

Form-focused Teaching for the Intermediate Latin Student

Peter Anderson and Mark Beckwith
Grand Valley State University

ABSTRACT

Form-focused teaching methods (derived from Focus-on-Form theory and methodologies) incorporate proactive interventions as well as exercises and activities that might be more familiar to grammar-based instructors. Form-focused methods attempt to direct the attentional (cognitive) resources of the student to a specific point of grammar within a specific communicative context. Adopting a form-focused mentality will not be difficult for most teachers and students; the adjustment lies in the perspective one adopts concerning these activities and when they are used during the lessons. There are many Focus-on-Form and form-focused methods, both reactive and proactive. Of those we have investigated, visual highlighting, or enhanced input, and indirect corrective feedback with recasting offer a set of intriguing possibilities for the intermediate Latin classroom, where the conflict between the demands of reading and interpreting complex texts and the constraints of students' cognitive resources becomes most apparent.¹

INTRODUCTION

Some of the complexity of learning a language comes from the nature of the language itself, and some from the cognitive processes of how the brain learns and works. This cognitive component is not only very subtle; it is frustratingly difficult to describe, assess or anticipate. But the set of cognitive resources and limitations unique to each student (which cognitive psychologists term “individual difference”) are essential to language acquisition. We can't change the difficulty of an inflected language such as Latin, and we can't really change our students' basic cognitive resources. But thinking about what our students *can do* in cognitive terms could shape what we ask our students *to do*. A well-studied theory of language pedagogy called Focus-on-Form (FonF) addresses some aspects of cognition and language acquisition by leveraging a specific set of cognitive resources in the classroom context. FonF theory suggests that when students bring their attentional resources to bear on language input in specific ways, language acquisition is enhanced and more durable. The purpose of this paper is to present in brief outline the theoretical aspects of FonF but especially a related pedagogical approach called “form-focused teaching,” to discuss particular applications of a form-focused strategy, and to offer several lesson plans that employ this strategy, two of which use texts that are part of the AP Syllabus. The discussion, these lesson plans, and the passages chosen are explicitly aimed at intermediate readers (those past initial grammar study) in college or high school. Our examples and reflections are pulled from the college level classroom, but will not be unfamiliar to those who teach high school. We feel that this critical stage, moving from “lower” level classes to “upper” level classes, presents common challenges for both teacher

1 We would like to extend our deep gratitude to Dr. John Gruber-Miller for giving us the benefit of his very considerable expertise and knowledge, as well as to the two anonymous readers for their insightful and helpful comments. This is a much, much better article than it was when we started, and we hope that it will prove useful and thought-provoking to our colleagues in schools and colleges.

and student in any classroom context as we negotiate, as we might Scylla and Charybdis, the importance of syntax and the desire for meaning. Mark's experience, perhaps, is a familiar one for many students, and Peter's observations may resonate with teachers. After giving voice to each author separately, the article continues with a discussion of our shared research findings. The exercises appended to the article were developed by Mark as part of an Honor's Senior Thesis at Grand Valley State University.

MARK SPEAKS ABOUT HIS EXPERIENCE AS A STUDENT

In my studies of Latin (and Greek) at Grand Valley State University, I have experienced a range of instructional methods. While the content and the preferences of the instructors have made each class unique, there seems to have been a general trajectory in teaching methods: in the early stages of language study there was a heavy focus on grammatical forms, while in the later years, especially from the third year forward, the focus shifted from the grammar to the meaning of the text. This is not a surprising pattern, since one must first learn the grammar before one can properly approach a text, and in the upper level courses interpretation of the text becomes the dominant task, leaving less time in class for a focus on the grammar.

It can be difficult to move from such a grammar focused classroom into one that is more focused on interpretation in later years of study. The difficulty for me came from transferring the isolated grammar from the previous years of study to the actual text. The relatively straightforward grammar of the text proved to be more troublesome than it should have been: even though the grammar was right in front of my eyes, it was odd to see it in a form other than a drill exercise. This was particularly acute in my third semester Latin course, when we read unaltered Latin prose (Cicero and Seneca), although the disjunction was lessened because of the structure of the course and a focused grammar review (after two weeks intense review, the class was given authentic Latin texts and asked to write a grammatical commentary).² While this continued focus on grammar allowed for the translation of the text to go fairly smoothly, I ended up making the text and the commentary two separate tasks. That is, while focusing on the grammar and the commentary I approached the text almost like something to be dissected bit by bit. It was not until I had all of the grammar in place and explained that I began to consider the meaning of the text. I began to see the grammar and the interpretation of the text as mutually exclusive tasks, when in fact I should have seen that they complement each other. As a result, while learning the grammar in an essentially isolated way made for effective learning of the grammar, it became difficult for me to take that isolated grammar and move it into an interpretation-focused context.

By the time I reached my third and fourth year of Latin, there was a clear shift towards focusing on the interpretation and translation of the text. In these classes there was usually one main text being dealt with throughout the semester, and the goal of each day was to translate a little more of that text and talk about what it meant. Grammar was dealt with on a sentence by sentence basis, and usually only if there was some trouble translating. But if the class (or at least the student translating) seemed to have a grasp on the meaning of the sentence, the grammar of the section was not dealt with. In the times when grammar needed to be addressed, it was usually done by stating the name of the rule but not necessarily explaining the rule, thus leaving it up to individual students to review it on their own time. Only in cases of extreme confusion or difficulty did the focus of the class shift entirely towards grammar. Grammar did appear on some tests (depending

2 See the methodology outlined in P. Anderson.

on the instructor), but usually it was much less emphasized than the translation and interpretive essay portions of the test.

The biggest advantage of focusing on interpretation like this is that the classes and the language become much more interesting. When the class was dealing with an authentic text, suddenly there was a use for all of the rules that once seemed meticulous and arbitrary, and the class became about more than language. History, anthropology, philosophy, religion, and many more topics became a part of the discussion. The result, in my opinion, was much livelier and interesting class discussions and a higher level of involvement from the students. While not all may be interested in how an ablative absolute works, most might be interested in the cultural context and the ideas articulated in a text. But, while the third and fourth year language classes were more enjoyable because of the focus on interpretation, meaning took over at times to the point that grammar slipped into the background, only specifically addressed when a problem became apparent in class. The result of this limited focus on grammar was that we started to forget the grammar out of which meaning arises, or at least paid less attention to it. It became possible, for instance, to gloss over a strange dative phrase, so long as the translation was acceptable enough to keep the class going – whether or not we actually understood what was going on. It was as if we could guess what the text was saying, but had forgotten why – when the meaning was obscure we did not have the resources to elicit meaning through grammar immediately at hand. By focusing on interpretation it seemed that a certain amount of grammar was lost.

One Latin class which I took at Grand Valley State did find a balance between grammar instruction and a focus on meaning, and this class was Latin prose composition. For Prose Comp, students were asked to write weekly journal entries in Latin while reviewing grammar and encountering the same grammar in authentic Latin texts (*colloquia* from the Renaissance, in this case). The first part of the week was spent reviewing a particular grammar topic. After reviewing the topic, a text that used the grammar was discussed and translated, offering a model for students on how to use the particular aspect of grammar in question. During the second part of each week students were asked to write a journal entry that used the grammar that was reviewed earlier in the week. The students brought their Latin to class and were given feedback by the professor. With this feedback students could correct their mistakes. All of this built up to a final project in which students created an extended dialogue using their knowledge of certain grammar rules and idioms, as well as Roman cultural and historical information. The prose composition class stands out for me because it was at this point that I began to feel the gap between my knowledge of grammar and my reading of Latin texts shrink. I was able to review the grammar I had been taught in my first year, see it in a context similar to what I was encountering in my more advanced Latin classes, and experiment with the rules of the grammar by creating my own Latin and learning from mistakes. The result of all of this was a better understanding of grammar while reading texts in my other Latin classes. After taking the prose composition class, I found that I was able to encounter an *ut* clause without stopping to refer to my first year textbook, and I no longer had to take time to consider what kind of subjunctive was being used. For me, this class helped me find a way to reconcile the differences between focuses that were either too heavy on grammar or too heavy on meaning and translation; in a sense I found a middle ground between the two. The Prose Comp class had in fact been designed around a second language instruction theory called “Focus on Form” and used form-focused methods.

PETER'S OBSERVATIONS AS A TEACHER

It seems clear from Mark's experience that the shift from "lower division" courses to "upper division" courses, from a grammar focus to an interpretative focus, created the perception of a rift between grammar and meaning. The kind of FonF activity carried out in the Prose Comp class was "active" (i.e. production oriented). Mark's senior project – the fruit of which contributes to this paper and is the basis for Lessons Two and Three below – sought to research and present methods for applying FonF theory to "passive" language activities (i.e. reading). This kind of pedagogical framework in the critical intermediate years carries the potential to springboard students into greater comprehension without jeopardizing secure knowledge of syntax. As we push students who are intellectually ready and eager to grapple with the concepts and ideas embedded in the linguistic structures of Latin, are we pushing them away from the grammar too soon, before it is properly acquired?

John Anderson argues for three stages of language acquisition that he calls 1) declarative, 2) procedural and 3) automatized. Declarative knowledge is factual. At the declarative stage the Latin student will know and be able to relate certain pieces of information: for example, that 3rd person singular active verbs end in *-t*. Procedural knowledge is more implicit: for example, a student at this stage will be able to transform a verb into 3rd sg. When Procedural knowledge is automatized the student no longer consciously thinks about the rule or form. Students at this stage may actually lose declarative knowledge (DeKeyser). This automatization stage is a critical point for the Latin student, since it is at this point that she is approaching competent use of the language. And, obviously, to develop skilled users of Latin we want to get students to the automatized stage – for by automatizing as much knowledge as possible, students then free up cognitive resources for other tasks. The shift to automatization, in my experience, can take a student far longer than the shift from declarative knowledge to procedural knowledge. When that shift begins to occur, however, it may be that demanding declarative knowledge from a student who has automatized knowledge could be as unrealistic and unfair as expecting students still mostly in the procedural phase to perform tasks that require a high degree of automatization. Indeed, a student may exhibit different levels of acquisition for (or propensities for acquiring) different kinds of knowledge at any one time. I asked above whether we might be pushing students away from grammar before it is properly acquired. Could we likewise be holding students back from fluency by emphasizing grammatical knowledge in upper level reading courses?

These questions are intended to provoke; the answers are not obvious. But teachers of language, I fear, are at great risk of being oblivious to this important difference in achievement between procedural and automatized skills. Since we live with one foot in all stages (by constant exposure to beginning users although we are expert), we tend to constantly assess students on the basis of declarative knowledge when we would most likely say that automatized knowledge is in fact the goal of our pedagogical efforts, and a necessary cognitive step in effective language processing. What is the future passive infinitive of *amāre*, anyway? Would Cicero know what kind of ablative that is? Or care?

Most textbooks, if not all, encourage learners to learn (declarative) and use (procedural) one or two linguistic rules per chapter and then to synthesize the parts for use in communication (automatized), either reading or writing, in the following chapters; Wilkins called this the synthetic approach to syllabus design.³ Synthetic syllabi (lexical, structural, and notional-functional, for

3 For a brief overview of types of syllabus design, see Rabbini.

example), are accompanied by synthetic “methods” (Grammar/Translation, ALM, Audio-Visual Method, Silent Way, Noisy Method, TPR, etc.), and by the synthetic classroom devices and practices commonly associated with them (e.g., explicit grammar rules, repetition of models, memorization of short dialogs, linguistically “simplified” texts, transformation exercises, explicit negative feedback, so-called “error correction,” and display questions). In this grammar-focused model, the best role Latin teachers in the classroom can expect to play is that of clarifier and negotiator of meaning *on behalf* of the ancient author, while also dragging students, sometimes grudgingly, towards accuracy. It is often, I feel, a battle of principle against not simply the students’ drive to construct sense but rather the reality of their cognitive resources.⁴ And it is sometimes wearying, both for students and teachers.

MARK AND PETER DISCUSS FOCUS-ON-FORM (FONF) AND FORM-FOCUSED TEACHING

Focus-on-Form⁵ is a theoretical and practical extension of cognitive research directed at second language acquisition. FonF refers “to how the learner’s attentional resources are allocated at a particular moment” (Long and Robinson 24). In contrast to models of instruction that deal with linguistic elements in isolation⁶ – i.e., grammar based methods that present forms divorced from meaningful content – FonF “overtly draws students’ attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding goal is meaning or communication” (Long 45-46). This model of learning is often reactive, with little or no planned intervention: the learner is encouraged to pay attention to a linguistic form in the course of communicating. While interesting and exceptionally successful in elementary school ESL contexts, for instance, the approach to teaching is unworkable in our modern college or high school Latin classrooms because very few teachers are willing or have the training to teach Latin with a purely communicative model.

We do not think this needs to be an all or nothing proposition, and there are ways in which teaching practices can be enriched by employing some of the theory behind Focus-on-Form methods without embracing a fully communicative model. As Nassaji points out,

“A number of [...] empirical studies on the role of form-focused instruction have revealed that a focus on form can successfully promote second language development far beyond that achieved by unfocused approaches (Doughty, 1991; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Harley, 1998; Lightbown, 1991). However, although research suggests that it is useful to include some kind of form-focused activity in communicative contexts, this suggestion may be of little use if teachers do not know how to do so.” (Nassaji 389)

This middle path—variously described as “form-focused teaching,” “proactive focus on form” (Ellis, “Introduction”), or “planned focus on form” (Grim)—suggests that any use of an in-

4 For an interesting discussion of successful communication even though syntax is compromised, see Skehan and Foster.

5 See Long for the classic definition of FonF. For a recent critique of the question with a great deal of background literature, see Poole.

6 This method is overwhelmingly employed in standard textbooks for Latin, where learning a linguistic element (new forms, grammatical concepts) is the primary syllabus activity, supplemented or complemented by readings, oral practice, or composition. This is true even of inductive approaches, although the grammar is slightly delayed.

structional activity that draws students' attention to linguistic forms (e.g. grammar or morphology) during the communicative process will promote language acquisition.⁷ In fact, it is quite likely that every Latin teacher at any level employs, knowingly or not, some of the elements of Focus-on-Form and form-focused theory. For instance, one key element of FonF is the need for instructors and students to notice gaps in language acquisition and to address such problems immediately through techniques such as recasting and indirect corrective feedback (Long and Robinson). Indirect corrective feedback occurs when the instructor indicates that there is an error in the student's utterance and then asks that the grammar of the utterance be corrected while still maintaining the original meaning. This process of grammatical correction is known as recasting. In order for such feedback and recasting to occur, the instructor must be paying attention to students and noticing whenever there appears to be a systematic and pervasive error in communication. Once the error is noticed, the correct form of feedback and recasting can be employed. Negative feedback and recasting are two of the ways that FonF can mediate the need for grammatical precision in a communicative context. Proactive or planned form-focused teaching anticipates a range of interventions without sacrificing the basic purpose of FonF: to direct the (cognitive) attention of students to maximum effect. Many FonF methods have been the subject of classroom-based research, and there has been some attempt to produce research around form-focused methods also (e.g. Grim). Of the FonF methods we have investigated, visual highlighting, or enhanced input, and indirect corrective feedback with recasting offer a set of intriguing possibilities for proactive or planned form-focused activities. In what follows we discuss each method and how they might be deployed in class as a form-focused activity.

ENHANCED INPUT AND INDIRECT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK WITH RECASTING

Enhanced input is a common name for visually highlighting certain elements, such as grammatical constructions that have just been reviewed. As White describes it, this involves techniques such as bolding, italics, and underlining in order to increase the likelihood that students' attention will be drawn to certain grammatical forms.⁸ This will help students use their attentional resources efficiently because it causes them to focus on the grammar that the instructor has pre-determined needs their attention most of all. If, for example, indirect speech were recently reviewed in class, and the text were enhanced in such a way that indirect speech was more noticeable, students would be able to conserve attentional resources because they would see the indirect discourse more readily than if they suddenly encountered a "stray" infinitive. However, as White notes, it is important that the text not become so visually altered that it would cause distraction during reading; thus only simple highlighting techniques should be used. Another possible way of enhancing the text could be to break the sentence down into thematic or grammatical sections, as Harrison proposes. If students are reading prose, the sentences could be separated into different clauses, or, if students are reading verse, then an extra space could be inserted between lines where there is a potentially difficult shift in tone, subject, or voice. Such techniques allow intermediate level students to more readily see different sense units in a text and decrease the likelihood that they will spend time and attention working out, for example, where clauses start and end but instead spend that cognitive

7 Grim's article has a full and up to date list of works pertaining to form-focused research.

8 Although White was ultimately unable to say whether or not other factors affected the study, there was a clear improvement in student performance and attention to form after the text had been visually enhanced. For Latin-specific work in this vein, see Harrison, and Markus and Ross.

resource discerning which kind of clause they are encountering. Something as simple as enhancing the text in a way that makes grammatical and thematic points more visually salient to the students provides a way for the instructor to effectively draw students' attention where she or he wants it to be. Coupled with review and preparation before class (another proactive element to this method), visual enhancement can be a powerful and empowering method for sight reading and reading comprehension exercises in intermediate classes: a student might encounter the Latin text in class for the first time, but has already reviewed grammar and vocabulary essential for that passage.

Indeed, visual enhancement of a text is especially useful when students have already called to mind key vocabulary and grammar before class takes place. In any text the students read, there are likely to be certain vocabulary items which could cause difficulty in interpretation if the meaning in that context is not common or familiar, or if the word is easily confused with another. Similarly, certain grammatical concepts are likely to arise with which students are not familiar or which are relatively infrequent; attention thus becomes split between the Latin text being read and turning to grammar books and dictionaries. Such semantic and syntactic confusions use up students' attentional resources, and if that effort could be avoided then students would be more able to focus on the interpretation of the text *as they are reading it*. Providing some sort of review of key grammar and vocabulary for a lesson beforehand could reduce the load on cognitive attention. One way to provide such review is to give the students a vocabulary list and a worksheet that reviews the salient grammatical concepts of the text. Such a worksheet would be completed and discussed before the text was encountered. Once students approach the text, the necessary vocabulary and grammar should be fresh in their minds, and they can focus their attention on interpreting while also reading the text. Of course, worksheets and vocabulary lists are only one way to draw students' attention to such key elements. The main point is that this form-focused approach enables intermediate students to have the necessary grammatical and lexical tools in mind before approaching a text; in a sense, this method offers students a way to practice or mimic the automatized stage of language acquisition.

Corrective feedback is a necessary part of learning a language, especially in a FonF model. Students are not able to learn from their mistakes if those mistakes are not pointed out to them or if they are not given the tools to correct them. However, not just any type of feedback will suffice. Ellis suggests that different types of corrective feedback, two of the primary forms being direct feedback and indirect feedback, have different effects on the learner ("Typology"). *Direct corrective feedback* refers to when the instructor indicates where a mistake has been made and immediately provides the correct answer for students. Such feedback has the benefit of being relatively quick because there is no delay as the student forms the correct answer. This kind of feedback has been shown to be effective in lower-level language courses and with younger students. *Indirect corrective feedback* occurs when the instructor indicates that there has been a mistake but does not give the student the correct answer. Instead, the student must develop the correction on her own. This form of feedback is helpful in long-term acquisition of grammar and concepts, and it also creates a problem-solving environment in the classroom. Because of the more involved nature of indirect feedback, it may be more suitable for intermediate language classes with older students. Indirect corrective feedback does have the advantage from form-focused teaching perspective because it offers students the opportunity to recast their work (i.e. to formulate a grammatically correct version of a prior attempt at communication). Indirect corrective feedback paired with recasting can be a powerful and attention focusing activity.

PROACTIVE/PLANNED AND REACTIVE LESSON PLANS FOR A FORM-FOCUSED TEACHER

The practical extension of FonF and form-focused theory is to pedagogical design, and it is with this that we shall conclude our article, through examples. A reactive application of form-focused methods is precipitated by the learner's mistake. This reactive approach, although it is in fact more closely connected to FonF methods, may still be coupled with proactive tasks. For instance, a student makes two mistakes while reading/translating a sentence. While a FonF teacher might give indirect corrective feedback and ask for a recasting, perhaps with a quick review of the linguistic rules that were misidentified or missed altogether, a form-focused teacher might choose to devote time (and the student's attention) only to a mistake and recasting that reinforces a review of a grammar rule studied in the class immediately prior, or in an exercise preparatory for the classroom assignment. The reactive FonF model is advantageous in that it allows the learner to generate the issue, and it involves little preparation. What's more, having the student "recast" their mistake is an extremely effective learning technique. But the range of learner abilities in any given classroom will be very great, and it is sometimes very difficult to decide on the spot what might be worth an interruption. That is, will a review of the function of the dative case in combined 3/4/AP class really benefit all or most students? Will we be as effective in the classroom as we can be by using only a reactive model in a classroom with more than one student?

A second possible scenario, in the same situation, is proactive or planned, and is task-based. That is, tasks are designed and performed ahead of time to review potentially problematic linguistic features of a particular reading students will encounter in class. The proactive form-focused teacher will have anticipated that a linguistic feature will present a problem for students, or will be beneficial for them to review it in a meaningful context. In this case the review of the linguistic feature *prior to the analysis of the meaningful text* is the goal of the form-focused task and also provides a more or less immediate exemplar for any necessary reactive intervention during in-class interpretation.

HOW ENHANCED INPUT AND INDIRECT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK WITH RECASTING FUNCTION IN PLANNED FORM-FOCUSED ACTIVITIES

The purpose of enhanced input and indirect corrective feedback with recasting in a planned form-focused activity is to draw a student's attention to a specific point of grammar prepared by proactive techniques. For enhanced input, students are alerted to a construction in a meaningful context. For indirect corrective feedback students are alerted to an error concerning the prepared rule and provided with the opportunity to correct it. Both methods allow students to further internalize a rule under review. Recasting after feedback does not have to be a complex effort – it can be as simple as changing a multiple choice answer after the instructor has indicated that there is a problem with the initial answer. Once again, it will be the instructor's role to determine what form recasting will take in a particular classroom setting. Though recasting is a relatively simple idea, the challenge for most traditional Latin teachers, who fall naturally into a reactive mode of teaching, lies in coupling this reactive technique with proactive elements of the lesson plan.

At the intermediate level, in our experience, there must be a consistent focus on and review of linguistic code, forms, and syntax, even as we begin to push students towards automatization of some of the more complex language tasks. Form-focused teaching methods at this stage of acquisition offer a bridge between procedural, declarative, and automatized knowledge as described in Anderson ("Developing Expertise"). The cognitive constraints on focus and the limits of atten-

tional resources in a sense set boundaries for student achievement – form-focused methods and techniques can help overcome some of these boundaries. There is, after all, only so much a brain can keep in focus at one time and only so many cognitive resources available to each student. Without fully automatized higher-level linguistic tasks, it would be hard to imagine true fluency.

The lessons and assignments that follow provide samples of how the pedagogical techniques described above (reactive vs. proactive form-focused instruction, visual enhancement, and indirect corrective feedback with recasting) can be used to implement form-focused lessons. While Lesson One offers a sample with a contrast as to how reactive and proactive methods might be employed on the same text. Lessons Two and Three offer complete planned form-focused approaches to texts like those students might encounter at the upper level in high school or college classrooms. Each of the texts in Lessons Two and Three has been enhanced in the general manner described above, but with slight variations due to the nature or focus of the assignments. Along with the enhanced text, students' attention will be focused in these lessons by means of worksheets that call to mind the essential vocabulary and grammar of each text, with an emphasis on reviewing one or two syntax rules that occur often in the chosen text. These worksheets are intended to be completed *before* students encounter the given text. Recasting occurs at different times for each lesson. In Lesson Two students are asked to recast the verbs in Catullus VIII, and in Lesson Three the opportunity for recasting lies in the multiple choice questions on the grammar worksheet. Included with each text is a list of possible comprehension questions. These questions provide a model of how an instructor could conduct class in a manner that does not focus entirely on grammar or translation, but rather moves students through the text in a way that allows them to formulate interpretation and see how the grammar informs that interpretation.

CONCLUSIONS

We suggest that even limited use of proactive form-focused methods will be extremely beneficial and make optimal use of intermediate level students' cognitive resources. For example, proactive tasks such as those described below are designed to dredge a piece of knowledge out of the depths of long-term memory into short-term memory before this cognitive activity is required by the target text itself; student attention is directed meaningfully with less cost to their resources and more resources may be left for interpretation. It is our conviction that the more this kind of task is performed, the sooner this knowledge is automatized, in the same way that the more often one dials a phone number the sooner it is memorized. Because reading is a much more complex cognitive task than dialing, attentional resources can be directed, through worksheets and exercises, at particular pieces of knowledge. Over time, intermediate students will read enough different texts with exercises aimed at enough different constructions to result in faster and more competent reading. In addition, this is a strategy that encourages students to encounter grammar and meaning together, forcing them to make connections between the two in a significant, targeted way in order to generate accurate interpretation. Given the limitations of cognitive resources, and given that students will often privilege meaning over grammatical accuracy – and given that Latin cannot be comprehended without accuracy – this kind of pedagogical method can be an excellent strategy for encouraging students to separate the processes of building grammatical accuracy and building good reading habits at a critical stage in their development. Form-focused instruction provides a method for the Latin classroom through which students can enjoy the benefits of reading ancient texts while still gaining an understanding of the grammar as a part of the interpretation of the text rather than as a set of paradigms and rules to be conquered.

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, J. R. "Acquisition of Cognitive Skill." *Psychological Review* 89 (1982): 369-406.
- Anderson, J. R. "Developing expertise." *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. 4th ed. Ed. J. R. Anderson. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1995. 272-304.
- Anderson, Peter. "Next Year?: Evaluating a Model for Second-Year College Latin." *Classical Journal* 99.4 (2004): 433-38.
- DeKeyser, Robert. "Cognitive Perspectives on Learning and Practicing Second Language Grammar." *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 42-63.
- Ellis, Rod. "A typology of written corrective feedback types." *ELT Journal*, 63.2 (2009): 97-107.
- , "Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction." *Language Learning* 51 (2001): 1-46.
- Grim, F. "Integrating Focus on Form in L2 Content-Enriched Instruction Lessons." *Foreign Language Annals* 41.2 (2008): 321-46.
- Harrison, R. "A Structural Arrangement of Text to Facilitate Reading." *Classical Journal* 102.3 (2007): 291-303.
- Long, M. "Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology." *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective*. Ed. K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1991. 39-52.
- Long, Michael H. and Peter Robinson. "Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice." *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 15-41.
- Markus, D. and D. P. Ross. "Reading Proficiency in Latin through Expectations and Visualization." *Classical World* 98.1 (2004): 79-93
- Nassaji, H. "Towards integrating form-focused instruction and communicative interaction in the second language classroom: some pedagogical possibilities." *Canadian Modern Language Review* 55.3 (1999): 385-402.
- Poole, A. "Focus on Form Instruction: Foundations, Applications, and Criticisms." *The Reading Matrix* 5.1 (April 2005): 47-56.
- Rabbini, Roberto. "[An Introduction to Syllabus Design and Evaluation](#)." *The Internet ESL Journal* 8.5 (2002). Web. 15 March 2011.
- Skehan, P., and P. Foster. "Cognition and tasks." *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*. Ed. P. Robinson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 183-205.

White, Joanna. "Getting the learners' attention: A typographical input enhancement study." *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 85-113

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

APPENDIX 1. LESSON ONE (SEN. EP. 41.1)

Facis rem optimam et tibi salutarem si, ut scribis, perseveras ire ad bonam mentem, quam stultum est optare cum possis a te impetrare. Non sunt ad caelum elevandae manus nec exorandus aedituus ut nos ad aurem simulacri, quasi magis exaudiri possimus, admittat: prope est a te deus, tecum est, intus est.

Method	Comments
<p>PROACTIVE: in the class or in the home-work assignment prior to the assigned reading, review and construct syntax exercises on: 1) present general conditions, 2) purposive infinitive, 3) passive periphrastic, and 4) purpose clause vs. <i>ut</i> + indicative.</p> <p>Give a dictionary assignment on <i>optare</i> and <i>impetrare</i>, discuss the interesting difference between English and Latin points of reference from physical space using <i>prope est a te deus</i>.</p> <p>Have a vocabulary list for infrequent or possibly misconstrued words (e.g. <i>salutarem</i>, <i>aedituus</i>), linking them with their roots.</p>	<p>Translation in class may not be necessary; consider giving a comprehension quiz instead (e.g. “Draw a picture showing where Seneca thinks <i>deus</i> is in relation to his reader”). One might now be able to concentrate on stylistic issues or contextual questions as well as focus on how style might affect reading strategies (e.g. parallel structures). Although the review process will be substantial and could affect class time, it may be possible to read (not translate) much larger sections of Latin at one time, while being fairly confident that all students will be “on the same page” in grammatical terms.</p>
<p>REACTIVE: When or if a student misconstrues 1) present general conditions, 2) purposive infinitive, 3) passive periphrastic, or 4) purpose clause, review on the spot by asking for the syntax rule and a recasting of the translation.</p> <p>Students will likely translate <i>prope est a te</i> too literally, impeding sense and the point of Seneca’s comment. This will provide an opportunity for discussion of meaning and the interesting difference between English and Latin points of reference from physical space using <i>prope est a te deus</i>. See <i>OLD</i> (s.v. <i>prope</i> A.1.) or <i>L&S</i> (s.v. <i>prope</i> I.A.2).</p>	<p>Direct translation will probably be necessary to check student comprehension and to generate syntax issues for discussion and clarification. One might now be able to concentrate on each student’s particular weaknesses, forcing “recasting” as a pedagogical strategy. Note that the student who failed to identify the syntax issue will be very unlikely to be able to provide the “rule”; you will probably always rely on the top tier of students for answers. Each class will be spent translating and discussing syntax and content. The review process and reading comprehension may compete for students’ attention. Students encounter similar amounts of Latin each class; each class comprises similar activities. One can be fairly confident that all students are “on the same page” in grammatical terms by the end of the session.</p>

APPENDIX 2. LESSON TWO (CATULLUS VIII)

Class Day A

- Assign the grammar and vocabulary handout as homework two days before the lesson is to take place. Correct the handout in class the day before the lesson, and assign the students to review the corrected handout before Class Day B (see table).
- This lesson assumes students are familiar with syllable quantity and meter, specifically hendecasyllabic, and forms of the personal and interrogative pronoun.

Homework for Class Day A	Class Day A	Homework for Class Day B	Class Day B
Students prepare the handout on imperatives and review personal and interrogative pronouns	Review any questions students may have concerning handout.	Students review the handout with the corrected answers and information.	Students use the information reviewed in the handout to read and interpret Catullus 8.

Class Day B

- Hand out Catullus VIII at the beginning of class.
- Mention that the poem is in scazons, and model reading the poem in meter. Then have a few students read through the poem, thus helping the class to notice certain long and short syllables as well as to gain a sense of context for the poem.
- Work through the meaning of the poem without doing a line-by-line translation. This can be done by asking students prompting questions concerning areas of the poem where the grammar may be more difficult.
- Ask students to break into groups of two or three and recast a few lines so that they replace second person with third person, thus requiring the students to identify the verbs (and pronouns) and create the new, correct form. By imagining the subject *ille Catullus* in place of *tu, Catulle* and *illa Lesbia* in place of *tu, Lesbia*, the students will in effect de-personalize the poem and come to a greater awareness of how the use of the second person makes the poem more personal and emotionally intense.
- Ask the groups to each write one of their recasts on the board.
- Provide indirect corrective feedback by identifying where there are mistakes and asking the students to correct them.

Catullus VIII Review of Commands in Latin

Note: Before beginning this exercise, review the forms of the imperative and the uses of the jussive subjunctive.

1. Fill in the proper ending as indicated by the person, number, and mood.

_____ (2nd pl. imperative, amō) _____ (2nd sg. subjunctive, scribō)

_____ (1st sg. subjunctive, maneō) _____ (2nd sg. imperative, videō)

_____ (3rd pl. imperative, vincō) _____ (2nd pl. subjunctive, superō)

_____ (3rd sg. imperative, audeo) _____ (3rd sg. subjunctive, sciō)

2. Underline and identify which form of command (subjunctive or imperative) is used.

Audeant illī virī esse fortēs.

Vocāte puellās ex domo.

Nē id faciāmus.

Laudēs bonōs librōs.

Fīliam fabulam docē.

3. Translate the following into Latin, using the form of command specified.

Announce the message to the king. (2nd sg. imperative)

Let us stop the man in the market. (1st pl. subjunctive)

Finish your job (*commercium*, -ī) tonight. (2nd sg. subjunctive)

Let him call the boys to dinner (use *ad* + accusative). (3rd sg. subjunctive)

Learn the teacher's customs (*mōs*, *mōris*). (2nd pl. imperative)

Catullus VIII Vocabulary Worksheet

1. Define the following terms:

dēsīnō, -ere
fulgēō, -gēre, fulsī
sōl, sōlis, m.
nōlō, nōlle, nōluī
volō, velle, voluī
invītus, -a, -um
adeō, -īre
dēstinātus, -a, -um
perferō, perferre
scelestus, -a, -um

2. Provide the lexical entry and definition.

ineptīre
perisse
ventitābās
sectare
dolebis
mordēbis
rogābit

3. Guess what the following words likely mean.

iocōsa (Hint: i's often become j's when entering into English)
impotēns
obdūrā (Hint: it's a verb, ob-dūrā)

Catullus VIII Visually Enhanced Text

Miser Catulle, **desinas** ineptire,
et quod uides perisse perditum **ducas**.

fulsere quondam candidi *tibi* soles,
cum uentitabas quo puella ducebat
amata *nobis* quantum amabitur nulla.
ibi illa multa cum iocosa fiebant,
quae *tu* uolebas nec puella nolebat,
fulsere uere candidi *tibi* soles.

nunc iam illa non uult: *tu* quoque impotens **noli**,
nec quae fugit sectare, nec miser **uiue**,
sed obstinata mente **perfer**, **obdura**.
uale puella, iam Catullus obdurat,
nec *te* requiret nec rogabit inuitam.
at *tu* dolebis, cum rogaberis nulla.

scelesta, uae *te*, quae *tibi* manet uita?
quis nunc te adibit? *cui* uideberis bella?
quem nunc amabis? *cuius* esse diceris?
quem basiabis? *cui* labella mordebis?
at *tu*, Catulle, destinatus **obdura**.

Catullus VIII Sample Comprehension Questions

- To whom is Catullus speaking in the opening line?
What is another way to translate *dūcās* in line 2 besides “lead”?
What grammatical construction would follow this that includes an accusative and infinitive?
Where does the relative clause initiated by *quod* end?
What word is “missing” after *perditum*?
Parse *fulsēre*.
What kind of ablative is *quō* in line 4?
What kind of dative is *nōbīs* in line 5?
Who is the subject of *amābitur*?
What is the subject of *fiēbant*?
How is *cum* best translated in line 6?
What are the different attitudes between Catullus and the girl in line 7?
What is now different in line 9?
Who is the subject of *fugit*?
What construction is *obstinātā mente* an example of?
How has Catullus’ attitude towards Lesbia changed in 12-14, and how do we know this?
What is *nūlla* doing in line 14?
What is the subject of *manet*?
How is the *cui* in “*cui videberis bella*” similar to *nobis* in line 5?
Why is *esse* in the infinitive?
What kind of dative is *cui* in line 18?
How is the *at tū* in the final line different than in line 14?

APPENDIX 3. LESSON THREE (CAESAR, *DE BELLO GALLICO*, BK. 2.1.1-4)

Class Day A

- Assign the grammar and vocabulary handout as homework two days before the lesson is to take place. Correct the handout in class the day before the lesson, and assign the students to review the corrected handout before the lesson (see table)
- For the grammar worksheet, go over each question in class, asking the students to share their multiple choice answers. If students chose the incorrect answer, ask them to consider why they chose that answer and correct their mistake by choosing a new answer.
- For the extended sentence, ask students to break into groups and compare their marking of the sentence. Then ask a representative from each group to put their answer on the board. Provide corrective feedback, and allow the students to recast their work where necessary.

Homework for Class Day A	Class Day A	Homework for Class Day B	Class Day B
Students prepare the handout on indirect statement and sequence of tenses.	Review any questions students may have concerning handout.	Students review the handout with the corrected answers and information.	Students use the information reviewed in the handout to translate Caesar.

Class Day B

- Hand out Caesar text at the beginning of class.
- Work through the meaning of the text without doing word-by-word translation. This can be done by asking students prompting questions concerning areas of the poem where the grammar may be more difficult.

Caesar Indirect Discourse and Sequence of Tenses Review Sheet

Note: Before doing this worksheet, review indirect discourse, paying special attention to the uses of the infinitive, indicative, and subjunctive, as well as the sequence of tenses rule for the subjunctive.

Read the sentence (DO NOT TRANSLATE), and determine if the action of the infinitive is happening before, after, or at the same time as the main verb.

1. Nōn arbitror tē ita sentīre.
 - a. Before
 - b. Same
 - c. After
2. Vidēmur enim quiētūrī fuisse.
 - a. Before
 - b. Same
 - c. After
3. Rēs ipsa monēbat tempus esse.
 - a. Before
 - b. Same
 - c. After

Read the sentence (DO NOT TRANSLATE), and determine if the main verb is primary or secondary sequence and if the subjunctive verb indicates complete or incomplete action.

1. Rogō quid faciās.
 - a. Primary, complete
 - b. Primary, incomplete
 - c. Secondary, complete
 - d. Secondary, incomplete
2. Rogāvī quid facerēs.
 - a. Primary, complete
 - b. Primary, incomplete
 - c. Secondary, complete
 - d. Secondary, incomplete
3. Rogābō quid fēceris.
 - a. Primary, complete
 - b. Primary, incomplete
 - c. Secondary, complete
 - d. Secondary, incomplete
4. Rogāvī quid fēcissēs.
 - a. Primary, complete
 - b. Primary, incomplete
 - c. Secondary, complete
 - d. Secondary, incomplete

Read the following sentence (again, DO NOT TRANSLATE). Identify the verbs and break the sentence into its different clauses (i.e. main clause, indirect Discourse, Subordinate Clauses)

Quis neget haec omnia quae vidēmus deōrum potestāte administrārī?

Caesar Vocabulary Worksheet

1. Define the following terms:

citerior, -ius
crēber, -bra, -brum
conīurō, -āre
obses, obsidis
partim (adv)
nōlō, nōlle, nōluī
inveterāscō, -ere
mōbilitās, -tātis
condūcō, -ere

2. Provide the lexical entry and definition.

adferēbantur
verērentur
pācatā
sollicitārentur
versārī
studēbant
cōnsequī

3. Guess what the following words likely mean.

rūmorēs
litterīs (HINT: Change the first i to an e)
addūcerētur (HINT: Separate the preposition and the verb)
diūtius
hiemāre (HINT: Consider this a “verbing” of a noun)
facultātēs
occupābantur

Caesar Passage Visually Enhanced

Cum esset Caesar in citeriore Gallia [in hibernis],
ita uti supra demonstravimus,
crebri ad eum rumores adferebantur litterisque item Labieni certior fiebat

omnes Belgas, quam tertiam esse Galliae partem dixeramus, **contra populum Romanum**
coniurare obsidesque inter se dare.

Coniurandi has esse causas:

primum quod vererentur

ne, omni pacata Gallia, ad eos exercitus noster adduceretur;

deinde quod ab non nullis Gallis sollicitarentur,

partim qui,

ut Germanos diutius in Gallia versari noluerant,

ita populi Romani exercitum hiemare atque inveterascere in Gallia moleste
ferebant,

partim qui mobilitate et levitate animi novis imperiis studebant;

ab non nullis *etiam quod* in Gallia a potentioribus atque iis

qui ad conducendos homines facultates habebant

vulgo regna occupabantur;

qui minus facile eam rem imperio nostro consequi poterant.

Caesar Passage Sample Comprehension Questions

Where is Caesar, and where have we this description of this region before?

Who is *eum*?

Why is *litteris* not accusative?

What is *quam* referring to and what is its function in the relative clause?

What two things are the *Belgas* said to have done?

Why is *esse* infinitive?

What part of speech is *coniurandi*? What case is it in and why?

What “condition” exists for the *Belgae* to be afraid?

What do they fear?

Who is the grammatical agent of *sollicitarentur*?

What do the Germans not want to do?

What are the two results of the Germans’ reluctance?

What kind of ablatives are *mobilitate* and *levitate*?

Why is *novis imperiis* in the dative?

What kind of adjective is *potentioribus*?

What is the antecedent of *qui*?

What use of *ad* is this?

Homines and *facultates* are both accusative plural, what is each the direct object of?

Who is doing the action of *occupabantur*?

Parse *consequi*.

What is *minus* modifying?