Fossilization and the Role of Attention in Adults Second Language Learning

by

Zhaleh Ghasemi, B.A.

A thesis submitted to:
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

December 2003

©2003

2003, Zhaleh Ghasemi

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file   Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89840-7

Our file   Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-89840-7

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this dissertation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de ce manuscrit.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the dissertation.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigated fossilization and the role of attention in adults second language learning. The questions asked were 1) whether attention to speech prevents stabilized learners from repeating non-target-like forms in their speech, 2) whether there are differences between subjects in terms of ability to improve accuracy, and 3) whether between-subject differences in their ability to improve can be related to their attitude towards acculturation and the degree of motivation to use English. Three adult learners of English, with different language backgrounds, participated in the study and completed six tasks: two interviews, an elicited imitation task, a story retell task including three subtasks: answering comprehension questions, retelling the story paying attention to grammatical accuracy, and writing about the story. The presence of motivation, ability, and opportunity to learn were the three main criteria in choosing the participants. The analysis revealed three main findings. One refers to attention as being a necessary cause to achieve higher accuracy, but it is not a sufficient cause by itself. Attention helps improve accuracy when accompanied by favorable circumstances: planning, no time pressure, discourse cohesion, low cognitive load, and familiarity with the subject. The second finding indicates that in case of the subject with a fairly high level of proficiency, attention does not appear to play a large role in bringing about higher accuracy. However, the two subjects with a lower level of proficiency benefit greatly from attention to achieve higher accuracy. The third finding suggests that fossilization occurs at the level of performance and not at the level of competence for the three subjects.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest and sincerest thanks and gratitude to my respected supervisor, Professor Helmut Zobl, whose kindness, support, encouragement, and generosity in offering his time and his knowledge, wisdom, and inspiration supported me all the way through my MA thesis.

My thanks also go to my second reader, Professor Janna Fox, for her valuable comments and assistance.

I feel a deep sense of gratitude to Professor Devon Woods, graduate supervisor, for his support, understanding, and humanity.

I thank Professor Juana M. Liceras, external reader from the University of Ottawa, for her careful study of the thesis and expert comments and feedback.

Warmest thanks is also extended to Ms. Sharon Palmer, degree program administrator, who has been so kind in helping me out cheerfully all the time with whatever I needed any time for my study.

I should also like to thank the three participants, Ferial, Jasmine, and Nefissa, who put their hearts and souls in this work and made this study possible.

I cannot thank and admire enough my wonderful and knowledgeable teacher during my BA studies, Mr. Farhang Ghosni, who has always motivated me for higher achievements, encouraged me, and created a positive spirit in me.

I am very grateful to the National Spiritual Assembly of the Baha'is of Canada for making my MA study possible in Canada, giving me all kinds of support, and being responsive to all my needs during my stay in Canada. I owe to them a lot and I believe no words can convey my cordial thanks and appreciation to them.

My special thanks also go to Phyllis Perrakis, Jack Mclean, Neil and Jane Macmillan, and the Baha'i community of Ottawa for their immense support and help during my study and stay in Canada.

I would like to thank my friends from SLALS: Emese Bukor, Jennifer Lloyd, Eunyoung Kang, Sally Olsen, and many others for their sincere and warm encouragement and friendship.

Last but not the least is my heartfelt and boundless thanks, respect, and appreciation to my father, mother, and brothers for their infinite love, help, and support. I also can never forget to thank my uncle and his family for their continued love, sincere and honest hospitality, understanding, and family support, which continued to support me through difficult times.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Fossilization and Second Language Acquisition	1
1.2. Thesis Research and Questions	10
1.3. Overview of the Thesis	14
2. Literature Review	15
2.1. Literature on Fossilization	15
2.2. Different Perspectives of Models	21
2.2.1. Biological Model	21
2.2.2. Acculturation Model	29
2.2.3. Interactive Model	36
2.3. Approach to Fossilization in this Study	40
2.4. A Fourth Approach	40
2.4.1. The Role of Instruction	41
2.4.1.1. Benefits of Instruction	41
2.4.1.1.1. Higher Level of Accuracy	42
2.4.1.1.2. Faster Rate of Learning	43
2.4.1.1.3. Higher Level of Ultimate Attainment	44
2.4.1.2. Components of Instruction	45
2.4.1.2.1. Explicit Information	46

2.4.1.2.2. Corrective Feedback	47
2.4.1.2.3. Input Enhancement	47
2.4.2. The Role of Attention and Variability in Interlanguage	52
2.4.2.1. Summary	62
3. Methodology	63
3.1. Research Questions	63
3.2. Nature of the Study	63
3.3. Description of the Participants	65
3.3.1. “J”	65
3.3.1.1. Education and English Background	66
3.3.1.2. Social Life	68
3.3.2. “F”	69
3.3.2.1. Education and English Background	69
3.3.2.2. Social Life	70
3.3.3. “N”	71
3.3.3.1. Education and English Background	72
3.3.3.2. Social Life	74
3.4. Data Gathering	75
3.4.1. Tasks	75
3.4.1.1. First Interview (INT.1)	76
3.4.1.1.1. Procedures	76
3.4.1.2. Follow-Up Interview (INT.2)	78

3.4.1.2.1. Extracted Features	78
3.4.1.3. Elicited Imitation Task (EIT)	79
3.4.1.4. Story Retelling Task (SRT)	82
3.4.1.4.1. Comprehension (SR1)	82
3.4.1.4.2. Oral Retelling with Attention to Form (SR2)	83
3.4.1.4.3. Story Writing Task (SWT)	83
3.5. Data Analysis	84
3.5.1. The Size of the Corpus	86
4. Results	88
4.1. Degree of Variability Association Between Subjects for Grammatical Features	89
4.1.1. Variability in Each Task	90
4.2. SPSS Graphs and Data Base	91
4.2.1. Contracted Copula <i>be</i> (... 'm, ... 's, ... 're)	91
4.2.1.1. Total Percentage	91
4.2.1.2. Accuracy Percentage	92
4.2.2. Uncontracted Copula <i>be</i> (am, is, are, was, were)	93
4.2.2.1. Total Percentage	93
4.2.2.2. Accuracy Percentage	94
4.2.3. Contracted Auxiliary <i>be</i> (... 'm, ... 's, ... 're)	96
4.2.3.1. Total Percentage	96
4.2.3.2. Accuracy Percentage	97
4.2.4. Uncontracted Auxiliary <i>be</i> (am, is, are, was, were)	98

4.2.4.1. Total Percentage	98
4.2.4.2. Accuracy Percentage	99
4.2.5. Regular Past Suffix (<i>-ed</i>)	100
4.2.5.1. Total Percentage	100
4.2.5.2. Accuracy Percentage	101
4.2.6. Indefinite Articles (<i>a, an</i>)	102
4.2.6.1. Total Percentage	102
4.2.6.2. Accuracy Percentage	103
4.2.7. Negation with <i>be</i>	104
4.2.7.1. Total Percentage	104
4.2.7.2. Accuracy Percentage	105
4.2.8. Negation with <i>do</i>	106
4.2.8.1. Total Percentage	106
4.2.8.2. Accuracy Percentage	107
4.2.9. Inversion in Question	109
4.2.9.1. Total Percentage	109
4.2.9.2. Accuracy Percentage	110
4.2.10. Plural “-s”	111
4.2.10.1. Total Percentage	111
4.2.10.2. Accuracy Percentage	112
4.2.11. Participle-Adjective Suffix (<i>-ed</i>)	113
4.2.11.1. Total Percentage	113
4.2.11.2. Accuracy Percentage	114

4.2.12. Verb + <i>to</i> + Verb	115
4.2.12.1. Total Percentage	115
4.2.12.2. Accuracy Percentage	116
4.2.13. Word Order (<i>Adjective</i> + <i>Noun</i>)	116
4.2.13.1. Total Percentage	116
4.2.13.2. Accuracy Percentage	117
4.2.14. Target-like Negation in Double Negative Contexts	118
4.2.14.1. Total Percentage	118
4.2.14.2. Accuracy Percentage	119
4.2.15. Passive Voice	120
4.2.15.1. Total Percentage	120
4.2.15.2. Accuracy Percentage	121
4.3. Relationship Between the Subjects' Accuracy Mean and Tasks	122
5. Discussion	126
5.1. Accuracy Rate in Different Tasks and the Effect of Attention and Planning ...	128
5.2. Accuracy Rate in Individuals and the Effect of Attention and Planning	130
5.3. The Role of Acculturation	135
5.4. Washburn's Model and Fossilization	137
5.5. Fossilization in this Study	139
6. Conclusion	141
6.1. Summary	141

6.2. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	144
6.3. Pedagogical Suggestion	146
References	147
Appendix	159

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Fossilization and Second Language Acquisition (SLA)

In the process of learning a language, foreign or second-language learners produce a type of language that is different from both the mother tongue and the target language. The basic assumption in SLA research is that the learners create a grammar out of their available linguistic data, a new and unique system, called *interlanguage* (IL). Interlanguage can be seen as a continuum made up of the first and the second language at either end, and the learners are traveling along this continuum while learning the second language. Tollefson and Firn (1983) hold the view that almost all adult second language learners fail to achieve native like competence and will fossilize somewhere along the interlanguage continuum.

Fossilization is a concept in SLA research central to interlanguage and it is of such a great importance that Selinker (1972) believes it is a fundamental phenomenon of SLA. It is so well-recognized that it has an entry in the *Random House Dictionary of the English Language* (1987) with a linguistic definition.¹

Fossilization was first introduced by Selinker (1972) who believes it is the failure of the learners to achieve a native-like state. It is assumed that fossilized learners have a

---

¹ “fossilize 5. Ling. (of a linguistic form, feature, rule, etc.) to become permanently established in the interlanguage of a second-language learner in a form that is deviant from the target-language norm and that continues to appear in performance regardless of further exposure to the target language.” (*The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* 1987: 755)

different grammar from that of the native speakers made up in part of deviant forms and rules which are permanently incorporated into their interlanguage despite the fact that they have opportunities to make improvements. Selinker and Lamendella (1978) point out that fossilization can be found even with learners who have the ability, motivation and opportunity to learn and successfully acculturate into the target-language society.

SLA researchers consider it necessary to make a distinction between fossilization as product and fossilization as process. When fossilization is explained in terms of the L2 grammar containing nontarget-like or deviant forms, fossilization is being viewed as product. On the other hand, looking at fossilization as process has to do with the mechanisms that bring about a halt in SLA. Some of the factors possibly involved in fossilization when viewed from the process perspective are the lack of self- monitoring and self- correction, failure to attend to input, and the influence of the first language.

Another important distinction which SLA researchers consider necessary to make is the distinction between fossilization at the level of knowledge and fossilization at the level of performance. In the former case, the learners are unable to restructure or add to their knowledge. The latter applies to the processing. The speech production procedures are automatized, and they determine that well-rehearsed forms appear in speech. This distinction is important for my thesis and it will be developed more fully in the next sections.

The literature suggests a number of different ways in which fossilization can express itself. They are transfer, permanent indeterminacy, and resistance to instruction and corrective feedback.

I will deal briefly with transfer first. Both researchers subscribing to the Universal Grammar framework (Bley-Vroman, 1990; Schachter, 1989; Strozer, 1994) and those outside of it (Weinreich, 1953) have recognized that transferred structures have high potential for fossilization.

Well before the appearance of UG, Weinreich (1953) already referred to permanent grammatical transfer which, according to him, resulted from the learners establishing incorrect equivalents between L1 and L2. The wrongly identified forms become stabilized and then fossilized.

Chomsky (1965,1981) introduced the notion of Universal Grammar (UG) to refer to a set of universal principles which govern all languages, and a set of principles named parameters which are the major sources of difference among languages. Parameters come with options, for example, the null-subject parameter². According to some UG researchers (Bley-Vroman, 1990; Schachter, 1989; Strozer, 1994), adult learners are not able to access parametric options which are different from those of the L1. This means that the options that are transferred from the L1 will remain in the learners' interlanguage permanently. Selinker and Lakshamanan (1992) observed that even learners with a great amount of exposure to the target language seem to be unable to either discriminate the parameters of the new language and those of the native tongue or restructure the grammatical features which are not essential for communication.

Aside from the question of whether resetting parameter options is possible by adult learners or not, there is the recognition that transfer of parameterized options from L1 can become permanent when the input from the L2 is too ambiguous for the learners to

---

² The null-subject parameter applies to all languages, and it refers to whether subject pronouns can be omitted or not. Languages such as Spanish and Italian allow omission but English does not.

recognize the difference between L1 and L2. Therefore, the learner concludes that L1 options apply to L2. So, L1 transfer persists as the learners are unable to determine the structural contrasts between L1 and L2 in order to restructure the parameters. As a result of transfer, L1 forms become fossilized forms of the L2 grammar.

Transfer can be understood as a mechanism by which fossilization occurs, but when the focus is on the permanent presence of L1 options in the learners' interlanguage, what we are looking at is product. So, fossilization can express itself in the permanent presence of L1 transfer.

Another way in which fossilization can manifest itself, according to Sorace (1990), is in permanent indeterminacy. For her, interlanguage grammars are characterized by indeterminacy, by which she means that the learner is unable to make a clear judgment about the grammaticality of certain sentences. To illustrate this, she refers to Coppieters's (1987) study. In that study, there were native speakers and near native speakers of French. Some near-native speakers could not express clear intuitions about two different grammatical forms and had unsystematic preferences for either one. Sorace concludes that competing rules in their interlanguage grammar had become fossilized, in other words, they could not settle on the correct forms and they showed permanent parametric variation.

Another form of variation which the literature recognizes as a manifestation of fossilization is backsliding. Selinker's (1972) backsliding hypothesis also refers to the reappearance of an interlanguage form which the learner had seemed to cease using for a long time but which suddenly reappears. Even though an earlier developmental structure seems to have been eradicated from the grammar, they are kept potentially active in the

interlanguage and appear in speech, especially when the learners have to produce linguistic structures that are new and difficult and on which the learners focus and pay attention.

Both Washburn (1994) and Selinker (1972), and Sorace (1990) raise the very important question of the role of variability in fossilization. Studies by sociolinguists have shown that there is variability in the speech of native speakers as well. The variability for native speakers arises depending on the situation, who is being spoken to, the topic, etc. So, researchers like Labov (1970) believe that variability is important for language change. In contrast to this kind of variation in the speech of the native speakers, in second language acquisition we find variation consisting of fluctuation between correct and incorrect forms, or more target-like forms and less in the interlanguage. Selinker (1989) believes that we cannot call the forms fossilized unless those fluctuating forms remain in the learners' speech for two to five years during which time the same mistakes are repeated over and over regardless of the fact that they have been exposed to the target language spoken by natives (cited in Bean and Gergen, 1990, p.206). Variability is seen with children too. Children are able to eliminate the incorrect forms, but adults just go back and forth between these forms and fail to eliminate ungrammatical forms.

Yet one more manifestation of the phenomenon of fossilization, suggested in the literature, is resistance to instruction and corrective feedback. The most widely known example is Schumann's (1975) study of Alberto. Alberto was a 33-year old adult Spanish speaker learning English in the U.S. Over several months of formal instruction, Alberto showed no permanent change. Another study revealing resistance to instruction was carried out by Higgs and Clifford (1982) who introduced the notion of Terminal 2

learners.³ These learners had a high vocabulary but low grammar due to fossilized incorrect patterns. They were called “Terminal 2” or fossilized because no further improvement was evidenced in their second language performance even after intensive language training.

In the preceding paragraphs, I referred to the distinction between fossilization as product and as process, mechanisms through which fossilization can come about such as transfer and the ways through which fossilization is manifested, including backsliding, variability, indeterminacy, resistance to instruction and feedback. In the following section, I would like to examine the contrast between fossilization at the level of knowledge and performance.

When dealing with fossilization, there seems to be a disagreement in the literature (Schachter, 1989; Lardiere 1998a) about whether fossilization occurs at the level of competence (knowledge), at the level of performance, or both. When we talk about fossilization at the level of knowledge, it means that the learner’s competence does not undergo any further changes and it is at the end-state. An example of this would be if L2 learners are unable to restructure L1 parametric options. By contrast, in fossilization at the level of performance, learners may be adding knowledge to their interlanguage or restructuring their knowledge but the processing and the production routines that they employ to access their knowledge have been automatized to such an extent that they have difficulty to access newly acquired, more advanced forms. This may give rise to the

---

³ Higgs and Clifford studied learners who entered the government language training program and they were divided into levels one, two, and three. Higgs and Clifford classified those who could not progress as “Terminal” within that group. Terminal 2 learners were placed at level 2 and did not improve their language to be qualified for level 3.

appearance of fossilization even though careful investigation may show that they know more than what is revealed in their performance.

Sorace (1990) explains fossilization at the level of performance by suggesting that some learners have extreme difficulty in using more advanced forms of their knowledge across tasks. Certain tasks are so demanding that their fulfillment brings about some regression to earlier forms. At the time of communication, the learner relies on easily manipulated and well-rehearsed forms which are automatic in production. Sorace's analysis of the study suggests that the learners are still expanding their knowledge. Judging learners' knowledge based on what they produce is an underestimation of what they really know.

A related perspective is offered by Lardiere (1998a) whose focus is on fossilization in performance. Her approach is that inconsistency in the appearance of grammatical forms is due to impairment in the learners ability to map their knowledge into phonetic form (speech) or visual form (writing). In her study, she explains an adult learner's low percentage of past tense marking as resulting not from a deficit in knowledge but as a disturbance in the mapping of the tense features to the phonetic forms. Thus, as she mentions, "the complexity of the mapping itself will obviously have a significant impact on the results of the production"(Lardiere, 1998a: 23).

The recent research dealing with the role of attention in SLA, the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990), and the contribution of controlled processing are related ideas which may help to resolve some of the issues I have covered. I think that this cluster of concepts will give me a framework to investigate fossilization as process. It

also allows me to address the issue of whether fossilization is at the level of knowledge or performance or both. In order to make the above- mentioned ideas clear, I refer to the three concepts of attention, noticing, and controlled processing.

In the recent L2 literature (e.g Schmidt, 1990; Truscott, 1998), attention has come to the forefront as being essential for noticing the gap between what the learner is outputting and the input. Schmidt's (1990) hypothesis concerning the importance of noticing argues that for learning to take place, attention is required. Attention can be described as being involved "in selecting the input to be processed and stored in memory", and "the mental effort involved in processing information" (Robinson, 1995: 287- 288). Those forms which are not attended to, do not go into short-term memory and as long as they are neither noticed nor attended to, they cannot be processed into the long-term memory.

Attention is not only relevant to noticing but it was also claimed by Tarone (1983) to be responsible for variability in interlanguage performance. She argues that second language learners' interlanguage has variable properties caused by the degree of attention they pay to their production. In fact, the availability of attention influences the accuracy of learners' output. Hulstijn and Hulstijn (1984) in their study showed that learners could improve their accuracy by attending to linguistic form in production more so than learners who only paid attention to the content. They too, similar to Tarone (1983), found that attention to form led to higher accuracy.

Attention also seems important for controlled processing. In controlled processing, the learners' attentional resources are consistently deployed in the service of self-monitoring of output or possibly in monitoring aspects of input. In production, controlled

processing may allow the learner to access newer and more advanced forms of the interlanguage grammar that have not yet been automatized. Schneider and Shiffrin (1977) describe the characteristics of controlled processing as “a temporary activation of a sequence of elements and....requires attention, is capacity limited....” (cited in Flores d’Arcais, 1988: 117). Also, controlled processes are “conscious or accessible to awareness, under strategic control of the subject, and therefore highly flexible and modifiable” (Flores d’Arcais, 1988: 117). Hulstijn (1989) affirms that language learning requires paying attention to the linguistic information, which has to pass through controlled processing. This way, the linguistic information is taken in and maybe available to be stored in the long-term memory. Controlled processing is about “a focus of attention on individual language forms and their meanings and their integration into receptive and productive skills”(Hulstijn, 1989:18).

On the other hand, in automatic processing, little or no attentional resources are needed for the task to be performed. Schneider and Shiffrin (1977) describe automatic processing as “the activation of a learned sequence of elements in long-term memory” (cited in Flores d’Arcais, 1988: 117). Moreover, the properties Flores d’Arcais (1988) mention for an automatic process are that it “occurs without attention, without producing interference with other ongoing mental activities, and is highly resistant to modification” (p.117). The learners may wish to express an idea for which controlled processing may be more appropriate and instead of using that occasion to access the more advanced forms, they revert to automatic processing; hence, the well-rehearsed forms show up in the production. When learners are speaking with a higher degree of attention to their speech

engaging controlled processing, they monitor, control, and may self correct their utterances. As a result, more advanced forms can be accessed and accuracy is improved.

The idea I would like to pursue in my own study is whether avoiding controlled processing to access more advanced knowledge by adult learners is the reason which leads to the appearance of fossilization, manifested at the level of performance.

The preceding section has dealt with general characteristics of fossilization, some important distinctions concerning fossilization that the literature has recognized such as the one between product and process. I have also dealt with fossilization at the level of knowledge and performance, and the forms which it manifests. I have further discussed the possible role of attention in explaining fossilization, specifically that the lack of attention to input and output may contribute to fossilization. In the next section, I wish to describe my own empirical study and the research questions guiding it.

1.2. Thesis Research and Questions

The phenomenon of fossilization in SLA has been very interesting and important for me as a learner of English as a foreign language. I became much attracted to it and was inspired by Long (2001) and Washburn's (1994) studies, which were, in fact, the genesis for my research.

Long's (2001) study provides an overview of the research which has been done in SLA about fossilization, specifically criticizing unreliable findings, and unsuitable subject choice, both of which make it impossible to tell whether fossilization is present or not. In his critical review, Long identifies three important conditions which should be met

when investigating fossilization in learners. The three main requirements Long refers to are: ability, motivation and opportunity to learn. Another and equally major condition is a minimum of five years residence in the L2 society during which the subject is exposed to the target language. I used the four conditions in choosing subjects for my study.

I turned to Washburn's study (1994) for help in planning activities for the volunteers. Washburn in this study investigated the difference in performance between fossilized and nonfossilized speakers on tasks such as, interview, cloze test combined with a grammaticality judgment and imitation task, and a short-term learning task⁴. The results of Washburn's study show that fossilized speakers had difficulty keeping the target-like forms in their utterances. Their interlanguage competence appeared to include those forms but they required an unusual amount of effort to access them. In this study, it would appear that fossilization was not at the level of knowledge but at the level of performance. The participants in Washburn's study were recognized as fossilized based on the length of their residence in the United States (five years or more) and the failing record of their English courses at school (failing at least once). So, taking my cues from Long's (2001) critical review of the literature on fossilization and Washburn's research, one of the qualifications I was looking for in my participants was at least five years of residence in Canada.

My own study is a case study of three individuals who have lived in Canada for more than five years, who had systematic English instruction (EFL) back home, and who have been taking English courses while living in Canada. At the time of my study, they

---

⁴ If we consider automatic and controlled processes as a continuum, the interview can be considered to be at the automatic end, but imitation, grammaticality judgment, and the short-term learning tasks are at the controlled end, allowing the learners to utilize more advanced forms of L2. The cloze test can be considered somewhere in-between automatic and controlled processes.

were taking ESL classes and job training courses. Therefore they fulfilled the four conditions Long mentions: motivation, ability, opportunity, and at least five years' residence in the L2 society.⁵

I approached the investigation of fossilization from the perspective of the role of attention. Attention to output and input are closely tied to the presence of the element of consciousness and imply that there is controlled processing at work. I chose to investigate how tasks requiring different degrees of attention to speech affect the performance of the presumably fossilized speakers. The question I pursued in my study was whether attention to speech would bring about higher levels of accuracy; in other words, whether the subjects were able to engage in controlled processing, access more target-like forms, and use the correct forms more consistently.

Taking my cue from Washburn's study, I tried to evaluate the role of attention by planning three tasks: two interview sessions, an oral elicited imitation task using isolated sentences containing correct versions of the nontarget-like forms identified in the interview sessions, and as the final task, story retelling. It consisted of three subtasks. First they listened to a story and answered a few comprehension questions. Then, they listened to the same story for a second time and were asked to retell the story paying

---

⁵ I started my study with seven subjects but I lost four of them one by one during my empirical investigation for various reasons. Their reasons for not taking part involved such factors as being a single mother or having family and work pressure. They were too busy to dedicate even one hour of their time per month for this study.

It is necessary to mention that I had many problems finding volunteers with those qualifications who were willing to cooperate with me for at least five months, especially since their lives were so busy and my study appeared to them to have no obvious benefits. The contributions of the three who did make the effort to make my study possible are therefore greatly appreciated, all the more so since there was no financial reward for the time they were spending. Ideally future experiments would be more successful if they could provide remuneration to the subjects.

attention to their speech. Finally, they listened for a third time and wrote a summary of the story.

I assumed that writing and imitation tasks required higher degrees of attention and so should result in higher accuracy. While writing, the subjects have more time to plan, think and change their sentences; therefore, the nontarget-like structures identified in the interviews should not emerge or would emerge less frequently in their writing. Although the imitation task did not allow ample time and planning, as writing does, it involved the repetition of a model sentence which required attention to be engaged so that the exact sentence could be produced.

In my study, I was also interested in the relationship between fossilization, acculturation, motivation, and attitude. In addition to providing samples of spontaneous speech, the two interviews also provided information about my subjects' background and their acculturation in Canada. Using this information from the interviews, I hoped to be able to find relationships between acculturation, attitude, and performance on the tasks that required controlled processing.

The chief findings can be summarized as follows:

- The hypothesis that attention to speech led to greater accuracy was in part supported. It was found that the element of planned discourse, no time pressure, low cognitive load, familiarity with the subject, and discourse cohesion were also important. In planned discourse, attention plays an important role, and the element of time is crucial enabling the learners to access and use more advanced forms of linguistic rules.

- The three subjects were different in their accessing of the more target-like forms and their ability to improve their accuracy on the tasks that required controlled processing. Differences in being able to use controlled processing seemed to be related to the higher proficiency in English for one subject and was not related to the attention and planning; however, the second subject's accuracy was greatly affected by attention and planning. The third subject's performance barely improved on tasks requiring attention. Instead, a combination of factors, namely, attention, planning, low cognitive load, no time pressure, and familiarity with the topic seemed necessary for her to achieve higher accuracy.
- Based on my findings, for the two subjects, whose proficiency in the language was not high, fossilization appeared to be at the level of performance.

1.3. Overview of the Thesis

Chapter 1 presents definitions of fossilization and the main issues involved in fossilization. Chapter 2 is a review of this phenomenon in SLA and discusses the different models that have been proposed as explanations of fossilization. Chapter 2 also includes a discussion of variability in interlanguage performance and its relationship to attention and controlled processing. Chapter 3 presents the methodology used for the present study, the description of the participants, and the tasks given to them. The results are presented in chapter 4, based on which the discussion of the findings follows in chapter 5. Finally, chapter 6 is the conclusion of the thesis.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part includes different definitions for fossilization and the literature pertaining to this phenomenon in SLA. The different causes for fossilization as proposed by different models will be discussed. The impact of error correction, corrective feedback and form-focused instruction in relation to fossilization will be presented as well. The second part is especially focused on the role of attention, variability and planning and the assumed relationship of these to fossilization.

2.1. Literature on Fossilization

In the literature, there is a dispute concerning the existence of fossilization. Although Selinker (1972), Higgs and Clifford (1982), Perdue and Klein (1992) are strong proponents of its existence, there are some authors who claim that what appears to be fossilization is only temporary cessation in learning, variously referred to as plateauing, temporary stability, stabilization, and jellification. On the other hand, Tollefson and Finn (1983) believe that both temporary and permanent aspects of fossilization exist.

Higgs and Clifford (1982) refer to the permanent nature of fossilization, for which they see no remedy. They based their observation on the performance profile of language learners at the CIA Language School. The oral proficiency levels of learners were scored on the FSI (Foreign Service Institute) 0-5 scale, based on which students were placed in

levels 0 to 5⁶. They interpret the phenomenon of permanent cessation in learning as a *terminal profile* (Terminal 2+). The term terminal profile is used for those learners who fail to develop their second language beyond 2+.

They observed numerous cases of fossilized language behavior involving learners who entered the government language training program at level 2 and could not progress to level 3 (terminal 2+). The terminal profiles had a high vocabulary score but low levels of grammar, including fossilized incorrect patterns which could not be remedied even by intensive instruction. Fossilized or terminal language development, Higgs and Clifford (1982) point out, is the common experience found in these learners whose common background is that they started learning 'in the street' and picked up the language in a naturalistic situation. Higgs and Clifford claim that these people are prone to fossilize because whenever their competence is inadequate for a communicative situation, their communication strategies employ well-rehearsed forms or structures which eventually fossilize.

Perdue and Klein (1992) studied two Italian speakers who were learning English over a period of two years. Up to a certain point in their study period, they noticed that

---

⁶ Higgs and Clifford (1982) define the different levels as follows:

Learners placed at Level 0 are not able to communicate. In Level 1, the learners are a bit creative to be able to ask and answer factual questions. Level- 2 learners are able to narrate events in present, past and future tense. At level 3, learners are able to use the language to talk about more abstract and unfamiliar topics. Level 4 includes those learners who are able to take part in discussions and express their opinions under different situations. Their linguistic competence is in such a state that allows them to choose language forms according to who their audiences are. Level 5, the highest level, "requires performance on all tasks equivalent to that of an educated native speaker, with the emphasis on the word *educated*" (pp.63-64).

both of the subjects built a similar basic learner variety “in which major constituents of utterances are organized in accordance with the constraints (S) and (P)”⁷(p. 268)

Second language learners benefit from the characteristics of the basic variety and develop such a system, because “it is simple in structure, easy to acquire, natural to handle, and adequate for the job” (Perdue & Klein, 1992: 271). However those learners who find the basic variety inadequate for communication and intend to become more native-like, usually progress beyond it. At the end of their study, Perdue and Klein found that one of their subjects, who was a reserved and cautious learner, made considerable progress, grammaticalized his utterances in a systematic way, and managed to go beyond the basic variety. The other learner, who was a risk-taker, developed his language knowledge just a little and stopped at that level to the end of the research.

It is necessary to mention that these two learners were taking English courses at the time of the study, they both had the same language learning opportunity and the same exposure to the English language, and they were at the same level of proficiency at the outset.

Perdue and Klein concluded that the difference in progress between these two learners was not due to social, psychological and biological factors but rather to the degree of attention they allocated to their speech and their motivation. Unlike the less developed learner, the successful learner used to take the time to plan his utterances. He also had a higher degree of receptivity to the linguistic environment, to the target language input, and the reformulations of his speech by native speakers. In contrast, the features of unplanned discourse were apparent in the utterances of the unsuccessful

---

⁷ S and P stand for semantic and pragmatic constraints.

research subject. He just wanted to be understood, so he used simple structures that sufficed to meet his needs and was unwilling to risk restructuring his utterances.

Schumann's (1975) study of Alberto and Schmidt's (1983) study of Wes are two well-known cases in the literature illustrating plateauing and fossilization.

Alberto, a 33-year-old Costa Rican, was a native speaker of Spanish whose development was observed by Schumann (1975). During the course of the research period (10 months), during part of which he was also receiving formal instruction, he showed very little progress and remained at the early, simplifying stage of linguistic development. For example, at the end of the study, his negation was still at the *NO+V* stage. Based on the observation, Schumann also concluded that his level of acculturation to English-speaking society was very low.

Wes was a 33-year-old Japanese speaker learning English in the U.S., studied by Schmidt (1983) over a period of three years. Wes acculturated very successfully to the target language society and did not appear to experience any social psychological distance. He achieved considerable communicative ability in English. He was a very sociable and extrovert person, had a high level of self-confidence with low anxiety, was a risk-taker and perceptive of the feelings and thoughts of others. He had many English monolingual friends and was living with an American roommate. Although he managed to improve his communicative competence, his IL did not develop and showed premature fossilization like Alberto. His grammar remained at a very low and elementary level. His success in achieving communicative competence may have been due to memorizing certain utterances. Getting by with that amount of language may have contributed to his premature stabilization.

On the other hand, there are researchers such as Long (2001) who believe that fossilization does not exist. “While fossilization may yet turn out to exist, there is little evidence that it does thus far, and hence, there is currently little or nothing to explain” (Long, 2001: 37). Washburn (1994) also seems to hold the view that what we are witnessing is not fossilization but plateauing, by which she means that target language development has been inhibited. The plateauing level can be overcome by further instruction and changes in the learners’ attitude or motivation.

Washburn (1994) provides some definitions of fossilization which differ from each other, but she believes that all of them imply the view that adult learners fail to acquire the second language at least temporarily. Some aspect of the second language acquisition process may just cease. She also claims that fossilization does not affect the whole interlanguage, but occurs selectively. For example, pronunciation is often fossilized but there is no argument for fossilization in vocabulary. Learners can always go on learning and expanding their vocabulary.

As we have seen, two views exist on the nature of fossilization, one being that it is temporary, the other that is permanent. There are researchers such as Tollefson and Finn (1983) who believe that both temporary and permanent fossilization exist, and that we have to recognize both. However, we have to make a distinction between them by using different terms for each. The first type, of a permanent nature, they refer to as *fossilization*, and the second type they call *jellification*.

According to Tollefson and Finn (1983), the word *fossilization* should refer to cases when the interlanguage is fixed and modifications of which have ceased due to biological factors including critical period effect which will be discussed later in this chapter. In

such cases as biological age having to do with the loss of cerebral capacities, Tollefson and Finn (1983), believe that defossilization is impossible. On the other hand, *jellification* is used to describe temporary cessation of interlanguage development. The causes of jellification are to be found in interactive, social, and psychological aspects. As circumstances change, learning and interlanguage development can resume, and will result in dejellification. In order to have a clear understanding of what is happening with adult language learners, both types must be considered.

In the SLA field, there are many pronouncements about fossilization, but actually there is no reliable longitudinal research focusing on fossilization except for three studies which, as Long (2001) reports, are presently being conducted. Of the three existing longitudinal studies in the literature, those by Lardiere (1998a,b, 2000a,b) and Long (1997) comfortably exceed the upper bound” (Long, 2001: 18) of five years, while that of Han (1998, 2000) “just meets the lower bound”. Long believes that the studies that have been carried out about fossilization so far are not comprehensive and suffer from one form of weakness or another, such as, invalid results, limited data, general methodological flaws, inappropriate units of analysis, unqualified subjects and limited duration of studies.

Setting aside the methodological concerns that Long expresses, SLA research offers several models to account for the cessation of learning. I turn next to a discussion of the models.

2.2. Different Perspectives of Models

In the previous section, we saw that, the cessation of learning has been hypothesized to be temporary, permanent, and both. The temporary aspect refers to the perspective of fossilization provided by a sociolinguistic approach, which argues that changes in circumstances will lead to learning resumption.

Opposed to the sociolinguistic approach are those views which relate fossilization to factors of age or maturation. They view fossilization as being permanent (cf. Tollefson & Firn). One possible account for this other perspective is the Critical Period Hypothesis. This approach to fossilization would argue that maturational changes in the learners' brain will result in second language learning being incomplete once the learner has passed the critical period. Incompleteness means cessation in learning before attaining native-like competence. In the recent literature, the restrictions due to critical period effects have been linked to the issue of ultimate attainment and the question of whether adults can access UG.

2.2. 1. Biological Model

The biological model of fossilization predicts permanent cessation in learning and builds on the Critical Period Hypothesis, which assumes a general failure by adults has to do with critical period and general failure of adults in achieving native-like competence. One of the reasons for fossilization, as discussed by Selinker and Lamendella (1978) are the neuromaturational factors. Referring to Scovel (1969, 1976, 1977), Selinker and Lamendella regard age as a major factor influencing the process of language learning. People who start to learn the target language after their puberty, fail to achieve target

language norms, especially in the phonology of the language. Some authors prefer the term *sensitive period*, because language learning ability does not decline abruptly but shows a more gradual decline and is more selective depending on the linguistic elements.

The Critical Period Hypothesis states that acquisition of native-like competence in either L1 or L2 occurs during a limited developmental period after which language learning ability declines. Birdsong (1992) believes that when learners start learning the second language at different ages, their ultimate attainment, end-point or steady-state competence can be explained through critical or sensitive period effects (p.706).

Johnson and Newport (1991) explain that learning abilities of nonlinguistic development improve with maturation. However, recent research has shown the opposite to be the case for language acquisition ability. That is, the ability to acquire a language is at its highest potential in the first few years of life, and it declines little by little until the mid-teens. Some aspects of learning behavior in other species also face this decline in ability.

Lenneberg (1967) claims that the difference between adults and children in language learning is in direct relation to the critical period. He mostly deals with this issue in first language acquisition and proposes that L1 acquisition in children has been programmed and is biologically determined to take place during the sensitive period. As they approach puberty, the lateralization of the brain will make language learning abilities fade. Recent research shows, though, that lateralization is completed by the age of five. Hawkins (2001) refers to the ability of a child to learn the first language rapidly, effortlessly, without any formal instruction. The success of language learning in children, he claims, supports the assumption that there are innate mechanisms at work specifically

for grammar-building. That's why there is such a uniformity of success among children in their language acquisition. By the age of three or three-and-a-half, many of the major structures of the language have already been acquired. When they get to the age five, they fully understand complex sentences as well the subtle structures, like adults. For many researchers, this is evidence which shows that children acquire the language rapidly by innate mechanisms.

Strozer (1994: 136) mentions that critical period in language learning extends from age two to six during which the brain reaches the final levels of its physical maturation. Long (1990) also raises the age issue, and claims that the deterioration of the biological abilities in some people starts at age six not at puberty. Strozer (1994) points out two interpretations of the Critical Period Hypothesis. One is the “the use it or lose it hypothesis” which does not specifically deal with second language acquisition but explains how the failure to use the acquisition capacity during the early stages of life results in its loss, as in the case of Genie⁸. “ Her lack of linguistic competence, particularly in syntax, after seven years of rehabilitation supports the critical period hypothesis” (Johnson & Newport, 1989: 62).

The other interpretation Strozer calls “ the maturational completion hypothesis”. It again refers to the availability/accessibility of the capacity, during the early period of humans' lives, to attain mastery of language natively merely as a result of exposure to the language. The capacity diminishes after this period and so language learning ability will

---

⁸ In the literature, Genie, is a well-known example of the role of the critical period for first language acquisition. Genie was deprived of language learning from the very early age when she was about 20 months to the age 13.7 years. She was kept totally isolated for the whole of that time and so “she was not able to learn even the rudiments of the ‘computational system’ of a first language after puberty” (Strozer, 1994 : 136).

be lost. An analogy to this would be “people are not expected to grow taller after their teens” (Strozer, 1994: 137).

Herschensohn (2000) supports the restricted age of language learning view (up to age six or seven) and finds that it is validated by the existing SLA literature. From this perspective then, children should acquire the second language fully and their grammatical and lexical competence should become exactly like that of native speakers. After age seven and up to the teen years, they may attain native-like ability, but their grammatical competence has already begun to fade. By the teen years, although they can benefit from instruction, negative feedback, and hard work to develop their L2 grammar, they will never attain native-like command of the language; they may enjoy the advanced skills gained consciously in syntax, morphology, and the lexicon but not in phonology.

Johnson and Newport (1989) carried out research with non-native speakers which sheds new light on critical period effects in SLA. Their research indicates that critical period effects are noticeable at a much younger age than previously thought. They carried out a study with native Korean and Chinese speakers who had moved to the United States between the ages of 3 and 39 and had lived in the United States between 3 and 26 years at the time of testing. The English proficiency of the subjects in twelve basic structures of English grammar was tested through grammaticality judgments. The analysis revealed that there was a systematic relationship between age and performance. The performance of those who had arrived between ages 3 to 7 was at a native-like level, but as the age increased, the performance proved poorer.

The research results confirm that maturational state has an obvious effect on second language learning. Based on their findings, Johnson and Newport (1989) conclude that

critical period effects extend to second language acquisition, and children exceed adults in ultimate attainment.

Johnson and Newport's (1989) research shows that as humans mature, language learning ability declines gradually and plateaus at puberty. "The precise level of this plateau differs between individuals" (p.90). Furthermore, they clarify that even though there is a critical period in language learning, it does not mean that adults do not have the capacity to learn language in adulthood. Based on their findings, adults continue learning but not all aspects of language and only to a certain degree.

Second language acquisition research which is inspired by Universal Grammar has investigated the question of whether after a certain age learners are able to reset parameters in their L2. This research links the Critical Period Hypothesis to the availability/accessibility of UG in adults.

Strozer (1994) asserts that the invariant principles of language, which apparently in the case of Genie failed to mature, are available after the critical period for all normal humans. But, however identical the output of an adult acquirer may be with the output of a native speaker, it does not indicate that the parameters of the foreign language have been appropriately set in the adult learner's mind. Absolutely different grammars of different languages can result in identical outputs, but the correctly uttered outputs do not provide sufficient foundation to claim that the parameters of the language in question have been set in a native-like form in the mind/brain of the adult acquirer. "No one has ever claimed that a particular individual has succeeded in setting all the parameters in the process of acquiring a foreign language" (Strozer, 1994: 156). This is the main difference between adults and children. The reason for this is related to the critical period.

Bley-Vroman (1990) also supports the direct role of the critical period in children's language acquisition, after which unconscious and complete acquisition would be impossible. Bley-Vroman (1990) strongly believes that UG is not available for adult learners as a separate system except for those principles present in the L1, which adult learners can transfer. Yet he seems to agree with some evidence suggesting that some of the UG principles are also available in adults foreign language learning.

To examine the effect of the critical period on a UG parameter, a number of studies have investigated subjacency⁹ with speakers of different languages (Johnson & Newport, 1991; Bley-Vroman, 1988; Schachter, 1989). Speakers of languages such as Korean, Chinese, and Japanese, whose languages do not have WH movement, were the subjects employed in the research studies.

Johnson and Newport (1991) tested Chinese speakers' performance on subjacency. They had first learnt English when they were children and had had English immersion as adults. The analysis of Johnson and Newport's (1991) investigation suggests that maturation prevents the adult learners from obeying principles such as subjacency, presumably as a result of partial or no access to UG. They found that their subjects just show tendencies to obey these principles but do not do it as consistently as native speakers. Thus, they conclude that the mature learners' failure on the subjacency principle was not due to the inability to set the parameters of this principle but that " the entire integrity of the principle appears to be affected by maturation" (Johnson & Newport, 1991: 245). What happens between childhood and adulthood "seems to affect

---

⁹ Subjacency refers to restrictions on WH movement out of certain constructions such as relative clauses and indirect questions.

all aspects of grammar acquisition, including access to UG, the ability to set parameters, and the ability to master the language-specific details of the grammar” (p.256)

Bley-Vroman (1988) evaluated Korean speakers competency on subjacency and found that the subjects’ performance was below that of native speakers. Similarly, Schachter (1989) carried out research with three different language groups (Korean, Chinese, and Indonesian) on subjacency using a written grammaticality judgment task in addition to a syntactic test. Her results revealed that Korean speakers’ performance was the poorest of the three groups. Most of them performed successfully on the syntactic test but failed the subjacency test.

Here too we can notice that there is a critical period effect for subjacency. It negatively affects speakers who do not have WH movement in their native language, such as Korean and Chinese. In their ability to recognize violations neither of the groups was as consistently accurate as the native speakers nor were they as accurate as Dutch speakers, whose L1 is like English in this respect.

These three studies showed different degrees of severity with regard to how age affects participants’ abilities to observe subjacency. They all seem to agree on the existence of critical period effect for subjacency.¹⁰

As many studies have proved (Birdsong, 1992; Ioup, 1995; White & Genessee, 1996), the mastery of syntax by adult learners, both in production and grammaticality judgments, morphology and the lexicon, can be near-native. In this regard, Birdsong’s findings from his 1992 study confirm that even after puberty, ultimate attainment is

---

¹⁰ I chose subjacency as my example for the difficulty with parameter setting because it is such a well-researched area. There are other parameters which also seem to be affected by critical period effects, such as the pro-drop and verb movement parameter.

possible. His study involved 20 native English speakers acquiring French after their puberty. They were exposed to French between ages 11-28 (mean age: 14.9), who had lived in France for at least three years, and who had arrived in France when they were between 19-48 years old (mean age: 28.5 years). They were tested for the grammaticality judgment of seven French syntactic structures representative of parametric variation. 6 out of the 20 participants performed well within the range of native speakers.

However, this study contradicts Coppieters's (1987) study which indicated that the performance of none of the near-native speakers was within the range of native speakers except for those aspects which were governed by and within UG domain. In the case of grammatical and lexical features, Hyttenstam (1990) reports that even those highly proficient bilinguals who had started learning L2 in childhood, perform like non- natives.

Before concluding the discussion of fossilization resulting from critical period effects in ability to reset parameters, it needs to be mentioned that there are researchers (Birdsong, 1992; White & Genesee, 1996; Schwartz & Sprouse, 1996) who share the position that adults have full access to UG. White and Genesee (1996) claim that non-native speakers can attain native competence even on structures which are assumed to be influenced by a critical period. Schwartz and Sprouse (1996) propose "the Full Transfer/Full Access" model according to which adult L2 learners have full access to UG and that the difference in their performance depends on how much of the grammatical properties of their L1 have initially been transferred into L2 grammar. The representation of UG in the initial state for adult L2 learners is their L1 syntax and for L1 learners are UG parameters. Therefore, Schwartz and Sprouse (1996) believe that adults too like children have full access to UG.

If, according to the Critical Period Hypothesis, the age factor affects everyone, and there is such a phenomenon as fossilization, then why is it that some learners within the same age group stop learning at an early stage and cannot go beyond the basic variety while others do progress to quite advanced levels. Clearly, there should be other non-age related factors at work such as, social and psychological factors. So, the biological model for fossilization is also put into question by the research indicating successful parameter resetting.

2.2.2. Acculturation Model

In the biological model, the process of language acquisition is affected by maturation and aging; so, fossilization is an inevitable and permanent phenomenon affecting all individuals regardless of attitudinal factors and social psychological distance to the target-language society. In the acculturation model, the process of language acquisition is affected by internal factors such as attitudes, behaviors, beliefs, and values, as well as external factors, including the social relationship between the learners' group and the target-language group. These, and not age, are the dominant factors and the determinant of the onset of fossilization; therefore, fossilization in the acculturation model need not to be permanent.

Schumann (1978) claims that age is not a significant factor in second language acquisition. Referring to the findings of his ten- month study, Schumann found that one of his subjects, Dolores, demonstrated greater success than Alberto in acquiring English even though they were at the same age. Dolores's improvement was presumably due to internal factors. The reason that adults are less successful second language learners is that they typically do not get involved in real communication situations, as do children, and,

are therefore less inclined to absorb the linguistic input from the environment to which they are exposed. Schumann argues that even children can be affected by social and psychological distance and consequently do not become bilingual effortlessly.

Schumann is the most prominent researcher on acculturation in SLA. His basic hypothesis is that pidginized forms that occur in the early stages of SLA will persist and become fossilized if the learners fail to acculturate. He believes that pidginized forms will remain in the interlanguage when the learners regard themselves as socially separate from speakers of the target language and when, because of a lack of acculturation, the language is used for a very limited range of functions. As a result, the learners develop a grammatically reduced form of the target language, characterized by a limited system of auxiliary verbs, simplified questions, and preverbal negation. If they acculturate, however, they will be able to move out of this stage. Schumann's Pidginization Hypothesis predicts that if social and psychological distance is not removed, pidginization will exist in L2 learners' speech. As stated earlier, Schumann (1978) does not believe that fossilization needs to be permanent and notes that pidginized forms can be eliminated when the adult learners' affective factors (attitude, motivation, beliefs, etc.) are put under the right conditions. Once they are improved, it will lead to successful second language acquisition. Pidginization is usually a temporary and early stage in language learning which all second language learners go through because of processing difficulty.

Pidginized forms, according to Schumann (1982), are the result of simplification in the early stages of SLA. Simplification is a strategy adopted by second language learners to make production of the target language easier, for example, by omitting function

words and grammatical inflections. Simplification can occur because of difficulty processing the input. In the early stages of learning, learners cannot process all linguistic elements in the input at once; they just notice those elements in the input which are necessary for survival and for conveying their meaning. Those grammatical morphemes that are redundant are filtered out. Another reason for simplification is the purpose for which the language is used. At the early stages of SLA, there is little acculturation, and so the language is used for referential or instrumental purposes, such as shopping. But as the acculturation level of the learners grows, the language will be needed for other purposes.

Perdue and Klein's (1992) risk taker subject who couldn't progress beyond the basic variety showed signs of pidginization (absence of grammaticalization) in his speech apparently due to psychological distance. Perdue and Klein (1992) attribute this to his lack of motivation and the psychological distance that he was experiencing.

Perdue and Klein (1992) use the term 'basic variety' to refer to the early stage in second language learning, which can be another term for a pidginized variety. In this stage, the learners pick up those elements from the L2 input which are important for conversation, such as lexical elements, but abstract input such as function words and grammatical inflections which are hard for the learners to hear in the input, tend to be filtered out. Alberto, in Schumann's study stayed at this stage.

Schumann's (1978) study of Alberto, a 33- year- old Costa Rican, who was studied longitudinally for about ten months, revealed that Alberto showed little inclination to acculturation. Alberto also received instruction for a period of three months, but failed to improve. His negation remained at the level of *No+ V*, and no relative pronouns were

used. His auxiliary system remained simplified. So, Schumann looks at Alberto as a speaker who has fossilized because of his acculturation profile.

In Schumann's social-psychological model, two kinds of variables are involved in facilitating language learning. One is the social variable, the other is the psychological variable, which is affective in nature, and so specific to each individual. Language shock, cultural shock, motivation, and ego-permeability are among the psychological factors influencing acculturation and SLA. According to Schumann (1978), social distance is determined by the amount of contact between the language-learning group and the target-language group, and it depends on certain social factors such as, social dominance patterns, three integration strategies (assimilation, preservation, and adaptation), enclosure, cohesiveness and size, congruence and similarity between the cultures, attitude, and finally the intended length of residence in the TL society (pp.380-382). But psychological distance, in which affective and attitudinal factors are involved, refers to the learners' perception of how distant they are from the target-language society.

In the acculturation model, the greater the social-psychological distance, the less the learner will acculturate, and so the less input the learner will obtain. Presenting his acculturation model, Schumann actually claims successful learners are those who are able to integrate into the target language community and become so highly acculturated that there would be no room for social and psychological distance. However, he does not believe that assimilation, the desire to adopt the life style and values of the target language, is required for successful language learning.

Brown (1980) proposes an acculturation model of second language learning which is different from Schumann's in an interesting way. Whereas for Schumann, failure in acculturation leads to the persistence of fossilization, in Brown's model premature acculturation results in plateauing. The proposed optimal distance of Brown (1980), is based on four features: "acculturation, anomie, social distance, and perceived social distance" (p.158). Acculturation takes place in four stages. First is the excitement stage in which the second language learner is influenced by the new environment, and everything around him looks nice and amazing. The second stage in the acculturation process is culture shock. This is when the differences between cultures become more evident and the individual faces a challenge. In this stage, learners experience feelings such as "hostility, indecision, frustration, sadness, loneliness, homesickness, even physical illness" (p.158). The third stage is culture stress, in which learners are slowly becoming familiar with the target culture in thinking and feeling and generally making progress although some acculturation issues have not yet been solved. Brown (1980) hypothesizes that sometime at the beginning of this stage, the mastery of the second language happens. Adults who can somehow pass through stage three and then stage four without a considerable advance in their language learning will develop fossilized forms of the language and carry them to stage four. The fourth stage is the stage in which learners either assimilate or adapt to the new culture. They have accepted the new culture and are more self-confident.

In relation to the factor of personality, one of the subjects in Perdue and Klein's (1992) study persisted in his basic variety. What seems to explain this are his priorities and his personality. His priority was to be fluent. As for his personality, he was a risk

taker. His risk-taking personality inclined him to put emphasis on fluency, yet at the same time, his social and psychological distance and, according to Perdue and Klein, his lack of motivation meant that he couldn't improve. Similarly, Wes (Schmidt, 1983), who was discussed earlier, can also be considered as a risk taker. These kinds of learners are open to the target-language society and have the courage to integrate with its people. They take the initiative to talk and accept the culture more openly. Therefore, they have little difficulty acculturating. This explains how socially they can get close to the target-language society and the people.

Among the affective factors in the social and psychological model, motivation is defined as the learners' reasons for which they attempt to learn the second language. Concerning Gardner's (1972) motivational theory, there are two kinds of motivation at work for second language learning. Integratively motivated learners want to learn the language to be able to talk to, find out about, and become like the target language speakers. Risk-takers (like Wes) are integratively motivated. As soon as they can get enough language to get by, they are satisfied and do not think about improving their grammar. On the other hand, instrumentally oriented learners learn the language for reasons such as job promotion, etc, but they are not interested in the people of the target language.

Contrary to acculturation model, a high instrumental motivation also enables people to progress to advanced levels. Therefore, the integrative motivation implied by Schumann's Acculturation Model does not appear to be the only means to a high level of achievement.

Tollefson and Firn (1983), agreeing with Schumann on the temporary nature of fossilization in the acculturation model, suggest that as fossilization is “merely a temporary stage in interlanguage development,” so “it can be overcome by an increase in integrative motivation”(p.22). Selinker and Lamendella (1978) also have the same idea and indicate that when there is less social and psychological distance, the learner is immune to fossilization and encounters a great amount of input.

Much has been written about acculturation, and there is much critical discussion of the model. Some of the discussions involve counter evidence to it; others involve conceptual and methodological aspects as well as problems of definitions. Schmidt's study (1983) of Wes, is counter evidence for the acculturation model.

A conceptual problem concerns the relation between acculturation and learning. It means that not only acculturation results in learning, but learning also results in acculturation. A methodological problem refers to devising ways to measure social and psychological factors in acculturation, especially psychological factors including, language shock, culture shock, and ego permeability. As acculturation has a dynamic nature, social and psychological distances of language learners change over time. All the research carried on so far suffers from devising ways to measure social and psychological distances and investigating the changes over time.

The acculturation model fails to answer cases in which learners' acculturation level is low but the rate of language learning is high and cases in which learners are highly acculturated with a minimum amount of social and psychological distance but persist on using a simplified variety. In further attempting to resolve the contradiction, Vigil and Oller (1976) resort to cognitive feedback as a solution for the former case (low

acculturation and high language learning achievement); learners' age and genetic predisposition toward the target language for the latter (high acculturation and no language learning).

2.2.3. Interactive Model

In research carried out by Vigil and Oller (1976), an interaction model is developed to account for fossilization. They suggest that the source of fossilization is in the type of interaction between the "sources of messages and audiences for messages in natural languages" (p.283). In the communication process, what encourages learning and enhances production skills is the feedback received by the source and sent by the audience.

According to them, linguistic rules are fossilized partly as a result of the kind of affective and cognitive feedback non-native speakers receive during their attempts to communicate with the native speakers. The nature of the feedback they receive determines whether their grammatical system will develop or not. If they get favorable feedback for any form they use, that specific form will tend to fossilize. That's why they strongly believe that corrective feedback from any source including teachers is necessary for the learners. On the other hand, the forms for which the learner does not receive any corrective feedback will fossilize.

Tollefson and Finn (1983) give a definition for cognitive and affective feedback, saying that feedback of cognitive or affective type can be positive, neutral, or negative.

Positive cognitive feedback means the speaker manages to get his meaning across, and the listener is processing the message; on the other hand, negative cognitive feedback means “the message is not understood or is considered irrelevant”(p.20).

In contrast, affective feedback gives information about the impression and feelings the speaker creates in the listener. Positive affective feedback implies that the speaker is doing a good job, and the listener is intending to enhance the relationship. The neutral affective feedback suggests no change, and negative affective feedback implies that the speaker should give up whatever he/she is doing.

The interaction model predicts the occurrence and /or prevention of fossilization to depend on affective and cognitive feedback. As long as language learning is taking place in an environment where there is a positive affective feedback and negative cognitive feedback, fossilization should not occur. On the other hand, the development of positive cognitive and affective feedback encourages fossilization, because the non-native speaker perceives that his message is processed and the interlocutor conveys a positive attitude towards the speaker.

Tollefson and Firn (1983) believe that according to this model, improvement or fossilization of the learners' interlanguage is highly determined by the variables at work during the conversational interactions between native and non-native speakers. These variables “determine whether the interlanguage rule system of the learner is ‘ reinforced ‘ (leading to fossilization) or ‘ destabilized ‘ (leading to interlanguage progress)” (p.20). If the communicative output of non-native speakers can be understood, the success in communication and the positive affective feedback from the native speakers will lead the

learner to keep using this effective and accepted system even if it is grammatically and phonologically flawed.

Like Vigil and Oller (1976), Johnson (1992) believes in the importance of corrective feedback and introduces two types of feedback as a source of continued learning. He draws a distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic feedback. Intrinsic feedback refers to the students' own experiences in detecting whether their messages have been understood, and if they have met the "rudiments of survival" (p.183). According to Johnson (1992) this type of feedback is not effective, as it only indicates what works and what does not. Moreover, what works may not necessarily be correct, but it helps the learners to get by. Johnson believes that the 'rudiments of survival' can include pidgin forms. If in a communicative task, the only feedback present is intrinsic, probably the pidgin forms will become established.

Extrinsic feedback, on the other hand, is the information about whether or not the forms expressed by the learners are correct. For example, irregular past tense forms or adverbial ending are among those norms which are not necessary for 'survival' and are arbitrary. Therefore, the learners will develop these norms only if extrinsic feedback provides the information about whether the forms have been correctly employed. To be effective, extrinsic feedback has to be presented before the learner has been surrounded by a large amount of positive intrinsic feedback and has survived by using the pidginized forms.

In the model Tollefson and Finn (1983) offer, fossilization is a temporary phenomena. Destabilization of learners' rule system may be the result of receiving

unexpected negative cognitive feedback which encourages language learning to resume after a pause.

Selinker and Lamedella (1979) draw a distinction between fossilization and stabilization in the process of learner's interaction. They believe that when the learners make progress to the extent that interactions are implemented successfully and that language knowledge is enough to meet their needs, then the target- language linguistic rules will tend to stabilize first but not necessarily fossilize. If this period of stabilization persists for a long time, the interlanguage will lose its permeability and fossilization occurs.

The problems with the Vigil and Oller's interactive model is that they fail to include all the structural levels of language, such as the phonological, morphological, syntactical, or other features of language, in their model to explain how expected positive feedback affects them. Assuming that feedback of any kind can correct everything seems illogical. Furthermore, correction does not always have an impact on learning. The learners do not always notice the correction. Their sensitivity to the correction depends on the level of their knowledge. Advanced learners can analyze the feedback they receive from the natives of the target language better. The result of the study of Carroll, Roberge, and Swain (1992) showed that corrective feedback is beneficial. Furthermore, they found out that more corrective information could be retained by advanced learners than intermediates after a week. Therefore, how effectively the learners can use the feedback depends in part on the level of their knowledge. A possible problem associated with this model, according to Tollefson and Firn (1978), is that "there is no percentage of total feedback set to indicate when expected positive feedback is predominant"(p. 24).

However, the importance of the model is that it does agree with some literature in SLA that corrective feedback is beneficial (e.g. Spada & Lightbown, 1993; White, 1991; White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta, 1991; Carroll & Swain, 1993; Schachter, 1984, 1986). In general, it seems communication with feedback is better than just communication itself.

2.3. Approach to Fossilization in this Study

My approach to fossilization in this thesis will be from the perspective which views it as temporary, as the acculturation model suggests. That is, with the change in situation, learning resumes.

2.4. A Fourth Approach

So far I have discussed three models of fossilization. There is a fourth approach for fossilization which I would like to present now. The basic idea is that fossilization may result from a lack of attention to grammatical aspects of input and the lack of self-monitoring.

This fourth approach can be connected to the acculturation model. Because of the great social and psychological distance, learners presumably would not self monitor their speech. Also with social and psychological distance, the input is too limited to notice the grammatical features- formal aspects of input. Perhaps, social and psychological distance causes the learners not to pay attention to formal aspects but rather largely to the lexical aspect of the input for survival and basic communication.

With regard to the interactive model, the fourth approach can be explained in terms of positive cognitive and affective feedback, in which case learners are able to communicate successfully, and therefore, their attention to input and grammatical features is reduced. In support of this framework, there are two other aspects that I am going to discuss, namely, the research that has been done on the benefits of instruction, especially form-focused instruction. The second aspect is the research that has derived from studies on variability.

2.4.1. The Role of Instruction

Research of the last twenty years or so increasingly seems to support the view that instruction is beneficial to second language acquisition in adults (see Norris & Ortega, 2000). As part of this reorientation with regard to the benefits of instruction, the significance of a focus on form has been stressed. The findings all seem to support the importance of instruction focusing on form, as the learners under form-focused instruction have shown a “faster rate of learning and (probably) higher levels of ultimate second language attainment than instruction with no focus on form” (Long, 1991: 47) and higher accuracy (Lightbown & Spada, 1990).

2.4.1.1. Benefits of Instruction

In this section I would like to look specifically at the benefits of form-focused instruction reported in the literature, such as, higher accuracy, faster rate of learning, and higher levels of ultimate attainment.

2.4.1.1.1. Higher Level of Accuracy

The first benefit claimed is a higher level of accuracy and less simplification in the speech of the instructed learners. Pica (1983), in a study of morpheme accuracy, concluded that there is no pidgin-like simplification in the speech of instructed learners in comparison to the naturalistic learners. This indicates that instruction results in higher levels of accuracy.

Ellis (2002) explicitly mentions that learners under form-focused instruction benefit from it. “That is, by and large, learners seem to learn the grammatical structures they are taught” (p.223). In emphasizing the high efficacy of explicit instruction, Norris and Ortega (2000) refer to 49 studies in this regard. Their analysis of the studies shows not only the benefits of the explicit instruction but also the durability of the knowledge gained this way.

Studying the effect of form-focused instruction on accuracy, Lightbown and Spada (1990) investigated the performance of learners in four classes. The learners had been equally exposed to English through ESL classes and their contacts outside the class. The only difference was the degree of form-focused instruction the teacher presented to the learners. The results showed that the group that received the most form-focused instruction in the class had higher accuracy in using the features the researchers were concerned with. Other studies which have showed higher accuracy as a result of form-focused instruction are Doughty (1991), White, Spada, Lightbown, and Ranta (1991), and White (1991).

Doughty (1991) studied the effect of instruction on relativization in the performance of three groups of learners. The first group received comprehensible input by being exposed to the structure in question. The second group received input enhancement activities such as frequent paraphrasing of the relative clauses. They had exposure plus instruction. The third group received explicit information. The result revealed that the second and the third group made improvement. However, the third group improved greatly. The exposure-only group showed just a little improvement.

The study by White, Spada, Lightbown, and Ranta (1991) on question formation also showed that exposure to form-focused instruction and feedback could result in higher rate of accuracy in a group of francophone ESL learners.

Likewise, White (1991) studied adverb placement with native French speakers learning English (experimental group) and with a control group consisting of native speakers of French as well. She provided the experimental group with explicit instruction, exercises, and correction on the positioning of adverbs in English. However, the control group did not receive any explicit instruction on the adverb placement. The results showed that explicit information indeed helped the instructed learners improve but in the long run the performance of the experimental and control group did not differ. Actually, they did not unlearn the wrong positioning of adverbs.

2.4.1.1.2. Faster Rate of Learning

The second benefit reported for form-focused instruction is that it speeds up learning. In his study about the effects of formal instruction, Long (1983) realized that classroom learners appeared to learn more rapidly than naturalistic learners. Likewise,

Ellis (1989) in his investigation with 39 learners agrees with the effect of instruction in helping speed up learning.

Ellis (1989) compared the performance of second language learners of German who were receiving input through grammatical explanation with those who were exposed to the use of German in communication (naturalistic). The results showed that instructed learners could develop more rapidly than the ones who were receiving input through communication only.

Pienemann (1989) investigated German word-order development on a group of ten Italian speakers learning German as a second language in the classroom and compared their performance with the same group used by Ellis (1989). Pienemann asserts that learners benefited differentially from instruction based on their stage of linguistic development. Those who were just one stage before the presented instructional point learned faster, but those who were in the earlier stages did not benefit from instruction, because they were not ready for it. Like Ellis (1989), Pienemann (1989) observes that with instruction, the transition from one stage to another stage takes place more quickly than with naturalistic learners. Thus, it can be concluded that classroom learners progress faster through developmental sequences than naturalistic learners.

2.4.1.1.3. Higher Level of Ultimate Attainment

The third benefit of form-focused instruction is that instructed learners go further in learning than uninstructed learners do (Pavesi, 1986). As a result, fossilization (if there is any) and plateauing in instructed learners would occur much later than with uninstructed learners.

Long (1990) in support of Pavesi's study also mentions that form-focused instruction seems to delay at least early fossilization and plateauing. Therefore, no early plateauing, as is seen in Schumann's Alberto and Higgs and Clifford's terminal 2 learners, can be found in the instructed learners.

Pavesi (1986) studied Italian speakers learning English and compared the performance of naturalistic (street) as opposed to instructed (classroom) learners in learning relative clauses. She found that classroom learners achieved high levels of attainment and could produce more marked¹¹ forms than the street learners. The results appear to indicate that "the classroom context can provide a richness that an informal environment cannot" (Gass & Selinker, 2001: 326).

Ellis (1989) also refers to the high level of attainment by instructed learners, noting that this is one of the differences between street and school learners. He believes that formal instruction may help learners prevent fossilization. Ellis explains that as soon as learners manage to communicate, the more difficult rules are not properly acquired. That is why form-focused instruction is required to bring the less important grammatical features, which are not vital for communication but form target-language norms, to their attention.

2.4.1.2. Components of Instruction

Factors responsible for the benefits of form-focused instruction can involve explicit information, corrective feedback, and various forms of input enhancement.¹² I would like

---

¹¹ Marked forms are those linguistic features which are not as basic and frequent.

¹² Input enhancement can include things that stand out in input well, such as visual highlighting of grammatical features and so on.

to argue that these three factors promote close attention to input and encourage self-monitoring.

2.4.1.2.1. Explicit Information

The first possible aspect of form-focused instruction is explicit knowledge. Explicit information may facilitate the comparison between what a native speaker says and a SL speaker produces. The comparison can take place internally leading to self-monitoring. Schmidt and Frota (1986) call this second kind of comparison “notice the gap”, which may lead learners to detect that they are unable to produce the precise structures they wish to say. They claimed that learners’ progress depends on their focus of attention and noticing that there is a mismatch between the input and their output. This conscious perception, which requires attention, converts input into intake.

Another aspect of explicit information pertains to input processing. Ellis (1995) believes that by means of explicit knowledge¹³, learners are enabled to process the grammatical information more efficiently by having their attention drawn to certain aspects of input. It therefore results in more intake.

Ellis (1995) explains that explicit knowledge makes the learners more aware of the non-standard forms in their interlanguage. As a result, acquisition of target language forms is facilitated. In addition, feedback and instruction play a role in informing learners about what is and is not possible in the L2.

---

¹³ Explicit knowledge can be defined as a conscious knowledge about the aspects of the target language , for example, grammatical rules and so on.

2.4.1.2.2. Corrective Feedback

The second aspect of form-focused instruction is corrective feedback, which lets the learners compare their output with the target language norms. Feedback focuses the learners' attention on more formal aspects of the language and allows the learners to be aware of the discrepancies between the target language norms and their own language output.

This is a kind of input enhancement, and it presumably leads to higher accuracy (Lightbown & Spada, 1990; White, 1991; Carroll & Swain, 1993; White, Spada, Lightbown, & Ranta, 1991). Closely connected with accuracy is the claim that there is less simplification in the speech of instructed learners, which is a characteristic of pidginized speech.

Carroll and Swain (1993), in their study employed four groups of learners to investigate the effects of feedback on learning. The first group received explicit metalinguistic information. The second group was just told whether their responses were correct or not. The third group received corrective feedback, and the last group were instructed to think about their responses (if they were correct or incorrect) when they committed an error. Among these groups, those learners who received any kind of corrective feedback made progress and learned better. They conclude that both types of feedback, with or without explanation, were effective.

2.4.1.2.3. Input Enhancement

The third aspect of form-focused instruction is input enhancement. Schmidt (1990) hypothesized that by drawing learners' attention to form, learning is facilitated in all

cases. In this regard, White, Spada, Lightbown, and Ranta (1991) proposed 'input enhancement', referring to form-focused instruction and corrective feedback. Using the target structures frequently, paraphrasing, and visual enhancement are among other types of input enhancement.

Input enhancement is intended to make the input salient. It, therefore, may facilitate input processing. Input enhancement tasks, when they are well-designed, help the learners not only notice the forms but also the connection between form and function.

White et al.(1991) believe that input enhancement contributes more than natural interaction because in the natural situation, learners do not pay attention to the structures they are exposed to. For example learners may frequently hear questions formed with an auxiliary at the beginning of the sentence, but they do not notice it because it is either too advanced for them or not important for communication and meaning. However, through input enhancement their attention is explicitly drawn to the formal properties of L2.

Having presented the benefits of formal instruction, I would now like to review what differences have been mentioned between instructed and street learners. Among the contrasts that have been proposed, we find the following: Valette (1991), for example, makes a distinction between street and school learners based on their learning situation. Street learners pick up a language from the environment in which they live and where the people speak the target language. Street learners, because of their exposure to an authentic native language, are assumed to receive sufficient input. Valette points out that inaccurate input is found in the street, and street learners receive a great deal of their

input from their self-generated output, which is full of errors, and for which they do not get any corrective feedback.

The distinction between street learners and school learners revolves around the primacy of communication and fluency. Street learners are claimed to put great emphasis on fluency rather than accuracy. That is why these learners process the input for information not for accuracy. Their attention is on being understood. They are motivated to learn the language to be able to communicate successfully without necessarily being accurate. Usually street learners have no problem communicating with target language speakers, though they do so with incorrect patterns of lexical and syntactic forms.

Valette believes that street learners are more likely to fossilize than school learners, not only because of the inaccurate input but importantly because of the lack of corrective feedback from native speakers. She believes that the positive feedback from native speakers helps reinforce the inaccuracies in the learners' language. With respect to the impact of instruction on the plateau effect, which is thought to be permanent, Valette (1991), using Krashen's terminology, suggests that these incorrect fossilized forms "have been 'acquired' and further 'learning' has little remedial effect except in those rare circumscribed instances when the monitor has sufficient time it requires to function" (p.326).

Tracy Terrell (1990, cited in Valette, 1991) seems to support Valette's idea in relation to street learners. He calls street learners, natural learners. Natural learners are those learners who learn the language in environments rich with authentic native language. Terrell like Valette suggests three factors to be responsible for the learners' fossilization: 1) lack of corrective feedback from native speakers, 2) the learners do not

try to correct themselves and remove those inaccuracies (lack of self-monitoring), and 3) the learners can communicate successfully, so there is no reason to worry about language form (lack of attention to grammatical forms).

According to Higgs and Clifford (1982), a terminal 2+ profile (fossilization) is a common phenomenon among street (natural) language learners whose survival does not depend on accurate grammar. Street learners communicate successfully without correct grammar; as a result, they develop and internalize their own communication strategies.

One of the communication strategies is to invent language when the communication tasks become too demanding for the interlanguage system that they have. These invented language forms fossilize and thereby interfere with either the accessing of more accurate forms, if they have them, or they interfere with the acquisition of more accurate forms. When these types of learners can get their meanings across without having to produce grammatically correct forms, there is the threat of interference from fossilized forms on more accurate ones. So, one of the benefits of form-focused instruction is obvious in the case of street versus school learners. That is, the school learners go further in learning than the street learners, and early plateauing seems to be delayed.

The benefits of corrective feedback, input enhancement, and explicit information point to the importance of attention. I have argued that each of these aspects is designed to encourage attention and self-monitoring, and based on the discussions and the studies in the literature, they result in learning and higher accuracy. In reviewing these aspects, I tried to demonstrate how each of these components encourages learners to attend to the formal aspects of input and also to self-monitor their own production either through the

comparison with norms displayed in the input or through comparison with the learners' own explicit knowledge.

Attention is the basis for self-monitoring, and matching output with input. It is also the basis for input to become intake (Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis). If the learners' attention, even in class, cannot be focused on grammatical form either through input enhancement, form-focused activities, or corrective feedback, they are also in the danger of plateauing (Valette, 1991).

Although not all researchers think that explicit grammatical explanation and corrective feedback are necessary (e.g. Van Patten, 1988; Truscott, 1999), there is enough evidence to support this idea (e.g. Schmidt & Frota, 1986). Lyster, Lightbown & Spada (1999) also state "that corrective feedback is pragmatically feasible, potentially effective, and, in some cases, necessary" (p.457).

I think that corrective feedback is very effective in focusing attention on grammatical form. This becomes clear in the study by Washburn (1994) with fossilized and non-fossilized learners. The fossilized learners appeared insensitive to modeled input and produced non-target-like forms. However, when they were prompted by the correct model repeatedly, or when the input was emphasized in some specific ways, they could infer that there was something wrong with their production, and therefore, they were able to produce more target-like forms.

Having established the importance of attention for continuing progress in the L2, based on my review of the literature on form-focused instruction, I would like to turn to the issue of variability. The benefits mentioned for form-focused instruction are the result

of focusing attention on formal aspects of input. The investigation of variability also demonstrates the positive effect of attention for the use of more target-like forms when learners' speech is variable.

2.4.2. The Role of Attention and Variability in Interlanguage

In the preceding section, I have considered the benefit of instruction for second language acquisition and argued that negative feedback and explicit knowledge and input enhancement promote attention and self-monitoring, and that these two are responsible for the higher levels of accuracy and less simplification.

In *A Dictionary of Psychology*, attention has been defined as:

sustained concentration on a specific stimulus, sensation, idea, thought, or activity, enabling one to use information-processing systems with limited capacity to handle vast amounts of information available from the sense organs and memory stores. (*A Dictionary of Psychology* 2001: 62)

Neumann (1971) points out that attention has three aspects. One is the capacity aspect, referring to the limited amount of attention. The other is the selection aspect, which deals with the idea that attention cannot focus on several things at once. The third aspect of attention is the activity aspect, referring to the voluntary allocation of attention.

Robinson (1995) and Tomlin and Villa (1994) provide the same definition for attention. Tomlin and Villa refer to the four main conceptions of attention accepted in SLA research indicating that attention is: 1) “ a limited-capacity system”, 2) “ the process of selecting critical information for further processing”, 3) the representation of “effortful processing that can be contrasted with more automatic and less effortful processing”, and 4) “a matter of the control of information and action”(p.187).

Many learners, such as Wes (Schmidt, 1983) who are exposed to an ample amount of input suggest that environment alone cannot explain success or failure in language learning, but that internal elements in the learner, such as attention, may partly explain success or failure. The attention learners pay to their output, and noticing that the input does not match the output, as argued by Schmidt and Frota (1986), is a determining factor for their progress.

Schmidt (1990) believes that without attention, learning does not happen. Gass and Selinker (2001) in their discussion of the factors affecting learners to notice some aspects of language and not others, refer to the role of attention as well. They agree with Schmidt and Frota (1986) that attention helps learners recognize the mismatches between their own production of the second language and what native speakers produce. As a result of perceiving the mismatch, they will find out what changes need to be made in their grammar.

According to Schmidt (1990,1993,1994; cited in Long, 1996), for input to become intake, noticing or ‘conscious perception’ is required, “ at least for low-level grammatical items, such as plural or third person singular –s” (p.426). Schmidt’s noticing hypothesis indicates that for learning to take place, attention is required. Attention enables the learners to extract items from the linguistic input, allowing them to go to short-term memory for processing. If these items can be related to familiar features in long-term memory, they have the chance to be stored there.

In the preceding paragraphs, the role of attention for input processing was presented. Now I am going to turn to the role of attention in output processing.

In regard to the relationship between, production, memory, and attention, Ellis (1989) claims that “production involves a constant trade-off between the competing demands on memory and control mechanisms” (p. 34). Therefore, the number of demands on short-term memory when fulfilling a task determines whether attention to form would be possible. If there is just one demand on short-term memory, attention-to-form is possible. It is under this condition that the learner may have access to metalingual knowledge. However, if memory is engaged by more than one demand at a time (e.g. writing, organizing, planning discourse content), “the learner can only access those resources over which he has automatic control” (Atkinson & Schiffrin, 1968 cited in Ellis, 1989: 34).

There are a number of studies suggesting that attention leads to more accurate target language use, regardless of whether learners know the rules or not. Hulstijn and Hulstijn (1984) investigated the effects of time pressure and focus of attention on the performance of learners of L2 Dutch. They did not find any evidence for the effect of time pressure on accuracy, but when subjects were instructed to focus attention on specific structures (inversion, and verb-end), this resulted in higher accuracy for both structures.

Another perspective on the role of attention in SLA is offered by studies of variability. Tarone (1983) believes that second language learners' interlanguage has variable properties, and that attention plays an important role in this variability. Specifically if we assume that there is a single homogeneous competence for the learner, then the amount of attention may determine how fully this competence can be accessed in production. The second possibility is that competence is heterogeneous (e.g. as suggested by backsliding). In this case, attention may determine which grammar is accessed. So, in

the absence of attention, elements from the earlier interlanguage grammar which are well-rehearsed or automatized may be accessed. Then, only with full attention can the most recent grammar that the learner has developed be accessed.

Tarone (1983) describes second language learners' interlanguage variability with reference to a capability continuum. The capability continuum proposes that L2 learners' interlanguage system is heterogeneous in the sense that it consists of different styles which are accessed under different situations and with different topics. Different tasks are fulfilled by paying different amounts of attention and it is attention which determines what style is accessed.

Tarone identifies two chief styles on this continuum. The vernacular style consists of utterances produced spontaneously without any attention to the speech. This style can be linked to automatic processing. On the other hand, the careful style includes more target language forms because of the amount of attention paid to speech. Careful style is can be linked to controlled processing. A Language produced by the learners in this style is more variable than the one in the vernacular style¹⁴. Tarone (1983) claims that those forms that can only be retrieved by conscious attention are able, through repeated practice, to emerge in the vernacular style.

In Tarone's framework, the speech style of Washburn's (1994) fossilized subjects would be close to the vernacular end of the continuum as they appeared to have difficulty with self-monitoring both in vernacular style tasks and careful style tasks calling for attention. The incorrect forms were so automatized that retrieving the correct forms was

---

¹⁴ Not all studies seem to show that with a higher degree of attention accuracy improves. The Counter evidence has been provided by Sato (1985) and Tarone (1985).

effortful and required a high degree of controlled processing. This conscious and deliberate processing is exceedingly effortful for all second language learners, especially for those who are at the beginning levels. As a result, simplification occurs.

However, the fossilized learners in Washburn's study, who were at more advanced stages, resisted the attentional effort required for retrieving the less well-rehearsed forms. That is why, in the interview, the fossilized learners showed more backsliding in producing target-like forms than non-fossilized learners. Even when they were given an explicit model of the correct forms, they were able to produce the target-like forms only after several attempts. This strongly suggests that fossilization has its roots in a disinclination to make the effort to pay attention and use controlled processing so that correct forms can be retrieved.

In studying the relationship between attention and variability, Ellis (1985) refers to a discourse continuum ranging from unplanned to planned discourse. A discourse continuum "accounts for the fact that L2 learners produce output that manifests one rule on one occasion and a different rule on another occasion"(p.47). Selinker (1972) calls it *backsliding*, and Ellis calls it *discourse sliding* arising from socio- and psycholinguistic factors. According to Ellis (1985), depending on whether the situation is formal or informal, planned or unplanned discourse is manifested, respectively. The main difference between planned and unplanned discourse is the degree of attention involved in each. "The more the learner monitors his language, the more planned the resulting

discourse will be and the more likely he is to ‘perform his competence’ i.e. to use his maximal knowledge of linguistic rules”¹⁵ (Ellis, 1985: 49).

Ochs (1979) describes the characteristics of planned and unplanned discourse and asserts that the major element in a planned discourse is forethought. “ *Planned discourse* is discourse that has been thought out and organized (designed) prior to its expression” (p.55). However, unplanned discourse is the idea or set of ideas presented on the spot (spontaneously) and which speakers do not have time to organize ahead of their speech. Therefore, it can be concluded that spontaneous speech is unplanned, whereas written discourse is more planned, because there is ample time to think about what to say and how to say it. A written piece can be rewritten or reorganized as much as necessary before the final version is submitted.

The two subjects in Perdue and Klein’s (1992) study seem to exemplify the distinction between planned and unplanned discourse. They studied two Italian speakers who were learning English over a period of two years. They found that one of them, who was a reserved and cautious learner, made considerable progress and grammaticalized his utterances in a systematic way during the observation period, while the other, who was a risk-taker, developed his language knowledge just a little and stopped at that level to the end of the research. It is necessary to mention that these two learners were taking English courses at the time of the study, they both had the same language learning opportunity and the same exposure to the English language, and they were at the same level of proficiency at the beginning of the study. Klein and Perdue concluded that the difference

---

¹⁵ Ellis is not clear about what he has in his mind for the learners’ competence, i.e. homogeneous or heterogeneous competence.

between these two learners was not due to social, or biological factors. It was due to psychological factors including the degree of attention they allocated to their speech and their motivation to improve.

Unlike the less developed learner, the successful learner used to take the time to plan his utterances. He also had a higher degree of receptivity to the linguistic environment and to the target language input. In contrast, the features of unplanned discourse were apparent in the utterances of the less successful subject. He just wanted to be understood, so he used simple structures that sufficed to meet his needs. The one who was the risk-taker did not seem to engage in any self-monitoring.

The speech of the risk-taker subject can be characterized as simplifying. All beginning second language learners simplify because of output processing restrictions and because there are less automatic forms available at the beginning stage of the learning process. In the case of Perdue and Klein's subject, though, simplification appears to have been a performance strategy accompanied by absence of self-monitoring, lack of attention and planning.

According to Hulstijn (1989), L2 learners' insufficient linguistic knowledge and failure in output processing, result in using non-target language forms. He claims that language learning requires paying attention to the linguistic information, which has to pass through controlled (conscious) processing. Controlled processing is about "a focus of attention on individual language forms and their meanings and their integration into receptive and productive skills" (Hulstijn, 1989:18).

Another perspective on the relationship between attention and fossilization is proposed by Ellis (1985) who believes that fossilization occurs when the learner is not able to make form-function relationships. Controlled processing is beneficial to making these form-function connections, without which free variation emerges in the speech of learners. Free variability is the absence of stable form-function relationships. It occurs when learners use different forms interchangeably to express the same meaning or function, regardless of linguistic, discoursal, or situational context. Importantly, Long (2001) suggests that free variability is immune to different degrees of attention during production. Ellis (1989) also refers to this aspect of free variation by stating “there is, in the manner of their [i.e. fossilized L2 speakers] production, no evidence of any difference in the amount of attention paid to the form of the utterances” (p.26). If Ellis (1985) is correct in claiming that there is more free variability in fossilized learners, we can establish a direct connection between fossilization and attention.

Selinker and Han (2001) introduce a similar idea to Ellis (1985) regarding variability and refer to two types of variation in learners' speech, one of which is believed to be the manifestation of stabilization potentially leading to fossilization. The other one occurs in the speech of native speakers too. One type they call 'stabilized inter-contextual variation', by which they refer to the situations in which the learners sometimes produce one form target-like and sometimes non-target-like in different contexts. So, it seems that learners' accuracy in producing target-like forms depends on the degree of control they have on their production. In the contexts where the learner uses more monitoring, target-like forms are used, but in the case of less monitoring, non-target-like forms appear. This

kind of variation is found in the speech of native speakers who use different forms based on the context, though this does not mean the forms they produce are correct or incorrect.

Unlike the stabilized inter-contextual variation, there is another kind of variation which Selinker and Han (2001) call ‘stabilized intra-contextual variation’. It occurs when two or more forms are used randomly in the same context as a result of the lack of form-function relationships. This is equivalent to free variability (c.f. Long, 2001; Ellis, 1985). Schachter (1996) calls this kind of variation, ‘fossilized variation’ or ‘random error variation’. She further provides an example of this kind by referring to the speech of a perfectly fluent adult non-native-speaker of English producing “ ‘ I see him yesterday’ and shortly thereafter producing ‘I saw him yesterday’ apparently on a random basis” (p.160).

Because intra-contextual variation is independent from control and attention, it is more prone to potential fossilization. Schachter (1996) explains that ‘fossilized variation’ can be observed with the morphemes which do not have much heavy semantic load, but the incorrect use of which creates a totally non-native-like speech. Fossilized variation “ is a phenomenon not found in the speech of native speakers” (p.160).

It must be admitted that attention is not consistently productive of more accurate forms, and that bound and free morphemes may respond differently to attention. Tarone (1985), in her study of the use of bound (present tense third person singular *-s*, and plural *-s*) and free morphemes (definite article *the*, and direct object pronoun *it*) did not find a consistent relationship between increased attention and more target-like production of bound morphemes. In the case of free morphemes, it was actually the opposite. The more

the tasks required attention, the less target-like were the speech productions. Tarone proposes that this may have been due to the task requirement of keeping *discourse cohesion*. This finding corresponds to Littlewood's (1981) observation that interlanguage variation also depends on the communicative function of forms. In narrative and, for example, in interview tasks, the speaker has to use articles and pronouns accurately for tracking referents, and therefore, communicating effectively which is not important in other tasks such as a grammar test, because there is no pressure for the speaker to communicate.

Tarone and Parrish (1988) in their study of the form and function of articles in second language learners' speech, found that articles were used more accurately in narrative task than the interview task and the grammar test. They concluded that the different accuracy rate on the usage of articles in different tasks were not due to the factor of attention to form but due to the communicative demand of the tasks and the cohesiveness of the discourse a task required.

Ellis (1987) believes that in cases related to phonological variables, such as regular past (-t/d inflections), there is a direct relationship between high accuracy and planning time and attention. However, this is not true for the use of free morphemes (e.g. irregular past and past copula). It seems that factors other than planning and attention are influencing accuracy (see Young, 1991).

2.4.2.1 Summary

In summary, factors proposed as causes of fossilization include biological factors, lack of corrective feedback on error, a low degree of acculturation, and successful communication in spite of error. I have noted the importance of controlled processing, self-monitoring, and attention in successful learning progress. There is sufficient evidence indicating that the lack of attention and self-monitoring lead to less accurate forms.

On the other hand, we find studies showing that self-monitoring and attention are very important to attaining high accuracy and less simplification. Fossilized speakers do not engage in these processes, and they persist in using the performance strategy of producing the well-rehearsed forms while seeming to avoid controlled forms of processing. With these learners we can expect less variation in response to how much attention the processing situation calls for. On the other hand, more free variation is expected to occur. Free variation or inter-contextual variation is important because, according to Ellis (1985) and Long (2001), it seems to be immune to controlled processing and attention, and it is an expression of fossilization.

The main focus of my thesis will be on the role of attention and whether or not stabilized learners, whose language learning has appeared to stop are able to replace ungrammatical forms and patterns found in their spontaneous speech when the situation calls for monitoring and paying attention to their utterances. I am also assuming that in stabilized speakers, there is more free variation in both monitored and unmonitored speech.

Chapter 3

Methodology

This chapter will describe the subjects involved in the study, the tasks used to test the thesis hypothesis, the procedure for data gathering, and finally the data analysis. The thesis hypothesizes that fossilized learners, whose language learning has appeared to stop, are able to replace ungrammatical forms and patterns in spontaneous speech when they monitor their speech and pay attention to their utterances.

3.1. Research Questions

- 1) Does attention to speech as operationalized in terms of different tasks requiring varying degrees of attention and planning make any difference in preventing the stabilized learners from repeating non-target-like forms in their speech?
- 2) Are there differences between subjects in terms of ability to improve accuracy in relation to the amount of attention and planning?
- 3) Can between-subject differences and their ability to improve be related to their attitude towards acculturation and the degree of motivation to the use of English as widely as possible in their daily lives?

3.2. Nature of the Study

These are three case studies which took about five months to complete. The subjects had to meet three main criteria:

- 1) They had to meet a length of residency criterion (five years or more in Canada).
- 2) They had to have the ability, motivation, and opportunity to learn.

- 3) They had to be taking ESL classes or any other courses in English at the time they were also taking part in my study.

The reasons for the criteria were: 1) According to the literature, after five years or more residency in the target language, for some learners stabilization can occur. 2) The three factors of ability, motivation, and opportunity are absolutely necessary to study fossilization in any kind of a meaningful way. The absence of these factors may lead to failure in learning for reasons other than those which are assumed to contribute to fossilization. 3) Taking ESL classes or any English courses is a way of operationalizing their motivation.

As it may be obvious, it was very difficult to find people who fulfilled all three criteria. That is why it took me more than three months to look for these learners. I was able to find two qualified participants from one ESL school, and four in another ESL school in Ottawa. So, initially I started with six participants, but unfortunately three of them did not complete the study.

The participants were recruited based on their agreement to be treated with coffee or lunch, because they did not seem to like the idea of getting cash for the time they were investing in the study. So, I tried to keep them motivated by buying them such things as gift certificates, coffee, or lunch, since I was meeting them during lunch break at their school.

At first they all seemed to be motivated and excited about the study, as I explained to them what the purpose of the study was and what I expected from them. So, as they realized that it might help them improve their language learning, they all took part in the

first interview. However, in the second interview, which was held a month later, just four of them appeared. Finally I was left with three at the end of the study.

It is necessary to mention that all of the volunteers were married adults with a family, or single mothers. They all were working at the time of the study, so the time element was very important to them. Therefore, there was not a great motivation for them to be involved in this study. It seemed to be time-consuming task for them.

3.3. Description of the Participants

In this section, I am going to present the information I obtained through the two interviews with the three participants who cooperated with me to the end of the study.

3.3.1. “J”

“J” is a 35-year-old single mother with two children, 6 and 4 years old. She is from Haiti. Her native languages are French and Haitian Creole which are spoken at home too. She speaks Creole with her mother and French with her children. The only time the children listen to English at home is when they watch a TV program. But if “J” wants to rent a video film, it would definitely be in French. In the interview, she said, “Never (renting English video films). If I spend my money, it’s gonna be in French”.

She has been living in Canada for 7 years. She has never been to any English-speaking country except Canada. Before deciding to have a permanent residence in Canada, she had traveled to Canada once for one year and the second time for six months for the purpose of studying. She had planned to come to Canada to study and then go back to her country, but because of the political problems in Haiti, she decided to stay.

She has not been able to find a job in her field of study. But she has to work hard to support herself and her children. In addition to work, she is taking a training course in an ESL school, where they are trained to improve their job qualifications.

3.3.1.1. Education and English Background

“J” is an educated person with a university degree in economics from Haiti; she also pursued her studies in Quebec City for two years. The language of her academic studies both in Haiti and in Canada has been French.

She learned English at school. English was an obligatory subject which all the students had to take. This was part of their curriculum based on which students learned English in secondary school for seven years during which the teaching was just focused on vocabulary, grammar, and translation without any emphasis on speaking and listening skills. However, students’ writing skill was well developed because of a strong grammar education. They had little contact with English. The only exposure to English was the teacher talking in the class for roughly two hours per week. The students were also supposed to speak English in the class, but practically they did not, as they were not motivated. The only reason for them to learn English was that they had to pass two official tests held by the government.

“J” considers herself a good student of English as she received good grades. Yet she did not enjoy learning English since the educational system demanded more than it was offering to the students. She was frustrated with not being able to make sentences in English in spite of the advanced knowledge of grammar.

Having arrived in Canada, “J” did not take any ESL classes. She has been exposed to English but not in a formal classroom situation. Upon arrival in Canada, she wanted to communicate and survive. Therefore, it was more important for her to pick up those key words and expressions she needs to communicate successfully at the work place, when shopping, and so on. That is why she says, “ I would like to talk like ... on TV, you know. But it’s hard to me sometimes to find a good word ... because I am try to talk a little bit fast and then I don’t have the good words. That’s the problem”.

She speaks English just at work. On any other occasions such as shopping, she believes that she can make herself understood and she can understand the people very well. The only situation she never wants to be in English is visiting a doctor. She always asks for French service in medical cases, as she thinks she cannot fully convey her purpose in English.

She watches English TV programs and reads magazines and newspapers without having any problem understanding them, but she still finds understanding books difficult. The reason she mentions is that the topics in the newspapers and magazines are familiar and, consequently, they are easier to understand. At the time of the study, “J” was taking a training course to find a better job. The course was “Home Support”, through which they are trained to take care of sick and disabled older people. She was attending the class five days a week, each class lasting for about three and a half hours. So, in addition to her work where she listened to and spoke English, she was exposed to English at school. She believed that the course was helping her especially to improve her speaking skill.

3.3.1.2. Social Life

“J” said that she is happy with her life in Ontario and she would not like to move to Montreal or Quebec City because of the French language or the Haitian community there even though some of her relatives live in Montreal. However, in summer she mostly likes to go to Montreal to visit her relatives and also see a lot of Haitian people and go to Haitian restaurants.

From an acculturation point of view, “J” claims that she has not needed to change. In Haiti, people are aware of North American culture because they have access to all the same TV channels, either in English or French. She does not seem to have any difficulty or confusion about adopting or adapting to the culture in Canada. She celebrates all Canadian events such as Halloween, Thanksgiving and Canada Day. She says in the interview, “ They have the same in my country, so it’s not for Canadian only... When I came here, I am not very stranger. I not feel stranger... It’s not difficult to me to adopt them ”.

She has very positive views about Canadians, the culture, and her relationship with Canadians at work. She has anglophone Canadian friends and neighbors with whom she likes to communicate and if she goes to a restaurant, she prefers to go to a Canadian restaurant rather than a Haitian one. Because of the strong sense she has about her high level of acculturation to the Canadian society, “J” does not mind going out, talking with people, and integrating into the society. It seems that the sense of belonging to the same culture has increased her self-confidence to be open to the target-language society and integrate with its people.

3.3.2. “F”

“F” is a married, 40-year-old woman with four sons. She is from Egypt and her native language is Arabic. She has been living in Canada for 5 years. Before coming to Canada, she had lived in the UAE for 15 years and was working as an Arabic teacher. The purpose of their coming to stay in Canada was the betterment of life and education. At the time of the study, it was the second term of her ESL education. She was in an intermediate level. Her reason for attending ESL classes was to be better able to understand her children when they are speaking in English, and to find a job. She could not take English classes as soon as they arrived in Canada because she had to take care of her children and it was difficult for her to go to school. As a result, she was dependent on her husband as her husband’s English was perfect. Now that her husband has gone to another country for work, she has started to feel the need to learn English so that she can do the shopping, talk with a nurse or a doctor to explain her problems, and so on.

3.3.2.1. Education and English Background

“F” has a university degree from Egypt. She learned English when she was at high school. At university, there were courses in English. Everything was taught in Arabic and the teachers spoke Arabic in the class. English instruction at high school was mainly focused on grammar explanation, some reading and a little writing. Teachers did not speak English at all and students were allowed to speak and ask their questions in Arabic.

Speaking skill was totally ignored. That’s why she complained when she arrived in Canada that she could not speak although she knew the grammar very well. She did not

enjoy English classes back in Egypt. There was no motivation at all to learn English because it is not necessary and important to know English in Egypt. Being an obligatory subject, English is learnt to pass a test. Living in Canada has motivated her in three ways to learn English. First, she has to survive. She has to know English to go shopping, to speak with and understand people in the street. Second, she wants to understand her children, and third, she wants to work. She is happy that the ESL class is very helpful in improving her speaking skills but still she would like to develop her reading and writing skills in addition to being able to use her grammar knowledge in practice.

She admires the instructional method in her ESL class highly. It has helped her develop her speaking very much. She has to speak English (no Arabic) even when she has difficulty expressing her meaning. The challenge she has in the class to listen to and speak English, and the desire to learn it, have improved her communication skill.

At the beginning, she was not willing to speak since she was afraid of making mistakes. However, as she feels she is making progress and can make herself understood, it has given her a high degree of self-confidence to take risks and speak in any situation, such as the classroom, the doctor's office, or when shopping. She comments, "...but no problem. I want to learn. I talk wrong and some correct, like that." "F" watches TV, listens to the news, and sometimes rents video films to enhance her English skills. She has difficulty understanding newspapers but not when reading a story.

3.3.2.2. Social Life

As mentioned in the previous section, "F" and her family's main purpose for coming to Canada was education. "F" has no relatives in Canada. She does not have any

English-speaking friends. Even in her leisure time she prefers to spend her time with her sons or her Arabic-speaking friends. She has been teaching Arabic at school for two years. So, her work does not require her to speak English either. The dominant language at home is Arabic. She has native English speaking neighbors but does not take the opportunity to develop her speaking by talking to them.

From a cultural point of view, she is very strict in holding on to her own culture in dress, cooking and so on. She wears the Hejab (scarf) and is covered. She said in the interview, “ I dress....my dress. I can’t dress for Canadian”. She has little information about the culture in Canada, its politics and sports. She likes some Canadian events and holidays such as Canada Day, Thanksgiving, and Christmas, but not Halloween. Thus, religious and cultural factors have kept her from fully integrating into the society.

Generally speaking, “F” is an introvert, quiet, and shy person

She does not have a negative attitude towards Canadians but she does not want to lose her culture and identity. She does not mind getting positive and good points from this culture but definitely not ones that are against her moral and family principles. She likes living in Canada and would like to contribute to making changes in youths’ lives here in Canada.

3.3.3. “N”

“N” is a 33-year-old married woman with three children, 9, 7, and 5 years old. She is from Ethiopia and speaks her mother tongue, Oromipha, in addition to the official language of Ethiopia, Amharic. She has been living in Canada for 10 years. She came to Canada because her husband had been living in Canada; moreover, she mentions other

advantages for living in Canada, such as more freedom and peace. She is not satisfied with the political and economical situation and the civil war in Ethiopia.

She wishes her kids to be well educated and not experience what she had gone through when she was their age. She is thinking about her own education too. She has the desire to learn about other cultures, to explore the opportunities to improve her life, and to understand what is going on in the society. At the time of the study, she was taking a training course at the same school as “J”.

3.3.3.1. Education and English Background

“N” graduated from high school in Ethiopia. She took English at school without having any real exposure to English. The areas taught at school were mostly grammar and vocabulary. Although their school subjects were supposed to be taught in English, the teachers explained in Amharic and students spoke Amharic even in their English class.

“N” explains that it was very hard to learn English as a foreign language in Ethiopia where most of the people are poor and have a tough life. It was not easy to own a dictionary or go to the library. As a result, the learning was based on memorization so that tests could be passed. “ You have to study really really hard and memorize everything...we have to struggle to just pass that test.....Once you pass the test, maybe you can’t remember some irregular verb...” Learning English back in Ethiopia was not enjoyable at all because of the hard and poor academic, political, and economical situation. She did not consider herself a good student of English as her grades were always at the average level.

When she arrived in Canada, she took ESL classes for a few months. Having interrupted studying because of pregnancy, she took independent study courses first in a school offering upgrading courses such as, math and English for one year. English instruction was focused on grammar and vocabulary. “ Still I have a lot of problem with new words, maybe because I don’t use it (English) at home”. She adds that her writing skill is very poor and needs improvement as well. Then, she registered in an adult high school and started at the Grade 10. This was also a correspondence study. Since her needs for being in a real classroom setting with a teacher to correct her errors and mispronunciations and developing her communication skill were not met, she took home support and computer courses.

Most of the students in this course are immigrants. It has helped her develop her writing, vocabulary, and speaking. “N” thinks she has no problem getting her meaning across under different situations, and people can understand her. Still, she believes that sometimes she has problems understanding people, either because they speak fast or the vocabulary they use is not familiar to her.

“N” hears English more than she speaks it. She only speaks when she is in the classroom or if she wants to buy something. She is also exposed to English by listening to the radio and watching TV. At home, she speaks her own language, Oromipha, and teaches her children to speak it. She does not have any English-speaking neighbors, but she has some Canadian friends with whom she enjoys socializing once in a while. However, activities such as going on a pic-nic would be with the friends from her country. She loves learning and making progress to be able to communicate with people

and find a job she would love to do. She is planning to go back to high school sometime soon and believes that she will never stop learning.

3.3.3.2. Social Life

“N” is very happy living in Canada although she has just one relative here. Her motivation to learn, to help, and communicate with people is high. That’s why she is taking the home-support course. She mentions that living in Canada has been a big change for her. For example, in her country, women are not valued at all and are considered creatures that know nothing. Women must not wear pants. Although “N” still wears a scarf or a veil and is covered, she wears pants. She thinks that she has changed a lot since she has come to Canada. She has got to know Canadian culture a bit and likes events such as Canada Day. But she does not like Halloween and does not let her children go out to celebrate that because she does not know the reason behind it.

“N” does not work and this is one of the reasons she mentions for not having enough contact with Canadians, besides also being too busy taking care of her children. But she is very open to making friends and learning about any culture and people. She wishes to go out and be in touch with society more when her children grow older and she can find time to do that. “N” is trying to strike a balance in teaching her culture and Canadian culture to her children by taking positive points from each. She says, “ As long as I am here, we came for change”.

3.4. Data Gathering

In this section, I will describe the goals and specifications of each task I designed to obtain production data from each of the participants. The data elicitation process took about five months. The participants took part in four sessions altogether once a month. Each meeting lasted between 45 to 60 minutes depending on the speed, the quantity of their speech, and the kind of task they had to perform.

I collected the data at the school they were attending during their lunch break. This put some time pressure on them to complete the tasks, but on the other hand, I had the impression that it did not negatively affect their ability to perform. Participants signed a consent form giving their permission to take part in this study and do the assigned tasks. The data from the oral tasks was transcribed including pauses, and hesitations, self-repetition, and self-corrections. The speech of the subjects in the oral tasks was clear and I had no difficulty in identifying what they were saying. I did not have to discard any spoken data because I was able to figure out what they were saying.

3.4.1. Tasks

There were four different tasks:

- 1- First interview.
- 2- Follow-up interview.
- 3- Elicited imitation task.
- 4- Story retelling, which consisted of three parts. The first two parts of the story retelling task were oral, and the third one was written.

The tasks were selected to elicit differences between spontaneous and careful speech, and thereby, to assess the contribution of attention to variability and bringing about higher levels of accuracy. The description of these tasks and the procedures are as follows. The characteristics of each task in terms of attention, planning, discourse, and time pressure will be mentioned at the end of the task-description.

3.4.1.1. First Interview (INT.1)

This task sought to obtain as much information as possible about the participants by covering questions related to: *A)* individual biography, *B)* education, *C)* English background, *D)* amount of contact with English, *E)* acculturation views, and *F)* how they viewed their cultural identity. (see Appendix 1)

The second aim of this task was to identify recurring non-target-like forms in order to be able to compare their performance on these forms in different tasks. The participants took part in this interview voluntarily without being aware of what kind of questions they were going to be asked. Each interview took about 45 to 60 minutes depending on how talkative they were and the rate of their speech.

3.4.1.1.1. Procedures

Before starting the main interview, I tried to initiate a friendly chat with them about general topics so that they would get warmed up and feel more comfortable to keep talking. Then I turned to questions designed for this task and told them not to answer any questions they thought were more personal, or which for any reason they were not comfortable talking about.

I began with factual questions. Then little by little, I moved to more interpretive questions and the ones requiring more detailed answers. There was quite a bit of laughing and joking which helped them feel more comfortable, especially when they were talking about their personal life, a topic they knew about very well and were eager to talk about without any time constraint in delivering their message. I tried to help them talk more when they gave a very short answer by putting the questions in another way or expanding them with examples so that they became motivated to talk.

I met them at their lunch break at their school. There was a separate and a quiet room, for the interview. The only exception to this was “J” who could not be present at the lunch break or any other time at school for the study. So, I used to meet her at her house. The participants were informed beforehand that the conversation between us would be recorded, and they all agreed. Then, the whole interview was transcribed word by word.

The speech in this task was spontaneous. The setting and the questions were intended to elicit the vernacular style in which attention to form was not a concern. It was unplanned speech. The topic was not familiar. It required a discourse for which cohesiveness was not important¹⁶. There was no time pressure on them to formulate and produce their utterances. They were free to use structures they were familiar with; thus, the speech was very relaxed, and, in general, the anxiety level was low.

3.4.1.2. Follow-up Interview (INT.2)

“J”, “F”, and “N” were asked some open-ended questions not just about their lives but also some general questions to describe, elaborate more, and voice their ideas (Appendix 2). The purpose of the second interview was to get “J”, “F”, and “N” to talk more, so that their recovering grammatical mistakes could be identified clearly and extracted from their spontaneous speech, to be used for the next tasks.

It is obvious that, the second time, the subjects had got to know me better, they could guess what kind of questions might be asked, and they knew what they should do. Moreover, they had already become familiar with my tone of voice. All these factors indicate that their speech in the second interview was produced in a more comfortable and relaxed manner. All three subjects were at the same level of ease in doing the task.

The second interview had the same characteristic as the first one. It was spontaneous and unplanned. Attention was not on form in this task. Undo attention to cohesiveness was not necessary. There was no time pressure to formulate and produce the utterance.

3.4.1.2.1. Extracted Features

The grammatical features that appeared to be problematic for “F”, “J”, and “N” can be put under two categories. One category includes the features that either all three subjects or that two of the three had in common. The second category contains the features specific to each subject (Table1).

---

¹⁶ In the biographical interviews, the subjects are the only chief actors. It is not difficult to maintain discourse cohesiveness. However, in the case of story retelling, they have to remember the actors, and the

Table 1: Extracted Features

<i>Subjects</i>	<i>Categories</i>	
	Specific Features	Common Features
J	- frozen form “ <i>suppose</i> ” - double negative	- copula <i>be</i> - auxiliary <i>be + ing</i> - plural <i>-s</i> - regular-past suffix <i>-ed</i> - inversion in questions - indefinite articles (<i>a, an</i>) - negation with <i>do</i> and <i>be</i>
F	- frozen form “ <i>do it</i> ” - word order (<i>adj + noun</i>) - infinitive <i>to</i>	
N	- passive voice - participle adjective - present perfect tense	

3.4.1.3. Elicited Imitation Task (EIT)

In the imitation task, there were 34, 34, and 36 single separate sentences for “J” (Appendix 3), “F” (Appendix 4), and “N” (Appendix 5), respectively, to repeat. As this task was totally different from the previous ones, I explained what they were required to do and provided them with two examples.

The sentences contained recurring non-target-like forms that had been identified in their interview data. They are as follows:

- Omission of copula *be*. (e.g. *Our dream about education for my kids.*)
- Omission of either *aux.* or *ing* in *aux + ing* structures. (e.g. *He was work in Pizza delivery. / When my children growing, ...*)
- Omission of regular-past suffix *-ed*. (e.g. *When I came here and live in Canada, I like Canada.*)

---

events and then remember who did what.

- Omission of infinitive *to*. (e.g. *I want learn English.*)
- Omission and inaccurate use of indefinite articles *a, an*. (e.g. *UAE is country in Middle East. / This woman is a very nice.*)
- Omission of suffix *-ed* in participle adjectives. (e.g. *We are very advance*)
- Omission of plural *-s*. (e.g. *More idea / We begin to be friend.*)
- Omission of *aux.* or past-participle suffix *-ed* in passive structures. (e.g. *Oromipha spoken by large society. / All of us are force to give.*)
- Lack of inversion in questions. (e.g. *How I can do it.*)
- Adding *no* or *not* to bare verbs to make negations. (e.g. *He not talk with his parents. / This man no die.*)
- Double negative. (e.g. *We don't have nothing.*)
- Word order (*adj + noun*). (e.g. *mark good / poem Arabic*)

In constructing sentences for the imitation task, I followed guidelines set out in the literature (e.g. Naiman 1974).

Each of the grammatical items listed above appeared in four token sentences in order to obtain a more reliable indication of their ability.

Sentences that were simple in structure containing easy and familiar vocabulary were used as well as lexical subjects instead of subject pronouns because I thought speakers could build up associations between pronouns and copula *be* verbs (*am, is, are, was, were*) as their interview performances showed.

The sentences were controlled for the number of words and syllables. The number of words in each sentence ranged from 9 to 13 (average 11) with either 14 or 15 syllables. So, the sentences were equal in length and also long enough so that the subjects could not keep them in their short-term memory and had to process them through their internalized grammar.

The target structures in focus were placed in the middle of each sentence (close to the seventh syllable). The reason being that words in the first and end positions can be easily remembered.

For the regular-past category, commonly used regular past verbs ending in /*id*/, /*t*/, and /*d*/ were used. In case of plurals, plural nouns with /*s*/, /*z*/, and /*iz*/ ending pronunciations were selected.

The sentences were presented at a slower pace than the conversational pace used in the interviews with no pause between words. The sentences were recorded so that the speed of the speech and the rhythm could be kept the same.

The order of presentation of the grammatical items as well as the sentences with each grammatical category was randomized. Although order of presentation was randomized, it did not involve two items in sequence that were highly similar (e.g. aux *be* and copula *be*).

The subjects were asked to listen to each sentence carefully and to try to repeat the sentences. Each sentence was played once. There was a ten-second pause between each sentence providing enough time for repetition. Therefore, they had to listen and process the sentences to understand and produce them. The subjects did not always have enough time to complete the sentences.

The number of the next sentence was read out in order to get them to focus their attention on a new repetition. This way, they had a little time to switch the focus of their attention to the new sentence.

Obviously, this task was the most difficult one because it included unfamiliar and isolated sentences with no discourse context. As a result, this was a task which demanded a high degree of attention to form. At the same time it was structured speech. Due to the severe time constraint it was also unplanned.

3.4.1.4. Story Retelling Task (SRT)

A story including most of the problematic grammatical features of the three subjects was selected and recorded (see Appendix 6). It was about 1300 words long. The unfamiliar vocabulary was explained to them before listening to the story. Furthermore, the names of the people in the story and their relationships were explained to them. I also provided them with the names of the people so that they would not get confused while telling the story or when writing the story.

The story retelling task consisted of three parts: 1) comprehension questions (SR1), 2) retelling the story orally (SR2), and 3) writing the story task (SWT). The first two parts were oral.

3.4.1.4.1.Comprehension (SR1)

In this section of the task, the subjects were requested to listen to the story carefully and were told that they would be asked to answer some comprehension questions based on the story. The story was played once, and then they answered 12 questions about the

story. There was no time pressure in this task. The performance was spontaneous and unplanned. The questions to which they had to provide appropriate answers were not familiar. They were allowed to give elliptical answers. They did not need to worry about the cohesiveness of their answers. So, the speech pattern was close to the two interviews. It was assumed that their attention was focused on the content of the story and less on grammatical form.

3.4.1.4.2. Oral Retelling with Attention to Form (SR2)

The second part in the story retelling task involved listening to the story once more and then retelling it, while paying attention to accuracy. The instruction given to them was to listen to the story again. After it was finished, they were supposed to retell the story. When the story was over, I asked them to tell the story and try to be as grammatically correct as possible.

In this part, I would say that their speech was in the careful style and semi planned, since it was the second time they were listening to the story. They were familiar with the subject and attention was on grammatical form. They already knew the sequence of the events, so they could partly organize their narration. There was no time limit in doing this task. Keeping discourse cohesion was important in this section, as they had to retell the story keeping in mind the sequence of events and the identity of various actors.

3.4.1.4.3. Story Writing Task (SWT)

They listened to the story for a third time and then were asked to retell it in writing. The goal of the writing task was to find out how attention and planning affected their

accuracy. It was expected that the speech in this part would be careful and planned. By this time, they were familiar with the story. Hence, maintaining discourse cohesiveness would not be too much of a burden. Therefore, they would have enough time to think about grammatical structures and also have available the processing resources to focus on grammatical form. Since the writing task represented the third time they were listening to the story, some vocabulary and structures presumably had been memorized and were used in their writing. The three subjects wrote one draft. They did not have any crossing out, i.e. self-corrections, in their writing.

3.5 Data Analysis

Having finished the tasks, I examined the entire transcripts of the two interviews, the elicited imitation task, the story retelling and story writing for each of the three subjects. For each, I extracted all the features that I had identified at the end of their interviews (Table1) regardless of whether they had been used correctly or incorrectly. This way, I arrived at the total number of occurrences for each feature on each task.

Then, those features were judged to be either correct, partially correct, or incorrect. Features such as copula *be*, *aux + ing*, and negation with *be* and *do* were considered partially correct when they were used wrongly in terms of tense, or person. Moreover, in cases when an *aux* was used to indicate tense (e.g. *I am believe*), it was also considered partially correct. Inappropriate use of indefinite articles (*a*, *an*) and the use of the definite article *the* instead of *a*, *an* was counted partially correct. The use of auxiliary *be* and *do* for negation was considered partially correct even though agreement was ungrammatical

(e.g. *A lot of people doesn't have ...*), or the wrong auxiliary was used (e.g. *I am not like it*).

Similarly in the case of plurals, when plural-*s* was added to a noun which has an irregular plural form (e.g. *womans*), they were regarded partially correct. In the case of irregular past, addition of *-ed* to irregular verbs, it was considered partially correct. (e.g. *goed, tooked*)

The features were judged incorrect when they were omitted in required contexts, for example, past tense suffix *-ed* omission or *-ed* used in a present tense context. Similarly, missing indefinite articles (*a, an*) or their presence in cases when they were not required (e.g. *I have a some idea ; a children*) was incorrect.

Missing copula, missing *aux* or *-ing*, lack of subject *aux* inversion in questions (e.g. *When you finish?*; *Where I can find it?*) , missing past participle suffix *-ed* to make a passive voice, adding *-s* plural in a singular context, omission of plural *-s* in a plural context , double negative, using *no* or *not* without an *aux* and ungrammatical positioning of the negator (e.g. *They not Canadian people*; *not they are different*), were also incorrect .

In deciding on grammatical correctness, I asked two native speakers if the specific forms would be acceptable in the contexts they had been used, especially in the story retelling and writing task. In this task, the use of the historical present and the shift between past and present definitely required the judgement of a native speaker.

Two methods were used to analyze the data. One was to find the percentage of correct and incorrect forms for each feature. In the percentage method, each grammatical feature was counted to see how many times it had appeared in speech in each task. Then,

the number of times each feature was used correctly/ incorrectly was counted separately, and their percentages were calculated. This analysis provided a rough estimation of the subjects' performance.

The other method was a quantified analysis. By this method, the total number of occurrences for each feature was multiplied by two (e.g. if a feature had occurred 20 times $20 \times 2 = 40$). The result showed the total number of points possible that could be obtained for a certain feature. Then, two points were allocated to correct items, one point to partially correct, and 0 to incorrect ones. The points were added up, and the total demonstrated the number of points achieved (e.g. If out of 20 times, a feature was used 10 times correctly, 5 times partially correctly, and 5 times incorrectly, the total would be 25). The total number of points possible for each category was divided by the total number of occurrences to obtain a percentage ($25/40 = 0.625 = 62.5\%$). I decided to use the quantified analysis because, in my estimation, it takes better account of the knowledge a learner has than a simple correct / incorrect dichotomy. The results will be reported in Chapter 4.

3.5.1. The Size of the Corpus

In this section, I would like to present information about the size of the corpus for each subject, their hesitations and self corrections throughout their speech production in each task (Tables 2 and 3).

Although the number of the words produced in speech is an indication of the level of proficiency in language, it is necessary to mention that in tasks, such as story retelling, the attitudinal factors may stop the speaker from talking in detail and elaborating more.

Table 2: Number of words produced in each task

Tasks	No.of words		
	J	F	N
Interviews 1 and 2	7970	3700	7300
Imitation	34 sentences	34 sentences	36sentences
Story retell 1	270	425	490
Story retell 2	420	571	747
Writing	290	400	500

As self-corrections and hesitations indicate that controlled processing and attention is at work, the percentages were calculated in each task¹⁷.

Table 3: Percentages of hesitations and self-corrections

Tasks	Percentage of self corrections			Percentage of hesitations		
	J	F	N	J	F	N
Interviews 1 and 2	0.35%	0.77%	0.1%	0.93%	15%	1.9%
Imitation	0	0	0	20.5%	80%	67%
Story retell 1	0	0.62%	0	8%	13%	9%
Story retell 2	0	0.95%	0.39%	5%	16%	13%
Writing	0	0	0	-	-	-

¹⁷ The total number of self corrections or hesitations were counted in each task and then the percentage of each was calculated out of one hundred words.

Chapter 4

Results

This chapter presents the results of the analyses performed on the data collected with the three participants in my study. SPSS version 9 was used to create a data base and generate graphs to analyze data in the performances across the different grammatical features. Line graphs were used to represent these differences because they helped me to see trends and the directionality of growth and decline. In addition, the relationship and connection between tasks and people are clearer in the line chart than in other graphic representations¹⁸. Also, the degree of association between participants and the total scores for each grammatical feature across different tasks is measured through crosstabulation analysis and *Eta* using SPSS version 9.

Eta is a nominal (i.e. person, task) by interval (total score) analysis. “When the sample statistic is significant, one rough way of determining how much of the overall variability in the data can be accounted for by the independent variable is to determine its *strength of association*. For the t-test and matched t-test, this measure of strength of association is called *eta squared*.”¹⁹ (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991: 266). According to Hatch and Lazaraton, *eta squared* below 5 is a weak association between variability and performance, but 5 and more show strong association.

---

¹⁸ Bar charts would typically be used to represent these data

¹⁹ The sample was not randomly drawn and was far too small to test for significance. Further, if multiple T-Test were run, there would be a great risk of a type-one error. Type-one error is finding a significant difference when there is none. What was of interest, however, was *Eta* itself. The difference in association suggested by the table may only be viewed as a meaningful trend, a possible indication of a feature deserving further investigation.

4.1. Degree of Variability Association between Subjects for Grammatical Features

Table 4: *Eta* Analysis²⁰

Features	Eta
Contracted Copula <i>be</i>	.192
Uncontracted Copula <i>be</i>	.317
Contracted Auxiliary <i>be</i>	.126
Uncontracted Auxiliary <i>be</i>	.133
Regular past suffix (-ed)	.301
Plural "S"	.387
Negation with <i>be</i>	.796
Negation with <i>do</i>	.323
Inversion in question	.244
Indefinite articles (<i>a, an</i>)	.901
Participle adjective suffix (-ed)	.506

²⁰ Missing from the table are other features in the *Eta* analysis due to a lack of sufficient number of participants. Since *Eta* analysis is used to show the degree of association between the performances of participants, more than one person is required. Therefore, the features absent in Table 4 are the ones which were specific to one individual.

4.1.1. Variability in Each Task

Table 5: Variability (based on correct percentages)

Features	INT.1			INT.2			EIT		
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Contracted Copula <i>be</i>	3	90.00	9.53	3	97.33	2.08	-	----	----
Uncontracted Copula <i>be</i>	3	63.33	17.00	3	66.66	21.03	3	42.00	19.28
Contracted Auxiliary <i>be</i>	2	100.00	.00	2	77.00	8.48	-	----	----
Uncontracted Auxiliary <i>be</i>	3	38.00	14.10	3	17.00	15.39	-	----	----
Regular-past suffix (-ed)	3	22.66	17.00	-	----	----	3	30.16	19.55
Plural “-S”	3	58.66	5.68	3	47.66	14.36	3	38.33	8.02
Negation with <i>be</i>	2	48.00	32.52	-	----	----	2	26.50	9.19
Negation with <i>do</i>	2	77.50	10.60	2	76.50	19.09	2	29.00	5.65
Indefinite articles (<i>a, an</i>)	3	43.00	30.80	3	39.16	28.97	2	53.50	4.94
Participle adjective suffix (-ed)	-	----	----	-	----	----	2	50.00	42.42

Features	SR1			SR2			SWT		
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Contracted Copula <i>be</i>	2	75.50	6.36	-	----	----	-	----	----
Uncontracted Copula <i>be</i>	3	65.66	17.78	3	62.33	4.16	3	90.33	10.59
Uncontracted Auxiliary <i>be</i>	-	----	----	2	58.50	12.02	3	58.33	14.43
Plural “-S”	-	----	----	-	----	----	3	51.33	42.19
Negation with <i>do</i>	2	85.25	3.18	2	66.50	23.33	2	83.50	23.33
Inversion in question	-	----	----	-	----	----	2	42.50	24.74
Indefinite articles (<i>a, an</i>)	3	48.33	36.47	-	----	----	3	60.66	27.22
Regular- past suffix (-ed)	-	----	----	3	16.66	11.59	-	----	----

4.2. SPSS Graphs²¹ and Data Base

Following are the two sets of graphs for each grammatical feature. The first one shows the total percentages of correct plus partially correct responses (explained in chapter 3). The second graph for the same feature shows the percentages of only correct responses. So, the lines in the graphs represent the three participants' performances for each grammatical feature in different tasks and the differences the lines show in the two sets of graphs (1- Total percentage and 2- Accuracy percentage) are due to the partially correct tokens.

It is necessary to mention that with a few of the features, such as, plural *-s*, infinitive *to* in verb + verb structures, participle-adjective suffix *-ed*, and word order: *adj.* + *noun*, producing partially correct structures is virtually impossible. Therefore, the total and only correct percentages turn up to be the same resulting in identical graphs for both sets of scores.

4.2.1. Contracted Copula *be* (*.. 'm* , *.. 's*, *.. 're*)

4.2.1.1. Total Percentage

Based on the total percentage graph (Figure 1), in the speech of the three subjects the contracted copula fluctuated between the 80% and 100% accuracy range in the INT.1 and 2 and the SRT (SR1, SR2, SWT). This feature was the only feature the accuracy of which started from 80% and went up.

---

²¹ Where there is a gap for any task in the graphs, it indicates that there was insufficient data in that particular task. It means the particular grammatical feature did not occur often enough in the speech of the participant to make calculations possible. In the case of contracted copula and auxiliary *be* (Figures 1 and 5), the absence of the EIT is due to the lack of contracted copula and auxiliary *be* in the sentences of this task.

Figure 1 : Contracted Copula "be" by person and task

4.2.1.2. Accuracy Percentage

Figure 2 shows that “J” and “N” got the same scores as in Figure 1 in the INT.2 (J: 99%, and N: 98%).

As “J”, “F”, and “N” produced partially correct tokens in the other tasks, it makes their performances in Figure 2 look different from Figure 1.

Table 5 shows that the variability across tasks is not meaningful. Moreover, based on Table 4, the *Eta* analysis shows a weak overall variability (.192), which cannot be accounted for.

Figure 2 : Contracted copula "be" by person and task

Comparing Figures 1 and 2, we can find a difference of 11% in the INT1 for F, 14% and 10% in the SR1 for "J" and "N" respectively, and 12.5% in the SR2 for "N".

For this feature, "N" produced the most partially correct tokens, followed by "J" and "F".

4.2.2. Uncontracted Copula *be* (*am, is, are, was, were*)

4.2.2.1. Total Percentage

Producing this feature, "J" improved to the fullest (100%) in the SWT. "F", also,

made near-perfect progress up to 96% in the SWT. “N”’s performance was lowest in the EIT (67%) and highest in INT.2 (88%) followed by the SWT (86%).

Figure 3 : Uncontracted Copula "be" by person and task

4.2.2.2. Accuracy Percentage

Figure 4 shows that the accuracy range for “J” and “N” in the SR1 is the same as in Figure 3. That is, 50% accuracy for “J” and 85% for “F”. In addition, “J”, in her SWT got all the uncontracted copulas totally correct (100%).

In the other tasks, “J” and “F” were different from Figure 3. “N” achieved different total and accuracy scores in all the tasks. This means that she produced partially correct features in all the tasks.

The correct percentage variability, based on Table 5, is lowest in the SR2 and highest in the INT.2. However, Table 4 (*Eta* analysis) shows that overall variability is .317 which is not meaningful.

Figure 4 : Uncontracted copula "be" by person and task

For this feature, based on graphs 3 and 4, there is quite a noticeable difference between “N”’s and “F”’s performance, especially in the EIT and SR2.

The greater occurrence of partially correct uncontracted copula is found in “N” (45%), followed by “F” (39%), and then by “J” (24.5%).

4.2.3. Contracted Auxiliary *be* (..’*m*, ..’*s*, ..’*re*)

4.2.3.1. Total Percentage

The contracted auxiliary did not appear often enough in “F”’s speech. So, there is missing data for this particular feature in “F”’s performance in different tasks.

“J” and “N” used the contracted auxiliary just in the INT.1 and 2 (Figure 5). Both “J” and “N” were fully correct (100%) in using it in INT.1. but they fell to lower levels in the INT.2. “J” reached to 83% and “N”, 78%.

Figure 5 : Contracted Auxiliary "be" by person and task

4.2.3.2. Accuracy Percentage

Based on Figure 6, in the first interview both “J” and “N” were 100% correct. In the INT.2, “J” was 83% correct, which is the same as her total percentage (Figure 5). This means that 83% of the contracted auxiliaries produced were correct and the rest were incorrect. There were no partially correct tokens.

In the INT.2, “N” had 71% correct contracted auxiliaries.

Table 4 indicates overall variability of .126 for the three subjects, and Table 5 shows low levels of variability across tasks. So, subjects’ performance fluctuations in different tasks did not distinguished well.

Figure 6 : Contracted auxiliary "be" by person and task

That "N"'s accuracy declined to 83% in the INT.2 is clear in Figure 6, and this is due to 7% partially correct forms in her speech.

4.2.4. Uncontracted Auxiliary *be* (*am, is, are, was, were*)

4.2.4.1. Total Percentage

As the EIT was not directly testing this feature, and the number of uncontracted auxiliaries used in other sentences was not sufficient, this task does not appear in the graph.

Figure 7 : Uncontracted auxiliary "be" by person and task

4.2.4.2. Accuracy Percentage

The highest degree of variability on this feature occurred in the INT.2 which is close to what happened in variability in the INT.1 and the SWT (Table 5). However, the *Eta* analysis (Table 4) reveals .133 overall variability in the three subjects' performance, which cannot be accounted for at all.

Figure 8 shows a decline in accuracy for all three subjects due to their partially correct percentages.

Partially correct forms for this feature across tasks were highest in "N"'s speech (30%). It was 19.5% for "J", and 10% for "F".

Figure 8 : Uncontracted auxiliary "be" by person and task

4.2.5. Regular Past Suffix (-ed)

4.2.5.1. Total Percentage

“J” performed weakly in this task. She did not produce regular past suffix (-ed) to an acceptable degree for statistical calculation in the SR1. However, in the SR2, she reached 15% and was totally inaccurate (0%) on the regular past suffix (-ed) in the SWT.

“F” achieved 40% in the INT.1 but dropped to 0% in the INT.2. She revived the usage of regular past suffix (-ed) in the EIT to 45%. In the three parts of the SRT, the scores grew in each step. In the SR1, she obtained 20%, in the SR2 29%, and in the SWT 31%.

Figure 9 : Regular- past suffix (-ed) by person and task

“N” performed the best in her writing (56%) and worst in the SR1(0%).

4.2.5.2. Accuracy Percentage

The variability for regular past suffix (*-ed*) in table 5 is not great. Table 4, also shows .301 overall variability, which is not a strong association between subjects' score fluctuations.

The only partially correct form of this feature was produced by “N” in the INT.2. This is where Figure 10 declines in accuracy (7%). Other than this, the three subjects remain stable in Figure 9 and 10.

Figure 10 : Regular- past suffix (-ed) by person and task

4.2.6. Indefinite Articles (*a, an*)

4.2.6.1. Total Percentage

“J” showed stability in the range of 70% in her performance in the different tasks except for the SWT, in which she progressed to 91%.

“F” performed very poorly in her use of the indefinite articles (*a, an*), and “N” showed the most variety in her performance.

Figure 11 : Indefinite articles (a,an) by person and task

4.2.6.2. Accuracy Percentage

Table 5 suggests a great degree of variability for this feature in different tasks, except for the EIT where the three subjects' performances varied very little. Furthermore, Table 4 (*Eta* analysis) makes it evident that the overall variability (.901) is noticeable. So, this feature discriminated the performances of the three subjects well.

“F” performed very poorly on the indefinite articles.

“J” produces partially correct tokens in different tasks, but the sharpest difference between her accuracy and correct + partially correct performance is obvious in the EIT where her accuracy declines to 25% (Figure 12, 4.2.6.2.).

Figure 12 : Indefinite articles (a,an) by person and task

“N” also had partially correct tokens in different tasks but the high partially correct scores, which contributed to her lower accuracy (Figure 12, 4.2.6.2.), were in the EIT (7%) and in the SR2 (8%).

Altogether, on this feature, “J” demonstrated the most partially correct forms (44%) while “F” had 16% and “N”, 20%.

4.2.7. Negation with “*be*”

4.2.7.1. Total Percentage

This feature, *be*-negation, was tested for “J” and “F” but not “N” because it was not recognized to be problematic for “N”.

“J” produced this structure in the INT.1 and 2, and in the EIT (Figure 13).

“F” used *be*-negation in the INT.1 with a low level of success (25%), and showed progress (60%) in the EIT.

Figure 13 : Negation with "be" by person and task

4.2.7.2. Accuracy Percentage

According to Figure 14, “J” was the most accurate in the INT.2 (93%) and the least accurate in the EIT (33%). In this task, she did not produce any partially correct tokens.

Using negation with *be*, the two subjects showed a high variability in their performance in the INT.1, but not in the EIT (Table 5). The *Eta* analysis (Table 4) indicates a high degree of overall variability (.796).

Figure 14 : Negation with "be" by person and task

“J” and “F” produced a high percentage of partially correct forms in the EIT which contributed to their low accuracy, as demonstrated in Figure 14 (4.2.7.2.). “J”’s partially correct forms reached 48%, and “F”’s production reached 40% in all on this feature.

4.2.8. Negation with “do”

4.2.8.1. Total Percentage

As in the above case, *do*- negation was tested for “J” and “F” but not “N”, because it was not recognized to be problematic for “N”.

“J”’s accuracy hit the highest rank (100%) in her SWT. “F” obtained the highest accuracy (93.5%) in the SR1. It was almost the same in the SR2 (91%).

Figure 15 : Negation with "do" by person and task

4.2.8.2. Accuracy Percentage

“J” was the most accurate (100%) in the SWT. She got the lowest accuracy score in the EIT (33%) and the SR2 (50%).

“F” performed with the highest accuracy (87.5%) in the SR1. The second highest accuracy level (83%) was in the SR2.

In the SR2 and the SWT, the variability seems to be high based on Table 5, but we can notice that the *Eta* analysis (Table 4) does not show a great overall variability (.323).

Comparing Figure 15, which indicates correct + partially correct answer, and Figure 16, which indicates correct only ones, we can see that there is a decline in all tasks for “J” and “F” except that “J” remained stable (100%) in the SWT.

Figure 16 : Negation with "do" by person and task

The main decline in “J”’s performance was in the EIT. Another big accuracy decline was on the SR2, due to 25% partially correct forms. In the INT.1, the INT.2, and the EIT, partially correct tokens amounted to 4%, 9% and 8% respectively, in each task. So, in Figure 16 there is an accuracy decline in these tasks.

“F”’s sharp accuracy decline was in the INT.2 because of 15% partially correct forms in the EIT due to 12.5% partially correct tokens, and in the SWT because of 17% partially correct occurrences. In other tasks, the difference is small: 2.5% partially correct in INT.1, 6% in the SR1, and 8% in the SR2.

4.2.9. Inversion in Question

4.2.9.1. Total Percentage

“J” had no correct tokens in the INT.1 (0%) and did not have any production of inversion in questions in the INT.2. In the EIT, she improved to 37.5%.

Figure 17 : Inversion in question by person and task

“F” also started with 0% in the INT.1. However, she showed noticeable progress in the SWT (60%).

“N” performed best in the INT.1 with a score of 60%. She fell to 0% in the SR2.

4.2.9.2. Accuracy Percentage

The *Eta* analysis (Table 4) suggests .244 overall variability which cannot be considered a meaningful fluctuation for variability.

Figure 17 and 18 demonstrate the same performance for the three subjects, as partially correct forms were rarely produced except in “J”’s speech in the EIT. The accuracy of “J”’s speech in completing the imitation task dropped up to 12.5%. This is clear in Figure 18.

Contrary to “F”, who shows great improvement in her SWT, “N”’s performance drops sharply from 60% in the INT.1 to 25% in the SWT.

Figure 18 : Inversion in question by person and task

4.2.10. Plural “-s”

4.2.10.1. Total Percentage

“J” was perfect using plural “S” in the SWT (100%) and had the poorest performance in the SR2 (20%).

Figure 19 : Plural “-S” by person and task

“F” performed the highest in the INT.1 (57%) and the lowest in the SR2 (20%).

“N”’s performance was the highest in the INT.1 (55%) and the INT.2 (64%). It was the lowest (0%) in the SR1 and SR2.

4.2.10.2. Accuracy Percentage

As mentioned in section 4.2., it is impossible to have partially correct forms for plural -S, so, Figures 19 and 20 turned out to be identical.

Figure 20 : Plural "-S" by person and task

The *Eta* analysis (Table 4) indicates overall variability of .387, which is not meaningful.

4.2.11. Participle-adjective Suffix (-ed)

4.2.11.1. Total Percentage

The participle adjective suffix (-ed) was specific to “J” and “N”. “J” produced participle adjectives in the INT.1 at a very low level (14%). This rose in the INT.2 (50%), but in the EIT, it went down to 20%.

Figure 21 : Participle - adjective suffix (-ed) by person and task

“N”, however, provided ample tokens in almost all the tasks, except in the INT.1. In the INT.2, she was totally inaccurate (0%) in forming participle adjective suffix *-ed*. She was perfectly accurate in the SR2 and in the SWT (100%).

4.2.11.2. Accuracy Percentage

As for this feature, partially correct structures are not possible. What they produced was either correct or incorrect.

Figure 22 : Participle - adjective suffix (-ed) by person and task

Table 4 suggests a meaningful variability for this feature. The overall variability of the subjects on the *Eta* analysis is .506, which is a high degree of variability.

4.2.12. Verb+ *to* +verb

4.2.12.1. Total Percentage

Inconsistent use of the infinitive marker *to* between main verb and infinitive verb was specific to “F”. The highest accuracy was found in her INT.1 (46%) and the lowest in the INT.2 (8%).

Figure 23 : Verb + to + Verb by person and task

4.2.12.2. Accuracy Percentage

“F”’s use of this grammatical feature was either correct or incorrect.

Figure 24 : Verb + to + Verb by person and task

4.2.13. Word Order (*adjective +noun*)

4.2.13.1. Total Percentage

The word-order feature was specific to “F”. She started with a high level of accuracy in the INT.1 (82%). “F” was perfectly accurate in the SR1 and SR2 (100%). However, in the SWT, she was less accurate (80%).

Figure 25 : Word order (Adj + Noun) by person and task

4.2.13.2. Accuracy Percentage

This structure is among those features (mentioned in section 4.2.) which can only be used either correctly or incorrectly. No partially correct forms are possible.

Figure 26 : Word order (Adj + Noun) by person and task

4.2.14. Targetlike Negation in Double Negative Contexts

4.2.14.1. Total Percentage

This feature, the double negative construction, was specifically problematic for “J”. She produced examples of the elimination of double negative construction in the INT.1 and INT.2 in addition to the EIT. She showed improvement from the INT.1 (33%), which was a quite low level of accuracy, to the INT.2 (67%), and obtained complete accuracy in the EIT (100%).

Figure 27 : Target like negation in double negative contexts

4.2.14.2. Accuracy Percentage

“J” produced no partially correct structures in her speech. Thus, her total percentage (Figure 27) and correct percentage (Figure 28) are identical.

Figure 28 : Target like negation in double negative contexts

4.2.15. Passive Voice

4.2.15.1. Total Percentage

Passive was a feature specific to “N”. Her accuracy in forming passive structures in the INT.1 was quite low (25%). She did not produce enough passive structures in the INT.2. So, there is missing data for that task. Accuracy fell sharply to the lowest possible level (0%) in the SR1. Her performance in the SWT was the most accurate (80%).

Figure 29 : Passive by person and task

4.2.15.2. Accuracy Percentage

“N”’s accuracy (Figure 30) is the same as her total percentage in Figure 29 because of the lack of partially correct passives. The only exception is in the EIT in which she had 11% partially correct tokens and she achieved an accuracy score of 22%. Her highest accuracy was in the SWT.

Figure 30 : Passive by person and task

4.3. Relationship between the Subjects' Accuracy Mean and the Tasks

Table 6, below, includes total means for all the three participants on the tasks. The total means give an indication of accuracy according to task.

Table 6: Accuracy Mean by Person and Task

Tasks	Mean			Means Total
	J	F	N	
Interviews 1 and 2 ²²	62.85	41.9	53.19	157.94
Imitation	52.66	38.06	42.06	132.78
Story Retell 1	76.25	46.5	36.5	159.25
Story Retell 2	52.2	50.25	47.61	150.06
Writing	75.58	57.77	63.06	196.41
Average of Mean	64	47	48	

Table 7 shows the range of the scores for the three participants in each task. The range indicates the degree of dispersion of the scores across the different tasks.

Table 7: Range of Scores by Task

Tasks	Range of scores
Interviews 1 and 2	21
Imitation	14
Story retell 1	40
Story retell 2	5
Writing	18

---

²² The average of the scores were calculated for interview one and two, as both tasks are basically of the same nature.

Table 8, below, gives the range of accuracy scores between the interviews and the writing task

Table 8: Range of Scores in Interviews and Writing task

Participants	Range of scores
J	13
F	16
N	10

Figure 31 : Accuracy mean by person and task

The results are discussed in chapter 5.

Chapter 5

Discussion

Before discussing the results, I would like to repeat my hypothesis and research questions below:

Hypothesis:

Fossilized learners, whose language learning has appeared to stop, are able to replace ungrammatical forms and patterns found in their spontaneous speech when they monitor their speech and pay attention to their utterances.

Research Questions:

1) Does attention to speech, as operationalized in terms of different tasks requiring varying degrees of attention and planning, make any difference in preventing the stabilized learners from repeating non-target-like forms in their speech?

2) Are there differences between subjects in terms of ability to improve accuracy in relation to the amount of attention and planning ?

3) Can between-subject differences and their ability to improve be related to their attitude towards acculturation and the degree of motivation to use English as widely as possible in their daily lives?

In order to test the hypothesis, the subjects had six tasks to complete involving both spontaneous and attentive speech:

- 1) Interview one. (INT.1)
- 2) Interview two. (INT.2)
- 3) Imitation task. (EIT)
- 4) Story retell part one: Answering comprehension questions. (SR1)
- 5) Story retell part two: Retelling the story paying attention to the speech. (SR2)
- 6) Story retell part three: Writing about the story. (SWT)

Some of the linguistics features were common to the three subjects, such as contracted / uncontracted copula *be*, uncontracted auxiliary *be*, regular past suffix (*-ed*), plural (*-s*), indefinite articles (*a.an*), and inversion in questions.

Some features were common to two subjects such as: Contracted auxiliary, and participle-adjective suffix (*-ed*) (“J” and “N”), and negation with *be* and *do* (“J” and “F”).

Finally, there were features specific to each subject. Verb + *to infinitive* structures and word order (Adj + Noun) were specific to “F”. Target-like negation in double negative contexts was “J”’s, and the passive structure was specific to “N”.

5.1. Accuracy Rate in Different Tasks and the Effect of Attention and Planning

Does attention to speech, as operationalized in terms of different tasks requiring varying degrees of attention and planning, make any difference in preventing the stabilized learners from repeating non-target-like forms in their speech?

As explained in chapter 3, the six tasks required different levels of attention and planning. There is a fair degree of variability in the different tasks. The mean scores of the three subjects on each task were added up and the total score on each task was calculated. These scores (see Table 6, chapter 4) can be put in a descending order as follows:

Tasks	Total accuracy scores
1- Writing task	(196.41)
2- Story retell one	(159.25)
3- Interviews	(157.94)
4- Story retell two	(150.06)
5- Imitation	(132.78)

It is necessary to mention that the total accuracy scores in SR1 and the INT.1 and INT.2 are very close. So, they could be grouped together. The SWT combines a high number of factors favorable for higher accuracy, such as attention, planning, discourse cohesion, familiarity with the subject, no time pressure and low cognitive load. Although the SR2 consists of all the favorable factors mentioned for the SWT, it is an oral task in contrast to the writing task. So, there is not as much time as in the written task to monitor for higher accuracy.

Moreover, in SR2 in spite of the existence of the element of attention and some familiarity with the content of the story, the task was probably more difficult than SR1, where they basically just answered some questions and did not have to put the story in a coherent narrative form. In SR1, they were able to give short and simple answers. This may have made it easier for the three participants to perform with higher accuracy regardless of the higher cognitive complexity due to unfamiliarity with the topic, as it was the first time they were hearing the story.

However in SR2, it was the first time they had to put their answers from the previous task in the form of a story. This means that they had to identify the referents in the story, and observe tense sequence. All these factors may have contributed to the lower accuracy, as their attention was on the content and grammar at the same time.

Close to the accuracy mean in SR1 is the accuracy mean in INT.1 and INT.2. A slightly lower accuracy in the interviews can be explained by assuming that because it was spontaneous speech, there was an absence of planning and attention; moreover, they used more compound and complex sentences in INT.1 and INT.2 than in SR1. So, there was the possibility of incurring more errors than in SR1 where they were able to use elliptical answers.

The lowest accuracy, however, is in the EIT (Table 6, chapter 4). This task proved to be the most difficult task for the three participants, presumably because of the time pressure and the use of isolated sentences. Although attention was supposed to be high in doing the imitations, it may not have been fully focused on correct grammar, and as a result, it did not have a great effect on achieving higher accuracy. One reason might be that in this task attention is split between repetition and pronunciation at the same time.

The participants may not have only wanted to repeat the sentences as closely to the modeled sentences as possible, but they may also have tried to imitate the intonation, and pronunciation. Unfamiliarity with the sentences could also have contributed to poor performance as well as the time pressure.

In summary, the answer to the first research question is a qualified yes. It might be proposed that attention is a necessary cause for accuracy, but it is not a sufficient cause. Other factors such as low cognitive load, no time pressure, familiarity with the subject, and discourse cohesion (depending on the feature) should also be present. The existence of one of these factors in any task contributes to a certain extent to accuracy.

5.2. Accuracy Rate in Individuals and the Effect of Attention and Planning

Are there differences between subjects in terms of ability to improve accuracy in relation to the amount of attention and planning ?

The performance of the subjects in different tasks revealed that attention was not equally significant for all three of them to achieve higher accuracy. “J” performed reasonably well and achieved the highest scores in all the tasks. For “J” attention appeared not to play an important role in obtaining high accuracy. She had high accuracy means in spontaneous tasks with almost no self-correction in any task, and with low percentage of hesitations²³. It could be concluded that attention and planning for her were not as vital as they were for the other two subjects. She seemed not to be a planner and a monitor. She obtained her highest accuracy score in completing SR1 where attention and planning were not an issue. Yet, it may be suggested that the processing load of this task

---

²³ Hesitation is an indicator of monitoring, paying attention to, and planning the speech.

was higher due to unfamiliarity with the content. Nonetheless, this task seemed to be an easy one for her and can be looked on as evidence to support the view that she has fairly high proficiency in the language.

Another reason for her overall proficiency may be that she benefits from her first language, French, whose similarity with English enables her to transfer quite a bit. One kind of evidence for transfer being at work is the use of “*it’s*” after any subject, either singular or plural, in her oral tasks, for example, *my children it’s not smile, my son it’s not agree with me, the light wind it’s not strong*²⁴. Interestingly, *it’s* does not occur in her writing.

Although her writing obtained the second highest accuracy score, the absence of *it’s* strongly suggests that her performance does benefit from attention and planning.

It is interesting that her accuracy dropped in SR2. In this task, she obtained the lowest accuracy, possibly because it was the first time she had to put the information into a story form, and it may have been difficult for her to put the story together. Admittedly, this is just a speculation for why her accuracy dropped sharply.

Contrary to “J”, “F” appeared to benefit greatly from attention. She performed at a low level of proficiency in all the tasks (Table 6, chapter 4). Her scores fluctuated within a fairly narrow range and her performance was stabilized in that range. Considering her hesitations and self-corrections as objective means to measure attention, we can suggest that she does monitor her speech. Her accuracy means (Table 6, chapter 4) suggest that

---

²⁴ This is actually an influence from Haitian Creole. Although this example is not contributing to the transfer of similar structures in English and French, it provides an example that she is using the transfer while speaking.

there is a correlation between the degree of attention involved in a task and higher accuracy. Moreover, the spread of her scores between the interviews (spontaneous task) and writing task (requiring attention) was the highest (Table 8, chapter 4) of all the three subjects. This seems to suggest that the attention demanded in the writing task helped her improve accuracy.

“F” performed with higher accuracy in her writing and SR2- the two tasks which required attention, planning, and discourse cohesion. Probably the issue of time pressure, planning, and cohesiveness was the main concern for “F”. When she had enough time to plan and produce her speech, her performance was more grammatically accurate than her spontaneous and unplanned speech.

“F”’s highest accuracy scores in the story retell tasks (SR1: 46.5, SR2: 50.25, & SWT: 57.77), as shown in Table 6, chapter 4, may be an indication of the importance of repetition for her, not unlike what Washburn found in her study with fossilized learners. Her highest score was in the writing task, when she had heard the story for the third time and by which time, she had probably memorized some structures and vocabulary.

Her second highest score was in SR2. She elaborated on the story more than “J” (Table 2, chapter 3) and had the highest numbers of self-corrections and hesitations (Table 3, chapter 3). This suggests that attention did play a more significant role for her and that she is a planner and a monitor.

“N”’s performance could be interpreted as similar to that of the fossilized learners in Washburn’s study. Her production seemed to be unstable considering that she has two sharply different accuracy scores in the interviews and in SR1, both of which involve

spontaneous speech. Yet, when she was directly told to pay attention to her speech in SR2, self-correction occurred, and she achieved a higher accuracy.

It seems that in the story retell tasks, attention appeared to positively influence her accuracy, but the narrow spread of scores between the interviews (spontaneous task) and writing (controlled task) is an indication that she is not responding in a major way to the presence of attention to improve accuracy to a greater degree. Of course, it is possible that she did not follow the instructions and did not pay attention.

Her scores (Table 6, chapter 4) show that her proficiency in the language was higher than “F”’s but still much lower than “J”’s. Like “F”, in SR2 and SWT, attention seemed to help her to achieve higher accuracy scores than in SR1. She got the highest accuracy in SWT and the lowest in SR1.

“N” elaborated more than the other two subjects on the story retell tasks (Table 2, Chapter 3). She provided longer, more detailed answers for the questions in SR1. This fact plus her scores show that her proficiency is higher than “F”’s but less than “J”’s.

Unlike “J”, SR1 was the most difficult task for “N”. Her accuracy dropped sharply in this demanding task. Apparently, she was strongly affected by the cognitive load of the task due to the lack of familiarity with the topic. I assume that this might have made this task even more difficult than the imitation task for her. If she had been a proficient speaker like “J”, her performance should not have suffered as much. Her higher percentage of hesitations and self-corrections (Table 3, chapter 3) relative to “J” may be an indication that she had a bit more inclination than “J” to plan and monitor her speech.

The three subjects did not all exhibit a direct relationship between attention and planning. “J”’s higher accuracy did not seem to be a result of paying attention and planning. She was a fluent speaker who could be as accurate in her spontaneous speech as in her writing. However, attention and planning affected “F”’s accuracy. Her spontaneous performance showed a fairly low level of grammatical accuracy, yet she tended to produce more accurate forms in the tasks requiring attention. “N”’s proficiency level seemed to be higher than “F”’s but lower than “J”’s. Attention and planning helped her improve her accuracy. But her fairly narrow spread of scores between the interviews and the writing task makes one wonder if attention is really an important factor for achieving higher accuracy. Perhaps one can propose that attention is not greatly benefiting her accuracy, but not in the same sense as in “J”’s case who does not need attention to achieve higher accuracy.

Table 9, below, demonstrates the performance of the three subjects on the production of indefinite articles (a/an) across tasks. Comparing “J”’s accuracy percentage in the interview tasks, where discourse cohesion and the factor of attention are not involved, with SR2 and SWT, we can notice that her performance did not fluctuate but remained almost the same. This confirms that for “J”, attention is not a significant factor to bring about higher accuracy. However, “F”’s and “N”’s performance improved significantly in the tasks requiring discourse cohesion (SR2 and SWT). This finding agrees with Tarone and Parrish’s (1988) study where they make the claim that attention is not the sole factor bringing about higher accuracy. The different communicative demands in different tasks and discourse cohesion produced in the tasks contribute to achieving higher accuracy as well.

Table 9: Accuracy Percentage for Indefinite Articles (a/an)

Tasks	INT.1	INT.2	EIT	SR1	SR2	SWT
Participants						
“J”	76%	82%	50%	76%	75%	82%
“F”	15%	12.5%	----	7%	0	30%
“N”	38%	35%	57%	62%	72%	70%

5.3. The Role of Acculturation

Can between-subject differences and their ability to improve be related to their attitude towards acculturation and the degree of motivation for the use of English as widely as possible in their daily lives?

Based on the information in their interviews, “J”, “F”, and “N” appeared not to be experiencing difficulty acculturating to the second language society. This does not imply that they were willing to give up their own life style and values. “J” already knew about the culture as she claimed living in Canada was not a new life style for her. She claimed that in Haiti, people lived much like in Canada and they could learn a lot about North American culture on T.V. “J” was recognized as a person highly acculturated with Canadian society. She was a good communicator and her high scores and proficiency suggested that she was making good progress. Her perception that she possessed a high level of acculturation with the second language society might be one cause for her accelerated language learning. As I already mentioned earlier, her knowledge of French may have contributed to this.

“N” and “F” did not claim that they were highly acculturated with the target language society, but they appeared to appreciate the second language culture; at the same time, they were trying to keep their cultural values and life style, as can be concluded on the basis of the insights gained in the interviews. “N” and “F” were open to the people and culture of the second language society. They were both motivated to learn the language and find a job. Although “F” and “N” were from very different cultures and spoke different languages, they were trying to adopt the positive aspects of the second language society, find work, and make a contribution to the betterment of the society. Therefore, they do their best to communicate well.

In the case of “N” and “F”, the concept of acculturation can be regarded in two ways. That is, not only does acculturation result in learning, but learning also results in acculturation. They claimed in their interviews that as they learn more and become more fluent in speaking, they become more self-confident to reach out to people in the society, take part in social activities, and try to help, as much as they can, to contribute to the society.

Based on Schumann’s (1978) model, acculturation with the target-language society is necessary to be a successful language learner. Schumann also agrees that it is possible to be a successful learner, and at the same time, keep the life style and values of one’s own culture. Learners’ perception of possessing a high level of congruity with target language society may give a boost to language learners.

5.4. Washburn's Model and Fossilization

The results of my study partly supported Washburn's proposal that fossilized speakers can produce more target-like forms when they are given models and more prompts.

Washburn divided her subjects into two separate groups: fossilized and non-fossilized, based on the length of their residency and their failure at least once in one ESL course. The fossilized speakers used to produce non-target-like forms more consistently in the interview, but when they were given a model, or the importance of the form was emphasized in specific ways, they were able to produce more target-like forms.

In my study, I did not assume that they were fossilized based on residency criteria. Instead, I planned to observe their performances without any bias in spontaneous tasks and the tasks requiring attention to speech.

"F" and "N" appeared to have the characteristics of the fossilized speakers in Washburn's study. The more target-like forms are part of their interlanguage competence but retrieving them requires controlled processing, which is effortful. In order to produce target-like forms, they need to enjoy favorable conditions, including enough time to monitor their speech. The higher accuracy in SR2 and SWT support this point for the speech of "F" and "N".

Like the learners discussed by Sorace (1990) and Lardiere (1998a), "F" and "N" have the potential to learn, and they know more than what their spontaneous performance reveals, but they have difficulty accessing their knowledge of more accurate forms and are in danger of fossilization. Therefore, it can be concluded that "F" and "N"'s impediment to progress is at the level of performance. They have not achieved the

grammatical accuracy level in their spontaneous and automatized speech that they demonstrate in their writing when those favorable factors mentioned earlier are present.

As a matter of fact, favorable factors are not available at all times. Hence, correct forms will be accessed by “F” and “N” just with the presence of full attention, planning, no time pressure, and low cognitive load. As Valette (1991) mentions, monitoring and retrieving correct forms requires conscious deliberate processing, and this type of processing is too effortful in everyday conversation for everybody, especially for near-fossilized learners.

However, “J” was a proficient speaker whose performance in spontaneous and controlled tasks did not fluctuate a lot. She was even more accurate in the more demanding and spontaneous SR1. Therefore, “J” seemed not to have difficulty retrieving correct forms when needed. The more target-like forms are well automatized and available even under time constraints, as in spontaneous speech.

“J” is a speaker for whom attention does not appear to be a necessary ingredient to bring about higher accuracy. She is able to perform in spontaneous and controlled tasks with about the same level of accuracy and could even achieve higher accuracy in one of the spontaneous tasks. As a result of her higher proficiency, the variability in her speech due to attention diminishes.

The results of my study suggest that accuracy increases when favorable factors are all present, such as attention, planning, low cognitive load, familiarity with the subject, and no time pressure. This combination of factors only exists in writing. However, in everyday conversation, there is not much opportunity to benefit from all or some of the factors involved in the optimal situation; yet at the same time, it is equally important to

be able to produce correct forms in spontaneous conversation. So, this points to the need to automatize the kind of linguistic production that they are capable of in the optimal situation.

The results indicate that “J” was able to speak spontaneously at a higher level of accuracy, no matter whether the favorable factors for higher accuracy were present or not. However, “F” and “N” relied fully on the presence of these to bring about higher accuracy; as a result, their accuracy dropped when one or several of these factors making for optimal conditions was missing.

5.5. Fossilization in this Study

This study suggests that “F” and “N” are examples of fossilization at the performance level. Their performance in different tasks seems to indicate they may know more than what they show in their spontaneous speech or in tasks with cognitive load, e.g. an unfamiliar topic. They were able to achieve greater accuracy only when the favorable factors were all present.

This study supports the interactive model, according to which learners who are able to communicate successfully, may not be sensitive to negative feedback or may not be noticing it in the input. The model claims that instruction is necessary for these learners.

Both “F” and “N” spoke about many different complicated points in their interviews, about their lives in the past, their present life style, their education, and so on. It can be concluded that they can communicate well in most situations of every day life. As immigrants, at the beginning of their arrival, they had to survive with whatever knowledge they possessed. So, even if they were not accurate, they could get their

meanings across and even pick up some language from the environment, even though it might not have necessarily been grammatically correct.

Now, in the classroom setting, what they are learning helps them recognize what is the correct form and what is the wrong form. “F” acknowledged that when her teacher corrected her, she could learn more and notice the correct form more clearly. And yet she has not reached that level of proficiency where correct forms can be retrieved quickly for spontaneous production.

To produce correct forms more consistently in spontaneous situations or in situations imposing more cognitive load, all the elements now necessary for an optimal situation, i.e. writing, have to become less important. That is, their careful speech as we find it in their writing needs to become automatized to be available for spontaneous use as well. Otherwise, in everyday conversations, because optimal conditions do not exist, those forms which are well-rehearsed will appear.

In light of the preceding observation, one could propose that these learners would benefit if automatization in the early stages of learning could be delayed until later stages when accuracy is more advanced. Otherwise, the production of forms learnt at the early stages would be so automatic and natural that they may even appear in their writing. Whether such postponement is possible with immigrants, who learn the language naturalistically without any form of instruction, and whether these well-rehearsed forms can be deautomatized is an important subject for pedagogical research.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

In this chapter, I will summarize the findings of this study and suggest some issues for future research.

6.1. Summary

One of the fundamental questions in SLA is why some adult second language learners can make progress in mastering the second language and others face failure attaining adequate proficiency. The answer to this question in the literature is related to fossilization. Chapter 2 discusses the distinctions that SLA researchers have made between fossilization as product and fossilization as process, and furthermore, between fossilization at the level of knowledge and fossilization at the level of performance. Moreover, the three models (the biological, acculturation, and interactive model) suggested in SLA research for the existence of fossilization are discussed. I also present a fourth approach to fossilization related to acculturation and interactive models. It suggests that fossilization may be due to the lack of attention to grammatical aspects in the input and the lack of self-monitoring.

This study hypothesizes that fossilized learners whose language learning has appeared to stop are able to replace ungrammatical forms and patterns found in spontaneous speech when they monitor their speech and pay attention to their utterances. The results in part support the hypothesis. The study shows that attention by itself does not seem to be the sole factor in achieving higher accuracy. Other factors such as planning, cohesive discourse, no time pressure, low cognitive load, and familiarity with

the subject are effective in creating an optimal situation for higher accuracy in the speech of those learners who are not fluent - in other words, those who are at the lower level of proficiency and who have difficulty retrieving the correct forms in their spontaneous speech.

This present thesis provides three main findings. One of the findings refers to attention as being a necessary cause to achieve higher accuracy, but it is not a sufficient cause by itself. Attention helps improve accuracy when accompanied by favorable circumstances: planning, no time pressure, discourse cohesion, low cognitive load, and familiarity with the subject. The existence of one of these factors in addition to attention in spontaneous speech and in speech requiring attention contributes to accuracy.

The second main finding examines the connection between attention and its relation to the level of proficiency. How much the subjects benefit from attention seems to depend on the level of proficiency. When a fairly high level of proficiency in the language is attained in the sense that the correct forms become retrievable under all conditions, no matter whether it is spontaneous speech or careful speech, attention does not appear to play a large role in achieving higher accuracy, and it becomes a less reliable predictor of accuracy. However, in the case of those who are at a low proficiency level, attention turns out to be a more reliable predictor of higher accuracy.

The third important finding of the study shows that fossilization appears at the level of performance and not at the level of competence for these three subjects. With the presence of the optimal situation, the subjects were able to produce more accurate forms in their speech. Learners who are at a low level of proficiency and for whom fossilization occurs at the level of performance may actually know more than what their performance

shows; that is, they have difficulty accessing more target-like forms in their spontaneous speech.

Regarding the three models of fossilization suggested in the literature, this study could be related to some extent to the interactive model, certainly more to it than to the biological and acculturation models. The interactive model suggests that when learners make progress to the extent that they can communicate successfully, they are in danger of losing their sensitivity to the input and the feedback from the learning environment..

From the discussion above, a definition for fossilization can be proposed. It can be defined as premature automatization. The participants in this study were immigrants who started using the language for survival when they arrived in Canada, and so their early forms of language became automatized. Although later on, they received formal instruction, too early automatization of ungrammatical forms accounts for their fossilization at the level of performance.

One can speculate then, that it would be beneficial if the automatization process could be delayed until more advanced grammatical knowledge is attained. From this speculation, one can go one step further to suggest that perhaps formal language instruction is helpful. Because formal instruction puts great emphasis on accuracy, it can offset automatizing the immature and easily manipulated grammatical forms occurring in everyday conversation. Unless automatization is delayed and practicing the accurate forms in a classroom setting is ignored, it is hard to see how fossilization of immature grammatical forms can be avoided.

6.2. Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

My approach to exploring fossilization utilized the completion of six tasks involving spontaneous and careful speech: Interviews, an imitation task, answering comprehension questions about a story, retelling the story paying attention to correct grammar, and writing about the story. It is unfortunate that the imitation task appeared not to be very useful, as all of the three subjects' performances dropped in this task, contrary to what was predicted. It seems that the subjects found it a difficult and maybe a too unfamiliar task. This was true even for the more proficient speaker, "J". The subjects should perhaps have been provided with a few more sentences to practice prior to doing the original task in order to become more familiar with what they were expected to do.

I have to admit that the number of informants was small. Unfortunately, out of the eight subjects with whom I started working, I ended up with subjects who were comparable in their educational background, age, and length of residency, but who came from different language backgrounds. This fact made it difficult, first, to determine to what extent "J" is benefiting from transfer from Haitian French and "F" and "N" are not able to take advantage of transfer from their mother tongues, namely Arabic and Amharic, which are more distant languages from English. Secondly, the different language backgrounds made it difficult to draw comparisons on an equal basis and generalize statements about their performance on the features common to all of them.

Another limitation of the study is related to the time constraint. This study was done in five months, which is not enough time for the study of fossilization. A longitudinal study would give more credibility to the findings. Long (2001) believes that in order to have qualified evidence for fossilization, researchers should spend at least two

to five years to collect data. Only three studies, so far, have met that requirement: Han, 1998, 2000; Lardiere, 1998a, b; Long, 1997. I hope that future research will investigate fossilization over a longer period of time.

However, I would like to draw attention to the strength of the method that I used. The six different tasks elicited different styles of speech ranging from spontaneous to careful speech. The six different tasks varied according to several dimensions, such as attention, planning, discourse cohesion, and familiarity with the subject. This allowed me to recognize that although attention is an important factor in achieving more accurate forms, it is not sufficient by itself. A cluster of factors is necessary to contribute to more accurate speech.

Avoiding the limitations experienced in this study can help improve the quality of future research on fossilization. It would be helpful to measure each of the factors in the optimal situation individually to investigate how much each contributes to bringing about more accurate speech. This approach would involve more subjects, require multi-factorial design and multi-variate analysis. Also the use of a grammaticality judgement task would be a desirable complement to production tasks. In a grammaticality judgement task, judgements are used to get at the competence of the participants under study. It is a task which involves attention. It does not, however, impose as much of a processing burden, i.e. message encoding, as production tasks require. It also involves less chance for the automatized forms to emerge since the subjects are not producing the language.

It can also be suggested that in the investigation of fossilization, if researchers adopted the same tasks in their study, the comparison between findings would be facilitated.

6.3. Pedagogical Suggestion

I believe that formal instruction in a classroom setting in which classroom activities are focused on practicing writing, reading, and paraphrasing what is understood from readings might be helpful. In the classroom setting, there is an emphasis on accurate forms and learners have limited opportunity to develop survival language because they are expected to apply what they are learning, and so accurate forms are practiced and produced more. As well, the syllabus for instruction pushes them to learn more target-like forms and advance their proficiency. Therefore, there is less opportunity for automatization of ungrammatical forms to take place. To be able to automatize their more accurate grammatical knowledge for speech, writing practice may be one approach to pursue. By beginning with monitored writing, the more they write, the more the correct forms used in the writing become rehearsed and may then transfer to their spontaneous speech.

Since there is no concrete pedagogical strategy in the literature, at this stage trying out different classroom strategies seems to be an acceptable way to make progress. This is a speculation suggesting one direction to be followed as a pedagogical strategy for fossilized learners. It is devised based on the insights gained through the empirical findings in my thesis.

References

- Anderson, R. (1983). Transfer to somewhere. In S. Gass and L. Selinker (Eds.). *Language transfer in language learning* (pp.177-201). Newbury House, Rowley, Mass.
- Anderson, R. (1989). The theoretical status of variation in interlanguage development. *Variation in Second Language Acquisition*. Psycholinguistic Issues By S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston and L. Selinker. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters.
- Bean, M. and Gergen, C. (1990). Individual variation in fossilized interlanguage performance. In H. Burmeister and P. Rounds (Eds.). *Variability in second language acquisition . Proceedings of the Tenth Second Language Research Forum, Vol. 1*, Eugene, OR: Department of Linguistics, University of Oregon, 205-19.
- Birdsong, D. (1992). Ultimate attainment in second language acquisition. *Language* 68(4) 706-755.
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1988). The fundamental character of foreign language learning. In Rutherford, W. and Sharwood-Smith, M. (Eds.). *Grammar and second language teaching: a book of reading*, (pp.19-30). Newbury House/ Harper and Row, New York.
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1989). What is the logical problem of foreign language learning ? In Schachter, J. and Gass, S. (Eds.). *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp.41-68). Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1990). The logical problem of foreign language learning. *Linguistic Analysis*, 2, 3-49.
- Brown, H.D (1980). The Optimal Distance Model of Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14(2), 157-164.

- Carroll, S., Roberge, Y., and Swain, M. (1992). The role of feedback in second language acquisition: Error correction and morphological generalizations. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 13(2), 173-198.
- Carroll, S., and Swain, M., (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 357-386.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* : Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris Publications.
- Coppieters, R. (1987). Competence differences between native and non-native speakers. *Language*, 63, 544-573.
- Daughy, C. (1991). Second language instruction does make a difference. Evidence from an empirical study of SL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13 (4), 431-469.
- Ellis, R. (1985). A Variable Competence Model of Second Language Acquisition. *IRAL*, XXIII (1), 47-64.
- Ellis, R. (1987). Interlanguage variability in narrative discourse: Style shifting in the use of the past tense. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9, 257-274.
- Ellis, R. (1989). Are classroom and naturalistic acquisition the same? A study of the classroom acquisition of German word order rules. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 11, 305-328.
- Ellis, R. (1995). Appraising second language acquisition theory in relation to pedagogy. In Cook, G. & Seidlhofer, B. (Eds.). *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics : Studies in Honour of H.G. Widdowson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2002). Does Form-Focused Instruction Affect the Acquisition of Implicit Knowledge? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 223-236.

- Flores d'Arcais, G. B. (1988). Language perception. In Newmeyer, F.(Ed.). *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey*, (pp.97-123). Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner, R.C. & Lambert, W.E. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, M.A: Newbury House.
- Gass, S. and Selinker, L. (1994). *Second Language Acquisition: An introductory course*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gass, S. and Selinker, L. (2001). *Second Language Acquisition: An introductory course*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Han, Z-H. (1998). *Fossilization: An investigation into advanced L2 learning of a typologically distant language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. London : Birkbeck College, University of London, Department of Applied Linguistics.
- Han, Z-H. (2000). Persistence of the implicit influence of NL: the case of the pseudo-passive. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(1), 55-82.
- Harley, B.(1986). *Age in Second Language Acquisition*. San Diego: College-Hill Press.
- Harley, B. and Wang, W.(1997). The Critical Period Hypothesis: Where are we now ? In DeGroot, A. M. B and Kroll, J.F. (Eds.). *Tutorials in Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*, (pp.19-52). Mahwah NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Hatch, E. and Lazaraton, A. (1991). *The Research Manual: Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics*. Newbury House Publishers. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Hawkins, R. (2001). *Second language syntax: A generative introduction*. Graphicraft Limited, Hong Kong.
- Herschensohn, J. (2000). *The Second Time Around Minimalism and L2 Acquisition*. John Benjamins Publishing Co. Amsterdam. Philadelphia.

- Higgs, T. and Clifford, R. (1982). The push toward communication. In Higgs,T.(Ed.). *Curriculum, Competence, and the Foreign Language Teacher*, pp.57-79.: National Textbook Co., Skokie, Illinois.
- Huebner, T. (1983). Linguistic systems and linguistic change in an interlanguage. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6(1), 33-53.
- Hulstijn, J. & Hulstijn, W.(1984). Grammatical errors as a function of processing constraints and explicit knowledge. *Language Learning*, 34, 23-43.
- Hulstijn, J. (1989). Implicit and incidental second language learning: Experiments in the processing of natural and partly artificial input. In H. Dechert (Ed.). *Interlingual processing*, pp.50-73. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Hyltenstam , K. (1990). *Non-native features of near-native speakers: On the ultimate attainment of childhood L2 learners*. University of Stockholm, MS.
- Ioup,G. (1989).Immigrant children who have failed to acquire English In Gass, S., Madden,C., Preston, D.and Selinker, L.(Eds.). *Variation in second language acquisition* (vol.I *Discourse and pragmatics*; vol. II *Psycholinguistic issues*), (pp.160-175). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ioup,G. (1995).Evaluating the need for input enhancement in post-critical period language acquisition. In Singleton, D. and Lengyel, Z. (Eds.). *The age factor in second language acquisition*, (pp. 95-123). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Jacobs, B. (1988). Neurobiological Differentiation of Primary and Secondary Language Acquisition . *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 10, 303-337.
- Johnston, M.(1987). Understanding Learner Language. In D. Nunan(Ed.). *Applying Second Language Acquisition Research*, (pp.5-41). Adelaide; National Curriculum Resource Centre.

- Johnson, J.S. and Newport, E.L. (1989). Critical period effects in second language learning: The influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language. *Cognitive Psychology*, 21, 60-99.
- Johnson, J.S. & Newport, E.L. (1991). Critical period effects on universal properties of language: The status of subjacency in the acquisition of a second language. *Cognition*, 39, 215-58.
- Krashen, S.(1980). The input hypothesis. In Alatis, J. (Ed.). *Current issues in bilingual education*, pp.168-80. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.
- Krashen, S.(1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S.and Seliger, H. (1976). The role of formal and informal linguistic environments in adult second language learning. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 3, 15-21.
- Krashen, S., Seliger, H, and Hartnett, D. (1974). Two studies in second language learning. *Kritikon Litterarum*, 3, 220-228.
- Labov, W. (1970). The Study of Language in its Social Context. *Studium Generale*, 23, 20-87.
- Lardiere, D. (1998a). Case and tense in the ‘fossilized’ steady-state. *Second Language Research*, 14, 1-26.
- Lardiere, D. (1998b). Dissociating syntax from morphology in a divergent L2 end-state grammar. *Second Language Research*, 14, 359-375.
- Lardiere, D. (2000a). Mapping features to forms in second language acquisition. In J. Archibald (Ed.). *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory*, (pp.102-29). Malden, MA : Blackwell.
- Lardiere, D. (2000b). On optionality and grammaticality in L2 knowledge. Paper presented at the 4th Meeting on Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition (GASLA), MIT, April 1, 2000.

- Lenneberg, E.(1967). *Biological foundations of language*. New York:Wiley.
- Lightbown, P. M. (1983). Exploring relationships between developmental and instructional sequences in L2 acquisition. In Seliger, H. and Long, M. (Eds.). *Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition*, pp. 217-43. Newbury House, Rowley, Mass.
- Lightbown, P.M.and Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: Effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 429-48.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). Language variation and second language acquisition theory. *Applied Linguistics*. 2 (2), 150-158.
- Long, M. H (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of the research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 359-82.
- Long, M. H. (1990). Maturational constraints on language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 251-286.
- Long, M. H (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In De Bot, K.,Ginsberg, R. and Kramsch, C. (Eds.). *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*, pp.39-52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Long, M. H (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia (Eds.). *Handbook of second language acquisition*, pp.413-468. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Long, M. H (1997). Fossilization : Rigor mortis in living linguistic system? Plenary address to the EUROSLA 97 conference, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, May 22-24.
- Long, M. H. (2001). *Stabilization and fossilization in interlanguage development*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Hawaii.

- Lyster, R., Lightbown, P.M. and Spada, N. (1999). A Response to Truscott's 'What's Wrong with Oral Grammar Correction'. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55 (4), 457-467.
- Naiman, N.(1974). The use of elicited imitation in second language acquisition research. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 2, 1-37.
- Neufeld, G. (1979). Towards a theory of language learning ability. *Language Learning*, 29, 227-241.
- Neufeld, G. (1980). On the adult's ability to acquire phonology. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14, 285-298.
- Neumann, O. (1971). Aufmerksamkeit (Attention). In J. Ritter (Ed.). *Historisches wörterbuch der philosophie, Vol.1*, P.432. Basel, Stuttgart: Schwabe
- Norris, J., and Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction : A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417-528.
- Ochs, E. (1979). Planned and unplanned discourse. In T. Givon (Ed.). *Syntax and Semantics, Vol 12: Discourse and Syntax*, pp. 51-80. New York: Academic Press
- Pavesi, M. (1986). Markedness, discoursal modes, and relative clause formation in a formal and informal context. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 8, 38-55.
- Perdue, C. and Klein, W. (1992). Why does the production of some learners not grammaticalize? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 259-272.
- Pica, T. (1983). Adult acquisition of English as a second language under different conditions of exposure. *Language Learning* 33 (4), 465-497.
- Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? *Applied Linguistics*, 10, 52-79.
- Preston, D. (1989). *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- Ritchie, W. (1978). The right-roof constraint in adult second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie (Ed.). *Second Language Acquisition Research*. New York: Academic Press.
- Robinson, P. (1995). Review Article attention, memory, and the “Noticing” Hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 45(2), 283-331.
- Sato, C. (1985). Task variation in interlanguage phonology. In Gass, S. and Madden, C.(Eds.). *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 181-96. Newbury House, Rowley, Mass.
- Schachter, J.(1984). A universal input condition. In W. Rutherford (Ed.). *Universals and Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 167-183. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schachter, J.(1986). Three approaches to the study of input. *Language Learning*, 36(2), 211-225.
- Schachter, J. (1988). Second language acquisition and its relationship to Universal Grammar. *Applied Linguistics*, 9(3), 219-35.
- Schachter, J. (1989). Testing a universal proposal. In Gass, S. and Schachter, J. (Eds.). *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition*, (pp.73-88). Cambridge University Press.
- Schachter, J. (1996). Maturation and the issue of Universal Grammar in second language acquisition. In Ritchie, W. and Bhatia, T.(Eds.). *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence: a case study of an adult. In Wolfson, N. and Judd, E. (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics and Second Language Acquisition*, pp.137-74. Newbury House, Rowley, Mass.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.

- Schmidt, R. and Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: a case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In Day, R. (Ed.). *Talking to Learn : conversation in second language acquisition*, pp.237-326. Newbury House, Rowley, Mass.
- Schneider, W. and Shiffrin, R. M. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: I. Detection, search and attention. *Psychological Review* 84, 1-66.
- Schumann, J. (1975). Affective factors and the problem of age in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 25, 209-35.
- Schumann, J. (1978). *The pidginization process: a model for second language acquisition*. Newbury House. Rowley, Mass.
- Schwartz, B. and Sprouse, R. (1996). L2 cognitive states and the 'full transfer/full access' model. *Second Language Research*, 12, 40-72.
- Scovel, T. (1969). Foreign accents, language acquisition, and cerebral dominance. *Language Learning*, 19, 245-54.
- Scovel, T. (1976). Contrastive Analysis is Alive and Well, and living Somewhere in Phonology. Paper read at the 10th TESOL Convention, New York City.
- Scovel, T. (1977). The Ontogeny of the Ability to Recognize Foreign Accents. In C. A. Henning (Ed.). *Proceedings of the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum*. Department of English, UCLA, 38-47.
- Scovel, T. and J. T. Lamendell (1978). A Typology of Ontological Factors in Second Language Acquisition. Paper read before the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum, Los Angeles.
- Scovel, T. (1988). *A time to speak: A psycholinguistic inquiry into the critical period for human speech*. Cambridge MA: Newbury House.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL*, 10(3), 209-31.

- Selinker, L. (1992). *Rediscovering interlanguage*, New York: Longman.
- Selinker, L. and Han, Z.-H. (2001). Fossilization: Moving the concept into empirical longitudinal study. In C. Elder, A. Brown, E. Grove, K. Hill, N. Iwashita, T. Lumley, T. McNamara, and K. O'Loughlin (Eds.). *Studies in Language Testing: Experimenting with Uncertainty*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 276-291.
- Selinker, L., Swain, M., and Dumas, G. (1975). The interlanguage hypothesis extended to children. *Language Learning*, 25(1), 139-52.
- Selinker, L. and Lamendella, J. T. (1978). Two perspectives on fossilization in interlanguage learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 3(2), 143-191.
- Selinker, L. and Lakshmanan, U. (1992). Language transfer and fossilization: The "Multiple Effects Principle". In S. Gass and L. Selinker (Eds.). *Language transfer in language learning* (176-217). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Shiffrin, R.M. and Schneider, W. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: II. Perceptual learning, automatic attending, and a general theory. *Psychological Review*, 84, 127-90.
- Sorace, A. (1990). Indeterminacy in first and second languages: Theoretical and methodological issues. In J. de Jong and D. Stevenson (Eds.). *Individualizing the assessment of language abilities*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Sorace, A. (1993). Incomplete vs. divergent representations of unaccusativity in non-native grammars of Italian. *Second Language Research*, 9(1), 22-47.
- Spada, N., and Lightbown, P.M., (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in L2 classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 205-224.
- Stern, H. (1976). Optimal age: Myth or reality? *Modern Language Review*, 32, 283-294.
- Strozer, J. (1991). Non-native language acquisition from a principles and parameters perspective. In H. Campos and F. Martinez (Eds.). *Current studies in Spanish linguistics*. Washington, D.C: Georgetown University Press.

- Strozer, J.R.(1994). *Language Acquisition after Puberty*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Tarone, E. (1983). On the variability of language systems. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 142-163.
- Tarone, E. (1985). Variability in interlanguage use: a study of style-shifting in morphology and syntax. *Language Learning*, 35, 373-404.
- Tarone, E. (1994). Interlanguage. In R. E. Asher (Ed.). *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, pp.4: 1715-1719.
- Tarone, E. and Parrish, B. (1988). Task-related variation in interlanguage: The case of articles. *Language Learning*, 38(1), 21-44.
- Tollefson, J. W. and Finn, J.T. (1983). Fossilization in Second Language Acquisition: An Inter-Model View. *RELC Journal*, 14(2), 19-34.
- Tomlin, R. S. and Villa, V. (1994). Attention in Cognitive Science and Second Language Acquisition. *SSLA*, 16, 183-203.
- Truscott, J. (1998). Noticing in Second Language Acquisition: *A Critical Review*. *Second Language Research*, 14.2, 103-135.
- Truscott, J. (1999). What's Wrong with Oral Grammar Correction. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55(4), 437-455.
- Valette, R. (1991). Proficiency and the prevention of fossilization- An editorial. *Modern Language Journal*, 75(3), 325-28.
- VanPatten, B. (1988). How juries get hung: problems with the evidence for a focus on form in teaching. *Language Learning*, 38 (2), 243-60.
- Vigil, N. A. and Oller, J. W. (1976). Rule Fossilization: A Tentative Model. *Language Learning*, 26(2), 281-295.

- Washburn, G. (1994). Working in the ZPD: Fossilized and nonfossilized nonnative speakers. In J. P. Lantolf and G. Appel (Eds.). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 69-81.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Language in contact*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- White, L. (1984a). Implications of parametric variation for adult second language acquisition: An investigation of the pro-drop parameter. In V. Cook (Ed.). *Experimental approaches to second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press, Oxford.
- White, L. (1984b). Universal grammar and language transfer. Revision of a paper delivered at the 13th Annual University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Symposium on Current Approaches to SLA, March 1984.
- White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research*, 7, 133-161.
- White, L. (1992). Universal Grammar: Is It Just a New Name for Old Problems? In S. Gass and L. Selinker (Eds.). *Language transfer in language learning* (217-232). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- White, L. and Genesee, F. (1996). How native is near-native? The issue of ultimate attainment in adult second language acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 12, 233-265.
- White, L., Spada, N., Lightbown, P.M., and Ranta, L. (1991). Input enhancement and L2 question formation. *Applied Linguistics*, 12, 416-432.
- Young, R. (1991). *Variation in interlanguage morphology*. New York: Peter Lang.

Appendix 1

First interview questions

1) Individual factors

- Where are you from ?
- What is your native language ?
- Have you learned other languages?
- What languages do you speak?
- How old are you?
- How old were you when you arrived in Canada?
- Why did you decide to move to Canada? (personal decision, friend's persuasion or for the sake of relatives and friends?)
- How long have you been living in Canada?
- Have you been to any English speaking country before coming to Canada?
- Have you been in a place where English were used a lot? (Like refugee camps.....)
- Are you married ? (Any kids ? How many ?)
- What is your objective for your kids? and yourself ? (the place they live, career plans, jobs ....)
- Are you alone here ? Is your spouse here ?
- Do any other members of your family live in Canada ?

Haitian subject

- Why did you choose to come to Ontario ? As in Montreal and Quebec City , there is a large Haitian community .

- Do you want to move to Quebec ?

2) Education

- What kind of education did you have? (diploma, high school, ...)
- Did you finish school back in your country?
- Did you have university education ?
- How long did it take? What was your major ?
- Did you have to study all your course materials in English ?
- Did your professors use to teach in English or in your native language?
- What about exams ? Were they designed in your mother tongue?

3) ESL classes

A) Before

- How much English instruction did you have before coming to Canada?
- Had you taken any EFL classes back home ? how long
- What kind of instruction did you have when you learnt English back home? (eg, three times a week for one hour .....)
- How much English did you use to hear and listen to in the class?
- Did you have to speak English or you could sometimes shift to your native language?
- Were you allowed to translate sometimes to your native language?
- Did you enjoy learning English when you were learning it ?
- What areas of English do you think you were mostly taught during your instruction back home ? (reading, writing, listening, speaking, grammar ?)

- Could you speak English well? Did you know grammar well ? What were you good at ?
- Did you consider yourself a good and successful student in learning English ?

B) Currently

- Is it the first time you are taking ESL classes here in Canada ?or you had it before?
- Why are you taking ESL classes now ? What is motivating you ?
- How many days a week do you attend English classes?
- How long does each class take ?
- In what area taking ESL classes is going to help you ?
- What skills do you want to improve ? (Grammar, Speaking, Writing, etc)
- Is the class helpful for your purpose ?
- Are you satisfied with your progress ?
- How much progress have you made since you have come to Canada ?
- How successful are you in communicating in English in different situations ?
- Can you make yourself understood in different situations ?
- Can you understand what people say ? Don't you have any problem understanding what people say ?

4) *The amount of contact with English*

A) Work place

- Do you hear and speak English a lot on a daily basis ? In what situations ? (Work, children, neighbors)
- On a normal day, how often do you use English ?
- Do you have English speaking friends?
- Do you work?
- What kind of work is it?
- Do you have opportunity at work to use English?
- How much contact do you have in the work place ? (with native speakers ,foreign speakers, your own countrymen ?)
- With whom do you usually have contact during lunch or coffee break?
- What kind of practical job training have you had? (or unskilled worker)
- How long have you been working for the same company?
- What kind of work did you have in your country? What did you use to do ?

B) Media

- Do you watch TV ?Listen to the radio? How often?
- Can you name some of your favorite TV programs?
- Do you rent video tapes to watch English movies?
- Do you watch Ice Hockey?
- Do you read newspapers (like Ottawa Citizen)? English novels, books, etc? name them.

C) Residence

- Do you live in a private residence ? Do you have contacts with foreigners and native speakers ?
- Do you talk with your English-speaking neighbors?
- Whom do you spend your leisure time with? (your relatives and family ,countrymen, your native speaking neighbors, foreigners,.... ?)
- What language do you use to speak with your kids at home?(NL or English or both?)
- In general, what is the predominant spoken language at home ?

5) Social factor and acculturation

- How much do you know about Canadian customs?
- How often do you move in Canada? How mobile are you?
- Has your life style changed since you have come to Canada?
- Do you cook any typical Canadian food?
- What about your dress? Has your style been changed to be more Canadian?
- How about your shopping habits (Once a week or daily?)
- Do you participate predominantly in English movies, community centers, restaurants?
(how often ?) or you prefer to participate in your own community centers, see movies in your own language and eat your country food in your own countrymen's restaurants ?
- Do you know anything about Canadian political parties ,Alliance Party?
- Can you name any well-known Canadian politicians,athletes,artists,scientists, authors,.....?

- Do you participate in social cultural life? (like volunteering jobs, collecting money for charity ,etc...)
- Do you celebrate the important social and cultural North American occasions? (like Canada Day, Halloween, Thanksgiving Day etc.....)
- Are you involved in kids' education?
- Do your children seem more North American to you?
- Is there any cultural conflict (disagreement) at home between you and your children? Do they force you to become more like Canadians? (Cultural Clash?)
- How would this feel if your children become like other Canadian children ?

6) Identity

- Your attitude towards your countrymen, foreigners, and Canadians (Integration or segregation)
- How do you feel or think about Canadians?
- Do you like to become like Canadians? Or are you trying to be more like Canadians and identify with them ?
- Do you like to be mostly identified with your own countrymen?.
- Can you describe what experience you have had with Canadians?
- What things about the Canadian culture would you like to adopt and what things not to adopt?

Appendix 2

Second interview questions

- 1) Describe the most memorable time in your life
- 2) Describe the most recent film you have watched, story, novel, or an article you have read, etc...
- 3) Compare your country with Canada (Politics, society, economy, education, and so on.)
- 4) If you had one million dollars, how would you spend it ?
- 5) Can you talk about a very well-known figure in your country and whom you admire (Politician, athlete, actor or actress, singer, etc)
- 6) Have you met your expectations from coming to Canada ?
- 7) Can you please talk about your children?
- 8) Do you like to go back to your country to live ?
- 9) Describe an event in your life that you will never forget.
- 10) Describe love
- 11) Do you like parties?
- 12) If you had the chance, where would you live in the world ?
- 13) Describe the word "crazy"
- 14) Would you change anything in your personality? If so what ? If not, why not ?
- 15) What makes a good student ?
- 16) What is your favorite occupation?
- 17) Describe the concept or the word "work"
- 18) Do you think men and women are equal ? Why and why not ?
- 19) What is the role of knowledge in society ?

- 20) What is the purpose of your life ? (short-term and long-term goals)
- 21) Do you think English is a universal language ? Why and why not ?
- 22) Complete the statement : Happiness is .....
- 23) Why do people suffer ?
- 24) What is loneliness ?
- 25) What makes you laugh ? (What do you find funny)
- 26) How has technology changed people ?

Appendix 3

Elicited imitation task for “J”

I Plurals

- 1) The living room had only four chairs for the guests to sit on. (15)
- 2) My mother placed some roses in the red vase on the table. (15)
- 3) The cook uses a lot of dishes to prepare chicken soup. (15)
- 4) The tired patients read magazines in the doctor’s office. (15)

II Regular past tense : lived, learned, talked, helped, decided, sounded

- 5) My oldest son learned to drive a car when he was eighteen. (14)
- 6) Yesterday, the neighbors helped us to move all the furniture. (15)
- 7) In the past, many people lived to be one hundred years old. (15)
- 8) The nice old lady talked very slowly with her grandchildren. (15)
- 9) The church bell sounded very loud to the people on the street. (15)
- 10) The man decided to eat a pear for breakfast every day. (15)

III Negation (auxiliary and copula)

- 11) The children were not playing outside because of the rain. (14)
- 12) The light wind was not strong enough for the boats on the sea. (14)
- 13) My brother is not coming home for the wedding of my friend. (15)
- 14) The books in the library are not useful for the students. (15)

IV Negation (do, does, did)

- 15) Sometimes, the man does not even want to talk about himself. (15)
- 16) When I went to school, teachers did not teach how to sing songs. (14)
- 17) Many children do not smile when they have green beans for dinner. (15)
- 18) My son does not agree with going to the beach every year. (15)

V Inversion in questions

- 19) The customer asked the engineer, " what is this machine for?" (15)
- 20) The young mother shouted, " Why are the children always crying?" (15)
- 21) The little sick boy cried, " When can my friends come to see me?" (15)
- 22) The teacher asked me, " where should the students go to study?" (14)

VI Copula

- 23) At the party, the child was very rude to his father. (14)
- 24) In the past, horses were important in people's daily lives. (15)
- 25) Watching sun - rises is exciting for people in the North. (15)
- 26) In the summer, people are in the street until late at night

VII Frozen form : suppose

- 27) Robert is supposed to help me move on Saturday morning. (15)
- 28) My parents are supposed to send me money by next Friday. (15)
- 29) The teacher was supposed to bring the papers to class today. (15)
- 30) The Canada geese were supposed to fly south in November. (15)

VIII Double negative

- 31) Bill does not know anything about making maple syrup. (15)
- 32) Students are not learning anything from the books in this course. (15)
- 33) The pop musicians do not see anybody at their concert. (15)
- 34) Joan is not bringing anyone to the party on Sunday. (15)

Appendix 4

Elicited imitation task for “F”

I Verb + Verb

- 1) On the playground, the kids try to make a house with the toys (14)
- 2) All students hope to get higher marks in their next exam. (14)
- 3) Some refugees want to return to their countries very soon. (15)
- 4) People in the world wish to live in peace and harmony. (14)

II Regular past tense : lived, learned, talked, helped, decided, sounded

- 5) My oldest son learned to drive a car when he was eighteen. (14)
- 6) Yesterday, the neighbors helped us to move all the furniture. (15)
- 7) In the past, many people lived to be one hundred years old. (15)
- 8) The nice old lady talked very slowly with her grandchildren (15)
- 9) The church bell sounded very loud to the people on the street. (15)
- 10) The man decided to eat a pear for breakfast every day. (15)

III Negation (auxiliary and copula)

- 11) The children were not playing outside because of the rain. (14)
- 12) The light wind was not strong enough for the boats on the sea. (14)
- 13) My brother is not coming home for the wedding of my friend. (15)
- 14) The books in the library are not useful for the students. (15)

IV Negation (do, does, did)

- 15) Sometimes, the man does not even want to talk about himself. (15)
- 16) When I went to school, teachers did not teach how to sing songs. (14)
- 17) Many children do not smile when they have green beans for dinner. (15)
- 18) My son does not agree with going to the beach every year. (15)

V Inversion in questions

- 19) The customer asked the engineer,” what is this machine for?” (15)
- 20) The young mother shouted,” Why are the children always crying?” (15)
- 21) The little sick boy cried,” When can my friends come to see me?” (15)
- 22) The teacher asked me,” where should the students go to study?” (14)

VI Copula

- 23) At the party, the child was very rude to his father. (14)
- 24) In the past, horses were important in people’s daily lives. (15)
- 25) Watching sun - rises is exciting for people in the North. (15)
- 26) In the summer, people are in the street until late at night. (15)

VII Frozen form : do it

- 27) The boys wondered if they could do the challenge of the game. (14)
- 28) All my friends do the same when they are happy with everything. (15)
- 29) Parents would like to do something for their children’s first birthday. (15)
- 30) In the west, people are always free to do anything they like. (15)

VIII Adjective

31) My brother says Lebenese pastries are very sweet and rich. (15)

32) You can find very few catholic schools in this city. (15)

33) My aunt was too old to take English courses at night school. (14)

34) Most of the modern Persian poems are very long and deep. (15)

Appendix 5

Elicited imitation task for “N”

I Plurals

- 1) The living room had only four chairs for the guests to sit on. (15)
- 2) My mother placed some roses in the red vase on the table. (15)
- 3) The cook uses a lot of dishes to prepare chicken soup. (15)
- 4) The tired patients read magazines in the doctor’s office. (15)

II Passive

- 5) The beautiful painting was quickly hung on the white wall. (14)
- 6) The management meeting is scheduled to take place on Thursdays. (15)
- 7) The adult students are treated the same in this large high school. (15)
- 8) The conditions of the contract were fulfilled quickly last year. (15)

III Infinitive passive

- 9) The young girl expects to be paid more for what she does this month. (15)
- 10) The little boy wanted to be rewarded for his good work. (15)
- 11) My course work is going to be done hopefully this April. (15)
- 12) The nice wooden chairs were going to be sold in the market. (15)

IV Participial adjectives

- 13) Some employees feel completely depressed when nothing goes right. (15)
- 14) Most parents are amazed with their children’s achievements. (15)
- 15) The girl was quite embarrassed when she was called by the wrong name. (15)

16) The new company is delighted that the ad worked so well. (15)

V Copula

17) At the party, the child was very rude to his father. (14)

18) In the past, horses were important in people's daily lives. (15)

19) Watching sun-rises is exciting for people in the North. (15)

20) In the summer, people are in the street until late at night. (15)

VI Present perfect

21) Many countries have fought to gain their freedom for a long time. (15)

22) The members in the club have chosen Jack as the president. (15)

23) The trading company has grown rapidly in the last five years. (15)

24) The newly-wed couple has dealt with their problems wisely so far. (15)

VII Auxiliary

25) In spite of the rain the children were still playing outside. (14)

26) My oldest brother is coming home soon for my friend's wedding. (15)

27) While the young mother was looking after her kid, she sang songs. (15)

28) The people on the street are walking quickly to get tickets. (15)

VIII Inversion in questions

29) The customer asked the engineer, "what is this machine for?" (15)

30) The young mother shouted, "Why are the children always crying?" (15)

31) The little sick boy cried, "When can my friends come to see me?" (15)

32) The teacher asked me, "where should the students go to study?" (14)

IX Indefinite article (a)

33) Mandela is a very remarkable person in the world. (15)

34) Finding a good job is going to be a big thing for me. (15)

35) The students watched a film on National Geographic last week (15)

36) Most people don't have peace either in their minds or in their lives. (15)

Appendix 6

Story retelling

The Model Millionaire

Hughie Erskine is a good-looking man. He is living in London. He is the best-looking gentleman in London. Hughie has curly brown hair, gray eyes and a handsome face. He is loved by many people in the city. He has made quite a few good friends who admire Hughie's personality and his friendly behavior. However, Hughie does not have much money. He has been very lazy and expected to be supported by his father.

Hughie's father was very sick. He was an officer in the army and had always wished Hughie could do something to earn enough money to live on his own. One day Hughie told his father that he was in love and he wanted to get married. His father got really puzzled and said, "Tell me again. What do you want to do?" Hughie said, "It is not complicated, father. I have decided to get married. I love Laura Merton, the daughter of an army officer. She loves me too." Then his father asked, "Do you mean colonel Merton's daughter?" "Yes," said Hughie "I am offering the marriage proposal tomorrow." Hughie never thought that having a job was a very important factor in marriage. The father did not say anything. He just smiled and wished good luck for his son.

When Hughie asked Colonel Merton's permission to marry Laura, he said, "you are a fine young man but you don't have any money. My daughter cannot marry a man with no money. You may marry my daughter when you have found a good job and saved ten thousand pounds." Hughie's marriage proposal was turned down and he felt so

depressed because he did not have even ten pounds. His old aunt gave him four or five pounds a week. Today he had only one pound in his pocket. Hughie was almost broke.

Then Hughie realized that he was supposed to work hard to be accepted as a suitor. He had to do something to earn money for the marriage. But poor Hughie was not good at anything. He suddenly remembered Alan, one of his friends who was a good artist and quite famous. He was only painting pictures for rich people in his studio. Alan's pictures were very expensive. So, his paintings were purchased mainly by wealthy people.

Alan was working on a painting when Hughie visited him in his studio. He was painting the picture of an old beggar. A picture of a man who was standing in the corner of the studio was being painted. The model was an old man dressed in old, torn clothes. His face was sad. A hat was held out with one hand and a stick was in the other." What do you think of this?" asked Alan. "And what do you think of my model?" Hughie looked at the model and the painting. The he said," They are both very nice. But I don't like the expression on your model's face." Alan asked, " Why do you feel so? My model is wonderful. Have you ever seen such a wonderful beggar?" Hughie said, "Poor old man. How sad he looks." "Of course," said Alan. "I don't want a beggar to look happy." "How much are models paid for standing in your studio?" asked Hughie, "Not much" answered Alan, " they are paid only a shilling an hour." "Oh, no," said Hughie," Would it be the money you wanted to be paid if you were a model?" "Well. Maybe not," said Alan. "And how much money do you get when you sell a picture?" asked Hughie "For this picture, I will get two thousand pounds," said Alan. "You are a rich man. I think the model should get some of the money," said Hughie.

“Nonsense.... nonsense!” said Alan. “The model does not get any money, because it is difficult to be a painter, but it is not difficult to be a beggar. Few people can paint pictures. Anyone can beg.” “But many people want to be rich and famous painters although they are not well-known and they are poor,” said Hughie. “No one wants to be a poor beggar. You artists are very unkind.”

Alan laughed and said, “I am busy. Sit down and stop talking. You are not supposed to teach me what is right and what is wrong.” Then Alan went out and left Hughie and the old man alone in the room. They were so quiet and were not even talking about anything when Alan just came back to get something from the room. Then the old beggar sat down on a chair and rested. His hat was still in his hand. The old man looked so sad that Hughie felt sorry for him and thought he really needed to be helped out. So, he put his hand in his pocket. He had one pound. It was the last of his money.

“Well, he needs the money more than I do,” thought Hughie. He went across the room and put the pound in the old man’s hat. The old man was very surprised. He looked at the money and smiled. “Thank you, sir,” he said. “Thank you very much.”

Hughie left the room and went to see Laura and told her about the beggar. “You gave all your money away?” said Laura. “That was very foolish. My father will never let me marry a foolish man. You are very foolish, but you are very kind and I love you very much.”

That night Hughie met Alan at a club. Alan was looking very pleased. “I finished that picture,” said Alan. “And my model was very interested in you. He asked me lots of questions.” Poor old man,” said Hughie. “I wish I could help him. What did he ask you

about me?" "He wanted to know everything about you," said Alan. " And what did you tell him?"

"I told him everything and all about you. I told him about Laura. I told him about Laura's father. I told him you want to marry Laura but have no money," said Alan.

"Alan!" said Hughie angrily. "You told him all about my private business?" "Don't be angry," said Alan. " You don't know who I was painting the picture for. I was painting it for the Baron. He is one of the richest men in Europe. Baron was my model. The Baron dressed up as an old beggar."

"The Baron!" cried Hughie. " You mean that old beggar was the Baron himself?" "Yes," said Alan " You were not even imagining that the old man might be the Baron, were you?" "No, never," said Hughie "But I gave him just one pound and now I feel foolish." "You gave him a pound?" said Alan. "That's the funniest thing I have ever heard."

Alan could not stop laughing. Hughie walked home. He felt foolish. He had given his last pound to a millionaire. If Laura's father would hear about this, he would never let his daughter marry a fool.

The next day Hughie had a visitor. He did not know the man. "How can I help you?" asked Hughie. "I have come from the Baron," said the visitor. "The Baron," said Hughie "I did not know him when we met yesterday. I want to tell the Baron that I am sorry. I think I was rude to him." The visitor smiled. "You were not rude to the Baron." He said. " The Baron asked me to give you this." He gave Hughie an envelope.

Hughie thanked him and looked at the envelope. These words were written on the envelope: *A wedding present to Hugh Erskine and Laura Merton, from an old beggar.*

Inside was a cheque for ten thousand pounds.