UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE EDUCACIÓN

Enrique Guzmán y Valle

*Alma Máter del Magisterio Nacional*

FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES Y HUMANIDADES

Escuela Profesional de Lenguas Extranjeras



**MONOGRAFÍA**

**Linguistic Foundations of Language Teaching**

Examen de Suficiencia Profesional Res. N°0726-2018-D-FCSYH

Presentada por:

**Cáceres Estaña, Marlene**

Para optar al Título Profesional de Licenciado en Educación

Área Principal: Inglés

Área Secundaria: Español como Lengua Extranjera

Lima, Perú

2018

# MONOGRAFÍA

## Linguistic Foundations of Language Teaching

Designación de Jurado Resolución Nº 0726-2018-D-FCSYH

_____
Dr. Sánchez Quintana, Rogil
Presidente

_____
Dra. Lavado Rojas, Betty Marlene
Secretaria

_____
Dra. Zárate Aliaga, Edith Consuelo
Vocal

Línea de investigación: Metodologías y evaluación educativa

For my family: Angel, Amira, Roberto, Anita.

# Index of contents

## Introduction

The field of the language teaching has undergone many shifts and trends over the last few years. In acquiring a language that is not our mother tongue it is common to speak interchangeably about "second language" or "foreign language", however a distinction can be made between these two terms with an example. In the case of the English language we speak English as a Second Language (English as a second language ESL) when the medium in which the student lives is English-speaking, for example, people who learn English living in the United States or Canada. In our case we speak English as a Foreign Language (English as a foreign language EFL), because in the medium in which our students develop Spanish is the first language or mother tongue. It is important to emphasize that for the purposes of our investigation we will use the two terms interchangeably. There are around 6528 living languages in the world, which means that there is great linguistic and cultural diversity in the world. In addition, we know that a notable percentage of the world's population speaks more than one language, that is, it is bilingual or multilingual. Brown and Ogilvie (2006) state that "one in three individuals use two languages daily" (p .1). For Crystal (1997) "approximately two-thirds of children worldwide grow up in a bilingual environment, which leads them to become bilingual or multilingual as adults" (p. 17). Baker (2011) also states that "between half and two thirds of the universal population is bilingual or multilingual" (p. 66).

In the European context, in most countries it is mandatory that all students study two foreign languages for at least one year during compulsory education. Therefore, in today's global world, fluid communication in a second language and even more in several languages opens up a broad horizon of possibilities for a better quality of life.

Speaking English constitutes, today, an essential part of the integral formation of a person inserted in a world, our borders continually cross.

In the American context, the same phenomenon is happening, because current academic and personal training requires that an individual be able to interact with other societies to have access to knowledge development and the debate of ideas. In this way, you can confront their positions and define their insertion in the world.

Peruvian society has advanced in the understanding that speaking English allows us to be connected to the world and that it is a way to publicize our culture and defend our identity. It is the English teacher's job to communicate this to his students, so that in the difference of cultures the advantages of their own over the external one are enhanced and appreciated.

This work has been developed in the same direction of the lines afore mentioned. This work has been divided into seven chapters. Chapter I has to do with Linguistic Structuralism and the Audiolingual Method of Language Teaching. Chapter Two focuses on Generative linguistics and language teaching and Chapter Three develops Functional linguistics and language teaching. Also Chapter IV develops topics referred to pragmatics and language teaching. Chapter V has to do with Text Linguistics and Language Teaching to end with the development of linguistic foundations of the Communicative Language Teaching in Chapter VI. Finally, we develop the didactic application of the topic where we present a lesson plan about a point of the linguistic foundations of language teaching.

**Chapter I**

**Structural linguistics and the audiolingual method**

## 1.1 Structural linguistics

Prior to the advent of Structural linguistics there existed some linguistic schools such as the traditional linguistic ideas based on the tradition of language studies based on the study of grammar. Basically, those studied were referred to Latin and Greek grammars from the medieval times. Later with the discovery of the scientific method emerged the comparative grammar studies.

The oldest writings on language known to us today come from India. The inspiration for linguistic studies in India came from the need to preserve ritual texts from the Vedic period (1200-1000 BC). The best-known representative of Indian linguistics was Panini (5th century BC) who is known for his Sanskrit grammar (known as "Eight books"), particularly for his formulation of the rules of Sanskrit morphology. The work of Panini and of other Indian linguists became known in Europe at about 1800 and it made a deep impact on European linguistic studies.

The history of European linguistics begins in Greece. Pre-Socratic philosophers, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle made many observations on language but the recognition of

linguistic studies as a distinct part of philosophy was the work of the Stoics. They treated phonetics, grammar and etymology as separate areas of the descriptions of language. Their writings are known from the first grammar, *Technégrammatiké*, written by Dionysius of Thrax (170- 90 BC).

In the area of phonetics, the Greeks introduced the syllable as a structural unit. They also distinguished vowels and consonants and introduced further classification within the consonants.

The most valuable Greek observations were made in grammar. The Greeks identified the word as an isolable linguistic entity, they established word classes and worked out the necessary grammatical categories.

The Greek linguistic theory was absorbed by the Romans and Roman grammatical works became the basis of all education in later antiquity and in the Middle Ages.

In 1786 Sir William Jones of the East India Company read a paper to the Royal Asiatic Society in Calcutta in which he established the historical kinship of Sanskrit with Latin, Greek and the Germanic languages. In the first decade of the 19th century Sanskrit grammars were published by English authors.

During the 19th century, the development of comparative grammar and scientific historical linguistics. Three scholars are usually regarded as the founders of scientific historical linguistics: Rasmus Kristian Rask, Franz Bopp and Jacob Grimm.

A very influential and historically important figure in linguistics was August Schleicher (1821; 1868) who contributed to the progress of linguistic methods by his precise reconstructions. Schleicher's theory was in line with Darwinian ideas. He thought that language should be treated by the methods of natural science. In his view, Indo-European represented the undamaged stage in the history of language and following developments were part of the decline. The worst case of decline was English.

Synchronic linguistics as a theoretical discipline started in Germany roughly at the same time as the historical study of languages. The founder of the synchronic, analytic approach Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767; 1835) who did the historical study of languages developing its own methods and was recognized as an independent branch of research from its beginning, the synchronic study went through a long process before it established itself as equally important as the historical study.

The first half of the 20th century is influenced by De Saussure, who was the founder of structuralism. In the first part of his scientific career, he concentrated on Indo-European and later the problems of method and theory became predominant. He published little himself and his main work, *Cours de linguistique générale*, was published posthumously by his pupils.

### 1.1.1   Ferdinand de Saussure.

Saussure (1857; 1913) was born in Geneva, Switzerland. From a young age he learned Greek, French, German, English and Latin. After growing up in a family of scientists, he studied natural sciences at the University of Geneva. Subsequently, he trained in linguistics at the University of Leipzig, where he obtained a doctor degree in 1881. After this, he taught courses in ancient and modern languages in Paris, and in 1891 he returned to Geneva.

In his native city he served as professor of Sanskrit and historical linguistics. It was until the year 1906 when he taught the *General Linguistics* course, which guided much of his attention and that of other intellectuals to this day.

Ferdinand de Saussure developed the theory of signs that we knew as semiotics, as well as other aspects of the linguistic tradition. However, the impact of his work quickly moved to other fields of knowledge.

Along with other intellectuals of his time, Saussure provided many of the bases for the development of different approaches to human behavior.

Saussure realized that understanding of human practices and institutions cannot be complete if we reduce explanations about our behavior to a series of events that occur just like events in the physical world. This is because it considers that, unlike the systems of the physical world, the interaction and the objects that make up a human social system have meanings.

That is why, by studying the behavior of human beings, researchers cannot simply dismiss or omit the meanings that things and actions have for members of a society. For example, if people consider that some action is discourteous or impolite, this is a convention, a social fact crucial for social interaction and for individual practices. Thus, the linguistic sign has, for Saussure, two components: significant (the word) and meaning (the concept to which the word appeals).

Among other things, Saussure developed a general science of signs and sign systems (semiotics), as well as some of the bases of structuralism, a current that proposes that sociocultural systems are delimited by a key structure: language.

Especially this was relevant to the development of anthropology, modern linguistics and literary criticism, however, some decades later it also affects much of psychology and sociology. In general, it allowed to rethink the social sciences.

Saussure's proposals also clarified much of modern thought, that is, the way in which scientists, philosophers, artists or writers tried to represent and explain world phenomena.

His work opened the way to generate new paradigms of knowledge: the idea that the scientist cannot obtain an absolute knowledge, as if he were a god, but always chooses or assumes a perspective under which objects are defined by their relationships with other

elements of the same system (beyond that the objects have a fixed essence that can be discovered).

The way in which Saussure explains language allows us to focus attention on a problem that is central to the human sciences, especially for those who care about the relationship between language and the mind.

Saussure considers that humans are beings whose relations with the world are characterized by two mental operations that clearly manifest themselves in language: structuring and differentiation. Part of Saussure's thought is present in the consideration that there is a tendency of human beings to organize things in systems through which different meanings are transmitted.

### 1.1.2 Course in general linguistics.

De Saussure's formalization of the new science of structuralism was published posthumously by two of his students Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye as *Course in General Linguistics* in 1916. Their version of de Saussure's theories has predictably occasioned much interpretive disagreement. On the one hand, it is still a matter of debate whether the reconstructed text faithfully reproduces his thought (Malmberg, 1964). While on the other hand, there are passages which are obscure, confusing, and even contradictory (Holdcroft, 1991). Holenstein (1974) asserted that "Much of what Saussure proposed merely as a possibility, as a question, or in otherwise subtilized and differentiated form, appears as simple and definitive doctrine in the edition compiled by his students" (p. 25). However, his famous dichotomies are reasonably clear. As against the strictly historical or diachronic school of thinking in which artifact, shape, and descent were of paramount importance, de Saussure envisaged an indelibly synchronic science whose concern would

be biopsy - the study of the responsive, systematic natures of living languages - rather than autopsy.

### *1.1.2.1 Parole.*

This synchronic approach is immediately subsumed within an overarching domain of sign- relations, or semiology which had been another latent predilection of nineteenth century scholarship. From this vantage point, every natural language is a system of cognitive signals first coordinated in the mind and then emitted vocally. The signaling matrix in the mind, de Saussure called *le langage* - the superordinate term of the CGL and correctly understood as the human faculty of speech/communication. *Langage* is disassembled into three primary categories and consequently studied from either a diachronic, phonetic, or phonemic perspective (Lane, 1970). The historical or diachronic study of *langage* was the perspective of the philologists away from which de Saussure was moving. The phonetic approach directs the linguist towards in *parole* or "speech" and it is the psych-physical study of the structure of an individual language (Course in General Linguistics [CGL], 1988). The protean sum of daily utterances. There is nothing collective about speech. Its manifestations are individual and ephemeral. It is no more than an aggregate of particular cases (CGL, 1988).

Although this psycho- physical aspect of *langage* is intrinsic to the integrity of the whole theory, it nevertheless occupies a position of subordinate interest as well. The primary object of de Saussure's talent was the third, phonemic perspective of *langue* and its arbitrary, linear, syntagmatic, and paradigmatic realities.

### *1.1.2.2 Langue.*

Lane (1970) claimed that "The notion of *langue* is the first step in making linguistics a science" (p. 121). That *langue* was the primary object of De Saussure's analysis and the crux of the new synchronic science is clear in hindsight. At the same time, Holdcroft (1991) explained the reason on which *parole* is based. *Langue* in a sense constitutes the mainframe of articulate behavior: "The linguist must take the study of linguistic structure as his primary concern, and relate all other manifestations of language to it" (p. 23).

Since de Saussure is at pains to elaborate this at various places in CLG and since it is the foundational notion of structuralism, his references should be read in their entirety. De Saussure's crucial point is that *langue* is a system of forms or signs (Culler, 1976). And these will henceforth be its operational terms - *word* and *utterance* constituting the tokens of *parole*. In orienting the science to *sign* rather than to *word*, de Saussure is expressing his dissatisfaction with the imprecision of the latter term. Philological research demonstrated not only that the sounds and shapes of words change over time but also that their meanings are highly susceptible to nuance and transfer. The diachronic shape of a word exists on the surface of an underlying grid of coordinates. It is this underlying network which permits the transfers, shifts, and individual entropies in the first place.

The conclusion follows immediately: The language [*langue*] itself is a form, not a substance (Saussure, 1988). The formal network of the kind de Saussure envisaged is comparable to the cobweb which is as much the spaces among as the threads between. In the same way that a nexus of intersecting threads in the web cannot be removed and studied in isolation without doing damage to the integrity of the whole, neither can a form in *langue* be excised. Isolated analysis is inconceivable (Lane, 1970).

The substrate of *langue* is a complex equilibrium of terms holding one another in mutual juxtaposition (Saussure, 1988). The conclusion which de Saussure draws from this

relationship is logical: the meanings of forms - and therefore meaning-in-language itself - can only be defined in negative terms. Having no substance in itself, a sign exists only to designate otherness, dissimilarity and boundary.

De Saussure here makes it clear that the sign represents the linkage of sound and meaning and these two realities are the conceptual poles of all future grammatical models. De Saussure expressly did not cal1 the sign a relation between a sound and an object. Objects have many perspectives and names but meaning is attached to the concept assigned its place in the underlying matrix of mental signs. De Saussure recognized that there is no reason why a concept could not be expressed in an acoustically distinct way and from this he adduced 'the organizing principle for the whole of linguistics'- the principle of arbitrariness (Saussure, 1988).

### *1.1.2.3 Syntagm.*

The next step was to describe how these arbitrary units of sound and meaning were arranged differently in the mind in order to eventually convey intelligible meaning between speakers. His answer was that *langue* makes sense through linear arrangement of its forms in time; linearity is the second organizing principle of *langue* (after arbitrariness) and its significance equals that of the first law.

De Saussure's conception may perhaps be clarified here by contrasting the linear principle of huge with systems of communication evolved by other species which convey meaning in distinctive ways. Some utilize scalar strategies in which meaning is conveyed by modulating the loudness of a call; other species use gesture, coloration, scent, or some other means. Humans, however, recognize the passage of time, arbitrarily link sounds with meanings, and sequence these arbitrary sign is in a strategy hence forth to be described as syntagmatic.

### *1.1.2.4 Paradigm.*

These linear sequences, however, convey no intelligible meaning as yet: like the Mayan hieroglyphics the forms are simply concatenated. The linear arrangement is apparent to all but the meaning remains mute. The same is true in de Saussure's description: the signaling infrastructure of the language is there but the switches remain off until something else activates the meanings along the *syntagm.*

People listening to a foreign language remark on this continuous stream of sounds, pitches, and stresses but no intelligible meaning. De Saussure's point is that such noise becomes meaning when the associations of these objects are rendered transparent. What the paradigmatic axis contributes Hjelmslev's term replacing de Saussure's is contextual meaning through what de Saussure somewhat oracularly describes as principles of difference and grouping (Saussure, 1988). What is clear is that syntagmatic concatenation is only half of the equation, completely opaque until of meaningful paradigms of groups and differences intersect with them. Paradigmatic relations are characterized by their indefinite number and their indeterminate order. De Saussure's theory of the axes would be later described in terms of "choice" and "chain" or "selection" and "combination".

The notion of paradigm is quite nebulous and various authors have sought to clarify its details. Carroll provides a useful example here by describing the familiar tip-of-the tongue phenomenon: Recently, I was trying to recall the word *contagious*, but I could only remember *incongruous, contextual*, and *infectious* - all of them similar to the word I sought, in general length (number of syllables), stress pattern, and certain combinations of sounds (*con-, ous*), and one of them, *infectious*, overlapping semantically with the target word... (Hill, 1969). Each sign is thought of as an exponent of a paradigm in which innumerable others could just as easily replace it. The exponent is linked to all others in its paradigm in terms of resemblances to and contrasts with all others. These associations, metaphorically

speaking, however every selected exponent of *langue*, intimating by their implied contrasts and echoes suggestions of what could be expressed at any moment. These are de Saussure's simultaneous, in *absentia* relationships unlike those linear relations which are in *praesentia*, Saussure (1988). This axis concerns relations between things which coexist, relations from which the passage of time is entirely excluded. The preceding sketch of Saussure's fundamental beliefs illustrates a model in which meaning is wholly contingent upon connectedness: sound is arbitrarily linked with meaning and the resultant form partakes of a system in which it is defined differentially by what it is not. These differential forms are interconnected cognitively through associations of resemblance and contrast and only become intelligible when they intersect temporal reality which places them one after the other. The privative syntagmatic analyses of later American descriptivist would thus seem to be incompatible with de Saussure's model since the chain to intelligible meaning has been broken if one axis is excluded. On the one hand, the resemblances and contrasts in paradigms become intelligible when they are placed in a sequence. On the other hand, these objects remain uninterpretable unless they partake of evocations; meaning is ensconced within the heart of the model right from the beginning.

### 1.1.3   European structuralism: Roman Jakobson.

In producing their version of de Saussure's work, Bally and de Sechehaye had in fact sketched the first contours of a "structuralist" manifesto. But it was not until a group of principally Slavic linguists convened in Prague - of whom Vilem Mathesius, Nikolai Trubetzkoy, and Roman Jakobson were the leading members that the diffuse Saussurean notions of pattern, relation, interdependence, resemblance, and contrast began to kindle. The Prague Circle as it came to be known published a series of *Travaux* in which their interests ranged from poetic to philological analysis. In their first *Thesis* the Prague

linguists stated that human language was a "functional" system whose purpose was communication (Holenstein, 1974). In this first development of de Saussure's thought, structuralism became irrevocably oriented toward the communicative behavior of the individual rather than the formal apparatus within the mind. As Sampson points out, however, their functional conception of language would have been little more than a truism had it not been for the efforts of Trubetzkoy, Mathesius and others who attempted to *scientize* this commonplace observation.

The intent was to discover how the signs of *langue* became the words of parole. The goal was to make explicit the implicit knowledge used in the recognition and reading of signs (Robey, 1973).

From the beginning, the Prague Circle had displayed a marked preference for paradigmatic as opposed to syntagmatic analysis and this penchant was to be developed through the analysis of one stratum in particular. The most accessible writer in phonological matters was Roman Jakobson whose writings are characterized by breadth, transparence, and holism and a clear fealty to de Saussure is evinced (Lane, 1970). Jakobson not only traces the origins of others in the field but also explicitly traces his own indebtedness, in particular to de Saussure, and in a refreshing manner.

It is characteristic of Jakobson's linguistics that it embraces all aspects, levels, and related points of language and takes into account both their inner autonomy and their interdependence. Reductions, or to use a more linguistic expression, excommunications, are foreign to it. Meaning is not excluded to the sole advantage of syntax, diachrony to that of synchrony, everyday language to that of the formalized languages of the exact sciences, inner language to that of the extremally observable language of intersubjective communication (Holenstein, 1974).

### 1.1.4   Jakobson's Ladder.

All throughout, the CGL was the underlying, permanent model against which the Prague linguists made further discoveries (Holenstein, 1974). From the CGL the Prague School was to develop groundbreaking insights not only about the phoneme but also into its interna1 relations of invariance, markedness, and binary opposition. Jakobson states it simply - the CGL contains almost all the essential problems of modern linguistic thought. In Jakobson's hands, nevertheless, details in the CGL were modified, disputed, and occasionally abandoned. While he did not undermine the substantive dichotomies, Jakobson nevertheless questioned emphases within each: the form/substance dichotomy, the ontology of *Langue*, issues of arbitrariness and linearity, and the subordinate status of *parole*. What Jakobson derived from the phonemic principle took the discourse to its next stage - that stage at which the phoneme became embedded within a theory of distinctive features. This theory is universally acclaimed as his most enduring contribution to linguistic science. It was Jakobson primarily who provided the most discernible link to de Saussure by converting the latter's *éléments differentiels* into a set of contrastive distinctive features as he did not adopt Bally and de Sechehaye's interpretation of the CGL uncritically (Lepschy, 1970).

What Jakobson and the Prague Circle took most fundamentally from de Saussure was the belief that the structure of language was *differential*, constructed out of notions of boundary and otherness. Jakobson believed that de Saussure's negative, differential approach to the objects of *langue* had been fundamentally misconstrued by the two students who had conceived of the *éléments differentiels* of *langue* as phonemes, that is, as the meaningful sounds of a language. According to Jakobson, what Saussure had really intended was that these elements be construed as sets of contrasts or distinctive features to which the human ear was finely sensitive (Holenstein, 1974). Speakers hear acoustic

differences rather than discrete sounds. The breaking down of the phoneme into a set of distinctive features, however, did not take place until the late1930s.

Believing that the acoustic phenomena of living languages could be most transparently explained through a universal substrate of ethic distinctions, Jakobson set about the elaboration of this theory. He maintained that all languages shared in this inherent elegance and developed a theory in which three inherent qualities of sonority, protensity, and tonality on the one hand and three prosodic features of force, quantity, and tone on the other were considered universal.

All differences of phonemes can be resolved into simple and undecomposable binary oppositions of distinctive features. Thus, the phonemes of French are aligned in terms of six of these basic oppositions  and the phonemes of Serbo-Croatian have been assigned to a similar sextet (Lepschy, 1970). This continuous excavation of de Saussure's speculations proved highly rewarding. In phonetics, vowels and consonants were long considered two quite disparate groups with no common denominator, Jakobson succeeded in bridging the gap. He demonstrated that the two oppositional pairs *compact/diffuse* and *grave/acute* are invariant structures common to vowels and consonants (Holenstein, 1974).

Holenstein also adds, interestingly, that Jakobson found authoritative precursors to his endeavours among the ancient Indian grammarians. Confirmation that he was on the right track was afforded to him later from research into language acquisition (build-up) and language pathology "break-down". Phonology was thus acquired and lost in a manner congruent with feature theory.

Three hundred and thirty three pages earlier Jakobson had confessed an attraction to 'binary solutions' in linguistic analysis, a predilection variously traced to the 'irreconcilable antinomies' of Russian formalism the inherent economy of information theory or to philosophical investigations at the University of Moscow. Jakobson, in Martinet's opinion,

is the initiator and most active propagator of the application of the binary principle to phonology whose position was supported by resonance in the field of information processing (Kroeber, 1953). The procedures of information theorists who utilized a sequence of binary selections as the most reasonable basis for the analysis of the various communication processes were consequently regarded approvingly. Not the last linguist to be reinforced by mathematical theory, Jakobson applied this notion to illuminating effect in the area of distinctive features. Distinctive features seemingly paired off and the nature of this pairing off was, as de Saussure had speculated years earlier, contrastive and oppositional. Another potential contour of real grammar may be discerned then. With this principle of binary opposition in mind, a serendipitous variety of hitherto unnoticed insights began to emerge for researchers. Jakobson relates that it was Trubetzkoy who discovered that one remember in a phonemic correlation often conveyed more information than the other.

Jakobson (1994) writes that:

The general meaning of the *marked* is characterized by the conveyance of more precise, specific, and additional information than the *unmarked* term provides. In language containing an opposition between the two grammatical tenses of past and present, for example, the former is always marked and the latter unmarked (p. 136).

The marked term is somehow less essential with the unmarked term furnishing the substrate of meaning and this may have implications for the teaching of lexis in the classroom.

Holenstein (1974) furnishes a concrete example:

In comparison to the unmarked term, the marked term provides more information. This is best illustrated by the example of polar adjectives and nouns. The statement *Peter is as young as Paul* is more informative than the statement *Peter is as old as*

*Paul*. Someone unfamiliar with Paul's age knows, after the first statement, that he is relatively young while the second statement reveals nothing about his age. Young is the marked term, old the unmarked term (p.13l).

The concept of (un) markedness resonated with the notion of (in)variance relations in mathematical theory and form such observations, the theory of the invariant phoneme and its allophonic variants would evolve.

There is yet another serendipity that emerges from the quest for underlying continuities in linguistic science. The research of the paradigms of distinctive features had an attendant, if unexpected effect upon the other axis of the CGL. In isolating the underlying characteristics of phonological systems, Jakobson likely encouraged a commensurate elaboration in syntagmatic analysis.

With such characterizations available, the phonologists could begin to formulate the syntagmatic laws governing phonemic combination: roughly, laws of form - phonemes with certain features do not occur in certain positions in the neighbourhood of phonemes with certain other features.

The study of the syntagmatic axis, however, is the province of the American scholars who explored its intricacies, dominated its analyses, and guided its development.

### 1.1.5   American structuralism: Leonard Bloomfield.

If the phonemic principle may be considered central to the thinking which predominated in Europe at the time, then the morphemic principle may be conceived of as similarly emblematic across the Atlantic. If functionalism was the banner under which the Prague Circle at the time gathered, it was a distributionalist standard below which their American counterparts stood. Broadly speaking, each of the two main branches of early structuralism may be said to have taken an axis of the CGL as its own.

Bloomfield clearly esteemed the use and rigorous demonstration of fundamental principles that de Saussure had outlined in the CGL honoring Sapir and Boas, but, as Haas tells us, unlike the linguist and the anthropologist, Bloomfield was primarily a language teacher and…interested in applying the important principles developed in linguistic science to the more practical problems of language teaching (Kroeber, 1953).

While de Saussure was developing the theory of structuralism, the compelling concern in America was the rigorous description of fast-disappearing aboriginal languages and American structuralism was impelled forward in particular by Franz Boas's *Handbook of American Indian Languages* (1911) and Edward Sapir's *Language* (1921). The structuralist analyses within these books became canonical in the literature as both authors showed convincingly, foreshadowing the heterogeneity of Firth, for example, that each language was *sui generis* analyzable principally, if not solely on the basis of its own emic categories. As Sapir put it, it must be obvious to anyone who has felt something of the spirit of a foreign language that there is such a thing as a basic plan, a certain cut to each language.

The declensional and conjugational apparatuses appropriate for European languages were consequently viewed as blunt, unwieldy tools which, while eminently suited to the inflecting languages of Europe were demonstrably unsuited to the polysynthetic subtleties of languages encountered by Amerindian linguists. Students were therefore enjoined to keep uppermost in their minds the maxim that languages could vary indefinitely in terms of their notional categories and that scientifically legitimate generalizations would emerge only when the patterns called from the data were minutely, impartially observed. As a result of their influence, linguistic relativism became a benchmark of American structuralism; however, it took its imprimatur from Leonard Bloomfield.

### *1.1.5.1 The relegation of meaning.*

Boas's insights in particular, according to Geoffrey Sampson, are simply rendered more explicit and systematic in Leonard Bloomfield's 1933 publication, *Language*. It is perhaps because of his resolutely scientific approach to the data that Bloomfield is esteemed so highly within the discipline (Allen, 1979). It is a matter of his own record that Bloomfield was aware of de Saussure's theories and the Genevan's differential framework is dispersed throughout the text: For the working of language, all that is necessary is that each phoneme be unmistakably different from all the others speech sounds are uttered as signals. Further into the realm, however, Bloomfield refused to tread. Although he shared de Saussure's two foundational beliefs, namely that language was an interrelated set of forms rather than substances, and that meaning and substance were arbitrarily linked he departed markedly in other ways (Mackey, 1961).

Reviewing his efforts in his survey of *Structural Linguistics*, Lepschy essentially credits Bloomfield with constructing the science of de Saussure's other axis. To him are attributed (i) the axiomatic terms and notions of morphology, (ii) scientific conclusions regarding case, number, gender, tense, agreement and derivation, (iii) the foundational descriptions of 'immediate' and 'ultimate' constituency, and no less than (iv) the elaboration of the morphemic, sememic, and lexical frameworks of language. His genius was of a different tune altogether and the ideas laid out in his 1933 publication were to dominate *North American linguistics* until the 1950 (Wilkins, 1972).

Philosophically, Bloomfield was a disciple of the movement known as logical positivism and adhered enthusiastically to the behaviorist principles of Thorndike, Weiss, Watson and Pavlov. An encyclopedia of the day relates the basic tenets of his position: Linguistic science will deal only with events that are accessible in their time and place to any and all observers and that are placed in co-ordinates of time and space. The only useful

generalizations about language, we are told, are inductive generalizations and significantly for the next generation of linguists, the science should concern itself solely with such initial statements and predictions as lead to definite handling operations and with terms such as are derivable by rigid definition from a set of everyday terms concerning physical happenings. These propositions became known as behaviorism, mechanism, operationalism, and physicalism respectively and more than any other contributions, such tenets were to result in the resolutely scientific framework known as *distributionalism*. This analytic mode1 is of great importance to the language teacher since its intent is to capture in a replicable manner the formal i.e., predictable operations in the network of grammar.

Practically, Bloomfield was acutely aware of the difficulty of utitizing meaning as an operational construct in linguistic definition, having studied languages as diverse as possible. Atoms of meaning in these languages, as Boas had discovered, were not so amenable to analyses based on the above scientific principles. The search for verifiable forms of meaning-in-language thus fell to the wayside early on because of its fundamentally uncircumscribable nature as (Lepschy, 1970).

In place of this approach, Bloomfield proposed that the morphemes of a language be isolated, dissected, compared and contrasted in a purely mechanical way. The meaning of any object would be determined in based on its combinatory and segmentable possibilities. Phonemes and morphemes therefore would be identified according to their 'fit' - their compatibility or incompatibility in certain contexts along the syntagm. One of the fundamental premises of Bloomfieldian structuralism is that these patterns of combination do exist, can be formalized and, in the absence of notional criteria, their behavior can be distilled into 'same' and 'different' occurrences. For Bloomfield and his followers '...what characterizes a language is a set of combinatorial regularities, the acceptance of certain

associations and the rejection of others' (Ducrot, 1994). Meaning-in-language thus became the discussion of forms-in-language.

Years later, Chomsky would complain that his views on meaning-in-language had been 'wildly distorted' and in his day Bloomfield believed similarly. Seventeen pages in *Language* very forth rightly discuss meaning-in-language and it is stated unequivocally in various places that semantic considerations are above all implicated in phonological analysis. It is nonetheless arguable that subsequent linguists were not wide of the mark when they took the wary approach to be an anathema. "The statement of meanings is therefore the weak point in language-study, and will remain so until human knowledge advances very far beyond its present state" (Bloomfield,1933, p.140). In the behavioristic scholarly climate of the 1930s, this was all that was really needed although does relate that his followers were ambivalent in their discipleship: some were to utilize semantic criteria in their analyses, while others sought to 'define language elements solely on the basis of their distribution (Malmberg, 1964).

### *1.1.5.2 The elevation of form.*

With associative meaning of the paradigmatic axis out of the way for the time being, linguists were encouraged to mine the syntagmatic axis using what Bloomfield called immediate constituency (IC) analysis and Bloomfield adduces the famous example: (It is interesting to note here that IC theory is inaugurated with a distinctly mentalistic appeal to native- speaker intuition.) The crux of the distributionalist approach lies in this IC analysis: how does the linguist arrive at the immediate and finally at the ultimate (indivisible) constituents of a phrase non-intuitively?. The answer given by Bloomfield and other proponents of IC analysis was that "the elements which are given constituent status are those which may be replaced in their environment by others of the same pattern or by a

shorter sequence of morphemes" (Malmberg, 1964, p.168). A facet of the distributional approach is the paradigmatic replacement of forms by other forms. A constituent is any element capable of substitution by another element and a set of these intersubstitutable elements is a 'form-class' (Lyons, 1986). An immediate constituent which cannot be further dissected downwards is an 'ultimate' (indivisible) constituent as Ducrot (1994) points out:

> The postulate of this method is that when one pursues, stage by stage, the process of subdivision, one arrives at classes that are increasingly homogeneous from the distributional viewpoint. In other words, the elements of the classes obtained at a given stage resemble each other more, in terms of their distribution than they resemble the elements of the classes obtained at the preceding stage, so that the whole process leads...towards the rigorous specification of distributional classes (p.34).

It is this notion of 'class' rather than that of 'verb' or 'noun' which constitutes an inherent property of language. As an intrinsic property of language and definable contour of psychologically real grammar, the form class will be an indispensable tool of the teacher's competence (Strevens, 1966). In his 1933 book and elsewhere, Bloomfield tirelessly advocated for verifiable scientific procedures; it was his followers, however, who applied the exhortation with a vengeance. Here, an important distinction between the empirical approach urged by Bloomfield and the increasingly astringent, empiricist views taken by his followers must be made since Bloomfield appears to have been taxed for the excesses of his disciples. It is debatable, given Bloomfield's later statements to the contrary, that he had ever intended the science to become as inflexibly empiricist as it did. It should be noted in passing too that when Chomsky critiqued 'structuralists' he was not targeting those who made use of a mechanistic, Bloomfieldian method of analysis principally. He aimed his critique rather at those descriptivists who, instead of assigning a distributionalist *ethos* to its proper place in an overall linguistic theory, elevated it to the very purpose of linguistic

theory. Distributional analysis for him was but a means rather than an end of linguistic analysis, the utility of which he would show most effectively in his paper *Remarks on English Nominalizations.*

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that Bloomfield's science was a radical departure from anything that de Saussure had ever envisaged for synchronic science. De Saussure's view was one in which the central datum of analysis was the meaning of the *sign*. He had considered the *sign* - the linkage of *acoustic image* with *meaning* - to be the fulcrum of synchronic science and its entire intelligibility in turn depended on paradigmatic and syntagmatic intersection. Ostensibly, Bloomfield had agreed with the semiological basis yet had methodologically excised the contributions of the paradigmatic axis from the discourse (something which leads one to question whether Bloomfield ever really did acknowledge the coaxial theory in the first place). The evocative, intangible relations and associations of the paradigm were much less amenable to scientific analysis in stark contrast with the dissectable realities of the syntagm its phonemes, morphemes and tagmemes. Even though the relegation was provisional and the rationale tactical by relegating the study of meaning to a remote future, Bloomfield effectively anathematized the concept for a generation of American linguists. The history of linguistic science is the richer for it. Had the analytic acumen of an American generation not been so determinedly trained upon the description of form, the morphophonology of language might never have been formalized to the extent that it was.

### 1.1.6   The descriptivists.

The inheritors of Bloomfield's approach R.Wells, B. Bloch, G.L. Trager, C. Hockett and Z. Harris pursued Bloomfield's notions of immediate constituency in which the approach has been alternatively described as 'formal', 'descriptive' or simply 'structural'.

A formal approach is, as Allen (1975) points out "...based on the fact that every linguistic unit below the level of sentence has a characteristic distribution; that is, it is restricted to a greater of lesser degree with respect to the environments in which it can occur" (p.21). The term 'formal' will be used interchangeably with 'distributional' and is understood to mean any constituent whose basic structure can be scientifically verified and whose contextual (syntactic) behavior can be predicted. This approach has alternatively been termed a 'taxonomy' one in which the 'units of the analysis are defined internally in relation to each other, rather than externally in relation to psychological, logical or metaphysical categories. At a broader level, the distributional approach is characterized by its empiricist rationale, the importance attached to the collection of data, the focus on surface analyses, emphasis on the elaboration of strict taxonomies, and the prospective development of a set of inductive discovery procedures (Robey, 1973).

Aware of the problems of meaning-in-language which Bloomfield encountered earlier, descriptivist field workers were enjoined to do nothing more than mass corpora. Through replicable procedures, the linguist would see the internal distributional configuration of the language slowly emerge. "This is a totally corpus-based approach, where all the linguist does as identify the minimum grammatical units (morphemes) and describe their distribution relative to each other" (Allerton, 1979, p. 94). However, in what can only be described as surprising, this insistence on impartial analysis, verifiable data collection, and the avoidance of subjective judgments ended up being a concerted attempt to obviate subjective judgments altogether. This is an important link to transformational-generative grammar. The pedagogical reflex of descriptivism - the Audio-lingual method - imbued the pedagogy of the late forties and early fifties. If the theoretical approach to language focused upon the distributional relationships of its objects, it was reasoned that teaching should follow theory. A clear example of this isomorphism may be seen in Charles

Fries's *English Sentence Patterns* (1957) which is considered to be a "monument to structuralism as applied to language teaching; its materials ...rest upon the view that learning a foreign language consists not in learning about the language but in developing a new set of habits" (Bell, 1981, p.97). These new sets of habits are founded upon Fries's theory of 'form classes' which he had elucidated five years earlier in *The Structure of English*. Nelson Francis describes the background:

In Fries's schema these four parts of speech could be further identified either by their form "noun", "pronoun", "verb", "adverb" and "adjective" or by their position, in which they were termed "nominal", "verbal", "adjectival", and "adverbial" (Hartung, in Allen, 1964, p.30). This type of pedagogical application was called a 'slot-and-filler' approach and widely adopted for its clarity, its various manifestations entitled drilling, pattern practice, or the mim mem method. Robert Lado's 1957 book *Linguistics Across Cultures*: *Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers* is one such text and proposes another corollary of distributional analysis. Introduced by Fries, this Bloomfieldian book is an attempt to show the teacher how to '...develop a new set of language habits against a background of different native language habits'. Lado takes the various morpho-phonological phenomena and examines their cross-linguistic comparisons and contrasts in a purely formal way subsequently gaining fame as the Contrastive Analysis hypothesis; it enjoys extensive coverage in the field and is generally recognized as one of the conceptual insights gleaned thus far from theoretical linguistics.

The Descriptivist, nevertheless, were criticized very heavily on one count in particular, a conceptual misstep first made by Bloomfield and then repeated by his heirs. The fallacy has been identified by Sampson who notes that in excluding semantic considerations until such time as human knowledge advances well beyond its present state, linguistic behaviorists took the wrongness of introspection to imply that there was nothing

to be introspected (Sampson, 1980). "Their approach thus violated a fundamental axiom of structuralism, namely, that it is the functioning, interrelated whole which must be described" (Lane, 1970, p. 80).

According to Fries (1972) European and American structuralists stand apart on this score that:

American Descriptivism...first of all compares form, position and distribution of language elements both in the system of the native language and that of the target language. The Prague School compares the ways in which these forms actually function in the languages in question... American Descriptivism isolates form from content, the language system from the extra-linguistic reality it conveys, It only takes note of the invariant systematic meanings of form and their formal signals... For the Prague School the consideration of both form and content was always characteristic, which protects it from an antisemantic bias (p. 56).

The descriptivists were taxed for having elevated a viable methodological approach along one axis to the status of a theory itself. It was Chomsky who critiqued this equivalence of discovery procedure and linguistic science most caustically: analyses derived from such a misalliance resulted in trivial and misguided conclusions about superficialities. Rather, it was the underpinning grid, Chomsky maintains in distinctly Saussurean terms, which constitutes the true abject of linguistic analysis. 'Structural linguistics, by basing itself inductively on the utterances of informants was accused of lacking criteria by which to distinguish the regular from the accidental, the grammatical from the ungrammatical (Stem, 1992). Bell found structuralist grammars 'weak' and 'possibly misleading' in syntactic matters.

Despite the excesses, it must be recognized that any attempts to denigrate the insights from linguistic history needlessly tear the thread. In a review of its central tenets, one can

only be struck by the extent to which American structuralism constitutes the internal weave that joins Chomskian linguistics to de Saussure's (Ferdinad, 1988). While certain tenets are no longer accepted today e.g., language as habit formation, many of its basic constructs and exhortations still provide the substance of modern teacher training programs.

Moulton (1966) itemizes some of the more renowned: "Language is speech not writing. Teach the language, not about the language. A language is what its native speakers say, not what someone thinks they ought to say and languages are different" (p. 86). All of these dictums derived from structuralism are familiar to teachers in training. However, one conceptual bequest, the separation of the levels upon which Trager and Smith in their *Outline of English Structure* insisted, is problematic for the language teacher.

The labors of one descriptivist in particular, Zellig Sabbatai Harris, provide the next link in the chain (Lyons, 1986). His emerging dissatisfaction with the paradigm in many ways recapitulates and parallels the development of de Saussure fifty years earlier. This formalizer of 'discovery procedures' in the end found them constricting. While an analysis of his seminal work deserves a chapter in itself, the discussion will simply point to the procedures of segmentation which he formalized for posterity. Its two principle operations were elaborated by Harris in a dense and closely argued tome entitled *Structural Linguistics* (1951).

### 1.1.7  Audio-lingual language teaching method.

Prior to Audiolingual method there existed other methods to teach languages. The most common in the pre-structural linguistics era were the grammar translation method and the direct or phonetic method. But they did not seem to have shown theoretical bases behind them.

With the emergence of the oral approach and its set of conceptual precepts, the audiolingual method appears in response to the generalized dissatisfaction felt towards more traditional methods and approaches. This dissatisfaction was born of the little importance that communication had in the oldest methods. The audiolingual method began in the mid-twentieth century and its main characteristic is the acquisition of oral communication skills through oral practice, analogy and repetition.

Although this method shares certain characteristics with the direct method, in relation to oral production and listening, the difference between these two methods lies mainly in the weight given to auditory input and the distinction between implicit acquisition and explicit learning. . The proponents of the audiolingual method affirm that a student must first be able to perceive the language accurately, before producing his own statements through explicit and controlled practice.

One of the influences of this method was the practices that the United States Army carried out during the Second World War. This event brought with it the requirement to prepare specialists in other languages quickly and effectively. Therefore, the audiolingual method is based on both linguistic theories and psychological theories that support the methodology that is implemented in the classroom. On the one hand, there is the predominant psychological theory of the 1950s in the United States: behaviorism. This considers that learning can only be given as a process of habituation between a stimulus and a response. Behaviorism states that language is primarily oral and that orality is a prerequisite for the written form. These conclusions are based on the observation of the process of acquisition of the mother tongue as well as the existence of signed languages. According to this theory, linguistic development is based on repetition and imitation, and is directly linked to the stimulus-response dichotomy. For example, the presentation of a *chair* (stimulus) would result in the statement "chair" (response).

In relation to the linguistic theories that sustain this method, we find structural linguistics and the contrastive analysis of (Fries, 2000). Structural linguistics promulgates that language has its own structural system. This system is composed of different levels that are: the phonological level, the morphological level and the syntactic level. Each of these levels has its own system of patterns and, therefore, the learning of a second language is understood as the acquisition of communication skills or skills and the implicit rules that determine how the elements of these levels combine phoneme a morpheme, from morpheme to word, and from word to phrase. However, as indicated above, these rules governing the system and structure of a language must first be acquired orally.

Due to its link with behaviorism, the audiolingual method focuses on intensive repetition exercises and the efforts of the students focus on avoiding any error in the repetition or pronunciation of the presented structures. Systematic activities are very common, during which students are asked to repeat a sentence orally, to which a linguistic unit will be changed progressively.

During the first stages of habit formation, student production is limited to imitative forms. However, students are expected to develop a wider range of structures and be able to make an analogy between learned structures and new communicative contexts - similar structures and, ultimately, have the ability to use linguistic structures to express new meanings.

Although the audiolingual method focuses on the explicit and intentional formation of habits, while the direct method is based on the unconscious acquisition of linguistic structures, there are several similarities between them. In the first place, in both methods the protagonist of the class is the teacher and no reference is made to autonomous learning. Consequently, the student has little or no control over the contents presented. In the same way, teachers depend mainly on systematic activities, during which they insist on the

acquisition of oral communication patterns: intonation, pronunciation and rhythm. In addition, linguistic structures are presented situationally from dialogues or short communicative exchanges that students then repeat and imitate. There are a series of principles by which this method is governed:

- The instructions are given in the foreign language.

- Teaching takes place within a context.

- The mistakes are avoided because they produce the formation of bad habits.

- Through positive reinforcement the student is helped to develop good habits.

- The teacher is considered an orchestra conductor who guides and controls students in the foreign language.

- Mimics, memorization and pattern exercises are the techniques that are most frequently used.

- Listening and speaking receive a greater importance, and precede reading and writing.

- Greater attention is paid to correct pronunciation, stress, rhythm and intonation.

- The meanings of words are derived from a linguistic and cultural context, and not in isolation.

### 1.1.8    Principles of the Audio-lingual method.

The linguistic basis of the Audiolingual Method lies in structuralism, which performs a formal description of the languages involved (the mother tongue and the second language), compares them to detect differences and similarities, and from this comparison infers the most probable errors.

This method follows the principles of behaviorism and defends that it is learned through the acquisition of habits through repetitive behaviors. Thus, it was insisted on the

repetition of the provided productions (recordings in the foreign language) and on the reinforcement of the correct answers, which supposes a specific attention to the error detection. The Audiolingual Method achieved good results but it seems that more for the insistence on the time spent than for the effectiveness of the method itself.

As for the ludic component, it is not detected in a method that does not encourage creativity and tends to mechanicism. Logical when behaviorism opts for imitation and restricts spontaneity.

The main characteristics of this method was to favor practices where necessary, using pronunciation and conversation patterns, in which grammar and translation were not considered.

According to Prator and Celce-Murcia (as cited in Brown, 2001) it is possible to define the following characteristics of the Audiolingual Method:

- The new material was presented through dialogues.

- Mimicking and memorization of phrase sets is used.

- The structures are sequenced by means of comparison analysis and are taught one at a time.

- Structure patterns are learned through repetition.

- There is very little grammatical explanation. Grammar is taught inductively rather than deductively.

- Vocabulary is limited and learned in context.

- There is a lot of use of recordings, language lab and visual support.

- Great importance is given to pronunciation.

- Very little use of the mother tongue is allowed by teachers.

- Correct answers are immediately highlighted through positive reinforcement.

- Students are not allowed to make mistakes.

- There is a tendency to manipulate language to teach content.

### 1.1.9  Main features.

The origin of how this method of teaching languages was born gave it several characteristics, but as the main ones we can point out that it focuses on the development of two fundamental skills for soldiers: 1) the ability to understand the language that is heard and 2) the possibility of communicating with others. Its appearance caught the attention of American linguists who, taking the structure of the method, laid the foundations of the audio-lingual method. Once the method was put into operation, the general opinion was that its success was due more to the time devoted to the study than to its methodological structure. With the emergence of the Audio-lingual Method great importance is given to sound. Its main features are:

- The elements of language are taught in a way governed by rules (structured) and linear production.

- Examples of language are described exhaustively at any structural level (from sounds, phonetics, morphology, etc.).

- Linguistic levels are taught through systems immersed within other systems, that is, from a pyramidal structure, the phonetic systems that guide morphological systems, etc. and these in turn to high-level systems such as phrases, clauses and sentences.

- The learning of a language is basically a process of forming mechanical habits.

- The subjects to be learned are presented in a spoken form in the target language.

### 1.1.10   Techniques.

As it was sustained, the Audio-lingual Method had an amount of techniques proper from its implementation in the Army method context that later was used in the civil world. Some of the specialists as Brooks patented the method including its techniques.

"Audiolingualism (a method patented by Professor Nelson Brooks in 1964) claimed for himself that he had transformed the art of language teaching into a science that allowed students to learn the foreign language in an effective way" (Richards and Rodgers, 1988, p.52).

*Role of the teacher*

Richards and Rodgers (1988) stated that:

The role of the teacher is to direct the class and get the students involved. To execute the linguists' planning, he must use the materials and resources specified in the lesson plans and must also receive training that enables him to perform his function satisfactorily (p.61).

*Role of the student*

The student was someone who actively participated in every step of the mechanical activities that conducted to the process of learning. In this context, it was believed that the oral listening and practice were the most important activity to develop the oral skills in the different contexts of language practice. The language command was believed to be important in terms of the use of oral patterns in the most diverse context and situations.

*Presence of grammar*

As learning was conceived to be inductive an intensive practice was devoted to the memorization of structures, repetition was also important activity as well as the simulation of the use of patterns or pattern practice in different contexts and situations. In the

development of this method, the materials take on a leading role: they are the ones that allow specifying the curricular design.

**Chapter II**

**Generative linguistics and language teaching**

While many linguists disagree with and/or modify his theories, Noam Chomsky's

contributions to the study of language are nevertheless considered seminal. Whether it is a

question of the fundamental linguistic postulates, the unresolved relationship between

syntax and semantics, or even the disciplinary status of linguistics, it is an understatement

to say that the linguistic paradigm inaugurated by him in 1957 has been one of

"significance". There are many who consider the influence to have been positive yet

equally many whose assessments differ sharply.

Ellis (1993) writing with thirty years hindsight, evokes the kind of categorical

opposition that is felt by many:

*Syntactic structures* captured the attention of a then theoretically stagnant field by

offering a sense of rigor, purpose, and scientific precision, but it was based on

theoretical mistakes that were so basic and so disastrous that recovery from them was

scarcely possible short of abandoning the entire theory and beginning anew (p.97).

Whether revolution, paradigm shift, or palace revolt, the arguments put forth in SS initiated, at least in North America, a wholly novel way of looking at grammar in general and syntax in particular.

For Plato, the answer was epistemological and involved the metaphor of a cave and its flickering images. For Chomsky, however, the linguistic analogue is the more interesting one. It is the learnability problem of first language acquisition and it is worth quoting in its entirety:

"Infants incapable of rolling over have begun to grasp that some of the behavior around them is articulate, and by the age of six, they have acquired it" (Halliday, l994, p.16). This logical problem was simply the fulcrum upon which two related observations, one empirical, one speculative - rested uneasily in 1957 and centuries before the appearance of deep structure the Cartesians already had had the insight, according to Chomsky: For the Cartesians the creative aspect of language use provided the best evidence that another organism who looks like us has a mind like ours (Chomsky, 1966).

The infinite linguistic creativity characteristic of humans in general and the child's accelerating mastery of language suggested to Chomsky that a genetic, species-specific mechanism was in place and that the study of language was a direct pipeline: It may well be that the general features of language structure reflect... the general character of [our] capacity to acquire knowledge (Chomsky, 1966).

Given his Cartesian loyalties, it is not surprising to find that Chomsky's earliest books and papers are filled with polemics against the empiricist conception of science (Newmeyer, 1986). In particular, it was the extension of behaviorist tenets into the linguistics that was most worrisome. The behaviorist agenda was most rigorously formalized in B.F. Skinner's 1957 publication *Verbal Behaviour*. Skinner's paradigm was one governed by strict adherence to the principles of the scientific method: observability,

experimentation, replicability, and falsifiability of hypotheses (Stern, 1992). Mid-century psychologists proceeded on the basis of these tenets contending, in essence, that the characteristic behavioral patterns of all living organisms could be most aptly described in a dyadic stimulus-and- response (SR) mechanism, eventually to be formalized in terms of laws of habit formation. Such habits could be variously modified through schedules of positive and negative reinforcement or extinguished altogether through a lack of reinforcement. Rote and associative learning, habit ingraining, shaping, - reward and punishment schedules, environmental manipulation, instrumental and developmental learning are some of the concepts associated to this school of thought (Brown, 2001). In *Verbal Behavior* Skinner's overarching concern was to provide a coherent and thoroughly empiricist framework for language acquisition in which the learning precepts of lower species were to be carried over into the realm of *sapiens sapiens*. Among other things, Skinner proposed that (i) language teaching could be expedited and (ii) the underlying principles of first language acquisition explained by a theory of conditioning involving strategic reinforcement schedules. Any word or 'verbal concept' along with its position or 'frame' in a sentence was learned through a trial-and-error approach in which the child laboriously, but effectively, narrowed the logical possibilities aided by parental schedules of positive and negative reinforcement in the form of approval or correction. From the speech community around her, the child deduced that words fit into various slots, and, when appropriately chained in speech, the result was meaningful.

Chomsky's objections to the Harvard psychologist's thesis were framed quite polemically in 1959 in his *Review of Verbal Behavior*. In the first place, Chomsky contended that were the psychologist's empiricism to be followed to its logical conclusions, his hypotheses would be vacuous, misleading, subjective, and simply not true. In the second place, having circumscribed legitimate scientific inquiry so narrowly, and

behaviorists had it liberally declared much of genuine human interest beyond the shallow research.

The most severe problems, however, were the logical and operational inadequacies of the behaviorist position in relation to mother tongue acquisition. Given that the child is exposed to only a minute sample of the language, that vast differences in intelligence exist, and that the child is experimentally naive, Chomsky re-asserted that it is logically impossible for a child to formulate hypotheses of commensurate sophistication and two examples of the kind of argument he was advancing ought to suffice here. Phonologically, each phoneme has enormous powers of recombination. From a strictly behaviorist perspective of frames and fillers, the child must learn through schedules of reinforcement and trial-and-error strategies that in English, for instance, /s/ can precede /t/, /k/, /l/, /m/, /n/, /p/, but not /b/, /d/, /g/, /r/, /v/, or /z/. Such an approach is highly improbable requiring coordinated schedules of reinforcement, well-honed mnemonics, and much lengthier exposure and practice. Syntactically, Bickerton (1990) suggests that the behaviorist perform the following operation:

A new arrangement is necessary to any sentence with ten words. In fact, there are exactly 3, 628,800 ways in which you can do this, but only one of them gives a meaningful and correct result. In other words, 3, 628,799 of them are ungrammatical. How did we realize this? No teacher or parent ever told us, indeed.

If the philosophical debate with Skinner centered on the impasse resulting from the exponence of creativity on the one hand and the dictates of logic on the other, the battle was also fought within the discipline itself. The core of this debate focused on the reflexive determination of certain linguists to introduce behavioristic principles into the discourse and Chomsky's equal determination to show that such an extension was critically misguided. Apart from the felt imperialism of such an approach, the many important

questions about the nature of linguistic structure are overlooked when the discussion is so constricted (Chomsky, 1966). It was the syntactic claims made by Skinner in particular that drew Chomsky's attention. Meanwhile, the breakthrough required in linguistic theory was emphatically not to be located in methodological refinements. According to Chomsky (1966) the study of linguistic structure "...should not be identified with a manual of useful procedures, nor should it be expected to provide mechanical procedures for the discovery of grammars" (p.55). Various authors have pointed out the fallacy at the heart of the discovery procedure agenda: Just as the proof of a mathematical theorem can be checked without taking account of the way in which the person constructing the proof happened to hit upon the relevant intermediate propositions, so it should be with respect to grammatical analysis (Lyons, 1986).

## 2.1    Syntactic Structures (1957)

In proposing a new model of generative grammar, Chomsky was continuing the venerable inquiry into the interconnectedness of sound and meaning which were taken to be axiomatic by de Saussure. Whereas McIntosh would see the bridge between sound and meaning as primarily phonological, Webelhuth (1995) sees the conceptual bridge between sound and meaning as basically syntactic "Generative Grammar is founded on the specific hypothesis that sound and meaning are only indirectly related in that they are mediated by syntactic representation" (p.3). Newmeyer (1996) traces the preeminence of syntax to one facet of the learnability problem "Whereas the analysis of 'text' characterizes functional linguistics, the analysis of sentence is thought to epitomize formalist linguistics" (p.132).

In *Syntactic Structures*, Chomsky introduced a wide variety of novel, mathematically nuanced terms, of which one of the most storied is the term 'formal'. For structuralists following de Saussure, the term denoted the differential meaning that a linguistic object

acquired by virtue of being a member in an interlocking network of relationships. Crystal (1991) lists at least six additional approaches. Harris (1964) it is "...nothing more than codified abstraction" (p.13). Emmon (1966) however, specifies that "with regard to generative linguistics, the term 'formal' is to be sharply contrasted with 'notional' there may be no appeal to semantic considerations if a concept is 'formally' defined" (p.10). Thus, a formal definition implies that the explanation is to be carried out in a mechanical, specific, precise, replicable, and non-intuitive way. The term is synonymous with explicit. A Generative Grammar is thus nothing more than formally precise grammars that see empirical predictions follow mechanically from its rules and postulates (Oiufang, 1999). Another concept - the notion of  sentence - bears tittle if any resemblance to what is normally understood by the term. In generative terms, it begins life as a construction - a concatenation of elements which, as economically as possible, makes up a proposition. The juncture at which a construction becomes sentence is not entirely clear and complains that the term 'sentence' was never concretely defined, its sense, instead, being left up to the intuitive judgement of the native speaker (Wilkins, 1972). Although it would be sharply distinguished later in the literature, the term is at this juncture used interchangeably with 'utterance' (Matthews, 1993). Gleason (1961) states that "the Chomskian 'sentence is better understood as representing all sentences in the language" (p.182). Like an equation, the Chomsky's specifies that another 'string' of increased detail must further clarify, or 'rewrite' the non-terminal symbol to the left automatically. These terminal symbols are to be read in much the same way that a mathematician would read an equation or a scientist a formula: a function that expands everything to the left on the right. Whenever a terminal symbol appears, it is to be immediately rewritten as a series of more concrete, more explanatory elements or 'formatives'. *A chain of algorithmic formatives is a 'string'.*

This 'string' is not an unordered set of elements, but, in Bloomfieldian terms, a particular kind of sequence of elements characterized by constituent structure (Gleason, 1961). For Lyons (1991) it is a "sequence of symbols" (p.59). And for Crystal (1991) "a linear sequence of elements" (p.329). The term has various operational usages: The 'initial string' is the prime, irreducible formula with which the syntactic device operates: S = NP + VP and appears equivalent to 'underlying string' i.e., the sequence of elements which has not as yet undergone any kind of transformation (Lyons, 1986).

These types of symbols - S, NP, VP, AUX, etc. - are called 'non-terminal' symbols in a 'non-terminal' string because they can be further specified. However, when the non-terminal symbols are 'filled in' with actually occurring formatives in the language, e.g.,*-en, the, cat*, etc., these latter are called 'terminal symbols' and the resultant concatenation is called a 'terminal string' i.e., one which cannot be rewritten specified any further. The terminal string is the final string generated by the generative grammar.

Much more accommodating with regard to the admissibility of intuitive evidence than Bloomfield had ever been, Chomsky would come to reverse the Bloomfield's dictum that the field-worker should 'accept everything the native speaker says in his language but nothing he says about it'. The acceptance of intuition is the characteristic which marks Chomsky off from Bloomfield. For Chomsky, it was precisely these native speaker abilities – "the abilities to label certain sentences as clearly grammatical, others as clearly ungrammatical, to recognize certain sentences as ambiguous, pairs of sentences as synonymous, etc" (Wilkins, 1972, p. 4). That constituted the Royal Road to linguistic consciousness.

In overturning the resolute empiricism of previous descriptivists, and in insisting upon the centrality of grammaticality in the discourse, Chomsky was required to offer a new trajectory and this he did in a tentative way in 1957. Initially, "the notion of

grammaticality refers to little more than the quality of a sequence that is acceptable to a native speaker" (Chomsky, 1966, p. 13). *Grammaticality* is determined neither probabilistically (i.e., the more frequently an object occurs, the more grammatical it must be) nor semantically. In terms of the first, however, Chomsky does concede that frequency of use may be a useful heuristic for the native-speaker in judging relative grammaticality. Nevertheless, the point is that heard utterances are only a small subset of all potential grammatical sentences generated by the rules of the system. Such a measure is consequently an impoverished metric by which to determine grammaticality. He is interested in describing the algorithmic system which pre-exists these judgments of grammaticality in the first place because it generates the strings beforehand. Ultimately, however, both the linguist's and the native-speaker's intuitive judgements of grammaticality are scalar: there are 'levels of grammaticalness' or 'degree[s] of grammaticalness' in the system. Grammar is fuzzy.

This formal (non-semantic) quest for the principles of grammaticality was to be judged in terms of a hierarchy of adequacy. Bloomfield's search for descriptive adequacy, then, was to be replaced by a standard of *explanatory adequacy*. The centrality of this adjective in the development of Transformational-Generative (TG) grammar can scarcely be underscored sufficiently.

Radford (1981) provides some guidance:

At the most elementary level, a grammatical model/theory of language is observationally adequate provided that it predicts which sentences are syntactically, semantically, and phonologically well-formed and which are not. A descriptively adequate grammar fulfills exactly these same requirements but significantly furnishes an explicit set of grammatical principles to formalize the native speaker's intuition.

The acme of scientific explication, however, would be a theory of explanatory adequacy (p.28).

A grammar of explanatory adequacy offers criteria by which to select the optimal description from among the competing models of grammar. A record of utterances, no matter how carefully culled, necessarily contains many well-formed utterances but equally crucially, as many hesitations, fragments, slips, and faulty native speaker judgments. Such utterances would thus provide a doubtful basis upon which to state the principles governing a particular language, the merest possibility that an utterance not be grammatical rendering any discussion inconclusive and implicit. Explicitness requires measurement and conclusion.

## 2.2 Competence and performance

His dissatisfaction with the state of linguistic science led Chomsky to introduce his fundamental postulate of autonomous syntax: dichotomous levels of analysis. The contours of deep structure and surface structure had been implicit in Chomsky's contention in 1957 that the central notion of linguistic theory is to produce what later was called universal grammar. The set of these sentences given in advance was the set against which the native speaker measured the grammaticality of his utterances; these were the sentences of his competence to be distinguished from the utterances of his performance.

Grammatical analysis in *Aspects* will proceed upon these assumptions but not in equal measure. His objective is an understanding of a competence which is identified by its singular creativity.

Formal universals, on the other hand, refer to the processes to which these substantive universal submit. Formal universals involve rather the character of the rules that appear in grammars and the ways in which they can be interconnected

## 2.3    Universal Grammar

The link between a universal base and an evolving theory of interna1 constraint seemed natural. A cardinal function of the universal base was to factor out of the child's linguistic learning certain communicational non-starters - to economically excise those communicational systems that could never be construed as distinctively human. Definite echoes of de Saussure's differential linguistic epistemology are heard here: the device or substrate conveys to the child what her language can potentially consist of by first conveying to her what her language can never consist of.

The speakers access the content of universal grammar through the activation of the language acquisition device or LAD. Acquiring a language consists in learning to apply the universal principles in the language in question and in identifying the appropriate value of each of the parameters.

The publication *Syntactic Structures* by Chomsky (1957) is considered as the beginning of generativism or generative-transformational grammar. Since then, this theory has undergone successive reformulations by N. Chomsky himself and some of his disciples. With the UG hypothesis, Chomsky aims to solve the logical problem of language acquisition or problem of learning, that is, explain how the speaker can acquire language in a relatively short period of time and on a regular basis, overcoming the deficiencies of the input it receives. This insufficiency of input to give rise to acquisition alone is due, on the one hand, to the fact that it contains elements of linguistic performance (for example, false principles, errors, ungrammatical expressions, etc.) that hinder the acquisition , and, on the other, to the fact that it never offers information about the deficient, erroneous or ungrammatical nature of such action, which prevents the individual from identifying the ungrammatical elements. The explanation that Chomsky gives to this process is precisely

the use of UG, which allows the individual to properly select the input and learn the particular rules of the language in question.

Chomsky's theory, universally accepted in the world of linguistics, has received some criticism in partial aspects. One of them is the speed with which Chomsky affirms that the acquisition of language takes place; According to some studies, children spend a lot more time, and they do it more intensively. Another is the innate character of some syntactic principles, which is not considered sufficiently established. Finally, the poverty of the input does not seem to require the hypothesis of a universal grammar.

In the research on the acquisition of second languages three types of opinion are distinguished with respect to the applicability of universal grammar:

- There is no difference in the use of the UG, whether it is an L1 or an L2.

- For learners of an L2, especially adults, it is impossible to access the UG.

- The UG is one of the factors that intervene in the acquisition and learning process of an L2, but not the only one.


## 2.4   Chomsky's ideas in language teaching

Chomsky argued that a linguistic theory must have the capacity to capture the psychological side of the knowledge of language. That is, the human mind is not a blank slate. The aim of linguistics is to understand and explain the following:

- What is in the mind/brain of the speaker of English or any other language?

- How did this knowledge arise in the mind/brain? How did we learn our native languages? Were we born with it? Or was it learned later?   Or both?

- How is this knowledge put to use in speech? etc.

Chomsky, therefore, emphasizes that the role of the native speaker is very important. For him a linguist who tries to learn and describe a language different from his/her own

may be able to produce a good description (as the structuralists did) but not the explanation that his generative grammar aspires for. For Chomsky the business of linguistics was to construct a theory which would explain and predict facts regarding languages. He treats linguistics as a science, and the point about science is that it seeks to explain why things are the way they are. It is this search for explanation which distinguishes science from other human activities. Chomsky has given a special name to this description Generative Grammar or Transformational Generative Linguistics. Generative grammar defines the aim – that is the grammar should be able to generate all and only the correct sentences, transformational defines one of the means of achievement. That is, grammar which is able to generate all and only the correct sentences of the language by means of applying transformational rules is a transformational generative grammar.

Chomsky has, therefore, once more shifted the pendulum in the opposite direction by making linguistics a branch of cognitive psychology. Linguistics today activity cooperates with a whole spectrum of disciplines including semiotics, logic, cybernetics, electronics, poetics, acoustics, neurophysiology, genetics, psychology, anthropology and sociology: areas regarded as extralinguistics (by the structuralists) have now become part and parcel of linguistic study. Linguistics thus started as a branch of humanistic studies and was later regarded as a natural science and still later as a social science some saw it as an empirical science others as an axiomatic discipline. If it took time depending from its original humanistic basis, determined by various philosophical system and philosophical needs it has in recent time - under the influence of Chomsky-shown an inclination to return to these traditional sources. But this time it is supported, as never before, by powerful theoretical, methodological and experimental means.

## 2.5    The cognitive approach to language teaching

Without denying that the individual is endowed with any biological equipment or LAD that allows to appropriate languages, cognitive psychology maintains that activity.

The mentality of the individual is essential for language learning. Next, it will briefly examine the main currents based on cognitivism: the cognitivism and the theories of information processing.

### 2.5.1    Cognitivism.

The European Structure-global audio-visual methods of the 60s collect this Piagetian conception of the individual as being able to reorganize his tailored knowledge advances in learning. These methods also incorporate the theory of gestalt (perception, in German), according to which people do not perceive isolated elements but rather groups that take on global meaning. To as the individual becomes familiar with the global aspects of a phenomenon (the intonation of a statement, for example) will be able to determine its parts and organize each of them into subsets. The cognitive activity of the individual is thus essential in the processes of language appropriation. This explains why these methods will begin to propose activities aimed at the student himself who discovers the rules of the language he learns from his own knowledge. The conceptualization exercises of phenomena, which appear in the notional-functional methods of the last third of the 20th century are a consequence of this constructivist vision of human capabilities.

The current contributions from constructivism understand the evolution of learner's language as a movement from what he calls a pragmatic mode, determined by the needs to satisfy the requirements of communication, towards a syntactic mode, which implies the mastery of forms and their nuances, that is, from what is purely functional towards what is formal.

Perdue (1990) describes what the author calls the basic reading, as a system minimum common to all learners of a given language, system that possesses similar traits. Level after level and from the data provided by the environment, the individual appropriates more complex forms. The itinerary of the learners would start in a nominal organization (a pragmatic way) to achieve a flexed organization (syntactic modes). So, for example, the mastery of morphosyntax, the use of pronouns and subordination would respond to final stages of acquisition, in the case of Romance languages.

### 2.5.2   The processing of information.

A recent stream within cognitive psychology describes the human mind as an information processor. According to this theory, learning consists of collecting, store, modify and interpret the new information that one receives.

Within the models of information processing applied to learning of second languages can be highlighted the contributions of McLaughlin (1987; 1990) and Van Patten (1996).

McLaughling makes a key distinction between declarative knowledge of the grammatical rules, or what is the same, what the learner knows consciously about the system of language, and procedural knowledge of an unconscious nature, or what the learner knows how to do in the target language. Thus, the learning process is defined as the gradual transformation of declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge.

Another key concept in McLaughling is restructuring. According to this theory, the incorporation of a new rule by the learner can result in the restructuring of the entire system. This characteristic would explain why some apparent setbacks suffered by learners who make mistakes in forms that in a previous stage produced correctly. An example of this phenomenon, occurs when students, who previously produced correctly the irregular past of the verb *make: made*, happen to use the wrong *maked* form. This error, which is

caused by the overgeneralization of an English grammar rule, shows how the student advances from a lexicalized system (or knowledge of the word made as a unique element, not belonging to a grammatical paradigm) to an analyzed system (or knowledge of the rule that governs in the formation of pasts in English, and of which this word is an exception).

Van Patten, on the other hand, analyzes from a cognitive perspective the role that input plays in the acquisition of a second language. While Krashen merely concerned with the understanding of the messages, Van Patten puts the emphasis on the control of attention during the process of understanding and explains that the attention span of learners is limited. The learners, in a first stage, pay special attention to the meaning and are only able to notice formal aspects when the meaning does not offer problems. In addition, a learner is not capable of processing a purely formal aspect of the language (for example, the -S of third person, in English), until the communicative content of the message does not offer difficulty, and consequently, the learner does not use hardly any resources of its attention span in the processing of content.

This statement contradicts McLaughling's explanation of the declarative and procedural knowledge. Actually, it seems that McLaughling and Van Patten refer to very different learning conditions. While in the first it is easy to recognize the way of working in a traditional classroom that uses the presentation, practice and production model (PPP), the second one refers to situations in which the learner uses the language to express meanings own, either in a communicative classroom or in the natural environment. In this type of contexts the priority attention of apprentices is focused on the transmission of message, while grammaticalized forms emerge later.

From the postulates of McLaughlin it is inferred that the mere declarative knowledge of grammatical rules is not enough to produce competent speakers, which is a generally accepted principle. However, contrary to what he affirms, it seems evident that the

declarative knowledge of a grammatical rule is not always a necessary condition for a learner to produce sentences in which this rule applies, as shown by many speakers who learn the language informally or in classrooms where a communicative methodology is practiced. Therefore, using its own terminology we could say that the procedural knowledge does not always need declarative previous knowledge. On the other hand, while it is true that formal instruction on certain grammatical rules can accelerate the process of acquiring such rules to facilitate their perception by the learner in the course of communication, certain rules are difficult to formulate or have so many exceptions that are more easily available through use than through formal education. An example of the latter is the rules of use of the article *the* in English.

# Chapter III

## Functional linguistics and language teaching

Beyond structuralist, descriptivist, and generative analyses, the typological analysis of language indicates that there are also semantic, syntactic, and phonological constructs which are held in common by members of the species. Beneath the diverse surface structure phenomena of the world's languages theorists such as Comrie (1981) and Greenberg (1966) have conceptualized the underlying linguistic universals of language in a sense quite distinct from the UG project initiated by Chomsky. Cross-linguistic affinities have enabled typologists to establish broad taxonomies of absolute, implicational and non- implicational universals and a high premium is placed on ensuring that categories demonstrate a cross-linguistic validity (Rutherford, 1984). Failure to ensure this cross-language comparability would mean that we are not doing language universals research, but are simply analyzing each language as an independent unit - and unlike those linguists who maintain that this is the only way to study languages, we would be doing so surreptitiously by pretending, through use of the same term, that our results are comparable across languages (Comrie, 1981). The tension here is familiar and ultimately perspectival: the approach points not to irreducible conflicts but to competing emphases.

## 3.1   Dell Hymes's Linguistics

The insights of Firth foreshadowed the emergent discipline of sociolinguistics; there were many others vaguely uneasy with a logical-mathematical bent of modern linguistics. These were sociologists of language who sought to supplement the theory with equally pertinent situational variables to reorient the discourse away from the vista of encoder and toward that of decoder. The American ethnographer Dell Hymes fought the extending supremacy of the former with the memorable call of the ethnolinguist:

Christie (1980) reiterates the perspectival motivation here:

It is not the case, as we might like to tell ourselves it is that we merely discover a framework lying in the data and waiting to be found. Various frameworks are possible for given batches of data and the framework chosen will influence the data we find (p.19).

This *ethos* is the methodological point of departure in any quest for a psychologically real grammar. Hymes's framework of communicative competence was conceived as the pragmatic complement to the framework of grammatical competence being developed at MIT. In so doing Hymes was hoping to construct a sociolinguistic superstructure above the cognitive infrastructure outlined by Chomsky in *Aspects*. He was attempting to bring an increasingly recondite discourse back to its proper coordinates in human activity. While accepting of Chomsky's basic competence/performance dichotomy, Hymes would nevertheless reorient the discourse away from a discussion of idealized algorithms to one in which Malinowski's daily communions and Firth's situational realities were central. The daily grammar of the child was a reflection of the cultural and interpersonal assumptions of her speech community, her tacit understanding of the speech situation, along with her speech event, speech networks, and speech acts. The expanse of Hymes's realm of

pragmatic competence is rather breathtaking, although there is an distinctively Firthian theme throughout.

Hymes's insistence upon the significance of the daily communions of the talking ape was fully in accordance with the goals envisaged for linguistic ethnography advocated by Malinowski and Firth. This deliberately contextual approach to language was intended to accomplish for the developing science of pragmatics what transformational analysis had carried out for syntax: to establish a performative structure above the bedrock of formally construed competence.

## 3.2    Michael Halliday's Linguistics

In the late sixties Michael Halliday was also considering language from the point of view of its social implications and concurred with Hymes (1978) in seeing "...the linguistic system as a component - an essential component - of the social system" (p.51). He diverges from the ethnographer, however, on a number of issues, but mainly because he envisaged a different orientation for the discourse. Whereas Hymes was attempting to buttress the generative infrastructure and in particular the competence-performance distinction, Halliday believed that the structure was fundamentally misshapen to begin with.

Butler(1985) said that what is needed is a theory "...which, rather than being directed towards sociological or psychological researches, is intended to illuminate the internal structure of language itself, explaining why language is patterned as it is, and not in one of the many other possible ways" (p.46).

While Hymes was laudably involved in rescuing the functioning individual from almost total immersion in deep syntax, he was nevertheless throwing along a needlessly weighty anchor. Competence and performance, for Halliday, were artifacts of the *Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory*.

Chomsky's idealized speaker-listener is a bloodless creature alienated from the myriad realities of market, home, and playground.

Halliday's point of departure is functional; Chomsky's is psycholinguistic and that of Hymes a hybrid psycho-sociolinguistic approach. We could say, following Dell Hymes, that it is part of the speaker's communicative competence that he knows how to distribute lexical items in a text according to different kinds of language use.

In an attitude reminiscent of Firth's notion of language as activity, Halliday suggests the term languaging to emphasize the essence of what he is describing - formalized activity or actualized form.

Along with Chomsky, Lamb, Bloomfield, and Jakobson, Halliday states that "we take it for granted that language is... organized into levels or strata" (Halliday, 1994, p. 30). However, the admission that grammar was stratified was as far as he would go and Christie recaps the traditional view of grammar which Halliday sought to change:

MEANING

Semantics

Syntax

Morphology

Phonology

Phonetics

SOUND

Christie(1980) said that:

It was a fundamentally bi-stratal view of grammar essentially in which the meaning of a sentence begins at the top most level of semantics and accrues formal objects of various kinds on the way down to the level of sound (p.37).

While the stratified nature of the model does not appear to disturb Halliday, it is the compositional attitude to meaning-in-language that does. As Christie (1980) puts it:

The traditional view has been one of layers of structure with meaning flowing through them, as it were, on its way to becoming sound...But this view retains a notion of meaning as something a sentence has rather than something a speaker does. If meaning is use, then such a flow-through model as this is unnecessary and inappropriate (p.37).

Halliday (1978) proposes instead a functional revision in which grammar would still be stratified but in terms of three proposed levels:

Sounding (phonetics and phonology), (ii) wording (morphology, syntax, and lexis), and (iii) meaning (semantics). When linguists talk about the semantic system, the lexical-grammatical (or syntactic) system and the phonological system, they are simply referring to the meaning, the wording, and the sounding (p.208).

## 3.3    Functional grammar

Halliday's model of grammar is thoroughly scalar as opposed to discrete or perhaps even stratified. Halliday (1978) said that "never seeking the degree of formal idealization at which Chomsky aimed and which he considers misguided and pointless anyway" (p.37), the latter placed much more emphasis on the overlapping, fuzzy nature of grammar and comparatively less on its boundaries and terminal junctures.

Grammar is a continuous weave with no clear frontiers between semantics and grammar, structure and phonology (Hasan, 1989). Intonation, for example, in a highly novel perspective, is simply the 'most delicate mood' of the grammar. This is a conception of grammar in which the realities of the playground and the structures in the clause are two ends of the same tapestry. At the time that interpretivists and semanticists were embroiled

in controversies over transderivational constraints at campuses around America, Halliday envisaged a functional-formal continuum rather than purely formal stratification.

In the general denomination of functional grammars, theoretical approaches that describe linguistic phenomena from their different communicative functions are included. The fundamental assumption of functional grammars is that linguistic phenomena cannot be explained without taking into account their semantic or communicative function. These grammars are presented as an alternative to poststructuralist approaches that attempt to account for linguistic phenomena from strictly formal perspectives (for example, by raising the autonomy of syntax).

The way of analyzing the verbal agreement allows us to exemplify the different conceptions: in a strictly formal approach, this phenomenon is explained by morphosyntactic arguments: thus the finite verb agrees with the nominal phrase (in the nominative case) that functions as the subject of the preaching, explanation which is valid for most European languages. In a functional approach, however, the influence of the semantic role (for example, the animate or determined character) of the noun phrase is basic to verbal agreement. This description procedure accounts, for example, for the agreement of the verb and the object in Swahili in that language, together with the subject-verb agreement, there is also a verbal agreement with the object, in the event that the object is a human being or a defined entity.

A central theme in the functional grammar of typological orientation are the formal and functional properties of the subject and the object in grammatical processes such as relativization, passivization, erasure of the nominal phrase and reflexive pronouns. The interlinguistic comparison results in a huge variety in the way different languages mark subjects and objects, and how they behave in different grammatical processes. A recurrent

topic in the different volumes compiled by Givón (1990; 1997) is the notion of subject and object in ergative languages.

There are different proposals within this functional framework. One of the most finished theories is the one elaborated by Michael Halliday, the systemic functional grammar. The theoretical-methodological instrumentation of this theory has been developed for the English language, but in recent years it has had an increasing impact on other languages, such as French and Spanish, and has been extended in a proposal of textual scope, linguistics functional system with important developments in the field of applied linguistics (especially linguistic education, academic communication, teaching English as a foreign language, etc.). On the other hand, the functional grammar, developed by Simon Dik, constitutes an established theoretical body but of more restricted diffusion. The most important work centers are in Holland, England and Spain. In the Hispanic sphere, grammars described as functionalists base their models and descriptions on structural-functional linguistics (Ferdinand de Saussure, Louis Hjelmslev and André Martinet): they agree on basing their classifications and orderings on the basis of the syntactic roles that elements meet in sentences. Formal descriptions are linked to functional aspects, whether pragmatic or rhetorical-stylistic. On the other hand, the orderings and categorizations are illustrated with authentic examples, extracted from documented written or oral sources.

Functional notions play essential roles at different levels of the grammatical organization. The theory distinguishes, on the one hand, semantic functions, which define the roles that participants play in the states of affairs that designate predications (such as agent, patient, receiver, etc.); on the other hand, the syntactic functions, which express the different perspectives by means of which the states of affairs are presented in linguistic expressions. Finally, it also distinguishes the pragmatic functions (theme and coda [tail],

topic and focus) that define the informational status of the constituents of the linguistic expressions, that is, these notions express the inclusion of the expressions in the discourse and are determined by the pragmatic information handled by the speaker and the addressee during the verbal interaction (Hill, 1969).

Since functional grammar aspires to have a great practical applicability in the analysis of the different aspects of language and its use, it is designed to maximize the degree of typological adequacy and simultaneously minimize the degree of abstraction of linguistic analysis.

## 3.4    Functional approach to language teaching

This method arises at the end of the 70s of the 20th century. It was proposed by Wilkins in his work *Notional Syllabuses* (1976).

It is characterized by setting its objectives in terms of observable behavior and is carried an analysis of the language applying the concepts of notion and function; the various combinations between functions and notions give rise to a series of linguistic exponents.

Functions: the intentions of the speaker in the use of the language as presentation, denial, affirmation or information.

Notions: concepts expressed through the language as time, quantity or frequency.

There are a series of principles within this method:

- Principle of communication: the activities and exercises that require a communication promote the learning of a language.

- Task principle: the activities that carry out a real-world task they favor the learning of a language.

- Principle of the significant: students must be involved in meaningful use of the language so that learning happens.

The situation is defined as extra-linguistic conditions that determine the nature of a linguistic act, or more simply, the context in which communication takes place. Examples of situations are: in the supermarket, on the beach.

Another very common way to organize language teaching is to do it around a theme: home, free time, travel, health ... etc.

On the other hand, notions are defined as a concept or an idea, they can be very specific (for example: house, animal) or they can be very general (for example: space, time, size, movement ...)

Functions are the things we do when we talk. Examples of functions are: ask for forgiveness, give thanks, say hello, invite someone, say goodbye, express wishes ... etc. It is important to understand that one or more linguistic forms correspond to each function.

# Chapter IV

## Pragmatics and language teaching

Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that studies the use of language in context. As contexts are different the meanings of words will be different depending on the contexts where they are used. In a communicative situation we can notice that there  is a sender and a receiver of the message and that message has a special meaning according to the context. Some of the basic conceptions of pragmatics were:

- Pragmatics is conceived as a perspective on which to observe the rest of the phenomena. Its approach is broader and does not depend on other language disciplines.

- Doing pragmatics as a perspective implies overcoming the reductionist views of pragmatics as a component.

Pragmatics as a perspective explains linguistic facts in all their cognitive, social and cultural complexity: metaphor, irony, the discursive subject, the representation of discourse.

## 4.1    The contributions of pragmatics to language teaching

### 4.1.1    The principle of cooperation.

Whenever there is some kind of conversational exchange, there are certain rules that are being followed. Human beings are not always aware of these rules. However, if we did not follow them, communication would be almost impossible. Applying these rules also becomes very important when communicating in another language, in the language we are learning. But many other language learners, English in this case, do not know these rules and therefore cannot apply them, resulting in a communication failure. The principle of cooperation proposes that there are four maxims that the participants of a conversation should follow. These maxims are:

The maximum amount, which tells us that we must provide only the necessary amount of information, neither more nor less than necessary for them to understand us. In the maximum of quality, the use of real, true information is emphasized, not information that we think is real, but that we are sure of its truthfulness.

The maximum relevance indicates that we must communicate using only relevant information for the purpose of communication.

The maxim in a way or way is about the importance of communicating our ideas in a clear way, avoiding ambiguities and phrases that can cause confusion in the listener (Fries, 1972).

Fries (1972) proposes the following example to analyze this principle put into practice:

- How is C doing in his new job?

- I guess very well. He likes his co-workers and hasn't gone to prison yet.

Based on this information, we can infer that C had problems with colleagues in the past and was also in prison. Of course, B knows information about C's background in order to understand the message. In this case, the maximum amount is observed; B does not need extra information to understand the message (Grice, 1975).

The example proposed by Grice (1975) is a reflection of a conversation that can occur between two friends, acquaintances, relatives, etc. It is easy to conclude that the ability to understand these types of conversational exchanges is acquired unconsciously as we learn our mother tongue. However, when learning a second language, many books and teachers tend to focus too much on formal aspects of this, for example, grammar and its rules, with which the student may have problems communicating with a native speaker of the target language (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). As is generally known, we often use indirect language to communicate our message because we assume that our listener is prepared to understand it. When talking about direct and indirect language, we have to mention speech acts.

### 4.1.2  Speech Acts.

Every day people use language to ask, apologize, thank, etc. All these functions of language are known within the pragmatics as speech acts (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). These consist of three fundamental categories that are:

- Consecutive act: refers to what we say. It is the statements created by people.
- Illocutive act: this act is the meaning of what we say. For example, in a direct language, the phrase, "close the door, please" It is clearly understood. The intention is for the listener to close the door. However, if the speaker says "it is very hot in here," the message is not necessarily clear. It can be an indirect way of suggesting someone to turn on the air conditioner, for example. In this case, the consecutive act would be

"it's very hot in here." And the illocutive act would be the intention of this phrase
(someone turn on the air conditioner, for example).

- Perlocutive act: this act refers to the result obtained with the mentioned phrase. In this
  case the result may be that someone, who understood the message, gets up and opens
  a window or turns on the air conditioner (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

Let us briefly analyze the act of greeting. Apparently, this routine is simple and is
achieved by learning certain phrases that can be taught by the teacher or reviewed in a book
or online. However, greeting is more than saying a few sentences, shaking your head or
shaking hands. In oral communication, the role of greeting is so important that it can affect
the purpose of communication. Saluting properly is of the utmost importance to create a
good and lasting impression (Zhou, 2003).

Taking into account that, according to what has been investigated, the language used
in the texts, and by many teachers, does not always reflect that used by the ordinary citizen,
it is of utmost importance to present to students opportunities to learn this way of using the
language used by the majority of native speakers of the target language.

## 4.2  Importance of teaching pragmatics in language teaching

As pragmatics studies the use of language based on the relationship between statement-
context-interlocutors, it is interested in analyzing how speakers produce and interpret
sentences in a given context. This shows the importance in the communication of extra-
linguistic factors such as the position of the interlocutors with respect to each other, the
knowledge of the world of each of them, the communicative intention ...

It is important for our students, to become familiar with this dimension of language,
to be aware of the fundamental role that all these factors play in communicative exchanges.

If we encourage students to think about misunderstandings that they themselves have experienced during their stay in an English speaking country (funny or embarrassing situations), it is certain that in many of them, pragmatics have intervened in a relevant way.

Did you have trouble understanding the words of your interlocutor? Trouble using exactly the words you wanted to use? Why then were there problems in communication? How much weight were the words, and how much, all other factors surrounding these words?

Thought about what were the factors that caused the misunderstanding, they will probably understand that the confusion was a consequence of the difference between what was said and what was meant.

A brief and simple explanation of how important pragmatics are, can serve as a starting point to introduce didactic proposals in the classroom that help develop this competence:

Using effectively and adequately the foreign language we learn - English in this case - requires, beyond purely linguistic knowledge, to know the socio-cultural norms and values that surround it.

In many occasions, a message goes far beyond its literal meaning, because through other factors, we can communicate or understand another implicit meaning, which contradicts the explicit one, but which is really what you want to convey.

Therefore, there are several extralinguistic elements that we must consider for efficient communication: context, tone of voice, intention, gestures ...

If conversations between natives are not exempt from certain misunderstandings caused by any of these elements, imagine how much more can occur in intercultural conversations, between people used to handling different behavioral codes.

Logically, by learning a different language, we tend to apply with it the behavior patterns that govern ours: when both systems are different, we can fall into misunderstanding. That is why it is essential to recognize these elements in the discourse of our interlocutors and know how to put them into practice on our own.

True, it is not always a simple task. Let's look at the following examples:

If an English speaker asks an interlocutor:

"Will you come to my party tomorrow?", Actually use this question as an invitation. He is saying, "Come to my party tomorrow."

If the interlocutor is not native, he can remain in the literalness of the question (ask for information), thus causing the misunderstanding.

Also in the English culture, before a compliment like "I love your jacket", the recipient of the compliment tends to lose importance with answers such as "it cost me very little" or "it is very old".

The response of an Anglo-Saxon, in whose culture the compliments are grateful only with a "thank you", could be impolite.

Thus, we see how to decode the messages and have a successful communication, not only depends on understanding the words, but also requires a mutual knowledge, on the one hand what each interlocutor knows, and on the other, what he knows that the other knows. We must understand the forms that English culture uses to express statements that transcend its literal meaning, which acquire other values, which contain implicit meanings.

# Chapter V

# Text Linguistics and Language Teaching

Language is the fundamental instrument of communication and transmission of experiences and all the work of a community. Therefore, it is necessary to stop in the linguistic communication, a communicative process carried out by means of linguistic signs and that is known as the verbal communicative activity.

Text linguistics deals with fragments of language larger than a sentence. The approach to text is functional rather than formal, i.e. how people use it, the whole context of a speech act, more than distribution of text elements.

## 5.1    Spoken vs. written texts

Language is a form of human communicative activity and, as such, a generally conscious and intentional social process because it is carried out with a specific purpose. It uses a very complex system of signs that allow us to transmit all kinds of feelings, ideas, thoughts or concepts. According to Eugenio Coseriu, it is a universal human activity that is carried out in each case according to certain historical traditions characteristic of linguistic communities and by particular individuals acting in particular situations (Coseriu, 1977).

Verbal human communication is a linguistic activity and, like any activity, it constitutes a process of transformation of the natural or social environment. This process is carried out by human subjects, individual or collective, who appropriate the environment in an intentional way, to achieve a specific purpose. This activity was born from the social needs of production, because it was work, collective activity, which forced the human being to seek an effective system to communicate with their peers and to transform reality seeking the benefit of the entire social group.

In summary, we can affirm that linguistic communication is an activity through which, using the signs of the language, we form a message with the intention of achieving a goal set in advance.

Both oral and written languages have a productive and an interpretive process. In the oral, the productive is done when speaking, and the interpretive, when listening. In writing, we produce when we write and interpret through reading.

We can say, then, that speaking and writing are productive psycholinguistic activities, and listening and reading, interpretive psycho-linguistic activities. Through them we meet personal or social needs and communicate with the members of a society.

Both oral and written languages are learned by the individual who, through its use, is integrated into a social group, manages to interact with him and learn about his culture. Language develops as the individual develops, but this development, especially with regard to written language, is the product of explicit teaching that begins in primary school, continues in secondary school and, in Many times, it must be reinforced at the university level.

We already know that language is the main means of human social communication and is carried out through verbal communicative activities with which we carry out

transactions of meanings. But these meanings are not transmitted through isolated words or sentences. We communicate using other units called texts, which we will deal with next.

A text is the fundamental unit of human verbal communication; as such, it is a sociological event, a semiotic encounter through which the meanings that constitute the social system are exchanged; therefore, the text becomes valuable in culture and is the primary conduit through which its transmission takes place. Thus conceived, the text is a semantic unit: it is the basic unit of the process of significance (Halliday, 1982). Text is all that people really mean. It is a potential of realized social meaning, that is, converted into a linguistic activity through the textual function of language, which is the function of creating texts. In this function of creating texts there is an accomplishment of all levels: the level of significance, the level of diction or expression and the level of sound or writing (Halliday, 1982). The meaning materializes as an expression and this is realized as sound in the oral language or as a spelling in the written language.

The text is a fabric in which several networks are present, understanding as a network a set of options or choices. These networks of the text correspond to the language levels and are:

a)     a semantic network, constituted by what the speaker decides to mean. This network is regulated by the native theory and system of speech (Hymes, 1974), according to which the community member has a communicative ability that makes him able to know when to speak, when not to speak, what code to use, when, where, with whom, for what, etc.

b)     a grammatical network, which is the lexical-grammatical structure of the sentences through which the text is encoded.

c)     a phonological network, which are the phonemes that combine to form the sentences with which the texts are enunciated.

Halliday defines the text as everything that is said or written in a specific situation and understands as a situation, the environment in which the text arises to life (Halliday, 1982). Conceived in this way, the text is a semantic unit, independent of size: it can be very long or very short.

In summary, we can define the text as any coherent sequence of linguistic signs, produced in a specific situation by a speaker and endowed with a specific communicative intentionality and a specific cultural function.

## 5.2    Characteristics of a text

After having defined the text as the minimal unit of communication, we can point out some of its characteristics as follows:

- The text is communicative because it is the result of a linguistic activity, through which we communicate meanings.

- The text has a social character because it is the fundamental linguistic unit of social interaction. The exchange of meanings is a transactional process and the text is the instrument through which we carry it out.

- The text is pragmatic because the issuer of a text has an intention to state it and produces it in a particular situation.

- The text has semantic or communicative closure because it cannot establish dependencies (formal or not) with other texts to be understood as full text; it must be an independent semantic unit through which meanings are exchanged.

- The text has coherence because it is constituted by a set of related propositions. These propositions are codified in sentences. The text is, therefore, a logical sequence of propositions expressed in sentences that are joined together by means of syntactic elements. This leads us to establish the distinction between coherence and cohesion.

The first is of a semantic nature and refers us to a global meaning of the text; It depends on the way the author of a text wishes to organize the ideas he will express. Cohesion refers to the syntactic elements that relate the components of the text to each other; these contribute to the interpretation of the text by the recipient: it is the discovery of coherence by the listener (Butler, 1982).

- Text structure. The fundamental property of the text is its structured or systemic character, because this is a totality where all the parts are interrelated. It consists of two planes: content plane and plane of the form or expression.

The first is constituted by a series of conceptual contents related to each other and that play a role within the whole.

These contents are called subtexts or subthemes, because they are divisions of the subject or fundamental information that the author of the text wants to transmit to the recipient or recipient. The subthemes are divided, at the same time, into thematic propositions that are carriers of a certain value of truth attributed by the issuer of a text to certain objects or events of reality. Thematic propositions are the relationship established between concepts or ideas that have about an object or event.

So far we have stopped in the content structure that Van Dijk calls semantic macrostructure. But, as we well know, language is a psycholinguistic process in which two activities are involved: production and interpretation of meanings. In the first activity comes into play first the thought that makes a semantic configuration and builds the semantic macrostructures of the texts that are beginning to be produced. This meaning thus constructed has to be expressed by linguistic signs so that the text takes a concrete form.

The different parts of the content plan are expressed through various linguistic categories of different levels, organized hierarchically, and in this way the formal

macrostructure or plan of the form is constructed. This is constituted by combining the following linguistic categories:

- Syntagm, which is the minimum semantic-syntactic unit of the text, which unlike the sentence is not offered in the language in a finished way, but is formed during the process of generating (or receiving) the text to name complex concepts that arise in consciousness and reflect a fragment of the reproduced reality.

- Sentence, is the syntactic-semantic unit that tries to express the meaning of a thematic proposition.

- Communicator, part of the text made up of a certain informational thematic block, organized hierarchically by a chain of sentences, sentences and by the phrases that are part of them. In the oral language, the communicator can be equivalent to the sections of the discourse, and in the writing, to the sections or paragraphs through which we express the different subthemes or subtexts (Torsugeva, 1989).

In addition to the semantic macrostructure and the formal macrostructure, each type of text has a certain schematic structure or superstructure; This is understood as the global form of a discourse that defines its global order and the hierarchical relations of their respective fragments (Van Dijk, 1983).

According to the superstructure, each type of text is made up of different categories and training rules that determine the order of appearance of each category. Thus, for example, an argumentative essay has three categories: introduction, where the thesis is posed and which must appear first. Then comes the development, which is done through arguments; and in the last place the conclusion appears.

The superstructure of a text determines the semantic macrostructure, that is, the overall content of the text. Thus, in the case of the argumentative essay, the content must consist of a thesis that is raised in relation to the referent on which it is to be written; own

arguments to prove it and the thesis proven. This content must be accompanied by persuasion strategies that constitute the rhetorical structure of the text and relate the form and meaning.

## 5.3    Standards of textuality

It has been established that a sequence of utterances is a text if it meets the 7 standards of textuality are cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality and intertextuality.

### 5.3.1    Cohesion.

Cohesion and coherence together are the most important factors. The cohesive devices have two tasks: a) to unify text; b) to make it more economical (to save short-term memory).

The cohesive devices are:

● Recurrence (the direct repetition of elements).

*My brother has bought a car, and this car is really cool.*

● Paraphrase (the recurrence of content with a change of expression, the use of synonyms) *murderer taker of life*

● Ellipsis (omission of words or phrases felt to be unnecessary because they have already been referred to or mentioned.)

*Where are you going?  To town. (I am going to town).*

● Junction (the use of connecting expressions e.g. conjunctions, linking phrases = transitions)

   Functional sentence perspective (FSP)

An utterance has the old information and new information. Old information – theme, at the beginning of an utterance. New information – rheme, at the end of an utterance.

*I saw a woman.  The woman was carrying a large suitcase.*

- Intonation

(The falling intonation marks the end of an utterance or whole text, rising – continuity).

### 5.3.2   Coherence.

Concerns the logical arrangement of elements of text. It reflects cognitive processes of language users, their experience, and knowledge of the world.

*Could you open the door?*

*I'm in the bath!*

Often texts are both coherent and cohesive, but sometimes only coherent, e.g. the example above.  As long as they are interpreted by the users, and are understood, they are acceptable. However, a text which is cohesive but not coherent is unacceptable.  Logical unity is more important than surface unity.

*Yesterday I saw a car.  A car is a machine.  There is no doubt about it that a machine is a noun.  We have many kinds of nouns and he was very kind to me.  What's more, kind has four letters.*

### 5.3.3   Intentionality and acceptability.

It has to do with the one who produces the text and the other who accepts the text. The receiver of the text has to decode the intentions of the speaker or writer. If a conversation is to be successful, it should involve:

- Co-operation of the interlocutors;

- Truthfulness of the interlocutors;

- Providing necessary information (but not more than necessary);

- Being relevant, to the point; (these can be purposefully violated)

Acceptability is sensitive to context- what can be accepted as a text in a pub, may not be accepted in a posh restaurant.

### 5.3.4  Informativity.

Concerns the balance between the unknown and certain,  expected and unexpected in a text. A text which is full of the new and unexpected can be rejected as too difficult. A text which consists of only known information can be rejected as boring. (Too low informativity).

It is also context-sensitive – you expect high informativity of a lecture, and rather low informativity of a text heard at a bus stop.

### 5.3.5  Situationality.

Concerns factors which make a text relevant to a current situation or occurrence. These are strategies of monitoring and management employed by the speaker to make sure that the discourse develops according to his expectations.

### 5.3.6  Intertextuality.

The transfer from an old text to the present one can take the form a direct quotation or an allusion.

**Chapter VI**

**Linguistic foundations of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)**

The communicative approach centers the teaching on the individual who learns, the student

is the protagonist of the teaching / learning process, is the center of attention. The

dictionary of French Didactics (2003) defines it as the methodological choices to develop in

educating adaptive and flexible communicative competencies to the diversity of concepts

that are organized according to the objectives based on the functions and the notions One of

the main objectives is to get students to increase their level of communicative competence,

it must be taught from real communication contexts with communicative and thus lead

those involved to understand how communication serves as source to build and exchange

meanings.

From the broader perspective, this approach is a logical notion of learning between

language and literature, and on the other hand, is aimed at the development of skills in the

use of student's language in any situation of formal, informal, academic communication,

scientific, cultural, religious or artistic. Mendoza (2003) mentions that the focus of

communication is only possible if the characteristics of each student are taken into as your

interests and needs.

**6.1  Theory of the language**

The linguistic theory of the Communicative Language Teaching has to do within the latest trends such as text linguistics, pragmatics and discourse analysis.

**6.2  History of the communicative approach**

According to Chomsky (as cited in Pilleux, 2003) states that factors are not considered sociocultural that help the linguistic and communicative process. Suffers various changes during its development stages, but its objective was always the same: achieve in the students a significant communicative competence. Its beginnings go back to the decade of the 70, where changes are made to the traditional way of learning, which focused on developing grammatical and orthographic skills. It is Chomsky who lays the foundations and classifies the structure of the approach and imposes its ideas and produces a revolution in the teaching of second languages.

It is in the decade of the 90s that this approach reaches schools in a more developed way and formal, positioning itself as a method of teaching oral and written interaction where the progression is visible through the development of different communication activities that are adapted to the needs of the students.

In 2002, the Council of Europe conceived the communicative approach as a basic competence in education which develops a set of skills, knowledge and experiences that people should be able to contextualize and use in a adequate and effective in the different communicative situations and thus demonstrate the acquisition of the four communicative skills (speaking, listening, understanding and writing).

**6.3    Features of the communicative language teaching**

Melero (2000) characterized this approach as a means of general education and not a teaching method with clearly defined class practices: use group techniques to start forums, theatrical games or any other type, organize round tables, debates and seminars in which an issue is discussed, a theme is chosen and the participating students, they elaborate their points of view.

The importance of the application, function and relevance of this learning through the situations of everyday life, will make learning much more motivating. Bloomfield (1933) provides a list with 5 characteristics of the communicative method:

- Consider the personal experiences of the students as components that they contribute to your learning.

- Links the language learned in the classroom with activities carried out outside of it.

- Give maximum importance to interaction as a way and as a final purpose in learning of a language.

- It offers the possibility of carrying out a large number of oral and written activities.

- Also, it is characterized by having a functional vision of the language and uses it in a contextualized as a means of communication. It is developed through 5 important competences:

- Linguistic competence: the ability to formulate understandable statements is developed.

- Discursive competence: through this the person determines the text or dialogue appropriate to the circumstance that it faces.

- Textual competence: build a well-organized text (take into account rules grammatical and orthographic)

- Pragmatic competence: It is the ability to achieve a specific effect or answer by half of the text made.

- Encyclopedic competence: They are all the previous or acquired knowledge that allows the effective dialogue between interlocutors.

Based on the study of the term communicative approach, new types of competences (linguistic-grammatical, textual or discursive, sociolinguistic, strategic, symbolic and literary media), which structure an integrating nature.

As well other terms arise that are interrelated to be considered of frequent use by the interlocutor, of these terms the one that stands out most is the context that, independently of the historical time and space in which something is said, can be understood as the variable frame in which the discursive and changing interventions of the communicative relationship are elaborated between people.

## 6.4    A communicative paradigm to language teaching

Sánchez (2002) reports that several years have passed since the beginning of this approach, which over time it has evolved and been strengthened to be considered as a reference in the improvement of the teaching-learning process of a language, which seeks not only teach grammatical notions but develop a communicative skill in the students, where linguistic knowledge processes are understood and acquired, strategic, sociolinguistic and digital essentials for an effective dialogue, always a contextualized way.

At present, this type of approach is a didactic means for teaching languages and literature which focuses on developing communicative competence from all its dimensions (grammar, oral, written), that is, the capacity acquired to understand and produce statements that adapt to the communicative social context that is presented as this approach proposes a series of skills as a fundamental teaching axis.

Not only should they be put into practice in the classroom, they should also be applied to situations of real daily life. On the other hand, Lomas (2002) makes reference that when learning to use a language not only is learning to build grammatically correct sentences, but also to know what say? to whom?, when?, how to say it ?, what and when to keep silent ?, also determines that the modern communicative approach in education proposes to stop understanding teaching as a mere transmission of knowledge by the teachers to put the accent on the Knowledge construction by students. What emphasizes that the acquisition of strategies, the understanding and production of both oral and written texts should be the objectives to be achieved by the teacher towards their students, which transforms the environment of learning in a privileged space of interaction and communication where they combine aspects and oral, written and non-verbal skills.

## 6.5    Communicative approach and language teaching

Cortés (2000) mentioned that, in the teaching and didactics of the second languages or languages foreign, the communicative approach has been predominant in the teaching process. Since its inception more than 40 years ago, this approach has been enriched and strengthened with different research and contributions, which make it a flexible tool in constant evolution.

This approach proclaims a type of student-centered teaching, taking into account their both communicative and learning needs, which makes evident the loss of protagonism of the teacher and the programs, which favors autonomy and greater responsibility on the part of the apprentices, leading them to take the necessary decisions about their own learning.

It allows the development of the language since it favors the skills and development of self-training (responsibility and decision making), guides and monitors the teaching process in class, a relation of space and time of events, actions and scenarios is created.

These skills are acquired and work through the compression of sounds, words, language messages, the expression of vocabulary and the proper use of morphosyntax moral and written form.

The repetition, memorization of sounds, phonemes, syllables or single words without contexts, phrases, sentences, or simple repetitions of vocabulary, are unnecessary elements for a real and meaningful learning in a second language, that is why the focus communicative helps to detect the needs of students and adapts to these for expose those involved to real-life situations that guide them to put into practical linguistic processes learned from the right situation.

Nussbaum (2002) affirms that languages are the means and objects of learning. So to speak and read, new knowledge is acquired in order to talk about things approaching how experts in the different fields of knowledge do it. In general sense, the communicative approach focuses its function on the teaching of the language to through real works and situations, where the language is the resource to reach an end. In class can be worked through exposure to real-life situations, for example, order food or read newspaper classifieds.

## 6.6    Implications for a communicative approach in teaching

The Common European Framework of References for Languages and Cultures (2002) refers that this approach is carried out when the interlocutor manages to distinguish: when to speak, when not, of what to talk about, with whom, when, where and in what form, that is, it is about the capacity of form statements that are not presented only correct in their grammatical form, but also socially approved.

The communicative approach is emphasized in the acquisition and development of strategies that help and allow the understanding of a second language, as well as written

texts. You will also be known as communicative teaching of the language which leads to those involved be trained to carry out a real and contextualized communication. It develops from the hand of technology and modern tools like videos, audios, movies, dramatizations and conversations. Adapts the needs of students through the culture in the learning process.

It is essential to mention that to train students to become professionals competencies demanded by society, it is necessary that each teacher (who must be qualified to work with this teaching tool) know and dominate so effective the term communicative approach, clear and real objectives must be established, in addition of the properly linguistic. In the classroom you must work hand in hand with the following aspects:

- Encourage autonomous learning.

- Train the student to solve future situations in real life, both in the field personal as a professional, relate the theoretical foundations with the real world.

- Carry out work of a cooperative nature, with the aim of encouraging decision-making and the social / oral relationship between the students.

- Develop communication skills (argue, inform, negotiate, converse) by means of real activities.

- Develop the attitude in each student, helping him to understand that in a moment given must face only the social and professional reality.

- Enhance self-learning.

- For a team to work in a meaningful and effective way, it is necessary:

- Facing real situations.

- Encourage participation.

- Avoid dependence on external sources.

- The content and the learning process need to be complemented in an integral way.

- Encourage active and cooperative work.

The communicative approach is fundamentally linked to the relationship that must exist between the learning of the language and all its dimensions with the functioning that this has within the social sphere, where the main purpose of establishing the communication and thus take into account the student's needs that determine the skills you want to develop with the use of authentic documents of life daily so that acquired knowledge can be used in real situations and respect the socio-cultural codes.

**Didactic application**

The class consists of the oral presentation of the information or content of a topic or lesson. It can rely on the use of materials and audiovisual resources and allows an organized explanation in the classroom and communicate a lot of material to many students in a short time.

The presentation should be brief, clear, with good rhythm and abundance of examples, and properly planned. For this, it is recommended to follow a series of phases:

- Initial phase or preparation for learning, which will serve as an introduction to the contents of the topic to be discussed. The objectives and context that allow a first approximation to the fundamental ideas to be treated will be raised.

- Phase of presentation of the contents, organized in a way that begins with the simplest and, once assimilated, gradually increase its complexity. It can be complemented with visual resources.

- Learning review phase, which allows students to integrate new knowledge and transition to the next lesson or activity.
  The class method has major disadvantages:

- They only transmit information, which the student receives passively, and they do not offer the opportunity to practice developing social and cognitive skills.

- Its duration usually exceeds the ability of students to maintain continued attention.

- It maintains the same rhythm for the whole class, being evident that the students learn and understand at different rates.

- The information that is transmitted can be read individually, so time could be devoted to other activities.

Therefore, it is recommended not to abuse it or combine it with other techniques, materials and activities:

- Resort to verbal and nonverbal resources (communication skills) to capture the attention of students.

- Flex the class to the characteristics of the group and the different situations.

- Encourage student participation during class to maintain an active attitude, improving their learning.

- Including varied activities will favor the interest and motivation of the students, as well as evaluate the learning process.

- Asking questions can increase attention and encourage participation, while allowing feedback and better monitoring of student progress.

But there are some practical problems for those who want to study linguistics for teaching purposes. It is abstract. It has to do with theory and people do not like theory because sometimes when one is not familiar to meet, it seems to be boring. How to overcome that problem? I think that there is one way: Planning the class.

# Lesson plan

I. **General information:**

1.1 Institution: Instituto de Idiomas El Altiplano

1.2  Program : Language teaching methodology

1.3 Trainer:  Marlene Caceres

1.4 Unit Topic: Structural linguistics

1.5 Lesson Title: Linguistic Foundations of the Audio-lingual method

1.6 Class: 2018 Date: September m18th, 2018.

II. **Objectives**

The student should be able to recognize some fundamental ideas of the linguistic theory

behind the audio-lingual method.

III. **Teaching materials and resources**

Books, cards, equipment, demonstration materials, and other visual aids, handouts, etc.

IV. **Teaching procedure**

**Table 1.** *Procedures*

| Stages | Activities | Techniques |
|--------|-----------|------------|
| **Presentation** | T introduces herself and presents a video about the audio-lingual method model class. Asks questions about the topic. Ask sts to read a text. | Lead in, worksheets, videos, etc. |
| **Application** | Ask Sts to answer the questions in groups. Sts interchange their answers. | worksheets |

| | Ask Sts to write a summary of the | worksheets |
|---|---|---|
| **Evaluation** | topic. | |

## V. Evaluation

Teacher will assess the process of reading comprehension taking into account formative

and summative criteria.

## VI. References

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English: An introduction to the practice of English language teaching*. New York: Longman.

Richards, J. C. and T. S. Rodgers. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN: 0-19-435574-8.

**Summary**

After having developed the study of the topic of Linguistic foundations of Language Teaching I have arrived at the following conclusions:

- Structural linguistics contributed to the linguistic theory of the Audio-Lingual Method. Language was considered as set of signs to be acquired by imitation and repetition as habit formation.

- Generative linguistics considered language as something creative and innate and it originated the Cognitive approach to language teaching.

- Functional linguistics contributed to the development of the Communicative language teaching defining language functions.

- Pragmatics contributes to language teaching giving special attention to the use of language in use according to social context.

- Text linguistics emphasizes the use of text (spoken or written) in communicative contexts.

- Communicative language teaching is based on functional language, pragmatics, text linguistics and related areas to develop methodology for language teaching.

**Suggestions and critical appraisal**

The topic is interesting, but it is absolutely necessary to get information at the library of the University. Authorities of the library of the National University of Education should make arrangements in order to acquire more books and digital information for the students of the study program.

**References**

Allen. S. (1979). *Funtion and contex in Linguist analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Allerton. B. (1979). *Funtion and contex in linguistic analiysis.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of Bilingual Education*.(5ª. ed). USA: McNaughton y Gunn Ltd.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Brown. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to languaje.* Longman: White Plains.

Butler, C. (1985). *Statistics Linguistics.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Chomsky. N. (1966). *Cartesian linguistics.* New York: Haper and Rowley.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1976). *Reflections on Language*. London: Temple Smith.

Crystal, D. (1997).*English as a Global Language*.(2ªed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culler, J. (1976).*Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism*. Linguistics and the Study of Literature. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Ducrot, O. et al (1994). *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Sciences of Language*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Ellis, R. (1991). *Second language acquisition and language pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fries, C. (1972). *Linguistics and reading*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hill, A.A. (1969). *Linguistics Today. New York*: Basic Books.

Holenstein, E. (1974). *Roman Jakobson's approach to language: Phenomenological Structuralism*. Ontario: Indiana University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An introduccion to functional Grammar* . Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, H. (1985). *Language, context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1981). Text Semantics and Clause Grammar: Some Patterns of Realization. James E. Copeland and Philip W. Davis (eds.) *The Seventh LACUS Forum.* Columbia, South Carolina: Hornbeam Press. Pp.31-59.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1964). Descriptive Linguistics in Literary Studies. In Alan Dithie (ed.) *English Studies Today*: third series. 1964. pp.26-39.

Holenstein. E. (1974). *Roman Jacobson's approach to language: Phenomenological structuralism.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kroeber, A. L. (1953). The determination of linguistic relationship. *Anthropos Journal* 8.389-401.

Lane, M. (1970). *Structuralism: A reader*. London: Jonathan cape Publishers.

Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1970). *Chomsky*. Harlow, England: Longman.

Lepschy, G.C. (1970).*A survey of structural linguistics*, London: Faber & Faber.

Littlewood,W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mackey, W. F. (1965). *Language Teaching Analysis*. London: Longman.

Malmberg, B. (1964). A Propos Du Che Argentin. *Studia Linguistica: A Jorunal of General Linguistics.* Recuperado de https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9582.1964.tb00445.x

Newmever, F. (1986). *Linguistic theory in America.* Seattle: Academic Press.

Oiufang, W. (1999). *Oral English test and teaching* . Shanghai: Teaching Press.

Pettit, P. (1975). *The concept of Structuralism: a critical analysis*. Berkeley.

Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robey, D. (1973). *Structuralism: an Introduction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sampson, G. (1980). *Schools of linguistics: Competition and evolution.* London: Hutchinson.

Saussure, F. (1988). *Course in General Linguistics.* Eds. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. Trans. Roy Harris. La Salle, Illinois: Open Court.

Stern, H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching* . Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Strevens, M. I. (1966). *The linguistic sciences and language teaching.* London: Longmans.

Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: MFT Press.

Zhou, S. (2003). *Study of English Language Test*. Chengdu: Sichuan UP.

**Appendices**

Appendix A. Worksheet 1

Appendix B. Worksheet 2

**Appendix A. Worksheet 1**

**I.** **Work in pairs.** Try to answer the following questions.

1. According to the teacher's class, What is more important, oral language or written language?

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. How important is repetition exercises to learn a language?

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Do you think that mechanical repetition of language makes easier learning a new language?

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………

**Appendix B. Worksheet 2**

**II.     Individual work. Answer the following questions**

1.  What is more important to you, oral language or written language?

    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………..………..

2.  Do you think that repetition drills are important to learn a new language? Why?

    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………..………….

3.  How do you think students can learn a new language easier?

    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………..