**Lesson 10 : Foreign Language Learning – part 02 -**

**The Natural Order Hypothesis:**

According to the hypothesis, the acquisition of grammatical structures proceeds in a predicted progression. Certain grammatical structures or morphemes are acquired before others in first language acquisition and there is a similar natural order in SLA. The average order of acquisition of grammatical morphemes for English as an ‘acquired’ language is given below:

-Ing--------Aux---------Irregular------Regular Past

Plural----->Article---->Past---------->3rd Sing.

The implication of natural order is not that second or foreign language teaching materials should be arranged in accordance with this sequence but that acquisition is subconscious and free from conscious intervention .

**The Input Hypothesis:**

This hypothesis relates to acquisition, not to learning. Krashen claims that people acquire language best by understanding input that is a little beyond their present level of competence. Consequently, Krashen believes that ‘comprehensible input’ (that is, i + 1) should be provided. The ‘input’ should be relevant and ‘not grammatically sequenced’. The ‘input’ should also be in sufficient quantity as Ri­chards pointed out:

“.. child acquirers of a first language are provided with samples of ‘caretaker’ speech, rough - tuned to their present level of unders­tanding, ..[and] adult acquirers of a second language [should be] provided with simple codes that facilitate second language compre­hension.”

**The Monitor Hypothesis:**

As is mentioned, adult second language learners have two means for internalising the target language. The first is ‘acquisition’ which is a subconscious and intuitive process of constructing the system of a language. The second means is a conscious learning process in which learners attend to form, figure out rules and are generally aware of their own process. The ‘monitor’ is an aspect of this se­cond process. It edits and make alterations or corrections as they are consciously perceived. Krashen believes that ‘fluency’ in second language performance is due to ‘what we have acquired’, not ‘what we have learned’: Adults should do as much acquiring as possible for the purpose of achieving communicative fluency.

Therefore, the monitor should have only a minor role in the process of gai­ning communicative competence. Similarly, Krashen suggests three conditions for its use:

1. there must be enough time;
2. the focus must be on form and not on meaning;
3. the learner must know the rule.

**The Affective Filter Hypothesis :**

The learner’s emotional state, according to Krashen, is just like an adjustable filter which freely passes or hinders input necessary to acquisition. In other words, input must be achieved in low-an­xiety contexts since acquirers with a low affective filter receive more input and interact with confidence. The filter is ‘affective’ because there are some factors which regulate its strength. These factors are self-confidence, motivation and anxiety state.

The expression “language learning” includes two clearly distinct, though rarely understood, concepts. One involves receiving infor­mation about the language, transforming it into knowledge through intellectual effort and storing it through memorization. The other in­volves developing the skill of interacting with foreigners to unders­tand and speak their language. The first concept is called “language learning,” while the other is referred to as “language acquisition.” These are separate ideas and we will show that neither is the conse­quence of the other.

The distinction between acquisition and learning is one of the hy­potheses (the most important) established by the American Stephen Krashen in his highly regarded theory of foreign language learning. The concept of language learning is linked to the traditional ap­proach to the study of languages and today is still generally practiced in high schools worldwide. Attention is focused on the language in its written form and the objective is for the student to understand the structure and rules of the language through the application of intel­lect and logical deductive reasoning.[[1]](#footnote-2)

**Total Physical Response Method:**

This method is developed by psychologist from San Jose State College, United States, James J. Asher (1966). Psycholinguistic principles in language learning according this method are as following. a. Language competence will improve significantly by involving kinesthetic sensory system in language learning. This related to the fact that children are given utterances that require

them to move physically. b. Comprehension is primary rather than speech production. Students are directed to achieve comprehension competences before they try to speak or write.

Related to kinesthetic theory, it is believed that there is a positive correlation between physical movements and students’ language achievement. It becomes the focus in designing and applying appropriate language teaching technique in a certain topic. A spacious classroom is required in applying this method. The class ideally consists of 20-25 students. This method can be applied to teach children or adults. Grammatical rules are presented in imperative sentences because basically all materials are presented in

imperative sentences. In this method, dictionary is unneeded because the meaning of words will be expressed by physical activities. Students usually

do not get homework because language learning is performed together in the classroom.

**Suggestopedia :**

This method is developed by Georgy Lazanov, a psychiatrist in Bulgaria in 1975. Psycholinguistic principles in language learning according this method are as following. Humans can be directed to do something by giving them a relaxed atmosphere and opened and peaceful mind. These will stimulate nerves to easily respond and store the information for longer. Before the

lesson started, students are persuaded to relax their body and mind in order to gather hypermnestic ability, it is an incredible supermemory. The classroom is set up with dim light, comfortable seats, relaxed atmosphere and

classical music. Laboratorial program and strict grammar exercise are rejected in the class.

Generally, material is presented in a long dialogue.

The characteristics of the dialogue are: (a) emphasizes vocabularies and content, (b) related to the real life, (c) practical utility, (d) relevant

emotionally, and (e) some words are underlined and given the phonetic transcription. Each meeting in this method is divided into three time allocations. The first is reviewing the previous topic through discussion, games, sketch, or role playing. If students do some mistakes, teacher corrects

it carefully to keep a positive atmosphere. The second is distributing the dialogue traditionally. The third is relaxing students. This is divided into two: active activity and passive activity.[[2]](#footnote-3)

 **How can artificial language learning methods help?**

The most important contribution of artificial language learning experiments to date is in allowing researchers to test the predicted behavioral efects of hypothesized constraints in a controlled laboratory environment. Observations from linguistic typology, or language acquisition can be used to generate hypotheses linking language structure to human cognition. The predictions of these hypotheses can be tested using precisely designed experimental manipulations. While most work in theoretical syntax does not yet incorporate this kind of evidence, the last decade has seen a surge in

the use of arti\_cial language learning experiments in research on theoretical phonology. For the most

part, these studies have explicitly focused on statistical typological tendencies, attempting to show that typologically common patterns are acquired (or inferred) more readily than rare patterns. In other words, this research is focused on uncovering cognitive biases which might explain a given typological distribution. Such biases are di\_cult to test with natural language acquisition data alone, since no two natural languages will di\_er only in the phenomenon of interest. Further, the researcher cannot control the frequency with which particular learners might receive relevant information in the input. Where research has in fact focused on apparently non-defeasible principles, the problem is obvious: there simply are no natural language acquisition data available.

Using artificial language learning experiments makes it possible to perfectly match languages

aside from properties of interest, to control input frequency, and to compare learning of attested

versus unattested and common versus rare linguistic patterns. In addition to this, these methods allow us to explore whether the same biases are found across development, how they might be amplified or dampened by language experience, and how widely they apply across cognitive domains.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will first outline four general artificial language learning methods used for research on syntax.[[3]](#footnote-4)

**INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN SECOND LANGUAGE STUDIES:**

It has been long observed that there is a particularly wide variation among language learners in terms of their ultimate success in mastering an L2 and therefore the study of IDs, especially that of language aptitude and language

learning motivation, has been a featured research area in L2 studies since the 1960s (for past reviews, see e.g., Breen, 2001; Cohen & Dörnyei, 2002; Cornwell & Robinson, 2000; Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003; Ehrman, 1996; Ellis, 2004; McGroarty, 2001; Oxford, 1999c; Oxford & Ehrman, 1993; Sawyer & Ranta, 2001; Robinson, 2002; Segalowitz, 1997; Skehan, 1989, 1991, 1998). In the 1970s the momentum of ID studies was further augmented by influential research on the good language learner (for a retrospective review, see MacIntyre & Noels, 1994; for a new perspective, see Norton & Toohey,

2001). The results of this line of investigation indicated in a fairly consistent manner that besies a high degree of language aptitude and motivation there were other learner factors that helped students to excel, in particular the students’

own active and creative participation in the learning process through the application of individualised learning techniques. Thus, language learning strategies were included into the inventory of important learner characteristics, and Peter Skehan’s (1989) seminal book on the subject, Individual Differences in Second Language Learning, and his follow-up overview paper under the same title (Skehan, 1991), also added learning styles to the ‘canonical’ list of IDs in language learning.

Thus, IDs have been researched extensively in L2 studies, making the area one of the most thoroughly studied psychological aspect of SLA. As already mentioned, these studies have typically found IDs to be consistent predictors of L2 learning success, and yet in an overview of ID research

Sawyer and Ranta (2001) correctly pointed out that the L2-related ID literature has remained relatively uninfluential within the broader field of SLA.

This curious situation of isolation, I believe, largely stems from the fact that the original product-oriented conception of the two key ID factors, aptitude and motivation, was incompatible with the inherently process-oriented stance of SLA.[[4]](#footnote-5)
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