

Review article

Received 21 September 2018, accepted for publication 3 October 2018

Mersad Dervić, PhD student

International Burch University Sarajevo
mersad_dervic@hotmail.com

Nizama Spahić, PhD student

International Burch University Sarajevo
nizama.spahic@ibu.edu.ba

AN EVALUATION OF FIVE KEY ASPECTS OF THE LANGUAGE ACQUISITION (LA) – A CRITICAL REVIEW OF KRASHEN'S THEORY

Abstract

The development of Krashen's theory of second language acquisition has been disadvantaged due to the dispute over its untestable hypotheses. In his Monitor Model Krashen (1981; 1982; 1985) claims that linguistic competence can only be acquired subconsciously, while conscious learning mainly depends on learners' mood and emotions at the time of learning a second language. A review of the studies investigating the coherence of Krashen's hypotheses derived from the Monitor Model supported the validity of this approach. However, competing theories emphasize the importance of conscious learning not addressed by the Monitor Model. This paper critically reviews the five key aspects of Krashen's Monitor Model and closely looks at the relevance of the theory and its characteristics to SLA nowadays. It was concluded that while effective in some classroom applications, the Monitor Model is too restrictive to justify the conscious learning as a source of spontaneous language production, so cannot alone provide a comprehensive account of language competence.

Keywords: Second Language Acquisition, Krashen Theory, Input Hypothesis, Monitor Model.

Introduction

Stephen Krashen is widely recognized as an expert in the field of linguistics. He is a professor at the University of Southern California where he specialized in theories of language acquisition and development. He has written numerous books and articles and

delivered more than three hundred university lectures in the States and Canada (Schütz, 2017).

Ricardo Schütz (2017) maintains that “Krashen’s theory is well accepted and has had a large impact in all areas of second language research and teaching since the 1980s” (p. 1). The idea of Krashen’s theory is that “Language acquisition does not require extensive use of conscious grammatical rules, and does not require tedious drill”, rather it requires “meaningful interaction in the target language-natural communication- in which speakers are concerned not with the form of their utterances but with the messages they are conveying and understanding” (Krashen, 1982, p. 10-12).

Most contemporary language teachers would without doubt agree with this, as the traditional method of grammar teaching of drilling rules in a formal manner, which was often out of any relevant context, tended to produce students who could construct written sentences and reel off lists of memorized vocabulary, but who had difficulty communicating verbally with any fluency (Harmer, 2005).

Furthermore, Krashen’s use of the word “tedious” serves to emphasize problems of de-motivation amongst bored students and in the case of younger learners, the subsequent potential for disruptive behavior. Krashen’s basic ideology also supports the case for interactive/communicative teaching, as practiced and recommended by many in the current pedagogical climate. However, Ellis (2005) and Schmidt (1990; 1994) and many others (Abukhattala 2012; Bahrani 2011; Liu 2015; Zafar 2010) consider conscious learning as an inseparable part of the acquisition and carefully clarify that attention to form also refers to the notice of specific linguistic items and not only to the awareness of grammatical rules (Ellis 2005; Liu 2015; Zafar 2010).

Therefore, Stephen Krashen’s theory of second language (L2) acquisition, as illustrated in his famous five-pronged “Monitor” model, has created a deal of debate as to its validity and coherence. This article critically reviews the five key aspects of Krashen’s Monitor Model, and examines some of the challenges offered by those who deny its efficacy. It closely looks at their impact on learners’ conscious language learning development and its relevance to learners nowadays.

Brown (2000) explains that the SLA theory is as an interrelated set of hypotheses concerned with the process of becoming proficient in an L2 (Brown, 2000, p. 274). The Monitor

Model is a theory where Krashen (1982) maintains the following five main hypotheses:

1. The Acquisition-Learning hypothesis
2. The Monitor hypothesis
3. The Natural Order hypothesis
4. The Input Hypothesis
5. The Effective Filter hypothesis

It is of a great significance to critically review and consider all five hypotheses separately, since all of them complement each other and are independently related to a different aspect of the Monitor Model.

The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis

The first and perhaps the most well-known of the hypotheses amongst linguists and language practitioners is the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis. It represents two different systems that influence the production of a language speaker, and makes an unusual distinction between acquiring a language and learning it. The acquired system requires meaningful interaction and is produced from a sub-conscious process, very much like the way in which children acquire their native language. This means that “speakers are concerned not with the form of their utterances but with the messages they are conveying and understanding” (Krashen 1981, p. 1). On the other side, language learning is built on rules, formal instruction and error correction, which results in knowing about the language (Krashen, 1982, p. 10). In other words, while learners learn about the language, acquirers use and produce the language.

Krashen (1985) states that acquisition appears to play the major role in L2 learning, and the ability to use new languages is primarily acquired rather than learned. He maintains that focus on form inhibits fluency and if a learner is consciously trying to apply learned grammar rules, then performance will be disrupted. Young children learn to speak their first language (L1) from parents/family members, without conscious “learning” of structures. They hear language used in obvious contexts and soon begin to respond appropriately and to verbalize needs in a comprehensible way. They assimilate word order and intonations required to communicate with no knowledge of rules (Krashen, 1985, pp. 8-22).

Krashen recommends that L2 learners who are beginning to learn a new language should not be exposed to the grammar component as they do not need to “learn about” language at this stage. Error correction and explicit teaching of rules are not relevant to language acquisition (Krashen, 1981, p. 1). However, the study conducted in Nepal by Shresta in 1998 suggests that formal and informal language learning environments contribute to L2 acquisition in two ways. Firstly, the accuracy is promoted by the formal grammar-based classroom instruction, and secondly, the fluency is promoted by the informal natural interaction with native English language speakers (Shresta, 1998, p. 238).

In support of these findings, it has been noticed that the speed with which young English speaking children have made the transition to speaking Welsh increases once they begin to interact regularly with native speakers. There is also little doubt that the fluency of L2 learners improves if they are continually exposed to the language, such as by living in the target country. It has, however, also been noted that older learners are often less likely to acquire a new language without recourse to some conscious learning methods.

Although acquisition and learning are two distinct terms, there are grey areas where their distinctions become blurred. For example, someone may be listening to an informative radio program with the definite aim of learning something. Another individual enters the room for a very different reason, yet may pick up and remember information that is being relayed by the program in the background. In such a case one might ask whether or not the subsequent “learning” was conscious or sub-conscious. It might not be possible to say that it was learned as there was no deliberate effort to do so, yet it is not pure acquisition as the scenario lacks the frame of this approach. The second person in the room may or may not have been interested in the radio topic, so motivation to remember the information might not have any relevance.

Zafar (2010) maintains that this Krashen’s hypothesis is over-simplified and raises the question as to how language is stored in the brain, and in particular how an L2 is stored. Krashen fails to define the process of acquisition in a precise manner and asks why learned information is not accessible in the same way as acquired information. He suggests that the distinction between the two may be explained more accurately as a distinction between two stages of the learning process. In addition, he argues that the acquisition

would be a way more logical and understandable if described as “a process enriched by the learned system” and hence should be looked at as two discrete disciplines (Zafar, 20010, p. 142).

Gregg (1984) further questions the value of the Acquisition/Learning hypothesis and states that if Krashen’s claim that “learning cannot become acquisition” is valid, then the hypothesis lacks some consistency; citing Krashen’s own words that it seems “intuitively obvious” that we can learn a new rule and eventually acquire it. Gregg refers to his own L2 experience wherein he learned the rules for the past tense in Japanese and became error free in a few days. He learned expressions and an explanation for them thus, “I know these rules. I am aware of them. I can talk about them. These seem to me to be of cases of “learning” becoming “acquisition””. He goes on to suggest that the onus is on Krashen to disprove this theory and further states that the hypothesis is flawed due to lack of clear terminological definitions and consistent theory and explanation (Gregg, 1984).

The Monitor Hypothesis

This hypothesis explains how acquisition and learning are used in production, i.e. how the learners’ ability to use an L2 comes from acquired competence. Schütz (2017) states that the monitoring function is the practical result of the learned grammar and that acquisition acts to initiate utterances whilst learning has the role of “editor” or “monitor”. The latter contributes to planning, editing and correcting when an L2 learner has sufficient time, focuses on the structure or thinks about accuracy, and knows the relevant rule/s (Schütz, 2017).

Krashen and Terrell (1995) claim that the role of conscious learning is rather limited and minor in L2 learning; only being used to correct deviations from normal speech and to give it a “more polished appearance”. They admit that students can be exposed to a few grammatical rules, and those who become very familiar with their details will practice them in a limited way (Krashen & Terrell, 1995, p. 30-32).

On the other hand, Ellis (2005) maintains that the process of learning a language requires grammatical structure and constant error correction and that “such attention is necessary for acquisition to take place” (Ellis, 2005, p. 212). Furthermore, Schmidt (1994) agrees with Ellis (2005) and adds that more attention results in more

learning (Schmidt 1994). However, he carefully explains that attention to form particularly refers to noticing of specific linguistic items and not the awareness of grammatical rules (Schmidt, 1994).

Furthermore, Krashen (1985) maintains that there are three specific groups of L2 learners with regard to “monitor” use; “over-users,” “optimal users” and “under-users”. The latter are generally confident or those who have not learned, whilst over-users tend to lack self-confidence, and optimal users use the monitor appropriately. Krashen states that focus on grammatical form takes time and can inhibit communication. He cites Hulstijn and Hulstijn’s 1984 study, the results of which revealed that the use of the “monitor” took approximately 30% longer and resulted in around 14% less information transmitted. Krashen concludes that a formal framework in a language “provides isolation and feedback for the development of the Monitor but that production is based on what is acquired through communication with the language norms” (Krashen, 1985, p. 2).

Also, Krashen’s position is that conscious knowledge of rules does not help acquisition but only enables a learner to “polish up” what has been acquired through communication (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 24). However, Krashen and Terrell (1995) do maintain that conscious knowledge of grammar is useful when it comes to tests that make students think about the form of language, but this tends to be in written rather than oral tasks. They conclude that monitoring is also helpful in writing and prepared speeches, because learners have time to apply their conscious knowledge, and can use it to improve the structure of their output (Krashen & Terrell, 1995, p. 19).

Furthermore, Gregg (1984) points out that Krashen perceives learning as only being available for use in production and not comprehension and that he fails to present evidence for this assumption. He cites the case of being able to deduce the subject matter of a complex announcement (in a language that he was just learning) by applying some of the rules he had learned. Often a learner is able to “get the gist” of a conversation from knowing something about that language, thus “learning” is not confined to production, but can be used in comprehension (Gregg, 1984, p. 82).

Ellis (1985)disparages Krashen’s theory in general, maintaining that it “poses serious theoretical problems regarding the validity of the “acquisition-learning”, the operation of Monitoring and the explanation of variability in language-learner

language” (Ellis, 1985, p. 56). However, Bahrani (2011) believes that Krashen’s persistence that “learning” cannot become “acquisition” is quickly refuted by the experience of anyone who has internalized grammar that was previously and consciously memorized (Bahrani, 2011).

Natural Order Hypothesis

Natural Order Hypothesis refers to the process of going through a predictable order of grammatical structures to learn a language, like the one native speakers go through when learning their first language (Krashen 1982, p. 12). Schütz (2017) explains that the implication of the natural order hypothesis is not that a language program syllabus should be based on the order found in the studies. In fact, Krashen rejects grammatical sequencing when the goal is language acquisition (Schütz, 2017).

The extensive research with language acquirers implemented by Krashen showed that the order of grammatical structures and morphemes when learning a second language is slightly different from the order when learning their first language (Krashen, 1982, p. 14). Furthermore, Krashen (1981) argues that whether or not the second language is acquired or learned in the classroom makes little difference to the order. Gregg (1984) acknowledges the existence of numerous morpheme studies, both in L1 and L2 acquisition, and most seem to support this hypothesis. In most of the studies cartoon pictures and questions were used with children learning English (McLaughlin, 1987). A study involving Spanish and Chinese children in New York showed that the order of learning was almost the same, regardless of the L1 background. However, another research with Korean children indicated different results, one reason for this being that the Spanish language contains the definite article whereas Korean does not. This suggests that the actual order of L2 learning may be dependent upon the native language of the learners. The research also suggests that different learning strategies can result in different patterns of acquisition in the target language (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 30-34).

Krashen (1985) maintains that the Natural Order for grammatical morphemes is established in Monitor-free surroundings, whilst unnatural orders are found when monitoring is given a lot of time, effort, or attention within pencil and paper grammar type tests. He does not however elucidate on the reasons

for the existence of the Natural Order, nor does he provide concrete evidence to back up his theory (Krashen, 1985). However, Abukhattala (2012) claims that “students can use their learned competence to modify their production, thus correcting mistakes as they appear in their statements”. He argues that the late structures always cause errors during the acquisition process, and thus “the best way to correct students’ mistakes is to provide more input containing the structure” (Abukhattala 2012, p. 129).

Gregg (1984) points out that Krashen fails to show how one can interpret this particular theory. He states that the learner acquires the different structures that make up a language, but Gregg asks “what is a structure?”, and goes on to question whether the order of acquisition of the 3rd person singular and the –ing ending is comparable or even related to the acquisition of relative pronouns or placement of an indirect object for example (Gregg, 1984).

Gregg (1984) further argues that if the Natural Order hypothesis is valid, then learners would go through exactly the same stages in their language acquisition and there would be only one stream of progression from “1 to 3,217” of the structures of English. He points out that Krashen himself acknowledged that several streams of development are occurring simultaneously and that a strictly linear perception of his hypothesis is incorrect, therefore his acceptance of more than one ‘natural order’ vitiates the Natural Order hypothesis. Gregg purports that if the structures of the English language for example are ‘divided into varying numbers of ordered sets, the number of sets varying according to the individual, then it makes little sense to talk about a “natural order” (Gregg, 1984, p. 84-5). Therefore, Zafar (2010) points out that separating learning from acquisitions is a false theory. “Instead of drawing a borderline separating acquisition and learning into two discrete disciplines, the cross-currents of both the systems constantly at work in second language acquisition (SLA) are yet to be acknowledged and explained” (Zafar, 2010, p. 141).

The Input Hypothesis

Schütz (2017) describes the Input Hypothesis as Krashen’s attempt to explain how the learner acquires an L2. This theory relates to the acquisition, not the “learning” of a language and is the progression along the natural order as the learner improves and receives input that is a step beyond his/her current stage of

linguistic competence. The language can only be acquired when a learner understands a message or receives “comprehensible input”. When this happens, “we move from i , our current level, to $i+1$, the next level along the natural order”. A learner is able to comprehend language that contains unacquired grammar if the communication is within a clear context and builds on previously acquired linguistic competence (Schütz, 2017).

Krashen (1985) cites the way in which young children learn their L1 from the parent or guardian who uses simple structures repeatedly within a context that is generally concerned with the “here and now”. He suggests that language teachers deal with beginner learners in a similar fashion, using appropriate visual aids and simple sentences that are associated with familiar topics. He cites the following two corollaries for the Input hypothesis:

- a) Speaking is a result of acquisition and it emerges on its own without being taught due to the building of competence through comprehensible input
- b) Grammar is provided automatically if the input is understood and there is enough of it. The language teacher does not need to formally teach the next structure along the natural order because it will be in the right amount and automatically reviewed if there is enough understandable input (Krashen, 1985, p. 2).

Krashen also accounts for what he describes as the “silent period” in the language learning process. He states that the spoken words of the new language are not the beginning of acquisition because a learner, particularly a young learner, will have a period where nothing is spoken until expressions and vocabulary have been assimilated. Often this can be a silent period of a few months until what has been heard is made sense of and a learner develops the confidence to speak. When learners receive comprehensible input over a period of time, they can develop competence in their own time (Krashen, 1982).

Krashen also suggests that adult learners in a classroom situation are expected to start verbalizing the language from the outset and this is one reason why they may resort to using the familiar rules of their L1 to produce a new language. They are often not allowed to have the time and silent period to acquire structures from comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985, p. 9). Not all new language is learned in the classroom, and learners who have to rely on comprehensible input from native speakers and other

language learners in everyday contexts will often “acquire” errors. Thus Krashen proposes that the ability of a learner to “produce” is not taught directly, but emerges after a period of time.

Gregg (1984) claims that Krashen fails to provide evidence for the Input hypothesis and that there are various anomalies in his theory. He questions Krashen’s notion that a learner can acquire grammatical structures through extra-linguistic means as it seems paradoxical that we can understand language forms which we have not yet acquired. Krashen claims that learners can make sense of more complex structures due to their knowledge of the world, the context of the input and extra-linguistic knowledge. Gregg (1984) admits that learners can deduce meaning from input that exceeds *i*, due to context and educated guesswork, but this does not mean that the new structure has been acquired. Just because a listener hears and deduces the meaning of input containing the passive voice, for example, does not mean that he/she acquires this structure and can then produce it appropriately.

Gregg (1984) also questions the validity of Krashen’s comparison between how young children learn to speak their native language and how learners acquire an L2. He maintains that the “caretaker” speech used to communicate with babies varies from individual to individual and from culture to culture, being modified in some households whilst not in others. Gregg cites Newport et al. (p. 126) to back up his criticism, “three special characteristics of Motherese (brevity, well-formedness and intelligibility) arise for the purpose of here and now communication with a limited and inattentive listener, and cannot be described in terms of a language-instruction motive, and this begins to suggest that they may not serve a language-learning purpose.”

Gregg (1984) concludes that that caretaker speech is probably irrelevant in the field of second language acquisition theory. He points out that it is common sense to speak to a language learner in a modified form that he/she is more likely to understand and that any sensitive teacher will address this and give modified input (Gregg, 1984, p. 87-90).

The Affective Filter Hypothesis

Krashen’s Affective Filter Hypothesis claims that comprehensible input, although necessary, is not sufficient for L2 acquisition. Input may be understood by an acquirer, but this does

not mean that this input will achieve the language acquisition device (LAD) (Krashen & Terrell, 1995, p. 10).

Schütz (2017) and Zafar (2010) maintain that a number of affective variables play an important role in L2 acquisition. These variables include learners' motivation, self-confidence and anxiety, and Krashen argues that without a high level of motivation and self-esteem, on the one hand, and a low level of anxiety about producing the learned language, on the other, a learner is not really equipped for successful acquisition. Moreover, poor motivation, low self-esteem and high anxiety, are debilitating factors that can create a "mental block", and the "affective filter" in this case is raised to a stage where comprehensible input is prevented from becoming used for the acquisition process (Schütz 2017; Zafar 2010).

On the face of it this theory is rather obvious, as it is clear that a learner who is nervous and feels that he/she does not have the ability to succeed or even the drive to do so, is going to face more challenges within the learning process than the confident enthusiast. A well-motivated learner is more likely to access comprehensible input of his/her own accord and to improve the language knowledge. He/she is also more likely to socialize with native speakers and actively seek linguistic practice.

There are many reasons why individuals learn an L2, thus motivation is often related to requirement. Someone who needs to learn in order to communicate for business or academic purposes will tend to be well-motivated. Also a learner who is new to a country will generally wish to acquire the language for social purposes and conducting everyday life activities etc.

In a classroom situation, learners may be in a language class because it is a compulsory subject in the curriculum. In this case there is sometimes low-motivation because the learners see the acquisition of the new language as having no relevance for them, and therefore some actively refuse to engage in the lessons.

As Krashen (1985) suggests, the onus is then on a language teacher to design programs that appeal to students, and the writer agrees that very often formal grammar teaching and long lists of vocabulary only serve to exacerbate the apathy. A language teacher is also responsible for understanding and accommodating the learners' needs, and offering differentiated materials so that each student can succeed within his/her own level. Krashen maintains that positive "affect" is very important, but not sufficient on its own

for acquisition to take place. The language teacher will agree here that there are numerous considerations and influences, both external and internal that affect the successful acquisition of an L2. Krashen's Affective Filter is based on the proposition of Dulay and Burt (1977) with the addition of his own notion of the affective variables. Gregg (1984) does not deny the importance of these variables, however he disputes that Krashen can justifiably offer his Affective Filter hypothesis, particularly in view of Gregg's opinion that it does not explain why the Filter does not work in young children who have varying levels of motivation and certainly go through a range of emotions and insecurities. Babies probably do not have motivation to acquire their L1, yet Krashen maintains that caretaker speech encourages them to acquire, thus there must be motivation for this (Krashen, 1982).

Gregg (1984) questions why emotions and variables seem irrelevant to children, yet are applicable to adult learners. He further criticizes the hypothesis when he cites the example of a Chinese woman whose fluency in English is near perfect, yet on occasions she still drops the "s" from the third person singular. Gregg asks ironically if this is due to a lack of confidence, anxiety or low self-esteem, because something must have "filtered" out this grammatical form. He questions whether or not the "filter" can differentiate between differing parts of language and states that any such grammatical knowledge could only be a part of the Language Acquisition Device or of the acquired competence produced through the combination of unacquired grammar and input. He raises the point that Krashen's filter must have the power to be selective and know what is and is not new data, yet "this presupposes access to the output of the LAD". Therefore, if it does not have the access and it does not filter out all input, then some data will get through and be acquired despite variables (Gregg, 1984, p. 90-93).

Conclusion

Krashen has a huge following in the USA and Canada and his Monitor Model is highly acclaimed amongst language students and teachers around the globe. Even though his theory is flawed (Liu, 2015), some of his critics agree that his five hypotheses, along with Monitor Model as a whole, represent a creditable effort to unify observations about language acquisition into one single theory.

Many of his ideas are valid and useful for language teachers and offer inspiring insights and valuable suggestions for effective teaching styles and methods. In fact, the Monitor Model can be considered “as an example of a macro theory attempting to cover most of the factors involved in second language acquisition” such as age, classroom instructions, environmental influences and language input (Bahrani, 2011, p. 284).

However, Krashen has created controversy and this in itself has highlighted the need for constant attention to the way we acquire language and how this acquisition can be best translated into practice. Currently many scholars are trying to modify his hypotheses in the way of exemplifying and characterizing a learner and input even more (Abukhattala, 2012; Bahrani, 2011; Gregg, 1984; Liu, 2015; McLaughlin, 1987; Shresta, 1998; Schmidt, 1990/1994; Zafar, 2009). His critics are many, including McLaughlin (1987) who states: “Krashen’s theory falls at every juncture... Krashen has not defined his terms with enough precision, the empirical basis of the theory is weak, and the theory is not clear in its predictions” (McLaughlin, 1987, p. 56). Ellis (1985) concurs with Gregg (1984) that, “the Monitor model poses serious theoretical problems regarding the validity of the acquisition-learning distinction, the operation of Monitoring, and the explanation of variability in language-learner language” (Ellis, 1985, p. 266; Gregg, 1984, p. 94). Whereas Gregg takes it even further and claims that “each of Krashen's hypotheses is marked by serious flaws: undefinable or ill-defined terms, unmotivated constructs, lack of empirical content (Bahrani, 2011, p. 284) and thus of falsifiability, lack of explanatory power” (Gregg, 1984, p. 94).

Therefore, Krashen himself was forced to admit that the model together with forthcoming research may be subjected to some changes or even rejection of proposed hypotheses (Krashen, 1988, p. 2). Then, Zafar (2009) appeals that it is about a time to finally implement more testable and practical changes and modification within Monitor Model (Zafar, 2009). As Liu (2015) reminds us that “it is preferable not to see his ideas as a unified and integrated theory but one of the many models dealing with certain aspects of SLA” (p. 145). This means that the unmodified Monitor Model (Bahrani, 2011; Zafar, 2009) is too restrictive and irrelevant to justify the conscious learning as a source of spontaneous language production, and therefore it cannot provide a

comprehensive account of language competence since it has not been measured appropriately. Thus, it shows that consciousness is inimitably connected to the process of second language acquisition.

References

- Abukhattala, I. (2012). Krashen's Five proposals on language learning: Are they valid in Libyan EFL classes. *English Language Teaching*, 6 (1), 128–131.
- Bahrani, T. (2011). The implications of the monitor theory for foreign language teaching. *Asian Social Science*, 7 (10), 281–284.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (4th ed.). White Plains, New York: Longman.
- Cook, V. (1993). *Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. London: Macmillan.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learnin. *System*, 33 (2), 209–224.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gregg, K. R. (1984). Krashen's Monitor and Occam's Razar. *Applied Linguistics*, 5 (2), 79–100.
- Harmer, J. (2005). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Malaysia: Longman.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Essex: Longman.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1995). *The Natural Approach*. London: Prentice Hall Europe.
- Liu, D. (2015). A Critical Review of Krashen's Input Hypothesis: Three Major Arguments. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, 4 (4), 139-146.
- McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of Second Language Learning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. *AILA Review*, 11-26.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11 (2), 129–158.
- Schütz, R. (2017, March 12). *Stephen Krashen's Theory of Second Language Acquisition*. Retrieved August 15, 2018, from

English Made in Brazil: <http://www.sk.com.br/sk-krash.html>

Shresta, T. B. (1998). Instruction and exposure: How do they contribute to Second language acquisition? *Foreign Language Annals* , 31 (2), 231–242.

Zafar, M. (2010). Monitoring the 'Monitor': A Critique of Krashen's Five Hypotheses. *Dhaka University Journal of Linguistics* , 2 (4), 139–146.

EVALUACIJA PET KLJUČNIH ASPEKATA UČENJA JEZIKA – KRITIČKI OSVRT NA KRASHENOVE TEORIJE

Mersad Dervić, student doktorskog studija

Nizama Spahić, student doktorskog studija

Sažetak

Razvoj Krashenove teorije o usvajanju jezika nije napredovao zbog neslaganja vezanih za hipoteze koje nisu podložne ispitivanju. Krashen u svom Monitor modelu (Krashen, 1981; 1982; 1985) navodi da se jezičke kompetencije jedino mogu steći nesvjesno dok svjesno učenje uglavnom zavisi od raspoloženje učenika i njegovih osjećaja za vrijeme učenja drugog jezika. Osvrt na istraživanja koja su se bavila zaostavštinom Input hipoteze izvučene iz Monitor Modela, su podržala validnost ovog pristupa. Međutim, suprotstavljajuće teorije naglašavaju važnost svjesnog učenja koju ne spominje Monitor Model. Ovaj članak daje kritički osvrt na pet ključnih aspekata SLA (Krashenov Monitor Model) te ukazuje na relevantnost teorije i njegovih karakteristika za SLA danas. Zaključeno je da iako je efektan u određenim primjenama u učionicama, Monitor Model je previše ograničavajući da bi opravdao svjesno učenje kao izvor spontane proizvodnje govora, tako da sam po sebi ne može dati sveobuhvatan prikaz jezičke kompetencije.

Ključne riječi: učenje jezika, Krashenova teorija, Monitor model, Input hipoteza

مرصد درويش - طالب الدراسات العليا- جامعة البرج العالمية سرايفو
نزامى سباهتش - طالبة الدراسات العليا- جامعة البرج العالمية سرايفو

تقييم الجوانب الرئيسية الخمسة للتعلم اللغوي - نظرة نقدية إلى نظريات

كروشين

ملخص

لم تتطور نظرية كروشين في اكتساب اللغة بسبب الخلافات حول الفرضيات التي لا تخضع للاختبار. وأورد كراشين في نموذج مونيتور (Krashen، 1981، 1982، 1985) أن الكفاءات اللغوية يمكن أن تكتسب بطريقة غير واعية بينما يعتمد التعلم الواعي بشكل كبير على مزاج الطالب ومشاعره أثناء تعلمه للغة الثانية. و قد دعمت النظرة إلى الأبحاث التي تناولت فرضية الإدخال القديمة المشتقة من نموذج المراقبة صحة هذا النهج. ومع ذلك، تؤكد النظريات المعارضة على أهمية التعلّم الواعي الذي لا يذكره نموذج المراقبة. واستنتج أنه على الرغم من فاعليته في بعض التطبيقات في الفصول، فإن نموذج المراقبة مقيّد أكثر من اللازم لتبرير التعلم الواعي كمصدر لإنتاج الكلام العفوي، بحيث لا يقدم نفسه نظرة عامة شاملة عن الكفاءة اللغوية.

الكلمات الأساسية: تعلّم اللغات، نظرية كراشين، نموذج المراقبة، فرضية الإدخال