

دکتر مسعود رحیم پور^۱

فراگیری زبان دوم در محیط طبیعی و آموزش کلاسی

چکیده:

هدف عمده این مقاله بررسی تحلیلی دو شیوه فراگیری زبان دوم، تحت شرایط محیط طبیعی زبان و آموزش کلاسی می‌باشد. در نوشته حاضر، پژوهش‌های صورت گرفته در این زمینه مورد بررسی دقیق قرار گرفته و نتایج آنها ارائه خواهد شد. بررسی تحقیقات انجام گرفته و نتایج حاصله نشان می‌دهد که آموزش کلاسی روند فراگیری زبان دوم را آسانتر نموده و باعث ارتقای کیفی و کمی فراگیری زبان دوم می‌شود. همچنین سرعت یادگیری زبان آموزان کلاس‌های آموزشی نسبت به زبان آموزان محیط طبیعی زبان بیشتر بوده و سطح فراگیری این زبان آموزان در

۱- عضو هیأت علمی گروه زبان انگلیسی دانشگاه تبریز.

ability in a second language: a case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.). *Talking to learn: Conversation in a second language* (PP.237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Shcumann, J. (1978). *The pidginization process: a model for second language acquisition*, Rowley, Mass, Newbury House.

Spada, N. (1986). The interaction between types of content and type of instruction: some effects on the L2 proficiency of adult learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 8:181-199.

Upshur, J. (1968). Four experiments on the relation between foreign language teaching and learning. *Language Learning*, 18:111-124.

Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. MIT. Press, Cambridge. Mass.

- Language Learning*, 14:259-72.
- Pica, T. (1983). Adult acquisition of English as a second language under different conditions of exposure. *Language Learning*, 33:465-97.
- Pica, T. (1985). The selective impact of instruction on second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 6:214-22.
- Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6(20): 186-214.
- Pienemann, M. (1985). Learnability and syllabus construction. In Hyltenstam, K. and Pienemann, M. (Eds.) *Modelling and second language development*. Multilingual Matters.
- Pienemann, M. (1988). *Processing constraints and learnability*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Sydney.
- Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? *Applied Linguistics*, 10:52-79.
- Prabhu, N.C. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ravem, R. (1968). Language acquisition in a second language environment. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 6:175-185.
- Schmidt, R. and Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational

- multiple perspective*, pp.115-41. Newbury House, Cambridge, Maas.
- Long, M. and Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26:27-56.
- Long, M. and Robison, P. (1998). Focus on form: theory, research, and practice. In Doughty, C. and Williams, J. (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. (pp.15-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loschky, L. and Bley-Vroman, R. (1993). Grammar and task-based methodology. In Crookes, G. and Gass, S. (Eds.), *Task and language learning theory and practice* (pp.123-167). Clevedon: Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Mason, C. (1971). The relevance of intensive training in English as a foreign language for university students. *Language Learning*, 21:197-204.
- Nunan, D. (1993). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1994). *Personal communication with Allwright*. Australia.
- Perkins, K. and Larsen-Freeman, D. (1975). The effects of formal instruction on the order of morpheme acquisition.

32(4):257-261.

- Krashen, S. and Seliger, H. (1976). The role of formal and informal linguistic environments in adult second language learning. *International Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 3:15-21.
- Krashen, S. Seliger, H. and Hartnett, D. (1974). Two studies in second language learning. *Kritikom litterarum* 3:220-8.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Long. M. (1992). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.
- Lightbown, (2000). Anniversary article. Classroom SLA & second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*. Vol.21, No.4. Dec.2000. pp.431-462.
- Lightbown. P. and N. Spada (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12:429-448.
- Lenneberg, E. (1967). *Biological foundations of learning*. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Long, M. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(3):359-382.
- Long, M. (1988). Instructed interlanguage development. In Beebe, L. (Ed.) *Issues in second language acquisition:*

Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2000). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fathman, A. (1975). The relationship between age and second language productive ability. *Language Learning*, 25(2):245-253.

Fathman, A. (1976). Variables affecting the successful learning of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(4):433-441.

Felix, S. (1981). The effect of formal instruction on second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 31(1):87-112.

Hale, T. and Budar, E. (1970). Are TESOL classes the only answer? *Modern Language Journal*, 54:487-92.

Krashen, S. (1973). Lateralization, Language Learning and the critical period: some new evidence. *Language Learning* 23:63:63-74.

Krashen, S. (1981a). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon.

Krashen, S. Jones, C. Zelinski, S and Usprich, C. (1978). How important is instruction. *English Language Teaching Journal*,

- Doughty, C. (1991). Second language instruction does make a difference: evidence from an empirical study on SL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13:431-69.
- Dulay, H. and Burt, M. (1973). Should we teach children syntax? *Language Learning*, 23:245-58.
- Ellis, R. (1984a). *Classroom second language development*. Pergamon.
- Ellis, R. (1984b). Can syntax be taught? A study of the effects of formal instruction on the acquisition of WH-question in children. *Applied Linguistics*, 2:138-55.
- Ellis, R. (1989). Are classroom and naturalistic acquisition the same? A study of the classroom acquisition of German word order rules. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11:305-28.
- Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1992). *Instructed second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. (1995) *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1996). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford:

References

- Allwright (1984). Why don't learners learn what teachers teach? The Interaction Hypothesis. In Singleton, D. and Little, D. (Eds.) *Language learning in formal and informal contexts*. Dublin, IRAL.
- Brier, E. (1978). Variables affecting native Mexican children's learning Spanish as a second language. *Language Learning*, 28:159-74.
- Caroll, J. (1967). Foreign language proficiency levels attained by language majors near graduation from college. *Foreign Language Annals*, 1:131-51.
- Cazden, C., Cancino E., Rosansky, E. and Schumann, J. (1975). *Second language acquisition in children, adolescents and adults*. Final report. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Education.
- Chihara, T. and Oller, J. (1978). Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: a sociolinguistic study of adult Japanese speakers. *Language Learning*, 28:55-68.
- Corder, P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5:161-9.

which learners acquire the language, and probably beneficial effects on their *ultimate level of attainment* (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1992: 321).

Implications: Most of the studies examined in this paper have significant implications for teachers, syllabus designers in curriculum planning and developing appropriate materials and developers of language tests.

practical studies and enough evidence in SLA (Long, 1983; Lightbown and Spada, 1990; Doughty, 1991; Long and Robinson, 1998) which have examined the role of formal instruction and conclude that a form-focused instruction does help the acquisition of linguistic competence and has a positive effect on L2 acquisition. As Ellis (1992) claims, instruction can work directly, that is, it can have an immediate effect on the learner's ability to perform the target structures in natural communication. However, not all structures are teachable. Also teachable structures have to be taught at the right time (see, Pienemann, 1985). Lightbown (2000) agrees with Pienemann and argues that there are some predictable sequences in L2 acquisition and these certain structures have to be acquired before others can be learned. Finally as Larsen-Freeman and Long (1992:321) suggest it should be borne in mind that:

Formal instruction does not seem able to alter acquisition sequence, except temporarily and in trivial ways which may even hinder subsequent development. On the other hand, instruction has what are possibly positive effects on SLA processes, clearly positive effects on the rate at

Pienemann's (1989) answer to the question of "Why learners don't learn what teachers teach' is that teachers are often trying to teach the unteachable items. Pienemann, working with adult learners of German as a foreign language in Australia, proposed a series of developmental stages and argued that a target form would only appear in the productive repertoire of learners when they were developmentally ready to acquire that particular form. Earlier, Pienemann (1984) had also claimed that some grammatical structures do not appear to be teachable unless the learner was developmentally 'ready'. Dulay and Burt (1973) also concluded that children should not be taught syntax. They proposed that if children were exposed to a natural communicative situation the 'natural processes' responsible for second language acquisition (SLA) would be activated and a resulting 'natural order' of development would occur. Krashen (1982a) has almost the same idea and points out that most of an SL cannot be taught. Krashen then claimed that it must be acquired. Finally, Nunan (1994), referring to his personal communication with Allwright (April, 1994), suggests that the question should be 'why don't teachers teach what learners learn?'"

Conclusion: To sum up, there are a lot of theoretical and

has acquired all preceding structures on the acquisitional route. Pienemann indeed believes that instruction has an accelerating effect on acquisition for learners who are ready for it (cf. Pienemann, 1984a) and teaching can then be effective. Therefore, the Teachability Hypothesis does not predict that teaching has no influence whatsoever on acquisition. Rather, it maintains that the influence of teaching is restricted to the learning of items for which the learner is 'ready'. This claim has an important consequence for teaching: namely, that teaching can only promote acquisition by presenting what is learnable at a given point in time. Loschky and Bley-Vroman (1993) agree with Pienemann (1989) and suggest that ideally structures should be taught in the order that they are 'learnable' and tasks should be ordered by their degree of difficulty.

Allwright (1984) once raised a question "Why don't learners learn what teachers teach?". Nunan suggests that one answer to the question of why learners don't learn what teachers teach is that they come into the classroom with different mind sets, different points of focus, or different agendas. Corder (1967) also proposed that learners of language do not simply learn what they are taught, but act on the input in ways determined by what Corder called the "built-in-syllabus".

same sequence of acquisition of word order rules as that reported for naturalistic learner. The results of this study also revealed that the classroom learners appeared to be more successful than naturalistic learners in that they reached higher levels of acquisition in short period of time. The results of study thus support the claim that the classroom and naturalistic L2 acquisition of complex grammatical features such as word order follow similar routes. It is also argued that classroom learners may learn rapidly. Ellis reports that thirty nine learners investigated in this study seemed to outperform naturalistic learners. Ellis then refers to Long (1983), whose review of the effects of formal instruction supports the results of his study. Pienemann (1989) posed a question; "Is danguage teachable?", and in order to answer this question he referred to his Teachability Hypothesis. According to the Teachability Hypothesis:

instruction can only promote acquisition if the interlanguage is close to the point when the structure to be taught is acquired in the natural setting (Pienemann, 1985:36).

This point, in Pienemann's view, is not reached until the learner

appeared to have little impact, as all three groups followed a similar developmental sequence, unaffected by their conditions of exposure to English L2.

Spada (1986) designed a study to find whether there was any interaction between type of contact and type of instruction. She examined the effects of instruction and exposure on forty eight adult learners enrolled in an intensive ESL course in Canada. Spada found that although type and amount of contact seemed to account for variation in some aspects of the learner's proficiency before the effects of instruction were considered `it did not account for differences in the learner's improvement during the course. Spada concluded that contact was less powerful predictor of differences in learner's L2 abilities than instruction. Spada also found that `contact positively accounted for differences in learner's improvement on the grammar and writing tests when the instruction was more form-focused, and negatively accounted for differences on these measures when the instruction was less form-focused (Spada:1986:97).

Ellis (1989) carried out a study in order to address the research question whether classroom and naturalistic acquisition are the same or different. The study investigated the general hypothesis that adult classroom learners of L2 German would manifest the

instruction and the learner's stage of interlanguage development. Pienemann (1985) claims that instruction can speed up the learner's progress by offering teaching just beyond the learner's current level of knowledge. On the other hand, development could be slowed down if the input is inappropriate. This is similar to Krashen's input hypothesis 'I+1', in that he suggests that learners need exposure to language at 'I+1'. The 'I' refers to the learner's current interlanguage; '1' refers to language just beyond the interlanguage in terms of complexity and in terms of proximity to the target language.

Pica (1983, 1985) conducted a study to compare subjects acquiring English outside the classroom and those learning English in an exclusive classroom environment. This study compared the production of eighteen adult native speakers of Spanish acquiring English through either (1) Formal classroom (instruction only), (2) Input solely from everyday social interaction (untutored) and (3) a combination of (1) and (2) (mixed). Results of this study showed that classroom instruction had a selective effect on the learner's production, accelerating the development of accuracy for linguistically simple -s, but retarding the attainment of target-like use of the more linguistically complex progressive-ing. For highly complex grammatical morphology such as article a, instruction

WH questions, which displayed subject-verb inversion. Ellis then argues that instruction can influence second language acquisition in two rather different ways. It can result in a different developmental route/order, or it can increase the rate at which learners pass along a standard route. The results of three hours of teaching WH questions showed that there were no effects on the route. Ellis then reports that this study cannot be said to have proved that teaching does not aid the acquisition of syntax for children. Ellis again (1984b) confirms that teaching of a second/foreign language has traditionally taken place on the assumption that instruction can beneficially affect the process of classroom second language acquisition (SLA). But he argues that the question that motivated early research was not whether instruction had a role to play, or what this role was, but what kind of instruction had the strongest effect.

Schmidt and Frota (1986), in a case study of Portuguese as a second language, found that both instruction and opportunities to interact out of class were both necessary.

Felix (1981), Krashen (1982) and Pienemann (1985) have proposed a hypothesis that instruction does not alter the path of development, but may slow or speed up the rate of development according to the extent of appropriate matching between

helpful and it positively affects acquisition. Findings of her empirical study show that ESL instruction is effective. Doughty claims that second language instruction does make a difference and promotes acquisition. Doughty demonstrates that SL instruction had a positive effect on the rate of relativisation in English. She found that learners receiving instruction outperformed learners who received only exposure.

Long and Crookes (1992: 42) again point out the results of those studies comparing tutored and naturalistic learning that suggest:

- 1. Formal instruction has no effect on developmental sequences.**
- 2. Formal instruction has a positive effect on the use of some strategies as indicated by relative frequencies of certain error types made by students in tutored and untutored settings.**
- 3. Formal instruction clearly improves rate of learning.**
- 4. Formal instruction probably improves the ultimate level of SL attainment.**

Ellis (1984a) designed a study to investigate the effects of almost three hours of teaching on the ability of thirteen children to ask

formal ESL teaching (Caroll, 1967; Chihara & Oller, 1978; Brier, 1978; Krashen, Seliger, Hartnett, 1974; Krashen & Seliger, 1976; Krashen, et al. 1978). Two studies (Hale and Budar, 1970; Fathman, 1976) showed ambiguous results, but almost in the same direction, and three studies (Upshur, 1968; Mason, 1971; Fathman, (1975) indicated that instruction had no effect. On the basis of this review, Long (1983: 374) claimed that "There is considerable evidence to indicate that SL instruction does make a difference." Long found that instruction did play a role, in opposition to Krashen (1985), who claimed that instruction did not contribute to language acquisition. Long finally concludes that instruction is beneficial:

- 1) for children as well as adults**
- 2) for beginning, intermediate and advanced students**
- 3) on integrative as well as discrete point tests, and**
- 4) in acquisition-rich as well as acquisition-poor environments.**

In an updated review of the instructed IL development research, Long (1988) also concluded that instruction was beneficial to learners, particularly in the areas of SLA process, rate of SLA, and level of ultimate attainment.

Doughty (1991) also agrees with Long (1983) that instruction is

situations apparently has no effect in improving the adult learner's performance beyond certain point. The importance and impact of instruction once again is supported by Krashen, Jones, Zelinski, and Usprich (1978) who argue that students of English as a second language with more formal instruction are superior to those with less formal instruction on classroom related measures of English proficiency. Krashen et al.(1978) found that the proficiency of one hundred and sixteen ESL students correlated more strongly with number of years of formal English study than with the number of years they had spent in English-speaking country. That is why they conclude that instruction is a more efficient way of learning for adults than trying to learn it 'in the streets'.

In a key paper, Long (1983) raised an important question. "Does language instruction make a difference?" Some studies, as mentioned earlier, answer negatively and conclude that instruction does not help; others react positively and find it beneficial. To answer this question, Long reviewed eleven studies that examined the effect of formal instruction/natural exposure (or combination of both) on the rate/success of L2 learners. Of eleven studies, Long reviewed, he found that six of them clearly showed that instruction was helpful for children and adults who received

language learning than Naturalistic Acquisition (see Long, 1983; Doughty, 1991; Ellis, 1990, 1991, 1996; Lightbown and Spada, 1990). This view is confirmed by Krashen and Seliger (1975), who argue that for adults formal instruction is in general of more benefit for second language learning than is exposure to and use of second language in "natural" situation. They found that when pairs of students were matched for years of exposure to English, the one who had studied English longer in school was more proficient. Krashen et al. (1978), also found a strong correlation between years of formal study of English and English proficiency, but only a weak relationship existed between the number of years the student lived in an English-speaking country and proficiency in English. They also demonstrated that the amount of formal instruction a learner receives might be more important factor in his second language than the amount of practice he gets in formal environments outside the classroom. Krashen and Seliger (1976) and Krashen, Seliger and Hartnett (1974) claim that when the effects of "exposure" and formal instruction are compared, it is revealed that more instruction means higher proficiency, while more exposure does not necessarily mean more proficiency in ESL. Their findings provide empirical support for the traditional view that language 'must be taught' and more exposure to natural

language proficiency can utilize natural communication situations for the purpose of improving their proficiency only up to a point. Ellis(1984) also cites Vygotsky (1962) who argues that students who have reached the Piagetian stage of Formal Operation (i.e. intellectual maturity) are likely to be better equipped to benefit from grammar teaching than those who have not.

Some years later Felix (1981) carried out a reserch observing thirty four German students learning English as a second language under classroom conditions. It was found that formal instruction cannot eliminate or suppress those processes which constitute man's natural ability to acquire languages.

Perkins and Larsen-Freeman (1975)also conducted a study to determine if informal learners of ESL had the same acquisition order of morphemes as formal learners had been found to possess. They found that there was an indication that formal language instruction does not change the order of acquisition. Language instruction might result in improved performance but not necessarily a change in ordering.

Instructed Second Language Acquisition: On the contrary to the view favoring the *Naturalistic Second Language Acquisition*, there is a view that believes that *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*, (Formal Instruction) is more beneficial for second

1982), who argued that little time should be spent in teaching grammar. Krashen indeed believes that grammar cannot be taught. In another study, Ellis (1995) refers to a number of applied linguists like (Krashen, 1982; Prabhu, 1987), who have argued in favor of what Ellis terms a *zero position* where grammar teaching is concerned. That is, they have proposed that attempts to teach grammar should be abandoned and that learners should be allowed to develop their interlanguage naturally by engaging in communication.

Krashen and Seliger (1976), referring to the differences between adult and child language learning, propose that child is able to learn both first and second language in informal learning environments through communicative use of the language alone. They believe that this ability to utilize informal environments for language learning may be biologically determined. Lenneberg (1967) has suggested that natural learning (by more exposure) can only take place before the completion of the development of cerebral lateralization, an event that he argues occurs around puberty. Krashen (1973), however, presents evidence that the development of lateralization is complete much earlier, at around age five. Krashen & Seliger (1976) also point out that some learners, especially those at intermediate and advanced levels of

that the use of a second language in informal environment may be important than formal study. Mason (1971) proposed that intensive EFL work might be a waste of time. According to Hale and Budar(1970) student's exposure to the English language and culture in real situations is primary, and TESOL courses secondary. They recommend maximizing the immigrant student's total in-school exposure to the English language and culture, and minimizing English language teaching formal classes. Hale and Budar reported that more successful junior high ESL learners were those who did not have formal instruction in English and were more isolated from speakers of their native language. Like Hale and Budar (1970), Fathman (1976) suggested minimizing the time spent by the student in special ESL classes and insulating the student as a great extent as possible from speakers of his native language.

Dulay and Burt (1973) also conducted a research in an attempt to answer: "Should we teach children syntax?". Their findings suggest that we should leave the learning of syntax to the children and redirect our teaching efforts. According to them, less time and energy may result in better learning. This view among SLA researchers that formal instruction was not the best way to learn a second language (L2) grew. Ellis then refers to Krashen (1981a,

Naturalistic Second Language Acquisition: From historical perspective, the late sixties and seventies saw the beginning of the empirical study of naturalistic SLA. Some studies (Brier, 1978; Ravem, 1968; Upshur, 1968; Hale and Budar, 1970, Dulay and Burt, 1973; Cazden et al., 1975) revealed that SLA could successfully take place with learners receiving little or no instruction at all. In some instances (e.g. Shcumann, 1978) it appeared that even when instruction was provided nothing was gained by it.

Upshur (1968) conducted four experiments, comparing three groups of the adults ESL students enrolled in a special summer session for law students at the University of Michigan, to find whether formal foreign language instruction was useful for students living and working in that language environment. Results of his study confirmed the hypothesis that English language learning is not related to the amount of language instruction for students in an English language environment. Upshur argued that the most efficient foreign language learning was informal. He concluded that foreign language learning courses might be less effective means for producing language learning than the use of language in other activities. Brier has also similar idea, claiming

Introduction Acquisition/learning can be viewed in two different views: 1. **Instructed** (also called: Formal or Tutored Acquisition/Learning); 2. **Naturalistic** (also called Uninstructed, Informal or Untutored Acquisition/Learning).

The first view belongs to those researchers who claim that SLA can successfully take place with learners receiving formal instruction. The second view belongs to those researchers who believe that SLA can occur with learners receiving little or no instruction. For example, Long (1983) argued that research showed that instruction did play a role, in opposition to Krashen (1985), who claimed that instruction did not contribute to language instruction.

In order to have a clear picture from these two opposing camps, first, some of the related studies dealing with the **Naturalistic Second Language Acquisition** are reviewed and their results are presented. Then the studies dealing with the **Instructed Second Language Acquisition** will be analyzed and explored. The limitations, advantages, disadvantages and implications of these two approaches would be discussed in detail.

Massoud Rahimpour*

The Acquisition of L2 in Instructed and Naturalistic Settings

Abstract The main purpose of this paper is to explore and investigate two different ways of learning second language (L2): 1. Instructed Second Language Acquisition and 2. Naturalistic Second Language Acquisition. A number of studies, addressing these issues and examining different theoretical positions, have been reviewed and explored in detail. The conclusion reached was that formal instruction facilitates and promotes acquisition. It was also found that learners who receive formal instruction outperform those who do not; that is, they learn more rapidly and they reach high levels of ultimate achievement. Implications would be discussed.