

SOME REMARKS ON THE ANTI-PEDAGOGICAL ASPECTS OF
KRASHEN'S THEORY OF SECOND-LANGUAGE
ACQUISITION

WALDEMAR MARTON

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

Analysing Krashen's theory of second language acquisition (Krashen 1981, 1982, 1985) from the point of view of language pedagogy, one can easily notice its anti-pedagogical implications. These implications are related to the fact that Krashen assigns only a minimal role to language pedagogy in the process of language acquisition. In his opinion, the most important function realized by formal language teaching can be defined as providing comprehensible input to the learner and taking care that this input is basically at the $i+1$ level, that is, that it only slightly exceeds the learner's current competence. Yet this function is not uniquely connected with the formal educational setting; it can be also realized in naturalistic settings of second language acquisition, where the beginning learner also has a chance of getting a lot of input 'roughly tuned' to his actual competence, in the form of foreigner-talk (Krashen 1981: 119-37). Accordingly, Krashen believes that classroom teaching is helpful only when it is the primary source of comprehensible input, while where language learning in an informal environment is available, the value of instruction is actually nil (Krashen 1985: 13-4). Thus he implies that classroom learning cannot improve at all on the natural processes of language acquisition; at best, it can only try to replicate these processes in the classroom.

It is clear that this kind of thinking is deeply anti-pedagogical. The essence of pedagogy and its value reside in the conviction that formal teaching and learning can be and should be superior to trial-and-error learning in a natural environment, otherwise sending our children to schools would not make any sense at all. The same is true of language pedagogy; indeed, it is a necessary assumption of the majority of language courses all over the world, where the learner has incomparably less time and gets incomparably less input than in a natural setting. When we realize that in the latter the learner very often

has a chance of being meaningfully exposed to and of communicating in the second language for several hours per day, and when we compare this with the time available for language learning in very many school settings, we will see the difference at once. For example, in many countries, including Poland, school learners get only two to four 45- or 50-minute classes per week, which amounts to only a few hundred hours, usually spread over four or five years, for the whole course (cf. Lewis and Massad 1975; Carroll 1975). It is obvious that without the assumption that instruction can make a tremendous difference, language learning in such acquisition-poor environments would have to be simply considered a waste of time.

This basic belief that language pedagogy can do better than merely try to replicate the natural acquisition process in the classroom has been common to the European and American tradition of good and efficient language teaching as practised and recommended by several great language educators, such as Berlitz, Sweet, Palmer, de Saúzé, Carroll, Strevens, Stevick, Rivers. All these names represent not only solid scholarship but also (maybe with the exception of Sweet) years of successful experience in the teaching of foreign languages, so that their bearing witness to the effectiveness of good teaching cannot be just shrugged off as less substantiated than self-assured claims made on the basis of extrapolations from a few not completely convincing studies concerning the natural order of acquisition of several grammatical morphemes. The works of all these educators are pervaded with the conviction that classroom learning can be not only highly effective but also much more efficient than unaided language acquisition in informal environments, so that the level of proficiency that the classroom learner may reach after, say, 500 hours of good teaching would require five or even more times this number of contact hours with the language on the part of the informal learner. Even Palmer, who was an ardent supporter of basing language pedagogy on some elements of the natural acquisitional processes, had no doubt at all that pedagogical intervention can accelerate these processes and make them more efficient. In his well-known book *The Principles of Language Study* he wrote that, "We should not conclude that methods involving our powers of study are to be abandoned, and that nature alone is to be responsible for our linguistic education. On the contrary, we suggest that an extensive use be made of powers which are not possessed by the young child or the barbarian". (Palmer 1964: 16). In another book the same author pointed out that, "by some means or other we have to bridge the gulf between the linguistic capacity of the native child at the age of two and that of the foreign person at whatever age he takes up his studies. We are convinced that this gulf may be bridged by certain procedures which, though 'unnatural', are nevertheless effective and helpful". (Palmer and Redman 1969: 104). Another great educator, de Saúzé, the creator of the famous 'Cleveland Plan', (which has probably been one of the most successful language

programmes ever), although promoting a variety of the direct method containing a certain number of 'natural' elements, was of the opinion that a careful gradation of structural difficulty combined with the explicit teaching of L_2 grammar by way of an inductive method and the systematic correction of learners' errors were extremely powerful pedagogical devices leading to an increased efficiency of the learning process (de Saúzé 1959). Carroll, a contemporary language educator, is also of the opinion that just trying to create a rich linguistic environment in the classroom and making the learner experience the totality of the target language without any specifically pedagogical support does not make for maximum efficiency in language teaching. Instead he recommends a two-stream approach and suggests that: "Second-language learners' appear to be helped by guidance and explanations with respect to particular aspects of instructional content... A program of instruction should contain two parallel streams, one devoted to exposing the learner to materials containing a relatively uncontrolled variety of linguistic elements (for example, vocabulary and grammatical constructions) and the other devoted to a rather carefully developed sequence of instructional content". (Carroll 1974: 140-141). Strevens, another contemporary educator, has been tirelessly making the point that the quality of teaching, defined by him as the management of learning is one of the most essential factors which determines failure or success in language learning and that, accordingly, language teachers should strive to become highly professional individuals, proud of their expertise in language pedagogy (Strevens 1980: 12-24, 27).

The same belief in the superiority of well-organized language instruction over the natural processes of language acquisition has been typical of Soviet language pedagogy, where it has found its ultimate realization in the application of Galperin's educational theory to foreign language teaching. Galperin's stage theory of the formation of mental operations actually sees the role of instruction as helping the learner to learn successfully by guiding his mental operations involved in learning tasks through the use of pedagogical algorithms. As applied to language pedagogy it means that instead of wasting a lot of time on the unaided forming and testing of hypotheses about the target language in a trial-and-error manner, the learner is supposed to follow pedagogical algorithms in productive and receptive tasks at the beginning level (cf. Galperin 1970; Talyzina 1970; Leontiev 1981: 41-48).

The conviction that learning guided by instruction is superior to natural and unaided learning also underlies the thinking of such great educators and educational psychologists as Vigotsky, Bruner, and Ausubel, whose works have exerted a profound influence on present-day educational theorizing. Vigotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development is particularly relevant to our considerations. This term refers to a given learner's ability to successfully acquire a certain part of the instructional material (in the form of know-

edge or skill) but only when his natural learning capacity is supported by the teacher's help and intervention (Vigotsky 1971: 356—357). Thus, applying this concept to language teaching, we can hypothesize that a given language item, although being, in terms of Krashen's theory, at a level higher than $i+1$, can be acquired by the learner with the help of appropriate instruction, i.e. it need not conform to the natural order of acquisition (assuming, as Krashen does, that such an invariable order really exists). Similarly, Ausubel, in his often quoted *Educational Psychology*, while specifically addressing the issue of language learning and teaching, criticizes the assumption that the natural way of learning is the best model for language teaching, pointing out that although the natural method may be the most efficacious for children it certainly cannot be claimed to be such for adults, who are more mature cognitively and who have already acquired a lot of intellectual skills (Ausubel 1968: 73—4).

It is clear, then, that Krashen's anti-pedagogical stand flies in the face of a lot of opinions and ideas which are based on solid theoretical grounds and on vast teaching experience and are held by the most outstanding language educators of the last hundred years, as well as being indirectly supported by some of the most prominent thinkers of the 20th century in the area of general education. It is true that Krashen supports his claims with some empirical evidence yet it seems to me that this evidence is by no means so strong and convincing, as to make us reject the above-discussed statements and opinions as un scholarly and old-fashioned. Actually, one should rather wonder why quite a few theorists and practising language teachers seem to have jumped on the newest anti-pedagogical bandwagon in total disregard of this fairly long tradition of solid scholarship and highly effective teaching. After all, one should rather doubt whether extrapolations from the morpheme studies, which are so important for Krashen's argumentation, are a sufficiently solid foundation on which to base the claim that language instruction *per se* does not make a difference. Certainly, Krashen also quotes some empirical studies specifically related to this issue, which seem to support his position, such as those carried out by Upshur (1968) and Mason (1971). Yet we also have studies which seem to confirm the view that language instruction is a factor increasing the effectiveness of learning as, for instance, the study carried out by Long (1983). In my opinion, however, none of these studies, irrespective of whether they confirm or disconfirm Krashen's disbelief in the significance of planned pedagogical effort, are truly convincing for the simple reason that actually none of them take into consideration an extremely important factor, which is all-decisive as far as the value of language instruction is concerned, that is, the quality of teaching.

The point is that in language learning, even more than anywhere else, the

advantages of formal instruction show only when this instruction is of a particularly high quality. Bad teaching may indeed have no other effect on the learner except to provide him with some amount of meaningful input, but in the typical school context of foreign language teaching this amount may be too small to lead to any noticeable development in L_2 competence. Thus the learner subjected to a pedagogical treatment which fails to help him in his learning may be forced to resort to the natural, unaided acquisitional process and may produce acquisitional orders and developmental sequences similar or even identical to those produced in naturalistic settings. For example, responding to the teacher's question, "How did you get to school today?", he may produce the following utterance: "Come school bus". Another thing may happen as well, especially when the amount of input is insufficient for the learner to allow him to make his own hypotheses about the language: he may, when pressed for an answer by the teacher, vaguely recall the complexity of a given form which he has not yet acquired and, striving to recreate it, produce one of those 'impossible' utterances which are typical only of classroom learning and probably never appear in informal settings. For example, if asked the same question, "How did you get to school today?", the learner might produce something like "I have is went school with bus". Thus we may conclude that teaching which fails to gear the learning process to it can probably result in two different things. It can either promote the natural acquisitional process, which is particularly likely to happen when the learner gets a sufficient amount of comprehensible input, or it can completely fail to lead to any development of L_2 competence, leaving the learner with a rather chaotic conglomeration of various ill-absorbed bits and pieces of the target language, which may be not sufficient even for performing the simplest receptive or productive tasks.

Taking a personal point of view I would like to say that my own professional experiences and my own observations of language teaching in many countries of the world and in various types of institutions have fully convinced me that language instruction makes a difference and that it renders the learning process much more efficient than the process of natural acquisition in informal settings, but only when the teaching is of good quality. I have seen classes in which most learners after only 500 to 600 hours of school learning were able to speak freely, both fluently and fairly accurately, on a variety of topics including political, economic, and philosophical issues. But I have also seen classes where after the same or an even larger number of hours most learners were not able to make any reasonable use of the target language, not even in the receptive mode.

I certainly realize that making statements which assign such a great role to good teaching begs the question of what good teaching is and how it can be

defined. Yet I think that the reader also realizes that to try to answer this question would require a separate book and is obviously beyond the scope of this paper. It is not strictly connected with its main theme, either; for the purposes of our argumentation it is sufficient to claim that the quality of teaching is an extremely important factor, to a large extent determining success or failure of language learning in a formal educational setting. Without trying to give even an outline of a complete answer to this question, I will, however, reflect on certain issues which are connected with the quality of teaching and the discussion of which may pave the way for further pointing out what are, in my opinion, other anti-pedagogical aspects of Krashen's theorizing. One of these issues is related to the fact that in assessing the quality of teaching we should distinguish between general pedagogical and specifically methodological criteria. The former should be met by any organized teaching process, irrespective of the subject taught, so it is clear that they also apply to language teaching. The latter are related only to what is specific to the methodology of teaching foreign languages, that is, to what makes this methodology different from the methodologies of teaching other subjects.

I think that using these two groups of criteria any language teaching specialist can, first of all, easily point to those pedagogical procedures which obviously violate the principle of teaching efficiency. Thus if the teacher introduces a technique which, for a longer period of time, keeps only one learner busy while the others may go to sleep, this is a serious fault of a general pedagogical nature, since it is obvious that any teaching procedure used in the classroom should, in some manner, activate all the learners. Or if the teacher fails to create a warm and friendly atmosphere in the classroom and thus makes the learner resort to what humanistic psychologists call 'defensive learning', it is also clear that this is a fault of a general educational nature, since the psychology of learning tells us that the learner's effective domain is as important in any kind of learning as the cognitive one (which also means that the notion of the effective filter, so important to Krashen's theorizing, can be applied to any learning process and not uniquely to second language acquisition).

As far as specifically methodological criteria are concerned, I believe that there is also a lot of consensus among contemporary language educators as to what teaching and learning procedures could be described as extremely ineffective. For example, when we consider François Gouin's pathetically unsuccessful attempts at learning German by memorizing a few grammar books and a dictionary of 30,000 words (Diller 1971: 51-53), it is obvious that this kind of learning strategy would not be recommended by any language teaching specialist today. It would not since, although it is not quite clear yet whether explicitly taught and learnt grammar rules can really help in learning a language for spontaneous, communicative uses, certainly nobody believes that any learn-

er could construct (or comprehend) utterances at a more or less normal speed on the basis of totally conscious decisions and operations involving every single language item. This is not possible for the simple reason that the processing capacity of the human mind is too limited to cope with such an incredibly complex task. Similarly, I think that a grammar drill of an extremely mechanical type (that is, one that can be successfully performed without the learner being necessarily aware of the meanings of the particular sentences he is manipulating) would also be rejected by most contemporary language educators as obviously not meeting the criterion of methodological efficiency. This is so because today we understand very well that we cannot totally separate form from meaning in learning procedures, since in doing this we create a barrier for the transfer of linguistic knowledge and skill from exercises to more spontaneous uses of the language.

The point that I really want to make is that in spite of the fact that particular language educators today have different recipes for success in teaching, it would not be difficult to find a lot of agreement as to the exclusion of a number of procedures which obviously do not meet the criterion of maximum teaching efficiency, either from a general educational or a specifically methodological point of view. Thus, by the process of elimination, we might arrive at a set of principles and procedures which might pass muster and be included into the category of good and effective teaching. Yet I believe that we can do even better and, on the basis of accumulated teaching experience and the relevant knowledge provided by related disciplines (such as linguistics, psycholinguistics, and the psychology of learning) try to define those language learning strategies which may lead to a successful development of L_2 competence.

Now, I think that there are only three such strategies. One of them can be described as prolonged, silent processing of meaningful input without making any utterances in the 'target language'. By dint of frequent repetition clear and stable mental representations of the particular language items are formed in the learner's cognitive structure. Owing to their clarity and stability, these mental representations are easily recalled by the learner and thus can be utilized for the performance of not only receptive but also productive tasks. In plain words, we acquire competence by listening to and reading comprehensible texts in the target language. Another basic strategy can be defined as developing competence through attempted communication in the L_2 . By his participation in communicative situations in which meanings have to be negotiated, the learner also generates a lot of input from his interlocutor. This input is particularly useful for learning purposes because it is directly related to the meanings that the learner wants to convey. In this way the learning of the L_2 system can be seen as a result or a by-product of attempted communication via this language. Finally, the third strategy can be described as a very gradual and controlled development of L_2 competence through the performance of

reconstructive tasks based on the imitation of language models. Speaking in practical terms, the learner following this strategy does not negotiate meaning and does not communicate his own ideas but gradually absorbs the particular language items and learns to combine them into novel utterances by the performance of tasks involving the reproduction, reconstruction, transformation and adaptation of various source texts.

It can be easily seen that these three strategies of learning correspond to three basic teaching strategies, assuming that we define teaching strategy as a globally conceived pedagogical procedure promoting a definite strategy we can also assume that these three teaching strategies, if only consistently and appropriately applied are successful by definition, i.e. must lead to the development of a competence in the target language. By using the term 'appropriately' I want to emphasize two very important things, namely, that none of these strategies can work equally successfully under all conditions and that none of them can be considered the best or better than the others in some absolute and abstract sense. The relative effectiveness and efficiency of each of them depends on two essential sets of variables, i.e. the set related to the learner and the set related to the context of language teaching.

Notwithstanding the fact that I may be wrong about the number or types of basic learning and teaching strategies, I think that only this kind of relativized approach is truly pedagogical and consistent with contemporary educational theory. This also explains why I consider as anti-pedagogical Krashen's tendency to reduce all language teaching to only one universal formula, that is, to the providing of comprehensible input. It is true that Krashen also seems to recommend learning by communicating, since this type of learning is largely promoted by the Natural Approach (Krashen and Terrell 1983), which he enthusiastically supports. Yet at the same time he rejects the view that two-way interaction is necessary for language acquisition, claiming that it is no more than helpful and that it only facilitates the acquisitional process (Krashen 1985: 33—4). Thus we can infer that the essential pedagogical value of the Natural Approach is seen by Krashen not in terms of providing the learners with the opportunity to communicate and to negotiate meaning but in skillfully providing comprehensible input in a low anxiety situation. Comparing Krashen's approach with the concept of three basic language teaching strategies, we see that the latter also involves the idea that we can successfully learn a language by receiving comprehensible input, but sees this possibility as only one of three and certainly not as the only one. Moreover, the concept of three strategies implies that the receptive strategy cannot be recommended for all types of learners and for all types of teaching contexts but that it may be fully efficient only with relation to certain more or less predictable configurations of learner and contextual variables.

Yet this does not end my argument supporting the claim that Krashen's

theory can be named anti-pedagogical. While presenting the three learning and teaching strategies, I pointed only to their most essential and characteristic features, which might give the impression that the receptive and communicative strategies do nothing else but try to replicate the natural acquisitional process in the classroom. This might in turn look like inconsistency in my reasoning since in the preceding pages I argued that the *raison d'être* of language pedagogy lies in the fact that it should try to do better than natural learning processes. Yet this inconsistency is only apparent since I assume that each of these two above-mentioned strategies should introduce certain pedagogical procedures whose purpose would be to improve on the natural processes and make them more efficient. Thus to make the receptive strategy more efficient and to better provide for transfer from the receptive to the productive skills, the teacher may introduce the explicit teaching of L_2 grammar with appropriately selected grammar exercises which do not require production. If, for some reason, the explicit teaching of grammar is not considered suitable for a given context, the teacher should at least train the learners to pay deliberate attention not only to the contents of the messages they listen to or read but also to the formal features of the target language, such as inflectional affixes, function words, word order, conventions of lexical co-occurrence etc. (this can be achieved through the application of some specifically designed exercises, not involving, however, any metalinguistic knowledge). This is essential since learners can successfully decode messages by applying the semantic strategy, which is based on using the meanings of content words and on a lot of anticipation and guessing, and thus can disregard these formal features, whose internalized knowledge is necessary, however, for the performance of productive tasks (for a description of the semantic and syntactic decoding strategies see Clark and Clark 1977: 57—85). It is not inappropriate at this point to mention that we already have some evidence indicating that merely receiving meaningful input, even in massive quantities and for a long time, does not automatically lead to the inclusion of all the basic structural features into the learner's productive repertoire. This evidence is provided by the well-known Canadian immersion programmes, also lavishly praised by Krashen as the perfect embodiment of his teaching principle. Some fairly recent studies have shown that while immersion learners indeed demonstrate superior comprehension skills, their level of productive accuracy is far below that characterizing native speakers even after some years of participation in the programme; some researchers even claim that learners emerging from several years of French or English immersion are not bilingual but speak their native language plus a defective classroom pidgin (Hammerly 1985: 31—34, Harley 1985). It seems that the introduction of the above-mentioned special pedagogical measures might to a large extent prevent these negative phenomena in language courses promoting the receptive way of learning.

Also the communicative strategy of teaching can make learning by communicating more efficient if some corrective pedagogical measures are introduced. For example, the systematic application of an indirect way of error correction known as 'expansion' in the literature on first language acquisition, seems to be an excellent pedagogical device, which not only provides a lot of valuable input but probably also contributes to an increase of accuracy in learners' utterances. For readers not familiar with this term let me add that expansion takes place when the teacher picks up the learner's erroneous or incomplete utterance and repeats the intended message in the correct form. That such special pedagogical devices may be useful has again been brought to our attention by some studies demonstrating that programmes emphasizing 'natural' communication may lead to the emergence of a highly inaccurate version of the target language, full of fossilized errors (Omaggio 1983).

It seems, then, that natural acquisitional strategies, when introduced wholesale into the classroom not only do not meet the requirements of maximum teaching efficiency but may also easily produce various unwanted and pedagogically harmful consequences. It is only logical to conclude that it is not the role of language pedagogy to either just faithfully imitate the natural learning process or to introduce procedures opposing it. The role of pedagogy can be rather seen as finding measures which can both best adapt the natural processes to the formal educational context and make them more efficient. I believe that we already know a fairly large number of such measures which have been associated with various successful language teaching methods and programmes and whose value has not been at all disconfirmed by the newest empirical studies and theoretical insights. I will now present some of these measures, which can be also regarded as some of the essential functions of language teaching (of course, only with reference to theoretical schemas which assign a more significant role to language pedagogy than Krashen does).

One of these traditional pedagogical functions refers to the programming of language courses, that is, to the construction of syllabuses, which is based on the principle of the selection and gradation of items to be taught. We can realize the importance of this function when we consider that the time allotted to language courses in formal educational settings is always strictly limited and has to be used very efficiently. Thus, in order to present the learner with at least the basics of the whole L_2 system it is necessary to have a teaching programme. It is particularly vital for receptive and reconstructive teaching, although in courses based on the communicative principle some kind of syllabus most probably also makes for greater effectiveness. From our point of view it is of relatively lesser importance what type of syllabus is adopted for a given course; whether it is, for example, a structural or a notional-functional one — it seems that most syllabus designers today try to incorporate aspects of both

linguistic and communicative competence and to correlate them in some way in their pedagogical programmes.

Another traditionally important function of language teaching can be described as the systematic provision of feedback related to the learner's performance of various receptive and productive tasks. It seems that systematically provided feedback may greatly facilitate and accelerate the process of hypothesis testing, even if we admit that a lot of hypothesis testing is input-based and takes place subconsciously. I am also convinced that the provision of feedback is indispensable if our learners are to achieve accuracy, and that it can help in this even within the communicative framework, in which fluency rather than accuracy is emphasized. The exact manner in which feedback should be provided depends on the teaching strategy and certainly should be consistent with it. Accordingly, within the receptive paradigm feedback is related to the various types of tests which assess learners' comprehension and their awareness of the formal features of the L_2 . In communicative teaching feedback has primarily the form of expansions. Under the reconstructive strategy, which strongly emphasizes accuracy, feedback is provided in the traditional form of error correction, with induced self-correction being probably the most recommendable technique.

Yet another way in which language pedagogy can help the learner involves deliberately teaching him to practise linguistic creativity by making novel utterances out of the elements that he has already absorbed. This is to me the core of the language learning process. I think that learning a large number of the building elements of the language in the form of lexical items, set phrases, patterns, and routine formulas and gaining the ability to combine them into novel utterances in accordance with the rules of grammar and the conventions of lexical co-occurrence is the most essential and the most difficult task for the learner, in comparison with which everything else is of relatively lesser importance. There are lots of very effective pedagogical techniques, particularly compatible with reconstructive teaching and learning, which can be used for the controlled practising of creativity, such as text adaptation and transformation, renarration, summary, retranslation etc. Some of these techniques form the cores of some very successful language teaching methods, such as the Berlitz Method, Dodson's (1972) Bilingual Method, and Henzel's (1978) Reproductive-Creative Method (which has been lately used experimentally for the teaching of Russian in Polish primary and secondary schools of the Kraków district in southern Poland and which has proved to be one of the most effective methods of language teaching in the school context).

Another important pedagogical function is related to the explicit teaching of L_2 grammar on the basis of metalinguistic terminology, pedagogical grammar rules and grammar exercises. It is true that this function is a matter of considerable controversy today and that many educators, including Krashen, support

the non-interface position, claiming that metalinguistic knowledge cannot be directly accessed and utilized in communicative tasks involving spontaneous production of utterances. I personally am of a different opinion and uphold the opposite position, known as the interface hypothesis, which is also in keeping with the tradition of good and effective language teaching and is supported by many contemporary educators and researchers (e.g. Bialystok and Fröhlich 1977; Stevick 1980 267—82; Sharwood-Smith 1981; Sorace 1985). But even Krashen and other scholars of a similar orientation agree that the explicit teaching of grammar can also be useful to a point and that it should be provided, at least for those learners who want it (Krashen 1985: 75—6). I also think that the weak interface position, which I would formulate as the claim that teaching grammar may be helpful in some limited way in the achievement of greater accuracy in speech production by some types of learners, would find the support of most educators and is a sufficient reason for considering instruction in grammar a worthwhile contribution of language pedagogy to the process of language learning.

Language pedagogy can also make learning more efficient by the introduction of specially designed teaching materials which can accelerate the process whereby the learner gains semantic experiences in the L_2 . This possibility is related to the fact that such materials may present a great number of language items in the form of, first of all, lexical units, phrases, collocations, routine formulas etc. referring to a certain theme or a certain fragment of reality within the framework of a single text. Thus a text of this kind in a condensed form presents the learner with many semantic experiences, the acquisition of which might require a relatively long time in the course of informal learning. I realize that such specially designed texts are not recommended by certain contemporary theorists, who claim that they often do not exhibit proper rhetorical structure and who insist on the exclusive use of authentic materials. Yet I strongly disagree with this kind of reasoning which confuses the end with the means, and which is, in fact, also deeply anti-pedagogical. I think that the learner may use all sorts of artificial devices in order to learn faster and that, although authentic texts certainly have to be introduced at some point, they do not have to and perhaps even should not be used exclusively in all the stages of the learning/teaching process.

Another function of language teaching which has been brought to the fore recently is related to the notion of strategic competence (Canale and Swain 1980), which can be defined as the learner's ability to flexibly use various problem-solving strategies, referred to in the literature as communication strategies, in order to overcome his linguistic inadequacy and to successfully get his message across. It is obvious that this ability can be very useful for the learner in a real-life communication situation, in which it will allow him to considerably extend his limited competence and to cope successfully with communica-

tion problems at hand. Since we already know something about which of these strategies are most helpful and achieve their purpose particularly well, the explicit training of our learners in the use of communication strategies of the achievement type might be particularly useful. This kind of training is compatible, first of all, with the notion of communicative teaching, but I think that also within the reconstructive framework a session devoted to the practising of communication strategies should be held from time to time. It has to be kept in mind, however, that this kind of practice does not directly contribute to the development of competence proper and can be regarded only as a preparation of the learner for an emergency situation and not as an essential learning experience.

Finally, the organization of remedial teaching can also be considered as an important function of language pedagogy. The need for remedial teaching arises very often because it often happens that we have a learner or a group of learners marked by some obvious linguistic inadequacy (such as, for example, bad pronunciation), which is rather incompatible with their overall proficiency level. Remedial teaching is particularly often necessary in language courses for so-called false beginners, that is, for learners who, although formally starting from scratch, have already been subjected to some kind of teaching and have acquired a lot of fossilized errors in the process. Without doubt the eradication of such errors, which is supposed to be effected by remedial teaching, is extremely difficult, and none of the existing recipes for it seems to be fully successful. The point is, however, that the eradication of fossilized errors continues to be an important acquisitional problem, which can be solved only within a formal educational framework.

The above list of pedagogical functions is by no means exhaustive; its aim is only to make the reader aware of the fact that the assignment of basically only one function to language pedagogy by Krashen is a gross oversimplification and disregards lots of ways in which for centuries language teachers have striven to help their learners in the difficult task of language learning. Certainly it can be taken for granted that providing meaningful input is also one of the most fundamental functions of language pedagogy since, as has already been said, there can be no acquisition without some prior exposure to the language. Yet I think that raising this function to the position of exclusive importance trivializes the whole idea and role of language education and makes it largely redundant.

Yet, in spite of its anti-pedagogical implications, Krashen's theory also contains some elements which make it worthy of consideration even by those who assign to language pedagogy a much greater role than Krashen does. As I see it, there are two such important elements. One of them is, after all, the emphasis put by the theory on the role of meaningful input in the process of language acquisition. Although, as I have just said, this role is rather obvious and taken

for granted, it is a fact of life that we often disregard very obvious things and tend to forget about them. Owing to Krashen's theorizing, certainly many contemporary educators and teachers have become aware of the principle that input must come first in language learning. I believe that this awareness will contribute positively to various solutions both in the sphere of theory and in day-to-day classroom teaching and that it will help to eliminate certain misapplications of the new methods and approaches. For example, teachers keen on the application of group work in the classroom as an important aspect of communicative teaching may sooner avoid the fault of pairing equally incompetent beginning learners and making them negotiate meaning in the L_2 , since they will realize that this procedure will not provide much useful input to either of them and thus has a very questionable value as a teaching technique.

Another pedagogically valuable aspect of Krashen's theory is related to his Monitor Model and to the underlying belief that the learned and the acquired systems are kept separate in the learner's mind so that there is no transfer of knowledge from the former system to the latter. I think that the analysis of this claim and of the evidence (albeit certainly not very convincing) supporting it, turns our attention to an extremely important psychological and educational problem. This problem has to do with the transfer of knowledge and skill from some learning situation in which this knowledge or skill seems to have been acquired, to a less controlled situation involving its application to a new task. The problem, actually, lies in the fact that very often this desired transfer does not take place. It is my belief that the successful solution of this problem, the overcoming of the transfer barrier, lies at the very heart of all effective teaching. It is also relevant to language pedagogy, and, particularly to the explicit teaching of the L_2 grammatical system. I am convinced that teaching grammar is often so ineffective precisely for the reason that teachers assume that the transfer of knowledge and skills gained in a grammar class to more or less spontaneous production tasks will occur automatically. Yet most often it does not, and I think that it is exactly in this area that the learner should be helped by some special pedagogical devices. It seems that the Monitor Model, by questioning the value of explicit teaching, can make us rethink the problem of transfer and look for more satisfying solutions in this area.

In conclusion of these remarks on the anti-pedagogical aspects of Krashen's theory I would like to emphasize that the fact that this theory has been formulated is altogether beneficial to language pedagogy. By challenging the value of language teaching procedures that have been developed over centuries and by questioning the indispensability of the language teaching profession, it should turn our attention to and make us more appreciative of our achievements in language teaching. I am convinced that, in spite of the pronouncements of some contemporary theorists who think that institutional language

teaching has only had a record of dismal failure, there exists in language pedagogy a tradition of good and efficient teaching and careful theorizing, which weighs the effects of various factors and does not blow up any single one out of proportion. In the era of changing winds and shifting sands, to use Marckwardt's (1975: 41—3) formulation, it is probably wise to take the long and informed view inspired by the accumulated experience of what has been best in the practice and theory of language teaching and not to be unduly alarmed by yet another hypothesis, however forcefully and convincingly formulated. Trying to help the reader to see it has been the main purpose of this paper.

REFERENCES

- Ausubel, David P. 1968. *Educational psychology: a cognitive view*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bialystok, E. and M. Fröhlich. 1978. "Aspects of second language learning in classroom settings". *Working papers on bilingualism* 13: 2—26.
- Canale, M. and M. Swain. 1980. "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing". *Applied Linguistics* 1: 1—47.
- Carroll, John B. 1974. "Learning theory for the classroom teacher". In Jarvis (ed.) 1974. 113—149.
- Carroll, John B. 1975. *The teaching of French as a foreign language in eight countries*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Clark, Herbert H. and Eve V. Clark. 1977. *Psychology and language: an introduction to psycholinguistics*. New York: Harcourt-Brace-Jovanovitch.
- Diller, Karl Conrad. 1971. *Generative grammar, structural linguistics, and language teaching*. Rowley Mass.: Newbury House.
- Dodson, C. J. 1972. [1967] *Language teaching and the bilingual method*. London: Pitman.
- Galperin, P. Ia. 1970. "An experimental study in the formation of mental actions". In Stones (ed.) 1970. 142—154.
- Hammerly, Hector. 1985. *An integrated theory of language teaching and its practical consequences*. Blaine, WA.: Second Language Publications.
- Harley, Birgit. 1985. "Second language proficiency and classroom treatment in early French immersion". Paper presented at the FIPLV/Eurocentres Symposium on Error in Foreign Language Learning. London, September.
- Henzel, Janusz. 1978. *Nauczanie języka rosyjskiego metodą reprodukcyjno-kreatywną*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe WSP.
- Jarvis, G. A. (ed.) 1974. *The challenge of communication*. ACTFL Review of foreign language education. Vol. 6. Skokie IL.: National Textbooks.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1981. *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1982. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, Stephen D. and Tracy D. Terrell. 1983. *The natural approach: language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1985. *The input hypothesis: issues and implications*. London and New York: Longman.

- Leontiev, Alexei A. 1981. *Psychology and the language learning process*. [Edited by C. V. James] Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Lewis, E. G. and C. E. Massad. 1975. *The teaching of English as a foreign language in ten countries*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Long, Michael H., 1983. "Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of research". *TESOL Quarterly* 17, 3: 359—382.
- Marckwardt, Albert H. 1975. "Changing winds and shifting sands". *English Teaching Forum. Special issue: The art of TESOL, Part 1*, 13: 41—43.
- Mason, C. 1971. "The relevance of intensive training in English as a foreign language for university students". *Language Learning* 21: 197—204.
- Omaggio, Alice C. 1983. "Methodology in transition: the new focus on proficiency". *Modern Language Journal* 67: 330—340.
- Palmer, Harold E. 1964. *The principles of language study*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Palmer, Harold E. and H. Vere Redman. 1969. *This language-learning business*. London: Oxford University Press.
- de Sauzé, Emile B. 1959. *The Cleveland plan for the teaching of modern languages with special reference to French: revised edition*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Xinston.
- Sharwood Smith, Michael. 1981. "Consciousness-raising and the second language learner". *Applied linguistics* 11, 2: 159—168.
- Sorace, Antonella. 1985. "Metalinguistic knowledge and language use in acquisition-poor environments". *Applied linguistics* 6, 3: 239—254.
- Stevick, Earl W. 1980. *Teaching languages: A way and ways*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Stones, E. 1970. *Readings in educational psychology: learning and teaching*. London: Methuen.
- Stevens, Peter. 1980. *Teaching English as an international language: from practice to principle*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Talyzina, N. 1970. "The stage theory of the formation of mental operations". In Stones (ed.) 1970. 155—162.
- Upshur, J. 1968. "Four experiments on the relation between foreign language teaching and learning". *Language Learning* 18: 111—124.
- Wygotski, L. S. 1971. *Wybrane prace psychologiczne*. [Transl. into Polish by E. Flesznerowa and J. Fleszner] Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.