**THEORY: A BRIEF REVIEW**

**The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis:** Two DIFFERENT ways of developing ability in another language.

**ACQUISITION** – subconscious = "picking up" a language
1. While it is happening, we are not aware that it is happening.
2. Once we have acquired something, we are not usually aware that anything has happened; the knowledge is stored in our brains subconsciously.

Everybody can acquire, children and adults: The language acquisition device never shuts off.
Both oral and written language can be acquired.
Acquisition - What the brain does well.

**LEARNING** – conscious = Everyday language: "rules", "grammar"
What we did in school.
Error correction is supposed to help learning. When we make a mistake and are corrected, we are supposed to change our conscious version of the rule. BUT: error correction and conscious learning are very limited.
Learning – What the brain does poorly.

**The Monitor Hypothesis:** Consciously learned language is only available as a Monitor, or editor.

Fluent production comes from Acquisition.
Grammar rules help only as an editor: before we say/write something or after.

![Diagram](attachment:diagram.png)

Conditions (severe) for Monitor use:
1) Know the rule.
2) Think about correctness (focus on form)
3) Time.

Monitor weak but not useless: As editor, final stage in composing process: Where our version of the language differs from the "standard", e.g. it's/its, lie/lay (language change?)

Dangers of overuse:

"The major, who had been a great fencer, did not believe in bravery, and spent much time while we sat in the machines correcting my grammar. He had complimented me on how I spoke Italian, and we
talked together very easily. One day I had said that Italian seemed such an easy language to me that I could not take a great interest in it; everything was so easy to say. "Ah, yes," the major said. "Why, then, do you not take up the use of grammar?" So we took up the use of grammar, and soon Italian was such a difficult language that I was afraid to talk to him until I had the grammar straight in my mind." (Hemingway, In Another Country)

**The Comprehension Hypothesis:** The centerpiece of the theory

We acquire language when we understand messages.

While people differ in many important ways, they do not differ in the way they acquire language.

More precise, we acquire language when we understand messages than contain aspects of language (vocabulary, grammar) that we have not yet acquired, but that we are “ready” to acquire.

Previously stated by James Asher, Harris Winitz, Leonard Newmark, Frank Smith, Kenneth Goodman.

TWO AMAZING FACTS about language acquisition:

**Effortless:** no energy, no work.

**Involuntary:** Given comprehensible input, you must acquire, you have no choice.

To teach language: Comprehensible, Interesting input

An important corollary of the Comprehension Hypothesis:

Talking is not Practicing.

1. we acquire language by input, not output: more output does not result in more language acquisition
2. ability to speak: the RESULT of language acquisition
3. What to do when students make mistakes
   a. correction: aims at learning, not acquisition: research confirms limited or zero value (Truscott)
   b. the real cure: More comprehensible input – accuracy EMERGES
4. A case history:
   a. Forcing output doesn’t help;
   b. the value of allowing a silent period
5. how speaking can help indirectly

**The Affective Filter Hypothesis:** Affective variables prevent input from reaching the “Language Acquisition Device”

Affective variables: motivation, anxiety, self-esteem

The FILTER (block) prevents input from reaching the Language Acquisition Device.
Is anxiety good for you?
1. A warning: you are about to violate the theory
2. Tells you to avoid forced output > incomprehensible input
3. Do "cures" make things worse? (rehearse your lines, negotiate)

APPLICATION TO LANGUAGE TEACHING
"Four years ago I was looking for any kind of a job I could find. I happened to get one teaching ESL to a class of six women from various parts of the world who spoke no English. I had never heard of ESL before. The salary was poor and I didn't know if I wanted to pursue a teaching career, therefore my approach was very casual and low pressure. My method usually consisted of thinking up a topic to talk about, introducing it, and encouraging each student to express her feelings.

In spite of my casual approach, the teaching job was extremely pleasant. I had a deep empathy for anyone who was facing a language barrier because I had just returned from a trip around the world alone as a monolingual.

They all started speaking English fairly well after the first two weeks of class. I remember a woman from Colombia telling me that she hadn't spoken English before because she was afraid of making mistakes. After being in class for a while, she spoke English and made mistakes and didn't care. I didn't attach much significance to the progress the women made. I had no idea how long it took people to learn a language.

Gradually I became quite career-oriented, and made a conscious decision to try to be a top-notch ESL teacher. I had guilt feelings about the casual way in which I had taught those first six women, and my teaching evolved into the traditional authoritarian style with the textbook dominant. Over the years, it has gotten to where I feel frustrated if a student takes class time to relate a personal anecdote.
I can look back on these four years and see a gradual decline in the performance of my students. Until recently, I have been assuming that I need to be more attentive to their mistakes in order to speed their progress. My present style of teaching bypasses the students' feelings and basic needs, and concentrates on method. I never see successes like those first six ladies" (Story related to Earl Stevick by one of his students, in Teaching Languages, A Way and Ways, 1980).

Role of the class:
The role of the class: DEVELOP INTERMEDIATES, not perfection.
Class is ideal for beginners! Outside world reluctant to provide comprehensible input to beginners.
A universal theory of education: Prepare you for the outside world, not complete mastery.

**Beginning level:**

**Methods**
Natural Approach (Terrell)
Focal Skills (Hastings) Website: http://focalskills.info/articles/list.html,

**Underlying principles**

class: filled with comprehensible input
organized, but not around points of grammar: activities that these students will find comprehensible and interesting (compelling)
speech not forced but encouraged (indirect contribution)
grammar: not for children, as linguistics, for editing

Research: CI wins in method comparisons
Communicative tests: CI much better.
Grammar tests: CI better or no difference.
Some examples:
* Hammand (1988) Spanish as a FL: No difference after one semester on a grammar test.
* Nicola (1990): Defense Language Institute – Arabic as FL. Grammar/audio-lingual compared to comprehensible input emphasis: 30 weeks, six hours/day; ½ of classes identical. CI students in three sections best on reading and listening tests, one section better in speaking, most differences not statistically significant.
* Winitz (1996): university Spanish as FL in the US: implicit grammar group outperforms explicit grammar group on test of grammaticality judgments (d = .61) (“modified natural approach”)
* Nikolov and Krashen (1997): 7 year duration: two groups of children in EFL – “communicative” (story based; no grammar until the final year) vs. traditional. Test given in grade 8, students interviewed (about self, person they knew, film they saw, book they read): Communicative slightly better in grammatical accuracy, much more fluent (morphemes in obligatory occasions).
* TPRS vs. traditional: Varguez (2009), Watson (2009), in IJFLT.com, summer.

*Isik (2000) High school EFL in Turkey, intermediates; 29 hours per week, 36 weeks CI = TPR, communication-based activities with minimal correction, graded readers, 75% CI, 25% grammar.
Grammar = 24 hrs/week form-based, 20% CI, 80% grammar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>comprehensible input</th>
<th>grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oxford grammar test</td>
<td>67.6 (5.0)</td>
<td>45.6 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>22.25 (1.07)</td>
<td>14.5 (4.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening compr.</td>
<td>24.9 (2.29)</td>
<td>17.5 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing</td>
<td>19.4 (2.6)</td>
<td>7.5 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from: Isik 2000
Continuation data: Students in CI-based classes in voluntary foreign language programs more likely to continue.

**Complaints about Comprehensible Input-based methods**

1. They make lots of mistakes (you hear them because they can talk)
2. CI leads to a lowering of standards (more continue to higher levels)
3. Not enough: Not "academic language" (True!)

**Intermediate methods:** Several ways to reach academic language (let's do them all).

Sheltered subject matter teaching: based on comprehensible input

Characteristics
- 1. intermediates only
- 2. focus on subject-matter, not language (If there is a test, the test is on subject matter) > more comprehensible input, more language acquisition

**Research** on sheltered subject matter teaching:

* Ottawa studies (Edwards, et al. 1985; Weshe et al. 1988): university level ESL, French SL, in sheltered psychology acquire as much or more as comparisons.
* Layfayette & Buscalia, 1985: 4th semester French as FL = culture civilization and culture; better than comparisons on listening, reading, speaking, worse in grammar but 20% of test on subjunctive.

**WHAT ABOUT GRAMMAR?**

Review of the Monitor hypothesis: Three **necessary** conditions
- 1. Know the rule: A very strong constraint.
- 3. Time: Not available normally in conversation.

When are these conditions fully met? On grammar tests.

Early results: Principles and Practice (1982; see [www.sdkrashen.com](http://www.sdkrashen.com))
- 1. when conditions are not met, only "acquired competence" is used, we see the "natural order" for language acquisition reflected in errors.
- 2. Current push for grammar: studies that claim to show that grammar instruction works. In ALL cases, the conditions for Monitor use were met.
  - a. Students had studied the rule.
  - b. They were focused on form during the test.
  - c. They had enough time to apply the rule.
Example: Masters (1994)
Treatment: SIX hours of direct instruction on the article
Subjects: University ESL students, intermediate level
About 70% had already studied the def, indef article
Pre and posttest: fill in the blank –
Carlos is ___ student at our university.
Once there were many trees here. Now, ___ trees are gone.
Results:
UCLA: instructed group improved 6.5% (from C to low B), comparisons 2%.
Fresno: instructed group improved 9% (from C- or D+ to a C).
Does this show that grammar works? NO: It shows the limits of grammar teaching – a small increase after a lot of instruction on a rule most had already studied, on a test that focused them on form.

What about CORRECTION?
Truscott – small or no effect: even when all conditions for monitor use met

BEST CASE studies
Fathman and Whalley (1990): intermediate ESL college students in the US, taking composition classes. Students wrote compositions in class that described a series of pictures. Correction limited to grammar, and consisted “solely of underlining all grammar errors (e.g. verb forms, tenses, articles, agreement)”: location only. Corrected versions were returned “a few days later” & students were given 30 minutes to rewrite.
1. correction only
2. correction + feedback on content.

Number of errors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>before</th>
<th>after</th>
<th>improvement</th>
<th>% corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grammar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammar + content</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from: Fathman and Whalley (1990)

Students did better after correction, but missed quite a bit, only correcting about half their errors.

Ashwell (2000): subjects wrote compositions outside of class, errors corrected by “underlining or circling grammatical, lexical, and mechanical errors or ... using cursors to indicate omissions” (p. 233). Students had one week to return their revised papers.

Students could correct about one third of their errors, even though they tried: students acted on 75% of the formal corrections, and 88% of the formal changes made in response to the corrections.
Chandler, 2003: adv. ESL in music conservatory, all “had had quite a bit of training in English grammar.” Accuracy counted on their grades. Given “several days” to make corrections.

full correction: Students provided with the correct form. Corrected nearly 90% of their errors, but all they had to do was copy.

underline: Location indicated. Students able to correct 54%
describe: kind of error, without location (‘punc’). 52% corrected.
Underline plus describe: 69% corrected.

**Conclusion:** In rewriting the same draft after correction, motivated advanced adult students given time and focused on form failed to correct 1/3 to 2/3 of the errors on their papers unless they were given the actual correct form. Even then, they were not quite able to correct all their errors.


**Beniko Mason: Effect of adding output & correction**
Japanese college learners of English in extensive reading program
Japanese summary group: summaries in Japanese,
English summary group: summaries in English,
Correction group: summaries in English, received corrective feedback (25 times), rewrote their corrected summaries.
Participants read about 500,000 words in three semesters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Sum</td>
<td>30.63(7.7)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45.43(6.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Sum</td>
<td>28.42(8.1)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42.42(6.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum + Correction</td>
<td>27.00(8.5)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.97(8.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOEIC READING COMPREHENSION**
Japanese Sum
English Sum
Sum + Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Sum</td>
<td>129.8 (33)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>163.5(38.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Sum</td>
<td>112.7(36.4)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>146.8(43.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum + Correction</td>
<td>121.8(25.1)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>162.3(54.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF ERROR-FREE CLAUSES per 100 words**
Japanese Sum
English Sum
Sum + Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Sum</td>
<td>8.95 (3.6)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.19 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Sum</td>
<td>8.05 (4.3)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.37 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum + Correction</td>
<td>9.62 (3.3)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.3 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Efficiency/Hour – Japanese summary group more efficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>hours</th>
<th>Cloze</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Comprehensible Output?
CO = make a mistake, mis-communication, try again until you get it right. = "Need" hypothesis
Encourages forced speaking, submersion

CO is RARE
- Pica, 1988: 44 in ten hours, only 13 involved grammar.
- Pica, Holliday, Lewis & Morgenhaller (1989): 116 adjustments (CO) in response to 1952 native speaker utterances (6%) in situation designed to require negotiation & comprehensible output.
- Lyster & Ranta (1997): one per hour (18 hours recorded of French immersion language arts, subject matter, gr 5)

No evidence CO is necessary: Acquisition can occur without output

No evidence CO works: Nobuyoshi & Ellis (1993): Students pushed to use past tense in interacting with teacher: Only one subject in three shows significant gain, could have been review of previously learned rule.

CO is painful: speaking the most anxiety-provoking activity

The NEED hypothesis and the Minnesota Language School

http://sdkrashen.com/articles/comprehensible_output/all.html

Why study grammar?
Language Appreciation

The pleasure of learning: Providing learning where you already had acquisition.

1. satisfying feeling: An advanced student at Queens college.
   The present continuous has three meanings:
   - John is playing the violin.
   - current ongoing (what's that noise?)
   - long term ongoing (Guess what John is doing this year.)
   - immediate future: (Who is playing the violin in the quartet this evening?)

2. = a demonstration of the power of acquisition

The Monitor: How effective is the Monitor? What can be taught and used for editing?
What about vocabulary?

1. Why vocabulary can't be taught: Too many words, too complex
   a. estimates: 50,000 to 150,000 words
   b. grammatical features (transitive/intransitive)
   c. semantic features (home, house)
2. Evidence that vocabulary is acquired
   a. Nagy studies: Each time we see a word in print we get about 5% of the meaning: faster than instruction for the full meaning.
   b. Clockwork Orange: Saragi, Nation & Meister, 1978. 241 slang words (nadsat). Average score = 68/90 (76%), range 50% to 96%.
   c. Beniko Mason: story telling more efficient than instruction (Mason and Krashen, 2004; RELC Journal)
Japanese students in college in Osaka.
Story only: 15" hearing a story
Story plus study: spent nearly the entire class hour (85 minutes) hearing the story and doing supplementary activities.

Efficiency (words learned/acquired per minute)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st posttest</th>
<th>2nd posttest</th>
<th>delayed posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story Only</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Plus Study</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE POWER OF READING

Free Voluntary Reading (FVR): source of reading ability, writing style, vocabulary size, much of spelling, complex grammar

The overwhelming research case for FVR
a. Hooked on Books!
   b. Sustained Silent Reading

The Fiji Island study (RRQ, 1983): Elley & Mangubhai: gains in RC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grade</th>
<th>ALM</th>
<th>SSR</th>
<th>Big Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

year 2: larger differences, readers better in writing, listening and grammar

Evidence from English as a foreign language (Krashen, 2007, ijflt.com)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>study</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>titles</th>
<th>titles/S</th>
<th>duration</th>
<th>ES Cloze</th>
<th>ES RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yuan &amp; Nash, 1992</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sims, 1996</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sims, 1996</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason retakers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>one sem</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason Jr college</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason university</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason: response L1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason: response L2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lituanas et al, 2001</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, 2001</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>142.9</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheu, 2003</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheu, 2003</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, 2005a</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>12 weeks</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsu &amp; Lee, 2005</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Smith, 2006</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, 2006</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hsu &amp; Lee, 2007</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Smith, 2007</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu, 2007</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Histories:
Goeffrey Canada: "I loved reading, and my mother, who read voraciously too, allowed me to have her novels after she finished them. My strong reading background allowed me to have an easier time of it in most of my classes."
Liz Murray (Breaking Night): "Any formal education I received came from the few days I spent in attendance, mixed with knowledge I absorbed from random readings of my or Daddy's ever-growing supply of unreturned library books. And as long as I still showed up steadily the last few weeks of classes to take the standardized tests, I kept squeaking by from grade to grade."
Bishop Desmond Tutu: “One of the things I am most grateful to (my father) for is that, contrary to educational principles, he allowed me to read comics. I think that is how I developed my love for English and for reading.”
Richard Wright: “I wanted to write and I did not even know the English language. I bought English grammars and found them dull. I felt I was getting a better sense of the language from novels than from grammars.”

Encouraging FVR

A. Rewards and incentives
What about Accelerated Reader?
Components: Books / Time to read/ Tests/ Prizes
A conservative position: Spend the money on books
Conjecture: Long term harm – turning play into work

B. literature & read alouds: the bridge to free reading (Wang and Lee, IJFLT, 2007); “natural partners” (Jim Trelease)

C. the power of compelling reading A conjecture.
Interesting input lowers the affect filter; Compelling input destroys it.
Interesting input reduces focus on form; Compelling input destroys it.
Interesting input makes motivation less relevant; Compelling input makes motivation irrelevant

D. reading itself and “home run books”
1. KS Cho: Twilight as a home run book for EFL in Korea
2. The case of Daniel (Lao and Krashen, IJFLT 2008: Heritage language development: Exhortation or good stories?) The stories of Fan Ti

The major factor: ACCESS!! Access, a place to read and the role of LIBRARIES!!

1. Children get their books from libraries

Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>predictor</th>
<th>beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r2</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAN READING & BILINGUALISM KEEP YOU YOUNG?

Three ways of staying young
1. Free voluntary reading
2. Bilingualism (executive control)
3. Coffee: can 5 cups a day reverse Alzheimers?

Can we combine all three?
WHAT WRITING DOES
More writing does not lead to better writing. But writing can make you smarter.
The composing process: strategies for solving problems, making yourself smarter.
COMPONENTS OF THE COMPOSING PROCESS
Inspiration is the result of writing, not the cause (Boice)

I. Revision: "Novelists have, on the average, about the same IQs as the cosmetic consultants at Bloomingdale's department store. Our power is patience. We have discovered that writing allows even a stupid person to seem halfway intelligent, if only that person will write the same thought over and over again, improving it just a little bit each time. It is a lot like inflating a blimp with a bicycle pump. Anybody can do it. All it takes is time" (Vonnegut).

II. Flexible Planning:
a. Have a plan: “... experienced writers refuse to leave on a trip with a map. The map may be in the head or on paper, but the writer needs a sense of direction" (Murray)
b. Be willing to change it: “For all the planning, writers are surprised at what they write” (Murray)

III. Rereading: “I rise at first light and I start by rereading and editing everything I have written to the point I left off” (Hemingway,)

IV. Delay Editing: “Tony” had a concern with form “that actually inhibited the development of ideas. In none of his writing sessions did he ever write more than two sentences before he began to edit” (Perl) Also: this draft may not be the final version. “Treat grammar as a matter of very late editorial correcting: never think about while you are writing. Pretend you have an editor who will fix everything for you, then don’t hire yourself for this job until the very end” (Elbow, 1973, p. 137).

V. Incubation: "Composition is not enhanced by grim determination" (Frank Smith)
Moments of insight are preceded by hard work (preparation)
Problem-solving often requires “an interval free from conscious thought” to allow the free working of the subconscious mind (Wallas, 1926, p. 95).
Tolle (1999): “All true artists, whether they know it or not, create from a place of no-mind, from inner stillness ... Even the great scientists have reported that their creative breakthroughs came a a time of mental quietude” (p. 20).

VI: Daily Regular Writing:
Robert Boice: Professors who do daily writing versus binge writing: more writing and more ideas Rosellen Brown: writing “is a job, not a hobby ... you have to sit down and work, to Schedule your time and stick to it
Stephen King: don’t “wait for the Muse. Your job is to make sure the muse knows where you are going to be every day from nine 'till noon or seven 'till three.’
Madeleine L'Engle: "Inspiration usually comes during work, rather than before it"
Regular writing vs binging:
Woody Allen, "If you work only three to four hours per day, you become quite productive. It's the steadiness that counts" (Murray, 1990, p. 46).
Why DRW helps: incubation between sessions, warming up
Flaubert: "I have the peculiarity of a camel - I find it difficult to stop once I get started and hard to start after I've been resting" (Murray)

**CONCLUSIONS:** We acquire the special academic language by input, by reading. Writing helps us use this competence to solve problems and make us smarter.

**COMMENTS ON TESTING**
Our goal: develop AUTONOMY – intermediate level competence so students can continue to improve on their own from authentic input + knowledge of how to continue to improve

1. FACT: Students study for the test, teachers teach to the test (= prepare students for the test).

2. THEREFORE: studying for the test/teaching to the test should help students improve in the second language

3. If the comprehension hypothesis is correct: test preparation should provide students with more comprehensible input. Autonomous test preparation should be a rehearsal for real-life autonomy, when students are on their own after completing the course of instruction.

4. This means: few or no tests where test prep = conscious learning activities
   This eliminates (or at least reduces):
   1. Speaking tests: the result of comprehensible input, not the cause; encourages practicing speaking alone
   2. Vocabulary testing > encourages direct vocabulary instruction, not as efficient as reading
   3. Cloze tests > an excellent measure but doing cloze exercises does not improve competence
   4. Writing > writing style is the result of reading, not writing practice
      a. editing: should it be tested?
      b. Speed writing
      c. Can we "test" the composing process?

Possibilities
1. Reading comprehension, covering a variety of areas, the student can choose
   a. encourages self-selected reading in areas of interest
   b. correlates highly with tests of writing and vocabulary, and cloze tests
2. Listening comprehension, covering a wide variety of areas, the student can choose
3. Test subject matter (danger if factual testing)