Chapter Two: Language Education

2.0 Introduction

In Chapter One the ESL situation in India has been reviewed briefly and a rationale for adopting a socio-cultural perspective to understand the language learning process has been presented. The assumption here is that psychological factors have social and cultural underpinnings. Sociology and the leading perspectives in the field of the Sociology of Education provide a framework for understanding human behaviour and learning. Psychological theories with a socio-cultural perspective also offer insights into the social – individual dichotomy and how they overlap.

The theoretical implications of the sociological and psychological orientations relevant for Language Education are presented in 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.

Issues and concepts in bilingualism and bilingual education provide the perspective to analyze the empirical field being looked at in this study. Second language theories offer an in depth analysis of the process of language learning and the influencing factors by putting forth models of language learning relevant for different contexts. The discussion of the social psychological perspective through an examination of the phenomenon of Bilingualism and the Theories of Second Language Acquisition is elucidated in 2.2.1 and 2.3.

The focus in this study is on the social psychological factors such as beliefs and attitudes, motivation, anxiety and self-assessment towards language learning, and explores how these differ according to different socio-cultural contexts and language ecology. The social-psychological factors (2.4) that operate in language learning, identified through the earlier discussions are discussed in: Attitudes and beliefs (2.4.1), Motivation (2.4.2), Anxiety (2.4.3) and Self Assessment (2.4.4).
2.1 Theoretical Orientations

2.1.1 The Sociological perspectives to Education

Sociology can be defined as the systematic study of social and physical environments and their effects on our experience and behavior as individuals. It helps us see the human arrangements of shared ideas and relationships that connect our otherwise separate lives. It provides us with a "window on the world" and a mirror of our participation in it. We use shared ideas to make sense of the world, one another and ourselves. We spend our lives in webs of social relationships that affect not only how we behave, but also affect who we think we are. Social life is itself affected by physical conditions, including the ways in which societies produce goods. C. Wright Mills (1959) coined the term 'Sociological imagination' which helps to capture the way people’s own individual biographies and the course of human history is linked. He says that both of these cannot be understood unless one takes into account the influence of each on the other. Further, sociologists apply ‘Sociological paradigms’ (also called sociological perspectives or frameworks) which are specific 'points of view' to do social research in the investigation of the society. Paradigms in sociology can be identified through perspectives that emerge from intellectual stances because of economic, political and cultural imperatives. Throughout the history of sociological analysis, several paradigms emerged have emerged.

*Positivism or the Consensual Paradigm* which came up in early 19th century is now considered obsolete in its pure form. Here sociologists believed we can scientifically discover all the rules governing social life. A sub-set of this paradigm is the *Structural functionalism paradigm* also known as a social systems paradigm that addresses what functions various elements of the social system perform in regard to the entire system. It is also a "consensual” system of description because it is basically descriptive and does not see the claims of different groups as confrontational in nature. *Ethno methodology paradigm*: This paradigm comes from Anthropology where the researcher enters into the context of a community which is the focus of research, so that an ‘outsider’ to the community becomes an ‘insider observer’, participating in the entire fabric of life in
order to study what seems to be ‘commonsense’ and ‘natural’ for the community under study. **Conflict paradigm:** This paradigm analyses sociology whereby the perspectives of opposing or different groups are seen because of vested interests and power struggles of each group. This perspective identifies the ability of some groups to dominate others, and also resistances to such domination. *For example Feminism* focuses on how male dominance of society has shaped social life at the cost of the woman’s human rights and dignity. **Symbolic interactionism paradigm:** In this paradigm, the emphasis is on shared meanings and social patterns that are developed in the course of social interactions.

In the following discussion we shall look at the approaches adopted by each of these perspectives. Different authors who are going to be discussed here within different paradigms mostly fit into moulds which can be discussed only in relation to a single paradigm or sometimes overlapping different paradigms. It can be the case that one is inspired by or evolves one’s argument from another perspective as a response to or in reaction to it. Since we are interested in this thesis to trace the sociological bases of education we present authors who raised issues in education directly or whose ideas have been applied to education by other educational theorists.

**Sociological Paradigms**

2.1.1.1 The Structural Functional Paradigm

The structural-functional-or, more simply, functionalist-perspective sees society as a system. Functionalism is based on a number of key concepts. Firstly, society is viewed as a system – a collection of interdependent parts, with a tendency to equilibrium. Secondly, there are functional requirements that must be met in a society for its survival (such as reproduction of the population). Thirdly, phenomena are seen to exist because they serve a function. This approach to sociological analysis is associated with the work of Emile Durkheim (1858- 1917), Talcott Parsons (1902- 1979) and Robert King Merton (1910-2003). Their work can be said to have established sociology as an area of study.
Emile Durkheim

Durkheim's *The Division of Labor in Society* (1893), is his fundamental statement of the nature of human society and its development. In this work Durkheim examined how social order was maintained in different types of societies. He focused on the division of labor, and examined how it differed in traditional societies and modern societies. He argued that traditional societies were 'mechanical' and were held together by common interests. In traditional societies, argues Durkheim, the collective consciousness entirely subsumes individual consciousness—social norms or rules that are socially enforced are strong and social behavior is well-regulated. This phenomenon has a life of its own and is called the 'conscience collective' of society. It is a term, which according to him refers to both collective conscience and collective consciousness. In modern societies, however, Durkheim argues, the highly complex division of labor resulted in 'organic' solidarity. That is, different specializations in employment and social roles created dependencies that tied people to one another, since people no longer could count on filling all of their needs by themselves. We are therefore led to consider the division of labor in a new light. In this case:

"indeed the economic services that it [division of labour] can render are insignificant compared with the moral effect that it produces, and the feeling of solidarity it creates and maintains between two or more people which is its true function" (Durkheim 1893:17).

Durkheim explains social evolution in terms of how division of social labor as well as psychological labor increases and becomes sophisticated along the lines of social density and volume, producing a higher state of culture. His explanation of how society evolved from being regulated by mechanical solidarity regulated by the expansion of conscience collective to organic solidarity, regulated by the expansion of 'division of labor' explains the phenomenon.
This puts forth one of Durkheim’s central ideas namely, the priority of the whole over the parts, or again, the irreducibility of the social entity to the sum of its elements, the explanation of the elements by the entity and not the entity by the elements (Raymond, 1970).

Durkheim explains that various institutions – family, crime, education, politics, morality, and religion- are conditioned by the organization of society. Each type of society has its type of family, its type of education, its type of state, its type of morality. He views these institutions as having the characteristic of being given to everyone from without and of being imperative for all for the purpose of maintaining the equilibrium/solidarity in society.

The *Rules of the Sociological Method* (1895), is a manifesto stating how ‘social facts’ are to be studied on which Durkheim’s conception of sociology is based. These are defined as: “states of collective mind” distinct from the forms these states assumed when manifested through private individual minds.

‘*Social facts must be regarded as ‘things’* and are general because they are collective; they are different from the repercussions they have on individuals; their substratum is the collectivity as a whole. The Social facts are a category of facts which present very special characteristics; they consist of “manners of acting, thinking, and feeling external to the individual, which are invested with a coercive power by virtue of which they exercise control over him” (1895:52). Thus the social facts encompass both ways of *functioning* (acting, thinking, feeling etc) and ways of *being* (number, nature, relations, size, geographical distribution of population, nature and extent of communication networks). In other words Durkheim’s social fact is a conveniently elastic concept, covering the range from the most clearly delineated features of social structure (e.g. population size and distribution) to the most spontaneous currents of public opinion and enthusiasm. Durkheim works on a sociological experiment to determine the rate of ‘suicide’ in a society by studying the phenomena as a social fact. He explains its occurrence in terms of the suicidogenic impulse, a social tendency to suicide, which is within certain individuals because of circumstances of an individual order.
Durkheim approaches the matter of education through his theory of morality, and his lectures were on the subject of 'moral education' (Durkheim, 1879). He saw the education of the young in the widest possible sense as the influence of any adult on children not yet ready to become full members of society, and saw education as a lifelong process. He says education is simply the means by which society prepares, in its children, the essential conditions of its own existence. It is the means by which we learn to cope with our physical existence, control our desires and impulses, and adjust to the social environment. In this perspective we understand how educational systems were developed on different values in different ages that the society itself is built on.

**Talcott Parsons**

The structural functionalism perspective was further developed by Parsons and he wanted to develop a 'grand theory' of society. He began by examining the individual and their actions. He stated that "the social system is made up of the actions of individuals" (Parsons, 1961: 41). His starting point was the interaction between two individuals. Those individuals were faced with a variety of choices about how they might act. However, those choices are influenced and constrained by a number of physical and social factors (Craib, 1992:40).

He classifies the primary constituents of the general system of action according to their functions as **social systems**, **cultural systems**, **personality system** and **behavioral organisms**. The four primary functions which are imputed to all systems of action, are pattern-maintenance, integration, goal-attainment, and adaptation.

An action system's primary integrative problem is the coordination of its constituent units. Hence the primacy of integrative function is attributed to the social system; primacy of pattern-maintenance and of creative pattern change is attributed to the cultural system; primacy of goal attainment is attributed to the personality of the individual.
In analyzing the interrelations among the four subsystems of action and between these systems and the environments of action, it is essential to keep in mind the phenomenon of interpenetration. Parsons presents internalization of social objects and cultural norms into the personality of the individual as an example of interpenetration. Learned content of experience, organized and stored in the memory apparatus of the organism is another example, which is the institutionalization of normative components of cultural systems as constitutive structures social systems (Parsons, 1951).

Parsons (1951) analyses the structure of social systems in terms of four types of independently variable components: values, norms, collectivities and roles. Values take primacy in the pattern maintenance functioning of social systems, for they are “conceptions of desirable types of social patterns that regulate the making of commitments by social units”. Norms, which function primarily to integrate social systems, are “specific to particular social functions and types of social situations”. Collectivities are the “type structural component that has goal- attainment primacy”. A role, the type of structural component that has primacy in the adaptive function, is conceived of as “defining a class of individuals who, through reciprocal expectations are involved in a particular collectivity”. Hence, roles comprise the “primary zones of interpenetration between the social system and the personality of the individual”. Further, Parsons developed the idea of roles into collectivities of roles that complemented each other in fulfilling functions for society (Parsons, 1961:41).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsystems</th>
<th>Primary Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social system</td>
<td>Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social system</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural system</td>
<td>Pattern Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality system</td>
<td>Goal attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural - Organisms</td>
<td>Adaptations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: 2.1 Social Subsystems Environment (Parsons, T. 1971: 5)
From the Parsonian functional point of view the school class as a social system is treated as an agency of socialization. It is an agency through which individual human personalities are trained to be motivationally and technically adequate to perform adult roles. Socialization is the development in individuals of the commitment and capacities which are essential prerequisites of their future role-performance. There are two components of commitment: commitment to the implementation of the broad values of society, and commitment to the performance of a specific type of role within the structure of society. Therefore, culture is transmitted, learned and shared, and further, 'culture is on the one hand the product of, on the other a determinant of systems of human social interaction' (Parsons, 1964: 15).

Thus, Parsons provides an understanding of how society works as a grand system within which several other subsystems work. The individual, within this system, is seen as an objective/ detached member dispassionately performing his role to maintain the system as per the demands of the system on him.

Robert King Merton

In spite of stressing the importance of interaction between individuals, Parsons’ theory tends to imply that all institutions are inherently good for society and beneficial to the individuals. Merton (1957) however, emphasizes the existence of dysfunctions. He thinks that some things may have consequences that are generally dysfunctional or which are dysfunctional for some and functional for others. On this point he approaches conflict theory, although he does believe that institutions and values can be functional for society as a whole. Merton states that only by recognizing the dysfunctional aspects of institutions, can we explain the development and persistence of alternatives. Merton’s concept of dysfunctions is also central to his argument that functionalism is not essentially conservative. This is the rationale for the distinction between manifest functions and latent functions; the first referring to those objective consequences for a specified unit (person, subgroup, social or cultural system) which contribute to its adjustment or adaptation and were so in intended; the second referring to unintended and
unrecognized consequences of the same order” (Merton, 1957). Manifest functions are the consequences that people observe or expect, latent functions are those that are neither recognized nor intended. While Parsons tends to emphasize the manifest functions of social behavior, Merton sees latent functions as increasing the understanding of society: the distinction between manifest and latent forces the sociologist to go beyond the reasons individuals give for their actions or for the existence of customs and institutions; it makes them look for other social consequences that allow these practices’ survival and illuminate the way society works. Dysfunctions can also be manifest or latent.

Merton’s concept of ‘Role model’ refers to a person who fills his or her role as a good or bad example for others. A good example is a positive role model. A bad example is a negative role model. The term role model on its own is usually taken to mean a positive role model.

A positive role model carries out a role demonstrating values, ways of thinking and acting, which are considered good in that role. Parents can be positive role models helping their children learn adult ways or they can be negative role models. In dysfunctional families parents tend to be primarily negative role models.

Robert K. Merton is also credited with coining the expression "self-fulfilling prophecy" and formalising its structure and consequences. In his book Social Theory and Social Structure (1957), Merton gives the following definition: The self-fulfilling prophecy is, in the beginning, a false definition of the situation evoking a new behaviour which makes the original false conception come true. Once a prediction or prophecy is made, actors may accommodate their behaviour and actions so that a statement that would have been false becomes true or, conversely, a statement that would have been true becomes false- as a consequence of the prediction or prophecy being made. The prophecy has a constitutive impact on the outcome or result, changing the outcome from what would otherwise have happened.
He popularized the concept the ‘Law of Unintended Consequences’ which holds that almost all human actions have at least one unintended consequence. In other words, each cause has more than one effect, including unforeseen effects.

Merton (1957) spoke of the "unanticipated consequences" of "purposive social action", emphasizing that his term "purposive action... concerned with 'conduct' as distinct from 'behavior.' That is, with action this involves motives and consequently a choice between various alternatives.

Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) test the hypothesis of the 'self fulfilling prophesy', that in any given classroom there is a correlation between teachers' expectations and students' achievement. In 1968 they published 'Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development', which eventually would become a classic in the Sociology of Education. Put simply, the main argument of the book is that the expectations that teachers have about their students' behaviour can unwittingly influence such behavior. This influence, or self-fulfilling prophecy, could have a positive or negative impact. In other words, when teachers expect students to do well, they tend to do well; when teachers expect students to fail, they tend to fail.

The theory of society developed by Merton offers a view of the society that need not always contribute to the blooming and nurturing of individual potential. In other words the larger society might limit and restrict an individual for a smooth functioning of the system as a whole, making the individual unintentionally dysfunctional by projecting a false prophecy of his ability.

Discussion

Structural Functionalist paradigm provides an understanding of the structural bases of society. We have identified three main sociologists in this group in order to describe the development of basic sociological ideas that contribute to sociological analysis.
Dukheim (1893) has contributed to an understanding of how society is held together and continues to function through the concepts of Mechanical solidarity and Conscience collective; and Organic solidarity and Division of Labor. Another of his seminal contribution is the Sociological method he has rendered to the field of sociology to study societal phenomenon and the view he holds about the nature of different phenomenon in society as qualifying to be called social facts which can be studied. What is interesting is to see that he includes among the social facts even ways of thinking besides ways of being. Therefore psychological phenomenon also are to be understood here as social phenomenon endowed with the same coercive power as other societal phenomenon as they are as much determined by the society as any other phenomenon.

The next sociologist discussed here was Talcott Parsons who has given us a broad framework of how society functions as an action system with his concept of several other subsystems within it, with their relegated primacy of functions based on the other components of values, norms, collectivities and roles. He presents a clear structure of society in terms of systems and subsystems at a purely structural level on one hand, and on the other, succeeds in showing the way individual personality also functions as a system, and the ways in which the “institutionalization” of “values, norms, collectivities and roles” happen with his concepts of “interpenetration” between systems and “internalization” in individual personalities. Therefore he offers an understanding of how to analyze society on the whole and the individual personality as being part of the society helping it to function in a stable way.

Merton (1957), as opposed to the stance taken by Parsons (1951), undertakes to show that functionalism need not be conservative. With his concepts of “dysfunctions”, and “latent and manifest functions”, he shows that the development and persistence of alternatives can be explained. The recognition of the working of self fulfilling prophecy is an example of how he explains dysfunctional aspects of human action as contributing to the functionalism of society. This view therefore gives an understanding of the scope of conflict in society.
The importance of this paradigm in the present study relates to the understanding it offers in sociology of education, to the beginnings of the discussion of the 'hidden curriculum' of how school as a system functions within the structuralist perspective. The discussion of hidden curriculum is well known in terms of the conflict paradigm but here the hidden curriculum is understood. It is understood as a functional requirement in itself. It is nom discussed here in terms of the power relations that the concept explains within the conflict paradigm. The hidden curriculum of the school as discussed within this paradigm is “the social requirements of its learning situation.” (Jackson, 1968, as quoted by Lynch 1989: 1). According to this line of thought, simple consensual relationship exists between the school and the society, though there could be a contradiction between “the institutional expectations of the hidden curriculum and the requirements of intellectual mastery” (ibid, p.2). In more explicit functional terms, the social life into which people are initiated via school is assumed to be a consensual, socially undifferentiated whole where achievement, independence, universalism and specificity are the required norms of conduct.

In other words, school is a maintenance sub-system of the larger society. To reiterate Durkheim’s words, the school is simply the means by which society prepares, in its children, the essential conditions of its own existence.

The structural functional paradigm, therefore, does not discuss opposing forces inherent to the society which try to destabilize or pose a constant threat to the structure of the society. Even if it recognizes such forces, they are considered dysfunctional to the functioning of the society. It restricts the individual and human agency to a subservient role vis-à-vis the functioning of the society. In spite of these limitations, however, this paradigm is credited for providing the foundational concepts to study and describe society and its primacy over the individual while providing the beginnings of an understanding of the occurrence of conflict and power struggles between different institutions and individuals within society, the argument, which is central to the conflict paradigm, which is going to be discussed next.
2.1.1.2 The Conflict Paradigm

The Conflict paradigm goes further than the structural functionalist perspective in moving from a mere description of the society (The Consensual approach) with a tendency for equilibrium to a perspective which takes into account the dynamic interrelationships in terms of role relationships. It envisages the members and the institutions of the society as having conflicting orientations and concerns for the functioning of the society, reflected in their ideologies, warring against each other for power.

The conflict approach draws much of its inspiration from the work of Karl Marx (1818-1883) and argues that the structure of society and the nature of social relationships are the result of past and ongoing conflicts. The Marxist, conflict approach emphasizes a materialist interpretation of history, a dialectical method of analysis, a critical stance toward existing social arrangements, and a political program of revolution or, at least, reform.

Marx summarized the key elements of this materialist view of history as follows:

In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness (Marx 1971:20).

Marx therefore gives primacy to the social over the individual, that is, for him society develops the individual rather than the other way around as described by the positivist school.
It is through a ‘dialectical’ process that is in constant interaction with the material world that we come to know of ‘materialism’ which is Marx’s view of how we come to know about the world. We change the world but in tum are changed by it.

“The driving force for Marx’s system stems from the relationship which we have with the means of production; in other words, the control we have over our labour, its inputs, outputs and the necessary technologies to complete the tasks (Robinson 1981).

This is to suggest that the position we hold in the means of production determines whether we are controlled by others or we ourselves are in control of things. Thus even the system of beliefs which we hold, ideology, is a consequence of the division of labour.

“The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships”. (Marx and Engles, 1960: 15, as quoted by Robinson 1981).

The ruling group not only controls the productive forces but also the way of thought. They dictate what is right and acceptable and fix the very framework within which thought is possible. Marx’s philosophy is concerned with the individual’s experience of everyday life and he propagates transcending the framework presented by the ruling class by removing the class bias ingrained in one’s own thought.

The Marxist perspective to education, Robinson (1981) says, illuminates the conflict underlying the economic relations of production within society and the concomitant domination of one group by another. The views put forth by Althusser (1969), Freire (1972), Illich (1971), Bowles and Gintis (1976) and Bourdieu (1977), use the ideas of ‘economic and ideological practices’, ‘pedagogic oppression’, ‘institutionalized values’, ‘the relation between the capitalist economy and schooling’. In the following paragraphs each of these sociologists are discussed presenting a gist of their main ideas, which relate to or draw from the Marxist- conflict paradigm.
Louis Althusser

A major connection which has been made between Marxist theory and the theory of education has been via the elaboration of the Marxist theory of the State and the concept of 'Ideology'. Louis Althusser (1969) proposes the addition to the Marxist theory of the state, of the notion of Ideological State apparatuses (ISAs) of which the educational ISA is dominant in mature capitalist social formations.

The operation of ideology in human life basically involves the Constitution and the patterning of how human beings live their lives as conscious, reflecting initiators of acts in a structured, meaningful world. Ideology operates as discourse, addressing or, as Althusser (1969) puts it "interpellating" human beings a subjects.'

The basic characteristic of ideology, or the ideological element in cultural practices and discourses, according to this definition, is that it constructs subjects (or subjectivities).

Ideology produces or constructs a subject by fixing the individual with a certain mental horizon. And when such a horizon is accepted as a natural attitude, for example, the existing relations of power are not only accepted but perceived precisely as the way things are, ought to be and will be. The assumption of Marxist sociology of knowledge seems to be that social practices and relations in ordinary life are in some crucial sense structured and mediated by high-level theories.

In this sense Ideology is always more than ideas; it is a material force in that it constructs subjects in specific relations to the social relations. Marxist thought thus takes into account ideological practice, besides economic and political practices in constructing a subject. Conflict theory as applied to the educational enterprise helps look at the inherent power relations in the educational system. The work of Paulo Freire (1972), Illich (1971), Bowes and Gintis (1976), Bourdieu (1977) reflects the Marxist and neomarxist thought in education. In the following sections we shall discuss ideas presented by each of these theorists.
Paulo Freire

Work has not only found its way into the sociology of education but also into the work of Marxist educational theorists such as Paulo Freire. According to Freire (1972):

*Pedagogy which begins with the egoistic interests of the oppressors (an egoism cloaked in the false generosity of paternalism) and makes of the oppressed the objects of its humanitarianism, itself 'maintains' and 'embodies' oppression. It is an instrument of dehumanization.* (Freire 1972: 30)

Freire's writings are concerned with forms of 'cultural action'. He asserts that economic and cultural dominance is practiced by a metropolitan society upon a dependent society. Freire maintains that forms of economic and cultural domination may be implicit in the domination of one class over another within the same society. Freire argues that man's historical task is the transformation of reality, which is precisely the transformation of himself, because in Freire's conception, reality is constituted by men. Society is 'being'. It is the Super-Subject which manifests itself in the phenomena of the individual beings of men. 'Social change' manifests itself in transformations of man. The dominant concept in Freire's anthropology is the 'humanization of man'. For him the specific character of the 'oppressed' is defined by the state of their 'being'. He postulates a conception of a 'complete being', in comparison to which the oppressed are incomplete, not fully human beings. It is the will and cultural action of the oppressors which prevents the oppressed from achieving their historical vocation as fully human beings. According to Freire:

"The pedagogy of the oppressed, as humanist and libertarian pedagogy has two stages... In both stages it is always through action in depth that the culture of domination is culturally confronted. In the first stage this confrontation occurs through the change in the way the oppressed perceive the world of oppression; in the second stage, through the expulsion of the myths created and developed in the older order, which like specters haunt the new
structure emerging from the revolutionary transformation” (Freire, 1972: 31).

Therefore, the cycle of cultural reproduction of the oppressed can be broken only by ‘conscientization’ and cultural action on the part of the oppressed.

Illich

Illich (1971) advocated another form of radicalism, a libertarian doctrine to educational theory through his work Deschooling Society. Illich, however, refers to himself not as libertarian but as a radical and a revolutionary. According to him the school is a modern institution which has as its primary purpose the ‘shaping of man’s vision of reality’. The agent of this process is the schoolteacher, who fuses in his person ‘the functions of judge, ideologue and doctor,’ and the political interests of ‘consumer society’ are promoted in the ‘hidden curriculum of schooling’, that is the ceremonial ritual of schooling itself.

The social system, in Illich’s conceptualization, consists of a continuum of institutions. The ‘institutional spectrum’ runs from left to right, and Illich points out that his schema has not to do with the ‘left-right spectrum used to characterize men and their ideologies’ but rather that it characterizes social institutions and their styles. On the right of the institutional spectrum are the bureaucratic, manipulative institutions of which the schooling system is exemplary. The right-wing institutions have reached old age, and Illich’s aim is their ‘rejuvenation’. This rejuvenation constitutes Illich’s conception of social change, and consists of the shifting of institutions form right to left along the institutional spectrum. The key to social transformation is the deshcooling of society.

Bowles and Gintis

The critique of Illich’s forms one of the bases for Bowles and Gintis’s (1976) development of a ‘political economy’ of education. For Bowles and Gintis, Illich’s concern with consumption rather than with production is a major ‘failing’. Gintis argues
that ‘to understand consumption in a capitalist society requires a production orientation, in contrast to Illich’s emphasis on ‘institutionalized values’ as basic explanatory variables’.

A recurrent theme of Bowles and Gintis’ book *Schooling in Capitalist America* and in particular their correspondence thesis is the argument that,

> *Different levels of education feed workers into different levels within the occupational structure and, correspondingly, tend toward an internal organization comparable to levels in the hierarchical division of labor.* (1976:132).

This argument is functionalist. Education is treated as an agency of supply of educated manpower and it is argued that the internal organization of education is structured so as to be compatible with the needs of industry.

In their functionalist analysis of relations between educational system and the economy Bowles Gintis and Meyer assert that the educational system legitimates economic inequality by providing an ostensibly open, objective and meritocratic mechanism for assigning individuals to unequal economic positions. Indeed, the more meritocratic the educational process appears, the better it serves to legitimate inequality. (1975: 30 as quoted by Demain, 1981)

Therefore what is interesting to see in Bowles and Gintis is the discussion of the relations of production between school and society, which brings it closer to conflict theory of production than for the structuralist mechanism it tries to explain.

**Bourdieu**

Another seminal sociologist of education within the Marxist paradigm is Pierre Bourdieu who propagates a culturalist approach to educational reproduction which becomes a tool of cultural reproduction and class reproduction. He invokes the ideas of ‘cultural capital’ and ‘habitus’. The ‘pedagogic action’ he says is ‘symbolic violence’
which is undertaken within a particular habitus, that is, "a system of schemes of thought, perception, appreciation and action" which reflects the material and symbolic interests of the dominant groups or classes (Bourdieu and Passerson 1977: 40). Bourdieu's theory inclines more towards a theory of resistance rather than conflict.

**Discussion**

In summary, conflict theory seeks to catalogue the ways in which those in power seek to stay in power. In understanding conflict theory, social class competition plays a key part. Conflict theory is credited therefore for providing us with the description of the dynamic interrelationships between different institutions within the society.

Marx (1971) explains how relations with respect to the "material" production extend to a restriction of the "Nonmaterial" privileges or the way the mental horizon is fixed through his concept of 'ideological practice' in society. This offers a deeper understanding on one hand, of the working of the structure of society at different levels, and on the other hand how conflict shapes the very structure of society.

It makes an attempt to describe the different perspectives of different parties in different institutions with differing ideologies which against each other. Yet, in this paradigm as in the structural functionalist paradigm, primacy is given to the Society over the Individual. The Individual is seen as being thrust into the collective ideology which is in turn the Ideology of those who win the battle of Ideologies. It does not offer an explanation for the possibility of an ongoing interaction between the society and the individual’s ability to alter social reality.

The ideas of Marxism and the conflict theory are used by sociologists of education like Althusser to extend the idea of economic practice to that of ideology, which brings the mental, and the psychological realm into the arena of dominance and subjection in society. While Friere (1972), exposes in a radical way, the oppressive nature of the educational enterprise and calls for resistance and revolutionary transformation, Illich (1971) advocates a libertarian note, the need to 'deschool' and de-institutionalize
and thereby expose the hidden curriculum of the school as an Institution in Society which limits the individual. Bowles and Gintis (1976) are the next sociologists of Education, who directly analyze the issue of schooling in Capitalist society, showing how the school prepares students to fit the roles in the capitalist market. Bourdieu's (1977) theory of cultural reproduction, presents one of the most powerful statements in Marxist theory of resistance to cultural reproduction through manipulative power relations. Therefore the conflict theory helps to see the relations of power within the enterprise of schooling and that between the school and society.

However, the weakness in Marxist analysis, is in going beyond the statement of contradiction to a prescription for its removal which implies elimination and not regulation of contradiction which itself has imposition (of equality) inherent to it. Society is basically seen as a force working against the individual but in favour of those in power. This total antagonism leads to an unhealthy conflict between society and individual. For the individual is reduced to a passive actor who is at the mercy of the society, it does not allow for an ongoing negotiation of the individual in the construction of reality which is considered by the interactionist paradigm in sociology discussed below.

### 2.1.1.3 The Interactionist Paradigm

Interactionists focus on the subjective aspects of social life, as opposed to the Structuralists' focus on objective, macro-structural aspects of social systems. On the other hand, they give primacy to the individual's interpretation and construction of reality while crediting the role of the Society in the individual's existence as opposed to the view held by the conflict paradigm of the controlling nature of the dominant party in society over the individual. They explore the practical consciousness of everyday life as suggested by Alfred Shutz (1967).

Symbolic interactionists contend that society is possible because human beings have the ability to communicate with one another by means of symbols. They say that we act toward people, objects, and events on the basis of the meanings we impart to them.
Consequently, we experience the world as *constructed reality*. This perspective views social order and social change as resulting from all the immense variety of repeated interactions among individuals and groups. The interactionist perspective usually generates analyses of social life at the micro level of interpersonal relationship. It looks at how middle and macro level of social phenomena result from micro level behaviors or conversely how middle and macro level influences shape the interactions among individuals. This perspective insists that we look carefully at how individuals interact, how they interpret their own and other people’s actions, and the consequences of those actions for the larger social group.

Within this perspective two separate views of interactionism are included. The first is the *Rational Choice* sociological view, which considers interaction as in exchange theory in economics and political theory because it focuses on what people seem to be getting out of their interactions and what they in turn are contributing to relationship or to the larger group. In interaction something is being exchanged. An alternative view is that of symbolic interactionism which includes those aspects of communication that give information without speaking it or speak one thing and mean another. According to this view words are of great importance in making explicit the content of communication. The second view within this perspective is that of *symbolic interactionism* which takes into account other forces shaping our behavior as well. It has within its purview other levels of communication that give information without speaking it, or speak one thing and mean another. Sociologists refer to all these aspects of behavior as *symbolic interaction*. Symbolic interactionists call attention to how social life is “constructed” through the mundane acts of social communication. The power of symbolic interactionism lies in its ability to generate theories about how people learn to play certain roles and how those roles are used in the social construction of groups and organizations. Symbolic interactionism is influential in many areas of sociology and particularly dominant in microsociology and sociological social psychology.
George Herbert Mead

Symbolic interactionism is derived from American *pragmatism* and particularly from the work of George Herbert Mead (1863-1931), who argued that people's selves are social products, but that these selves are also purposive and creative. His theory of how the *mind* and *self* emerge from the social process of communication by *signs* founded the *symbolic interactionist* school of sociology and social psychology. Mead called his approach "social behaviourism." Mead's self proves to be noticeably entwined within a sociological existence: For Mead, existence in community comes before individual consciousness. First, one must participate in the different social positions within society and only subsequently can one use that experience to take the perspective of others and thus become self-conscious. In *Mind, Self and Society* (1934), Mead distinguishes between the "I" and the "me." The "me" is the accumulated understanding of "the generalized other" i.e. norms, unconscious opinions, patterns of social response etc. The "I" is the more personal opinions, the reflector or observer, the social struggler - it is what creates the individual's individuality. It is important, when reading Mead, to remember that he sees the human mind as something that can arise solely through social experience. The thinking process, for instance, is for Mead nothing but internalized communication.

Herbert Blumer

Herbert Blumer (1900-1987), a student and interpreter of Mead, coined the term "symbolic interactionism" and put forward an influential summary of the perspective: people act toward things based on the meaning those things have for them; and these meanings are derived from social interaction and modified through interpretation.

Herbert Blumer (1969), who coined the term "symbolic interactionism," set out three basic premises of the perspective:

1. "Human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them".
2. "The meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one's fellows."

3. "These meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretive process used by the person in dealing with the things he/she encounters."


Blumer (1969), following Mead, claimed that people interact with each other by "interpreting or 'defining' each other's actions instead of merely reacting to each other's actions. Their 'response' is not made directly to the actions of one another but instead is based on the meaning which they attach to such actions. Thus, human interaction is mediated by the use of symbols, by interpretation, or by ascertaining the meaning of one another's actions" (Blumer, 1969). Blumer contrasted this process, which he called "symbolic interaction," with behaviorist explanations of human behavior, which don't allow for interpretation between stimulus and response.

**Goffman**

Erving Goffman (1922-82), although he famously claimed not to have been a symbolic interactionist, extends this perspective with the application of the metaphor of dramaturgy. He, among many other sociologists, attempted to define the self. In dramaturgical sociology it is argued that human actions are dependent upon time, place, and audience. He says, "every person lives in a world of social encounters, involving him either in face-to-face or mediated contact with other participant, in each of these contacts, he tends to act out what is sometimes called a line- that is, a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts by which he expresses his view of the situation and through this hid evaluation of the participants, especially himself" (Goffman, 1967: 5). Thus, for Goffman, the self is a sense of, who one is, that emerges as a dramatic effect from the immediate scene being presented.

Symbolic interactionism is a social constructivist approach to understanding social life that focuses on how reality is constructed by active and creative actors through their interactions with others. **Social constructionism** is a sociological theory of
knowledge developed by Berger and Luckmann with their, The Social Construction of Reality (1966). Socially constructed reality is seen as an ongoing, dynamic process; reality is reproduced by people acting on their interpretations and their knowledge of it. Berger and Luckmann argue that all knowledge, including the most basic, taken-for-granted common sense knowledge of everyday reality, is derived from and maintained by social interactions.

Symbolic interactionist researchers investigate how people create meaning during social interaction, how they present and construct the self (or "identity"), and how they define situations of co-presence with others. One of the perspectives central ideas is that people act as they do because of how they define the present situation. Sociological areas that have been particularly influenced by symbolic interactionism include the sociology of emotion, deviance/criminology, collective behavior/social movements, and the social constructionist approach to studying social problems.

Interactionists focus on the subjective aspects of social life, rather than on objective, macro-structural aspects of social systems. One reason for this focus is that interactionists base their theoretical perspective on their image of humans, rather than on their image of society (as the functionalists do). For interactionists, humans are pragmatic actors who continually must adjust their behavior to the actions of other actors. We can adjust to these actions only because we are able to interpret them, i.e., to denote them symbolically and treat the actions and those who perform them as symbolic objects. This process of adjustment is aided by our ability to imaginatively rehearse alternative lines of action before we act. The process is further aided by our ability to think about and to react to our own actions and even our selves as symbolic objects. Thus, the interactionist theorist sees humans as active, creative participants who construct their social world, not as passive, conforming objects of socialization.
2.1.1.4 New Sociologists

The Conflict paradigm gave sociologists a radical perspective of looking at knowledge and education as being political in nature. Further, the phenomenological approach to sociology suggested by the Social Interactionists giving the individual due credit in meaning making called for a new approach to the sociology of education. The new sociology refers to itself, or is described as, "New Directions", the radical, and the phenomenological sociology of education. Young (1971) ushered in the 'new' sociology of education which challenged the traditional sociology of education.

The task of the New Directions was the exploration of the political character of educational knowledge, which is conceived as a construct of 'underlying meaning' and as such, a reflection of certain political interests. The application of sociology of knowledge in the new sociology of education enables the sociologist to consider that:

"What counts as education is socially and historically constructed. This process points to an analysis of what are perceived as the dominant definitions of educational knowledge by different groups at particular times. This takes us back to the political nature of education...." (Young, 1972: 02)

The task of the New Directions is the exploration of the construction of these meanings and it is claimed that this can be accomplished by following the 'phenomenological' and philosophical works of Alfred Schutz.

'Science and reason' are a 'new absolutism' which 'together with the various social, political and educational beliefs that are assumed to follow from them... represent the dominant legitimizing categories' (Young 1971:3), 'like the feudal, clerical and market dogmas of earlier centuries, the dogmas of rationality and science become open to enquiry' Young(1971:3)

Young regards that it is sufficient to allow the sociology of knowledge to press its claims, and to reveal knowledge educational or otherwise as 'neither absolute nor
arbitrary, but as "available sets of meanings", which in any context do not merely "emerge", but are collectively given. It must explore what is 'taken for granted as sets of unquestioned assumptions'.

Knowledge is to be considered as a product of social organization. Educational knowledge, like any other knowledge in Young's conception, refers to the shared meanings of human subjects and the criterion for validity of knowledge is intersubjectivity.

Young (1971), thus asserts his position concerning the value of the sociology of knowledge, in which discourses in science, philosophy and everyday communication alike, become subject to sociological analysis on the grounds that they are nothing but shared subjective meanings, socially and historically constructed. It is this extreme relativism and subjectivism that characterizes Young's new directions for sociology of education with 'radicalism'. The political nature of educational knowledge is expressed in the nature of its 'control' which results in the 'imposition of meaning'. Young raises the questions of how and by whom meaning is given to education.

Thus, the new sociology of education, apart from exposing the political and social value judgments built into the structuralist functionalist perspective, brought up 'educational knowledge' as the central issue of sociology of education.

Discussion

The uniqueness and the strength of the interactionist paradigm over the earlier two paradigms is the view it holds of the social construction of reality through a dynamic and continual interaction between the individual and the society. The equal importance is given to the society and the individual and there is the possibility of social construction of reality by the individuals in immediate contexts through a continual interaction through their experiences in the immediate social contexts they live in. This ongoing construction of reality means that individuals are neither stuck with the ideas presented by society nor
fixed by a dominant ideology in the society. It gives scope for healthy relationship between the society and the individual even when there is conflict in society. The individual therefore is defined in a new way within this paradigm by Mead (1934). While giving credit to the individuality of the thinking self the key role that social experience plays is not undermined.

Next, the social constructionist line of thought that emerges from this paradigm explicates the continuous interaction and negotiation on the part of the individual which is symbolic in nature in the process of meaning making and creation of knowledge. The social context therefore offers and creates the scene for social drama to enfold in a dynamic interactive, constructivist manner.

For the interactionist, society consists of organized and patterned interactions among individuals. Thus, research by interactionists focuses on easily observable face-to-face interactions rather than on macro-level structural relationships involving social institutions. Furthermore, this focus on interaction and on the meaning of events to the participants in those events (the definition of the situation) shifts the attention of interactionists away from stable norms and values toward more changeable, continually readjusting social processes. Whereas for functionalists, socialization creates stability in the social system, for interactionists negotiation among members of society creates temporary, socially constructed relations which remain in constant flux, despite relative stability in the basic framework governing those relations.

Whereas structural–functionalism has tended to treat schools as passive filters, which process pupils with different prior socialization and hence varying educational potential, the new sociology resulted in a refocusing of attention towards the cultural differentiations of pupils and of knowledge within the school itself. At the heart of the new perspective lay the belief that the process of social reproduction was none other than a process of cultural reproduction. Educational inequality is seen to emanate primarily from the cultural practices and typifications within the context of the school, whilst social inequality at the social level became a matter of social definition and ‘routine accomplishments’ of members as they went about their daily lives.
2.1.1.5 Sociology of the Curriculum

According to the new sociologists of education, educational curriculum can only ever be a selection. It was incumbent upon the researcher to explore the range of cultural meanings and typifications of those involved in the process of educational transmission, because it is through a dynamic process of negotiation that their notions of education, differentiated pupil types and definitions of worthwhile knowledge are socially constructed.

Bernstien

Bernstein's sociolinguistic theory (1971), taking off from Durkhiem (1983), suggests that the difference in syntactical and lexical forms reflect different relationships between people and have consequences for the maintenance of social control within society. Bernstein argues that the form of social relationship affects speech which in turn acts back on the social relationship. Language is a set of rules to which all speech codes must comply, but which speech codes are realized is a function of the culture acting through social relationships in specific contexts. Also speech refers back to the individual, a view of the world formed in relation to other, yet unique, as it reflects the idiosyncratic position of the speaker, the center of that configuration of relationships.

Bernstein argues that it is not only capital in the strict sense which is subject to appropriation, manipulation and exploitation but also cultural capital in the form of the symbolic systems through which man can extend and change the boundaries of his experience.

Further, the concept of code and its use in our understanding of sociolinguistics, offers an intuitively acceptable explanation of some of the socio-cultural causes of underachievement by working class children. Bernstein contends that linguistic codes are basic controls on the transmission of a culture or subculture and are creators of a social identity.
The communication system therefore offers a role to a child in terms of his/her unique social, affective, and cognitive characteristics. His elaborated and restricted codes are to be understood as ideal types to help study different patterns of social control they exert.

He claims "changes in codes involve changes in means whereby order and relevance are generated. Further, changes in codes involve changes in role relationships and procedures of social control. Explaining how in different types of families (positional and person oriented) social control is affected in different ways; Bernstein reiterates that social control will be based upon linguistically elaborated meanings rather than upon power. The socialization type itself differs so that if it is reciprocal in person-oriented families, it tends to be unilateral in positional families.

Bernstein (1972) lists four interrelated contexts within which socialization of the young in the family proceeds:

- The regulative context constituting authority relationships is where the child is made aware of the rules of the moral order and their various backings.
- The instructional context, where the child learns about the objective nature of objects and persons, acquires skills of various kinds.
- The imaginative or innovative contexts, where the child is encouraged to experiment and re-create his world on his own terms, and his own way.
- The interpersonal context, where the child is made aware of affective states—his own, and others.

Further, the linguistic performances within the family in these four contexts are determined by the sociological factors of culture and subculture in the family and kin.

Language constitutes the most important significant symbols through which we exert our hold on the world and of ourselves.
Conclusion

Sociology thus, shows how society is organized and the position of the individual in it. Different paradigms expand the understanding of societal workings and the role and importance given to individual actors within it.

The Structuralist paradigm has a functionalist perspective – seeing the individual for the purpose of the reproduction and maintenance of the structure of society in a consensual way.

The conflict paradigm looks at individual as being at odds with the societal forces. It identifies conflicting agendas and the power of fixing an individual with an ideology on the part of the ruling group in society. This paradigm looks at ideological practices on par with economic practices. It shows how the working class is exploited, and inequality is maintained in society through material relationships of production by means of an unequal distribution and access to cultural capital. This is done through the maintenance of *habitus* - by fixing an ideology.

In addition to highlighting the inequalities and power struggles, the critical paradigm also states the need for resisting oppression.

Interactionist paradigm looks at individual as constantly interacting in the process of meaning making while modifying it and constructing it. The importance of everyday experiences of life and construction of reality - the individual agency as significant for contributing to one’s predicament in society is considered.

These paradigms set the scope or provide sociological imagination to understand the interrelationship between the structural, historical and biographical levels of organization of society.
2.1.2 Psychological Perspectives to Education

Psychology is another field of discourse which offers valuable insights to the field of education. Even in the history psychology there is a shift from positivism to social interactionism. In the theories of Educational Psychology a major shift can be traced starting from a behaviourist view to learning where adults are entirely responsible for shaping children’s learning by the judicious use of rewards and punishments, to a cognitive view which says that from the time of birth children learn independently by exploring their environment. In contrast to behaviourism, cognitive psychology gives importance to the mental processes, strategies such as information processing, memory and intelligence which credit the learner as an active agent in the learning process. Further, humanistic approaches provide us with powerful educational messages regarding whole person involvement in learning.

Social Constructivism is the psychological framework which takes into account the social context of learning experiences and the ways in which individuals make sense of those experiences in such contexts. For the argument presented in this thesis, this particular framework is important in that it brings together the working of the social and the individual psyche together.

2.1.2.1 Social Constructivism

Social constructivism has bee discussed earlier from a sociological perspective. Here we shall look at it from psychological focus. The Social Constructivist approach encompasses the insights provided by cognitive and humanistic approaches as well as social interactionism. For social interactionists, children are born into a social world, and learning occurs through interaction with other people. From the time we are born we interact with others in our day-to-day lives, and through these interactions make our own sense of the world. The main psychologists who adopt the social constructivist perspective in their psychology are Vygotsky (and Bruner, whose work is discussed
below since the two of them are also psychologists who are also concerned with an analysis of schooling and education in their psychology.

Vygotsky

Social constructivist and Sociocultural approaches emphasize the interdependence of social and individual processes in the co-construction of knowledge. Vygotsky, the theorist whose work refers to the Cultural-historical psychology closely investigated the role of culture and interpersonal communication. Vygotsky observed how higher mental functions developed through social interactions with significant people in a child's life, particularly parents, but also other adults. Through these interactions, a child came to learn the habits of mind of her/his culture, namely speech patterns, written language, and other symbolic knowledge that affected a child's construction of her/his knowledge. The specific knowledge gained by a child through these interactions also represented the shared knowledge of a culture. This process is known as internalization.

In *Thought and Language* (1962) Vygotsky presents an argument demonstrating that language, the very means by which reflection and elaboration of experience takes place, is a highly personal and at the same time a profoundly social human process. He sees the relation between the individual and the society as a dialectical process, which like a river and its tributaries, combines and separates the different elements of human life. They are never frozen polarities to him. Vygotsky says,

“*Every function in the child’s cultural development appears twice, on two levels; first on the social, and later on the psychological level; first, between people as an interpsychological category, and then inside the child, as an intrapsychological category.*” (1962:10)

Thus, this conception clearly throws light on the interrelationship between the social and the psychological levels.
The zone of proximal development is another individual concept that Vygotsky introduces that is of great value to our consideration of the psycho-social in the classroom. Zone of proximal development is

"the distance between the child’s actual development level as mined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers". (1962)

This means that learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his adults. Thus learning is a necessary and universal aspect of the process of developing “culturally organized, specifically human, psychological functions”.

Through the concept of zone of proximal development Vygotsky explains the transformation of an interpersonal (social) process to an intrapersonal one; the stages of internalization; and the role of experienced learners from the point of view of instruction. Vygotsky proposes a parallel between play and school instruction for the young: both create a “zone of proximal development” and in both contexts children elaborate socially available skills and knowledge that they will come to internalize. Applying this principle of instruction to learning at any level would mean to draw implications for looking at learning within a context.

Discussion

The most distinguishing theme of Vygotsky’s writings is his emphasis on the uniqueness of our species, how as human beings we actively realize and change ourselves in the varied contexts of culture and history. Vygotsky differentiates the adaptive capabilities of animals from those of humans. The critical factor on which this distinction is based is the historically created and culturally elaborated dimensions of human life that are absent from the social organization of animals. In the development of higher functions-that is, in the internalization of the processes of knowing – the particulars of
human social existence are reflected in human cognition and individual has the capacity to externalize and share with other members of his/her social group his/her understanding of their shared experience.

Next, through the concept of "zone of proximal development" Vygotsky telescopes, from the point of view of instruction, central tenets of his cognitive theory: the transformation of an interpersonal (social) process to an intrapersonal one; the stages of internalization, and the role of experienced learners. The social psychological dichotomy is therefore seen here to merge as one framing the course of the other. Vygotsky's views are reported to have influenced development of a wide range of psychological and educational theories including the second language acquisition theory.

Bruner

Jerome Bruner is the second psychologist considered here, because as we said earlier, he also focuses on a cultural understanding of the individual psyche.

Bruner (1990) says that man's participation in culture and the realization of his mental powers through culture make it impossible to construct a human psychology on the basis of the individual alone. Further by virtue of participation in culture, meaning is rendered public and shared. This folk psychology alters with the culture's changing responses to the people in it. Bruner calls it "folk psychology", "ethnopsychology" or "folk social science" or more simply, "common sense". He explains that all cultures have as one of their most powerful constitutive instruments a folk psychology, a set of more or less connected, more or less normative descriptions about how human beings "tick," what our own and other minds are like, what one can expect situated action to be like, what are possible modes of life, how one commits oneself to them, and so on. He says we learn our folk psychology early, learn it as we learn to use the very language we acquire and conduct the interpersonal transactions required in communal life.

Bruner is of the view that a culturally sensitive psychology is and must be based not only upon what people do, but what they say they do and what they say caused them
to do what they did. "Classical" psycho-physical psychology had no place for folk psychology. Yet a culture's folk theories about the nature of human nature inevitably shape how that culture administers justice, educates its young, helps the needy, and even conducts its interpersonal relationships— all matters of deep consequence.

Bruner shows a way in which psychology can, by devoting its attention to certain critical topics in a variety of ways, illustrate the interaction of biological, evolutionary, individual psychological and cultural insights in helping us grasp the nature of human mental functioning. Therefore the 'next chapter in psychology he says is about "intersubjectivity". Bruner (1996) says, "Education does not stand alone, and it cannot be designed as if it did. It exists in a culture". Knowledge helps only when it descends into habits. Skill is a way of dealing with things, not a derivation from theory. Or ways of doing depends on conventionalization, which makes us embedded in a world of practice that goes beyond each individual, practice whose very operation depends upon being distributed communally.

In *Culture and Education*, Bruner (1996) sets out nine tenets that guide a psycho-cultural approach to education, the tenets of, *perspectival, constraints, constructivism, interactional, externalization, instrumentalism, institutional, identity and self esteem, narrative*. Each of these tenets is discussed below:

1) *The perspectival tenet:* The meaning of any fact, proposition, or encounter, Bruner says, is relative to the perspective or frame of reference in terms of which it is constructed. Interpretations of meaning reflect not only the idiosyncratic histories of individuals, but also the culture's canonical ways of constructing reality. It is the interaction between them that both gives a communal cast to individual thought and imposes a certain unpredictable richness on any culture's way of life, thought, or feeling.

An "official" educational enterprise presumably cultivates beliefs, skills, and feelings in order to transmit and explicate its sponsoring culture's ways of interpreting the natural and social worlds.
2) The constraints tenet: The forms of meaning accessible to human beings in any culture are constrained in two crucial ways. One of the constraints is to be taken as an inheritance of our evolution as a species, part of our fixed “native endowment”. The second constraint is that imposed by the symbolic systems accessible to human minds. If pedagogy is to empower human beings to go beyond their “native” predispositions, it must transmit the “toolkit” the culture has developed for doing so.

3) The constructivism tenet: The reality that we impute to the “worlds” we inhabit is a constructed one. Reality construction is the product of meaning making shaped by traditions and by a cultures’ toolkit of ways of thought. Education must be conceived of as aiding young humans in learning to use the tools of meaning making and reality construction, to adapt themselves and to help in the process of changing it as required.

4) The interactional tenet: Passing on knowledge and skill, like any human exchange, involves a sub-community in interaction. It involves at least a “teacher” and a “learner”- or if not a teacher in flesh and blood, then a vicarious one like a book, or film, or display, or a “responsive” computer.

One of the most radical proposals to have emerged from the cultural-psychological approach to education is that the classroom be reconceived as just such a sub-community of mutual learners, with the teacher orchestrating the proceedings.

5) The externalization tenet: Externalization produces a record of our mental efforts, one that is “outside us” rather than vaguely “in memory.” Works in progress create shared and negotiable ways of thinking in a group. Thinking works its way into its products. Externalizing rescues cognitive activity from implicitness, making it more public, negotiable, and “solidary”, it makes it more accessible to subsequent reflection and metacognition.
The greatest milestone in the history of 'externalization' is literacy, putting thought and memory "out there" on clay tablets or paper. The modern day information technology may represent another step forward.

6) The instrumentalism tenet: Education has instrumental consequences to the culture and its various institutions.

Education is never neutral, never without social and economic consequences. It exists in culture. One of the major educational tenets of a cultural psychology is that the school can never be considered as culturally "free standing." What it teaches, what modes of thought and what "speech registers" it actually cultivates in its pupils, cannot be isolated from how the school is situated in the lives and culture of its students.

7) The institutional tenet: Education in the developed world becomes institutionalized. Its special role is however, in preparing the young to take part in other institutions of the culture.

The expressions primary, secondary, and tertiary are metaphors for the distinctions in education as in any other institution.

8) The tenet of identity and self esteem: The most universal thing about human experience is the phenomenon of "self" and education is crucial to its formation. Education should be concerned with that fact in mind. Bruner examines two aspects of selfhood. The first is agency and the second is evaluation. What characterizes human selfhood is the construction of a conceptual system that organizes a record of agentive encounters with the world. This agentive efficacy combined with self evaluation makes up "self esteem." It combines our sense of what we believe ourselves to be capable of and what we fear is beyond us. How self esteem is experienced varies with the ways of one's culture.
Ideally the school is supposed to provide a setting where our performance has fewer esteem-threatening consequences than in the “real world,” in the interest of encouraging the learner to “try things out.”

9) The narrative tenet: Story making and the narrative is needed for psychologically creating a version of the world in which children envisage a place for themselves. To create a narrative sensibility, first the child should “know” or have a “feel for, the myths, histories, folktales, conventional stories of his or her culture”. They frame and nourish an identity. The second thing necessary is imagination through fiction. Finding a place in the immediacy of home, mate, job, and friends, is ultimately an act of imagination.

A system of education must help those growing up in a culture to find an identity within that culture. Without it they stumble in their effort after meaning. It is only in the narrative mode that one can construct an identity and find a place in one’s culture. Schools must cultivate it, nurture it, and cease taking it for granted.

Discussion

Bruner therefore, emphasizes the powers of consciousness, reflection, breadth of dialogue, and negotiation in all his tenets of education from a cultural-psychological perspective on education. He says a failure to equip minds with the skills for understanding and feeling and acting in the cultural world is not simply scoring a pedagogical zero. It risks creating alienation, defiance, and practical incompetence. Thus education is not simply a technical business of well-managed information processing, nor even simply a matter of applying “learning theories” to the classroom or using the results of subject-centered “achievement testing.” It is a complex pursuit of fitting a culture to the needs of its members and of fitting its members and their ways of knowing to the needs of the culture.
For the argument presented in this thesis, Bruner provides valuable insights in terms of how individual psychology is constructed within specific cultural contexts.

Conclusion

Social Constructivism and specifically the cultural psychology of Vygotsky and Bruner with reference to education provide the framework for analyzing individuals and their social psychological orientations in the educational enterprise. Vygotsky’s own ideas about the relation between thought and language, explicates the development of language on one hand and the role of mediation in the process. This is significant in terms of teaching and learning in that it emphasizes the importance of constructivism and the role of mediation.

2.2 Social and Psychological bases of Language Learning

The theoretical orientation that the sociological and psychological perspectives provide to language education helps in understanding language learning as a social psychological phenomenon. It places the enterprise of language learning in the actual social contexts of its occurrence. Firstly, the work of Pennycook (2001) is discussed presenting his analysis of the global spread and role of English in the present society using the Sociological paradigms. Secondly, Lynch’s (1989) analysis of ‘Hidden curriculum’ using the sociological perspectives is considered.

As discussed in Chapter One, Pennycook analyses, “English is in the world and the world is in English”. Pennycook uses the sociological paradigms of the Structural Functionalism and the Conflict theory. He says,

"English is today commonly justified by recourse to a functionalist perspective, which stresses choice and the usefulness of English, and suggests that the global spread of English is neutral (although its spread was initiated by colonialism, since then it has been an accidental by-product of global forces), neutral (unlike other local languages, English is
unconnected to cultural and political issues), and beneficial (people can only benefit by gaining access to English and the world it opens up).” (Pennycook, 1995)

According to this view regarding the spread of English there is an adherence to positivist and structuralist paradigms of analysis, with their emphasis on description and objectivity, because within this perspective the extent of debate on the role of English in the world is between a conservative view on standards and more liberal pluralist concept of variety, and the primary concerns are those of intelligibility and description. This outlook limits most people in English language teaching to address a far more diverse range of questions that might encourage a reassessment of our role as teachers of English in the world.

As opposed to the above structural functionalist view a critical view of English in the world however, tries to “problematise the notion of choice”, applying a historical analysis that would raise many more questions about the supposed naturalness of the spread of English during both colonial and neo-colonial eras. This perspective “views language as not being free of cultural and political influences” and it “does not assume that individuals and countries are not free from economic, political and ideological constraints.”

The theorists working within the critical paradigm (Cooke 1988 and Cooke and Judd 1993 as quoted by Pennycook, A 1995) draw attention to the moral and political implications of English teaching around the globe in terms of firstly, the threat it poses to indigenous languages discussed using the term “linguistic genocide” (Day 1980, 1985 as quoted by Pennycook, 1995). In bilingual or multilingual societies, the prevalence of English leads to a disregarding of one or more other languages. Secondly, these theorists focus on the role English plays as a gatekeeper to better jobs in many societies. English is being given an important position in many educational systems around the world, it has become one of the most powerful means of inclusion into or exclusion from further education, employment, or social positions.
In addition to the implications discussed above, the problem with English, as one goes up to pursue higher education is that the textbooks in the world are published in English and designed either for the internal English speaking market or for an international market. In both cases, students around the world are not only obliged to reach a high level of competence in English to pursue their studies, but are also dependent on forms of Western knowledge that are often of limited value and extremely inappropriate to the local contexts.

With such views emerging, Pennycook (1995) says that we cannot reduce questions of language to such a social psychological notions as instrumental and integrative motivation, but must account for the extent to which language is embedded in social, economic, and political struggles.

Pennycook says that if we are to move towards an understanding of English in the world, we need to avoid the limitations of structuralism and positivism not only in our views of language but also in our understanding of the world. In attempts to show how all our thinking is constructed by particular social, cultural and historical forces, rather than by reflecting some universal truths, there has been recognition of the fundamental roles of language and culture.

At the end of his presentation of this Conflict line of thought, however, Pennycook says that he is arguing for an avoidance of totalizing theories of social and cultural reproduction in favour of a critical paradigm that acknowledges human agency and looks not only at how people both resist those forms of and produce their own forms. This takes him closer to the sociological paradigm of interactionism. He sets up the need for counter discourses and advocates, critical applied linguistics.

Further, an aspect of education that the sociological analysis based on these paradigms helps look at is found in Lynch’s (1989) analysis of the “Hidden Curriculum”.
Working within a perspective of assuming a structural and consensual relationship between the school and society, the contradictions between the institutional expectations of the hidden curriculum and the requirement of intellectual mastery are highlighted by theorists (Jackson, 1968, as quoted by Lynch 1989), i.e., to say that the social requirements of the learning situation of the school is itself the hidden curriculum. The social or institutional requirements of schooling, according to Jackson (1968) are against educational goals. It is conformity rather than creativity which bring rewards in school.

The discussion of the Hidden Curriculum within the Conflict paradigm relates to the work of Bowles and Gintis (1976) and looks at the relationship between norms of schooling and those of work. This correspondence thesis is central to the debate on the hidden curriculum. They suggest that schools reproduce the existing social relations of capitalist society by reproducing the consciousness necessary for such relations, which pertains to the unwritten functions of school life.

The particular social relations which they deem important in the reproductive process are summarized by Lynch (1989) as “the hierarchical division of labour between teachers and pupils; the alienated character of pupils’ school work itself; and the ‘fragmentation in work... reflected in the institutionalized and often destructive competition among students through continual and ostensibly meritocratic ranking and evaluation’ (Bowles and Gintis 1976).

The differentiation between Universalistic and Particularistic practices and the recognition of the potential of human agency and the scope for interaction between Universalistic and Particularistic practices brings the Interactionist perspective to the discussion of the Hidden Curriculum. This highlights the Significance of Mediation in accessing the hidden curriculum through particularistic practices.

Therefore the hidden curriculum with respect to hegemony on the part of the society on one hand in terms of Universalistic practices and the possibility of negotiation
as part of the Particularistic practices gives scope for accessing or understanding hidden curriculum at both the levels- universalistic and particularistic, from the point of view of the individual through mediation.

So far we have discussed the sociological and psychological bases of education. Against this background now, bilingualism and second language learning phenomenon shall be discussed to explore language learning as a social psychological enterprise. For purposes of developing second language skills we should think of Bilingual education and foreign or second language teaching as natural allies rather than alternatives. In this section two orientations to the social psychological and language learning of more that two languages will be discussed. The first section looks at the social psychological milieu of Bilingualism and the second at the Social psychological perspectives in Second Language Acquisition Theories.

### 2.2.1 Social Psychological Milieu of Bilingualism

Several factors of sociological, psychological, economic, political, religio-cultural and linguistic factors influence bilingualism. Depending on the different criteria / factors involved in learning a second language an individual’s description of being bilingual differs.

The following descriptive types discussed by (Baker, 1988) reveal the complexity of the issue of Bilingualism. The differentiation is made as per the following criteria:

i) according to the criterion of age or origin – to distinguish between the time-determined types:

- **Early Bilingualism/ Child or infant bilingualism/ Consecutive bilingualism.**
- **Late bilingualism/ Adult bilingualism/ Successive bilingualism.**
ii) according to 'context'- to distinguish between the types involving the processes of language acquisition and language learning:

- *Primary bilingualism/ natural bilingualism/ascribed bilingualism.*
- *Secondary bilingualism/ school or cultural bilingualism/achieved*

iii) according to relationship between sign and meaning to distinguish between the systems of language representational mediation processes or meaning systems:

- *Coordinate bilingualism*
- *Compound bilingualism and (subordinate bilingualism).*

iv) according to the direction of language development to distinguish between maintenance or loss of ones bilingual ability:

- *Ascendant bilingualism*
- *Recessive bilingualism.*

v) according to the consequence of learning a second language to distinguish between the enriching and diminishing effects of L2 on L1:

- *additive bilingualism*
- *subtractive bilingualism.*

vi) according to the proficiency or the criterion of competence to distinguish between the degree of proficiency in L1 and L2:

- *Perfect bilingualism/ true bilingualism/ ambilingualism*
- *equilingualism/ balanced bilingualism*
- *double semilingualism.*
viii) according to the use or function to distinguish between the ability of a bilingual to function in various levels of language use:

- *Receptive bilingualism/passive bilingualism/asymmetrical bilingualism*
- *Productive bilingualism/active bilingualism/symmetrical bilingualism.*
- *Semilingualism*

viii) according to attitude to distinguish between one’s own and the society’s conception of an individual being bilingual:

- *identified by self as bilingual*
- *identified by community as bilingual*

ix) according to the status and relationship between the languages or language variants and standard or nonstandard varieties paired in a bilingual situation:

- *horizontal bilingualism*
- *vertical bilingualism*
- *diagonal bilingualism*

x) according to the level or domain of the use -to distinguish between the broad canvas of bilingual situation in a community within which a range of domains are involved and an individual bilingual:

- *societal bilingualism*
- *individual bilingualism*

xi) according to the motives behind a person becoming bilingual to distinguish between individual who learns a language with elitist motives as a part of his/
her education and one who is forced under pressure, in practical contact with people who speak it:

- *elite bilingualism*
- *folk bilingualism*

The phenomenon involved in each of the above definitions is psychological, sociological, economic, political, religio-cultural and linguistic in nature. Therefore, to define bilingualism in a particular context such a wide spectrum of ideas need to be taken into consideration. Bilingual profile needs to be worked out for each individual between the extremes of the cline of definitions given above.

### 2.2.2 Issues in Bilingualism

The persistent issues in bilingualism are listed by Lambert (1990) to explain why and how some of the theorists have focused on the topic of bilingualism over a number of years. He says, "bilingualism is a serious, real world matter, much more than an academic matter" and that theorists need to extend themselves through self education in current political and sociological ways of thinking. This is so because bilingualism is inextricably linked with such basic concepts as personal identity, culture and ethnicity, biculturalism and, on a national level, multiculturalism. One of the persistent issues Lambert raises is that of the sociology and politics of bilingualism. He refers to contexts where learning another more necessary and prestigious language leads to subtractive bilingualism. This form of bilingualism can be devastating because it usually places youngsters in a psycholinguistic limbo where neither of the languages is useful as a tool of thought or expression- a type of "semi-lingualism," as Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaal (1976) put it.

The social context of bilingual development has been studied by Cummins et al (1990) among Portuguese-Canadian children. The theoretical issues examined in this study are the following:
The nature of language proficiency indicated by the pattern of relationships within languages—specifically, the extent to which grammatical, discourse, and sociolinguistic competence could be distinguished in context—embedded and context reduced situations.

The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency indicated by the pattern of relationships across languages—in other words, the extent to which there is evidence for a common underlying proficiency" that accounts for variance in both the bilingual's two languages; and the extent to which proficiency in English and Portuguese could be predicted by language use and attitude variables.

One important hypothesis that Cummins (1976) puts forth is worth discussing here. The threshold theory explains in terms of two ladders representing language competence, how on reaching higher levels there are likely to be no negative but positive cognitive effects. The threshold levels of linguistic competence and cognitive functioning (Baker 1988; Cummins 1976) gives much motivation for developing learners' L1 in correspondence with SLA. This raises the crucial need for use of more Bilingual models of education in place of our popular monolingual-submersion-English medium education. One other issue of concern should also be about the age at which the second language is introduced. Caution should be taken not to introduce it before a threshold level is acquired by learners in L1.

Next, Cummins (1979) BICS and CALP distinction between linguistic facade and the more cognitive and academic aspects of language skills helps to conceptualize the relationship between bilingual education and school achievement in varying school and home contexts. However, one has to keep in mind not only that dichotomizing language proficiency into two categories oversimplifies the phenomenon but also that the movement from one to another is not in the same pattern in all contexts.
Further, discussing one of the origins of societal bilingualism Hamers and Blanc (2000) say that a society may decide to make a second language available or even compulsory in order to gain access to wider markets or information. Further, whatever the reasons for societal bilingualism, it involves languages in intergroup relations.

In order to understand the mechanisms by which a child becomes a member of a cultural or ethnolinguistic group, we must first take a closer look at what is meant by internalization of a culture. ‘Enculturation’ is a part of the socialization process and begins with the primary socialization. If a child is socialised in a bicultural environment, enculturation involves the two cultures. However, if a child lives in a monocultural home surrounded by another culture in the community, enculturation starts in his first culture and he has to cope with enculturation in a second culture.

When a child has already been through the enculturation process and comes into contact with a second culture, he has to acculturate in order to adjust to the new culture. Acculturation occurs when an individual experiences changes of behavior as a result of being in contact with the other cultures.

In culturally plural societies, that is those in which two or more cultural groups coexist, acculturation is a constant process: groups and individuals influence each other. Berry (1980, as quoted by Hamers and Blanc, 2000) distinguishes four possible modes of acculturation by individuals or groups: assimilation, integration, segregation or separation and deculturation. These categories are not discrete but continuous. He further discriminates between cultural acculturation, in which the behaviour of one group becomes more similar to that of another, and structural acculturation, in which one group participates in the economic and social systems of the larger society without losing its cultural distinctiveness.

Assimilation for the subordinate group means the surrender of its cultural identity and its absorption into the larger society. Assimilation is complete when the members of the group see themselves as belonging to another group and when that other
group accepts them as full members. In the case of integration, a group becomes an integral part of the society while retaining its cultural distinctiveness in varying degrees. In the case of segregation the dominant group imposes its solution; in the case of separation it is the subordinate group that decides to assert its distinctiveness and leave society. In deculturation, a group loses its cultural identity without gaining another, this happens when the subordinate group is marginalized.

From the social historical perspective, Ross (1979, as quoted by Hamers and Blanc 2000) has proposed a model of group identity development in four stages. These are the communal, minority, ethnic and national group identity modes.

Different people at all levels in the society have varying agendas about languages. Some wish to assimilate different language groups to form a homogeneous society of monolinguals, others are keen to retain linguistic diversity and pluralism. Some language minorities dream of self-sustainability and self determination. Others aspire to internationalism and globalism. Bourhis 2001 (as quoted by Baker 2006) proposes four ideologies on a continuum from pluralism, civic, assimilation to ethnist. Pluralist ideology tends to assert an individual's liberty to own, learn and use two or more languages. This right is then supported by those in power by promotion-oriented language policies. Pluralists argue for individual choice in language and culture, but there are no equal choices, there is no equal starting point or level playing field. Without an equal starting point, the context of choice for individuals is constrained by numerous unequal circumstances for which language minorities bear no responsibility. Civic ideology expects language minorities to adopt the public values of the potentially dominant majority while allowing freedom in the private values of individuals. This ideology is characterized by an official state policy of non-intervention and non-support of the minority languages and cultures, Assimilation ideology tends to argue that there may be some areas of private values where the state has a right to intervene. Language is such an area. Assimilationist ideology is an umbrella term under which a variety of types of assimilation may occur: cultural, structural, marital, identificational, attitudinal, behavioral, social and civic (Gordon 1964 as quoted by Baker 2006). Assimilation is thus
multidimensional and complex (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). Linguistic assimilation has two broad goals: deculturation to achieve subordination and acculturation to promote absorption. Ethnistic ideology encourages or forces language minorities to give up their language and culture and adopt that of the dominant group. It also attempts to prevent or exclude such minorities from assimilating legally or socially even when such individuals seek cultural, linguistic and economic assimilation.

Schmidt (2000 as quoted by Baker 2006) argues that the root of the assimilation/pluralism issue is not language but identity, of which language is one component. This theme of acculturation is brought up even in the theories of second language acquisition discussed below.

Discussion

The complexity of the issue of Bilingualism suggests that in the context being examined in this study, there is therefore a need for reconceptualisation of the bilingual in India. Given the conflicting nature of the English Language situation in the multilingual context of India the various solutions offered by several theorists center around the learner factor. Thus in this study a consideration of individual differences of social psychological nature will be the focus.

The phenomenon of ‘bilingualism’ is closely associated with second language learning. The complexity of the issue of bilingualism in society in terms of different factors influencing language learning has a bearing therefore in any context of second language learning. The following section presents the classification of theories or models of second language learning which are concerned with the social context of language learning, showing the relationships between different factors at the social and the individual levels, involved in language learning.

The definition and the understanding of bilingualism need to take into account psychological, cognitive, socio-cultural and economic factors which actually clarify
different individuals as bilinguals. This understanding of the multifacetedness of bilingualism in India is obligatory because a weak definition of bilingualism which is based only on one or a few of these factors is likely to misrepresent the population at large. This multidimensionality has serious implication for language planning and development. This is further confused because learners’ motivation to be bilingual and be individual need based or community based for purposes of assimilation. In terms of education the multilinguality of the learners which is usually ignored or nullified needs to be recognized and brought back into the foray of education. In the teaching of English the use of L1 in L2 has always been subject to criticism and disapproval. However, the unconscious availability and use of the L1 can neither be suppressed nor wished away. The ways in which the L1 needs to be harnessed has to be worked out so that the L2 develops in consonance with L1 and leads to an additive bilingualism rather than a subtractive one. The model of transitional bilingualism used so often in the case of migrant population cannot be subscribed to in the Indian multilingual context. As a result in materials production attempts have to be made to carefully incorporate the multilingual nuances of learning a new language. This way the hierarchical relationship which exists between English and other Indian languages will be diffused and English will be treated as one of the Indian languages rather than an alien, super-ordinate language.

2.3 Social Psychological Perspectives in Second Language Acquisition Theories

The field of second language learning is characterized by a multiplicity of theoretical approaches and varying views of the relationship between research and the applied activities of teaching and learning.

Gardner (1985) presents an overview of different models concerned with explaining the development of competence in a second language in two sections. He classifies them into two sections. The first section deals with models with a ‘linguistic' perspective and the second section deals with models that adopt a ‘social perspective'.
The ‘Monitor model’ (Krashen, 1978, 1981, 1983), the Conscious Reinforcement Model (Carroll 1981) and the Strategy model (Bialystok, 1978) belong to the section of models, which have a common focus on the ‘linguistic process’. The latter section includes models that have the social process focus, considering the social psychological variables that facilitate or impede second language acquisition. The models that feature in the second section include Lambert’s Social Psychological model (1963a, 1963b, 1974); Schumann’s Acculturation model, (1978a, 1978b); Clement’s Social Context model (1980); and the Inter Group model (Ball and Giles 1982).

Since Gardener’s attempt to classify the second language models, there have been many ways of categorizing these models. McLaughlin (1987) analyses five theories (The Monitor Model, Interlanguage Theory, and Linguistic Universals, Acculturation / Pidginization Theory and Cognitive theory). Spolsky (1989) aims to develop a comprehensive theory of second language learning, including social, psychological and educational as well as linguistic dimensions, and also to consider its relevance for language teaching. Mitchell and Myles (1998) offer six general approaches, which normally contain reference to more than one theory. The multiple perspectives towards SLA, presented by Mitchell and Myles (1998) cover the linguistic and language learning perspectives: the Universal Grammar approach, Cognitive approaches, Functional/Pragmatic perspectives, Input and Interaction approach, Sociocultural perspectives, and Sociolinguistic perspectives.

Subsequently, other authors are of the view that grand synthesizing of theories encompassing all aspects of L2 learning in a single model has not received general support. They are of the view that new theoretical perspectives (such as connectionism or sociocultural theory) have entered the field without displacing established ones (such as Universal Grammar).

In a more recent survey of the history of SLA, Block (2003) suggests there is a social turn in SLA. He lists Schumann’s (1978) Acculturation model, Gardener’s socioeducational model (1985) and Giles’ (1991) Inter-group model as the few attempts to
take the social context and affective factors in naturalistic settings into account and to make the strong claim that these factors are causative of SLA. He examines critically some of the basic notions and assumptions that underpin the Input-Interaction-Output model and suggests a more interdisciplinary and socially informed approach to SLA research.

The insights derived from the discussion of social theories and models of language learning give an understanding of language development within social contexts that in turn will help in informing instructional strategies and mediated learning. Therefore the discussion on the theories accounting for the social factors in language learning will be taken up in detail in the following section.

2.3.1 SLA Models with a focus on the social process

The set of models discussed below are a few attempts, which focus more on the social process and are concerned less with the details of language behaviour among the SLA theories. These models raise the possibility that language acquisition can have social implications on the individual. They all concern themselves with the effects of cultural factors on second language acquisition as well as the adjustment demands that acquisition places on the individual.

i) Social psychological model

The social psychological model (Lambert, 1963, 1974) is a theory of bilingual development and self identity modification. The central proposition in this theory is that "linguistic distinctiveness is a basic component of personal identity..." This model proposes that the extent to which an individual successfully acquires a second language will depend upon ethnocentric tendencies, attitudes toward the other community, orientation toward language learning, and motivation.
ii) Acculturation model

Schumann’s acculturation model (1978) is concerned solely with identifying the major causal variables underlying ‘natural second language acquisition’; that is, learning language without instruction and in the environment where it is local. Schumann’s major proposition is that second language acquisition is just that one aspect of acculturation and the degree to which a learner acculturates to the target language group will control the degree to which he acquires the second language. He presents taxonomy of factors that influence second language acquisition. These include social, affective, personality, cognitive, biological, aptitude, personal, input and instructional factors. He argues that only two types of factors, social and affective are the major causal ones in second language acquisition, and these two are subsumed by the larger construct of acculturation. He defines acculturation as ‘the social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language group.’ (1978). The model shows acculturation as a process moving forward but with a series of social (group and situational) and affective (individual) factors, which might impede acculturation and therefore second language acquisition.

iii) The Social context model

Clement (1980) presented the social context model placing emphasis on the milieu and the relative vitality of the language communities involved. This model assumes that second language includes not only the learning of language skills but also the adoption of other patterns of behaviour of second language community. As a consequence language acquisition is seen to involve changes in self identity. The central concept in this model is motivation. The first type of motivation is the primary motivational process, which is the result of integrativeness and fear of assimilation. Another type of motivation is the secondary motivational process, which reflects self-confidence with the second language resulting from the number of and nature of contacts with other language community. Besides, motivation being a primary determinant of
competence in the second language this theory points to the social implications resulting from the development of proficiency in the second language.

For members of the majority language group, learning the second language has integration as a social consequence, which means acquiring a knowledge and appreciation of the other language and culture while maintaining their own cultural identity (Lambert’s (1974) concept of additive bilingualism). For members of the minority language group, however, the social consequence of second language acquisition is assimilation (Lambert’s (1974) concept of subtractive bilingualism).

These consequences of learning a second language have collective implications that help to define the social milieu vis-à-vis second language learning for members of both communities. That is, the expectation concerning the possible implication of learning the second language can be transmitted to young members of a language community, and these expectations will in turn influence their primary motivation process. The individuals can be motivated by integrative feelings to learn the second language or by fear of assimilation to avoid learning the language. In this way, the social context is seen as an important factor in the language-learning context.

iv) The Inter-group model

Giles and Byrne (1982) proposed an inter-group model of second language acquisition, which focuses on the acquisition of a second language by members of a linguistic minority group. The central concept underlying this model is self-concept, and the major motivating force is one of developing or maintaining a positive self-image.

In the Inter-group model, the ‘ethno-linguistic vitality’ of the first language is also given attention because it increases the salience of ethnic group membership. Perceived group boundaries are important because where they are flexible individuals are free to move in and out of their group. Finally, the concept of ‘multiple group memberships’ is necessary because it signifies that under certain circumstances
individuals are able to identify with many groups if their ethnic identification is less important and salient.

v) Socio educational model

Gardner (1985) positions second language study at the centre of Social Psychology rather than in a purely educational realm to account for individual differences and second language attainment. He proposes that second language learning is a social psychological phenomenon. He quotes Born (1977) to point the orientation to language teaching thus:

'...to treat language as a whole: its nature, its history, its relationship to culture, the acquisition of it, the immediate uses to which it can be put, and the development in our students of an appreciation of the gift of tongues.' (Gardner, 1985: 1)

The socio-educational model (Gardner, 1983) shows that second language acquisition takes place in a particular cultural context. The model centers attention on four classes of variables: the social milieu, individual differences, language acquisition contexts and outcomes. Another theme in the model is that there are four different types of individual differences that will influence achievement directly, intelligence, language aptitude, motivation and situational anxiety.

In summary, SLA theories with a social bent consider the social psychological factors important i.e., the factors that relate to the social context of learning and individual psychological differences in learning. On the one hand, there are socially bound processes of ethnocentric tendencies, cultural factors in the social milieu, orientations toward and social implications of language learning such as acculturation and integrativeness as well as group memberships, and on the other hand are individual psychological processes of forming a cultural identity, self image, motivation, anxiety and self confidence. Both of these factors combine and contribute to success in SLA.
Further, several theorists apart from the ones discussed in the models and theories have considered the role of the social - psychological factors in SLA and discuss important insights this brings to it. Authors such as Firth and Wagner (1997) and Rampton (1997) take into consideration the fact that there are diverse circumstances where second language learning takes place and make a case for moving from essentialised and simplified constructs and theories to a full embrace of as many socio-historical and contextual factors as possible.

2.3.2 Issues in Second Language Acquisition:

Additional Language Acquisition

In a recent attempt, to trace what he calls the social turn in second language learning, Block (2003) reviews several language learning contexts of the foreign language context, official language context, second language context and the naturalistic context. Block (2003: 57) in his argument for a shift to the use of ALA (Additional Language Acquisition) in place of SLA, points to the present ‘divide between those of a psycholinguistic and scientific bent and those of a sociological and epistemologically more open bent’ in SLA theory. The use of SLA, he says, leads to a ‘monolingual bias’, ‘compartmentalised view of languages’ and an ‘oversimplified view of context’ (emphasis mine). He sees second language contexts as ideal in that they combine formal learning with naturalistic exposure. A naturalistic setting in Norton’s (2000) view not only provides abundant and useful opportunities for the learner to interact on the L2 and learn through such interaction but also gives scope for how learners develop identities as what Bourdieu (1977) calls ‘legitimate speakers’ in society. How an individual learner negotiates and carves out an identity in the target language ultimately determines relative success and failure. Bailey (2000) also focuses on how learners negotiate multiple identities via heteroglossic practices. In a multilingual situation the possibility according to these authors is that, in linguistic terms, individuals display multi-competence and further in sociolinguistic and social terms, they are involved in an ongoing process of identity construction, maintenance and projection.
Several of these themes have been developed further in more recent theorizing of language learning leading to second language acquisition and bilingualism. Introducing second language acquisition, Troike (2006) discusses two levels of context that affect language learning: microsocial and macrosocial. The microsocial focus deals with the potential effects of different immediately surrounding circumstances, whereas the macrosocial focus relates SLA to broader cultural, political and educational environments.

Within the microsocial purview, firstly, the ‘variation’ in learner language is accounted for by the contextual dimensions of the following: ‘linguistic contexts’; ‘psychological contexts’ and ‘microsocial contexts’ Troike (2006: 102). The next important factor in this purview is that of ‘input’ and ‘interaction’. Within the social approaches ‘input’ has a more important role in determining what features of language are learned and how, besides being data for innate linguistic and/or cognitive processes. ‘Interaction’ is seen as essential in providing learners with the quantity and quality of external linguistic input which is required for internal processing, in focusing learner attention on aspects of their L2 which differ from target language norms or goals, and in providing collaborative means for learners to build discourse structures and express meanings which are beyond the current level of their linguistic competence. Troike (ibid) discusses further an alternative view of the role of interaction in SLA which is based on the ‘Sociocultural (S-C) Theory’ (Vygotsky 1962, 1978). A key concept in this approach is that interaction not only facilitates language learning but is a causative force in acquisition; further, all of learning is seen as essentially a social process which is grounded in sociocultural settings. This theory differs from theories with a different perspective and even those theories with a social perspective in considering interaction as an essential force rather than as merely a helpful condition for learning. This theory includes discussion of ‘interpersonal’ and ‘intrapersonal’ interaction.

The macrosocial purview draws on the frameworks of the ‘ethnography of communication’ and ‘social psychology’ which allow exploration of issues such as how
identity, status, and values influence L2 outcomes and why. The macrosocial factors that work at several levels in the ecological context of SLA that Troike (ibid) lists are: global and national status of L1 and L2; boundaries and identities, institutional forces and constraints; social categories; and circumstances of learning.

The power and status of learners’ native and target languages at the global or national levels might be overtly stated in official policies or covertly realized in cultural values and practices. Social boundaries may coincide with national borders, but they also exist within and across them as they function to unify speakers as members of a language community and to exclude outsiders from membership which involve the relationship between native and target language groups, as well as the permeability of community borders. Institutional forces relate to forces and constraints of social control, political and religious practices, and economic and educational opportunities which have an effect on the use and knowledge of L2. The social categories include age, gender and ethnicity which are the main factors of group membership. Finally circumstances of learning such as learners’ prior educational experiences, whether the L2 learning process is informal or formal and (if informal) the type of educational model learners have access to and the pedagogical orientation of their teachers and administrators can influence SLA.

The second language context needs to take these views into consideration since it involves a formal classroom setting inside a community where the target language is spoken with potential for multiple opportunities of contact with the target language outside the classroom allowing for the learning of aspects of language which are not just limited to minimal exposure in the classroom or from text books. The shift from viewing what is acquired in SLA as purely and simply linguistic competence towards viewing it as what Hymes (1971, 1974) termed as ‘communicative competence’ also extended the view of language as being social as well as linguistic. It views language learning as socially realistic and socially constituted. The Input–Interaction-output model (IIO), takes this view of language further by two concepts essential to the model: ‘task’ and ‘negotiation for meaning’. Task in a formal classroom setting is similar to what goes on in unmonitored day to day social intercourse. Further communicative competence was
seen as communication as being fundamentally about conversational interaction. The IIIO researchers were particularly interested in a fundamentally instrumental view of conversational interaction where the key was exchange of information. However, Hymes’ view of a ‘socially constituted linguistics is concerned with contextual as well as referential meaning’ and with language as part of communicative conduct and social action. It involves, as Block says, putting linguistics at the service of social functions which give form to the ways in which linguistic features are encountered in actual life and also interactional and interpersonal communication at the service of the social construction of self identity, group membership, solidarity, support, trust and so on.

**Learning and Acquisition**

The distinction between acquisition and learning put forth by Krashen (1981) brought to SLA another level of importance to the social dimension. Though Krashen’s view was more grounded in cognitive psychology it paved way for ushering a more discursive psychology and an application of sociocultural and activity theory to SLA which viewed mental processes as much social as they are individual and external as they are internal. A sociocultural perspective on human development takes what Vygotsky termed a ‘genetic approach to the study of mental activity. Lantolf and Pavelenko (2001) set out to argue that a sociocultural /activity perspective allows researchers to frame learners ‘as more than processing devices that convert linguistic input into well formed outputs’ and as individuals with human agency who ‘actively engage in constructing the terms and conditions of their own learning’. This, according to Block calls for substituting the acquisition metaphor with the metaphor of ‘activity’ and ‘agency’ (Block 2003: 109). This is a clarion call in SLA theory for a sociolinguistic, sociocultural, multiexperiential view of multilingualism. In the following sections each of the social psychological factors identified in the discussion of SLA theories are examined with a perspective that both the cultural and the psychological or the social and the individual are intertwined and inseparably complementing each other.
The Social Context of language learning

Language learners are not disincarnate spirits studying in a social vacuum. Without forfeiting their individuality in personal and affective terms, they are also members of a given socio-cultural community, and their membership of this community is an integral part of their identity. Focusing exclusively on the personal aspect of learners’ life goals and identity would therefore be divisive, and deny the full range of their human experience – as a result it would be distinctly unlearner-centred. As Tudor (1996) pointed out that language learning is therefore ‘not just a mental process’ but ‘a process of negotiation between individuals and society’. For instance, learners’ goals do not arise merely out of personal factors but they are shaped directly or indirectly by the demands of the social context. Other contextual factors relate to the practical conditions under which teaching will be conducted. Yet another set of contextual factors relates to the learning culture and traditions of learning present both in the educational system concerned and in the community as a whole. Learning style preferences may arise out of a number of individual factors but they are determined by the learners’ previous language learning experience, and reflect the traditions of language teaching and learning in their home culture. If language learning is taking place within this culture, learners’ expectations are likely to be reinforced by the attitudes, beliefs and behaviour of other participants, such as teachers (including teachers of other subjects) administrators and parents. Thus appropriate patterns of interactions in the ‘micro-social’ context of the classroom are subject to the beliefs and ideologies which are held in the broader ‘macro-sociological’ context of the community in question.

A genuinely learner-centered approach to teaching therefore needs to work constructively with all of these factors and therefore view learners as full human beings – as individuals and as members of a social group.

The socio culturally based traditions of learning to which students have been exposed exert a very real influence on how they perceive the teaching learning process, how they define their goals, and how they interact with methodological choices. This
entails being sensitive to students' socio-cultural identity and their socio-culturally based expectations with respect to various aspects of the learning process. Further the influence of socio-cultural and ideological factors on language learning has an implication for language teaching to adopt an “ecological perspective” to learn to live with complexity (Tudor, 2003).

Further, as language learning involves the self identity of the learner as an individual with the personal history and as a member of a group, a society, and a culture, the input provided may not become intake due to reasons that implicate the learner’s beliefs and values as well as features of the socio-cultural context (Lo Castro, 2001).

Similarly, Gardner and MacIntyre (1992) say that the context determines the availability of the language, society’s reaction to the language and the individual learner’s own perceptions of what it means to learn the language. In their study “Home background characteristics and second language learning”, Gardener et al (1999) investigated a link between socio-cultural milieu of the learner and individual difference variables and assessed the linguistic nature of the home community; respondent’s recollections of early experiences in second language learning and their current attitudes and beliefs about language learning and bilingualism. Support was found for a causal model that indicated that early socio-cultural experiences (as reflected in respondent’s recollections), influence their current cultural attitudes, motivation to learn a second language and self-perceptions of second language proficiency.

At another level, Rivers (1964) has also identified personality correlates of second language achievement, but rather than suggesting a direct link with proficiency, she implies that they are mediated by motivation, governed by the learner’s history. She states that the previous history and the personality of the individual are important and must be taken into account in endeavoring to understand his motivation. Such highly personal motives as fear or anxiety, learned through past experience, may combine with learned social motives, such as desire for status in a group and for social approval,
creating complex reactions which can work powerfully toward progress in a foreign language or toward inhibiting oral language responses.

Other researchers like Cassidy and Lynn, (1991) also consider how the social and familial background, intelligence and personality are translated into behaviour through the mediation of achievement motivation. Thus, the socio-cultural context not only determines the languages that individuals will encounter but also the attitudes and beliefs or the social-psychological orientation of individuals toward a particular language being learnt in the context.

**Individual Differences in Language Learning**

That learning of a language involves far more than simply learning the different aspects of the language is endorsed by Williams and Burden (1997) also. According to them it involves “an alteration in self image”, “the adoption of new social and cultural behaviors and ways of being as well as thinking”.

There are probably as many factors that might account for individual differences in achievement in a second language as there are individuals, however, they may be grouped into one of the two classifications of cognitive or affective variables. The individual difference variables influence through their interaction with both formal and informal acquisition contexts. In the formal context involving direct instruction both cognitive and affective variables would be directly involved; cognitive variables facilitate learning by making for the smooth transmission of learned material. Affective variables play their role by influencing the individual’s reaction to the learning environment. Cognitive and affective variables influence the individual’s level of achievement. Further, experiences are seen as having an influence on the individual primarily on affective attributes though it could also influence language learning strategy use.

Ellis (1986) provides a summary of the scope of theories of SLA which presents the essential role played by the situational factors, learner differences: social
psychological/socio-affective and learner strategies in the process of Second Language Learning from input to output stages stand out as common themes covered by all the theories of second language learning. Further, a taxonomy of the areas affecting language learning is presented in a summary by Ehrman (1996).

Encompassing concerns which have underpinned many main developments in language teaching since 1960s ‘Learner centeredness’ has evolved as an endeavour designed to gear language teaching in terms of both content and the form of instruction, around the needs and characteristics of learners. This approach to language teaching implies that language teaching needs to acknowledge and work constructively with the diversity and richness of human experience that learners bring with them to their language study-- which leaves little scope for neat, pre-packaged solutions to language teaching problems. One pole of diversity relates to the terms in which learning goals are defined. Another pole of variance related to the area of subjective needs, or the way in which learner’s psychological and cognitive characteristics interact with their language learning. Research in the areas of individual differences and of learning style preferences has revealed how varied learners’ reactions to teaching procedures can be, and how strong an influence these reactions can exert on the quality of learning.

A third pole of variance which has begun to receive more attention in recent years relates to the role played by culturally -based traditions of teaching and learning and the expectations and interactional norms to which these traditions give rise among both teachers and learners. As members of a given socio-cultural community to which they belong the learners are influenced by social norms, role expectations and learning traditions proper to that group. The Learner centered approach to teaching must therefore, work with the socio-cultural aspects of learner’s identity as much as with the more individual aspects of their identity (Tudor, 1996).

The following section deals with the next point of consideration: individual differences of social psychological nature.
A review of theories which deal with social factors and processes of second language learning has shown that external factors like exposure, group membership, and identity... have to be considered in language acquisition. A monolingual linguistic model which treats the second language as an autonomous model disregarding the other available languages either in the mind of the learner or the context will not help in an accurate profiling of the language learners. In a second language condition particularly the external forces coupled with the internal mechanism have a stronger role to play. It is the perception of the learner about the language being learnt, the language context, the function of the language in day to day world, the manner in which it is taught what needs to be taught are all affected by socio-psychological factors. Therefore their language is governed by societal and educational pressures which cannot be explained with a well defined neat linguistic analysis of the language. Language learning is therefore not merely language a set of rules or words it is conditioned and determined by individuals learner factors which actually influence their interaction with the language in a social world. Model of language needs to take into account these factors in a socio-political/cultural context in which the language learning is happening. The study looks at these social factors which affect the learning of second language.

2.4 Social- Psychological factors in Language Learning

Social psychological factors are discussed under the label individual differences of the ‘affective nature’. Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) define these as the emotionally relevant characteristics of the individual that influence how he / she will respond to any situation. Language attitudes and Motivation, language anxiety and self-confidence are identified as the affective factors in language learning situations.

In the State of the Art article “A student’s contributions to second language learning” Gardener and MacIntyre (1992, 1993) classify the individual learner variables into three broad categories: variables that involve different aspects of cognition like intelligence, language aptitude, language learning strategies, previous language training and experience (cognitive variables); those attributes that involve individual’s reactions
to situations like attitude, motivation, language anxiety, feelings of self-confidence about the language, personality attributes, and learning styles (Affective variables) and a final miscellaneous category that includes factors like age, or socio-cultural experiences that could have either cognitive or affective implications.

Under cognitive variables, Gardner and MacIntyre (1992), identify three variables, intelligence, language aptitude and language learning strategies. Language aptitude helps a learner in absorbing a new language, Intelligence helps in how well and how quickly instruction is absorbed and Language strategies are the means or plans of acquiring learning new material.

Affective factors are broadly classified as language attitudes and motivation, and language anxiety and self-confidence. Besides these there is the context which is considered as determining availability of the language, society’s reaction to the language and the individual learner’s own perception of what it means to learn the language.

Apart from the societal reaction which are general to a language there are, “personal and general factors” (Ellis, 1986) which are highly idiosyncratic and reflect an individual’s approach to learning a language. The general societal reactions are manifested differently in individual learners and are realized in idiosyncratic ways.

Again, personal factors have social, cognitive, and affective aspects, whereas social factors are external, the cognitive and affective factors are internal. Different personal and general factors involve all three aspects in different degrees.

Learners use different language learning strategies, the direct and indirect strategies interact with and support each other (Oxford 1990), where using direct strategies learners engage with the new language directly, whereas the indirect strategies help with indirect language learning through focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities and controlling anxiety. Some direct strategies determined by Oxford (1990) are Memory strategies; Cognitive strategies; and Compensation strategies, and
indirect strategies are the Social strategies; Affective strategies: and Metacognitive strategies.

It is to be understood what Oxford means by the term 'affective'- refers to emotions, attitudes, motivation, and values, on which language learners can gain control through lowering anxiety, encouraging oneself, and maintaining emotional temperature stable since this is one of the primary concerns of the present study.

The affective domain is impossible to measure and delineate (Brown 1987: 99 as quoted by Oxford 1999) and spreads like a net, encompassing concepts like self-esteem, attitudes, motivation, anxiety, culture shock, inhibition, risk taking, and tolerance for ambiguity. Oxford 1999 states that the affective domain is one of the determinants of language learning success or failure. So much so, good language learners are those who can control their emotions and attitude about learning.

It is well known that, negative feelings stunt progress, even for learners who understand how to learn a new language. On the other hand, positive emotions and attitudes can make language learning more effective and enjoyable, and lead to greater results. In this, the role of teachers influence the emotional temperature of the classroom he/she can do this in three different ways: by changing the social structure of the classroom to give students more responsibility, by providing increased amounts of naturalistic communication, and by teaching learners to use affective strategies. (Oxford 1999)

Attitudes or beliefs towards language learning, motivation to learn a language, anxiety in language learning, and self-perceptions of second language proficiency will be discussed in detail in the following sections.
2.4.1 Attitudes and Beliefs in Language Learning

The first factor that we consider is attitudes/beliefs which are perceptions or a kind of cultural filters specific to social groups, individualized to a greater or lesser extent. Attitudes used to be understood as distinct from beliefs and values. Beliefs are defined by Johnson and Merton (1989) as *symbolic statements about what is real*. Culture provides beliefs that furnish us with the obvious facts to sort our perceptions and experiences at the same time limiting our awareness to those things that have a place in our cultural framework. Akin to beliefs are "values", abstract ideas that set goals and rank them in terms of their relative desirability. Johnson and Merton claim that cultural desirability of education is reflected in individual choices, but at the same time exists independently of individuals just as cultural beliefs. Attitudes on the other hand, focus on emotions and may be positive or negative evaluations of objects, people, or situations that predispose us toward them differently. Though based on beliefs and values, attitudes are feelings that flow from them and are essentially cultural in nature. This would explain phenomenon of "ethnocentrism" where we judge the beliefs/values of other cultures as incorrect/absurd on the basis of beliefs/values that define the reality for us.

Let us look at the effect of learner beliefs on language learning. "Beliefs which are strong perceptual filters of reality" Puchta (1999) serve as explanations and generalizations about cause and effect, and they influence our inner representation of the world around us in turn which determine future behaviour. The effect of learner beliefs on learning outcomes, materializing in negative or positive self-talk, has been discussed by Seligman(1991), Oxford and Shearin (1994), Ehrman (1996), and most recently by Arnold (1999). They help us make sense of that world, and they determine how we think and how we act. Beliefs can be an impediment to successful language learning. This was shown by the Beliefs about language learning inventory (BALLI) developed by Horwitz (1999) which studied *difficulty of language learning, foreign language aptitude, the nature of language learning and learning and communication strategies* of learners. The findings from many Balli studies show how beliefs across learner groups indicate cultural and situational influences on learners' beliefs about language learning and several
differences identified were clearly attributable to differences in learning circumstances than culture.

In comparison to the notion of belief, the concept of attitude is complex, and many definitions have been proposed to describe its essence. Allport (1954: 45) states that, “an attitude is a mental and neurological state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations with which it is related’. Attitudes are said to have cognitive, affective and conative components. The cognitive component refers to the individual’s belief structure, the affective to emotional reactions, and the conative to the tendency to behave toward the attitude object. The work of Gardner and his colleagues forms the knowledge base in the field of attitudes and motivation.

Schumann (1978 as quoted by Ellis 1986) lists ‘attitude as a social factor on par with variables such as ‘size of learning group’ and ‘motivation’ as an affective factor alongside ‘culture shock’.

Attitudes are influenced by the kind of personality the learner whether he is ethnocentric or authoritarian, and may be influenced by the social milieu in which learning takes place (Ellis 1986).

Attitudes are discussed as ‘subjective needs’ in opposition to ‘objective needs’ by Tudor (1996). He says neglecting to pay attention to learners’ subjective needs of which attitudes are a part will result in dire consequences where quality of their language and their affective involvement with language is likely to suffer. The psycho social or cognitive nature of attitudes will influence the manner in which learners perceive and interact with the process of language study.

For Oxford (1999), attitudes are mental dispositions, beliefs and opinions, which subsume the sense of efficacy that underlies self-esteem, and both work together to affect performance in language learning, both global proficiency and specific
language skills. For Oxford (1999), self encouragement strategies are powerful ways to improve attitudes and motivation.

The notion of self-esteem linked to attitudes is exemplified in Puchta’s (1999), example where a man’s failure to speak Spanish, cannot be explained through any argument but to the man’s emotional block and a limiting belief that” I’ll never be able to do this”. This is despite any cognitive deficiency or any standard argument usually given in ESL.

The story of Pygmalion (from Shaw, 1912) as used by Prodromou (1999), also demonstrates how teacher expectations can transform the performance of the learner. He quotes what Eliza says, (to Higgins and his friend Pickering), “You see, really and truly, apart from the things any one can pickup (dressing and the proper way of speaking and so on), the difference between a lady and a flower girl is not how she behaves, but how she’s treated. I shall always be a flower girl to Professor Higgins, because he always treats me as a flower girl, and always will; but I know I can be lady to you (to Pickering), because you always treat me as a lady, and always will. (Act V)”. Prodromou says this can be applied to language learning in that;

"the difference between a good student and a bad student is not the way they behave but how they are treated. Some students will always be failures to some teachers because they always treat them like failures; but they can be successful in other classes because they are treated as if they are, or could be successful“(1999: 94).

Many researchers treat attitudes as similar to beliefs. Students’ and Teachers’ beliefs about language learning are assessed by Kern (1995) by means of BALLI. He suggests that teachers’ beliefs are but one of many factors that affect students’ beliefs about language learning. Hinenoya and Gatbonton (2000) report that cultural traits and beliefs play a role in second language learning. The structure of language learners’ beliefs about ‘learning in general’ and ‘beliefs specifically about language learning’ and the relationship between the two belief domains was examined by Mori (1999). Although
there were some significant correlations between these belief factors, it is said, that they are characterized as consisting of multiple independent dimensions.

Yang and Lau (2003) discussed the attitudes students have towards English before and after their tertiary studies. They conclude that students' attitudes and comments towards English do not change much after they have obtained tertiary education. Cotterall (1995) investigates learners' beliefs regarding the key variables and language learning. Beliefs held by students about the role of the teacher, nature of language learning, dimensions of beliefs about strategy use, autonomy - fostering strategies, monitoring and evaluating strategies and self-efficacy are investigated.

In conclusion it can be said that attitudes and beliefs have a deep effect on classroom processes by significantly influencing how students perceive language lab and how they evaluate their role in the classroom and their performance. Thus, these are what Widdowson (1981 as quoted by Tudor 1996). Thus, calls for 'process oriented' needs.

When social scientists attempt to measure an attitude, they typically infer it from the individuals' reactions to evaluatively-worded belief statements. Although the procedures differ, this is the essential nature of the four major attitude assessment techniques, the Likert (1932), the Thurstone (1928) the Guttman (1944), or the semantic differential (Osgood et al (1957) procedures. Consequently an individual's attitude is an evaluative reaction to some referent or attitude object, inferred on the basis of the individual's beliefs or opinions about a referent.

The attitudes and beliefs towards the language being learnt surface in the amount and the kind of motivation individuals bring to learning that language.
2.4.2 Motivation in Language Learning

Along with the notion of attitudes an aspect which has been discussed extensively is “motivation”. Motivation is discussed as the extent to which the individual works or strives to learn the language because of a desire to do so, and the satisfaction experienced from this activity. Traditional approaches to Motivation are mostly social-psychological. It is linked with attitudes toward the community of speakers of the target language, with an interest in interacting with such speakers and with some degree of self-identification with the target language community.

Gardener’s influential socio-educational model of language learning incorporates the learner’s cultural beliefs, their attitudes towards the learning situation, their integrativeness and their motivation. However, Gardener emphasizes that the primary factor in the model is motivation.

He defines motivation as referring to a combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes towards learning the language. Operationally, for the purpose of measurement he includes in it, a desire to learn the language, motivational intensity, and attitudes toward learning the language. The Attitude/ Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) measures integrative/ instrumental motivation (Gardener 1985).

The AMTB consists of a series of self-report questionnaires containing a battery of questions to measure 19 different sub-scales representing different aspects of motivation. It operationalizes five categories of motivation, integrativeness, attitudes towards learning situation, language anxiety and other attributes.

An additional factor that Gardener considers is when he links ‘integrative motivation’ to ‘additive bilingualism’ and proposes that instrumental motivation is more likely to be linked to ‘subtractive bilingualism’. (Gardener, 1979)
In response to the conflicting findings from studies based on Gardener and Lamberts' distinction of Integrative and Instrumental orientations, Clement and Kruidenier (1983) suggest, that definitional problems and failure to consider the influence of the social milieu were the source of these discrepancies. Therefore, Desi and Ryan (1985) adopt a self-determination approach to motivation. Two types of motivation 'Intrinsic' and 'Extrinsic' are outlined along a continuum of self-determination. They are \textit{Intrinsic Motivation-Knowledge}, \textit{Intrinsic Motivation-Accomplishment}, \textit{Intrinsic Motivation-Stimulation}; and Extrinsic Motivation of three levels: \textit{External regulation}, \textit{Introjected regulation} and \textit{identified regulation}.

IM-Knowledge is the motivation for doing an activity for the feelings associated with exploring new ideas and developing knowledge. The second type, IM-Accomplishment, refers to the sensations related to attempting to master a task or achieve a goal. The third type, IM Stimulation relates to motivation based simply on the sensations stimulated by performing the task, such as aesthetic appreciation or fun and excitement. Next, are the three levels of Extrinsic Motivation from the lowest level to the highest level of self-determination. External regulation is defined as those activities that are determined by sources external to the person, such as tangible benefits or costs. The second type of extrinsic motivation which is more internalized into self concept is introjected regulation, which refers to reasons that pertain to performing an activity due to some type of pressure that individuals have incorporated into the self, such that they compel themselves to carry out that activity. The third type of extrinsic motivation, the most self determined form is identified regulation. This point is where individuals invest energy in an activity because they have chosen to do so for personally relevant reasons of achieving a valued goal.

Motivation is defined by Erhman (1996) as the perceived "payoff" for the student's investment of time, energy, and effort. It has to do with the reason why the student is there in first place and why he persists there. She further says that motivation may be positive or negative.
In a recent attempt to make sense of the different components involved in second language motivation, Dornyei (1994) proposes a three level categorization, first, the language level: various orientations and motives related to aspects of second language e.g., the culture and the community, and the usefulness of the language etc; second, the learner level: the individual characteristics that the learner brings to the learning task e.g. need for achievement and self confidence etc.; and the third is the situation level: components related to the course, the teacher and the group dynamics. One important thing that Dornyei contributes to this discussion is that motivation is a multifaceted construct which will be affected by situational factors.

Further, a cognitive view to motivation is possible. It centers on individuals’ making decisions about their own actions as opposed to being at the mercy of external forces over which they have no control. Williams and Burden (1997) present the constructivist perspective to language learning and apply it to the aspect of motivation in language learning. A constructivist view of motivation centers on the premise that each individual is motivated differently, making sense of the external influences in personal ways. Therefore, an individual’s motivation is also subject to social context and contextual features. Thus, the constructivist definition for motivation is essentially cognitive, but fits within a social constructivist framework.

Dornyei (2004) presents an overview of recent advances in research on motivation to learn a foreign or second language (L2). Firstly he points out the social dimension of the construct of L2 motivation dealing with such issues as multiculturalism, language globalization, language contact, and power relationships between different ethno-linguistic groups. However he says further that the social dimension does not constitute a complete picture and that a range of other motivational aspects need depending on the actual context in which L2 learning takes place need to be considered for an understanding of the motivational tapestry underlying second language acquisition (SLA).
Learner motivation is considered a major factor for success in language learning and therefore teachers’ guides must make a positive contribution to heightening and sustaining learner motivation (Cunningworth and Kusel, 1991). A study by Georgesen and Solano (1999) on “The effects of motivation on Narrative content and structure” found out that motivation influences not just the content of a story but also how a story is constructed.

One of the tasks Parrott (1993) designs for language teachers is about motivation and learning to look at ways in which a teacher can affect motivation in the classroom context.

### 2.4.3 Anxiety in Language Learning

Related to motivation, another factor is “anxiety” which Erhman (1996) defines as the response a student has to a perceived threat to his or her sense of security or self esteem”. This threat could be direct, in terms of getting a bad grade, or indirect, such as having to give up cherished beliefs about the uniqueness or superiority of one’s own native culture, or even deeper, a threat to the perceived integrity of one’s identity.

Psychologists differentiate between trait anxiety which is a stable part of a person’s personality, and state anxiety which is related to specific events or situations. Perhaps trait anxiety is state anxiety extended over many repeated situations. Another important distinction in the literature is between debilitating and facilitating anxiety. The kind of anxiety that gets in the way of learning is debilitating. Facilitating anxiety in contrary mobilizes resources to accomplish a task.

Anxiety at the three different stages: input, processing, output has been examined through different scales by Onwuegbuzie, Bailey, Daley (2000). Anxiety is not treated as a unidimensional construct but as occurring at each of the three stages of second language acquisition. MacIntyre and Gardener (1994) apply this model of Tobias
(1986) but suggest that learning should not be taken as occurring in discrete sections but that the three stages are interdependent.

Writing on reticence and anxiety in Second Language classrooms, Tsui, (1996) says;

"we need to understand language learning not only as a process of acquiring linguistic rules or participating in communication activities, but as a process in which individual learners are constantly putting themselves in a vulnerable position of having their self-concept undermined and subjecting themselves to negative evaluations".

Language learning therefore becomes a “profoundly unsettling proposition.” Language classroom anxiety is described by Horwitz et al (1986: 128) as;

“distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process.”

The uniqueness of language learning lies firstly, in the fact that learners are required to perform in a language that they are still trying to master. As Horwitz et al. (ibid) point out, “performance in L2 is likely to challenge an individuals self concept as a competent communicator and lead to reticence, self consciousness, fear, or even panic” (p. 125). In such situations learners feel they do not reflect their actual personality and their intelligence in its true picture and feel a kind of helplessness.

Also, language learners appear more vulnerable to criticism and negative evaluation than in domains of learning. This is clearly reflected in the ridicule one is subjected to because of one’s accent and pronunciation which Alwright and Bailey (1991) also talk about:

“A learner may get the answer right in terms of content, but wrong in terms of form or pronunciation. And given the importance that many ESL teachers attach to correctness, the constant error correction students receive from the teacher can be seen by them as a form of mild public humiliation” (Alwright and Bailey 1991).
Beebe (1983: 43) on the other hand talks about speaking in the ESL classes which is 'high risk, low gain'. Speaking in a language classroom is one of the most frequently cited causes of concern for anxious foreign language students. Whereas, second language writing anxiety as compared to the speaking anxiety is a language-skill-specific anxiety (Horwitz, et al. 1999).

It is also true that anxiety is found in good learner/users. Alwright and Bailey (1991) bring to light the fact that some very competent learners are anxious because if they do not make mistakes, they will stand out among their peers and be resented. In such cases, accuracy is foreign for being a member of a group.

Also, anxiety though can be facilitative, can also block language learning. Harmful anxiety presents itself in many guises: worry, self-doubt, frustration, helplessness, insecurity, fear, and physical symptoms (Oxford 1990). Even the ordinary language classroom can create high anxiety, because learners are frequently forced to perform in a state of ignorance and dependence in front of peers and teacher.

At times, the notion of anxiety is culture specific, which is shown by Tsui (1996) with the example of Hong Kong secondary school students who told themselves:

1. You should not demonstrate verbal success in English in front of your peers.
2. You should hesitate and show difficulty in arriving at an answer.
3. You should not answer the teacher voluntarily or enthusiastically in English.
4. You should not speak fluent English.

As we see here, anxiety is a reflection of modesty in the Chinese culture, where showing oneself as not better than the others is more acceptable.
In any of the four skills, anxiety can play a strong role, short-circuiting potential learning. Speaking a new language often causes the greatest anxiety of all, but some learners also experience tremendous anxiety when listening, reading, or writing the new language. Oxford (1990:165) suggests the following strategies lower anxiety, no matter which skill or combination of skills is involved: "Using progressive Relaxation, Deep Breathing, or Meditation, Using Music, Encouraging yourself. Teaching students some self encouragement strategies will pay off in all of the skill areas.

To provide learner centered, low anxiety class environment Young (1991) says that we need to identify sources of anxiety, recognize expressions of stress in learners and to identify suggestions for reducing anxiety. The sources of language anxiety are associated with the learner, teacher and instructional practice. They are

1. Personal and interpersonal.
2. Learner beliefs about language learning.
3. Instructor beliefs about language learning.
4. Instructor learner interactions.
5. Class room procedures and
6. Language testing.

Young suggest that helping teachers to recognize signs of anxiety manifested by students is very important.

2.4.4 Self Assessment in Language Learning

Oxford (1990) includes self evaluating under the Meta cognitive group of indirect strategies - in the category of 'Evaluating your learning' strategies which include: 'self monitoring' and 'self evaluating'.

Ehrman (1996) discusses the concept of "self efficacy" that relates to the degree to which the student thinks he or she has the capacity to cope with the learning challenge.
It is the belief that one can cope and succeed. It could be with respect to specific domains of learning or one or more areas of skill to the extent one feels about him or her-self in general.

Ehrman says further that enhanced self-efficacy — that is, more expectation of good results — tends to increase motivation. It also increases willingness to take learning risks. Students who consider themselves poor learners are likely to want to learn in settings that reduce risk by reducing options and imposing external structure.

Language learning difficulties constitute a particular assault on the self-esteem of people who have had success in other aspects of life or other academic subjects that require different skills and often less tolerance of ambiguity. Therefore, expectations of self are a particular type of beliefs a student has about learning. Students may believe that languages are difficult to learn or only certain kinds of people can learn languages or that there is a "right way" to learn. Lack of self-efficacy, Ehrman says, can lead to very dependent behavior by a student.

Lack of success can be seen as depriving the students of self esteem. On the other hand, self-esteem is often built on a sense of self-efficacy. Ehrman points to another extreme where self-efficacy is not helpful when it leads to inflexibility. In such a situation self esteem is debilitating and hinders learning.

A consistent association between low self esteem and anxiety encourages a serious consideration of the role low self confidence might play in students' expectations about second language learning especially their experience of second language learning. In terms of Bandura's (1977) self efficacy theory of emotional behaviour, those who believe they are capable of managing specific impending dangerous or threats have little reason to fear or avoid them; those who doubt their ability will easily give up, feeling vulnerable and anxious. In the context of second language learning, MacIntyre et al (1997) say, we could hypothesize that students with low self confidence might tend to underestimate their ability to learn a second language and have negative expectations.
about their performance their by feeling insecure or anxious in the phase of language learning task.

Self-evaluating is one of the basic features of self esteem which involves gauging either general language progress or progress in any of the four skills.

Cummins et al. (1990) mention that 'the patterns of language use are reflected in students’ self ratings of current proficiency in speaking, understanding, reading, and writing Portuguese and English. Therefore self assessing one’s proficiency is also highly social Psychological in nature revealing much more than just evaluation of proficiency. MacIntyre et al. (1997) also reports that second language anxiety, perceived second language competence and actual second language competence are correlated.

2.5 Conclusion

A social psychological perspective to language learning requires that these factors discussed above are taken in to consideration in the teaching learning process since they have either positive/ facilitating or negative/ debilitating influence.

These need to be exposed through mediation in the particularistic practices through critical language pedagogy. Addressing the conflict and access the hidden curriculum in language learning in different contexts requires focusing on the conflict between individual and cultural attitudes and beliefs; and motivation for language learning.

There is a crucial need for expanding and supporting the Zone of Proximal Development (1978) through shaping the social psychological orientation through interaction and mediation. Further, conscious strategy training in anxiety management and self assessment needs to be given to the learners. To do this however, we need to generate a profile of such factors in specific contexts of learning and expose them and critically address them.
This study takes up to explore these factors empirically in the English language learning context at the tertiary level in Andhra Pradesh in the multilingual country of India. The next chapter presents the details of the study.