

## Chapter 9. Cross-linguistic influence and learner language

- I. The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH)—rooted in the behavioristic and structuralist approaches
  - A. Hierarchy of difficulty
    1. Level 0-Transfer  $L1=L2$
    2. Level 1-Coalescence  $A, B \rightarrow C$
    3. Level 2-Underdifferentiation  $A \rightarrow 0$
    4. Level 3-Reinterpretation  $A \rightarrow B$
    5. Level 4-Overdifferentiation  $0 \rightarrow A$
    6. Level 5-Split  $A \rightarrow B, C$
  - B. From the CAH to CLI (Cross-linguistic influence)
    1. Strong version—predict difficulty by means of contrastive analysis
    2. Weak version – utilize their knowledge of the target and native languages to understand the sources of error (Cross-linguistic influence)
  - C. Empirical evidence
    1. Whitman and Jackson (1972) found no support for the predications of the contrastive analysis.
    2. Oller and Ziahosseiny (1970) found that English spelling proved to be more difficult for people whose native language use a Roman script than for those whose native language used a non-Roman script.
    3. Sheen (1996) found that overt attention to targeted syntactic contrasts between Arabic and English reduced error rates.
  - D. Conclusion
    1. subtle differences cause great difficulty
    2. Intralingual vs. Interlingual errors
    3. CLI implies the second language also influence the first language.
- II. Markedness and Universal Grammar
  - A. Eckman (1977, 1981) proposed Markedness differential Hypothesis (markedness theory) to account for relative degrees of difficulty by means of principles of universal grammar.
  - B. The marked member contains at least one more feature than the unmarked one.
  - C. The unmarked member has a wider distribution.
  - D. Marked items will be more difficult to acquire than unmarked.
  - E. In recent year, the attention of some second language researchers has expanded beyond markedness hypotheses along to the broader framework of linguistic universals in general.
  - F. Competition Model
- III. Learner language

- A. Second language learning is a process of the creative construction of a system.
- B. By the late 1960's, SLA began to be examined in much the same way that first language acquisition had been studied for some time—by looking at learners as creative beings.

C. Interlanguage= idiosyncratic dialect=learner language

#### IV. Error Analysis

A. Mistakes and errors

B. Shortcomings in too much attention to learners' errors

1. ultimate goal of second language learning is that attainment of communicative fluency
2. overemphasis on production
3. fails to account for the strategy of avoidance
4. Error analysis can keep us too closely focused on specific language rather than viewing universal aspects of language

C. Identifying and describing errors (p. 221)

1. Overt and Covert errors
2. Addition, omission, substitution and ordering
3. phonology or orthography, lexicon, grammar, and discourse
4. Global and local errors
5. domain—the rank of linguistic unit that must be taken as context in order for the error to become apparent  
extent—the rank of linguistic unit that would have to be deleted, replaced, supplied, or reordered in order to repair the sentence

D. Sources of error

1. Interlingual transfer
2. Intralingual transfer
3. Context of learning
4. communicative strategies

#### V. Stages of learning language development

A. random errors=pre-systematic stage

B. emergent

C. systematic stage

D. stabilization =post-systematic stage

#### VI. Variability in learner language

A. Elaine Tarone's (1988) capability continuum paradigm

1. variation according to linguistic context
2. variation according to psychological processing factors
3. variation according to social context

4. variation according to language function
- B. Rod Ellis's (1994, 1986) variable competence model
  1. a storehouse of variable interlanguage rules depending on how automatic and how analyzed the rules are
  2. planned and unplanned discourse
- VII. Fossilization
  - A. the relative permanent incorporation of incorrect linguistic forms into a person's second language competence
  - B. Oller (1976) provided a formal account of fossilization as a factor of positive and negative affective and cognitive feedback
- VIII. Error treatment
  - A. Basic options
    1. to treat or to ignore
    2. to treat immediately or to delay
    3. to transfer treatment or not
    4. to transfer to another individual, a subgroup, or the whole class
    5. to return, or not, to original error maker after treatment
    6. to permit other learners to initiate treatment
    7. to test for the efficacy of the treatment
  - B. Possible feature
    1. face the error indicated
    2. location indicated
    3. opportunity for new attempt given
    4. model provided
    5. error type indicated
    6. remedy indicated
    7. improvement indicated
    8. praise indicated
- IX. Categories of error treatment
  - A. Types of feedback
    1. Recast
    2. Clarification request
    3. Metalinguistic feedback
    4. Elicitation
    5. Explicit correction
    6. Repetition
  - B. Responses to feedback
    1. uptake

2. repair

3. repetition

X. Form-focused instruction (FFI)

A. Definition

B. Effectiveness

1. FFI can indeed increase learners' levels of attainment, and error treatment and focus on forms are most effective when incorporated into a communicative, learner-centered curriculum.
2. Corrective feedback after communicative task
3. Explicit instruction was more appropriate for easily stated grammar rules and implicit instruction was more successful for more complex rules
4. Salience is more important than frequency
5. Analytic, field-independent, left-brain-oriented learners internalize explicit FFI better. Js and Ts on the Myers-Briggs scale will more readily be able to focus on form.