CHAPTER IV

THE NOTIONS OF INTERACTION AND INDIVIDUAL LEARNER-INVESTMENT - AN 'ASIDE'
CHAPTER IV

4.1 Introduction: A Conceptualisation of Interaction and Learner-Autonomy in My Scheme

In this chapter what I focus on are the two important aspects of my language model - the notions of interaction and learner-autonomy which goes with it. What has gone into the first three chapters should have brought a good deal of clarity about these notions. Yet in this chapter, by contrasting what is contained for me in these notions with positions they occupy in current syllabuses and teaching practices in ELT, I not only seek further clarity on them in my scheme, but also justify their manifestations in my model and later in my teaching, as being, due to their ideological background, qualitatively different from these current practices.

This chapter is a slight diversion from the main line of the thesis - yet a necessary diversion, since interaction and negotiation are loaded terms in current ELT literature and it is imperative for the thesis that clarity is attained about them as I use them for my language syllabus.

I seek such a clarity and a perspective on a placement of the ESL teaching to be discussed in the next chapter, within the field of current ELT, by discussing the communicative teaching practice in common parlance and in two interesting and exciting new developments.
4.2 Reiteration of a Logical and Metaphoric Connection between the Language Model and the Enacted Syllabus

In Section 3.7.2 of the previous chapter, I raised the question if my syllabus model of interactive creation/construction of the moment of execution was a logical consequence of only my model of language, that language model itself being an exemplification of the principles of interactive creation once again.

Another look at figure 18 in Chapter III which captures the movement of my thesis development, would indicate that I claim on the one hand a metaphorical paradigm application-connection between my language model and my syllabus model (Movement B in the figure). But it does not stop there. I also show, e.g., in Movement 'D.' there that since languaging in my scheme of things is not learning a language 'code' which implemented makes meanings; but basically it is an act of meaning-making or meaning exploration or reality exploration and construction with its attendant forces of personal efforts at creations in the moment of execution, it argues for an epistemology of a dynamic changeable core as against an objective permanent one, re-inforced or supported by the overriding value of the process. This makes for the incorporation of a dynamic content of the moment into a language teaching/learning syllabus as well. Thus making the language syllabus
a framework for construction rather than a blueprint for execution.

Hence my recommendation or postulation of interaction where learner autonomy is a major force or a construction of a syllabus in interaction with the learner as a decision maker in his/her role as an important interlocutor in the process follows two kinds of connection between my language model and my syllabus model, viz., a logical and a metaphorical one.¹

In this context I also pointed out that Allwright (1982a) in his discussion of interaction establishes learner's active role in negotiating for a syllabus and the creation of a syllabus in the execution of it inside a classroom as descriptively valid concepts and as independent of any paradigmatic principles which could extend it to other areas such as communicative language use itself.

Through the point I am making here, viz., that learner autonomy which I recommend is as much based upon a metaphorical extension of the model as it is upon a logical follow-up of the notion of (language) knowledge being a dynamic changeable core with its dynamism dependent upon personal investments during creations of the moment, I propose to show how motivation of these sorts contribute in a major way to the difference in interaction and learner autonomy as they function inside the classroom.
Keeping this important idea and the purpose behind my explication in the background, let us now look at interaction (pedagogic and language communicative) and learner autonomy in the context of what is generally referred to as communicative language teaching syllabuses and methodology in the field of ELT.

4.3 Allwright's Conceptualisation of Interaction in Communicative Language Teaching Syllabuses - The Axes of Content and Process/Methodology

Allwright (1982b)² conceptualises communicative language teaching and syllabuses as they exist, along the two axes of content and process of methodology. 'Content' in communicative language teaching are the notions and communicative functions, in addition to an inventory of linguistic content; in other words, use plus usage (see Wilkins, 1976; Widdowson, 1978 etc.).

The process or methodology in communicative language teaching could be the transfer type when introduction to the learners of communicative activities is seen as communicative practice (equipping learners for communication with language outside the classroom) after usage has been 'taught'. Or it could start with communicative practice and then go on to teach the content part which emerges from this as problem areas. This Allwright says, would be a procedural syllabus since the content here is uncertain and dependent upon what 'comes up' during communicative practice.³
These two methodologies or processes are generally associated with teaching the communicative way, i.e., to teach communicative content along with linguistic content. Up to this point, this is what is understood within the discipline of language teaching, as communicative syllabus and methodology in a broad sense.

4.3.1 Communicative Processes of Interaction and Negotiation as Pedagogic Method - Allwright's Critique of Candlin and Breen

There are two other versions of the communicative process now prevalent in the area, which Allwright takes up for extensive analysis and evaluation. The first one, the one recommended by Breen and Candlin (1980) considers communication to be a process of negotiation, and such negotiation as being the crux of learning in general and learning language.

"If we believe that learning ... is best promoted by engaging in communication and that communication is the establishment of meanings through a process of negotiation, we will perhaps find it easy to believe that a curriculum is best seen as the product of a process of negotiation between all the participants involved (learners as well as teachers) and, further, that we should take advantage of this, for language teaching purposes, by promoting the overt and ongoing negotiation of the curriculum in the classroom."

(Allwright, 1982b:9-10)

Allwright objects to this manifestation of the communicative method in language teaching as the Negotiated Curriculum on two grounds: 1. That this sets a lot of dependence upon
communication and negotiation of meaning (I consider this the articulated version of communicative methodology or the process) to effect all the learning that is needed. In other words, communication as the sole method of learning puts all the weight of learning to communicate (which is in a major way mastering linguistic and communicative content) on incidental learning. 2. Candlin and Breen's model of communicative method for language learning (where all content is learnt incidentally) cannot be tied up with a similar way of curriculum making (where the content of a syllabus is built up through communication and hence incidentally) since the connection between communication and curriculum making is only a metaphorical one and not a logical one. Allwright justifies his objection by pointing out that a curriculum can be negotiated by learners and teachers and the negotiated curriculum (i.e., the emergence of content in interaction) might take the form of a demand for a non-communicative language model of language teaching (where the content is specified and transmitted through lectures, rather than taught in the communicative method); thus one negotiation or communication i.e., negotiation in language need not necessarily mean the other kind of negotiation, i.e., curriculum communication or vice versa. They are two independent phenomena for Allwright and so communicative method, for learning communicative language is not a pre-requisite and argument for learner autonomy.
The latter can exist or rather should exist for Allwright within the former. In fact, making learner-autonomy in curriculum making dependent upon communicative method for communicative language does not suit Allwright at all, since his language model makes the latter inadequate for him. His scheme of learner autonomy needs one and rejects compulsorily the other. Or he would like the learner to be autonomous to the extent of choosing the one core-language model or endorse content learning.

4.4 An Examination of Learner-Investment and Interaction in Communication and Curriculum Making

It is at this point that I shall take up Allwright's argument about interaction and learner autonomy and set it against my thesis in order to show the different conceptualisation there. To begin with, I see a contradiction here in Allwright's position.

In one instance, i.e., in the matter of syllabus construction he sees interaction, that is, learner involvement and learner autonomy as inevitable - and an outside plan of the teacher as not the inside occurrence between the teacher and the learner. Here then, one could argue that Allwright does not see a generalised, objective Core Plan (or Core Syllabus in which the individual learner does not have a say). Also such a scheme would allow for the incidental creation of a
syllabus and hence the anxiety about 'all' the syllabus (coverage) depending upon such incidental fall-out can arise - the same kind of anxiety that Allwright evinces about the language core. Allwright does not seem to follow-up his learner-autonomous syllabus with such a possibility, though.

The same change in 'outside plan' - i.e., the incompatibility between the Plan and the Executed is not extendable to pre-communicative Core and post-executed Core in language. I see this happening as a result of the paradigm of dichotomies that Allwright's model of language is set within. In that paradigm languaging and meaning-making are not considered simultaneous activities; where competence is different from performance and a product from a process (method). I will since not go into details about this arguments in the first two chapters have covered this aspect of a 'different' paradigm.

4.4.1 Dynamic Core and Status of Interaction

Now let me state why I see such a 'non-extension' as a contradiction in Allwright, while it is a plausible model for Allwright himself. For this I go to my main thesis. In my thesis, I postulate the inevitability of interaction and its concomitant, i.e., the making of incidental power the sole power behind construction (and not retrieval) of a (and not the) core, into a pervasive paradigm. But not just that; my
syllabus model (as negotiation) and my language model, as mentioned earlier, are not connected only through such a metaphorical application. I also show how languaging or communicating or negotiating to me is not just a method for learning a core - since there is no objective core. The distinct separation of content and process that Allwright postulates does not exist in my scheme of languaging. The process is the content. Learner autonomy springs as a logical fulfilment of my language model which makes 'core' a dynamic construction, a fall-out of interaction.

The key to the qualitative difference I claim for my model then, lies in this objective content-less-ness or the undercurrents of dynamic change that I infuse into any presence of a static (a priori or post-priori) core. Core for me has to be constructed 'anew' through negotiation (and exploitation). There is no question of learning it. And it is only in such communicative (interaction) that it has to be constructed - there is no other way.

What I see as imperative then, is a conceptualisation and a different conceptualisation of the 'core' to show the important nuances of the much used words and notions such as interaction and learner autonomy in several currently in use language syllabuses.
Take my difference away, i.e., think of the core as an objective invariant quantum, then immediately the anxiety about effective learning of the core, through only communication arises since communication is only an optional pedagogic method; yet trying this out only as an experiment in methodology is tolerated; (see Allwright, 1982b) or the question of there being no logical but only metaphorical connection between language model and the negotiated curriculum comes in (i.e., an isolated treatment of learner autonomy, a freedom for the learner to juggle around only with the given).5

Let us take up this question of dichotomies, and the making of process into an option.

For me, since the dynamic core has to be created, the only way open for creation is interaction. The dynamic nature of the core and interaction are inseparable. The one feeds the other. While there cannot be such an inevitable linking up of an invariant core and interaction. This makes for the difference in the interaction itself. The justification for interaction as the sole method in the de-linked model, exists only in an experiment, with the strong hypothesis about incidental learning of the code/core.
An only experiment to test such a strong hypothesis the Communicative Teaching Project (CTP) (see Prabhu, 1980) forms the fourth manifestation in the field of ELT of the concept of communicative process that Allwright deals with.

4.5 A Mid-Way Account-Taking

Before I turn to a discussion of this, let me briefly recount what I have attempted to say till now about the stand on interaction and learner-autonomy in languaging and curriculum making in my model in relation to these notions in current (communicative) ELT.

1. Two teaching exercises of providing communicative practice (i.e., interaction) after or before the teaching of content (inclusive of communicative functions and notions) are not very exciting or radical as ideas since communication (or interaction) is considered in both these instances only as communicative practice and is not central to the teaching.

2. There is a third category where communicative method results in interaction and which interaction provides the entire communicative content (i.e., a method of providing communicative practice not before or after a treatment of linguistic or/and communicative content but the emergence of content (both linguistic and communicative) itself in the method, and its learning through it). Allwright questions the validity
of this; due to the total reliance it places on incidental learning of all the communicative content (a matter of coverage), and which also advocates a syllabus-making through the same process of interaction. I used the discussion here by Allwright to pick out from there certain issues, a clarification of which would counter Allwright's doubts about incidental learning of the language core.

These were the issues about the content and method/process dichotomy in communicative language teaching the consequence of which clarification was the re-affirmation of the notion of the dynamic changeable immediate-process-dependent content in languaging which notion besides making process/capacity of negotiation during interaction the single most relevant fact in languaging leads to the inevitability of not only interaction and individual/learner autonomy in languaging but also in syllabus making.

But such clarifications here so far have resulted (we could say) only in a clarification of the status of interaction in my scheme which status motivates interaction and negotiation in the classroom.

Does this status (which I claim is a perceptual/conceptual validity of interaction and creation status) substantially make for a difference in the quality of interaction? That is, can we say that even without this attitude towards interaction
as not being a method or means for an end but an end in itself and a descriptively true fact; but with an attitude to interaction as a method but a useful and the best method available, powerful enough to account for all that is involved in language acquisition, remain the same kind of interaction which involves negotiation, where and when it is made to operate solely in the classroom?

That is the question which has not been answered.

4.6 Communicative Processes of Interaction and Negotiation as Pedagogic Method - The CTP

I propose to expand on this below in my discussion of what Allwright refers to as the fourth manifestation of the communicative method - in current language teaching, viz., the communicational teaching project (Prabhu, 1980, 1981, 1985). (Inspite of these quoted papers by Prabhu, and several discussions of the CTP by Allwright, Brumfit (see e.g. Brumfit, 1984-a; Johnson 1982 etc.), there has not yet been a full treatment of the CTP in the published form. Most of what I say here and henceforward about the CTP is derived from my personal association with the project in the capacity of an interested observer, and the innumerable personal discussions I have had with Dr. Prabhu.) This is a radical and exciting
departure especially from the first two kinds that we have already mentioned, in that this makes the method central in the whole teaching endeavour.

I shall start a discussion of this project from what Prabhu says about this method. His hypothesis, "that the internal grammar develops as unconsciously as it gets deployed in language use and that the process involved is a holistic one" leads him to "a very indirect form of teaching, confined to ensuring availability of language data and attempting to bring about a preoccupation with meaning" (Prabhu, 1985:12). I will discuss the second part of this quotation from Prabhu, especially his stand on "pre-occupation with meaning" and reserve the first part for a later reference.

In a pre-emptive move, I shall replace meaning pre-occupation with a more dynamic and tentative phrase, meaning-exploration. To me, it is in this dynamic activity of the moment of execution of an act, that the whole concept of there being the possibility of the existence of a dynamic language core hinges.

Thus meaning pre-occupation (i.e., interaction or negotiation) as the starting point could lead to an expansion of this notion into meaning-exploration, and again meaning-exploration along the two dimensions of pragmatic and mathetic
meanings (see Chapter III). The possibilities here are of unpredictable and plural outcomes (in terms of meanings and the language code) to these explorations.

But a basic assumption that Grammar is a universal objective core of rules and the goal for language learning is an acquisition of such rules makes irrelevant (if not actually restricts) such an analysis and branching out.

Meaning pre-occupation could (and does) remain meaning retrieval; in fact, it is better it remains so, since as I said earlier, allowing for meaning exploration would logically lead to learner-autonomy in language and learner-autonomy in syllabus creation (more radical than in the procedural syllabus sense) and an unpredictable dynamic code (meaning and language) creation of the moment.

Such plurality of outcomes is what any goal of grammar construction (imminent in this a universal core) cannot have. I shall come to a more detailed examination of the connection between meaning-retrieval and grammar construction further below.

I am saying here, (albeit obliquely) that Prabhu's goal being avowedly such a grammar construction (or 'core' attainment) in his methodological scheme, the nature of interaction then is not the kind of learner-investment (I shall come back to a discussion of the nature of interaction and negotiation
in more detail below) in communication that I have been talking about, and negotiation is not accommodation (with contributions from the learner). Interaction i.e., meaning pre-occupation in CTP occupies the status of a methodological tool for the learning of an objective, outside-the-process (before-the-process and after-the-process) common core (again common meaning core and common language core). Process (i.e., interaction) is not considered as constituting the core (two points involved here; the rejection of the centrality of process or interaction in creation, and the notion of new creation itself). 7

I go back to the initial point that I made that interaction seen as a methodology is an optional phenomenon - it is a matter of choice. It is mainly because the composition of the core is not wholly known, and as it seems to be an organic whole that this 'methodology' of not tampering with the whole is advocated. The important need, however, remains, core-learning; or learning of the content of language i.e., notions and functions or communicative and linguistic competence.

It has to be said in fairness to Prabhu that his holistic grammar core is more accommodative of 'capacity' (language as PLUS communicative and linguistic competence and so nearer to a user's model) than Allwright's notions and functions as
communicative content for a language syllabus, which is a linguist's analytic model (see Chapter III, for a discussion on analyst's and user's models).

Observe Prabhu for instance here:

"What emerges from this discussion is that there are a number of things about language acquisition which we do not know and should not assume we do in language pedagogy. We do not know the form of the internal grammar we hypothesise and should not assume that it is the same as the linguist's grammar. We do not know the process of internal grammar-constructions and should not assume that it is a linear one. We cannot say what any learner will learn at any given stage and should not assume that what is learnt is what we teach..."

(Prabhu, op.cit.:11-12)

This is the reason why it is only in the communicational teaching model that at least the potentiality of meaning-exploration in meaning-pre-occupation exists. Yet this potentiality remains unrealised because Prabhu's model does not provide for the crucial immediacy and flux principle of the core - which is also what makes a subjective core through learner investment in learning possible. This, then, ultimately makes even capacity a pre-determined, standard core (see Note 14).
4.6.1 Dynamic Core and Invariant Core: Two Kinds of Status-Assignment to Interaction

What I claim here is that as I pointed out earlier in this chapter that considering a core a dynamic changeable core affects the validity or status of interaction and raises it above the level of a method or means to an end, to the status of the creator of a code, and as the most relevant aspect of languaging itself - similarly, here, in explicating the nature of interaction as an act of meaning-exploration logically assumes the code as being dynamic and changeable (and changes and mitigates its status too). Similarly considering a core a set of invariant rules affects the status of interaction and makes it only a means to an end; a process rather than the relevant or important product. And interaction as meaning-pre-occupation considers core a static construct.

Altogether, I claim, there can be two kinds of motivation for interaction: 1. as a means to a common core of language rules; 2. as creator of a core (meaning and language simultaneously), which is tentative and dynamic. As the motivation for interaction defines its status/role (as methodology or constitutor) it also defines its nature - as meaning-pre-occupation/retireval and one kind of negotiation which is not accommodation and meaning exploration with associated negotiation (as accommodation) and exploitation.
I shall illustrate these differences about interaction - a consequence of its status - further with the kind of tasks that CTP has, to induce interaction in the classroom.

**Quality of Interaction - Differences Between Models**

**A. Experiences and Outcomes**

All the problem-solving tasks (see Prabhu, 1980, 1981) - the mainstay of the project - have a well defined problem - with well-defined solutions or outcomes. They are mostly in the form of puzzles and who-dunits and map-readings. Such tasks for Prabhu ensure meaning-pre-occupation which I have claimed are more retrieval of meanings than anything else. This is what I now set out to substantiate.

When I say all of the problem solving tasks in allowing for meaning preoccupation for the learners actually induce meaning retrieval, I am not advancing the conventional touchstone for communicative tasks which sets out to gauge whether tasks provide genuine information gaps - do the learners need to really solve the problem set by the teacher to provide information to the teacher? The issue for me is not in providing for information gap in the sense that only questions for which the teacher does not know the answers should be asked. The issue is, more importantly, that even when the meanings
are known to the caretaker (as a thoroughly 'socialised' human being) the allowance for the learner making his/her own efforts and getting the meaning she/he wants should be made.

The answer becomes a 'known' (conventional) answer due to the constriction of:

1. The structuring of the task/experience itself - e.g., as in a puzzle where 'logically' only one conventionalised answer is possible.

2. The necessity to make the other person understand it - (accommodation to the hearer/other interlocutor schema and its interference).

But these answers should not be taken as being inevitable only possibilities. If this is the attitude, then, the implication could be that all answers (or meanings) are conventional ones - already fixed ones - and growing up is a matter of accumulating the fixed answers.9

Hence a deliberate variety of experiences where the experience does not constrict creativity, which makes possible plural outcomes;10 and tasks where the interlocutor constriction factor does not exist should be introduced.

There is a need for more than problem-solving puzzle-tasks on grounds which are more serious than feasibility/practicability teacher capacity etc. Only a conceptual clarity and/or
an ideological stand about meanings - what they are, whether they are universal conventional ones or unique plural ones created in the moment of exploration - makes for a difference in the quality of the interaction in the classroom, and the degree of learner investment allowed.

Either Prabhu's implied definition of meaning-preoccupation and consequent tasks of problem-solving as comprising a major chunk of his course, are due to a deliberate ideological position or need much more 'thinking about' if they are not to be detrimental (as I have shown) to creativity - which creativity can be fostered only by an attitude to meanings and language as plural on the part of the teacher and the learners.

Prabhu's confinement to problem-solving tasks, asking for negotiation - where adjustments are made (presumably) have to, according to my cline (see Chapter III) also move to exploitation ones. Claiming to teach a 'part' for practical purposes, partial teaching in this case could be 'distorted' teaching.\(^{11}\)

This is the first point.

B. Negotiation

Even Prabhu's negotiation (a part of interaction) works out to be different from what I mean by the same term. Since
negotiation in Prabhu does not go beyond negotiation in problem-solving tasks it does not practice the effort at building-up an approximative meaning that pragmatic interpersonal exchanges ask for. In other words, the 'accommodation' involved in negotiation is not quite evident in the project's definition and realisation of negotiation.

I would place the project's tasks lower down in the cline of degrees of negotiation and readiness to agree (see Chapter III). In Prabhu's tasks there is much less of negotiation and more readiness to acquiesce (see figure below).

There is invariably one path to the final meaning. So even negotiation can be predicted and pre-specified. That is exactly what I see as happening in the project's structuring of a lesson as pre-task and task. The learners are initially invited to participate in a pre-task, a kind of 'trial-run' of the actual task, and later the task is given for a working-out. In other words, the 'path' to the solution is
generalised and applied to a slightly different situation in the pre-task stage; this 'generalised path' the pre-done negotiation is transferred to a 'new' task, which is new only in terms of different 'tokens' for the same kind of a problem.

The notion of pre-tasks to precede tasks, in Prabhu, is an integral part of the rationale behind the project.

This 'formalisation' - defining clearly the one path to one solution - results also in one inexorable teacher-to-whole class technique of teaching. Thus, in Prabhu, this factor will not allow for not only open-ended tasks, which call for unpredictable outcomes and so non-formalisable negotiation, but also group-work as a technique of teaching. Their absence, I would submit, is not entirely due to feasibility principles.

Thus from what is (potentially) a method which counters pre-specification of content the method could easily slip into pre-specification (of negotiation), i.e., pre-association of meaning and strategies or procedures of interpretations; and this would be pseudo-negotiation for me.14

It is in this way that the meaning pre-occupation as meaning retrieval as in a 'logical' problem-solving task could affect the kind of language 'core' product, as static objective or as dynamic personal (and of the moment).
The point I am trying to make is that communicational teaching syllabus does fall into the paradigm of pre-specification (not just theoretically, but even in practice, as my analysis of the practice above shows) either because of its ambivalence about preoccupation with meaning or its goal commitment to 'grammar construction'.

Or I would like to say that its primary concern is a commitment to grammar construction (i.e., for a unitary system for implementation) and hence 'pre-occupation with meaning' can be fairly interpreted to advocate in actuality retrieval of pre-specified meaning as a means to an end. 15

Communicative interaction which employs negotiation in pre-occupation with meaning then, I would claim is qualitatively different from interaction which employs exploitation along with negotiation in exploration of meanings; and which latter is what my language teaching sets out to do.

4.7 Conclusion

I have, then, in this chapter, attempted to show how my language model is essentially different from other models used currently in ELT; though, I also use terms like 'interaction', 'process' etc., much-used in the field today. My concentration was especially on what I consider a very interesting development in ESL teaching - the Communicational
Teaching Project. The *notions* of interaction, meaning-pre-occupation, use through usage etc., in the project, seemed on the surface to be very much like the concepts in my model; hence an examination of notions in CTP in relation to my scheme became necessary if confusion was to be avoided.

In the course of the next two chapters, I propose to illustrate among other things, the points I have made about interaction and negotiation involved in problem-solving tasks as I discuss some lessons that were part of the two years of teaching I did, which teaching explored some of the ideas extended here and in the other three chapters; and draw out their implications for language syllabuses.

The relevance of the clarity I have sought here about interaction in my scheme, with learner-investment and immediate creation of the moment forming central factors therein, becomes evident as the thesis progresses.
NOTES

1. Thus languaging/meaning-making/reality - exploration could be said to encompass all walks of life; this would logically argue that communication is not using language as a special code, but using the skills of interactive construction which principle is extended to language use - when the child enters 'language'; and in this way becomes reality-construction in and through this specific symbolic tool.

The possibilities for the whole-school curriculum, i.e., the teaching of the subjects, like History, Geography etc., using the 'discovery method' that this throws up are not followed up here for obvious reasons. Yet it is interesting to speculate upon the logical route that my model of language as basically meaning-making or reality-construction could take. See also Introduction to this Thesis.

2. I take up Allwright's writing upon the communicative curricula in this particular paper especially because I feel that in his discussion here and elsewhere, he neatly summarises and articulates the developmental plateau that communicative language teaching has reached to date.
3. Here and later in Prabhu's communicational teaching model, 'procedural' refers to the emergent nature of the common 'rule-core' (communicative and linguistic). There is a separation of the situations/meanings from the rules in the procedural syllabus. The former is amenable to pre-planning, while the latter, as a methodological variation, as in these procedural syllabuses, could be allowed to emerge. This is different from the emergent syllabuses or more aptly, enacted syllabuses I have been discussing, and Breen's process syllabus, where everything, including the situations or meanings are allowed to emerge. This difference becomes clearer as an ideological difference below.

4. It is such a conceptualisation about the core that I am not sure whether Breen and Candlin have made.
5. Interaction in communication, and pedagogic interaction, and associated learner autonomy become two distinct concepts. (This has important repurcussions on the planning for teaching. See Chapter VI). Thus learning and learner based syllabuses are distinguished. Prabhu below, for instance makes this same distinction, and places his teaching project within one and not the other. While Allwright's claims recommend a learner-based syllabus, but without seeing a connection with a learning-based one (i.e., interaction in communication) Prabhu recommends learning-based without going in for learner-based. The one I see as a partial autonomy since personal investment in creating a language and a meaning core is not allowed; and the other as partial development of the concept of learning, since personal investment in decisions about meaning-making is not allowed. Only the paradigm of dichotomies of content and process can justify this. For me, a learner-based syllabus is a learning-based one; and both together, end up in making the core only a product of incidental learning, or a fall-out of the process. Yet here is no anxiety about this, since it is as it should be. Also for me, learning is also the learnt - so learning or interaction in communication is not merely a means or method for content learning as in Prabhu and Allwright.

6. Here it has to be remembered that for me the 'final' code or meaning does not consist in its 'outer' apparent manifestation, i.e., in its linguistic code manifestation, but its underlying unique paths to the signifier-signified relationships established by interlocutors at a particular moment based on the principle of shifting configurations of semantic space (see Chapters I and II, for more details).
7. This connects with my arguments about the several dichotomies that the paradigm of objective core endorses: Thus (in one dichotomy): (1) meaning pre-occupation or a process leads to a (2) language core; (in another): (1) language rule applications lead to (2) meanings, etc.

8. In other words is the teacher asking pseudo-questions (see Barnes, 1969) questions to which he/she already knows the answers etc.).

9. See Widdowson's recommendation to let the learners flout rules and be iconoclasts referred to in Chapter II.

10. This condition on experience is not as simple to adhere to, as it sounds here. In Chapter V as I discuss the language teaching based on some of these principles, I have to say much more about this.

11. The kind of artificial and harmful division of communicative competence and analytic competence that Bruner makes for instance - see Chapter II.

12. As the analysis of my tasks in the next chapter shows, I should point out that even my project had plenty of such tasks. Only I was not quite happy with them; and my theorising helped me to see that they were not entirely satisfactory and my present conceptualisations help me place them in the cline and see their uses in perspective. Plus, even in problem-solving tasks, the negotiations engendered never were allowed to fall into a format. My point is, that Prabhu's anxiety to provide for pre-tasks formalises them. More clarification on this occurs in Chapter V.
13. In Prabhu's own words, pre-tasks are, "a parallel to the task, performed through teacher-class interaction and useful in 1. making known the nature of the task, 2. bringing into play the language relevant to the task, 3. regulating the difficulty-level of the task, and 4. allowing some learners to learn from attempts made by others". From a paper by Prabhu, based on his presentation at the TESOL Convention, circulated informally; n.d.

14. See Widdowson, Chapter II; as he points out there, the pre-association of procedures and meanings, makes them lose their spontaneity and hence their status as the dynamic capacity; they get augmented into the core - while the whole point of negotiation is that it is spontaneous. Note, other attendant aspects of such pre-specification; e.g., transmission teaching and so on.

15. That is why we see Prabhu saying that this kind of pre-occupation of meanings can be encouraged in a subject classroom taught with the language to be taught as the medium. This is not quite possible in my scheme, where the subject's teaching itself has to be done within the meaning-exploration paradigm (see Note 2 above).

***