

- communication* (pp. 191-266). London: Longman.
- Perdue, C. (1996). "Pre-basic varieties: The first stages of second language acquisition". In E. Kellerman, B. Weltens, and T. Bongaerts (Eds.), *EUROSLA 6: A Selection of papers* (pp. 135-149). Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij.
- Peters, A. (1983). *The Units of Language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Peters, A. (1985). "Language segmentation: Operating principles for the perception and analysis of Language" in D.I. Slobin (Ed.) 1985: *The Cross-linguistic Study of Language Acquisition*, Vol. 2. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pienemann, M., Johnston, M., and Brindley, G. (1988). "Constructing an acquisition-based procedure for second language assessment". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 10, 217-243.
- Pine, J. and Lieven, E. (1993). "Reanalysing rote-learned phrases: Individual differences in the transition to multi-word speech". *Journal of Child Language*, 20, 551-571.
- Raupach, M. (1984). "Formulae in second language speech production". In H. Dechert, D. Mohle, and M. Raupach (Eds.), *Second Language Productions* (pp. 114-137). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Schwartz, B. (1993). "On explicit and negative data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behavior". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 147-163.
- Skiba, R. and Dittmar, N. (1992) "Pragmatic, Semantic, and Syntactic constraints and grammaticalization". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 323-349.
- Soars, J. and Soars, L. (1996). *Headway*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Towell, R. (1987). A "Discussion of the psycholinguistic bases for communicative language teaching in a foreign language teaching situation". *British Journal of Language Teaching*, 25, 91-101.
- Towell, R. and Hawkins, R. (1994). *Approaches to second language acquisition*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Vihman, M. (1982). "Formulas in first and second language acquisition". In obler and L. Menn (Eds.), *Exceptional Language and Linguistics* (pp. 261-284). New York: Academic Press.
- Weinert, R. (1995). "The role of formulaic language in second language acquisition: A review". *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 180-205.
- Wong-Fillmore, L. (1979). The "Second Time Around: Cognitive and Social Strategies" in Second Language Acquisition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

least one of the variables representing the arguments in a proposition, stating necessitates the presence of all of them. The absence of variables in a proposition has long been associated with structural signals, namely, question words, word order, and/or intonation. Linguists, as well as English syllabus writers, have been tempted to reduce interrogation to uniform formal analyses and heuristic or pedagogic analyses, respectively. However, these analyses are misleading, and tend to distort the very nature of interrogation—that is, its being function-bound and/or context-bound. It is, after all, the speaker and/or the context that makes an utterance carry a specific illocutionary force. Another line of research can investigate this aspect of interrogatives.

References

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1986). ACTFL proficiency guidelines. New York: ACTFL.
- Clark, R. (1974). "Performing without competence." *Journal of child language*, 1, 1-10.
- Clark, R. (1997). "What's the use of imitation?" *Journal of child language*, 4, 341-358.
- Department for Education/Welsh Office. (1995). National curriculum for modern foreign languages. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Ellis, N. (1996 a) "Analyzing language sequence in the sequence of language acquisition: Some comments on Major and Loup." *Studies in second Language Acquisition*, 18, 361-368.
- Ellis, N. (1996b). "Sequencing in SLA: Phonological memory, chunking, and points of order". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 91-126.
- Foster, S. (1990). *The Communicative Competence of Young Children*. New York: Longmen.
- Hakuta, K. (1974). "Prefabricated patterns and the emergence of structure in second language acquisition". *Language Learning*, 24, 287-297.
- Hickey, T. (1993). "Identifying formulas in first language acquisition." *Journal of child Language*, 20, 27-41.
- Huang, J. and Hatch, E. (1978). "A Chinese child's acquisition of English." In E. Hatch (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition: A book of readings* (pp. 118-131). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Klein, W. and Perdue, C. (1993). "Utterance structure." In C. Perdue (Ed.), *Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives: Vol. 2* (pp. 3-40). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nattinger, J. and DeCarrico, J. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford: University Press.
- Pawley, A. and Syder, F. (1983). "Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Native like selection fluency". In J. Richards and J. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and*

The interpretation of the findings should be accomplished with regard to the context, the material, and the measurement procedure.

More recently, Ellis (1996a, 1996b) has argued for sequence analysis being the underpinning of the acquisition of both phonology and syntax. He argues (1996b) that language sequences serve as the database for the acquisition of memorized sequences of language. Thus, the importance of formulaic speech can not be underestimated; it is imperative that we treat it appropriately in second foreign language curricula. By the same token, some of the investigations should be directed toward probing the impact that specific factors have on success or failure of FL in order to provide valuable insight for teachers, curriculum designers, and material writers.

In view of certain limitations to the study, its results can not be extended too far. Nevertheless, the study has shown rather dramatically that formulaic speech can actively contribute to creative construction processes for nonnative learners of English. In other words, the degree at which learners have to decompose ready-made chunks and feed them into creative processes are important variables in learning and practice.

All this information helps teachers gain a clear perspective of what individual learners are doing as they engage in formulaic speech. Continued research and application to the classroom will assist language learners improve their use of strategies and increase their ability to learn and recall the chunk better.

This type of chunk analysis developed by this research which reveals the interaction of two processes may well have pedagogical value itself. If some students fail to detect the

interaction, then giving them experience with sort of chunk analysis may aid them in their learning. Consequently, presenting input while considering the duration and frequency of the chunks, the amount of information in each chunk, and the needed time for recalling chunks improve the comprehension of materials which in turn affects the development of the target language.

Suggestions for Further Research

The issue of ready-made chunks and creative construction processes and their interaction on learning is ubiquitous and important, and it is on the basis of experimental studies that practical recommendations for successful language teaching and learning can be drawn. Throughout this study, the interaction of two separate processes, viz, formulaic speech and creative construction was investigated. But further research is needed to investigate the role of memory in recalling chunks and its contribution to creative process. That is, this issue can be studied within the field of psycholinguistics properly.

Further research is required to verify and investigate the validity of the criteria proposed for L2 chunk identification which by no means clear cut-bound and retains an irreducible intuitive dimension.

The experiment reported in this study made use of 16 beginner students; other studies may be conducted using larger groups of students at intermediate or advanced level.

Interrogatives are the formal counterparts of statements in English as in other languages. While interrogating entails the absence of at

semantic and pragmatic concerns that are characteristic of the very early stages.

On the creative construction side, we have seen how our classroom learners start with a pregrammatical stage (the V-less stage), similar to the ESF project's nominal utterances structure (e.g., Klein and Perdue, 1993; Perdue, 1996). Klein and Perdue (1993:25) analyze the development of utterance structure in their learners as follows:

Development goes from nominal via infinite to finite utterance organisation. All learners started with what we call *nominal utterance organisation (NUO)*. At this stage, spontaneous utterances (i.e., those which are not just rote forms) mainly consist of seemingly unconnected nouns, adverbs and particles (sometimes also adjectives and particles). What is largely missing in *NUO* is first any functional morphology, and second the structuring power of verbs such as argument structure, case role assignment, etc. This is different in what we call *infinite utterance organisation (IUO)*. At this level, non-finite verb forms are attested... What we do not find is the distinction between the finite and non-finite component of the verb, a distinction fundamental to all languages involved in the study. This distinction characterises the next level, called here *finite utterance organisation (FUO)*, which is not attained by all our learners.

However, our learners differ from the uninstructed adult learners studied by these researchers, in that they spend considerable effort in rehearsing and memorizing relatively complex chunks, which are explicitly taught to them. Once automatized, these formulas provide classroom learners with rich and

complex linguistic input that is beyond their present linguistic capabilities and that is readily available for analysis: Our subjects can be seen to start unpacking these formulas and their analysis actively feeds into their creative construction hypotheses. This is of course a two-way process, but this very fact has important implications for our understanding of how the different kinds of linguistic knowledge (competence vs. learned linguistic knowledge) are stored and what the interaction between the two might be.

Conclusion

It can be concluded from this research that, far from inhibiting progress in the learners, ready-made chunks or formulas provided by the classroom context were instrumental in the learning process. At one extreme, we have learners who do not seem to be able to retain a store of memorized chunks and soon become stuck in a pregrammatical stage in which they are only able to string simple V-less phrases together. At the other extreme, we have learners who memorized a large number of chunks in the early stages and who use this linguistic database as a springboard for creative construction. They do not drop chunks but seem willing to keep working at them over sustained periods of time, presumably until they merge entirely with an evolving grammatical competence.

Implications

This line of research appears to have practical application for chunk studies and theoretical value in understanding how and why learners may approach the same phenomenon.

a number of changes; although the subject pronoun seems to be used accurately from the start, the reflexive pronoun is still being worked on in round 5. Another interesting feature is that, in the later rounds a lexical subject NP is added in front of the chunk, in keeping with the emerging creative utterances following the SVO order that is concurrently produced by this subject. Far from dropping these chunks from his repertoire, this pupil is using them and working on them all the time.

Finally, as shown before, Pupil 57 also uses chunk-based constructions in the later stages:

Round 1: *what's your name?*

Round 2: *umm... what's the boy's name?;
what's the girl's name?*

Round 4: *what're their friends' names?*

Round 5: *what's his name?; what's her
name? what' Ali's name?*

In the round 5, we see him trying to replace the lexical NP with a subject pronoun, although not yet with success.

Discussion

In conclusion, creative construction and chunk breakdown clearly go hand in hand. We have seen that interrogative chunks form the basis for subsequent analysis and creativity. For example, learners start with the more complex *wh*-fronted interrogatives with inversion and only subsequently modify these unanalyzed formulas to make them fit their basic order; they do not abandon them as such when their creative competence becomes greater, but instead they work on them, modifying certain

aspects. These chunks provide a large quantity of rich linguistic data that the learners exploit. They first overextended them to inappropriate contexts, but they are often aware of their inappropriateness and resort to a number of strategies in order to overcome it. The need to establish reference correctly is a strong driving force behind their analysis of the pronominal system within chunks. Because the chunks they learn in the early stages typically contain verbs and their pronominal subjects (not just interrogatives but also declaratives of the type *I am called, I like/ I hate/ I love+NP*) and because reference is crucial in the kind of information-gap classroom activities they typically engage in, subject pronouns seem to be dropped or added to when they are inappropriate.

In our classroom data, it seems that the learners who are able to memorize formulas successfully, and who were still working on them by the end of the study, are also the learners who were earliest to engage in creative construction and who progressed farthest along the developmental continuum during the course of our study (e.g., Pupils 03, 09, 57). At the other of this continuum we find learners who had abandoned formulas by the end of our study and who seem to be stuck in a pregrammatical V-less stage (e.g., Pupils 26, 34, 45) in which they are only able to paste together NPs and PPs. This can be linked to recent claims that there is a correlation between the phonological STM (Short Term Memory) of learners and their grammatical ability (Ellis, 1996). This first group of learners seems to be able to successfully automatize formulaic routines, thereby enabling them to free up controlled processes to attend to the form of language rather than being constrained by processing limitations to concentrate on the purely

- Stage 1. Single words or formulas
- Stage 2. Declarative word order
- Stage 3. Fronting
- Stage 4. Inversion in wh-and yes/no questions (with copula and auxiliaries other than do)
- Stage 5. Inversion in wh-questions (with do and other auxiliaries)
- Stage 6. complex questions (question tags, negative questions, embedded questions).

On this scale, some of our learners have reached stage 2, but there is little evidence of them having entered stage 3 or any later stage.

Three

In this final results section, the last research question, which concerns the existence of interaction between chunk use and chunk analysis, and the learners' developing capacity for ceative construction will be addressed.

At one extreme, we have subjects such as 26, 34, and 45, who appear not to retain their early memorized chunks and who also seem to miss out on creative construction; as we have seen, by the end of our study this combination resulted in heavy reliance on V-less expressions, at least for asking questions. For such subjects, conversational tasks could be accomplished only with extensive interlocutor help and support, and meaning were expressed through lexical and pragmatic means only.

At the other extreme are subjects such as Pupils 03, 09, and 57, who by the end of the study are developing a genuine capacity for creative construction. However, it is clear from data about these pupils presented earlier that this development by no means involves the abandonment of chunk use. Instead, it runs alongside a sustained struggle to analyze and restructure previously learned chunks. For example, when we examined subjects' use of various *to call* chunks, we saw how Pupil 03 was using the *what's your name?* chunk as a context to explore the workings of the pronoun system. In round 5, for instance, he was experimenting with utterances such as *what's his name?* and *his name is John*. It is quite clear that early learned chunks were still a live and a dynamic part of his repertoire at this late stage in the study.

If we now look at Pupil 09, a similar pattern emerges for *to call* chunks, although he is clearly more advanced:

- Round 1: *what's your name?; what's his name? what's her name?*
- Round 2: *what's his name?* [twice]
- Round 3: *what's his name?; what's her name?*
- Round 4: *what're their names? what's his name?*
- Round 5: *what's the umm... boy's name? what's the girl's name?*

This pupil seems to have been able to memorized three interrogative chunks as early as the first round. We would argue that they are chunks at this stage, rather than being generated productively, because they undergo

that would fit the situation appropriately. In those cases, they used a number of strategies:

1. They used the nearest chunk or part of a chunk, even if sometimes totally inappropriate; for example, *where lives a living room? that is, where is the living room?* (Pupil 02, R 4).

2. They isolated the question word in a chunk and used it productively. For example, *where do you live?* was identified early on by many learners as the question word for location and was often used with an NP in order to question the location of that NP; for example, *where the swimming pool?*, *where the beach?* (Pupil 24, R 4), *where the house?* (Pupil 26, R 4)

3. They resorted to utterances lacking a VP, mostly in the shape of NPs and PPs (but also APs, quantifiers, and combinations of all these), either on their own or pasted together, hoping the message would get across; for example, *which activities... at Belleville?* (Pupil 26, R 6); *the lady at the stadium?* (Pupil 51, R 5); *the umm... the grandmother and he children umm... in a boat on a lake?* (Pupil 52, R 3).

4. In the later stages, some of our subjects started forming sentences containing a VP, initially (and mostly) untensed, with a few learners managing sentences with a finite verb. For example, *and he play cricket?* (Pupil 09, R 4)

We do not need to concern ourselves here with the first two strategies, as we analyzed the use of chunks in detail in the previous section. Instead, we will concentrate on the last two, which, because they can not be traced back to chunks, are the best illustration of our subjects' creativity. The breakdown of this

corpus can be classified into *three* broad categories: V-less interrogative utterances, interrogatives involving VP chunks or possible chunks, and creatively constructed V-headed interrogatives. A chi-square analysis confirms the difference between the proportion of V-less, V-headed creative, and V-headed chunk questions is very highly significant over time, $X^2(10, N=2,084)=236.9534, p<.001$.

Summing up interrogative development on the creative construction side, then our subjects can be seen progressing through the following stages:

1. A verbless stage; for example, *I big house?* (Pupil 12, R2); *and activities evening ... the ... cinema?* (Pupil 24, R6).

2. An infinitival stage, at which verbs are introduced in creative constructions but are typically untensed; for example, *umm... the ... mother look-at (INF) the shop?* (pupil 03, R4)

3. A finite verb stage, at which verbs are marked morphologically; for example, *the mother looks (FIN) umm read (FIN) umm the little brother and sister umm fish (FIN)?* (Pupil 38, R6).

Even by round 6, however, only a minority of subjects could be said to have reached stage 3. As we have seen, a few subjects (26, 34, 45) are still clearly in the V-less stage, and a majority are still making a tentative entry into the second stage.

Pienemann, Johnston, and Brindley (1988) have proposed a developmental scale for the acquisition of interrogatives, shown below:

Given the wide variety of forms used by the subjects in order to patch together the questions they wanted to ask in a pragmatically acceptable way, it is hard to trace any clear collective developmental patterns in the group data. Two points are worth noting, however. The first concerns the issue of question inversion commonly hypothesized to be a complex phenomenon not normally acquired in the early stages of naturalistic L2 learning. In our case, where learners had been forced to use interrogative chunks involving inversion, it was interesting to see whether, as they became more creative and less reliant on unanalyzed chunks, there would be a shift in their production towards canonical declarative order. For English, there is abundant evidence that both types of questions (yes/no and wh-questions) first appear without inversion in L1 acquisition (Foster, 1990:97).

Would creative construction in our learners be similar to that of L1 learners of French and English and to that of L2 learners of English and follow the declarative order initially, or would they use both the interrogative input (consisting almost exclusively of inverted forms) in which inversion is obligatory in interrogatives, in order to produce inverted forms in their L2 from the start?

A clear trend across time is evident, such that by round 5 more than half the interrogatives produced had declarative order. This shows that, even though subjects were still relying quite substantially on (partly analyzed) chunks, the way in which they modified them tended to make them fit the order hypothesized to be most natural to their developmental stage. A chi-square analysis just fails to reach significance at the 5% level, $X^2(3, N=150) = 7.5502, p > .05$.

Two

In this section, attention will be concentrated on what happens when no chunks are available to learners. This category includes not only the kind interrogative chunks explored above but also all declarative chunks that are used in the asking of questions. For example, interrogatives such as *does the boy like cricket?* (Pupil 12, R 4) or *is the man tall or small?* (Pupil 52, R 5) can be argued to be unanalyzed chunks, were excluded from our investigation. What is of interest is what learners do when they choose not to rely on any of the chunks available in their interlanguage at the time, for whatever reasons. It is important to note that the number of interrogatives we are left with after this elimination process is certainly much lower than the actual number of creative interrogatives produced; this is because, as we saw in the above sections, a number of learners have gone a long way down the road of analyzing chunks and are probably producing creatively towards the end of the period of data collection the same structures that were produced as formulas at the beginning.

So, what do our subjects do when they want to ask a question about something for which they have no chunks? In most of the routines, L2 learners' performance in the classroom enable them to safely produce well-rehearsed formulas. This was always the case in our battery of tasks. As mentioned in the discussion of chunks, for example, we encouraged them to change reference from the familiar second person to the third, with the results discussed above. In some cases we also required them to venture into areas for which they had no chunks

Results

Activities undertaken with an adult included Talk-about-Photos, a Story Retelling task, and a one-way information gap task, Landscape-with-Figures (the learner had a landscape picture and had to find out from the subjects where to sketch in various figures and what they looked like). Activities undertaken in pairs included other one-way information gap tasks (e.g., Pupil B drew a person described by Pupil A). Several tasks were repeated, over longer or shorter cycles (e.g., Talk-about-Photos happened in rounds 1, 2 and 4; story Retelling in rounds 3 and 6). The results include.

One

In this section the development of one such formula *what's your name?* is traced in detail, across subjects and across rounds. There are a number of reasons for focusing on this particular chunk. It was taught in all classrooms from a very early stage, with its companion reply *my name is NAME*. Second, it was very commonly used across the various data collection rounds, both with targetlike (second person) and with extended (third person) reference. It was observed that 13 out of 15 subjects used it in the first round. Another reason is that it is particularly complex structurally, involving both wh-fronting and inversion, and we would not therefore expect our subjects to produce it creatively in the early stages of learning English. Also, this item met the earlier stated criteria for a chunk, even when used with correct second-person reference.

As a first step in our analysis of *what's your name?*, all individual utterances in which pupils

were asking somebody's name whether by using this chunk or not, were extracted from the interrogatives data set; these comprised 182 items, or 9% of the total. Analyzed by elicitation round, there was considerable variability in the frequency of naming questions, which was clearly task dependent. Thus rounds 3 and 6 which centered on the Story Retelling task, elicited few examples of naming questions; however, round 5, which included the Landscape-with-Figures task elicited the highest number. The remaining interrogative utterances comprised:

1. Utterances consisting of an NP only identifiable as questions on pragmatic grounds from the conversational context (21 utterances or 11%; e.g., *and the boy?*)
2. Utterances using some unrelated chunk for the same purpose (7 utterances or 4%; e.g., *what is it the boy?*)
3. Utterances involving another wh-question word plus NP (6 utterances or 3%; e.g., *what name?*)

During data-elicitation rounds 1 and 2, 13 out of the 16 pupils used the chunk *what's your name?* in one or more tasks requiring interactive second-person reference. From round 2 onwards, subjects started to ask naming questions about third parties with increasing frequency. We knew from lesson evidence that at least some of them had been exposed in class to the parallel third-person inverted interrogatives expression *what's he/she called?* However, only one subject (Pupil 09) had apparently internalized this particular form. Although he used it fairly consistently from round 1 onwards, no other subject ever used it.

does he like to do? what doesn't she like to do?, or what's your name? and how old are you?.

Such activities typically followed from similar whole-class practice, in which the teacher modeled and rehearsed the target expression globally, with little variation or analysis. That such complex interrogative expression, typically involving wh-fronting and inversion, were being learned and produced as chunks in the context of classroom interaction seemed likely from the beginning. The coursebook for instruction was *Headway (Elementary)* by (Liz and Soars, 1996).

A questionnaire was also completed by each pupil to make sure that the subjects were not in contact with English in other situations during the experimentation.

Procedures

For the purposes of the interrogative chunks study, all individual data files for the 16 chosen subjects derived from all pair tasks were analyzed. This meant that data from a total of up to 13 tasks per learner were analyzed. A total of 2,084 interrogative utterances were extracted from these data files. This represents an average of 130 interrogatives per subject overall and average of 347 interrogatives per round of elicitation.

From the beginning, it was clear that interrogative data included a good number of possible chunks. For example, in round 1, the following forms were produced by a majority of the 16 subjects, within a single information-exchange pair task: (a) where do you live? (14 subjects); (b) what's your name? (13 subjects);

(c) how old are you? (12 subjects); (d) do you have a pet? (11 subjects). These questions all involved second-person reference, as the task involved exchange of personal information.

Applying the criteria outlined in the introduction to this paper, these seemed to be good candidates for chunks, given their relative syntactic complexity (involving wh-fronting and subject-verb inversion). These formulas contrasted in our learners' data with other utterances that were syntactically very simple (e.g., single noun phrases; *the girl*, Pupil 12, R 5) and less fluent (e.g., full of hesitations and pauses: *I have oh no ... her sister*, Pupil 02, R 2). Also the frequency with which question about names, ages, and so forth recurred throughout further rounds of data collection meant that the reuse and evolution of such items could in principle be traced over time, and offered a testing ground for our more general investigation of the role chunks play in the creative construction process.

Following sections of this paper will present findings in relation to the three research questions formulated earlier. First, we investigate the development of one particular interrogative chunk over six rounds and analyze the way in which it breaks down. We then outline the development of other interrogative construction—that is, those for which learners do not have ready-made formulas at their disposal. Finally, the relationship between formulas and creative construction is briefly explored.

commonly suggested in the literature (Peters, 1983, 1985; Weinert, 1995). They embrace the notion of an invariant multimorphemic phrase or sentence, fluently but perhaps inaccurately produced, and used at times with overextended semantic or pragmatic function, compared with target language norms. More formally, it is believed that formulaic L2 utterances usually have the following characteristics:

1. Greater length and complexity of sequence compared with other learner's output;
2. Phonological coherence, that is, fluent, nonhesitant encoding without a break in the intonation contour;
3. They tend to be used inappropriately (syntactically, semantically, pragmatically);
4. They are generally used in the same form, with no parts substitutable;
5. They tend to appear well formed and to be grammatically advanced compared to the rest of the learner's language;
6. They usually occur in situationally specific ways or are predictable in context.

In this study, the issue of the relationship between chunks and creative construction in SLA will be pursued by examining the production of interrogatives in corpus of L2 English produced by classroom learners. Specifically, the aim is to address the following research questions:

1. Do learners use L2 interrogative chunks, and how do these chunks evolve over time?
2. Do learners use creative construction of L2 interrogatives, independent of chunk use?
3. What is the relationship (if any) between the use of chunks and creative construction in

learner's developing ability to ask questions in the L2?

Concerning the above-mentioned questions, the following hypotheses can be formulated:

H0: Formulaic language can not actively contribute to the creative construction process.

H1: Formulaic language can actively lend itself to the creative construction process.

Method

Subjects

The subjects in the present study were randomly selected from among those attending Pooyesh Language Institute in Esfahan city. All the male subjects were 11 or 12 years at the start of the experiment. Subject selection was done in the following way: first a standard test of language proficiency (Nelson English Language Tests, 1977) was administered to 120 students, then, on the basis of their scores on language proficiency test, two homogeneous groups, each including 30 students were selected by Matched Subject Technique. Since the subjects of the two groups were selected by this technique, the mean and the standard deviation of the two groups will be identical.

Materials

The style of teaching that predominated in these classrooms was both strongly oral and student-centered, with considerable emphasis on the rehearsal and memorization of conversational exchanges, often involving question-and-answer sequences. For example, pupils might work in pairs on information gap activities with text or picture cues, taking turns at asking and answering questions such as *what*

understanding of the L2 learning process. Furthermore, within recent models of SLA, the relationship between the different types of linguistic knowledge (competence vs learned linguistic knowledge) remains unclear. For example, Schwartz (1993) argues that there is no relationship, whereas Towell and Hawkins (1994) suggest that the relationship between the two needs to be much better understood.

Review of Related Literature

The existence of chunk as a significant feature of early classroom learners' L2 production has gain recognition in various practical assessment schemes, figuring for instance in elementary level definitions both in the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Proficiency Guidelines (ACTFL, 1986) and also in the assessment model proposed for the British National curriculum in modern Foreign Languages (Department for Education/Welsh Office, 1995).

In both L1 and L2 research, formulaic language has been explored under a variety of labels: prefabricated routines and patterns, imitated utterances, formulas, and formulaic units (e.g., L1: Clark, 1974, 1977; Hickey, 1993; Peters, 1983; Pine and Lieven, 1993; L2: Hakuta, 1974; Huang and Hatch, 1978; Pawley and Syder, 1983; Raupach, 1984; Skiba and Dittmar, 1992; Towell, 1987; Vihman, 1982; Weinert, 1995; Wong-Fillmore, 1978). The varying terms embrace the notion of (rote learned or imitated) chunks of unanalyzed language that are available for learner use without being derived from generative rules. Weinert (1995) outlined three possible functions for chunks. First, the use of formulaic

language may be seen as a communicative strategy allowing learners' entry into communication, when lack appropriate L2 rules. Second, its use may be seen as a production strategy, in which resorting to formulas allow fluency in production and faster processing. Third, using formulas as learning strategy implies that learners analyse memorized sequences and derive rules from them which they then use productively.

In L2 acquisition, some researchers argue that the task facing learners is also to find out which slots can be filled by other lexical items in the many formulas they are confronted with in everyday speech (Pawley and Syder, 1983). Wong-Fillmore (1976) claimed a central role for formulaic speech in second language, arguing that imitated utterances provide material for eventual analysis by the learner, the resulting pieces themselves becoming part of the developing linguistic system. More recently, Ellis (1996 a, 1996) has argued for sequence analysis being the underpinning of acquisition of both phonology and syntax. He argues that language sequences serve as the database for the acquisition of language grammar and much of language learning is the acquisition of memorized sequences.

Identifying chunks in learner language can be quite difficult. How do we a particular construction has been retrieved by the learner as an unanalyzed whole or it is derived creatively from a rule or, and to what extent both processes can coexist in the learner's interlanguage at any one time? Although there is a good deal of overlap in the identifying criteria used by both first and second language researchers, the issue is by no means clear cut, and chunk identification retains an intuitive dimension. The criteria we propose for L2 chunk identification are based closely on those

Abstract

This research explores the relationship between formulaic language and creative construction in SLA by examining the production of interrogatives in an extensive naturalistic corpus of L2 English produced by early classroom learners. The main project tracked 60 pupils (30 in each of two classes) during six months. On six occasions, here called rounds, 16 subjects were extracted from their normal English classes and participated in a range of data elicitation activities. The resulting corpus of audio recording was transcribed so as to produce a complete file for all pupils of all tasks in which they participated. The results revealed that ready-made chunks provided by the classroom context were instrumental in the learning process. At one extreme, there were learners who did not seem to be able to retain a store of memorized chunks and soon became stuck in a pregrammatical stage in which they were only able to string simple V-less phrases together. At the other extreme, there were learners who memorized a large number of chunks in the early stages and who used this linguistic database as a springboard for creative construction. They did not drop chunks but seemed to keep working on them.

Key words: Creative Construction, Case of Interrogative, Formulaic

Introduction

The use of formulaic language and its role in SLA has not figured prominently in SLAR (Second Language Acquisition Research) over the last 20 years. Studies have tended to focus instead on the importance of creative, rule-

governed processes in SLA and, to a large extent, have dismissed formulas as a peripheral phenomenon playing no part in this creative process. They tend to be seen as crutches that enable learners to enter into communication and that will be discarded when creative processes take over. At the same time, there have always been approaches within linguistics, sociolinguistics, and applied linguistics which have suggested that ready-made chunks of unanalyzed language are as important as productive rules. Peters (1983) and more recently Nattinger and DeCarrio (1992) suggest the role of ready-made chunks of language in L1 and L2 development may be underestimated. They argue that formulaic language may play an important role in second language development and suggest how this aspect may be exploited in language teaching. The central focus of the debate as to the role of formulaic language is whether L2 learners gradually unpack the initially unanalyzed utterances and begin to use parts of them productively in the generation of new utterances, or they merely drop such rote-learned or imitated utterances from their speech repertoire as their creative rule-governed competence develops along a different route. Whether there is any interaction between chunks and creative construction is a crucial from a theoretical point of view. It can contribute to our understanding of the different kinds of knowledge L2 learners use, and whether or how they interact. If, on the one hand, creative competence is seen as the result of the interaction between linguistic input and universal principles of language, a process over which learners have no control, and if formulas are, on the other hand, the result of more general learning mechanisms that are not language specific, then clarification of the relationship between the two is of crucial importance to our

Formulaic L2 Utterances and Creative Construction Hypothesis in SLA: The Case of Interrogatives

M. R. Talebnezhad (Ph.D. TEFL)
Parviz Ahmadi Darani
Esfahan University

چکیده فارسی:

قریب دو دهه است که فرضیه خلاقیت و تأثیرات آن در یادگیری مورد توجه محققین زبان آموزی دنیای غرب بالاخص کشور کانادا قرار گرفته است. این مطالعات ثابت کرده است که به هنگام یادگیری مفاهیمی که توسط شخص زبان آموز به کمک ذهن او خلق می گردد از مفاهیمی که از طریق هر ابزار آموزشی مستقیم و غیرمستقیم ارائه می گردد به مراتب بهتر به خاطر سپرده شده و بهتر بیاد آورده می شوند. از طرف دیگر به ساختارهای کلیشه ای به عنوان یک پدیده حاشیه ای نگاه شده و عقیده بر این است که زبان آموز از آنها صرفاً در ایجاد ارتباط استفاده می کند و در مراحل بعدی کلاً کنار گذاشته می شوند. هدف عمده ای که در این تحقیق مورد نظر می باشد میزان تأثیری است که ارائه کلیشه های بیانی زبان دوم به همراهی فرآیند خلاق در تسریع و تسهیل یادگیری ساختارهای نحوی زبان دوم دارند.

جامعه آماری این پژوهش را دانش آموزانی که در یکی از آموزشگاههای زبان در سطح شهر اصفهان مشغول فراگیری زبان دوم بودند تشکیل می دهند. در مرحله نخست تعداد ۱۲۰ نفر از طریق آزمون مهارت زبانی انتخاب شدند. تعداد ۶۰ نفر از این افراد از طریق تکنیک گروههای همتا جهت شرکت در آزمایش مورد استفاده قرار گرفتند. دامنه سنی این دانش آموزان از ۱۱ تا ۱۲ سالگی بود و از نظر مهارت زبانی در حد مبتدی قرار داشتند. تعداد ۶۰ نفر مورد نظر بدو گروه تجربی و شاهد بطور مساوی تقسیم شدند. به گروه تجربی مواد درسی که شامل کلیشه های بیانی بود تدریس شد. از گروه تجربی ۱۶ نفر انتخاب شد و در ۶ جلسه در مصاحبه شرکت کردند. تمام گفته های دانش آموزان ضبط شد و برای هر یک پرونده (File) جداگانه ای فراهم گردید. در مرحله بعد این پرونده ها مورد تجزیه و تحلیل قرار گرفتند جهت اطمینان از عدم شرکت افراد در دوره های آموزشی دیگر خارج از کلاس مورد نظر، پرسشنامه ای در همین خصوص توسط آنها در اوایل دوره آموزشی تکمیل شد. در این تحقیق چون از یک طرف با عملکرد مقایسه فراوانی تعمیم های افراطی که مربوط به اشکال دستوری ارجاع دوم شخص - ارجاع سوم - کاربرد ضمائر سوم شخص و توالی واژگانی معکوس و خبری کلیشه های بیانی و از طرف دیگر با فراوانی کلمات پرسشی (V-less) و (V-headed) و (V-headed chunk) فرضیه ساختار خلاق روبرو بودیم، از روش آماری مربع خن (chi-square) به عنوان روشهای تجزیه و تحلیل یافته های آماری استفاده شد.

نتایج نشان داد که تعاملی پویا و دوسویه بین کلیشه های بیانی و ساختار خلاق وجود دارد. اصولاً دانش آموزانی موفق تر بودند که از کلیشه های بیانی به عنوان سکوی پرتابی برای ورود به مرحله فرضیه ساختار خلاق استفاده کرده و در موقعیتهای مختلف ارتباطی زبان آنها را بکار گیرند

کلیدواژه ها: ساختار، فرضیه خلاقیت، مواد پرسشی، فرمول