CHAPTER TWO
A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. The Dynamics of the Second Language Acquisition

In the introductory chapter, the researcher has presented a bird’s eye view of the overall development of the Indian ELT scenario with the relevant issues and possible solutions. The main thrust of the emerging Indian paradigm has been how to adopt a learner-centred orientation in ELT with a communicative approach that suited the present job-market. In this chapter, the researcher presents a review of literature on how teachers of L2 have been endeavouring to evolve a suitable pedagogy for teaching L2. Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is a complex process, involving many inter-related factors. As Rod Ellis points out, “It is not a uniform and predictable phenomenon. There is no single way in which learners acquire a knowledge of a second language” (R. Ellis 4).

SLA is the outcome of a process involving many factors pertaining to the teachers and their pedagogical approaches on the one hand and the learners and their learning situations on the other. It is crucial to recognise the complexity and diversity which are the direct consequences of the inter-play of these two sets of factors. Ellis further observes that “different learners in different situations learn a L2 in different ways” (R. Ellis 4). Therefore, it is essential to take into consideration how ELT pedagogy has been evolving, before one addresses the pertinent question of how SLA takes place for different learners in different contexts while different factors affect their actual performance.

2.2. Approaches in Language Teaching

It has been pointed out that “language teaching in the twentieth century was characterized by frequent change and innovation and by the development of sometimes competing language teaching ideologies” (Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers 1). From a historical perspective of language teaching (LT) methods, the researcher sees that
the concerns that have prompted modern innovations were similar to those that have always been at the centre of discussions on how to teach foreign languages (FL). Changes in LT methods throughout history have reflected recognition of changes in the kind of proficiency learners look for, such as a move towards oral proficiency than reading comprehension as the goal of language study. They have also reflected changes in theories of the nature of language and of language learning (LL). Some of the modern issues related to ELT reflect the contemporary responses to these frequently asked questions throughout the history of LT. Therefore, it is necessary to study the historical development of teaching methods in ELT.

Today English is the most widely studied L2 in the world but about five hundred years ago, it was Latin that was used for education, commerce, religion, and government in the Western world. In the sixteenth century, however, French, Italian, and English gained in importance as a consequence of the changes in the political scenario in Europe and Latin was displaced as a language of communication. When the ‘modern’ languages began to enter the curriculum of the European schools in the eighteenth century, they were taught with the same methods that were used for teaching Latin. By the nineteenth century, this pedagogy became the standard way of studying FL in schools and came to be known as the Grammar-Translation Method.

2.3.0. The Grammar-Translation Method

The Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) was the offspring of German scholarship and, in fact, it was first known as the ‘Prussian Method’ in the USA. As pointed out earlier, it was historically used in teaching Latin and was later generalised to teaching modern languages. Classes were taught in the learners’ L1, with little active use of the target language (TL). Vocabulary was taught in the form of isolated word lists. Elaborate explanations of grammar points were always provided. Instruction in grammar provided the rules for putting words together and these instructions often focussed on the form and inflection of words. Reading of difficult texts was begun early in the course of study. Little attention was paid to the content of texts, which were treated as exercises in grammatical analysis. Often the only drills practised were exercises in translating
disconnected sentences from TL into L1 and vice versa. Little or no attention was given to pronunciation.

In this method, while teaching the text book, the teacher translated every word and phrase from English into L1 of learners. Further, learners were required to translate sentences from their L1 into English. These exercises in translation were based on various items covering the grammar of the TL. This method emphasised the study of grammar through deduction i.e. through the study of the rules of grammar. A contrastive study of the TL with L1 gave an insight into the structure not only of the FL but also of the L1. According to W. H. D. Rouse, the objective of this method was “to know everything about something rather than the thing itself” (Kelly 53).

2.3.1. Basic Assumptions of GTM

1. Translation interpreted the words and phrases of the FL in the best possible manner.
2. The phraseology and the idiom of the TL could best be assimilated in the process of interpretation.
3. The structures of the FL were best learnt when compared and contrasted with those of one’s L1.

2.3.2. Basic Principles of GTM

The main principles of this oldest method were the following:

1. According to this method, the goal of FL study was to learn a language in order to read its literature or to benefit from the mental discipline and the intellectual development that resulted from such a study.
2. The priority of GTM was mostly reading and writing in TL. Listening and speaking were practically given least importance.
3. This method approached the TL primarily through detailed analysis of its grammar rules, followed by application of this knowledge to the task of translating sentences and texts into and out of the TL. Hence, it viewed LL as
consisting of little more than memorising the rules of grammar in order to understand and manipulate the morphology and syntax of the FL. “The first language is maintained as the reference system in the acquisition of the second language” (Stern 455).

4. Grammar rules were very well illustrated and taught at length. It was taught deductively by studying the grammar rules, which were practised later.

5. Vocabulary items were presented with their translation equivalents and translation exercises were given prime focus.

6. The sentence was the most basic unit of teaching and learning practice. Translating sentences into and out of the TL was the main activity of this method. It was an attempt to make the exercise easy for learners (Howatt 131).

7. Accuracy was emphasised. Fluency in TL was out of question and was treated as unnecessary.

8. Learners’ L1 was used as medium of instruction. Often comparisons were made between the structures of L1 and L2.

2.3.3. Advantages of GTM

1. The phraseology of the TL was quickly explained. Translation was the easiest way of explaining meanings of words and phrases from one language into another. Any other method of explaining vocabulary items in L2 was found time-consuming. A lot of time would have been wasted, if the meanings of lexical items were to be explained through definitions and illustrations in L2. Further, learners acquired some accuracy in understanding synonyms in their L1 and TL.

2. Teachers’ labour was saved. Since the textbooks were taught through the medium of L1, they could ask comprehension questions in L1. Learners did not have much difficulty in responding to such questions in their L1. The teacher could easily assess whether learners had learnt what was taught to them. Communication between the teacher and learners did not cause linguistic problems. Even teachers who were not fluent in English could teach English
through this method. That is perhaps the reason why this method was practised so widely and had survived so long.

2.3.4. Disadvantages

1. It is an unnatural method. The natural order of learning a language was listening, speaking, reading, and writing. This was the way children used to learn their L1 in natural surroundings. However in the GTM, L2 instruction started with the teaching of reading. Thus, the learning process was reversed. This posed problems to the learners.

2. Speech was neglected. GTM emphasised reading and writing to the detriment of listening and speaking. The learners who were taught English through this method failed to express themselves adequately in spoken English. Even at the undergraduate stage, they felt shy of communicating through English. Learners were exposed to listening to their L1 more than they were to their L2 in such classes. Since LL involved habit formation, such learners failed to acquire the habit of speaking in English. Therefore, they had to pay a heavy price for being taught English through this method.

3. Translation was, indeed, a difficult task and exact translation from one language to another was not always possible. Linguists considered that any language was the outcome of various customs, traditions, and modes of behaviour of a speech community and these traditions differed from community to community. There were several lexical items in one language, which had no synonyms/equivalents in another language. Each language had its own structure, idiom, and usage, which did not have their exact counterparts in another language. Thus, one’s ability to translate should not be considered as an index of one’s proficiency in a language.
4. GTM never gave practice in patterns of the TL. Learners could learn a language only when they internalised such patterns to the extent that they formed a habit. This method did not provide any such practice to the learners in the TL. It rather attempted to teach language through rules and not by use. To speak any language fluently by merely mastering its grammar was quite impossible. LL meant acquiring certain skills, which could be learnt through practice and not by just memorising rules. Learners who learnt a FL or L2 through this method found it difficult to give up the habit of first thinking in their L1 and then translating their ideas into L2. They failed to achieve proficiency in L2. The method, therefore, suffered from certain defects for which there was no remedy.

5. Accuracy was over-emphasised to the detriment of fluency. Learners were expected to attain high standards in translation, because of “the high priority attached to meticulous standards of accuracy which, as well as having an intrinsic moral value, was a prerequisite for passing the increasing number of formal written examinations that grew up during the century” (Howatt, A History of English Language Teaching 132).

To sum up, GTM dominated FL teaching from the 1840s to the 1940s and its modified form continues to be in vogue in some parts of the world even today. It stayed on in the Indian schools until the 1960s, when a complete evaluation of the FL pedagogy was taking place. The researcher is of the view that there are no advocates of this method in the present context because it has no theoretical justification. There is no literature that offers a rationale for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics, psychology, or educational theory. In the mid-nineteenth century and later, opposition to GTM developed gradually in Europe. The Reform Movement, as it was christened, laid the foundations for the development of new ways of teaching languages and raised controversies that have continued to the present day.
2.4.0. The Reform Movement

In the meantime, teachers experimented with new approaches in the Post-war and Depression Era classrooms, but without much structures to follow. The most trusted GTM set the pace for ELT in many classrooms for many decades all over the world. LT specialists like Marcel, Prendergast, and Gouin endeavoured much to promote alternative approaches to GTM but their views failed to receive wide acclamation and support. From the 1880s, practical-minded linguists like Henry Sweet in England, Wilhelm Viëtor in Germany, and Paul Passy in France offered intellectual leadership needed to give reformist ideas greater credibility and acceptance. Speech, rather than the written word, emerged as the primary form of language. The International Phonetic Association (IPA) was founded in 1986 and its International Phonetic Alphabets system revolutionised the accurate transcription of sounds in any language.

2.4.1. Basic Principles of RM

The Reformists aimed at improving the teaching methodology of modern languages. They advocated the following principles (Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers 9):

1. The study of the spoken language;
2. Training in Phonetics in order to establish good pronunciation skills;
3. The use of conversational texts and dialogues to introduce conversational phrases and idioms;
4. An inductive approach to the teaching of grammar;
5. Teaching new meanings through establishing associations within the TL rather than with the L1.

These principles provided a theoretical framework for a systematic approach to LT and learning. None of these proposals assumed the status of a method but they created an interest in developing principles for LL out of naturalistic principles such as were seen in L1 acquisition. At various times throughout the history of LT, attempts were made to make SLA more like the L1 learning. L. Sauveur and other believers in the Natural Method argued that a FL could be taught without translation or the use of L1, if meaning
was conveyed directly through demonstration and action. This natural method led to the
development of the Direct Method (DM).

2.5.0. The Direct Method

This method was developed initially as a reaction to the GTM in an attempt to
integrate more use of the TL in instruction. Lessons began with a dialogue using a
conversational style in the TL. Materials were first presented orally with actions or
pictures. The L1 was never used. There was no translation. The preferred type of
exercise was a series of questions in the TL based on the dialogue or an anecdotal
narrative. Questions were answered in the TL. Grammar was taught inductively and rules
were generalised from the practice and experience with the TL. Verbs were used first and
systematically conjugated only much later after some oral mastery of the TL. Advanced
learners read literature for comprehension and pleasure. Literary texts were not analysed
grammatically. The culture associated with the TL was also taught inductively. Learning
the culture of the TL was considered as an important aspect of learning the language.

2.5.1. Basic Principles of DM

The DM has the following features (Titone 100-101):

1. Classroom instruction was conducted exclusively in the TL.
2. Only everyday vocabulary and sentences were taught.
3. Oral communication skills were built up in a carefully graded progression
   organised around question-and-answer exchanges between the teacher and
   learners in small, intensive classes.
4. Grammar was taught inductively.
5. New teaching points were introduced orally.
6. Concrete vocabulary was taught through demonstration, objects, and pictures;
   abstract vocabulary was taught by association of ideas.
7. Both speech and listening comprehension were taught.
8. Correct pronunciation and grammar were emphasised.
2.5.2. Advantages of DM

1. It made the learning of English interesting and lively by establishing direct bond between a word and its meaning.
2. It was an activity-oriented method facilitating alertness and participation of the learners.
3. It was the quickest way of getting started. In a few months, over 500 of the commonest English words could be learnt and used in sentences. This served as a strong foundation for further learning.
4. Due to the application of the DM, learners were able to understand what they were learning, think about it, and then express their ideas in correct English.
5. Psychologically speaking, it was a sound method as it proceeded from the concrete to the abstract.
6. This method could be usefully employed from the lowest to the highest class.
7. Through this method, fluency of speech, good pronunciation, and power of expression were properly developed.

2.5.3. Disadvantages of DM

1. There were many abstract words which could not be interpreted directly in English and much time and energy were wasted in making attempts for the purpose.
2. This method was based on the principles that auditory appeal was stronger that visual. Still, there were children who learnt more with visual than with their oral-aural sense.
3. The method ignored systematic written work and reading activities and sufficient attention was not paid to reading and writing.
4. There was a dearth of teachers trained and interested in teaching English in this method.
5. This method might not hold good for higher classes of learners where the GTM was found more suitable.
6. In larger classes, this method was not properly applied and teaching in this method did not suit or satisfy the needs of individual learners in large classes.

2.5.4. GTM and the DM Compared

The Table below shows the differences between the GTM and the DM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Grammar-Translation Method</th>
<th>Direct Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It maintained close association between the FL and the L1.</td>
<td>It avoids the close association between the FL and the L1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It emphasised reading and writing.</td>
<td>It emphasised listening and speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It followed the adult’s natural way of learning a language.</td>
<td>It followed the child’s natural way of learning a language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It taught the language by ‘rule’ and not by ‘use’.</td>
<td>It taught the language by ‘use’ and not by ‘rule’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It taught formal grammar from the very beginning.</td>
<td>It did not favour the teaching of formal grammar at the early stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It promoted accuracy in communication.</td>
<td>It promoted fluency in communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DM was quite successful in private schools where paying clients had high motivation and the use of native-speaking teachers was the norm. On the other hand, despite pressure from the proponents of this method, it was not easy to implement it in public schools. It over-emphasised and distorted the similarities between naturalistic L1 acquisition and classroom FL learning and failed to consider the practical realities of the classroom. Since it lacked a rigorous justification from applied linguistic theory, it was often criticised by the proponents of the Reform Movement.
The DM represented the product of enlightened amateurism. It was perceived to have several drawbacks. It required native speakers or those who had native-like fluency to teach a FL. The teacher occupied the central stage since it was largely dependent on the teachers’ skill rather than on the textbook. Not all teachers were proficient enough in the FL to adhere to the principles of this method. In their attempts to avoid the use of L1, often teachers took more time to explain simple things, when a brief explanation in L1 would have been a more efficient route to comprehension.

2.5.5. Major Issues in FL Teaching

What started as a debate on FL teaching methodology emerged later as a significant educational issue in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. From this historical survey, some major issues that prompted innovations and new directions in FL teaching can be identified. They are as follows (Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers 14):

1. What should the goals of LT be? Should a language course try to teach conversational proficiency, reading, translation, or some other skills?
2. What is the basic nature of language and how will this affect the teaching method?
3. What are the principles for the selection of language content in LT?
4. What principles of organisation, sequencing, and presentation best facilitate learning?
5. What should the role of the native language be?
6. What processes do learners use in mastering a language and can these be incorporated into a method?
7. What teaching techniques and activities work best and under what circumstances?

To sum up, from the late nineteenth century to the present, different pedagogical approaches and methods have attempted to solve some of these vital issues. The DM can be regarded as the first LT method to have caught the attention of teachers and LT experts as it offered a methodology that appeared to move LT into a new era called, ‘the
Methods Era’. The twentieth century saw the rise and fall of a variety of pedagogical approaches and methods having very different characteristics in terms of goals, assumptions about SLA, and preferred pedagogical paradigms. The general assumption was that the quality of LL would improve, if teachers used the best available approaches and methods. As Lange rightly points out, “The current attraction to ‘method’ stems from the late 1950s, when FL teachers were falsely led to believe that there was a method to remedy the ‘LT and learning problems’” (Lange 253).

2.6.0. The Reading Method

By the 1920s, the use of DM in Europe declined considerably. It was gradually modified into versions that combined some DM techniques with more controlled grammar-based activities. This method pervaded to other parts of the world too in the early parts of the twentieth century. In 1923, a study in the USA on the efficacy of FL teaching programmes concluded that no single method could ever guarantee successful results. The idea of teaching conversational skills in a FL course was considered to be impractical because of the paucity of time, the limited expertise of the teachers, and the perceived irrelevance of conversational skills in a FL for the average Americans. In 1929, the Coleman Report advocated a reading-based approach to FL teaching. It promoted the knowledge of a FL, achieved through a gradual initiation into the vocabulary and syntax in simple reading texts. Consequently, reading became the goal of most FL courses everywhere. This stress on reading continued to characterise FL teaching until World War II. There were also many variations to this approach, though under the same umbrella of the Reading Method (RM).

2.6.1. Approaches and Procedures of RM

The Reading Method was gradually used for academic and scientific purposes. It was mostly adopted for people who did not travel abroad and for whom reading was the one usable skill in a FL. Their priorities in studying the TL were a reading ability and an historical knowledge of the country where the TL was spoken. Only the grammar necessary for reading comprehension and fluency was taught. Minimal attention was
paid to pronunciation or gaining conversational skills in the TL. From the beginning, a great amount of reading was done in L2, both in and out of the classroom. The vocabulary of the early reading passages and texts were strictly controlled for difficulty levels. Vocabulary was expanded as quickly as possible, since the acquisition of vocabulary was considered more important than that of grammatical skill. Translation reappeared in this approach as a respectable classroom procedure, related to comprehension of the written text.

2.6.2. Basic Principles of RM

The RM was a reaction to the impracticality of the DM as few teachers could use the TL in a native-like manner to apply DM successfully. In addition, reading was somehow neglected in the DM, although reading was seen as the most usable skill to have in a FL, since not many people travelled abroad around the 1930s. Therefore, a new approach focussing on the development of reading skill emerged. The basic principles of this method were as follows:

1. Teaching of grammar was restricted. It was taught only to ease the reading comprehension.
2. The presentation of vocabulary was highly controlled at the beginning and then gradually expanded at the later stages.
3. Translation was regarded as a fruitful classroom practice.
4. Among the other language skills, reading comprehension received the highest attention and it was heavily emphasised.
5. Teachers did not need to have a good oral proficiency in the FL, since it was not used as a tool for communication in the classroom environment.

RM had strategic weaknesses and it attracted only poorer learners and led to the rash abandonment of traditional values in FL teaching (Bertocci 39).
2.7.0. The Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching

Few language teachers today are familiar with the terms Oral Approach or Situational Language Teaching, which refer to an approach to LT developed by the British applied linguists during 1930s and 1960s. In spite of the fact that these terms are not in vogue today, the impact of the Oral Approach (OA) and the Situational Language Teaching (SLT) has been long-lasting, and it has permeated the designing of mostly used EFL/ESL textbooks and courses all over the world. It is, therefore, vital to understand the principles of this approach. Palmer, Hornby, and other British applied linguists from the 1920s onwards developed an approach to methodology with the following principles:

1. Selection: A systematic procedure of selecting the lexical and grammatical contents.
2. Gradation: A method of determining the organisation and sequencing of the content.
3. Presentation: Techniques used for presenting and practising of items in a course.

2.7.1. OA in Language Learning

Though there were differences among these linguists with regard to the specific procedures to be used in teaching English, their general principles were referred to as the OA to LT. “An oral approach should not be confused with the obsolete Direct Approach, which meant only that the learner was bewildered by a flow of ungraded speech, suffering all the difficulties he would have encountered in picking up the language in its normal environment and losing most of the compensating benefits of better contextualisation in those circumstances” (Pattison 4). By 1950s, OA became the accepted British approach to LT.

2.7.2. Basic Principles of OA

The following were the basic principles of OA (Salim 80):
1. LT began with the spoken language. Material was taught orally before it was presented in written form.
2. The TL was the language of the classroom.
3. New language points were introduced and practised ‘situationally’.
4. Vocabulary selection procedures were followed to ensure that an essential general service vocabulary was covered.
5. Items of grammar were graded following the principle that simple forms should be taught before complex ones.
6. Reading and writing were introduced once a sufficient lexical and grammatical basis was established.

2.7.3. Role of Situation in Language Learning

The third principle mentioned above became the key feature of this approach in the 1960s, and it was then that the term *situational* was used increasingly while referring to this approach. The theory of language underlying Situational LT (SLT) could be viewed as a type of *British structuralism*. Speech was regarded as the foundation of language and structure was viewed as being at the heart of speaking ability. The theory that knowledge of structures had to be linked to situations in which they could be used gave SLT one of its distinctive features. Many British linguists like J. R. Firth and M. A. K. Halliday developed powerful views of language in which meaning, context, and situation were given prominence. “The emphasis now is on the description of language activity as part of the whole complex of events which, together with the participants and relevant objects, make up actual situations” (Halliday, M. A. K., A. McIntosh, and P. Strevens 38).

2.7.4. Theory of Learning in SLT

The theory of learning underlying SLT was a type of behaviourist habit-learning theory. It addressed primarily the processes rather than the conditions of learning. Like DM, the SLT adopted an inductive approach to the teaching of grammar. The meaning of words and structures was not to be given in either L1 or in TL but was to be induced
from the way the form is used in a situation. Explanation was discouraged, since the learners were expected to deduce the meaning of a particular structure or vocabulary item from the situation in which it was presented. The learners were expected to apply the language learnt in a classroom to situations outside. Since L1 acquisition took place in a similar fashion, the same processes were thought to occur for SLA too, according to the practitioners of SLT. The objectives of SLT were to develop a good command over the four basic skills of language (namely Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing – often referred to as LSRW), goals which it shared with most methods of LT. However, the skills were approached through structure. Accuracy in both grammar and pronunciation was regarded as crucial and errors were to be avoided at all costs.

Basic to the teaching of English in SLT was a structural syllabus and a word list. A structural syllabus was a list of the basic structures and sentence patterns of English, arranged according to their order of presentation. Structures were always taught within sentences and vocabulary was chosen according to how well it enabled sentence patterns to be taught. SLT employed a situational approach to presenting new sentence patterns and a drill-based manner of practising them. The practice techniques employed generally consisted of guided repetition and substitution activities, including chorus repetition, dictation, drills, and controlled oral-based reading and writing tasks. In the initial stages of learning, the learners were obliged to listen and repeat what the teachers said and to respond to questions and commands. The learners had no control over the content of learning. At a later stage, more active participation was encouraged.

2.7.5. The Teacher and the SLT Method

The teachers’ function was multi-lateral. At the presentation stage of the lesson, they served as models, setting up situations in which the need for the target structure was created and then modelling the new structure for learners to repeat. The teacher then became “more like the skilful conductor of an orchestra, drawing the music out of the performers” (Byrne 2). They were required to be skilful manipulators, using questions, commands, and other cues to elicit correct sentences from their learners. Hence, lessons were teacher-directed and the teacher set the pace in the classroom. SLT also was
dependent on textbooks and visual aids. The textbooks contained tightly organised lessons planned around different grammatical structures. Visual aids, produced by the teachers themselves or commercially produced, consisted of wall charts, flashcards, pictures, etc.

In principle, textbooks were used only as a guide in the learning process. The teacher was expected to be the master over the textbook. Some of the essential features of SLT were seen in the ‘P – P – P lesson model’ with the lesson having three phases: Presentation, Practice, and Production. This approach was very much in vogue until the 1980s. However, objections and doubts popped up against SLT as early as the mid-1960s. No doubt that this approach recognised the importance of oral practice, grammar, and sentence patterns in SLA and, therefore, it offered a very practical methodology, well-suited to EFL/ESL classrooms.

2.8.0. Audio-lingual Method

As pointed out earlier, the Coleman Report recommended a reading-based approach to FL teaching in all American educational institutes. Since teaching comprehension of texts was emphasised, teachers taught from books containing short reading passages in the FL, preceded by vocabulary lists. “Teachers of English as a second language in the United States between the two world wars used either a modified Direct Method approach, a reading-based approach or a reading-oral approach” (Darian 50). Since America had emerged as a major global power after the World War II, there was a growing demand for English. Many foreign learners entered the USA to pursue their higher studies and they needed to learn or improve their English. However, owing to the internal deficiencies of DM and OA, there was a search for a more efficacious approach to FL teaching. There were several factors which led to the emergence of the American approach to ESL, which by the mid-1950s, had come to be known as ‘Audio-lingual method (ALM).
2.8.1. Historical Background

This was the product of three historical circumstances:

1. For its views on language, ALM drew heavily on the works of American
   structuralist-linguists such as Leonard Bloomfield. “The dominant linguistic
   model through the 1950s was structuralism which emphasised the description of
   different levels of production of speech” (Saville-Troike 24-25). The prime
   concern of American linguistics at the early decades of the 20th century had been
   to document all the indigenous languages spoken in the USA. However, because
   of the dearth of trained native teachers who would provide a theoretical
   description of the native languages, linguists had to rely on observation. For the
   same reason, a strong focus on oral language was developed.

2. At the same time, behaviourists such as B. F. Skinner were forming the belief that
   all behaviour (including language) was learnt through repetition and positive or
   negative reinforcement. According to Saville-Troike, “The most influential
   cognitive model of learning that was applied to language acquisition at that time
   was behaviourism which stressed the notion of habit formation resulting from S-
   R-R: Stimuli from the environment (such as linguistic input), Responses to those
   stimuli, and Re-inforcement, if the responses resulted in some desired outcome.
   Repeated S-R-R sequences are ‘learned’ i.e. strong stimuli-response pairings
   become ‘habits’ ” (25).

3. The third factor that enabled the birth of the ALM was the outbreak of World
   War II, which created the need to post a large number of American servicemen
   all over the world. It was, therefore, necessary to provide those soldiers with at
   least basic verbal communication skills. Unsurprisingly, the new method relied
   on the prevailing scientific methods of the time, observation and repetition, which
   were also admirably suited to teaching learners in a classroom. Because of the
   influence of the military, the early versions of the ALM came to be known as ‘the
   Army Method’. “The objective of the army programs was for students to attain
   conversational proficiency in a variety of foreign languages” (Jack C. Richards
   and Theodore S. Rodgers 50).
2.8.2. The Main Features of ALM

1. Structuralist described that languages began with the phonological level and ended with the sentence level. It was assumed that this was also the appropriate sequence for teaching and learning a FL. Since speech had come to be held primary and writing secondary, LT should focus on mastery of speech first and writing at a later stage in the process. Since structure was important for a language, practice should focus on mastery of phonological and grammatical structures rather than on mastery of vocabulary.

2. ALM was also based on the principles of behaviour psychology. It adopted many of the principles and procedures of the DM and, in part, as a reaction to the lack of speaking skills of the RM. New materials were presented in the form of a dialogue. W. M. Rivers confirmed the views of the American linguist, William Moulton who said in his Report to the 9th International Congress of Linguists that, “a language is a set of habits” (Rivers 5). Based on the principle that language was a verbal behaviour and learning a FL was habit formation, the method fostered dependence on mimicry, memorisation of set phrases, and over-learning.

3. Structures were sequenced and taught one at a time. Structural patterns were taught using repetitive drills. Little or no grammatical explanations were provided and grammar was taught inductively.

4. Skills were sequenced: Listening, speaking, reading, and writing were developed in the order. Listening was viewed largely as training in aural discrimination of basic sound patterns in a language. When reading and writing were introduced, the learners were taught to read and write what they had already learnt orally.

5. Dialogues and drills formed the basis of ALM classroom practices. Vocabulary was strictly limited and learnt in context. Teaching points were determined by contrastive analysis between L1 and L2.
6. In the mid 1960s, three new technological aids came into general use in the classroom: they were language laboratory, portable tape-recorder, and film-strip projector. All these were greeted with euphoria in all modern language departments. Extensive use of tapes and equipment was revolutionary for language teachers.

7. There was an extended pre-reading period at the beginning of the course. Great importance was given to precise native-like pronunciation. Correct pronunciation, stress, rhythm, and intonation were emphasised.

8. Use of the L1 by the teacher was permitted, but discouraged by the learners. Successful responses were reinforced and great care was taken to prevent learner errors.

9. Meanings of the words of a language could be understood only in the linguistic and cultural contexts of the native speaker, not in isolation. “Teaching a language thus involves teaching aspects of the cultural system of the people who speak the language” (Rivers 19-22).

2.8.3. Advantages of ALM

1. ALM approach did mark the commencing of the technological age in LT and it did introduce important new elements.

2. It emphasised the need for visual presentation and the possibility of eliciting language from visual cues.

3. Oral communication in FL was given its due importance. Brooks argued that “speech is language. Since many languages do not have a written form and we learn to speak before we learn to read or write, language is primarily what is spoken and only secondarily what is written” (Brooks 55).
4. In this approach, fluency and spontaneity were preferred to accuracy.

5. It placed far more weight on the use of FL in classroom by both the teacher and the learners. The language used was of far greater practicality.

6. More gifted and energetic teachers used new courses with great success, moved forward to open-ended question and answer work and extended dialogue.

7. Teachers designed their own supplementary materials, exercises, and worksheets.

8. Both the teacher and the learners were involved in greater application of efforts towards accomplishing their goal of LL.

2.8.4. Disadvantages of ALM

1. The basic method of teaching was repetition and speech was standardised. The learners turned into parrots who could reproduce many things but never created anything new or spontaneous on their own. They improved their performances at pattern practice but were unable to use the patterns fluently in natural speech situations.

2. Mechanical drills of early Audio-Visual approach was criticised as being not only boring and mindless but also counter-productive, if used beyond initial introduction to new structures.

3. Audio-Visual materials were open to misuse. There was a tendency to regard audio-visual materials as the teaching method in themselves, not as a teaching aid to facilitate LL.

4. It soon became clear to teachers that audio-visual approach could only assist in presentation of new materials. More subtle classroom skills were needed for
learners to assimilate the given materials and use them creatively. This final vital phase was often avoided by teachers to the detriment of LL in the classroom.

5. The new technology caught publishers and text-book writers unaware and unprepared, as very few commercial materials were available at the early stages. Consequently, they stressed oral and aural skills but did not develop reading and writing skills.

6. New materials necessitated extensive use of gadgets with all associated problems such as the blacking-out of the classroom for video watching, setting up of power connections with extension leads, carrying tape-recorders from classroom to classroom, and training of supportive staff to handle such gadgets.

7. Gadgets like projectors, tape recorders, etc., could break down. Use of such hardware involved extra time, worry, and preparation and, for these reasons alone, its use gradually faded away.

8. Though heavy investments were made on purchase of new gadgets, it threw doubts on claims made for language laboratory. Costly gadgets could not improve the performance of learners, when compared with the same materials being used on a simple tape-recorder in classroom. It affected the morale of the teachers adversely.

9. Learners were viewed as organisms that could be directed by skilled training techniques to produce the expected responses. Teaching was focussed on the external manifestations of learning than on the internal process.

10. The teacher’s role was central and active. ALM was essentially a teacher-dominated method. It was the teacher who modelled the TL, controlled the direction and pace of learning, and monitored and corrected learners’ performance. The teacher had to keep the learners attentive and responsive by
drills and tasks and choosing relevant situations to practise structures. LL was the outcome of the active verbal interaction between the teacher and the learners.

2.8.5. The Decline of ALM

ALM reached the zenith of its popularity in the 1960s. However, the initial enthusiasm for audio-visual materials and language laboratory soon cooled down as teachers gradually recognised the limitations of this approach. There was also some criticism on two counts. On the one hand, the theoretical foundations of ALM were attacked as being unsound in terms of both language theory and learning theory. On the other hand, practitioners found that the practical results fell short of expectations. While many learners found the ALM procedures monotonous and unsatisfying, others were unable to transfer the skills acquired through this method to real communication outside the classroom.

Noam Chomsky found the structuralist and the behaviourist approaches totally unacceptable. “Language is not a habit structure. Ordinary linguistic behaviour characteristically involves innovation, formation of new sentences, and patterns in accordance with rules of great abstractness and intricacy” (Chomsky 153). His theory of Transformational Grammar proposed that the fundamental properties of language derived from innate aspects of the human mind and from how human beings processed experience through language. His concept of ‘Universal Grammar’ suggested that some rules of grammar were hard-wired into the brain and manifested themselves without being taught.

2.9. Cognitive Code Learning

Chomsky’s views revolutionised the whole scenario of LL as it focussed on the mental properties that learners brought to bear on LL and language use. Suddenly, the whole of ALM paradigm was called into question and there was a crisis in American LT circles. A temporary relief was offered in the form of a theory, partly derived from Chomsky namely, Cognitive Code Learning. It asserted that much of the human
language use was not imitated behaviour but was created anew from the underlying knowledge of abstract rules. Sentences were not learnt by imitation and repetition, but ‘generated’ from the learner’s underlying ‘competence’.

In 1966, a concerned psychologist observed that the ALM “is no longer abreast of recent developments. It is ripe for major revision, particularly in the direction of joining it with some of the better elements of the cognitive code learning theory” (J. B. Carroll 105). The lack of an alternative to ALM led in the 1970s and 1980s to a period of adaptation, innovation, experimentation, and also some confusion. Several alternative proposals emerged in the 1970s that made no claims to any links with any of the mainstream methods and approaches. However, the concern for grammatical accuracy that was a focus of ALM had not disappeared but continued to provide a challenge to contemporary applied linguists.

2.10. Alternative Approaches and Methods

There was a major paradigm shift from the 1970s to the 1980s in the field of LT. The quest for alternative approaches to the traditional ones let to many different directions. Communicative approaches (CA) to LT were becoming more and more acceptable. There was a gradual shift in focus from grammar as the core component of language to the process of communication, thus making the classroom an ideal environment for authentic communication. This revolutionised the traditional view held about language, LL, the teacher, and the learners. ALM and SLT were mainstream teaching methods developed by linguists and applied linguists, whereas CA was developed outside of the mainstream. There were many innovative methods like Total Physical Response, Silent Way, and Suggestopaedia which were known for their ‘humanistic approach’ with a stress on the affective (emotional) aspects of learning.

Instead of originating from a theory of language and eliciting support from research and practice by the stakeholders, these methods were developed around particular theories of learning. Consequently, these methods were relatively under-developed in the domain of language theory. The learning principles they reflected were generally
different from the traditionally-held SLA principles. Besides, these methods could not succeed in winning the support of the mainstream LT, even though each of them could be seen as stressing important dimensions of the teaching-learning process. They also offered particular insights that attracted the attention of some teachers. However, their popularity was on the wane since the 1970s and today, they are of little more than historical interest. Due to the limited influence and appeal of these approaches and methods, a less detailed description is given here.

2.11.0. Total Physical Response

James J. Asher, a professor of psychology at San Jose State University, California and the originator of this method defined the Total Physical Response (TPR) method as one that combined information and skills through the judicious use of the kinaesthetic sensory system. This combination of skills allowed the learners to assimilate information and skills at a rapid rate. This method was built around the coordination of speech and action and attempts to teach language through physical (motor) activity.

It draws on several traditions including developmental psychology, learning theory, and humanistic pedagogy, as well as the LT procedures proposed in 1925 by Harold and Dorothy Palmer through his book, *English Through Actions*. Palmer had evolved an approach that united the linguistic rigour of the RM with a serious examination of the psychological roots of the DM. By doing so, he had created a solid intellectual and practical foundation for the development of ELT as an autonomous profession.

2.11.1. Child Learning and Adult Learning of L2

Asher saw successful adult L2 learning as a parallel process to child L1 acquisition. He claimed that speech directed to children consisted primarily of commands and children responded to them physically, even before they began to produce verbal responses. He stated that, “most of the grammatical structure of the target language and hundreds of vocabulary items can be learned from the skilful use of the imperative by the
instructor” (Asher 4). He advocated that adults too should recapitulate this process of learning the language.

This process was undemanding in terms of linguistic production and the game-like movements that were characteristic of this method of teaching reduced learner stress and anxiety, thus creating a congenial ecology and positive mood in the learner for better LL. Asher ushered in an era of concern for the role of affective factors, so aptly promoted by the School of Humanistic Psychology pioneered by Carl Rogers. In addition, he also elaborated an account of what facilitated or inhibited FL learning.

2.11.2. Asher’s Three Learning Hypotheses

1. The bio-programme: A specific innate bio-programme existed in all LL learners. This determined the optimal path for learners towards the development of L1 and L2.

2. Brain lateralisation: The lateralisation of the brain defined different learning functions in the left and the right hemispheres of the brain.

3. Reduction of stress: Stress intervened between the act of learning and what was to be learnt. It also controlled the pace of learning. The lower the stress, the greater would the learning be.

2.11.3. The Bio-programme

TPR, as proposed by Asher, was a type of a Natural Method. As pointed out earlier, he saw both the acquisition of L1 and the learning of L2 as a parallel process. He saw three processes as central to L1 learning. They were as follows:

1. Children developed listening competence before developing speaking ability. At the early stages of L1 acquisition, they could grasp complex utterances which they could not spontaneously produce nor imitate.
2. Children acquired their ability in listening comprehension because they were required to respond physically to spoken language in the form of parental commands and in the motherese.

3. Once their listening comprehension was well-established, speech evolved naturally out of it and without efforts.

2.11.4. Brain Lateralisation

In the SLA scenario, Asher was one of the first to bring home the association between the two hemispheres of the human brain and learning of languages. He saw TPR as being directed to right-brain learning whereas most of the SLA methods were directed to left-brain learning. Deriving a cue from the works of Jean Piaget, he held that it was through the children’s motor movements which were their right-brain activities that they acquired language. For children, right-hemisphere activities had to occur before their left-hemisphere could process language for production. In the same way, it was better that the adults too should work towards language mastery through right-brain activities whereas the left-brain monitored the process and could learn. When sufficient amount of right-brain activities had occurred, the left-brain would be triggered to produce language and to initiate other abstract and complicated language processes.

2.11.5. Reduction of Stress

Asher pointed out that L1 learning usually occurred in a stress-free environment whereas adults’ SLA invariably occurred amidst considerable anxiety and stress. A conducive atmosphere for SLA was the absence of stress. The key to stress-free learning was to tap into the natural bio-programme for LL to re-capture the relaxed and enjoyable experiences that accompanied the L1 acquisition. By focussing on meaning interpreted through physical movements, rather than on language forms studied in the abstract, learners were liberated from the self-conscious and stressful situations and were able to devote all their energy to LL.
2.11.6. Basic Tenets of TPR

TPR aimed at teaching oral proficiency at the initial level. Comprehension was only a means to an end and the ultimate purpose was to teach basic speaking skills. The objective of the TPR course was to produce learners who were spontaneous in their oral communication that was intelligible to a native speaker. The basic tenets of TPR were:

1. Understanding the spoken language was encouraged before developing the skills of speaking. Conversational dialogues were delayed until after 120 hours of instruction.

2. Other classroom activities included role plays and slide presentations. Role plays centred on everyday situations.

3. Initial attention was paid to meaning rather than to the form of items. Grammar was thus taught inductively.

4. A fixed number of items for instruction were introduced at a time to facilitate ease of differentiation and assimilation.

5. Specific instructional objectives were not elaborated since these would depend on the particular needs of the learners. Imperatives were the main structures to transfer or communicate information.

6. Learners had the primary roles of listeners and performers. They listened attentively and responded physically to commands given by the teacher. They were also expected to recognise and respond to novel combinations of their own and of previously taught items. They monitored and evaluated their own progress.

7. Learners were not forced to speak but were allowed ‘an individual readiness period’. They were allowed to spontaneously begin to speak, when they felt comfortable and confident in understanding and producing the utterances.
8. The teacher played an active and direct role. It was the teacher who decided what to teach, who modelled and presented the new materials, and who selected the supportive materials for classroom use. However, Asher insisted that the teacher’s role was not so much to teach as to provide opportunities for learning.

2.11.7. Procedure Followed in TPR

TPR followed a particular procedure to teach oral skills to learners. It was as follows:

Step 1: The teacher gave the command as he/she performed the action himself/herself.
Step 2: The teacher gave the command as both the teacher and the learners performed the action.
Step 3: The teacher gave the command but only the learners performed the action.
Step 4: The teacher asked one learner at a time to do the commands.
Step 5: The roles of the teacher and the learners were reversed. Learners gave commands to the teacher and to other learners.
Step 6: The teacher and the learners allowed for command expansion or produced new sentences.

2.11.8. Advantages of TPR

TPR could be used to practise and teach various things. It was well-suited to teaching classroom language and other vocabulary connected with actions. It could be used to teach imperatives and various tenses. It was also useful for story-telling. Because of its participatory approach, TPR might also be a useful alternative teaching strategy for learners with dyslexia or related learning disabilities, who typically experienced difficulties in learning a FL with traditional classroom instruction. TPR was popular in the 1970s and the 1980s because of those who emphasised the role of comprehension in SLA. Krashen, for example, extolled the provision of ‘comprehensive input’ and reduction of stress as keys to successful SLA and he also affirmed the de-stressing role of physical activities in the classroom. Asher insisted that TPR should be used in
association with other methods and techniques and thus it should be made compatible with other approaches to LT.

It had a number of advantages. Learners enjoyed getting up out of their chairs and moving around. Simple TPR activities did not require a great deal of preparation on the part of the teacher. TPR was aptitude-free, working well with a mixed ability class, and with learners having various disabilities. It was especially good for kinaesthetic learners who needed to be active in the class. Class size was not a problem and it worked effectively for children as well as adults.

2.11.9. Disadvantages of TPR

TPR was most useful for beginners, though it could not be used much at higher levels where preparation became an issue for the teacher. It did not give the learners an opportunity to express their own thoughts in a creative way. Further, it was always prone to overuse and monotony. Any novelty including TPR, if carried on too long, would trigger adaptation. This method could be a challenge for shy students. Additionally, the nature of TPR placed an unnaturally heavy emphasis on the use of the imperative mood. This feature was of limited utility to learners in practical contexts and could lead to the learners appearing as rude, while attempting to use their new language in their natural conversation with others.

To sum up, “Methods that supply plenty of comprehensible input have been shown to be more successful than methods that are based on formal language study or practice” (R. Ellis 103). Some strategies which were found to work were the repeated use of patterns and routines by the teacher and repetitive lesson formats. Over and above these reasons, TPR had been successful to some extent due to its de-stressing nature of the physical activities of the learners in the classroom. As pointed out earlier, TPR was also one of the early methods that cultivated a humanistic approach with a special emphasis on the affective factors in ELT.
2.12.0. The Silent Way

The Silent Way (SW) was a LT method devised in 1963 by Caleb Gattegno that made extensive use of silence as a teaching technique. It was not usually considered a mainstream method in language education. Gattegno was sceptical of the mainstream language education of his time and conceived of the method as a special case of his general theories of education. It was based on the premise that the teacher should be silent as much as possible in the classroom but the learners should be encouraged to produce as much language as possible. The method emphasised the autonomy of the learner and the teacher’s role was to monitor the learners’ efforts. They were encouraged to have an active role in learning the language.

Pronunciation was seen as fundamental and the beginners started their study with pronunciation and much time was spent practising each lesson. The SW used a structural syllabus and structures were constantly reviewed and recycled. The choice of vocabulary was important with functional and versatile words seen as the best. Translation and rote repetition were avoided and the language was usually practised in meaningful contexts. Evaluation was carried out by observation and the teacher never set a formal test.

The teacher used silence for multiple purposes in the SW. It was used to focus learners’ attention, to elicit their responses, and to encourage them to correct their own errors. Even though teachers were often silent, they were still active. They would commonly use techniques such as mouthing words and using hand gestures to help the learners with their pronunciation. Teachers would also encourage learners to help their peers. The SW teachers used some specialised teaching materials.

One of the hallmarks of the method was the use of ‘Cuisenaire rods’ which could be used for anything from introducing simple commands to representing abstract things. The method also made use of colour association to teach pronunciation. There was a sound-colour chart which was used to teach the language sounds, coloured word charts which were used to teach sentences, and coloured charts which were used to teach spelling.
2.12.1. The Learning Hypotheses of the SW

The SW shared a great deal with other learning theories and educational philosophies. The underlying learning hypotheses of SW were as follows:

1. Acquisition took place if learners discovered or created materials for themselves rather than remembered or repeated what was to be learnt: SW tradition held that learning was a problem-solving, creative, and discovering activity, in which the learner was the main actor rather than a bench-bound listener. Bruner enumerated the benefits derived from this serendipity learning under four heads: “The increase in intellectual potency, the shift from extrinsic to intrinsic rewards, the learning of heuristics by discovering, and the aid to conserving memory” (83). Gattegno claimed similar benefits from learners taught in this way.

2. Learning always occurred if accompanied by physical objects: The rods and the colour-coded pronunciation charts called ‘Fidel charts’ provided physical foci for learners and also created memorable images to facilitate recall. These visual devices served as associative mediators for learners’ learning and recall.

3. Problem-solving method dealing with the materials to be learnt would be a good solution for poor learning: SW was also related to a set of premises of problem-solving approaches to learning. Getting involved with the issue always helped learners to acquire the language skills better and faster.

2.12.2. SW Approach to Theory of Language and Learning

1. This approach took a structural approach to the organisation of language to be taught. The sentence was the basic unit of teaching and the teacher concentrated on propositional meaning, rather than communicative value. Learners were presented with the structural patterns of the TL and they learnt the grammar rules through inductive processes.
2. Vocabulary was the core of the LL and the choice of vocabulary was crucial and dealt with functional and versatile words of the TL, many of which might not have direct equivalents in one’s L1. This functional vocabulary provided a key to the comprehension of the ‘spirit’ of the TL.

3. The method drew inspiration from the experience of the learners’ L1 acquisition process and recommended that the learners had to “return to the state of mind that characterizes a baby’s learning – surrender” (R. Scott and M. Page 273).

4. The processes of SLA were considered to be radically different from those involved in acquiring L1. The L2 learner was different from the L1 learner and “cannot learn another language in the same way because of what he now knows” (Gattegno, Teaching Foreign Languages in Schools: The Silent Way 11). The natural or direct approaches to acquiring L2 were treated as misguided ones. A successful L2 approach would replace the natural approach with an approach that was inherently artificial and strictly controlled.

5. The artificial approach proposed by Gattegno was based on the principle that successful learning involved total commitment of the self to language acquisition through the use of silent awareness and then active trial. The repeated emphasis on the primacy of learning over teaching placed a focus on the self of the learner, the learner’s priorities, and commitments.

6. Silence was considered to be the best vehicle for learning because in silence, the learners were able to concentrate on the task to be accomplished. Repetition as opposed to silence “consumes time and encourages the scattered mind to remain scattered” (Gattegno 80). Silence, as avoidance of repetition, was thus an aid to alertness, concentration, and mental organisation.

7. Awareness promoted education. As learners learnt in awareness, their capacity to learn would become greater. The SW claimed to facilitate ‘learning to learn’. This process promoted attention, production, self-correction, and absorption. SW
learners acquired ‘inner criteria’ which allowed them to monitor and self-correct their own production of L2. It was through this activity of self-correction through self-awareness that the SW claimed to differ most notably from other methods.

To sum up, the general objective of the SW was to offer beginners in SLA oral and aural facility in the basic elements of the TL. The general goal set was near-native fluency in the TL, correct pronunciation, and mastery of the prosodic elements of the TL. The immediate objective was to provide the learners with a practical knowledge of grammar of the TL. The SW adopted a structural syllabus with lessons planned around grammatical items and related vocabulary. However, the actual practices were much less revolutionary than might have been expected. This method exemplified many of the features of the traditional FL learning methods such as SLT and ALM, with a strong focus on accurate repetition of sentences modelled initially by the teacher and a movement through guided elicitation exercises to freer communication.

The only innovations in this method derived primarily from the way in which classroom activities were organised, the indirect role of the teacher in monitoring the learner performance, the responsibility placed on the learners to figure out and test their hypotheses about LL, and how the materials were used to elicit and practise language. The most praise-worthy aspects of this method were the teacher silence and the learner autonomy. Learners were expected to develop independence and responsibility. The system of ‘no correction’ and ‘no examination’ facilitated greater comfort level for learners. Since they had only themselves and their group to rely on, they developed co-operative rather than competitive learning in the classroom.

2.13.0. Community Language Learning

Charles A. Curran, SJ developed a method called ‘Community Language Learning’ (CLL) and he derived his ideas from ‘Counselling Learning’, a humanistic concept introduced by the humanistic psychologies, Carl Rogers in the 1950s. CLL techniques belonged to a set of FL teaching practices called ‘humanistic techniques’ articulated by Moskowitz and these techniques engaged the whole person, including the emotions and
feelings as well as linguistic knowledge and behavioural skills of the person. This methodology was not based on the usual methods by which languages were taught. Rather, the approach was patterned upon counselling techniques and adapted to the peculiar anxiety and threat as well as the personal and language problems a learner encountered in the learning of FL.

Consequently, the learner was not thought of as a student but as a ‘client’. The native instructors of L2 were not considered as teachers but rather were trained in counselling skills, adapted to their roles as ‘language counsellors’. The language-counselling relationship would begin with the client’s linguistic confusion and conflict. The aim of the language counsellor was first to communicate empathy for the client’s threatened inadequate state and to aid him linguistically. Then gradually, the ‘teacher-counsellor’ strove to enable him/her to arrive at their own increasingly independent language adequacy. This process was furthered by the language counsellor’s ability to establish a warm and understanding relationship, thus becoming an ‘other-language self’ for the client.

2.13.1. Approach and Process of CLL

In CLL, the learners largely decided what was happening. This approach, at least in the beginning stages, was based around a set technique, within which the learners were free to determine the course content. A typical CLL lesson using this technique would have the following stages:

1. Stage One – Investment: The learners sat in a circle with a tape recorder in the middle. The teacher (often called the ‘knower’) was outside the circle. The first learner who wanted to say something called the knower over and quietly said what he/she wanted to say in his/her own language. The knower repeated this in English, using a non-threatening and encouraging tone of voice. The learner had the chance to repeat and practise the utterance, with help if necessary from the knower, before finally recording it on the tape. Another student who wished to
reply then repeated the process. This continued until a full conversation had been recorded.

2. Stage Two – Analysis: Between one session and the next (or possibly immediately, on the board), the knower transcribed the complete conversation and the learners then listened again to the tape while following the transcript. They then had the chance of asking for any explanation they wanted, and if they wished, to ask for practice activities on specific points.

3. Stage Three – Reflection: The learners then had the chance to reflect on the whole experience and to decide how useful it was, if they could have done things differently and so on. Again, the knower’s job was not to ‘tell them where they went wrong’ but to help them discover for themselves how they could have made the session maximally useful.

2.13.2. Five Psychological Stages of CLL

The FL learners’ tasks were to apprehend the sound system of the language, to assign fundamental meanings to individual lexical units, and to construct a basic grammar. In these three steps, the CLL resembled the Natural Approach to LT in which learners were not expected to speak until they had achieved some basic level of comprehension. Learners were also seen as passing through five psychological stages as learning progressed, which Curran likened to progressing from childhood to adulthood. These changes of interactive relationship were paralleled by five stages of LL and five stages of affective conflicts (Forge 80). The five stages were:

1. Birth: The learners knew nothing of the TL and were completely dependent on the knower for everything they wanted to say.

2. Self: The learners started to get an idea of how the language worked and to use it for themselves, but still sought the knower’s help. For instance, they might tell
the knower what they wanted to say directly in the TL, looking up to the knower only for confirmation or correction.

3. Separate Existence: They started to use the TL without referring to the knower and might even be resentful of his/her attempts to help.

4. Adolescence: Learners continued to express themselves independently but might be aware of gaps in their knowledge and started to turn back to the knower.

5. Independence: learners could continue their learning independently. They no longer needed the knower and might start to act as counsellors for the less advanced students.

2.13.3. Merits of CLL Methodology

This method encompassed all the four skills (LSRW) of language while simultaneously revealing learners’ styles that were more or less analytical in their approach to LL. CLL also blended innovative learning tasks and activities with conventional ones like translation, group work, recording, transcription, analysis, observation and reflection, listening, and free conversation. Learners appreciated the autonomy CLL offered to them and thrived on analysing their own conversations. CLL worked especially well with lower-level learners who were struggling to produce spoken English. The CLL class often became a real community and members learnt through interacting with their community. Learners became fully aware of their peers, their strengths and weaknesses and wanted to work as a team.

Learning was not viewed as individual accomplishment but collective achievement. Learners took exceptionally well to peer-correction and by working together, they overcame their fear of speaking. CLL courses evolved out of the interactions of the community – the fellow learners and their teacher – and so textbooks were not considered a necessary component. Textbooks would impose a particular body of language content on the learners, thereby impeding their interactions and growth. Learners often worked in groups to produce their own materials such as scripts for
dialogues and mini-dramas. Perhaps the enduring value of CLL was its emphasis on the whole-person learning, the role of a supportive, non-judgmental teacher, the passing of responsibility for learning to the learners themselves, and the abolition of any pre-planned syllabus.

2.13.4. Demerits of CLL

CLL imposed its own rigidly prescriptive method. It could only be done with a small number of learners, usually from six to twelve and they had to share a common mother tongue. The teacher (Knower) had to be highly proficient in the TL as well as the L1 of the learners. The teacher also had to possess enormous reserves of energy – both physical and psychic. It was also unwise to undertake CLL as a teacher without some professional counselling training, as it happened often. It was pointed out that this methodology suited adult learners exclusively and not for children. Besides, most descriptions of it in action focussed only on the early stages of learning the TL and teachers might wonder what to do at the later stage.

Occasionally, some learners might find it difficult to speak on tape while others might find that their conversation lacked spontaneity. Teachers could find it strange to give the learners too much freedom and might regress into the traditional teacher-controlled system of classroom management. Teachers were relatively non-directive and were ready to accept and even promote the ‘adolescent aggression’ of the learners as they strove for independence. Teachers were also forced to operate without conventional materials, depending on learner topics to shape and motivate the class – a gigantic task indeed. Special training in CLL techniques, over and above the regular teacher training, was usually required of them.

To sum up, CLL placed unusual demands on language teachers who had to be highly proficient and sensitive to nuances in both L1 and L2. Besides being the ‘knowers’, they were expected to be familiar with psychological counselling. However, questions also arose about whether teachers should combine these two roles at all in their profession. Lack of a particular syllabus made the objectives of FL learning unclear and evaluation
more difficult to accomplish. The emphasis on fluency rather than accuracy might lead to inadequate control of the grammatical system of the TL. On the other hand, CLL had been widely acclaimed as the learner-centred method, stressing the humanistic aspect of LL and not merely its linguistic dimensions.

2.14.0. Suggestopaedia

Suggestopaedia (SP), also known as Desuggestopaedia, was a method developed by the Bulgarian psychiatrist-educator Georgi Lozanov in the 1970s. Also known as ‘Super learning’, this method was considered to be the strangest of the humanistic approaches in FL learning. SP derived its insights from Suggestology that Lozanov described as a science, which was “concerned with the systematic study of the non-rational and non-conscious influences” (E. W. Stevick 42) that human beings were constantly responding to. SP endeavoured to harness such influences and re-direct them to optimise learning. The most conspicuous features of SP were the decoration, furniture, classroom arrangement, use of music, and the authoritative behaviour of the teacher.

Lozanov claimed that “there is no sector of public life where suggestology would not be useful” (Lozanov 2). Lozanov also claimed that memorisation in learning through this method was accelerated 25 times over that in learning through conventional methods (Lozanov 27). The author acknowledged ties to the great Indian ‘Raja yoga’ tradition and the Soviet psychology. From the Yogic school of India, he had borrowed and modified techniques like awareness, concentration, meditation, and rhythmic breathing. From the Soviet psychology, he had taken the notion that all learners could be taught a given lesson at the same level of skill. Through this method, equal success in performance was assured of all learners, irrespective of one’s level of competence and efforts.

2.14.1. Approach and Process of SP

Suggestion was at the heart of the theory of learning in SP. Lozanov distinguished his theory of suggestion from the “narrow clinical concept of hypnosis as a kind of static, sleep-like, altered state of consciousness”(1978: 3). He further claimed that what
distinguished his method from hypnosis and other forms of mental control was that those other forms lacked “a desuggestive suggestive sense and failed to create a constant set up access to reserves through concentrative psycho-relaxation”(1978: 267). Some of the key elements of SP included a rich sensory learning environment (pictures, colours, music, etc.), a positive expectation of success, and the use of a varied range of methods: dramatised texts, music, active participation in songs and games. The approach was based on the power of suggestion in learning and the notion being that positive suggestion would make the learner more receptive and, in turn, stimulate learning. Lozanov held that a relaxed but focused state was ideal for learning. In order to create this relaxed state in the learner and to promote positive suggestion, SP made use of music, a comfortable and relaxing environment, and a perfect relationship between the teacher and the learner that was akin to the parent-child relationship. Music, in particular, was central to the approach.

2.14.2. Role of Classical Music in SP

Unlike other methods and approaches, there was no apparent theory of language in SP and no obvious order in which items of language were presented. The original form of SP presented by Lozanov consisted of the use of extended dialogues, often running to several pages in length, accompanied by vocabulary lists and observations on grammar points. These dialogues would be read aloud to the learners to the accompaniment of music. The most formal of these readings, known as the ‘concert reading’ would typically employ a memorable piece of classical music such as a Beethoven Symphony. This would not be in the form of background music but would be the main focus of the reading, with the teacher’s voice acting as a counterpoint to the music. Thus, the ‘concert reading’ could be seen as a pleasurable event, with the learners being left free to focus on the music, or the text or a combination of the two. The rhythm and intonation of the reading would be exaggerated in order to fit in with the rhythm of music.
2.14.3. Role of Stimulating Environment in SP

A second, less formal reading would employ a lighter, less striking piece of music, such as a piece of Baroque music and this would take a less prominent role. During both types of readings, the learners would sit in comfortable seats, armchairs rather than classroom chairs, in a suitably stimulating environment in terms of décor and lighting. After the readings of these long dialogues to the accompaniment of music, the teacher would then make use of the dialogues for more conventional language work. In theory at least, large chunks of the dialogues would be internalised by the learners during the readings due to the relaxed and receptive state of the learners and to the positive suggestion created by music.

2.14.4. Procedure Followed in SP Classroom

SP adopted a carefully structured procedure, using four main stages as follows:

1. Presentation: A preparatory stage in which learners were helped to relax and move into a positive frame of mind, with the feeling that the learning was going to be easy and fun.

2. The First Concert – ‘Active Concert’: This involved the active presentation of the material to be learnt. For example, in a FL language course, there might be the dramatic reading of a piece of text, accompanied by classical music.

3. Second Concert – ‘Passive Review’: The learners were then invited to relax and listen to some Baroque music, with the text being read very quietly in the background. The music piece was specially selected to bring the learners into the optimum mental state for effortless acquisition of the material.

4. Practice: A range of games, puzzles, etc., were used to review and consolidate the learning.
2.14.5. Merits of SP

The use of music both in the background and as an accompaniment to certain activities could be motivating and relaxing. Attention to factors such as décor, lighting, and furniture was surely well-received by the stakeholders. Dialogues and conversations, if properly monitored, would definitely enhance fluency in FL. Perhaps most importantly of all the ideas, creating conditions in which learners were alert and receptive would have a positive effect on their motivation. Whether these conditions were best created by the use of classical music and the reading of dialogues was open to questions, but there was no doubt that SP had raised some interesting questions in the areas of both learning and memorising.

2.14.6. Demerit of SP

There was, however, little evidence to support the extravagant claims of the success magic. The more obvious criticism was about the fact that many people found classical music irritating rather than stimulating. To some cultures, Western music might even sound discordant. The length of the dialogues and the lack of a coherent theory of language might serve to confuse rather than to motivate learners. For purely logistic reasons, the provision of comfortable armchairs and a relaxing environment would probably be beyond the means of most educational establishments. In addition, the idea of the teacher reading out long dialogues aloud, with exaggerated rhythm and intonation, to the accompaniment of Beethoven or Mozart might well seem ridiculous to many learners. Certain elements of this approach could not be taken and incorporated into the more eclectic approach to LT widely in evidence at present.

To sum up, the techniques and procedures of SP offered invaluable insights about FL learning in the modern times and Lozanov himself was unequivocally opposed to any eclectic use of these techniques outside the panoply of SP. Though Scovel commented that “if we have learnt anything at all in the seventies, it is that the art of LT will benefit very little from the pseudo-science of suggestology” (265), its scientific outlook gave SP its authority and respectability in the eyes of learners and prepared them for success in
their SLA. SP was an attempt at harmonising multiple successful techniques in the FL learning inventory.

2.15.0. Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative language teaching (CLT) marked the beginning of a major paradigm shift within LT in the twentieth century, whose ramifications continued to be felt even today. It was an approach to the teaching of L2 and FL that emphasised interaction as both the means and the ultimate goal of LL. It was also referred to as the ‘Communicative Approach’ (CA). CLT began in Britain in the 1970s as a replacement to the SLT. This was partly in response to Chomsky’s criticisms of structural theories of language and partly based on the theories of British functional linguists, such as John Firth and M. A. K. Halliday, as well as American socio-linguists, such as Dell Hymes, John Gumperz and William Labov and the writings of John Austin and John Searle on speech acts. They felt the need to focus on communicative proficiency rather than on mere mastery of structures. Historically, CLT was a response to the ALM and as an extension or development of the notional-functional syllabus. Task-based LL, a more recent refinement of CLT, gained considerably in popularity. CLT set as its goal the teaching of communicative competence in L2. CLT was usually characterised as a broad approach to teaching, rather than as a teaching method with a clearly defined set of classroom practices. As such, it was most often defined as a list of general principles or features.

2.15.1. Theory of Language in CLT

CLT put the focus on the learner. Learners’ communicative needs provided a framework for elaborating programme goals with regard to functional competence. At the level of language theory, CLT had a rich and eclectic theoretical base. Some of the characteristics of this communicative view of language were:

1. Language was a system for the expression of meaning.
2. The primary function of language was to allow interaction and communication.
3. The structure of language reflected its functional and communicative uses.
4. The primary units of language were not merely its grammatical and structural features but categories of functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse.

2.15.2. Theory of Learning in CLT

There was no single text or authority on CLT, nor any single model that was universally accepted as authoritative. “One of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspects of language” (Littlewood 1). David Nunan enumerated the following five features of CLT (Nunan 279):

1. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the TL.
2. The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
3. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language but also on the learning management process.
4. An enhancement of the learner’s own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
5. An attempt to link classroom LL with language activities outside the classroom.

These five features of CLT showed an interest in the needs and desires of the learners as well as the connection between the language as it was taught in the class and as it was used outside the classroom. Under this broad approach, any teaching practice that helped the learners develop their communicative competence in an authentic context was deemed to be an acceptable and beneficial form of instruction. Thus, in the classroom, CLT often took the form of pair and group work requiring negotiation and co-operation among learners, fluency-based activities that encouraged learners to develop their confidence, role-plays in which learners practised and developed language functions as well as judicious use of grammar and pronunciation-focused activities.
2.15.3. Objectives of Communicative Approach

The following are the levels of objectives in CA (Piepho 8):

1. An integrative and content level (language as a means of expression);
2. A linguistic and instrumental level (language as a semiotic system and an object of learning);
3. An affective level of inter-personal relationships and conduct (language as a means of expressing values and judgements about oneself and others);
4. A level of individual learning needs (remedial learning based on error analysis);
5. A general educational level of extra-linguistic goals (LL within the school curriculum).

These were proposed as general objectives, applicable to any teaching situation. Particular objectives for CLT could not be defined beyond this level of specification, since such an approach assumed that LT would reflect the particular needs of the learners.

2.15.4. The Role of the Teacher in CLT

There were multiple roles for the teacher in CLT. Breen and Candlin described that “the teacher has two main roles: the first role is to facilitate the communication process between all participants in the classroom and between these participants and the various activities and texts. The second role is to act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group. The latter role is closely related to the objectives of the first role and arises from it. These roles imply a set of secondary roles for the teacher; first, as an organizer of resources and as a resource himself, second as a guide within the classroom procedures and activities. .... A third role for the teacher is that of researcher and learner, with much to contribute in terms of appropriate knowledge and abilities, actual and observed experience of the nature of learning and organizational capacities” (M. Breen and C. N. Candlin 99).
2.15.5. The Role of Learners in CLT

Since the emphasis in CLT was on the processes of communication, rather than mastery of language forms, this led to different roles for learners from those found in more traditional L2 classrooms. Breen and Candlin described that “the role of learner as negotiator – between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning – emerges from and interacts with the role of joint-negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedures and activities which the group undertakes. The implication for the learner is that he should contribute as much as he gains, and thereby learn in an inter-dependent way” (110). Often, there was no textbook; grammar rules were not presented; classroom arrangement was sub-standard; students were expected to interact primarily with each other rather than with the teacher; and correction of errors was absent or infrequent. The co-operative rather than individualistic approach was stressed in CLT. Learners were made to understand that successful communication was an accomplishment jointly achieved. In the same way, failed communication was also a joint-responsibility and not the fault of the speaker or the listener.

2.15.6. The Role of Instructional Materials

Many varieties of materials were used to support CA to LT. Teachers of CLT viewed materials as a way of influencing the quality of interactions and language use in the classroom. There were three types of such materials:

1. Text-based materials: Numerous textbooks were designed to promote CLT. Many of them even followed a structural syllabus with slight modifications in order to justify their claim for CA. Other textbooks had none of the usual dialogues, drills, or sentence patterns, visual cues, taped conversations, pictures, etc., to initiate conversation.

2. Task-based materials: Role plays, variety of games, simulations, and task-based communicative activities were utilised in CLT classrooms. Exercise handbooks,
cue cards, activity cards, pair-communication practice materials, student-interaction practice booklets, etc., were used for this purpose.

3. Realia: Many proponents of CLT methodology advocated the use of authentic, ‘from-life’ materials in the classroom. These might include language-based realia such as signs, magazines, advertisements, newspapers, maps, pictures, symbols, graphs, charts, graphic and visual sources, etc. Different kinds of objects were also used to support communicative exercises, such as a plastic model to assemble from directions.

2.15.7. Major features of CLT Approach

CLT could be best considered to be an approach rather than a method. Diverse principles were used to reflect a communicative view of language and LL. These principles were:

1. Learners learnt a language through actual use in communication.
2. Authentic and meaningful communication had to be the goal of classroom activities.
3. Fluency was an important dimension of communicational process.
4. Communication involved the integration of different language skills.
5. Learning was a process of creative construction and involved trial and error.

2.15.8. Characteristics of the Current Communicative Methodology

Five core characteristics that underlie the current applications of communicative methodology are (K. Johnson and H. Johnson):

1. Appropriateness: Use of language should reflect on the situations of its use and it has to be proper and appropriate to that situation. The role of the participants, the situation, the purpose of communication, the context, etc., should be borne in
mind. Learners should be free to use formal as well as informal styles of speaking according to the situation.

2. Focus of message: Information sharing in CLT activities should focus on the learners’ ability to create and understand the real meanings in the process of communication.

3. Psycho-linguistic processing: CLT activities seek to engage learners in the use of cognitive and other processes that are vital factors in SLA.

4. Risk-taking: Learners are encouraged to make guesses and learn from their errors. By going beyond what they have been taught, they are encouraged to employ a variety of communication strategies.

5. Free practice: CLT encourages the use of ‘holistic practice’ involving the simultaneous use of a variety of sub-skills, rather than practising individual skills one piece at a time.

2.15.9. The Present Scenario of CLT

Berns provides a useful summary of eight principles of CLT at present (104):

1. LT is based on a view of language as communication. That is, language is seen as a social tool that speakers use to make meaning. Speakers communicate about something to someone for some purpose, either orally or in writing.

2. Diversity is recognised and accepted as part of language development and use in L2 learners and users, as it is with L1 users.

3. A learner’s competence is considered in relative, not in absolute terms.

4. More than one variety of a language is recognised as a viable model for learning and teaching.

5. Culture is recognised as instrumental in shaping speakers’ communicative competence, in both their first and subsequent languages.
6. No single methodology or fixed set of techniques is prescribed.
7. Language use is recognised as serving ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions and is related to the development of learners’ competence.
8. It is essential that learners be engaged in doing things with language – that is, that they use language for a variety of purposes in all phases of learning.

To sum up, since its inception in 1970s, CLT served as a major source of influence on LT around the world. CLT appeared on the stage of ELT at a time when LT all over the world was ready for a paradigm shift. SLT and ALM were no longer felt to be appropriate methods. CLT appealed to those who were eagerly looking for a more humanistic approach to LT, one in which the interactive processes of communication received priority.

“The rapid adoption and worldwide dissemination of the CA also resulted from the fact that it quickly assumed the status of orthodoxy in British LT circles, receiving the sanction and support of leading applied linguists, language specialists, and publishers, as well as institutions such as the British Council” (Richards, The secret life of methods). Many of the crucial issues raised by CLT methodology are relevant even today.

However, CLT has not percolated, as it appears, to many ELT countries. As Richard Allwright points out, “The implied charge that only lip-service has been paid to the aim of communication is difficult to prove but perhaps not so difficult to accept, given that it does seem generally accepted that language teaching globally has not led to the satisfactory level of communicative skill in the vast majority of the cases” (C. J. Brumfit and K. Johnson 167).

2.16.0. The Dogme Language Teaching Movement

Dogme Language Teaching was considered to be both a methodology and a movement. It emerged from Dogme 95 which was an avant-garde film-making movement which started in 1995 by the Danish directors Lars von Trier and Thomas Vinterberg, who created the ‘Dogme 95 Manifesto’ and the ‘Vow of Chastity’
These were rules to create film-making based on the traditional values of story, acting, and theme, and excluding the use of elaborate special effects or technology. Dogme 95 manifesto influenced LT through the Dogme Language Teaching Movement which proposed that published materials could stifle the CA. This communicative approach to LT encouraged teaching without published textbooks and focussed instead on conversational communication among learners and the teacher.

It had its roots in an article by the language education author, Scott Thornbury. The Dogme Approach (DA) was also referred to as ‘Dogme ELT’. The aim of the DA to LT was to focus on real conversations about real subjects so that communication was the engine of learning. The spirit of the movement could be felt by the vigour of the founder’s argument. ‘The point is to restore teaching to its pre-method ‘state of grace’ – when all there was, was a room with a few chairs, a blackboard, a teacher and some students, and where learning was jointly constructed out of the talk that evolved in that simplest and most prototypical of situations. Who, then, will join me and sign a Vow of EFL Chastity?” (Thornbury).

2.16.1. Key Principles of ‘Dogme ELT’

The following were the key principles of the Dogme (Thornby):

1. Interactivity: The most direct route to learning was to be found in the interactivity between the teacher and the learners and among the learners themselves.
2. Engagement: Learners were most engaged by content they had created themselves.
3. Dialogic processes: Learning was treated as social and dialogic where knowledge was co-constructed.
4. Scaffolded conversations: Learning took place through conversations where the learners and the teacher co-constructed the knowledge and skills.
5. Emergence: Language and grammar were thought to emerge from the learning process. This was seen as distinct from the ‘acquisition’ of language.
6. Affordances: The teacher’s role was to optimise LL affordances through directing attention to the emergent language.

7. Voice: The learner’s voice was given recognition along with the learner’s beliefs and knowledge.

8. Empowerment: Learners and the teacher were empowered by freeing the classroom of published materials and textbooks.

9. Relevance: Materials like textbooks, audios, and videos should have relevance for the learners.

10. Critical use: The teacher and the learners should use published materials and textbooks in a critical way that recognised their cultural and ideological biases.

2.16.2. Salient Features of DA

1. Conversation-driven teaching: Conversation was seen as central to LL within the DA because it was the ‘fundamental and universal form of language’ and so was considered to be ‘language at work’. Since real life conversation was more interactional than it was transactional, DA placed more value on communication that promoted social interaction. It also placed more emphasis on a discourse-level (rather than sentence-level) approach to language, as it was considered to better-prepare learners for real-life communication, where the entire conversation would be more relevant than the analysis of specific utterances. DA considered that the learning of a skill was co-constructed within the interaction between the learner and the teacher. In this sense, teaching was a conversation between the two parties. As such, DA was seen to reflect the view that “to most truly teach, one must converse; to truly converse is to teach” (Luke Meddings and Scott Thornby 8-10).

2. Materials light approach: The DA considered that learner-produced material was preferable to published materials and textbooks to the extent of inviting teachers to take a ‘Vow of ELT Chastity’ and not use textbooks. Dogme teaching had, therefore, been criticised as not offering teachers the opportunity to use a complete range of materials and resources (Gill). However there was a debate to
the extent that Dogme was actually anti-textbook or anti-technology. Meddings and Thornbury focussed the critique of textbooks on their tendency to focus on grammar more than on communicative competency and also on the cultural biases often found in textbooks, especially those aimed at global markets (Templer). Indeed, DA could be seen as a pedagogy that was able to address the lack of availability or affordability of materials in many parts of the world. Proponents of DA argued that they were not so much anti-materials as pro-learner and thus aligned themselves with other forms of learner-centred instruction and critical pedagogy.

3. Emergent language: DA considered LL to be a process in which language emerged rather than one in which it was acquired. DA shared this belief with other approaches to LT, such as task-based learning. Language was considered to emerge in two ways. Firstly, classroom activities led to collaborative communication among the learners. Secondly, learners produced language that they had not been necessarily taught. As such, the teacher’s role, in part, was to facilitate the emergence of language. However, DA did not see the teacher’s role as merely to create the right conditions for language to emerge. The teacher had to also encourage learners to engage with this new language to ensure that learning took place. The teacher could do this in a variety of ways, including rewarding, repeating, and reviewing it. As language emerged rather than was acquired, there was no need to follow a syllabus that was externally set. Indeed, the content of the syllabus was covered or ‘uncovered’ throughout the learning process (Dogme and the Coursebook).

2.16.3. Pedagogical Foundations of DA

DA had its roots in CLT and, in fact, saw itself as an attempt to restore the communicative aspect to communicative approaches. DA was noted for its compatibility with reflective teaching and for its intention to ‘humanise the classroom through a radical pedagogy of dialogue’. It also shared many qualities with task-based language learning and only differed with task-based learning in terms of methodology rather than
philosophy. Thornbury argued that the similarities with task-based learning suggested that DA was likely to lead to similar results. An example was the findings that learners tended to interact, produce language and collaboratively co-construct their learning when engaged in communicative tasks.

On the other hand, DA also came under criticism from a wide range of teachers for its perceived rejection of both published textbooks and modern technology in language lessons. Furthermore, the initial call for a ‘Vow of ELT Chastity’ was seen as unnecessarily ‘purist’ and that a weaker adoption of DA would allow teachers the freedom to choose resources according to the needs of a particular lesson. Maley also presented DA as an approach that increased the constraints on teachers (Maley 190). Christensen noted that adoption of DA practices might face greater cultural challenges in countries outside of Europe, such as Japan (Christensen 15-18). Questions were also raised about the appropriateness of DA in low resource contexts and where learners prepared for examinations with specific syllabi (Online Forum Report: Dogme).

2.17.0 The Natural Approach

In 1977, Tracy Terrell, a teacher of Spanish in California, proposed a new philosophy of LT called the Natural Approach (121). This was an attempt to develop a LT methodology that incorporated the ‘naturalistic’ principles of SLA. Terrell joined hands with Stephen Krashen, an applied linguist at the University of Southern California, in elaborating a theoretical rationale for the NA, drawing inspiration from the latter’s influential theory of SLA. The NA attracted much attention from L2 teachers from all over the world. The Natural Approach (NA) should not be confused with Natural Method which was another name for the traditional DM. Unlike the DM, the NA placed less stress on teacher monologues, direct repetition, and formal questions and answers along with less focus on accurate production of TL sentences. There was also an emphasis on exposure, or input rather than practice, optimising emotional preparedness for learning, a prolonged period of attention to what the learners listened before they produced language, and a willingness to use written materials as a source of
‘comprehensible input’. Comprehension also occupied a vital role in the NA. The NA and the CA shared a common theoretical and philosophical base.

### 2.18. Krashen’s Monitor Model

Krashen and Terrell saw communication as the primary function of language. Language itself was viewed as a vehicle for communicating meanings and messages. Since they focussed on teaching communicative abilities, they referred to the NA as an example of a CA. The NA “is similar to other communicative approaches being developed today” (17). They rejected the earlier methods of LT which viewed grammar as the central component of language. They felt that those methods had emphasised the structure of language rather than the meaning. While stressing the importance of the vocabulary, Krashen emphasised that language acquisition did not require extensive use of conscious grammatical rules and tedious drills. Acquisition required meaningful interaction in the TL - natural communication - in which speakers were concerned not with the form of their utterances but with the messages they were conveying.

“The best methods were, therefore, those that supplied ‘comprehensible input’ in low anxiety situations, containing messages that learners really wanted to hear. These methods did not force early production in the L2, but allowed learners to produce when they were ‘ready’, recognising that improvement came from supplying communicative and comprehensible input, and not from forcing and correcting production” (Principles and Practice in Second language Acquisition 6-7). Krashen’s theory of SLA consisted of the following five hypotheses (Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning):

### 2.19. The Acquisition - Learning Hypothesis

The acquisition - learning distinction was the most fundamental of all the hypotheses in Krashen’s theory and the most widely known among linguists and language teachers. According to Krashen, there were two independent systems of L2 performance in the learners: ‘the acquired system’ and ‘the learned system’. The ‘acquired system’ or
‘acquisition’ was the product of a sub-conscious process very similar to the process children used to undergo when they acquired their L1. It required meaningful interactions in the TL - natural communication - in which speakers concentrated not in the form of their utterances, but in the communicative act.

The ‘learned system’ or ‘learning’ was the product of formal instruction and it comprised a conscious process which resulted in conscious knowledge ‘about’ the language, for example, knowledge of grammar rules. According to Krashen, ‘learning’ was less important than ‘acquisition’. Fluency in L2 would come from the acquisition process and accuracy from the learning process. Learning produced a ‘monitoring’ or editing of performance. The application of the monitor function required time, focus on form, and knowledge of the rule.

2.20. The Monitor Hypothesis

The Monitor Hypothesis explained the relationship between acquisition and learning and defined the influence of the latter on the former. The monitoring function was the practical result of the learned grammar. According to Krashen, the acquisition system was the utterance initiator, while the learning system performed the role of the ‘monitor’ or the ‘editor’. The ‘monitor’ acted in a planning, editing, and correcting function when three specific conditions were met: i.e. the L2 learner had sufficient time at his/her disposal, he/she focussed on form or thought about correctness, and he/she knew the rule. It appeared that the role of conscious learning was somewhat limited in L2 performance.

According to Krashen, the role of the monitor was - or should be - minor, being used only to correct deviations from ‘normal’ speech and to give speech a more ‘polished’ appearance. Krashen also suggested that there was individual variation among language learners with regard to ‘monitor’ use. He distinguished those learners that used the ‘monitor’ all the time (over-users); those learners who had not learnt or who preferred not to use their conscious knowledge (under-users); and those learners that used the ‘monitor’ appropriately (optimal users). An evaluation of the person’s psychological
profile could help to determine to what group they belonged. Usually extroverts were under-users, while introverts and perfectionists were over-users. Lack of self-confidence was frequently related to the over-use of the ‘monitor’.

2.21. The Natural Order Hypothesis

The Natural Order Hypothesis suggested that the acquisition of grammatical structures followed a ‘natural order’ which was predictable. In a L2, some grammatical structures were acquired early, while others late. This order seemed to be independent of the learners’ age, L1 background, and conditions of exposure. Krashen, however, pointed out that the implication of the Natural Order Hypothesis was not that a language programme syllabus should be based on the order found in the studies. In fact, he rejected grammatical sequencing when the goal was language acquisition. L2 learners acquired forms in a predictable order. This order paralleled very closely the acquisition of grammatical and syntactic structures in the L1.

2.22. The Input Hypothesis

The Input Hypothesis was Krashen’s attempt to explain how SLA took place and it was only concerned with ‘acquisition’, not ‘learning’. According to this hypothesis, the learner improved and progressed along the ‘natural order’ when he/she received L2 language ‘input’ that was one step beyond his/her current stage of linguistic competence. For example, if a learner was at a stage ‘i’, then acquisition occurred when he/she was exposed to ‘comprehensible input’ that belonged to level ‘i + 1’. Since not all learners could be at the same level of linguistic competence at the same time, he suggested that natural communicative input was the key to designing a syllabus, ensuring in this way that a learner received some ‘i + 1’ input that was appropriate for his/her current stage of linguistic competence.
2.23. The Affective Filter Hypothesis

Finally, the fifth one, the Affective Filter Hypothesis, embodied Krashen’s view that a number of ‘affective variables’ played a facilitative, but non-causal, role in SLA. These variables included motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety. Krashen claimed that learners with high motivation, self-confidence, a good self-image, and a low level of anxiety were better equipped for success in SLA. Low motivation, low self-esteem, and debilitating anxiety could combine to ‘raise’ the affective filter and form a ‘mental block’ that would prevent comprehensible input from being used for acquisition. In other words, when the affective filter was ‘up’, it impeded language acquisition. On the other hand, positive affect was necessary, but not sufficient on its own, for acquisition to take place.

2.24. The Role of Grammar in Krashen’s View

According to Krashen, the study of the structure of the language could have general educational advantages and values that colleges might want to include in their language curriculum. It should be clear, however, that examining irregularity, formulating rules, and teaching complex facts about the TL was not LT, but rather was ‘language appreciation’. The only instance in which the teaching of grammar could result in language acquisition and proficiency was when the learners were interested in the subject and the TL was used as a medium of instruction. Very often, when this occurred, both teachers and learners were convinced that the study of formal grammar was essential for SLA and the teacher was skilful enough to present explanations in the TL so that the learners understood. In other words, the teacher talk met the requirements for comprehensible input and, perhaps with the learners’ participation, the classroom became an environment suitable for acquisition.

Also, the affective filter was low with regard to the language of explanation, as the learners’ conscious efforts were usually on the subject matter, on what was being talked about, and not the medium. In effect, both teachers and learners were deceiving themselves. They believed that it was the subject matter itself, the study of grammar, that
was responsible for the learners’ progress, but in reality their progress was coming from the medium and not the message. Any subject matter that held their interest would do just as well.

2.25. Implications of NA for Language Teaching Today

Krashen’s five hypotheses have the following implications for L2 teaching at present:

1. Learners should be presented with as much comprehensible input as possible.

2. Whatever helps comprehension should be treated as important. Visual aids are always useful. Exposure to a wide range of vocabulary rather than study of syntactic structure is preferred.

3. Teachers in the classroom should focus on listening and reading, as they are inputs. Speaking as the output should be allowed to emerge on its own.

4. In order to lower one’s affective filter, a learner must concentrate on meaningful conversation rather than on form. Input should be interesting and contributive to healthy and relaxed classroom ecology.

To sum up, the NA evolved into a method as a fruit of observation and interpretation of how learners learnt their L1 and L2 in non-formal settings. In this approach, a focus on comprehension and meaningful communication as well as the provision of right type of comprehensible input would ensure successful SLA in a classroom context. The main contribution of this method was its unique emphasis on comprehensible and meaningful practice activities in LL process in the classroom.

2.26.0. Co-operative Language Learning

Co-operative Language Learning (COLL) or Collaborative Leaning was an approach to L2 teaching which made maximum use of co-operative activities involving pairs and small groups of learners in the classroom. COLL was defined as “group learning activity organized so that learning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups and in which each learner is held accountable for
his or her own learning and is motivated to increase the learning of others” (R. Olsen and S. Kagan 8). There had been antecedents like peer-tutoring, peer-monitoring, etc. in the past.

John Dewey was usually credited with promoting the idea of co-operative learning in the classroom on a regular and systematic basis (Rodgers). Educators were concerned that the traditional models of classrooms learning were teacher-centred, fostered competition than collaboration, and favoured majority learners. Minority learners were left behind in this kind of learning environment.

2.26.1. Theory of COLL

COLL attempted to achieve the following (D. Johnson, R. Johnson, and E. Holubec 2):

1. Raising the achievement of all learners, including the gifted and trailing ones.
2. Enabling the teacher to foster healthy relationships among the learners.
3. Creating an ambience for healthy social, psychological, and cognitive growth.
4. Replacing the competitive classroom structure with team-based friendly structure.

2.26.2. Pedagogical Objectives of COLL

COLL was viewed as a learner-centred approach to teaching L2 and was seen as an extension of CLT. The following were its pedagogical objectives:

1. To promote naturalistic SLA through the use of interactive pair and group activities.
2. To develop a pedagogical paradigm for teachers for L2 and mainstream teaching.
3. To focus on lexical items, language structures, and communicative functions through interactive tasks.
4. To enable learners develop successful learning and communicative strategies.
5. To reduce learner stress, enhance motivation, and create a healthy climate in the classroom.
2.26.3. Theory of learning in COLL

COLL advocates drew heavily on the theoretical framework of developmental psychologists like Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky who stressed the central role of social interaction in learning. According to Piaget's *Theory of Cognitive Development*, all learners constructed their knowledge through a process of equilibration using assimilation and accommodation. For this process, interaction with others was significantly contributive. Vygotsky, through his Socio-cultural Theory, affirmed that mental functions which were beyond an individual learner’s current level of competence had to be performed in collaboration with other people before they were achieved independently. Vygotsky’s *Zone of Proximal Development* (ZPD) was the area of potential development, where the learner could achieve that potential only with assistance.

One way in which others could help the learner in LL within the ZPD was through *scaffolding* which was a verbal guidance given by an expert to help the learner perform a specific task. “Scaffolding is not something that happens to a learner as a passive recipient, but happens with a learner as an active participant” (Saville-Troike 113). In COLL, group activities were the major mode of learning L2. The use of discussion groups, group work, pair work, etc., was advocated for both teaching languages as well as other subjects. Such groups provided a change from the normal pace of classroom events and increased the learners’ participation in the classroom. Proponents of COLL stressed that this method enhanced learning L2 as well as learners’ interaction skills.

2.27. What is the Best Method in ELT?

So far, the researcher has presented a detailed account of different methods that have been in vogue all over the world including India for facilitating LL in the classroom. From the age-old GTM to the current eclectic method of LT with a particular emphasis on learner-centred communicative approach, various L2 teaching methods have been presented along with their merits and demerits. It may be difficult to classify any single method as ‘the best’ because of the uniqueness of each classroom. Choosing the right
method is crucial but “the best method in teaching can become ungraspable and invisible, if it is not chosen properly” (Kumaravadivelu 37).

Tickoo observes that “years of research for the best method have produced no evidence to show that by itself any method consistently guarantees better learning. Also, once inside the classroom, teachers find it neither possible nor helpful to use a particular method fully or consistently. Successful teachers rely on what works for them. A single method in its pure form is rarely seen at work in a real classroom” (348-349). As it is wisely pointed out, “The important issues are not which method to adopt but how to develop procedures and instructional activities that will enable program objectives to be attained” (Richards 42).

N. S. Prabhu, the progenitor of the well-known ‘Bangalore Project’ opines that “perhaps the best method varies from one teacher to another, but only in the sense that it is best for each teacher to operate with his or her own sense of plausibility at any given time” (175-176). He concludes that “the search for an inherently best method should perhaps give way to a search for ways in which teachers’ and specialists’ pedagogic perceptions can most widely interact with one another, so that teaching can become most widely and maximally real” (N. S. Prabhu 1990:176).

2.28. ELT with Equality and ELT with Equity

ELT classrooms have witnessed a wide variety of methods being practised by L2 teachers for many years. The researcher is of the view that any method which respects the personhood of individuals and the individuality of persons in the classroom should be the best ELT method. Such a method will affirm the uniqueness of the learners and consider the learner differences not as a bane but as a boon in the classroom. The researcher is also of the opinion that the Achilles’ heel of ‘AP ELT’ has been, as it is all over India, treating all L2 learners equal – perhaps the greatest inequality indeed. All learners have their unique styles of learning and they have different levels of motivation, attitudes, aptitudes, and social contexts. Treating all of them as equals amounts to disrespecting their uniqueness and killing their individual identities. This ‘ELT Sword of
Damocles’ hangs over all L2 learners today. ‘ELT with equality’ should pave the way for ‘ELT with equity’. Treating them with equity implies that their individual differences are not just identified and tolerated but recognised and respected. L2 learners from AP are eagerly looking at the horizon for this ‘ELT Renaissance’ in their classrooms.

2.29. Current Approaches to Language Teaching and Learning

Approaches to LT today seek out to capture the rich view of language and LT assumed by communicative views of language. This paradigm shift in our thinking about learners and learning as well as teachers and teaching can be presented as follows (George Jacobs and Tom Ferrell 25):

1. From teacher-centredness to learner-centredness: Focussing greater attention on the role of learners rather than the external stimuli learners are receiving from their environment. Thus, the centre of attention shifts from the teacher to the learner.

2. From product-orientation to process-orientation: Focussing greater attention on the learning process rather than the products that learners produce.

3. From individual learning to social learning: Focussing greater attention on the social nature of learning rather than on learners as separate, de-contextualised individuals.

4. From uniformity to diversity: Focussing greater attention to diversity among learners and viewing the differences not as impediments to learning but as resources to be recognised, catered to, and appreciated.

5. From outsider view to insider view: In research and theory formulation, focussing greater attention on the views of those internal to the classroom rather than solely valuing the views of those who come from outside to study the classrooms, to investigate and evaluate what goes on there, and engage in theorising about it.
Such qualitative research highlights subjective, affective, and the participants’ insider views and the uniqueness of each social context.

6. From parochial learning to holistic learning: Along with the emphasis on the local context comes the idea of connecting the educational institution with the outside world as a means of promoting holistic learning.

7. From external push to internal pull: Helping the learners to understand the purpose of learning and develop their own purpose. This approach excludes any pressure from outside.

8. From a part-to-whole orientation to a whole-to-part orientation: This involves such approaches as beginning with meaningful whole text and then helping the learners understand the various features that enable texts to function, e.g., the choice of words and the text’s organisational structure.

9. From forms to meaning: An emphasis on the importance of meaning and messages rather than structures and drills and other forms of rote learning.

10. From short-term goals to long-term goals: A view of learning as a life-long process rather than something done to prepare the learners for an examination.

2.30. The emerging new paradigm in SLA

The paradigm shift outlined above has led to some major changes in approaches to LT in the present context. They are as follows:

1. Learner autonomy: Autonomy – ‘feeling free and volitional in one’s actions’ (E. Deci and R. Flaste 2) – is a basic human need. It is nourished by, and in turn nourishes, our intrinsic motivation, our proactive interest in the world around us. Henri Holce defines ‘learner autonomy’ as “the ability to take charge of one’s own learning” (Holec 3). It is not inborn but must be acquired either by natural
means or by formal learning. Autonomous learners draw on their own intrinsic motivation when they accept responsibility for their own learning and commit themselves to develop the skills of reflective self-management in learning. Success in learning strengthens their intrinsic motivation. Precisely because autonomous learners are motivated and reflective learners, their learning is efficient and effective. Conversely, all learning is likely to succeed to the extent that the learner is autonomous. The efficiency and effectiveness of the autonomous learner means that the knowledge and skills acquired in the classroom can be applied to situations that arise outside the classroom. Hence, learners should be given greater choice about their own learning, both in terms of the content of learning as well as the processes they may employ.

2. Classroom practices: Effective classroom learning tasks and exercises provide opportunities for learners to negotiate meaning, observe the functioning of a language in a social context, expand their linguistic resources, and take part in meaningful inert-personal exchanges. Such meaningful communication results from learners processing content that is relevant, purposeful, interesting, and engaging. Communication is a holistic process that often calls upon the use of several linguistic skills. LL is facilitated both by activities that involve inductive or discovery learning of underlying rules of language as well as by those involving language analysis and reflection. LL is a gradual process involving creative use of language through trial and error. Though errors are a normal product of learning process, the ultimate goal of LL is to be able to use the new language both fluently and accurately. Learners develop their own routes to LL, progress at different rates, and have different needs and motivations for LL. Successful LL involves the use of effective learning and communication strategies.

3. Teaching-learning as celebration: Teaching and learning of the TL have to be taken as an occasion for celebration by the stakeholders. They are not a tedious yoke to be shouldered but rather a pleasant job to be enjoyed. If teachers enjoy their teaching of L2, they will show interest in updating and improving their
knowledge and skills in their profession and their roles as guides and ‘gurus’. On the other hand, learners should deem LL as a joyful and thrilling experience, since it is part and parcel of creating and moulding their own personalities. The whole process of LL as well as LT should be devoid of any tedium, force, and punitive aspects for both. Teachers and learners should be excited about their roles.

4. The social nature of learning: learning is not an individual, private activity but a social one that depends upon one’s interactions with others. The Co-operative Learning Movement reflects this view. The classroom is a community of learners where learners co-learn through collaboration and sharing to achieve their goal.

5. Curricular integration: The connection between different strands of curriculum should be emphasised so that English is not seen as a ‘stand-alone’ subject but is linked to other subjects in the curriculum. Text-based learning reflects this approach and seeks to develop fluency in text types that can be used across the curriculum. Project work and field activities in LT also require learners to explore issues outside the language classroom.

6. Focus on meaning: meaning is viewed as the driving force of learning. Content-based teaching reflects this approach and seeks to make the exploration of meaning through content the core of LL activities. The traditional structural approach should give way to the emerging meaning-oriented approaches in LT.

7. Diversity: Learners learn in different ways and have different strengths. Affective, cognitive, and social factors influence their performance in LL to a great extent. Often in the past, these differences have been treated as impediments to learning rather than resources to be recognised, catered to, and appreciated. Teaching needs to take these differences into account, rather than try to force all learners into a single mould. In LT, this has led to an emphasis on developing learners’ use and awareness of different learning strategies.
8. Thinking skills: Language should serve as a means of developing higher order thinking skills, also known as critical and creative thinking. In LT, this means that the learners do not learn a language for its own sake but in order to develop and apply their thinking skills in situations that go beyond the language classroom.

9. Alternative assessment: New forms of assessment are needed to replace the traditional question items like the multiple choice and other forms that test lower order skills. Multiple forms of assessment like observation, interviews, journals, portfolios, etc., can be used to build up a comprehensive picture of what learners can do in L2. Self-assessment should also be part of any LL programme.

10. Teachers as co-learners: The teacher is viewed as a facilitator who creates a conducive climate for LL and provides opportunities for learners not only to use and practise the language but also to reflect on language use. They also constantly try out different alternatives, i.e. learning through doing. In LT, this has led to an increase in action research and other forms of classroom investigation.

2.3. Individual Learner Differences

Having studied the evolution of Indian ELT scenario, the researcher is of the view that a significant lacuna in all the ELT pedagogies enumerated above is the underlying assumption about the phenomenon of SLA that all learners process L2 data in the same way. As a result, all learners have been treated on par with each other. While employing one of these or a blend of these pedagogical methods, the teachers have treated the learners as a class with common qualities and not as individuals with unique features. Even those who adopted the so-called ‘humanistic approach’ like James Asher, Caleb Gattengo, Charles Curren SJ, and Georgi Lozanov have treated the learners as belonging to a single category.
Teachers of L2 everywhere, therefore, can be compared to the conductor of a symphony, treating student-performers in the same way - delivering the same material, employing the same pedagogical methods, following the same pattern of evaluation, and finally reaching the same destination of dissatisfaction with their pedagogical efforts. However, it is a fact that learners vary enormously in both the way they learn their L2 and also in how they actually succeed in their learning.

The study of individual learner differences (ILD) comprises an important area of study in ELT research. There is a marked change in the labels used to refer to individual differences. The terms good and bad, intelligent and dull, motivated and unmotivated learners have given way to a myriad of new terms such as integratively and instrumentally motivated, anxious and comfortable, field independent and field sensitive, auditory and visual learners. These changes are “evolutionary rather than revolutionary” (Horwitz).

However, they seem to reflect a radical shift in the way learners are viewed. Whereas earlier they were seen in absolute terms, as either innately endowed with or lacking in LL skills, in more recent research they are characterised in more relative terms, as possessing different kinds of abilities and pre-dispositions that influence learning in complex ways. This change of perspective over the years reflects a development in the role of ILD research in applied linguistics.

In earlier periods, the primary concern was to provide a basis for selecting which learners should be chosen to receive FL instruction. To this end, the main purpose of ILD research was to predict which learners would succeed. This led ultimately to the development of tests of language aptitude such as the Modern Language Aptitude Battery (J. Carroll and S. Sapon). More recent research on motivation or on learning strategies, however, has sought to explain why some learners succeed more than others and has been seen as complementary to mainstream research in SLA. However, this later research continues to have an ‘applied’ side. It has been used to identify the characteristics of ‘good language learners’ as a basis for learner training (i.e., providing guidance in how best to learn). It has also served as a basis for aptitude–treatment
interactions (i.e., matching learners to different types of instruction so as to maximise learning). Interest in individual differences has grown since the 1970s to the point where it has become a major area of enquiry in SLA.

2.32. Basic Questions about ILD

The study of ILD in SLA research seeks answers to four basic questions. They are:

1. In what ways do individual language learners differ?
2. What effects do these differences have on learning outcomes?
3. How do ILD affect the process of L2 acquisition?
4. How do ILD interact with instruction in determining learning outcomes?

2.33. Aspects of SLA Influenced by ILD

There are two basic possibilities with regard to which aspect of SLA is influenced by ILD. Rod Ellis observes (1999) that, “One is that differences in age, learning style, aptitude, motivation, and personality result in differences in the route along which learners pass in SLA. The other is that these factors influence only the rate and ultimate success of SLA” (99). While it is acceptable to most scholars that individual learners vary in the rate at which they learn their L2 and reach their level of competence at the end, to claim that ILD influence the sequence in which they acquire their linguistic competence is far more controversial. It counters the arguments in favour of the ‘natural’ route of L2 development.

There are stark disagreements about the role of ILD in SLA. As it has been pointed out (Fillmore 1979), on the one hand, ILD are seen as an all-important factor, while on the other, they are ignored as relatively insignificant. The type of research that has focussed on accounting for the differences in the proficiency levels of L2 learners has tended to emphasise the importance of ILD factors whereas the other type of research that examines the process of SLA has tended to play it down. However, understanding the individual variations among learners is a crucial question since “attention to
individual variation is the key to understanding the process of second language acquisition” (Andersen 02).

2.34. Identification and Classification of ILD

Identifying and classifying the ILD factors have been very difficult because it is not easy to observe and measure qualities like aptitude, motivation, or anxiety. These are merely labels for clusters of behavioural patterns and, not surprisingly, different researchers have defined these qualities in different ways. Consequently, it is not easy to evaluate and assess their findings. Each factor is not a unitary construct but a complex of features manifesting themselves in a range of over-lapping behaviours.

It is, therefore, not surprising to find that a host of terms have been used to figure out this phenomenon. Tucker lists the ILD factors as ‘affective, cognitive, and social factors’ (Hawkey); Chastain calls them ‘affective and ability factors’ (Chastain); Gardner names them as ‘attitudinal/motivational characteristics’ (R. Gardner, P. Smythe, and R. Clement); Ellis divides them into two broad categories, namely ‘personal’ and (‘modifiable’ and ‘unmodifiable’) ‘general’ factors. The researcher has provided his own taxonomy of these categories such as ‘learner characteristics’ and ‘learning conditions’. These intra-personal and inter-personal factors are operational at different degrees and different proportions to all learners of L2. Besides, there are also several demographic factors which can exert some influence on learners’ performance.

2.35. Demographic Factors

The demographic factors include learners’ age, gender, socio-economical status, ethnic identity, etc., which influence their proficiency in L2. A brief explanation about each factor is given below:
2.35.1. Age

It is a widely-held lay belief that younger L2 learners generally do better than their older counterparts. This position is supported by the *Critical Period Hypothesis*, according to which there is a fixed span of years during which LL can take place naturally and effortlessly and after which it is not possible to achieve native-like proficiency. The optimum period for LL falls within the first ten years of life, when the brain retains its plasticity (W. Penfield and L. Roberts).

It is also controversial as several studies like (Lenneberg) (S. Krashen) and (H. Whitaker, D. Bub, and S. Leventer) have challenged the critical period for L2 acquisition. The advantages of younger learners are their brain plasticity, their non-analytical outlook, fewer inhibitions, weaker group identity, and the likelihood of simplified inputs for them. The older learners enjoy the advantage of their learning capacity, analytical ability, pragmatic skills, greater knowledge of L1, and their real world knowledge.

Ellis observes that the starting age of LL does not affect the *route* of SLA but affects the *rate* of learning. Both the number of years of exposure and the starting age affect the level of success (Ellis 1985:106). Many point out that “the age issue remains an important one for theory building in SLA research, for educational policy-making, and for language pedagogy” (D. Larsen-Freeman and M. Long). However, Ellis observes that “unfortunately, there has been very little research that has investigated others aspects of L2” (Ellis 1994:485) regarding the age issue.

2.35.1.1. Some General Conclusions about Age

In spite of the wide differences of opinion with regard to the age question, the following conclusions are acceptable to most scholars (Ellis 1994:491-492):

a) Adult learners have an initial advantage where the rate of learning is concerned, particularly in grammar. They will eventually be over-taken by child learners
who receive enough exposure to the L2. This is less likely to happen in instructional than in naturalistic settings because the critical amount of exposure is usually not available in the former.

b) Only child learners are capable of acquiring a native accent in informal learning settings. Some put the critical age at 6 years (Long), but Scovel argues that there is no evidence to support this and argues for a pre-puberty start (T. Scovel). Some point out that children will only acquire a native accent if they receive massive exposure to the L2 (Singleton). However, some children who receive this exposure still do not achieve a native-like accent, possibly because they strive to maintain active use of their L1. Adult learners may be able to acquire a native accent with the assistance of instruction but further research is needed to substantiate this claim.

c) Children may be more likely to acquire a native grammatical competence. The critical period for grammar may be later than for pronunciation (around 15 years). Some adult learners, however, may succeed in acquiring native levels of grammatical accuracy in speech and in writing and even full ‘linguistic competence’.

d) Irrespective of whether native-speaker proficiency is achieved, children are more likely to reach higher levels of attainment in both pronunciation and grammar than their adult-counterparts.

e) The process of acquiring an L2 grammar is not substantially affected by age, but that of acquiring pronunciation may be so.

2.35.2. Gender

There is a widespread belief that females tend to be better L2 learners than males but this belief is probably a social construct. A distinction is often made between ‘sex’ and ‘gender’. The former constitutes a biological distinction, while the latter is a social one.
Many socio-linguists prefer the term ‘gender’ as it emphasises the social construct of ‘male’ and ‘female’. Labov observes that “there is little reason to think that sex is an appropriate category to explain linguistic behaviour” (206). Socio-linguistics has identified two distinct and apparently contradictory principles relating to sex differentiation in native-speaker speech. They are:

1. In stable socio-linguistic stratification, men use a higher frequency of non-standard forms than women.

2. In the majority of linguistic changes, women use a higher frequency of the incoming forms than men.

Both these principles suggest that women may be better at learning L2 than men. They are likely to be more open to new linguistic forms in the L2 input and also more likely to rid themselves of ‘interlanguage’ forms that deviate TL norms. Women outperform men in verbal fluency (Kimura). Females seem to be better at memorising complex forms, while males appear to be better at computing compositional rules (Halpern). Others point out the hormonal variables: higher androgen level co-relates with better automatised skills and high estrogen level with better semantic/interpretive skills (Mack).

2.35.3. Socio-economical Status

Individual learners’ socio-economic status is typically determined by means of a composite measure that takes into account their social status, occupation of the head/bread-winner of the family, the over-all income, level of education of parents and siblings, etc. There is evidence of a relationship between social class and L2 achievement (Burstall). Many studies (E. Olshtain, E. Shohamy, J. Kemp, and R. Chatow) (Skehan) prove that learners from lower socio-economic groups are less successful educationally than those from higher groups. The British sociologist, Bernstein asserts that the working-class students whom he has taught at London’s Institute of Education exhibited relatively poor performance in language-based subjects, when they were achieving
scores as high as their middle-class counterparts on mathematical topics (Bernstein 76). His Socio-linguistic Theory of Language Codes establishes a direct relationship between societal class and language learning. “The code that a person uses indeed symbolizes their social identity” (Bernstein, 1973). That is to say that the way language is used within a particular societal class affects the way people assign significance and meaning to the things about which they are speaking. Littlejohn agrees and states that “people learn their place in the world by virtue of the language codes they employ” (Littlejohn 193).

It is important to recognise, however, that it is not socio-economic class per se that produces less successful L2 achievement, but rather the experiences of the world which members of the different social classes are likely to have. In India, for example, caste plays a vital role in determining the self-identity of a learner. Learners from the higher castes usually achieve L2 proficiency with ease, whereas learners from the Dalit communities who were denied access to education for centuries struggle hard to learn L2, but perhaps with minimal success. However, this issue is yet to be thoroughly investigated.

2.35.4. Ethnic Identity

The topic of language and ethnicity is a controversial one. Two fundamental trends in scholarship exist. The first trend denies any direct or necessary link between language and ethnic identity. It also emphasises that the relation between language and ethnic identity is accidental. Apple and Muysken (1987) state that race, political class affiliation, and social class are more important factors in the determination of ethnicity (15). The second trend stresses that language is a true marker and vehicle of ethnic identity as an essential criterion along with cultural heritage, history, assumptions, values, religion institutions, and beliefs. Language is an instrument of ethnic identity. Much socio-psychological research has indicated that language and identity are complementary to each other, and therefore are reciprocally related. They cannot be separated from each other. The sense of ethnic identity is intrinsically connected with the use of a language.
In the sphere of SLA, there is a general consensus that ethnic identity can exert a profound influence on LL primarily because of socially constructed attitudes from within native and TL communities as a result of historic or current inter-group relations related to social boundaries and identities. These attitudes determine to a great extent what inputs L2 learners will be exposed to and make use of as well as the nature of their interaction with the TL speakers. When different ethnic groups co-exist in heterogeneous societies, either there will be a perceived horizontal distance between the groups or relative power and prestige of one over the other.

Members of different ethnic groups who perceive themselves to have much in common are more likely to interact and thus more likely to learn L2. When members of a dominant group learn the language of a subordinate group without threat to their L1 competence or to their ethnic identity, it leads to ‘additive bilingualism’. When members of a subordinate group learn the language of a dominant group as L2 and are more likely to experience some loss of ethnic identity and attrition of L1 skills, it leads to ‘subtractive bilingualism’. When people have negative attitudes towards both their own culture and that of the TL, ‘semi-lingualism’ may result. ‘Mono-lingualism’ is associated with a strong ethnic identity and negative attitudes towards the TL culture (Lambert).

To sum up, it is clear that the relationship between these four demographic factors and L2 learning is extremely complex. Ellis cautions that “it should be recognised that it is not age, sex, social class, or ethnic identity that determines L2 proficiency, but rather the social conditions and attitudes associated with these variables. Also, the factors interact among themselves and their effect on learning depends to a large extent on the setting. Any conclusions, therefore, need to be cautious” (Ellis 1994: 211).

2.36. Learner Characteristics

The learner characteristics include affective as well as cognitive factors. Affective factors concern the emotional responses of learners, aroused by their attempts to learn L2. Cognitive factors deal with the nature of problem-solving strategies of the learners. Affective and cognitive factors are internal to the learners. As it is pointed out, “Total
commitment, total involvement, a total physical, intellectual, and emotional response is necessary to successfully send and receive messages in a second language” (H. D. Brown 1). The acquisition of a new language is a fascinating, though colossal, enterprise, encompassing a wide range of variables that may stem from neurological to psychological, cognitive, and affective.

In the early sixties, Benjamin Bloom offered a comprehensive definition of two domains of learning: the cognitive and the affective (D. Karthwohl, B. Bloom, and B. Masia). Brown defined the affective domain as ‘the emotional side of human behaviour’ (Brown 135). By analogy, the cognitive domain can be defined as ‘the mental side of human behaviour’. These seemingly clear-cut definitions for the two most important domains of learning may suggest a division between cognition and affection, when indeed they are two sides of the same coin.

2.36.1. Affective Factors

There can be several affective factors which include the likes/dislikes of the learners with regard to SLA, their attitude towards L2 learning and their teacher, self-esteem, the level and type of motivation, inhibition, their level of fear, anxiety, and confidence, etc. The mounting interest in exploring the affective domain appears to be prompted by the conviction that cognitive factors, which seem to continue dominating education, are not the only ones that account for the learning process. Daniel Goleman notes that the Western civilisation has over-emphasised the importance of the rational functions of the mind to the detriment of the non-rational functions: intuition, emotions, and feelings (Goleman).

His viewpoint is consonant with Carl Rogers, one of the founders of humanistic psychology of the 1960s, who stated that by focusing so extremely on the cognitive side, we have limited ourselves. “Thus educating becomes a futile attempt to learn material that has no personal meaning. Such learning involves the mind only. It is learning that takes place ‘from the neck up’. It does not involve feelings or personal meanings; it has no relevance for the whole person” (Rogers 19).
In recent years, the importance of affective issues has become a matter of extensive research among language teachers, linguists, and researchers. Some affective variables have been found as having a high impact on success in EFL/ESL learning. An overview of the affective variables which are considered to be highly influential is briefly described below.

2.36.1.1. Self-esteem

Self esteem is a mental state which reveals the way you think and feel about yourself and others and is measured by the way you act. “Self esteem means having a positive image of self” (Simmermacher 50). It is “an evaluation of the emotional, intellectual, and behavioural aspects of the self-concept” (Diane Frey and C. Jesse Carlock 10-11). Dr Stanley Coopersmith defines ‘self-esteem’ as “a personal judgement of worthiness that is expressed in attitudes that the individual holds towards himself, …and indicates the extent to which the individual believes in himself to be capable, significant and worthy” (Coopersmith 4-5). According to Nathaniel Branden, “Self esteem is a confidence in our ability to think, to cope with the basic challenges of life and confidence in our right to be successful and happy. …. …. To trust one’s mind and to know that one is worthy of happiness is the essence of self esteem” (Andrew Beck, Peter Bennett, and Peter Wall 59). Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (OALD) defines self-esteem as “a feeling of being happy with your own character and abilities” (Hornby 1377).

Research has shown that learners who feel good about themselves are more likely to succeed in SLA. Maslow remarks that learners need teacher’s care because “self-esteem is a necessary deficiency need, which has to be met before cognitive and aesthetic needs could be engaged with” (Harmer 74). On the other hand, there is a summary of many studies which indicate that self-esteem is the result rather than the cause of academic achievement (Holly).

In addition, Dr Martin Covington from the University of California carried out an extensive review of the research on the relationship between self-esteem and achievement, concluding that “self-esteem can be modified through direct instruction and
that such instruction can lead to achievement gains” (Covington). This point is considered to be of great importance in the classroom as teachers can exert an influence both on the performance and well-being of their learners. Good teachers succeed “because they give optimal attention to linguistic goals and to the personhood of their students” (H. D. Brown).

2.36.1.2. Inhibition

OALD defines ‘inhibition’ as ‘a shy or nervous feeling that stops you from expressing your real thoughts or feelings’. Inhibition is closely related to self-esteem: the weaker the self-esteem is, the stronger will the inhibition to protect the weak ego be. Students with thick, perfectionist boundaries find language learning more difficult than those learners with thin boundaries who favour attitudes of openness and the tolerance of ambiguity (Ehrman). As Brown (1994) notes, LL implies a great deal of self-exposure as it necessarily involves making mistakes. Due to the defence mechanisms outlined above, these mistakes can be experienced as threats to the self. It can be argued that the students arrive at the classroom with those defences already built and that little can be done to remove them.

However, classroom experience shows that the teacher’s attitude towards mistakes can reinforce these barriers creating, in the long run, learning blocks, or the self-fulfilling prophecy: “I can’t do it. I am not good at it.” In short, this produces in the learner a deep-seated fear of inadequacy and deficiency. Fortunately, we are witnessing that a growing number of language teachers are becoming increasingly aware that focusing on students’ strengths rather than weaknesses is a powerful way to break down learning blocks and overcome inhibition.

2.36.1.3. Anxiety

OALD defines ‘anxiety’ as ‘the state of feeling nervous or worried that something bad is going to happen’. As learners, many have encountered this feeling, which is, no doubt, closely linked with self-esteem and inhibition. Any task that involves a certain
degree of challenge can expose the learner to feelings of self-doubt, uneasiness, or fear. Behind these emotions lies the basic doubt about one’s success in L2 learning. As L2 learning is a highly demanding task, it is very likely to raise anxiety in the learner. Anxiety can be considered a negative factor in LL, and several teaching methodologies in modern approaches indicate that anxiety should be kept as low as possible.

Brown (1994) makes the distinction between ‘trait anxiety’ - the permanent predisposition to be anxious - and ‘state anxiety’ as the feeling that is experienced in relation to some particular situation. Many studies (E. K. Horwitz, M. B. Horwitz, and J. Cope), (P. MacIntyre and R. Gardner), (Young), (Philip) conducted on state anxiety indicate that foreign language anxiety can have a negative effect on the LL process. Conversely, Bailey notes that a certain concern or anxiety is a positive factor. This kind of anxiety is described as facilitating the LL process (Bailey).

Just as tasks without a certain amount of challenge can undermine the learner’s interest, assignments without balance and enough support can be disheartening as they can submerge the learner into a state of emotional dullness or paralysis. In sum, a certain degree of concern, anticipation, and curiosity can be useful and even necessary to achieve, but too much anxiety can have an inhibiting effect and impede the process of successful LL.

2.36.1.4. Motivation

Another factor which is frequently cited to explain why some L2 learners are more successful than others is their individual motivation. According to OALD, ‘to motivate’ means ‘to make somebody want to do something, especially something that involves hard work and effort’. Brown (1994) defines motivation as ‘an inner drive, impulse, emotion, or desire that moves people to a particular action’. Some psychologists define motivation in terms of needs or drives. In his famous ‘Pyramid of Needs’, Maslow presented his theory of motivation as a hierarchy of needs, which stem from basic physiological needs (air, food, shelter) to higher needs of safety, belonging, self-esteem,
and the need for self-actualisation. Maslow claimed that the last need placed at top of his ‘Pyramid’ could only be achieved, if all other needs were fulfilled (Maslow).

A number of studies conducted in the field of EFL/ESL learning have shown that motivation is crucial to successful EFL/ESL learning. Others argue that intrinsic motivation, the one that stems from the interest in the activity itself independent from extrinsic reward, should be favoured in the classroom (G. Crookes and R. Schmidt). Conversely, Fontana argues that there are occasions when students’ intrinsic motivation is insufficient and recourse has to be made to motivation of an extrinsic tangible nature. Thus, it seems that balance should be kept between both stances, understanding that extrinsic motivation may be valid, useful, and even necessary, but if over-used, it can be detrimental to learners’ autonomy in the long run (Fontana).

“Motivation largely determines the level of effort which learners expend at various stages in their L2 development, often a key to ultimate level of proficiency” (Saville-Troike 85-86). According to her, the most widely recognised types of motivation are integrative and instrumental. Integrative motivation is based on interest in learning L2 due to a desire to learn about or associate with the TL community. In this case, emotional or affective factors are dominant. Instrumental motivation involves perception of purely practical value in learning the L2, such as increasing occupational or business opportunities, enhancing power and prestige, accessing scientific and technical information, or just passing a course in an educational institution. Saville-Troike further observes that “neither of these orientations has an inherent advantage over the other in terms of L2 achievement. The relative effect of one or the other is dependent on complex personal and social factors” (86).

Recent research developments in SLA theory (J. H. Schumann 1997), (J. H. Schumann 2001), etc., suggest that motivation is controlled by neurological mechanisms. Specific areas within the human brain conduct a ‘stimulus appraisal’ which assesses the motivational relevance of events and determines how we respond, including what our attitudes and ultimately the degree of effort will be.
2.36.1.5. Affective Variables in EFL/ESL Language Teaching and Learning

The interest in affective variables in LL is reflected in some modern teaching stances aimed at reducing anxiety and inhibitions and enhancing the learner’s motivation and self-esteem. These approaches can be identified within the so-called ‘humanistic education’. Stevick refers to Gertrude Moskovitz who is of the view that “humanistic education is related to a concern for personal development, self-acceptance, and acceptance by others, in other words, making students more human. Humanistic education takes into consideration that learning is affected by how students feel about themselves. It is concerned with educating the whole person - the intellectual and the emotional dimensions” (E. Stevick).

Examples of these innovative humanistic approaches to LT teaching are: Curran’s Community Language Learning, Gattegno’s Silent Way, Lozanov’s Suggestopedia, and Terrell’s Natural Approach. The latter is firmly rooted on The Monitor Model, the theory of language acquisition proposed by Stephen Krashen who has argued that a low affective filter is necessary for acquisition to take place. As pointed out earlier, the affective filter is a mental block, caused by affective factors like high anxiety, low self-esteem, and low-motivation.

To sum up, learners’ affective states are obviously of crucial importance in accounting for the ILD. Whereas the learners’ beliefs about LL are likely to be fairly stable, their affective states tend to be volatile, affecting not only the overall progress but responses to particular learning activities. If language is communication, EFL/ESL learning and teaching must be aimed at establishing meaningful communication in the classroom and the first requirement towards this end is an affective affirmation of the learner.

Perhaps there is a need for further research to determine the effects of different approaches and methods; yet what is needed is awareness that a focus on the subject matter of learning is no longer enough to develop the ultimate aim of education: love of learning. If learners have to develop their inherent potential to learn, the affective variables such as self-esteem, anxiety, inhibition, motivation, etc., can no longer be
denied; the inner needs of the learners can no longer be neglected. “Every learner requires first and foremost: to be noticed, to be attended to, to be valued, and to be affirmed. Out of that attention and affirmation grow the confidence and, yes, the courage to learn: if the teacher dares to teach, that is, to attend to and care for the learners, then the learners in their turn can dare to learn” (Whitaker).

2.36.2. Cognitive Factors

The cognitive factors are learner aptitude and their IQ level, personality types and traits, learner preferences and styles, etc. Learners have their unique styles of addressing their issues in SLA. Throughout the first 16 years of life, human cognition unfolds at great speed. During this period, some changes are more critical than others. As Piaget notes in his ‘Theory of Intellectual Development’, children develop through successive stages (J. Piaget and B. Inhelder). These stages are:

1. The sensory-motor stage from ages 0 to 2,
2. The pre-operational stage from 2 to 7, and
3. The operational stage from 7 to 16.

A crucial moment of change seems to occur around the age of 11, when thinking shifts from concrete to abstract. This turning point is of paramount value for L2 teachers as it highlights the importance of connecting teaching with concrete tasks and experience for children who have not reached puberty. In other words, children below 12 are not interested in the rules of the language, or in analysing grammar, but rather in games, songs, and activities that are meaningful to them. Furthermore, as Brown observed, “Children do learn second languages well without the benefit - or hindrance - of formal operational thought!” (1994: 59).

Another cognitive issue highly important for EFL/ESL teachers is the construct of ‘meaningful learning’ (Ausubel). His distinction between ‘rote learning’ and ‘meaningful learning’ is relevant to all ages. Ausubel has posed that human beings have a need for meaning and very little or no need for rote/mechanistic learning that is not connected to previous knowledge and experience. The implication of this concept for EFL/ESL
teachers is that an excessive focus on rote activities, such as rote drills, rote dialogues, reciting rules, practising patterns, may hinder LL, if not presented in purposeful contexts (Brown, 1994).

2.36.2.1. Learner Aptitude

For centuries, educational experts have been assuming that there is a specific talent for LL in human beings. General aptitude has been defined as ‘capacity of learning a task’, which depends on ‘some combination of more or less enduring characteristics of the learner’ (J. Carroll). For language aptitude, the capability involves a special propensity for learning an L2. Carroll also identifies four factors in language aptitude. They are (J. Carroll):

1. Phonemic coding ability: It is the ability to code foreign sounds in a way that they can be remembered later. This ability is seen as related to the ability to spell and to handle sound-symbol relationships.

2. Grammatical sensitivity: It is the ability to recognise the grammatical functions of words in sentences.

3. Inductive LL ability: It is the ability to identify patterns of correspondence and relationships involving form and meaning.

4. Rote learning ability: It is the ability to form and remember associations between stimuli. This ability is believed to be involved in learning vocabulary.

Learner aptitude is essentially a hypothesis that possessing various degrees of these abilities predicts correlated degrees of success in SLA. Skehan opines that “talents in all factors is not a requirement for success in L2 learning. Some good learners achieve success because of their linguistic-analytic abilities, and some because of their memory aptitude.” He also concludes that LL aptitude “is not completely distinct from general cognitive abilities, as represented by intelligence tests, but it is far from the same thing” (Skehan 209).
The findings that learner aptitude is a vital predictor of differential success in SLA hold both for naturalistic contexts as well as the formal classroom instruction. “It is not completely deterministic, however, and is but one of several factors which may influence ultimate L2 proficiency” (Saville-Troike 85).

2.36.2.2. Learning Modalities

Researchers have relied on survey techniques to collect data on learners’ preferences. On the basis of such data, the following perceptual learning modalities can be identified (Reid):

1. Visual learning (e.g., reading, studying charts, etc.)
2. Auditory learning (e.g., listening to lectures, audio tapes, etc.)
3. Kinaesthetic learning (experiential learning involving physical response)
4. Tactile learning (hands-on learning, as in building models or doing laboratory experiments, etc.)

These sensory preferences are unique to all learners. Apparently, no one means of processing has an inherent advantage over the other, but L2 learners reportedly feel more comfortable, when their teachers’ instructional strategies are congruent with their sensory preferences. This dimension may also be age-related as younger learners show more preference for kinaesthetic and tactile modalities. Each learner processes information differently from other learners. If teachers teach exclusively in one style, the learners’ comfort level may be diminished. They may also lose their mental dexterity to think in different ways.

2.36.2.3. Learning Styles

Learning/cognitive style refers to the individuals’ preferred way of processing information. Keefe defines it as “a consistent way of functioning that reflects underlying causes of behaviour” (Keefe). Learners have their own manner of perceiving, conceptualising, organising, and recalling data. It involves a complex interaction with
specific L2 social and learning contexts. It is also closely related to and interacts with personality factors and learning strategies of individual learners. Therefore, it reflects ‘the totality of psychological functioning’ (Willing).

An individual learning style is viewed as relatively fixed and not readily altered. Many learner style distinctions have been made in cognitive psychology. The ‘focusers’ tackle a problem by concentrating on one issue at a time, in step-by-step process, while the ‘scanners’ deal with several features simultaneously and allow their ideas to crystallise gradually (J. Bruner, J. Goodnow, and G. Austin). ‘Serialists’ operate with simple hypotheses consisting of a single proposition and ‘holists’ deal with complex hypotheses involving multiple propositions (G. Pask and B. Scott).

Other distinctions which seem to reflect personality as much as learning style differences include ‘impulsive’ and ‘reflective’ styles, ‘divergent’ and ‘convergent’ styles, field-dependence and field-independence, etc. Categories of cognitive style are usually identified as pairs of traits on opposite ends of a continuum. Saville-Troike observes that “individual learners are rarely thought to be at one extreme or the other but are located somewhere along the continuum between the poles” (87). She has categorised the following cognitive styles:

2.36.2.3.1. Field-dependent and Field-independent Styles

The Field-dependent (FD) and Field-independent (FI) dimension has been most frequently used in SLA-related research. This distinction was originally introduced by Witkin and others (H. A. Witkin, H. Lewis, M. Hertzman, K. Machover, P. Meissner, and S. Wapner). A commonly used criterion for FD/FI is a performance on an embedded figures test which requires learners to find out a simple shape within a more complex design. Learners who have difficulty discerning a figure apart from the ground within which it is embedded are judged to be relatively FD and those who have no difficulty are judged relatively FI. FD learners are considered to be more global and holistic in processing new information whereas FI learners are more particularistic and analytic. FD learners are thought to be more successful in L2 acquisition through highly
contextualised interactive communicative experiences and FI learners profit more from de-contextualised analytical approaches and formal instruction. FI learners also may have better attention capacities than FD ones.

2.36.2.3.2. Global and Particular Learners

Global learners like to take in a lot of information and sort out the details later. They like to get the big picture first and then study the smaller concepts. They tend to learn in large jumps, absorbing material almost randomly without seeing connections, and then suddenly ‘getting it’. Particular learners, also called ‘sequential learners’, tend to gain understanding in linear steps, with each step following logically from the previous one. They also tend to follow logical step-wise paths in finding solutions. Global learners may be able to solve complex problems quickly or put things together in novel ways, once they have grasped the big picture but they may have difficulty explaining how they have done it.

2.36.2.3.3. Analytical and Holistic Learners

Analytical learners like to take in information one piece at a time, although they can do it very quickly. Analytical learners prefer to learn alone while holistic learners prefer to learn in pairs, with peers, or as part of a team. Analytic learners process information by induction, reasoning from specific facts to a general conclusion, while holistic learners process information by deduction, reasoning from a general conclusion to specific facts. Analytical learners also learn best in a quiet, brightly lighted, and formal learning environment, while holistic learners learn best with background noise, soft light, and in a relaxed learning environment. Analytical learners prefer to start and finish one project at a time, and do not snack while learning; however, holistic learners simultaneously work on several projects, take frequent breaks, and enjoy snacks while learning (R. Terregrossa, F. Englander, and V. Englander).
2.36.2.3.4. Deductive and Inductive Processing

Another dimension is preference for deductive or inductive processing. Deductive processing is a ‘top-down’ process and it begins with a prediction or rule and then applies it to interpret particular instances of input. Inductive or ‘bottom-up’ processing begins with examining input to discover some pattern and then formulates a generalisation or rule that accounts for it and that may then, in turn, be applied deductively. An inductive cognitive style of learning promotes success in L2 learning in both naturalistic and instructed circumstances.

2.36.2.3.5. Focusing on Meaning and Focusing on Form

Some proofs can also be found for differential success in relation to relative focus on meaning versus focus on form. In a study of exceptionally talented L2 learners, it was found that they possess “a cognitive style whereby subjects are able to focus on form perhaps better than meaning but certainly in conjunction with meaning” (L. Nonoa, D. Fein, and L. Obler).

2.36.2.4. Personality Types

For most language teachers, the personality of their learners constitutes a major factor contributing to success or failure in LL. Significantly, learners also consider personality factors to be important. Personality factors are often added to cognitive style in characterising more general learning style. Some personality factors are vague and often overlap with other variables. For example, the concepts of extroversion, empathy, and risk-taking are related like those of self-esteem and inhibition. Saville-Troike (89) gives a list of such personality traits:

2.36.2.4.1. Anxious and Self-confident

Anxiety has received the most attention in SLA research, along with lack of anxiety as an important component of self-confidence. Anxiety co-relates negatively with
measures of L2 proficiency and higher anxiety tends to go with lower levels of success in L2 learning.

2.36.2.4.2. Risk-avoiding and Risk-taking

Lower anxiety may be manifested by more risk-taking or more adventurous behaviour. Learners who avoid taking risk under-perform in SLA. Risk-takers show less hesitancy, are more willing to use complex language, and are more tolerant of errors. They are less likely to rehearse before speaking.

2.36.2.4.3. Shy and Adventurous

Shyness is related to self-confidence and it is a major hurdle for some learners on their path towards achieving their L2 ambitions. Adventurous learners show remarkable success.

2.36.2.4.4. Introverted and Extroverted

Introverts are quiet and prefer non-social activities. However, extroverts are sociable, risk-taking, lively, and active. Extroverts are good at basic inter-personal communication skills and may succeed in oral skills in L2.

2.36.2.4.5. Inner-directed and Other-directed

Highly motivated learners are usually inner-directed while those who lack in motivation usually look for direction from without and they are usually less successful in SLA.

2.36.2.4.6. Reflective and Impulsive

Learners who are reflective by temperament are usually slow learners and they try to focus on accuracy in L2 whereas learners who are impulsive are usually quick in learning and they succeed in fluency in L2.
2.36.2.4.7. Imaginative and Uninquisitive

Learning a language is a creative activity and those who are imaginative use all their senses to learn L2 whereas uninquisitive learners progress rather slowly in SLA.

2.36.2.4.8. Creative and Uncreative

What is said about imaginative and uninquisitive learners can be attributed to creative and uncreative learners too. Creative learners experience less stress, unlike their uncreative counter-parts.

2.36.2.4.9. Empathetic and Insensitive to Others

Empathetic learners have a people-sense and they are usually very sociable. Since they mingle with other learners easily, they have a lot of opportunities to learn L2 well, unlike the insensitive ones.

2.36.2.4.10. Tolerant of Ambiguity and Closure-oriented

It entails an ability to deal with ambiguous new stimuli without frustration. It allows for indeterminate rather than rigid categorisation. Flexible learners always achieve better results in their SLA.

2.36.2.5. Learner Strategies

Differential L2 outcome may also be affected by the learning strategies adopted by individual learners. Though it is their conscious choice, it is also strongly influenced by their motivation, cognitive style, personality, and the context. Age, sex, aptitude, culture, etc., can also play a role in strategy selection. Not all strategies are equally effective. A typology of LL strategies is given below (Chamot):
2.36.2.5.1. Meta-cognitive Strategies

These strategies attempt to regulate LL by planning and monitoring. For example, previewing a concept or principle in anticipation of a learning activity, deciding in advance to attend to specific aspects of input, rehearsing linguistic components which will be required for an upcoming language task, self-monitoring of progress and knowledge states, etc.

2.36.2.5.2. Cognitive Strategies

These make use of direct analysis or synthesis of linguistic material. For example, repeating after a language model, translating from L1, remembering a new word in L2 by relating it to one that sounds the same in L1, or by creating vivid images, guessing meanings of new material through inference, etc.

2.36.2.5.3. Social/affective Strategies

These involve interaction with others. For example, seeking opportunities to interact with native speakers, working co-operatively with peers to obtain feedback or pool information, asking questions to obtain clarification, requesting repetition, explanation, or examples, etc. As Saville-Troike observes, “Age can have an influence on learning strategies” (92) For example, children tend to use more repetition whereas adults use more synthesis. Similarly, the learner’s gender can be significant, as females tend to use relatively more social/affective strategies than males, as well as more meta-cognitive strategies in listening tasks.

2.36.2.5.3.1. Linkage between Affective and Cognitive Factors

Research has shown that cognition and affection are indeed inextricably linked. An extensive review of the latest brain-based research has clearly shown the critical links between emotions and cognition and has concluded that in a positive state of mind, the learner is able to learn and recall better (Jensen). However, many puzzling questions
about language and emotions remain unsolved; linguists still struggle to determine how language affects thought and how thought affects language. Yet what seems to be clear is that: “Language is a way of life, it is as the foundation of our being, and as such interacts simultaneously with thoughts and feelings (Brown, 1994: 38).

2.37.0. Learning Conditions

So far, the researcher has presented a brief overview of learner characteristics under affective and cognitive factors which are responsible for ILD in SLA. While these two factors are internal to the learners, there are also other external forces at work, while they attempt to learn L2. SLA always takes place in a social context which has a bearing on the learner. In this section, the researcher presents a brief overview of the learning conditions which influence learners’ performance in L2.

2.37.1. Social Factors

Social factors are external to learners and are related to their relationship with the native speakers of L2, or with their teacher, or with their peers. Social factors also include the learners’ family background and its influence, college campus culture, and socio-cultural ecology of the locality of learners. Social factors have a major impact on L2 proficiency but probably do not influence it directly. Rather, their effect is mediated by a number of variables. These factors help to shape learners’ attitudes which, in turn, influence learning outcomes. There are two kinds of social contexts for the phenomenon of L2 learning. They are:

2.37.1.1. Micro-social Contexts

“These are the features of setting/situation and interaction which relate to communicative events within which L2 is being produced, interpreted, and negotiated. These include level of formality and participants’ relationship to one another, and whether the interaction is public or intimate. Such features interact importantly with the amount of attention that is paid to language form” (Saville-Troike 103-104). L2 learning
in classroom situation, the attitude of the teacher towards learners’ L2 learning, the
disposition of learners towards their L2 teacher, their impressions about the teacher’s
capabilities and interests in handling L2 classes, the ambience of the classroom, the
relevance and appeal of L2 syllabus, the availability and suitability of textbooks/study
materials, the positive or negative influence of co-learners in the same classroom, etc.,
form the micro-social context of the learners.

2.37.1.2. Macro-social Contexts

These are the features of “the larger socio-political setting within which language
learning and language use take place, including the social position and role of learners,
societal attitudes towards L2 language and multi-lingualism in general, and institutional
organisation” (Saville-Troike 103-104). The influence of the learners’ family
background, the level of education of learners’ parents and other siblings, the roles
played by close relatives, neighbours, and people of the locality, the caste/community
identity, the influence of the learners’ religious beliefs like fatalism, the influence of
learners’ L1, the impact of campus culture of the learners, the attitude of the
management of the educational institutions towards learners’ L2 learning, the availability
of the Internet facilities for LL in the campus, etc., form the macro social context of the
learners.

2.38. Characteristics of a Good Language Learner

Several attempts have been made to portray the picture of a ‘good language learner’,
based on studies of influencing factors in SLA (Rubin); (N. Naiman, M. Frohlich, H.
Stern, and A. Todesco). The following traits can be perceived in good language learners
(Ellis 1985:122):

1. The good language learner will be able to respond to the group dynamics of the
   learning situation so as not to develop negative anxiety and inhibition;
2. He/she will seek out all opportunities to use the TL;
3. He/she will make maximum use of the opportunities afforded to practise listening
to and responding to speech in the L2 addressed to him and to others – this will
involve attending to meaning rather than to form;

4. He/she will supplement the learning that derives from direct contact with
speakers of the L2 with learning derived from the use of study techniques (such
as making vocabulary lists) – this is likely to involve attention to form;

5. He/she will be an adolescent or an adult rather than a young child, at least as far
as the early stages of grammatical development are concerned;

6. He/she will possess sufficient analytical skills to perceive, categorise, and store
the linguistic features of the L2 and also to monitor errors;

7. He/she will possess a strong reason for learning the L2 (which may reflect an
integrative or an instrumental motivation) and also develop a strong ‘task
motivation’ (i.e. respond positively to the learning tasks chosen or provided);

8. He/she will be prepared to experiment by taking risks, even if this makes the
learner appear foolish;

9. He/she will be capable of adapting to different learning conditions.

These characteristics, if taken together, reflect the affective, cognitive, and social
factors which have been considered to be vital for SLA. As it is with other co-relational
research, it is difficult to establish causality or even directionality. For example, ‘good
learners’ may approach language tasks more actively because they are more proficient
(not more proficient because they are more active), or because they are more self-
confident.

In spite of the extensive research in this area, there is no certainty about the efficacy
of these strategies. There is also a doubt about whether strategies are the cause or effect
of success in SLA. Another threat to SLA process is that a teacher may have pre-
conceived notions as to ‘what works’ and may disrupt the learners’ successful strategy
by imposing a different one on them.
2.39. Social Models of L2 Acquisition

There are three models of L2 acquisition which seek to account for the role of social factors. These models reflect the primary research interests of their progenitors and the contexts in which they worked. Schumann’s Acculturation Model and Giles and Byrne’s Inter-group Model were designed to explain L2 learning in natural settings, in particular those where members of an ethnic minority learnt the language of a powerful majority group. Gardner’s Socio-educational Model was derived mainly from the studies of L2 learning in language classrooms, although Gardner argued that it was also applicable to L2 learning in natural settings.

2.39.1. Schumann’s Acculturation Model

This model was established to account for the acquisition of an L2 by immigrants in majority language settings. It specifically excluded learners who received formal instruction. According to Schumann, “Second language acquisition is just 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” (J. Schumann 34). SLA involved the negotiation of the social and psychological distance between TL and learners’ L1 group. He identified two kinds of acculturation, depending on whether learners viewed the TL group as a reference group or not.

Both types involved social integration and therefore contact with the TL group, but the first type of learners wished to assimilate fully into its way of life, whereas the second did not. Both types of acculturation were equally effective in promoting L2 acquisition. This model recognised the developmental nature of acquisition and sought to explain the differences in learners’ rate of development and also in their ultimate level of achievement in terms of the extent to which they adapted to the TL culture. The extent to which learners acculturated depended on two sets of factors which determined their levels of social distance and psychological distance (Schumann 1978:165). Social distance was determined by the status between the TL and learners’ group, their pattern of integration, the enclosure, the cohesiveness within the group and the size of two
groups, their attitudes towards each other, and the length of residence in the TL area. The amount of contact with the TL group determined the degree of acculturation and L2 proficiency.

Schumann identified three integration patterns, namely assimilation, preservation, and acculturation. When the learners’ group discarded their own values and lifestyles and adapted to that of the TL group, they assimilated to the TL culture. In this case, a high degree of SLA would be expected. When the learners’ group preserved their lifestyle and cultural values and rejected those of the TL group, SLA was less likely to happen. Acculturation was the integration pattern in which the learners’ group kept their own lifestyle and values while accepting those of the TL group. In this case, the learners’ group tended to have different levels of L2 proficiency (Schumann 1978:165).

The ‘psychological distance’ included factors such as language shock, culture shock, motivation, and ego permeability. Language shock referred to the anxiety a learner experienced when using the L2, such as the fear of looking comical or the feeling of losing one’s own identity. Adult learners tended to have language shock but generally children did not (Hilleson 250); (McGroarty 322). People experienced culture shock, when their commonly perceived and understood signs and symbols of communication were not functional in the new culture. It came with feelings such as loneliness, anger, frustration, and self-questioning of competence (Schumann 1978:166). Motivation was described as consisting of two kinds: integrative and instrumental. Ego permeability referred to the learners’ perception of whether they had rigid or flexible boundaries between the L2 and their L1. Learners who had permeable language boundaries tended to succeed in SLA (McGroarty 1988:322; Ellis 1994:232).

Though Schumann’s Acculturation Model focussed on the social factors such as the integrative patterns with the TL group and the psychological factors which affected L2 acquisition in informal learning contexts, it did not explain the process of acculturation. Ellis observes that “the greatest failing of the Acculturation Model is that it has nothing to say about how social factors influence the quality of contact that learners experience. In this respect, the Inter-group Model is superior” (Ellis 1994:234).
2.39.2. Giles and Byrne’s Inter-group Model

The key construct of Inter-group Model was that of ethno-linguistic vitality. Giles and Byrne identified a number of factors that contributed to a group’s ethno-linguistic vitality and the conditions under which sub-ordinate groups like immigrants or members of ethnic minority were most likely to acquire native-like proficiency in the dominant group’s language. These were (H. Giles and J. Byrne):

a) When in-group identification was weak or the L1 did not function as a salient dimension of ethnic group membership;
b) When inter-ethnic comparisons were quiescent;
c) When perceived in-group vitality was low;
d) When perceived in-group boundaries were soft and open; and
e) When the learners identified strongly with other groups and so developed adequate group identity and intra-group status.

When these conditions prevailed, learners experienced low ethnic-linguistic vitality and without insecurity, as they were not aware of the options open to them regarding their status vis-à-vis native-speaker groups. These five conditions were associated with a desire to integrate into the dominant out-group, additive bilingualism, low situational anxiety, and the effective use of informal contexts of acquisition. The end result was that learners would achieve high levels of social and communicative proficiency in the L2. Learners from minority groups will be unlikely to achieve native-like proficiency when their own ethno-linguistic vitality is high. This occurs if the following conditions prevailed (Ellis 1994:234):

a) They identified strongly with their own in-group;
b) They saw their in-group as inferior to the dominant out-group;
c) Their own perception of their ethno-linguistic vitality was high;
d) They perceived in-group boundaries a hard and closed; and
e) They did not identify with other social groups and so had an inadequate group status.
In such cases, learners were likely to be aware of ‘cognitive alternatives’ and, as a result, emphasise the importance of their own culture and language and, possibly, engage in competition with the out-group. Such learners would achieve low level of L2 proficiency, although they might gain knowledge of the formal aspects of the L2 through classroom study.

Like the Acculturation Model, the Inter-group Model also attempted to specify a set of socio-psychological factors that governed how successful individual learners would be and used those factors to describe ‘good’ and ‘bad’ learning situations. The former emphasised ‘contact’ as mediating between social factors and L2 acquisition but the latter viewed ‘interaction’ as crucial. The Inter-group Model integrated a macro-linguistic and a micro-linguistic approach to the study of L2 acquisition. However, this model had not been tested by longitudinal studies, documenting the social factors that influenced style-shifting in L2 learners, the extent to which style-shifting was related to acquisition, and whether learners who converged towards TL norms in their interactions with native speakers ultimately achieved high level of L2 proficiency.

2.39.3. Gardner’s Socio-educational Model

Unlike the other two models which were designed to account for the role of social factors in natural settings, this model was developed to explain L2 learning in FL classroom setting. Gardner’s Socio-educational Model identified four variables of social psychology that affected LL. They were (R. C. Gardner and R. Clément 495):

a) Development of attitudes;

b) Relationships among members of the same and different ethnic, political, or social groupings;

c) Individual’s feelings about various groups; and

d) Characteristics of individuals that influenced interpersonal relationships.

Gardner proposed that learning a new language was not just a matter of learning new information (vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, etc.), but a matter of ‘acquiring symbolic elements of a different ethno-linguistic community’ (Gardner 193). Based on this, he proposed his Socio-educational Model which consisted of four components:
1. Social milieu: The learners’ social and cultural milieu determined the extent to which they wished to identify with the TL culture and also the extent to which they held positive attitudes towards the LL situation. Both contributed to the learners’ motivation and the learners who were motivated to integrate with the TL milieu developed both a high level of L2 proficiency and better attitudes. When learners were in a context where the TL speaking community was not available, the learning situation developed by L2 teachers, encouragement by parents and significant others, and the mass media could influence SLA. However, where the TL group was available, the amount of interaction, the relative social statuses of the TL and L2 groups, and the linguistic components of the community were the important factors which affected SLA (Gardner and Clément 505-507).

2. Individual differences: According to Gardner (1979:197, 1990:509), learners’ cultural beliefs were linked to individual learner variables. For example, learners’ cultural expectation of the SLA process would influence their motivation, which, in turn, would affect L2 achievement. Individual differences like cognitive characteristics, attitude and motivation, and personality attributes correlated with each other. For example, the successful use of a particular learning strategy might enhance learners’ motivation and reduce their levels of anxiety; learners’ personalities could influence their beliefs and affective reactions, and so on.

3. Second language acquisition contexts: There were two types of learning contexts, namely formal and informal. The former referred to educational settings such as classrooms, while the latter referred to daily events such as watching TV, chatting and shopping in the L2 (Gardner 1979:198). There was a common assumption that the learners would achieve a higher level of achievement in the L2 in informal contexts (Ellis 1994:215). Ellis (1994:229) conceptualised two different social contexts where SLA occurred: natural contexts and educational contexts. Natural contexts included informal contexts such as monolingual, bilingual, official language settings and international settings. Educational
contexts referred to formal learning contexts which were present in language classrooms.

4. Learning outcomes: Gardner’s model had two kinds of learning outcomes: *linguistic outcomes* and *non-linguistic outcomes*. Linguistic outcomes referred to the mastering of grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation while non-linguistic outcomes referred to changes in attitude towards L2 as well as L2 speaking group and culture. Gardner (1979:199) argued that there was a relationship between learning contexts and learning outcomes. Both linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes could be developed both in formal and informal learning contexts.

However, the differences in outcomes might depend on the nature of the particular formal language training or informal language experience. For example, in formal learning contexts, learners developed mainly their grammatical skills and idiomatic expressions and in informal contexts, they might improve their oral skills through interaction with the TL community which would influence their attitudes towards the TL culture.

The merit of this model is that it elucidates how setting is related to L2 proficiency by positing a series of intervening variables like attitudes, motivation, self-confidence, etc., and how they are inter-related to influence LL. However, this model does not explain how particular settings highlight different variables which affect attitudes, motivation, and achievement. Besides, this model does not articulate the role of ‘interlanguage development’ through social interaction. Therefore, it does not answer the basic question of ILD.

As Ellis observes, “Although quite a lot is known about the *general* impact of social factors on L2 achievement, it is not yet possible to make accurate predictions. One reason for this is that social factors interact with other factors of a psychological nature that contribute to individual differences. The nature of these interactions is only understood in the broadest terms” Ellis 1994:240).
The affective, cognitive, and social factors are operational at different degrees and different proportions to all learners of L2. Besides these three major sets of factors, there can also be several other factors of which nothing much is known. As ILD study is spreading its tentacles now, more and more factors may see the light of day in future.

2.40.0. Approaches in ILD Research

It is possible to identify two general approaches to the study of ILD (Skehan). They are:

2.40.1. The Hierarchical Approach

This deductive approach has as its starting point a theory that predicts about how a particular individual difference affects L2 learning. These predictions generally take the form of specific hypotheses which can be tested empirically. Specially designed studies can be undertaken to investigate them. Since this method lacks sufficient theoretical backing, this method has been relatively little used in ILD research.

2.40.2. The Concatenative Approach

This is an inductive method which follows a research-then-theory approach. Its starting point is the identification of a research question such as “To what extent does motivation account for L2 achievement? The next step is to collect data that can be used to identify various ILDs (the independent variables), and perhaps also to obtain measures of L2 learning (the dependable variable). Various procedures are then used to investigate the nature of the relationships among the independent variables (for example, to see if ‘aptitude’ is related to ‘motivation’) and also the relationship between the independent variable(s) and the dependent variable.

Such research is typically co-relational in nature i.e. it can demonstrate the existence of relationships but cannot easily determine what cause is and what effect is. Nevertheless, it can contribute to theory development. This approach has been widely used in SLA research, a good example being the study of motivation (Gardner).
2.41. Research Traditions in ILD Research

Besides these two approaches to ILD research, there are two general research traditions in ILD research and they are evident in all branches of the social sciences. They deal with the way subjects are chosen for study, method of data collection, and data analysis. These two traditions are:

2.41.1. Naturalistic Research

People are studied in their real-life settings in this type of research. No attempt is made to manipulate the learning context nor are subjects randomly assigned to predetermined groups. This research also typically involves the collection of qualitative data through detailed observation of subjects and their settings. However, this method has not been very successful in the study of ILD, since what learners do often does not reveal much about their psychological states and characteristics or the strategies they use to learn (Rubin, What the ‘good language learner’ can teach us); (Cohen). On the other hand, methods involving introspection, retrospection, and diary studies have been proved helpful. However, neither the validity nor reliability of such self-report methods is universally accepted.

2.41.2. Confirmatory Research

As opposed to the naturalistic research, confirmatory research is interventionist in nature. It seeks to control the learning environment and to manipulate key variables. It does not make use of intact groups of subjects but rather assigns them to specific groups. This type of research is often conducted by means of carefully designed experiments involving some kind of ‘treatment’. Data are collected by asking learners to complete various kinds of tests. These tests afford rich numerical data which can be analysed statistically. Such research can also be co-relational in nature, using data collected from tests or questionnaires to establish if predicted relationships occur.

2.42.0. Four Types of Research Model for ILD Studies

ILD research, therefore, can be characterised in terms of the general approaches and the research traditions, thus affording four main types of research. They are:
## Table 2.2: Four Types of Research Models for ILD Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Research Models</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hierarchical approach with naturalistic tradition</td>
<td>Theory-led study which examines ILD in how learners learn and use L2 in natural setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Concatenative approach with naturalistic tradition</td>
<td>Exploratory study which examines ILD in the way learners learn and use L2 in natural setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Hierarchical approach with confirmatory tradition</td>
<td>Theory-led study which examines ILD experimentally, by assigning learners to specific/controlled groups and by manipulating their learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Concatenative approach with confirmatory tradition</td>
<td>Co-relational study which investigates whether expected patterns of relationships involving ILD and L2 learning occur in specially selected groups of learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concatenative research of both Type B and Type D has been the principal method of enquiry but hierarchical research in the confirmatory tradition (Type C) is gaining in popularity as theories are being developed. Hierarchical research which employs the naturalistic methodology (Type A) is the least well-represented. ILD researches are increasingly making use of more than one way of collecting information about learners in a single study, thus obtaining a rich databank. Such research which allows for triangulation (the use of diverse kinds of data as a means of achieving more accurate and reliable results) seems particularly promising in shedding light on the complex relationships that exist among ILD variables. The researcher has adopted the concatenative approach with confirmatory tradition (Type D) for his exploratory study of major factors influencing learners’ performance in L2 at Degree Colleges in AP. The details of his research methodology will be presented in the following chapter.