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1. Introduction
This paper aims at showing the relevance of pedagogical Contrastive Analysis (CA) to the teaching/learning of Grammar as understood and defined within the theoretical framework of Cognitive Linguistics. Some methodological problems of CA are considered and illustrated through a brief report of research findings. The implications of these findings for Foreign Language Learning and Teaching (FLL/T) are related to current views on the criteria implied by Cognitive Linguistics for FL syllabus design. The nature and aims of pedagogical grammar, and in particular of one that relies on Cognitive Linguistics, are discussed in terms of principle. The potential role of the teaching of grammar within a Language Awareness perspective is also briefly discussed. More specifically, the teaching and learning of the grammar of a foreign language are related to the issue of conscious and unconscious learning and, eventually, to internalisation and automatisation. Moreover, the importance of meaning to the teaching/learning of grammar is argued for. It is also argued that both overtly and covertly contrastive approaches may prove to be useful in the FL classroom. Finally, some examples illustrating the use of suggested teaching grammar techniques are presented.

2. Some methodological considerations
2.1 CA and the teaching of Grammar within communicative approaches to FLT
Over the last two decades or so, the communicative approach to FLL/T (e.g. Widdowson 1978) has been established and widely used in FL classrooms. The communicative approach has stressed the need for exposure of the learner to the FL (L2) and, furthermore, the need for the learner to be actively involved in communicative activities that would enhance his/her ability to use the FL for successful communication. Although the new trends in FLL/T were based on the actual needs of FL learners and have to be positively assessed, it cannot go unnoticed that two important parameters of FLL were seriously neglected within this approach: the teaching of grammar and the influence of the learners native language (L1) on the learning process. However, interest in both these aspects of FLL/T has increased recently. Does that mean that we are going back to the teaching of grammatical rules or back to the

* This paper is based on data from an unpublished PhD thesis (Ayakli 1998).
Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (Lado 1957), which claimed that it could predict all learning problems and difficulties by comparing linguistic units between L1 and L2? The answer is ‘No’, since this renewed interest was manifested through new directions in SLA research and new trends in FLT.

On the one hand, in the context of the FL classroom, the term Grammar has acquired a wider sense than the one it had at the time when structuralist theories of language and behaviourist theories of learning were dominant in our field. Grammar can now cover, for instance, areas from pragmatics or semantics, aspects of usage, etc. On the other hand, the scope of CA has been expanded to include more levels of linguistic analysis than the phonological and syntactic ones. Moreover, interlanguage analyses adopting a contrastive approach have amply documented the influence of the learner’s L1, the question investigated now being not whether the L1 can influence FLL but rather how it does so. However, CAs have been fragmentary and have carried out comparisons of linguistic units, which do not correspond to the learners psychological reality. Psychologically-oriented IL analyses on the other hand have not been able to account for the use of actual grammatical categories. Therefore, the methodological problem posed is to embed the method of CA and the study of IL in a theoretical model which can associate linguistic form to learner’s psychological reality, i.e., their language learning experience and the cognitive processes and models that characterise it.

2.2 On the theoretical framework of Cognitive Linguistics

It is suggested in Ayakli 1998 that the theoretical framework of Cognitive Linguistics can offer a model of linguistic analysis upon which we can rely to carry out both CAs and IL analyses. These, in turn, can provide a basis for us to draw some implications for FLL/T. Some of the general assumptions of Cognitive Grammar, as have been stated in Langacker 1987, which allow for a more coherent account than has been done so far of interlanguage phenomena and of L1 influence in particular, are the following:

Language is an integral part of human cognition. “Linguistic development is dependent on 'experiential factors' and is bound up with 'psychological phenomena' that are not necessarily specifically linguistic in character” (Langacker 1987:12-13).

Language is symbolic in nature. As Langacker puts it, language “makes available to the speaker [...] an open-ended set of linguistic signs or expressions, each of which associates a semantic representation of some kind with a phonological representation”. This conception of all linguistic structure as a set of “symbolic units” extends beyond lexicon to grammar. From the symbolic nature of language follows “the centrality of meaning to all linguistic concerns. [] Both grammar and the lexicon are equally meaningful (Langacker 1987:11-12). The grammar of a language is defined as those aspects of cognitive organisation in which
resides "a speaker's grasp of established linguistic convention". Grammatical patterns are analysed as schematic, symbolic units which differ from other symbolic structures not in kind, but only in "degree of specificity".

Linguistic analysis incorporates the prototype model of categorization (e.g. Rosch 1973, 1975, 1978; Mervis & Rosch 1981). Both Lakoff (1987), and Langacker (1987) have stressed the importance of incorporating the prototype model of categorization into linguistic analysis. Lakoff (1987) has argued that category structure and "prototype effects" are by-products of the organisation of knowledge by means of "Idealized Cognitive Models" (ICMs).

3. A pedagogical CA of a grammatical construction

Based on these assumptions, I have carried out (Ayakli 1998) a Contrastive Analysis of the English and Modern Greek present perfect constructions, which are linguistic units, represented as ICMs, which are cognitive units and can be taken to be psychologically real. The diagram in the next page shows the main points comprising this analysis. On the basis of this analysis I designed and conducted a research aiming to study the present perfect construction in the IL of Greek EFL learners in the context of state secondary education. 530 Greek students participated in the research and 55 students from English schools were also used as control group.

The findings of this research indicate that Greek learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) make use of the Idealized Cognitive Model (ICM) of the present perfect as they have internalised it in their mother tongue when they judge the appropriateness of sentences containing the English present perfect construction or when they use it in their production. On the other hand, my findings also indicate that formal teaching of as well as exposure to the foreign language may contribute to the modification of this ICM, thus resulting in the use of the English construction by Greek learners in a way more similar to that in which it is used by students from English schools. This indication comes from the fact that, although the majority of students from Greek schools were reluctant to use or to accept those instances of the present perfect construction in which the aspect of the participle was to be understood as imperfective or the participle denoted a habitual or continual action - unlike their experience and expectations from their mother tongue - there was still a number of them who did use or accept it. It also comes from the fact that the total amount of time of instruction the subjects had received when they took the tests is among the few factors that seem to be somewhat related to this development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTIES PERTAINING TO THE ENGLISH PERFECT</th>
<th>COMMON PROPERTIES</th>
<th>PROPERTIES PERTAINING TO THE GREEK PERFECT</th>
<th>OTHER ICMs INVOLVED IN MG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>recency</td>
<td>Possession</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persistent situation</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Present Paratatikos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result</td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result Experience</td>
<td>RP (antioriity)</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past ← participle</td>
<td>have + atemporal relation</td>
<td>→ aorist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both summary and sequential scanning possible</td>
<td>only summary scanning possible</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combines with all content verbs</td>
<td>content verbs with inherent imperf. aspect excluded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present moment or RP can be included</td>
<td>present moment or RP is excluded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of the ICMs of the perfect in English and MG

The findings of the research also indicate that subjects learn grammatical constructions in the same way as they learn words, i.e. by analogy to prototypes. Moreover, the prototype effects traced in the subjects' performance indicate that prototypes may be interlingual. This means that prototypical members of a category in the L1 may influence the perception of similar L2 categories and the development of corresponding interlanguage categories. However, learning by prototype is not incompatible with learning by schema. Although it has not been
investigated whether the subjects are aware of the cognitive schema of abstract possession have-complementiser (Langacker 1991, 1995; Ayakli 1997), it is worth noting that students from Greek schools (GSs) seem more familiar than their counterparts from English Schools (ESs) with the label used for the general schema of the present perfect construction, i.e. the term 'Present Perfect'. 62% of ESs versus 17% of GSs answered that they had problems sorting out the sentences in a best example assessment task, while a few of the ESs (but none of the GSs) said they were not sure what the Present Perfect was. The reason for this difference could be attributed to the formal teaching of grammar, which can be found as a component in Greek rather than in English curricula.

Finally, my findings imply that dealing separately with each variant of a polysemous word or a grammatical construction may result in more effective learning. It was obvious from the different percentages obtained for different variants of the perfect construction that knowing the general schema was not enough for learners to be able to recognize and use each variant of the construction. Each variant might present differences in meaning from the prototype or centre of the category in focus (which consists of a number of variants) as well as from other variants comprising the category. One consequence which may arise from this conclusion is the importance of distinguishing between variants, i.e. types of different uses of a construction, and instances, i.e. tokens of the same type of use of a construction. Another consequence is the importance of meaning in the learning/teaching of the grammar of a FL.

All the above may lead us to the conclusion that FL syllabus design could take into consideration and exploit all three modes of knowledge (Givón 1989), namely: (1) deduction or top-down processing, which relates to learning by schema, (2) induction or bottom-up processing, which relates to dealing with items at the basic level of abstraction, and (3) abduction, which relates to learning by analogy to prototypes. The need to offer the FL learner the opportunity to use these three modes of knowledge or modes of inference, brings us to three criteria which could be applied in syllabus design, namely: (1) using cognitive schemas to present meaning, (2) dealing separately with each variant of a polysemous word or grammatical construction, which could be considered as a basic level item, and (3) providing descriptions of meaning in terms of prototypes on the basis of which FL learners could expand their knowledge.

It would also seem useful to suggest that we should not only stress the importance of meaning in the teaching of grammar as far as each individual grammatical item is concerned. We could also attempt a graded meaning-based organisation of the teaching of grammar in the FL syllabus.

---

1 E.g. accurate tense appropriateness judgements of correct sentences: 85.6% for an experiential perfect, but only 27.1% for a perfect denoting a state.
The findings of the research and the suggestions made above are in accord with and lend further support to current views concerning the influence of Cognitive Linguistics over foreign language learning and teaching. Among recent reports of these views is the one provided by Ungerer (1996), who argues for the importance of CL in EFLL/T along three lines or criteria as I have called them above:

(a) attributing priority to basic level items,
(b) presenting meaning in terms of cognitive schemas, and
(c) providing simple descriptions in terms of prototypes.

These three criteria may affect the teaching of both vocabulary and grammar. All three can “bridge the gap between formal syntax and morphology on the one hand, and on the other, the semantic aspects of grammar, by relating them both to a common conceptual basis” (Ungerer 1996:273).

4. Pedagogical Cognitive Grammar
What is the relevance of these criteria to Pedagogical Cognitive Grammar? I will adopt Taylor’s characterisation of a pedagogical grammar as a description of a language which is aimed at the foreign language learner and/or teacher, and whose purpose is to promote insight into, and thereby to facilitate the acquisition of the foreign language (Taylor 1993:201). I will also agree with his remark that a pedagogical grammar, which is selective from its starting point, will have to focus on learning problems, i.e. on what is “idiosyncratic” in a language rather than on those aspects of general cross-linguistic validity. This remark may concern any part of the grammar that is to be explicated to EFL students either by means of written materials or through oral presentation.

4.1 A Language Awareness perspective
Recognizing the need for pedagogical grammar and defining its purpose as the promotion of insight into the FL is the same as recognizing its potential contribution to what is known as “consciousness raising” (Sharwood Smith 1981; Rutherford 1987) or “language awareness” (Hawkins 1981; 1984; Papageorgiou-Lytra 1987; James & Garrett 1991). These terms have been often used interchangeably and the latter

---

2 Ungerer characterises these three lines as approaches. However, since the term is used in Applied Linguistics in a more general sense (defined e.g. in the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics as different theories about the nature of language and how languages are learned), I will refer to them as criteria for the selection of items in syllabus design and for the evaluation of teaching materials.

3 Not only a description of syntactic properties, but also of semantic and pragmatic ones.
in particular presents differences in meaning when used in different contexts. Hawkins (1981, 1984), realizing the need "to bridge the gap" between the mother tongue and foreign languages, proposed the awareness of language as a new element in the curriculum of both primary and secondary schools in the UK, which "would help pupils in their attack of the foreign language, by strengthening their capacity for 'insight into pattern' and setting up correct expectations as to what patterns to look for." This study of language, supplemented by the proper presentation to the students of the foreign language itself, could help them develop their awareness of language provided that the FL teaching strategies used encouraged them "to compare their emerging insights in the new language with their intuitions about their mother tongue" (Hawkins 1981:40).

By implementing language awareness (LA) courses Hawkins was hoping to cope with the problems of both foreign language learning and school leavers' illiteracy. The type of language awareness that has been more widely used however, is the LA which is aimed rather at foreign language learners. In this context, Rutherford (1987) also suggests that consciousness raising may be used to bridge the gap between the "familiar" and the "unfamiliar" as far as the learner's knowledge is concerned. He specifies the role of consciousness raising as "one in which data that are crucial for the learner's testing of hypotheses, and for his forming generalizations, are made available to him in a somewhat controlled and principled fashion" (Rutherford 1987:18). As far as the presentation of these data is concerned, he stresses the importance of "blending" explicit and implicit learning (see also Ayakli 1998; Spada 1985).

In an attempt to increase learner autonomy and independence from teacher control and guidance Papaefthymiou-Lytra (1987) suggests that a language awareness component be incorporated in the EFL syllabus. This component mainly focuses on learning and communicating strategies but includes, among other aspects, learning to talk about the foreign language and culture. This aspect of EFL learning and teaching, she argues, could help learners become aware of that part of language behaviour that native speakers hold in their subconscious. It could help them rationally move towards "the so-called native speaker's insight." Awareness of the L2 language and culture, combined with wide exposure to the foreign language, eventually leads learners to develop a sensitivity in the foreign language for interpreting and selecting accurate and appropriate language for oral and written discourse (Papaefthymiou-Lytra 1987:115; see also Sharwood-Smith 1981).

4.2 Conscious learning
From what we have mentioned so far, it seems that the key issue relating the concepts of pedagogical grammar on the one hand and language awareness on the other is the issue of learners consciously promoting their insight into the foreign language. At this point the exponents of
"natural acquisition" theories might argue that the terms “insight” or “intuition” are totally irrelevant and even contradictory to conscious or intentional learning. Krashen’s theory, for instance (e.g. Dulay, Burt & Krashen 1982; Krashen & Terrell 1983), is based on a distinction between conscious “learning” and unconscious “acquisition”. It claims that acquisition takes place within the context of communicative language activity and that conscious learning plays a very limited role, namely, occurring only when the learner might momentarily “focus on form”. Its most important claim is that the conscious application of a rule cannot cause learning to "turn into" acquisition. The only thing FL students need, therefore, in order to learn, is a classroom where conditions promoting acquisition have been set up. Such conditions are met when "comprehensible input" is provided and when affective barriers that may block "intake" are reduced. Pedagogical grammar and, even more, any type of awareness is considered to be useless to the purporses of FLT within this framework.

However, one of the indications from the findings of the investigation that I have conducted is that formal teaching may contribute to the modification of ICMs towards the L2. Moreover, research on language learning through interaction, as well as discourse analysis and learning and communicating strategies literature, have clearly indicated that making the rules and the conventions of language and culture explicit to language learners is part and parcel of L1 as well as L2 language learning (see Papaeftymiou-Lytra 1981/1987 and Wenden 1983, among many others). While Krashen, to support his hypothesis, uses the fact that learners often continue to make errors even though they know the rules, it is also the case that learners achieve error-free mastery of a form, as a result of conscious effort. And, as Taylor notes, "it is by no means clear why the output of conscious rule applications, as well as the interrelationships highlighted by a pedagogical grammar and the arrays of illustrative examples with which grammar rules are explicated, should not themselves count as 'comprehensible input' [...] in those situations where the learner has only limited access to foreign language data" (Taylor 1993:204, our emphasis). If formal teaching can provide "comprehensible input" which will "turn into acquisition", then one could argue that the distinction between “acquisition” and “learning” is itself unclear. So is the distinction between the learner “focusing on form” and “focusing on meaning”. In addition to showing an understanding of grammar as merely comprising the memorisation of inflectional endings and a few more dull exercises, this distinction seems to overlook the fact that, as Gregg (1984:83) has noted, “focusing on form is focusing on meaning”. From this perspective, promoting insight, which can be set as the aim of a pedagogical cognitive grammar, means, in essence, reducing the arbitrariness of the foreign language system for learners (Gregg 1984: 219). This brings us to our next issue, namely, the importance of meaning within the framework of cognitive linguistics.
4.3 Grammar and meaning

Grammatical constructions as the one I have studied in my investigation, are regarded as schemas for integrating two or more simpler symbolic units into a more complex, composite unit. As mentioned earlier, they are symbolic units which differ from other such units only by degree of specificity (Langacker 1987). FL learners are therefore expected to learn grammatical constructions as schemas which pair forms with meanings. However, categorising and learning by schema is not incompatible with categorising and learning by prototype. Therefore, both schematicity and prototypicality relations are expected to play a role in the process of learning grammatical constructions as my findings have indicated. "The distinctive contribution of cognitive grammar is to approach other symbolic units - including lexical categories and syntactic structures - in the same way in which words are approached, i.e. not as forms whose distribution is governed by an autonomous syntax, but as forms which symbolise meanings" (Taylor 1993:212-13). Moreover, meanings are regarded as "conventionalised conceptualisations", and grammatical constructions are characterised as "grammaticised concepts" (Lakoff 1987). Since formal differences between languages show differences in conceptualisation, learning a foreign language will involve learning the concepts associated with forms, or gaining "conceptual fluency" as Danesi (1995) has put it. A pedagogical grammar therefore, would not only need to compare and clarify differences between L2 elements. It would need to be inherently contrastive (Taylor 1993:213). It would have to reveal and explicitly state the concepts lying behind particular L2 forms. This is another element placing a cognitive pedagogical grammar within the scope of a Language Awareness perspective.

4.4 Grammar and CA

In most teaching approaches based on the rationale of Language Awareness the focus is on both making the learners aware of their mother tongue (MT) intuitions, and increasing their explicit knowledge of what happens in the foreign language (FL). As James and Garrett (1991:6) have noted, this suggests a scope for a new type of Contrastive Analysis "done by pupils as FL learners themselves, to gain linguistic awareness of the contrasts and similarities holding between the structures of the MT and the FL." The way in which this kind of Contrastive Analysis can be exploited in the classroom will depend on whether the students share a mother tongue or not. If they do, however, as is the case with EFL learners in the context of Greek state schools, I suggest that a pedagogical cognitive grammar need not remain covertly contrastive, as is proposed by Taylor (1993:213). Comparisons between the two languages can be overtly made in the classroom, as we shall see later. It has been suggested that such comparisons may help learners enhance their mastery of forms which present some similarities as well as some differences between English and Greek. In Ayakli (1992) for instance, a grammaticality judgement task concerning the complementation of
volitional verbs with to infinitives was given to A-class-Lykeion students as a pre-test. A control group received one period of remedial teaching, and an experimental group received the same teaching, which also included a short overtly contrastive component. In the post-test, the experimental group improved their successful judgements from 69.80% in the pre-test to 81.90%, while the control group dropped from 72.36% to 71.67% respectively. Although it is not safe to generalise from one small-scale experiment, one could note that these findings indicate a direction towards which more investigation is required.

5 Application in FLT: an example
On the basis of all this we can now move from general to specific by making some suggestions concerning the teaching of a specific grammatical point, for instance, the teaching of the present perfect construction. The suggested techniques can be used in the EFL classroom as long as the syllabus which is being followed contains a language awareness component. My main claim is that an overtly contrastive approach could facilitate the acquisition of the construction. Since a comparison between the two languages will be made by learners either consciously or unconsciously, it is preferable to control it as much as possible in order to accelerate or even to maximize the potential benefit from it (see also Marton 1981).

5.1 Focusing on what is idiosyncratic in the FL
The striking similarities between the experiential and the perfect of result in the two languages should be exploited and used as a basis for learners to understand the meaning of the construction. The main focus of the grammar lesson, however, should be on the differences between the variants of the present perfect construction and the extension principles that link them to the central member of the category in the two languages. Contrastive explanations concerning many different aspects of form, meaning, and use of the construction in the L1 and the L2 could be given in the classroom, depending on the level of proficiency, age, grade and other learner characteristics. As far as Greek state schools are concerned, contrastive remarks such as the ones suggested below could be made in all classes in which the present perfect is taught.

The main problem of Greek learners with the construction seems to concern its simple form vis à vis the imperfective aspect associated with it in English. In particular, it seems to concern the imperfective aspect of the participle on the one hand, and on the other, the inclusion of the moment of speaking (MOS) when there is an event or state which is not terminated at the MOS or "coding time", e.g. I have worked here for two years, but I still don't know where the headmaster's office is (possible in English, although more likely: "I've been working...", but possible only with the present tense in Greek). Much attention should be given therefore to the understanding of such cases by the learners.
The present perfect construction is not an item one would expect to learn within a short time span. The learning process may start at different times for each learner. This time may precede the presentation of the perfect construction in the classroom and it may vary according to learner characteristics, such as analyticity, attention, extra-curricular exposure to the target language, etc.

Once learners have found out about the construction, they may get to recognize it, and then they may start using it with conscious effort. An ICM of the English construction will be formed little by little, and the learners may reach a point when this ICM will be evoked automatically in both perception and production, i.e. when a mental space has been constructed from the activation of the appropriate ICM.

It should be kept in mind, however, that at early stages of their encounter with the construction, Greek learners are expected to relate it, consciously or unconsciously, to the Greek present perfect construction, which is, in turn, expected to function as a prototype from which learners may start their learning process of the English construction, as is supported by the data I have collected. Greek learners, therefore, do not have to form an ICM of the English construction from scratch. They will make use of the existing ICM for the corresponding category in Greek, which means that they will tend to perceive the aspect of the participle as perfective and the action as terminated. The Interlanguage ICM of the construction will be transformed as their experience of the English construction develops, and as a new mental space is being structured. Ideally, learners will reach a point when they can master the construction in both languages, i.e. when they can adjust themselves in either mental space, the one structured by the use of the construction in Greek, or the one structured by the use of the construction in English, in the same way as actors adjust themselves between onstage and real life situations. Moreover, awareness in the two languages, as far as the construction is concerned, should enable them to distinguish the similarities or differences between the construction in the two mental spaces, and to establish relations and equivalences. As they become more aware of the two different mental spaces, they may be able to make judgements of the sort "we can say THIS in English but not in Greek" and vice versa. Such statements are common in FL classrooms. They are often made by teachers, while questions of the sort "(how) can we say THIS in English?" are often asked by learners. The space-builder (Fauconnier 1985) in English shows that speakers are aware of the fact

---

4 Mental spaces are cognitive constructs reflecting the ability of the speaker to create representations of states of affairs and participants in those states. They are conceived situations relative to which sentences are processed. They have different statuses, which are in some cases indicated by explicit signals, called space-builders. Counterpart relations can hold between entities in different spaces. These relations are effected by means of connectors. Hypothetical situations and domains of human activity are examples of mental spaces. Classroom discourse could prove that
that an item they consider to be "the same" in the two languages may behave differently in each language. For example, teachers may comment on the fact that "we can use the present tense in Greek to say Παίζω μπάσκετ δύο χρόνια but we cannot use it in English; we say in English I have played/I have been playing basket-ball for two years". In this comment the present tense is considered to be "the same" in the two languages, since this form of the verb conventionally means in both languages that the action denoted by the verb takes place at or around the time of speaking. It is also stressed however, that one of the meanings of the Greek present tense, namely, the one referring to a time span stretching from a certain point in the past to the moment of speaking, is not expressed with a Simple Present form in English. In other words, while the category Present in Greek can include this meaning by extension of the prototypical meaning of the present (now, the moment of speaking), this extension is not conventionally possible in English. This meaning of the Greek Present is "rendered" in English by the present perfect construction instead of *I play basket-ball for two years. Greek learners often use this extended meaning of the Greek Present in English, in the same way as they use extended meanings of words, such as *My joy didn't keep long or *The concert kept two hours (see Ayakli 1991), where this less prototypical meaning of keep or hold (both expressed by χρήστω) in Greek is also used by learners as an extended meaning of keep in English instead of lasted long or went on for two hours. What is suggested here is that teaching each tense of the English verb separately does not maximize the potential benefit of grammar for learners. Pointing out the interrelationships existing between the use of different tenses in the two languages, on the other hand, could draw learners' attention to the language specific meanings of each tense and thus enhance their awareness.

Of course, the teacher's comment about the present tense that I mentioned earlier is not expected to be sufficient for students to learn how to use the present perfect construction in English. A great number of examples accompanied by a detailed explanation are necessary along with the creation of opportunities for learners to use the construction in focus. An example of a communicative activity creating information gaps, which can be used to this end would be students asking their classmates "How long ...?" questions and getting answers about things they own or do, as a game in the classroom (Ayakli 1992). A detailed explanation, on the other hand, should draw learners' attention towards those aspects of the construction that present more difficulties in the target language, so that they are better able to benefit from the examples they are exposed to and the activities in which they take part. It is important that all aspects of cognitive structure of the ICM of the construction are taken into consideration and are provided for and exploited in the classroom: metaphorical mappings, such as the relation

different languages are also processed linguistically as different mental spaces.
of abstract possession to the category of have-constructions in English and MG, image-schematic structure, which may be referred to with drawings such as visualisations of the time-line (sec 5.3) and its differentiations for each variant included in the category, and finally propositional structure. This does not mean that cognitive structure could be reduced to some ready-made substance with which the learners could be "spoon-fed". It simply means that the teaching procedure should be aimed at providing favourable conditions for learning. In what follows, we will discuss some ways of creating these conditions.

5.2 Making reference to abstract schemata
As has already been mentioned, before the explication takes place the learners may have encountered a greater or lesser number of instances of the construction. Nevertheless, the form of the construction should not be overlooked in the classroom. The formation of the construction has to be explained to the learners and the combination of the auxiliary with the past participle can perhaps be drilled with a number of common verbs.

It is crucial to point out that the atemporal relation combined with the auxiliary have in English is a participle and not an infinitive as in Greek. It is this seemingly unimportant detail, which usually goes unnoticed in EFL classrooms, that makes all the difference between the two languages. It is often regarded as too specific for learners. However, it is not so difficult to explain this difference to learners if the similarity of the English construction to the less prototypical Greek form of Parakeimenos B' is used as a basis of the explanation. In this form, the atemporal relation is also a participle, thus making the occurrence of states or imperfective events possible in the construction. By making reference to a form which is not totally unfamiliar to the learner, the teacher can help towards the reduction of the seeming arbitrariness of the FL system. With the use of this technique, the learner may be more open and ready to accept the imperfective aspect of the English construction at earlier stages of learning.

Another less prototypical have-construction in Greek, which could help learners find some correspondence between their L1 and L2, is the schema Have + time_span + that_clause (Ayakli forthcoming).

e.g. ἔχω διο ὀρές που τον ἔχει, ἀλλὰ δεν καταλαβαίνει τίποτα.
'I have been explaining to him for two hours, but he understands nothing'.

ἔχω ἵδη διο χρόνια που περιμένω αυτή την προαγωγή.
'I have already waited for this promotion for two years'.

ἔχω από τις 6 το πρωί (που κάθομαι) εδώ.
'I have been (sitting) here since six o'clock in the morning'.

In all these examples, the imperfective aspect which can coexist with the verb *have* within an expression of abstract possession, can provide a basis for learners to understand the potential occurrence of the imperfective aspect within the perfect construction in English. The interlanguage of Greek learners of English shows that they find their own interrelationships between expressions of abstract possession in the two languages. For example, they sometimes say *I have to see you for two years* 'I haven’t seen you for two years' (Alexander, 1991). In this case, the correspondence of the Greek subjunctive (*να δώ, να έρθω, να μιλήσω*, etc.) is most probably the cause of confusion. The meaning of the Greek subjunctive is the non-past as in

\[ Εξώ να σε δώ δύο χρόνια \]

'I have to see (= not seen) you for two years'.

It can only be used as a complementizer with other verbs. In the case of

\[ Εξώ να ψώνισω. \]

'I (still) have to do the shopping'.

the meaning of the complementizer is considered by learners to be the same in the two languages. So is the case of other verbs, such as volitional verbs:

\[ Θέλω να πάω (στο) σινεμά \]

'I want to go to the cinema'.

The combination of *have* with the subjunctive in the variant "*have*+time_span+subjunctive" adds anteriory and present relevance to the non-past meaning of the subjunctive. The time adverbial specifies the time of the non-occurrence of the situation described. The end of the time-span coincides with reference point (RP), which in this case is the moment of speaking or coding time. The variant "*have* + time-span + subjunctive" is linked to the central member "*have* + infinitive" of the experiential indefinite time type with a principle of extension, or schema, by which the central member denotes the possession of an action in a person’s experience, while the variant with the subjunctive denotes the possession of the same action as non-past, i.e., it denotes the non-posssession of this action in a person’s experience. When learners tend to apply the same extension principle to the L2 construction as they do in L1, they produce forms such as *I have to see you for two years*.

### 5.3 Using visualisation techniques in the classroom

One common method used by many grammar books (e.g. Tomson & Martinet 1960) is the time-line, which visualises the concept of time as a line stretching from the past through the present and to the future. The MOS or coding time is usually represented as a dot or intersecting line,
the past being the section of the line on the left of the dot and the future being on its right (see fig.1). If the imperfective aspect is represented by a bold line and the perfective aspect by a square dot, then there are three possible representations of the various instances of the present perfect construction: case 1 in figure 1 may be used to represent a state or a durative event, e.g. I have been here for two hours. Case 2 may represent an event that has happened at some indefinite time in the past, e.g. I have read this book. And case 3 an event that has happened more than once, e.g. I have already written three letters this morning.

![MOS Diagram](image)

Figure 1. Time-line visualisation. Adapted from Tomson & Martinet 1960.

This representation could help Greek learners realize that the simple form of the English present perfect construction can express not only the meanings of the Greek equivalent construction, but also the meaning represented in case 1. Learners were found to evaluate this method of explaining the meaning of the present perfect very highly. In previous research (Ayakli 1992) they ranked it first in their preferences among different components of remedial teaching, such as a communicative activity, and a presentation with examples on the blackboard.

The use of such representations, as the one described above, in the FL classroom is a direct implementation of the general statement that grammatical constructions are "grammaticised concepts" and that "formal differences between languages show differences in conceptualisation". The present perfect construction is a grammaticised concept involving the metaphor of "possession of an action in a person's experience", the image-schema of summary or sequential scanning of the time-axis, the reference-point model, etc. The central member of the category of have-constructions in MG, the experiential perfect of indefinite time, seems to be defined by a YES/NO answer to the question of whether the action denoted by the infinitive may or may not be included in a person's experience. The Greek learner of English has available, at the initial stages of learning the L2, an inventory of have-constructions structured around the central member of the MG category, and a number of language-specific principles of extension linking the variants to the prototypical member. It is the task of the teacher to help the learner realize which of these extensions can be applied in English or any other L2, which cannot, and which are convention-specific in the
L2. To this end, the teacher can apply language awareness perspectives/techniques on the teaching and learning of grammar.

6. Conclusions
The distinctive contribution of Cognitive Grammar is to approach syntactic structures in the same way in which words are approached, i.e. not as forms whose distribution is governed by an autonomous syntax, but as forms which symbolise meanings. Within the theoretical framework of cognitive linguistics, Interlanguage study and CA of L1 and L2 can promote our understanding of specific problems encountered by FL learners. Such analyses can be followed by both covertly and overtly contrastive approaches to FLT, which, when integrated in a language awareness perspective, could help learners enhance their insight into the FL.
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