

A Security Framework Based on Four Methodologies

Joseph A. Stavoy

INTRODUCTION

This paper will deal with four teaching methodologies that have been quite prominent in ESL circles in the last 15-20 years. Their prominence was due in part to the innovative assumptions each methodology utilized in the field of foreign language teaching. The Silent Way, Suggestopedia, The Natural Approach, and Counseling Learning/Community Language Learning have been analyzed and scrutinized in both theory and practice by researchers in the libraries and teachers in the classrooms. This paper will not deal with in-depth histories or analyses of the four methodologies, but rather with how they affected me as a teacher of ESL. In the main body of this paper I will give a brief explanation of each methodology and then examine in detail one point in each methodology that has been particularly helpful in shaping my own opinions and viewpoints on teaching ESL in general and security in the classroom in particular.

Security in the classroom has been a recurring theme in my teaching. The security a student feels in any learning situation, I believe, is directly related to clear and obtainable objectives set forth by the teacher. In a foreign language class, security plays an even more crucial role because of the obvious pitfalls language learners encounter on the road to fluency. There are certain elements in each of the four methodologies that have helped shine light on how security can initially be set and maintained in a foreign language class.

In the conclusion I will attempt to explain how ideas from the four methodologies have led me to believe that student security is an integral part of teaching languages and that teachers can directly affect how a language learner feels about learning the L2. Also, I will explain how these methodologies have pervaded my teaching--not singly or individually, but as a re-interpretation or combination of the finer points of each methodology.

The Methodologies

1. The Silent Way

One of the basic tenets of Caleb Gattegno's Silent Way method is that there exists in all of us an inner criteria that can be used as a foundation or inner well of knowledge. Gattegno's philosophy is that if language learners can draw on this inner criteria of knowledge and past experiences, language learning can be a more fruitful and efficient endeavor. Inherent in Silent Way methodology is the fact that language teachers must step away from an active participatory role and let language learners discover different aspects of the L2 themselves. Gattegno's own words (1972) best sum up this sentiment : "If there is one feature I value in my approach, it is well described by the word silent, since it will convey at once that there are means of letting the learners learn while the teacher stops interfering or sidetracking." This means, in effect, that while the students are being asked to learn inductively--by figuring things out for themselves--the teacher is guiding the students through the many steps of language learning. The teacher, then, is working on the students while the students are using their inner criteria to discover and work on the L2.

The notion that a learner can (and in fact does) draw on inner criteria when faced with the very real "aggression" of learning a new language is intriguing and quite appealing to me. The uniqueness of The Silent Way in allowing a learner to utilize his inner criteria by focusing primarily on inductive learning has far reaching implications to my own personal views of teaching, particularly when considering the role of responsibility and security in the classroom.

What does it mean to a teacher when students rely primarily on themselves to learn? Does this in any way diminish the teacher's responsibility? I think not. What it does do, as I see it, is re-channel responsibility--or maybe redefine it--to other areas. The teacher now becomes the prime mover in the classroom only in that he plans and allots time for activities. The teacher does not necessarily implement the activities. This responsibility is given to the students. The teacher's role then, is soon recognized by the students to be secondary and that most, if not all discovery can be achieved by what they, the students, already know. I am thinking that the teacher's responsibility, therefore, takes on subtler and more difficult dimensions. It is subtler because the teacher seemingly relinquishes control in the class and yet is able to give direction, correct mistakes nonevaluatively, and urge students to discover things for themselves ; but these duties are carried out in such a manner that learning continues as if no decisions or no teaching takes place. The difficult aspect of responsibility on the teacher's part comes in knowing when a particular point is retained. In this respect the teacher might very well be advised to consult his own inner criteria, or to draw on his past learning/teaching experiences. The teacher is, in effect, learning the students and, in so doing, utilizes his own inner criteria in the decision making process.

What does this mean for the students? It soon becomes clear that the teacher will point them in the right direction (sometimes) but that they are expected to make the journey themselves. In fact, Gattegno (1972) says, "It has been my repeated experience that whenever I am in doubt about a student's reasons for not joining in and I suspend action on, or reaction to him, the outcome is success at a later date. But whenever I enter too forcefully or too quickly into a situation of which I have inadequate understanding, my students entrench themselves in an uncooperative mood that does not serve anyone." The responsibility for learning (and for participating), then, rests entirely on the students. They must be aware that their peers are an important resource and a valuable support system. But ultimately, an awareness and trust that they themselves are capable of learning by utilizing their inner criteria is absolutely crucial to the Silent Way succeeding.

What intrigues me most about the roles of responsibility in the classroom and how they relate to The Silent Way and more specifically inner criteria, is that they are clearly defined for both students and teacher and yet are realized or applied in quite different manners. The teacher carries out his responsibilities in an aloof, nonevaluative, and perfunctory manner, while the student, because of the very nature of The Silent Way, accepts responsibility for his learning almost unconsciously by actually participating in the lesson. Whether the application of these responsibilities is carried out successfully or not depends largely on the ability and willingness of both teacher and student to rely on their own inner criteria as a base and final source for their respective classroom roles.

It seems, too, that if a strong sense of security is not present in the class, Silent Way teaching--relying on students to learn inductively by using their inner criteria--might well turn out to be a tricky proposition at best. Fortunately, students who may never have been taught using inductive techniques learn quickly that the rewards of discovering or unearthing new aspects of language are strong motivators and security builders in and of themselves. Students also quickly become aware that because correction techniques are nonevaluative, experimentation is not necessarily an embarrassing or humiliating proposition but one that becomes enjoyable and gratifying. Gattegno asserts, also, that because there is joy in learning inductively, students have a higher retention level which is an ongoing confidence builder and hence firmly establishes security in the L2 classroom.

There are, of course, possible security crises looming for the student if the teacher makes an incorrect assessment at where the student is at any given point in the language learning process. Whether a point has been retained and whether it is time to move on are also rather nebulous areas. As teachers gain experience and a more substantial inner criteria is developed on their part, these questions will become less problematic and more of an instinctive response--much like language itself.

2. Suggestopedia

In Georgi Lozanov's model of Suggestopedia, the attention of the student is

engaged through the use of games, songs, music, and positive suggestion. In stark contrast to *The Silent Way*, students are given examples, dialogues with translations, and roleplays. The teacher then offers yogic style breathing lessons to relax the students and then performs the dialogues in several "concerts". These "concerts" are meant only to be absorbed by the students while they are in a relaxed state. Music--usually Baroque--is played to further suggest a low-anxiety situation. Using this somewhat controversial method of teaching, the language teacher serves up a veritable barrage of language that very often includes use of both the L1 and the L2. The teacher, in a purely Suggestopedic model, is highly authoritative and the final voice in all classroom activities.

On a more theoretical note, Lozanov says that there is a double planeness inherent in all learners and that the teacher must be aware of what is happening on each plane. Earl Stevick's interpretation of Lozanov's idea of double planeness is that learners actually learn and retain things on both the subconscious and conscious levels and (Stevick 1980) "that the best learning takes place when what is happening on each of these two levels supports what is happening on the other".

Lozanov asserts that the teacher's ability to control the conscious in order to teach the subconscious is a crucial aspect of Suggestopedia. The subconscious, in turn, greatly affects how a student manages learning on the cognitive level. To say that a student's subconscious directly affects what is happening on the cognitive level has led me to examine *The Silent Way* more closely to see if there is a correlation between Lozanov's idea of double planeness and Gattegno's notion of inner criteria.

I am thinking that there are indeed similarities in Gattegno's and Lozanov's thinking. The inner criteria of *The Silent Way* can be thought of as a foundation or basis for learning. It is a device or reservoir of experience that is triggered by the student's desire to learn something. The awareness of one's ability to draw upon an inner criterion is obviously conscious. But the actual doing, or the connection of past experience to a present learning experience is manifested subconsciously. This is not quite what is happening in Suggestopedia because a student may not (in fact, usually is not) aware that learning is taking place apart from the conscious/cognitive aspect that both he and the teacher are focusing on. This type of learning is usually acquired peripherally with the aid of positive suggestion.

In Suggestopedia there are two important techniques used to activate the subconscious and start the interaction and affect between what Lozanov refers to as the two planes. Both techniques are fundamental to Suggestopedic philosophy and yet can easily be employed in any language class regardless of the methodology used. The techniques espoused in Suggestopedia that affect the subconscious are positive suggestion and peripheral learning.

In using positive suggestion the teacher strives to make classes fun and enjoyable for the students. A positive, non-threatening environment is, I believe, the greatest result of Lozanov's idea of positive suggestion. Students are encouraged to play with the language by adopting names and even identities in the L2 and the teacher stresses the

fact that participation is paramount, talking ensures improvement, and mistakes will be handled non-evaluatively. There are many practical ideas set forth in Suggestopedia that help to establish and maintain security by using positive suggestion. Music as background while students "absorb" a dialogue, comfortable chairs arranged in a circle, and even the color of the paint on the walls are important elements in a Suggestopedic classroom. But by far the most important background element necessary to the positive suggestion idea is what Lozanov calls the "authority" of the teacher. The main idea here is that the students must recognize and hence be positively influenced by the competence and confidence of the teacher. This is manifested in a liveliness, exuberance, and enthusiasm on the teacher's part that ideally will be transferred to the students. This attitude and teacher bearing should be (and hopefully is) present in most language teachers. In Suggestopedia, however, it is an integral part of the methodology in so much as it is a major part of the teacher's training. I sincerely believe that a teacher who possesses a positive attitude (to both his students and the material), and a healthy, caring disposition, and who shows these traits in his speech, gestures, and tone of voice, adds new dimensions to the security level of his students and hence the learning process.

Peripheral learning is achieved by using charts and posters in the L2, music as background, and arranging the class in a comfortable way. With peripheral learning devices the student has an opportunity to step outside of what the class is focusing on and absorb pertinent information almost incidentally with little or no effort. This usually is not a conscious activity but one that takes place while attention is focused elsewhere. And it does work. And I can see no reason why it should not be employed regularly in any learning environment. It is like a drawing or lottery at which you do not have to be present to win. A student can be influenced and learn without mentally being present and without consciously focusing. What an intriguing concept!

Peripheral learning is also an important factor when considering the security level of students in a foreign language classroom. Because it is learning taking place on a subconscious level, results must remain intangible. Aside from the fact that a room is much more "dressed up" by peripheral learning devices, I think students are comforted somewhat by easy-to-understand charts and posters in the L2. I, as a language learner, certainly appreciated verb conjugations, pronunciation guides, and colorful posters hung about the room. They made me feel at ease and "closer" to the language.

In conclusion, it seems that gauging what is happening on the subconscious level is fraught with difficulty because of the very nature of the subconscious beast. Perhaps with the use of Lozanov's idea of positive suggestion and peripheral learning, the beast can be tamed and maybe even conditioned to sit up...and take notice. Stevick (1980), in describing a Suggestopedic technique he found useful, best sums up my feelings on the more practical benefits of Suggestopedia : "...it does appear to have taken account of the many sources of anxiety and alienation...and to have provided security against them ; and to have drawn the students out of their shells and into self-asserting activity ; and to have produced a growing degree of accuracy alongside a gratifying increase in fluency."

3. The Natural Approach

In formulating his Natural Approach (NA), Tracy Terrell has relied heavily on Stephen Krashen's "input hypothesis" (1980), i.e., comprehension precedes production. A fundamental tenet of the NA is that classroom activities should be primarily acquisition activities. Terrell's distinction between acquisition and learning is noteworthy in that most, if not all language learners have been in foreign language classes in which "learning" activities have been utilized. Terrell's explanation (1977) helps to clarify the distinction between acquisition and learning: "Acquisition is an unconscious process of constructing grammar rules...or *picking up* a language, and learning is a conscious attempt to internalize grammar rules; it usually includes focused study, drills, and practice with various sorts of exercises."

Terrell believes (and most researchers agree) that, at least for beginning language students, if input is comprehensible, acquisition of the L2 is not unlike a child's acquiring his native language. Then, as comprehension increases, production will come naturally without prodding, pressure, or trickery. This idea--that after considerable comprehensible input, the student is not forced to reproduce the L2 but is allowed to start talking when a readiness and comfortableness on his part is present--is a most intriguing notion. It has provided important implications to my teaching because of the profound effect it has had on me as a learner.

I look at the idea of not forcing production to be a much broader concept than the actual postponement of the L2 that we see taking place in the NA. By this I mean that some methods, such as the Silent Way, state very clearly that early production is integral to the method. I feel, however, that what is produced does not have to be forced, but is indeed done willingly by the student. This idea has roots in all the methods in that they all maintain the idea that the teacher can influence how a student reacts to material by exhibiting a positive attitude and maintaining a low-anxiety/high security classroom situation. The essence of my point is that even in using an approach where early production is necessary, like the Silent Way, this production can be seen as unforced, non-pressured, and quite natural. (I think this idea can be manifested in Suggestopedia as well, if the teacher were to "bend the rules" somewhat and wait patiently for students' production. There is, after all, considerable input provided by the teacher when using Suggestopedic techniques.)

The idea of not forcing production and allowing the student to respond or contribute when he feels ready is one that has affected me deeply both as a learner and as a teacher. As succinctly as possible, I will just say that in nearly all of my undergraduate courses I very rarely contributed. When called upon I always felt incredible pressure and consequently stumbled through not well-thought-out responses. In a class during my graduate studies, however, I was given the impression (I am not sure if it was ever articulated but the impression certainly was clear) that no one was under any pressure to speak--that we could contribute or not contribute when and if we were comfortable

and felt the need. This had a profound effect on me. For once, I was comfortable in a classroom. For once, I was not thinking about whether I should invent something significant to say. And most importantly, I felt that I had developed a self-confidence that would allow me to participate or not participate without worrying about the repercussions of either decision. There simply were no repercussions.

The implications of conveying to my students that there will be no repercussions pertaining to their output (or lack of output) are staggering. If I can conduce to my students a learning environment in which they feel as I did in that graduate course, my job as a teacher quickly becomes like that of a tour guide--leading my students to different points of interest and then letting them discover things on their own. Whether this feeling of security is something I try to impress upon students through explanations and actions or whether I actually manifest it in NA methodology depends, of course, on which methodology I use. But for a student to feel that there is no pressure to participate and, just as importantly, that there will be no embarrassment at not producing correct responses is crucial to conducing towards a comfortable and low-anxiety classroom. In short, the feeling of panic I experienced at the mere thought of participation has helped me empathize with language learners who may not be prepared to produce the L2.

There are two facets of the NA other than the comprehension precedes production hypothesis that help to initially set and maintain security and a low-anxiety situation in the classroom. One idea that has drawn much criticism and not a few raised eyebrows is that there should be no error correction in a true NA classroom. Terrell (1977) cites three reasons for this : (1) correction of speech errors plays no important role in the natural acquisition of grammar in any L1 acquisition situation, (2) correction of speech errors tends to focus on form and hence learning takes precedence over acquisition, and (3) correction of errors tends to promote barriers and increase insecurity on the students' part. Speech errors are not forsaken entirely in a NA situation. Restatement and expansion of students' errors--modeling the proper sentence, so to speak--are both considered appropriate correction avenues that will help maintain a low-anxiety classroom.

The other facet of the NA which helps to promote security and a low-anxiety situation is the acquisition activities I mentioned above. Terrell asserts that these are acquisition activities because of the fact that their focus is always on the *message* or *content* of the communication instead of the form of the communication. These activities, I believe, help the student to step outside the L2, become personally involved, and very often forget that he is conversing in the L2. Some examples of acquisition activities : (1) games and recreation activities (Terrell has said that no instruction hour should go by without at least one game using the L2), (2) cultural or historical explorations (see Levine 1982), (3) humanistic-affective activities (see Moskowitz 1979), (4) information and problem-solving activities (see Rinvoluceri 1981).

One of the problems with utilizing this approach is that some students may choose to remain non-productive and not take the initiative at any stage. A student's

continued reticence is often cause for concern on the teacher's part. I think a teacher's awareness and an appreciation of the barriers that cause a student to remain reticent, and how the teacher can break these barriers down, are considerations of paramount importance to a language teacher. By choosing not to put pressure on students to produce, and by using activities whose focus is on the message and not the form, the teacher has an opportunity to establish a situation where security will be high, anxiety will be low, and any barriers that remain will be like stepping stones on the path to maximum production of the L2.

4 . Counseling Learning/Community Language Learning

Charles Curran's Counseling Learning/Community Language Learning (CL/CLL) method is based on the assumption that students can be eased into an independence and confidence in the L2 by establishing a non-threatening counseling relationship between the teacher and the students. The teacher begins as the "expert knower" and the students depend on the "knower" extensively to translate from the L1 and then supply the correct model of the L2. Inherent in CL/CLL methodology is the fact that much of the material is student invested--that is, a student will say a sentence in the L1, the teacher will translate and the student will repeat the translation until he is comfortable. When each student has contributed a sentence, they are transcribed and the teacher goes on to use this student invested material in games, pronunciation practice, and introducing grammatical points suitable to the level of the class.

In my first experience in a CL/CLL class, the teacher stood behind the students and modeled the sentences with the student repeating until he was comfortable with his production. Then the teacher would gently squeeze the shoulders of the student just finishing the task and move on to the next student. This little gesture was quite novel for me--it produced, at once, a bonding with, and a trust in the teacher that I had never before experienced in a language class. I felt like the teacher was on my side and not at all an adversary--much like past language teachers seemed to be. That seemingly insignificant gesture was like a shot of instant security. Since then, I have striven to give my students that same feeling of calm and well-being in my classes.

One of the ways a teacher can establish this feeling of calm and security is by using what Curran has called the counseling response. Any communication from teacher to student--from first day translations to rephrasing or restating a flawed sentence--should be shrouded in a warm, secure, and reassuring manner. As Curran says (1976) : "The language counselor's tone and manner (should) strive to convey the same deep understanding of the client's anxious, insecure state as he might experience in a good counseling relationship."

Curran has outlined what he believes to be the five stages of growth a language learner encounters on the road to fluency. In each stage there are certain parameters that he believes describe the interaction between the teacher and students (1976).

In stage I, the student is entirely dependent on the teacher to provide translation

and modeling of the L2. This is the student's maximum security stage.

In stage II, the student begins to take independent steps to produce the L2 with less dependency on the teacher. The teacher aids the student only when he hesitates or turns for help.

Stage III sees the students becoming more comfortable with the group or community, and the L2 being used with more insight into the grammar and syntax of the language. The teacher's role is continually diminishing except when a member of the group needs a translation or explanation.

In stage IV, the students are speaking more freely and with more complexity in the L2. In this stage the teacher directly intervenes in grammatical errors, mispronunciation, or when more complex expression is desired. The students' security level is sufficiently secure to handle direct correction.

Stage V is very near fluency and students' needs are such that the teacher intervenes only to offer correction or add idioms and more elegant speech patterns.

It is the five stages of growth that intrigues me most about CL/CLL. They seem remarkably similar to my own progression in the acquisition of French, my second language.

In my own experience as a language learner studying French, I reached a point in the process where my proficiency was functional and I was comfortable with most aspects of the language. At this point it seemed that there was a conscious decision to be made : to stay at this "functional plateau" or to move on to a stage in learning that would refine and expand what I had learned. I remember, quite vividly, my ambivalence towards moving on. On the one hand I could rest on the relatively secure plateau that I had achieved or I could move into an area in the learning process that would involve more risk taking and, in a sense, test my security with the language and the people most closely associated with my learning, e.g., the teacher and the community of students with whom I was studying. I think Curran would describe this transition as the move from stage III to stage IV. I would like to explore further, some thoughts about how a learner reaches this level and the things a teacher might do to aid in maintaining or reinforcing a learner's security.

In moving through the first three stages of language learning as Curran described it, there is present the notion that a learner's security must not be compromised in order for the learning process to flow smoothly. As the learner progresses, the role of the teacher in structuring the content (or being a part of the content as translator and "knower") diminishes and his role as final authority (or scrutinizer and corrector of mistakes) increases. This skillful interplay between teacher and students is absolutely necessary to the students' security. As the teacher disassociates himself from the content (i.e. the students now are speaking the L2 and the teacher is a necessary element only in relation to the students' needs) an even greater sense of security is being developed. What I see happening, then, is the decision to move on to stage four being directly related to the security developed in the first three stages. I think, too, that the security of the

student plays no less of a role in the fourth stage because the student is there on his own volition and can just as easily opt to return to the less hectic functional plateau and not pursue a refinement of the L2.

As I understand it, the major difference between the first three stages and stage four is the more rigorous, concrete, and almost interruptive style of correcting errors. It would seem that the security established in the first three stages would be sufficient to ensure a happy and productive stay in stage four. But suppose it isn't. Suppose the teacher's more overt efforts at error correction rattle the foundations of the student's security. Is this possible? Will the student revert to a previous stage and does the teacher accompany him? I think this is a definite possibility. I also think it can be avoided. The students' need for security does not diminish in the fourth stage but in fact is just as important and necessary because of the fact that error correction is no longer shrouded in a cloud of security. What is crucial to remember, I think, is that as the students are progressing through the stages, the teacher must constantly be adapting with them. If this idea of adapting includes going back to stage one with a student, I see no loss of security ; rather, it seems more like a security reinforcement. It is of course immensely important that the teacher be able to gauge what is happening with the students and determine which stage they are in at any given time in order to adapt to their needs and maintain or reinforce a sense of security.

While I am doubtful that I would ever depend solely on student invested material in my classes, there are some theories of CL/CLL that I see coinciding with my own framework on teaching. I recognize the value of counseling responses but I also see them as being somewhat limited to the very early stages of Curran's framework because of the very nature of the students' needs in the fourth and fifth stage. The idea of cloaking *any* communication in a warm and caring manner is one that knows no parameters, however, and I believe, will enhance the security of students at any stage in the language learning process.

The idea of establishing a "community" feeling in a language class has been another recurring theme in my teaching. It is, for me, directly related to the security a student feels and what a teacher can do to establish and maintain that security. Curran's methodology provides for just that security if a teacher is aware of the stages a language learner must necessarily pass through. This awareness on the teacher's part is absolutely fundamental if security is to be maintained. It is no easy task, however, considering that students will be at different levels at different times and that outside influences can trigger affective barriers that can propel students from one level to another. But as the teacher's role diminishes and students become more aggressive in their use of the L2, and as the teacher constantly strives to give counseling responses, security, I believe, will be maintained and the move upward through the stages will not be traumatic or difficult.

Conclusion

It has been five years since I first encountered these methodologies in my graduate work in ESL. Since then, I have worked steadily in a variety of teaching situations ranging from University EFL classes in Puerto Rico to intensive language programs in Vermont, USA and Cambridge, England, and back to University EFL classes and private tutorials in Japan. I have found that in each of these teaching situations, some aspect of one or all of these methodologies has been present and has affected the way I present myself and my lessons to my students.

Stevick (1980) has said, "...success in the classroom depends less on techniques, materials, etc., and more on the interactions or what goes on inside and between the people of the classroom." I could not agree more. My own philosophy of language teaching has been somewhat eclectic in that I have picked and chosen what I believe to be the most workable and time proven hypotheses and techniques from these four major methodologies. The glue that binds together these ideas and theories from such divergent methodologies is security. If a student is not secure in a language classroom, no amount of perfect techniques or cunningly conceived lesson plans will make him a willing participant. On the other hand, I truly believe that a poorly planned lesson can be successful if the necessary security foundation has been laid. The teacher can, in fact, be the deciding element in whether a student decides to put forth an effort or just be an unwilling and therefore unhappy participant.

How have these four methodologies helped me to establish a workable security framework? Suggestopedia offers the notion that a teacher's confidence, enthusiasm, and energy for his task will positively suggest to the students that the teacher is indeed competent and trustworthy. This "liveliness" on the part of the teacher is crucial. We have all had "drone-ish", monotonous teachers--language learning is difficult enough without the added burden of someone who brings you down just by his manner. It does not take special training to show a little enthusiasm for one's job. It is infectious. Every language teacher should give a little to his students.

The Natural Approach espouses comprehension before production and not forcing anyone to speak before he is comfortable and ready. This, for me, says "be patient". I have always told students they can "pass" anytime when called upon. Some do. Most do not. But they know they can. Is there anything worse (from a student's perspective) than a teacher, or a class of students, tapping their feet and looking at their watches while waiting for a response from a seemingly uncooperative student? The NA has taught me that patience truly is a virtue. Eventual L2 production from shy or reticent students is usually the reward of that patience.

Also from the NA, the idea of using language acquisition activities has been an integral part of my teaching. In Japan, especially, games and activities focusing on the message or content instead of the form have proven to be most useful. Students in Japan

have a strong foundation in English from Junior and Senior High School but need to use the L2 in spoken communication. Terrell's idea of language acquisition activities has taken on more communicative based traits simply because they are extremely effective in getting Japanese students talking.

From *The Silent Way* I have taken Gattegno's notion that students retain more of the language if they are allowed to discover it on their own. If I present a new grammar point, I almost always ask the students to explore, dig, and hopefully uncover new aspects of that particular point using induction based on their inner criteria. I liken inductive learning to a home-cooked meal, and everything else as going out to eat. I enjoy and utilize deductive methods as I enjoy going to a nice restaurant. But I believe the enjoyment derived from preparing, creating, or discovering something for oneself is not at all comparable to being constantly pampered and served. There is, of course, a considerable amount of work involved for students who learn inductively, but I think that in allowing them to discover things--to cook their own dinner--a feeling of appreciation and respect is developed for the teacher for his confidence in them as learners. Of course the metaphor breaks down if you don't like cooking or if you are a restaurant critic but it can be applied to almost any situation where there is opportunity for people to assert themselves and use what they know, or what they feel inside, to accomplish a task. This feeling of accomplishment and sense of satisfaction, I believe, are paramount to establishing and maintaining security and to enthusing students to continue the language learning process.

From CL/CLL I have seen the importance of establishing a community in my classes. Through the use of counseling responses and projecting answers and corrections in a warm and caring manner, students *do* come to put trust in the teacher and in each other. Also, an awareness of where a student is in Curran's stages of growth is extremely helpful in that it shows students that the teacher is indeed conscious of individual needs. These ideas from CL/CLL are obviously more difficult to implement in Japan because of the number of students in language classes, reticence and shyness on the part of the students, and because small groups have probably been formed before the first class. It is important, however, to keep in mind that even in large classes, communities can be formed and counseling responses can be effective.

The reader has probably noticed that at least one element from each methodology has been left out ("disregarded" is a more apt term) of my teaching framework. Gattegno's idea of silence on the part of the teacher, Lozanov's idea of having "concerts" and relaxing students with breathing exercises, Terrell's notion that there is no place for correction in the language classroom, and Curran's idea of utilizing only student invested material simply do not fit my style of teaching. The ideas I have set forth in this paper, however, have been extremely instrumental in forging my style and in giving me insight into what Stevick referred to as "interaction" in the classroom. I sincerely believe that the interaction he speaks of has its roots in the security and trust a language student feels for his teacher. These four methodologies have provided me with the theory that fuels

the engine that keeps that security in motion.

In closing, I would like to borrow a quote from Sandra J. Savignon (1978) who, in writing about her children acquiring/learning French in Paris, states what should be the goal of any language teacher : "My primary concern was that my children enjoy their French experience, make friends, have fun." I would like to think that my framework provides that opportunity for my students.

References :

- Curran, C. 1976. *Counseling-Learning in Second Languages*. Dubuque, Illinois : Counseling-Learning.
- Gattegno, C. 1972. *Teaching Foreign Languages in Schools : The Silent Way*. New York : Education Solutions.
- Krashen, S. 1980. "The Input Hypothesis". In Oller, J. and P. Richard-Amato (eds.). 1983. *Methods That Work*. Rowley, Mass. : Newbury House 146-179.
- Levine, D. 1982. *Beyond Language ; Intercultural Communication for ESL*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall.
- Lozanov, G. 1978. *Suggestology and Outlines of Suggestopedya*. New York : Gordon and Breach.
- Moskowitz, G. 1979. *Caring and Sharing in the Foreign Language Classroom*. Rowley, Mass. : Newbury House.
- Oller, J. and P. Richard-Amato (eds.). 1983. *Methods That Work*. Rowley, Mass. : Newbury House.
- Rinvulcri, M. and M. Berer. 1981. *Action Mazes*. London : Heinemann.
- Savignon, S. 1978. "Three Americans in Paris : A Look at 'Natural' Second Language Acquisition". In Oller, J. and P. Richard-Amato (eds.). 1983. *Methods That Work*. Rowley, Mass. : Newbury House.
- Stevick, E. 1980. *Language Teaching : A Way and Ways*. Rowley, Mass. : Newbury House.
- Terrell, T. 1977. "The Natural Approach to language Teaching : An Update". In Oller, J. and P. Richard-Amato (eds.). 1983. *Methods That Work*. Rowley, Mass. : Newbury House.