

Does The Monitor Theory Provide An Adequate Model For The Second Language Classroom ?

(2)

The Utterance Initiator

Jackson Stewart

1. INTRODUCTION

Stephen Krashen's Monitor Theory claims that there is a fundamental difference between second language learning and second language acquisition, and that acquisition is more important than learning. A second claim of the Monitor Theory is that second language statements are initiated by the acquired system, and if there are insufficient acquired skills, the performer will fall back on his native language acquired skills to initiate a statement.

The Monitor, or conscious edited second language output, is generally viewed by Krashen as being a hindrance to natural communication, and therefore to be used in moderation. This anti-cognitive approach reveals an apparent preference for the oral-aural language experience which was prevalent during the behaviorist era. However, the Monitor is essentially a cognitive device, and its widespread use is explicitly recognized by Krashen

as belonging to many students' learning styles and personality traits. Thus the Monitor Theory incorporates elements of both behaviorist and transformational linguistics.

In the previous paper, the notion of an acquisition-learning distinction was examined in light of persistent child-adult differences, evidence obtained from analogy with surgical procedures, and the long-term effects of memory. Acquisition and learning can both be achieved through input, yet Krashen considers the basic goal of the classroom to be one of providing input for acquisition. The purpose of this paper will be to consider the relationship between the input and output aspects of the Monitor Theory, that is, whether second language statements are initiated by the acquired system. Conclusions of the first paper will not be used to substantiate tenets presented in this paper: for the time being the "acquired system" will be treated as separate and distinct from the "learned system".

In comparing input and output, one must remember that both acquisition and learning are *processes*, which result in competence, which is a *state*. If acquisition and learning are distinct, then competence must also consist of an acquired system and a learned system from which performance emanates. A study of competence and performance as they relate to both behaviorist and transformational linguistics will serve as preparatory material for the study of the utterance initiator. Since the acquired system user must focus on meaning rather than on form, it is also necessary to examine the role of meaning and form in the communication process.

2. COMPETENCE AND PERFORMANCE

If the classroom achieves its goal of providing intake for acquisition, and if the acquired system initiates statements in the second language, the degree of non-edited output should be proportional to the degree of comprehensible input.¹ The proportion which relates input to output can be thought

of as competence, which, according to the Monitor Theory, can be either learned or acquired. One of the fundamental questions to be asked in examining the Monitor Theory concerns the types of competence produced by acquisition and learning. What can be discovered, from the data obtained from performance, about the speaker's competence and how he arrived at such a state? There are two schools of thought concerning competence and performance.

The first school of thought is the behaviorist school, represented by the psychologist B.F. Skinner, the linguist Leonard Bloomfield, and their followers. The behaviorists believed that the variability of human conduct was due to the complex human nervous system, which responded according to earlier dealings with similar stimuli. They considered language to be the result of numerous cause and effect sequences, in other words, stimulus, response and reinforcement.²

Several aspects of the behaviorist approach are worth mentioning. First, the strict adherence to a stimulus-response mechanism indicates that the behaviorists considered language to be a learned, rather than innate behavior. This is consistent with the thinking of Edward Sapir, who said that "language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions, and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols."³ Second, the speaker's situation was the most likely stimulus for producing a statement, because the speaker could observe events within his situation better than anyone else.⁴ Finally, the mental processes of the speaker became known through his observable actions or statements.⁵ This emphasis upon observation was evident in Bloomfield's focus upon phonetics, the most observable aspect of human language. However, observation led the behaviorists to record among their data a number of irregularities and exceptions, which were difficult to explain by the

stimulus-response model.⁶

The difficulties encountered in the behaviorist approach led to the development of another school of thought, stemming from the work of Zellig Harris. Harris developed the notion of expansion of sentences into the concept of transformations. An *expansion* involves the change of a sentence, for example, "John worked," becomes "The King of England opened Parliament." A *transformation* is a restatement of an idea, expressed as affirmative, negative, interrogative, passive, imperative, etc. Harris's student, Noam Chomsky, realizing that the behaviorist model was unable to account for certain classes of data, sought to explain the exceptions therein by developing a new theory. In doing so, he hoped to combine in a single principle those characteristics of language which had previously required multiple explanations.

Chomsky defined a grammar as a device that enumerated all the permissible occurrences of the grammatical sequences of a language. He described this theoretical grammar in terms of the speaker's competence: "A grammar can be regarded as a theory of a language; it is *descriptively adequate* to the extent that it correctly describes the intrinsic competence of the idealized native speaker."⁷ Competence referred to "the ability of the idealized speaker-hearer to associate sounds and meanings strictly in accordance with the rules of his language."⁸ The system of rules of a language included three major components: the syntactic, phonological, and semantic components. The central idea of Chomsky's grammar was that the syntactic component contained a *transformational* subcomponent which repeatedly acted upon a deep structure (that determined semantic interpretation) to produce a surface structure (that determined phonological interpretation).⁹

One difference between transformational grammar and the behaviorist

model is that deep structure cannot be observed. Observation becomes possible only after the process of transformation has been completed and the surface structure has been realized. This points out a second difference, namely, that the behaviorist model depends upon performance to draw conclusions relating to the speaker's mental processes, while transformational grammar is concerned primarily with abstract, theoretical competence. Furthermore, the behaviorist model concentrates on real language users in concrete situations, whereas transformational grammar represents the ideal speaker-listener. Another difference is that the behaviorists regarded language as a skill to be learned, either as a child or as an adult; transformational grammar regards competence as innate, thus restricting language acquisition to the pre-adolescent period. Hence transformational grammar offers an explanation for the phenomenon of native language acquisition only, whereas the behaviorist mechanism of stimulus-response-reinforcement can account for either native language acquisition or second language learning.

It follows that a single application of the terms "competence" and "performance" to the behaviorist model and to transformational grammar can be misleading. Whereas Bloomfield was highly interested in performance, Chomsky maintained that performance did not lie within the theoretical framework of transformational grammar. Krashen, meanwhile, is primarily interested in whether performance utilizes the Monitor or the acquired system. Nonetheless, all three consider performance to be essentially the same, that is the overt verbal behavior of the speaker. This behavior has its basis in the underlying set of principles which establishes a correlation between meanings and sequences of sounds. Since these principles are viewed differently by Bloomfield, Chomsky and Krashen, it is necessary to clarify the term "competence" as it applies to each.

Chomsky referred to competence as a means of relating sounds and meanings in accordance with the rules of a language. Here, performance does not directly reflect the innate faculties of the speaker's mind, but rather a distorted view of the ideal sound-meaning relationship. Monitor Theory competence can be thought of as the proportion of output to intake, and can be equated with acquisition. Krashen says that "while intake builds acquisition, some fluency work [output] may be necessary to enable the performer to perform this competence in a workable way."¹⁰ Since the acquired system requires the performer to focus on meaning rather than on rules, Krashen's "competence" must differ fundamentally from Chomsky's rule-oriented, idealized, innate competence. The only similarity is that Krashen hypothesizes the existence of a child-like language acquisition device, which corresponds to Chomsky's innate characteristic of language acquisition. However, since this hypothesis has not been empirically verified, two alternatives are possible for the acquired competence of the Monitor Theory. First, as Chomsky points out, the speaker may not even be aware of the rules, or be able to be aware of them.¹¹ This leads to a pseudo-acquired system, in which the speaker focuses on form, however unconsciously. The second alternative is that acquired competence is a skill, similar to that of the behaviorist model. Although Bloomfield was not concerned with competence *per se*, he considered language to be a set of habits, or skills, to be learned. However, the learned system, according to Krashen, leads to the use of the Monitor, which stands in opposition to the acquired system.¹² The phenomenon of the "acquired skill" will be discussed further in the section on Form and Meaning.

A final clarification of terminology must be made before moving on to the next section. Krashen himself uses many terms to refer to the speaker's ability to perform second language skills. These include "achievement",

“proficiency”, and “competence”, used in a vague, almost interchangeable manner. Henceforth the term “competence” will be used to denote the ability of the second language performer to perform non-instinctive verbal skills (whether learned or acquired). Performance, therefore, is a direct indicator of the level of competence attained by the performer. The terms “pre-competent”, “imminently competent”, and “competent” will denote performers who have achieved increasingly higher levels of proficiency.

3. FORM AND MEANING

One of the conditions of successful Monitor use (hence, unsuccessful use of the acquired system) is that the performer focus on form rather than on meaning. However, Krashen's claim that the acquired system initiates statements requires the performer to focus on meaning, resulting in suppression of the Monitor. In order to understand the complex system of cognitive and affective factors which lead to the initiation of a statement, it is best to keep in mind the following aspects of the human communication system.

The communication process begins with the speaker's *intention*. The human biological system provides the neurological conditions which are necessary for formulating systems of mutually understood symbols, which combine to signify events. The *encoding* phase requires the speaker to use these symbols to convert his intention to a mentally represented message. The *production* phase occurs when the speaker utilizes his acoustic environment to convey the encoded message to the listener. The listener decodes the message from his understanding of the sign system, and thereby arrives at his interpretation of the meaning of the statement.¹³

The behaviorists viewed the communication process in light of the stimulus-response-reinforcement sequence. According to this view, the situation provided the stimulus which ultimately produced the statement. Although each form was considered to have a constant, specific meaning,

the behaviorists recognized that various situations could lead to the production of the same form. Similarly, among different speakers, the same situation could lead to varying forms. Since the situation could stimulate different forms for the speaker and for the listener, the speaker possibly would not succeed in communicating his intention.¹⁴

This brings up the issue of generalization in behaviorist communication. Each experience, which was unique and non-reproducible, had to be simplified and generalized in order to be communicated to other individuals with similar experiences. However, this very generalization limited the speaker's creativity. If a speaker became too creative in his use of language, he would violate the principles of generalization, and risk the breakdown of communication. Generalization was achieved by the use of form class words, such as common nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. However, some words, such as "atom", were not identifiable. The behaviorists believed that since science had not properly defined the word, it was impossible to use such a word as the basis for communication. At this point, observable data was preempted, and connotation had to supplement deficient denotation. The behaviorists concluded that the only rational alternative was to reject meaning in favor of purely objective description and explanation, based on observable data taken from the production phase.¹⁵

The behaviorists also found it necessary to consider the listener as part of the communication process. In addition to providing the speaker with an occasion to break his silence, the listener provided social approval or disapproval toward the speaker's statement. Thus the listener, acting as both stimulus and reinforcement, could influence not only the situational meaning of the speaker's statement, but also the form of that statement.¹⁶ This would be the case if the listener were to ask a "loaded" question, which

was phrased in such a way as to require the answer to contain a desired meaning, and also, as in many questions, required the answer to be of a corresponding form.

Transformational grammar views the communication process from a different vantage point than does the behaviorist model. Rather than stimulate the speaker toward a situation-dependent exchange of habits with the listener, transformational grammar allows the speaker to transform his meaning into a mutually understood surface structure which he communicates to the listener. The many irregularities in traditional structuralist grammars led Chomsky to explore the possibilities of a universal grammar, which would include those aspects of a language that can be found in all languages. He felt that a grammar could only account for a speaker's innate competence after being supplemented by a universal grammar, which accounted for the creative aspect and the regularities of a language.¹⁷ In the same way that a grammar is a theory of a language, a universal grammar is a theory of grammars, that is, it establishes a set of conditions that determine whether a grammar qualifies as a possible human language. Universal grammar has a goal of determining the nature of each component of a language (transformational, semantic, phonological), and specifying how they interact.¹⁸

Chomsky was careful to distinguish between universal grammar, which applies to all languages, and deep structure, which applies to one stage in the communication process of one particular language.¹⁹ He further distinguished between deep and surface structures, and the transformational relation between them. He stated that paired surface and deep structures, although they may be very similar or very different, relate to form and meaning.²⁰ However, since the message is affected by various non-linguistic cognitive factors, the manner of combination of the parts of a sentence contained in the surface structure is for the most part irrelevant to the

semantic interpretation. The grammatical relations contained in the deep structure determine the meaning of the sentence.²¹

To summarize, the behaviorists viewed the communication process according to their views of language learning. They considered language to be a non-innate system of observable habits which responded to the speaker's situation. For the behaviorists, problems of meaning arise in all three stages of the communication process. In the intention phase, the varying experience of speaker and listener creates a difficult condition for meaningful communication. In the encoding phase, generalization further reduces the number of possibilities for accurate communication. In the production phase, the listener molds and shapes the speaker's responses, altering his intention according to the stimulus-response-reinforcement model. Whereas the behaviorist model dissociates itself from meaning, transformational linguistics finds meaning contained in the deep structure of a language. If deep structure represents the intention phase of the communication process, transformation and surface structure represent the encoding and production phases, respectively. Thus a continuum is established which assigns a specific role to both meaning and form in the communication process.

The Monitor Theory hopes to align its acquired and learned systems with this meaning-and-form continuum. Such an alignment would predict that the acquired system is associated with deep structure and meaning, and that learning is associated with surface structure and form. The surface structure of a language contains grammatical morphemes which are usually presented to second language students in an order of increasing difficulty, especially in the audio-lingual (behaviorist) method. However, Krashen enumerates a series of skills which he claims are not learned, but acquired. He states that among children acquiring English as a first language, there

is a natural order for acquisition of grammatical morphemes, which is similar to the order found among children learning English as a second language. Evidence of a natural order in adults supposedly verifies the prevalence of the acquired system in second language performance.²² If the acquired system shows such a strong tendency toward formalization, it would appear to contradict the notion that the speaker focuses on meaning when using the acquired system. This also raises suspicions that the acquired system is more closely related to the learned system than the Monitor Theory allows. These suspicions are deepened when the role which formal operations plays in language acquisition is considered, that is, that adults rely more heavily upon conscious generalizations about language than children do. It is more probably true that instead of being aligned with the form-meaning continuum, acquisition and learning themselves comprise a continuum which acts in a perpendicular fashion upon the deep structure, transformation and surface structure to initiate a statement in the communication process.

4. THE UTTERANCE INITIATOR

What does Krashen mean when he refers to the “utterance initiator”? In light of the preceding discussions, the initiation of a statement could be any of the following: the speaker's *situation*, which acts upon him in such a way as to prompt him to speak; his *intention*, arrived at through his encounter with the situation; or the *listener*, who provides the speaker with a stimulus which requires a verbal response. Two of these, the situation and the listener, represent external forces acting upon the speaker, and are essentially beyond his control. Intention, however, is an internal factor which the speaker can manipulate, and is therefore a more likely candidate for the statement initiator.

It is also important to understand the meaning of statement initiation in

terms of the communication process. Is initiation limited to the speaker's intention, or does it extend into the encoding and production phases? Krashen suggests that not only the acquired system, but memorized routines and patterns, and even the speaker's native language surface structure can serve as the statement initiator, depending upon the competence of the speaker. Monitor Theory initiation therefore seems to be not so much the speaker's *intention* to speak, as his *ability* to speak.

Two conditions must be met in order for the acquired system to initiate a statement: the performer must focus on meaning, and he must have mastered enough of the second language form to feel confident in non-edited speech production. The emphasis upon meaning implies that the Monitor is to be excluded from the statement initiation stage and relegated to subsequent stages in the communication process. The highly competent performer might use the Monitor in the encoding phase at the earliest, but preferably during the production phase, and then only as a supplement to acquired usage. Consequently, the competent speaker's intention relates directly to the acquired system, which initiates the statement. However, the acquired system itself depends upon another condition, which is a fundamental precept of the Monitor Theory.

Krashen asserts that a process similar to that used by children in acquiring a first language is also available to adults.²³ Certainly, adults utilize an "acquired system" to initiate statements in their native language. If this carries over into second language performance, the speaker's innate competence will allow him to understand new expressions and to produce statements which are appropriate to each situation, using his acquired system.²⁴ The existence of child-adult differences, however, would preclude the notion of innate competence for second language speech production. The non-instinctive stimulus-response model could produce automatic

responses which resemble the acquired system. However, since each experience is unique, and must be generalized to a communicable form which is supplemented by connotation, this model fails to provide the focus on meaning which is necessary for the acquired system to act as the statement initiator. The competent speaker's mastery of form gives the appearance of his using the acquired system, while in fact he is using the learned system to initiate his statement.²⁵

Krashen claims that if the performer has not acquired enough of the target language to initiate a statement, he may replace the acquired system with memorized routines and patterns.²⁶ A *routine* is a memorized whole sentence, such as "How are you?" A *pattern* is partly memorized and partly creative, such as "This is a —." The following conditions must be present in order for routines and patterns to function as the statement initiator.

First, the performer must be unable to use the acquired system to initiate his statement. This means that he has not mastered enough second language form, or he is not focused on meaning, or both. Second, the performer must have mastered enough second language routines and patterns to enable him to initiate a statement. In this respect, competence includes mastery of forms larger than morphemes, which are situationally functional, but not acquired. The use of memorized routines and patterns therefore introduces a practical combination of meaning and form to facilitate early speech production, effectively sidestepping the acquired system as the statement initiator.

In the event that the performer has not acquired sufficient skills in the second language to initiate a statement, and he does not utilize memorized routines and patterns, Krashen offers another possibility, which allows the performer to fall back on his native language surface structure.²⁷ In this case, second language competence lies at the low end of the spectrum, and

the performer is more likely to focus on form than on meaning. External factors will play a more dominant role in statement initiation, enabling the performer to make extensive use of the Monitor in earlier phases of the communication process.

Use of the first language occurs when the speaker has not internalized enough second language form to produce a statement without editing. With the Monitor at work, the pre-competent performer will look to the situation or to the listener for help in initiating a statement. If the situation evokes a form which has not been mastered by the performer, it is possible that he will choose a native-language form as a substitute. Cognates or first-language vocabulary items with altered pronunciation are the most common forms used. Similarly, the listener might dictate the form for the speaker, as in the case of a question which requires a corresponding form in the answer.²⁸ The speaker may assume a passive role in the conversation and allow the listener to provide its momentum, but the balance is upset and eventually the conversation, if not enforced by the situation, will disintegrate. Krashen says that “the user of L1 surface structure plus the Monitor is severely limited in terms of the range of structures that can be produced as well as in fluency of performance.”²⁹

5. THE UTTERANCE INITIATOR AND THE FORMAL CLASSROOM

The Monitor Theory emphasizes communication, or meaningful interaction in the target language, as a requirement for acquisition.³⁰ If the acquired system is to initiate statements in the second language, the function of the classroom should be to develop the student's desire to communicate. However, the traditional classroom has maintained the goal of increasing knowledge of the overall structure of the target language, and developing skills through various techniques. The cross-over from classroom

exercise to meaningful communication, if it took place at all, was largely left to the student's initiative. Assuming that absolutes are more suitable to linguistic theory than to language classrooms, it would be wise to synthesize the behaviorist and transformational theories in order to arrive at an educational program of optimal efficiency. Such a program would possibly incorporate elements of formal systems and communicative competence as administered by the teacher, and development of performance by the student.

The Monitor Theory implies that the student's competence facilitates the use of the acquired system to initiate a statement. The role of the teacher would therefore seem to be to provide meaningful, comprehensible input to increase competence and thereby increase the likelihood of statement initiation by the acquired system. Since the student must possess a mastery of form to utilize the acquired system, the teacher must emphasize formal systems, employing both deductive and inductive techniques toward the end of imparting to the student the "acquired skills" discussed in Section 3. Universals in grammar, or linguistic qualities that are common to all languages, can be presented as abstractions of larger entities, although there may be no need to teach them, since they are naturally part of the student's mental capabilities.³¹ On the other hand, those qualities which are language specific must be taught inductively, that is, the entirety is constructed from study of the individual parts. This study should include skill development through oral practice and repetition, using exercises which are graded in order of difficulty. The aim of inductive learning is automatic speech production, which is the same as Skinner's habit formation. Although Krashen acknowledges evidence in favor of automatic speech developing into creative language use, he favors evidence which excludes routines and patterns from the acquired system.³² Here the dispute over

child-adult differences discussed in Section 4 becomes crucial to the validity of the Monitor Theory's claims. Whether pattern practice produces an acquired system or merely a facsimile thereof is a question to be discussed by the theorists. The classroom teacher, meanwhile, is concerned with developing the student's ability to convey both form and meaning. The second area of competence requires the teacher and student to leave the security of the textbook and venture into the uncertain territory of "meaningful interaction", or communication.

Mary Finocchiaro defines communicative competence as "the ability to use the language system appropriately in any circumstances."³³ The speaker's intention can be organized into functions, which attempt to do something, and notions, which attempt to convey meanings, depending on the elements in the situation and the topic being discussed.³⁴ Earl Stevick says that "language use... requires communication, and communication means the resolution of uncertainties."³⁵ These uncertainties are not those of the traditional classroom, in which the student is uncertain of the correct response to the teacher's question. This would equate error correction and the supplying of factual information with communication. Of course Stevick asserts that communicated information contains facts, but he organizes these facts over a continuum from least to most communicative. This continuum includes rote repetition; prescribed responses to teacher, tape or textbook; selection of a situationally appropriate response; and conversing freely about matters of genuine interest.³⁶ From this continuum it appears that communicative competence might develop concurrently with formal competence. However, a communicative syllabus encourages the student to communicate even in the early stages of language learning.³⁷ This poses a problem for adult language learners in that their command of formal structures is not adequate to communicate the complex ideas and

emotions which their adult intellect has experienced. The problem for the teacher becomes one of immense psychological proportions, of maintaining the adult's dignity in his greatly reduced capacity, of resolving the uncertainty of students who would like to depend on their textbooks or dictionaries, and of buoying what is, in effect, a "Monitor-free" environment.

6. CONCLUSION

The search for the nature of the statement initiator offers a few conclusions, while leaving many problems unsolved and questions unanswered. The Monitor Theory offers a convenient method for bridging the gap between the absolutes of transformational and behaviorist linguistics. One of its central components, meaningful communication, involves both internal and external factors: the human capacity for language consists of innate mental faculties which make use of the individual opportunities for acquisition and learning. Where the individual tends to create new forms, society forces him to generalize, placing restrictions upon the unlimited resources of human language, while enforcing communication. The classification of speakers into Monitor underusers, overusers, and optimal users effectively balances form and meaning, and renders them interdependent. Moreover, Krashen allows the optimal Monitor user to utilize conscious learning if it does not interfere with communication. Communication would appear to be best served by the acquired system, but it has been shown that the latter is really concerned with form rather than meaning. A close examination will show that the three possibilities of statement initiator offered by Krashen do not strictly correspond to deep structure, transformations, and surface structure, nor to the intention, encoding and production phases of the communication process. The notion of the acquired system acting as a statement initiator therefore seems to represent more of an ideal process than the down-to-earth "meaningful communication" which is necessary in

the Monitor Theory.

The implications for the second language classroom point to the development of competence, both formal and communicative, and performance as a means of initiating statements by the “acquired system”. The interaction between the cognitive and affective systems indicates that both acquisition and learning are necessary for the communication process to take place. The use of routines and patterns and the first language surface structure do not seem to be true statement initiators, but instead they are useful tools employed by less-than-competent speakers. Since the statement initiator lies in the intention phase of the communication process, and the use of the acquired system as statement initiator is dependent upon competence, the Monitor Theory falls short of providing an adequate model for the second language classroom in terms of statement initiation. However, its hybrid qualities of behaviorist and transformational linguistics provide useful insights into problems of language acquisition for the concerned second language teacher.

NOTES

- 1 Stephen D. Krashen, *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*, (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981), pp. 100-117.
- 2 B.F. Skinner, *Verbal Behavior*, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957), p. 81.
- 3 Edward Sapir, *Language*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1921), p. 8.
- 4 Leonard Bloomfield, *Language*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933), pp. 74-75.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p. 143.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 213.
- 7 Noam Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1965), p. 24.
- 8 Noam Chomsky, *Language and Mind*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1968), p. 116.
- 9 Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, p. 16.
- 10 Krashen, p. 110.
- 11 Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, p. 8.

- 12 Krashen, p. 21.
- 13 John B. Carroll, *The Study of Language*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 88.
- 14 Bloomfield, pp. 140-149.
- 15 Skinner, pp. 7-10.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 172.
- 17 Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, pp. 5-6.
- 18 Noam Chomsky, *Language and Responsibility*, (New York: Pantheon, 1977), pp. 180-181.
- 19 *Ibid.*, p. 183.
- 20 Chomsky, *Language and Mind*, p. 106.
- 21 Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, p. 162.
- 22 Krashen, p. 52.
- 23 *Ibid.*, p. 1.
- 24 Chomsky, *Language and Mind*, p. 100.
- 25 Krashen, p. 39, Footnote 3.
- 26 *Ibid.*, p. 111.
- 27 *Ibid.*, p. 67.
- 28 Wilga Rivers, *Teaching Foreign Languages in Schools*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 163.
- 29 Krashen, pp. 25-26.
- 30 *Ibid.*, p. 1.
- 31 James W. Ney, "Transformational Linguistics, Cognitive Psychology, and Teaching English as a Second Language," *Cross Currents*, IX, 1 (Spring, 1982), p. 45.
- 32 Krashen, pp. 87-99.
- 33 Mary Finocchiaro and Christopher Brumfit, *The Functional-Notional Approach*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 218.
- 34 *Ibid.*, pp. 13-15.
- 35 Earl W. Stevick, *Memory, Meaning and Method*, (Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1976), p. 33.
- 36 *Ibid.*, p. 43.
- 37 Finocchiaro and Brumfit, p. 18.