Language Learning Perspectives :
Language and Cognitive Models

関西大学人間活動理論研究センター
Center for Human Activity Theory, Kansai University

Yuriko Kite

The purpose of this paper is to trace the construction of language teaching/ learning in a second language in the last 50 years in order to better understand why we see a "boom" in the social cultural perspective in Japan and the world (Verity, 2007, p. 125). Here a "second language" refers to any language, which is acquired/ learned after one's first language with a variety of goals in any language learning context. Second language acquisition (SLA) explains how one processes a second language (L2) in the field of applied linguistics. Those who are in first language (L1) studies looking at how a baby learns its first language initially studied this situation, and now it is a well-established separate field. While SLA is a relatively a young field compared to linguistics or other social sciences, it has been productive, as we see in the number of journals which are specifically dedicated to explaining how and why one is successful or unsuccessful in their second language learning. This paper, the first one in the series, focuses on what we understand how language learning occurrs, and what we have not been able to understand. Thus, it demonstrates why the shift in perspective is occurring in our paradigm from individualistic to more situated learning. This paper intends to initiate a dialogue with the Activity Theory community on how we, the applied linguists, can better understand the process of language acquisition/learning. This paper seeks to find a joint inquiry of how learning occurs, and ultimately, how we can best help the learners.

Applied linguistics is highly interdisciplinary in that it has applied many theories from other social sciences. To date, we do not seem to have "the" second language acquisition (SLA) theory, even though diverse hypotheses have been proposed. Hypotheses such as the Input hypothesis, Interaction hypothesis, and Output hypothesis have generated many data－based studies. According to Long (1997, p. 22), between 40 to 60 hypotheses are reported in the literature. Besides theses, some recently discussed theories include the Sociocultural theory from education, Language Socialization from anthropology, or Conversation Analysis from sociology, to name a few. Due to historical reasons, perhaps, the mainstream

view is still considered a cognitive perspective even by sociolculturalists（e.g., Johnson, 2004；Lantolf in Verity, 2007）．The plan for this paper is to follow historical shifts in our SLA. Therefore, the discussion of Behaviorism is the topic of the first tradition. Then, we move to the Cognitive tradition, where the focus shifted into the mentalist tradition. Some issues have been raised about inadequacy of these traditions, which will be pointed out. These will be the foci of the second report in this series.

Behaviorism

In the 1940s to 1960s, Behaviorism was prevalent in psychology, while Structurism was the dominant theory in linguistics. In Structurism, a language was defined as a system. Therefore, the goal of language learning was to master a system of language. Each language system was independent, thus it was thought that each sub-system： system, syntax, morphology and phonology should not be mixed in its analysis, or as a learning goal. Since the language was the system, like a compilation of blocks, the goal of language learning was to master all the blocks by one at a time. Of all the language skills, speaking was the primary skill, it should be taught first, and teaching speaking along with other skills were not encouraged since it was a different system. The theory of language learning was based on Behaviorism, in which learning occurs as a response to a stimulus. Thus, learning was considered as a formation of habit. Therefore, it is extremely important that a correct and good input（stimulus）was provided. For example, a teacher should be or provide a perfect model, thus his/her native-like pronunciation was a prerequisite. When an incorrect response was produced, it was corrected immediately, since a learner may form a bad construction.

Error treatment

Contrastive Analysis

A theory of language and that of language learning led the Structurist linguists to engage in a compare and contrast of a learner's L1 and his / her target language （TL）called contrastive analysis（CA）. They predicted that differences in a system between language A and B, lead to difficulties in learning, and that there was a positive correlation between the differences in a language and the difficulty in learning the TL. Lado in his book, *Linguistics Across Cultures* states, "We can

predict and describe the patterns that will cause systematically the language and culture to be learned with the native language and culture of the students" (1957, p. vii). Japanese language learners of English, for example, would have a more difficult time learning English than French learners, since the distance between Japanese and English is wider than that of French and English in morphosyntactic and phonological aspects. It is reported that in those days researchers produced volumes of description of languages, which mainly documented the differences between languages, and they occupied the shelves of their library. This prediction, however, was questioned in a paper by Schachter (1974). Her paper investigated writing samples of four language groups, and compared both errors and correct usage of relative pronouns. In two languages, Persian and Arabic, the learners showed more mistakes in ratio than other two language groups, Chinese and Japanese where the relative clause system is not close to that of English. She challenged the prediction of CA analysts at that time by saying, "I regard the CA aposteriori [i] hypothesis as untenable and think it should be abandoned" (p. 213).

The treatment of an error represents a view of language learning. In the Behaviorism paradigm, errors were interference in learning, since it was a negative transfer from the learners' L1. It was considered 'a sin' and something to be eradicated immediately. Thus errors were always corrected. Since the theory of language learning is of habit formation, the error was a sign of a wrong learning on students' part that needed to be corrected immediately before it formed a habit.

In CA, the error, or learners' production was compared with their target language (TL) forms, but the next error treatment is called Error Analysis (EA) in which they explained its behavior toward their L1.

Error Analysis

This view is close to CA in that the language forms, either L1 or L2, have a great impact on the process of language learning. We need to mention a couple of applied linguists who influenced our view on learners' errors. One is Corder. In his paper, "The significance of learner's errors" (1967), he first made a distinction between mistake and error. Mistakes according to Corder, are slips of tongue (or pen). Therefore they do not hold any meaning to researchers, he called them 'errors of performance.' An error is defined as "the systematic errors of the learner from which we are able to reconstruct his knowledge of the language to date, i. e., his

transitional competence（p. 168）. He argued that the errors are significant in three ways（p. 169）：

（1）to teachers： Errors show developmental stages showing what they have learned, and what remains to be learned.
（2）to researchers： Errors provide evidence of learning processes, and learning strategies that the learners used.
（3）most importantly, errors are indispensable to the learner himself. They show learners' hypothesis testing.

His paper not only challenged the view of CA, but also is considered the beginning of a field called Applied Linguistics.

EA was conducted in various perspectives, compared with CA where the strong version stated that the differences in forms（language A or language B）could predict the level of difficulty. In identifying and analyzing errors, superficial errors such as 'omission', 'double marking'（e.g., *He didn't* <u>*went*</u> *there.* Where *went* is marked with the past tense, so does *did*）, 'and overgeneralization'（e.g., *There are sheeps*. Where - *s* is marked as plural but *sheep* is already marked as plural.）were identified. Furthermore, discussion on depth of errors occurred：error vs. mistake, global error vs. local error. Explanation of these errors is a crucial focus, and the researchers began to take an account of developmental process, as well as errors from interference from L1.

EA was not without criticism. First, the identification of errors was actually extremely difficult. For example, in a written response to a question, one first year Japanese student wrote：

Example（1）

I don't agree the idea. There is some truth that we don't have to know, or we mustn't now. Knowing the cruel truth we wisht be hurted.

（Kite, 2007-387）

In this example, we observe that the lack of preposition *with* in the first sentence, as it should be *I don't agree* <u>*with*</u> *the idea.* Or the 'hurted' is overgeneralization of -*ed* past tense maker. However, 'wisht' is not a recognizable word, and it is difficult to

tell what this student had in mind. Was it *wished to* ? The second criticism lies in the methodological issue in which only the learners' errors, mostly morphosyntacitc ones, were considered. The correct usage, for example, the preposition *with* after the verb as seen in the above example（1）was not counted as such showing the learners' learning. Third, these studies also neglected to look at progress from a longitudinal perspective. the investigation only focused on a single learner performance, and did not study how learners did or did not use the correct forms over a period of time. Lastly, they could not count for 'avoidance.' Avoidance is one strategy that a learner uses when he or she faces difficulty in communication such as not knowing a vocabulary or grammar such as a relative clause. He can substitute a word with familiar word, or paraphrase so that he can avoid a relative clause, and uses two simple sentences. This kind of avoidance, or use of other strategies, is not counted as an error.

It is interesting to note here that both CA and EA are not at all concerned with mental processing. EA helped us understand that errors are not necessarily caused by an interface of a learner's L1, and something to be corrected right away as predicted by CA. EA also showed us that mistakes or errors are necessary processes in L2 language learning. That said, the attention to forms or systems of language dominates the explanation of how one learns a second language. Corder in his paper （1967）implies, however, that learning cannot be explained solely by looking at the forms. For example, in discussing input in L2 learning, he stated（1967, p. 167）：

> The simple fact of presenting a certain linguistic form to a learner in the classroom does not necessarily qualify it for the status of input, for the reason that input is "what goes in" not what is available for going in, and we many reasonably suppose that it is the learner who controls this input, or more properly his intake. This may well be determined by the characteristics of his language acquisition mechanism and not by those of the syllabus. After all, in the mother tongue learning situation the data available as input is relative vast, but it is the child who selects what shall be the input.

In other words, Corder implies that forms comparison, as CA theory dictates, is by far inadequate, and we need to consider what a learner does with his/her input

in their learning. Later, he quotes Von Humbold and says "we cannot really teach language, we can only create conditions in which it will develop spontaneously in the mind in its own way. We shall never improve our ability to create such favorable conditions until we learn more about the way a learner learns and what his built－in syllabus is（1967, p. 171）". Though their views imply that the learning process can not be explained just by looking at the forms, it was not recognized as one coherent theory at the time.

Around this time, the notion of 'interlanguage' was introduced by Selinker （1972）. Interlanguage ─ "a separate linguistics system"（p. 214）─ is the concept that any second language learner has his/her language, which is specific at the time of learning, different both from their L1 and L2. This notion is close Coder's transitional competency（1967）in that learners will develop an autonomous language, and has their own rules and regulations. Selinker claims that the observable output which language learners produce as meaningful performance are the base of framework on which psychology of second language learning：NL（native language）or TL（target language）, and IL（interlanguage, any process in between）. He concludes his paper by stating that "these data have to be organized with the help of certain theoretical constructs"（p. 228）. Central constructs he suggests are mixture of language forms such as identification of language forms,（NL, IL and TL）or syntactic string, as well as psychological processing of fossilization.

Selinker has shown keen insight on how learning occurs. Though his theoretical constructs focus on description of language forms in the three ways mentioned above, he observed the lack of investigation in the coherent learning process. He states（1972, p. 224）：

> Perhaps the rather curious confusion in the literature of 'learning a second language' with 'teaching a second language' …can be explained by the failure to see a psychology of second-language learning in terms of other than those related to 'success'. For example, typical learning-theory would demand knowledge of where the learner will tend to end up, not where we would like him to end up. Experiments of this type would also demand knowledge of where the second language learner begins. We would claim that prerequisite to both these types of knowledge are detailed descriptions of ILs ─ descriptions not presently available to us. Thus such experiments

at present are premature, with the results bound to prove confusing.

Selinker's claim of IL seems to be the key argument here, and he insists on the description of languages, especially the forms in IL. However, the emphasis on only the environment of learning, such as language input, the teachers' input is being questioned. The shift in the theories of language form the background to these trends, namely the failure of CA, EA studies, and the notion of IL. In the next section, the fall of behaviorism and emergence of the cognitive research tradition will be discussed.

Cognitive tradition

Behaviorism and structuralism were rejected by Chomsky's theory of language (1965). In his paper of *Review of 'Verbal Behavior' by B. F. Skinner* (1959), he made a convincing argument that language learning does not occur by response to stimulus, but that an inner mechanism is more responsible. He argued that humans are born with a wired device, which he called language acquisition device (LAD), where universal grammar (UG) operates. Input from the environment activates UG in the LAD, and produces grammatical (language) competence. Thus, as it did in Behaviorism, input does not play a major role in language acquisition, but stimulates human mental processing within the LAD. Chomskyan camp researchers then attempted to describe this innate faculty, and have transformed this to a number of grammars : transformational grammar, generative grammar (Chomsky, 1965), the government and biding theory (Chomsky, 1981), and now the minimalist program (Chomsky, 1995). These grammars are not language specific, but are universal, encompassing all the languages in the world. In discussing grammar, the theory refers to one's L1, not their L2. Chomsky and his followers influenced the theory of language, and also the theory of language learning 'overnight' according to Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982, p. 140). A new theory was called Cognitive code-learning theory, and it is not a coincidence that the studies on errors by Corder (1967) came out around this time.

UG

Some of us are concerned with the status of UG, and it is one of the productive sub-fields in applied linguistics. According to the Chomskyan camp, all the human beings are born with a LAD and have an innate language faculty. The researchers, then, ask if UG still is available in adults' learners who have mastered their L1, and if so, to what extent and what part of it is accessible. The answers are far from conclusive and there are two opposing views on this. One is the views is the complete access view（Flynn, 1996）, which states that adults indeed still have access to UG, after their L1, enabling them to help learn their L2. Flynn investigated the head parameter, and looked at Japanese language learners of English. Her claim was that Japanese has a different head construction, whether it has a head-last construction as in Example（2）, while English has a head-first construction as in Example（3）, yet the Japanese learners of English were able to acquire this construction.

Example（2）head－last（Japanese）

Akazukin	*wo*	*kabut-ta*	+	*onnnan no ko*
red hood	OBJECT	wear PAST		girl
verbal phrase			+	head

Example（3）head－first（English）

the girl	+	*with a red hood*
head	+	verbal phrase

Her idea is that Japanese adults learners first were exposed to Example（2）type. When Japanese learners of English received an English input as in Example（3）, they access to LAD faculty and develop the English head-first type.

The other is the view which is opposite of the above, mainly stating that adults do not have access to UG. Bley-Vroman（1989）proposes the fundamental different hypothesis. He sees the contrast between success in child learning（L1） and variations of success in adult learning（L2）, and claims that adults do not have an access to UG. Instead the general problem-solving system is responsible for language learning. The Language acquisition is not considered autonomous, but a

part of general cognitive domain by Bley-Vroman. Children learn their L1 without any formal instruction or negative feedback [ii], in other words, acquire their L1 only with input. Furthermore, they all become successful L1 speakers and listeners. On the other hand, adult learners learn or acquire their L2 in a very different way than children's L1：input only does not lead to L2 acquisition, they show variations in their success rate, and they are further influenced by various factors such as affective （personality, motivation）, or environment （instruction type, instructor in formal learning setting）.

So far, we have looked at the two views：Behaviorism and Cognitive traditions. In a novice's terms, this contrast can be explained as 'nurture' vs. 'nature'. Input, or stimuli in Behaviorism terms, was the most salient in the Behavirorism / Sturcturist views. For Chomsky, however, who later advocated the 'mentalist' view of language learning, the environment plays the role of a trigger, and not the major input. Though these days the Behaviorism view of language acquisition and learning is not supported at all, but not everyone agrees with the Chomsky's theory of SLA, either. That said, In SLA, the mainstream view still is the cognitive-code processing approach （e.g., Long, 1997：Gregg, 1989）. Their view is clearly shown in his criticism against Firth and Wagner （1997）. The special issue of *The Modern Language Journal* （1997）, Firth and Wagner, in their influential paper, criticized that the SLA views of language learning as a narrow and reduced perspective to the cognitive view, ignoring how a learner interacts with his/her interlocutor and the social context of learning. Long, in his rebuttal, states （1997, p. 319）.

> Whether F & W like it or not （they do not）, most SLA researchers view the object of inquiry as in large part an internal, mental process：*the acquisition of new （linguistics） knowledge*" （emphasis in original）

Long views any socially situated learning as minor, since it is peripheral to L2 acquisition. For Long, the goal of L2 is to acquire knowledge of morphosyntacs （grammar forms and meaning）, phonology （pronunciation）, and lexicon （vocabulary）, which is close to Chomky's notion of grammatical competence. Though Long is aware of language use as he states "SLA is a process that （often） takes place in a social setting" （1997, p. 319）, however he does not believe that it requires any theory. Long states further （ibid）：

> Social and affective factors, the L2 acquisition literature suggests, are important, but relatively minor in their impact, in both naturalistic and classroom settings, and most current theories of and in SLA reflect that fact.

Long proposed Interaction Hypothesis（see below）, however his theory is centered on the mental process of an individual on language forms.

Input Hypothesis

Krashen's input hypothesis（1985）has been criticized these days by the mainstream SLA researchers, but no one can deny that it was considered a robust hypothesis that left a huge impact on many practitioners. Krashen proposed five hypotheses, and probably the most discussed is his Input hypothesis. It states that all we need in L2 language learning is input from TL, as we see in children's L1 acquisition. Massive input led the L1 acquisition; likewise it will work the same way in L2. When this hypothesis first appeared, Krashen and his practitioners believed that we did not need to provide any explicit explanation of grammar, since grammar knowledge would emerge as a result of massive input. His hypothesis that comprehensive input should include "I + 1" in which "I" referred to the learner's current stage of language knowledge, and "1", something to be learned, or the next stage. In other words, "I + 0" where "0" is the stage that learners are, no learning occurs since input does not include anything new. When the input is "I + 2", then, input is not comprehensive since items that the learners do not know and need to learn, is more than they can process.

Krashen's hypotheses appeared when many argued that L2 acquisition is similar to that of L1, and heavy reliance on LAD was in the background. He believed that "I + 1" makes the input possible as intake [iii]. When learners are exposed to "I + 1" comprehensive input, teachers do not need to provide "finally-tuned input." He believed that since learners had a built-in grammar, they can pick up the "I + 1" from any kind of input, be it roughly tuned or finely tuned. Learners in an incidental context where they live in a community where the language is spoken are exposed to all kinds of input. In these contexts, however, it is impossible to control the kind of input one would be exposed to.

Input hypothesis, along with the other four hypotheses Krashen proposed, had a significant impact, both positive and negative. For example, the Input hypothesis brought our attention to investigating caretaker speech, foreigner talk（how the mothers or teachers talk to their babies or to students, respectively, in a simplified manner）, immersion program（which emphasizes massive input）, and silent period （delay response in language production）. These helped us understand the nature of input, or the role of input that plays in language learning. However, all of Krashen's hypotheses were severely attacked（e.g., Gregg, 1984；McLaughlin, 1987；White, 1987）. One criticism is that evidence is indirect, as some studies simply imply that input is important in any language context. And the amount of empirical evidence is low. Furthermore, many people have presented counter evidence. White（1987）, for example, discusses how 'incomprehensive' input may lead to learning, thus it is not the case the input is necessary in acquisition. She claims that in the case of passive construction, for example, failure to understand the input is the 'the driving force for grammar change is that input is incomprehensible, rather than comprehensible' （1987, p. 95）. Other criticism falls into the category of lack of operationalizing. The Input hypothesis, for example, stated "I + 1" in comprehensive input. However, Krashen never made clear what he meant by "1".

However, these hypotheses were proposed during the time when language learning focused on the "grammar translation" method, these hypotheses brought attention to a new look at what is called 'communicative language teaching approach'. His hypotheses generated research questions such as 'is there a natural order of learning?' or 'what are the roles of affective factors in language learning?' The discussions of explicit and implicit knowledge actually depart from Krashen's distinction of acquisition from learning. No one denies that input is necessary in any language learning, and we need to credit Krashen for his contributions, but whether input only is sufficient is not supported at all, as we will see as two other hypotheses emerged.

Output Hypothesis

Input hypothesis was influential to the immersion program, and especially productive in Canada as French immersion. In immersion programs, the target language（in this case French）is used as the language medium to English speaking children. Thus input in this context is considered massive and rich. Swain observed

that this massive input produced fluent language speakers and readers, but the learners lacked in accuracy, especially in their grammar, or pragmatic language use. This incomplete learning, she argued, cannot be explained by lack of input. She questioned input-sufficient notion. She proposed an Output hypothesis which states that it is a learner's output which has a significant role in language learning (1985, 1995, 2000). Swain states (1995, p. 125)∶

> (it) has been argued that output is nothing more than a sign of the second language acquisition that has already taken place and that output serves no useful role in SLA except possibly as one source of (self−) input to the leaner, (Krashen, 1989).

Swain proposed that output has three functions∶noticing, hypothesis testing, and metalinguistic. In noticing, she claims that only by output, like speaking or writing, a learner sees the gap between what they can actually say and what they would like to say. Noticing was proposed more systematically by Schmidt and Frota (1986), and Swain states that it is output which give rise to noticing. Without this opportunity, a learner would never understand this difference, and by pushed output, he/she would understand what they do not know or know only partially. Usually our receptive levels of language, namely listening and reading are higher than productive levels in speaking and writing even in our L1. Thus this function seems to make sense at first glance. The second function is the hypothesis-testing. By producing an output, a learner tests the rules of language. This 'trying to sound out', Swain claims, will "invoke feedback which can lead learners to modify or 'reprocess' their output (1995, p. 126). The third function, metalinguistic, makes the learners reflect upon their target language, and helps them 'to control and internalize linguistic knowledge' (ibid).

This output hypothesis is indirectly supported by research. Swain and her colleagues' studies from immersion focused on how French immersion students learn French grammar construction (e.g., Swain and Lapkin, 1995∶Kowal and Swain, 1997). In completing a dictation task, they show that two learners come to realize the incomplete knowledge in some grammar construction, and by interacting together, both came to learn a new construction, where neither knew it before by themselves. The audio-taped data shows convincingly how the negotiation led to

new learning, but we do not know how often this kind of ʻlanguage episodeʼ occurs, and more importantly if this leads to language acquisition.

Swain（1995）herself makes a disclaimer in which she does not say anything about how these three functions operate when learners produce the target language, but in her paper, she implies that studentʼs negotiations provide them access to the learning processes. She quotes Vygotsky and states that the negotiation of forms seen in her studies are like the construction of co-knowledge, and adds that the process is close to ʻdialogically driven constructionʼ（p. 137）. She quotes Donatoʼs （1994）and LaPierreʼs（1994）work as being ʻsuggestive of this sort of negotiation about form for second language learningʼ（ibid）.

Interaction Hypothesis

Long（1983）attempted to operationalize the Input Hypothesis, and actually expanded it with evidence. The claim is that the learnerʼs exposure to a target language is not in itself a sufficient condition as claimed by Krashen, but what is needed is an interaction. He looked at the interactions of native speakers（NSs）of English, and non-native speakers（NNSs）of different L1s, and showed what was happening in their interactions and compared between 16 NS-NS and 16 NS-NNS pairs. They were engaged with six kinds of tasks. The result showed that in a NS-NNS pairs, language they used did not show much complexity in grammar, but what they showed was a number of interactional modifications. These modifications include discourse management in which a speaker attempts to simplify to avoid communication problems. Long calls these modifications three Cʼs, as strategy as shown in Examples（4）,（5）and（6）below. The arrows show these modifications.

Example（4）Confirmation Checks

	NS：	And right on the roof of the truck, place the duck. The duck.
→	NNS：	I to take it ? <u>Dog ?</u>
	NS：	Duck.
	NNS：	Duck.

Example（5）Clarification requests

      NS： It's yellow and it's a small animal. T has two feet.

→ NNS： <u>I put where it </u>?

Example（6）Comprehension checks

      NS： Yeah, Quack, quack. That one. The one that makes that sound.

      NNS： ah, yes. I see in the, in the head of him.

→ NS： OK. <u>See</u> ?

<div align="right">（Pica, Young and Doughty, 1987：p. 740）</div>

In completing the tasks, the NNS used discourse management strategies, and these strategies did not exist in NS − NS interactions. NSs talking with NNSs also showed strategies such as *You understand ?, Okay ?* much more often than in NS-NS discourse. Through these negotiations of meaning, the claim is made that learners come to reach mutual understanding.

One of Long's hypotheses is about input and comprehension in that adjusted input will promote comprehension of input. The empirical research shows mixed results, though. Pica, Young and Doughty（1987）compared the effect of three types of input on 16 ESL learners on their oral comprehension： unmodified input, pre-modified input and interactionally modified input. The results showed that the 'interactionally modified input' produced the highest level of comprehension. At the same time, studies by Parker and Chaudon（1987）reviewed 12 experiments on the effects of modifications, and stated that the results are not consistent. Their own studies looked at how the comprehension differed according to the level of modification in reading passages. Their study failed to show the effects of modification, and stated that the level of syntactic complexity overrode the effects.

Long's second hypothesis is mixed, and less supported by the first one；the relationship between input comprehension. It states that interactional adjustments promote acquisition. Loschky（1994）conducted a similar study as in Pica, Young and Doughty（1987）in which adult learners of Japanese were asked to do a task in three groups：baseline input, premodified input and interactionally modified input. The results were similar in that the group who were allowed to have interactions

did the best. Loschky further conducted both pre-and post-tests on the participants' language proficiency and locative knowledge. The results showed that all three groups gained some in the post-test, but the difference among the groups was not significant. Therefore, it did not show how interactional adjustments led to any development.

Long later revised his hypothesis and added the notion of 'corrective feedback' (1996). He states, '(n)egative feedback obtained during negotiation work or elsewhere may be facilitative of L2 development, at least for vocabulary, morphology, and language-specific syntax, and essential for learning certain specifiable L1-L2 contracts' (1996, p. 414). In an earlier version, Long believed that negotiation of meaning will bring comprehensive input, but now it will bring negative feedback (e.g., ungrammatical construction), be it explicit or implicit.

In summary, Long's Interaction Hypothesis is one directional in which a learner's selective attention and with the learner's processing capacity, the environment (input) is mediated through negotiation of meaning. His fundamental focus is one individual's mental process by which the negotiation of meaning provides negative evidence, or input that will provide information. However how the learners' attention and language forms are mediated is not clear. Furthermore we do not see evidence that international modifications actually lead to acquisition.

Conclusion

We have looked at the last 50 to 60 years of SLA theories. So far, the following observations can be made :

1. Second language acquisition hypotheses are not fully supported by evidence. We do not seem to have solid evidence to support either one of the hypothesis discussed here, since the results of the studies are either mixed, or indirect. Further, all the studies are experimental in which the subjects were asked to perform artificial tasks in an unrealistic context.

2. The hypotheses discussed above assume that language-learning processing is within the scope of one individual. This view says that learning is cognitive and linear in which a learner processes an input, an interaction, and produces an

output as a mechanical process. How learners are situated in reality is either not considered or considered only peripherally or superficially.

Notes

i   This view is the same as prediction type.

ii Correction : During interactions, when a grammatical mistake is made, an explicit or implicit correction can be made. It ranges from an explicit (correction) to an implicit (confirmation, checking, etc.).

iii It is Corder (1967), not Krashen, who distinguished input from intake.

▶ References

Bley-Vroman. R. (1989). What is the logical problem of foreign language learning ? In M. S. Gass & J. Schachter (Eds.), *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 41-69). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1959). Review of 'verbal behavior' by B. Skinner. *Language, 35*, 26-58.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax.* Cambridge : MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding.* Dordrecht, Holland : Forsi.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist Problem.* Cambridge : MIT Press.

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5*, 161-172.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., and Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Firth, A., and Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285-300.

Flynn. S. (1996). A parameter-resetting approach to second language qcquisition. In W. Riche & T. J. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 121-158). San Diego : Academic Press.

Gregg, K. (1984). Krahsen's monitor and Occam's razor. *Applied Linguistics, 5*(2), 79-100.

Gregg, K. (1989). Second language acquisititon theory : The case for a generative perspective. In S. M. Gass and J. Schachter (Eds.) *Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 15-40). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, M. (2004). Vygotsy's sociocultural theory and second language learning. New Haven, CT : Yale University Press.

Kite, Y. (2007). Unpublished data.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis : Issues and implications.* London : Longman.

Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1997). From semantic to syntactic processing : How can we promote metalinguistic awareness in the French immersion classroom ?" In R. K. Johnson and M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education : International perspectives* (pp. 284-307). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistic across cultures : Applied linguistics for language teachers.* Ann Arbor : University of Michigan Press.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Riche & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego : Academic.

Long, M. H. (1997). Constructive validity in SLA research : A response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 35-49.

Loschky, L. (1994). Comprehensible input and second language acquisition : what is the relationship ? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,16,* 303-323.

McLaughlin, B. (1987). The monitor model : Some methodological considerations. *Language learning, 28,* 309-332.

Parker. K., & Chaudron, C. (1987). The effects of linguistic simplification and elaborative modification on L2 comprehension. *University of Hawai' I Working Papers in ESL, 6*(2), 107-133.

Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987) . The impact of interaction on comprehension. *TESOL Quarterly, 21,* 737-758.

Schachter, J. (1974). An error in error analysis. *Language Learning 27,* 205-214.

Schmidt. R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language : A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *talking to learn : conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA : Newbury House.

Selinker, L.（1972）. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10,* 209-231.

Swain, M.（1985）. Communicative competence：Some roles of comphrehensible input and comprehensive output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden（Eds.）, *Input in second language acquisition*（pp. 235-253）. Rowley, MA：Newbury House.

Swain, M.（1995）. Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook, and B. Seidlhofer（Eds.）, *Principle and practice in applied linguistics：Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson*（pp. 125-144）. Cambridge：Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M.（2000）. The output hypothesis and beyond：Mediateing acquistion hrough collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf（Ed.）, *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*（pp. 97-114）. Oxford：Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S.（1995）. Interaction and second language learning：Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Langauge Journal, 82,* 320-337.

White, L.（1987）. Against comprehensive input：The input hypothesis and the development of second language competence. *Applied Linguistics, 8,* 95-110.

Verity, D. P.（2007）. Exploring the dialectic：An Interview with James P. Lantolf. *The JALT Journal, 29*（1）, 123-130.