

## Further Implications of Krashen's Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis for Applied Linguistics\*

**Rod Pederson**

Incheon National University

**Pederson, Rod. (2015). Further implications of Krashen's acquisition-learning hypothesis for applied linguistics. *Modern English Education*, 16(4), 23-44.**

Krashen's (1981, 1982) acquisition-learning hypothesis (ALH) is a well known concept that has been taught in applied linguistics for over 30 years. It has also been adapted into many other fields of study such as education (Gee, 1989), composition (Tricomi, 1986) and neuroscience (Kuhl, 2004). While it may be said that the basic concept of the ALH represents a foundational aspect of communicative approaches to teaching English and the emergence of socio-cultural theory (Lantolf, 2006), it is nevertheless hotly contested by other applied linguists for the inability of the ALH to make an empirical distinction between the seemingly amorphous line between acquisition and learning. This paper examines the theoretical implications of the ALH within applied linguistics as well as extrapolating on the theoretical implications of Gee's (1989) use of the ALH for his theories of literacy. In doing so, the analysis in this paper not only traces theoretical moves from the ALH to theories of literacy, situated learning, intertextuality, and representation, all of which are gaining expanded attention in applied linguistic literature and practice. In addition, the analysis shows that the dichotomy of the ALH is representative of an epistemological divide across the social sciences, including applied linguistics.

[second language acquisition (SLA)/ situated learning/intertextuality/  
representation, 제2언어습득/상황학습/상호텍스트성/재현]

### I. INTRODUCTION

Krashen's (1981, 1982) Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis (ALH) is one of the most

---

\* This work was supported by the Incheon National University (International Cooperative) Research Grant in 2015.

widely known and influential concepts in the field of applied linguistics. While it may be more specifically accurate to relate the ALH to the field of second language acquisition (SLA), it is also well known that the ALH is part of the foundational corpus of theories of many other fields of study such as linguistics, teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL), English as a second language (ESL), English as a foreign language (EFL), and many other as well. Therefore, for the purposes of clarity this article will only refer to the ALH in terms of applied linguistics. The ALH is taught to all students of applied linguistics and may be generally understood as acquisition as being what humans are best at and which is picked up unconsciously through social interaction, whereas learning is the conscious action of study and application. In this definition, Krashen clearly intends the hypothesis to be understood as acquisition being the paramount way in which languages are ‘learned’, whereas learning is generally a waste of time and effort. However, although Krashen presents the ALH as more of a strict dichotomy in terms of how a language is best ‘learned’, many scholars disagree with this interpretation and see the ALH as more of a grey area where acquisition and learning interact in a synergistic manner that may not be described so simply (Gregg, 1984; McLaughlin, 1978). Nevertheless, it is clear that the concept of acquisition that comes through the ALH signifies a more social and interactive perspective on language teaching and learning that is recognized as a key concept in the genealogy of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and other similar approaches such as Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT). This theoretical connection between the ALH and communicative approaches to language teaching is documented by Griffiths and Parr (2001) and K. Yoon (2004) where Griffiths and Parr (2001) state that “In so far as he believed that language develops through natural communication, Krashen might be considered to be one of the driving forces behind the CLT movement which is in vogue to the present day” (p. 248). This assertion of the ALH being an important theoretical aspect in the genealogy of CLT is also implicit in the relationship between Socio-cultural Theory (SCT) and CLT (Lantolf, 2006; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

The importance and usability as an academic theory of the ALH may be seen in how it has been appropriated by other fields of study such as education (Gee, 1989), composition theory (Tricomi, 1986), discourse theory (Gee, 1989), and Neuroscience (Kuhl, 2004). While such widespread knowledge and use of the ALH in extant or related fields of study is important in itself to this analysis, what is more interesting and useful to teachers and scholars are the many similar dichotomies that exist in various fields of study. It will be shown how these dichotomies are related to the ALH and these connections have implications useful to theories that may be applied to teaching and learning in applied linguistics. Examples of similar dichotomies that may be seen to be closely related to the ALH are Freire’s (1987) definition of literacy as ‘reading the word and the world’ and the distinctions being made between pedagogy and methodology, and/or education and

training (Giroux, 1985; Kincheloe, 1999). Moreover, it may be said that the ALH is representative of an epistemological bifurcation between scientific (positivistic) and social-constructivist approaches to knowledge across the social sciences (Kuhn, 1970; Popkewitz, 1984; Shannon, 1989). A good example of the implications that are inferred by the ALH is Gee's (1989) use of the ALH in terms of how it relates to and helps describe both theories of literacy and discourse. Moreover, when viewed through the lenses of literacy and discourse theory, the ALH clearly implies useful theoretical and pedagogical concepts such as situated learning, intertextuality, representation, and media or new literacies (Lankshear & Knobel, 2006; Street, 2003) which may all be applied to second language teaching and learning. The intent of this paper is to analyze and discuss the further development of theoretical and pedagogical applications related to the ALH and how they may inform, and are indeed being employed in current applied linguistic theory and practice.

## II. THE ACQUISITION-LEARNING HYPOTHESIS

The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis is one of five hypotheses that make up Krashen's (1982) theory of second language acquisition, which includes the natural order, monitor, input, and the affective filter hypotheses. Together, these hypotheses form the basis of his Natural Approach to SLA (1983). The acquisition aspect of the hypothesis is generally understood to be a subconscious process where learners are conscious that they are using language to communicate, but are unaware of the language competencies they have acquired. In other words, language competency is acquired through the social act of using language, or more simply, through natural social interaction, which he terms implicit learning. As such, it is not surprising that Krashen (1981) states that SLA is "...similar if not identical to first language acquisition" (p. 10) by relating it to Chomsky's (1957) theory of the Language Acquisition Device (LAD) that is hard wired into all human brains. In this way Krashen (1981) theorizes that both children and adults acquire language in the same way as they both have access to the LAD. In his definition of the first part of the hypothesis, Krashen is clearly stating that acquisition is the most powerful aspect of first or second language learning.

Similarly, Krashen's definition of the learning part of the hypothesis is equally clear in stating that learning, as a conscious process, is actually detrimental to language acquisition as the time spent in understanding the rules of language hinders the actual process of acquisition. Krashen defines learning as a conscious process of understanding the rules of language and being able to explain them, or more simply, explicit learning. By defining learning this way he sets up a firm dichotomy between both sides of the hypothesis by

drawing a distinction between implicit and explicit learning. As reflected in his Natural Approach to language learning, the ALH posits that optimal language learning takes place through the natural social interaction of language use, not the explicit learning of linguistic structures and rules.

While the criticisms of the ALH are many and varied, they tend to focus on the difficulty of distinguishing whether increased student language production is attributable to implicit acquisition or explicit learning (McLaughlin, 1978) and the question of whether acquisition can become learning (Gregg, 1984). McLaughlin (1978), using anecdotal evidence of student language production that demonstrates the difficulty in determining whether a specific utterance is a product of intuition (acquisition) or grammatical knowledge (learning), posits that it is impossible to prove a distinction between Krashen's (1982) definitions of acquisition and learning. Similarly, Gregg (1984) also uses anecdotal student utterances to question whether the correctness of an utterance is a product of the experience of social interaction in language learning or the result of rote memorization and pattern practice. Gregg (1989) later questioned the validity of the ALH by asking "...what is it that is acquired when one has acquired a language?" (p. 17) and concluding that what is acquired/learned is both innate and learned. In doing so, Gregg draws a distinction between language competence (linguistic knowledge) and performance (language behavior). Long (1990) seems to agree with these criticisms by classifying the ALH as a 'mixed model' containing both innate and language processing aspects. What is interesting about these criticisms is that the existence of acquisition is not denied, but questioned in terms of its absolute dichotomy and where the distinction between acquisition and learning lies. Indeed, Krashen (2003) himself later qualified his position on the ALH regarding these distinctions, but did so in ways that left no doubt that he believed that acquisition was the dominant process of language learning.

Another aspect of the ALH that bears attention within applied linguistics theory is the relationship between the ALH and what has come to be known as SCT. While the genesis of SCT is generally attributed to the work of Vygotsky (1978), the similarities between these two seemingly separate aspects of applied linguistics theory may be seen in the often noted similarity between Krashen's (1982) *i + 1* hypothesis and Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development (Lantolf, 2006; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). In addition, the work of Vygotsky (1978) and Norton (2000) acknowledges that SCT has also incorporated much of its theoretical corpus from sociology through the works of scholars such as Bourdieu (1991) and Foucault (1984). In essence, SCT claims that human cognition and functioning is a product of the interactions of people in the social world. In other words, language and the structures and functioning of human societies mediates human biological and behavioral activity. Lantolf and Thorne (2006) summarize this general definition of SCT by stating that:

Practically speaking, developmental processes take place through participation in cultural, linguistic, and historically formed settings such as family life and peer group interaction, and in institutional contexts like schooling, organized sports activities, and work places, to name only a few. SCT argues that while human neurobiology is a necessary condition for higher order thinking, the most important forms of human cognitive activity develop through interaction within these social and material environments (p. 197).

Although the ALH is not generally seen to be a foundational theoretical aspect of SCT, it is nonetheless clear that the dichotomy posed by the ALH, and its focus on social interaction, or implicit/innate learning, is the theoretical heart of SCT. As such, the general meaning posed by the ALH dichotomy, the dominance of acquisition in language pedagogy) may also be seen as a foundational theory to CLT, TBLT, and other communicative approaches to second language learning as these approaches are firmly rooted in the belief that communication and learning through the social interaction of language use is the most important aspect of second language learning. In other words, it is not the ALH itself, or the theories and pedagogies that Krashen (1982) derives from his theory of SLA, which is so closely aligned with SCT and communicative approaches to second language learning, but the general meaning of the ALH dichotomy that is so clearly aligned with these ideas.

### III. RELATED DICHOTOMIES

The ALH is by no means the only dichotomy in academic theory that represents an understanding of a polarity between theories in a field of study. What is interesting and significant is that this same dichotomous polarity exists in so many fields of study across the social sciences and represents the same general concept of the distinction between scientific (positivistic) and social ways of knowing. Kuhn's (1970) seminal work *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* detailed how theoretical paradigm shifts in academia were intimately entangled with the socio-historical forces of human societies. Kuhn's work showed that the social world had very tangible effects on the production, evolution, and understanding of scientific theories that in time become dominating paradigms of academic thought, or epistemologies. Shannon (1989) expanded on this work to illustrate how disparate research paradigms actually represented specific epistemologies that represented the forms of research being published in the academy and that some forms were clearly favored over others in terms of what was being published. Shannon delineated current research paradigms into empirical/analytic, symbolic, and critical forms of research where

empirical/analytic science reflected the positivism of the scientific method, symbolic science the discovery and definition of the rules that govern social systems, and critical science that explicates the socio-historical construction and behavior (discursive nature) of social systems. In doing so, Shannon showed how empirical/analytic science dominated the field of education, with symbolic science coming in second and critical science holding a marginalized position in terms of publishing production. Pederson (2006) later used Shannon's model to demonstrate similar findings in the field of applied linguistics. However, what these studies did not reveal was the question of whether the results reflected editorial bias or restrictions on the literature base being used for teaching burgeoning scholars. Nonetheless, this work demonstrates the tangible reality of an epistemological dichotomy between scientific and social ways of knowing in the fields of education and applied linguistics as both the symbolic and critical paradigms reflected social epistemologies by definition.

Besides the ALH, the scientific/social epistemological dichotomy may be seen in several ways in the corpus of applied linguistics theory. To begin with, the genesis of applied linguistics as a separate field from linguistics may be seen as a differentiation between the scientific and social nature of language as it was originally conceived as 'linguistics applied' (Widdowson, 2000). The application of linguistic theory to language teaching immediately rendered the field as much a social endeavor as a scientific one. Although the 'grey area' between scientific and social ways of knowing resembles the criticisms of the ALH in this instance, it is clear that the social side of the equation is what separated applied linguistics from traditional structural linguistics. The impetus for this division between the scientific and social side of linguistics may be seen in the works of Saussure (Hall, 1997) and Whorf (1956) where Saussure's (Hall, 1997) semiotics posited this distinction with his rendering of *langue* (language) and *parole* (meaning) and Whorf's (1956) theory of linguistic relativity, with both theories clearly theorizing an inseparable link between *langue* and culture. This division between the scientific and social sides of linguistics may be Linguistic turn further seen in Hymes' (1966) call for the introduction of sociological theory into linguistic theory, his formulation of the theory of communicative competence, and the birth of CLT within applied linguistics (Savignon, 1972). Firth and Wagner (1997) highlighted this division in SLA theory with their claim that SLA theory was dominated by structural linguistics of Chomsky (1957) and overlooked the fertile possibilities of social theories within SLA which led to a well known and bitter theoretical debate in the field (Gass, 1998). The reality of this theoretical division in applied linguistics may best be exemplified by the comments in the *TESOL Quarterly Forum* between Atkinson (2002) and Kubota (2002) where both claimed that the other really did not understand the other's theoretical position. All of these theoretical movements within the academy obviously addressed what was well known both within and without

linguistics: that a distinction between the scientific and social understandings of linguistic phenomenon existed and was under-theorized.

All of these examples of the epistemic dichotomy between scientific and social epistemologies within applied linguistics overlook the fact that the dichotomy has been firmly established in several well known applied linguistic theories for many years. The arguments between implicit and explicit grammar teaching are an obvious example, with the consensus supporting the implicit side of the argument being bolstered by the emergence of CLT (Canale & Swain, 1980; Ellis, 2012; Savignon, 1972). The similarity between implicit/explicit grammar instruction with the debate over form and function should also be noted (Spada & Lightbown, 2008). Brown's (2007) categorization of SLA theory into cognitive, behavioral, and social-constructivist paradigms also represents this dichotomy with cognitivism clearly being a scientific enterprise sharply separated by the obvious social epistemology of social constructivism, with behaviorism taking a place between the two with a quasi-scientific and social understanding. Moreover, within cognitive theory this division may be seen between the scientific-biological understandings of SLA theorists who follow Piaget's work (Donaldson, 1978) and those who follow the social-constructivism of Vygotsky (Lantolf, 2006). In addition, the dichotomy is also seen within CLT with the theorization of communicative competence being categorized into linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies (Canale & Swain, 1980). While other theoretical examples assuredly exist within applied linguistics theory it is clear that the dichotomy between scientific and social epistemologies is well entrenched in applied linguistics.

The integration of social epistemologies into applied linguistics can generally be traced to have come from sociology and psychology into education and thus into applied linguistics. This is easily demonstrated through the works of scholars such as Kubota (2002), Norton (2000), and Pennycook (2001), who often cited the works of educational theorists (Giroux, 1985; Kincheloe, 1999) and social theorists (Bourdieu, 1991; Foucault, 1984). The influence of Vygotsky (1978) is widely recognized in educational literature through the theories of situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991) and scaffolding (Hammond, 2002), to name a few, and the influence of sociology is well represented in the literature of critical pedagogy and literacy (Apple, 2010; Giroux, 1985; Kincheloe, 1999). In addition, various scholars in applied linguistics, such as Crookes (2009) and Lin (2013), have also incorporated these ideas into their theoretical and pedagogical practices. It is also worth noting that this chain of theoretical integration has also played a key role in the development of SCT.

The scientific versus social dichotomy in sociology is well understood, though highly questionable in terms of its genesis as some attribute it to the inception of the Frankfurt School and critical theory (Shannon, 1989), while others point to the development of the

field of semiotics (Hawkes, 1977) or even the Socratic Method (Pederson, 2012). Perhaps the clearest articulation of this dichotomy in the social sciences is the development of what has come to be known as post-structuralism, or discursive thought. Closely related to post-modernism, post-structuralism gained its name and theoretical foundations through the works of scholars such as Derrida (1998), Foucault (1984), and Lacan (2006). While structuralism is often linked to the semiotics of Saussure (2006), and the subsequent 'linguistic turn' in the social sciences (Hall, 1997) and is thought of as being modeled on the structure of language (descriptive), post-structuralism is generally associated with the works of many scholars and interrogates the binary oppositions (contradictions) associated with the descriptive structures of structuralism (Giroux, 1985; Hall, 1997). As such, post-structuralism is concerned with investigating the socio-historical construction of social phenomenon and may use both positivistic (scientific) and social-constructivist research methodologies in its analyses, whereas structuralism is constricted to the use of purely scientific methodologies. The difference between these two epistemologies is most clearly seen in Saussure's belief that only *langue* could be fruitfully studied as it could be accurately described by the scientific method, hence the term structuralism, whereas he also recognized the fecundity of potential analyses of the workings of *parole* could not be interrogated through positivistic thought (Hall, 1997). Thus, post-structuralism has not only come to be known for its examination of the workings of binary oppositions, or contradictions, in human societies, but may also be seen as representing the dichotomy between itself and structuralism. This dichotomy may also be seen in the Halls definition of representation a being in constant flux, by definition rendering multiple meanings to any specific representation, and Derrida's (1998) concept of differance that posits an implicit difference in meaning between objective meaning as in the written or spoken word, and the endless chain of signifiers related to it. Its focus on the socio-historical construction of social systems was what made its theoretical insights of interest to scholars in education and, ultimately, applied linguistics.

The scientific-social dichotomy represented in the ALH may also be seen in many diverse fields of study, such as political science (Hoffman & Graham, 2009), sociology (Stetstenko, 1999), and psychology (Eyo, 1980). While it would be interesting to investigate the similarities inherent all of these theoretical dichotomies, for the purposes of brevity and clarity this analyses will focus on two theories from the field of education that are more closely aligned with the scientific-social dichotomy represented by the ALH in applied linguistics, namely Gee's (1989) definitions of dominant and powerful literacy and Freire's (1987) definition of literacy as "reading the word and the world." Gee (1989) uses the ALH as a theoretical tool in his theorization of dominant and powerful forms of literacy. According to Gee, dominant literacy obviously mirrors Krashen's definition of acquisition as the mastery of any discourse is "for most of the people most of the time only mastered

through acquisition, not learning" (p. 262), whereas powerful literacy, or the ability to critique a discourse, is only gained by obtaining meta-knowledge (learning) of a discourse already acquired. The similarities between Gee's definitions of literacy and the ALH are also apparent in that the distinction between the two sides of the equation are not absolute; there is some amorphous interaction between them that is not clearly defined. Although Gee's use of the ALH may not seem unusual as he is a trained linguist, it is unusual to see such use of linguistic theory in literacy education, particularly as it clearly represents the scientific-social dichotomy in cognition. Similarly, Freire's (1987) word-world definition of literacy is closely aligned to the ALH as reading the word may be defined as the common definition of literacy, the ability to read texts, or learning, whereas reading the world is seen as understanding the social world, or acquisition through social interaction. However, this theorization of literacy is more fluid than Gee (1989) and Krashen's (1981, 1982) articulations of the ALH as it is seen as a dialogic process between both sides of the equation. Freire (1983) makes this clear by stating that:

Reading the world always precedes reading the word, and reading the word implies continually reading the world...this movement from the world to the word is always present; even the spoken word flows from our reading of the world...(pp. 10-11).

By theorizing literacy as a dialogic process between the reading of the word and the world, Freire mirrors the discursive processes of post-structuralism in understanding the scientific-social cognitive dichotomy expressed in various theories in the social sciences as well as by the ALH. His elegant rendering of this seeming dichotomy may also explain why his works have been increasingly used by scholars in applied linguistics from Brown (2007) to Pennycook (2001).

The scientific-social dichotomy represented in the ALH may also be understood to represent an epistemological bifurcation in the field of applied linguistics. The debates that followed Firth and Wagner's (1997) call for a greater inclusion of social epistemologies in SLA and Atkinson (2002) and Kubota's (2002) argument over the nature of post-structural thought are strong evidence for this assertion. However, the strongest evidence that the scientific-social dichotomy represents a schism in academic theory in applied linguistics, and the social sciences, may most clearly be seen in the vast number of dichotomies that exist in theory and jargon across the social sciences (see Table 1).

**TABLE 1**  
Dichotomies in the Social Sciences

Scientific	Social
Learning	Acquisition
Form	Function
Explicit	Implicit
Teacher-Centered	Student-Centered
Theory	Practice
Word	World
Linguistic	Social-Constructivist
Cognitivism	Situated cognition
Training	Education
Method	Pedagogy-Approach
Structuralism	Post-Structuralism/Modernism
Positivism	Critical Theory/Literacy

#### IV. FURTHER IMPLICATIONS OF THE ALH

The theoretical and pedagogical implications that may be derived from the ALH are many and include situated learning, intertextuality, inquiry education, representation, and new literacies. The theoretical moves that may be derived from the ALH are well known in the field of education and come through the works of scholars like Adorno (2000), Bakhtin (1986), and Vygotsky (1987) and many others in the fields of sociology and psychology. While the theoretical genealogy of these moves is not directly associated with the ALH, they are all based on the social-constructivist side of the scientific-social dichotomy discussed above. However, the connection between these theoretical moves and the ALH may be deduced through an examination of Gee's (1989) understanding of the ALH in the construction of his definitions of dominant and powerful literacies.

Gee's (1989) interpretation of the ALH is both more succinct and detailed than Krashen's (1981, 1982) original explications as it was conceived at a much later date after much scholarly debate. Gee's (1989) rendering of the ALH is instructive and is as follows:

Acquisition is the process of acquiring something subconsciously by exposure to models and a process of trial and error, without a formal process of teaching. It happens in natural settings which are meaningful and functional in the sense that the acquirer knows that he needs to acquire the thing he is exposed to in order to function and the acquirer in fact wants to so function. This is how most people come to control their first language.

Learning is a process that involves conscious knowledge gained through teaching, not necessarily from someone officially designated as a teacher.

This teaching involves explanation and analysis, that is, breaking down the thing into its analytic parts. It inherently involves attaining, along with the matter being taught, some degree of meta-knowledge about the matter (p. 259).

Although Gee stresses that the 'identity kit' that constitutes the social construction of the individual through discourse[s] which includes both acquisition and learning, he nonetheless stresses that most of what we know, are best at, and are most interested in comes through acquisition. It is this understanding that leads to the theoretical moves of situated learning, intertextuality, inquiry education, representation, and new literacies if a simple question is asked: does most of what we know, are best at, and most interested in come from the classroom? Quite obviously, the answer is no; they come from the myriad social interactions we have engaged in through our lives outside of the classroom, through the process of acquisition. This understanding points to a disconnect between what occurs in the classroom and the lives of students and suggests that the way to more fully engage students in classroom activities is to make connections between what happens inside the classroom and who the students are as people (Pederson, 2012). Making curricular and pedagogical connections to the lived experiences of students is known as situated learning (Barton, Hamilton & Ivanic, 2000; Gee, 2004; Lave & Wenger, 1991).

## 1. Situated Learning

The theoretical concept of Situated Learning (SL), as it is generally known today, is attributed to Lave and Wenger's (1991) seminal work: *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Although Lave and Wenger's work looms large in SL theory, it is well known that that much of their work was derived from Vygotsky's (1978) work on social forms of learning and may be referred to as situated cognition (Lantolf, 2006). In addition, according to Barton and Hamilton (2000), Gee (2004), and Pederson (2012), the basic concepts of SL may be seen to have antecedents in sociology (Durkheim, 1956; Hymes, 1966), education (Dewey, 1971), and psychology (Leontiev, 1978; Vygotsky, 1978). The most basic understanding of SL may be summated as making connections between in-class learning experiences (curriculum & pedagogy) and the lived experiences of students. However, this view of SL is simplistic as the content knowledge presented in the classroom may also be situated within multiple contexts (Barton et al., 2000; Pederson, 2012). Another key aspect of SL is its relation to the dialogism of Vygotsky (1978) and Freire (1987) where learning experiences are dialogically shared and investigated through verbal and physical social interaction. As such, SL may also be seen as a metaphor for models of 'student-centered' pedagogies (Barton et al., 2000; Pederson, 2012), as well

conforming to the dictates of the current English National Curriculum in Korea that stipulates an increasing inclusion of communication (dialogism) and student-centered pedagogies. Finally, SL theory posits that situating pedagogy within the lived experiences of students leads to higher levels of student engagement as students naturally become more interested and active with content that resonates with who they are as people (Giroux, 1985; Pederson, 2012).

Theories and pedagogies in applied linguistics that apply situated learning are many and various. Besides the aforementioned connections SL has to social-constructivist approaches to second language teaching and learning, through the notion of authenticity, SL is connected to the practices of communicative language teaching Savignon (1972), task-based learning (Long & Crookes, 1992; Nunan, 1989), and other similar approaches. As the concept of authenticity stresses that classroom activities need to be developed in ways that mirror current or future the contexts of social language use, it clearly demonstrates a situated form of pedagogy (Pederson, 2012). Moreover, the concept of situated pedagogies has been a key part of the works of many applied linguists who draw much from the theories of critical pedagogy and literacy (Pederson, 2006), such as Canagarajah (1999), Kubota (2001), Lin (1999), Norton (2000), and Pennycook (2001). Canagarajah's (1999) six point schema of the applications of theories derived from critical pedagogy in applied linguistics best illustrate this connection by showing how classroom learning in EFL needs to be situated in both individual and institutional-social contexts.

Just as the personal background of the learner influences how something is learned, what is learned shapes the person: our consciousness, identity. And relationships are implicated in the educational experience. We should therefore consciously engage the influences, consequences, and implications of the personal in the learning process...The rules, curricula, pedagogies, and interactions in schooling shape, and are shaped by, socio-political realities. Schooling is so implicated in the needs, interests, and imperatives of the dominant institutions and social groups that it is often difficult to see the full effect of their influence in the classroom (p. 15).

Here, Canagarajah explicates how learning involves the situating of content knowledge in both individual and larger social contexts for students to not only learn effectively, but to be able to effectively use what they have learned in authentic contexts.

If situated learning is to be understood as making curricular and pedagogical connections between students and their lived experiences, interests, and the larger contexts of then social world, the question arises as to what these things really are. The answer to the latter question seems simpler as one would clearly look at the institutional nature of the

society in question as well as social movements of the day. Notional-functional syllabus design (Brown, 2007) and TBLT (Long & Crookes, 1992; Nunan, 1989) are clearly related to such situated analyses. Non-native speaking teachers (NNSTs) would be able to closely approximate the lived experiences and interest of students, although SL theory would necessitate dialogic input from students to more accurately determine their true nature (Barton et al., 2000; Pederson, 2012). However, doing such an analysis does not give the teacher any insight into how to pedagogically apply the insights gained. In order to apply the insights derived from SL, an appropriate theory is needed. The well known theory taken from literature (Barthes, 1967), psychology (Bakhtin, 1986), and education (Beach & Myers, 2001; Bloom & Egan-Robertson, 1993) that is generally used to make these connections is known as intertextuality.

## 2. Intertextuality

Theories of intertextuality posit that individual texts do not exist; that every text exists within a multiplicity of connections to other texts (Bakhtin, 1986; Barthes, 1967; Kristeva, 1980), hence the controversy over the death of the subject (Barthes, 1967). This understanding of textuality is generally associated with a discursive (post-structural) view of textuality that not only theorizes texts as being constructed through a web of discursive relationships, but also as being comprised of both written and visual social artifacts, as well as the memories of individuals. This means that apart from written texts, such as books, magazines, and web pages, texts may also be pictorial or graphic in nature. Therefore, pictures, video, graphics, and lived experiences may be viewed as texts. Moreover, the discursive nature of textuality means that texts only exist in relation to other texts (Foucault, 1984). As such, theories of intertextuality may be seen to fit within SL theory as lived experiences of an individual student may be seen to be comprised of a myriads of texts discursively related to each other, which in essence, is the post-structural view of identity (Bourdieu, 1991; Foucault, 1984; Norton, 2000). Therefore, intertextuality becomes a means to pedagogically connect students lived experiences to classroom content through the juxtaposition of outside texts with course texts, thereby engaging students at higher levels.

Pedagogical uses of intertextuality within applied linguistics are primarily seen in genre based approaches to teaching writing (Harman, 2013; Hyland, 2002). Intertextuality may also be recognized as a key component in applications of Multimedia Assisted Language Learning (MALL) as computer graphics and video are an integral part of MALL's theory and pedagogy. While the term intertextuality is rarely used in MALL theory or practice, it is nonetheless evident that it is a key concept in MALL literature such as Klimanova and Dembovskaya (2013), Mills (2011), and Rienhardt and Zander's (2011) examination of

social networking, Chun's (2011) investigation of intercultural competency or Wang and Chang's (2011) intercultural awareness, the use of film in English language teaching (H. Kim, 2011; E. Seo, 2013; J. Yoon, 2010), and new or multi-literacy approaches (Blattner & Fiori, 2011; Egbert, Elturki, Elhussein & Muthukrishan, 2012). Perhaps the best example of the application of intertextuality to applied linguistics may be seen in Moffatt and Norton's (2005) intertextual use of *Archie* comic books to examine and challenge student understandings of gender. In doing so, Moffatt and Norton not only use an intertextual approach to SL, they are also invoking representation as a theoretical tool as they are asking students how they understand each of the characters, as well as imagining how they might be differently understood (Pederson, 2012). Examination of the various implications of the ALH demonstrates how a theoretical chain may be understood to run through the social-constructivist side of the scientific-social epistemological dichotomy evident in the social sciences to applications of SL, intertextuality, and representation that encompass a wide range of existing theories and pedagogies in applied linguistics. While these theories are generally not named in terms of their genealogies, they are nonetheless evident in their practices.

### 3. Representation

Representation is a theoretical and pedagogical concept derived from semiotics (Hawkes, 1977; Saussure, 2006) and the post-structuralism of Foucault (1984) that interrogates and explicates how meaning is encoded and decoded by individuals and societies. The initial concept of representation may be said to have originated with the semiotics of Saussure (Hall, 1997) and developed through the works of scholars like Foucault (1984) and Hawkes (1977). Although the concept of representation was implied in the discursive relationship between Saussure's *langue* (signifier) and *parole* (signified), according to Hall (1997), Saussure declined the investigation of *parole* as being non-scientific and was further developed by Hawkes (1977) through his addition of the *interpretant* that theorized a discursive relationship between the signifier (symbol), signified (meaning), and the interpretant (shared social meanings). Central to this discursive understanding of representation is the realization that representation is never fixed: that there are always a myriad of other signifiers (interpretant) that mediate a specific representation. As such, the meanings of a specific representation may always be contested ideologically or pedagogically (Derrida, 1998; Hall, 1997). This understanding of the discursive relationship between language and meaning eventually became known as representation and was mirrored by the works of the European sociologist's Adorno (2000), Bourdieu (1991), and Foucault (1984). In time, the theory of representation was taken up in the fields of education (Giroux, 1999; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997), cultural studies (Giroux, 2005;

Hall, 1997), media and new literacies (Beach, 2007; Semali, 1999), and applied linguistics (Kubota, 2001; Pennycook, 2001).

The connection between representation and applied linguistics may best be seen in the emergence of CLT and other approaches to language teaching that focus on authentic language (Brown, 2007), culture (Kramsch, 1993; Norton, 2000), and meaning (Savignon, 1972). Perhaps the best illustration of this connection is Kramsch's (1993) assertion that language should be taught through culture, not the other way around. Representation is a useful theoretical and pedagogical tool for these approaches as it focuses on how symbolic meanings, both linguistic and visual, are encoded and decoded, thus giving a more complete understanding of both the target language and culture meanings being learned (Hall, 1997; Pederson, 2012). Key to understanding the discursive nature of representation is the idea that representations are never fixed; that meanings are constantly changing through social interactions (Foucault, 1984). Nonetheless, as in discourse, they form constellations of meaning that may be called dominant and alternative meanings (Hall, 1997). As such, many meanings may exist for one individual representation which may be interrogated by students for individual and social significance. Beach (2007), Hall (1997), and Semali (1999) all explicate how individual meanings are constructed from a discursive milieu of potential meanings that may be pedagogically investigated and discussed in the classroom in ways that are situated to their own and other social contexts which enable them to more fully understand the content under study. Thus, representation is not only intertextual as it encompasses many specific meanings (texts) that reside within individuals and societies; it is also a situated pedagogical tool that allows the interrogation of the contexts of individual and social meanings. Thus these pedagogical examples from theories of intertextuality and representation illustrate the pedagogical move into what has come to be known as 'new literacies' that focus on the examination of social meanings derived from these multiplicity of sources to give a fuller meaning to the content under study. Finally, representation may be seen as a means of reconciling the scientific-social dichotomy represented by the ALH as it is able to explicate both scientific and social meanings as simply differing interpretations of existing signifiers in society.

## V. CONCLUSION

The theoretical analyses in this paper have shown how Krashen's (1981, 1982) acquisition learning hypothesis is not only representative of the apparent scientific-social epistemological dichotomy that exists through the social sciences and the communicative approaches in applied linguistics that are informed by socio-cultural theory (Lantolf, 2006), but is also associated with a chain of theoretical and pedagogical thought that leads goes

through situated learning to intertextuality and representation. The theoretical moves into theories of intertextuality and representation also help explain the epistemological shift informed by post-structural thought and socio-cultural theory that is apparent in the literature of applied linguistics over the past few decades and is visible in the works of Canagarajah (1999), Kubota (2001), Pennycook (2001), and many others. Moreover these theoretical moves have been shown to be associated with pedagogical applications in applied linguistics (Canagarajah, 1999; Moffat & Norton, 2005; Pennycook, 2001), and sub-fields of applied linguistics such as MALL (H. Kim, 2011; E. Seo, 2013; J. Yoon, 2010) and the movement into new literacies (Blattner & Fiori, 2011; Egbert et al., 2012). The main point of this analysis is not so much to demonstrate and explicate the nature of the opposing sides of the scientific-social dichotomy represented by the ALH in applied linguistics and its genealogy, but to illustrate how these understandings lead to useful situated pedagogical applications that will better inform teaching and learning in applied linguistics. Although the utility and power of situated forms of learning have only recently been codified in academic theory through the works of scholars like Vygotsky (1978) and Lave and Wenger (1991), the concept has been applied in human cognition for perhaps thousands of years (Pederson, 2012). The 9<sup>th</sup> century Confucian scholar Xun Kuang (Knoblock, 1994) gave perhaps the best summation of the power of situated cognition by stating: “Tell me and I forget, teach me and I may remember, involve me and I learn” (p. 81).

## REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. (2000). *The Adorno reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Apple, M. (2010). *Global crises, social justice, and education*. New York: Routledge.
- Atkinson, D. (2002). Comments on Ryuko Kubota’s “Discursive construction of the images of U.S. classrooms”. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(1), 79-83.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Barthes, R. (1967). *Elements of semiology*. London: Cape.
- Barton, D., Hamilton, M., & Ivanic, R. (2000). (Eds.). *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*. New York: Routledge.
- Beach, R. (2007). *Teaching media literacy.com: A web-linked guide to resources and activities*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Beach, R., & Myers, J. (2001). *Inquiry-based English instruction: Engaging students in life and literature*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Blattner, G., & Fiori, M. (2011). Virtual social network communities: An investigation of

- language learners' development of sociopragmatic awareness and multiliteracy skills. *CALICO Journal*, 29(1), 24-43.
- Bloom, D., & Egan-Robertson, A. (1993). The social construction of intertextuality in classroom reading and writing lessons. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28(4), 304-333.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, D. (2007). *Principles of language teaching and learning*. New York, NY: Pearson.
- Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. New York: Moulton de Gruyter.
- Chun, D. (2011). Developing intercultural communicative competence through online exchanges. *CALICO Journal*, 28(2), 329-419.
- Crookes, G. (2009). The practicality and relevance of second language critical pedagogy. *Language Teaching*, 43(3), 333-348.
- Derrida, J. (1998). *Monolingualism of the other, or, the prosthesis of origin*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1971). *The child and the curriculum and the school and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Donaldson, M. (1978.) *Children's minds*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Durkhiem, E. (1956). *Education and sociology*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Egbert, J., Elturki, E., Elhussein, I., & Muthukrishan, R. (2012). Applying principles for new literacies in differing CALL contexts: Conceptualizing issues for teaching, research, and policy. *CALL-EJ*, 13(2), 1-11.
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Eyo, I. (1980). An analysis of major psychological problems of a developing nation. In E. C. Amucheazi (Ed.), *Readings in social sciences: Issues in national development* (pp. 202-217). Enugu, Nigeria: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some fundamental concepts in SLA research). *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-300.
- Foucault, M. (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York: Random House.
- Freire, P. (1983). *The importance of the act of reading*. *Journal of Education*, 165(1), 5-11.
- Freire, P. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the word and the world*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gass, S. (1998). Apples and oranges: Or why apples are not orange and don't need to be: A

- response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 83-90.
- Gee, J. (1989). What is Literacy? In L. Cleary & M. Linn (Eds.), *Linguistics for teachers* (pp. 257-264). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gee, J. (2004). *Situated language and learning: A critique of traditional schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. (1985). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory culture, and schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Giroux, H. (1999). *The mouse that roared*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Giroux, H. (2005). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.
- Gregg, K. (1984). Krashen's monitor model and Occam's razor. *Applied linguistics*, 5(2), 79-100.
- Gregg, K. (1989). Second language acquisition theory: The case for a generative perspective. In J. Gass & J. Schachter (Eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp.15-40). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Griffiths, C., & Parr, J. (2001). Language learning strategies: Theory and perception. *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 247-254.
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: cultural representations and signifying practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hammond, J. (2002). (Ed.). *Scaffolding teaching and learning in language and literacy education*. Newtown, Australia: PETA.
- Harman, R. (2013). Literary intertextuality in genre-based pedagogies: Building lexical cohesion in fifth-grade L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(2), 124-140.
- Hawkes, T. (1977). *Structuralism and semiotics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hoffman, J., & Graham, P. (2009). *Introduction to political theory* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Essex, England: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Hyland, K. (2002). Genre: language, context, and literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 113-135.
- Hymes, D. (1966). *Why linguistics needs the sociologist*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Miami Beach.
- Kim, Hyun-Ju. (2011). Suggestions for teaching world Englishes using English-medium movies. *STEM Journal*, 12(2), 3-22.
- Kincheloe, J. (1999). *The post-formal reader: Cognition and education*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Kincheloe, J., & Steinberg, S. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism: New times, new curriculum*. London: Open University Press.

- Klimanova, L., & Dembovskaya, S. (2013). L2 identity, discourse, and social networking in Russian. *Language Learning & Technology*, 17(1), 69-88.
- Knoblock, J. (1994). *Xunzi: A translation and study of the complete works Volume III, Books 17-32*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Boston, MA: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.
- Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kubota, R. (2001). Discursive construction of the images of US classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 9-38.
- Kubota, R. (2002). The author responds: (Un) raveling racism in a nice field like TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36 (1), 84-92.
- Kuhl, P. (2004). Early language acquisition: Cracking the speech code. *National Review of Neuroscience*, 5, 831-843.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structures of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lacan, J. (2006). *Ecrits: The first complete edition in English*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2006). *New literacies: Everyday practices & classroom learning* (2nd ed.). New York: Open University Press.
- Lantolf, J. (2006). Sociocultural theory and second language learning: State of the art. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 67-109.
- Lantolf, J., & Thorne, S. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Leontiev, A. (1978). *Activity, consciousness, and personality*. Hillsdale, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Lightbrown, P., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lin, A. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds.

- TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 393-412.
- Lin, A. (2013). Towards paradigmatic change in TESOL methodologies: Building plurilingual pedagogies from the ground up. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(3), 521-545.
- Long, M. (1990). The least a second language theory needs to explain. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 649-666.
- Long, M., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 27-56.
- McLaughlin, B. (1978). The monitor model: Some methodological considerations. *Language Learning*, 28(2), 309-332.
- Mills, R. (2011). Situated learning through social networking communities: The development of joint enterprise, mutual engagement, and a shared repertoire. *CALICO Journal*, 28(2), 345-368.
- Moffatt, L., & Norton, B. (2005). Popular culture and the reading teacher: A case for feminist pedagogy. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 2(1), 1-12.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. London: Longman/Pearson Education.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pederson, R. (2006). Epistemologies and research paradigms in applied linguistics: 10 years of published research. *English Teaching*, 62(1), 171-197.
- Pederson, R. (2012). Situated learning: Rethinking a ubiquitous theory. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 9(2), 123-148.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Popkewitz, T. (1984). *Paradigm and ideology in educational research: The social functions of the intellectual*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Rienhardt, J., & Zander, V. (2011). Social networking in an intensive English program classroom: A language socialization perspective. *CALICO Journal*, 28(2), 326-344.
- Saussure, F. (2006). *Writings in general linguistics*. Boston, MA: Oxford University Press.
- Savignon, S. (1972). *Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign language teaching*. Philadelphia, PA: Center for Curriculum Development.
- Semali, L. (1999). *Intermediality: The teachers' handbook of critical media literacy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Seo, Eun-Mi. (2013). Creating theme-based teaching through inspirational movies such as *The Blind Side*. *STEM Journal*, 13(1), 41-56.
- Shannon, P. (1989). Paradigmatic diversity within the reading research community. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 21(2), 976-107.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated?

*TESOL Quarterly*, 42(2), 181-207.

- Stetsenko, A. (1999). Social interaction, cultural tools and the zone of proximal development: In search of a synthesis. In S. Chaiklin, M. Hedegaard & U. Jensen (Eds.), *Activity theory and social practice: Cultural historical approaches* (pp. 235–253). Aarhus, DK: Aarhus University Press.
- Street, B. (2003). What's new in new literacy studies? *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 5(2), 1–14.
- Tricoli, E. (1986). Krashen's second-language acquisition theory and the teaching of edited English. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 5(2), 59-69.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wang, A., & Chang, W. (2011). Developing intercultural awareness and language speaking proficiency for foreign language learners through cross-cultural voicemail exchange. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(4), 17-32.
- Whorf, B. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Widdowson, H. (2000). On the limitations of linguistics applied. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(1), 3-25.
- Yoon, Jae-Woong. (2010). The use of movies in cultural education for enhancing cross-cultural awareness. *STEM Journal*, 11(2), 117-139.
- Yoon, Kyung-Eun. (2004). CLT theories and practices in EFL curricula: A case study of Korea. *Asian EFL Journal*, 6(3), 1-16.

**Examples in: English**

**Applicable Languages: English**

**Applicable Levels: Tertiary**

Rodney W. Pederson, Ph.D.  
Department of English Education  
Incheon National University  
A-218 Michuhol Tower Annex  
12 Gaelbeol-Ro, Songdo-Dong,  
Yeonsu-Gu, Incheon, Korea 406-740  
Tel: 32-835-8126  
Email: docrod88@hotmail.com

Received 15 September 2015

Revised 1 November 2015  
Accepted 20 November 2015