Nunan, 1988). The learner is required to analyze language in a more natural and holistic environment, aiming to “approximate his own linguistic behaviour more and more closely to the global language” (Wilkins, 1976: 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1 Syllabus classification schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on what to teach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkins (1976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breen (1987a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (1988)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Product-oriented syllabuses

Until fairly recently, the majority of syllabus types have been product-oriented, focusing on the knowledge and skills considered necessary for learners to acquire a second language. While there are numerous syllabus types that can be identified as product-oriented, the following discussion is limited to the three syllabus types most relevant to the development of the FL approach: the structural-grammatical syllabus, the notional-functional syllabus, and the lexical syllabus.

2.2.1 The structural-grammatical syllabus

The SG syllabus consists of a list of grammatical structures arranged in the order they are to be taught, based on frequency, perceived difficulty, usefulness, or any combination of these (Richards & Schmidt, 2002). Originally the driving force behind the audio-lingual and grammar-translation approaches to language learning, the SG syllabus is now most commonly associated with Present, Practice, and Produce (PPP) methodology. Although it has long been, and arguably still is, the most prevalent type of ELT syllabus (Skehan, 1998; Groom, 2009), there has been highly vocal criticism directed towards both SG sequencing and PPP methodology in the last four decades (e.g. Rutherford, 1987; Skehan, 1996; D. Willis, 1996). The main arguments against the SG syllabus are outlined below.

2.2.2 Problems with the structural-grammatical syllabus

The SG syllabus represents the product-oriented view of language learning known as ‘accumulated entities’ (Rutherford, 1987) where language is treated as a body of knowledge to be acquired. The second language learner begins at “point zero”, and is taught individual “entities” of the target language one at a time in a predetermined linear sequence until the language is mastered (Rutherford, 1987: 4). The accumulated entities view pairs well with PPP methodology: A specific grammatical structure is isolated and presented to the learners, followed by a teacher-controlled practice stage, and ending with a freer production stage (Richards & Schmidt, 2002).

There is a fundamental flaw with the SG syllabus and PPP methodology however, as research has shown that language is not acquired in a clear-cut linear fashion and that students do not simply learn the language that the teacher presents to them (Rutherford, 1987; Skehan, 1996). This realization, referred to in the literature as the
**learnability problem,** is well documented. Corder’s (1967, cited in Ellis, 1993: 92) suggestion that learners have a “built-in syllabus”, which determines when grammatical features can be acquired, has been supported by several empirical studies (Felix, 1981; Ellis, 1984, 1989; Pienemann, 1984, 1989). While the learnability problem is challenging for any syllabus, Ellis (1993: 92), a proponent of using the SG syllabus for consciousness-raising (CR), acknowledges that learnability “becomes acute when the content is specified in grammatical terms”.

From a social-semiotic perspective, the SG syllabus is predominantly concerned with exploiting the ideational function of language (Farghal, 1993). However, by focusing on isolated grammatical structures, the SG syllabus fails to adequately convey communicative, social meaning and at times even grammatical meaning (Wilkins, 1976: 8), “brazenly [leaving the learner] to realize his linguistic competence as communicative behaviour when the occasion arises” (Widdowson, 1979: 240). This lack of communicative meaning is further exemplified in the SG ‘slot and filler’ treatment of lexis, where vocabulary plays a secondary role to grammatical structure (Sincair & Renouf, 1988). Rather than being chosen for their communicative value, lexical items are usually selected to highlight certain grammatical features, often in ways that run counter to corpus evidence (Shortall, 2007). Thus the SG syllabus conveys an incomplete, lexically deficient representation of the ideational function of language. As its name suggests, it is grammatical, not lexicogrammatical. The role of lexis in the syllabus will be explored more fully in the discussion on the lexical syllabus in 2.2.5, after dealing with the notional-functional syllabus below.

### 2.2.3 The notional-functional syllabus

The notional-functional (NF) syllabus was specifically developed to address the non-communicative nature of conventional SG syllabus designs (Wilkins, 1976) and remains “the most popular alternative” to the structural-grammatical approach (Finch, 2000: section 3.4.3.2, para. 1). Eschewing grammatical organization, the language content of the NF syllabus is organized around the communicative needs of learners though notions and functions (Richards & Schmidt, 2002). **Notions,** also referred to as ‘semantico-grammatical’ categories by Wilkins (1976), refer to classes of conceptual meaning (e.g. frequency, quantity etc.) while **functions,** or speech acts, refer to the communicative purpose of language items (e.g. greeting, enquiring, suggesting etc.)
By organizing the content according to notions and functions, the NF syllabus is able to group together various language structures that perform similar language functions. For example, “How’s it going?”, which is structurally a question, and “It’s good to see you”, structurally a statement, would be grouped together under the functional category of greetings. This focus on speech acts moves the NF syllabus primarily towards the interpersonal function of language (Farghal, 1993).

2.2.4 Constructive criticism of the notional-functional syllabus

Despite Wilkin’s assertion that the NF syllabus is analytic (i.e. process-oriented) in nature, it is considered by some (Widdowson, 1979; Nunan, 1988) to be just as synthetic (i.e. product-oriented), as the structural syllabus. Widdowson (1979: 240) labels the NF syllabus’ attempt to foster communicative competence by incorporating it into the syllabus itself a “delusion” since it too presents language as itemized units to be accumulated and stored. “They are notional rather than structural isolates, but they are isolates all the same” (Widdowson, 1979: 240). Nunan (1988) following Widdowson’s reasoning, notes that, despite their functional labels, NF syllabuses end up looking very similar to the SG syllabuses they were designed to replace. Nonetheless, Widdowson (1979) praises the intentions behind the NF syllabus for bringing attention to what is needed in a syllabus in order to develop communicative competence. He sees the NF syllabus as a “starting point, not a destination”, and recommends merging the seemingly opposing SG and NF organizational schemes while pursuing methods to develop true dynamic and communicative processing skills (Widdowson, 1979: 241-242).

2.2.5 The lexical syllabus

The lexical approach to syllabus design, first proposed by Sinclair and Renouf (1988) and developed further by Willis (1990), Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) and Lewis (1993), is based on the argument that lexis is the primary organizational feature of communication and language learning, with special attention paid to lexical ‘chunks’ (i.e. collocation), which Sinclair (2004b) identifies as the predominant ‘units of meaning’. A syllabus organized around lexis returns to the ideational function of language, and while not fully lexicogrammatical, Sinclair and Renouf (1988:155) argue that a proper analysis of words and phrases will ensure that “all the relevant grammar, etc. should appear in a proper proportion”.
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Evidence supporting a lexically centered theory of language comes from both corpus studies and spoken discourse analysis. In his seminal work with the COBUILD corpus project, Sinclair (1991: 110) formulated his well-known *idiom principle*, which states that the choice of any particular word affects or prospects the words that will follow, and concluded that language users have access to “a large number of semi-preconstructed phrases that constitute single choices”. Kjellmer (1991: 124, citing research by Pawley & Syder, 1983) points out that typical moderately fluent learners pause much more frequently than typical moderately fluent native speakers and postulates that the difference is due to the automation of collocations. Error analysis offers further support to this argument: Learners continue to make errors that are lexical in origin long after they have developed a sufficient knowledge base of general syntactic rules (Little, 1994). Lewis (1993) argues that many grammar mistakes are caused by insufficient vocabulary, and lack of collocational awareness in particular. He gives the following example:

…a student may say *We made some studies to get informations about what the people want*. …the temptation is to see a student with grammatical problems. The student would have little problem with the grammar if (s)he knew the collocation *market research*: *We made some market research*. There would be no problem if the student knew the collocation *do market research* (Lewis, 1993: 171).

### 2.2.6 Challenges for the lexical syllabus

Perhaps the biggest challenge for the lexical approach has been convincing teachers, teacher trainers, and students of its value and practicality. Despite ample research in support of adding more lexical focus in pedagogic description, it seems that few are willing to abandon SG and NF syllabuses. Compounding this drawback is the lack of commercially available, lexically-based teaching materials. One of the few truly lexical coursebook series developed to date, the Collins COBUILD English Course (Willis & Willis, 1988), received somewhat negative reviews from both teachers and students who complained that it was too dense and difficult to use (Taylor, 1991). Whether or not it was the presentation and layout that caused the problems, Sinclair and Renouf (1988: 160) predicted that a coursebook based on a lexical syllabus would be “radically different from conventional ones” and would “almost certainly meet resistance at first”.
In addition to being largely ignored by teachers and publishers, the lexical approach has been criticized for lacking a comprehensive learning theory (Richards & Rodgers, 2001), despite Lewis’ (1993) assertion that the lexical approach is in effect a subset and development of CLT. Richards and Rodgers (2001) argue that lexis makes up only one component of communicative competence and claim that the lexical approach has yet to convincingly demonstrate how it can be effectively applied to syllabus design and methodology. This is a valid point as there is still no clear consensus on how a lexical syllabus should be organized and presented. Sinclair and Renouf (1988) argue that frequency should be the main organizing principle, starting with the most common word forms, their central patterns of usage and their most typical combinations. Little (1994: 116), however, cautions against reliance on frequency counts for lexical syllabus design since “even texts dealing with the commonest everyday topics often contain words of low frequency.”

While Sinclair and Renouf (1988), taking a narrow approach to syllabus design, do not specify or endorse any specific methodology, others have proposed specific methodologies, leading to rather different lexical syllabuses from a broad perspective. Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) propose a functional organization of lexical phrases including social interactions, topics, and discourse devices. Lewis (1993) supports Krashen’s (1981) Natural Approach and stresses the importance of ‘language-rich’ classrooms and materials, including effective teacher talk, and an abundance of listening and reading. Also focusing on input, Willis (1990, 2003) argues for the creation of a pedagogic corpus specified to the needs of the learners. The corpus is used to draw the learners’ attention to the target items in context through various communicative tasks. Thus, by combining content and methodology, the lexical syllabuses, as envisioned by Willis and Lewis are closer to the process side of the product-process continuum and may be better described as communicative hybrids (discussed in 2.4). Before moving on to the communicative hybrid syllabuses however, it is necessary to outline the rationale and main features of process-oriented syllabuses.

### 2.3 Process-oriented syllabuses

Although some distinctions can be drawn between the practices and principles underlying procedural, and task-based syllabuses (TBS) (see Long & Crookes, 1992),
they both share a basic concept of ‘task’ as a primary unit for syllabus design, focusing on the process of language use rather than the products. Following Nunan (1988) and Richards and Schmidt (2002), both syllabus types will be treated as synonymous in the discussion of the task-based syllabus that follows.

2.3.1 The task-based syllabus

The emergent popularity of the process approach to syllabus design, and TBLT in particular, stems from frustration with “the limitations of the PPP model” (J. Willis, 1996: 52) and “the realization that specifying functions and notions would not in itself lead to the development of communicative language skills” (Nunan, 1988: 41). In TBLT, a task is something that is done rather than said (Long & Crookes, 1993), with meaning as its primary focus (Skehan, 1996). Jane Willis defines task as:

...a goal-oriented activity in which learners use language to achieve a real outcome...learners use whatever target language resources they have in order to solve a problem, do a puzzle, play a game, or share and compare experiences (J. Willis, 1996: 53).

Both J. Willis (1996) and Skehan (1996, 1998) propose similar three-phase task-based frameworks. In the Pre-Task phase, the topic and task are introduced; students are exposed to relevant words and phrases, and given time to prepare for the task. In the Task Phase, Willis recommends a three-part Task Cycle consisting of the communicative Task to be completed by the students in pairs or groups, followed by a Planning phase. Here, the students are given time to prepare for the Report phase in which they present their task strategy and outcome to the whole class. When communicating in small groups to prepare for and complete the task, students will most likely focus on fluency to negotiate meaning, but will plan ahead and rehearse to ensure more accuracy when presenting to the whole class (J. Willis, 1996). Finally, in the Post Task phase, there is a focus on form to help the students develop awareness of the LG system.

From a communicative, social-semiotic perspective, it can be argued that the TBS is more effective than product-oriented designs as it promotes real and meaningful communication among language learners (Rabbini, 2002). Essentially, tasks “call upon and engage the same abilities which underlie communication itself” (Breen, 1987b: 161), and therefore reflect all three of Halliday’s language functions – the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual.
2.3.2 The dangers of task-based language teaching

Although TBLT better reflects Halliday’s (1975) social process of ‘learning how to mean’ when compared to SG and NF syllabuses, Skehan (1996, 1998) warns against the exclusive use of communicative tasks, which can lead to fossilization and an over-reliance on communication strategies. Stressing the need for learners to be focused on both language-as-form and language-as-meaning, Skehan (1996) notes that a disproportionate focus on one can lead to an overreliance on the other:

> An excessive focus on meaning during task completion runs the risk of learners becoming confined to the strategic solutions they develop without sufficient focus for structural change or accuracy. An excessive focus on form will not push the learners to integrate structure into effective on-going communication (Skehan, 1996: 30).

In order to promote balanced language development then, it is essential that TBLT include a focus on form. This has been addressed in different ways; J. Willis (1996) and Skehan (1996, 1998) advocate the inclusion of various form-focused activities within both the pre-task and post-task phases, while Long (2000) on the other hand, favours a more real-time focus on form as it is needed during meaningful interaction within the task itself. Acknowledging the need for a focus on form in TBLT moves these balanced TBSs more toward the middle of the product-process continuum, which may also be better described as communicative hybrid syllabuses.

2.4 Communicative hybrid syllabuses

Learning how to create meaning in a second language is a highly complex process and the brief review of the major syllabus types outlined above suggests that no single method of syllabus design on its own is adequate for successful language learning. Nunan (1988) points out that the product/process dimension of syllabus classification should not be treated as a mutually exclusive dichotomy, but as a continuum on which any given syllabus can be located; and while there have been periodic shifts between product and process orientations within ELT in the past (Hadley, 2001), the emergence and popularity of hybrid product-process syllabuses suggests that a more effective syllabus can likely be found somewhere between the two extremes.

With CLT now firmly established as the dominant methodology in ELT (Knight, 2000), there is a general consensus that a well-balanced communicative syllabus
needs to encompass elements of both process, in the form of meaningful communication, and product in the form of units of meaning (Wilkins, 1981; Ellis, 1993, 2006; Willis, 1990, 2003; Long & Crookes, 1992; Long, 2000). While TBLT is becoming synonymous with CLT, proponents of task-based approaches stress the need for a focus on form. There is disagreement, however, on the most efficient product/process combination. Ellis’s (1993, 2006) endorsement of pairing a structural syllabus with a meaning-based one (i.e. communicative tasks) and Wilkins’s (1981) concession that the NF syllabus needs to be integrated into a fuller view of language (e.g. the grammatical system) has contributed to many mainstream ELT structural-functional hybrid coursebooks. These are usually based on an SG framework with accompanying functions, topics, and interactive tasks, attempting to realize Widdowson’s (1979) call for an integrated SG-NF-communicative-processing syllabus. However, since the main organizing feature of these hybrids is typically SG, they are most easily taught using inefficient PPP methodology, with the meaning-based activities merely incorporated into the final Production stage. In many cases, what were once called exercises or activities have been labeled tasks, “but there is no difference between them” (Robinson, 1998: 4). Willis (1990) is critical of these structural-functional hybrid syllabuses since true communication is often subordinated to the primary goal of rehearsing a particular form.

Willis (1990, 2003) argues for pairing a lexical syllabus with a task-based syllabus as a more effective alternative to the structural-functional hybrids that are common today. The benefits of this approach are acknowledged by Long and Crookes (1992), proponents of TBLT, who note that CL research has initiated a renewed interest and focus on lexis in syllabus design:

If any targetlike linguistic items are learnable separately and completely at one time, words or collocations may be the most likely candidates. It seems more reasonable to suppose a learner can connect items like car and book, put on and take off, with their referents accurately and invariably from Time 1, and do so on demand, not when dictated by some internal syllabus, especially if the lexical item marks a one-to-one, form-meaning relationship (Long & Crookes, 1992: 32).

Willis’s (1990, 2003) endorsement of a hybrid product-process syllabus that combines a focus on lexical units of meaning with communicative tasks forms the basis for the development of the FL approach to syllabus design outlined in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3 THE FUNCTIONAL-LEXICOGRAMMATICAL SYLLABUS

In developing the FL approach to syllabus design, every attempt was made to integrate corpus-driven innovations within a holistic, social-semiotic view of language that covers all three of Halliday’s metafunctions. From a product orientation, this is primarily accomplished by compiling a pedagogic corpus to be used as the foundation for the syllabus. Starting with whole texts ensures that ideational, interpersonal, and textual meaning is present, and most importantly, context of situation. Next, by drawing students’ attention to LG patterns found in the texts, a more natural and complete form of ideational meaning can be addressed than is found in most SG syllabuses. This is realized through corpus-driven pattern grammar and DDL activities. Finally, from a process orientation, designing functional language tasks for the learners that correspond to the texts and LG patterns ensures continued focus on all three metafunctions in the form of authentic social communication. Each of these components will be outlined in more detail below as they pertain to the prototype FL syllabus.

3.1 Discourse-driven: The pedagogic corpus

Compiling a core set of texts to produce what Willis (2003) terms a ‘pedagogic corpus’ is the starting point and foundation of the FL syllabus, since the study of texts is the primary way of understanding how language operates within a social-semiotic perspective (Halliday & Hasan, 1985). One of the main problems with product-oriented syllabuses (SG, FL and isolated lexical syllabuses) is their reductionist nature. By focusing on the figure (i.e. language form and/or language function) without any relation to the ground (i.e. discourse/language in use), these syllabuses fail to highlight the interrelation of form and function in the process of creating meaning (Farghal, 1993). For this reason, several applied linguists (Widdowson, 1979; Willis, 1990, 2003; Lewis, 1993, 2000; Farghal, 1993; Feez, 1998, 2000) stress the importance of discourse-driven materials as they provide much-needed context of situation. “It is only when listeners connect language up to contextual conditions of one kind or another that they can do things with it” (Widdowson, 1998: 708).

Basing the syllabus on a pedagogic corpus allows the syllabus designer to customize the content to the level, needs, and interests of the specific group of learners in question. The texts should be authentic, or what Brazil (1995) labels ‘used language’,
that is purposeful, and produced for real communication, as opposed to artificial texts. Texts contrived solely to present specific grammatical structures are almost always unrealistic and do not reflect language as it is actually used (Carter, 1998; Shortall, 2007). Willis (2003) however, argues that the material chosen for a pedagogic corpus can include texts that have been simplified for specific purposes, referring to such texts as being ‘natural texts’ that still retain their communicative purpose.

Observing that most coursebooks are linear despite the fact that learning does not occur in a linear fashion, Lewis (1993: 183) recommends recycling texts throughout the syllabus, noting that “in natural language we re-read, check for particular information in a text we read earlier in detail etc.” He also stresses the importance of exploiting texts of different types, including dialogue and continuous prose in both written and audio form. This of course also mimics natural language use in which we typically deal with many different types of discourse on any given day.

If all the texts chosen for the FL pedagogic corpus are authentic, or at least natural, and relevant to the learners, the most common vocabulary and grammatical structures for the register should be represented, as well as any low frequency lexical items of value to the learner. A syllabus built around a carefully compiled pedagogic corpus is also better prepared to deal with the learnability problem. The students will be exposed to a more natural combination of grammatical and lexical patterns at one time so that they are more likely to come into contact with the core grammatical structure that their built-in syllabus is ready to acquire.

### 3.2 Lexicogrammatical units of meaning

While still largely ignored in the majority of ELT coursebooks and syllabuses, considerable progress has been made in developing LG models of language since Halliday (1961, cited in Hasan, 1996) first set out to unite lexis and grammar, which he maintains are “names of complementary perspectives” (Halliday, 1991: 32). Summarizing the research into LG modeling, O’Grady (forthcoming) notes that two approaches have been taken to achieve Halliday’s ‘grammarians’ dream’, one paradigmatic and one syntagmatic. The former focuses on generating lexical items through systems networks (e.g. Hasan, 1996; Tucker, 1998) while the latter focuses on creating structure through lexical patterning (e.g. Sinclair, 1991; Hunston & Francis, 2000).
The lexical approach to syllabus design (discussed in 2.2.5), with its focus on collocation, falls within the syntagmatic approach to LG modeling where language is viewed primarily as grammaticalized lexis rather than lexicalized grammar (Lewis, 1993). Noting the importance attributed to prefabricated lexical chunks for social communication (Pawley & Syder, 1983; Willis, 1990; Lewis, 1993; Wray, 2002, 2008), the FL syllabus aims to integrate and expand the lexical approach by focusing on LG patterns found in the pedagogic corpus. Here, the term LG pattern will be applied broadly to include all forms of prefabricated lexical chunks such as collocation (e.g. *study Japanese*), colligation (e.g. *interested in*), and collocational frameworks (Renouf & Sinclair, 1991) (e.g. *verb from _____ to ______*). The primary vehicles used to exploit the LG patterns, pattern grammar and DDL, are detailed next.

### 3.2.1 Corpus-driven pattern grammar: Expanding the lexical approach

When first proposing their lexical syllabus two decades ago, Sinclair and Renouf (1988: 43) noted that organizing a syllabus around both grammar and lexis at the same time was “exceptionally difficult”. While this observation certainly holds if grammar and lexis are treated as separate entities, taking a single-system LG view of language makes an attractive compromise possible via corpus-driven pattern grammar.

Developed by Hunston, Francis, and Manning (1997) and Hunston and Francis (1998, 2000), *pattern grammar*, is the first corpus-driven grammar to integrate syntax and lexis. It is a descriptive lexicogrammar that “does not rely on a distinction between grammar and vocabulary, but provides connections between the two” (Hunston et al., 1997: 208). Pattern grammar is based on the concept of the LG pattern, which Hunston and Francis (2000: 247) define as “a description of the behaviour of a lexical item, or one of the behaviours of that item, as evidenced in a record of large amounts of language use”. They developed a simple and transparent notation system based on words and word classes that is capable of dealing with any form of lexical behavior, from patterns found in traditional grammars and ELT classrooms such as ‘V to-inf’ and ‘V –ing’ (e.g. *I started to follow him up the stairs* and *Snow began falling again*), to patterns not traditionally found in pedagogic materials such as ‘V about n’ (e.g. *I
heard about the accident) and ‘V n against n’ (e.g. You have to weigh the responsibilities against the rewards) (Hunston & Francis, 2000: 50-51).

Pattern grammar clearly demonstrates Sinclair’s (1991) observation that sense and pattern are interrelated when groups of verbs with a shared pattern are observed. This opens up the possibility of exposing learners to a more meaningful and principled system of lexical sets than they are used to for developing the mental lexicon. Rather than listing LG patterns by type or grammar structure, a common practice in current coursebooks (Koprowski, 2005), they can be grouped together according to shared functional patterns. For example, the pattern ‘V about n’ takes many related mental and verbal processes (e.g. read, learn, hear, think, forget, talk, say, comment, complain etc.).

Hunston, Francis, and Manning (1997: 213-215) argue that the focus on patterns in pattern grammar leads to the development of four key elements of language learning: 1) Understanding is improved due to the shared meaning of patterns which can help when guessing the meaning of unknown words; 2) accuracy can be improved through an awareness of word and pattern compatibility; 3) fluency can be developed by incorporating more prefabricated lexical chunks into the mental lexicon; and 4) flexibility in expressing ideas can be developed through an awareness of different patterns that share the same meaning.

3.2.2 Consciousness-raising and data-driven learning

Traditional SG and NF syllabuses realized through PPP methodology are generally associated with the explicit presentation of grammar rules or lists of phrases to be memorized (i.e. deductive teaching), despite evidence suggesting that learning is more effective when students are encouraged to analyze data and formulate hypotheses for themselves (Sharwood-Smith, 1981; Rutherford, 1987; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Boulton, 2007a). This process, termed consciousness-raising (CR) by Rutherford (1987), involves a focus on inductive teaching strategies to help raise students’ awareness of specific features of the target language without relying on explicit presentation of rules. In other words, Rutherford (1987) sees learning grammar as more effective within a process-oriented syllabus than a product-oriented syllabus (Nunan, 1988).
Developed by Johns (1991: 2) on the premise that “research is too serious to be left to the researchers”, DDL is a method of CR where language learners are presented with either ‘raw’ or pre-selected corpus concordance lines in order to draw their own conclusions about the subtleties of language usage. The first method often stems from student questions such as ‘what’s the difference between x and y?’ and ‘which is more natural, x or y?’ (Hunston & Laviosa, 2001). In these cases, the teacher and students look at raw corpus data together with no predetermined answers and the students are encouraged to make hypotheses and formulate their own pedagogic rules. The second method of DDL requires some data manipulation by the teacher who carefully selects and occasionally edits concordance lines. This method is more appropriate for lower-level students as it gives the teacher more control (Hunston & Laviosa, 2001) and can be used to aid in the teaching of target LG patterns considered useful or problematic for students (Johns, 1991). Table 3.1, (taken from the FL syllabus developed for the present study) demonstrates the second method of DDL using the ‘V about n’ LG pattern discussed above.

While DDL can provide an effective complement to pattern grammar for highlighting LG patterns and has been supported by both qualitative and quantitative classroom research (e.g. Johns, 1991, 1994; Tian, 2004; Bolton, 2007a, 2007b, 2008), it remains on the fringe of teaching methodology and has not been embraced in ELT classrooms. While it is often believed that DDL is only useful for advanced learners in computer labs, Boulton (2008) has shown that it can be successful with low-level students and that the computer lab can be bypassed by using prepared materials (e.g. paper handouts), as originally envisioned by Johns (1994). A very real problem with DDL however, involves preparation time, which Johns (1991) reports can take anywhere from forty minutes to four hours. Many teachers do not have that much extra time during the day. This issue can be partially alleviated by incorporating DDL into a syllabus that can be reused, and through the integration of DDL into published material.
### Table 3.1 ‘V about n’ DDL exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V about n</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I read about it in the paper</td>
<td>[V about n]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It helps you learn about new cultures,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was shocked to hear about the violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think about the future a lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think about job security all the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They don't care about the harm they are doing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't worry about it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatever you know about the brain --please adapt it to our computers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forget about gym and aerobic classes for the time being.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let's talk about something else.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He wouldn't talk about himself, or his wife, or what he was writing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about yourself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did he tell you about me?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All I can say about the software is WOW!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have nothing to say about him.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to them chat about each other,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian refused to comment about the coming struggle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is much to cheer about in China's state firms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not going to complain about anything.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they would lie about other things.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to ask you about something else.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I haven't asked anybody about it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) What kind of words go before about in the examples above?

2) What does she usually __________ about? (run/try/sing)

3) I like to __________ about historical events. (draw/write/play)

4) He needs to talk to you __________ your homework assignment.

### 3.3 Integration: Process and products of social communication

The FL syllabus is an attempt to integrate the contextual, corpus-driven LG elements discussed above into a fluid system of syllabus design that addresses both the products (text/LG units of meaning) and the process (communicative language tasks and CR) of social communication.

The pedagogic corpus foundation of the FL design is largely based on the integrated model proposed by Willis (2003) but diverges on a few points of development sequencing and content. In outlining his recommended approach to syllabus development Willis (2003: 223-224) lists the following six steps:
1) List the lexical items that you think your students should become familiar with.

2) Develop a pedagogic corpus of spoken and written texts and tasks based on the levels and interests of the learners.

3) Order the texts and tasks by perceived level of difficulty.

4) Analyse the pedagogic corpus for lexical coverage of the items identified in step 1.

5) Identify elements of the grammar structure, orientation and patterns found in the corpus and determine a sequence of focus for these features.

6) Design a series of language-focused tasks that focus on the target items in context.

Apart from the DDL and pattern grammar integration, the key difference in Willis’s syllabus design and my FL syllabus is in the initial sequencing. Where Willis advises determining the lexical items before compiling the pedagogic syllabus, the FL syllabus takes on a more ‘reverse engineering’ approach by first selecting the texts based on the levels and communicative needs of the target learners and then scanning the pedagogic corpus for LG patterns that the teacher deems useful for the students. This approach places a large amount of trust in the texts themselves. However, since the 700 most frequent English words make up around 70% of all English text (Willis, 1990), a careful selection of texts for the pedagogic corpus should ensure that the learners will be exposed to an appropriate selection of the most frequent words and LG patterns, as well as any relevant low-frequency items. Furthermore, a careful selection of words and phrases should result in a proper proportion of the relevant core grammatical patterns as Sinclair and Renouf (1988) note that verb tenses consist of some of the most common English words.

The next step, after selecting a number of LG patterns from the pedagogic corpus for a particular lesson, involves creating DDL exercises to draw the learners’ attention to the specific patterns, which are represented in the form of pattern grammar notation. Concordance lines containing the patterns can be compiled from the pedagogic corpus itself, if it is large enough, or from any other relevant corpora. To maintain the focus on context, it is important that the students process the text or texts containing the patterns for meaning before working on the corresponding DDL exercises.
Following Willis’s (2003) model, the final step of the FL design process, involves developing communicative language tasks that correspond to each lesson. A well-designed task will provide opportunities for the learners to use at least some of the LG patterns focused on in the lesson, but without forcing them to be used as is typical in the practice and production stages of PPP methodology.

3.3.1 Observe, Hypothesize, Experiment

Rejecting the ineffective product-oriented PPP paradigm, the various components of the FL syllabus are brought together in each lesson through the Observe-Hypothesize-Experiment (OHE) cycle proposed by Lewis (1993, 2000), which corresponds to Willis’ (2003) discussion on the probability of a Recognition, System building, and Exploration learning process.

The Observe phase involves exposure to new language, providing the learner opportunities to notice and recognize various features of the text(s) that they will be asked to process for meaning (Lewis, 2000). Each lesson of an FL syllabus will typically begin with the introduction of a new text, the return to a previously studied text, or both. Next, the lesson moves into the Hypothesize phase, where the learners begin to sort through the input and form hypotheses about the language system (Lewis, 2000). In the FL syllabus this phase is of the cycle is prompted through the DDL exercises, which aim to draw awareness to various LG patterns found in the texts. Finally, in the Experiment phase, learners test and reformulate their hypotheses (Lewis, 2000); this is achieved by using the language to complete language tasks that are functionally connected to the general topic(s) of the text(s). While various task frameworks can be employed here, such as Jane Willis’s (1996) three-phase task approach, both the Observe and Hypothesize phases can be considered pre-task activities.

Group work is a key element of the FL approach, and CLT in general, due to both its pedagogical and psycholinguistic benefits, including increases in comprehensible input and negotiation of meaning (see Long & Porter, 1985; Pica, 1987). Group work should also lead to instances of ‘languaging’ (Swain, 2006: 97), which involves coming to an understanding about a language feature “through the process of talking-it-through”. Under the FL syllabus, students are encouraged to work in pairs or groups in all phases of the OHE cycle. In the observation phase, students are exposed to text
in either written or audio form and then asked to discuss various comprehension questions briefly in groups. In the hypothesize phase, students are encouraged to work together on the DDL exercises, and in the experiment phase, they work through various communicative tasks in pairs or groups.
CHAPTER 4 DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION

This chapter documents an experiment conducted to evaluate the FL syllabus by comparing it with the SG/Task-based hybrid syllabus endorsed by Ellis (1993, 2000). An abridged FL syllabus was developed based on two texts and corresponding SG and post-methods control syllabuses were concurrently developed and implemented around the same texts. Following a pre-test/post-test quasi-experimental design, the three syllabus treatments were compared to evaluate their effectiveness for increasing student awareness of LG patterns and grammatical word order found in the pedagogic corpus.

4.1 Developing the texts

The FL syllabus is discourse-driven to ensure that all of the material the learners will be exposed to and the communicative tasks they will be asked to perform have immediate context, based on authentic/natural data in order to meet immediate context-bound communicative needs. The text selection and pedagogic corpus compilation is therefore of utmost importance. In compiling or developing the texts, careful consideration of the levels and communicative needs of the students must be taken as the pedagogic corpus forms the core of the syllabus from which all the LG patterns and task themes will be extracted.

4.1.1 Considering the learners

The particular groups of students available for this study were enrolled in three Basic English Conversation classes at a private university in northern Japan. All of the students were engineering majors from one of three departments (electrical, electronic, or mechanical engineering) with the majority being in their first year of study (see 4.4.3 for a more detailed breakdown of the study participants). Based on my previous experience teaching these classes and my knowledge of the Japanese school system, the texts were developed based on the following assumptions:

- The majority of the students will be false beginners, or remedial learners, with six years (junior high and high school) of classroom English instruction.
- The students have been taught predominantly through the grammar-translation method based on SG syllabuses.
• Although they will be familiar with various grammatical structures and have a basic vocabulary, they will have very little experience using English for social communication.

• Being non-English majors, the overall levels of student motivation for learning English will be fairly low, with the exception of a small number of students in each class.

With these points in mind, the texts were developed to form the foundation of the FL syllabus which covers the social functions of introducing and talking about oneself, and asking biographical questions – appropriate topics for the beginning of a low-level general conversation course. The decision to write the material, rather than search for level-appropriate authentic texts, was primarily due to the low level of the students. The majority of stories and articles that would be of interest to the learners were considered too difficult, at least for the first few units of the syllabus. However, the Self-introduction and Interview texts are considered to be ‘natural texts’, as defined by Willis (2003), as they were not written to illustrate specific isolated grammatical points and have more naturally occurring transition and flow between changes in verb tense and aspect which is rather uncommon in material developed for SG syllabuses (Shortall, 2007).

4.1.2 The ‘Self-introduction’ text

The first text, ‘Self-introduction’ (see Appendix 1) is a 442-word speech written to introduce myself to the students at the beginning of the term. It consists of six paragraphs outlining my basic personal information (e.g. name, age, nationality, hometown etc.), personal history (e.g. education, career path and current situation), family, hobbies and interests, and future plans.

4.1.3 The ‘Interview’ text

The second text, ‘Interview’ (see Appendix 2) is a 625-word script for a fictitious student radio program and is directly linked to the Self-introduction text. Following a brief introduction, a Japanese student from the university interviews me in English, asking questions that match the same biographical information revealed in the Self-introduction text. To accompany the written script, the Interview text was recorded onto CD for audio presentation: I read my own part and two Japanese speakers of
English read the introduction and interviewer parts. The total length of the recording is 3 minutes and 33 seconds.

4.2 Developing the syllabuses

This section outlines the methods used to develop the FL syllabus lessons from the pedagogic corpus and the subsequent development of the comparative SG and control lessons.

4.2.1 Functional-lexicogrammatical lessons

In developing the four lessons that made up the FL syllabus, a number of LG patterns were first identified and selected from the texts that were deemed relevant and useful for the corresponding communicative tasks, and DDL exercises were then created to draw the learners’ attention to the patterns. Once a pattern was selected for inclusion in one of the lessons, the entire Bank of English corpus was searched to find examples of the particular pattern in use. Since the focus was on LG patterns, no attempt was made to limit the concordance examples to any specific grammatical structure; both statements and questions, in various tenses and aspects, were included, as long as the functional meaning of the pattern was held constant.

The concordance lines were presented in boxes for the students to reference as they completed cloze exercises (see Carter, 1988 for a discussion on cloze procedure) that prompted them to analyze the corpus examples and thus focus their attention on the repeated patterns. Pattern notation was used throughout the FL lessons following the simple system outlined by Hunston and Francis (1998, 2000), where the pattern ‘be from n’, for example, would represent the use of ‘from’ in the sentence ‘I’m from Truro, Canada’. The DDL concordance lines presented throughout this particular FL syllabus were ‘trimmed’ both before and after the sentences containing the target patterns. This was done in consideration of the low level of the students so as not to distract them from the target patterns; this would not be necessary for higher-level students. Finally, simple communicative tasks were designed in which the LG patterns would be useful, but not necessary, to successfully complete. The content and tasks for the lessons in each treatment are detailed in section 4.3, ‘Implementing the syllabuses’.
4.2.2 Structural-grammatical lessons

The SG syllabus also consisted of four lessons based on the same source material used for the FL syllabus, the Self-introduction and Interview texts. Like the FL lessons, the SG lessons were paper based and prompted the students to read the texts before working on the exercises. Rather than LG patterns however, the SG lessons were structured around traditional grammar points common to ELT coursebooks, and vocabulary was presented separately, mostly to complement the isolated grammatical structures. Where the LG patterns of the FL syllabus were loosely organized by communicative functions, the SG lessons were organized by perceived difficulty and complexity of the grammatical structures as often presented in traditional PPP style courses.

Besides the obvious difference in pedagogical content, the SG lessons followed the same organization as the FL lessons. For each exercise, an isolated grammar or vocabulary point was presented in traditional subject-verb-object/complement notation, followed by corresponding sentences or clauses extracted from the texts. Next, a grammar box displaying examples of the structure and its variations was presented, followed by a series of cloze exercises to test the students’ understanding of the particular grammatical structure. Many of the cloze exercise sentences include the same collocations and colligations from the texts and FL exercises. A key difference between the two syllabus designs however, was the source of the examples shown in the boxes: The FL syllabus is DDL based, thus the examples consist of concordance lines originating from authentic ‘used language’ (Brazil, 1995). The examples in the SG lesson grammar boxes, on the other hand, were written, or ‘contrived’ in Shortall’s (2007) terms, to demonstrate the specific structures.

4.2.3 Control lessons

In addition to the FL and SG syllabus groups, a post-methods control syllabus was implemented with a third group of students. This group was exposed to the same two texts and performed the same communicative tasks as the FL and SG groups, but did not work through any FL or SG exercises.

Due to the extra time available with the control class, as there were no form-focused handouts to complete, the students had more time to complete the tasks. Any
additional time was spent working from the class coursebook: Touchstone, Student’s Book 1 (McCarthy, McCarten, & Sandiford, 2005). The exercises from the coursebook were carefully chosen so as not to provide further input or activities related to the LG patterns found in the test and the texts.

4.3 Implementing the syllabuses

The three treatment syllabuses were concurrently implemented over a period of four weeks, with each class meeting on the same day once a week. This section details the implementation process, organized according to the functional task common to the three syllabuses for each week.

4.3.1 Week 1: Talking about yourself

FL Lesson 1

The first lesson of the experimental FL syllabus, summarized in Table 4.1 below, consisted of eight DDL exercises focusing on simple LG patterns found in the Self-introduction text. At the beginning of the class, I explained that I had prepared a self-introduction and read it to the class at a near-native rate of speech. After the initial reading, I asked the class several comprehension questions, such as “Where am I from?” and “When did I graduate from university?” and then handed out a copy of the text to the students, instructing them to read along as I read the text one more time. Following the second reading, I explained the system of notation for the pattern grammar and the students were given the main lesson handout (see Appendix 3) consisting of the DDL exercises and 26 cloze questions. Each DDL exercise was preceded by the original sentence or sentences from the text, followed by three to six questions based on the particular pattern. Students were encouraged to work through the exercises in groups while I circulated around the class offering guidance and support as needed.

After the students completed the exercises they were instructed to compare their answers with each other to encourage ‘languaging’ (Swain, 2006) before the answers were discussed with the whole class. The lesson ended with a communicative task in which the students got into small groups and took turns introducing themselves to each other while taking notes on their classmates’ introductions. The task instructions and space for notes on three classmates were located at the end of the handout.
Table 4.1 FL Lesson 1 patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Original phrase/sentence from texts/worksheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td>[be from n]</td>
<td>I’m from Truro, Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live</td>
<td>[live in n]</td>
<td>I lived in Halifax for six years…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate</td>
<td>[graduate from n]</td>
<td>I graduated from Saint Mary’s University in 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>[major in n]</td>
<td>I majored in Psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study</td>
<td>[study n]</td>
<td>I’m studying Applied Linguistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td>[for length of time]</td>
<td>I’ve been living in Yamagata for six years now…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>since</td>
<td>[since point in time]</td>
<td>…since February 18th, 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested</td>
<td>[be interested in n/v-ing]</td>
<td>I’m interested in computers and playing chess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 SG Lesson 1 structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar/vocabulary points</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Original clause/sentence from texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be verb/simple present statements</td>
<td>[subject+be+object/complement]</td>
<td>My name is Jason Peppard. I’m 31 years old… I’m from Truro, Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple present verb statements</td>
<td>[subject+verb+object/complement]</td>
<td>I teach part-time here at Tohoku Gakuin University… I have many different hobbies and interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third person singular verbs-‘s’ ending</td>
<td>[he/she/it → verb+s]</td>
<td>Mayumi Matsumoto interviews Jason Peppard,… It has lots of nice hiking trails…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present continuous</td>
<td>[subject+be+verb+ing]+object/complement]</td>
<td>I’m working on a distance MA degree… I’m studying Applied Linguistics….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple past verbs</td>
<td>graduate → graduated move → moved go → went major → majored</td>
<td>After I graduated from high school in Truro, I moved to Halifax,… I went to Saint Mary’s University and majored in Psychology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SG Lesson 1

The first SG lesson handout (see Appendix 4) covered the five basic grammatical points outlined in Table 4.2 below and 30 cloze questions.

All four of the SG lessons were conducted to parallel the format of the FL lessons: I read the Self-introduction text to the class and informally asked several comprehension questions. Next, the students were given copies of the text to follow along as I read the text a second time. I then explained the basic SVO English grammar structure and defined the main grammatical terms, subject, verb, object and complement with simple example sentences on the blackboard. The students were
then given the main lesson handout and completed the exercises in groups. After going over the answers with the class, the students got into small groups to complete the same ‘Introduction’ task as in the first FL lesson also located at the end of the handout.

Control Lesson 1

For the first control lesson, I read the Self-introduction text to the class and asked the same basic comprehension questions I asked the FL and SG classes. I then handed out copies of the text and read it one more time as the students followed along. Finally, the students were given the ‘Self-introduction’ task handout (see Appendix 5) and completed the task in groups.

4.3.2 Week 2: Asking about others

FL Lesson 2

The second FL lesson was based on the Interview text. At the beginning of the lesson, I explained to the class that I had been interviewed by a student for an English language university radio program. This caught their attention, as there is no such radio program at the university. I played the recording and instructed the students to simply listen to the interview. The Interview text was then handed out to the students and the recording was played a second time as they followed along. Next, the students were given the main lesson handout (see Appendix 6), consisting of the eight patterns, summarized below in Table 4.3, and 36 cloze questions.

### Table 4.3 FL Lesson 2 patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Original phrase/sentence from texts/worksheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. where/from</td>
<td>where be n from</td>
<td>Where are you from originally?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. where</td>
<td>where be n</td>
<td>Where is Nova Scotia?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. what/like</td>
<td>what be n like</td>
<td>What’s Truro like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. why</td>
<td>why do n v</td>
<td>Why did you come to Japan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. where</td>
<td>where do n v</td>
<td>Where do you live?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. what</td>
<td>what do n v</td>
<td>What do you study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. study*</td>
<td>study n/3rd pers sing. ‘s’</td>
<td>I study Japanese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. come/go</td>
<td>come [V to n][V here/home]</td>
<td>I came here over six years ago, in February 2003.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the final communicative task, the students were given a handout with a chart to fill out with information about their classmates (see Appendix 7). First however, they needed to go through the Interview text and underline all the questions. After doing this activity, they completed the task by circulating around the classroom, interviewing each other to find out their classmates’ names, where they were from, where they lived, their hobbies and interests, and about their families.

**SG Lesson 2**

The second lesson of the SG syllabus (see Appendix 8) consisted of 25 cloze questions based on the five grammatical structures shown in Table 4.4. Having studied the simple present and past tenses in the first lesson, Lesson 2 introduced three ways to talk about the future and then moved on to yes/no questions.

**Table 4.4**  
**SG Lesson 2 structures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar/vocabulary points</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Original clause/ sentence from texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  going to</td>
<td>[subject+be+going to +verb]+object/complement</td>
<td>My wife and I are going to go to Canada this summer…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  present continuous (future)</td>
<td>[subject+be+verb+ing]+object/complement</td>
<td>My wife and I are going to Canada this summer…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  will (future)</td>
<td>[subject+will+(adverb)+verb]</td>
<td>…I’ll probably go mountain biking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…we will probably visit Vancouver for a couple of days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  yes/no questions with be</td>
<td>[be+subject+object/complement ]</td>
<td>Are you busy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  yes/no questions with do</td>
<td>[do/does/did+subject+verb]+object/complement</td>
<td>Do you have any questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you like natto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do you have any brothers or sisters?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the same class procedure as the second FL lesson, the students first listened to the recording of the Interview script and then listened again while reading the text. Next they completed the exercises on the main handout before working on the ‘Interview’ task (Appendix 7).

**Control Lesson 2**

Following the same basic format outlined in the FL and SG lessons above, the Interview text recording was played twice for the students. The first time, they just
listened, and the second time, they listened and read along with the script. The students then completed the ‘Interview’ task (Appendix 7).

4.3.3 Week 3: What’s your schedule like?

FL Lesson 3

For lesson 3 of the FL syllabus, the students reviewed both the Self-introduction and Interview texts again before beginning the main DDL exercises (see Appendix 9). Seven of the eight patterns were taken from the Interview text with the exception of Pattern 5, ‘be going to v’ (see Table 4.5). This pattern was included in order to expose the students to both the ‘going to’ future and the present continuous function of talking about future plans. Both patterns were placed next to each other in the lesson and based on the same information in both texts resulting in near identical sentences. In addition to the same basic structure as the first two lessons, with cloze exercises following each DDL box, Lesson 3 introduced a new type of exercise that involved categorization of lexical items by their respective LG patterns as seen in the DDL concordance lines (see Question 11 for Pattern 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Original phrase/sentence from texts/worksheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 get up</td>
<td>[get up at/around time]</td>
<td>I get up around 7:00 and work from 10:50 to 4:00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 from/to</td>
<td>[v from time to time]</td>
<td>Um, Amanda is an aesthetician...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 be (occupations)</td>
<td>[n be n]</td>
<td>I take the bus from Yamagata to Sendai and then take the train from Sendai Station to Tagajo Station and walk to the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 drive/walk/ride/take (modes of transportation)</td>
<td>[V (N) to n] [take N] [v by N] [V (to n) on foot]</td>
<td>My wife and I are going to go to Canada this summer...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 going to</td>
<td>[be going to v]</td>
<td>...we will visit Vancouver for a couple of days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 going (future)</td>
<td>[be v-ing]</td>
<td>My wife and I are going to Canada this summer...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 will</td>
<td>[will v]</td>
<td>What kind of movies do you like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 kind of</td>
<td>[what kind of n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the final communicative task, the students formed groups and were asked to guess who the busiest member of the group was. Students then took turns telling the group about their weekly schedules and routines before writing short paragraphs to summarize what they told their group. The transition here from speaking to writing for task completion follows J. Willis’s (1996) assertion that this sequence fosters
student awareness of switching from ‘Private’ use where fluency is prioritized to
‘Public’ use where accuracy takes on a more important role. Students were
couraged to use the two texts and the three FL lesson handouts as reference
material to assist them in writing their weekly routines. As a post-task activity, I
circulated among the groups and had the students read their summaries to me. The
summaries were not graded and I mostly gave feedback on the content, occasionally
giving form-based feedback in the form of backchanneling recasts.

**SG Lesson 3**

The third SG lesson (see Appendix 10) moved onto Wh- questions with *be* and *do*, as well as possessive adjectives and the common play/do/go collocations for activities (see Table 4.6). These were included as they are often one of the few collocation exercises in traditional SG syllabuses. The lesson handout consisted of four main exercises and 20 cloze questions. As in Lesson 3 of the FL syllabus, the students read both texts before working through the handout and then completed the ‘Describe your weekly schedule/routine’ task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar/vocabulary points</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Original clause/ sentence from texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1      possessive adjectives</td>
<td>[possessive adjective+noun]</td>
<td>Let’s talk about your family. There are five people in my family:… Edward Norton is one of my favourite actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2      Wh- questions with <em>be</em></td>
<td>[wh-+be+subject]+ object/complement]</td>
<td>Where are you from originally? Where is Nova Scotia? What’s Truro like? Who is your favourite actor? What is your favourite food? What is your schedule like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4      play/do/go</td>
<td>[play/do+noun] [go+verb+ing]</td>
<td>I go mountain biking in spring, summer, and fall, and snowboarding in winter… I like to play video games and online chess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control Lesson 3

In the third control lesson, the students read both the Self-introduction and Interview texts one more time and completed the ‘Describe your weekly schedule/routine’ task outlined above. For the remainder of this class, the students were given some unrelated exercises to complete in the coursebook.

4.3.4 Week 4: Likes and dislikes

FL Lesson 4

The fourth and final FL lesson (see Appendix 11) of the experimental FL syllabus had the students again re-read both texts before working on the DDL exercises based on LG patterns (see Table 4.7) taken from both texts. The main handout consisted of eight DDL boxes and 38 questions, including a categorization question (see Pattern 3, Question 11) similar to the one found in Lesson 3. Rather than matching nouns and verbs to particular patterns however, this exercise involves matching the concordance lines to one of three patterns for the word ‘like’: ‘like n’, ‘like to v’, or ‘like v-ing’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Original phrases/sentences from texts/worksheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 who</td>
<td>[who be poss n]</td>
<td>Who is your favourite actor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 what/favourite</td>
<td>[what be poss/favourite n]</td>
<td>What is your favourite food? Edward Norton is one of my favourite actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 like</td>
<td>[like n/to v/v-ing]</td>
<td>Do you like natto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 have/has been</td>
<td>[have/has pp]</td>
<td>I’ve been to the United States, Cuba, and Thailand. I haven’t been to many places yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 about</td>
<td>[v about n]</td>
<td>Let’s talk about your family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 have/any</td>
<td>[do n have n]</td>
<td>Do you have any brothers or sisters?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 free time have/spend</td>
<td>[in/spend poss free time]</td>
<td>What do you do in your free time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 play/do/do</td>
<td>[play n]</td>
<td>I go mountain biking in spring, summer, and fall, and snowboarding in winter… I like to play video games and online chess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to scheduling constraints for the syllabus evaluation experiment, Lesson 4 did not conclude with a communicative task, as time was required to administer the post-test.
Under regular circumstances however, every lesson would involve at least one communicative task.

**SG Lesson 4**

The fourth and final SG lesson (see Appendix 12) consisted of 25 cloze questions, covering the five grammar and vocabulary points outlined below in Table 4.8. The students were instructed to read both the Self-introduction and Interview texts one more time before working on the handout. After going over the answers to the questions, the students were given the post-test, following the same format as the final FL lesson.

### Table 4.8 SG Lesson 4 structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar/vocabulary points</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Original clause/ sentence from texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 adverbs of frequency</td>
<td>[subject+freq. adverb +verb]+object/ complement</td>
<td>I usually do some reading or studying on the bus. I sometimes teach at James English in Yamagata…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 let’s+verb (imperative)</td>
<td>[let’s+verb]+object/ complement</td>
<td>Let’s talk about your family/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 present perfect</td>
<td>[subject+have/has+pp+ object/complement]</td>
<td>…I haven’t been to many places yet. I’ve been to the United States, Cuba, and Thailand. I’ve always been interested in Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 present perfect continuous</td>
<td>[subject+have/had+been +verb+ing]+object/ complement</td>
<td>I’ve been living and working in Japan…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 for/since</td>
<td>[for+length of time] [since+point in time]</td>
<td>I have been living and working in Japan for six years now, since February 18th, 2003.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Control Lesson 4**

In the fourth and final control lesson, I told the students they would be given a test on the two texts that we had been working with in the last three classes. I instructed them to read both of the texts again and gave them the opportunity to ask any questions they might have. While none of the students had any questions, we had a short informal discussion about the texts and the tasks they had performed. The remainder of the class was used to administer the post-test.
4.4 Evaluation

Following the implementation phase, the FL syllabus was compared to the SG and control syllabuses using a quasi-experimental pre-test/post-test design to evaluate its effectiveness for increasing awareness of the LG patterns found in the pedagogic corpus, as well as grammatical word order for questions.

4.4.1 Test instrument

The test instrument (see Appendix 13) was designed to measure the students’ levels of awareness of LG patterns found in the Self-introduction and Interview texts and was administered three times, as a pre-test, a post-test, and a delayed post-test. The test consisted of 54 questions with a total of 57 points. The first 46 questions were fill-in-the-blank cloze questions, with three of the questions containing two blanks to test for awareness of collocational frameworks (e.g. They work ____ 9:00 ____5:00 on weekdays) and question-answer sequences. The last eight questions were of the ‘scrambled sentences’ type, comprising of two ‘yes/no’ questions and six ‘Wh-’ questions. In addition to being a part of the test as a whole, these questions were analyzed separately as a subtest, reflecting a more grammatical approach in which the students were being tested on their knowledge of word order for questions.

4.4.2 Hypotheses

The following two hypotheses were posited for the test results of the three groups:

1) Students in the FL group will outperform students in both the SG and control groups, with significantly higher overall gain scores between the pre-test and post-tests.

2) No significant difference between the FL and SG groups are expected on the grammatical word order sub-test.

The first hypothesis reflects the main rationale behind developing the FL syllabus: Prefabricated LG patterns make up a large part of our daily social communication but are often not fully integrated into ESL syllabus designs, and many learners are not consciously aware of LG patterns or their importance (Willis, 2003). The purpose of the FL syllabus is to specifically draw the learner’s attention to common LG patterns found in authentic or natural texts. Students under the SG syllabus, who only focus on
the grammatical structures of the same texts, are not expected to develop an adequate awareness of the common LG patterns passively on their own.

The second hypothesis implies that the FL syllabus will be just as effective as the SG syllabus for conveying core grammatical clause structure through the higher amount of input and examples conducive to grammatical CR.

4.4.3 Participants

The participants consisted of three groups of Japanese engineering students. All of the students were enrolled in one of the three Basic English Conversation classes that I teach, and while the three classes were considered to be the same course, normally following the same syllabus and using the same coursebook and materials, the students were enrolled according to their specific department. This class organizational scheme made it impossible to follow a true experimental design as the students could not be randomly assigned to the three treatments. Further complicating the experimental design process, the three classes were quite uneven in terms of the number of students enrolled, reflecting the overall size of their respective departments. A total of seven students were absent for one or more of the test classes, two from the FL group, four from the SG group and one from the control group, and were not included in the statistical analysis. Table 4.9 outlines the details of the three classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic Engineering</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>FL Syllabus</strong>&lt;br&gt;36 students n = 34&lt;br&gt;male: 28 female: 8&lt;br&gt;1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; year: 34&lt;br&gt;2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; year: 1&lt;br&gt;3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; year: 0&lt;br&gt;4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; year: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanical Engineering</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>SG Syllabus</strong>&lt;br&gt;23 students n = 19&lt;br&gt;male: 23 female: 0&lt;br&gt;1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; year: 19&lt;br&gt;2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; year: 0&lt;br&gt;3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; year: 1&lt;br&gt;4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; year: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electrical Engineering</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Control Syllabus</strong>&lt;br&gt;14 students n = 13&lt;br&gt;male: 14 female: 0&lt;br&gt;1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; year: 14&lt;br&gt;2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; year: 0&lt;br&gt;3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; year: 0&lt;br&gt;4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; year: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.4 Procedure

The experiment was conducted over a ten week period at the beginning of the school year. All three classes were 90 minutes long and taught consecutively on the same day, with a lunch break between the first and second lesson.

The Mechanical Engineering group, which met during the first class of the day, was taught under the SG syllabus; the second class, the Electrical Engineering group, was used as the post-methods control group; the last class, the Electronic Engineering group, was taught under the FL syllabus. These designations were chosen to strengthen the evidence, pending significant results, in support of the FL syllabus, as larger classes are typically viewed as a handicap for communicatively oriented teachers (Miller & Aldred, 2000; Jarvis & Atsilarat, 2004; Pham, 2007). Along the same line of reasoning, the smallest class was used as the control, providing a perceived pedagogical advantage, as the students had a much greater proportion of direct face-to-face contact with the teacher.

To begin the experiment, the pre-test, which was presented as a ‘quiz’, was first administered to all three groups and took between 25 to 30 minutes, (although no time limit was set) for most students to complete. The four experimental lessons for each group were then taught in four consecutive weeks following a two-week break due to national holidays, and the post-test was administered at the end of the fourth week of lessons. Finally, a delayed post-test was administered four weeks after the post-test to check for lasting memory effects or memory decay effects of the treatments. All test scores were recorded as averages out of 100.

4.5 Results

The results of the experiment are reported in three parts below, starting with the full test results, followed by the grammatical word order subtest results, and ending with a brief summary of results pertaining to the original hypotheses.

4.5.1 Full test

A preliminary analysis of the pre-test scores was performed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) (p ≤ .05) to determine if any pre-treatment differences were present between the groups. The mean pre-test scores for the FL group, SG group, and
the control group, as shown in Figure 4.1, were 63.2%, 55.4%, and 64.9% respectively. Fortunately, the ANOVA results, F(2, 63) = 2.21, p = 0.12, indicate that no significant pre-test differences were present. It can be assumed then, that there were no major differences among the groups concerning their LG awareness of the test items before the syllabus treatments.

![Figure 4.1 Pre-test scores](image)

Next, the pre-test and post-test scores for each group were compared using Mann-Whitney U tests (one-tailed, p ≤ .05) to determine if any significant gains were made that could be attributed to the syllabus treatments. The same analyses were then performed with the pre-test and delayed post-test scores (see Table 4.10).

The pre-test/post-test analysis revealed a highly significant gain in test scores for the FL group (p ≤ .01) with an average gain score of 10.5%. Although less significant than the FL scores, the SG group also showed a significant increase in test scores (p ≤ .05), with an average gain score of 9.7%. Test score gains for the control group did not increase significantly with an average gain score of only 5.1% (see Figure 4.2).

The results of the pre-test/delayed post-test analysis paralleled those of the pre-test/post test but with slightly lower levels of significance for the FL and SG groups (see Table 4.10). The average gain scores for the FL group dropped 2.3%, from 10.5% to 8.2%, while the gain scores for the SG group were more resilient, dropping
only 0.4%, from 9.7% to 9.3%. The delayed post-test scores for the control group remained unchanged from the post-test scores (see Figure 4.2).

### Table 4.10 Full test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pre-test mean (%)</th>
<th>Post-test mean/ Post post-test mean (%)</th>
<th>Mean Gain Score (%)</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FL Group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>73.7/71.4</td>
<td>10.5/8.2</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>0.0028**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG Group</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>65.1/64.6</td>
<td>9.7/9.3</td>
<td>247.5</td>
<td>0.0301*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>70.0/70.0</td>
<td>5.1/5.1</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>0.1038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates significance (p ≤ 0.05, one-tailed)

** indicates significance (p ≤ 0.01, one-tailed)

---

4.5.2 Grammatical word order subtest

The eight grammatical word order questions located at the end of the test were analyzed separately to determine if the different syllabus treatments had any effect on student awareness of core grammar structure for questions. The pre-test subtest scores for all three groups were very high at 91.9%, 82.2%, and 89.4% respectively for the FL, SG, and control groups (see Figure 4.3). As with the full test, the pre-test grammatical word order subtest scores were compared using a one-way ANOVA.
(p ≤ .05) which found no significant differences between the groups: F(2, 63) = 2.03, p = 0.14. Again, it can be assumed that there were no significant differences present among the groups concerning their knowledge of core grammatical word order for questions.

![Figure 4.3 Grammar pre-test scores](image)

Following the same procedure as the main statistical analyses outlined above, the pre-subtest, post-subtest, and delayed post-subtest scores for each group were compared using Mann-Whitney U tests (one-tailed, p ≤ .05) to check for post-treatment differences between the groups in their awareness of core grammatical word order (see Table 4.11 & Figure 4.4). As predicted, no significant gains were found between the groups for the pre-subtest/post-subtest comparison with average gain scores of 2.6%, 9.2% and 7.7% for the FL, SG and Control groups respectively. Contrary to expectations however, the SG group showed a significant increase between the pre-subtest and delayed post-subtest with an average gain score of 12.5%. The FL and Control groups’ gain scores remained insignificant at 3.3% and 1.9% respectively.
Table 4.11  Grammar subtest results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pre-test mean (%)</th>
<th>Post-test mean/ Post post-test mean (%)</th>
<th>Avg. gain score (%)</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FL Group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>94.5/95.2</td>
<td>2.6/3.3</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>0.0853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG Group</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>91.4/94.7</td>
<td>9.2/12.5</td>
<td>222.5</td>
<td>0.1131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>97.1/91.3</td>
<td>7.7/1.9</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0.0505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates significance (p ≤ .05, one-tailed)

Figure 4.4  Grammar subtest gain scores

4.5.3 Summary of results

To summarize the results, the first main hypothesis was confirmed: The FL syllabus was significantly more effective than the SG and control syllabuses for raising students’ awareness of LG patterns found in the pedagogic corpus. Somewhat unexpectedly however, the SG syllabus was also effective, although the levels of significance reached were lower than the FL syllabus. The results concerning the second main hypothesis produced mixed and surprising results: As predicted, no significant differences were found between the FL and SG syllabus groups for the grammatical word order subtest on the post-test. However, the SG syllabus group
showed a significant improvement between the pre-test and the delayed post-test. These results and their implications for future research and development of the FL syllabus will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSION

This chapter is divided into three sections. First, the implications of the results are discussed for the FL approach to syllabus design, next, the limitations are outlined, and finally, the future research and application of the FL syllabus are considered.

5.1 Implications of results

The comparative analysis of the FL syllabus outlined above was conducted as a preliminary test-run for the prototype hybrid syllabus, and although the project can be viewed as a success, the results bring to light some interesting points that will affect future incarnations of the FL syllabus.

First, the results of the experiment confirm the importance of a focus on form in the language syllabus. While all three treatment syllabuses were controlled for meaning by using the same texts and communicative tasks, only the FL and SG syllabuses overtly focused on language form. The results clearly indicate that this focus on form, both LG and SG, led to significant increases in LG awareness, while the control syllabus showed no significant improvements.

More specifically, the experiment results suggest that while there is likely no single best method of form-focused instruction, some methods are more effective than others for certain aspects of the target language. Thus, while the SG syllabus did lead to improved test scores, the FL syllabus was significantly more effective, at least for raising students’ LG awareness. However, although the grammatical word order sub-test scores were very high for all three groups, the SG syllabus appears to have contributed to increased scores, suggesting that an even more effective product-process hybrid syllabus should focus on both core grammar structure and LG patterns.

Also, the gains made through LG focus seem to be more susceptible to memory decay, which comes as no surprise since core grammatical structure takes much less time to acquire when compared to dealing with the lexicon (Cook, 1994). This will need to be taken into consideration for further FL syllabus development with considerable recycling of the texts and LG patterns to encourage full integration into the mental lexicon.
Finally, regarding the overall design of the FL syllabus, the significant results favouring the FL syllabus over the SG syllabus indirectly validate the DDL and pattern grammar integration within the pedagogic corpus. This is especially promising considering the low level and low motivation of the students.

5.2 Limitations of the study

As with any study conducted under constraints of time and available resources, there will be limitations that must be taken into account when considering the study outcomes. The main limitation of this study was the lack of flexibility with grouping the participants. Although all of the students were essentially enrolled in the same Basic English Conversation course, they were grouped according to their department, making experimental randomization impossible and necessitating a weaker quasi-experimental design.

The second main limitation is concerned with the perceived lack of student motivation. As previously noted, all of the study participants were engineering students at a private Japanese university in which they are required to take one language course. Although no measures were taken to determine motivation levels and attitudes towards studying English, it was apparent that only a small minority in each class were genuinely interested in improving their English communication skills. The low student motivation levels certainly could have had an effect on the effort put into completing the exercises and tasks, as well as the tests. On the other hand, however, it could be argued that the significance of the results are even more impressive considering the low student motivation levels, as well as the large class size of the FL group.

Finally, considering the arguments here for the importance of meaning-based communicative tasks alongside a focus on form, there is no doubt, a negative washback effect, and even a hint of hypocrisy, by testing only declarative knowledge of the target LG patterns. However, due to limitations of time, a communication/task evaluation and analysis was not considered feasible for the study.

5.3 Future research and application of the FL syllabus

Despite the limitations noted above, the successful implementation and significant results of the experiment are very promising and open the door for further research
and development of the FL approach. First, considering that the FL syllabus used for the experiment was based on only two texts and four lessons, the next step is to develop a full course based on a much larger pedagogic corpus. Additionally, future evaluation would benefit from participant randomization and a true experimental design, in addition to a qualitative analysis in the form of student questionnaires. Most importantly, a process-oriented evaluation needs to be carried out to determine if the FL approach can successfully lead to improved fluency and accuracy during actual communication. Thus some form of interview or group conversation/task analysis needs to be performed.

One of the main benefits of the FL approach to syllabus design is in its utility and flexibility. Basing the syllabus on a pedagogic corpus allows for unlimited applications, most notably within the field of English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Essentially, a pedagogic corpus can be compiled for any genre, register, or mode of English (e.g. business, newspapers, medical, American spoken, academic written etc.), and with each specialized corpus, there will be specific LG patterns and appropriate functional tasks. My vision here, is a series of genre and register specific coursebooks, thus the main problems of time and computer labs are bypassed. For teachers who do want to teach in a computer lab, or for students’ home study, interactive FL syllabus CD-ROMs could provide a paperless course (the four-lesson FL syllabus developed for this study was very paper heavy). A CD-Rom could potentially include several sub-pedagogic corpora with highlighted LG patterns, whereby clicking on a pattern would link to a corresponding interactive DDL exercise. The possibilities are endless.

Finally, considering the significant results of the SG syllabus in the experiment, future incarnations of the FL syllabus should include some focus on core grammar structures. Lewis (1993: 38) notes that the core English SVO pattern, which is very powerful and can still convey meaning even when “badly grammaticalized”, is seldom stated explicitly in coursebooks and syllabuses. However, there are plenty of alternatives to traditional grammar that should be investigated, most notably, possible integration of functional grammars, such as SFL, Brazil’s (1995) Grammar of Speech (GOS), or Sinclair and Mauranen’s (2006) Linear Unit Grammar (LUG). Also of note, Boulton (2007b) reports that DDL has been shown to be no less effective than traditional presentation of rules for teaching grammatical concepts.
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION

With the goal of innovating communicative syllabus design, two questions were posed at the onset of this project. The first question was concerned with determining the most effective language product to focus on in a hybrid product-process ELT syllabus, while the second question was concerned with integrating innovative CL methodology into this syllabus.

Regarding the first question, it was argued that the traditional view of grammar and vocabulary being separate is invalid, and following SFL, should be replaced by a unified system of lexicogrammar. It was shown that prefabricated LG patterns make up a large part of our daily social communication but are often not fully integrated into ESL syllabus designs, and that learners should be made aware of common LG patterns and their importance. Next, an integrated system of DDL and corpus-driven pattern grammar applied to highlight LG patterns extracted from a pedagogic corpus was demonstrated to be an efficient and streamlined solution to the second question.

The resulting FL syllabus was evaluated in an experiment with very promising results as it was shown to be more effective than an SG oriented syllabus for raising students’ awareness of LG patterns. The FL approach provides a means of integrating innovative corpus-driven methodology into a truly holistic and communicative syllabus. While this was only a preliminary evaluation of a prototype FL syllabus within a limited quasi-experimental design, it opens the door for further development and evaluation, hopefully leading to more mainstream acceptance and use of CL resources by teachers and students in the classroom.
Hello everyone, nice to meet you. My name is Jason Peppard. Please call me Jason. I’m 31 years old and I’m from Truro, Canada. Truro is a small town with a population of about 12,000. It’s in the province of Nova Scotia, which is on the east coast of Canada. Nova Scotia means New Scotland in Latin. It is a very beautiful place with warm summers and cold winters.

After I graduated from high school in Truro, I moved to Halifax, the capital city of Nova Scotia, for university. I went to Saint Mary’s University and majored in Psychology. I lived in Halifax for six years and had several part-time jobs. I worked at a hardware store, a hotel, and a group home. I also worked as a teaching assistant at the university in my last year.

I’ve been living and working in Japan for over six years now, since February 18th, 2003. I started teaching English full-time at James English, a private language school in Yamagata City where I still live. Now I teach part-time here at Tohoku Gakuin University, at Yamagata University, and at two eikaiwas in Yamagata. I’m also a graduate student. I’m working on a distance MA degree with the University of Birmingham in England. I’m studying Applied Linguistics, which is the study of second and foreign language teaching and learning.

There are five people in my family: my mother, my father, my younger sister, and my younger brother. They all live back home in Truro. I also have a family here in Japan. I got married almost four years ago. My wife’s name is Yuriko. We don’t have any kids yet but we have a dog named Billy.

I have many different hobbies and interests. I like to spend time outdoors in my free time when the weather is nice. I go mountain biking in spring, summer, and fall, and snowboarding in winter, so of course I love living in Yamagata! I like most kinds of music and movies, but I don’t like pop music or romantic movies very much. I’m interested in computers and technology, especially Apple computers and iPods, and I like to play video games and online chess. I also like to travel but I haven’t been to many places yet. So far, I’ve been to the United States, Cuba and Thailand. My wife and I are going to go to Canada this summer for my sister’s wedding, and if we have enough time and money, we will probably visit Vancouver for a couple of days.

That’s my introduction. I’m looking forward to hearing yours. Thank you for listening everyone. Do you have any questions?
APPENDIX 2

Interview

In this week’s edition of Campus Life, Mayumi Matsumoto interviews Jason Peppard, one of the English Instructors at the Tagajo Campus, in English!

MM: Thank you for agreeing to meet with me today Mr. Peppard.
JP: Thanks for having me. Please call me Jason.

MM: OK Jason. So, where are you from originally?
JP: I’m from Truro, Nova Scotia, Canada.

MM: I’ve never heard of Truro. What’s it like?
JP: Well, actually, Truro is pretty small and boring, but it does have a great park called Victoria Park. It has lots of nice hiking trails and some beautiful waterfalls.

MM: That sounds nice. And where is Nova Scotia?
JP: Nova Scotia is on the east coast of Canada, next to the Atlantic Ocean. It’s the second smallest province in Canada.

MM: I see. Why did you come to Japan?
JP: Well, I wanted to travel and experience a different culture, and I’ve always been interested in Japan.

MM: When did you come to Japan?

MM: Where do you live now?

MM: Oh really? That’s pretty far from Tagajo. How do you get to work?
JP: I take the bus from Yamagata to Sendai and then take the train from Sendai Station to Tagajo Station and walk to the university. It takes about two hours.

MM: Wow, that’s a long commute.
JP: It’s not too bad. I usually do some reading or studying on the bus.

MM: What do you study?
JP: Ah, I study Japanese, and I’m working on a master’s degree in Applied Linguistics, so I have lots of reading to do.

MM: And what’s your schedule like? Are you busy?
JP: Well, last year at TGU I taught two classes on Wednesdays and one class on Thursdays. This year, all three of my classes are on Wednesday, so I only need
to come to Tagajo once a week. I get up around 7:00 and work from 10:50 to 4:10. I also teach two classes at Yamagata University on Fridays, and I sometimes teach at James English in Yamagata on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays.

MM: Let’s talk about your family. Do you have any brothers or sisters?

JP: Yes, I have a younger sister and a younger brother. My sister’s name in Amanda and my brother’s name is Mark. They both live back home in Truro.

MM: What do they do?

JP: Um, Amanda is an aesthetician, and Mark works for a milk company.

MM: What do you do in your free time?

JP: I have lots of hobbies and interests. I love mountain biking, camping and snowboarding. I like to travel, and I also like reading, listening to music and watching movies.

MM: What kind of movies do you like, and who is your favourite actor?

JP: Hmm, I usually watch dramas and comedies. Edward Norton is one of my favourite actors.

MM: What is your favourite food?

JP: Japanese food, especially sushi and tempura.

MM: Do you like natto?

JP: Yeah, I love it.

MM: Really? I thought only Japanese people could eat natto. How about uni, sorry I don’t know how to say it in English.

JP: Uni is ‘sea urchin’ in English. It’s OK, but I don’t love it.

MM: Really? I like natto, but I hate uni. OK, last question. Do you have any plans for summer vacation?

JP: Yeah, my wife and I are going to Canada for my sister’s wedding, and if we have time, we’ll probably go to Vancouver for a couple of days to visit my wife’s cousin.

MM: Well, Jason, thank you very much for answering my questions today.

JP: You’re welcome. It was my pleasure.
APPENDIX 3

FL Group Lesson 1

Read the handout “Self-Introduction”. Then look at the following patterns and fill in the blanks.

Pattern 1

I'm from Truro, Canada. [be from n]

| My name is Patrick and I am from Ireland |
| My name is Mary Rich. I'm from Napa, California. |
| I'm from Brazil but lived in London for two years. |
| I'm from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in America. |
| You're from Edinburgh, aren't you? |
| 'We're from Macclesfield, not Manchester,' |
| They're from Vermont. |
| He is from Arkansas. |
| She’s from Cambodia. |
| It’s from Russia. |
| I don't think it's from Australia. |

1) I ____________ from Sendai.
2) He ____________ from Canada.
3) Junko is ____________ Tokyo.
4) We ____________ Japan.
5) They ____________ Thailand.

Pattern 2

I lived in Halifax for six years… [live in n]

| I live in Hawaii and I go to school at Hawaii Job Corps Center |
| Do you live in Dublin? |
| He lives in Vancouver, British Columbia. |
| She lives in Brighton with her husband Peter and two children, |
| We live in Switzerland because my wife is Swiss, |
| They live in Berlin. She works as a counselor at a local hospital |
| I lived in America for eight years and I had a fantastic time. |
| They lived in Barry, South Wales, before moving to Ireland |
| I've lived in Surrey for about two years now. |
| How long have you lived in San Francisco? |

6) Which word usually comes between live and a place name? ____________
7) I ____________ in Yamagata.
8) Do you ____________ in Sendai?
9) She lives ____________ Boston.
10) We ____________ ____________ Tagajo.

Pattern 3

I graduated from Saint Mary’s University in 2001.

[graduate from n]

[graduate in month/year]

| Jason Sperber will | graduate from LA High next month. |
| `Did you` | graduate from college, and what was your major? |
| I | graduated from medical school in 1985, |
| After I | graduated from university, I took off and travelled Europe |
| After | graduating from Stanford, John taught history |
| She | graduated in 1967, and then went off to New York to work |
| I will | graduate in May with a degree in mechanical engineering. |
| Yeah I hope to | graduate in June. |
| They wanted to | graduate. |
| And when do you | graduate? |

10) What words usually come after graduate? ____________________

11) He graduated ____________ high school ____________ 2007.

12) They will graduate ____________ March.

13) They graduated ____________ Tohoku Gakuin University.

Patterns 4 and 5

I majored in Psychology. [major in n]

| George | majored in English literature. |
| At Harvard he | majored in American political history. |
| I | majored in economics in college, |
| He composes symphonies and is | majoring in music in college. |
| I decided to | major in history in college. |

I’m studying Applied Linguistics. [study n]

| He moved to Amsterdam to study painting |
| All pupils will study science and technology |
| She is studying journalism and communications, |
| Jeremy is studying computer science |
| I am studying art and enjoy music, soccer, films and tennis |
| He decided to study art. |

14) Which word usually comes between major and school subjects? ____________

15) He majored ____________ engineering.

16) They are ____________ in chemistry.

17) I’m ____________ history.

18) I’m ____________ in computer science.
19) He ____________ Chinese.

**Patterns 6 and 7**

I’ve been living in Yamagata for six years. [*for* length of time]

I’ve been living in Yamagata since 2003. [*since* point in time]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cook in a low oven</th>
<th>for 3 hours at 170°C,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I stayed on my own</td>
<td>for four years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d stay with my mom</td>
<td>for a week or two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have been on tour now</td>
<td>for 49 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Classes are</td>
<td>for 7 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Anne Henderson has been teaching | since 1961, |
| Korea has been divided | since 1945 |
| I've only had singing lessons | since I was sixteen |
| She's been here | since 10pm |
| I haven't been home, like I say, | since 6:00 this morning. |

20) I’ve been living in Sendai ____________ April.

21) She has studied English ____________ six years.

22) They have been waiting ____________ over five hours.

23) I’ve been interested in baseball ____________ I was in elementary school

**Pattern 8**

I’m interested in computers and playing chess. [*interested in* n/v-**ing**]

| She became | interested in Brazil |
| Mr Gore is | interested in science |
| we were | interested in the same things, |
| I've always been | interested in boxing. |
| I'm | interested in reading |
| We're just mainly | interested in playing music |

24) They’re interested ____________ travelling.

25) He’s ____________ in playing golf.

26) We’ve been very ____________ ____________ Japanese culture for a long time.

**Task**

Get into a group of three or four and introduce yourself to your classmates.

Take notes on your classmates introductions:

Name: ________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
SG Group Lesson 1

Read the handout “Self-Introduction”. Then look at the following grammar and vocabulary points and fill in the blanks.

Point 1: Be verb/simple present statements

[subject + be + object/complement]

My name is Jason Peppard.

I’m 31 years old…

I’m from Truro, Canada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am / I’m</th>
<th>You are / You’re</th>
<th>He is / He’s</th>
<th>She is / She’s</th>
<th>We are / We’re</th>
<th>They are / They’re</th>
<th>It is / It’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1) She ____________ a university student.

2) They ____________ studying engineering.

3) I ____________ from Canada.

4) We ____________ interested in computer programming.

5) Yamagata ____________ very beautiful.

6) You ____________ late for class!

7) David ____________ majoring in computer science.

8) My parents ____________ visiting Japan.

9) Elizabeth ____________ going to graduate from university next year.

Point 2: Simple present statements [subject + verb + object/complement]

I teach part-time here at Tohoku Gakuin University,…

I have many different hobbies and interests.
You play Soccer. You don’t play baseball.
He works part-time. He doesn’t work full-time.
We go snowboarding. We don’t go skiing.
It works. It doesn’t work.
She likes jazz. She doesn’t like rock.
They have a cat. They don’t have a dog.
I live in Yamagata. I don’t live in Sendai.

10) My friends __________ snowboarding in Hokkaido. (go)
12) Junko __________ Japanese. (teach)
13) They __________ at a bank. (not / work)
14) I __________ listening to music and watching movies. (like)

Point 3: Third person singular verbs – ‘s’ ending

Mayumi Matsumoto interviews Jason Peppard,...

It has lots of nice hiking trails…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I study</th>
<th>I have</th>
<th>I do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You study</td>
<td>You have</td>
<td>You do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He studies</td>
<td>He has</td>
<td>He does</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She studies</td>
<td>She has</td>
<td>She does</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We study</td>
<td>We have</td>
<td>We do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They study</td>
<td>They have</td>
<td>They do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It studies</td>
<td>It has</td>
<td>It does</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15) Hiroki ___________ tennis every Saturday. (play)
16) She ___________ in Boston. (live)
17) We ___________ English on Wednesdays. (study)
18) My parents ___________ in Nova Scotia. (live)
19) He ___________ up at 8:00 am every morning. (get)
20) I ___________ one brother and one sister. (have)
Point 4: Present continuous

[subject + be + verb+ing] + object/complement

I’m working on a distance MA degree with the University of Birmingham…
I’m studying applied linguistics,…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Verb +ing + Object/Complement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You’re studying.</td>
<td>You’re not studying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He’s playing baseball.</td>
<td>He’s not playing baseball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She’s working.</td>
<td>She’s not working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’re shopping.</td>
<td>We’re not shopping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They’re going home.</td>
<td>They’re not going home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s raining.</td>
<td>It’s not raining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m watching TV.</td>
<td>I’m not watching TV.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21) I’m ____________ history. (study)
22) They are ____________ table tennis. (play)
23) We ____________ ____________ in Sendai. (shop)
24) Ken ____________ ____________ on his cell phone. (talk)
25) She ____________ ____________ TV. (watch)

Point 5: Simple past verbs

After I graduated from high school in Truro, I moved to Halifax,…
I went to Saint Mary’s University and majored in Psychology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Past Tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>graduate</td>
<td>graduated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move</td>
<td>moved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>went</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live</td>
<td>lived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get</td>
<td>got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>majored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>start</td>
<td>started</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26) He ____________ from high school last year. (graduate)
27) I ____________ to university in Halifax. (go)
28) She ____________ to London to study English. (move)
29) They ____________ for three hours last night. (study)
30) We ____________ a great time at the party. (have)
Task

Get into a group of three or four and introduce yourself to your classmates.

Take notes on your classmates introductions:

Name: ________________________
_______________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________

Name: ________________________
_______________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________

Name: ________________________
_______________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________

APPENDIX 5

Control Group | Lesson 1 Task

Name: ____________________
Student number: ______________

Read the handout “Self-Introduction”.

Task

Get into a group of three or four and introduce yourself to your classmates.

Take notes on your classmates introductions:

Name: ____________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________

Name: ____________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________

Name: ____________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX 6

FL Group Lesson 2

Read the handout “Interview”. Then look at the following patterns and fill in the blanks.

Pattern 1

Where are you from originally?  

[where be n from]

Where am I from?
Where are you from in Israel, Marty? Haifa.
Where’re you from? I'm from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in America.
Where are they from? Er I think they're from London.
Where are they from? The Rhone Valley.
Where is he from? Massachusetts.
Where's he from? Here.
Where is she from? What church does she go to?
Where's she from? She grew up in the Lake District
Where is it from? Decordance in Notting Hill.
Where's it from? What block? Block one.

1) Where ____________ she from?
2) Where ____________ you from?
3) Where ____________ Jon and Nadine from?
4) Where ____________ he from?
5) ______________ ____________ Jason from?

Pattern 2

Where is Nova Scotia? [where be n]

Where is Samoa? Hand me the atlas,
Where's Chicago? In Illinois. Which part of America is that?
Where's Bolsterstone? It’s er it's in South Yorkshire
Where are the Faroe Islands? In the North Atlantic.
Where are the Rocky Mountains? They’re in western North America.

6) Where ____________ Tagajo? \(\rightarrow\) It’s ____________ Miyagi.
7) Where ____________ your parents? \(\rightarrow\) They ____________ ____________ Truro.
8) ______________ is Tendo? \(\rightarrow\) It’s ____________ Yamagata prefecture.

Pattern 3

What’s Truro like? [what be n like]
What am I like to work with? You're a little bossy actually.
What are you like in the mornings? The same as everyone else.
What is he like? He drinks too much.
What's he like? He's not too tall and he has a beard.
What is she like? Susan finally asked. She is very beautiful.
What's she like? She's really nice, I said.
What's it like? It's an incredible place.
What is it like to drive? Sensationally fast, smooth and quiet.
What are we like? Please inform me.
What are they like? They're just normal people.
What are the students like? Groups tend to be from 10 to 14 students.

What was I like before? He had to know what she thought of him.
What were you like at school? Pretty good actually.
What was he like? Can you remember? Very good. Very pleasant.
What was she like? She was really nice. She used to do music.
What was it like? The music was very, very loud.
What was Brooklyn like when you grew up? Full of gardens and yards.
what was that school like? It was okay
What were we like, eh?
What were they like? Were they pretty?

9) What __________ your best friend like? ⇒ He's smart and funny.
11) What __________ your classes like this year? ⇒ They’re interesting
12) What __________ the weather __________ yesterday? ⇒ It was sunny.
13) _______ were your classmates _______ in high school? ⇒ They were nice.

Pattern 4

Why did you come to Japan? [why do n v]

Why do they smoke?
Why do we have to wear a shirt and tie?
Why do you like English?
Why do I have to wait so long?
Why does he always wear the same suit?
Why does she do it?
Why does it rain?" asked my six-year-old son.

Why did I go back?
Why did you quit the job you had and--and decide to go to college?
Why did he fire you?
Why did she go to Puerto Rico?
Why did we have to wait until nearly 7:30pm on Monday?
Why did the dinosaurs become extinct?
Why did it take so long?

14) Why __________ you study English?
15) Why __________ they like winter so much?
16) Why __________ she move to Tokyo last year?
17) Why __________ they want to meet me?
18) __________ __________ you call me yesterday?

Pattern 5

Where do you live?  [where do n v]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where do I sign?</td>
<td>On the dotted line, Paul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do you go on a first date?</td>
<td>The pub.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do they play?</td>
<td>In Hyde Park every Wednesday night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do we have rum?</td>
<td>Under the sink, next to the cleaning stuff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where does he work?</td>
<td>Karlin works at home,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where does it come from?</td>
<td>There are four principal sources:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where does she live?</td>
<td>Er she lives with me in Manchester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19) Where ________ they study?
20) Where ________ she live?
21) Where ________ Yuta play soccer?
22) Where ________ we go next?
23) ________ __________ I sit?

Patterns 6 and 7

What do you study?  [what do n v]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do they grow?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do they do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you wear?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do they produce?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does he write?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did we learn?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you want?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does it mean?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does he talk about?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24) What ________ you play?
25) What ________ she cook?

I study Japanese.  [study n]

| I study paleontology.                     |                                              |
| You study the subject and apply it to your life, |                                          |
| We study the social behaviour of monkeys    |                                              |
| They study science and engineering         |                                              |
| He studies martial arts                    |                                              |
| She studies computer science.              |                                              |
| It studies the effects of smoking to understand why consumers buy |
27) She ___________ English twice a week.
28) Do they ___________ history?
29) What ___________ he study?
30) I ___________ electrical engineering at Tohoku Gakuin University.
31) What ___________ they ___________? They study biology.

Pattern 8
When did you come to Japan?

I came here over six years ago, in February 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>动词搭配</th>
<th>用法</th>
<th>示例</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>come [V to n] [V here/home]</td>
<td>He came to New York in 1985, and he worked as a cab driver.</td>
<td>He is planning to come to England again very soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go [V to n] [V there/home]</td>
<td>The first time I came here was four years ago.</td>
<td>He came to New York in 1985, and he worked as a cab driver,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists come here every day,</td>
<td>I spend time with my kid,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first time I came here was four years ago.</td>
<td>When I came home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One night he came home drunk</td>
<td>When I come home I spend time with my kid,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When do you go to work?</td>
<td>I went to Portugal for three weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you go there?</td>
<td>We went to Portugal for three weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I went there when I was 16,</td>
<td>Can I go home now, please?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I went home and went to bed.</td>
<td>I went there when I was 16,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32) I want to go ___________ Okinawa for my vacation.
33) They are going to ___________ here tomorrow.
34) When did you ___________ there?
35) When ___________ she go ___________ work?
36) He is going ___________ university in Tokyo.
37) I’m going to ___________ home after school.
APPENDIX 7

Lesson 2 Interview Task

Name: ______________________

Student number: ____________

---

Read the handout "Interview" and underline all the questions. Now, interview some of your classmates and complete the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>from</th>
<th>lives in</th>
<th>hobbies/interests</th>
<th>family</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 8

SG Group Lesson 2

Read the handout “Interview”. Then look at the following grammar points and fill in the blanks.

Point 1: Going to future

[subject + be + going to + verb] + object/complement]

My wife and I are going to go to Canada this summer...

| I’m going to play soccer tomorrow.          | I’m not going to play tennis. |
| You’re going to visit them.                | You’re not going to visit us. |
| He’s going to go to Seoul.                 | He’s not going to Tokyo.     |
| She’s going to meet us after class.        | She’s not going to meet us tonight. |
| We’re going to go shopping.                | We’re not going to go swimming. |
| They’re going to study tonight.            | They’re not going to study now. |
| It’s going to rain tomorrow.               | It’s not going to snow.      |

1) He __________ going to go to Australia for three weeks.
2) We __________ going __________ go shopping after class.
3) What __________ you going __________ do this weekend?
4) I __________ __________ to study for the test tonight.
5) She __________ not __________ to watch the movie with us.

Point 2: Present continuous (future)

[subject + be + verb+ing] + object/complement]

My wife and I are going to Canada this summer…

| I’m playing soccer tomorrow.          | I’m not playing tennis. |
| You’re visiting them tonight.         | You’re not visiting us. |
| He’s going to Seoul next month.       | He’s not going to Tokyo. |
| She’s meeting us after class.         | She’s not meeting us tonight. |
| We’re going shopping later.           | We’re not going swimming. |
| They’re studying tomorrow morning.    | They’re not studying tonight. |
| It’s opening on Friday.               | It’s not opening on Wednesday. |
6) We __________ playing soccer tomorrow.
7) I __________ going to Montreal next month.
8) They __________ ________ here on Friday. (come)
9) What __________ you _________ after school? (do)
10) She __________ __________ ________ next week (not/work)

Point 3: Will (future)

[subject + will + verb]
... I’lI probably go mountain biking
... we will probably visit Vancouver for a couple of days.

| I’ll play soccer tomorrow.        | I will not play tennis. |
| You’ll visit them.                | You won’t visit us.     |
| He’ll go to Seoul.                | He won’t go to Tokyo.   |
| She’ll meet us after class.       | She won’t meet us tonight. |
| We’re going to go shopping.       | We’re not going to go swimming. |
| They will study tonight.          | They won’t study now.   |
| It’ll arrive next week.           | It won’t arrive this week. |

11) I __________ call you later.
12) We __________ ________ them in an hour. (meet)
13) They ___________ ___________ soon. (arrive)
14) I ___________ ___________ you how to do it. (tell)
15) He __________ be late.

Point 4: Yes/no questions with be

[be + subject + object/complement]

Are you busy?

Am I late?
Are we going to eat here?
Are they studying English?
Are you a student?
Is he working after school?
Is she interested in foreign movies?
Is it cold?

16) __________ Yuriko a teacher?
17) __________ they from Akita?
18) __________ Mike and Jenny coming to the party?
19) Am __________ next?
20) __________ you interested in Japanese culture?

**Point 5: Yes/no questions with *do***

[do/does/did + subject + verb] + object/complement]

Do you have any questions?
Do you like natto?
Do you have any brothers or sisters?

Do I have to read this?
Do you work on Saturdays?
Do we have any homework?
Do they like shopping in Tokyo?
Does he play any sports?
Does she live in Sendai?
Does it have a swimming pool?

21) __________ Hidenori have any brothers or sisters?
22) __________ your parents live in Osaka?
23) __________ she like her classes?
24) __________ you work on Saturdays?
25) __________ we have a quiz next week?
APPENDIX 9

FL Group Lesson 3

Read the handouts “Self-introduction” and “Interview” one more time. Then look at the following patterns and fill in the blanks.

Patterns 1 and 2

What is your schedule/day like? \([\text{what be n like}]\)

I get up around 7:00 and work from 10:50 to 4:10.

1. \([\text{get up at/around time}]\) 2. \([\text{work from time to time}]\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>get up around 8am and cycle, drive or take the bus to work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>get up at six in the morning, and it's like a blue-collar job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>get up at 8am, have breakfast and go to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>get up every day around 6 a.m. and have breakfast together. Then they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>gets up at 5.30am and often works until 9pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She</td>
<td>gets up at 6.30 to walk the dog, then she and Jeremy have breakfast,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>work from 5.30 in the morning to 8.00 at night on Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>work ten hours a week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>work a nine-hour shift starting at 8.00am or 8.30am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>work from 9.30am to 3.30pm,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>works from 10 in the morning to 10 at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She</td>
<td>works from 10am to 5pm four days a week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) She ______________ up at 7am every morning.

2) They work ______________ 9:00 ______________ 5:00 on weekdays.

3) I get ______________ around 9:00 on my days off.

4) What time ______________ he get up?

5) Do you ______________ from Monday ______________ Friday too?

Pattern 3

What do they do? \([\text{what do n do}]\)

Um, Amanda is an aesthetician… \([\text{n be n}]\)

| I am a student |
| I’m a cashier |
| He is a university professor |
| He's a bus driver. |
| She is a graduate student at the University of South Carolina. |
| She's a medical student. |
| We are artists |
| We're engineers. |
| They are students at Ryde College, |
| They're farmers, |
6) Mike ____________ a bartender.

7) My parents ____________ doctors.

8) ____________ you a student here?

9) ____________ she a dentist?

10) I’m a ____________.

**Pattern 4**

How do you get to work? 

[how do n get to n]

I take the bus from Yamagata to Sendai and then take the train from Sendai Station to Tagajo Station and walk to the university.

| I drive to school                  | I drive my car five miles to my office, |
| I like to walk to work            | He used to ride a bicycle to work,    |
| Teddy used to ride his motorcycle.| I have to take a bus or just walk to the office |
| You can take a train or a bus from Helsinki. | I want to take a taxi. |
| Do you take the subway to work every day? | He had to take the bus home. |
| Stefan and Inga go by taxi,       | Take the ferry across the Noosa River at Moorindil Street, |
| Brian went home by train.         | Getting to and around Brooklyn is easiest by subway, |
| Bono travelled to school by bike some days, | Their children go to school on foot, |
| Most holidaymakers travel by air,| They went home on foot. |
| We came to work by bus.           |                                           |

11) Match the nouns and verbs above with the following patterns and add more nouns and verbs if you can:

[V [n] to n]: V-_________________________________________________

[take N]: N-___________________________________________________

[v by N]: N-__________________________________________________

[V [to n] on foot] V-____________________________________________

12) I usually __________ my bike to work.

13) She drives __________ work.

14) We go to school __________ train.

15) He goes __________ work __________ foot when the weather is nice.
16) It’s raining. Let’s __________ a taxi.

**Pattern 5**

My wife and I are going to go to Canada this summer for my sister’s wedding…


| I'm going to go | swimming every Tuesday |
| I'm just going to watch | TV |
| I'm going to play | the piano. |
| We are going to go | to America in October |
| He's not going to go | to school again. |
| We're going to eat | at 4:00. |
| Are you going to play | basketball this year? |

What are they going to do?

17) He __________ going to go to Australia for three weeks.

18) We __________ going __________ go shopping after class.

19) What__________ you going __________ do this weekend?

20) I __________ __________ to study for the test tonight.

21) She __________ not __________ to watch the movie with us.

**Pattern 6**

My wife and I are going to Canada this summer for my sister’s wedding,


| I am going | to America this year to work |
| I’m spending | the weekend with friends |
| Anna Langenbach is coming | to stay for a few days. |
| She is going | to college next October |
| He is going | to America in September |
| We are not going | to Canada next summer. |
| We are going | to Ibiza next week. It is our first holiday together |
| Are you working | tonight? |

Where __________ playing __________ this weekend?

22) We __________ playing soccer tomorrow.

23) I __________ going to Montreal next month.

24) They __________ _________ here on Friday. (come)

25) What __________ you __________ after school? (do)

26) She __________ _________ _________ next week (not/work)

**Pattern 7**

…and if we have enough time and money, we will visit Vancouver for a couple of days.
I’ll probably go mountain biking [will v]

I will come tomorrow.
I’ll show you how to do it.
I’ll call her at six,
He will spend the weekend in Cairo
We’ll lend you the money
Maybe I’ll move here one day.

Maybe she’ll go with me,
I will probably stay home and watch TV.
She’ll probably phone tonight.
We’ll probably have a beer or two.
Will you help me?
What will you do?

How long will it take?

27) I __________ call you later.

28) We __________ _________ them in an hour. (meet)

29) When __________ they __________? (arrive)

30) __________ you __________ me how to do it? (tell)

31) He __________ be late.

Pattern 8
What kind of movies do you like? [what kind of n]

What kind of music do you listen to?
What kind of car do you drive?
What kind of computer do you use?
What kind of job are you going to look for?
What kind of work did you do in Memphis?
What kind of beer do you like?
What kind of clothes do you like? I like simple, easy clothes - jeans
What kind of stereo do you own?
What kind of food do you have?
What kind of store was he in?

32) What __________ of food do you like?

33) What kind __________ video games do you play?

34) __________ kind of __________ do you listen to?

35) What kind of __________ do you read?

36) What __________ __________ dog do you have?
SG Group  Lesson 3

Read the handouts “Interview” and “Self-introduction” one more time. Then look at the following grammar points and fill in the blanks.

**Point 1: Possessive adjectives**

[possessive adjectives + noun]

Let’s talk about your family.

There are five people in my family:…

Edward Norton is one of my favourite actors

My favourite food is sushi.

Your favourite actor is Ken Watanabe.

His favourite TV show is Red Carpet.

Her sister lives in San Francisco.

Our classroom is on the second floor.

Their teacher is from Canada.

Yamagata is famous for its soba.

1) He likes sushi. It’s ____________ favourite food.

2) My friends love soccer. It’s ____________ favourite sport.

3) We’re watching Star Wars tonight. It’s ____________ favourite movie.

4) Sachiko doesn’t like Monday. It’s ____________ busiest day of the week.

5) Tomorrow is ____________ birthday. I’ll be 20 years old!

**Point 2: Wh- questions with be**

[wh- + be + subject] + object/complement]

Where are you from originally?

Where is Nova Scotia?

What’s Truro like?

Who is your favourite actor?

What is your favourite food?

What is your schedule like?
Who am I working with?  Who is my partner?
What are you doing?  What is your class like?
Where is he going after class?  Where is his office?
When is she coming here?  When is her family visiting?
Why are they late?  Why are our friends late?
How are we going to get there?  How are their friends getting there?

6) How ____________ you today?
7) ____________ is your favourite sport?
8) Where ____________ they from?
9) ____________ is your favourite singer?
10) ____________ is her birthday?

Point 3: Wh- questions with do
[wh- + do/does/did + subject + verb] + object/complement]

Why did you come to Japan?
Where do you live?
What do you study?
When did you come to Japan?
What do you do in your free time?
What do they do?
How do you get to work?
What kind of movies do you like?

Who do I work with next?
What do you after school?
Where does he play basketball?
When does she study?
Why do they go to Sendai?
How do we improve our English?
What does it mean?
11) What ____________ your father do?
12) What ____________ you do in your free time?
13) How ____________ she get to work?
14) ____________ ____________ our class start?
15) ____________ ____________ he live?

Point 4: play/do/go

[play/do + noun]    [go + verb+ing]

I go mountain biking in spring, summer, and fall, and snowboarding in winter,…

I like to play video games and online chess.

We play sports, games and instruments: play baseball/soccer/chess/guitar
We do health activities and martial arts: do exercise/yoga/karate
We go verb+ing: go shopping/bowling/swimming

16) He ____________ judo and karate.
17) I ____________ shopping in Sendai about once a month.
18) She ____________ softball and tennis.
19) We ____________ aerobics three times a week at the gym.
20) He doesn’t ____________ guitar, he ____________ bass.
APPENDIX 11

FL Group Lesson 4

Read the handouts “Self-Introduction” and “Interview”. Then look at the following patterns and fill in the blanks.

**Pattern 1**

Who is your favorite actor?  \[ \text{[who be poss n]} \]

Who is my boss?  Kelly asked.  You don't really have one,  
Who's my date?  Johnny's cousin. You'll like him;  
Who is your best friend?  Marjie Cooper. We go back a long way,  
Who’s your favourite TV actor?  David Jason-he's such a brilliant actor.  
Who is his dream date?  
Who’s his personal assistant?  
Who’s her stylist?  Al O'Pecia?  
Who is our true friend?  
Who is their captain?  
Who is its main character?  
Who is Kurt's favourite hero?  Superman  
Who is Arsenal's manager?  

1) Who is ________ partner for the project?  Junpe is your partner this time.  
2) Who’s ________ English teacher this year?  
3) Who ________ your English teacher last year?  
4) Who is Junpe ________ partner?  
5) ________ is your team leader?  

**Pattern 2**

What is your favorite food?  \[ \text{[what be poss favourite n]} \]  \[ \text{[favorite n]} \]

What is your favourite album?  
What's his favourite book?  
What is their favourite city?  
What's your favourite colour of car and why?  
What is her favorite Rolling Stones song?  
What is Glenn's favourite band?  
What was your favourite?  
What were your favourite subjects at school?  
My favourite channel is National Geographic  
My favourite actors are Johnny Depp and Sandra Bullock.  
His favourite car is the 1965 Mustang convertible,  
Primus is one of her favorite bands  
6) What's his ________ TV show?  
7) One of my ________ movies is Star Wars.  

74
8) What ________ her favorite TV show when she was a kid?
9) Is English your ________ subject?
10) ________ is your ________ kind of restaurant.

**Pattern 3**

Do you like natto? [like n/to v/v-ing]

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Do you like to sing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Do you like her?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Did she like the movie?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Do they like to watch TV?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Did he like the book?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Do you like driving?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Do you like baseball?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Does he like cars?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Do you like dogs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>What do you like to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>I like coffee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td>He really likes motorcycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m)</td>
<td>They like to read and discuss books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n)</td>
<td>He likes gardening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o)</td>
<td>I really like reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p)</td>
<td>I think they like Chinese food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q)</td>
<td>We like living here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r)</td>
<td>She likes working at the hotel?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) Sort the examples above into the following patterns for like:

- like n: ______ b
- like to v: ______ a
- like v-ing: ______ f

12) They like ________ watch movies.

13) I ________ driving.

14) ________ they like to snowboard

**Pattern 4**

I’ve been to the United States, Cuba and Thailand. [have/has pp]

I haven’t been to many places yet.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He has eaten</td>
<td>several meals in El Monte,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She has written</td>
<td>several children's books,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She hasn't finished</td>
<td>her training,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I haven't bought</td>
<td>much music recently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have worked</td>
<td>together on several projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We've read</td>
<td>all about you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He has travelled to Indonesia, Tonga, New Zealand and around Australia.
She has ridden camels, wild stallions and leapt from cliff faces into surf.
I have lived here about 30 years.
He hasn't decided what he will do yet.
I've been to many rock concerts,
It's been a hard first year but I've learned a lot.
Have you ever been to Europe?

15) She __________ already seen the movie twice.
16) They __________ __________ many books. (read)
17) She __________ __________ to Sapporo. (be)
18) __________ you ever __________ to New York? (be)
19) __________ he __________ his homework yet? (finish)

**Pattern 5**

Let’s talk about your family. [v about n]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I read about it in the paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It helps you learn about new cultures,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was shocked to hear about the violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think about the future a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think about job security all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They don't care about the harm they are doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't worry about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatever you know about the brain --please adapt it to our computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let's talk about something else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He wouldn't talk about himself, or his wife, or what he was writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did he tell you about me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All I can say about the software is WOW!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have nothing to say about him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to them chat about each other,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian refused to comment about the coming struggle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is much to cheer about in China's state firms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not going to complain about anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they would lie about other things too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to ask you about something else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I haven't asked anybody about it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20) What kind of words go before about in the examples above?

21) What does she usually __________ about? (run/try/sing)
22) I like to __________ about historical events. (draw/write/play)
23) He needs to talk to you __________ your homework assignment.
Pattern 6

Do you have any brothers or sisters? [do n have n] [any pl-n/uc-n]

| Do you have any children?    |
| Do you have any cash?       |
| Do we have any plans for next weekend? |
| Do they have any food?      |
| Does he have any brothers or sisters? |
| Does he have any photographs of her? |
| Does she have any computer skills? |
| Does it have any special features? |
| Do you have a dog or cat now? |
| Do we have a map?           |
| Do they have a parking space? |
| Does he have a job?         |
| Does she have a boyfriend?  |
| Does it have a battery?     |

24) Do they _________ any money left?

25) Does she have _________ dog?

26) Do we have _________ milk?

27) Do you have _________ brother?

28) Does he have _________ brothers?

Pattern 7

What do you do in your free time? [free]

| In your free time,       |
| visit Albania's medieval castles |
| In his free time,        |
| Ben renovated another house |
| She teaches Arabic dance in her free time. |
| He spends his free time glued to TV sports channels |
| She spends her free time reading. |
| They spend all their free time and all their money playing or buying games. |
| Many teenagers spend most of their free time there, |
| He spent most of his free time at the movies. |
| In her free time she enjoys inline skating |
| You will have plenty of free time to explore the beautiful city of Paris |
| She had some free time and decided to go for it. |
| I don't get a lot of free time. |

29) I like to read in _________ free time.

30) We usually play soccer in our _________ time.

31) They _________ their free time at the park with their dog.

32) Do you _________ any free time this weekend?

33) How do you _________ your free time?
Pattern 8

I go mountain biking in spring, summer and fall, and snowboarding in winter, I like to play video games and online chess.  

He used to play baseball with them  
He says he wants to play basketball,  
I play darts with them and I drink with them.  
I don't play golf, I don't go fishing, 
She wants to play violin.  
Rebecca and Stephanie -- play piano, cello and violin.  
Do you play tennis? 
Does he play chess? 
We can play video games all night! 
I didn't want to play poker any more. 

Some people prefer to do exercise rather than mindless activity 
I do aerobics every week  
I dance a lot and do yoga.  
I used to do karate five or six years ago  
I used to do judo as a kid, I do aikido, row, dance and play chess.  
on Friday we do gymnastics I still do archery and I like it.

You can go cycling or canoeing anywhere.  
Do you want to go dancing tonight? 
They used to go fishing together 
I go jogging quite a lot.  
Do you ever go shopping on a Sunday? 
She wants to go sightseeing 
Every winter I go skiing while my husband stays at home 
I climb mountains, go snowboarding, ride mountain bikes and go sailing. 
I aim to go swimming twice a week. 
You wanna go golfing? 

34) Let’s ________ swimming after lunch.  
35) Do you want to ________ golf tomorrow?  
36) I ________ exercise at least three times a week.  
37) How long have you been ________ guitar?  
38) ________ they ________ shopping with you yesterday?
APPENDIX 12

SG Group  Lesson 4

Read the handouts “Self-Introduction” and “Interview”. Then look at the following grammar points and fill in the blanks.

**Point 1: Adverbs of frequency**

[subject + freq. adverb + verb] + object/complement

I usually do some reading or studying on the bus.

I sometimes teach at James English in Yamagata…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100%</th>
<th>always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>sometimes work on weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>almost never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% never

**sometimes can go before the subject: Sometimes I…**

1) She ____________ does her homework. (0%)
2) We ____________ ____________ play tennis on Sunday. (90%)
3) ____________ I cook dinner for my girlfriend.
4) Kazuki ____________ drinks coffee in the morning. (100%)
5) My friends ____________ go drinking on Friday nights. (80%)

**Point 2: Let’s + verb (imperative)**

[Let’s + verb] + object/complement

Let’s talk about your family.

Let’s watch a movie tonight.

Let’s play baseball this weekend.

Let’s do our homework in the library.

Let’s go shopping after school.
6) Let’s ___________ bowling later.
7) Let’s ___________ TV.
8) Let’s ___________ to the park.
9) Let’s ___________ yoga together.
10) Let’s ___________ to music at my house.

Point 3: Present perfect

[subject + have/has + past participle + object/complement]

…I haven’t been to many places yet.
I’ve been to the United States, Cuba and Thailand.
I’ve always been interested in Japan.
I’ve eaten grasshoppers in Thailand.
You have seen the movie.
He’s been to Europe three times.
She has tried scuba diving and skydiving.
We haven’t been to Okinawa.
They’ve written many reports.
It has changed many times.

11) He ___________ travelled to many countries.
12) I’ve ___________ the movie three times.
13) She ___________ ridden a camel in Egypt.
14) My friends ___________ ___________ pizza in Italy.
15) We ___________ ___________ in a helicopter.

Point 4: Present perfect continuous

[subject + have/has + been + verb+ing] + object/complement]

I have been living and working in Japan…
I’ve been studying Japanese for six years.
You’ve been watching TV all day!
He’s been living in Vancouver since 2005.
She’s been playing tennis since she was in junior high school.
We’ve been waiting for a long time.
They’ve been meeting every weekend.
It’s been raining all day.

16) He ________ been ___________ in Tokyo since 2004. (live)
17) She has ___________ ___________ part-time for seven months. (work)
18) We ___________ been ___________ French for a long time. (study)
19) I’ve ___________ ___________ kendo since junior high school. (do)
20) They ___________ ___________ ___________ since this morning. (wait)

Point 5: for/since

[for + length of time / since + point in time]

I lived in Halifax for six years…
I have been living and working in Japan for six years now, since February 18th, 2003.

I’ve been studying for three hours. I’ve been studying since three o’clock.
He’s been living in Japan for six years. He’s been living in Japan since 2003.
She has worked there for five months. She has worked there since December.
We have been here for two hours. We have been here since 10:50.
They’ve been shopping for five hours. They’ve been shopping since 10am.
It’s been raining for two days. It’s been raining since Monday.

21) I’ve been living in Sendai ________ April.
22) She has studied English ________ six years.
23) They have been waiting ________ over five hours.
24) I’ve been interested in baseball _________ I was in elementary school.
25) He did karate _________ almost ten years.
APPENDIX 13

Test Instrument

name: ____________________________________
student number: _________________________

Fill in the blanks:

1) She _______ a university student.
2) I _________ an English teacher.
3) They _________ studying engineering.
4) Yamagata _________ very beautiful.
5) You _________ late for class!
6) He _________ a baseball player.
7) I’m _________ Canada.
8) I _________ in Yamagata.
9) He graduated ____________ high school __________ 2007.
10) He majored ____________ engineering.
11) I’ve been living in Sendai ____________ April.
12) She has studied English ____________ six years.
13) They’re interested ____________ travelling.
14) I _________ electrical engineering at Tohoku Gakuin University.
15) Where ____________ you from?
17) What’s Nova Scotia ____________? → It’s very beautiful.
18) Why ____________ you study English?
19) Where ____________ she live?
20) Where ____________ they study?
21) I want to go ____________ Okinawa for my vacation.
22) They are going to ____________ here tomorrow.
23) When did you ____________ there?
24) She _________ up at 7am every morning.
25) They work ____________ 9:00 ____________ 5:00 on weekdays.
26) I ride my ____________ to school.
27) She _________ her car to work.
28) We ____________ the bus to school.
29) Let’s go to school ____________ foot today.
30) They usually travel ____________ train.
31) We are going ____________ go shopping after class.
32) They are ____________ soccer tomorrow.
33) I ____________ call you later.
34) What kind ____________ video games do you play?
35) What's his ____________ TV show?
36) I like ____________ read.
37) She ____________ listening to music.
38) They have ____________ many Japanese movies. (watch)
39) She has ____________ to Sapporo three times. (be)
40) I’ve been ____________ Japanese for six years. (study)
41) Let’s ____________ about your family.
42) Do you have ____________ brothers or sisters?
43) What do you do ____________ your free time?
44) I like to ____________ soccer and basketball.
45) I ____________ yoga.
46) I usually ____________ shopping in Sendai.

Unscramble the words to make questions:

47) from/where/you/are?

48) do/what/does/he?

49) is/who/teacher/your?

50) you/why/did/Japan/to/come?

51) study/she/when/English/does?

52) go/they/do/how/school/to?

53) like/sushi/you/do?

54) favourite/is/what/his/food?
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