

# **Second Language Acquisition**

---

**(ENG504)**

### Table of Contents

<b>Lesson No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Lesson 1</b>	<b>Introduction to Second Language Acquisition</b>	001-006	4-5
<b>Lesson 2</b>	<b>Nature of Language, Modularity and SLA Variability</b>	007-012	6
<b>Lesson 3</b>	<b>Creativity and Second Language Learning</b>	013-018	7
<b>Lesson 4</b>	<b>Second Language Use and Performance Perspective</b>	019-025	8-9
<b>Lesson 5</b>	<b>Difference Between Individual Learners</b>	026-032	10
<b>Lesson 6</b>	<b>Behaviourism and First Language Acquisition</b>	032-038	11
<b>Lesson 7</b>	<b>Second Language Learning and Krashen's Monitor Model</b>	039-044	12-13
<b>Lesson 8</b>	<b>SLA Hypotheses</b>	045-050	14-15
<b>Lesson 9</b>	<b>Second Language and Universal Grammar</b>	051-056	16-17
<b>Lesson 10</b>	<b>Universal Grammar and First Language Acquisition</b>	057-062	18
<b>Lesson 11</b>	<b>Universal Grammar and Second Language Learning</b>	063-068	19-20
<b>Lesson 12</b>	<b>Evaluation of Universal Grammar and Cognitive Approaches</b>	069-074	21-22
<b>Lesson 13</b>	<b>Models of Second Language Learning</b>	075-079	23-24
<b>Lesson 14</b>	<b>Learning Strategies and Second Language Learning</b>	080-085	25-26
<b>Lesson 15</b>	<b>Theories of Second Language Processing and Connectionism</b>	086-091	27-28
<b>Lesson 16</b>	<b>Evaluation Of Cognitive Approaches and Functional Perspectives</b>	092-097	29-30
<b>Lesson 17</b>	<b>Cognitive, Textual, Social, Orientations and Functionalism</b>	098-103	31
<b>Lesson 18</b>	<b>Functionalism and Interaction in Second Language Learning</b>	104-109	32-33
<b>Lesson 19</b>	<b>Input and Interaction in Second Language Acquisition</b>	110-115	34-35
<b>Lesson 20</b>	<b>Consciousness Raising, Negative Feedback and Negative Evidence</b>	116-121	36-37
<b>Lesson 21</b>	<b>Input Processing and Autonomous Induction Theory</b>	122-127	38-39
<b>Lesson 22</b>	<b>Interactionist Approach and Sociocultural Theory</b>	128-133	40-41
<b>Lesson 23</b>	<b>Aspects of Sociocultural Theory</b>	134-139	42-43
<b>Lesson 24</b>	<b>Activity Theory, Private Speech, and Scaffolding</b>	140-145	44
<b>Lesson 25</b>	<b>Empirical Evidence and Socio-Cultural Learning</b>	146-151	45

<b>Lesson 26</b>	<b>Second Language Socialization and Identity Construction</b>	152-157	46
<b>Lesson 27</b>	<b>Investment and Social Identities In Second Language Acquisition</b>	158-163	47
<b>Lesson 28</b>	<b>Sociolinguistic Perspective on Language Learning and Second Language Research</b>	164-169	48-49
<b>Lesson 29</b>	<b>Instructional Policies and the Role of L1 in L2 Learning</b>	170-175	50
<b>Lesson 30</b>	<b>The Facilitative Role of L1</b>	176-181	51-52
<b>Lesson 31</b>	<b>Different Aspects of L1</b>	182-187	53
<b>Lesson 32</b>	<b>Language Awareness and L1</b>	188-193	54-55
<b>Lesson 33</b>	<b>The Facilitation of L1 in Second Language Learning</b>	194-199	56
<b>Lesson 34</b>	<b>The Role of L1 in Second Language Learning Performance Domain</b>	200-205	57
<b>Lesson 35</b>	<b>Factors Influencing SLA</b>	206-211	58
<b>Lesson 36</b>	<b>Different Learning Styles and Strategies</b>	212-217	59-60
<b>Lesson 37</b>	<b>Second Language Learning and Learner Motivation</b>	218-223	61-62
<b>Lesson 38</b>	<b>Language Theories and Second Language Learner</b>	224-229	63
<b>Lesson 39</b>	<b>Myths Related to SLA</b>	230-235	64
<b>Lesson 40</b>	<b>Culture Difference and Identity</b>	236-241	65-66
<b>Lesson 41</b>	<b>Teaching/Learning of Culture in Second Language Classrooms</b>	242-247	67
<b>Lesson 42</b>	<b>Second Language Acquisition and Teaching</b>	248-254	68-69
<b>Lesson 43</b>	<b>Focus on Form and Types of Instructions</b>	255-259	70-71
<b>Lesson 44</b>	<b>Explicit Instruction and Production Practice</b>	260-263	72
<b>Lesson 45</b>	<b>Input and SLA Pedagogy</b>	264-269	73
	<b>Abbreviations Used Within the Text</b>		74

**Lesson-01****INTRODUCTION TO SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION****Topic No: 001-006****Introduction to SLA; Key Concepts; What Makes a Good Theory: The Need; What Makes a Good Theory: Types of Theories; Evaluating a Theory of SLA; Views on the Nature of Language**

The term ‘second language’ includes languages other than the native language, languages of wider communication encountered within local region or community, and foreign languages. Learning can either be formal, planned and systematic or informal and unstructured.

Second language acquisition (SLA) is a research field that focuses on learners and learning rather than teachers and teaching. The field of SLA addresses the fundamental questions of how learners come to internalize the linguistic system of another language and how they make use of that linguistic system during comprehension and speech production.

The learning and acquisition of a second language occurs once the first language acquisition is established. For instance, a child who speaks Hindi as the first language, starts learning English when he starts going to school. English is learned by the process of second language acquisition. In fact, a young child can learn a second language faster than an adult can learn the same language.

Language development, like all human development, will be heavily determined by the nature of the environment, and may be severely limited unless the environment is appropriate. A stimulating environment is required to enable natural curiosity, intelligence, and creativity to develop, and to enable our biological capacities to unfold. The fact that the course of development is largely internally determined does not mean that it will proceed without care, stimulation, and opportunity (Chomsky, 1960).

In the sciences and social sciences, the construct “theory” has a particular meaning. A ‘theory’ is a more or less abstract set of claims about the significant units within phenomenon under study. It aims at explanation as well as description. Theories are produced collaboratively and evolve through a systematic enquiry. These are assessed through hypothesis testing and involve a reflexive process. A good theory is supposed to give clear and explicit statements about its claims. It must be testable or falsifiable in some way. The linguists view language as a complex communication which must be analyzed on different levels.

**Property Theory**

The linguists are more interested in ‘property theory.’ They are concerned with the structure of the language and how a language changes; how certain words become obsolete; how certain factors lead

to the addition of new words and merge them in a language system. In property theory, the language system is important.

### Transition Theory

‘Transition theory’ is more concerned with the developmental processes of language education. It is interested in finding out the different stages of learning in a second language learner. It can relate to the first language acquisition telling about the different learning stages in a child’s life and how that learning is different or similar to second language learning.

What is more, theories are also distinguished from frameworks and models. These latter constructs refer to compilations of ideas and constructs that are bigger than theories. They may subsume some theories but their intent is less to explain and predict and are generally more descriptive in nature. They can describe what happens in some detail and in some cases make relationships between different things, but they may not be able to explain why something happens the way it does.

### Nature of language

Language is the most important phenomenon in the world. From birth to death, all our activities are regulated by language. Language dominates every aspect of human life. In fact, it is a yardstick to separate us from other beings. Language is a mean of communication. With the help of language, we can express our thoughts and feelings to others. Without language, society would be impossible.

**Language is learnt:** Learning of language is not an automatic process. Of course, it is behaviour but not of the type like walking and crawling that comes to child in a natural way.

**Language is a system:** Each language is a unique system. The system of language consists of sounds, structures, and vocabulary. A person who wants to learn a new language will have to learn new sounds, new structures, and new vocabulary. The sound system of language differs from language to language depending upon the culture to which a language belongs. Similarly, each language has its own system of vocabulary. Thus languages are systematic in their own nature.

**Language is a skill:** Learning of a language is a skill subject. It is a skill like swimming and cycling. We cannot learn swimming or cycling just by studying rules. We can learn them by practice. In the same way, we can learn a language by rigorously practicing that language. So a lot of repetition for major linguistic skills like listening, speaking, reading and writing is required.

**Language is for communication:** Language is the best means of communication and self-expressions. Human beings express their ideas, thoughts, feelings, and emotions through language. In this way language is a means to connect past, present, and future.

**Language is rule governed:** Each language is governed by a particular set of rules. For example, English is S.V.O. language. In forming a sentence, we put subject, then verb, and after verb there comes object.

**Language is unique:** Each language is unique because it has its own style of functioning. The sounds, vocabulary and structures of every language have their own speciality.

**Lesson-02****NATURE OF LANGUAGE, MODULARITY AND LANGUAGE  
VARIABILITY****Topic No: 007-012****Views on the Nature of Language: Competence and Performance; The Language Learning Process: Nature vs. Nurture; The Language Learning Process: Modularity; Modularity and SLA; System and Variability in SLA**

Linguists disagree over their main focus of interest and study. Noam Chomsky prefers competence over performance. By competence, he refers to the abstract and hidden representation of language knowledge held inside minds with its potential to create and understand original utterances in a given language. However, there are difficulties in studying competence as language performance data are believed to be imperfect reflections of competence. The competence can only be assessed indirectly, under controlled conditions, through wide-ranging tests.

**Nature vs. Nurture Debate**

The best known controversy involves B. F. Skinner and Noam Chomsky. Skinner advocates behaviorist mechanisms; whereas, Chomsky emphasized the role of innate dispositions that expect natural languages to be organized in particular ways and support the role of Universal Grammar (UG).

Further, there are different views on seeing mind as modular or unitary. In Piaget's view, language is simply one manifestation of general skill of symbolic representation and first language acquisition does not require any special mechanism; whereas, Chomsky considers language as too complex to be learnt from environmental exposure and too distinctive in its structure to be learnable by general cognitive means. Universal Grammar is thus endowed with its own distinctive mechanism for learning.

When we talk about errors in SL utterances, Behaviorists view errors as a result of 'bad habits' which can be controlled through rote learning and pattern drilling using target language models. Recent studies contradict this view by claiming that errors and mistakes are patterned although some of them are caused by first language influence, yet this is not true for all of them. Learner's language system is unstable and characterized by high degree of variability which is a central feature of learner inter-language.

## Lesson-03

**CREATIVITY AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING****Topic No: 013-018****Creativity and Routines in SLA; Limited Learning: Fossilization; Cross-Linguistic Influences; Second Language Use and SLL; Second Language Use and SLL: Other Theorists**

Creativity is a complex notion, especially in cognitive terms. This is why theorists have never really reached a consensual definition of this notion. There are scores of theories about the nature and taxonomies of creativity. As far as language learning is concerned, creativity is not about the product; it is about the process of learning. The process of understanding the way the target language works through creative thinking.

Learners' surface utterances can be linked to underlying rule system, even if these seem primitive and deviant compared with the target language system. Formulas and routines play an important part in everyday language use by native speakers. Our first-language utterances are a complex mix of creativity and prefabrication. A frequent use of unanalyzed chunks is also evident in young children's first-language as well as early stages of second language.

Second Language (SL) learners mostly remain noticeably different from the native speakers in their pronunciation, and many continue to make grammar mistakes even when well-motivated to learn or after years of study of the target language. It is typified by *incomplete success*.

**Fossilization** refers to the situation when a learner's SL system seems to 'freeze' or become stuck at some more or less deviant stage.

These two phenomena are significant facts about Second Language Learning (SLL) process. Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic views interpret them differently. Former claims that language-specific learning mechanism simply cease to work for older learners, and no amount of study and effort can recreate them. The latter group exclaims that the older SL learners do not have the social opportunities or motivation to identify with native community. They may rather value their distinctive identity as learners or identifiable minority group.

Learners' performance in SL is influenced by the language/languages they already know which are obvious in their accent as well as in certain characteristic mistakes in their utterances. This phenomenon is called **language transfer**. Behaviorists view it as an important source of error and interference in SLL; whereas, recent theorists find widely differing views on extent and nature of influences. Performing in a language involves speaking, making sense of data we hear, interpreting, and processing incoming language data. Language input is essential for normal language learning. Behaviorist theory saw regular (oral) practice as helpful in forming correct language 'habits' whereas the contemporary theorists put emphasis on 'practice' function. For instance, information-processing theorists argued that language competence consists of both a **knowledge component** and a **skill component**. They see a vital role of SL use or SL performance in developing the skill component.

## Lesson-04

**SECOND LANGUAGE USE AND PERFORMANCE PERSPECTIVE****Topic No: 019-025****Second Language Use and SLL: Comprehensible Input Hypothesis; Second Language Use and SLL: Performance Perspective and Psycholinguistics; Performance Perspective and Psycholinguistics: Negative Evidence; Performance Perspective: Sociolinguistics; Views of the Learner; Learner as a Language Processor**

Language acquisition is very similar to the process children use in acquiring first and second languages. It requires meaningful interactions in the target language, natural communication, in which speakers are concerned not with the form of their utterances but with the messages they are conveying and understanding. Error correction and explicit teaching of rules are not relevant to language acquisition (Brown & Hanlon, 1970; Brown, Cazden, & Bellugi, 1973), but caretakers and native speakers can modify their utterances addressed to acquirers to help them understand, and these modifications are thought to help the acquisition process (Snow & Ferguson, 1977).

Krashen's comprehensible output hypothesis gives a more contrasting view. Swain points out that much incoming SL input is comprehensible without any need of full grammatical analysis, which raises a question that why should we be compelled to learn grammar when it is not needed in order to understand a message?

Another way of distinguishing among current theories from 'performance' perspective concerns their view of second-language interaction when speaking and listening are viewed as integral and mutually influential. Two major perspectives on interaction are psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic. From a psycholinguistic view, interaction offers opportunities to fine-tune the language input they are receiving which ensures that the input is well adapted to their internal needs. Interaction is also interesting to linguistic theorists because of the controversies over usefulness of *negative evidence's* provision for second language development. Negative evidence means any kind of input that informs about unacceptable forms in the target language. It includes formal correction by teacher and informal paraphrasing by a native-speaking conversational partner. However, corrections often seem ineffective; therefore, recent theorist put more emphasis on the provision of positive evidence.

Sociolinguistic views of interaction are very different. Here, language process is viewed as essentially social. Identity of the learner and his/her language knowledge are collaboratively constructed and reconstructed in the course of interaction. The details of these functions vary from apprenticeship to scaffolding.

The second language learners may be children or the adults who embark on learning of an additional language, at least some years after they have started to acquire their first language. They may be leaning the target language formally in school or college, or may be learning it through informal social interaction. They may be learning a highly localized language to become an insider in local speech community; or may be learning a language of wider communication relevant to their region in order to get



access to economic development and public life. There are three main points of view among SLL researcher as far as learner is concerned. **The linguistic perspective** is concerned with modelling language structures and processes within mind. **Social psychological perspective** is concerned with modelling individual differences among learners and their implications for eventual learning success. **Socio-cultural perspective** views the learner as social beings and members of social groups and networks. The first two are primarily concerned with analyzing and modeling the inner mental mechanisms available to the individual learner. They aim to document and explain the developmental routes, but are less concerned with the speed or rate of development. They minimize or disregard social and contextual differences.

## Lesson-05

**DIFFERENCE BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL LEARNERS****Topic No: 026-032****Differences Between Individual Learners; Cognitive Differences; Affective Differences; Learner as a Social Being; Summary of Key Points; History of Second Language Research; The 1950s – 1960s**

SL learners generally greatly differ in the degree of success they achieve even if they can be shown to be following a common developmental route. Social psychologists argue that it is due to individual differences among learners. Gardner and Macintyre divide the learner traits into two groups: **cognitive and affective (emotional)**. The Cognitive factors include intelligence, language aptitude, and language learning strategies. The affective factors include language attitudes, motivation, language anxiety, and willingness. The two perspectives highlighted so far have concentrated (a) on universal characteristics and (b) on individual characteristics. It is also necessary to view the SL learner as essentially a social being and consider the social context in which learning takes place and also the learning opportunities it makes available. Interest in ‘learner as a social being’ also leads to concern with a range of socially constructed elements in learners’ identities and their relationship with learning. Therefore social class, power, ethnicity and gender are significant in SLL research. The relationship between the individual learner and the social context is viewed as dynamic, reflexive, and constantly changing. The ‘individual differences’ tradition saw that relationship as being governed by the traits (aptitude, anxiety, etc.) which are relatively fixed and slow to change while socially oriented researchers viewed motivation, anxiety etc. being constantly reconstructed.

**History of Second Language Research: 1950s – 1960s**

This chapter aims to explore theoretical foundations of today’s thinking, focusing post-war period. This period since the 1950s can be divided into three main phases: 1950s – 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s onwards. In 1950s and early 1960s SLL theorizing was much adjunct to the practical business of language teaching. Language teaching methods at that time had to be justifiable in terms of an underlying theory. ‘Progressive’ language pedagogy (1950s) drew on a version of structuralism developed by British linguist Palmer. This approach is summed up as follows:

1. The conviction about finite set of ‘patterns’ or ‘structures’ in language systems
2. The belief that reception and practice result in accuracy and fluency in foreign language habits
3. Methodology to teach ‘the basic’ first before encouraging learners to communicate their own thoughts and ideas

Dominant learning theory in mainstream psychology in this era was ‘Behaviourism’.

## Lesson-06

**BEHAVIOURISM AND FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION****Topic No: 032-038****Behaviourism; Behaviourism under Attack; the 1970s: First Language Acquisition: Same Stages; First Language Acquisition: Similar Order; First Language Acquisition: Negatives; First Language Acquisition: Rule Governed**

Behaviorists view language learning (like any other kind of learning) as a formation of habits; that is creation of stimulus–response pairing which becomes stronger with reinforcement. In case of first language learning, the process is relatively simple as we have to learn a new set of habits. Second language learning involves replacing those habits by a set of new ones, which is complicated. If SL structures are similar to the learners’ first language then learning will easily take place but in case they are different, learning will be difficult. From a teacher’s point of view, this approach had two-fold implications.

- 1) Learning takes place by imitating and repeating (practice makes perfect).
- 2) Teachers needed to focus their teaching on structures which were believed to be difficult, which would be, the areas of differences.

Therefore, researchers embarked on comparing pairs of languages, termed as ‘contrastive analyses. In the late 1950s, the linguistics saw a shift from structural linguistics to generative linguistics, initiated by Noam Chomsky. In psychology too, pre-eminent role for the environment was losing ground in favour of developmentalist views, such as Piaget’s cognitive development theory. Chomsky strongly criticized Skinner’s Behaviorist views on number of issues and rejected the idea that one can compare the behaviour of rats in a laboratory, learning to perform simple tasks, to the behaviour of children learning language without direct teaching. Chomsky claimed that children have an innate faculty that guides them in their learning of language.

In 1970s, Klima and Bellugi (1966), Slobin (1970), Brown (1973) found striking similarities in language learning behaviour of young children whatever the language they were learning. It showed that children all over the world go through similar stages, use similar constructions, and make similar kinds of errors. A consistent order of acquisition was indicated while studying English language structures, i.e., children all over the world acquire negative around the same age and mark it in similar ways in all languages. Another important finding was that a child language is rule-governed even if initially the rules they create do not correspond to the adult ones. Children express relationships between elements in a sentence in a consistent way. When producing adult-like forms, they are not merely imitating and repeating; instead, they extract rules from the language they hear and apply them to their own production. It happens much later when they will be able to take on broad exceptions to rules.

## Lesson-07

**SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING AND KRASHEN'S MONITOR MODEL****Topic No: 039-044****First Language Acquisition: General Principles; SLL: Contrastive Analysis; SLL: Error Analysis; SLL: Where do Errors Come from? Krashen's Monitor Model; Acquisition Learning Hypothesis**

From the brief and oversimplified account of 1970s first language acquisition research, following characteristics emerge:

- Children go through stages.
- These stages are very similar across children for a given language, although individual progress rate varies.
- These stages are similar across languages.
- Child language is rule-governed and systematic, and their rules do not necessarily correspond to adult ones.
- Children are resistant to correction.
- Their processing capacity limits the number of rules they can apply at any one time.

These findings caught SLA researchers' attention too; because, the predictions made by contrastive analysis did not seem to be borne out in practice. Construction differences among languages are not necessarily difficult. Neither construction similarities among languages are necessarily easy; difficulty sometimes occurs in only one direction. The task of language comparison to design efficient language teaching programs now seemed to be disproportionately huge in relation to its prediction powers. Developments in first language acquisition and disillusionment with contrastive analysis originated 'error analysis,' the systematic investigation of SL learners' errors. Studies reveal that learners' errors do not necessarily originate from first language. First language interference was remained unfounded in majority of errors which raised a question that where do these errors come from? They are neither target-like nor first-language like; they must be learner-internal in origin. Researchers started classifying them for better understanding and with errors in the mother tongue. In 1972, Selinker coined a term 'inter-language' that refers to the language produced by learners both as a system and as a series of interlocked systems. These studies moved beyond error analysis and focused the learner system as a whole.

**Krashen's Monitor Model**

The theory evolved in late 1970s; it was refined and expanded in early 1980s. It is based around five basic hypotheses:

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

## Lesson-08

**SLA HYPOTHESES****Topic No: 045-050****Monitor Hypothesis; Natural Order Hypothesis; Input Hypothesis; Input Hypothesis: Critique; Affective Filter Hypothesis; Schumann's Acculturation Model of SLA**

According to Krashen, learning system has only one function, i.e., as a monitor or editor. It comes into play only to 'make changes in the form of our utterance.' Acquisition initiates the utterances and is responsible for fluency, thus, monitor is thought to alter the output of the acquired system. This hypothesis is criticized because the monitor doesn't operate all the time as pressures and demands of conversing in real time often doesn't allow it. Moreover, it is impossible to test the claims empirically.

Natural order hypothesis says that we acquire the language rules in a predictable order that cannot be determined solely by formal simplicity. This hypothesis is criticized for being too strong. It ignores well-documented cases of language transfer or individual variability. It is based almost exclusively on the morpheme studies, which reflect accuracy of production rather than acquisition sequences.

Input hypothesis is linked to the above mentioned hypothesis. It claims that we move along the developmental continuum by receiving comprehensible input. Too simple or too complex input will not be useful for acquisition. It claims that speaking is a result of acquisition and not its cause. Speech cannot be taught directly; it emerges on its own as a result of building competence via comprehensible input. Further, it says that if input is understood, the necessary grammar is automatically provided. This hypothesis is criticized for being vague and imprecise. It is impossible to verify the theory as no independently testable definitions are given. Nor does the theory specify the internal workings of the 'Language Acquisition Device' where acquisition actually takes place.

Just comprehensible input is not enough; learners also need to 'let that input in' as it is. Affective Filter supposedly determines how receptive to the input a learner is going to be. This filter captures relationship between affective variables and acquisition process. It posits that acquirers vary with respect to the strength or level of their affective filter. Learners' attitude toward second language acquisition determines their input and affective filter. Major criticism on this hypothesis claims it to be vague and a-theoretical.

**Schumann's Acculturation Model of SLA:** It views second language acquisition from a radically different angle, and also remained influential during subsequent decades. Schumann noticed that early inter-language resembled pidgin language with characteristic features. SLA was compared to the complexification of pidgins. This process was linked to degree of acculturation of learners. The closer they feel to the target language community, the better learner will 'acculturate' and vice versa. This model was influential in opening alternative lines of research comparing SLA with pidginization and creolization, and bringing to the fore social and psychological variables along with their roles in SLL.

According to the model, success depends on the extent to which learners adapt fully to target language culture. Two major factors are identified in acculturation: social distance and psychological distance.

**Social distance** factors refer to those involving the relationship between the internal characteristics of a language group and the ability for the learner to become closer (socially) to that target language group. Among these factors are the social dominance of the language group, the ability for the individual to integrate into the group, the cohesiveness and size of the group, the attitude of both the group and the individual toward each other, and the length of the exposure between the two.

**Psychological distance** factors refer to the extent to which individual learners cope psychologically with learning an L2. Among these factors are anxiety, motivation, and self-confidence.

## Lesson-09

**SECOND LANGUAGE AND UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR****Topic No: 051-056****SLA 1980s and Beyond; SLA: The Role of Internal Mechanisms; SLA 1980s: The Role of First Language; Linguistics and Language Learning: Universal Grammar Approach; Aims of Linguistic Research; Universal Grammar: Knowledge of Language**

By mid-1980s, SLL had matured into an autonomous field of inquiry encompassing a number of substantial programs of research with their distinctive theoretical orientations and methodologies. New links emerged with cognitive science, neuro-psychology and socio-cultural frameworks that have greatly enriched perception of SLA but SLL research agenda continues to focus on fundamental issues carried forward from the 1970s such as: The role of internal mechanisms (like language-specific issues, cognitive issues)

- The role of first language
- The role of psychological variables affecting learning (motivation, personality, language aptitude)
- The role of social and environmental factors
- The role of input

**Universal Grammar Approach (UG)**

Language is a result of two factors' interplay: the initial state – 'language acquisition device' and the course of experience – 'input'. This approach is developed by Noam Chomsky. Its aim is twofold: descriptive adequacy and explanatory adequacy. UG is a property theory that attempts to characterize the underlying linguistic knowledge in SL learners' minds. Main goals of SLA are to answer three basic questions about human language:

1. What constitutes knowledge of language?
2. How is knowledge of language acquired?
3. How is knowledge of language put to use?

Linguistic theory aims to:

- Describe the mental representations of language that are stored in the human mind.
- Define what all languages have in common as well as their distinctive characteristics.

UG approach in SLL provides detailed descriptive framework that enables formulation of well-defined hypotheses about the task facing the learner and to analyze the learners' language in a more focused manner.



**Universal Grammar as a ‘Transition Theory’**

A transition theory describes the process of language learning. UG is also a transition theory as it is interested in describing the language transition process or learning process that occurs during the learning of the second language. In that sense, it does answer the two main questions that Chomsky said the learners must know or the language theory must answer: it describes the knowledge of the language (property theory) and also moves on to explain how that knowledge is acquired by the learners (transition theory).

## Lesson-10

**UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR AND FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION****Topic No: 057-062****UG: Acquisition of Language; UG: Acquisition of Language: Theoretical Scenarios; How is Language Put to Use? Arguments from First Language Acquisition; UG and First Language Acquisition; Opposing Evidence**

On the basis of messy input, children create mental representation of language which goes beyond the input they are exposed to and is very similar to that of other native speakers of the same language variety. Language is the most abstract piece of knowledge. Second language learners are cognitively mature and presumably much more resourceful in problem solving and dealing with abstract concepts. From a theoretical point of view, different possible scenarios are open to consideration; for example,

- SL grammars are constrained by universal grammar (UG)
- UG does not constrain SL grammar or UG is impaired

UG approach is concerned with knowledge of language called ‘competence.’ It is not about performance, about how language is used in real life. A complete theory of language also has to define how we access our knowledge base and how it relates to a number of sociolinguistic and psychological variables. Chomsky acknowledges this and has been concerned almost exclusively with addressing the first two issues. Notion of an innate language faculty in children argues that children go through developmental stages which are very similar across children of given language though progress rate varies. These stages are similar across languages. Child language is said to be rule-governed and systematic; they are resistant to correction and have limited processing capacity. Universalists do not conclude that there must be a specific language module in the brain. It does not seem to be linked in any clear way to intelligence. In fact, children vary in the age at which they go through these developmental steps and in how fast they go through each stage. Furthermore, many children with cognitive deficit develop language normally. As there are numerous examples of people with cognitive disabilities or difficulties who performed well in language(s), evidence of opposite is also found. There are many cognitively ‘normal’ children with impaired language condition known as ‘specific language impairment.’ A study suggests that some aspects of language at least might be genetically controlled. Damage to left hemisphere of the brain also results in language deficit. Language and cognition seem to be largely separate but they do interact.

## Lesson-11

**UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING****Topic No: 063-068****Arguments of (Universal Grammar) UG; Principles of UG; UG: Cross-linguistic Variation; UG and Second Language Learning; UG and SLL – Different Hypothesis; Evaluation of UG: Scope**

The evidence posits that there must be some kind of innate language faculty that is biologically triggered. Lenneberg (1967) outlined characteristics that are typically biologically triggered behaviours and argued that language conforms to the criteria used in order to define such behavior. Aitchison presents Lenneberg's criteria as a list of six features:

1. The behaviour emerges before it is necessary. They start talking when they don't need it for survival.
2. Its appearance is not a result of a conscious decision.
3. Its emergence is not triggered by external events.
4. Direct teaching and intensive practice have relatively little effect.
5. There is a regular sequence of 'milestones' as the behavior develops; these can usually be correlated with age and other aspects of development.
6. There may be 'critical period' for the acquisition of the behaviour. Human beings have to be exposed to language before puberty in order for language to develop.

First language learner's initial state is supposed to consist of a set of principles and languages vary in limited ways. It means that language learning is highly constrained in advance. UG is the principle of structure-dependency which states that language critically depends on the structural relationship between elements in a sentence. All languages are made up of sentences which consist of at least a Noun-Phrase and a Verb-Phrase. Universal Grammar includes a universal inventory of categories that the child selects from on the basis of the input. According to White, there are three potential sources of cross-linguistic variation relating to functional categories:

1. Languages can differ in terms of functional categories which are realized in the grammar (like Japanese lacks the category Determiner).
2. The features of a particular functional category can vary from language to language (i.e. French has a gender feature while English does not).
3. Features vary in strength: a feature can be strong in one language and weak in another, with a range of syntactic consequences. (Inflection features are strong in French and weak in English, resulting in certain word-order alterations).

Universal Grammar is a theory of natural languages that definitely includes second language too. First and second language learning is similar in many ways. In first language acquisition, explanation that generated most enthusiasm was about some kind of language blueprint in brain. Second language learners

go through fairly rigid stages which are unlike both their first language and the second language they are exposed to. The situation is complicated by a number of factors, such as:

- SL learners are cognitively mature.
- They already know at least one other language.
- They have different motivations for learning a second language.

These points have important implications that need to be addressed. Even if, UG hypothesis is correct for first language learning, there are still some logical possibilities concerning its role in SLL.

1. Second languages are not constrained by UG principles and parameters, and they do not behave like natural languages.
2. They are UG constrained. There are different hypotheses regarding whether SL learner has full access or partial access to UG.

Learners might not be able to reset parameters; therefore, they operate with first language settings for some parts of the new language.

### **Scope and Achievements of (Universal Grammar) UG**

1. UG theory aims to describe and explain human language.
2. It is nonetheless directly relevant to the study of SL.
3. It is a linguistic theory, not a learning theory.
4. It has been hugely influential in drawing up sophisticated hypotheses regarding SLA.
5. It helps exploring interplay between the first and second language learners and facilitates understanding of linguistic knowledge learners bring to the task of SLA.
6. It is primarily concerned with the description and explanation of formal system underlying language.
7. Its scope does not include a theory of processing or learning.
8. UG is more of a property theory and not a transition theory. Therefore, it must be evaluated as such.

**Lesson-12****EVALUATIONS OF UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR AND COGNITIVE APPROACHES****Topic No: 069-074****Evaluation of Universal Grammar (UG): View of Language; Evaluation of UG: View of Language Acquisition; Evaluation of UG: View of Language Learner; Cognitive Approaches to SLL: Introduction; Cognitive Approaches: Variations**

The Universal Grammar (UG) view of language has been very influential since 1950s, but not uncontroversial. UG approach views language as a mental framework, underlying all human languages. It focuses on some aspects of language and not others. It is only concerned with the sentence and its internal structure rather than any larger unit of language. It studies languages clinically, in a vacuum, as a mental object, rather than a social or psychological one. It separates language knowledge and language use rigidly. Its methodologies are criticized for not being representative of reality. It is preoccupied with the modelling of linguistic competence, not concerned with naturalistic performance. UG theorists are criticized for lacking in reliability of SL judgments. Therefore, their recent work has used range of elicitation techniques. Furthermore, it has left untouched many central areas to our understanding of SLA process. It is exclusively concerned with documenting and explaining nature of SL linguistic system and ignores the social and psychological variables. UG has been very useful for linguistic analysis. It facilitates well-defined and focused hypotheses; it is useful in not only establishing some facts about SLA, but also in explaining those facts.

UG approach is only interested in the learner as the processor of a mind that contains language; variations among different individuals are of little concern. Its primary emphasis is on language as the object of study and on what is universal within mind. It makes clear and explicit statements of the ground it aims to cover and the claims it makes. It has systematic procedures for theory evaluation and explains as well as describes at least some language phenomena. It increasingly engages with other theories in the field.

**The Cognitive Approaches to Second Language Learning (SLL)**

The Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researcher under these approaches put more emphasis on the learning component of SLL; they are interested in transition theories. Their focus is still very much on the learner as an individual. They are more interested in understanding how the human brain processes and learns new information. UG theorists were interested primarily in competence; they were not centrally concerned with how learners access linguistic knowledge in real time or what strategies are employed when an incomplete linguistic system lets the learner down? On the other hand, these are the central issues for cognitive theorists.

The two approaches of **Cognitive theorists** of SLA are:

### **1. Processing Theorists**

Those who believe that language knowledge might be ‘special’ in some way, but they are concerned to develop transition or processing theories to complement property theories. Processing approaches investigate how second language learner process linguistic information, and how this ability develops over time?

### **2. Emergentist / Constructionist**

Emergentist or Constructionist does not consider separation between property and transition theories as legitimate. They believe that you can explain both the nature of knowledge and how it is processed through general cognition principles.

Constructivists consider that the complexity of language emerges from associative learning processes being exposed to a massive and complex environment. Many of them believe that the language develops as learners move from the learning of exemplars that are committed to memory. They claim that children pick up frequent patterns they hear around them and slowly make more abstract generalization as the database of related utterances grow.

## Lesson-13

**MODELS OF SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING****Topic No: 075-079****Processing Approaches; Information Processing Models of Second Language Learning; McLaughlin's Model; Processing Approaches: Anderson's Model; Anderson's Model: Three Stages**

Processing approaches are interested in how brain's processing mechanism deal with second language. These include 1) Information processing approach, 2) Processability theory.

**1. Information processing approach** investigates how different memory stores (short-term memory, long-term memory) deal with SL information and how this information is automatized and restructured.

**2. Processability theory** looks more specifically at processing demands made by various formal aspects of second language, and implications for learnability and teachability of second language structure.

Here, we will discuss two information processing models:

- McLaughlin's Information processing model (1987, 1990)
- Anderson's Active Control of Thought (ACT\*) model (1983, 1985)

In **McLaughlin's** model, humans are viewed as autonomous and active. The mind is a general-purpose, symbol processing system. Complex behaviour is composed of simpler modular processes; processes take time so predictions about reaction time can be made. The mind is viewed as a limited-capacity processor.

Within this framework, second language learning is viewed as acquisition of a complex cognitive skill. To learn a second language is to learn a skill because various aspects of the task must be practiced and integrated into fluent performance. This requires automatization of component sub-skills. Automatization means that learning involves a shift from controlled toward automatic processing via practice. It results in constant restructuring of the linguistic system of SL learner. When second language learner seems unable to get rid of non-native-like structure despite abundant linguistic input over many years, it is called fossilization. Fossilization in this model would arise as a result of a controlled process becoming automatic prematurely.

**Anderson's** Anderson's Active Control of Thought (ACT\*) model is more wide-ranging, and the terminology is different but practice leading to automatization also plays central role. It enables declarative knowledge. Anderson posits three kinds of memory: a working memory, a declarative long-term memory, and a procedural long-term memory. This model has been criticized for insisting that all knowledge starts out in declarative form, which is clearly problematic in case of first language learner as Anderson has accepted in answering to the criticism. Anderson's model is a general cognitive model of skill acquisition. It can be applied to those aspects of SLL that require proceduralization and

automatization. According to Anderson, the move from declarative to procedural knowledge takes place in three stages.

1. The cognitive stage: a description of the procedure is learnt.
2. The associative stage: a method for performing the skill is worked out.
3. The autonomous stage: the skill becomes more and more rapid and automatic.



**Lesson-14****LEARNING STRATEGIES AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING****Topic No: 080-085****Explanations of Learning Offered; Critique; Application of ACT\* to Learning Strategies; Classification of Learning Strategies; Learning Strategies and Second Language Learning; Benefits of Cognitive Theory Application to SLL; ACT\* and Fluency Development in Second Language Acquisition**

Above mentioned three stages can be understood from an example. At the cognitive stage, the learner would learn that an –s must be added to the verb after a third person subject. At associative stage, learner would work out how to add an –s when the context requires it. In other word, he/she learns to associate an action with corresponding declarative knowledge. At the autonomous stage learners' action would become increasingly automatic to the point that the declarative knowledge may even be lost.

Contemporary SLL theorists disagree with Anderson's implied position that SL grammar is initially learnt through conscious study and application of explicit rules. There is consensus that much grammar learning takes place without conscious awareness. Some information-processing (I-P) theorists have responded to this problem by suggesting that the 'declarative knowledge' component can be subdivided into conscious and unconscious parts. Others have argued that I-P models are most helpful in explaining more peripheral strands in SLL.

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) suggest that the learning strategies are procedures undertaken by the learners to make their language learning as effective as possible. Learning strategies must not be confused with communication strategies; they do overlap but there is difference in focus. Learning strategies facilitate learning whereas communication strategies help overcoming a specific communicative problem. Learning strategies can be classified into three categories:

1. Metacognition strategies: selective attention, planning, monitoring, evaluation.
2. Cognitive strategies: rehearsal, organization, inferencing, summarizing, deducing, imagery, transfer, elaboration.
3. Social or affective strategies: co-operation, questioning for clarification, and self-talk.

Learning strategies are complex procedures applied to tasks; they may be represented as procedural knowledge, acquired through cognitive, associative and autonomous stages of learning. The strategies may be conscious in early stages of learning and later be performed without person's awareness. Thus, these have to be learnt in exactly the same way as other complex cognitive skills. Before a skill is proceduralized, it will have to compete for working memory space with other aspects of the task in hand. If learning strategies are a skill, then they can be taught and get proceduralized more quickly. This will free working memory space for other aspects of learning. O'Malley and Chamot raised a problem that teaching strategies will involve considerable time and efforts to be effective; therefore, we need long-term studies investigating the effect of strategy teaching.

General benefits of applying cognitive theory to SLA are as follows:

- Learning is an active and dynamic process in which individuals make use of a variety of information and strategic modes of processing.
- Language is a complex cognitive skill in terms of how information is stored and learnt.
- Learning a language entails a stage wise progression from initial awareness, active manipulation of information and learning processes to full automaticity in language use.
- Learning strategies parallel theoretically derived cognitive processes and have the potential to influence learning outcomes in a positive manner.

### **Anderson's Active Control of Thought (ACT\*) and Fluency Development in Second Language Acquisition**

Towell and Hawkins reject the idea that Anderson's model can account for all aspects of SLL. They use models of natural language processing in order to explain how grammatical knowledge transforms into fluent performance in second language. In order to explain why certain grammatical structures appear before others and why learners go through rigid stages in acquisition of SL, they resort to Universal Grammar approach. In order to understand how learners use this grammatical knowledge in increasingly efficient ways, Towell and Hawkins appeal to an information-processing account.

## Lesson-15

**THEORIES OF SECOND LANGUAGE PROCESSING AND CONNECTIONISM****Topic No: 086-091****Theories of Second Language Processing; Processability Theory; Teachability Hypothesis; Perceptual Saliency; Connectionism; Connectionist Approach Difference from Other Approach**

Next two theories we are going to discuss focus on the factors controlling how SL learners process the linguistic input. These theories are Processability theory and Perceptual Saliency approach.

**Processability Theory:**

Outlined by Pienemann, it aims to clarify how learners acquire computational mechanisms that operate on the linguistic knowledge they construct. It claims that we need both theory of grammar and a processing component to understand SLA. It focuses on the acquisition of the procedural skills required for processing the formal properties of second languages. Pienemann believes that language learning is gradual acquisition of computational mechanisms. Limitations in processing skills in early stage of learning prevent them from attending to some aspects of SL. The processing challenge within this framework is that learners must learn to exchange grammatical information across elements of a sentence.

**Teachability Hypothesis**

Pienemann's Processability theory explains that SL learners follow a fairly rigid route while acquiring certain grammatical structures. It implies that structures only become 'learnable' when previous steps on this acquisitional path have been acquired. According to Pienemann, learners can only operate within their Hypothesis space, constrained by available processing resources. It led him to develop "teachability hypothesis" in which he considers the pedagogical implications of the learnability or processability model. It predicts:

- Stages of acquisition cannot be skipped through formal instructions
- Instruction will be beneficial if it focuses on structures from 'the next stage'

Its most interesting aspect is the attempt to establish a link between learning and teaching.

The Perceptual Saliency approach argues that human beings perceive and organize information in certain ways, and it is perceptual saliency of linguistic information that drives the learning process forward; rather, than an innate language-specific module. We find similarity in linguistic development across children and across languages because human beings are programmed to perceive and organize information in certain way. Slobin (1979) has devised operating principles which guide children in their processing of the linguistic strings which they encounter. These principles are based on the claim that certain linguistic forms are more 'accessible' or more 'salient' to the children than others. These principles are as follows:

1. Pay attention to the end of words.
2. Linguistic elements encode relation between words.
3. Avoid exceptions.
4. Underlying semantic relations should be marked overtly and clearly.
5. Use of grammatical markers should make semantic sense.

**Connectionism:** Advances in computer technology has given new life to this approach. Connectionism or parallel distributed processing likens the brain to a computer that would consist of neural networks, complex clusters of links between information nodes. These links or connections become strengthened or weakened through activation or non-activation. Learning in this view occurs on the basis of associative process rather than construction of abstract rules. It claims that learners are sensitive to regularities in the language input and extract probabilistic patterns on the basis of these regularities. Learning occurs as these patterns become strengthened or weakened through repeated activation or non-activation. Connectionism strikingly differs from other approaches as it does not believe that the learning of rules underlies the construction of linguistic knowledge rather it happens through associative process. According to them learning is not rule-governed. Connectionism is seen as an alternative to symbolic accounts of language acquisition. It is a transition theory that explains how associative patterns emerge in learners.

## Lesson-16

**EVALUATION OF COGNITIVE APPROACHES AND FUNCTIONAL PERSPECTIVES****Topic No: 092-097****Evaluation of Cognitive Approaches to Second Language Learning: Scope and Achievements; Evaluation: Cognitivists' View of Language; Evaluation: Cognitivists' View of Language Learning; Cognitivists' View of the Language Learner; Functional/Pragmatic Perspectives on Second Language Learning; Functional Perspectives on First Language Development**

The scope of cognitivists' research varies widely from application of general models of language processing to studies using computers to stimulate acquisition of discrete grammatical phenomena. Some cognitivists specifically focus the processing mechanisms and how they develop in SLL. They believe that they also need a property theory to understand the linguistic system which will complement their transition theory. While others, adopting an emergentist or connectionist approach, see their field as the whole process of language learning. They do not separate the development of processing from development of linguistic system. Processing theorists do not say much about language itself. They concentrate on study of processing constraints operating in SLA. Whereas, connectionists believe that our mind is predisposed to look for associations between elements and create neural links between them. They see language as a set of probabilistic patterns that gets strengthened in learner's brain through repeated activation. They rely on controlled laboratory research involving experiments with artificial language or small fragments of real languages. However, controlled nature can be seen as a disadvantage. Overall, connectionist models are often criticized for their clinical and fragmentary view of language ignoring social and linguistic phenomena. They are unable to explain what the mental grammar of learner consists of and what constraints learners' hypotheses about the language system. Developmental route of SLL and acquisition of highly complex linguistic phenomena are not yet convincingly explained by these approaches.

Cognitivists primarily investigate development of processing in SL learners. To do so, psychologists use laboratory techniques to measure accurately performance indicators; while, linguists apply linguistic analysis techniques to study SL learners' productions or intuitions. Both methodologies have their advantages and disadvantages. The ultimate goal of any SLA model is better understanding of SLA process overall. This goal is much enriched by cognitive studies. These studies have also enlightened us on the processes involved in speeding up of acquisition process. Connectionists are primarily concerned with individual; they do not see learner as a social being. They are interested in mind as a processor of information rather than in specificity of the linguistic information it contains. The link they build up with neurology and neurobiology is also important. The advantages of these models over traditional symbolic models are:

- a. They are neurally inspired.
- b. They incorporate distributed representation and control of information.

- c. They are data-driven with prototypical representations.
- d. They show graceful degradation as do humans with language disorders.
- e. They are models of learning and acquisition rather than static description.

### **Functional/Pragmatic Perspectives on Second Language Learning**

The researchers who adopt this approach are centrally concerned with the ways in which SL learners set about making meaning and achieving their personal communicative goals. They emphasize the importance of learners' speech acts and how they exploit immediate social, physical and discourse context to make meaning. They argue that the meaning-making efforts are a driving force in ongoing second language development that interacts with the development of formal grammatical systems. Functionalism in linguistics is the explication and explanation of grammatical structure in which semantic and pragmatic constructs are integral.

## Lesson-17

**COGNITIVE, TEXTUAL, SOCIAL ORIENTATIONS AND FUNCTIONALISM****Topic No: 098-103****Cognitive Orientation; Textual Orientation; Social Orientation; Multifunctional Orientation; Evaluation: Scope and Achievements; Functionalism and the Nature of Inter-Language**

Cognitive orientation can be exemplified by the work of Solbin (1985) that proposed the existence of 'basic child grammar' in which children construct their own form-function relationship to reflect a child's-eye view of the world. He suggested that one of the opening wedges for grammar is the linguistic encoding of a scene in which an *agent* brings about *change of state* in an *object*.

In textual orientation central issue is to investigate the extent to which particular linguistic devices are employed to organize stretches of discourse intra-sententially as well as across broader stretches of text. At discourse level, functional linguists are interested in how both vocabulary and grammar are deployed to create textual cohesion across sequences of clauses and sentences.

Functionalist research with social orientation is interested in relationship between the development of child's formal language system and aspects of their social world. Some of this work examines children's speech acts and their relationship with lexical or grammatical choices. Other work looks more broadly at the social context in which children interact and types of speech events they are engaged in. It also seeks to link these influences to linguistic development.

The functional approaches pay attention respectively to the relations between grammatical development and prototype events, between grammar, pragmatics and text organization, and between grammar and the social world. The functional tradition is well established in SLL theory. It claims that language development is driven by pragmatic communicative needs and that the formal resources of language are elaborated to express more complex patterns of meaning. Functionalist research takes form of naturalistic case studies, mostly of adults in early stages of SLL. These studies have offered numerous rich accounts of both rate and route of naturalistic SLL. They vary in their scope of enquiries. Some adopted a 'patch' approach, studying evolution of forms or development of SL within 'time' or 'space' domain. Whereas others proposed SL 'basic variety' that represents a proto-grammar stage that all learners should pass through.

Functionalist tradition has contributed to our understanding of inter-language communication and made interesting suggestions about interactions between formal and functional development. Functionalists have demonstrated various devices which inter-language users deploy to convey meaning. They have drawn our attention to textual and discourse organization issues, and offered considerable evidence that early learners rely heavily on parataxis rather than on syntax. A continuing limitation of this approach is that most attention is given to earliest stages of development. The range of target languages investigated is also not very wide.

**Lesson-18****FUNCTIONSLISM AND INTERACTION IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING****Topic No: 104-109****Functionalism on Language Learning and Development; Functionalist View of the Language Learner; Input and Interaction in Second Language Learning; The Significance of Interaction in SLL; Input and Interaction in First Language Acquisition; Findings Relevant for SLL**

Functionalist researchers insist on gradual nature of Inter Language (IL) development and syntacticization but with possible reorganizational consequences. At the same time, most functionalists have adopted a ‘patch’ approach—working on overall utterance structure when studying the basic variety or alternatively exploring development within semantic and formal sub-systems. Functionalists argue for a multi-level approach to analysis. While their contribution at the descriptive level has been very strong and varied, their contribution to the explanation of IL development is limited. It clearly shows how effective a basic variety can be in meeting immediate communication needs, but it is less clearly established that communicative need is the primary driver for syntacticization and development beyond the basic variety. Functionalist research largely concentrates on analysis of learners’ inter-language output and pays relatively less attention to input and even interaction.

Functionalist research has mostly concerned itself with naturalistic adult learners acquiring a socially dominant target language (TL) in the workplace and other non-domestic settings. It has conducted extensive comparative cross-language studies but has been mainly interested in the discovery of universal rather than language-specific characteristics of the learning process. Functionalist research on emergence of SL has concerned itself with instructed learner. These learners are seen more successful in acquiring morphology. Though functionalists agree that instruction works by increasing acquisition rate and pushing along the acquisitional route, yet it does not explicitly explain the reason.

**Input and Interaction in Second Language Acquisition**

The main focus here is directly on the role of environmental language use in promoting SLL in the form of input received by SL learner, SL output produced by learner, and SL interaction between learner and some other conversation partner. ‘Interactionist’ perspective mostly does not challenge the concepts of autonomous language module or cognitive mechanisms at work within the individual learner. Input hypothesis claims that comprehensive input is the only necessary condition for language learning to take place provided that learner pays attention to it. It is further directed toward interaction hypothesis and output hypothesis. Interactions are not a simple one-directional source of target language input feeding into the learner’s presumed internal acquisition device. Instead, when learners engage with their internal interlocutor in negotiations around meaning, input’s nature might be qualitatively changed. The more input is queried, recycled and paraphrased, the greater its potential usefulness as input gets because it should become increasingly well-targeted to particular developmental needs.



Merrill Swain's (1985, 1995) study with immersion students led her to question the claim that comprehensible SL input was sufficient to ensure inter-language development. So she advanced her claims called 'Output Hypothesis.' Swain argued that students often succeed in comprehending second language (SL) text while only partly processing them. SL production (output) really forces learners to undertake complete grammatical processing. Thus, it drives forward most effectively the development of SL syntax and morphology.

When we examine the role of input and interaction in first language acquisition, we come to know that adults commonly use 'special' speech styles when talking with young children. This is called 'baby talk' which might be helpful to language acquisition. But such child-directed speech (CDS) has undergone criticism from UG theorists. For instance, Noam Chomsky described the notion that aspects of first language acquisition could be related to the input as 'absurd.' In turn, some child language specialists criticized parameter-setting models of acquisition as overly deterministic and ignoring substantial evidence of probabilistic learning from 'noisy' input. Interactionists such as Gallaway and Richard (1994) have pointed out the ways in which CDS might facilitate language acquisition. These include: managing attention, promoting positive affect facilitating segmentation, feedback, correction models, reducing processing load, encouraging conversational participation, and explicit teaching of social routines. However, interactionists are cautious about any possible contribution of CDS to language acquisition. Some clear findings which are also relevant to SLL are:

1. Mostly CDS studies were carried out in English-speaking, middle-class family context in developed countries. In such context, CDS is typically semantically contingent. Also, explicit formal corrections of child's production are unusual but recasts are common which offer useful negative evidence.
2. There is evidence for some specific claims about relationship of particular formal characteristics of CDS and children's developing control of particular construction. However, such relationships are complex and dependent on precise developmental stage reached by the individual child.
3. Caretakers are neither motivated by any prime language-teaching goal nor are their speech adapted to model target grammar. Instead, it is derived from the communicative goal of engaging in conversation with a less competent partner, and sustaining and directing their attention.
4. Cross-cultural studies of interaction revealed that styles of CDS in middle class Anglophone societies are far from universal where infants are not seen as conversational partner. They strongly challenge environmentalist explanations of language learning that finely tuned CDS is actually necessary.

**Lesson-19****INPUT AND INTERACTION IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION****Topic No: 110-115****An Overview of the Field; Input in Second Language Acquisition: Krashen's Input Hypothesis; Critique of Krashen's Input Hypothesis; Interaction Hypothesis and Others; Interaction in Second Language Acquisition; Long's 'Interaction Hypothesis'**

Cultures where child directed speech (CDS) of Western type is rare or absent, children's early utterances frequently include partial imitation and rote-learned segments. Cross cultural study of child language development supports the idea that children will only learn to talk in an environment which they can make some sense of. On the other hand, they can learn to talk in a much wider variety of environments (Lieven, 1994). The normally developing child is well buffered against variation in the input. Buffering implies either small amount of social support or any of several different environmental events (Snow, 1994). Researchers agree that multi-dimensional models of acquisition are necessary, and the way forward in clarifying how input and interaction may be facilitating language acquisition lies at present in close.

Comprehensible input is both necessary and sufficient for SLL to take place. Humans acquire language in only one way – by understanding or by receiving 'comprehensive input.' Speaking is a result of acquisition, not its cause. If input is understood, there is enough of it, the necessary grammar is automatically provided.

**Critique**

Input hypothesis is supported by rather little empirical evidence and is not easily testable. The concepts of 'understanding' and 'noticing gap' are not clearly operationalized and constantly proposed. The processes whereby language in social context is analyzed and new elements are identified and processed by language acquisition device are imprecise.

Among the research traditions that took inspiration from Krashen's proposals are:

1. The Interaction hypothesis
2. The Output hypothesis

Some alternative psycholinguistic theories and claims are:

3. Noticing hypothesis
4. Input processing hypothesis
5. Autonomous induction hypothesis

**Interaction in Second Language Acquisition**

Various studies during 1970s and 1980s demonstrated that the talk addressed to learners was typically grammatically regular but somewhat simplified linguistically. The degree of simplification

reported in many descriptive studies was puzzlingly variable. Also, these studies stopped short at description of distinctive features of 'Foreigner Talk Discourse.' Long proposed a more systematic approach to linking features of 'environmental' language, and learners' second language. Long proposed his Interaction hypothesis as an extension of Krashen's original Input hypothesis. Following on Long's original studies, many others used a similar taxonomy and taught us a good deal about the types of task that are likely to promote extensive negotiation of meaning, inside and outside the classroom. They also demonstrated that negotiation of meaning occurs between non-native speaker peers as well as between more fluent and less fluent speakers, given the right task conditions.

**Lesson-20****CONSCIOUSNESS RAISING, NEGATIVE FEEDBACK AND NEGATIVE EVIDENCE****Topic No: 116-121****Noticing, Consciousness Raising and Attention; Rethinking the Interaction Hypothesis; Output in Second Language Acquisition; Feedback, Recasts and Negative Evidence: First Language Acquisition; Negative Feedback and Recasts; Negative Feedback and Recasts in the Second Language Classroom**

Mackey's (1999) study provided the clearest evidence that taking part in interaction can facilitate second language development. However, somewhat contradictory findings show a need for stronger theoretical models clarifying the claimed link between interaction and acquisition. These researchers appealed to add the ideas of noticing, consciousness-raising, attention etc. to acquisition. Earlier interactionist research was criticized for being one-sidedly pre-occupied with functional aspects of SL interaction and neglecting linguistic theory. Long's eventual reformulation of interaction hypothesis places more emphasis on linking features of input and the linguistic environment with 'learner-internal factors' and explaining how such linkages may facilitate subsequent language development. This new version highlights the possible contribution of negative evidence to SLL and clarifies the processes by which input becomes intake through introducing the notion of 'selective attention.'

**Output Hypothesis**

Many researchers consider output as necessary to increase fluency and emphasize on practice. However, output hypothesis by Swain (1985, 1995) goes beyond this 'practice' function and proposes three further functions for learner output:

- The noticing/ triggering function (conscious-rising role)
- The hypothesis-testing function
- The metalinguistic function (reflective role)

Swain believes that the activity of producing target language may push the learner to become aware of gaps and problems in their current SL system, provide them with the opportunities to reflect on, discuss and analyze problems explicitly and offer opportunities to experiment with new structures and forms.

**Feedback, Recasts, and Negative Evidence in First Language Acquisition**

These are increasingly important topic in debates. Theorists arguing for a strongly Innatist Model claimed that language is simply not learnable from normal input that provides positive evidence and lacks negative evidence. Without negative evidence, learners cannot discover the limits and boundaries of the language system. On the other hand, Nativists finds the answer in some form of Universal Grammar to eliminate many possible generalizations about language structure that are compatible with the input received but are actually incorrect.

We previously saw that negative evidence is much more prevalent in child-directed speech. Caretakers' recasts offer implicit negative evidence about children's interim grammatical hypotheses. It remains still less clear whether negative evidence is necessary for the acquisition of core aspects of language or not.

In light of the first language debate, related questions can be asked about the role of negative evidence in SLL, like, to what extent does the indirect negative evidence influence SL learners? And to what extent do they notice and make use of this evidence? To explore these questions, Oliver's (1995) study provides significant findings. It indicated that more than 60% of the errors by non-native speaker children received negative feedback from their native speaker partners; the most frequent were negotiations of some kind. Recasts usually occurred in response to utterances containing single errors in association with particular types of grammar mistakes.

### **Negative Feedback and Recasts in the Second Language Classroom**

Further observational studies examined the occurrence, and apparent effects of negative feedback in SL classroom. For instance, Lyster and colleagues (1997) noted that recasts were the most common type of feedback. However, recasts were much less likely to lead to immediate self-correction by the students. A further analysis reported that feedback provided by the teachers varied according to the type of error that had been made. Teachers were more likely to respond to lexical errors with negotiation (e.g. clarification requests), whereas they respond to grammatical and phonological errors with recasts. Recasts were seen as an effective strategy in case of phonological error. However, recasting was much less effective for repair of grammatical mistakes. The study suggested that more interactive feedback modes would be more effective in pushing learners to amend their hypotheses about SL grammar as well as vocabulary.

## Lesson-21

**INPUT PROCESSING AND AUTONOMOUS INDUCTION THEORY****Topic No: 122-127****Attention, Consciousness-raising and 'Focus on Form'; Theorizing Input and Interaction Research; Input Processing; Input Processing: Critique; Autonomous Induction Theory; Autonomous Induction Theory: Critique**

Researchers have developed the idea that the amount of attention may influence the extent to which SL input and interaction actually produce SL intake. Schmidt (1990, 1994, 2001) has been most influential in promoting this view. He is careful to distinguish among different types of attention. He uses the term 'noticing' to refer to the process of bringing some stimulus into focal attention and registering its simple occurrence, whether voluntarily or involuntarily. He reserves the terms 'understanding' and 'awareness' for explicit knowledge: 'awareness of a rule or generalization.' Schmidt is optimistic about the contribution of both kinds of attention. His main evidence supports the significance of noticing. He argued that noticing is the necessary and sufficient condition for conversion of input to intake for learning; later, he modified this view to the claim that: more noticing leads to more learning.

**Accuracy of Recast Reproduction (Philip, 2003)**

The accuracy of recast reproduction depends on the following factors:

1. Learners' language level
2. Length of the recast
3. Number of corrections

Survey of input, output, and interaction research showed descriptive nature of research; attempts to link different types of second language usage with SLL have produced mixed results. Many commentators have argued that stronger theorizing is required for interaction studies to progress. Interactionist researchers are increasingly interested in modelling internal linguistic and psycholinguistic factors. However, no detailed models of language processing have been proposed by any of interactionist researchers. Here, we will briefly discuss two models: Input processing theory and Autonomous induction theory.

Input Processing theory by Bill Van Patten and associates (1996, 2002) is well known because of an associated research program on language pedagogy, 'processing instruction.' It attempts to explain how environmental second language input becomes converted into intake. It does not offer a complete model of these processes; instead, it offers a set of 'principles' to explain apparent failure of second language to completely process the linguistic forms encountered in SL input.

**Input Processing Principles**

**Principle No.1:** Learners have preferences for semantic processing over morphological processing.

**Example:** ‘We travelled by train yesterday.’

**Principle No. 2:** The learners have a preference for beginning and ending words.

**Example:** Learners give importance to the beginning and ending words of recast/feedback.

This approach has led to a series of pedagogical experiments. Input processing theory is primarily focused on explaining the shortcuts and restricted processing strategies which learners seem to use.

### **Intake in Light of Input Processing Theory by Bill Van Patten**

1. Linguistic data is actually processed from the input.
2. It is held in working memory for further processing.
3. Input processing theory does not offer a complete model of successful processing input.
4. It offers a set of principles.
5. It explains the apparent failures of learners to process the input.

Autonomous Induction theory by Suzanne Carroll (2000) offers a much more complete and ambitious model of the above mentioned processes. According to Carroll, understanding of SLA processes requires an adequate theory of the following phenomena:

1. Representation of language in the mind
2. How the language is processed both receptively and productively?
3. How our mental representations of language can be changed to process the environmental language we encounter?

Carroll rejects parameter (re)setting as a totally inadequate metaphor. Instead, she proposes inductive learning (i-learning). Inductive learning refers to learning by generalization from examples. Carroll challenges the claim that increased comprehension can lead to identification and acquisition in a sequential manner. According to her, it is logically impossible. Unless enough formal analysis is done so that elements are identified in the speech stimulus, there is no way of generating interpretation of its meaning. Carroll’s model is complex. It’s been criticized for its neglect of the detail of language processing which converts language stimuli into interpretable input.

## Lesson-22

**INTERACTIONIST APPROACH AND SOCIOCULTURAL THEORY****Topic No: 128-133****Evaluation: The Scope of Interactionist Approach; Achievements of Interactionist Research; Limitations of Interactionist Approach; Socio-Cultural Perspectives On Second Language Learning; Sociocultural Theory; Mediation and Mediated Learning**

Input, Output, and Interaction hypotheses have led to very active strands of empirical research. The first phase of research was inclined toward documenting phenomenon of meaning negotiation. The second phase developed in the following ways:

- a) Relating environmental factors in language learning to linguistic theory, particularly to Universal Grammar
- b) Interest in the significance of negative evidence
- c) Increased attention to information processing theory and the complications involved in conversion of environmental language firstly into input and subsequently into intake

When we look at the achievements of this tradition, it has been shown that:

- Native speaker and non-native speaker interlocutors can and will work actively to achieve mutual understanding.
- Negotiations involve both linguistic and interactional modifications, which together offer opportunities to ‘notice’ aspects of target language form, whether from positive or negative evidence.
- Non-native speaker participants in ‘negotiations for meaning’ can’t attend to, take up, and use language items made available to them by native speaker interlocutors.
- Learners receiving negative feedback, relating to particular target language structures, can be significantly advantaged when later tested on those structures.

**Limitations of Interactionist Approach**

Achievements of this tradition are still constrained by a number of important limitations, such as:

1. Work on interaction has been carried out within a Western or Anglophone educational setting. More cross-cultural studies are still required before any claims can be made that ‘negotiation for meaning’ is a universal phenomenon.
2. Researchers in Input or Interactionist tradition generally accept that SLA must be the result of interaction between environmental stimuli, a learner-internal language system, and some language-specific language capabilities. Attempts at modelling this interaction are mostly still very fragmentary and incomplete.
3. There are still not many studies that focus on particular language structures, tracking them through processes of instruction, negotiation, and output or recasting.



4. There is lack of studies that document learners' use and control of these items.  
It is still not in position to generalize or make powerful predictions about likely usefulness of interaction in domains of variability.

### **Socio-cultural Perspectives on Second Language Learning**

The theorists who advocate this perspective view language learning in essentially social terms. They claim that target language interaction cannot be viewed simply as a source of 'input' for autonomous and internal learning mechanisms; rather, it plays more central role in learning. This theory was originally presented by Soviet developmental psychologist Vygotsky who argued that humans do not act directly on physical world but rely on tools and labour activity, use symbolic tools or signs to mediate, and regulate their relationships with others.

### **Vygotsky's Leading Supporters**

Following were the leading supporters of the Soviet theorist Lev Semeonovich Vygotsky:

1. Jerome Bruner
2. James Wertsch
3. Barbara Rogoff
4. James Lantolf
5. Mercer
6. Wells

From this point of view, learning is also a **mediated process**. It is mediated partly through learners' developing use and control of mental tools. It is also seen as socially mediated, that is dependent on face-to-face interaction and shared processes.

## Lesson-23

**ASPECTS OF SOCIOCULTURAL THEORY****Topic No: 134-139****Other Aspects of Sociocultural Theory; Zone of Proximal Development; Scaffolding; Self-Regulation; Learning as Social Activity; Private and Inner Speech**

Self-regulation is the capability of autonomous functioning that mature and skilled individual possess; whereas, children or unskilled individual learn under guidance of other more skilled individuals through a process of *other-regulation*, mediated through language. Thus, successful learning involves a shift from collaborative inter-mental activity to autonomous intra-mental activity. The process of supportive dialogue that prompts them through successive steps of a problem is known as ‘scaffolding’. The domain where learning can most productively take place is named as the ‘Zone of Proximal Development’. This is a domain where learner is not yet capable of independent functioning but can achieve the desired outcome through relevant scaffolding. Scaffolding has following functions:

- Recruiting interest in the task
- Simplifying the task
- Maintaining pursuit of the goal
- Marking critical features and discrepancies between what has been produced and the ideal solution
- Controlling frustration during problem solving
- Demonstrating an idealized version of the act to be performed

Learning is first seen as social, then individual consciousness and conceptual development are seen firstly as inter-mental phenomena; later individuals develop their own consciousness. Language is the prime symbolic mediating tool for this development. Humans remain capable of learning throughout their life, and local learning process for more mature individuals acquiring new knowledge or skills is viewed as essentially the same. This means that new concepts are also acquired through social or interactional means.

**Principles of Socio-cultural Theory across Time Scales**

1. **Phylogenesis** is the learning that happens across different human races across different periods of time.
2. **Microgenesis** is the description of how humans learn throughout their life.
3. **Ontogenesis** is the learning that infants pass through in the course of their early development.

Young children are well known to engage in **private speech**, talk to and for themselves rather than for external conversational partners. This private speech in classic Piagetian theory is seen as an evidence of children’s **egocentrism**, whereas socio-cultural theory interprets it as an evidence of

children's growing ability to regulate their own behavior. For Vygotsky, **private speech** eventually becomes **inner speech**, a use of language to regulate internal thought without any external articulation.

## Lesson-24

**ACTIVITY THEORY, PRIVATE SPEECH AND SCAFFOLDING****Topic No: 140-145****Activity Theory; Applications of Socio-Cultural Theory to Second Language Learning; Private Speech and Self-Regulation in Second Language; Types of Private speech and SLL; Activity Theory and Small Group Interaction; Scaffolding and Second Language Learning in the Zone of Proximal Development**

Activity theory comprises a series of proposals for the social context within which individual learning takes place. Activity is defined in terms of sociocultural settings in which collaborative interaction, inter-subjectivity, and assisted performance occur. It contains a subject, an object, actions, and operations. Actions are always goal-directed; different actions or strategies may be taken to achieve the same goal. Operational level of activity is the way an action is carried out and depends on the conditions under which actions are executed.

Socio-cultural perspective sees early language learning as a process of meaning-making in collaborative activity with other members of a given culture. Thus, language itself develops as a ‘tool’ for making meaning. Similarly, second language learner has an opportunity to create yet more tools and new ways of meaning through collaborative activity with other users of target second language. The radically different view challenges the compartmentalization of social and psychological aspects of language learning. The concept of microgenesis of new language forms disputes the distinctions between surface performance and underlying competence. The concept of Zone of Proximal Development links processes of instruction, organized learning, and ‘naturalistic’ development or acquisition. It assumes that knowledge is constructed through collaborative activity and then appropriated by the learners, seen as active agents in their own development.

The aspect of *private speech* has been regularly noted in naturalistic studies of child SLA; however, their significance has been variously interpreted. In Vygotskian perspective, it provides evidence about the role of language in problem solving, self-regulation, and appropriation. Early studies of private speech worked with data elicited from older learners in semi-controlled settings, while one of the earliest studies to apply Vygotskian theory to SLL was critical of *schema theories* of narrative and information processing models of communication.

Three main types of second language private speeches were identified by Ohta (2001), repetition, vicarious responses, and manipulation. Vygotskian theorists of SLL are generally critical of ‘transmission’ models of communication, input, and interactional models of language learning in which ‘negotiation of meaning’ is central. Activity theory strongly argues for the distinctive nature of individual interactions as experienced by the participants. According to it, individuals’ personal goals, entry level of knowledge, and skill may vary as well as being subject to change in course of the task itself.

## Lesson-25

**EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE AND SOCIO-CULTURAL LEARNING****Topic No: 146-151****Empirical Evidence; Evaluation of Sociocultural Theory: Scope; Socio-cultural Interpretations of Language; The Socio-Cultural View of (Language) Learning; Sociolinguistic Perspectives to SLL; Variability in Language Use**

Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) conducted a study to examine SL development during scaffolded teacher-student talk. Researchers looked for increased accuracy over time, evidence of students' developing capacity to self-correct and reducing dependency on other-regulation by the tutor. The researchers argued that the reduced need for other-regulation constituted evidence for microgenetic development within the learner's ZPD.

Socio-cultural theory is relatively newcomer to the field. Its distinctive features are:

1. It rejects conventional separation between social and psychological aspects of cognition and development.
2. It also rejects the classic view of language as a formal abstract system that is distinct from language use.
3. Learning is seen as a social and inter-mental activity taking place in the ZPD which precedes individual development.

These are challenging ideas for a second language research community accustomed to the Chomskian distinction between language competence and performance and psycho-linguistic assumptions. However, these research approaches are affected by difficulties in developing causal explanations and generalizations through naturalistic research. Researchers working in this tradition are aware of these problems and have tried to address them.

Socio-cultural theory views language as a 'tool for thought.' It is critical of 'transmission' theories of communication. Dialogic communication is seen as central to the joint construction of knowledge. Private speech and meta-statement are values used positively as instruments for self-regulation. However, it does not offer any thorough or detailed view of the nature of language as a system. It lacks a 'property theory.'

**Sociolinguistic Perspectives to SLL**

Sociolinguistics or the study of language in use is a diverse field with multiple theoretical perspectives. Socially patterned variation in language use is one of its major themes. Sociolinguists are interested in explaining why we speak differently in different social contexts.

## Lesson-26

**SECOND LANGUAGE SOCIALIZATION AND IDENTITY  
CONSTRUCTION****Topic No: 152-157****Second Language Socialization; Communities of Practice and Situated Second Language Learning; Empirical Studies of Second Language Learning as a Situated Social Practice; Power Relations and Opportunities for Second Language Learning; SLA and Identity Construction; Adult Transformations of Identity**

Researchers in socialization believe that language and culture are not separable. They are acquired together, each supporting the development of the other. Meanings and functions are socio-culturally organized; linguistic knowledge is embedded in sociocultural knowledge; whereas, understanding of social organization of everyday life is acquired through language. A language socialization perspective predicts that there will be structured strategic relationship between language development and ‘culturally organized situations of use.’

The communities of practice are an aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavor and this is different from the traditional community. Their practices emerge in the course of this mutual endeavor. The social structure of communities and the power relations obtaining within them define the learning possibilities available to the members.

The ideas of socially situated learning through participation in communities of practice were used to study SL development among both children and adults. The most obvious application was to consider the classroom as a community of practice.

Another important aspect that was investigated was the relations of power impact on language learning and teaching. It revealed that understanding is an interactive process that is mutually constructed in the course of inference by all participants in an encounter.

The concept of social identity has been borrowed in SLL studies from social psychology. Social identity is the sense of ‘belonging’ to a particular social group, whether defined by ethnicity, by language, or any other means. This concept has been criticized for being too static and too focused on the individual. Norton’s (2000) longitudinal study explored changes in social identity over time, particularly, their struggle to achieve the right to speak in SL settings. The study presented different examples, such as a young worker Eva’s transformation from an unskilled immigrant with no right to speak to multicultural citizen possessing the power to impose reception.

## Lesson-27

**INVESTMENT AND SOCIAL IDENTITIES IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION****Topic No: 158-163****Adolescents, SLA and Identity; Autobiographical Narrative; Affect and Investment in SLA; Investment and Social Identities; Evaluation of Sociolinguistics Approach: Scope; Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Inter-language**

Ethnographic studies of SL learners produced complex and dynamic portraits such as Chinese immigrants in USA high school being stuck in conflicting demands by multiple discourses in their environment. These included colonialist or racialized discourses positioning them as deficient and backward, 'model minority' discourses which celebrated economic success of Asian Americans and Chinese cultural-nationalist discourses which defined them 'being Chinese', etc. Individual students managed their identities differently in this complex environment with different consequences for their ambitions and success in learning English oral or literacy skills.

Pavlenko's (1998) analysis of autobiographical narratives revealed that many female SL users accepted second language English as the language that gives them enough freedom to be the kind of women they would like to be, because of the positive association between American English and feminist discourses. Norton (2000) shows that learners' motivation to succeed in SLL and the amount of effort they are willing to 'invest' are closely related to the social identities they were aiming to construct over time.

In quantitative strand of SLL variation, we have seen that sociolinguistic factors play an important role of increasing importance as learners become more advanced, but much variability must be attributed primarily to the psycholinguistic influences. The other strands, embedded in their social context, deal with SLL in a broader way. This work is qualitative and interpretive in nature and frequently involves case studies, focus on the personal qualities and ambitions of the learner, and its own social contribution to the learning context. Valuable concepts like 'community of practice' were introduced to the field. However, more attention is required for the linguistic detail of learning path or cognitive processes involved. One of the obvious strengths of sociolinguistic tradition in SLA is the rich accounts offered for cross-cultural second language communication.

**Lesson-28****SOCIOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE ON LANGUAGE LEARNING AND  
SECOND LANGUAGE RESEARCH****Topic No: 164-169****Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Language Learning; Sociolinguistic Perspective on Language Learner; One Theory or Many; Achievements of SLA Research; Future Directions for SLL Research; SLA Research and Language Education**

Sociolinguistically-oriented research has provided rich descriptions of the context for language learning and the speech events. Second language ethnographers believed that learning is a collaborative affair and language knowledge is socially constructed through interaction. They have paid less attention than socio-cultural theorists to the linguistic detail of expert or novice interaction or to ‘microgenesis’ of new language forms in learner’s SL repertoire. On the other hand, current ethnographies of SL communication and language socialization offer rich evidence of the influence of learning context and learner’s evolving style of engagement with it. SL ethnographers take a more rounded view of the learner as a social being; thus, dimensions as gender and ethnicity are seen as significant for language learning success.

Different research groups are pursuing theoretical agendas by focusing on different parts of the total language learning process. While many emphasize modelling of learners’ grammars as core issue, others focus on language processing or on SL interaction. Each tradition has developed its cluster of specialized research procedures. New perspectives emerge without displacing the established ones. On the whole, the grand synthesizing theories have not received general support. Rather, a process of theory reduction and consolidation is proposed.

**Achievements**

From a linguistic perspective, continuing application of UG has led to sophisticated and complex range of proposals. The UG approach has also been instrumental in providing sharper linguistic description of the learner’s language and has helped to better document the linguistic route.

From a cognitive perspective, main developments have been the application of information processing models to grammar learning domains. The connectionist models radically challenge traditional thinking in grammar learning. The functionalist tradition added substantially to our understanding of the course of SL development. Variationist studies suggest that much second language variability can be accounted for by evolving links between form and function.

The sociolinguistic perspective tells us that learners’ engagement in SL interaction is influenced by power relations and other cultural factors which are not inferably fixed but can be negotiated as learners build new identities. Interactionist and socio-cultural research show how ongoing character of SL interaction can systematically affect learning opportunities it makes available.



Future directions for SL research indicated here are: continuing reflexes of evolving linguistic thinking in SL research, ongoing application of general learning theories derived from cognitive psychology, attempts to cross-refer between different strands within SLA, and systematic examination of relations between different learning ‘modules.’

The roots of theorizing about SLL in reform movements are connected to the practical business of language teaching. It has been argued that the ‘scientific’ findings of second language acquisition should guide the practices of classroom teachers. Present SLA research offers a rich variety of concepts and descriptive accounts, facilitates teachers in making better pedagogic choices, and discusses the role of recasts and negative evidence. The sub-field of research on ‘instructed second language acquisition’ plays a special role in addressing teachers’ concerns. It may offer opportunities for more direct involvement of teachers as research partners. The researchers thus have a continuing responsibility to make their findings and interpretations as intelligible as possible to a wider professional audience.

## Lesson-29

**INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND THE ROLE OF L1 IN L2 LEARNING****Topic No: 170-175****Rethinking the Role of the First Language in Second Language Learning; Institutional Policies; The Context of Pakistan; The Focus of the Paper; Key Constructs and the Map; The Role of L1 in L2 Learning: Background**

The role of L1 in L2 learning has been a subject of much research and debate. Shifting paradigms in the debate are discussed in this paper, and teachers and educators are invited to rethink and restructure second language teaching toward more facilitative account of the role of L1. It points out the institutional policy of completely excluding learners' home or first language from SL classrooms in the context of elite private schools and universities in Pakistan. This policy is driven by the assumption that maximum L2 input will force learners to eventually think in L2 and that the habit of using L1 interferes and delays L2 learning. The evidence informs that Pakistani elite schools frequently punish, fine, or humiliate students for speaking Urdu or a home language in English classrooms. Despite much emerging evidence of the positive role of L1, its role is condemned in L2 classrooms. This practice not only infests the learners' identities with a sense of shame but also excludes a majority of students from meaningful learning. The paper invites a rethinking of the role of L1 in L2 classrooms from two **theoretical perspectives**:

**(i) Sociocultural theory of learning****(ii) Language awareness (LA) theory of pedagogy**

In the 1950s, L1 was seen as negative interference and prime cause of the learners' errors by the behaviourists. Robert Lado's Contrastive Analysis (CA) claimed that L1 interference was the main impediment toward L2 learning. It emphasized that similar aspects of L1 facilitate L2 learning, while dissimilar aspects cause difficulty. Therefore, a parallel study of two languages could predict learner errors in L2. Marton (1981) pointed out the learners' tendency to revert to their 'strong and persistent habit' of expressing in L1 that leads toward retroactive inhibition. He denied any sort of peaceful coexistence between the two language systems in the learner.

**Lesson-30****THE FACILITATIVE ROLE OF L1****Topic No: 176-181****The Problem with Contrastive Analysis; Shift Toward the Facilitative Role of L1; The When and How of L1 Transfer to SLL; Manifestation of L1 Transfer to SLL; Recognition of Facilitative Role of L1; L1 in Classrooms**

CA was strongly criticized by Chomsky (1959). CA had failed to predict the learner errors accurately as studies confirmed that L1 was not a major source of learner errors in L2. Dulay and Burt presented a study in 1974 in which they:

1. Challenged the very assumptions of CA.
2. Marginalized the role of L1 in L2 learning.
3. Presented the concept of 'creative construction of language'.
4. Emphasized that notion of 'interference' was built on the negative transfer of L1.
5. Argued that CA led to 'unlearning the habit of L1' – not the aim of L2 learning.
6. Criticized the lack of distinction between children and adults in the analysis as evidence was taken from adult settings.

As theorists revisited the role of L1 in L2 learning, there was a significant shift toward its facilitative role. New concepts of 'learner syllabus,' 'transitional competence,' 'idiosyncratic dialect,' 'approximative system', and 'inter-language' were introduced.

**Transitional Competence**

The first language acts as facilitator in second language learning and it helps the second language in terms of transition. While learning a second language, the L2 learners rely on their first language. They use their old knowledge to build new structures. Hence, the first language was seen as 'transitional competence.'

**Example**

For example, a new computer comes in the market and we relate it with a computer that we know, like an iPad. We say 'this new computer is just like an iPad.' That is how we start making sense of the new computer. It works the same for L2 learning.

**Idiosyncratic Dialect**

The language (L2) that the learners use while learning the second language can be identified as idiosyncratic dialect. It is not the target language; it is simply another language.

## Approximative System

Approximative system is a system of L2 that is near the target language. It is almost like the target language but not exactly like the target language.

## Inter-language

It is not essential that all language L2 learners speak like natives. The language (L2) that the L2 learners speak while learning L2 is known as 'Inter-language.' It is not the target language but a language in its own right.

Selinker (1972) described L1 'transfer' as the first of five processes at work in learners' inter-language. Corder (1981) suggested that L1 basic grammar is the starting point of this continuum and L1 transfer is a learner strategy for formulating hypothesis about L2, not resulting from the negative transfer but from borrowing. It reformulated the concept of transfer as 'intercession.' Research focus was shifted to when and how of transfer rather than if. It was suggested that certain similarities may lead to negative transfer; these similarities can also lead to fossilization and 'retardation' of L2 development. Corder suggests that borrowing from L1 would be positive in case of close similarities between both languages and would lead to errors if only moderately similar. Jackson (1987) asserts that interference occurs in proportion to the contrast between the two languages. According to Kellerman (1983), the complexity of transfer depends upon the interaction of learner's perception of distance from L1 and the degree of markedness in L1. Zobl (1982) emphasizes that L1 can accelerate or inhibit the developmental sequence of L2 learning but cannot alter it.

Mainly the role of L1 transfer is regarded as facilitative in terms of universal grammar. It is also suggested that L2 learners can only approach L2 through the parameters set for their L1. Corder finds it 'predominantly heuristic' and facilitative in the 'process of discovery' upon which the learning and elaboration of SL must proceed. Many methodologists endorse 'systematic' use of L1 in L2 classrooms, urging a 'paradigm shift' in L2 classrooms. It is argued that many teachers intuitively make use of L1 to ensure comprehension and meaningful involvement. There is a need to legitimize judicious use of L1 in L2 classrooms so that teachers can get rid of the guilt and conflict they feel with its use. Cook (2001) suggests that teachers should use L1 in view of four factors: 'efficiency,' 'learning,' 'naturalness,' and 'relevance.'

## Lesson-31

**DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF L1****Topic No: 182-187****Sociocultural Theory of Learning and L1; Role of L1 in Mediation; Scaffolding and L1; L1 and Zone of Proximal Development; L1 and Deep Processing of Knowledge; The Role of Inner Speech**

Sociocultural theory emphasizes that there is a crucial link between mental processes and sociocultural settings. It asserts that experimental or instructional manipulation can't deflect learner's overpowering and transformative agency. This agency embedded in their personal histories inevitably becomes involved in their learning process. The theory argues that the primary elements that promote learning and development are social by nature and meaningful learning occurs in interaction. L1 of learners is an important tool to facilitate interaction and make learning meaningful. The role of L1 in L2 learning from a sociocultural perspective can be argued through discussion of its basic concepts: mediation, scaffolding in the ZPD, and inner speech.

The sociocultural concept of **mediation** holds that humans interact through signs which are culturally and historically determined and act as psychological or physical tools. Learning is mediated as learners co-construct meanings through these tools, of which language is the most important. Language in this verbally mediated interaction supports memory and enhances its functional relationship with speech. It enables learner to comprehend, process and use knowledge. L1 remains the only available tool as they struggle to learn L2 since systems and structures of L2 have not been acquired.

**Scaffolding** is a dialogic process that assists learners to move from 'other regulation' to 'self-regulation.' It is a process of supportive dialogue that directs the learners through successive steps of a problem and enables them to achieve higher linguistic performance that was originally beyond them. Language mediates scaffolding of the learner within Zone of Proximal development (ZPD). First language (L1) assists to establish ZPD of the learner and ensures scaffolding by affording dialogic opportunities for 'expansion of established knowledge.' This concept is strikingly different from Krashen's (1982) input concept that perceives learner receiving input as a passive listening body. The concept of ZPD and scaffolding are social practices of assistance that shape, construct, and influence learning in which learner actively participates. In this, the value of L1 cannot be underestimated as it mediates mutual problem-solving and interaction.

*Inner speech* is the third fundamental tool in learning conceptualized by sociocultural theory. It assists in regulating internal thought, managing actions, appropriating and systematizing information, and carrying out meta-cognitive activities. It emerges when the learner faces difficulty and supports them in effective manipulation of the task. It works as dominant mode of verbal thought and remains a central fixture governing our higher mental functions.

**Lesson-32****LANGUAGE AWARENESS AND L1****Topic No: 188-193****L1 and the Role in Inner Speech; Language Awareness; Language Awareness and L1; L1 and Interface Between Acquisition and Learning; L1 and Input Enhancement; LA as Interface Between L1 and L2**

Learners are more likely to switch to first language (L1) in their inner speech when confronted with a difficult task. In the early development stages, learners have to resort to L1-the only available resource to organize and process new information. This resorting is critical for the learners to understand, contextualize, and respond to new knowledge. Encouraging them to use L1 inner speech allows them the crucial time and space to develop their inner speech in second language (L2), until they are able to manipulate tools of both languages. L1 facilitates self-regulation functions. It maintains the vital dialect relationship between speech and thought. Hence, it is best utilized rather than denied existence in L2 classrooms.

**Language Awareness (LA)**

**Language Awareness (LA)** pedagogical theory is suggested as complementary to communicative language teaching for its unique stance between L1 and L2. It accords value to learners' social background and their L1 and capitalizes learners' knowledge and experience of L1. It emphasizes persons' sensitivity and conscious awareness of language's nature and role in human life. LA empowers the learners to consolidate and systemize knowledge of L2 and become conscious of the relationship between different languages. It aims to enhance communicative effectiveness in their L1 as well as L2 by cultivating understanding of cross cultural, cross linguistic differences and influences in different modes of manifestation.

LA is predicated on the assumption of interface between acquisition and learning. It believes that explicit instruction and focus on form leads to L2 acquisition. Once consciousness of particular feature is raised through formal instruction, learners continue to remain aware of the feature and notice it. Taking L1 point of departure in discussion, LA raises consciousness about L2 as learners are encouraged to talk about the language. This meta-talk that encourages reflection is expected to be a pedagogical mean to ensure that other language acquisition process operates. Raising consciousness in learners is termed as input enhancement which involves focusing on the formal properties of language through 'induced salience.'

One of the ways of inducing salience is that the learners are encouraged to analyze and over generalize on the basis of L1 knowledge which is later used to serve as negative evidence to draw learner's attention to the differences between both languages. It enables them to appropriate their current assumptions about L2 by noticing the gap between their current and target knowledge. In communicative language teaching, as the sole focus is on meaning processing, learners often fail to 'notice' the difference in form, leading to fossilization of errors. Drawing on L1, LA focuses on forms and functions of L2 by

exploiting a methodology that is reflexive, inductive, interactive, and investigational. LA sees integral links between L1 and L2 and strongly stresses the positive role of L1 in L2 learning. Ironically, LA takes inspiration from behavioral concepts of transfer of L1/training, generalizability, and interference but works to produce the opposite effect: to focus on a comparative discussion and raising consciousness about L2. Structural similarities between L1 and L2 are juxtaposed and meanings are mutually clarified as 'mismatch' is talked about. It is referred to as 'contrastive salience.'

## Lesson-33

**THE FACILITATION OF L1 IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING****Topic No: 194-199****Meaning Making and Pattern Recognition: The Role of L1 in LA; The Facilitation of L1 in Five Domains of SLL; Affective Domain of SLL; Cognitive Domain of SLL; Social Domain of SLL; Power Domain of SLL**

All languages have much in common and many shared meanings which can be exploited. Language Acquisition (LA) facilitates learning by exploiting this commonality and highlighting divergence. The basic difference that marks L2 learner from native speaker is analytical competence. LA aims to evoke analytical insight into the learner and bridge the space between L1 and L2. Both languages work to strengthen each other, enabling the learner to discern the patterns in L2 and develop expectations for its structure. In this process, LA draws upon the learner's sensitivity toward L1 to develop L2 and brings realisation that the level of operating both languages is same, i.e. forms and function. This paves way for a more meaningful learning. LA works in five domains:

- a) **Affective domain** involves the whole person of learner by encouraging them to develop personal relevance to L2 and assigns importance to their feelings and attitudes.
- b) **Social domain** fosters tolerance and acceptance of ethnic diversity and awareness of the origins and characteristics of their own language, dialect and its place among other languages.
- c) **Power domain** creates awareness of the way language can be used to imply meaning.
- d) **Cognitive domain** helps analyzing the language, drawing inferences, and categorizing new knowledge.
- e) **Performance domain** raises consciousness of learner toward better performance.

In all operational domains, L1 is accorded pivotal facilitative position in L2 learning.



**Lesson-34****THE ROLE OF L1 IN SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING****Topic No: 200-205****Performance Domain of SLL; Achievement of Objectivity with L1; Arguments Against L1; The Contribution of LA in SLL? The Emphasis on the Role of L1 in SLL; Exploiting L1 for Learning L2**

As mentioned above, the performance domain raises the consciousness of the learners to gear them toward better performance. This domain is expected to reduce chances of fossilization. It simplifies the task and ensures focus on goal.

According to Hawkin, assigning a role to L1 in L2 learning provides the learners with the opportunity to view language objectively as a phenomenon. This detachment enables the learners to develop an understanding of how languages operate in a society and allows them to know what they can do with language. It also assists the development of sensitivity and is a step toward understanding the functioning of languages across cultures.

The debate about L1's role continues though in cognitive rather than behaviorist terms. The use of L1 in L2 classrooms has been appraised as too complex for learners, requiring them to operate in two different ways. It has been argued that frequent recourse to L1 would lead to slower L2 learning because of the habit of translation. However, stopping the flow of L1 information and thoughts is not possible, hence it is best to utilize it rather than ignore it. It is argued that focus on form and consciousness-raising could lead to cognitive development and better L2 performance. It has been observed that the learners have a very strong association with their native culture even after spending decades in another country. Ignoring this cultural bond can only add problems for L2 learners. Thus, bilingual medium oriented strategies must be not only allowed but actively encouraged to ensure real communicative competence. Inter-relationship between L1 and L2 lies at a much deeper level than surface or even near-surface categories. The role of L1 as prior knowledge is well founded in the light of human information processing, perceptual mechanism, and memory. Learners must not be deprived of the opportunity to use their language. Instead, they should be encouraged to exploit the richness of bilingualism by developing connections, comparisons and contrasts in formal functions of languages, cultural association, and cross-linguistic reference for knowledge building.

**Lesson-35****FACTORS INFLUENCING SLA****Topic No: 206-211****Concluding Arguments; Recommendations for the Use of L1 for SLL; Factors that Influence SLA; Internal Factors; External factors; Individual Differences in SLA**

Summing up the debate, the role of L1 in L2 classrooms confounds L2 teachers and thus remains in debate among researchers and educationists. The paper challenges the assumptions of official dismissal of L1 from L2 classrooms. It has analyzed the issue from dual theoretical perspectives: the sociocultural theory and language awareness pedagogical theory. It argues that L1 can be positively utilized to play a significant role in L2 learning; though, the use must be pre-planned; its effective role is acknowledged by the sociocultural and LA theorists. It is said to be related to affective, cognitive, social, power, and performance domains. Therefore, more informed institutional policy making is recommended to develop greater acceptance of L1 in L2 classrooms. The issue must be discussed at length in teacher education programmes. A more positive role of L1 should be advocated to allow teacher to move beyond mere methodological and procedural knowledge. Teachers also need to identify with the struggle and strengths of their learners for meaningful relationships and enhanced L2 learning outcomes.

**Influencing Factors**

Some students learn a new language more quickly and easily than others. The factors influencing their success are categorized as internal and external. It is their complex interplay that determines their learning speed and facility. The internal factors include age, personality, motivation (intrinsic), experiences, cognition, and L2's similarity to their native language. The external factors include curriculum, instruction, culture and status, motivation (extrinsic), and access to native speakers. Moreover, there are individual differences in language learning as they are reflected in learning styles, strategies, and affective variables.

## Lesson-36

**DIFFERENT LEARNING STYLES AND STRATEGIES****Topic No: 212-217****Differences in Learning Styles; Differences in Cognitive Styles; Conditions Under Which Strategies are Useful; Learning Strategies: Use; Learning Strategies: Six Groups; Defining Learning Strategies in SLL**

The term *learning styles* is commonly reserved for preferred forms of brain activity associated with information acquisition and processing. Researchers and practitioners use learning style research with personality and cognitive styles to determine ability, predict performance, and improve classroom teaching and learning. The terms learning style, cognitive style, personality type, sensory preference and modality etc. are often used loosely and interchangeably. Cognitive-style research initially addressed phenomena as perceptual speed and flexibility; later, researchers focused on processing styles from the point of view of ‘ego psychology.’ In recent years, the influence of personality variables on learning styles has increased greatly. Recently preferred models include Multiple Intelligences Model, 4-MAT Model, Kolb’s Jung-based Model, and Stenberg’s Mental Self-government Model. Ehrman and Leaver (2001-2003) have reorganized the scales for cognitive styles like random-sequential, levelling-sharpening, and abstract-concrete along with Ehrman-defined field (in) dependence/field sensitive styles under the new comprehensive construct. In this model, an **ectenic** learner wants or needs conscious control over learning process; whereas, a **synoptic** learner leaves more to preconscious or unconscious processing.

Learning styles and strategies are often interrelated. Styles are made manifest by strategies; strategy is neither good nor bad. It is essentially neutral. A strategy is useful under these conditions:

- a) It relates well to the L2 task at hand.
- b) It fits the particular students’ learning style preference to one degree or another.
- c) The students employ the strategy effectively and link it with other relevant strategies.

Such strategies make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations.

In language-learning field, definitions of strategies imply conscious movement toward a language goal. Students who frequently employ learning strategies enjoy a high level of self-efficacy. Less able learners often use strategies in a random, unconnected, and uncontrolled manner. Oxford (1990) identified six major groups of L2 learning strategies:

1. Cognitive strategies (reasoning, note-taking, synthesizing)
2. Metacognitive strategies (identifying one’s own preferences and needs, planning, monitoring mistakes and evaluating task success)
3. Memory-related strategies (acronyms, sound similarities, images, key words)
4. Compensatory strategies (guessing from context, circumlocution, gestures, and pause words)

5. Affective strategies (identifying one's mood and anxiety level, talking about feelings, rewarding oneself etc.)
6. Social strategies (asking questions, asking for clarifications, asking for help, talking with native-speakers, exploring culture and social norms)

Biggs (1992) categorizes learning strategies differently, that is, by grouping learning approaches by the purpose of learning. This model and instrument address both motivation and learning strategies:

- Surface (to get a task done with little personal investment)
- Achieving (to succeed in competition and get good marks)
- Deep (to make personal investment in the task through associations and elaboration)

## Lesson-37

**SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING AND LEARNER MOTIVATION****Topic No: 218-223****Deep Processing vs. Surface Processing; Strategy Instruction in SLL; Affective Factors in SLL; Learner Motivation and SLL: Early Studies; Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic Motivation; Expectancy-value Model of Motivation**

Deep processing is an active process of making associations with material that is already familiar, examining interrelationships, elaborating stimulus, connecting the new material with personal experience, and considering alternative interpretations. While surface processing is completion of the task with minimum conceptual effort that results in much less information retained in memory because there is no emotional or cognitive investment in it. Biggs' model exploits the probable connection between intrinsic motivation and deep strategies and treats motivation in parallel with strategies. Ehrman indicates that students may not have a choice for using deep strategies due to weak educational background, lack of aptitude for learning, inexperience, or inflexible learning style. Some other important treatments of language learning strategies are to be found in Cohen (1998) and Wenden & Rubin (1987).

Many researchers have attempted to design and execute strategy training programs. Positive effects of strategy instruction emerged for proficiency in speaking and reading. The most effective strategy instruction included demonstrating when a given strategy might be useful, as well as how to use and evaluate it, and how to transfer it to other related tasks and situations.

Affective factors in SLL include motivation, self-efficacy, tolerance of ambiguity, and anxiety, etc. Gardner and various colleagues proposed the Socio-Educational Model of Language Learning which presents two kinds of motivation: integrative and instrumental. Integrative motivated students are more successful language learners than the others. These are the learners who want to integrate into the target culture; however, this orientation proved far less important in foreign language settings. At times, highly ethnocentric individuals who do not like the culture of the languages they are studying, achieve high levels of foreign language proficiency. Clément et al. (1994) identified five orientations of foreign language learners:

- (a) Friendship and travel-related
- (b) Identification with the target language group
- (c) General interest in the culture and in world events
- (d) Knowledge expansion and career improvement
- (e) Desire to understand L2 media

Dec and Ryan's (1985) model distinguishes between intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. The former comes from within the individual and is related to the individual's identity and sense of well-being. It comes when learning is the goal itself; while, the latter comes from outside when learning is done for the sake of rewards. Students' total motivation is most frequently a combination of both.

External rewards can either increase or decrease intrinsic motivation depending on how they affect self-efficacy. Thus, motivation depends greatly on the context, people involved, and specific circumstances.

The expectancy-value model of motivation distinguishes between valuing something and expecting to be able to do it. Within the area of expectancy, two key theories stand out: Weiner's (1986) Attribution theory, and Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy theory.

**Lesson-38****LANGUAGE THEORIES AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNER****Topic No: 224-229****Attribution Theory by Weiner; Bandura's Self Efficacy Model; Attributes of Effective Second Language Learners; Shift in Focus in Motivation Theories; Affective Factors: Concluding Arguments; Helping the L2 Learner Succeed**

According to attribution theory, expectancy is tied to attribution about one's success. Some learners believe that their language learning success is attributable to their own actions or abilities. Others believe that their success depends on other people or on fate.

Self-efficacy theory refers to belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments. Such beliefs influence the amount of effort people put forth and how long they continue to pursue tasks. Research indicates that highly motivated successful learners (a) possess self-efficacy; (b) have an internal locus of control; (c) have positive attitudes toward learning; and (d) desire both social relatedness and self-direction or autonomy. According to Eccles (1984) and Wigfield (1994), motivation is based on how much students expect to succeed at a task; and how much they value that success. Eccles proposed four dimensions: attainment value, intrinsic value, extrinsic utility value, and cost attainment value.

All these models are criticized as being too broad, too simplistic, and too ambiguous. Consequently, today, theories about and even instrumentation for motivation abound. In recent years, interesting changes have occurred in expansion of motivation theory beyond the individual student to entire class or group of students. The 'process model' of motivation holds teachers responsible for student motivation; however, it does not let students off the hook. It suggests that teachers need to encourage students' self-evaluation.

Other affective factors besides motivation are all in some way related to motivation. These include anxiety, defense mechanisms, internal attitudes, self-esteem, activation or alertness required to act, hierarchies of need, self-regulation, self-management, beliefs, emotional intelligence, and self-monitoring. All these factors play important role in promoting or preventing learning autonomy.

In order to enable maximum learners to learn as much as they can, we need to give them every advantage including a program that enables them to start out in comfortable and stress-free way. We need to give them the opportunity to learn in their preferred styles rather than always outside of them. Moreover, good teachers and well-constructed syllabi are more important than ever for the majority of learners. Just as students vary, so do teachers in motivation, overall aptitude, self-efficacy as teachers, in teaching/learning style, and in preferred strategies. Self-knowledge is as important for teachers as it is for students. It is important for teachers to understand how a genuine desire to help can become interference for a learner whose approach to learning differs from the teacher's preference.

## Lesson-39

## MYTHS RELATED TO SLA

**Topic No: 230-235****Different Aspects of Second Language Proficiency; Myths Related to SLA: I; Myths Related to SLA: II; Myths Related to SLA: III; Myths Related to SLA: IV; Myths Related to SLA: V**

There are different aspects of second language proficiency. Canadian researcher Jim Cummins (1981) formally defined the two aspects as Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) for the sake of simplicity. BICS are often referred to as *conversational English*, the surface language that native speakers use in informal talk. Although there are individual differences, research shows that SL learners frequently develop native-like conversational skills within two years.

CALP is referred to as *academic English*, the proficiency to read, write, and learn at an appropriate grade level. This aspect of proficiency is much more critical to students' academic success and takes about five to seven years to develop. Educators sometimes mistakenly assume that student with fluent conversational English no longer require language instruction. It is difficult to know how long the academic language process will take for an individual student. There are numerous variables that affect the duration to acquire a second language and the approaches and methods effective in teaching the student. Such as: social and cultural factors, previous educational background, age, oral literacy skills in primary/home language, parental attitudes, and experiences etc. SLL is a complicated process that takes time. Teachers must know how children learn a second language; intuitive assumptions are often mistaken and children can be harmed if teachers have unrealistic expectations of the process of L2 learning and its relationship to the acquisition of other academic skills and knowledge. Some common misconceptions and myths about children and SL learning are:

- 1. Children learn SL quickly and easily as their brains are more flexible.** Current research challenges it. Learning SL is as difficult for a child as it is for an adult or even more difficult since children do not have access to memory techniques and other strategies.
- 2. The younger the child, the more skilled he is in acquiring an L2.** Research does not support this conclusion in school settings.
- 3. The more time spent in SL context, the quicker they learn the language.** Research indicates that increased exposure does not necessarily speed the SL acquisition. Children in bilingual classes acquired SL skills equivalent to those acquired by children who have been in English-only programs.
- 4. Children have acquired an L2 once they can speak it.** For school-aged children, proficiency in face-to-face communication does not imply proficiency in the more complex academic language.
- 5. All children learn an L2 in the same way.** This assumption underlies a great deal of practice. Teachers must be aware of cultural differences. They need to plan varied instructional activities that consider children's diversity of experience, as children are likely to be more responsive to a teacher who affirms the values of the home culture.



## Lesson-40

**CULTURE, DIFFERENCE, AND IDENTITY****Topic No: 236-241****The Role of Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning; Classroom Interaction: Cultural Differences Between Teachers and Japanese Learners; SLA and Identity: Japanese Example; Cultural Differences and Teaching Challenges: Japanese Example; The Concept of Hierarchy in Classroom: Japanese Example; Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning**

The methods of teaching and learning are both affected by culture. When we look at Japanese culture, we find that watching, imitating, memorizing, and other receptive methods are well represented in their teaching and learning of Japanese. But in proactive Western teaching-learning repertoire, we find doing, problem solving, comparing, discussing, etc. The former puts emphasis on perception and consideration of the whole context prior to understanding. Whereas, the latter puts emphasis on concentration of overt message and expects a prompt reaction to it. While the former is nearer to the defensive, the latter is nearer to the offensive type of communication behavior.

Good communication is the keystone of all teaching-learning situations. But the question is what is meant by 'good communication' and by whom? In western concept, it is a smooth, verbose interaction, exchange of ideas, exchange of doubts and offering solutions to problems, discussion, and debate. But in Japanese culture, things work differently. For them, primary function of communication is to maintain good human relationships. We will examine Japanese teaching-learning interface using Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory as a framework. These dimensions are: identity, hierarchy, truth, and virtue.

**Identity:** There is definite shift in Japanese values toward the western values, but these changes are traceable on consciousness level; very few of these manifest on behavior level. Like, students confess to a strong preference for individualism above collectivism, but in real-life situations they often behave according to the collectivistic behavior patterns. Students do not volunteer in answering question in class. Not because they do not have knowledge, but because no one takes the odium to be singled out from the group. This preference of cooperation and group achievement leads toward less competitiveness and behavior and attitude, and less assertiveness in their communication than their scores suggest in surveys. In Western settings, the main function of communication is information presentation and information exchange. While in Japanese communication, this function is only of secondary importance. The primary function is to maintain good relationships. Therefore, Japanese sacrifice individual preferences or convenience, keep back opinions, and control their communicative behavior to meld into the group.

**Truth:** The Japanese students avoid risks and show little value for personal choice or freedom of thought. They would rather be quiet than risk thinking differently. If they are unsure of how to do something, they would either refuse to do it or they would follow the crowd as carefully as possible.

**Hierarchy:** In the Japanese culture, the words and statements of authority (hence of teachers) are not doubted or criticized. Their truth-value is taken for granted and also treated so. Their interaction is

less mutual; students are not active and dynamic players of communication. They do not enter into communication flow with the same commitment because they do not feel they have the right to do so. Their passiveness is interpreted as a sign of respect within the Japanese frame and as a sign of indifference within the Western frame.

Language is not only part of how we define culture; it also reflects culture. Students cannot master the language without mastering the cultural contexts. Forms and uses of a given language reflect the cultural values of the society in which the language is spoken. Linguistic competence alone is not enough for language learners to be competent in that language. They need to be aware of culturally appropriate ways to address people, express gratitude, make requests, and agree or disagree with someone. In many regards, culture is taught implicitly because it is imbedded in the linguistic forms that students are learning. Students need to learn both the linguistic and cultural norms.

## Lesson-41

**TEACHING/ LEARNING OF CULTURE IN SECOND LANGUAGE CLASSROOMS****Topic No: 242-247****Teaching/ Learning of Culture in Second Language Classrooms Non-Judgmentally; Facilitating Cultural Knowledge: Strategies; Use of Authentic Materials; Strategies: A Closer Look; Some more Strategies; The Significance of Cultural Comparison: Concluding the Argument**

Cultural information should be presented non-judgmentally without placing value or judgement on distinction between students' native culture and the culture explored in the classroom. Kramsch (1993) describes the 'third culture' of the language classroom – a neutral space that learners can create and use to explore and reflect on their own and target culture and language. Teachers must allow students to observe and explore cultural interactions from their own perspective to enable them to find their own voices in the SL speech community. Cultural activities and objectives should be carefully organized and incorporated into lesson plans to enrich and inform the teaching content. Some useful strategies are:

1. Use of authentic materials
2. Proverbs (discussion of common proverbs and their comparison to the proverbs in students' native language)
3. Role play (they can act out miscommunications based on cultural differences)
4. Culture capsules (presenting objects like figurines, tools, jewelry, and art originated from the target culture)
5. Students as cultural resources (exchange students and immigrant students who speak target language at home can be invited as expert resources)
6. Ethnographic studies (carrying out interviews with native speakers, having discussion activities etc.)
7. Literature (as it is replete with cultural information)
8. Film (it connects with language and culture simultaneously)

Culture must be fully incorporated as a vital component of language learning. Second language teachers must identify the key cultural items in every aspect of language they teach. Students can be successful in speaking SL only if the cultural issues are an inherent part of the curriculum.

**Lesson-42****SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND TEACHING****Topic No: 248-254****Second Language Acquisition and Language Teaching; The Relationship Between Language Acquisition and Teaching; Communicative Language Teaching and SLA; Krashen's Theory and CLT; Problem with Krashen's Theory - Strong Version of CLT; Focus on Form; Focus on Form and Noticing Hypothesis**

Researches proposed that Second Language acquisition (SLA) research has played on two recent pedagogical proposals: Communicative language teaching and Focus on form in meaning-based curricula. Further, it discusses four macro-options of 'focus-on-form' interventions and their theoretical motivations followed by recent research evidence: input processing, input enhancement, form-focused output, and negative feedback. Then, it will deal with two related pedagogical issues: the choice of linguistic forms in focused instruction, and its benefits depending on individual factors and the learning context.

The relationship between SLA and teaching is neither straightforward nor it is determined that how much influence SLA should play on language teaching. Studies show that proportional knowledge within teacher education courses plays role in shaping teachers' personal theories of language learning and teaching. Nevertheless, basic SLA research tends to be regarded by teachers as difficult to understand and removed from their own concerns. There are contradictory findings about the impact of SLA research on teachers. There are linguists who consider that SLA research has made relevant contributions to language pedagogy, while others see a gap or conflict of interests between researchers and practitioners. However, these diverging stances originate from fundamental differences in the conception of teaching that both groups hold.

**Criticism of SLA Research**

Those critical of the role of mainstream SLA research reject the view of teaching as mainly proportional knowledge, as a set of behaviours that can be prescribed by researchers. Instead they view teaching as intuitive knowledge that takes form of theories or as a craft where the context guides the teachers' moment-to-moment decisions. Because of these views, basic SLA research has been criticized for paying little attention to the social context of L2 acquisition.

**Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)**

Communicative language teaching (CLT) emerged when teachers were skeptical about the role of grammar in foreign language instruction and felt disillusioned with the results of audio-lingual teaching. Scholars like Widdowson and Candlin advocated for a view of language as a communication system with focus on language in use. According to Krashen (1985), SL acquisition requires comprehensible input and motivation. Krashen made fundamental distinction between learning and acquisition. He mentioned that the teachers in his environment took it for granted that pointing out students' errors was not good nor was it recommended to focus on one single grammatical point at a time. These ideas fostered the adoption by

some of the strong versions of CLT. According to which, communicative activities are an integral part of instruction where students' attention is focused on the meaning of the message to the exclusion of any focus on the code.

### **Criticism on Krashen's Theory**

Krashen's theory was well tuned to the needs of teachers. It was criticized for having methodological problems. Its main weakness was presenting hypotheses as empirically valid models when those have not been tested.

The origin of Focus on form (FonF) can be traced back to Lon's distinction between focus on form and focus on forms, characteristic of synthetic and analytic approaches to language teaching respectively. It was motivated by Long's interaction hypothesis according to which negotiation of meaning in interaction between learners and other speakers plays a crucial role for language development, particularly L2. Negotiation of meaning also elicits negative feedback that leads the learner to focus on form. Formal instructions are said to be beneficial in both acquisition-rich and acquisition-poor environment.

---

## FOCUS ON FORM AND TYPES OF INSTRUCTIONS

### Topic No: 255-259

#### **Reaction to Immersion Programmes and Options for Focus on Form; Processing Instruction; Explicit Instruction; Explicit Instruction: Consciousness Raising Tasks; Explicit Instruction: Procedural and Declarative Knowledge**

The interest in focus on form also came as a reaction to the studies of French immersion programmes in Canada. Initial studies showed positive evidence as regards to listening comprehension skills and ability to use French to learn subject matter. However, later studies looking at the quality of students' spoken French showed less positive results. As a result of these studies, researchers started to question experiential approaches to language learning, especially learning in context where input is limited to classroom setting.

Ellis (1998) identified four macro-options to foster noticing or processing of linguistic form:

1. Processing instruction
2. Explicit instruction
3. Production practice
4. Negative feedback

In **processing instruction**, pedagogical intervention takes place at the input stage when learners are actively engaged in comprehension. It assumes that FonF interventions at comprehension stage will be less cognitively demanding. The input is carefully manipulated at the comprehension stage; learners are induced to notice the target grammatical features.

#### **Less Explicit Processing Instruction Options**

1. Input flood
2. Input enhancement
3. Involvement of comprehension-based activities

In **explicit instruction**, the pedagogical intervention impinges on the learners' L2 knowledge by deliberately directing them to attend to form. An instructional treatment is explicit if rule explanation forms part of the instruction (deduction) or if learners are asked to attend forms and try to find rules themselves (induction). In other words, explicit instruction can be delivered in two modes, depending on its directness: direct explicit instruction where grammatical explanation is directly communicated either orally or in writing, and indirect explicit instruction where learners discover grammatical rules by themselves through consciousness-raising tasks. These tasks develop awareness at the level of 'understanding' rather than at the level of 'noticing.'

Explicit **Declarative knowledge** is assumed to foster development of implicit procedural knowledge through intake facilitation. DeKeyser (1998) takes a different position about the role of

explicit knowledge. He advocates for explicit grammar instruction followed by first form-focused exercises to develop declarative knowledge, then by open-ended activities to foster automatization. In this way, practice may gradually bridge the gap between explicit knowledge and its use.

---

## EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION AND PRODUCTION PRACTICE

### Topic No: 260-263

#### **Production Practice; Production Practice: Structure Based; Negative Feedback; Existing Controversies**

In production practice, the pedagogical interventions take place at output stage through tasks that include language production. Production practice aims at noticing in several ways i.e. through specifically designed tasks to elicit use of preselected target linguistic items, or through communicatively oriented tasks followed by meta talk. According to Swain (1995), producing language may have three benefits: 1) it makes learners aware of their own limitations, 2) it fosters hypothesis formation and testing, and 3) it promotes reflection on one's own and others' language use.

The above mentioned type of task is reformulated by Ellis (2003) as structure-based production task. It suggests three ways of designing a task that incorporates target language features:

1. **Task-naturalness:** Target structure can be expected to arise naturally and frequently in performing the task, even though it may not be necessary for completion.
2. **Task-usefulness:** Targeted feature is not essential for completing task but it is very useful.
3. **Task-essentialness:** Learners are required to use the essential feature to complete the task successfully.

Structure-based production tasks cater to implicit learning, in contrast to conscious-raising tasks, which cater to explicit learning. The **negative feedback** provides information to the learner as to what is not grammatically possible in the target language. It occurs on the spot in an unplanned way and plays no role in task designing. Its techniques include recasts (implicit negative feedback) and metalinguistic clues (explicit negative feedback). Recasts are viewed as a more attractive option due to its implicit nature.

While reviewing key concepts and theoretical foundations of four macro-options in focus on form (FonF), there is perception of a growing emphasis on cognitive processes. There is also room for theoretical controversy. Central disagreement is about amount and type of attention needed for learning. While Noticing Hypothesis seems to be the most widely accepted position, there are other applied linguists who hold alternative views. Another source of controversy is the relationship between metalinguistic or explicit knowledge and L2 acquisition and performance. While Ellis believes that this type of knowledge can facilitate development of implicit knowledge, DeKeyser believes L2 learning should start with explicit rules that are later on proceduralized and automatized through spontaneous performance.

### **Lesson-45**



---

## INPUT AND SLA PEDAGOGY

### Topic No.: 264-269

#### **Input Processing Instruction; Input-enhancement; Form Focused Output; Negative Feedback and its Utility; From Research to SLA Pedagogy; SLA Pedagogy-Learner and Learning Context**

Numerous studies have evaluated the effectiveness of Processing Instruction (PI) in comparison with Traditional Instruction (TI). Typically, PI involves information about the target linguistic form or structure followed by information processing strategy and structured input activities; whereas, TI involves initial explanation, followed by mechanical and later communicative practice. Some of the referential activities proposed in PI are similar to traditional exercises in TI, the only difference being that language production is not required.

Comparison of visually enhanced vs. non-enhanced input showed limited results for this mode of FonF in which task design involves pre-selection of the target forms. A comparative study by Izumi (2002) of the effects of input enhancement vs. output activities failed to show any advantage for the former instructional mode. The other type of input enhancement, which is delivered orally through exact repetition, may be more effective. In contrast to these input modes, research carried out in nineties on form-focused output has been of descriptive nature. It proved validity of dictogloss as a task that promotes attention to form as a result of the students' collaboration. Text reconstruction seemed to be a more effective procedure to get learner to focus more often on the targeted features.

Research on negative feedback has been more abundant over the past few years than any other mode of FonF. Studies have shown that recasts contribute to the learners' inter-language development as measured by the performance tests. Recasts were considered more beneficial than models on form. Recasts can also be beneficial on forms of low perceptual salience and little communicative value. The superiority of recasts was confirmed by many researchers.

The relationship between research and language pedagogy is a complex one. Research findings cannot always advise teachers about how or what to teach. However, language teachers have a wealth of findings on SLA that may inform their methodological options. Similarly, they will find relevant proposals about the choice of the language features or items that may most appropriately receive form-focused instruction.

### **Abbreviations Used Within the Text**

**FonF**~Focus on Form

**UG**~ Universal Grammar

**IL**~ Inter-language

**TL**~ Target Language

**CDS**~ Child Directed Speech

**CA**~Contrastive Analysis

**SL**~ Second Language

**SLL**~ Second Language Learning

**SLA**~Second Language Acquisition