

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FOCUS ON FORM

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FOCUS ON FORM AND COMMUNICATIVE
COMPETENCE IN THE EFL SETTING OF COLOMBIA

by

Giovanny Alexander Benavides Barbosa

Submitted to the Faculty of Human Sciences in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of B.A.
in the English and French program
University of Nariño
November, 2011

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FOCUS ON FORM

Las ideas aportadas en el Trabajo de Grado son responsabilidad exclusiva de los autores, artículo 1° acuerdo # 324 del 11 de octubre de 1966 del Honorable Consejo Directivo de la Universidad de Nariño.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FOCUS ON FORM

Nota de aceptación:

Firma del presidente del jurado

Firma del jurado

Firma del jurado

San Juan de Pasto, noviembre de 2011

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FOCUS ON FORM

Table of contents

The Relationship between Focus on Form and Communicative Competence in the EFL setting of Colombia.....	7
Definition of Grammar	9
The Importance of Grammar in Communication.....	12
Historical Overview of Grammar Instruction	14
Approaches for Grammar Teaching	21
Focus on Forms.....	21
Focus on Meaning.....	23
Focus on Form	25
Focus on Form Techniques	28
Comments and Conclusions.....	33
Teacher's Role	39
References	44

Resumen

este trabajo de investigación presenta argumentos a favor de “focus on form”, un enfoque que pretende llamar la atención de los estudiantes hacia elementos lingüísticos dentro de un contexto significativo en clases basadas en comunicación, y explica como este enfoque puede ser beneficioso en lugares donde el inglés es estudiado como lengua extranjera, como es el caso de colombia, donde la enseñanza de la gramática aun permanece como una herramienta poderosa en la enseñanza de un idioma. en este sentido, el uso de “focus on form” puede ser valioso en nuestro contexto puesto que incluye la pedagogía tradicional que apunta al desarrollo de la competencia lingüística en los estudiantes (conocimiento de la gramática) pero con ejemplos de gramática dentro de un contexto significativo que promueve el desarrollo de la habilidad comunicativa.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FOCUS ON FORM

Abstract

this research paper presents some arguments for “focus on form”, an approach that intends to draw learners’ attention to linguistic elements within a meaningful context in lessons focused on communication, and explains how this approach could be beneficial in efl settings like colombia, where grammar instruction still remains one powerful tool for teaching a language. in this sense, the use of focus on form can be valuable in our context since it includes the traditional pedagogy aimed at developing learners’ linguistic competence (grammar knowledge) but with examples of grammar within a meaningful context which promotes the development of communicative ability.

The Relationship between Focus on Form and Communicative Competence in the EFL setting of Colombia

A controversial issue in second language acquisition is whether grammar instruction is relevant for learners to gain proficiency in the second or foreign language and how to provide it has become another problem. This has resulted in a pendulum going from one extreme to another, because there are some who support explicit approaches to grammar teaching and some others who deny this approach by proposing more implicit grammar instruction models.

Considering what is mentioned above, there are some language teachers who expect learners to be able to communicate by explicitly giving the rules and forms of the language and then make them perform some drills based on those rules. As a result, learners end up memorizing linguistic structures in isolation, which may be useful to complete written tests and exercises, but may prove to be useless when trying to use them in more communicative contexts. In other words, learners may have a difficult time when trying to get a message across concisely and coherently.

In the other end of the pendulum lie those teachers who, influenced by the difference between language learning and language acquisition, tend not to teach grammar at all. Those teachers believe that second language learners should be able to learn it in the same way as children acquire their first language, that is, by being exposed to huge quantities of input without overt grammar instruction. The assumption in this approach is that learners absorb grammar rules as they hear, read and use the language in more communicative activities emphasized on meaningful interaction and authenticity.

Although the goal here is to develop a well-built students' communicative competence, this view of language teaching is inadequate because it completely neglects grammar instruction.

In order to communicate, students should master some linguistic structures to the point where they can use them spontaneously to convey their intended message. The outcome of this absence of grammar specifications would be the students' general lack of accuracy in their speeches, which leads to another problem that is the learners' inability to make themselves understood, producing breakdowns in communication. Besides the use of authentic materials involves complex forms that cannot be acquired by processing meaningful input alone (Gass & Selinker, 2008).

Focus on Form balances these two extremes. This approach combines communicative language use with instruction on grammar forms within a meaningful and communicative context. Ellis (2001) defined focus on form as "any planned or incidental instructional activity that is intended to induce language learners to pay attention to linguistic form".

The purpose of this research paper is to describe the general situation in Colombia regarding grammar instruction and to explain how a focus on form approach could be advantageous when enhancing students' communicative competence considering that in Colombia most teachers in public schools follow traditional models of grammar teaching.

The general organization of this research paper consists of the definition of grammar, the importance of grammar in communication, an overview of the evolution of grammar instruction over the years, approaches of grammar teaching, the definition of focus on form, focus on form techniques, a description of the educational system in Colombia regarding foreign language teaching, and the pedagogical implications of this approach for EFL teachers at schools.

Definition of Grammar

The term "grammar" has been defined in different ways according to the distinct professionals involved with language, grammarians and teachers. The problem with finding an

exact definition of grammar lies on setting the parameters in linguistic terms. Some of the aspects that come under the umbrella of grammar are the following: morphology, phonology, discourse analysis, and pragmatics. However, these aspects are more related to an aspect of language analysis.

Depending on the professionals' perspectives, the definitions of grammar may include different aspects. For example, some grammarians like Leech et al. (1982) (as cited in Woods, 1995) saw grammar as a central component "which relates phonology and semantics, or sound and meaning". They modify that description to include "writing systems", and see the relationship of grammar as:

Semantics \leftrightarrow Grammar \leftrightarrow Phonetics or writing systems

Huddleston (1998) (as cited in Woods, 1995), another grammarian said: "The most basic units of grammar are the word and the sentence, one subcomponent of grammar, called morphology, deals with the forms of words, while the other called syntax, deals with the way words combine to form sentences" (p. 3).

Teachers also have participated in the quest of a good definition of grammar. Ur (1998) (as cited in Woods, 1995) suggested it "...may be roughly defined as the way a language manipulates and combines words (or bits of words) to form longer units of meaning" (p. 4). Likewise, Harmer (1987) (as mentioned in Woods, 1995) affirmed that: "grammar is the way in which words change themselves and group together to make sentences. The grammar of a language is what happens to words when they become plural or negative or what order is used when we make questions or join two clauses to make one sentence" (p. 4).

The different views of people regarding the parameters involved in grammar make it difficult to establish a complete definition of what the term actually entails. As Woods (1995)

stated: “the term grammar can itself be used in several different ways, a book listing grammar rules; an approach to describing language; a school subject” (p.20). But, a very good definition of grammar for teachers of English as a foreign language could be: “The structure of the language through which we communicate our ideas intelligibly, clearly and acceptably” (Woods, 1995), (p. 14). This definition goes beyond the teaching of rules or explaining the usage of a language because grammar is better seen here as a resource for communication. In other words, grammar helps to convey the meaning and intention of the message.

There are two approaches that attempt to analyze and describe the language and have influenced the teaching of grammar: Prescriptive grammars and descriptive grammars. Both views of grammar are broadly used, with certain tendency for linguists towards a descriptive approach of grammar, while teachers of a specific language tend to follow a more prescriptive approach.

- Descriptive grammar: Describes how grammar is actually being used. This approach acknowledges that a language is a dynamic system, constantly changing the rules of grammar usage (Chambers, 2010). Descriptivists look at the way people speak and then try to create rules that account for the language usage, accepting alternative forms that are used regionally and also being open to forms used in speech that traditional grammars would describe as errors.
- Prescriptive grammar: Refers to the structure of a language as certain people think it should be used. Those people are authoritative sources, such as an upper-class or academic-subculture, that create strict rules by which all speech within that language must abide to be considered grammatical. A prescriptive grammarian believes that certain forms used are correct and that others, in spite of being used by native speakers, are incorrect.

But, which of these two approaches should foreign language teachers use in order to present grammar in their lessons? When teaching English to beginners, it would be useful to use a prescriptive view of grammar so as to employ a standard form of English as a basis to teach from, this is in order to avoid confusion among the different forms that may be used to convey a specific meaning. Once students have developed a good understanding of the language, the grammar focus may change to a more descriptive one by adding to the lessons expressions that, from the prescriptive point of view are incorrect, but in factual spoken language are highly used.

It is also essential to bear in mind that the selection of any of these two approaches of grammar teaching depends greatly on the situation: If the objective is to write a formal document like an essay or a research paper, it is more convenient to use prescriptive grammar since for academic writing there are certain rules that need to be complied, including some standardized grammar structures; nevertheless, in more informal situations, such as e-mails or friendly conversations, descriptive grammar is perfectly acceptable.

To sum up, teachers must be aware of the real use of language and must develop strategies to present structures that, according to some prescriptive books, are wrong in usage, but have a high frequency in use. Some students might have a good mastery of standard grammar structures, but when they face structures that apparently are incorrect according to their knowledge of grammar, they can get confused. Here is where the teacher plays the important role of informing students that English is a dynamic language that has evolved over the years to become what it is today. That is why some grammar structures may be considered acceptable taking account of the context where they are used. However, language teachers must have a good knowledge of what is grammatically acceptable in the foreign language and that grammar must be used appropriately to convey our messages in a clear way. In short, there are variations in the

use of the grammar of a language, so what is not acceptable in one region or dialect, may be acceptable in another.

The Importance of Grammar in Communication

It is a fact that grammar has an important role in communication since it helps us to convey our messages precisely and clearly. In other words, one of the main important advantages of teaching grammar would be that it provides comprehensibility. Swan (2002) stated that knowing how to build and use certain structures makes it possible to communicate common types of meaning successfully and that without these structures, it is difficult to make comprehensible sentences.

Nevertheless, teachers must be careful not to overwhelm students with loads of structures that may not be useful in real communication since; in this case, we would not be teaching English, but a boring grammar course. Students may be under the impression that they know English well simply because they know the rules and are able to pass tests, but when it comes to using the language spontaneously in real communication, they realize that they do not have the enough elements to hold a conversation, like vocabulary and fluency.

So, in order to avoid creating grammar-heavy syllabi, teachers must first identify the students' needs, aims and objectives that are expected to be met in a determined context, and based on them, select the points of grammar that they need to fulfill those goals. Furthermore, teachers need to make sure that they are teaching such structures appropriately, following an adequate methodology that contributes to the development of students' communicative skills. With this, it is meant that those structures must occur within a meaningful and relevant context where students are able to notice their real and significant use. It is essential to point out that a

language is a whole integrated system that involves not only the study of linguistic features, but also social and cultural aspects that, altogether, build up its complexity.

As for that matter, teachers need to broaden their repertoire of techniques to present grammar in an effective way, especially those ones devoted to introduce certain grammar structures. To achieve this, it is worth considering some focus on form techniques that raise language awareness and where structures are unlikely to occur in isolation, but instead in a meaningful context. In this way, grammar could be taken as a useful resource for communication rather than a rule-governed system of structures.

Following with the previous idea, Hymes (1971) (as cited in Larsen & Freeman, 2000) put forward the theory of communicative competence to refer to the ability to know how and when to say something to whom. Littlewood (1981) presented some domains of skill which make up a person's communicative competence. They are the following:

1. Even though knowing how to manipulate the structures of a language does not guarantee their manipulation for communicative purposes, the learner must attain as high a degree as possible of linguistic competence. That is, he must develop skill in manipulating the linguistic system, to the point where he can use it spontaneously and flexibly in order to express his intended message.
2. The learner must distinguish between the forms which he has mastered as part of his linguistic competence, and the communicative functions that they perform.
3. The learner must develop skills and strategies for using language to communicate meanings as effectively as possible in concrete situations. He must learn to use feedback to judge his success.
4. The learner must become aware of the social meaning of language forms, in order to use generally acceptable forms of the language and avoid potentially offensive ones according to the social circumstances.

As it is clearly stated in the first domain, grammar has an important role in helping learners convey their messages precisely and coherently. To sum up, grammar is an essential resource in using language communicatively (Nunan, 1989, as cited in Woods, 1995).

Historical Overview of Grammar Instruction

Since its very first origins, language teaching methodology has vacillated between two kinds of approaches: making learners use the language or making them analyze the language (Celce-Murcia, 2001).

When learners use the language, they are able to speak and understand the language they are studying, but analyze refers to their capacity to treat the language as an object, that is, learning its grammatical rules. In other words, language learning emphasis was either on use or usage.

Celce-Murcia (2001) stated that language instruction began with the teaching of the classical languages, Greek and Latin, because they were widely used in different fields such as philosophy, religion, politics and business. Due to their influence in important fields concerning daily life, they were considered as *linguas francas* (languages that were spoken among people who did not share the same language or were different to their native one).

Thanks to the invention of the printing press during the Renaissance period, several books that reflected the formal study of the grammars of Latin and Greek were produced. Nevertheless, it was discovered that the Latin used for daily life purposes (also called Vulgate Latin) was different from the Latin in the grammar texts. The many differences between the Vulgate Latin and the Classical Latin described in the Renaissance grammars, which was also the object of study at schools, contributed to the demise of the Latin as a *lingua franca* (nobody continued using it anymore). As a consequence, some other European vernaculars started to gain

respectability and prestige, thus people in one country became interested in learning the language of another country or region (Celce-Murcia, 2001).

As described above, the focus of language learning was on use rather than usage during the seventeenth century. Without any doubt, one of the most salient teachers of that time was Johann Amos Comenius (as cited in Celce Murcia, 2001), a Czech scholar and teacher who published some books where he describes his teaching techniques. He proposed an inductive approach to learning a foreign language, the goal of which was to enable learners to use the language instead of analyzing the language being taught. Celce-Murcia (2001) described some of his techniques that reflect this view of language teaching:

1. Use imitation instead of rules to teach a language.
2. Have your students repeat after you.
3. Use a limited vocabulary initially.
4. Help your students practice reading and speaking.
5. Teach language through pictures to make it meaningful.

Even though this implicit view of language learning had a big influence during some time, the systematic study of the grammar of the classical languages, Greek and Latin, became once again the main objective in schools. As a matter of fact, the Grammar-Translation Approach emerged, now as a more consolidated method to teach not only the classical languages, but also modern languages such as French and German. It is not surprising that German was one the modern languages considered to be prestigious and useful to learn since the main proponents of the Grammar-Translation method were German: Johann Seidenstucker, Karl Plotz, H.S.Ollendorf, and Johann Meidinger (Celce-Murcia, 2001).

The main characteristics of this method according to Richards and Rodgers (2001) are the following:

1. Grammar is presented in a deductive way, it means, explicit explanation of rules and forms.
2. Learners have to memorize grammar rules and lists of vocabulary with their translation equivalents.
3. Translating sentences into and out of the target language is a common exercise.
4. Accuracy is emphasized since students have to attain high standards in translation and because of the various written examinations they have to pass.

Despite the fact that this type of language teaching approach does not enable students to communicate in the target language, it is still widely used in some parts of the world today. This is maybe because it is not demanding for teachers since they are not required to use the target language as a means of instruction and they feel more comfortable using their mother tongue.

According to my experience as a student, in Colombia most teachers in public schools still use this approach. Their philosophy of teaching is to provide students with explicit grammar rules and forms of the target language without a specific context and then get them to complete “fill in the gaps” exercises using the grammar they are taught. Besides, some teachers give students endless lists of isolated vocabulary and make students learn them by heart. The application of this kind of instruction has resulted in demotivated students unable to communicate in the foreign language. The fact that students manipulate the linguistic forms of a language (some of them unusable in communication), does not guarantee that they use them appropriately in communicative exchanges.

The main problem with this approach is that it has no rational or justification for application, with this it is meant that there are no theories related to psychology, linguistics or educational theory that try to support its principles.

As a reaction to the Grammar Translation approach and its ineffectiveness in preparing learners to communicate in the target language, the Direct Method emerged and became popular. The Frenchman, François Gouin was the main proponent of this method and suggested that the target language has to be used directly to convey meaning through the use of demonstration and visual aids, with no recourse to translation or students' native language (Celce-Murcia, 2001).

There were many in the nineteenth century who tried to apply natural principles of language learning, as children do. Among those who support this theory were L. Saveur (1827-1907) (quoted in Richards & Rodgers, 2001), who tried to promote intensive interaction in the target language by using questions as a means of presenting and eliciting language. The same author continues saying that in the direct method the emphasis was on encouraging the use of the target language rather than the use of analytical procedures that focus on grammar rules. Thus, grammar was taught inductively.

Then, in the 1940s, the Second World War broke out and it was necessary for the U.S. military to efficiently teach to foreign language learners how to speak and understand the language (Celce-Murcia, 2001). This was the starting point for the Audiolingual method proposed by Fries in 1945, which was a linguistic or structured-based approach of language teaching designed by linguists. Richards & Rodgers (2001) stated that the base of Audiolingualism is a linguistic syllabus, which contains the key items of phonology, morphology and syntax according to their order of presentation. The authors also claim that the purpose of language learning is to learn how to use the language to communicate, but for this to be

accomplished learners have to drill on some grammatical features of the language within a context or artificial situations, that in this case are specific dialogues that need to be memorized by the students. Within those dialogues, certain sentence patterns and grammatical points are included; this means that grammar rules are taught inductively.

Nevertheless, the major drawback of this approach is that grammatical structures do not fit conveniently in real communication outside the classroom because the drills and dialogues are sophisticated and very artificial, which is something that many learners find still boring.

In Britain the same historical milestones gave birth to the Oral-Situational approach which draws from the Direct method in that the focus was on the spoken language, but its view of language is much more systematic (Celce-Murcia, 2001). The author affirmed that attempts to analyze the target language and classify its major grammatical structures into sentence patterns were made. Consequently, grammar structures are graded from simple to complex. Even though the structures were often situationalized to provide a context to help learners, the exercises were to be developed in isolation with the only relevant aspect of presenting a pattern for students to practice.

But Audiolingualism and the situational approach had reached their peak when the linguist Noam Chomsky (1966) (as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2001) rejected the structuralist approach to language description as well as the behaviorist theory of language learning of Audiolingualism. As a reaction, he proposed the theory of transformational grammar. Chomsky claimed that the fundamental properties of language derive from innate aspects of the mind and from how humans process experience through language, but definitely is not a habit formation process. He suggests that learners should derive the grammar of a language and make it explicit by using their creative and innate skills. Due to the mental processes involved in his theory of

language learning, it was also known as the cognitive approach. In this approach, grammar instruction is relevant, but it can be taught deductively by providing some grammar rules and then make students put them into practice, or inductively by leaving rules as implicit information for the learners to process on their own.

Language teaching methods so far were intended to develop students' communicative skills in the target language, but although they pursued this purpose, they failed in meeting the goal in the right way, mainly because it was observed that students were able to produce sentences accurately during the lessons, but could not use them effectively in real communication outside the classroom. As for that matter, in the 1970s more communicative approaches started to appear. Widdowson (1978) (as cited in Larsen & Freeman, 2000) said that students may know the rules of linguistic usage, but be unable to use the language. In the same direction, Wilkins (1976) (as cited in Larsen & Freeman, 2000) suggested that being able to communicate required the performance of certain functions like promising, inviting, declining invitation within a social context. But it was Hymes (1971) (as quoted in Larsen & Freeman, 2000) who marked the shift from a linguistic structured-center approach to a Communicative approach by coining the term of communicative competence, affirming that learners must know when and how say something to whom.

According to Edward Woods (1995), Hymes' idea of communicative competence undervalue the role of grammar instruction since the aim of language teaching was shifted to communication, with the provision of activities and tasks that gave students the opportunity to engage in authentic communicative situations. However, Canale and Swain (1980) (as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 1986) developed more complete models of communicative competence, with an emphasis on L2 speakers. Canale and Swain's model had four major components:

1. Grammatical competence: grammatical and lexical capacity.
2. Sociolinguistic competence: social context in which communication occurs.
3. Discourse competence: interpretation of individual messages and their meaning according to the entire discourse.
4. Strategic competence: strategies to initiate maintain and terminate communication.

So, grammatical competence is one of the competences involved in communicative competence, because as it was previously mentioned in the importance of grammar in communication, it is necessary that learners manage as high a degree as possible of linguistic competence so as to convey their intended messages in a comprehensible way (Littlewood, 1981).

Perhaps the major problem with this communicative approach is that learners are not very accurate in their production despite being fluent as they speak. This lack of grammar accuracy could lead to breakdowns in communication because learners find it difficult to make themselves understood.

As a conclusion, this communicative approach advocated broader principles regarding language teaching and there is more room for individual interpretations and variation in the design and procedures to be followed during a lesson than some other methods permit. These aspects, in turn, gave origin to other approaches like the Natural approach, Content-based instruction; Cooperative language teaching, Task-based instruction, and others derived from CLT.

Approaches for grammar teaching

As it was previously stated in this research paper, the absence of a widely accepted theory regarding language learning, and therefore, the lack of agreement whether overt grammar instruction is beneficial when enhancing communicative competence, has resulted in drastic pendulum swings. Some supporters, pulling from one end, back up theories and methods which maintain grammar instruction at the core of language teaching, while others, claim that grammar should not be taught but acquired implicitly by developing realistic communicative tasks. This issue has led to the establishment of three major options for language teaching, which differ mainly on the way grammar is approached: Focus on Forms, Focus on Meaning and Focus on Form.

Focus on Forms

It is considered as the traditional approach since it relates to traditional teaching methods (GTM, ALM, Silent Way, TPR, etc). Long (1997) stated that course design starts with the language to be taught. This language is broken down into segments of different types (morphemes, phonemes, words, collocations, notions, functions, stress, and so forth), and they are displayed to the students one at a time, in a sequence which could be determined by either the frequency of the structures or their difficulty. In the end, it is the student's responsibility to combine all those structures for use in communication, that is, what Wilkins (1976) (as cited in Long, 1998) termed the synthetic approach.

In this approach, learners are encouraged to master each linguistic item one at a time, and so to attain native speaker levels using synthetic syllabi (lexical, structural, notional-functional, etc) combined with synthetic methods (Grammar Translation, ALM, Silent Way, TPR, Noisy Method) and synthetic practices associated with them, for instance explicit grammar rules,

repetition of models, memorization of short dialogs, transformation exercises, display questions and so on. All these aspects together result in lessons whose main focus is on forms (Long, 1998). Thus, focus on forms lessons consist mainly of work on isolated linguistic items, which are studied one at a time and that learners are expected to master at a native speaker level, with little, if any communicative L2 use.

However, according to Long (1998), this approach suffers from some problems:

- There is no needs analysis of an individual or a group of learner's communicative needs preferences, and styles. This results in teaching too much, items which are not really necessary to build-up students' communicative skills; and teaching too little regarding aspects that learners do really need. As a consequence, lessons tend to be daunting to students and inefficient.
- Textbook dialogues and classroom language use are artificial and simulated. For instance: "Hello John. Hello Mike. Are you a doctor? Yes, I am. What are you doing? I'm watching TV. Thus, focus on forms leads to what Widdowson (1972) as mentioned in Long (1998) named language usage, which refers to the grammatically acceptable features of language, and not authentic, realistic language use. In other words, what teachers do in this approach is simplify their input as much as they can in order to enhance better comprehension, but with the disadvantage of removing new items that learners need for acquisition purposes.
- Focus on forms discredits language learning processes and research findings by adopting a behaviorist model. This approach assumes that SLA is a process of accumulating entities, and therefore, ignores research findings such as those showing that learning new words or rules is barely, if ever, a one-time, categorical event. It also disregards the developmental stages a learner

has to pass through and forgets about the fact that target items students are supposed to master in isolation are undeniably linked to other items.

- This approach leaves learner out of syllabus design, which prevents them from taking an active role in language development. The misconception that what you teach is what they learn, and when you teach it is when they learn it, is not only simplistic, is wrong. Pienemann (1984) predicts "that a given linguistic structure cannot be added through instruction to the learner's interlanguage at any desired point in time in his/her acquisitional career" since formal instruction is constrained by speech processing prerequisites that have to be acquired sequentially.
- A focus on forms approach tends to produce boring lessons, resulting in demotivation, lack of attention and interest on the part of students.

Focus on Meaning

Focus on meaning appears as a response of focus on forms and displays a radical pendulum swift since the starting point now is not the language but the learners and learning processes. As Long and Robinson (1998) stated, the fundamental claim is that people from different ages learn more effectively by using the language as a means of communication and not by treating it as an object of study. Therefore, people could learn to use a foreign language incidentally, that is, while doing something else, and implicitly, without awareness of the language they are learning, and this could be achieved by exposing learners to comprehensible target language samples, which according to this view, is sufficient for successful second or foreign language acquisition.

The assumption in this approach is that, adolescents and adults learning a second or foreign language are still capable, like young children, of inducing rules from the input they are exposed to, without revising them explicitly, and with the provision of enough quantities of

positive evidence (what is grammatically correct and possible in the L2), they may form new neural networks underlying what looks like rule-governed behavior (Long and Robinson, 1998). In other words, acquisition of a second or foreign language occurs in the same way children acquire their first language.

As it is a single-minded approach in reaction of the inadequacies of the traditional synthetic syllabi and teaching procedures intended in focus on forms, it also has some drawbacks when enhancing acquisition of a L2 (Long, 1998).

- There is no needs analysis guiding curriculum content and delivery
- An increasing amount of evidence suggests that older learners do not have the same capacity as young children to acquire a language at a native level just by being exposed to huge quantities of input; that is to say, there seems to be some maturational constraints in SLA that impede older learners to attain native features in a new language (Hyltenstam, 1998; Long, 1990, 1993; Newport, 1990) (as cited in Long and Robinson, 1998).

Several studies support this view and suggest that older children, adolescents and adults normally fail to achieve native-like levels in an L2, not because of students' lack of motivation and abilities to learn a language, but because it appears to be a critical period before which and after which certain abilities do not develop (Lenneberg, 1967; Bickerton, 1981) in Long and Robinson (1998)

- Studies show that some graduates of Canadian French immersion programs with constant and prolonged natural exposure may become able to understand the L2 and speak fluently to the point that it would be hard to differentiate them from native speakers. However, and according to Swain (1991) (as cited in Long, 1998), even after 12 years of immersion at school or university “their productive skills remain far from native like, particularly with respect to grammatical

competence”. A clear example is the failure to mark gender on articles in spite of having been exposed to plenty of samples of this grammatical feature in the input throughout their schooling. As Long (1998) pointed out, there seems to be need of additional salience for the problematic features, that is, provision of negative evidence of some kind, so that students realize what is ungrammatical and start being aware of the correct use of such feature in their utterances.

- White (1991) as quoted in Long (1998) confirmed that positive evidence alone is not sufficient when it comes to contrast some grammatical structures between the L1 and the L2. For instance, the grammaticality of adverb-placement between verb and direct object in (L1) French (*Je bois tous le jours du café*), but grammatically incorrect in (L2) English (*I drink everyday coffee*). English speakers should have no trouble learning the new structure 'Je bois toujours du cafe' together with 'Je bois du cafe tous les jours', because of their frequent occurrence in the input (positive evidence). However, French speakers learning English will be faced with the task of noticing the absence of the alternative French construction in the input (*I drink everyday coffee*) and, as it causes no breakdowns in communication, French speakers are likely to mistakenly use it without being aware of the error.
- Finally, comprehensible L2 input is necessary, but not sufficient for efficient language acquisition. Several studies have shown that there are rate advantages for students who receive formal instruction of any kind, like benefits of the use of error correction, repetition and even drills in the classroom (Poole, 2005).

Focus on Form

Due to the inability of communicative language teaching to foster high levels of accuracy, and the even more inadequate traditional approaches regarding grammar instruction based on grammar-heavy syllabi, repetition of drills, memorization of rules and the like, a new trend that

tries to equate both extremes appeared. That is the focus on form approach. This approach combines communicative language use with instruction on grammar forms within a meaningful and communicative context.

The term Focus on Form was first coined by Long (1991) to refer to tasks which involve briefly drawing students' attention to linguistic elements (words, collocations, grammatical structures, pragmatic patterns, and so on), in context, as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning, or communication. Therefore, Focus on Form occurs whenever students have comprehension or production problems.

One of the advantages of this approach according to Long is that it respects the learner's internal syllabus, because the syllabus in this case is determined by the learner's developing language system and not by an external linguistic prescription. Thus, he noted, "it is not surprising that teaching grammatical forms in isolation usually fails to develop the ability of learners to use forms communicatively unless they are psycholinguistically ready to acquire them anyway" (Pieneman, 1984)

Although Long's (1991) original definition of focus on form stated that attention arose incidentally, subsequent studies expanded the definition to expand attention to form that was preplanned. Ellis (2001) (as cited in Rodríguez, 2009) provides a further description of focus on form and defined it as "any planned or incidental instructional activity that is intended to induce language learners to pay attention to linguistic form". This attention to form should take place within a meaningful, communicative context, making it an extension of communicative language teaching, not a departure from it.

In practice, planned focus on form involves targeting preselected linguistic items during an activity whose main focus is on meaning either through input (e.g. input flood or input

enhancement) or output (e.g. corrective feedback on errors in the use of pretargeted forms). On the other hand, in incidental focus on form the linguistic items arise spontaneously while a meaning-focused activity is being carried on (Loewen, 2005).

Although both types of focus on form might be beneficial for learners (Doughty & Williams, 1998), their impact may vary. Planned focus on form has the advantage of providing intensive coverage of one specific linguistic item, whereas incidental focus on form provides extensive coverage, targeting many different linguistic items (Ellis et al., 2001). Incidental focus on form can provide a brief time-out from focusing on meaning in order to assist learners in noticing linguistic items in the input that might otherwise go unnoticed in entirely meaning-focused lessons (Ellis et al., 2001; Schmidt, 2001; Skehan, 1998) (as mentioned in Loewen, 2005).

Apart from helping students notice linguistic items in the input, Loewen (2005) claimed that incidental focus on form can also provide opportunities for learners to produce *pushed output*. The output hypothesis proposed by Swain (1985) states that learners need the opportunity for pushed output, that is, output that is precise, coherent and situationally appropriate. Loewen (2005) suggests that producing language may be useful to develop advanced levels of grammatical competence or fluency in language production. Besides, output can be useful for hypothesis testing, where students become aware of grammar structures, try them out in their own production and receive valuable corrective feedback of their linguistic hypothesis. Additionally, the output itself and the potential feedback following it can serve as input that feeds back into the cognitive system and targets the specific areas being hypothesized by the learner (Loewen, 2005).

Finally, for acquisition to take place it is necessary that learners move from semantic processing of the information to syntactic processing, which occurs when learners produce the language. For instance, if learners are only exposed to input alone, it does not guarantee learner's production of the language given that learners do not have to understand every word and morpheme to get the gist of an utterance. Swain (1995) as quoted in Loewen (2005) claimed that pushed output forces learners to deeper, grammatical processing that potentially has a "significant role in the development of syntax and morphology" (p. 128)

Now, if teachers decide to apply a focus on form approach, they need to know how to adapt the activities in an appropriate way. As for that matter, there are several strategies they can choose from.

Focus on Form Techniques

Rodriguez (2009) argues that techniques used to draw learners' attention to form may be selected from a continuum which ranges from explicit, obtrusive techniques which involve traditional rule explanation and represent full intrusion into the learner's attentional resources, to implicit, unobtrusive ones which devotes all the learner's resources to processing for meaning (decoding). In other words, the author stresses that the implicit-explicit continuum still persists within the range of focus on form instructional activities, as shown in figure 1.

Noticing becomes crucial for learning L2 grammatical forms in Focus on Form. Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (1995) (as cited in McGinnis, 2007) states that "learners need to consciously detect either the form and function of a linguistic item or the gap between their interlanguage form and the target language form in order to internalize it and some language teaching and learning techniques have focused on providing or increasing this detection with

awareness. In particular, Focus on Form relies on maximizing the learner's noticing ability" (p. 12).

In focus on form techniques with low obtrusiveness, learners can merely detect a target language form in the input and this allows them to create an initial mental representation for the item. In more obtrusive methods, noticing is promoted. Noticing, because it involves detection with awareness, can allow learners with such preliminary mental representations (interlanguage rules or structures) to notice the correct grammar in the target language input, or to notice the gap between their initial mental representation of the target grammar and the target-like rule or structure (McGinnis, 2007).

Table 1.

Degree of Obtrusiveness of Focus on Form

	Unobtrusive Focus on Form	Obtrusive Focus on Form
Input flood	X	
Task-essential language	X	
Input enhancement	X	
Negotiation	X	
Recast	X	
Output enhancement	X	
Interaction enhancement		X
Dictogloss		X
CR tasks		X
Input processing		X
Garden path		X
Note: These focus on form techniques are organized from unobtrusive to more obtrusive ones.		

(Focus on form in Task-Based Language Teaching Michael H. Long (1997). University of Hawaii at Manoa. Retrieved from:
<http://www.mhhe.com/socscience/foreignlang/conf/task2.htm>)

Implicit techniques involve the *input flood*, which provides students with plenty of examples and instances of the target form contained in a text, so that students can notice them. The technique known as *input enhancement* consists on increasing the perceptual salience of the target form through the use of different colored inks, bold lettering, underlining, or other cues with the intention of raising students' awareness of a structure.

Fotos (2002) (as cited in Rodríguez, 2009) depicts an implicit *structure-based task* in which learners had to compare two cities. Students work in couples and talk about features of familiar cities and documented the information on task sheets. Afterwards, they were asked to write sentences comparing the cities based on the features they were discussing (e.g., "Tokio is more populated than New York"). The point here is that students were not given explicit instruction on the use of comparative forms at any point in the lesson, yet they had to use comparative forms to complete the task. Subsequently, the teacher taught a lesson on comparatives, students corrected inaccurate sentences and did more production exercises, and read stories that contained frequent instances of the comparative form.

On the other end of the explicitness continuum lie techniques such as *consciousness-raising tasks* which intend to provide conscious noticing or evidence of the target language grammar, and based on that students are encouraged to determine grammar rules by themselves. Similarly, the *focused communicative task* seeks the production of a target form in the meaningful context of developing a communicative task; in this case the task is designed so that the target feature is essential for the completion of the task.

Another way to explicitly focus on form within an overriding meaning-focused activity is through the use of *error correction strategies*, where learners will be able to notice differences between their utterances and the target structure. For instance, *the garden path technique* first

present learners with examples that encourage them to induce and generalize a grammatical rule and then learners are presented with the exceptions to the rule, without being told that these are exceptions (Rodriguez, 2009). The learners are thus induced into making errors that the teacher will immediately correct. Nation & Newton (2008) (in Rodriguez, 2009) provides an example of a typical garden path technique:

Teacher: Here is a sentence using these words: *think* and *problem*. *I thought about the problem*. Now you make one using these words: *talk* and *problem*.

Learner: We talked about the problem.

Teacher: Good. *Argue* and *result*.

Learner: We argued about the result.

Teacher: Good. *Discuss* and *advantages*.

Learner: we discussed about the advantages.

Teacher: No. With *discuss* we do not use *about*. (p. 3)

In the example above, the student is encouraged to overgeneralize a rule and then induced to make an error, so that the teacher explicitly corrects the error and the learner becomes aware of the exception of the grammatical rule. Even so, Celce-Murcia (2007) (in Rodrigues, 2009) recommends that teachers create short texts that include common errors made by students in their writing assignments, instead of just creating correction exercises using decontextualized sentences. In this way, students can work together on more authentic texts and then are encouraged to correct their own work more successfully.

Besides of the awareness-raising and noticing activities, there are focus-on-form grammar production activities. Larsen-Freeman (2003) (as cited in Rodríguez, 2009) proposes the following activities. *Collaborative dialogues*, which are conversation where students work

together to discuss and use a new form, building a sentence together. *Prolepsis*, another technique, is an instructional conversations being performed by a teacher and a student which, in the process of writing or saying something in English, the student may be able to perhaps incorporate the use of a new form. In the following example taken from Rodriguez (2009), a prolectic conversation is being carried out by the teacher (T) and a student (S) at a low intermediate level who is writing a description of an important event in her past.

(S writes "My baby was angry")

T: Oh, she was angry. And then?

S: I pick her up, but she cry.

T: I see. Why don't you write it down?

S: I can say, but I don't write.

T: Just try it. Write what you know.

(S writes "She cry".)

T: Good. Ok, cry when? Now?

S: No, she cried.

T: yes. Go ahead and write it. I'll help.

(S writes "She cryed")

T: Right. But remember what happens to the "y"?

(S erases "cryed" and writes "cried".)

T: Right. What happened then? (p. 3)

As it is observed in the conversation above, both teacher and student are involved in the story, and without giving the rules of the formation of the past tense, the teacher induces the

student to focus also on the mistakes she is making, encouraging her to correct the mistakes and come to an answer on her own (Rodriguez, 2009).

Finally, the *language experience approach* proposed by Larsen-Freeman (2003) (as cited in Rodríguez, 2009) is a technique where students tell the teacher something they would like to be able to say in English. Then, the teacher writes the sentences on the board using correct, grammatical English, so that students notice the changes between their utterances and the correct form of the messages, and therefore, students learn. For instance, a student might say: “I late the work for the bad traffic”. The teacher might write the sentence as “I was late for work because traffic was bad”

Comments and Conclusions

Colombia and many other EFL settings share certain characteristics. Firstly, the educational system in Colombia is under control of the Ministry of Education (Ministerio de Educación Nacional, MEN) which, in order to regulate English teaching in Colombia, introduced the Basic Foreign Language Competence Standards: English (2006). These standards were introduced as an attempt to meet the goal of achieving communicative competence, yet these standards are just an adaptation made from the Common European Framework (CEF), but they were set without taking into account the needs and the socio-cultural factors that come into play in education in Colombia.

Besides, there is no a clear research process for the development of these standards, there is no reliable literature support for their implementation here in Colombia and along the document it is pretty likely to find weaknesses which undermine the validity of this document. Due to its lack of literature support and research, there is no evidence which guarantees the successful implementation of these standards in Colombia.

One important drawback of this document is the apparent confusion of concepts regarding the setting and context where a language is learnt. It can be taken as reference a passage from the document on page 5: “En el contexto colombiano y para los alcances de esta propuesta, el inglés tiene carácter de lengua extranjera”. According to this excerpt, there is notably a disparity between their pushy goal of bilingualism and the context of our country, they oppose their ideas themselves by recognizing that English is learnt as a foreign language in our country. As a result, there is no coherence between their goals and the theory included in the document to support such goals, what can be expected from this unreliable document then?

Additionally, the time devoted for English lessons in the vast majority of public schools is only limited to just one to three hours per week, and in some particular cases the time frame for this subject is less than an hour (e. g forty five or fifty minutes). This factor does not allow English teachers to cover a wide variety of topics, themes and notions that students should learn in order to develop communicative competence and actively participate in communicative situations. Regarding this issue, it is also likely to say that these standards are unrealistic since most teachers make still use of traditional methods or approaches for delivering knowledge of the target language, reducing in this way the quality of learning and teaching. Particularly, those teachers continue to use the grammar translation method whose main purpose is to enable students to master a series of language features that account linguistic aspects of the language such as: grammar, lexis, phonology, and syntax. As a result, it is not feasible to develop communicative competence since the mastery of language structures does not guarantee their acquisition and their appropriate use in real life communication.

Following the previous idea, Fotos (1998) recognizes the traditional pedagogy dominating many EFL classrooms like ours, where learners are exposed to a target grammatical

form through modified communicative input, and states that such a type of instruction is not suitable for the EFL situation. The same author continues by explaining that a totally implicit approach is not apt for this setting either, since it depends on the provision of subsequent communicative input containing the form. The chances for those instances to happen in the EFL situation are low.

In fact, and according to Sánchez and Obando (2008) when student- teachers in Colombia are faced to the task of observing classes as an important step to become teachers, they are likely to find a worrying issue in most of them: classes are mainly conducted in Spanish. This is perhaps the result of problems in this context such as large classes, lack of appropriate and available materials, or the lack of proficiency of the target language on the part of some teachers at public schools. Fotos (1998) is aware of this situation and asserts: “not only are there few opportunities for communicative use of the target language outside the classroom, but even within many EFL classrooms, target language use may be surprisingly low” (p. 304).

As for that matter, Fotos (1998) suggests that through the use of modified focus on form activities which allow for formal instruction before the communicative task, and feedback afterwards, learning could take place more effectively.

In the Colombian context, teachers at secondary schools are more concerned with training students for the Saber 11 exam, which does not account for performance in the language, that is, the use of English in real communicative situations, but for reading comprehension skills. From this perspective, Fotos (1998) advocates for reading-based focus on form activities which would perfectly fit in several EFL situations because of the traditional emphasis on comprehension and translation skills. In this case, it is feasible to use some focus on form techniques like input

enhancement, where reading material is modified by highlighting, so that the target structure becomes salient while the learners are reading for meaning.

As well as the benefits on comprehension and translation skills, focus on form can also be advantageous to foster communicative competence on the part of students in an EFL setting like ours. Fotos (1998) describes what is possibly the optimum focus on form activity for EFL classrooms: The communicative language task, through the use of task based language instruction. In the original consideration of Long (1991) (as mentioned in Fotos, 1998), he suggests the creation of a third type of syllabus, different from the synthetic and purely communicative syllabuses, one which he named “focus on form”. This type of syllabus has the potential of combining communicative language use with instruction of grammar in a meaningful context, a design which is particular of task-based language instruction.

Fluent speakers use language to perform tasks such as solving problems, developing plans, and working together to complete projects. This is what Nunan (2004) called “real world or target tasks”, which as the name implies, refer to activities performed outside the classroom context. The use of similar task-based activities in the classroom is an excellent way to encourage students to use the language. These types of tasks are called by Nunan pedagogical tasks, since they occur in the classroom.

Nunan (2004) defines a pedagogical task as “ a piece of classroom work that involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing, or interacting in the target language while their attention is focused on mobilizing their grammatical knowledge in order to express meaning, and in which the intention is to convey meaning rather than to manipulate forms. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to start alone as a communicative act in its own right with a beginning, middle and an end”. (p. 4)

Through the use of task-based activities, learners are engaged in tasks which involve using the foreign language in meaningful contexts in order to accomplish an authentic and real life goal. In this way pedagogical tasks are intended to act as a bridge between the classroom and the real world in that they serve to prepare students for real-life language usage.

Owing to the teaching conditions in Colombia, the use of a task-based approach to focus on form is quite feasible so as to develop communicative activities that can take place inside the classroom while staying within the guidelines of the curriculum and syllabus. Communicative tasks can then be designed in order to promote interaction among students through pair or group work. This will provide students opportunities to comprehend and produce the target language while engaged in a meaning-focused interactive activity (Fotos, 1998). Additionally, Fotos (1998) claims that task-based activities offer EFL learners a way to maximize their target language use, even within large classes, which is particularly the case in Colombia. In order to achieve this goal, Fotos (1998) describes two tasks which are intended to make linguistic structures salient to learners but within the performance of communicative activities. In other words, what is sought through the use of these activities is that learners become aware of the use of a grammatical structure in a significant context while engaged in meaning-focused interaction.

The first task consists on designing purely communicative activities where learners must use the target language to complete the task. This is a task which uses an implicit focus on form during interactive task performance. Fotos (1998) illustrates this with a task on comparative forms of adjectives and adverbs which required EFL learners to exchange information about features of cities. Learners had to compare different features about their two cities and write comparative sentences. Fotos (1998) emphasizes that although there was no mention of the target form they had to use, learners were pushed to use comparative forms to complete the task.

Moreover, this task allowed learners to communicate mainly in the target language due to the need of producing sentences in that language, reducing in this way the use of their L1.

The second task involves a more explicit focus on form element since the aimed grammar form makes part of the content of the task. Through pair or group interaction, learners solve grammar problems such as the formation of tag questions, or indirect object placement on the basis of positive and negative information given on task cards. The purpose here is for students to develop the rules of the target structure by themselves after listening and noting down correct sentences. Communicative use of the target language is promoted given that there is a need for writing English sentences and agreement on grammar rules (Fotos, 1998).

The same author asserts that these tasks have been introduced in EFL settings together with formal instruction before and assessment activities after task performance. Finally, Fotos (1998) affirms: “Research on several explicit focus-on form tasks suggests that task performance can significantly increase learner awareness of the target structure and improve accuracy in its use, as well as providing opportunities for meaning-focused comprehension and production of the target language. Furthermore, such tasks release more traditionally oriented non-native speaker teachers from the requirement to lead communicative activities in the target language” (p. 307)

Based on what Fotos (1998) stated, teachers with low English proficiency level at public schools in Colombia may find the use of a task-based focus on form approach advantageous since it is student-centered, that is, the teacher is going to act as a facilitator for learning while students take an active role and are responsible in their own learning. In the case of the two tasks previously proposed, learners are encouraged to interact among themselves using the target

language in order to accomplish the tasks, keeping teacher's intervention as minimum as possible.

Teacher's role

Now, bearing in mind all the information contained in this research paper, it is worth asking the following question: What is the teacher's role in focus on form instruction in the EFL setting of Colombia? First of all, in several public schools in Colombia, grammar remains at the core of language instruction. As a consequence, syllabi are designed so that grammar structures follow a sequencing pattern according to difficulty, which is usually the order of contents in an English-course textbook. Even though they are structural, synthetic syllabi, which are to be followed by force according to institutional policies, it does not prevent teachers from devising tasks which allow for salience of those structures within meaningful, communicative contexts. As it was previously stated, while there is no flexibility as to syllabus design, there is usually flexibility regarding the tasks and activities to be implemented in the language classroom.

As for that matter, the use of planned-focus on form activities would be particularly beneficial since they provide intensive coverage of one specific linguistic item which is already scheduled in the syllabus. These activities are useful to introduce both, the meaning-focused activity, which could be any topic, and the grammatical structure. This could be achieved through techniques such as Input flood, which provides lots of examples contained in a text, recording, or even, the teacher's input. Input enhancement, which increases the learner's awareness of a structure by underlining or highlighting the target structure, making it more salient to the learner.

Following Fotos' (1998) model of a class containing focus on form instruction, this could be the first step to provide formal instruction, whether implicitly by letting learners discover the rules on their own based on the given input, or explicitly by giving an open explanation on the grammar topic, but only after students are made aware of the factual use of the target structure in context.

Nowadays, there are some communication-oriented textbooks where a focus on meaning comes first, followed by a focus on form. In these books the goal is to focus on preselected forms related to meaning-oriented tasks. For instance, the New English file series by Clive Oxenden and Christina Latham-Koening (1997), offer a great variety of activities where the main focus is communication. The topics are arranged in such a way that learners first focus on meaning, by answering some introductory questions about real life situations and then, read some texts which comprise plenty of instances of the target structure, which is often made salient by input enhancement. What is meant with this is that teachers now have at hand resources which could facilitate the incorporation of focus on form in the classroom, without struggling too much with creating materials that call for a focus on form approach.

However, the decision of implementing a determined textbook in public schools does not depend on the teachers, but on the administrators and the general economic resources available in such institutions, many of which do not have a textbook to follow. In some cases, family incomes are not enough to afford it, which is another reason why some institutions do not ask for a mandatory textbook. Provided that several public schools in Colombia share this characteristic, it is up to the teacher to choose the activities and adapt them into the classroom so as to meet the needs of the students and achieve the ultimate goal on students, the development of communicative competence.

The next step would be the use of tasks that induce students to practice the target form but in a communicative way. Here comes the type of tasks described by Fotos (1998) where learners are engaged in meaning-focused interaction, yet they increase learner awareness of how the target structure is used in context. In other words, what is intended with the development of these tasks is the promotion of output on the part of the students. Thus, the teacher's role here becomes essential to offer corrective feedback on errors in the use of pretargeted forms, or recasts when students are reporting back to the class the outcome of their task.

Nevertheless, teachers must be aware of the aim of the communicative activity, that is, if the aim is for students to develop accuracy or fluency, because the role of the teacher is different in each case. In accuracy activities, students are encouraged to form correct sentences, and in case students produce incorrect utterances, the teacher can perfectly correct their mistakes. On the other hand, in activities where the aim is fluency, correcting students may be counterproductive due to communicative nature of the activity itself. Students then should be given some time and space to communicate, to try out the structures they want to use, promoting in this way oral interaction. Therefore, the role of the teacher in these activities is that of a guide, a facilitator because the teacher needs to introduce the activity, explain students the purpose of the activity, decide on the students type of interaction and finally let students work on it (Keegan, 2010a).

Taking as a basis what was previously stated, it is necessary to ask the following question: to what extent should teachers correct students grammatical mistakes while engaged in communicative tasks? According to Keegan (2010a), teachers need to make sure that students know what they have to do, also make sure they are using the target language, provide vocabulary when necessary, but definitely not correcting grammar mistakes. He emphasizes that

learners learn greatly by struggling to communicate and solving communication problems in the target language, which is a key notion of the communicative approach. Keegan (2010b) states that any attempt to interrupt the student during the communicative task is detrimental for the learning process since it has been disturbed at a critical moment. However, Keegan (2010a) does not suggest that teachers ignore errors completely.

So, in order to avoid disrupting students when they are communicating in English, teachers can circulate during the process of the activity and write down ungrammatical structures made by students, and then provide some general feedback on form when they have finished the task.

To summarize all the information in this research paper, the use of focus on form could be useful in a setting like Colombia because it helps learners to improve their grammatical accuracy by involving them into meaningful learning activities and tasks that provide them with ample opportunities for practice and interaction. Besides, focus on form is a rationale alternative in our context given that grammar instruction is widely provided in schools all over the country, but it is necessary that teachers broaden their repertoire for presenting those linguistic elements in an effective way. In other words, it is worth considering some focus on form techniques that raise language awareness and where structures are unlikely to occur in isolation, but instead in a meaningful context.

In addition, focus on form holds up the importance of communicative language teaching principles such as authentic communication and student-centeredness. More precisely, rules are inducted by the students, students are given meaningful and authentic materials, students are engaged in tasks where they have to discover the rules by themselves and after the tasks are developed, the teacher provides some feedback and draws conclusions. Thus, grammar is used in

a meaningful way; besides, there is more group work and finally, students are provided with consciousness-raising tasks.

Fotos (1998) draws a great conclusion: “Through use of modified focus-on-form activities, traditional EFL pedagogy aimed at developing formal knowledge of English structures and rules can now include a strong communicative component which provides examples of grammar used in meaningful context and promotes the development of communicative ability”.

(p. 307)

References

- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (3rd Ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chambers, N (2010). Descriptive English Grammar vs. Prescriptive English Grammar. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <http://www.englishspark.com/en/blogs/stumpers/440-descriptive-english-grammar-prescriptive-english-grammar>
- Doughty, C, & Williams, J (1998) Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Ellis, R (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction in *Language Learning*, 51(Supplement 1), 1-46
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51, 281–318.
- Fotos, S. (1998). Shifting the focus from forms to form in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 52 (4), 301-307.
- Gass, S. M. & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition : An Introductory Course*. Third Edition. Great Britain, New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Keegan, P. (2010a). What Roles does the Teacher Play in Speaking Activities?. Retrieved May 3, 2010, from <http://philkeegan.com/PhilKeegansELTBlog/?p=17>
- Keegan, P. (2010b). To Correct or not to Correct? That is the Question!. Retrieved May 11, 2010, from <http://philkeegan.com/PhilKeegansELTBlog/?p=20>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Littlewood, W. (1981) *Communicative Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Loewen, S. (2005). *Incidental Focus on Form and Second Language Learning*. University of Auckland: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K.de Bot, Ginsberg, R. and Kramsch, C. (eds.), *Foreign Language Research in cross-cultural perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M. H (1997). Focus on Form in Task-Based Language Teaching. Retrieved August 18, 2001 from <http://www.mhhe.com/socscience/foreignlang/top.htm>

Long, M. and Robinson, P. (1998). Theory, research and practice. In Doughty, Catherine and Williams, Jessica. (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGinnis, A. (2007). *The role of attention in second language development: implications for language classrooms*. MA thesis, The University of Montana, Missoula, MT.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pienemann, M. (1984). *Psychological Constraints on the Teachability of Languages*. *SSLA*, 6, 2, 86-214.

Poole, A. (2005). Focus on form instruction: foundations, applications, and criticisms. *The Reading Matrix*, 5 (1), 47-56.

Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rodriguez, A. G. (2009). Teaching grammar to adult English language learners: Focus on form. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved September 11, 2009, from <http://www.cal.org/caelanetwork/resources/teachinggrammar.html>
- Sanchez, A. Obando, G. (2008). Is Colombia ready for Bilingualism?. PROFILE 9, 181-195.
- Swan, M. (2002). Seven bad reasons for teaching grammar – and two good ones. In Richards, J. & Renandya, W. (Eds.) *Methodology in language teaching: an anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Woods, E. (1995). *Introducing Grammar*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.