What grammar in foreign language pedagogy?

Anthony Bruton
Universidad de Sevilla

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to further the debate on how to define pedagogical grammar, as a necessary precursor to any discussion of the role of grammar teaching in formal language learning. A fundamental conclusion is that grammars should vary according to different factors, some of which are included in a check-list. Not least of these factors is the purpose to which the grammar is to be put, a factor which should not be ignored even by university FL departments.

The field of second and foreign language pedagogy has been debating whether grammar instruction is beneficial, or not, for over a decade now. Even though there is no conclusive evidence one way or the other, there have been significant clarifications on the issue. However, with one or two exceptions, university foreign language departments seem to be fairly immuned to defining the goals of courses on grammar, distinguishing the effect of different purposes on potential descriptions of a language, researching the practical applications of such descriptions and so on. And if the university foreign language students I come across are representative, they have trouble articulating even a rough definition of grammar, distinguishing grammar from morphosyntax and the lexicon, or discriminating meaning in grammar, though they might be able to label some constructions appropriately.

Our concern will centre on what appropriate grammars might or might not suppose, rather than the dynamics of their instruction, and when we refer to the university context, it will be in relation to foreign language instruction in schools, for a number of reasons. First, because the applied field has been much more progressive in this area and more self-critical. Second, because foreign language teachers are the products of foreign language departments, which owe their existence largely to these graduates. Third, because there is a tendency for many academics involved in descriptions of foreign languages to be ignorant of the applied pedagogic issues, even though this does not deter them from publishing and diffusing their ideas in applied forums, which are among the most lucrative. However, there is a growing recognition in the more realistic sectors of formal linguistics that any description of language must have some kind of applied validity, for theoretical and pragmatic reasons.

THE EFFECT OF GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION

It was Krashen (1982) who articulated, what Ellis (1985) calls, the non-interface position most clearly. This position is basically that teaching grammar rules, whether inductively or deductively, does not affect the development of spontaneous speech, though some rules may help when the user has time to apply them. The rules here are "rules of thumb", which Krashen (1981:134) contrasts with learning the "structure of the language" (Krashen, 1981:101). In reply, Garrett (1986:134) argues that we are confronted with the paradox that *grammatical competence must be an integral part of communicative competence, but learning grammar does not seem to help students achieve either.* Rutherford's (1988:172) position is that the question is *not whether to impart to the learner a knowledge of the language system but rather how we might go about it.* Garrett's (1986:134) answer was that *instead of asking how we should teach grammar, we need first to determine and analyze the basic notion of what grammar is.* So, effective pedagogic grammar (PG) needs to be defined, before the potential benefits of grammar pedagogy can be properly evaluated.

Nevertheless, Pienemann's (1985) teachability hypothesis suggests that in many cases grammar instruction can improve speed of acquisition and ultimate attainment, though it might not alter the stages through which learners have to progress between not knowing and knowing the syntactic and other systematic features of a grammar. The arguments are based on developmental stages, rather than the acquisition orders cited by Krashen (1981). This view is corroborated by Long's (1988) review of the research on instructed language contexts. Pica (1994:66-67) summarizes research which demonstrates that instruction helps the acquisition of "easy to learn" items, items close to the L1 or very opaque features. White (1987) describes the types of L2 information that would be inaccessible unless it were pointed out, as it might not be observable in positive evidence. There is an assumption that the itemized teaching of grammatical forms has not been successful (Long and Crookes, 1992), though Sheen (1994) has countered the evidence.

Despite the considerable polemic over the benefits of teaching grammar, the notion of (pedagogical) grammar remains very vague and the characteristics of the instructional contexts even more so. For example, Bruton (1995) evaluates the use of the popularized term 'focus on form' and concludes that it refers to a host of different language oriented practices. Even so, there is a consensus that focusing on items or features of the language might be beneficial for language development, at the right level.

IDENTIFYING PEDAGOGICAL GRAMMAR

Widdowson (1988:151-2) defines grammar as *a device for indicating the most common and recurrent aspects of meaning*, which *formalizes the most widely applicable concepts, the highest common factors of experience: it provides for*

communicative economy. Glisan & Drescher (1993) argue for a semantic organization of grammatical notions, rather along the lines of Wilkins' (1976) "semantico-grammatical" categories. However, as Chalker (1994) *rightly observes, most foreign* language teachers and students consider grammar to be rules. This is largely because the focus of attention is on those features of the language that are, in Greenbaum's (1986) terms, least in dispute, or alternatively most prescriptive. This is reflected in a more limited definition of grammar as *an account of the language's possible sentence structures* (Crystal, 1987:88). Alternatives for rule are socio-psychological terms such as norms, intuitions (Garrett, 1986) or prototypes (Leech, 1994). However, even in the case of those features of the language that might be closer to being rule-governed, it is impossible to determine a 'best' rule, which will depend on the purpose and context of the application (Westney, 1994). Finally, neither definition of grammar should be confused with the more general term language description, including the critical role of the lexicon.

Numerous distinctions have been made between different grammars, though we will only summarize some of those that make references to PG. Soporta (1973) contrasted scientific grammars, which were theoretical or descriptive, from pedagogic ones, which were in the form of course material for learning. Greenbaum (1986:191) puts this view more succinctly in defining PGs as teaching *the language and not about the language. Candlin (1979) places the PGs between the communicative ones and practical* materials. Sharwood Smith (1988a) believes that PGs may be more ex¹ensive than theoretical/ descriptive grammars as they include semantic and pragm   ɔments.

The purpose of a grammar has also been defined by the audience or consumer. Leech's (1994) different audiences are linguists/ university students, teachers and learners, which more or less correspond to his categories of theoretical, descriptive and pedagogic grammar, while Corder (1979) only distinguished teachers' and learners' grammar. The mode of use is another purpose. Greenbaum's (1987) distinction between self-help reference grammars and pedagogical classroom ones, leaves the teach-yourself type in between. Sharwood Smith (1988a:157-8) divides descriptions into "nonapplied" and "applied", which are then subdivided into "concentrated" or "extended", on pedagogical processing criteria. These terms might be more familiar as reference grammars and coursebook grammar. In either case, the intended assimilation of the underlying system can be inductive or deductive (Fortune, 1988), though deduction may be more common in reference books, despite such inductive exceptions as Shepherd, Rossner & Taylor (1984), and the former in textbooks. However, Sharwood Smith (1988b) does not believe that rules necessarily reflect either deductive or inductive teaching approaches, since, in the latter case, rules may be translated backwards into prepared input.

Nevertheless, we can identify PG being applied to either teachers' grammars or learners' ones. In the case of the former they may either be in a raw state to be

converted into appropriate content for specific learners, or they may already have undergone conversion. However, Chalker (1994) may be right in believing that most teachers learn their grammar from the same books as their learners, in practice. Learners' grammar tends to be either in coursebooks, to be assimilated under supervision, or reference grammars, to be assimilated more independently. In one of the few studies of its kind, Hermosín Gutiérrez (1994) shows that most of the learners of English in his sample from state secondary schools in Seville do not use grammars (63%) and, if they do, it is to revise for exams (26% frequently) or to complete exercises (21% frequently).

It is symptomatic that purpose is usually applied to PG, but not to descriptive grammar as it is taught in university foreign language departments. It is assumed that the audience on such courses is homogeneous with a common purpose. If any defined purpose can actually be identified, it is some system of analysis for future rule-formation, in terms of linguistic labelling, despite the needs of the audience being mainly pedagogic. In fact, the focus is on more complex prescriptive rules and technicalities, since foreign language undergraduates rarely receive instruction in research methodology. It is typical for descriptive reference grammars, such as Quirk & Greenbaum (1973), to be used pedagogically at university level. Downing & Locke (1992), however, *place meaning firmly within the grammar* (p.xii), but there is a certain confusion, as there is in other meaning-based grammars such as Leech & Svartvik (1994) or Halliday (1985), about whether the goal is receptive analysis and interpretation or productive selection and formulation, since the organizing categories are sometimes semantic and sometimes formal. Most of these grammars have either workbooks (Close, 1974) or tasks, both inductive and deductive, but they are still concentrated reference grammars, which is in complete contrast to Leech, Deuchar & Hoogenraad (1982), for example, which is progressive.

FL university courses do not seem to improve language ability on the one hand, and generally fail to develop genuine analytic ability on the other, with the possible exception of Leech, Deuchar & Hoogenraad (1982). They also avoid the more academically threatening organization of language for the expression of meaning, again with such notable exceptions as Downing & Locke (1992) or Leech & Svartvik (1994).

LINGUISTIC AND PSYCHOLINGUISTIC DESCRIPTIONS

Do linguistic descriptions have any psycholinguistic validity? The answer generally is that they do not necessarily (Candlin, 1979), though it may depend on the goal of the descriptions. Corder's (1988) point that rules may help learning, but are not what is learnt, since they are aids not objects, has not been heeded by many. As far as Garrett (1986) is concerned, linguistic rules are not rules for doing anything, knowledge of them does not mean a linguistic ability and *what we have been teaching as grammar is some pedagogical version describing the result of linguistic analysis* (p.137). Knowing

such rules, or not, is irrelevant. In complete contrast to James (1994:205), who does not see "psychological reality" as a requirement, Garrett emphasizes the need to know what mediates between thought and utterance, at different processing levels. This is compatible with Sharwood Smith's (1988a) inclusion of semantic and pragmatic factors. However, Westney (1994) reminds us that regularities differ in kind and degree at different levels, as well.

Two examples might help make the point about psycholinguistic and linguistic differences. Carroll (1989) in her study of the representation of gender marking for nouns by native French speakers concludes that they are stored with a gender attribute, while articles, quantifiers, adjectives and pronouns are variant. French-speaking children have to realize that it is precisely the items with gender variants that signal the gender of the causal noun element. Nouns are memorized initially with the determiners as prefixes in unanalyzed wholes and gender is then memorized for morphologically simple words. The same is not true of non-native learners who resort to rules of thumb and mnemonics which lead to overgeneralizations. These rules tend to be ones espoused by some formal linguistic grammars, a good example of which would be that word endings can identify genders. These results reflect other tendencies in the field of psycholinguistics. First, that it is the lexical items with their dependencies that are central (Bruton, 1987) to language processing, with grammar playing a subservient, mediating role in context (Widdowson, 1988). In developmental terms, Skehan (1994) suggests there is a process of 'syntacticisation' and Batstone (1994) 'grammaticisation' of the lexicon. Second, much of language is not rule-governed and has to be 'learnt' as chunks (Pawley and Syder, 1983).

In this sense the linguistic or computational principle of economy may not be applicable. Rutherford (1988a) argues that the question is not whether language is rule-governed, but which parts, and Corder (1988) that there is more to language learning than learning formation rules. However, where there are observable generalizations or prototypes, their explicit formulation may serve as an interim learning device, which, like all mediators, can be discarded, when no longer necessary. However, the mediator would have to be psycholinguistically appropriate for either receptive or productive processing (Bruton, 1987).

As another example, Bruton (unpublished) distinguishes between disambiguating the -'S genitive for possessive, social, professional and part-whole relationships from other constructions with the same form, but different meanings. Expression is totally different in kind, apart from which, choices have to be made between at least six different constructions in this semantic space. These selectional choices depend on semantic, pragmatic and co-textual processing factors. Finally, the 'rules' can be represented in various ways, such as categorizing the choices by unacceptability (i.e. 'you can't say that') or by acceptability (i.e. 'these are the options in this semantic space'). For this particular case, the unacceptable options are actually simpler than the

acceptable ones, though they might not reflect effective psycholinguistic processing in the longer term.

REFERENCE AND INSTRUCTED LEARNER GRAMMARS

When distinguishing reference grammars from coursebooks, Greenbaum (1987) identifies the mode of use as the major distinction. Reference grammars are for self-help, or consultation, though teachers may instruct learners in their use. However, as Hermosín Gutiérrez (1994) has discovered, consulting reference grammars is not like consulting dictionaries, since the former is usually for preparation and the latter for specific on-line problems - some bilingual dictionaries do include grammar summaries as entries, however. Reference grammars also tend to be more condensed, cross-referenced, indexed and more comprehensive than even some theoretical grammars, as they include semantic/ pragmatic variables (Sharwood Smith, 1988a). The organization may be alphabetical, or according to structural or semantic categories (Chalker, 1994). The alphabetical forms or labels are like those in indexed grammars, which reflects the limitation that they have to be familiar before they can be located. In some cases, features are recycled at different levels of complexity. Finally, such grammars do not tend to be especially attractive or glossy and the explanations can be in either the L1 or the L2.

Coursebooks are for use under supervision from beginning to end, but learners may use course material outside the classroom. They are divided into units according to expected class lessons, and the progression is according to psycholinguistic developmental learning criteria. This reflects the fact that *grammar knowledge evolves organically, rather than growing in discrete steps* (Leech, 1994:19). Deductive or inductive principles may affect the presentation (Greenbaum, 1987), nevertheless. Obviously coursebooks have an enormous amount of exemplary input, are practical and have to be attractive. Sharwood Smith (1988a:158) assumes that these books have fragmentary information plus a strong practice element, and are usually for specific types of learner. Even so, there might be *periodic specified gathering points for sets of previously practised language elements* (Rutherford, 1988a:176).

According to Chalker (1994:42), both types of book are based on structures, and the major difference is that the coursebooks *build up from structures judged to be useful or frequent (or perhaps easiest to teach), and continually recycle*. So, the distinguishing factors are Greenbaum's mode of use, Chalker's organizing by development or not, and Sharwood Smith's concentrated or extended processing. Presumably those books, or parts of books, used for reference have concentrated summarized grammatical explanations with deductive pedagogical procedures. The books for instruction can rely on less concentrated information, for the progressive assimilation of language over time, inductively (see Table I for some initial generalizations).

TABLE I

Instructed and reference grammars

USE	ASSIMILATION	INFORMATION	PROCEDURE
reference	intensive	concentrated	deductive
instruction	progressive	fragmentary & diffused	inductive

Pienemann (1985) suggests that we might select, sequence and focus input and output differently, which implies that there might be receptive and productive reference grammars. Furthermore, learners do not develop from zero to comprehensive knowledge of language features/items for recognition or recall, immediately, (Terrell, 1991).

INSTANTIATIONS, EXEMPLARS AND ABSTRACT SYSTEMS

Not unrelated is the issue of instantiations, exemplars and more abstract generalizations of the system. In natural discourse, native speaker children receive instantiations of language, which they generalize and systematize to some extent. However, the fault of pedagogical exemplars, usually in the form of summarized structures (Chalker, 1994), is that they may have been learnt by heart, as "summaries of behaviour", rather than being perceived as instances of a more abstract representation (Soporta, 1973:270). Even if they were, the result might be no more than what Rutherford (1988b) calls unit-accumulation. The same can be said of descriptive grammars which give prototype constructions, but little insight into the system. Rutherford & Sharwood Smith (1988), in this respect, distinguish between an abstraction and a collection of facts. The former is sometimes reflected methodologically in deductive explanations and the latter in inductive modelling. The explanations would identify relations within the system, to the system.

Can the system be 'explained' and assimilated partly by explanations, or can we only direct attention to critical factors, which the mind will naturally convert? Rutherford (1988b) argues that what is crucial to language development is precisely that which is not observable. In a sense, it is a truism that the system cannot be presented explicitly through language input, whether natural or prepared. Furthermore, the system is too complex to be explained and certainly to be assimilated through explanation, especially if we take pragmatic discourse relations into account. He argues that we can focus attention on the language and develop awareness. Terrell (1991) goes

beyond this to suggest that grammar instruction can serve as an advance organizer, a meaning-form focuser and output monitor.

However, these arguments do not mean that exposure to prototype exemplars, which learners might or might not reproduce, verbatim or otherwise, does not necessarily trigger more abstract processing. It is also questionable whether all of language use is based on assimilating abstract systems rather than more direct function-form associations (Pawley & Syder, 1983). A coherent position might be to identify different types of relationships to be focused on, at different levels, for different purposes, in different ways.

ACCESSIBILITY OF GRAMMAR RULES

First we must have some notion of regularities/ generalities in the abstract system defined as grammar. This has to be distinguished from instances or items of the language, which are not identified in system terms. Most linguists (Greenbaum, 1986; Leech, 1994; Nádasdy, 1994) agree that distinctions in languages are not clear-cut, but have fuzzy edges. Generalizations are characterized by prototypes (Leech, 1994), which are imposed on languages for convenience (Greenbaum, 1986). Beyond these generalizations, there are features that escape being summarizable (Heafford, 1993). Furthermore, Nádasdy (1994) demonstrates that pitching rules at different levels can result in a few big rules, with many exceptions, or many small rules, which are impossible to manage. This is reflected in Leech's (1994) point that there is a tendency to either overgeneralize or undergeneralize. However, lower-level generalizations or regularities, particularly on formation, tend to be less controversial (Westney, 1994) and more prescriptive (Chalker, 1994).

Apart from certain factors in PGs such as the arrangement (Chalker, 1994), the actual truth of the generalizations/ regularities (Swan, 1994) and the relations to L1s (Swan, 1994), the major distinction between learner grammar and other more complete ones is the level of simplification (Leech, 1994). The simplification may be in terms of complexity of the generalization/ regularity, the breadth of data to be covered, or the terminology. To some extent this is dependent on what the learners already know (Swan, 1994; James, 1994), consciously or intuitively. Usually, the regularities are based on the written medium (Heafford, 1993) and are summarized for production, which is more under the control of syllabus (Leech, 1994:19).

As Swan (1994:54) says, *a little truth goes a long way, when one is off one's ground*. In the literature, there are numerous references to the fact that only simpler or easier rules may be appropriate for instruction. However, these rules are very often restricted to formulation not use (Westney, 1994), despite use being more problematic in the long term (Bardovi-Harlig, 1992). Heafford (1993) suggests that the order of

accessibility of generalizations might be: those that are simple and unequivocal, those that are simple and show tendencies; those that are more complex, but unequivocal; followed by those that are complex, and intuitive and not absolute.

The consensus seems to be that some kind of simplification is necessary, and we will consider some of the variables that characterize good generalizations. First, they should demarcate the boundaries and state what is not possible (Swan, 1994), which might be through positive and negative evidence (James, 1994). Second, they should be terminologically (Swan, 1994; Chalker, 1994) and conceptually (Swan, 1994) clear and understandable. The generalizations should be simple, but not distortions (Swan, 1994) and relevant to the learner's first language (Swan, 1994). Finally, the generalization should have predictive value (Westney, 1994) and psycholinguistic appropriacy.

ADDITIONAL FACTORS

In this final section, we will consider certain general features that might produce more viable PGs for learners, in addition to the factor of appropriate simplification.

a)   general principles

First, it is probably useful that the learners are made conscious of certain general features of the language in question. Apart from English having fairly stable word order, Rutherford (1988b:233) lists some of its basic characteristics:

- the category subject is basic to canonical sentence form
- preverbal subject position must always be filled
- this plus the stable SVO constituent order requires a number of movement rules
- it is possible to have a heavy information load in subject position
- in order to maintain the subject before the lexical verb a *do*-support is invoked

At the noun phrase level, we could add further general tendencies with respect to pre- and post-modification. Furthermore, we could introduce differences between languages at a conceptual level, which is not to be confused with arguments for predicting difficulty at the lower contrastive levels (Sharwood Smith, 1988a; Rutherford, 1988b).

b)   reception and production

Leech (1994) distinguishes between the receptive and productive mediums, since the former requires less precision and is less controllable (see also Swain, 1985:249; Krashen, 1982:66). Leech argues that production might be more likely to be aided by deductive learning, and reception by inductive. Neither of these generalizations are actually valid and they avoid the question of how receptive representations are converted to productive ones. This is recognized by Terrell (1986:219), who says that

access does not automatically follow from binding, and by Bruton (1987), who demonstrates that input has to be recoded for production. Straight (1986) takes the radical stance that language representations for reception and production are different in kind and that there are two distinct storage systems. Consequently, we have two issues here. Do we have two grammars? Do we have a conversion process from receptive representations to productive ones?. Certainly, recent concern for receptive grammar activities (Ellis, 1995; VanPatten & Sanz, 1995) suggest the answer to the first question might be affirmative.

c) organization & indexing

Normally instructed grammar is progressive, and graded sequentially on the basis of criteria such as frequency, difficulty or utility. This type of grammar has to account for acquisition orders (Krashen 1981) and developmental stages (Pienemann, 1985), in production at least. The amount and types of input and output focus would be directly determined by the levels of expected accuracy for progress.

However, grammar to be referenced is usually concentrated under labels. These labels can be classified alphabetically by form or linguistic description, structurally by position in the system, or semantically by meaning. Normally, the organization is by structure (Chalker, 1994), with some notable exceptions mentioned earlier. For production, some type of semantic organization or L1 indexing, supplemented by explanations, examples or translations, should be essential.

d) lexical basis

Widdowson (1988) very convincingly represents the trend towards the recognition of the centrality of the lexicon, rather than the grammar. Bruton (1987) outlines a lexical dependency grammar, in which the realization of global meanings represented by the grammar, is dependent on lexical items. These lexical items, which can be sub-categorized on a semantico-syntactic basis, restrict the structural options. Furthermore, it is probable that lexical items are divided roughly into open and closed classes and that these classes suppose different psycholinguistic processing (Garrett, 1984). The features of these items appear to be stored mentally in sub-systems (Emmorey & Fromkin, 1988), the relevant features of which would have to be identified. Items have to be learnt uniquely, and the extent to which even 'rules' can be generalized is limited, since many acceptable options have to be learnt as fixed sequences (Pawley & Syder, 1983).

e) context & co-text

When features of the language are contextualized pedagogically, the purpose is to make the meaning clearer, even though this may conflict with the arguments for authentic corpus-based examples, which might be unclear or even confusing (Nesi, 1991). If we accept the episodic and semantic memory distinction (Tulving, 1986), we

can conjecture that initially semantic features are assimilated on the basis of the episodic. In standard grammatical explanations, we can identify differences between concepts or abstractions and actual contexts of use, including examples. Furthermore, it is only in context that certain choices can realistically be made, according to Bruton (unpublished). For example, in the expression of possession and other related meanings in English, the user has to take into account the relationships themselves plus definiteness, animacy, reference, postmodification and end weight, situational and social context, linguistic co-text and knowledge of the world. Reference grammars are necessarily limited by the lack of context, in a way that coursebook material need not be.

We find in language acquisition that learners begin by estracting clues from context and then co-text to make inferences about the language. In language use, the less proficient use context and co-text to interpret and express linguistic meaning, while the more proficient use language to interpret and express meaning. In other words, learners progress from being constrained by contexts and co-texts to being able to implement language to create them.

f) process

Logically, a PG for production should be organized to reflect real psycholinguistic processing structure (Garrett, 1986). Garrett (1984) outlines the basic structure of speech production processes, which include distinct elements contributing sequentially and in parallel to the final product, at varying levels. These elements are different in kind and in processing. In other words, different features of the language function differently and will require learning which is not uniform. For example, just because syntactic elements develop in certain ways does not necessarily suppose that all linguistic features do.

In the receptive context, the grammar would have to disambiguate items similar in form and explain the relation between items across stretches of discourse. Furthermore, receptive grammars would need to account for the recoding question.

g) L1 role

Leech (1994) is not the first to recognize the importance not only of explanations in the L1, but also comparisons between languages to resolve problems. We should add equivalents as well. However, explanations should not confuse the nomenclatures of one language with those of another, though we should try to build on existing knowledge (James, 1994). Secondly, comparisons should be made at the right level in the productive or receptive processing procedures. That is, from meaning downwards or from form upwards. The same applies to the use of equivalents.

CONCLUSION

The appendix summarizes most of the significant variables in PG, for either the receptive or productive mode. The elaboration of relevant PGs, at an appropriate linguistic level, is a necessary goal for all those who might feel responsible for the development of language ability in the classroom. They must have clear purposes on the one hand and reflect current research on second/ foreign language acquisition. The field will not benefit from the dissemination of suspect prescriptive rules of form, or watered down descriptions, with no pedagogical purpose and no psycholinguistic validity.

It is hoped that a generation of foreign language pedagogical grammarians will emerge, who will offer practicable solutions to both practising and trainee instructors in their local milieus. These solutions should take research into developmental grammar, and theory built on this research, rather than purely linguistic descriptions, as a point of departure. The challenge for university foreign language departments should be for some grammarians to change course and begin conducting research into one of the central concerns of their public: pedagogical grammar.

REFERENCES

Bardovi-Harlig, K. 1992. The relationshiup of form and meaning: A cross-sectional study of tense and aspect in the interlanguage of learners of English as a second language. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 13*: 153-278.

Batstone, R. 1984. Product and process: Grammar in the second language classroom In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (eds.), *Grammar and the Language Teacher*. London: Prentice Hall.

Bruton, A. 1987. *The Teacher of English as Lexicon*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Universidad de Sevilla.

Bruton, A. 1995. Tightening up on terms (2): Focus on form. *IATEFL Research Newsletter, 6*: 5-9.

Bruton, A. (unpublished). Expressing possessive, social, professional and part-whole relationships grammatically in English.

Candlin, C.N. 1979. The status of pedagogical grammars. In C.J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (eds.), *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carroll, S. 1989. Second-language acquisition and the computational paradigm. *Language Learning, 39/4*: 535-594.

Chalker, S. 1994. Pedagogical grammar: Principles and problems. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (eds.), *Grammar and the Language Teacher*. London: Prentice Hall.

Close, R.A. 1974. *A University Grammar of English: Workbook*. London: Longman.

Corder, S.P. 1988. Pedagogic grammars. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood Smith (eds.), *Grammar and Second Language Teaching*. New York: Newbury House.

Crystal, D. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Downing, A. & Locke, P. 1992. *A University Course in English Grammar*. London: Prentice Hall.

Ellis, R. 1995. Interpretation tasks for grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 29/1:* 87-105.

Emmorey, K.D. & Fromkin, V.A. 1988. The mental lexicon. In F.W. Newmeyer, *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey, Volume III (Language: Psychological and Biological Aspects)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fortune, A. 1988. Survey review: Intermediate grammar workbooks. *ELT Journal, 42/3*: 210-215.

Garrett, M.F. 1984. The organization of processing structure for language production: Applications to aphasic speech. In D. Caplan, A.R. Lecours & A. Smith (eds.), *Biological Perspectives on Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Garrett, N. 1986. The problem with grammar: What kind can the language learner use? *Modern Language Journal, 70/2*: 133-148.

Glisan, E.W. & Drescher, V. 1993. Textbook grammar: Does it reflect native speaker speech? *Modern Language Journal, 7/1*: 23-33.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Heafford, M. 1993. What is grammar, who is she? *Language Learning Journal, 7*: 55-58.

Hermosín Gutiérrez, A. 1994. El uso de gramáticas en BUP y COU: Una aproximación. In A. Bruton & J. Arnold (eds.), *Lingüídtica Aplicada al Aprendizaje del Inglés: Resumen monográfico 2*. Alcalá de Guadaira (Sevilla, Spain): C.E.P.

James, C. 1994. Explaining grammar to its learners. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (eds.), *Grammar and the Language Teacher*. London: Prentice Hall.

Krashen, S.D. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S.D. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. London: Prentice-Hall.

Leech, G. 1994. Students' grammar - teachers' grammar - learners' grammar. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (eds.), *Grammar and the Language Teacher*. London: Prentice Hall.

Leech, G., Deuchar, M. & Hoogenraad, R. 1982. *English Grammar for Today*. London: Macmillan.

Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. 1994. *A Communicative Grammar of English (2nd Ed)*. London: Longman.

Lewis, M. 1986. *The English Verb*. Hove, Sussex: Language Teaching Publications.

Long, M.H. 1988. Instructed interlanguage development. In L.M. Beebe (ed.), *Issues in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Newbury House.

Long, M.H. & Crookes, G. 1992. Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly, 26/1*: 27-56.

Little, D. 1994. Words and their properties: Arguments for a lexical approach to pedagogical grammar. In T. Odlin (ed.), *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nádasdy, A. 1994. Few big rules or many small rules? *IATEFL 1994 Annual Conference Report: Plenaries*: 14-15.

Nesi, H. 1991. English dictionaries in the classroom. University of Warwick: *CLIE Working Papers 12*.

Odlin, T. 1994. Introduction. In T. Odlin (ed.), *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pawley, A. & Syder, F.H. 1983. Two puzzles for linguistic theory: nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (eds.), *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.

Pica, T. 1994. Questions from the language classroom: Research perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly, 28/1*: 49-79.

Pienemann, M. 1985. Learnability and syllabus construction. In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (eds.), *Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Quirk, R. & Greenbaum, S. 1973. *A University Grammar of English*. London: Longman.

Rutherford, W. & Sharwood Smith, M. 1988. Introduction. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood Smith (eds.), *Grammar and Second Language Teaching*. New York: Newbury House.

Rutherford, W. 1988a. Aspects of pedagogical grammar. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood Smith (eds.), *Grammar and Second Language Teaching*. New York: Newbury House.

Rutherford, W. 1988b. Functions of grammar in a language teaching syllabus. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood Smith (eds.), *Grammar and Second Language Teaching*. New York: Newbury House.

Sharwood Smith, M. 1988a. Notions and functions in a contrastive pedagogical grammar. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood Smith (eds.), *Grammar and Second Language Teaching*. New York: Newbury House.

Sharwood Smith, M. 1988b. Applied linguistics and the psychology of instruction: A case for transfusion? In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood Smith (eds.), *Grammar and Second Language Teaching*. New York: Newbury House.

Sheen, R. 1994. A critical analysis of the advocacy of the task-based syllabus. *TESOL Quarterly, 28/1*: 127-151.

Shepherd, J., Rossner, R. & Taylor, J. 1984. *Ways to Grammar*. London: Macmillan.

Skehan, P. 1994. Second language acquisition strategies, interlanguage development and task-based learning. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (eds.), *Grammar and the Language Teacher*. London: Prentice Hall.

Soporta, S. 1973. Scientific grammars and pedagogical grammars. In J.P.B. Allen & S.P. Corder (eds.), *The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics, Volume 1: Readings for applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Straight, H.S. 1986. The importance and irreducibility of the comprehension/ production dialectic. In G. McGregor (ed.), *Language for hearers* (69-90). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Swan, M. 1994. Design criteria for pedagogic language rules. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (eds.), *Grammar and the Language Teacher*. London: Prentice Hall.

Swain, M. 1985. Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S.M. Gass & C.M. Madden (eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Terrell, T.D. 1991. The role of grammar instruction in a communicative approach. *The Modern Language Journal, 75/1*: 52-63.

Tulving, E. 1986. What kind of a hypothesis is the distinction between episodic and semantic memory? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition, 12/2*: 307-311.

VanPatten, B. & Sanz, C. 1995. From input to output: Processing instruction and communicative tasks. In F.R. Eckman, D. Highland, P.W. Lee, J. Mileham & R. Rutkowski (eds.), *Second Language Acquisition Theory and Pedagogy*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Westney, P. 1994. Rules and pedagogical grammar. In T. Odlin (ed.), *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. 1988. Grammar, and nonsense, and learning. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood Smith (eds.), *Grammar and Second Language Teaching*. New York: Newbury House.

Wilkins, D.A. 1976. *Notional Syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX

Variables affecting PGs, apart from linguistic level.

VARIABLE	RECEPTIVE	PRODUCTIVE
purpose	-instructed -reference	-instructed -reference
procedure	-inductive -deductive	-inductive -deductive
assimilation	-intensive -progressive	-intensive -progressive
content	-concentrated -dispersed	-concentrated -dispersed
organization	alphabetical or positional by: -form -label —> meaning	alphabetical or positional by: -meaning —> form
indexing	alphabetical by: -form -label -L1 -0	alphabetical by: –L1 –meaning –0
explanation	-L1 –L2 –0	-L1 -L2 -0
equivalents	-L2 forms —> L1 meanings (& L1 forms) -0	-L1 meanings —> L2 forms (& L1 forms) 0
exemplars (authentic or contrived; NS or NNS)	-L2 –L1 –L1/L2 –0	-L2 -L1 –L1/L2 -0