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The United States has administered the educational system in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia) since World War II with questionable success and sometimes unfavorable effects on the native cultures. There is a need to develop new teaching methods for the region that are culturally sensitive and more effective than previous methods. To create a teaching method for English composition in Micronesian cultures which meets these goals, three areas are considered. First, significant aspects of the culture which affect the classroom situation are examined, from indigenous forms of education to the importance of English language use in their culture and society. Next, theories of second language learning and theories of composition instruction are identified and analyzed. Finally, an approach to teaching English composition in Micronesian cultures is presented. Assumptions about language are identified, objectives are stated, and examples of classroom exercises are given. While this process is directed toward developing a teaching approach for the Micronesians, this same design would work for teachers planning a classroom approach in any English as a foreign language class.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Teaching composition to students of English as a second language is often difficult, even under the best of circumstances. For teachers who have little understanding of the culture in which they are operating or who are not familiar with recent and pertinent advances in language teaching and composition instruction, the task becomes monumental. Unfortunately, in Micronesia many teachers, both native and American, have been functioning under either or both of these constraints for many years. Although some Americans hired to teach in the region may be familiar with current theories on teaching composition, they often arrive with only limited knowledge of the culture which they are entering and become frustrated with the lack of success they experience in the classroom. Others have had little or no training or experience in working with students of English as a second language. Even teachers who have had experience in the United States teaching English as a second language may need to rethink their approach when moving to a new setting. The Micronesian teachers, though intimately familiar with the needs and function of their native culture in relation to the education process, often are
not adequately trained in methods of teaching ESL or English composition. If the process of education is to be truly effective, teachers must take into consideration both culture and teaching theory in order to develop a method of teaching that is suited to their unique situation.

While the previous assertion may seem obvious to anyone trained in teaching, historically in Micronesia this practice has not been followed, especially with regard to sensitivity to culture. The Micronesians of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands have operated for the past seventy years under systems of education that were of foreign design and which often did not attempt to address the needs of the islanders or adapt to the native cultures.

American education in Micronesia, which began in 1947 with the establishing of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands at the end of World War II, has recently come under much criticism from educators, anthropologists, social scientists, and the Micronesians themselves. These groups are mainly concerned with the way the foreign system of education has disrupted the island cultures. In the past several years there have been many studies of education and schooling in the Pacific Islands (see Murray, Colletta, Conklin, Hezel 1977 and 1978, Smith). Most
of these studies conclude with projections about the
direction educational practices will take in the future.
Scholars agree that the islanders should take a more active
role in developing educational practices that are a
response to the needs of their islands rather than a carbon
copy of an alien system.

American involvement in the education of the region
is far less at the present time than it was even five
years ago. The Micronesians have been gradually taking
on more responsibility for their educational systems,
and the culmination of the trusteeship has resulted in
withdrawal of many American teachers and administrators.
However, while there are fewer Americans teaching in
Micronesia and American influence is decreasing, the role
of the English language as a language of wider
communication for the area is becoming more important
because of the increased need for cooperation between
islands, which do not have a common language, and because
of the need for the islands to operate as independent
nations at the international level. In addition, the
remoteness of the region and the limited availability
of transportation and communication systems make the need
for a mastery of composition skills even more important.
Since it seems clear that the English language will
continue to play a major role in the communication of
the region and in its continued economic growth and
development, it is equally clear that instruction in
English as a second language, including composition, will
continue to be necessary. This instruction should be
given in a way which maximizes learning and minimizes
conflict with the native culture.

This thesis will present an approach that a teacher
of English composition, Micronesian or American, could
use to develop a composition course specifically designed
to meet the needs of the region. This information will
be directed toward teachers of intermediate and advanced
ESL students at the secondary or post-secondary levels.
To develop this approach there are three areas that must
be considered. First, I will examine significant aspects
of Micronesian cultures which may affect the education
process such as indigenous patterns of education, cultural
thought patterns and styles of rhetoric, and patterns
of language use in various social contexts. In the next
two chapters I will discuss some current theories about
language teaching and composition instruction. The final
chapter will synthesize this information, sometimes
modifying theories, to develop an approach to teaching
English composition in Micronesia which is both sensitive
to the needs of the region and theoretically sound.
The first step in developing a classroom approach is an assessment of the needs of the group which will be receiving instruction. English teachers in Micronesia or in any setting which is outside of the teacher's own native land and culture, must understand a complex set of variables in order to plan and implement an effective language teaching program. These variables include a sense of the role of education in the culture, aspects of the culture that relate to the educational process, and perhaps most important, the sociolinguistic conditions of the culture in which the language instruction will be introduced.

To understand the role of education in Micronesian cultures, it is important to note that since the introduction of formal schooling in the islands, Micronesians have participated in systems of education that were not their own. Public schooling was begun in 1915 by the Japanese, and for the next thirty years the Japanese used the education system as a means of indoctrinating the natives in Japanese culture and language. When the United States government took over trusteeship of the islands in 1947, we continued to develop
a system of public education. While the Americans did allow the Micronesians more opportunity to participate in the school system by giving them a voice in planning educational programs and by allowing them to teach in the system, what evolved was essentially "a copy of school organization in the United States...an American product, adjusted somewhat to the exigencies of the island's geography and cultures" (Murray 90). Essentially, the Micronesians have never had the opportunity to develop a system and philosophy of education that is a reflection of their own culture and values.

Despite the fact that the educational systems were of foreign design and reflected foreign values, the Micronesians were quick to accept the idea that formal education was the key to success and prosperity. One expert, who has been studying the effects of education in Micronesia for many years, observed that the Micronesians were quick to "look to the school as the quasi-magical means of introducing the millenary age of material prosperity into their society" (Hezel, "In Search" 47). Nat Colletta, in studying the effects of American schooling on the natives of Ponape, found that Ponapean parents perceived "formal schooling as an avenue of access to three things: to Western occupational roles in government employment; to the concomitant financial and
material benefits for the family; and to the attached social status" (Colletta 89). Especially during the late 1960's and through the 1970's, when money for education programs was pouring in from the United States government and when many new jobs were being created, many Micronesians began to feel that education was the "panacea, the solemn answer to all problems" (Colletta 131). The number of high school graduates on Truk jumped from only 295 in the years from 1965 to 1969, to 1323 in the years from 1978-1983, a trend that was reflected in most other Micronesian nations (Hezel, "Education Explosion" 32). This is partially due to more and better educational facilities, but it also reflects the desirability of education for Micronesian young people.

Unfortunately, this enthusiasm for education has been tempered with growing feelings of dissatisfaction on the part of the Micronesians, especially in the past decade. The growth in government jobs in the 1970's was absorbed by the new wave of high school and college educated Micronesians who took advantage of U.S. financial aid packages, including Basic Educational Opportunity Grants offered to the islanders. However, while the number of students continued to grow in the late 1970's and early 1980's, economic growth was not keeping pace. Many educated Micronesians were being graduated into an economy
that offered little or no prospects for jobs. Parents and children alike began to blame the educational system "for its failure to bring employment, long regarded as the sure reward for twelve years of schooling. With jobs no longer the certain result of education, some parents have pulled their children out of school ... rather than risk a vain investment of their children's time in a system that no longer guarantees a source of support later on" (Hezel, "In the Aftermath" 4). In addition to the economic disillusionment, there has been a sense of culture conflict and an erosion of indigenous values directly related to the rise of American education. American education typically stresses, either directly or implicitly, "alien objectives of individualism, independence, freedom, and democracy ... which tend to raise aspirations for personal change in the ... students" (Colletta 83). These American values then come into direct conflict with indigenous norms of "hierarchical authority, interpersonal dependence, and strict control" which are present in varying degrees in all Micronesian cultures (Colletta 83). This conflict, which is faced by the student and by the society as a whole as young people reject traditional respect behaviors and subordinate roles, leads to a variety of reactions noted by Colletta, which can range from withdrawal and deviance/rebellion to conversion to biculturality (84).
Most often, older Micronesians feel the danger of losing traditional culture in a gradual "Americanization" of Micronesia. This disillusionment with the process and product of foreign education, combined with the dissolution of the U.S. trusteeship, has led to a movement to change the educational systems in Micronesia to meet the economic needs of the students while preserving traditional value and culture. Meanwhile, Micronesians are struggling to balance their belief in formal education with the disappointing reality of the personal, social, and economic effects of the current educational systems.

Besides cultural attitudes toward education, other cultural variables may affect the success of classroom instruction. The first of these is indigenous patterns of learning. Education in Micronesia, until formal institutions were introduced by foreigners, consisted of the transference of cultural knowledge in real life situations (without the aid of a formal educational system as we define it). The "traditional Micronesian learning pattern" involved a process of "quiet observation, private trial and, finally, successful public imitation" (Conklin 40). Children's play activities are often centered around observation and imitation of adult behaviors (Colletta 25). Instruction is rarely given directly. "Indigenous education is not just a listening process where the burden
rests upon the teacher, but is a full educational experience, ... with the learner actively seeking what he needs to know" (Colletta 26). Colletta and Conklin both note that an exception to this type of education occurs with special skills, such as medicine, magic, or leadership skills. Information about these subjects is sometimes transmitted directly, but only very gradually. A successor may reach full adulthood before he learns all that he needs to know. Another important aspect of native learning is that individuals are singled out for instruction in additional skills on the basis of interest and demonstrated ability. Not all young men are instructed in canoe building, only those who show desire or talent in that area. With occasional exceptions, modeling is the teaching method most often employed.

Another important feature of the Micronesian personality, somewhat a result of the cultural approach to learning, is the idea that education must be practical. Both Hezel and Colletta note that the higher value placed on education is a direct desire for material gain. Micronesians do not value learning for its own sake. An American science teacher gives an interesting account of the failure of a lesson designed to teach the causes of rainfall, a lesson which had been quite successful in the United States. The Ponapean students' response
to the experiment and demonstration on the causes of rainfall was "utter boredom." In an attempt to explain the reason the lesson failed, a Ponapean teacher responded, "You know that it rains, I know that it rains, don't you think that the class knows that it rains?" (Colletta 31). This lack of interest in secondary analysis can be attributed to the choice to adopt a "participative rather than an analytical mode of dealing with the world" (Colletta 31). Conklin asserts that this same practicality is evident for the Micronesians as a group (41). There will be little motivation to learn if the Micronesian students cannot see a practical use for the knowledge in their normal range of activity.

Cultural expectations about individual and group behavior can also have an impact on the educational process. The American practice of singling out individuals for either praise or rebuke is foreign to the Micronesian culture. "Salient among the cultural characteristics of the Micronesians is their reticence to put themselves forward and the value they place on group harmony or consensus and on maintaining face in public" (Conklin 40). When in public, a child will demonstrate only learned behavior which he/she is sure has been sufficiently mastered. There is also a reluctance on the part of Micronesians to exhibit behavior that is not appropriate
to the group. Classroom procedures that are designed to encourage debate and individual assertions of ideas which may not be shared by the group will probably be met with quiet resistance and general unresponsiveness.

Another aspect of Micronesian culture that should be considered is traditional behaviors, which require displays of respect to others on the basis of age or clan affiliation. These behaviors may influence the learning process in several ways. First, there are traditional systems of political, social, and economic influence that survive despite foreign influences to the power structure. Alkire, in his book on the peoples and cultures of Micronesia, notes that "sociopolitical organization" in all Micronesia was based on rank or clan (22). These clan affiliations and rankings are still quite influential in many cultures and can cause stress in interactions among students because of inequalities, competitiveness, or required respect behaviors. Though the subtleties of clan relationships are often impossible for a non-native to detect, teachers can investigate them if there seems to be tension in the relationships among members of a class. A second type of respect behavior prevalent in Micronesian cultures is the belief that wisdom accrues with age. In some cultures, such as in Kosrae, a person is not considered to have reached adulthood and maturity
until middle age. Youthful exuberance and aggressive behavior are negatively valued, while age and socially controlled behavior are highly valued (Conklin 25). Traditionally, an elder's knowledge is transmitted in a fragmentary way over a long period of time. A young person is "tested on [the] ability to piece together the whole from the parts he has been given" (Conklin 41). Conklin notes that that "this suggests an indirect, perhaps circular questioning approach, rather than the linear, direct method that is the basis for the scientific mode of thinking that underlies Western thought" (41). This idea has important implications for an English composition teacher. Students may have trouble mastering the rhetoric of English paragraphs and essays, since the direct method is not the approach used within their culture, either to give or receive information.  

Studies done by cultural anthropologists show another interesting and pertinent aspect of the Micronesian personality: their propensity for concrete rather than abstract thinking. Barnett in his studies of Palauans, Gladwin and Saranson in their studies of Trukese, and Colletta in his studies of Ponapeans have all found this to be true. Their studies show that the islanders respond to their environment with little invention and originality. Responses tend to be literal and concrete, and they often
cannot see beyond the literal meaning of words. Gladwin and Saranson attribute this to be due in part to the desire not to offend anyone. To act originally would be to create the "possibility that one's opinions and reactions will not coincide with the interpretation of the situation made by one's fellows" (270-1). Colletta gives a more thorough discussion of the phenomenon:

The Ponapean tends to make mental associations which are concrete and immediate rather than abstract or defined in terms of multiple causation. He learns by listening, watching, or doing, not by reading. He stores no knowledge in symbols remote from contemporary applications.... Classification, experimentation, and abstraction may occur for practical knowledge (i.e. totemic classification), not as ends in themselves.... There is no reflective choice, only spontaneous, uncritical, and immediate action.... Thus, in the forming of opinions, emotional response takes the place of logical demonstration. (30)

Colletta relates these ideas to themes from the indigenous educational process in which memorization and direct imitation are valued over free thought and creative initiative. This aspect of the Micronesian personality can have a significant impact on the ability to do some tasks usually required in composition classes such as determining causality, doing critical analysis, and advancing a logical argument. Skills that come somewhat naturally for American students may be more difficult for these students to master because the skills, and ways of thinking, are not used in their everyday life.
In addition to considering student attitudes toward education when designing an approach for teaching a language skill such as composition, it is also important to consider the role of language in the culture and society where instruction will occur. Dubin and Olshtain, in *Course Design: Developing Programs and Materials for Language Learning*, recommend considering four factors: the language setting, the political and national context, patterns of language use in society, and individual and group attitudes toward language (6). By assessing these factors, teachers can get a clear representation of the needs of the community. This information can help them define realistic goals for instruction and enable them to pinpoint areas where affective factors, such as low motivation or resistance to target language use, may interfere with the learning process.

Support for the target language, in this case English, and motivation to learn it can vary greatly in accordance with the language setting. "Therefore, an initial survey of the language setting should provide a description of the role of the target language and the roles that all other languages fulfill in the local community" (Dubin and Olshtain 7). A wide variety of patterns of language use exist for English. Often there is confusion about the definition of and distinction between ESL (English
as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language), and often there is the mistaken belief that these designations represent only two distinct categories of language use and instruction within second language education. In reality, however, these are blanket terms which cover a wide variety of language use situations and behaviors. Dubin and Olshtain suggest viewing these two terms as the extreme ends of the following continuum:

[E]nglish speaking setting where the language is spoken natively by most of the population.

[C]ountries in which English is one of two or more official languages spoken natively by at least part of the population.

[C]ountries where English is the only official language but is not the native language of more than a small minority of the people. [In this setting the English language is usually used as a language of wider communication (LWC)] for international needs and for internal communication among speakers of different languages.

[C]ountries where English is neither the national language nor one of the official languages, but is given special status because of historical factors or social and economic reasons ... In some of these countries English is the medium of instruction in the school system, or at least for a part of the course of study, while in others it only has the status of a major foreign language, one which is compulsory and highly valued as a prestige subject in the curriculum.

[C]ountries where English is taught as only one of several foreign languages available to students within the school system, even though in practical terms it may be recognized as the most important foreign language. (7-8)

This continuum is useful for helping to determine the
level of support a learner will find for a target language in the immediate environment. Settings at the upper end of the continuum will generally provide more out of the classroom support for English, while settings at the lower end of the continuum will generally provide less support for the learner. This support includes opportunities and motivation for the students to use the target language.

The language setting in Micronesia is somewhere near the middle of the continuum. Although English has been the primary language used in education since the mid 1960's, "outside of Guam, only one percent of American Micronesians indicate that English is their language of choice for personal use" (Conklin 43). Although English has been the official language for over two decades, most Micronesians continue to use their native language for activities in everyday life. English does play a significant role as a LWC in the region and as an access to higher education, government employment, and modernization. However, cultural preservation has recently become a major consideration for these islanders, and while English will probably continue to be used as a LWC, it is unlikely that it will be used more in daily life, especially with the dissolution of the Trust Territory, which gives the region self-rule.

The political and national context of the region,
which has undergone dramatic change in the last several years, will continue to have a significant impact on the language situation. The "break-up of the TTPI [Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands] into four distinct political entities has lessened the immediate importance of English as a lingua franca" (Conklin 46). In addition, most of the new post-TTPI require the use of an indigenous language for official purposes instead of the English-only policy that was in place under the mandate of the TTPI administration (Conklin 46). The switch to self-rule has generated feelings of nationalism and spurred the interest in preservation of native language and culture. It is reasonable to assume that this new attitude could reduce many students' motivation to learn English, especially those who have no plans to leave their village or island and who have little reason to interact with speakers of English or in situations where English will need to be used as an LWC. This is especially true in light of the previously mentioned Micronesian desire to see a practical use for knowledge they acquire. Teachers should realize that these political and national attitudes may interfere with student motivation, especially if the teacher seems to assert or imply that the English language is "superior" in some way to the native language or if classroom assignments are not related to the Micronesian
experience.

In addition to the political and national context, teachers need to consider patterns of language use in social contexts as they relate to education, the labor market, and the process of modernization (Dubin and Olshtain 9). A starting place for this analysis is in the public schools. A teacher must determine to what extent English is necessary for furthering one's education. The question that is central to this is, "Do students study geography, math, and other general subjects in the native language or in English?" (Dubin and Olshtain 10). Because of the change in political and national status, the answer to this question is complicated and involves some conjecture. Although in the past several years there has been a call for more native language materials for public schools, it is likely that English will continue to be the language used for instruction in most secondary schools and institutions of higher education, such as Micronesian Occupational College, Guam Community College, and the University of Guam, since these schools tend to draw students from diverse language backgrounds and because the cost of "wholesale translation or creation of entire curricula for each language community" does not "appear to be a realistic prospect" (Conklin 46). However, in many schools, especially at the elementary level and in
schools located in more remote villages, native speaking teachers will often supplement materials written in English with native language explanations. At the Belau Modekgnei School in Palau, where I taught for one year, it was common to hear native teachers lecturing in Palauan, although the school did have an English-only policy for academic subjects. Teachers would also frequently make worksheets for various subjects, i.e. science, history, or business, which used the native language. This school was in a remote village, and I understood, from conversations with other teachers, that at the public high school in Koror this was much less common, and that at the various parochial schools, Catholic and Seventh Day Adventist, the English-only policy was strictly enforced. The issue of language of instruction for the various regions is not a settled one. Conklin predicts that "the question of language of instruction ... will play an important role in educational debate in the coming years" (46).

The ability to speak English has been important for Micronesians wishing to enter the labor market under the TTPI. Most of the jobs were in government and education, which were mandated as English-only. Since the new policies and constitutions, post-TTPI, call for use of indigenous languages, there will be a decrease in the importance of English as a prerequisite for these
positions. However, many of these positions require advanced degrees that are usually obtained in Guam, Hawaii, or the U.S. mainland. To get the education needed to qualify for these jobs, English continues to be necessary. In addition, the presence of the American military population on Guam has made English speaking a highly desirable prerequisite for islanders seeking jobs in business, retail, and service industries. This has been true to a lesser degree in the major cities of the other islands. Moreover, in recent years there has been an increase in the number of Filipinos immigrating, sometimes illegally, onto Guam and also spreading through other Micronesian islands. These Filipinos often take blue-collar jobs alongside the Micronesians. Since most of these Filipinos do not speak a Micronesian language, English becomes the LWC for these workers. The 1980 U.S. Census data reported over 16,000 of these Filipinos living in Micronesia (Conklin 45). In addition, there has been an explosion of Japanese tourism within the islands in the past several years. Many new hotels have been built in recent few years to cater to the Japanese clientele. The effect on the use of English that the increasing Japanese economic influence in the islands will have is not clear. Japanese could begin to take the place of English as a desirable language for entrance into the
job market. However, I did observe, in Palau, a resistance on the part of some of the older Palauans who could speak Japanese to use it to communicate with Japanese tourists. This reluctance was explained to me by a younger Palauan as reflecting a dislike for the Japanese because of the oppression suffered by these natives and their families at the hands of the Japanese before and during World War II. Although the economic factors relevant to the patterns of language use seem to reflect a slight decrease in the role of English in the labor market, the ability to use the English language will probably continue to be important, especially as the islands attempt to continue the process of modernization and make a place for themselves in the world economy of the twenty-first century.

In determining the role of English in the process of modernization, the important question is, "To what extent is such [technological] information accessible to a community whose primary language is not an LWC?" (Dubin and Olshtain 13). There are several more questions that need to be considered in relation to this issue:

1. To what extent are technological and scientific journals available in the local language(s)?
2. To what extent are instructions and catalogues accompanying modern machinery made available in the local language(s)?
3. To what extent do professionals receive training abroad?
4. To what extent is the community dependent on assistance given by foreign experts? (Dubin and Olshtain 13)

The answers to these questions help reveal the importance of the English language to the Micronesians' further modernization, despite traditional resistance to the idea. As one expert has pointed out, because these islands must participate in today's economy, they will be forced to communicate with the outside world in a language other than their native ones. English continues to be the language through which Micronesians gain access to technological information. At the Micronesian Occupational College, Micronesians from all islands study subjects such as agricultural science, appliance repair, food service, and electrical technology, all in English. In situations such as in Micronesia, "the acquisition of the LWC" [which in this case is English] is a "first prerequisite" to technological progress (Dubin and Olshtain 13). Therefore, students at the college or university level, or students preparing to continue their studies at these levels, may be highly motivated to acquire English as a necessary step to gaining knowledge that will allow them to participate in a career which requires specialized technological knowledge unavailable to them in their own language.

The information gathered about societal trends within
the region helps to define group attitudes toward both
the language and the educational process. In terms of
language, Micronesians may be somewhat resistant to the
use of English because of feelings of nationalism and
a renewed interest in preserving traditional languages.
Also support for the language within the culture may be
low because English is used as a principal language in
only a small percentage of the homes in Micronesia. It
can be expected that Micronesians will have high motivation
and support for the language only if they see a practical
use for it in their lives, or as a way to achieving
personal goals. There may also be resistance to the
learning process if traditional American methods, which
conflict with native learning patterns and cultural values,
are used to teach the language. To reduce this resistance
and resulting conflict and anxiety, teachers should try
to create approaches to teaching which are "responsive
to the unique characteristics of the constituent cultural
communities" (Conklin 47). In addition, teachers need
to be aware of the individual attitudes toward language
use that are present in each classroom situation.
Individual students will reflect the general cultural
attitudes to differing degrees. Dubin and Olshtain
recommend several ways a teacher can make an assessment
of individual attitudes, from mere observation to different
types of questionnaires (15-17). When using a questionnaire, however, it is important to remember that, in an effort to please, students may give answers which may not be accurate. This is especially true with the Micronesians, who often wish to avoid being confrontational or putting another person (or themselves) in an embarrassing situation. However, the importance of determining affective factors that may influence the language learning situation will be more clear when discussed in relation to current theories of second language teaching. So, before making any specific recommendations about design for a course in English composition for the Micronesians, it is necessary to first examine theories of second language teaching and current research on composition.
CHAPTER 3
Second Language Teaching

Just as the content and structure of the classroom activities must be sensitive to the culture in which they are being presented, it is also important that the ideas about language, language learning, and language use represented in the theories underlying these activities be compatible with each other and with the learning situation as a whole. Achieving this goal of compatibility involves a process of analysis, decision-making, and synthesis. Fortunately, composition theory and theories of language teaching seem to have been evolving in a parallel course over the past several years toward more process oriented approaches that have communication rather than correctness as their goals.

Many new theories and approaches have been developed for second language teaching in the past hundred years. There are several good reference books that teachers can use to acquaint themselves with current approaches to language teaching such as McLaughlin (1987) and Brown (1987). One that is especially helpful is Richards and Rodgers, Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and Analysis. Richards and Rodgers provide a comprehensive model for analyzing approaches to language
teaching which includes a discussion of the theories of language and learning that underlie the approach, as well as a discussion of course design including syllabus, teacher and learner roles, and classroom procedures. This format is extremely useful for a teacher who wishes to take into consideration both theory and classroom procedures when choosing a teaching method. The following brief summary of approaches to language teaching in the past hundred years is based in part on Richards' and Rodgers' approach to the study of language teaching practices.

THE GRAMMAR-TRANSLATION METHOD

For several centuries, and until the early 1900's, the major approach to formal language teaching was through the study of grammar. Methods based on this approach have roots in Latin grammar teaching in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The modern manifestation of this approach is most widely known as the Grammar-Translation Method. In this method the focus is on developing reading and writing skills, with little attention given to the learner's speaking and listening skills. The goal for the student is to be able to accurately read and translate written material between the student's native and target language. The key to
learning these skills is through studying and analyzing grammar rules. This is done deductively, most often in the student's first language. Grammar rules are presented and explained, then students practice and apply this knowledge by translating sentences into and out of the target language. Often a longer reading selection is also used to demonstrate the rule and to provide additional opportunity for translation. Vocabulary lists are also used in this method. They are usually bilingual, and the principle of selection is simply the word's occurrence in a text that is to be translated. The Grammar-Translation Method has been widely criticized in recent years because of the "tedious experience of memorizing endless lists of unusable grammar rules" (Richards and Rodgers 4). In addition, recent studies have shown that this method does not lead to communicative proficiency in the target language.4

Richards and Rodgers assess the current state of the Grammar-Translation Method in the following way:

...though it may be true to say that the Grammar-Translation Method is still widely practiced, it has no advocates. It is a method for which there is no theory. There is no literature that offers a rationale or justification for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology, or educational theory. (4-5)

Although elements of the Grammar-Translation Method are
still sometimes used in classrooms today, new developments in linguistic theory, psychology, and education have revolutionized language teaching.

Approaches to language teaching in the past century have been closely related to new developments in linguistic theory. As structural linguistics began to replace traditional grammar as a field of linguistic study, many new theories evolved that were based on a structural theory of language. The Oral Approach/Situational Language Teaching and the Audiolingual Method both rely strongly on a structurally based syllabus as a guide for presenting and teaching language. Methods based on structural linguistics share the view of language as "a system of structurally related elements for the encoding of meaning, the elements being phonemes, morphemes, words, structures, and sentence types" (Richards and Rodgers 49). In this method, learning a language means "mastering the elements or building blocks of the language and learning the rules by which these elements are combined" (Richards and Rodgers 49). The Oral Approach and the Audiolingual Method were based on the emerging science of behavioral psychology. In these methods, language learning is seen as a habit forming activity, involving stimulus, response, and reinforcement. For this reason these methods relied heavily upon drills and
repetition. To better understand the approaches developed during the 30's, 40's, and 50's which were based on a structural theory of language, it is necessary to more closely examine these theories and the teaching methods resulting from them.

The Oral Approach/Situational Language Teaching

The Oral Approach was developed by British linguists, primarily Harold Palmer and A. S. Hornby, during the 1920's and 1930's. They were attempting to develop an approach to language teaching that involved "systematic principles of selection (the procedures by which lexical and grammatical content was chosen), gradation (principles by which the organization and sequencing of content were determined), and presentation (techniques used for presenting and practicing of items in a course)" (Richards and Rodgers 33). In developing this "systematic" theory they relied heavily on a combination of structural linguistics and behaviorist psychology. Structuralists regarded speech as the basic form of language, and structure as the determining principle of speech. Therefore, the resulting theory maintained that the language should first be taught orally, with mastery of the spoken language as the goal, before moving on to instruction in reading and writing. Grammar should be
presented so that mastery of "simple" forms precedes the introduction of "complex" ones. Mastery of vocabulary was also an important part of this approach. Vocabulary was selected based upon new research at that time which showed, primarily by way of frequency counts, that a core of approximately two thousand words occurred most often in written texts in English. It was assumed that familiarity with these words would greatly increase the learner's ability to use the language. This approach to presenting vocabulary was significant because it was the first attempt to provide a scientific method for the selection of vocabulary items. Another unique aspect of this approach, the one that caused the theory to become more widely known as Situational Language Teaching, was the assertion that "knowledge of structures must be linked to situations in which they could be used." This was an attempt to recognize language as "a purposeful activity related to goals and situations in the real world" (Richards and Rodgers 35).

These theoretical considerations were combined with the behaviorist view of language as a habit-learning behavior to produce a design for classroom activities that relies heavily on drill and repetition. Grammar and vocabulary are learned inductively through the situational way in which new words are presented. A typical
type of activity for this method would be to demonstrate new words or sentence patterns by visual activities such as "with objects, pictures, action, and mime" (Davies, Roberts, and Rossner 3). For example, the structure for the lesson might be "This is a ________." The vocabulary may be the words "pen," "pencil," "paper," "book," etc. The teacher would begin by holding up a pen and saying, "This a pen." The teacher and students would then repeat the statement, "This is a pen" several times before moving on to the next vocabulary item or target structure. In this method there is no explanation of grammar or structure, either in the native or target language. In the beginning these drills are strictly controlled for introduction of content and structure; however, as students progress they are given somewhat more freedom in these areas. In this method accuracy is the primary goal, and errors are to be avoided, corrected, and eliminated.

The Audiolingual Method

At the same time that British linguists were developing the Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching, American linguists were developing their own approach to teaching English as a second language. During the thirties and forties Charles Fries was a leader in developing programs for language teaching. Fries applied
structural theories to language teaching. He developed the idea of contrastive analysis between the native language and the target language in order to predict areas where "interference" from the native language may cause problems in learning the target language. American linguists at this time were also developing an Aural-Oral approach to language teaching. The emergence of behaviorist psychology in the 1950's also had an important effect on language teaching, adding a learning theory to supplement the language theory of the structuralists. It was from this tradition that the Audiolingual Method evolved.

Although the theories developed independently, the basic tenets of Audiolingualism are similar in many ways to those of the Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching, probably due in part to their common basis in structural linguistics and behavioral psychology. In the Audiolingual Method the focus is on the spoken word. Contrary to earlier views that saw the written word as the primary and pure form of the language, Brooks, Fries, and other proponents of Audiolingualism held the structural linguist's view that the "primary medium of language is oral" (Richards and Rodgers 49). In this method, again, structure is the key to mastering oral language. Language proficiency could be achieved through mastery of
progressively more advanced structures, from phonemes to morphemes, words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. Therefore, courses were designed to present material of increasing structural complexity. According to Brooks, "the learner's activities must at first be confined to the audiolingual and gestural-visual bands of language behavior" (50). Reading and writing are introduced late in the learning experience, after a student has gained both accuracy and fluency with listening and speaking skills. When reading and writing are introduced, the approach is highly structured and controlled. Students read and write only those structures they have already demonstrated accuracy and fluency with. Experimentation is discouraged because of the possibility of making a mistake. Throughout the course of instruction, the student "concentrates upon gaining accuracy before striving for fluency" (Brooks 50).

Like the Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching, the Audiolingual Method uses drills and repetition as a basis for classroom activities. In order to achieve the goal of native level proficiency in speaking skills, the emphasis is on correct pronunciation, rhythm, stress, and intonation. Dialogues also play a major role in this method of language teaching. These dialogues are scenarios that "provide the means of contextualizing
key structures and illustrate situations in which structures might be used as well as some cultural aspects of the target language" (Richards and Rodgers 53). For example, a typical introductory lesson from a Spanish course based on the principles of Audiolingualism begins with the following dialogue:  

SRTA. MARTI -- Buenos días, señor (señora) Ortega.  
SR. (SRA.) ORTEGA -- Buenos días, señorita Marti.  
Como está usted?  
SRTA. MARTI -- Muy bien, gracias. Y usted?  
SR. (SRA.) ORTEGA -- Regular, gracias. Hasta luego.  

(Turk, Espinosa, and Haro 3)  
The students would listen to this dialogue several times, either on a tape or as read by the teacher, paying close attention to the pronunciation and intonation patterns. The students would then attempt to repeat the dialogue exactly as it had been presented, with the teacher correcting errors in performance. These pronunciation exercises would be followed by any number of different drill exercises that practice pronunciation, structural patterns, and vocabulary items. In Language and Language Learning: Theory and Practice, Brooks presents several types of drills that may be used including repetition, replacement, restatement, and completion (156-161). As students become more advanced they may begin to do exercises that are less structured and controlled, such
as transformations, integrations, and rejoinders, but the focus is still on correct pronunciation, and responses are limited to the set of structural and vocabulary items in which the students have shown previous mastery. A student would be discouraged from attempting to use, in originating a new sentence, a structure or form which he did not have complete knowledge of since this would increase the possibility of error. This refusal to allow students to experiment with language led many to criticize this theory on the grounds that the procedures were boring and that the language skills learned did not transfer well to situations outside the classroom.

In the 1960's a new movement in American linguistics began which seriously challenged the structuralist view of language and the behavioralist view of language learning. Noam Chomsky, in *Syntactic Structures*, challenged the ability of existing descriptive grammars to account for the "productive potential" of language (preface). He also questioned the validity of structural grammar, particularly Immediate Constituent Analysis, because of the descriptive nature of the approach. Chomsky asserted that it was not sufficient for a grammar to simply be able to describe a given sentence of a language; a grammar ought to be able to produce or "generate" all possible sentences that a native speaker of a language
would recognize as grammatical.\textsuperscript{6} Crucial to this argument is the idea of grammatical "competence" versus grammatical "performance." For Chomsky competence was defined as a native speaker's "working intuitive knowledge of the basic system of his language ... whether he can describe this knowledge or not" (Herndon 147). While "performance" is defined as "the speaker's day-to-day use of the language [which] includes use of that competence plus all the dialect and idiolect differences, mistakes, lapses of memory, and so on" (Herndon 147). For Chomsky, a grammar ought to be a representation of language competence rather than a description of language performance. His theory of transformational grammar, therefore, was an attempt to create an "idealized description of the linguistic competence of native speakers of that language" (Lyons 94).

In attempting to construct a grammar based on these ideas about language, Chomsky literally turned the structuralist approach upside down. The structuralist's approach, with Immediate Constituent Analysis, would be to take a sentence that had been produced by a speaker of a language, analyze it in terms of the relationships between the constituents, and identify and describe these relationships and the constituents that produced them. Chomsky, however, approached language in the opposite
way. Instead of beginning with the reality of a sentence that had been produced, he began with the abstract concept of the sentence and then worked to pinpoint all possible syntactic combinations that could produce the grammatical sentences of a language. His idea was to construct the syntactic system of a language by pinpointing the possibilities for phrase structures and combinations of phrase structures in the production of the possible sentences of that language. His resulting theory, which came to be known as Transformational Grammar (or sometimes Transformational-Generative Grammar) consisted of a set of phrase structure rules and transformations that account for the various possibilities of combinations available in producing the infinite number of sentences in the English language.

The original theory first proposed by Chomsky in 1957 has been continually changed and refined, both by Chomsky and by other transformationalists. In addition to a syntactic component, the theory has been expanded to include semantic and phonological components. Herndon, in *A Survey of Modern Grammars*, describes the revised theory. The revised theory has three major components: a syntactic component, a semantic component and a phonological component. The syntactic component includes the base rules, stylistic transformations, and phonological
transformations. The semantic component includes the lexicon and the interpretation of meaning. The phonological component involves the translation into sound. Herndon stresses that the boundaries between the divisions are "more imaginary than real" (159). The components of the theory sometimes overlap, interact, and change as the theory continues to undergo refinements in an attempt to make it a more precise and complete representation of language competence.

In conjunction with this theory, Chomsky made some other assertions about language and language learning that severely challenged the behaviorist view of language. He argued that the behavioral approach was inadequate to explain the "creativity" of language -- "the fact that by the age of five or six children are able to produce and understand an infinitely large number of utterances that they have not previously encountered" (Lyons 93). The behaviorist model of stimulus, response, habit, conditioning, and reinforcement clearly is inadequate in explaining this language behavior. 7

Another of Chomsky's ideas that significantly challenged the structuralist-behaviorist view of language and language teaching was the idea of linguistic universals. Although structural linguists did discover the common roots of modern languages through a study of
language structures, structural linguistics, by virtue of its descriptive approach, is very useful in highlighting the diversity of the surface structure of languages. Each language has a grammatical structure that is distinctly different, at least in some areas, from any other. Chomsky's approach, however, lent itself to the discovery of similarities between the grammars of different languages. Chomsky, building on the work of the Russian linguist Roman Jakobson, asserted that:

There are certain phonological, syntactic and semantic units that are universal, not in the sense that they are necessarily present in all languages, but in the somewhat different, and perhaps less usual, sense of the term 'universal', that they can be defined independently of their occurrence in any particular language and can be identified, when they do occur in particular languages, on the basis of their definition within the general theory. (Lyons 111)

Chomsky held that the similarities between languages separated by both time and space are at least as significant as their differences. Using his own findings from work with transformational grammar and available information on how children learn their native language, Chomsky proposed the idea of a genetically endowed "language faculty" which contains the principles of universal grammar and which enables humans to unconsciously analyze, process, understand, and produce grammatical utterances in a language to which they have been exposed.
This idea, although it has been criticized on a scientific basis due to the lack of empirical evidence to support the hypothesis, has, nevertheless, been influential in changing the structuralist/behavioralist paradigm that had dominated language teaching for the first half of the twentieth century.

The overwhelming effect that Chomsky's theories have had on language teaching since the 1960's is undeniable. He has changed the way most scholars view language and language behavior. Unfortunately for educators, Chomsky never really intended his ideas to be used for the teaching of language. He clearly identified the inadequacies in a structural-behavioral approach to language without directly proposing an approach for language teaching that would take its place. In the wake of Chomsky, linguists and language teachers have been searching for ways to apply new ideas to language teaching.

Since the 1960's several theories of language teaching have been developed or proposed that take into account the new perspective Chomsky gave to language. Some theories combine ideas from cognitive psychology with the new linguistic perspective. Others are based on humanistic views of language, while others are based in studies in sociolinguistics. These theories, with their wide variety of theoretical constructs, represent a new
attitude toward language teaching, which is different in many ways from the previous structural-behavioral approach to language teaching. Even the approaches that continue to be based on a structural syllabus are clearly different than the previously discussed approaches. A closer examination of these approaches is necessary to understand the current state of language teaching pedagogy.

TOTAL PHYSICAL RESPONSE

Total Physical Response is a language teaching method which was developed in the mid 1960's by James Asher, a psychology professor at San Jose State University, and which was based in part on the work of Harold and Dorothy Palmer in their book *English Through Actions* (1925, 2nd ed. 1959). Asher's approach to language teaching combines elements of developmental psychology, learning theory, and humanistic pedagogy. The most significant feature of this approach is the idea that language skills can best be taught through the "coordination of speech and action" (Richards and Rodgers 87). This idea combined with ideas about the process of adult second language learning create the basis of the Total Physical Response approach.

Asher, like many other theorists in the past two decades, holds the belief that adult second language
learning is a similar or parallel process to first language acquisition in children. As a result, Asher places great emphasis on the use of commands as a way to elicit physical response and to create what he refers to as a "detailed cognitive map" of the language (11). For Asher, comprehension should precede production skills in adult language learners. Another important aspect of his approach is the attempt to take into account the role of affective (emotional) factors in language learning. Asher's approach greatly eliminates students' anxiety by allowing them to delay the production of language until they feel ready. Asher's theory is primarily directed toward teaching aural/oral skills at the beginning level, with the major goal being communicative proficiency in basic speaking skills.

In developing an approach to meet this goal, Asher combines a modified behaviorist approach with a structuralist view of language teaching. The classroom activities are primarily imperative drills, with role playing and slide presentations being introduced as the course becomes more advanced. The learners listen to teacher commands and perform accordingly. Role playing presents everyday situations in which language use would be needed. Slide presentations introduce new information and to provide the opportunity for the teacher to formulate
commands and questions based on the new material. Learners may delay the production of language until they feel comfortable. Language items in a typical Total Physical Response syllabus are organized in a structural way, with the imperative verb form as the primary structure. Grammatical and lexical items are learned in an inductive way through their use in the command drills. Choice of these items seems to be closely related to the ease with which they can be introduced into the classroom drills. Asher also believes that students should master "nonabstractions," primarily concrete nouns and imperative verbs, before moving on to more abstract uses of the language (Asher 11).

Some important aspects of Asher's theory represent the new attitude toward language teaching in the years since Chomsky. Asher's method shows a new consideration of the similarities between adult second language learning and first language learning in children. It also reflects a growing concern for the role of affective factors in language learning and a shift to a comprehension based approach to language learning. Asher places less emphasis on elimination of learner error in the early stages; however, in the later stages of language learning more error correction takes place as the teacher attempts to "fine tune" learner production (Richards and Rodgers 94).
Perhaps one of the most important aspects of Asher's theory is that he advocates using it in conjunction with other teaching methods: "the imperative is a powerful facilitator of learning, but it should be used in combination with many other techniques" (Asher 28).

SUGGESTOPEDIA

Of the new approaches, the one that seems to be the furthest removed from conventional linguistic and learning theories is Suggestopedia, an approach developed in Bulgaria at the Institute of Suggestology by Georgi Lozanov, a psychiatrist and educator. Lozanov's approach is unique in several ways. It emphasizes the roles of unconscious learning and affective factors in the study of language.

Bancroft, a proponent of Suggestopedia in the United States, explains the major aspects of Lozanov's learning theories. One is that students learn best from a source whom they perceive as authoritative. Therefore, Lozanov emphasizes that teachers maintain an authoritative stance through self-confidence, commitment to the method, personal distance, and a positive attitude. Learners, on the other hand, are expected to adopt a childlike role in the classroom, thus encouraging the adult language learner to "regain the self-confidence, spontaneity, and
receptivity of the child" (Bancroft 19). Learners are also encouraged to maintain a state of extreme relaxation and alert receptivity, which is conducive to unconscious learning. Another important aspect of this method is its "Double-Planedness." Lozanov believes that the environment in which learning takes place (classroom decor, shape and type of chairs, background sounds, etc.) has a far greater effect on learning than most people consider. These environmental considerations play an important role in the design of classroom procedures in this method, much more so than in most other language teaching methods. Intonation and rhythm patterns both of background sounds and of presented material are probably the most unusual and most crucial components of this approach. Teachers vary intonation pattern in presenting new material to dramatize it and to avoid boredom. Material is presented rhythmically, with an eight second beat count.

Rather than rely on current linguistic theory as a complement to his innovative learning theories and as the basis for selection of elements in Suggestopedia courses, Lozanov chooses to focus on communicative value and interest when choosing material as content for his language courses. The only structural element specifically mentioned in this approach is verb forms. Because of the emphasis on group activities, "all basic verb tenses
are introduced to the students as soon as possible" (Bancroft 170). Lozanov also places considerable emphasis on the mastery of large numbers of vocabulary items. Selection of these items seems to be based on their usefulness in the dialogues. Richards and Rodgers make the observation that for Lozanov "one feels that the linguistic nature of the material is largely irrelevant" (Richards and Rodgers 144). And, in fact, the Suggestopedia procedures have been used "in a number of Bulgarian schools for the teaching of a variety of subjects" (Bancroft 169). It is the learning theory and resulting classroom procedures that make the Suggestopedia approach unique.

Lozanov's Suggestopedia courses are intensive, having a small number of students (usually a dozen or so) who meet four hours a day, six days a week, for approximately a month. The goal of these courses is "to deliver advanced conversational proficiency quickly" (Richards and Rodgers 147). According to Bancroft, each four-hour class is organized into three parts, which is sometimes called the "suggestopadic cycle" (170). These three parts are as follows:

1) Review: In the first part, previously presented material is reviewed. Since structural drills and "mechanistic repetition" are antithetical
to the Suggestopedia approach, review is conducted through a series of "conversations, games, sketches, and plays" (Bancroft 170). During this period errors are corrected, but in a positive and encouraging way.

2) Presentation of New Material: New material is most often presented in dialogue form with an accompanying native language translation. Based on real life situations, dialogues are constructed to be practical, interesting, and "emotionally relevant" (Bancroft 170). Because Lozanov believes that "events or activities are better remembered than static tableaux," dialogues center around events and activities that can be acted out by the instructor and/or groups of students (Bancroft 170).

3) Seance (Session): The seance is the most innovative part of Lozanov's approach. The seance itself is divided into two parts: active and passive. In the active phase students relax, watch the text, and do rhythmic breathing while the teacher reads the material. The breathing is eight-count yoga breathing with "two seconds' inhalation; four seconds' breath retention; two seconds' exhalation" (Bancroft 170). The teacher
coordinates his or her reading of the material with this breathing so that the native language translation is given during the inhalation, the target language material is read during the retention phase, followed by a two-beat pause during the exhalation phase (Bancroft 171). During this reading, the teacher varies his or her voice level and tone to "provide contrast," to keep the material interesting, and "to prevent the rhythmically breathing students from falling asleep in class" (Bancroft 171). The second part of the seance is the passive or concert phase. This phase has three parts: a two-minute musical introduction, a twenty to twenty-five minute phase in which students listen with eyes closed while baroque music is played and while the teacher again reads and acts out the dialogue, and a two-minute conclusion of fast and cheerful music to bring "the students out of their deeply relaxed state" (Bancroft 171).

This is the design of a Suggestopedia course as presented at Lozanov's institute in Bulgaria. Modifications have been made to these procedures so that they may be used in American language teaching situations and may fit into the framework of existing schools. For example,
classes have been made larger, the time periods for each class have been reduced, and the music has sometimes been changed or abandoned (Bancroft 172). These classes have, however, made an attempt to include the ideas basic to the Suggestopedia approach, such as providing an attractive classroom, employing a dynamic teacher, and creating a state of relaxed alertness through rhythmic breathing, concentration, and/or music (Bancroft 172).

Although Suggestopedia has little basis in current linguistic theory and its link to established learning theories is virtually non-existent, it has been probably the most popularly publicized of the current approaches due to a favorable review which appeared in Parade magazine, which has a circulation of approximately 30 million Americans, on March 12, 1978 (Richards and Rodgers, 152). However, it has also been highly criticized in professional journals such as the TESOL Quarterly (see Scovel) for its lack of scholarly and scientific credibility.

Although there is much about the Suggestopedia approach that seems to be somewhat extreme, there are also some important ideas about language teaching that this approach highlights. One of these is the role of affective factors in adult language learning. Affective factors, such as motivation and anxiety, do seem to have
an important influence and impact on how proficient an adult will become in a foreign or second language. This theory also makes an attempt to appeal to the unconscious or subconscious abilities of learners. These same ideas, although used in less extraordinary ways, are common to many of the new approaches to language teaching.

THE SILENT WAY

The Silent Way is an approach to language teaching developed by Caleb Gattegno in the early 1970's. It is another theory that reflects changes in psychology and educational theories in the past several decades. For his theory, Gattegno combines ideas from cognitive psychology with theories of "discovery learning," which had become popular in the 1960's (Brown 142). He bases his approach to language teaching on three general assumptions about learning:

1) Learning is facilitated if the learner discovers or creates rather than remembers and repeats what is to be learned.

2) Learning is facilitated by accompanying (mediating) physical objects.

3) Learning is facilitated by problem solving involving the material to be learned. (Richards and Rodgers 99)
Each of these assumptions contribute significantly to the distinctive features of Gattegno's approach.

The first and third ideas manifest themselves most prominently in relation to the teachers' and learners' roles in the method. In the Silent Way, "the learner is a principal actor rather than a bench-bound listener" (Richards and Rodgers 100). The learner is encouraged to take responsibility for solving problems and creating heuristics for processing new linguistic material. Rather than presenting material authoritatively, teachers build choices into presented material, so that learners may then make choices "among equivalent expressions in a given set of circumstances" and "exercise ... initiative in attacking new material" (Stevick 42). Brown observes that the teacher is a "stimulator but not a hand-holder" and "is silent much of the time, thus the name of the method" (142). Many teachers have found adopting such an unobtrusive role to be one of the more challenging and difficult aspects of implementing this teaching method (Richards and Rodgers 107).

The second idea manifests itself most clearly in Gattegno's use of Cuisenaire rods and Fidel charts in the presentation of linguistic material. The rods are used to present vocabulary such as colors and numbers; adjectives such as long and short, and to elicit
comparisons and to present spatial relationships; and
to present verbs such as "move," "lift," "give," and
"take." The Fidel charts are color-coded pronunciation
and vocabulary charts which both reinforce concepts
introduced by the rods, and illustrate those that are
difficult to express using the rods alone.

In conjunction with his ideas about learning, Gattegno
holds an "openly skeptical view of the role of linguistic
time in language teaching methodology" (Richards and
Rodgers 101). He believes that the view of language which
linguistics takes is too narrow, and that it does not
take into account the broader spectrum of language use,
which is its role "as a substitute for experience"
(Gattegno 1972, in Richards and Rodgers 101). Nevertheless,
he seems to base his selection of material to be presented
on a structural approach toward language, with grammatical
and lexical items presented in an inductive way. From
an examination of the material to be presented, Richards
and Rodgers observe that "lessons follow a sequence based
on grammatical complexity, and new lexical material is
meticulously broken down into its elements, with one
element presented at a time" (101). In addition, unlike
many new language teaching approaches which emphasize
communication, the Silent Way presents language in an
artificial way through the use of rods and charts. The
general goal of this approach is to give beginning students "near native fluency" in basic elements of the new language, including "correct pronunciation and mastery of the prosodic elements of the target language" (Richards and Rodgers 103). An additional goal is to help students become better learners by making them autonomous and giving them "inner criteria" which will help with "one's education throughout all of one's life (Gattegno 1976, in Richards and Rodgers 103).

The classroom procedures of this approach are centered around the use of the rods and the color charts. Although Gattegno has not specified a precise order for presenting grammatical material and vocabulary items, the teacher presents colors, numbers, action verbs, pronouns, adjectives, and comparison words early in the course because of their ease of presentation in relation to the materials and their usefulness in everyday life (Richards and Rodgers 105). The teacher will first model a word or phrase, using the rods as a tool, and then attempt to elicit student responses without direct instruction, using the rods and various nonverbal clues and gestures. The type of feedback supplied by the teacher in this method is different from that supplied in many other teaching approaches. There is very little in the way of either positive or negative feedback in the form of judging
students' attempts as either "right" or "wrong." Teacher responses are given in "a totally matter of fact way" (Stevick 48). Students are supposed to feel that their response, right or wrong, is being neither praised or condemned, but rather is being "accepted and worked with" (Stevick 48). Richards and Rodgers liken the teacher to a "disinterested judge, supportive but emotionally uninvolved" (107). A complete account of Gattegno's teaching methods can be found in either of his books on The Silent Way.

The Silent Way, like other language teaching methods, has received its share of criticism. Brown notes that "students often need more guidance and overt correction than the Silent Way permits" (143). He questions the value of having a student puzzle for days over the discovery of a concept that could have been easily understood with direct guidance from the teacher. He also points out that the lack of variety in the teaching materials may lead to student boredom (143). Richards and Rodgers also note that there is much in this method that is traditional in the choice of material (111). It seems that the more innovative and important aspects of the approach are not the use of colorful charts or the silence of the teacher, but the importance of discovery, student autonomy and problem solving in language
Another important aspect of this approach, which is representative of the new post-Chomsky perspective, is the feeling that errors can be accepted and worked with as students strive for increased proficiency in the language. This level of tolerance was not present in earlier approaches.

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

This approach to teaching originated in Europe, primarily Britain, in the mid 1960's, and has become perhaps the most pervasive movement in language teaching in the past twenty years. Many scholars, both British and American, in the disciplines of functional linguistics, sociolinguistics, and philosophy have seen "the need to focus in language teaching on communicative proficiency rather than on mere mastery of structures" (Richards and Rodgers 64). More study has been done recently on communicative approaches to language than any other type of approach. Much of the research is devoted to defining "communicative competence" (see, for example, Canale and Swain 1980, Savignon 1972), creating various syllabi for a communicative approach (see Yalden 1983 for a survey of the major current syllabus types), translating the syllabi into teaching techniques, and producing textbooks for teachers wishing to use this approach. It is important
to note that the name Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), "rather than being used to designate a single, well-defined approach, is used to specify any of a series of teaching approaches "that [aim] to (a) make communicative competence the goal of language teaching and (b) develop procedures for the teaching of language skills that acknowledge the interdependence of language and communication" (Richards and Rodgers 66). This diversity makes defining and analyzing the approach both more complex and more general than was that of many of the approaches to language previously discussed.

The theory of language upon which Communicative Language Teaching is based differs significantly from previous approaches. Unlike many of the post-Chomsky approaches, which downplay the role of linguistic theory in language teaching, but which, nevertheless, use a structural approach to ordering and presenting material, proponents of Communicative Language Teaching work to provide a more comprehensive and functional alternative to previous linguistic theories. The basic assumption about language that underlies Communicative Language Teaching is language as communication. This idea represents a clear departure from the structural linguistic approaches which have been so prominent in language teaching. This new perspective brings with it a new goal
for language teaching: communicative competence. Not content with the rather narrow definition of linguistic competence provided by Chomsky, proponents of this approach have made an effort to define this term to include a broader scope of language activity. Richards and Rodgers highlight a good recent definition of this term, proposed by Canale and Swain, who divide communicative competence into four dimensions:

1) Grammatical competence -- Grammatical and lexical capacity, including phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic components, what Chomsky calls "linguistic competence."

2) Sociolinguistic competence -- An "understanding of the social context in which communication takes place."

3) Discourse competence -- The "interpretation of individual message elements in terms of their interconnectedness and of how meaning is represented in relationship to the entire discourse or text."

4) Strategic competence -- The "coping strategies that communicators employ to initiate terminate, maintain, repair and redirect communication." (Richards and Rodgers 71)

This broader definition of competence helps reveal another
area where the CLT approach differs from many of the previous approaches: a concern with function rather than form. In Communicative Language Teaching, "form is not the primary framework for organizing and sequencing lessons. Function is the framework through which language forms are taught" (Brown 213). Learning a language then becomes the process of "acquiring the linguistic means to perform different kinds of functions" (Richards and Rodgers 71). A final significant way in which this approach is different from many earlier approaches is the stress it places on fluency rather than accuracy. "Accuracy is secondary to conveying a message" (Brown 213). A student's utterance is evaluated on the basis of its "communicative success," the success with which the intended meaning was communicated, rather than against some ideal linguistic standard. In Communicative Language Teaching, the student is always striving to learn to "use the language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts" (Brown 213).

The theory of learning that accompanies this theory of language is more nebulous. From an examination of classroom practices, Richards and Rodgers discern three learning principles used in this approach:

1) The communication principle: "Activities that involve real communication promote learning."
2) The task principle: "Activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning."

3) The meaningfulness principle: "Language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process." (Richards and Rodgers 72)

Others, such as Savignon (1983) and Krashen (1981), have proposed learning theories based on research on the process of second language acquisition. Theories which have a basis in language acquisition research "typically stress that language learning comes about through using language communicatively, rather than through practicing language skills" (Richards and Rodgers 72).

Discussing classroom design for a communicative approach is difficult because of the diversity within the approach. Richards and Rodgers, who present a modified version of Yalden's classification system, list eight different CLT syllabus types: structures plus functions; functional spiral around a structural core; structural functional, instrumental; functional; notional; interactional; taskbased; learner generated (Richards and Rodgers 74). Because of the wide variety in types of syllabus, there is a corresponding variety in the types of activities and materials used in the classroom.

Classroom activities can be divided into the categories.
of "functional communicative activities" and "social interaction activities." Functional activities are those where learners work, or work together, to solve problems or perform tasks. Social interaction activities are those where students interact in a conversational way and which can include activities such as dialogues and role playing (Littlewood, in Richards and Rodgers 76). In addition to this classification, Richards and Rodgers have identified three different types of materials used in CLT classrooms: text-based, task-based, and realia. Text-based materials of this approach are often not significantly different from those of many structural based approaches. These materials often are "written around a largely structural syllabus, with slight reformatting to justify their claims to be based on a communicative approach" (Richards and Rodgers 79). Richards and Rodgers, however, do list examples of texts, such as Watcyn-Jones Pair Work, which are very different from previous texts and which directly engage students in cooperative and communicative ways to complete pair activities. Task-based materials are "typically two sets of material for a pair of students, each set containing different information" necessary for the completion of a task (Richards and Rodgers 80). These materials can also be used to provide opportunities for role playing
and cooperative drills and practice. **Realia** refers to the use of materials such as signs, magazines, newspapers, objects, and pictures in the language classroom, as opposed to the use of materials which have been produced specifically for classroom use. CLT, because of its focus on language as communication, has a much broader and more diverse set of materials than most other methods. There is also more flexibility in teacher and learner roles than in some other methods. The learner in this approach takes an active role, both in his/her own learning and as a member of the group. Often a cooperative approach to learning is stressed. The ideas that "failed communication is a joint responsibility and not the fault of speaker or listener" and that "successful communication is an accomplishment jointly achieved and acknowledged" are important aspects of this approach. In this approach error is often ignored unless it hinders clear communication. The teacher has many roles within this approach. The teacher is at different times a facilitator of communication, a group participant, an organizer of resources, a resource, and a guide to classroom activities" (Breen and Candlin, in Richards and Rodgers 77). Richards and Rodgers note three additional teacher roles: needs analyst, counselor, and group process manager (77).

The actual classroom procedures resulting from any
of the various adaptations of this approach can be described as being "evolutionary rather than revolutionary" (Richards and Rodgers 81). Many traditional types of exercises, such as dialogues, role playing, and game playing, have simply been modified to be compatible with the basic assumption that language is communication. The most positive aspect of Communicative Language Teaching is its more holistic approach. CLT attempts to incorporate the learning of a language into the context of the student's life and experience rather than to isolate the language and the student's language use. The change in attitude toward learner error is also significant. The idea of error as failed communication rather than deviation from a linguistic standard allows for a more positive, less judgmental attitude, which decreases learner anxiety and allows for a more constructive view of the learning process. In addition, because of the wide range of communicative activities, teachers have an unlimited number of choices for lesson content and activities, all of which can involve using the target language for communication.

In addition to the approaches previously described, another theory about language learning is worth considering. Stephen Krashen has introduced a set of five interrelated hypotheses about second language learning, sometimes referred to as "The Monitor Model" or
"Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis," that represent an attempt to present a comprehensive model of how the process of becoming competent in a second language works for adult language learners. While Krashen's theory has been highly controversial and is often the target of critics (some of whom have quite valid objections to Krashen's ideas, which I will address later); nevertheless, there is much useful information in Krashen's theory that a teacher of English as a second or foreign language should incorporate into classroom procedures.

Krashen's approach is based upon five hypotheses:

1) The Acquisition-Learning Distinction: An assumption basic to Krashen's theories of language is the distinction between language acquisition and language learning. Krashen asserts that human beings have two distinctly different processes that are at work when developing the ability to use a second language: acquisition and learning. He defines acquisition as a "subconscious process" in which "language acquirers are not usually aware of the fact they are acquiring a language, but are only aware of the fact that they are using the language for communication" (Krashen, Principles 10). Acquisition "requires meaningful interaction in the target language -- natural communication -- in which speakers are concerned not with the form of their
utterances but with the messages they are conveying and understanding" (Krashen, *Second Language 1*). The product of this process of language development, "acquired competence" (sometimes referred to as "fluency"), "is also subconscious" (Krashen, *Principles 10*). Learning, on the other hand, is a conscious process in which students are presented with explicit rules of the language, which they consciously practice, discuss, and apply. The result of language learning is "'knowing about' a language," sometimes referred to as formal or explicit knowledge of a language (Krashen, *Principles 10*). This distinction between acquisition and learning is not new with Krashen; it is based on research in how children develop their language skills. What is important in Krashen's theory is the idea that while adults may not "be able to achieve native-like levels in a second language ... adults can access the same natural 'language acquisition device' that children use" (Krashen, *Principles 10*). Previously, many theorists believed that the development of cerebral dominance in human beings, which many believe is complete by puberty, renders the type of language acquisition used by children inaccessible to adults. Krashen reviews and criticizes recent research findings in this area and proposes an alternative explanation, the "affective filter hypothesis," to explain the difference between child and
adult language acquisition (Krashen Second Language 70-82).

2) The Affective Filter Hypothesis: Krashen relates his ideas about the differences between adult and child language acquisition to the onset of the stage of formal operations proposed by Piaget. At the stage of formal operations, adolescents become abstract thinkers. This ability to think abstractly, to know rules consciously and apply them to a whole class of situations, allows the adult to be much better at language learning than children. However, the onset of this stage also makes adolescents more aware of the way others perceive them. This can inhibit adult ability to acquire language because it raises what Krashen calls the "affective filter."

The affective filter, as used by Krashen, means the set of beliefs and attitudes students have about themselves and their ability to use language that acts upon, filters, and sometimes inhibits both the students' reception of linguistic information and their production of language. Krashen identifies three categories of affective variables:

a) Motivation: Performers with high motivation generally do better in second language acquisition.

b) Self-confidence: Performers with self-confidence and a good self-image tend to do better in second language acquisition.
c) Anxiety: Performers with low anxiety appear to do better in second language acquisition, whether measured as personal or classroom anxiety.  

(Krashen, Principles 31)  

The affective filter is significant for Krashen because even in situations that are ideal for acquisition, where there is a high level of what he designates "comprehensible input," the affective filter can prevent acquisition because the input does not "reach that part of the brain responsible for language acquisition, or the language acquisition device" (Krashen, Principles 31).  

3) The Monitor Hypothesis: As previously mentioned, one of the major differences between adults and children is the adult ability to think abstractly. This difference has a significant impact on the adult ability to learn language. Krashen's Monitor Hypothesis "posits that acquisition and learning are used in very specific ways" (Krashen, Principles 15). He asserts that conscious knowledge of rules is available only to edit or monitor communication that is produced. According to Krashen, "in general utterances are initiated by the acquired system ... our conscious learning may be used to alter the output of the acquired system, sometimes before and sometimes after the utterance is produced" (Krashen, Second Language 2). Presenting explicit rules of language use and
correcting student errors are useful and necessary means of developing the adult's ability to learn and monitor language. In addition, Krashen outlines three other requirements for successful use of the monitor: time, focus on form, and knowledge of the rule which applies to the situation. For a person to be able to monitor effectively, to use the language learning, all of these requirements must be met. For this reason Krashen asserts that language learning plays a very small role in most spontaneous communication, conversation, but can play a much greater role in writing and in prepared speech.  

Individual differences in the way students use the monitor is also an important consideration in Krashen's theory. He discusses three types of monitor users: overusers, underusers, and optimal users (Krashen, Second Language 4). A monitor overuser is a person who is so concerned with the correctness of the utterance, with knowing and applying a rule, that the fluency of the communication is severely hindered. An underuser, on the other hand, is a person who has little or no concern for learning or applying the rules of the language. It should not be presumed, however, that this group performs more poorly in communication, since they have often acquired a great deal of the language and have a good feel for the language they are using. The optimal monitor
user is "...the performer who uses learning as a real supplement to acquisition, monitoring when it is appropriate and when it does not get in the way of communication" (Krashen, Second Language 5). For Krashen, the function of learning in this context is to supplement the acquired language system by temporarily filling in gaps, correcting errors, for structures that have not been acquired. From this it seems reasonable to conclude that the need to learn rules, and which rules need to be learned, is a highly individual concern based upon structures which have been acquired and those which have not.

4) The Natural Order Hypothesis: Another component of Krashen's theory that helps define the relationship between acquisition and learning is the "natural order hypothesis." This hypothesis is primarily based on studies of morpheme acquisition in both child and adult language students. These studies seem to indicate that children and adults in unmonitored situations show a "similar order of acquisition for grammatical morphemes (Krashen, Second Language 51). The order found by Krashen and others for the group of studied morphemes is represented in the following diagram (from Krashen Principles 13). They are listed with those acquired earliest at the top:
Krashen notes that there is individual variation in this order and that the order itself has variations. Occasionally, a learner might acquire a structure from the next level before all the structures in the learner's current level have been acquired. While the validity of this order is still being questioned, the point that Krashen makes related to the learning/acquisition distinction is that often some of the later acquired structures, such as possessive and third person singular endings, can easily be learned through rules. Learning these rules would enable a student to monitor in situations where the rule has not yet been acquired.
5) The Input Hypothesis: In Krashen's view, acquisition is the key to becoming fluent in a language. The part of his theory that addresses the questions of how acquisition occurs and how this acquisition can be facilitated is the Input Hypothesis. Krashen bases this hypothesis on the assumption that the way to acquire language is through exposure to "comprehensible input." A new rule or structure is acquired by "understanding messages that contain this new rule" (Krashen, Inquiries 9). This acquisition process happens over time and with repeated exposure to meaningful communication in which the new rule is used. The messages that are given to the learner must be comprehensible, must be able to be understood, either through context or because they contain enough already acquired structures that understanding can take place, and must also contain a new structure to be acquired. Krashen used "i" to indicate the learner's current level of competence and "i plus 1" to designate a level which was next to be acquired. Krashen then asserts that a teacher should not try to "deliberately aim at i + 1" (Krashen, Principles 21). To attempt deliberately to concentrate on "i + 1" would be to return to the structural based syllabus, often used in earlier approaches, which has been rejected in favor of the idea of language as communication. Instead, if a teacher just
supplies a large quantity of comprehensible input that the learner would be interested in and motivated to comprehend, all the appropriate structures will be provided and acquired in much the same way that a child acquires language. Krashen also proposes that as with child language acquisition, there will be a period of time in which the input is processed, before the student actually begins to produce language or to use the new structure in the language he is producing. He believes this ability to produce language will emerge on its own, without direct instruction, when the acquirer is ready. (Krashen, Principles 22).

Even when comprehensible input is supplied to the learner, it is not always received because of affective factors, such as anxiety or low motivation or comprehension. What does reach the part of the brain where acquisition occurs, what he refers to as the language acquisition device, is processed, and when the learner is ready, this information is used to fulfill the desire to communicate a message. The message is generated by the acquired system and then may be altered by the learned system in an attempt to monitor the message, either before or after it has been uttered.

Krashen's theory has been widely criticized. Many of the criticisms, although directed toward various aspects
of the theory, really are rooted in the acquisition/learning distinction. One of the most scathing criticisms is by Kevin Gregg. On the distinction between learning and acquisition, he objects to Krashen on two major points. He disagrees with Krashen's belief that learning does not become acquisition and with the idea that there is little difference between the acquisition process of children and that of adults. Unfortunately, the very criticisms which Gregg directs at Krashen apply to his own arguments, i.e. "undefined or ill-defined terms, unmotivated constructs, lack of empirical content and thus of falsifiability, and lack of explanatory power" (Gregg 94). Often Gregg presents anecdotes of his own experience in learning Japanese as the major evidence for his claims that Krashen's hypotheses are false. He also rejects Krashen's definitions of "learning" and "acquisition," but then uses the words to argue against Krashen without adequately defining these terms within the scope of his own argument. He also seems occasionally to distort Krashen's assertions. In the text Gregg states, "Krashen has not shown that presentation of rules, explanation, etc. cannot facilitate the acquisition of a second language, which is the very strong claim he is making" (Gregg 82). The footnote attached to this states, "Actually Krashen does admit that 'learning' can precede
'acquisition,' but he denies that it can become acquisition" (Gregg 96). Although "facilitate" and "become" have different meanings, Gregg uses them interchangeably in a way that does not accurately represent Krashen's position. This criticism of Gregg is not meant to imply that I disagree entirely with the points Gregg makes. I do think, however, that he is too quick to dismiss Krashen's ideas without presenting empirical evidence or alternative theories as support for his claims. While I would agree that in many cases what Krashen has asserted is merely hypothesis, that there is not conclusive evidence in many of these areas, Gregg might have been more convincing if he had considered Krashen's own statement about hypotheses:

Hypotheses are hypotheses, or guesses as to how language works. Further research may change them or even force us to reject one or more of them.... We make hypotheses based on existing data, and make further observation in an attempt to find supporting evidence and/or contradictory evidence. Finding supporting evidence does not prove the hypothesis: the skeptic can always ask for more evidence, but contradictory evidence can disprove our hypothesis. (Krashen and Terrell 25)

Gregg then could have constructed a more substantial argument by finding supporting empirical evidence for his own arguments rather than just criticizing Krashen's hypotheses by presenting his own.

McLaughlin, another frequently cited critic of
Krashen's theory, makes some of the same criticisms as Gregg, but in a much more scholarly and authoritative way. McLaughlin criticizes the dichotomy that Krashen asserts with the learning/acquisition distinction. He points out that psychologists, as yet, have been unable to define the distinction between "conscious" and "subconscious" learning. In addition, the distinction between acquisition and learning which Krashen proposes can be measured only on the basis of "subjective, introspective, and anecdotal evidence" (McLaughlin 318). McLaughlin favors, instead, a distinction between "controlled" and "automatic" responses because these can be measured on the basis of "behavioral acts, not on inner states of consciousness" (McLaughlin 318). McLaughlin later proposed an alternative model to Krashen's theories, based on this distinction (see McLaughlin et al. 1983).

Besides the problem with the acquisition/learning dichotomy, which several critics have addressed, there are several other criticisms which I believe are valid. As Gregg points out, there is no conclusive evidence to support the idea that adult language acquisition is identical to language acquisition in children. However, this does not mean that it is necessary to reject completely the idea that adults can acquire a significant amount of language without direct instruction. I also
agree that the natural order hypothesis, while possible in theory, would be impossible to put into practice. However, criticisms centered around Krashen's lack of a grammatical syllabus do not seem to me to be important. Krashen's explanation of the role of grammar in his theory as presented in Chapter 4 of Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition, seems to address this problem of grammar teaching in the classroom in a very practical way. However, many linguists and teachers object strongly to the subordination of grammar teaching which Krashen's theory entails.

Despite the criticism, Krashen's theory of language learning has many positive aspects that make it a good choice as a basis for an approach to teaching a second language. When his theories are translated into classroom practice, the finer theoretical distinctions become less important. For example, the question of whether or at what point learning can become acquisition is not a critical question for most teachers. The important ideas a teacher can glean from this theory are that adult learners do have two ways to access a foreign language, a point that is seldom argued, and the idea that fluency may be better achieved through communicative activities than through intensive concentration on grammar or structure. In the absence of definitive answers to the
question of how adults learn a second language, and in light of the widespread agreement that previous structural-behavioral approaches, which have concentrated on learning rather than acquisition, have been less than successful in developing fluency and communicative competence in language students, teachers must choose among hypotheses and theories which seem to be most logical, most empirically supported, and which are compatible with their own experience, and test them in their classrooms. Krashen provides the basis for an approach in which each of the systems for developing proficiency in a language is used to do what it does best: the acquired system for increasing fluency and the learned system for improving accuracy. As Brown has stated, "you need not, as a language teacher, reject a method entirely just because it does not apply to your own situation perfectly" (143). It also does not seem necessary to reject a theory because it has not been proven, especially if it holds logical and intuitive appeal and is reasonably supportable with available evidence. Even if portions of Krashen's theory are proven to be inaccurate, there are still several reasons why Krashen's theory would be a good basis for a classroom approach to teaching English composition to ESL or EFL students.

One of the most important aspects of Krashen's theory
is that it gives a more complete view of the language learner. Krashen attempts to account for a person's automatic and unconscious language abilities, conscious and deliberate language use, and the role of emotional and psychological factors in language learning. He not only advocates use of the type of instruction which encourages natural, childlike, inductive language learning, but also encourages the use of direct instruction of structure and rules in situations in which adults can use this information to monitor language that has been produced. Since most of the previous approaches made no distinction between these two processes, they rarely used the adult student's total resources for learning a language. In addition, by basing his theory on the idea of language as communication, Krashen accounts for sociolinguistic factors and communicative context. This broader perspective of language learning has strong appeal for teachers who realize that their students are unique individuals with a wide variety of language abilities and needs.

The eclectic nature of Krashen's theory also makes it appealing. He combines some of the most positive elements of the approaches previously discussed. Like the proponents of Communicative Language Teaching, Krashen bases his theory on the assumption that language is
communication. And, like Lozanov and Asher, Krashen is concerned with the role of affective factors in language learning. Krashen, like Asher, allows for a period of delay between comprehension and production of language. He also attempts to incorporate ideas and research about adult second language acquisition and first language acquisition in children into his hypotheses. Krashen's theory also reflects a changing attitude toward learner error that has been prominent in most of the post-Chomsky approaches. Fluency has become a more central concern of the newer theories, while accuracy has been given a more subordinate role in language teaching. Many of the approaches ignore or tolerate learner errors, especially in initial stages, while students struggle to gain fluency. In earlier theories this tolerance for learner error was not present. Using Krashen's theory as a guideline, a teacher can use a wide variety of teaching procedures, many borrowed from other current approaches, in developing his or her specific approach to language teaching.

Another positive aspect of this theory is that it is very easy to put into practice and will work well in a wide variety of language teaching situations. Unlike many of the recent approaches that have been developed, Krashen's theory can be used for teaching students at any level, from beginner to advanced. The popular approach
developed from this theoretical base, The Natural Approach (see Krashen and Terrell 1983), is directed toward teaching beginning students; however, by modifying the type of input provided and by changing monitoring activities to correspond with the students' growing competence in the language, the theory could easily be adapted for intermediate or advanced students. As with Communicative Language Teaching, the communication-based nature of Krashen's theory allows for an almost endless variety of activities and topics for developing a course design.

A final reason that Krashen's theories are attractive is that they are quite compatible with current theories about the teaching composition. Before discussing the way Krashen's theory of second language learning would complement current composition theory as the basis for a course design for the Micronesians, a review of current developments in composition research is necessary.
CHAPTER 4
Composition Theory

In conjunction with ideas about culture and language that will provide a partial basis for classroom instruction, a writing teacher must, of course, consider composition theory and pedagogy. The synthesis of the variables that must come together to create a cohesive classroom approach is a difficult process, involving considerable analysis and decision-making. Fortunately, composition theory and theories of language teaching seem to have been evolving along a parallel course for the past several decades (which is not surprising since they are intrinsically related), toward more holistic approaches that have communication rather than correctness as their goal.

Writing instruction in the decades between 1900 and 1950 was marked by a "preoccupation with standards of usage," which eventually became a "cult of correctness" (Connors, Ede, and Lunsford 8). The primary purpose of instruction at this time was to teach students the mastery of form. This focus on form is best exemplified by the dominance of the modes of discourse as the major organizational model for courses in English composition. Not only were these modes (narration, description,
exposition, persuasion) used as a system for classifying discourse, they were used as a "conceptualizing strategy for teaching composition" (Connors 446). Form came to be regarded as an end in itself rather than as the means or the vehicle through which ideas could be expressed. Besides the focus on the form of the discourse, mastery of style and grammatical correctness were also high priorities. Exercises to promote style and grammatical correctness were an important part of this approach.

Classroom procedures related to this approach to teaching, especially those meant to improve grammar and style, were extremely behavioristic. The traditional approach to grammar was used: the teacher would present a rule with accompanying examples, students would then memorize it, recite it, do exercises using it, and maybe, but not necessarily, practice using it in composing sentences or paragraphs. The exercises were highly repetitive in nature and often would require rote memorization of rules. A typical homework assignment from a 1912 composition textbook reads: "Lesson 7 Exercise: Prepare for recitation the discussion of Capitalization, beginning on page 265" (Clippinger 16).

The procedure for learning the different modes was not much different. In a typical lesson, the type of discourse (such as description) would be defined and
divided into types if necessary (such as scientific versus artistic description), and then the "Law of Arrangement" and rules governing order and selection of detail would be presented (Clippinger 7-12). Usually these would be prescribed by the teacher in a lecture in conjunction with a text. The next step would involve the analysis of models of the type of discourse, with the teacher highlighting important structural and stylistic concerns. The students would then be given writing assignments for practice of the mode and style. Often students would be encouraged to imitate the textual models as closely as possible. These practice assignments would then be evaluated by the teacher to see how well the student had mastered the particular mode, stylistic concerns, and grammatical rules which had been presented.

The teacher's role in this approach to teaching writing was extremely authoritative and prescriptive. It had three major components: the first was to present, and sometimes explain, the particular rule or form; the second was to lead and guide the analysis of the models to assure that the rules and stylistic concerns were given appropriate emphasis; the third was to evaluate the finished product for conformity to the rules and adherence to the form. It is this evaluative aspect of the teacher's role, the concern with "marking and responding to finished
products," that is most characteristic of the approach (Hull 106).

Textbooks and materials were extremely important with this type of instruction. As mentioned before, texts during this period were almost exclusively organized around modes of discourse. Connors, in his study of "The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse," notes that single-mode and four-mode textbooks controlled the list of texts from the mid-1890's through the mid-1930's (448). These texts typically contained three major parts: modes, models, and grammar. That is not to say that other rhetorical concerns, such as unity, coherence, proportion, audience, and purpose, were completely absent from these textbooks, but they certainly played a minor role. In many cases they were relegated to introductory chapters of the text, and rarely did they receive significant emphasis. The chapters were typically organized around the idea of explanation, analysis, and practice. Often the practices were strictly controlled. A sample assignment for a short descriptive theme contains the following instructions:

1. Use the past tense in descriptions and narrations.
2. Do not use the pronoun "I," and do not refer to the person who is describing the scene; write only of the scene.
3. Use only one point of view and do not tell what that point of view is.
4. Usually the material of a short theme should be developed in a single paragraph about one
Note 1. -- These instructions apply to all themes in pure description.
Note 2. -- Before writing this theme, study carefully the general directions given in Part III, beginning on page 360. (Clippinger 12-13)

These directions are followed by an example which the students may use as a model. In this particular text, every assignment is followed by an example and a set of directions similar to the one above. In addition, most assignments are followed by a grammar exercise which involves recitation and discussion of grammar rules presented elsewhere in the text. This format was typical of the textbooks of the early 1900's.

Even with all the explanation and illustration in the textbooks of this time, the student still was faced with the monumental task of bridging the gap between theory and practice. It is important to note that the texts at this time were full of many "should's" and "do not's" but very seldom contained any information on "how." Much emphasis was put on the student's ability to memorize, recite, or reproduce the rules both for grammar and mode structure, which probably occupied much of the student's time and energy, but was perhaps the easier part of the student's role in the class. The harder task for the student was to translate the theory into practice, to produce a written product in which the rules and laws
had been applied correctly. With this the student received little help from either the teacher or the materials: teachers marked and graded papers, but they did not help students produce them. Researchers tallied textual features and calculated their frequency but did not concern themselves with how words got to the page. (Hull 106)

Students at this time were faced with the awesome task of trying to reconcile theory and practice with little to guide them but a set of rules, principles, and models. Hull offers one explanation for the lack of guidance in process throughout this period which is consistent with the focus on product:

Perhaps because the final written form of an essay is coherent and structured it seemed reasonable to assume that writing proceeds that way, too: correct-and-measured sentence by correct-and-measured sentence, one rolling effortlessly after the other. Such an understanding of writing would obviate any attention to process or to students whose written products failed to measure up. (106)

While students were given guidance in learning the rules and responses to their finished products, they were seldom given aid in the writing process itself.

In the 1960's the focus of writing research began to change from a concern with finished products to a study of the cognitive domain of writing. Ausubel's cognitive learning theory, with its distinction between "rote" and "meaningful" learning had a profound effect on language teaching which had been primarily based on a behavioristic
model of learning. Ausubel defined rote learning as mental storage of "discrete and relatively isolated entities that are relatable to cognitive structure only in an arbitrary and verbatim fashion" (Ausubel 108). Meaningful learning, however, is defined as "a process of relating and anchoring new material to relevant established entities in cognitive structure" (Brown 66). The superiority of meaningful learning over rote learning for any information that a learner wishes to retain and use over time and in conjunction with other ideas is clear. As a result, researchers studying writing and composition began to abandon their tallies of textual features, and instead began to ask questions about the how of writing: about what people do when they write and what cognitive processes are involved. Eventually, "like researchers in other disciplines who also study mental processes, writing specialists found a way to define with clarity and character the invisible mental acts that comprise producing written language" (Hull 107). These findings caused the focus of pedagogy to change from an approach dominated by a concern with form to one in which mastery of process was the major goal.

Classroom procedures and activities in a process-oriented approach are designed to help students gain mastery over their personal writing processes.
Writing is viewed as "a set of conscious cognitive and linguistic behaviors like planning, organizing, structuring, and revising" which students must learn to recognize, expand, and manipulate to produce quality writing. Therefore, classroom activities are usually designed either to give students more knowledge about aspects of the process, make students aware of their own action within the process, or to give students practice in applying their knowledge of process to create a written text. For example, a typical lesson might present an explanation of an invention activity such as freewriting, followed by an exercise in which students would freewrite in an attempt to generate ideas for a paper, then students would actually compose a paper, freewriting again if necessary to generate more ideas, which they would turn in for evaluation. Occasionally, students might follow up this exercise with an evaluation of how the freewriting seemed to effect their writing or writing process.

Because changes in pedagogy do not usually occur overnight, many of the elements of the earlier approach to writing are still present. Nowhere is this more true than in the texts. Ideally, a process oriented text would provide students with knowledge of the writing process; guide them through various stages of that process, increasing their knowledge of options and alternatives.
at each stage, so they can more fully develop their individual process; and finally, give them ample opportunities for writing, so that the students may apply this knowledge to compose their own texts. However, rarely does one find a text that is solely based on process.\textsuperscript{11}

There is clearly more diversity in the textbooks now than previously. In many texts, lessons on structure and lessons on process are intermingled, while others introduce process before going on to a typical organizational structure based on the modes of discourse.\textsuperscript{12}

Often models are present in process oriented texts, but they are sometimes used in a different way or for a different purpose than with earlier texts. Some texts will include several drafts of a single model essay to illustrate the writer's process in composing the essay. Other texts include readings because of the assumption that reading and writing are related cognitive activities. Therefore, reading critically can help students develop the ability to "question, evaluate, extend, analyze, interpret and apply what [they] are reading" and can help students to "recognize the decisions writers make and understand why they make them" (Axelrod & Cooper xxiii).

Process oriented texts are different from earlier texts primarily in the absence of repetitive exercises and rote learning and an emphasis on helping the individual
writer develop effective cognitive strategies to be able to master the writing process, and, consequently, to write well.

The student's role in a process centered class is to become aware of his or her own writing process and to be able to manipulate it to produce good writing. Students need to be able to identify and develop their own writing protocol. Flower and Hayes explain and define this idea. They view writing as a set of thinking processes which writers must manipulate while composing in order to meet their goals in writing (Flower and Hayes 365-387). Therefore, students must evaluate the writing situation, set appropriate goals, then choose writing strategies that will help them attain these goals.

Ideally, the teacher's role in this approach is that of facilitator. The teacher is there to explain various aspects of the writing process, provide options and alternatives within the process, and to be a model as a successful writer and negotiator of the process. The teacher must also diagnose problems in the individual students' processes and guide the students toward resolution of these problems. Unfortunately, because the composition class most often occurs within the context of the American school system, with its emphasis on grades and evaluation, the teacher is usually forced into the
role of evaluator as well as facilitator. In my experience in composition classrooms I have found that, regardless of the amount of time the teacher spends as facilitator of process, the students remain painfully aware of the teacher as evaluator. It becomes evident, both to the student and the teacher, that as important as mastery of process is to developing writing ability, process is not an end in itself. To have an approach to writing which concentrates only on the writer is just as narrow and incomplete as one which focuses only on the text.

It was just this type of observation about the process approach which led researchers to the next major shift in the focus of composition research and pedagogy, to the idea that writing is a communicative act that is "embedded in a context" (Hull 109). More than just a shift of focus, this movement implements an expanded view of writing that allows for the integration of many different elements involved in writing, including concerns with process and product. Hull explains the complexity this new point of view brings to the study of writing:

To say that writing is embedded in a context is to acknowledge that what counts as writing, or as any skill or any knowledge, is socially constructed. It depends for its meaning and its practice upon social institutions and conditions. According to this view, writing doesn't stand apart from people and communities... (109)

The following classification scheme, which linguists use
to analyze discourse, illustrates more clearly the elements involved in the idea of context. An act of communication involves the following:

1. cohesion - the way the elements of language (words, sentences, and paragraphs) work together within a text
2. coherence - the relationship of the text to reality
3. intention - the purpose of the originator of the communication, both in terms of meaning created in the text and desired reaction of the audience in the particular situation
4. acceptance - the level of receptivity the audience has to the text, again including the content of the text, the attitude toward the originator, and the attitude toward the perceived purpose of the communication
5. informativity - the combination of old and new information included in the text; there must be enough new information to keep the audience interested, but not so much that the reader is overwhelmed with information which cannot be processed in a meaningful way
6. situationality - this is the relevance and importance of the act and the message to the people involved, at that time and in that particular
situation

7. intertextuality - this is the way this piece of discourse relates to the discourse which has preceded it and that which will follow; this assumes that the communication is part of a dialog, rather than an isolated act; it also assumes the relatedness of all texts (de Beaugrande 1-12)

This definition of an act of discourse expands the scope of context. If this idea is applied to written communication, approaches to teaching writing must also be expanded. Teachers have traditionally focused primarily on cohesion and coherence, especially when the writing instruction had mastery of form as a primary goal. Process approaches often deal with intention and acceptance, but usually only in a superficial and artificial way. When a teacher makes a statement such as "Imagine you are writing to a senator," it is meaningful to the student in a very limited way; the student does not know the senator, and, more importantly, the student is aware that the text will never be read by the senator and will never achieve any real effect (except, of course, to earn a grade for the assignment). This is clearly not the same as having a real purpose for and response to communication. In addition, this perspective also challenges the idea
that there is a single correct process or product because "what will be valued as an expert writing process and product [will] vary, depending on what function that writing will serve, for which people, at which time" (Hull 110-11). For any teacher wishing to use these assumptions about communication and context as the basis for writing instruction, a major shift in pedagogy will be necessary.

Before discussing classroom procedures, it is important to consider the objectives of this type of approach. A general goal is to help "writers understand themselves as constructors of meaning within a social and cultural context" (Flower 284). Students must become aware of themselves as members of a discourse community, learn to recognize and manipulate the elements of the communicative act in their writing in order to become efficient communicators in that community, and then learn the necessary skills to evaluate new discourse situations so that they may operate in different contexts effectively. As Bartholomae has observed, students must learn to "invent the university for the occasion...learn to speak our language,...to try on the peculiar ways of knowing, selecting, evaluating, reporting, concluding, and arguing that define the discourse of our community" (134). However, students must also be able to "invent" the workplace, the neighborhood, the political arena, or any
other context which they might encounter, in which they may need to communicate.

Because this approach is new and radically different from previous ones and because the principles that it includes are often incompatible with the artificial environment of the classroom, it is difficult to put into practice in classrooms as they have traditionally been structured. Therefore, very few pedagogical materials have been developed for this approach. Much of the information is still at the theoretical stage, with a few notable exceptions (Perl, Hull and Rose, Branscombe). Most of the practical applications of theory thus far have either been in conjunction with research, or have been in the form of experimental lessons by those teachers wishing to try the theoretical approach in their own classrooms. Therefore, because pedagogy is still developing and because the nature of the method itself precludes the development of a single, blanket approach, discussion of pedagogical concerns in this approach are more general and vague than the previously discussed methods.

It is possible, however, to discuss a few qualifications that classroom procedures must meet to be compatible with the approach. First, and most important, "learning to write requires tasks that are
'authentic'" (Hull 121). Writing activities must have all the elements of successful discourse, especially situationality. There must be a real and relevant (not artificial or imagined) situation, intention, and a responding audience. When this real situation is created, other information about writing (individual processes, strategies forms, mechanics, etc.), can be taught in a meaningful way (in Ausubel's sense of the word) as the necessary means to achieving successful communication. This approach to teaching writing is the closest attempt thus far to use the same type of process that children use for first language acquisition, which is by far the most efficient way known to learn a language. As Linda Flower has stated in the article "Cognition, Context, and Theory Building," the new direction of writing theory should be toward "a far more integrated theoretical vision which can explain how context cues cognition, which in its turn mediates and interprets the particular world that context provides" (282). Creating real opportunities for writing, with real problems to be solved, is a way of moving this idea from the theoretical to the practical. In addition, writing exercises in this approach should enhance student awareness of the writing context and encourage them to expand their abilities to deal with diverse writing situations. The instruction should be
based upon "a framework that acknowledges the pressure and the potential the social context can provide, at the same time it explains how writers negotiate that context, create their own goals, and develop a sense of themselves as problem-solvers, speakers, or subjects who create meaning and affect other people through their writing" (Flower 284). Students should be provided with opportunities to analyze different discourse situations, set goals for communication within the situation, and to create strategies which allow them to achieve these goals.

Because this approach is still being developed, no definitive student role has been designated. It is possible, however, to make some general observations about the student's role based on the ideas presented and on the few attempts to put these ideas into practice which have been referred to in the literature. It is clear that when writing instruction is approached in this way, students must take a more active role in their own learning. They become active participants in a dialog. As active participants, they need to assume many different roles. These roles are dynamic, constantly changing as situations and communication needs change. They will sometimes be initiators and sometimes responders. They will at times be discourse analysts looking at the entire
act of discourse. At other times, they will be examining their own cognitive processes as they set communication goals and attempt to find strategies to achieve them. And, they will become more aware and efficient problem solvers. When discussed in this way, the student's role sounds incredibly complex and self-conscious, but it is important to remember that the average child can perform these same functions quite skillfully when attempting to negotiate a cookie from a parent before dinner. All that is really being asked of the students is that they assume the same active role in the education process as they do in other areas of their lives.

Although the teacher's role is also still being defined, some inferences may be drawn based on the nature of the approach. Just as the student's role is considerably different from that of the traditional classroom, so too is the teacher's role. However, the teacher's role is even more complex and multi-dimensional than the student's. Like the student, the teacher must become an active participant in the dialog, with both individual students and the class as a whole. The teacher is not simply a dispenser of information or a facilitator, although at times he or she may be either of these; the teacher is an initiator of and responder to real communication with the students. Since successful discourse assumes the
exchange of relevant ideas between participants in the discourse act, this approach requires that the teacher recognize that the student has valuable knowledge or information that the teacher or other students want or need. At another level, the teacher assumes the role of resource, dispensing information students need to meet their communication goals. If, for example, a student was having problems describing a particular place to a fellow student, the teacher might give that student information about using sensory details or figurative language to enhance the descriptive quality of his or her writing. At yet another level, the teacher must be a meta-analyst of the entire discourse situation. Besides directing, analyzing, engineering, and facilitating classroom discourse, the teacher must also ensure that the class is moving to meet the overall goals of the course. The teacher must be aware of other discourse communities in which the student may someday wish to interact and engineer classroom activities that prepare the students for those situations. For the teacher, these roles often exist simultaneously; to perform all these roles effectively is a challenging task, requiring flexibility and creativity on the part of the individual instructor.

One reason the teacher and student roles are so active
and complex in this approach is because the role of materials is so drastically different from in previous approaches. In other approaches, the text has traditionally played a major role in the course. It has provided an organizational structure, has been the focus of classroom activity, and has often been the originator of writing assignments. However, as previously mentioned, it is doubtful whether textbooks in the traditional sense could be developed that would suit this approach. The emphasis in this approach is off the text and on the students. Texts become a tool or reference for students to use to meet their communicative goals. The information in the text is only presented when it is necessary and meaningful to the task at hand. This is nearly opposite to the approach of earlier texts, where the information was seen as primary and the use of the information as secondary. In this approach there is a need for more and more diverse materials than in other approaches. Students must be able to find the type of information they need, whether it be about process, structure, grammar, or writing contexts.

To help illustrate this approach and move it from the vague and general to the specific, an example of how it would translate into actual classroom practice is helpful. A very good example is provided by Amanda
Branscombe, a teacher in a ninth grade Basic English class in the Deep South, and Shirley Brice Heath, an anthropologist. Branscombe organized instruction in the first semester around letter writing activities between her basic class and her eleventh and twelfth grade general English class. The students were motivated to learn new skills to improve the level of communication between themselves and the other students. When the students had completed a semester of this type of activity, exchanging information with members of a shared context, Branscombe moved the students to another level by giving them the opportunity to communicate with someone in a different (more academic) context, Shirley Brice Heath. Heath and the students wrote letters to each other, and Heath encouraged the students to become a "community of ethnographers" giving Heath information about their community (Heath and Branscombe 20). Heath and Branscombe report that the exercises were successful: students improved their writing, learned new ways of analyzing and presenting information, became more confident in their abilities, and learned to analyze discourse situations and respond to the particular needs of different acts of discourse, both within a shared context and between different contexts.

The discourse approach to teaching writing has several
important advantages over the other two approaches. Most importantly, it combines elements of both of the other approaches. Teaching writing as an act of discourse allows for instruction both in form and process because proficiency in both of these is necessary for communication to be effective. A teacher need not abandon the last seventy-five years of research in writing instruction, but merely present this knowledge in conjunction with real writing situations. Another strength of this approach is that it has theoretical support from both linguistics and psychology. One aspect of the approach, which can be considered as either negative or positive according to an individual point of view, is that it represents a considerable challenge for the teacher. Creating real opportunities for students to communicate in writing in the artificial classroom situation poses a challenge for teachers and requires creativity, flexibility, and ingenuity. However, if changing the paradigm for teaching writing to a framework that more closely resembles the natural language acquisition process helps the teaching of writing to become more effective, then it will certainly be worth the effort required to implement it.

When one considers its compatibility with the Micronesian situation, the discourse approach seems even more attractive. One aspect which makes it an especially
appropriate choice for teaching the Micronesians is related to the Micronesian mindset mentioned in Chapter Two. The discourse approach would be extremely compatible with the Micronesian propensity to deal with "the concrete and immediate rather than abstract" and the idea that "classification, experimentation, and abstraction may occur for practical knowledge ... not as ends in themselves" (Colletta 30). In addition, this approach is also similar to the indigenous learning patterns of the Micronesians, wherein knowledge is transmitted in the course of everyday activities in accordance with what the individual needs to know to complete a task. A formal educational pattern that duplicates this situation may help minimize the feelings of alienation students often experience in the educational system, thus allowing language learning to occur more easily (through a lowering of their affective filters) and lessening the level of tension between the formal educational system and the traditional culture, two primary objectives of this approach.
CHAPTER 5
An Approach

After examining the context for instruction and surveying both composition and linguistic theory, the teacher can now begin to make decisions about what will actually occur in the classroom. From this tangled web of theory the teacher must pull out the assumptions about language, learning, and writing which will be the basis for his or her individual approach. This list of assumptions could be incredibly long and too complex and restrictive to actually be useful if a teacher tried to cover all possible aspects of the instructional process. However, a shorter list, limited to major areas, is all that is really necessary to guide instruction. In designing a course in English composition for the Micronesians, I have identified four major assumptions upon which my teaching would be based. These assumptions deal with the nature of language learning, writing, and error.

The first assumption is that most language behavior (particularly that which generates language) is acquired; learned behavior (the conscious application of rules for language use) serves primarily as a monitor of the message. This assumption relies on the distinction between
acquisition and learning explained by Krashen. As Krashen has stated, for this acquisition process to occur, the language student must be provided with lots of "comprehensible input." For this input to be comprehensible it must be meaningful to the student in the way that Ausubel has described. That is, it must have a combination of language material that the student can understand and language material that is at a level above the student's current level of understanding, the "i+1" described by Krashen. There are several ways this assumption will affect classroom practice. First of all, a major goal of the class will be to supply large amounts of comprehensible input so that this acquisition process may occur. A traditional classroom, one that relied mainly on textbooks, lectures, exercises, and models, would probably not provide the amount of input and opportunities for interaction that are necessary for the acquisition process to occur. In an attempt to provide adequate amounts of input, most class time should be devoted to activities in which the students are actively involved in interaction with each other and with the instructor; activities that encourage interaction and collaboration will be favored over activities that involve an individual working in isolation. Activities that encourage communication of ideas will be favored over exercises
or drills. Rather than attempting to pinpoint an exact "i+1" structure and providing input containing that structure, a teacher can better serve the diverse language needs of the students by providing a large amount of input of various types, from various sources, and at various levels of complexity.

Since a starting point for instruction is obviously needed, a teacher will probably wish to make some type of general assessment of language proficiency at the beginning of a course. A good way to begin supplying input would probably be with realia, materials that the students come in contact with in daily life. These can include newspapers, magazines, television and radio shows, music, or any other source of English that is common in the environment. Since the major newspaper in Micronesia and most television and radio shows are in English, there are plenty of opportunities to bring these materials into classroom use. Even texts like comic books, fashion magazines, or cartoons should be valued for their use of language and their high interest/low affective filter values. If an objective of the course is to move students toward more academic forms of writing, this should be done gradually since the language in these materials may be at a level beyond the students' initial "i+1".

While most of the classroom activities will be
acquisition-oriented, some class time will be devoted to language learning as well. Adult learners especially, with their greater ability to apply abstract ideas, can benefit from language lessons designed to make them more efficient monitors of their spoken and written language. These lessons about language will be limited (both in the amount of class time devoted to them and in the scope of material covered) and, to make the information meaningful, will occur in conjunction with students' attempts to monitor their own work.

The second assumption is that writing is an act of negotiation. This idea is based on the new insights into writing which discourse analysis has provided. This assumption also incorporates two of the major principles of Communicative Language Teaching: the communication principle ("Activities that involve real communication promote learning.") and the task principle ("Activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning.") (Richards and Rodgers 72). This is a functional view of writing, and it requires a real purpose for the writing, whether that is to provoke a response in a reader or simply to solve a problem of the writer. That is, writing is generated in response to a need of the writer. In most cases this need is to elicit a response from someone else (a real audience).
When this assumption about writing is applied to the classroom, it requires that classroom writing be authentic, both in regards to audience and purpose. Classroom activities must be designed so that students are put in situations where they have real communication needs that they will use writing to address. In the classroom context, students should communicate with the teacher, another student, or with a group, rather than with an imagined audience. In addition, students should be encouraged to bring their real-life (English language) communication needs to the classroom. Personal letters, assignments from other courses, business letters or memos, letters of application, or any other need for English language communication presents an opportunity for language learning to occur.

The third assumption, which also deals with the authenticity of the writing, is that writing involves a set of cognitive processes embedded within and impacted by a social context. This assumption is based on the synthesis of writing process theory and discourse analysis, which is the new direction in writing studies (as Flower's recent article "Cognition, Context, and Theory Building" convincingly asserts). For writing instruction to be effective, it must take into consideration the interplay between the context for the writing (both the immediate
context of reader and writer, the situationality, and
the larger context in which the negotiation is occurring,
the intertextuality) and the writers' individual cognitive
processes, which interact with that context to create
goals for the communication and strategies to achieve
those goals. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this
view of writing allows for a more complete and real
approach that does not lose sight of the whole process
because of a narrow focus on one of the component elements
such as text or writers' process.

Classroom exercises based on this assumption would
help students recognize the elements of discourse that
are inherent in their communication acts, and would help
them develop and refine their cognitive processes to
generate more effective writing in response to their
communication needs. For example, if a student needed
to evaluate the effectiveness of a new procedure for his
or her job, the teacher could help the student understand
the purpose of the evaluation, determine the desired
outcome(s) of the communication, give the student
information about the expectations people that read
evaluations generally have, help the student with the
generation and development of ideas about the subject,
discuss goals for the writing, present to the student
options and alternatives for achieving the goals, give
the student feedback on the coherence and cohesion of
the text, and provide the information necessary for
successful monitoring of the form of the communication.
After the evaluation was submitted to the employer, the
teacher could help the student evaluate the effectiveness
of the communication by whether it achieved the desired
response from the audience. All of these activities would
have occurred in response to a real need on the part of
the student and within a real context. While some of
these activities are common procedures in many composition
classrooms, very few approaches base the writing students
do on authentic communication within a real social context.

The final assumption is that errors, whether in
language use or in discourse, indicate a student's stage
of development and therefore provide useful information
about what skills and concepts students have actually
mastered. This assumption has several sources such as
Selinker's ideas about interlanguage (see Richards' Error
Analysis), Shaughnessy's Errors and Expectations, and
the Communicative Language Teaching view of error as failed
communication. It is important to make a distinction
between "errors" and "mistakes." Brown gives a useful
definition:

A mistake refers to a performance error that is
either a random guess or a 'slip,' in that it
is a failure to utilize a known system
correctly.... Such mistakes must be carefully distinguished from errors of a second language learner, idiosyncrasies in the interlanguage of the learner which are direct manifestations of a system within which a learner is operating at the time. (170)

Mistakes, therefore, are problems which, when brought to the learner's attention, the learner can successfully correct. Errors, on the other hand, a learner would not have the capability to correct, even if they were brought to the learner's attention.

Another distinction that should be made is between errors of form, errors in writing process, and errors in discourse or communication. Errors of form can occur at several levels. These include problems with morphology, syntax, paragraph development and organization, and essay development and organization. Errors in writing process have to do with the student's ability to set appropriate goals for the writing and/or to create strategies that help achieve those goals. For example, a student who is "overmonitoring" has an error or problem with the writing process. Errors in discourse are problems with assessing the needs of the act of communication. Sometimes these result from an insensitivity to or incomplete understanding of the context for the writing.

The easiest type of errors to recognize, of course, are errors in form because they manifest themselves clearly
in the text. However, a teacher must be aware that errors in form (especially when dealing with larger chunks of language) often are mere symptoms of one of the other types of errors. To understand fully the source of these errors, teachers must look beyond the text and must encourage a dialog in which students freely discuss their thought processes so that teachers can distinguish between mistakes and errors and then understand the logic behind the errors. With this knowledge teachers can determine the direction of future instruction.

With these assumptions clearly defined, the next step is to establish some objectives for the course. The major objective is to enable students to join in the dialog of academic discourse. In order to achieve this goal students must first become engaged in a dialog with the instructor, which will lead to academic discourse. Students must also be both internally and integratively motivated to participate in this dialog. When students are properly motivated, the next objective is for the instructor to provide the necessary information for the student to be able to participate in the dialog. These, then, are the objectives of the course: to engage students in a dialog with the instructor, to motivate students to learn to become more active participants in the dialog, and to teach them the skills necessary to participate
in the world of academic discourse. In addition, this instruction should be presented in a way that recognizes the unique contributions, both linguistic and cultural, that the student brings to the language learning situation.

Many different types of exercises could work within the framework of assumptions and objectives I have provided. To give a clearer illustration of the nature of the approach, it is necessary to develop some actual classroom activities that could be used for this approach. It is important to note that all classroom instruction, interaction, and exercises will be conducted in the target language: English.

This first set of sample exercises would be used early in the course, most likely beginning with the first class meeting, and is based on the need for the students and teacher to "get to know each other" in the various roles: as individuals, as members of the classroom community, and as members of different cultures. The desire for information in the new situation, both on the part of the instructor and the students, creates an important opportunity for language learning to take place in a meaningful context.

An initial exercise would include discussing with the students the need to get to know each other, including the needs of the teacher to understand the students, both
personally and as users of English. As part of this discussion, the teacher elicits ideas about the kinds of things a student wants or needs to know about the teacher and the course. The teacher could then present the syllabus for the course as a partial answer to the questions. After presenting the information included in the syllabus, the teacher discusses it as a piece of discourse, evaluating it on its ability to serve its intended purpose, i.e. to answer many of the questions students may have about the nature of the course. The teacher could explain how the document evolved in response to speculation on the part of the instructor about the questions a student would want answered about the course. Any questions which were asked in class, but which were not answered in the syllabus would also be addressed.

This exercise, although fairly simple, does several important things. Most importantly, it immediately involves the students in a dialog with the teacher. Questions are being asked on both sides, and a real need for communication is acknowledged. The exercise also introduces the idea of analyzing a piece of discourse and evaluating it on the basis of its ability to achieve the writer's goals within a situation. This exercise may also help lower the students' affective filters by answering their questions and addressing their concerns.
early in the course, and by showing the students that the instructor is interested in eliciting their input and understanding their point of view.

As a follow-up lesson, after the syllabus is introduced and a dialog is invoked, the teacher could then ask the students to supply some information about themselves in writing. The teacher mentions again some of the questions teachers have about their students in a new class and a new culture. The teacher lists several of these on the board, just as the students' questions were. The teacher then shares with the students, the intention behind each of the questions. For example, a question might be "How do you feel about being in this English course?" and the intention behind the question is to discover the students' attitudes toward the course or toward the subject, as a way to determine their current level of motivation and susceptibility to the instruction, and to pinpoint early any serious fears or problems in members of the class. Another set of questions could be "Where are you from?"; "What is it like there?"; and "What is your native language?" The teacher could then explain the various intentions behind these questions: to discover the make-up of the class, to gain information about the different languages and cultures present in the classroom, to try to understand the individual students
a bit better by knowing something about their background, etc. When there are several questions on the board, students are then asked to respond to one or more of these questions.

At this point the teacher could begin incorporating ideas about writing process into the discussion. The teacher introduces the idea of the writing process and explains it briefly to the students. The instructor then introduces freewriting as a way to generate ideas and increase fluency in writing. The students could explore some of the questions on the board in several five minute freewritings.

After the freewriting, the students choose a question for which they would write an answer for the teacher. Before they begin to formulate the answer, the teacher should have them set goals for the writing in the form of identifying their intentions in the writing and by identifying exactly what they are attempting to negotiate. Looking at writing in this way will probably be new for the students, so the teacher should be prepared to help students formulate these goals. Have the students ask themselves, "What responses would I like to get from the teacher when this paper is read?" (It may be necessary to explain at this point that the paper will not be graded, but simply read by the teacher as an answer to a question.)
With the goals for writing established, the students can begin to draft an answer, borrowing ideas generated in their freewritings whenever possible. An additional idea that can be introduced at this time is collaborative learning. When the students have a completed draft, they could break into groups of three or four and take turns reading their drafts aloud. In this exercise, the students look at the writer's goals for the piece of writing in an attempt to determine whether the piece meets the goals set for it. The students could identify specific places where the writer meets or does not meet the expectations of the person asking the question. The teacher's comments on the finished draft would be similar to those of the students in the group negotiation. The teacher would add additional comments, and the instructor would be similar to those of the students in the group draft. After completing the group work, the student could revise the paper and prepare a draft to submit to the instructor.
questions, rather than just generating them as they did in the previous lesson. It also reinforces the view of writing as discourse and begins to develop the students' skills as analysts of discourse situations. It introduces both the writing process and collaborative learning techniques in a context that makes them meaningful to the students. Basically, these two exercises establish a framework for the forthcoming instruction by establishing a dialog with the students and introducing a new perspective on writing.

Another type of exercise that could be used in the course would be modeled after the exercise of Branscombe and Heath. The teacher explains his or her need to understand the patterns of English language use in the students' daily life: When do they use English, especially written English, in what situations, for what purposes, and with whom? In order for the students to supply this information, the teacher asks the students to keep a daily journal in which they record their observations about their own use of English and its use by the people around them. They could also include information about how they feel about the use of English in their lives. The teacher collects the journal weekly and responds to the students' observations with questions and comments that would lead the student to further observation, analysis, and
evaluation of their experiences. Collaborative learning techniques could again be used to allow the students the opportunity to compare, discuss, and evaluate their observations with other members of the class. Besides providing useful information to the instructor, this type of activity helps the students become more aware of different discourse situations, as well as their own use of language and their attitudes toward language. It also reinforces the idea of a teacher being part of the dialog. Moreover, this activity introduces the students to thought processes (observation, analysis, and evaluation) which are central to academic discourse.

Many other types of exercises would be introduced later. The journal exercise could be followed up with readings from a book such as Crossing Cultures, which contains essays which discuss "the diverse ways in which men and women live and think in different societies and social circumstances" (Knepler & Knepler ix). The class could explore important issues faced by others who have "crossed cultures" and determine how these issues do or do not impact their own lives. Other exercises could originate when students bring their real life communication problems to the classroom for discussion. These could include anything from a paper for another class, to an argument with a friend, or a situation where they felt
their command of English was inadequate to the situation. The class could then become involved in analyzing the situation, proposing responses, helping the individual establish goals for more effective communication in the situation, formulating this communication, and evaluating it. Throughout these exercises students would become more familiar with all aspects of the discourse model and the writing process. Comparison could be made between ways of responding to discourse situations in their language and culture and the way they respond in English. Questions of form could be addressed as students come to understand cohesion as an aspect of discourse and as editing is presented as a phase in the writing process. The only limitation to the material covered in the course is that it be provided in the context of real rather than artificial writing situations.

This approach seems to be suited to the Micronesian situation in three important ways. It is compatible with the indigenous patterns of learning because it provides for language learning in real-life situations. The learner actively seeks (and the teacher provides) information that is useful in meeting the needs of the situation. Furthermore, it satisfies the Micronesian propensity for practical instruction in the "participative rather than analytical mode" (Colletta 31). This approach can also
be sensitive to traditional behaviors related to age and clan affiliation. Because these behaviors affect the discourse model, they would be discussed for their effect on the communication act rather than ignored, repressed, or dismissed. This approach acknowledges the validity of these behaviors within the context, while it also provides the opportunity for discussing different expectations within different contexts.

As I have demonstrated, this type of approach can be applied to the Micronesian situation. It has a sound theoretical base, both in composition and linguistic theory, and is also sensitive to the needs of the culture. However, the validity of the teaching approach presented here can be judged only in terms of its ability to meet the teacher's objectives when used in an actual writing class. The next step then, which is out of the scope of a thesis such as this, would be to test this approach in the classroom. Beyond the success or failure of the individual approach presented, this thesis is valid in the approach to teaching that it represents: the attempt to bridge the gap between theory and practice in a systematic and logical way to create an approach that will bring maximum benefits to the students.
It is important to note that any discussion of Micronesia as a whole will deal largely in generalizations. Micronesia includes three major island groups: the Carolines, the Marshalls, and the Marianas. These groups are not culturally homogeneous, nor are the individual islands within these groupings. Within the region there are at least seven major languages and countless dialects. Although the languages are distinctly different and in many cases do not even share the same linguistic roots, many aspects of the cultures are common to a greater or lesser extent in all the islands. Each teacher needs to examine the particular culture in which he/she is operating to determine to what extent these generalizations apply to that culture.

Since this teaching approach will be based on generalizations about the region, it would be best suited for a situation where the classroom population is comprised of students from several different islands and cultures. This is the situation at the post-secondary institutions in the region, such as the University of Guam and the Micronesian Occupational College and is sometimes the case in the larger high schools, which often draw together students from different islands who speak different languages or dialects. However, a teacher with a more homogenous group of students could use this same process to develop an approach that would be even more specialized and which would, therefore, better meet the needs of that particular group.

For a more complete discussion of this idea and its implications for teaching, see Kaplan's "Cultural Thought Patterns in Inter-Cultural Education."

However, to be fair, communicative proficiency is not a stated goal of this method.

Although this particular example is from a student textbook, quite often courses based on Audiolingualism do not use a textbook, especially at the beginner level, since early exposure to the written form of the language is viewed as undesirable.

Lyons stresses that Chomsky has "continually warned us against identifying the 'production' of sentences within
the grammar with the production of sentences by the speaker of a language" (44). Chomsky most often uses the term "generate" when speaking of the function of the grammar he was proposing in order to avoid confusion, to help keep the division between competence and performance clear, and, to use it in a way common in mathematics to help stress the precise, mathematical, and logical approach of his grammar (Lyons 45).

It is interesting and important to note, however, that Chomsky did not assert that "no aspects of language, or the use of language, can be reasonably described in terms [of] a 'stimulus-and-response' model" (Lyons 93-4). The idea that follows from this, that the behaviorist model could account for certain types of language behavior learning and still not be in opposition to Chomsky's view of language acquisition, becomes significant when considering the current controversy over the roles of "acquisition" and "learning" in developing language skills.

This idea is related to the "trace theory" of memory which was presented by Katona in the 1940's. This theory holds that a memory connection is reinforced and made stronger by repeated and intensive tracing. Tracing can be accomplished either through verbal or physical activities, with the most effective tracing occurring when these methods are used together (Richards and Rodgers 87).

Stephen Krashen proposed a set of hypotheses which are compatible in many ways with the Communicative Language Teaching approach. However, because of the impact of these ideas and the criticism surrounding them, they will be treated separately later in the discussion.

It is also important to note that Krashen recognizes that unconscious, acquired knowledge can also play a role in self-correction, since many people who don't know a particular rule may correct strictly on their "'feel' for grammaticality" (Krashen, Second Language 2).

An exception may be Write to Learn by Donald M. Murray.

An interesting, but not uncommon, mixture exists in textbooks such as English Skills by John Langan. The book begins with a discussion of the necessity of a balance between unity, coherence, support, and sentence skills.
It then moves on to a section on writing process, followed by a section on paragraph development organized around the modes of discourse. Next is a unit on essay structure. The exercises in the paragraph and essay sections have instructions that encourage students to become aware of and master writing process. However, the final section of the book, the sentence skills section, reverts to the typical behaviorist approach to language: rules are presented and exercises are to be completed.

13 And, because the nature of the approach is so dependent upon individual acts of communication within changing and diverse contexts, it is questionable whether traditional pedagogical materials could be developed for this approach.

14 For more information see Heath and Branscombe (1985), Branscombe (1987), and Hull (1989).

15 Academic discourse is used here to mean writing in which the writer discusses a subject objectively and relates its significance to a larger audience. It involves the ability to distinguish between the trivial and significant when discussing a topic.


---. "In the Aftermath of the Education Explosion." Unpublished article, [c. 1985].


