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Abstract

There are two theories currently circulating in the field of teaching foreign languages: language studying and language acquisition. Typical "language studying" consists in the traditional practice of direct teaching by the instructor who delivers information to and retrieves it from a student. "Language acquisition" is an educational system based on immersion in the language, often called a "whole language" approach to learning a language. These theories lead to different teaching methodologies, procedures, and outcomes. Teachers of foreign languages should develop and implement a theory that aids the students best in improving their fluency in all the language skills. Presently, the beneficial elements of certain procedures used in the methodologies typically associated with the language studying theory could be integrated into the language acquisition classroom. This integrated methodology would best be enacted through a rendition of Nancie Atwell's language workshop approach with its accompanying mini-lesson procedures; this theory-in-action is the most appropriate for language teaching. To prove this thesis, the writer has examined some methodologies, certain procedures of the two main theories, and discussed their assets and drawbacks. She has then explained how these assets can be integrated and implemented in the language workshop in a foreign language class. The writer has focused on the language teaching process particularly as it applies in Secondary Education, although the theory of acquisition lends itself to all levels of education.
Introduction

In my first year at Carroll College, I enrolled in a course of Beginning Spanish (SP101). The professor, Dr. Tomas Graman, taught the class in a mode quite unfamiliar to me at the time: the language acquisition mode. In this mode, the teacher and students engage in authentic communication using the target language of Spanish. I eventually adjusted to this new mode of learning a language.

However, my doubts regarding the validity of this mode soon started to surface. Although I was able to listen to and speak in Spanish, I became frustrated as I noticed that my reading and writing skills did not seem to be improving. I doubted whether or not the acquisition theory led to the best type of language education.

Since I knew I wanted to be a teacher, I wanted to ascertain what would be the best approach to teaching a language. I recalled my years of studying Latin and Spanish in high school, and I considered how strong my linguistic skills (particularly reading and writing) had been in those classes. I later realized that the teachers of those classes had been teaching in, what some theorists call, the language "banking" system (Freire, 1985; Graman, 1988). By this system, they daily fed the whole class a linguistic diet, primarily supplied by lectures about syntax. I had thoroughly enjoyed those years of linguistic study and hoped to learn other languages in a similar structure. Yet I also doubted if the banking theory would be the best form of teaching a foreign language.

From several theoretical and educational courses, as well as from individual interviews, I discovered more about the two theories of language banking and language acquisition. I hypothesized about what I could do as a teacher of languages: I would
incorporate both theories into my language classroom. I later discovered, however, that the two theories were diametrically opposed. I considered, though, that I could establish a methodology that would employ certain procedures typically associated with the banking theory. I would implement my methodology, however, within the context of a language acquisition classroom.

To establish my thesis, I discussed the language pedagogy with other students and teachers. I later attended a course in which Dr. Graman taught about the theories and methodologies of teaching foreign languages (FL400) and which primarily focused on the language acquisition theory. In my courses in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), I also discovered several methodologies that typically promoted the language banking system. It is from my TESOL Practicum project about those methodologies that I formally started my investigation about my thesis of incorporating the two theories. I did not want, however, to limit myself to one theory or to one methodology.

A phrase in Celce-Murcia's book clarifies my position about choosing only one methodology: "Adapt; don't adopt" (quoting Clifford Prator in Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 10). This adage emphasizes the point that it is better to use several different approaches rather than just one methodology. For example, I discovered that the Communicative Approach, although fairly well acclaimed, has drawbacks in itself. On the other hand, the Audiolingual Approach, which is greatly criticized today for its restrictive and repetitive qualities, can also easily complement the other approaches so that a plurality of approaches would result.
This idea is the same concept of *methodological pluralism* as described by Bowen, Madsen, and Hilferty (1985, p. 64). This concept involves the tendency to use several different methodologies throughout teaching, because "varying situations call for differing approaches. . . . [Thus] we are able to modify them without the trauma associated with changing or abandoning a method" (p. 65). Indeed, such a tendency to have methodological pluralism can aid the teacher in adjusting her methods so that she can address the various needs of the students. If the teacher thinks that the students need drills in pronunciation, then she can drill them! However, she should try not to become trapped into using a single methodology to develop their pronunciation; she should experiment with other approaches, too. Approaching the material differently can greatly enhance any teacher's class. The proponents of methodological pluralism encourage doing just that. Bowen, Madsen, and Hilferty (1985) also support the teacher's experimenting with new ideas:

 Related to this pluralism is a healthy tendency to accept practical and theoretically sound practices from any new methodology. There is a parallel in the bilingual movement's full acceptance of multilingual and multicultural backgrounds. Innovative methods, such as those reviewed in this chapter, are now seen and very likely will continue to be seen as valuable resources that can enable us to vitalize and refine our approach to language teaching. (p. 65)
A teacher should be, therefore, not only open to using many methodologies but also courageous in trying new ones. It is exciting to be a professional in the foreign language field because so many new approaches are developing. By keeping informed about new ideas, a teacher can discover how to teach her students more effectively. Flexibility is necessary in developing her own approach as well as in being able to adapt new ideas to improve her teaching skills. A teacher can better address the needs of her students by integrating several of the approaches described that follow. She can also add her own touch of creativity to enhance the students' language development.
Methodologies

There are many methodologies that have been available to those who teach foreign languages. The seven methodologies described below, however, seem to be the most well-known. Before trying to describe those methodologies, there are terms that require definitions within this field of thought. Marianne Celce-Murcia is a well-known writer and editor of collections dealing with language teaching (for example, Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language, 1991). She defines a methodology, or "an approach to language teaching," as being "something that reflects a certain model or research paradigm" (p. 5). In other words, a methodology is the teacher's implementation of her theory about language. When teaching under a particular methodology, a teacher uses certain methods and techniques. A method "is a set of procedures, i.e., a system that spells out rather precisely how to teach a language. . . . Methods are typically compatible with one (or sometimes two) approaches" (p. 5). A method involves the use of techniques. "A technique is a classroom device or activity. . . . Some techniques are widely used and found in many methods. . . ; however, some techniques are specific to or characteristic of a given method" (p. 5). So the techniques are used to implement a method according to an approach (methodology) that is based on a particular theory. A diagram may prove useful in illustrating the relationship between these concepts.

Language Theory --> Methodology/Approach --> Methods --> Techniques --> Student Learns

Diagram 1: The pedagogical elements leading to a student's learning.
The seven approaches described below are Grammar-Translation, the Direct Approach, Audiolinguism, the Humanistic Approach, the Communicative Approach, TPR (Total Physical Response), and the Natural Approach, as described by Celce-Murcia (1991) and Richards and Rodgers (1988), the latter authors also being noted writers about language methodologies. Each description indicates the general purpose of the approach, the use of the native language in the classroom, and some brief comments about its positive and negative characteristics.3

Grammar-Translation

In the late nineteenth century, German scholarship developed the Grammar-Translation methodology (Richards and Rodgers, 1988). This methodology was later called the "Prussian Method" in the United States (Richards and Rodgers, 1988, p. 3). According to Celce-Murcia (1991), this methodology was "an extension of the approach used to teach classical languages to the teaching of modern languages" (p. 6). Under this approach, a teacher uses4 the students' native language (L1) to instruct them. The focus of the lessons is on grammatical content which is taught deductively.5 Under the Grammar-Translation methodology, most lessons deal with reading and writing skills, aiming especially for accurate translation. Unfortunately, most students under the Grammar-Translation Approach are unable to speak in the target language (L2) by the end of the course because they have focused so much on written skills. However, the teacher does not necessarily have to speak fluently in L2. Some teachers see this factor as being advantageous, particularly those who have not developed fluency in L2 and, therefore, do
not feel confident with their verbal communication abilities in that language (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 6; Richards & Rodgers, 1988, pp. 3-5).

The Direct Approach

The Grammar-Translation methodology led to a Reform Movement that eventually resulted in the development of several new approaches, including the Direct Approach (Celce-Murcia, 1991; Richards & Rodgers, 1988). Those who created the Direct Approach tried to offer a methodology that would "produce learners who could use the foreign language they had been studying" (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 6). This methodology would not allow the teacher to speak in L1; lessons would be strictly given in L2. This change in methodologies led to a change in focus such that listening and speaking skills became primary to language development, and reading and writing were viewed as supplemental skills. The daily procedures under the Direct Approach include student dialogs of typical conversation in the target language. Grammar is taught inductively, but it is still considered a vital element to language development along with correct pronunciation. One aspect of the methodology that some people may consider a drawback is that the teacher has to be able to speak fluently in L2. Unfortunately, many foreign language teachers cannot speak the target language but can only teach about that language. Having to learn to speak a language can seem like an insurmountable task to such teachers and so they would tend not to teach under this methodology. The positive thing about this methodology is that the students should be able to produce verbally L2 by
the end of a beginning level course (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 6; Richards & Rodgers, 1988, pp. 3-13).

**Audiolinguism**

Celce-Murcia (1991) also described how, during the middle of the twentieth century, a new methodology developed: Audiolinguism. This methodology was primarily used for providing quick and efficient language training for military officers and foreign officials so they could communicate overseas. In this approach, the native language is used to teach the elements of the target language. The teacher focuses on accurate pronunciation and grammar in listening and speaking skills; the student will develop reading and writing skills later. A typical lesson involves several drills and dialog memorization with frequent error correction. Celce-Murcia (1991) also states that grammar is taught inductively in this approach. One negative aspect of Audiolinguism is that it limits the students' vocabulary in the beginning such that they can only use the phrases they have memorized. However, they are able to learn and to use these phrases fairly quickly due to the rigorous training (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 6; Richards & Rodgers, 1988, pp. 44-63).

**The Humanistic Approach**

From the Audiolinguism movement came a methodology that tended to give more "affective considerations" to the students. This methodology was called the "Community Language Learning" or "Affective-Humanistic Approach" (in this study, the
methodology has been called the "Humanistic Approach). This approach focuses on the importance of the student and his individual progress in language development. Lessons are taught in the target language and include group work and student interaction. Even though this approach may improve the student's self-esteem and self-realization, it does not always address the different learning styles. Some students desire more whole class lecture than this approach supplies. Their desires are probably the results of years of study under other methodologies that tend to teach to the "whole class" and not to show personal, devoted interest in each student. Fortunately, a Humanistic teacher aims to treat students as individuals and is attentive not only to their linguistic needs but also to their emotional needs as well (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 7; Richards & Rodgers, 1988, pp. 113-127).

The Communicative Approach

Similar to the Humanistic Approach is the "Communicative Approach" or "Communicative Language Teaching." The Communicative Approach views "language as communication" (Richards & Rodgers, 1988, p. 69), so the focus of a lesson would include all communication skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). The lesson is given in the target language but the native language can be used if necessary. Students can "often engage in role-play or dramatization to adjust their use of the target language to different social contexts" (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 8). Error correction is secondary to the communication between teacher and student and between student and student. This methodology, like the Humanistic Approach, does not always have as much whole class
lecturing as some students desire. Besides providing a safe learning atmosphere for trial and error, this methodology also allows the students to progress in language development by directly using the target language (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 8; Richards & Rodgers, 1988, pp. 64-86).

**TPR (Total Physical Response)**

There is one approach that can be included with practically any of the methodologies: Total Physical Response (TPR). This approach uses the target language to teach vocabulary of physical actions which the teacher models and the students mimic. The focus of this approach is on listening and speaking; reading and writing are usually introduced after some mastery in the other skills is attained. A typical lesson involves the teacher’s giving a command and acting out the response which the students are meant to follow; the actions are repeated until the students can give the correct physical response to the teacher's commands. Thus, one positive aspect of this approach is that a student can respond to verbal commands. The student is limited, however, in that he can only respond physically with little opportunity for exercising higher mental processes (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 26-28; Richards & Rodgers, 1988, pp. 87-97).

**The Natural Approach**

Another methodology which, like most of the approaches, can be combined with other methodologies is the Natural Approach. As Celce-Murcia (1991) states, the Natural Approach
respects the initial preproduction period, expecting speech to emerge not from artificial practice but from motivated language use, progressing from early single-word responses up to more and more coherent discourse. Interpersonal and personal negotiation of meaning rather than attention to grammatical correctness is fostered for an extended period, and the learning activities are designed for learner comfort and enjoyment. (p. 29)

Thus, the approach focuses on "negotiation of meaning" through listening and speaking skills. Reading and writing skills can be introduced at any time, but the former skills take precedence. A typical lesson usually involves a discussion about a topic with the students interacting regularly. If the teacher addresses several different topics in class, then at the end of the course, the student can communicate his opinions fairly well in the target language, having developed a well-rounded vocabulary. The greatest criticism of this methodology has been that "fossilization" can occur (that is, the student develops a habit from making the same error again and again) because the teacher gives so little attention to error correction (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p. 29; Richards & Rodgers, 1988, pp. 128-141).

Discussion

There are, as stated earlier, several other approaches to teaching languages. Supplied above are brief—by no means complete—descriptions about those methodologies that are probably the most well-known today. Even though the last four methodologies mentioned are fairly new and popular does not imply that the more traditional methodologies are not currently being implemented in many schools. In fact, the Berlitz
Method, which follows the Direct Approach, is still popular today. There are also several remnants from the earlier methodologies that still influence the way people teach today. Indeed, each of those methodologies is probably being used, to one degree or another, by many teachers.

There are, however, other new approaches that are developing, too. For instance, some people promote the idea that the best way to learn a language is to immerse oneself in the foreign country. The idea of immersing oneself in a foreign country—if this were a possibility—certainly sounds appealing, too. In many circumstances, however, immersion is not an option. For this reason, some teachers try to create an immersion-style classroom environment in which the students and the teacher communicate in the target language about ideas (and not about grammar) as one might while living in a foreign country (Sternfeld, 1988).

Other teachers and students prefer a more guided approach to developing strong structural knowledge. Such an approach would be especially appealing to concrete-random learners who prefer to study the linguistic elements in full and in traditional lecture format. To which methodologies a teacher adheres greatly depends on the teacher’s theories about language education. In remaining true to her linguistic theories, the teacher can also examine the methodologies presently available, and perhaps select one or create a new approach that can best aid the foreign language development of her students.
An Examination of Two Methodologies:

Audiolingualism and the Communicative Approach

To illustrate how revealing a careful study of methodologies can be, I have further examined two seemingly opposed approaches that were described earlier: Audiolingualism and the Communicative Approach. To clarify the distinctions between the two approaches, I have created separate procedures for a one-week unit plan, applying these methodologies to a specific class of students. The separate procedures help to distinguish the differences between the two theories.

The class is made up of four students in their twenties: one Taiwanese man, two Korean men, and a Korean woman. This particular course is given in the United States. Although somewhat proficient, the students are studying in a beginning level course of English and they need to develop all their communication skills. The students hope to enroll in regular classes at an American college. I have chosen to focus on their need to improve their writing skills.

Audiolingualism

If a teacher were to teach under Audiolingualism, her procedures would reflect that methodology. The Audiolingual procedures provided in the Appendix (pp. 72-88) include an introduction of the unit material and worksheets that focus on learning this material. A teacher using these Audiolingualist procedures would have to limit her class work to drills.
In following the procedures, the Audiolingualist teacher would explain to the students the concept (e.g., "Noun Use") and then have them repeat the information after her modeling. Since in the case provided she would be focusing on Writing skills, she would have the students complete some written work on hand-outs. She could supply them with various, related vocabulary words, their definitions, and perhaps some poetry (in this example, Tudor, 1944, pp. 78-79, p. 84; Æsop, 1968, p. 140) that related to the content studied. A “pure” Audiolingualist teacher, however, would tend to use only vocabulary words and phrases to be memorized by the students; she would rarely use anything as contextual as a story or a poem.

These procedures, of course, continue where previous instruction left off; in this case, the teacher has already introduced noun and verb use. However, according to the Audiolingual Approach, she would have to review the material constantly to ensure that the students retained the information. She would also provide the students with a review sheet, again re-reviewing the material of the past and present weeks. According to these procedures, on the last day of this unit, she would give the students a quiz to assess their accumulated knowledge of the material. She could also give out the weekend homework which, in this case scenario, involved applying their knowledge to a work of prose. In the homework, the teacher would expect the students to identify the nouns, verbs, and numbers within the prose and to define those words that were new to the students.
The Communicative Approach

A teacher under the Communicative Approach would have different procedures than those of Audiolingualism. The Communicative procedures (see Appendix A, pp. 89-103) allow the students to use the language on a more spontaneous basis than the Audiolingualist procedures. A teacher would have to orient her class such that there would be more student interaction and actual language experience.

According to the Communicative procedures, the teacher could encourage the students to participate by first asking about their weekend activities. Having already introduced the vocabulary of months and days, she could then ask them to respond to such questions as, "What is the first month of the year? What holidays are in this month?" Then she would introduce the material (poetry, in this case) that would give them experience in using the new (or reviewed) vocabulary in context. She could have them identify the parts of speech being studied (nouns, verbs, etc.) and then have students define those parts of speech to assess the students' understanding. She could have games that would necessitate clear pronunciation (like the "Poem Connection," p. 99) or reading skills to scan for definitions or pictures of terms (See procedural activities, pp. 89-91).

A Communicative teacher would also have the students write short research papers. The students would then peer edit the first drafts the next day in class. Eventually, the students would turn in a final draft of their written work after evaluating it individually and with each other. The teacher would then correct and grade the final draft.

Several authors have explained this process of writing in various textbooks (Scott,
Foresman, 1989; Raimes, 1983). They suggest that the writing process includes the prewriting, writing, revising, and presenting stages to produce a paper.

If the need arose, the Communicative teacher would also address particular syntactical or sociological questions (such as letting the students describe cultural differences) as they arose from student interests. The teacher, however, would tend to adhere to the scheduled procedures focusing on the daily objectives (for example, on sentence type, number use, and so forth). With this approach, the teacher would also use various materials and techniques to address the class topic. The teacher could also use other forms of media (radio, newspaper, and so on) rather than only addressing syntactical entities (as the Audiolingualist would primarily address). Knowing this element of the approach, the Communicative teacher could include other literary works to expand the students' knowledge of and interest in other linguistic elements, such as poetry. She could use, for example, nursery rhyme poems (Tudor, 1944, pp. 78-79, p. 84; Æsop, 1968, p. 140) and classical poetry such as "The Highwayman" (Noyes, 1983). She would include, thus, such works that could enhance the students' language development not only syntactically, but also artistically.

Discussion

The Audiolingual Approach, I discovered, seems fairly rigid and somewhat mundane (for both the teacher and the students). Even though a teacher could incorporate something interesting (like poetry) into the class, the new material would not necessarily enhance the approach's "flavor." Besides, it would be difficult for the teacher to continue
creating new worksheets for the students. As a matter of fact, I think my presentation of
the Audiolingual procedures is much less strict than a true Audiolingualist would tend to
create. I included poems which gave the vocabulary words a context, which
Audiolingualists do not always do (see Richards & Rodgers, 1988). An Audiolingualist
teacher would primarily tend to lecture about grammar to the whole class outside of the
contexts of literary compositions. I had a hard time coming up with drills that the students
could memorize. Since I particularly wanted to focus on writing skills in this unit, I
included the Audiolingualist format for teaching grammar parts. This format focuses on
lecturing about the elements of English grammar, which the students should be able to
identify before they would begin studying at an American college.

Part of my difficulty with Audiolingualism also lay in my unstructured knowledge
of grammar. I believe this difficulty is present for many people: one can write well but
might not be able to identify the particular parts of speech. Such people would not,
therefore, be able to identify the elements for their students. I was also disappointed with
the lack of student-student interaction. Even if the students had worked in groups to
complete the assignments, the student interaction would probably have been too restricted
not only by the structure of the class but also by their inability to communicate
spontaneously.

Aside from these problems, I found the task of creating the Audiolingual
procedures fairly simple. I organized the information into a short, memorizable format
and drilled the students. The assumption of Audiolingualism is that eventually students
would be able to recite the information as well as one might recite the alphabet. This
rigorous memorization would result in quick and blunt responses from the students. I
could then easily "attack" their responses--whether their responses were right or wrong--
with error correction. I could therefore evaluate my students fairly easily using the
Audiolingual Approach.

Although I used similar materials as those in the Audiolingual procedures, I had to
address the content differently under the Communicative Language Approach. I had to
encourage classroom interaction, and to motivate my students to produce L2 in both
written and oral language. Rather than limiting myself to lecture and drills, I tried to have
several varied activities to stimulate communication. Under this approach, I had to apply
the material to real-life needs: the students would have to be able to summarize a poem in
a literature class in college; they would have to learn the vocabulary about seasons and
months; they would have to be able to punctuate properly the different types of sentences;
etc. Such classroom objectives focus on having the students learn the language skills
necessary for communicating well in an academic setting (which can also be applied to
extra-curricular settings, such as reading the newspaper or visiting a restaurant).

Although the Communicative Approach led to lively activities and frequent
interaction between students, I think that it might be hard to grade a student's progress.
Even if a teacher graded him on the basis of his completing a task, how would she rank
those students who excelled in speaking but were behind in writing skills? Shouldn't she
give higher grades to the students who participate more than to those who remain fairly
silent? Or should she? The problem here is the subjectivity present in this approach. For
this reason, a Communicative teacher needs to pay close attention to her students'
individual needs and progress, and then grade them independently of others. The grades in this approach are not seen by teachers or students as competitive marks, but rather as supplementary acknowledgments of individual achievement. A teacher can, however, grade students according to their completion of a task (including their class participation) in such a way that the students can focus on fulfilling the objectives (such as completing the "Evaluation Sheet," p. 101).

I found the Communicative Approach fairly lenient to the students and also fairly "humanistic" (for example, I could easily address issues aside from academics in the class as the topics arose through student interests). As a Communicative teacher, I could easily see myself incorporating a portfolio assessment project instead of having a final test as I might as an Audiolingualist. I also discovered that the Communicative Approach enabled me to use more variety in my teaching techniques; I did not have to restrict myself to repeating drills. I certainly think that there is much more room for creativity with the Communicative Approach than with Audiolingualism.
Language Theories

The two methodologies just examined seem to have obvious differences. They have beneficial qualities as well as certain drawbacks. From such a brief investigation, the reader might presume that the two approaches come from two totally different fields of thought, from two different theories of language education. For one thing, the Communicative Method may be deemed "progressive" in that it is more student-centered; it focuses on the student's need to manipulate the language directly. Audiolingualism, on the other hand, is labeled "conservative" in that it is clearly more teacher-centered; the teacher dominates the educational experience by systematically monitoring students' exposure to new material. The reader might similarly classify the other methodologies, described earlier in this work, as being either progressive or conservative, student-centered or teacher-centered. With their apparent differences, one can easily see how they fall into different groups of methodological system.

However, are these methodologies really that different? They certainly have differences, but what about the theory underlying those methodologies? One must realize that a methodology is not sufficient for the reflective teacher, since the methodology is simply an approach to enact theories about language education. Whether consciously or unconsciously, a teacher forms theories about what language is, what language education should be, and how those theories can best be implemented in daily procedures. Some teachers create their theories after years of reflection on their experiences; others select certain methodologies without recognizing the underlying theories. Hence, if a teacher chooses to use any of the above methodologies without consciously selecting language
Language Banking

To use an analogy, perhaps one could first view the above methodologies as types of vegetables: thus, the progressive approaches could be in the bean family and the conservative approaches are in the carrot family. These methodologies have distinct "nutritious" values. Their values, however, aren't completely different because the methodologies come from the same theoretical group—vegetables. They are based upon similar assumptions about language, about language education, and about educational procedures. These assumptions are the foundations, the key, to a language theory.

Banking theories about language education

What is language to this "vegetable" group of educational theories? Language appears to be a governed system that students must learn. Standard grammatical rules govern this system. These standards are the prime ingredient for this "vegetable stew," this theory of language banking. Several theorists have described the banking system of education, primarily Paulo Freire (Freire, 1985; Shor & Freire, 1987; Graman, 1988). The theory is based upon the assumption that students must adhere to the standards of language in order to produce correct language as the teacher models it. A teacher feeds the students the standard rules through a certain methodology that she has chosen; the students must repeat—often regurgitate—this material by mimicking a model. Students
Language Education 27

memorize these standards while moving through the levels of education: beginning, intermediate, and advanced. The theory that language is a system produces these levels; in this way, a student must first study the most basic standard elements of a language before studying more advanced material. Language banking theories about education promote this linear form of language development.

According to most of the adherents of the methodological systems discussed above, education is an information system, too, that is structured by the teacher and received by the students. It is the teacher's duty to provide the correct information to the students. The teacher provides this information so that the students accumulate it in a sort of banking procedure. In this banking procedure, the teacher has put information into the student's memory to be retrieved when called upon by the teacher, often without personal interest or motivation on the student's part (Freire, 1985; Shor & Freire, 1987).

Language education in this banking system involves an input from the teacher (regarding standard rules of pronunciation, punctuation, word order, etc.), a receiver (the student), and an output from the student (expressed through written and/or oral communication). Learning, therefore, is said to take place accordingly as the student memorizes the standards of language. The banking system has also been called the language learning system (Graman, 1995); learning, in this sense, means studying (retrieval and output) of standard rules and regulations of the language. For this reason, the writer referred to the language banking theory earlier as "language studying." A student shows that he is learning when he correctly produces the standard use of mechanics (pronunciation, punctuation, word order), according to the stipulations of the teacher.
Banking theory educational goals

The teacher's purpose is primarily to provide the student with the mechanics of "correct" language. The teacher is like a fountain of information from which the students drink. The teacher siphons this water so that the class will not drown in too much information; rather the input is carefully and systematically regulated. The teacher also adheres to concepts of educational objectives, such as Bloom's taxonomy (Linn & Gronlund, 1995) that address the realms of knowledge, application, and evaluation. The objectives are easily identifiable and measurable (e.g., "The student can translate a short 'active-present tense' sentence from Spanish into correct English"). These objectives provide a basis for grading the students. If the student mistranslates a word, then the teacher could deduct a point from the grade. The grade, then, provides a system for indicating the student's abilities and what he has supposedly learned. If he manifests mastery of the objectives, then he can move on to the next class level.

The student's task, then, is to fulfill or to complete those objectives. After completing one objective, the student can move on to other higher level objectives. These objectives center on skill level goals. Language banking theorists have usually divided these levels into three plateaus: beginning, intermediate, and advanced. Often these levels have sub-divisions (e.g., low intermediate, high intermediate, and so on). Within a level, the teacher focuses on the four main skill goals that the student has to manifest by the end of the course: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. If a school chooses to separate the oral and written expression skills into different courses, then a student could study, for
example, written skills (reading and writing) at the intermediate level class and at the same
time study oral skills (listening and speaking) in an advanced level class (if he had passed
written and oral exams that would warrant such a placement). If a student can pass a
written exam manifesting his mastery of the specified beginning level goals (learner
outcomes), then he could move on to the intermediate level of written expression. The
teacher can then address in a particular course those skill areas in which the students need
improvement. Specific goals, therefore, not only aid the teacher in writing up specific skill
objectives, but also provide a method of placing the student in a particular level.

Banking theory classroom procedures

The present work has already provided discussion about the procedures for such a
banking-type class which is examined in Appendix A (pp. 71-103). With any of the seven
methodologies described earlier, a teacher could use, to some degree, this procedural
format to help her adhere to the objectives. A closer look at the procedures will further
illustrate the grouping for the banking-type classes. In the following chart, the T-->S
symbol indicates the teacher directs a comment to a student; S-->T indicates a student
directs a comment to a teacher; S-->S indicates that a student directs a comment to
another student; and S indicates independent work.
Methodology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Audiolingualism</th>
<th>Communicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T--&gt;S</td>
<td>15 times</td>
<td>7 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S--&gt;T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S--&gt;S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1: Grouping interactions according to banking theory methodologies.

Thus, the Audiolingual class has significantly more Teacher-to-Student interactions whereas the Communicative class has a greater distribution of T-S interaction, S-S interaction and S (independent student) work. On several occasions, the Communicative class also allows for more round-table grouping and interaction. Thus, on Day 1, Activity 1 (p. 89), there is a T-S and S-S grouping to facilitate discussion of weekend activities and, later, about the lesson's topic at hand. Normally, the teacher calls on different students to answer the questions; the reply is usually given to the teacher. The teacher can encourage the student to ask another student a question; this second student then supplies an answer to the teacher. This type of discussion takes place in the Communicative setting and is illustrated below:

Diagram 2: Typical Communicative discussion for the students and teacher.
Similarly, in the Audiolingual setting, classroom interaction proceeds from teacher to student, but no student intervenes in this linear fashion:

[T]-------[S]-------[T]-------[S]-------[T] (etc.)

Diagram 3: Typical Audiolingual discussion between a teacher and her students.

The students, in the Audiolingual discussion, only respond to the teacher's questions; they do not address questions to other students. A response, however, is meant to be heard by the teacher and by the whole class, presumably so that other students could learn from each student's response. With this presumed goal in mind, the teacher usually arranges the classroom seats into rows so that the students focus on the teacher, direct their responses primarily to her, and also hear the responses of other students. All these procedural elements lead to the concept of a "whole-class approach," which is typically associated with the banking theory.

This whole-class approach is compatible with any of the methodologies indicated earlier (including some of those not described among the seven above; e.g., Situational Language Teaching, among others). Indeed, these methodologies primarily stem from the assumption that language education is a system governed by the teacher who provides the class with opportunities to memorize and to manipulate the modeled information about standard language use. The manipulation of this knowledge usually involves completion of inflectional worksheets (e.g., conjugating an irregular verb in the future tense) or

Arguments concerning the banking theory

Sometimes students in certain whole-class approaches are responsible for creating dialogs. The teacher does not allow, however, the students to step out of the modeled guidelines to produce a thought-provoking, personal discussion. Most students restrict themselves to the modeled form, seldom deviating from it or composing anything that has authentic meaning. Instead of being authentic, the dialogs are stilted, contrived, or simply copied phrases from the text book. The students can memorize these dialogs and present them to the whole class. However, the transfer of knowledge developed from these dialogs is dubious. There is probably as much chance for a student to transfer what he has learned from one dialog to real life (tacit to enacted knowledge) as it is for an actress to use lines from a memorized script to talk with real people (it may happen occasionally, but this case would not be frequent or normal). This non-transferable aspect of "banked" knowledge (supposedly deposited from memorized dialogs or repeated modeling activities) is due to the fact that real conversations are constantly changing. Real conversation is spontaneous, not static like a memorized dialog.

Proponents of the whole-class approach seem to assume that whatever the teacher imparts to the class the students will learn. They also seem to assume that deductive study (i.e., of standard rules) will lead to correct language use, in both written and oral expression. However, are these assumptions valid? Couldn’t a student just memorize the
rules, apply them to the test, and then be granted admission to the next level? This promotion can easily be done even if the student has not yet mastered (acquired fluency of) the skills for that level. It seems, then, that the purpose of having these levels is really only to label the students and to give them a grade (based on whether or not they have been able to reproduce discrete bits of information at various times, and so completed the requirements for fulfilling the skill level goals).

Rather than entering the argument of whether or not grades are valid or necessary elements in education (see Kutz & Roskelly, 1991), one could notice that students rely too much on the teacher as being the only source of information (Freire, 1985). Seldom do students rely on their own thinking or intellectual discussions among peers (aside from social norms and gossip). So, too, very rarely in the banking classroom, does a student challenge a teacher's authority about the information presented--even if that information contradicts the student's beliefs or prior knowledge. This restraint could be due to the fact that the teacher wields the "power of the grading system," and a student's disagreement or question perceived as challenging her authority might lead to a lower grade. Aside from the grade's power to silence the students, however, the teacher also typically does not invite criticism or critical thinking in the whole-class setting. Thus, the banking system limits a student and the teacher to restricted input questions and output responses, for the purpose of reproducing the standard rules. For this reason, most banking systems do not contribute to a student's ability to transfer his linguistic knowledge to unrestricted circumstances (Kutz & Roskelly, 1991). Consider, for example, the following situation.
I have observed several English-as-a-Second-Language classes. In one of these classes, the teacher claimed (and her colleagues agreed) that she taught under the Communicative Approach. She did, however, use error correction quite frequently (recall that error correction is secondary in this approach). Over the period in which I observed this class, I did not notice much (if any) improvement in the students on account of their being corrected so often in class. For example, when a student said "I was not very expressed by him," the teacher replied, "'Impressed' not 'expressed.'" Yet later that week, that same student used "expressed" in the same way. This observation may seem quite isolated, but it illustrates the idea that correcting a student in that manner will not lead to a habit of using standard English. It shows that the student did not transfer his deductively-learned knowledge to his actual practice. Some people could attribute this lack of improvement to the student's laziness or disinterest, yet it could also reflect his fear of being corrected again, or it could simply be a part of the psychological process involved in learning a language.

The above case invites further discussion about the issue of error correction. In the banking system, teachers frequently correct the students in verbal and written work. Studies have shown that error correction not only inhibits students from taking chances or experimenting with the language, but also has little effect on student progress (Terrell, 1981; Graman, 1991). Another incidence from my observations of ESL classes illustrates how much the students become overly concerned with being corrected by the teacher and also with adhering to standards. The following interaction shows to some extent how the teacher's overcorrecting seemed to hinder a student from self-expression.
Student: He went to—ummm, by...?

Teacher: By.

Student: He went to—by—by his friend's car.

Teacher: He went in the car.

Student: He went in his friend's car....

The student seemed so intimidated and unsure of himself that he kept pausing to look at the teacher for reinforcement and assurance, thus inhibiting his ability to communicate.

The teacher also seemed overly concerned with the student's adherence to standards rather than to the actual message he was trying to relay. One should also consider the common practice among advanced level language students to write at the most basic level (that is, using the most simplified, and usually "easier," word order and tenses) in order to avoid the risk of trying more complex forms of language.

Thus far, the banking system seems an insufficient option for the teacher who really wants her students to learn a language. The banking system tends to limit the student's progress in the whole class setting because his development or practice of meaningful communication is minimal. The typical error correction that accompanies the banking system does not seem to aid in student progress either (Terrell, 1981). The banking system also seems overly concerned with grading according to a student's satisfactory completion of the learning outcomes, even if the manifestations of such completion are contrived or non-original. In other words, the linguistic manifestations do not originate from the student's own thought processes but from an objective and detached (impersonal) manipulation of the material. The students should be able, however, not only
to learn the language's rules, but also to acquire an ability to pursue active communication
skills in the target language. It is for this aim that some teachers of language have
developed the language acquisition theory.

Language Acquisition

In the previous section, I characterized the two methodologies—Audiolingual and
Communicative—as both belonging, despite their differences, to the vegetable group.
They are certainly different from the standpoint of having either modern or traditional
techniques. However, the theory that underlies both of those methodologies is
significantly different from the theory behind language acquisition (Kutz & Roskelly,
1991; Graman, 1995). The former theory, that of language studying, is based on the
banking system—from severe banking with teacher-domination (Audiolingual) to subtle
banking with more student-centered (Communicative) classes. I say "more student-
centered," but both classes still predominantly center on formulated teacher-student
interaction that has little creative or spontaneous (i.e., authentic) response, so much so
that students vegetate (in continuing our metaphor) in critical thinking skills. In other
words, students seldom use their knowledge critically, introspectively, or authentically.
Although the students may give more responses in the Communicative setting, these
responses are usually determined by the teacher beforehand. What commences in class,
then, is not really discussion but "pseudodialogue" (a contrived interaction in which
specific responses are expected to follow certain questions, as opposed to an authentic
conversation that is stimulated by open-ended questions and arguing) (Graman, 1991;
Language acquisition, on the other hand, is quite distinct from the theory of language banking. Language acquisition could be termed the **fruitful** family of language education.

**Acquisition theories about language education**

What is language according to this fruit group of educational theory? Language is a means of communication that has certain dialectic rules and certain standards (governed by adherents to certain dialects). In this sense, Received Standard English (RSE)\(^\text{14}\) is a dialect primarily of the educated people in society (Sheridan et al., 1993; Kutz & Roskelly, 1991). Other dialects, though, are just as valid for communicating and for teaching (Sheridan et al., 1993).

Education, according to this theory, is the formalized means by which a student can develop experience in the fields of knowledge. This experience enables a student to bear fruits of linguistic fluency. The teacher is responsible for coordinating the student's course of discovery and experience of language. The acquisition mode of education also emphasizes the concept of **ownership** and **risk** as being essential to learning. "Ownership" refers to the student's personal investment in the learning process; a student will devote more time and energy to a goal that he sees as being his own. In the acquisition classroom, the student's goal is primarily to communicate; standard rules are tertiary and usually learned inductively within the context of composing or articulating his ideas (Kutz & Roskelly, 1991). The student's "risk" in learning stems from his authentic attempts to communicate his own ideas (Strickland & Strickland, 1993; Graman, 1991, 1995; Satre,
1996). These attempts may or may not fulfill the prescriptions of the standard rules, but they are attempts nonetheless. These risks are said to lead eventually to fluency. Thus, the student gains knowledge about language through experience using that language, within an authentic context (Rincón, 1996; Satre, 1996).

This acquisition experience, then, often involves trial-and-error, the possibility of error being the risk the student has to take in order to learn. But the "errors" are not considered a negative aspect of the educational process; rather, errors are vital to learning because it is from the mistakes that the student can learn. The teacher, however, rarely addresses these errors directly. Hence, the students are free to make errors without fear of negative remarks. So, too, the teacher seldom provides positive reinforcement to students for following the prescribed standards. Thus, knowledge of the language is not deposited into the student’s brain by way of the banking procedure (teacher input, student output). Rather, the student acquires knowledge through direct experience of using the language to communicate personal ideas, that is, the act of engaging in meaningful, authentic conversation. In following this theory, language education focuses on enabling the student to experience the target language first-hand.

"Experience" here does not mean a formalized, deductive exposure to the standard components of the target language, as the banking theory prescribes. Rather, experience means the constant use of the target language at whatever degree of fluency the student has acquired. In the language acquisition classroom, therefore, the student experiences the target language in all forms of communication: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The student, however, does not study these skills separately, but as a whole,
integrated system of communication. For this reason, the now common term "whole language" logically applies to the acquisition process. The acquisition mode of language education thus presents the means for experiencing "whole language" and acquiring knowledge of the language system in a wholistic manner (Satre, 1996; Strickland & Strickland, 1993).

Adherents to language acquisition claim that one does not learn a language (i.e., grasp meanings and form linguistic habits) from memorization. Hence, the lessons in a language acquisition classroom focus on discussing ideas and not on memorizing the standard rules of language; these rules are acquired unconsciously through immersion (a classroom in which all members communicate only in the target language) (Sternfeld, 1988). Students are free to present their arguments about a topic at hand and to engage in meaningful (authentic) conversation without consciously focusing on grammatical rules. Focusing on grammatical rules would inhibit the student's progress. Such a focus would remove emphasis from the content or purpose of the message.

Acquisition theorists argue that many people today say so much, but little of what they say is meaningful. Language education is supposed to be a time for experimenting with meaningful language. The student must take risks to express himself and to understand others so he will learn, unconsciously, through experience.15

Acquisition theory educational goals

The teacher's function in this classroom based on the language acquisition theory may seem minimal, but it is simply less visible (Satré, 1996; Atwell, 1987). The teacher
still provides structure to the class, organizing the lesson plans and goals, and initiating and guiding discussion. She needs to come to class prepared with reading materials, writing assignments, and discussion topics. The assignments usually involve the students in arguing a belief or in summarizing texts they have read. The discussion does not revolve around grammar, unless a student directly asks a question relating to a particular concept of syntax. The discussion normally centers on a current, controversial topic. The teacher can provide relevant material to read (e.g., newspapers, periodicals, readings from a text about an issue) to establish the basis for discussion. Students then voice their opinions, suggestions, and questions about the topic at hand, debating it with members in the class. The purpose of the discussion is not for students to arrive at one specific answer, but for students to create logical arguments well supported by examples. The teacher is responsible for promoting a classroom atmosphere that is safe for the students to take risks and to engage in critical thinking. The task at hand is always to stimulate the process of thinking rather than to prescribe what to think (Rincón, 1996; Satre, 1996).

The student's duty in the acquisition classroom is to engage in communication with a willingness to take risks—without worrying about rules. Standard rules are important in certain contexts, but they are not the primary focus in the student's education. From this standpoint, the student must not hinder his progress by focusing on whether or not what he says is grammatically correct. Rather, he must support what he says. If other students do not understand a student's comments, then the members of the class can ask for clarification; clarifications are mainly necessary when a student does not logically support his ideas. One should note, however, that even in the early stages of
acquisition, misunderstanding is rarely due to syntactic errors since most people can ascertain what is being said.

Acquisition teachers have not, to my knowledge, strictly defined the acquisition stages through which a student progresses. If a school requires a breakdown of levels, then there can easily exist beginning, intermediate, and advanced courses that address the written and oral means of communication. However, these divisions in proficiency are not ideal. Acquisition teachers have argued that new students can actually benefit from the experienced students. Thus, rather than having everybody at the same level (as the banking system tends to place students who have manifested particular abilities), each student can learn from others who have varying degrees of proficiency.

To acquire fluency, the acquisition mode adherents tend to favor an immersion program over the traditional classroom setting. Foreign immersion, however, is not always possible. Even if a student is restricted to his native classroom, though, he can experience a type of immersion in the acquisition mode classroom whereby he communicates in the target language (Sternfeld, 1988). In the language acquisition course in the native country, the classroom itself is also supposed to be an environment similar to the foreign atmosphere that involves the need to use the target language. The basic need to communicate propels students more to take risks in expressing themselves. The teacher provides the opportunities for the students to express their ideas about a pertinent topic.

As he progresses in his abilities to express himself, instead of moving through specific skill levels, acquisition theorists claim that each student reaches pitons in his language development (Bamberger & Schön, 1983; Graman, 1995). These pitons are
the steps to fluency. They are numerous and varied, but the student must reach them in
order to go to the next step. The student reaches the pitons unconsciously; very seldom
does a student recognize a linguistic achievement at the moment of production. A student
notices these steps when looking back at his previous shortcomings and comparing them
with his present abilities. These steps can be compared to one who is learning to ride a
bicycle; once he learns, he doesn't unlearn (regress back to a past piton). He can
remember learning to ride alone for the first time, but the actual moment (from not being
able to balance to being able to balance) is forgotten, if it is even ever recognized. So,
too, lecturing to a child about how to balance is ineffectual. Rather, he must experience
the risks (what some would call the disequilibrium\(^{17}\)) to learn.

In language acquisition, the individual pitons in developing language fluency are so
numerous that it would take books to describe them. In a general sense, though, one
could describe the basic progress from an initial exposure to an established fluency. The
first step could thus involve the movement from a noise level to a recognition level: at
first exposure, the target language sounds like noise and the student cannot express
himself in that language. He eventually learns to recognize cognates (target language
words similar to certain native language words), sound patterns, and spelling
particularities. He then starts to experiment with these elements of language to express
himself, perhaps by simply producing words that mimic the sounds of the target language.

The next piton might be at a point in the student's education when he starts to
notice and use patterns of words. This step involves a conscious or unconscious
recognition of syntax. The student will use this tacit knowledge to express himself and to
grasp the meanings of others. At this point the student often—quite naturally—starts to generalize rules that he has learned experientially. It is the same type of piton a child is at when he says "I runned to the store" rather than "I ran to the store." Here he is generalizing the rule of "-ed" suffix for the past tense form. He eventually breaks this habit and uses the correct form of this irregular verb. Phrase structure rules and transformational grammar could easily elaborate on this developmental process through all syntactical rules, however, the present discussion does not lend itself to such a study.

In continuing the description of pitons, one should realize that if the immersion process is long enough and risk-filled enough, then the student will eventually attain fluency. Perfect fluency, however, requires a life time of experiential studying. For this reason, acquisition theorists do not focus very much on syntax. Perfect fluency, they claim, is not a realistic goal. The teacher should, therefore, focus on the content of the message being communicated. Since the student is not hindered by adherence to syntactical rules, he will more freely take risks. This freedom also motivates him to try to communicate and thus he tends to reach higher pitons in the acquisition setting. He can reach several pitons in the language classroom, but his rate of movement or degree of fluency are not important. The student, however, is the one responsible for motivating himself to progress through those pitons.

**Acquisition theory classroom procedures**

How does the language acquisition classroom provide the student with such opportunities? The possible procedures for a week of classes are presented in Appendix B
This class is geared for the same group of foreign students as described earlier (under the Audiolingual and Communicative Examination section) who want to learn English. Under the traditional labeling system, these students are at the beginning level. According to acquisition theory, however, the students have stepped beyond the initial phase and are actually capable of expressing themselves as needed. Their abilities probably result from the fact that the students are immersed in English while studying in the United States of America.

The acquisition techniques for teaching these students call for the classroom to be set up in a round-table fashion. This formation allows for open discussion among all members of the class, not just directly between teacher and pupil. However, this classroom arrangement does not necessarily lead to the acquisition mode. For example, I watched a video about different language class techniques and I noticed the poor interaction that took place between a teacher and her students despite the circular arrangement of desks. Even though the classroom was arranged in a circle, the teacher's method of teaching was still founded in a language banking theory manifested in that the students did not talk and that the teacher did not always speak in the target language. These elements directly oppose the acquisition theory. So, too, does the fact that the teacher limited class interaction and discussion by presenting a lecture about a particular topic for the whole class period. Whether it was a controversial, informative, or grammatical topic does not matter. Her procedures were clearly founded in certain elements of the banking theory. The progress of her students' language development was probably very minimal.
In a purely acquisition mode classroom, however, the teacher presents the topic and coordinates discussion. In this context, "coordinate" means that, if no one speaks, the teacher promotes discussion by asking questions and also keeps the conversation focused on the topic to avoid digressions. The teacher can also give the students the opportunity to coordinate the discussion as well. It does not matter who coordinates because the student can come away from class with an authentic experience of using the target language to discuss ideas. Students can also unconsciously glean standard syntactic concepts from this experience in the acquisition mode classroom. To enhance this experience, the grouping interaction in this classroom is predominantly spent in a T<-->S manner (in which the teacher and students are actively and authentically engaged in discussing a topic) (See Appendix B, pp. 104-109).

The arrangement of the acquisition classroom seats can facilitate class interaction. The grouping of these interactions are predominantly T-S-S-T, as opposed to the T-S-T banking interaction. The acquisition grouping indicates that the discussion can bounce back and forth spontaneously among all members of the class. As in a typical, informal conversation, the communication is reciprocal: the teacher speaks, a student responds; another student replies, and the teacher (or a student) may "jump in" to challenge an argument or to ask for clarifications. Another student can then question, another student answers, and the discussion continues in a similar but very spontaneous (i.e., authentic) manner. The teacher and students are thus engaged in an authentic dialogue. The arrows in the following diagram have double-tipped poles to indicate this spontaneous and reciprocated manner of communication.
Interaction between student and teacher, therefore, is not limited to direct questions and simple answers. Rather, students are encouraged to probe into the topic when interested, just as authentically as one might discuss a controversial topic around the dining room table (Atwell, 1987; Satre, 1996).

In contrast, the whole-class approach of the banking system does not invite discussion because the teacher primarily focuses on eliciting and assessing the student's adherence to language standards. Acquisition mode teachers, on the other hand, mostly focus on communicating with the target language. This direct experience of communicating in class thus leads to a more "natural" development of linguistic standards. The "standards," in this sense, mean the grammar rules in a distinct dialect, not just those rules specific to RSE. The grammar rules of every dialect are valid in the immersion classroom. Students are encouraged to communicate however they can and explain themselves as best as they can so that others in the class can understand. Language, therefore, is seen as a tool for expressing ideas. In the acquisition mode, students discover how best to use this tool in a "whole language" approach (Strickland & Strickland, 1993). Experiencing the fullness of language through actual experience leads to the eventual acquisition of the whole language, including syntax.
This whole language approach of the acquisition theory is not entirely compatible with the methodologies described above that are typically associated with the banking theory. Unfortunately, when selecting a certain methodology from those "available," a teacher does not always consider the actual theory behind that methodology. Thus, without careful reflection, she can restrict herself to the banking system. Whether focusing on the Audiolingual or Communicative or any method, she will construct lesson plans stemming from the methodology's underlying theory about language education. If a teacher has been taught under the banking system, then she will tend to teach under that system, too. This adherence follows the idea that teachers will teach as they have been taught.

Arguments concerning the acquisition theory

The acquisition theorists have also claimed that the banking system hinders the process of learning. Indeed, they say, this method inhibits the student from taking risks and experiencing the language personally. But is the so-called banking system that constraining? If a teacher has spent years studying what the students may be waiting to learn and now has this information within her, then why should she not share that knowledge directly? From this question arises the answer of need (Graman, 1995; Rincón, 1996; Satre, 1996). Certainly a personal, authentic desire to discover truth or to express oneself can spur a student to learn something. If he has this personal need to talk about something, a topic that could be controversial but relevant to his life, then the student will more earnestly engage in classroom discussion and complete his assignments
pertaining to the topic. If he needs to investigate a topic through different materials, then he will more likely discover and retain that knowledge. The learning, then, is authentic because it is motivated by the student's personal need and interest and not instilled by the teacher's objectives or by the threat of a grade.

Whether or not the grade is essential for a student's education (although it may spur some people to memorize more quickly), the grade is required by the present educational system. Grading remains difficult in the immersion classroom. A teacher can grade the student for his written and verbal fluency, but how can she rank a student (i.e., give him a grade) when an overall growth in fluency is the goal? This goal is less quantifiable than in a whole-class banking system, in which a teacher can easily rank a student based on how well he reproduces standard rules. The acquisition mode, thus, is significantly more difficult to grade. A language acquisition teacher can grade a student from his summative or argumentative essays, personal interviews in the target language, and observations of his experience in the classroom (this factor would include participation, completion of homework, and so on). However, since the acquisition mode involves subjective judgment (which can be challenged), the teacher can often be overwhelmed by the grading process.

Another concern arises from the fact that some students can be lax in their participation and work in a discussion-oriented classroom. It is for this reason that some teachers grade students both for participation and on effort. Grading these two elements is another one of the subjective tasks of the teacher. Another problem with this subjectivity is that, often in discussion-oriented classes, a teacher can easily become prone
to favoring students who support the teacher's viewpoints or reproduce her linguistic preferences. This phenomenon is another one of the drawbacks to subjective grading. The threat of a poor grade, though, at least motivates students enough so that they take the risk of experiencing the target language.

Besides the subjective element involved, some education theorists further argue against the acquisition process. They presume that habit formation, although it is natural, can reinforce particular grammatical idiosyncrasies (i.e., consistent errors in syntax). The proponents of the acquisition mode, on the other hand, argue that error correction does not lead to learning but is just another banking method. Students rarely acquire the specific correct form through error correction because they do not transfer that knowledge. Instead, students can become irritated by frequent correction. Error correction also directly contradicts the idea that a student learns through taking risks and communicating his ideas successfully with the target language. These risks do not include the risk of disapproval but rather the risk of experimentation: is what I'm saying possible, do they understand me? The "errors" will eventually decrease within the context of the immersion process. This decreasing is the same process by which a child eventually reaches a new piton in saying "I ran" instead of "I runned."

This process leads to the argument that there is no single correct language (Sheridan et al., 1993). Rather, there are several dialects that can be used for communicating. The received standard language can be used to produce formal discourses with adherents of that same dialect, but this dialect should not be forced upon
the student. If it were forced upon him, he would be more concerned with forms of
language and less with meaningful communication.

Many students, however, have experienced frustration when learning a language
under the acquisition mode. These students wanted to learn the received standard rules in
the same manner they had learned material in other classes. I have experienced this
frustration myself; I have also discussed this problem with other students experiencing
similar difficulties. For one thing, most students rarely have experienced the acquisition
mode; the majority of their other classes have been in the traditional banking mode. For
this reason, the students seem wary of acquiring a language unconsciously (i.e., through
experience and not through direct instruction). They want the specific facts about the
language so that they can feel confident that they are actually learning new material. Some
students prefer to have all the facts freely provided, which they can then easily reiterate--
after so many years of similar training-- or regurgitate in whatever form the teacher
requires. Such minded students tend to dislike the acquisition mode.

Some students also think they learn best through concrete manipulation of specific
parts of the language (noting linguistic patterns, charts of conjugations, etc.). Learning
these elements through direct instruction tends to give many students confidence in their
abilities; they feel confident when they can acknowledge what linguistic facts they have
stored in their memory. These students prefer the expected and traditional structure of
class, with lectures and tests rather than with discussions that lead to an unconscious
acquisition of language. In truth, the latter process can be unnerving, especially when it
demands students to participate actively and to add personal arguments to the discussion
at hand. The educational preferences of these students, however, should not be ignored. Many students feel they learn best (at least, most confidently) in the banking system, whereas some students feel at ease with the acquisition mode. It is important that the teacher addresses these different styles of learning.

In the acquisition mode, the students are also responsible for experiencing the answers, and for discovering more answers, instead of relying on the teacher for all the information as the banking theory implies (Freire, 1985). The teacher, then, even though she holds a position of authority, is also seen as a discussion coordinator or class overseer. As coordinator, she is more likely to invite critical thinking into the classroom. She, therefore, encourages students to voice disagreements, leading to an increase in knowledge and experience in communication. The student is not limited to an input-output system of lectured material; rather, the student has at his disposal the workings and standard rules discovered within an authentic conversation.

But how authentic is a conversation that is coordinated by the teacher? Indeed many students become frustrated when a teacher presents the topic for the day—why should they have to engage in a conversation dealing with a topic that perhaps they do not feel willing to address at the time? Yet because of the pertinent and active discussion occurring in class, a student may feel compelled to participate and voice his opinions.

Yet what about those students who are shy? Or those who are more hesitant to participate because of a fear of error correction, even though the teacher may not employ that traditional element in her teaching methods? Many students also attend language classes because of curriculum requirements. So what about those students, then, who did
not expect or want a discussion class that may touch on topics disagreeable or uncomfortable to themselves? Should a teacher grade a student based on his participation in a discussion about a topic he is not ready or willing to address? Proponents of the acquisition mode insist that participation is necessary, but also that, in remaining silent, a student is still experiencing the target language through other faculties, at least in listening, reading, and writing. Speaking, however, certainly fulfills more the purpose of the language education class.

Adherents to the acquisition mode also tend to think that there is little need to focus on such language standards at the earlier stages of language development. They argue that a baby when learning to speak is rarely corrected or forced to use standard speech. They also argue that correction does not lead to perfect fluency. The error correction, then, is done in vain. The process is slow, but the child will eventually communicate such that others can understand him sufficiently.

The arguments against this concept are plentiful. For one thing, as an adult, I should now be able to compare rules and to learn consciously more so than when I was a child. I've also already established myself as a fluent speaker. It stands to reason that, when learning a foreign language, I should be able to take a different, more formulated, path of learning than that of a child, namely, through direct instruction ("conscious study") of standard rules. I should also be able to apply the corrections given to me by a teacher to improve my linguistic skills directly. The adult student is certainly in a different stage of his language development than that of a child. He should thus be able to make positive use of direct instruction and error correction.18
Another difficulty with the natural acquisition theory is that certain mistakes in syntax or pronunciation may lead to stagnation (that is, habitually producing a linguistic mistake). In an elitist society (dominated by the educated elite), such habitual error can be socially detrimental to a person (Freire, 1985). Discrimination comes in many forms and particularly targets those who do not follow societal norms—linguistic norms included.

Another argument against acquisition is the fact that it veers too much away from memorization to form linguistic habits. Many students tend to feel more confident about their language abilities when they can rely on the standard rules they have learned through formalized drills (e.g., inflectional homework assignments). Memorization, therefore, should not be considered a negative aspect of learning a language. Rather, memorization can be an asset, especially when the curriculum requirements mandate a focus on the standards of a language (through formal research papers, formal letters, and so on).

Besides, teachers should not regard these standards with such cynicism: Man has a wonderful gift in being able to speak, and speaking can be no less wonderful when it is governed by the precepts of the received standard rules. Standard language has just as much beauty and expressiveness as any dialect. Since a certain dialect has been reserved or received as the common standard, then there seems little reason to reject that form or to let students communicate without regard for adherence to that standard. It is the free manipulation of those standards under which many of the great authors have created lasting compositions. Students learning those standards could learn to do the same.

In summary, the main arguments against the acquisition mode center on the problems of subjective grading. Grading based on participation can be affected by student
disinterest in the discussion or students who are too shy (or too lazy) to make an effort to communicate. Different learning styles can also deter people from participation in a classroom founded in the acquisition theory. People who are used to the banking system of receiving information about the prescribed standards of a language may become frustrated when faced with the acquisition mode of education that is based more on participation and authentic (personally invested) linguistic experience. Adherents to the acquisition mode seem to believe that the benefits of this mode far outweigh its negative aspects. If students are free to explore a language without relying entirely on teacher-supplied information, then the students tend to express themselves and to take risks in learning through this whole language experience.
Theory-in-Action:

The Workshop Approach to Teaching Foreign Languages

So what can a language teacher do since both the language banking theory and the language acquisition theory seem to have negative elements? Perhaps there could be some way of combining the beneficial elements of the two theories. The positive elements of language acquisition far outweigh its negative aspects. In language acquisition, the student actually communicates his own ideas, whereas in the banking theory, he usually just reproduces the teacher’s ideas (particularly about standard linguistic forms). Yet direct instruction as well as whole-class teaching, both being methods that are typically associated with the banking theory procedures, have beneficial elements, too, especially because they address different learning styles of the students and the need to address linguistic questions. Perhaps a teacher could somehow directly teach short lessons to the whole class as needed in the context of students’ interests while providing the majority of class time to use this knowledge actively, spontaneously, and authentically to acquire the language through an immersion experience.

In answer to my questions, I finally discovered Nancie Atwell’s Workshop Approach to learning which she describes in her book, *In the Middle* (1987). This approach provides short periods of direct instruction in "mini-lessons" followed by time for actual language use. It appears that her methodology incorporates direct instruction within the context of the language acquisition classroom. It is this approach that leads to the best form of, what I term, language theory-in-action. Atwell enacts her theories about language education by creating an environment conducive to language acquisition
while using techniques typically found in the procedures of the language banking theory, primarily direct instruction. Even though she is writing her book for native language arts classes, her methodologies could be applicable in a foreign language classes, too.

Atwell begins each class with a mini-lesson that covers a pertinent topic (logistics of the classroom, linguistic standards, literary genre, and so on) to be presented to the whole class. Students then seat themselves at separate stations in the classroom, places where they can write without being disturbed, consult with other students and with the teacher, research particular standard rules, or review completed works of other students to generate ideas for future works. The teacher's daily procedures include the beginning mini-lesson and then specific objectives for each student. During the workshop period, the teacher checks with the students to see how they are progressing and if they want or need help. At the end of class, a few students share with the whole class what they particularly learned or accomplished that day or if they request suggestions from the whole class (see the Workshop Procedures in Appendix C, pp. 112-114).

One could easily call this workshop approach the "apprenticeship-style" of learning a language. It was through apprenticeship that people in the past learned the skills (and standards) of a particular trade of work in the real world. The apprenticeship style is what constitutes the Workshop Approach as being a methodology of the language acquisition theory. The Workshop Approach, in this sense, is directly related to the concept that internships provide the student with an authentic learning experience. So, too, the student gets hands-on experience that an "actual" writer would have when
creating a piece of work. It seems logical that a student would learn more quickly through such direct experience of the material in this apprenticeship fashion.

"Experience" in this sense does not restrict itself to a manipulation of the input received from the teacher to mold a particular output, as the banking theory proposes. Instead, experience in the workshop approach also provides the student with material at his disposal to be used for his own motives and interests. He strives to write as a real author writes. He tries to communicate in the same way most people communicate. Sometimes the genre of communication is formal and can focus on research papers—if this is what the student is motivated by personal interest to compose. The student then takes the initiative to choose the genre and topic; and from there he can create an authentic piece of work.

The amount of time spent in the workshop for producing one particular composition can last from a couple days to a few weeks or more. After the student comes up with a topic and the genre for dealing with that topic, he starts writing and revising drafts. During the drafting phase, the teacher checks up on students. "How are things going?" she asks. The student takes the initiative to describe what problems he might be having and to seek the teacher's advice. The teacher summarizes the primary problem and asks how he might solve it. The student then provides a possible solution; if he is stumped for ideas, the teacher can suggest something. She then asks, "so what are you going to do now?" The student then indicates what course of action he will take next.

This consultation promotes critical thinking on the student's part to solve his own problems, with the teacher offering alternatives should an idea not seem feasible or
appropriate. After this consultation, the student commences with his solution. He then edits the work, with or without peers aiding in the editing. With peer editing, students who are more fluent in the target language can help those who have had less experience acquiring the language. After the revising (the student determines the extent of revising needed since he knows when the composition is complete), he can ask the teacher to edit it completely. After an "editing" conference and further revisions, the teacher receives the student’s final draft. Throughout this process, she did not have to spend time editing first, second, or later drafts of the student’s composition.

The work can then be placed in the student’s portfolio, from which a teacher assesses the student (i.e., determines an appropriate grade). The student’s work, however, is not simply given a grade. Rather, it is also to be presented to an audience: the whole class, peers (perhaps in a mini-lesson), relatives, school administrators, journal readers, political leaders—indeed, anyone to whom the student wants to present his message. This authentic audience motivates the student to write as well as possible. Thus, he gains valid (i.e., authentic) experience in the real world of communication.

In Atwell’s classroom, the teacher is also seen as a resource at the student’s disposal to enhance that learning experience. If the student has a particular problem, the teacher can inform him about possible solutions and avenues for discovering solutions. She can also direct the student to material that could complement his learning experience. Thus, if a student were unsure of his spelling abilities, the teacher could provide him with access to dictionaries and spelling lists. So, too, if the student had writer’s block, the teacher could direct him to a collection of other students’ writings to inspire him to write.
The workshop thus provides the student with all the materials he needs. The teacher establishes an environment such that the student can discover the answers for himself.

This discovery is partially accomplished through the learning centers. If a student has a personal desire to learn something, then he will invest his time in learning that material. He will also independently use his time and energy for something that he personally needs to know more than for something that is just a requirement for all students. The student can, therefore, claim ownership for the work he has created, founded by an authentic need to communicate as well as by his personal investment of time and risk-taking to learn to communicate in the target language. This ownership element is critical in the learning process. When such an element presides in the educational environment, the student tends to put more of his “all” into the work. If he can independently investigate different materials, then he will more likely discover and retain that knowledge because of the personal investment and ownership involved in the process.

As mentioned earlier, Atwell’s workshop aims to improve the student’s use of his native language. It would certainly be easier for a teacher to use the workshop approach to aid in native language development because the students would constantly be using the language. The workshop approach, however, focuses primarily on writing and reading skills with very little whole-class discussion or conversation. Yet students seem to learn a foreign language best when they actively use it in both written and oral form. For this reason, when foreign students come to America to learn English, they more quickly acquire fluency because they are immersed in the target language. The American English-
speaker, however, who attempts to learn a foreign language while studying within an English-speaking environment has more difficulty acquiring a foreign language. This difficulty arises from the fact that less than an hour each day is spent using the target language. Could the workshop approach be affective, then, in overcoming these difficulties?

If a teacher uses her time wisely, she can create an atmosphere that promotes use of the target language in all forms of communication. Thus, instead of focusing on writing or reading every day (as Atwell does), the teacher could easily focus on particular skills on alternating days of the week. For example, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday could involve discussions about a controversial topic (covering the listening and speaking skills); Tuesday and Thursday could then be devoted to written skills (reading and writing). Every day, of course, the students and teacher would be communicating in the target language, thus implementing the language acquisition theory.

And how do the received grammatical standards enter into the workshop? The teacher can certainly present occasional mini-lessons about grammatical entities as the need or concern arises. This way, if a teacher notices a particular error recurring in the students’ work, she can bring up the issue and present her mini-lesson. These mini-lessons, that don’t usually last more than ten minutes, can involve the methodologies described earlier in an abridged fashioned.

Contrary to the beliefs of what some language teachers might claim, then, a teacher can use some procedures used in the banking methodologies within an immersion classroom. With some manipulation this integration would be possible. In this manner,
the teacher can present a five minute mini-lesson about action verbs using TPR techniques. Or she can provide a short pronunciation drill using the Audiolingual Approach (she would, however, only speak in the target language). She could also have the students role-play a short scenario in which they enact a visit to a restaurant. The integration of methodological procedures generally associated with the banking theory within an acquisition classroom is thus possible.

The teacher can also have a student who has recently mastered a concept to direct the mini-lesson himself. This experience can prove invaluable to the student’s language development, to his confidence, and to the other students as well. The experience of teaching provides the student with a new experience with the material as well as giving the rest of the class a new resource for information: the peer! Peers are free to consult with one another on a regular basis: for revising work, discussing new ideas, and so on. Here, peer discussion is seen as an integral ingredient and an asset within the workshop.

How does error correction fit into the workshop? Besides an occasional mini-lesson on syntax, the teacher can also correct errors on written work. In this sense, she selects a few errors and then consults with the student about the mistakes during the editing conference. In this way, the teacher acts as the student’s final editor (similar to that of a newspaper editor). Her marks do not appear on the paper until after the student has gone through several drafts and revisions; he has already worked by himself primarily with some help from other students and with minimal consultation from the teacher. As with the language acquisition theory, though, oral communication within a round-table discussion would not warrant error correction; the message in this spontaneous form of
communication takes precedence. Error correction during a conversation does not seem to produce authentic communication. It is the student's linguistic experience in the immersion classroom, however, that leads to a transfer of the grammatical concept. In the workshop approach, therefore, the student can learn the target language not only from the immersion element of the acquisition theory but also with a little help from some of the direct teaching methods typically associated with the banking theory.
Conclusions

I think that the workshop approach with its mini-lessons can incorporate elements from both the language theories. This approach allows for a balanced diet of the two theories, which were termed earlier as "vegetables" and "fruits." In this sense, a teacher can choose what she likes, but she must remember the student's intellectual health: he needs vitamins and nutrition from both groups. He needs to "eat his vegetables" but also "savor the fruit."

Unfortunately, this integrated workshop approach, like the methodologies introduced earlier, can be implemented by a teacher who bases her teaching solely in the language banking theory. However, it does not have to be this way. A teacher should realize that the acquisition theory provides the basis in this integrated approach. To lose this authentic element of learning would be detrimental to the student's whole-language learning experience. Indeed, as explained above, the student does not learn unless there are elements of personal need and ownership within his education. Implementing the acquisition theory, a teacher would have to provide these critical elements.

I promote, therefore, the practice of teaching students through the workshop approach under the acquisition theory while intermittently supplying contextual mini-lessons that are pertinent to the students' needs. In this regards, the acquisition theory should be the predominant mode within the classroom since the mode provides the student with an authentic, whole-language experience. This approach is then supplemented by occasional mini-lessons and editing conferences that incorporate certain beneficial, procedural elements of direct and whole-class instruction; these elements have been
typically associated with the banking theory. This approach also addresses the different learning styles of the students. Presently, this workshop approach seems to be the best methodology that is most conducive to a student's learning a foreign language in the secondary classroom.
Endnotes

1 I use the term "foreign" rather than "second" language because "foreign" implies any new or unfamiliar language to be studied, whereas "second" implies that the student knows only one other language, when, in fact, he might know more than one.

2 In the context of this report, I use the feminine pronoun to refer to "teacher" and the masculine pronoun to refer to "student"; for example: The teacher motivates and guides her student. The student, for his part, tries to develop his language skills.

3 For further information and details about methodologies popular for teaching foreign languages, consult Celce-Murcia (1991) and Richards & Rodgers (1988).

4 It is important to note that all of these methodologies are currently being used by teachers. The description, therefore, defines the methodology in the present tense.

5 In deductive lessons, the teacher explicitly states the rules of grammar which the students are to memorize and to produce, while in inductive lessons, the teacher implicitly indicates the rules of grammar through practical, contextual experience.

6 For more information about learning styles, consult the works of Anthony F. Gregorc.

7 Despite the difficulty of the material's vocabulary, the teacher could easily use vocabulary skills in this case (e.g., defining terms before reading the poem in full, using contextual clues, and other methods).

8 "Methodology" and "approach" are thus interchangeable.

9 Any other methodology not found above can also use this procedural format.
10 Although the student may be responding to the first student's question, the second student is supplying an answer for the teacher's approval and not for the student's interest. As such, this type of dialogue is not "authentic"; it is not a real discussion prompted by true interest from the people involved.

11 The students can engage in a dialogue drill, in which case they repeat phrases to each other, but such "dialogue" is not a discussion but a memorized skit.

12 It is important to note that even a circular arrangement of desks can still involve a banking-type class. More on this idea follows below on page 44.

13 Thus, a teacher can correct a student on several accounts (verbal or written), yet the student continues the same act despite the negative reinforcement.

14 Some would argue that this acronym stands for "Reserved Speech for the Elite."

15 "Unconscious," in this context, refers to the idea that the student is not directly studying or (being acutely conscious of) memorizing the individual standard elements of grammar traditionally lectured by a teacher in the banking system.

16 Bamberger and Schöhn (1983) describe the "'piton effect,' like the process of pulling yourself up through your own power to a new position (and view) on a mountain" p. 67).

17 Disequilibrium is an imbalance, a state in which the student is faced with making choices and taking risks. This psychological state gives the student the opportunity to learn.
Even though acquisition theorists claim that children learn languages more rapidly than adults, the present study focuses on adult learning (that is, from junior high school through adulthood).

Bamberger and Schön's concept of "knowledge-in-action" (1983, p. 67), which refers to the transfer of tacit knowledge during a student's learning process, led me to this idea of theory-in-action as applied here to a teacher implementing her theories about language education. The term "theory-in-action" also appears in Karmiloff-Smith and Inhelder's article, "If You want to Get Ahead, Get a Theory" (1974-75, p. 196).
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Appendix A:

Language Banking Procedures
### PROCEDURES FOR AN AUDIOLINGUAL CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Problems?</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Start lesson reviewing nouns; have students complete Wk #1 aloud</td>
<td>T→S</td>
<td>Introduce topic; prepare for Wk #2</td>
<td>Worksheet (Wk. #1)</td>
<td>Oral and written; answer &quot;?s about nouns</td>
<td>S. don't remember noun use; remind them through repetition</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present topic of seasons, month, &amp; days. Read aloud, S. repeat/read</td>
<td>T→S</td>
<td>S. learn noun vocab. of seasons, months, and days</td>
<td>Wk. #2</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read aloud Wk. #2</td>
<td>S. can't pronounce words; T. repeats and S. mimic</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Present month poem; T. read, S. read; identify nouns in poem</td>
<td>T→S</td>
<td>S. read and identify nouns in context of poem</td>
<td>Wk. #3</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read poems and identify nouns (aloud &amp; writing)</td>
<td>S. can't identify nouns; review nouns, S. repeat</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Using Wk. #3; S. do for homework: put a box around all nouns and define these; underline the verbs</td>
<td>T→S</td>
<td>S. receives homework and instructions</td>
<td>Wk. #3</td>
<td>Oral; listen to and follow instructions</td>
<td>Ss. don't remember instructions; repeat, have them write them down</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROCEDURES FOR AN AUDIOLINGUAL CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Problems?</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Go over homework; review verbs on board, S. repeat aloud</td>
<td>T--&gt;S</td>
<td>Introduce topic, prepare for Wk #5</td>
<td>Blackboard</td>
<td>Oral and written; read blackboard notes aloud</td>
<td>S. don't remember verb use; remind them through repetition</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use Wk #4 to review verbs; S. read and give own examples</td>
<td>T--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. review verbs</td>
<td>Wk. #4</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read aloud Wk. #4</td>
<td>S. can't pronounce words; T. repeats and S. mimic</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Return to Wk. #3 and define nouns</td>
<td>T--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. read and identify nouns in context of poem.</td>
<td>Wk. #3</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read identify and define nouns (aloud &amp; writing)</td>
<td>S. doesn't have Wk. #3; bring extras to class or S. share</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. S. turn in Wk. #3 as homework; S. ask questions</td>
<td>T--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. receives homework and instructions</td>
<td>Wk. #5</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; listen to/read instructions</td>
<td>S. doesn't understand instructions; repeat</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROCEDURES FOR AN AUDIOLINGUAL CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Problems?</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Return Wk. #3 with corrections; go over pronunciation of vocabulary</td>
<td>T--&gt;S</td>
<td>Practice in focusing on pronunciation</td>
<td>Wk. #3</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. can't pronounce; model, S.</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present Wk. #5; review numbers; on Wk. #6, S. circle numbers, box nouns, underline verbs</td>
<td>T--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. review number use; practice counting</td>
<td>Wk. #5, Wk. #6</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read aloud Wk. #5 &amp; #6</td>
<td>S. can't pronounce words; T. repeats and S. mimic</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use Wk. #6 to identify sentence types (imperative, interrogative, declarative, exclamatory)</td>
<td>T--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. review sentence types</td>
<td>Wk. #6</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read poem and identify sentence types</td>
<td>S. can't identify sentence types; review, S. repeat</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Problems?</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| DAY 4
1. Give Wk. #7 to do in class; S. ask ?'s in class | S | Review week's lessons | Wk. #7 | Written; answer ?'s on Wk. #7 | S. doesn't know answer; give answers; drill | 30 min. |
| 2. S. go over Wk. #7 orally; T. reads answers, S. mimic | T->S | S. drill what they've learned; work on pronunciation | Wk. #7 | Oral & written; read aloud answers to Wk. #7 | S. can't pronounce words; T. repeats and S. mimic | 15 min. |
| 3. S. can ask questions about lesson | T->S | S. ask ?'s | Wk. #7 | Oral | S. don't have ?'s; ask them ?'s | 5 min. |
## DAY 5

1. Invite questions; then give quiz on week's lesson  
   - **S**: Check to see what the S. have learned and what they need to learn  
   - **Written**: S. can't read test; give help  
   - **30 min.**

2. Exchange tests and go over answers orally  
   - **T->S**: S. practice reading answers  
   - **Oral & written**: S. can't pronounce words; T. repeats and S. mimic  
   - **15 min.**

3. Give homework (read Aesop story, Wk #9; identify nouns, verbs, numbers, sentence types; define vocabulary)  
   - **S**: S. do work independently  
   - **Written**: S. can't identify nouns, verbs, numbers, sentence types; review homework next day  
   - **5 min.**
Worksheet #1
Noun Use

Noun: a person, a place, a thing, or an idea

Examples: boy, ocean, hammer, joy, __________
(give one example)

Singular nouns: boy, ocean, hammer, joy, __________

Plural nouns: boys, oceans, hammers, joys, __________

Not all nouns have plural forms:
  bread, peace, grammar, __________

Some nouns have different plural forms:
  deer--deer, ox--oxen, goose--geese, __________

Nouns agree with verbs in number:
The boy walks to the ocean.
The boys walk to the ocean.
Worksheet #2
Nouns: Seasons, Months, and Days

Seasons (write down the descriptions as I read them)
   Fall_______________________________________________
   Winter_____________________________________________
   Spring_____________________________________________
   Summer____________________________________________

Months (write down the characteristics and holidays as I read them)
   January ____________________________________________
   February____________________________________________
   March______________________________________________
   April_______________________________________________
   May_______________________________________________
   June ___________________________________________
   July_______________________________________________
   August____________________________________________
   September__________________________________________
   October____________________________________________
   November___________________________________________
   December____________________________________________

Days (write down what you did last week)
   Sunday______________________________________________
   Monday____________________________________________
   Tuesday____________________________________________
   Wednesday__________________________________________
   Thursday____________________________________________
   Friday______________________________________________
   Saturday____________________________________________
Worksheet #3
Noun: Poem
(Follow my directions)

January brings the snow,
Makes our feet and fingers glow.
February brings the rain,
Thaws the frozen lake again.
March brings breezes loud and shrill,
Stirs the dancing daffodil.
April brings the primrose sweet,
Scatters daisies at our feet.
May brings flocks of pretty lambs,
Skipping by their fleecy dams.
June brings tulips, lilies, roses,
Fills the children's hands with posies.
Hot July brings cooling showers,
Apricots and gillyfowers.
August brings the sheaves of corn,
Then the harvest home is borne.
Warm September brings the fruit,
Sportsmen then begin to shoot.
Fresh October brings the pheasant
Then to gather nuts is pleasant.
Dull November brings the blast,
Then the leaves are whirling fast.
Chill December brings the sleet,
Blazing fire and Christmas treat.
Verb: an action

Examples: to walk, to carry, to think, _________
(give one example)

Singular verb form:
walks, carries, thinks, ____________

Plural verb form:
walk, carry, think, ______________

Not all verbs have different forms:
put, have, ____________

"Be" changes in its forms
I am, you are, he is,
we are, they are

Verbs agree with nouns in number:
The boy sees the ocean.
The boys see the ocean.

Verbs have different tenses (times):
Present: The boys see the ocean.
Past: The boys saw the ocean.
Future: The boys will see the ocean.

Verbs make commands:
Look at the ocean.
Bring me the hammer.
Worksheet #5
Number Use

Numbers can be adjectives or nouns.
I have two hammers.
The boy has three.

"One" makes a noun singular:
She has one hammer. = She has a hammer.
All the other numbers make a noun plural:
We want two hammers.

1 = one
2 = two
3 = three
4 = four
5 = five
6 = six
7 = seven
8 = eight
9 = nine
10 = ten
11 = eleven
12 = twelve
13 = thirteen
14 = fourteen
15 = fifteen
16 = sixteen
17 = seventeen
18 = eighteen
19 = nineteen
20 = twenty

Use Arabic numbers to calculate:
1 + 2 = 3
5 - 1 = 4
5 x 2 = 10
6 ÷ 2 = 3

Use word numbers to write:
I will see two of the oceans.
Give me one hammer please.
Worksheet #6
Sentence Types

There are four sentence types.

**Declaratory**: states a fact.
I have two hammers.

**Imperative**: makes a command.
Give me one hammer please.

**Interrogative**: asks a question.
Does he have three hammers?

**Exclamatory**: makes a statement of surprise.
Wow! That's a lot of hammers!

One, two, buckle my shoe.
Three, four, shut the door.
Five, six, pick up sticks.
Seven, eight, lay them straight.
Nine, ten, what a fat hen!
Eleven, twelve, who will delve?
Thirteen, fourteen, maid's a-courting;
Fifteen, sixteen, maid's a-kissing;
Seventeen, eighteen, maid's a-waiting.
Nineteen, twenty, my stomach's empty.
Worksheet #7
Review Sheet

What is a noun? Give an example.
____________________________________

What are two examples of singular and plural nouns?
____________________________________
____________________________________

What is the plural of
deer?_______________________
ox?_______________________
goose?____________________
mouse?_____________________

How are nouns and verbs related? Give an example.
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________

What are the four seasons? Describe each.
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
____________________________________
List the months and their characteristics and holidays.

List the days of the week; for each day, write down what you will probably do next week.

Review the vocabulary from the month poem.
What is a verb? Give an example.

Write two sentences, one with a singular verb and one with a plural verb. Identify which is singular and which is plural.

List the three tenses of verbs. Write one sentence for each tense.

When is a number an adjective? When is it a noun?

Review the spellings of the numbers.

List the four sentence types. Write an example for each type.
Worksheet #8
Weekly Quiz
If you have questions, you may ask the teacher.

1. How are nouns and verbs related? Give two examples, one with a singular noun and one with a plural noun.


2. Write the singular or plural form for each noun.


3. Describe each of the four seasons.


4. In what season is
   January?_____________________
   May?________________________
   August?_____________________
5. What holiday is in February? ________________________________
    November? ________________________________
    December? ________________________________

6. What did you do on Saturday of last week?
    __________________________________________
    __________________________________________
    __________________________________________

7. What will you do next Monday?
    __________________________________________
    __________________________________________
    __________________________________________

8. What day is today?
    __________________________________________

9. Use a number in the two possible ways. Identify each way.
    __________________________________________
    __________________________________________

10. Using a sentence from this quiz, write an interrogative sentence:
    __________________________________________

    an imperative sentence:
    __________________________________________

    a declaratory sentence:
    __________________________________________
Worksheet #9

The Crow and the Pitcher

A crow perishing with thirst saw a pitcher, and hoping to find water, flew to it with delight. When he reached it, he discovered to his grief that it contained so little water that he could not possibly get at it. He tried everything he could think of to reach the water, but all his efforts were in vain. At last he collected as many stones as he could carry and dropped them one by one with his beak into the pitcher, until he brought the water within his reach and thus saved his life.

Necessity is the mother of invention.
### Procedures for a Communicative Language Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Problems?</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAY 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Discuss weekend; discuss season, months, &amp; days (write on board)</td>
<td>T→S,S→S</td>
<td>Introduce topic, S. learn noun vocab. of seasons, months, and days</td>
<td>Blackboard</td>
<td>Oral and written</td>
<td>S. don't volunteer to talk; have S. ask each other ?'s</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Introduce poetry; read selection (first, silently, then aloud, taking turns)</td>
<td>T→S,S</td>
<td>Exposure to poetry; practice reading</td>
<td>Wk. #1</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read aloud Wk. #1</td>
<td>S. can't pronounce words; T. or S. gives help if S. requests it</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S. identify nouns and verbs in poem in groups; define words together</td>
<td>T→S,S→S</td>
<td>S. read and identify nouns in context of poem</td>
<td>Wk. #1</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read poems and identify/define words (nouns) (aloud &amp; writing)</td>
<td>S. can't identify nouns; T/S helps S.</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. S. describe months for homework</td>
<td>T→S,S</td>
<td>S. receives homework and instructions</td>
<td>Wk. #1</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Ss. don't remember instructions; have them write them down</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Problems?</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Share homework, look for noun and verb agreement</td>
<td>S--&gt;S</td>
<td>Practice Noun Verb agreement editing</td>
<td>Wk. #2</td>
<td>Oral and written</td>
<td>S. don't remember noun/verb use; S help each other</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S--&gt;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Play game of poem connection (each S. reads next line)</td>
<td>S--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. are responsible to complete poem aloud together</td>
<td>Wk. #3 (cut in strips)</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read aloud Wk. #3</td>
<td>S. can't pronounce words; T/S help</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use pictures (realia) to describe nouns in poem, S. find in books, etc.</td>
<td>S--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. learn vocabulary through context and realia</td>
<td>Flower books, magazines, encyclopedias</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; find definitions &amp; pictures in books</td>
<td>S. can't use books; T. explains use of books</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S--&gt;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. S. research a month &amp; its holidays, flowers, activities, etc.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S. receives homework and instructions</td>
<td>Oral; listen to and follow instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ss. don't remember instructions; have them write them down</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROCEDURES FOR A COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Problems?</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAY 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Group work of sharing research report</td>
<td>S→S</td>
<td>Motivate S., help each other</td>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>Oral and written</td>
<td>S. don’t help each other; T or other S. helps</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. S. self &amp; peer edit, look for noun/verb agreement, etc.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S. practice editing skills</td>
<td>homework</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written</td>
<td>S. didn’t do homework; S. help each other even so</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discuss numbers &amp; sentence type; write examples; use poem; write definitions of unknown words</td>
<td>T→S</td>
<td>S. learns principle &amp; practices through writing and reading</td>
<td>Wk. #4 Wk. #5</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read poems and identify nouns (aloud &amp; writing)</td>
<td>S. can’t identify nouns; review nouns, S. repeat</td>
<td>19 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Homework is to turn in final draft of month essay</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S. receives homework and instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral; listen to and follow instructions</td>
<td>Ss. don’t remember instructions; have them write them down</td>
<td>1 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Problems?</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Collect essays, answer question's about Counting Poem</td>
<td>T---&gt;S</td>
<td>Wk. #4</td>
<td>Worksheet (Wk. #1)</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. don't ask question's; T. ask question's</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. S. Pairs read poem strips aloud while other S. TPR action</td>
<td>S--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. voice and act out vocabulary</td>
<td>Wk. #6</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read aloud lines and act</td>
<td>S. can't pronounce words; S. can help each other</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discuss rhyme &amp; pattern; teach summarizing skills</td>
<td>T---&gt;S</td>
<td>S. learn material; apply to poem</td>
<td>Wk. #6</td>
<td>Oral &amp; written; read poems and identify rhyme/pattern</td>
<td>S. can't identify rhyme; T/S. helps</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Homework: S. write essay summarizing poem or write own poem</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S. receives homework and instructions</td>
<td>Wk. #7</td>
<td>Oral; listen to and follow instructions</td>
<td>Ss. don't remember instructions; have them write them down</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROCEDURES FOR A COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Problems?</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. S. peer edit written work; ask ?'s to focus editing</td>
<td>S---&gt;S</td>
<td>Practice editing; communicate problems</td>
<td>Homework (Wk. #7)</td>
<td>Oral and written</td>
<td>S. don't edit; T. suggests what they should look for to correct</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. T. gives sheet to evaluate work; S. complete sheet ?'s</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S. focuses on particular elements for editing</td>
<td>Wk. #8</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>S. don't find mistakes; S. can trade essays</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. S. write final draft in class with Wk. #8; hand-in to T.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S. complete a work; help each other if needed</td>
<td>Wk. #8</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>S. writes messily; T. teaches penmanship skills now or later</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Homework: Read &amp; summarize Wk. #9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S. receives homework and instructions</td>
<td>Wk. #9</td>
<td>Oral; listen to and follow instructions</td>
<td>Ss. don't remember instructions; have them write them down</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet #1
Month Poem

January brings the snow,
Makes our feet and fingers glow.
February brings the rain,
Thaws the frozen lake again.
March brings breezes loud and shrill,
Stirs the dancing daffodil.
April brings the primrose sweet,
Scatters daisies at our feet.
May brings flocks of pretty lambs,
Skipping by their fleecy dams.
June brings tulips, lilies, roses,
Fills the children's hands with posies.
Hot July brings cooling showers,
Apricots and gillyflowers.
August brings the sheaves of corn,
Then the harvest home is borne.
Warm September brings the fruit,
Sportsmen then begin to shoot.
Fresh October brings the pheasant
Then to gather nuts is pleasant.
Dull November brings the blast,
Then the leaves are whirling fast.
Chill December brings the sleet,
Blazing fire and Christmas treat.
Worksheet #2
Nouns: Seasons, Months, and Days

Seasons
Fall __________________________________________________
Winter ________________________________________________
Spring ________________________________________________
Summer ______________________________________________

Months
January ______________________________________________
February _____________________________________________
March ________________________________________________
April _________________________________________________
May _________________________________________________
June _________________________________________________
July _________________________________________________
August ______________________________________________
September _____________________________________________
October ______________________________________________
November _____________________________________________
December _____________________________________________

Days (write down what you did last week)
Sunday ______________________________________________
Monday ______________________________________________
Tuesday ______________________________________________
Wednesday __________________________________________
Thursday ____________________________________________
Friday ______________________________________________
Saturday ____________________________________________
Worksheet #3
Poem Connection Game (cut poem lines into strips)

January brings the snow,
Makes our feet and fingers glow.
February brings the rain,
Thaws the frozen lake again.
March brings breezes loud and shrill,
Stirs the dancing daffodil.
April brings the primrose sweet,
Scatters daisies at our feet.
May brings flocks of pretty lambs,
Skipping by their fleecy dams.
June brings tulips, lilies, roses,
Fills the children's hands with posies.
Hot July brings cooling showers,
Apricots and gillyflowers.
August brings the sheaves of corn,
Then the harvest home is borne.
Warm September brings the fruit,
Sportsmen then begin to shoot.
Fresh October brings the pheasant
Then to gather nuts is pleasant.
Dull November brings the blast,
Then the leaves are whirling fast.
Chill December brings the sleet,
Blazing fire and Christmas treat.
Worksheet #4
Number Use

Numbers can be adjectives or nouns.
I have two hammers.
The boy has three.

"One" makes a noun singular:
She has one hammer. = She has a hammer.
All the other numbers make a noun plural:
We want two hammers.

1 = one
2 = two
3 = three
4 = four
5 = five
6 = six
7 = seven
8 = eight
9 = nine
10 = ten
11 = eleven
12 = twelve
13 = thirteen
14 = fourteen
15 = fifteen
16 = sixteen
17 = seventeen
18 = eighteen
19 = nineteen
20 = twenty

Use Arabic numbers to calculate:
1 + 2 = 3
5 - 1 = 4
5 x 2 = 10
6 ÷ 2 = 3

Use word numbers to write:
I will see two of the oceans.
Give me one hammer please.
Worksheet #5
Sentence Types

There are four sentence types.

**Declaratory**: states a fact.
I have two hammers.

**Imperative**: makes a command.
Give me one hammer please.

**Interrogative**: asks a question.
Does he have three hammers?

**Exclamatory**: makes a statement of surprise.
Wow! That's a lot of hammers!

One, two, buckle my shoe.
Three, four, shut the door.
Five, six, pick up sticks.
Seven, eight, lay them straight.
Nine, ten, what a fat hen!
Eleven, twelve, who will delve?
Thirteen, fourteen, maid's a-courting;
Fifteen, sixteen, maid's a-kissing;
Seventeen, eighteen, maid's a-waiting.
Nineteen, twenty, my stomach's empty.
Worksheet #6
Poem Connection
(cut poem lines into strips, give one to each pair)

One, two, buckle my shoe.
Three, four, shut the door.
Five, six, pick up sticks.
Seven, eight, lay them straight.
Nine, ten, what a fat hen!
Eleven, twelve, who will delve?
Thirteen, fourteen, maid's a-courting;
Fifteen, sixteen, maid's a-kissing;
Seventeen, eighteen, maid's a-waiting.
Nineteen, twenty, my stomach's empty.
Worksheet #7
Poem Summary

Directions: Read the poem below. Write a summary of the actions in the poem. Also state what is being counted. You may write on the back of this paper.

One, two, buckle my shoe.
Three, four, shut the door.
Five, six, pick up sticks.
Seven, eight, lay them straight.
Nine, ten, what a fat hen!
Eleven, twelve, who will delve?
Thirteen, fourteen, maid's a-courting;
Fifteen, sixteen, maid's a-kissing;
Seventeen, eighteen, maid's a-waiting.
Nineteen, twenty, my stomach's empty.

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
Worksheet #8
Evaluation Sheet

I will grade you according to your work. Check to see if you

1. Wrote complete sentences.

2. Have correct spellings of words.

3. Used proper punctuation
   Declaratory = . (period)
   Interrogative = ? (question mark)
   Exclamatory = ! (exclamation point)
   Imperative = . or !

4. Started each sentence with a capital letter.

5. Have noun and verb agreement (The boy walks. The boys walk.).

6. Used correct tense (past, present, or future).

7. Wrote your name at the top of the page.

8. Wrote the date at the top of the page (month/date/year).


10. Told what the numbers were counting in the poem.

Grade: _____

50
The wind was a torrent of darkness among the gusty trees,
The moon was a ghostly galleon tossed upon cloudy seas,
The road was a ribbon of moonlight over the purple moor,
And the highwayman came riding--
    Riding--riding--
The highwayman came riding, up to the old inn-door.

He'd a French cocked-hat on his forehead, a bunch of lace at his chin,
A coat of the claret velvet, and breeches of brown doe-skin;
They fitted with never a wrinkle: his boots were up to the thigh!
And he rode with a jewelled twinkle,
    His pistol butts a-twinkle,
His rapier hilt a-twinkle, under the jewelled sky.

Over the cobbles he clattered and clashed in the dark inn-yard,
And he tapped with his whip on the shutters, but all was locked and barred;
He whistled a tune to the window, and who should be waiting there
But the landlord's black-eyed daughter,
    Bess, the landlord's daughter,
Plaiting a dark red love-knot into her long black hair.
And dark in the dark old inn-yard, a stable-wicket creaked
Where Tim, the ostler, listened; his face was white and peaked;
His eyes were hollows of madness, his hair like mouldy hay,
But he loved the landlord's daughter,
    The landlord's red-lipped daughter;
Dumb as a dog he listened, and he heard the robber say--

"One kiss, my bonny sweetheart, I'm after a prize tonight,
But I shall be back with the yellow gold before the morning light;
yet, if they press me sharply, and harry me through the day,
Then look for me by moonlight,
    Watch for me by moonlight,
I'll come to thee by moonlight, though hell should bar the way."

He rose upright in the stirrups; he scarce could reach her hand,
But she loosened her hair i' the casement! His face burnt like a brand
As the black cascade of perfume came tumbling over his breast;
And he kissed its waves in the moonlight,
    (Oh, sweet black waves in the moonlight!)
Then he tugged at his reins in the moonlight, and galloped away to the West.
Appendix B:

Language Acquisition Procedures
# PROCEDURES FOR A LANGUAGE ACQUISITION CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Problems?</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. T. starts day by asking S. about weekend activities</td>
<td>T&lt;--&gt;S</td>
<td>Initiate student discussion</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. doesn't participate; ask S. questions</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. T. brings up topic (gun control); T and Ss. debate topic for the rest of the class</td>
<td>T&lt;--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. actively engages in a debate using the target language</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. asks grammatical question; T. gives short answer</td>
<td>40 min.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Homework: S. read articles in newspaper and bring a summary of what they read.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S. reads and summarizes written work</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>S. can't read text; T. suggests S. look for cognate words</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Problems?</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td>T&lt;--&gt;S</td>
<td>Initiate</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. doesn't participate; ask S. questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. T. collects summaries; T. asks how Ss. are doing; asks if there are questions about articles read</td>
<td></td>
<td>student discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 min.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Class continues discussion about gun control</td>
<td>T&lt;--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. actively engages in a debate using the target language</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. asks grammatical question; T. gives short answer</td>
<td>35 min.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Homework: Ss. read chapter in textbook about cultural differences regarding death penalty</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S. reads written work</td>
<td>Textbook written work about death penalty; Worksheet #1 (about text reading)</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>S. reads text too slowly; T. suggests that S. read faster (don't look up each word)</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROCEDURES FOR A LANGUAGE ACQUISITION CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Problems?</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. T. returns summaries; T. collects Worksheet #1; T. asks how Ss. are doing; asks if there are questions about text read</td>
<td>T&lt;--&gt;S</td>
<td>Initiate student discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. doesn't participate; ask S. questions</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. T. brings up topic of death penalty issues; T and Ss. debate topic for the rest of the class</td>
<td>T&lt;--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. actively engages in a debate using the target language</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. asks grammatical question; T. gives short answer</td>
<td>40 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Homework: S. are given take-home test to assess S. acquisition of grammatical concepts</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>To assess student progress</td>
<td>Take-home test (Worksheet #2)</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>S. can't complete test; T. will allow questions in class tomorrow</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Problems?</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 4 1. T. starts class by asking for questions about take-home test; explains points if necessary</td>
<td>T&lt;--&gt;S</td>
<td>Teach grammatical elements if S. request it</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. doesn’t ask questions; T. commences with discussion for the day</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. T. brings up topic (immigration laws); T and Ss. debate topic for the rest of the class</td>
<td>T&lt;--&gt;S</td>
<td>S. actively engages in a debate using the target language</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. doesn’t want to discuss topic; T. asks about S. interests to discuss another day</td>
<td>35 min.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No homework (Ss. are to complete the take-home test to turn in tomorrow)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>To assess S. progress</td>
<td>Take-home test (Worksheet #2)</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>S. can’t complete test; T. addresses questions of S.</td>
<td>0 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROCEDURES FOR A LANGUAGE ACQUISITION CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Problems?</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ss. turn in take-home test; T. asks about weekend plans</td>
<td>T&lt;---&gt;S</td>
<td>Initiate student discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. has questions about test; S. should turn in test anyway or discuss with professor outside of class</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. T. and Ss. discuss a new topic (educational system in U.S.)</td>
<td>T&lt;---&gt;S</td>
<td>S. actively engages in a debate using the target language</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>S. asks grammatical question; T. gives short answer</td>
<td>40 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Homework: Write a weekly journal entry</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S. writes in target language</td>
<td></td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>S. can't write; T. accepts what S. writes</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet #1
Exemplary Discussion Questions
(To be answered after reading a newspaper article about the death penalty)

1. What does the author believe about the death penalty? Give his reasons for why he argued that position.

2. What do you believe about the death penalty? Give reasons and examples that support your beliefs.

3. What alternatives or tactics could be used in place of the death penalty? Describe two such alternatives and state their positive and negative elements.
Worksheet #2
Exemplary Take-home Test

Directions: Circle one of the words within each parentheses that best applies in the sentence.

My brother Paul is going to study in Spain this year. He wants to visit Salamanca and Madrid. He prefers, however, (to attend, attending) a school in Sevilla. He thinks that he will (to enjoy, enjoy) his time best in Sevilla. He has heard that Sevilla (have, has) the best tourist spots.

Paul has invited (I, me) to go with (he, him). I have decided (to go, go). We will travel in Spain a month before his school (start, starts). We needed to decide what (to bring, bring) for our trip. I suggested that we (to bring, bring) sleeping bags and a tent so (we, us) could go camping during our trip. I also suggested other camping equipment, like hiking boots, cooking gear, and First Aid kits.

Paul, however, (don't, doesn't) want to go camping. He wants to go on tour. Even though (I, me) have reminded (he, him) that tours (is, are) expensive. He still (want, wants) to go on tour. He also wants to have an English-translator accompany (we, us) on the tour. I (don't doesn't) understand Paul, though, because he wants to get a degree in Spanish. I think (we, us) should just go by (ourself, ourselves) and then he can (to translate, translate) for me.
Appendix C:

Workshop Procedures
## PROCEDURES FOR A WORKSHOP CLASS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini-Lesson</td>
<td>Class logistics: Journals and homework for the week (5 min.)</td>
<td>Noun usage; use Worksheet #1 (5 min.)</td>
<td>Sara presents Mini-lesson (5 min.)</td>
<td>John presents Mini-lesson (5 min.)</td>
<td>Punctuation: commas and periods in monetary system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David T.</td>
<td>Leads discussion on gun control (35 min.); turns in article summary</td>
<td>Continues work on personal essay about guns</td>
<td>Participates in discussion</td>
<td>Turns in gun essay for teacher conference; reads during class</td>
<td>Participates in discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John K.</td>
<td>Participates in discussion</td>
<td>Editing Conference with Teacher</td>
<td>Participates in discussion</td>
<td>Mini-lesson about American numerical system</td>
<td>Leads discussion on immigration issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike K.</td>
<td>Participates in discussion</td>
<td>Draft 3 of essay about Christmas in Korea</td>
<td>Leads discussion on hijacking and terrorists (35)</td>
<td>Turns in final draft about Christmas in Korea</td>
<td>Participates in discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara K.</td>
<td>Participates in discussion</td>
<td>Editing Conference with Teacher</td>
<td>Mini-lesson about month poem</td>
<td>Starts First Draft on new topic (her pet cat)</td>
<td>Participates in discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-class activity</td>
<td>Write individually in journals (10 min)</td>
<td>Group Share: What did you work on in class? (5 min.)</td>
<td>Write individually in journals (10 min.)</td>
<td>Group Share: What did you work on in class? (5 min.)</td>
<td>Write individually in journals (10 min.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homework</td>
<td>Read newspaper or short story or ?</td>
<td>Read newspaper about terrorists</td>
<td>Read newspaper or short story or ?</td>
<td>Read article about immigration laws</td>
<td>Record weekly journal on audio cassette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language Education: 113
Worksheet #1
Noun Use

Noun: a person, a place, a thing, or an idea

Examples: boy, ocean, hammer, joy, __________
(give one example)

Singular nouns: boy, ocean, hammer, joy, __________

Plural nouns: boys, oceans, hammers, joys, __________

Not all nouns have plural forms:
bread, peace, grammar, __________

Some nouns have different plural forms:
deer--deer, ox--oxen, goose--geese, __________

Nouns agree with verbs in number:
The boy walks to the ocean.
The boys walk to the ocean.