

تفاعل المدخلات والمخرجات في اكتساب اللغة

فاطمة رمضان أحمد أبو الهول - قسم اللغة الانجليزية - كلية الآداب السواني
جامعة طرابلس

الملخص :

توضّح هذه المقالة كيف كانت المناقشات في مجال اكتساب اللغة الثانية مدفوعة بالاختلافات حول الأسس النظرية للمقاربات المتميزة لدراسة اكتساب اللغة الثانية. وعلى الرغم من أن نظريات (لونسج) و (سوين) التي تأسست على افتراض أن عقل الفرد هو موقع الاستحواذ ، غيرت نموذج (كراشن) لتفسير المدخلات المفهومة ، إلا أنها ألهمت الأكاديميين الآخرين لرفض نظرية (كراشن) ، وتطوير نظريات جديدة بناءً عليها، وفقاً للباحثين الأكثر وعياً اجتماعياً الذين ينظرون إلى تعلم اللغة على أنه مسعى اجتماعي في الأساس ، فإنّ المعنى يتشكل أولاً من قبل الشركاء قبل أن يستوعبه المتعلم ، تم تطوير هذا لتمييز النماذج اعتماداً على تقنية المعالجة المستخدمة لإجراء التصحيح والتركيز الأساسي للفصل الدراسي ، سواء على الاتصال أو الدقة الرسمية للمعلومات الأساسية.

تعتبر الأساليب المستخدمة لإدماج معلمي اللغة في دراسة النشاط حول لغة الطلاب في الفصول الدراسية المستقلة مشكلة كبيرة - أيضاً - عندما يصبح المعلمون أكثر وعياً بسمات لغة المتعلم التي أنشأها الطلاب ، فقد يحسنون مشاركتهم التعليمية لتعظيم تطوير اللغة البيئية

The Interaction of Input and Output in the Acquisition of Second Languages

Article by Fatma Ramadan Aboalhol

The university of Tripoli/ Faculty of Arts/ Department of English Language

Abstract

This article demonstrates how discussions in the field of second language acquisition have been driven by differences over the theoretical foundations of distinct approaches to the study of second language acquisition. Although Long and Swain's theories, which were founded on the assumption that the individual's mind was the site of acquisition, altered Krashen's model to

account for understandable input, they also inspired other academics to reject Krashen's theory and develop new theories based on it. According to more socially conscious researchers who view language learning as fundamentally a social endeavour, the meaning is first formed by the partners before being internalised by the learner.

This was developed to set apart models depending on the handling technique used to perform the correction and the fundamental focus of the classroom, whether on communication or the formal accuracy of key information. The methods utilised to incorporate language teachers in the activity study on students' language in their independent classrooms are also a big problem. As teachers become more aware of the traits of the learner language created by the students, they may improve their instructional engagement to maximise the development of interlanguage.

Introduction

This piece of work explains the relationship between input and output in second language acquisition by reviewing the most relevant studies and theories. In this work, effort is devoted to precisely examining how every kind of linguistic environment enhances learner comprehension and, consequently, acquisition. Various theoretical suggestions are analysed so as to be able to explore the link between various sources of input and the development of language. It focuses on the main three probable sources of comprehensive input identified by Krashen (1982) for the acquisition of a second language, which can be referred to as modified input by Long (1996), communicatively modified input by Swain & Deters (2007), and modified output by Gass & Selinker (2008).

Because the study of second languages started as an interdisciplinary field, it is difficult to point out its establishment. However, there is some background literature that is seen as influential to the development of the contemporary study of second language acquisition, which is Selinker's (1972) "inter-language" articles, where they reveal the accounts of behaviourists of second language acquisition and claim that learners apply the inherent internal linguistic systems.

Since the early 1980s, Krashen's theories on second language acquisition have become a dominant model. These theories were based on the perspective

of the "input hypothesis," in which language acquisition is launched autonomously by "the comprehensive input". It is referred to as the language input that the learners are able to understand or comprehend. Krashen's model was influential in the field of second language acquisition and inspired other scholars such as Long (1996) and Swain (1995), as well as having a great impact on second language teaching. However, he disregarded some significant processes in the second language and has not incorporated them (Ellis, 2008). His studies in the 1980s were distinguished by the emphasis on fastening these shortcomings.

Long (1996) criticised and modified Krashen's pattern through the analysis of non-native speaker NNS interactions in the second language. The second-language classroom has drawn attention to the importance of the modification and meaning of interaction in the L2 establishment. He has maintained that modifying interactions through the concession of connotation offers comprehensive input to the learner's spontaneous language processing procedures. Hence, his model suggests that the development of the interlanguage process of the learner is influenced by the systems generated in the interaction and the necessity for logical input to the learner as a first phase, and then the test for learners to organise their output grammatically.

The idea that negotiating meanings offers adequate and essential analysis for second language acquisition and competence (Long, 1996) might thus be deduced as the basis for the psycholinguistic authenticity of a second language class's group activity. According to Freeman, Diane, and Long (1991), researchers need to keep an eye out for the ways that students provide thorough input and understandable output, and they need to acknowledge that negotiated interactions are extremely important sources of data.

In their research, one needs first comprehend the classification and description of fix tactics, i.e., the negotiating attempts that are observed by students during message understanding and explanation, in order to recognise this conversation process. It is still necessary to show how negotiations that develop for interactions affect the last stage of second language acquisition, even though empirical studies on second language interaction have produced a wealth of statistical results relating to the relationship between negotiating strategies, communicative tasks, and grammatical formation (Ellis, 2005).

Discussion and analysis

The principal explanation of the second language input and output in established interactions is the communication model of the message. In this model, the objective of the conversational associates during a communicative opportunity is the profitable sending and receiving of the symbols of language (Cook, 2006). Such studies of second language interaction reflect this hypothetical orientation by explaining the negotiation system from the perspective of the medium metaphor of communication, such as in message transmission and response. It has been argued that the framework analysis of second language interaction in the communication model of message spoils the importance of the principal mechanisms of second language establishment and diminishes the social background to a chance for unclear input. This led them to regard the social framework as invaluable and insufficient (Canale & Swain, 1980).

When the second language is in the classroom, learners, particularly those who are exposed to formal contact with language, have a rare chance to study the relationship between the input and the output in the development of the second language. While the input present in "natural" exposure or informal contact with a second language is difficult and varied to express completely, the classroom can be an example of exposure that can be sampled, recorded, and assessed with a high level of sufficiency. As a result of this analysis, it may be possible to relate input, which is the text book, the teacher's language, and the language that other students use in the classroom (Doughty & Williams, 1998).

The ability to apply this comparison to the issues of how learners map out the information and what capability of their establishing interlanguage may be represented by the element of the input makes it an essential theory. In practise, it is equally crucial to analyse classroom language as a component of second language learning. Assessing various input qualities that are important in L2 teaching as a field for second learning acquisition requires taking into account what the learners can do with the information. The capacity of the communication message model to capture linguistic interactions is constrained since it is based on a metaphorical communication channel.

The ability to apply this comparison to the issues of how learners map out the information and what capability of their establishing interlanguage may be represented by the element of the input makes it an essential theory. In practise, it is equally crucial to analyse classroom language as a component of second language learning. Assessing various input qualities that are important in L2 teaching as a field for second learning acquisition requires taking into account what the learners can do with the information. The capacity of the communication message model to capture linguistic interactions is constrained since it is based on a metaphorical communication channel.

The roots of second language learning development from a social perspective are very complicated, and the current approach to the subject recognises this fact. Understanding second language production involves examination of the utterance-building method as it unfolds in actual time. The unquestioningly firm information from the interaction studies darkens the cognitive processes that are applied to the social objective during an experimental procedure (Doughty & Williams, 1998).

This activity theory addresses the concerns of personal development, activity, and social setting. In its attempt to grasp the nature of activity, a basic principle of the theory of activity is the argument that human objective activity is founded on motives; for example, conventional and social definitions of attitudes about a specific activity establishment. It claims that to describe the individual's activity, one needs to find out the interrelationship and the motive with the choice of purpose-directed activity and their operational harmony. The motivation of the individual determines which activities will be emphasised and chosen and how they will be functionalized in a specific setting (Ellis, 1998).

In addition, the construction of the functions of a motivated activity is believed to be flexible to the material circumstances and physical conditions. This is fundamental to the theory, but it may reveal a number of conclusions indirectly from the second learning analysis and complicate it (Ellis, 2005). The theory of activity also implies that differences in motive during communicative action mean unreliability in the functional construction of the actions. The motive structures the communicative situation by concentrating

on one piece of linguistic activity at the expense of the other. For example, the motive is to be able to verify gender or culturally specific interaction models or focus on particular levels of language to negotiate semantic or phonological characteristics. According to Long's hypothesis, there has been a deep conviction that input should be comprehended by the learner when it is used to help the process of acquisition. This is consistent with the widely held belief that input that the learner understands is the most important source of information for second language acquisition (Long, 1996).

The situation is that the motive of the participant determines and guides the specific action, be it in the classroom, laboratory, or on the street. The individual motive, as opposed to the researcher's, determines the way in which activities will be interpreted as well as their functional importance. Therefore, the unreality of action, for example, the inter-relationship of goals, motives, and operations, should be explored while investigating second language interaction (Cook, 2008).

In his work, procedures and subjects are certain elements of language development that are discussed with respect to certain characteristics of classroom language. The learners of the second language whose development is analysed are French-speaking learners aged between 11 and 17 years, getting 20 to 60 minutes of ESL guidelines in public schools in Quebec (Schumann, 1978). The input information contains comprehensive recordings of eleven ESL classes taught by six teachers, sampled for a duration of two months.

Oral language samples from roughly 100 pupils were included in the output of the language production data. A two-year period was used to collect the linguistic samples (Krashen, 1982). When each student had to describe each card-drawn image in a play at the time, the output information gathering process was applied to the transcripts of interactions and recorded conversations with every student. One student had to sum up the picture that the other student was describing in front of the class for each of the four identical photographs that the instructor provided, one of which was comparable to the picture that the student had described (Krashen, 1982).

This study intends to analyse both the long-term and short-term links between the input and the output during the whole duration of the ESL guidelines from

grade six to eleven, including both cross-sectional and longitudinal components. In this study, students applied certain language functions and forms, which are the output, and certain elements of input, such as the intensity of practise and the frequency of occurrence. The features of this input attempt to describe the differences that may occur within L2 groups, which was a result of the hypothesis that research members who conducted the study had one way or another influenced the forms applied by the students, though the assessment of the transcripts did not agree with this.

Accordingly, the vital element affecting language acquisition seems to be the input that the learner outputs. Krashen's model was very devoted to input being positioned as a significant key to second language acquisition by restating that comprehensible input is everything that is needed for language acquisition analysis. In his works, he claimed that the length of time spent in a foreign country had a significant impact on a person's level of language acquisition. Some indicated that the evidence for the input originates from the works on reading; huge volumes that are free, voluntary reading have an important positive impact on the grammar, vocabulary, and writing of the learner. Input is also regarded as the system by which individuals acquire languages in accordance with the universal grammar model (DeKeyser, 1998).

However, others have opposed more contemporary studies, such as Long (1996), who argued that in spite of the fact that input is of critical significance, Krashen's affirmation that only input is important in the acquisition of the second language was not sufficient and testable. For instance, learners admitted to French-language immersion schedules in Canada could still deliver non-native sorts of grammar as they were speaking, despite having had a couple of years of meaning-oriented lessons, and their skills for listening were native-level statistically (Schumann, 1978). For other scholars, such as Swain and Deters (2007), intake appears to play a significant role and, in particular, is capable of providing learners with feedback, allowing them to focus on the form of what they are saying, and assisting them to self-regulate their language knowledge, becoming a part of their past knowledge or experience.

Other studies have also pointed out the importance of interaction in the second language as being critical for second language acquisition. From the perspective of Long's interaction hypothesis (1996), the circumstances for acquisition are particularly effective when interacting in the second language when a certain setting in communication that involves interactions between NNS and NS happens and learners have to negotiate for the meaning. Speech modifications originating from interactions such as these assist in making input highly understandable, offer feedback to the learner, and press the learners to modify their speeches. The significance of output implied in the hypothetical foundation was originally brought to light by Swain (1985, 1995, and 2000) in her hypothesis of comprehensible output, where she claims that, though comprehensive input and the distinction of interactional negotiations are critical, the role of exchange interactions in the acquisition of a second language may be dependent on comprehensible output. Gass & Selinker (2008) have influenced previous studies when they adopted the IIO model, which is based on four phases in analysing second language acquisition: input, intake, interaction, and output. For them, corrective feedback helps learners. This can be explained as the pure input introduced to the L2 learner by the native speaker, who afterwards provides a modified input after negotiation of meaning. This comprehensible input becomes gradually intake if the learner continues noticing the form and structure of the target language, and then with this new input (intake), the learner would be able to interact with the native speaker for testing or confirmation of the new knowledge, which results in modification of the intake forming interaction input. Meaning that there the learner has built new knowledge (interaction) input plus the previous knowledge (intake) input, which results in the interlanguage phase that can be restructured to have at the end and also throughout the process, what is called the output of acquired language for the learner

Conclusion

This piece of work demonstrates that the debate in the field of SLA has focused primarily on differences in the foundations of each approach to the study of L2 acquisition. While Krashen's model was adapted for comprehensible input, other scholars criticised his theory and invented new theories based on it after it was modified by Long and Swain. Their theories

were grounded on the assumption that the individual's mind was the place of acquisition, while more socially oriented researchers view language learning as essentially a social enterprise in which the meaning is first constructed by the partners before being internalised by the student.

This has been drawn to differentiate between models depending on the handling method used to make the correction and the general concentration of the classroom, whether on communication or the formal accuracy of consequential content. Also, there is an important concern with the processes that involve language educators in activity studies on learner language in their independent classrooms. As educators become conscious of the features of learner language generated by the learners, they are able to purify their pedagogical involvement to maximise the development of interlanguage

References

- 1/ Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Toronto: Centre de recherche en education Franco-ontarienne, Institute d etudes pedagogifues de J'Ontario
- 2/Cook, V. (2006). Second Language Learning and Language Teaching. London: Arnold.
- 3/Cook, V. (2008). Second Language Learning and Language Teaching. London: Arnold.
- 4DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In Doughty, Catherine; Williams, Jessica. Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition. London: Meckler.
- 5/Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (1998). Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- 6/Ellis, C. (1998). Emergentism, Connectionism and Language Learning. Language Learning
- 7/Ellis, R. (2005). Analyzing Learner Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 8/Ellis, R. (2008). The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford University Press.

- 9/ Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language research*. London: Longman
 - 10/Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd
 - 11/Krashen, S. D. (1977). Some issues relating to the monitor model. In Brown, H; Yorio, Carlos
 - 12/Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
 - 13/Long, M. (1996), *The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition*. NY: Academic Press.
 - 14/ Schumann, John H. (1978). *The Pidginization Process: a model for second language acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury
 - 15/Selinker, L. (1972). *Interlanguage*. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209 – 231.
 - 16/Swain, M., & Deters, P. (2007). “New” mainstream SLA theory: Expanded and enriched. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 818 – 834
- Bibliography**
- 1/Allwright, D. (2009). *The Developing Language Learning: An Introduction to Exploratory Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
 - 2/Bates, E. & MacWhinney, B. (1981). *Second-Language Acquisition from a Functionalist Perspective: Pragmatic, Semantic, and Perceptual Strategies*. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 379: 190.
 - 3/Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). *Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing*. Toronto: Centre de recherché en education Franco-ontarienne, Institute d etudes pedagogifues de J’Ontario
 - 4/Cook, V. (2006). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold.
 - 5/Cook, V. (2008). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold.
 - 6/DeKeyser, R. (1998). *Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar*. In Doughty, Catherine; Williams, Jessica. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. London: Meckler.

- 7/Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- 8/Ellis, C. (1998). *Emergentism, Connectionism and Language Learning*. Language Learning
- 9/Ellis, R. (2002). Does form-focused instruction affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24 (2): 223–236.
- 10/Ellis, R. (2005). *Analyzing Learner Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 11/Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- 12/Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language research*. London: Longman
- 13/Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd
- 14/Krashen, S. D. (1977). Some issues relating to the monitor model. In Brown, H; Yorio, Carlos
- 15/Krashen, S. (1994). The input hypothesis and its rivals: In Ellis, Nick. *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*. London: Academic Press. pp. 45–77.
- 16/Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- 17/Long, M. (1996), *The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition*. NY: Academic Press.
- 18/Schumann, John H. (1978). *The Pidginization Process: a model for second language acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury
- 19/Selinker, L. (1972). *Interlanguage*. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209 – 231.
- 20/Swain, M., & Deters, P. (2007). “New” mainstream SLA theory: Expanded and enriched. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 818 – 834
- 21/Zuengler, J., & Miller, E. R. (2006). Cognitive and sociocultural perspectives: Two parallel SLA worlds. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 35-58.