The Natural Approach

Background

In 1977, Tracy Terrell, a teacher of Spanish in California, outlined “a proposal for a ‘new’ philosophy of language teaching which [he] called the Natural Approach” (Terrell 1977; 1982: 121). This was an attempt to develop a language teaching proposal that incorporated the “naturalistic” principles researchers had identified in studies of second language acquisition. The Natural Approach grew out of Terrell’s experiences teaching Spanish classes, although it has also been used in elementary- to advanced-level classes and with several other languages. At the same time, he joined forces with Stephen Krashen, an applied linguist at the University of Southern California, in elaborating a theoretical rationale for the Natural Approach, drawing on Krashen’s influential theory of second language acquisition. Krashen and Terrell’s combined statement of the principles and practices of the Natural Approach appeared in their book The Natural Approach, published in 1983. The Natural Approach attracted a wider interest than some of the other innovative language teaching proposals discussed in this book, largely because of its support by Krashen. Krashen and Terrell’s book contains theoretical sections prepared by Krashen that outline his views on second language acquisition (Krashen 1981; 1982), and sections on implementation and classroom procedures, prepared largely by Terrell.

Krashen and Terrell identified the Natural Approach with what they call “traditional” approaches to language teaching. Traditional approaches are defined as “based on the use of language in communicative situations without recourse to the native language” – and, perhaps, needless to say, without reference to grammatical analysis, grammatical drilling, or a particular theory of grammar. Krashen and Terrell noted that such “approaches have been called natural, psychological, phonetic, new, reform, direct, analytic, imitative and so forth” (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 9). The fact that the authors of the Natural Approach relate their approach to the Natural Method (see Chapter 1) has led some people to assume that Natural Approach and Natural Method are synonymous terms. Although the tradition is a common one, there are important differences between the Natural Approach and the older Natural Method, which it will be useful to consider at the outset.
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The Natural Method is another term for what by 1900 had become known as the Direct Method (see Chapter 1). It is described in a report on the state of the art in language teaching commissioned by the Modern Language Association in 1901 (the report of the “Committee of 12”):

In its extreme form the method consisted of a series of monologues by the teacher interspersed with exchanges of question and answer between the instructor and the pupil – all in the foreign language. . . . A great deal of pantomime accompanied the talk. With the aid of this gesticulation, by attentive listening and by dint of much repetition the learner came to associate certain acts and objects with certain combinations of the sounds and finally reached the point of reproducing the foreign words or phrases. . . . Not until a considerable familiarity with the spoken word was attained was the scholar allowed to see the foreign language in print. The study of grammar was reserved for a still later period. (Cole 1931: 58)

The term natural, used in reference to the Direct Method, merely emphasized that the principles underlying the method were believed to conform to the principles of naturalistic language learning in young children. Similarly, the Natural Approach, as defined by Krashen and Terrell, is believed to conform to the naturalistic principles found in successful second language acquisition. Unlike the Direct Method, however, it places less emphasis on teacher monologues, direct repetition, and formal questions and answers, and less focus on accurate production of target-language sentences. In the Natural Approach there is an emphasis on exposure, or input, rather than practice; optimizing emotional preparedness for learning; a prolonged period of attention to what the language learners hear before they try to produce language; and a willingness to use written and other materials as a source of comprehensible input. The emphasis on the central role of comprehension in the Natural Approach links it to other comprehension-based approaches in language teaching (see Chapter 5).

Approach

Theory of language

Krashen and Terrell see communication as the primary function of language, and since their approach focuses on teaching communicative abilities, they refer to the Natural Approach as an example of a communicative approach. The Natural Approach “is similar to other communicative approaches being developed today” (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 17). They reject earlier methods of language teaching, such as the Audiolingual Method, which viewed grammar as the central component of language. According to Krashen and Terrell, the major problem with these methods was that they were built not around “actual theories of language acquisition, but theories of something else; for example, the
structure of language” (1983: 1). Unlike proponents of Communicative Language Teaching (Chapter 14), however, Krashen and Terrell give little attention to a theory of language. Indeed, a critic of Krashen suggested that he has no theory of language at all (Gregg 1984). What Krashen and Terrell do describe about the nature of language emphasizes the primacy of meaning. The importance of the vocabulary is stressed, for example, suggesting the view that a language is essentially its lexicon and only inconsequently the grammar that determines how the lexicon is exploited to produce messages. Terrell quotes Dwight Bolinger to support this view:

The quantity of information in the lexicon far outweighs that in any other part of the language, and if there is anything to the notion of redundancy it should be easier to reconstruct a message containing just words than one containing just the syntactic relations. The significant fact is the subordinate role of grammar. The most important thing is to get the words in. (Bolinger, in Terrell 1977: 333)

Language is viewed as a vehicle for communicating meanings and messages. Hence Krashen and Terrell stated that “acquisition can take place only when people understand messages in the target language” (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 19). Yet despite their avowed communicative approach to language, they view language learning, as do audiolingualists, as mastery of structures by stages. “The input hypothesis states that in order for acquirers to progress to the next stage in the acquisition of the target language, they need to understand input language that includes a structure that is part of the next stage” (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 32). Krashen refers to this with the formula “I + 1” (i.e., input that contains structures slightly above the learner’s present level). We assume that Krashen means by structures something at least in the tradition of what such linguists as Leonard Bloomfield and Charles Fries meant by structures. The Natural Approach thus assumes a linguistic hierarchy of structural complexity that one masters through encounters with “input” containing structures at the “I + 1” level.

We are left, then, with a view of language that consists of lexical items, structures, and messages. Obviously, there is no particular novelty in this view as such, except that messages are considered of primary importance in the Natural Approach. The lexicon for both perception and production is considered critical in the construction and interpretation of messages. Lexical items in messages are necessarily grammatically structured, and more complex messages involve more complex grammatical structure. Although they acknowledge such grammatical structuring, Krashen and Terrell feel that grammatical structure does not require explicit analysis or attention by the language teacher, by the language learner, or in language teaching materials.
Theory of learning

Krashen and Terrell make continuing reference to the theoretical and research base claimed to underlie the Natural Approach and to the fact that the method is unique in having such a base. “It is based on an empirically grounded theory of second language acquisition, which has been supported by a large number of scientific studies in a wide variety of language acquisition and learning contexts” (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 1). The theory and research are grounded on Krashen’s views of language acquisition, which we will collectively refer to as Krashen’s language acquisition theory. Krashen’s views have been presented and discussed extensively elsewhere (e.g., Krashen 1982), so we will not try to present or critique Krashen’s arguments here. (For a detailed critical review, see Gregg 1984 and McLaughlin 1978.) It is necessary, however, to present in outline form the principal tenets of the theory, since it is on these that the design and procedures in the Natural Approach are based.

THE ACQUISITION/LEARNING HYPOTHESIS

The Acquisition/Learning Hypothesis claims that there are two distinctive ways of developing competence in a second or foreign language. Acquisition is the “natural” way, paralleling first language development in children. Acquisition refers to an unconscious process that involves the naturalistic development of language proficiency through understanding language and through using language for meaningful communication. Learning, by contrast, refers to a process in which conscious rules about a language are developed. It results in explicit knowledge about the forms of a language and the ability to verbalize this knowledge. Formal teaching is necessary for “learning” to occur, and correction of errors helps with the development of learned rules. Learning, according to the theory, cannot lead to acquisition.

THE MONITOR HYPOTHESIS

The acquired linguistic system is said to initiate utterances when we communicate in a second or foreign language. Conscious learning can function only as a monitor or editor that checks and repairs the output of the acquired system. The Monitor Hypothesis claims that we may call upon learned knowledge to correct ourselves when we communicate, but that conscious learning (i.e., the learned system) has only this function. Three conditions limit the successful use of the monitor:

1. Time. There must be sufficient time for a learner to choose and apply a learned rule.
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2. **Focus on form.** The language user must be focused on correctness or on the form of the output.

3. **Knowledge of rules.** The performer must know the rules. The monitor does best with rules that are simple in two ways. They must be simple to describe and they must not require complex movements and rearrangements.

**The Natural Order Hypothesis**

According to the Natural Order Hypothesis, the acquisition of grammatical structures proceeds in a predictable order. Research is said to have shown that certain grammatical structures or morphemes are acquired before others in first language acquisition of English, and a similar natural order is found in second language acquisition. Errors are signs of naturalistic developmental processes, and during acquisition (but not during learning), similar developmental errors occur in learners no matter what their native language is.

**The Input Hypothesis**

The Input Hypothesis claims to explain the relationship between what the learner is exposed to of a language (the input) and language acquisition. It involves four main issues.

First, the hypothesis relates to acquisition, and not to learning.

Second, people acquire language best by understanding input that is slightly beyond their current level of competence:

An acquirer can “move” from a stage I (where I is the acquirer’s level of competence) to a stage I + 1 (where I + 1 is the stage immediately following I along some natural order) by understanding language containing I + 1.

(Krashen and Terrell 1983: 32)

Clues based on the situation and the context, extralinguistic information, and knowledge of the world make comprehension possible.

Third, the ability to speak fluently cannot be taught directly; rather, it “emerges” independently in time, after the acquirer has built up linguistic competence by understanding input.

Fourth, if there is a sufficient quantity of comprehensible input, I + 1 will usually be provided automatically. Comprehensible input refers to utterances that the learner understands based on the context in which they are used as well as the language in which they are phrased. When a speaker uses language so that the acquirer understands the message, the speaker “casts a net” of structure around the acquirer’s current level of competence, and this will include many instances of I + 1. Thus, input need not be finely tuned to a learner’s current level of linguistic competence, and in fact cannot be so finely tuned in a language class, where learners will be at many different levels of competence.
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Just as child acquirers of a first language are provided with samples of “caretaker speech,” rough-tuned to their present level of understanding, so adult acquirers of a second language are provided with simple codes that facilitate second language comprehension. One such code is “foreigner talk,” which refers to the speech native speakers use to simplify communication with foreigners. Foreigner talk is characterized by a slower rate of speech, repetition, restating, use of yes/no instead of Wh-questions, and other changes that make messages more comprehensible to persons of limited language proficiency.

The Affective Filter Hypothesis

Krashen sees the learner’s emotional state or attitudes as an adjustable filter that freely passes, impedes, or blocks input necessary to acquisition. A low affective filter is desirable, since it impedes or blocks less of this necessary input. The hypothesis is built on research in second language acquisition, which has identified three kinds of affective or attitudinal variables related to second language acquisition:

1. **Motivation.** Learners with high motivation generally do better.
2. **Self-confidence.** Learners with self-confidence and a good self-image tend to be more successful.
3. **Anxiety.** Low personal anxiety and low classroom anxiety are more conducive to second language acquisition.

The Affective Filter Hypothesis states that acquirers with a low affective filter seek and receive more input, interact with confidence, and are more receptive to the input they receive. Anxious acquirers have a high affective filter, which prevents acquisition from taking place. It is believed that the affective filter (e.g., fear or embarrassment) rises in early adolescence, and this may account for children’s apparent superiority to older acquirers of a second language.

These five hypotheses have obvious implications for language teaching. In sum, these are:

1. As much comprehensible input as possible must be presented.
2. Whatever helps comprehension is important. Visual aids are useful, as is exposure to a wide range of vocabulary rather than study of syntactic structure.
3. The focus in the classroom should be on listening and reading; speaking should be allowed to “emerge.”
4. In order to lower the affective filter, student work should center on meaningful communication rather than on form; input should be interesting and so contribute to a relaxed classroom atmosphere.
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Design

Objectives
The Natural Approach “is for beginners and is designed to help them become intermediates.” It has the expectation that students will be able to function adequately in the target situation. They will understand the speaker of the target language (perhaps with requests for clarification), and will be able to convey (in a non-insulting manner) their requests and ideas. They need not know every word in a particular semantic domain, nor is it necessary that the syntax and vocabulary be flawless – but their production does need to be understood. They should be able to make the meaning clear but not necessarily be accurate in all details of grammar. (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 71)

However, since the Natural Approach is offered as a general set of principles applicable to a wide variety of situations, as in Communicative Language Teaching, specific objectives depend on learner needs and the skill (reading, writing, listening, or speaking) and level being taught.

Krashen and Terrell believe that it is important to communicate to learners what they can expect of a course as well as what they should not expect. They offer as an example a possible goal and nongoal statement for a beginning Natural Approach Spanish class:

After 100–150 hours of Natural Approach Spanish, you will be able to: “get around” in Spanish; you will be able to communicate with a monolingual native speaker of Spanish without difficulty; read most ordinary texts in Spanish with some use of a dictionary; know enough Spanish to continue to improve on your own.

After 100–150 hours of Natural Approach Spanish you will not be able to: pass for a native speaker, use Spanish as easily as you use English, understand native speakers when they talk to each other (you will probably not be able to eavesdrop successfully); use Spanish on the telephone with great comfort; participate easily in a conversation with several other native speakers on unfamiliar topics. (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 74)

The syllabus

Krashen and Terrell (1983) approach course organization from two points of view. First, they list some typical goals for language courses and suggest which of these goals are the ones at which the Natural Approach aims. They list such goals under four areas:

1. Basic personal communication skills: oral (e.g., listening to announcements in public places)
2. Basic personal communication skills: written (e.g., reading and writing personal letters)
3. Academic learning skills: oral (e.g., listening to a lecture)
4. Academic learning skills: written (e.g., taking notes in class)

Of these, they note that the Natural Approach is primarily “designed to develop basic communication skills – both oral and written” (1983: 67). They then observe that communication goals “may be expressed in terms of situations, functions and topics” and proceed to order four pages of topics and situations “which are likely to be most useful to beginning students” (1983: 67). The functions are not specified or suggested but are felt to derive naturally from the topics and situations. This approach to syllabus design would appear to derive to some extent from threshold level specifications (see Chapter 14).

The second point of view holds that “the purpose of a language course will vary according to the needs of the students and their particular interests” (Krashen and Terrell (1983: 65):

The goals of a Natural Approach class are based on an assessment of student needs. We determine the situations in which they will use the target language and the sorts of topics they will have to communicate information about. In setting communication goals, we do not expect the students at the end of a particular course to have acquired a certain group of structures or forms. Instead we expect them to deal with a particular set of topics in a given situation. We do not organize the activities of the class about a grammatical syllabus. (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 71)

From this point of view, it is difficult to specify communicative goals that necessarily fit the needs of all students. Thus, any list of topics and situations must be understood as syllabus suggestions rather than as specifications.

As well as fitting the needs and interests of students, content selection should aim to create a low affective filter by being interesting and fostering a friendly, relaxed atmosphere, should provide a wide exposure to vocabulary that may be useful to basic personal communication, and should resist any focus on grammatical structures, since if input is provided “over a wider variety of topics while pursuing communicative goals, the necessary grammatical structures are automatically provided in the input” (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 71).

Types of learning and teaching activities

From the beginning of a class taught according to the Natural Approach, emphasis is on presenting comprehensible input in the target language. Teacher talk focuses on objects in the classroom and on the content of pictures, as with the Direct Method. To minimize stress, learners are not required to say anything until they feel ready, but they are expected to respond to teacher commands and questions in other ways.
When learners are ready to begin talking in the new language, the teacher provides comprehensible language and simple response opportunities. The teacher talks slowly and distinctly, asking questions and eliciting one-word answers. There is a gradual progression from Yes/No questions, through either-or questions, to questions that students can answer using words they have heard used by the teacher. Students are not expected to use a word actively until they have heard it many times. Charts, pictures, advertisements, and other realia serve as the focal point for questions, and when the students’ competence permits, talk moves to class members. “Acquisition activities” – those that focus on meaningful communication rather than language form – are emphasized. Pair or group work may be employed, followed by whole-class discussion led by the teacher.

Techniques recommended by Krashen and Terrell are often borrowed from other methods and adapted to meet the requirements of Natural Approach theory. These include command-based activities from Total Physical Response; Direct Method activities in which mime, gesture, and context are used to elicit questions and answers; and even situation-based practice of structures and patterns. Group-work activities are often identical to those used in Communicative Language Teaching, where sharing information in order to complete a task is emphasized. There is nothing novel about the procedures and techniques advocated for use with the Natural Approach. A casual observer might not be aware of the philosophy underlying the classroom techniques he or she observes. What characterizes the Natural Approach is the use of familiar techniques within the framework of a method that focuses on providing comprehensible input and a classroom environment that cues comprehension of input, minimizes learner anxiety, and maximizes learner self-confidence.

Learner roles

There is a basic assumption in the Natural Approach that learners should not try to learn a language in the usual sense. The extent to which they can lose themselves in activities involving meaningful communication will determine the amount and kind of acquisition they will experience and the fluency they will ultimately demonstrate. The language acquirer is seen as a processor of comprehensible input. The acquirer is challenged by input that is slightly beyond his or her current level of competence and is able to assign meaning to this input through active use of context and extralinguistic information.

Learners’ roles are seen to change according to their stage of linguistic development. Central to these changing roles are learner decisions on when to speak, what to speak about, and what linguistic expressions to use in speaking.
In the *pre-production stage*, students “participate in the language activity without having to respond in the target language” (Krashen and Terrell 1983: 76). For example, students can act out physical commands, identify student colleagues from teacher description, point to pictures, and so forth.

In the *early-production stage*, students respond to either-or questions, use single words and short phrases, fill in charts, and use fixed conversational patterns (e.g., How are you? What’s your name?).

In the *speech-emergent phase*, students involve themselves in role play and games, contribute personal information and opinions, and participate in group problem solving.

Learners have four kinds of responsibilities in the Natural Approach classroom:

1. Provide information about their specific goals so that acquisition activities can focus on the topics and situations most relevant to their needs.
2. Take an active role in ensuring comprehensible input. They should learn and use conversational management techniques to regulate input.
3. Decide when to start producing speech and when to upgrade it.
4. Where learning exercises (i.e., grammar study) are to be a part of the program, decide with the teacher the relative amount of time to be devoted to them and perhaps even complete and correct them independently.

Learners are expected to participate in communication activities with other learners. Although communication activities are seen to provide naturalistic practice and to create a sense of camaraderie, which lowers the affective filter, they may fail to provide learners with well-formed and comprehensible input at the I + 1 level. Krashen and Terrell warn of these shortcomings but do not suggest means for their amelioration.

**Teacher roles**

The Natural Approach teacher has three central roles. First, the teacher is the primary source of comprehensible input in the target language. “Class time is devoted primarily to providing input for acquisition,” and the teacher is the primary generator of that input. In this role, the teacher is required to generate a constant flow of language input while providing a multiplicity of nonlinguistic clues to assist students in interpreting the input. The Natural Approach demands a much more center-stage role for the teacher than do many contemporary communicative methods.

Second, the Natural Approach teacher creates a classroom atmosphere that is interesting, friendly, and in which there is a low affective filter for
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learning. This is achieved in part through such Natural Approach tech-
niques as not demanding speech from the students before they are ready
for it, not correcting student errors, and providing subject matter of high
interest to students.

Finally, the teacher must choose and orchestrate a rich mix of class-
room activities, involving a variety of group sizes, content, and contexts.
The teacher is seen as responsible for collecting materials and designing
their use. These materials, according to Krashen and Terrell, are based
not just on teacher perceptions but on elicited student needs and interests.

As with other nonorthodox teaching systems, the Natural Approach
teacher has a particular responsibility to communicate clearly and com-
pellingly to students the assumptions, organization, and expectations of
the method, since in many cases these will violate student views of what
language learning and teaching are supposed to be.

The role of instructional materials

The primary goal of materials in the Natural Approach is to make class-
room activities as meaningful as possible by supplying “the extralinguis-
tic context that helps the acquirer to understand and thereby to acquire”
(Krashen and Terrell 1983: 55), by relating classroom activities to the real
world, and by fostering real communication among the learners. Mate-
rials come from the world of realia rather than from textbooks. The
primary aim of materials is to promote comprehension and communica-
tion. Pictures and other visual aids are essential, because they supply the
content for communication. They facilitate the acquisition of a large
vocabulary within the classroom. Other recommended materials include
schedules, brochures, advertisements, maps, and books at levels appro-
priate to the students, if a reading component is included in the course.
Games, in general, are seen as useful classroom materials, since “games
by their very nature, focus the students on what it is they are doing and
use the language as a tool for reaching the goal rather than as a goal in
itself” (Terrell 1982: 121). The selection, reproduction, and collection of
materials places a considerable burden on the Natural Approach teacher.
Since Krashen and Terrell suggest a syllabus of topics and situations, it is
likely that at some point collections of materials to supplement teacher
presentations will be published, built around the “syllabus” of topics and
situations recommended by the Natural Approach.

Procedure

We have seen that the Natural Approach adopts techniques and activities
freely from various method sources and can be regarded as innovative
only with respect to the purposes for which they are recommended and
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the ways they are used. Krashen and Terrell (1983) provide suggestions for the use of a wide range of activities, all of which are familiar components of Situational Language Teaching, Communicative Language Teaching, and other methods discussed in this book. To illustrate procedural aspects of the Natural Approach, we will cite examples of how such activities are to be used in the Natural Approach classroom to provide comprehensible input, without requiring production of responses or minimal responses in the target language.

1. Start with TPR [Total Physical Response] commands. At first the commands are quite simple: “Stand up. Turn around. Raise your right hand.”

2. Use TPR to teach names of body parts and to introduce numbers and sequence. “Lay your right hand on your head, put both hands on your shoulder, first touch your nose, then stand up and turn to the right three times” and so forth.

3. Introduce classroom terms and props into commands. “Pick up a pencil and put it under the book, touch a wall, go to the door and knock three times.” Any item which can be brought to the class can be incorporated. “Pick up the record and place it in the tray. Take the green blanket to Larry. Pick up the soap and take it to the woman wearing the green blouse.”

4. Use names of physical characteristics and clothing to identify members of the class by name. The instructor uses context and the items themselves to make the meanings of the key words clear: hair, long, short, etc. Then a student is described. “What is your name?” (selecting a student). “Class. Look at Barbara. She has long brown hair. Her hair is long and brown. Her hair is not short. It is long.” (Using mime, pointing and context to ensure comprehension.) “What’s the name of the student with long brown hair?” (Barbara). Questions such as “What is the name of the woman with the short blond hair?” or “What is the name of the student sitting next to the man with short brown hair and glasses?” are very simple to understand by attending to key words, gestures and context. And they require the students only to remember and produce the name of a fellow student. The same can be done with articles of clothing and colors. “Who is wearing a yellow shirt? Who is wearing a brown dress?”

5. Use visuals, typically magazine pictures, to introduce new vocabulary and to continue with activities requiring only student names as response. The instructor introduces the pictures to the entire class one at a time focusing usually on one single item or activity in the picture. He may introduce one to five new words while talking about the picture. He then passes the picture to a particular student in the class. The students’ task is to remember the name of the student with a particular picture. For example, “Tom has the picture of the sailboat. Joan has the picture of the family watching television” and so forth. The instructor will ask questions like “Who has the picture with the sailboat? Does Susan or Tom have the picture of the people on the beach?” Again the students need only produce a name in response.
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6. Combine use of pictures with TPR. “Jim, find the picture of the little girl with her dog and give it to the woman with the pink blouse.”

7. Combine observations about the pictures with commands and conditionals. “If there is a woman in your picture, stand up. If there is something blue in your picture, touch your right shoulder.”

8. Using several pictures, ask students to point to the picture being described. Picture 1. “There are several people in this picture. One appears to be a father, the other a daughter. What are they doing? Cooking. They are cooking a hamburger.” Picture 2. “There are two men in this picture. They are young. They are boxing.” Picture 3 . . .

(Krashen and Terrell 1983: 75–77)

In all these activities, the instructor maintains a constant flow of “comprehensible input,” using key vocabulary items, appropriate gestures, context, repetition, and paraphrase to ensure the comprehensibility of the input.

Conclusion

The Natural Approach belongs to a tradition of language teaching methods based on observation and interpretation of how learners acquire both first and second languages in nonformal settings. Such methods reject the formal (grammatical) organization of language as a prerequisite to teaching. They hold with Newmark and Reibel that “an adult can effectively be taught by grammatically unordered materials” and that such an approach is, indeed, “the only learning process which we know for certain will produce mastery of the language at a native level” (1968: 153). In the Natural Approach, a focus on comprehension and meaningful communication as well as the provision of the right kinds of comprehensible input provide the necessary and sufficient conditions for successful classroom second and foreign language acquisition. This has led to a new rationale for the integration and adaptation of techniques drawn from a wide variety of existing sources. Like Communicative Language Teaching, the Natural Approach is hence evolutionary rather than revolutionary in its procedures. Its greatest claim to originality lies not in the techniques it employs but in their use in a method that emphasizes comprehensible and meaningful practice activities, rather than production of grammatically perfect utterances and sentences.
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