From:
Gass, S. M. & L. Selinker (³2008): *Second Language Acquisition. An Introductory Course*. New York: Routledge.

1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The study of second language acquisition

Second language acquisition (SLA) is a relatively young field. We would be hard-pressed to state a "beginning" date, but it is probably fair to say that the study of SLA has expanded and developed significantly in the past 40–45 years. This is not to say that there wasn't interest in the fields of language teaching and learning before then, for surely there was. It is to say, however, that since that time the body of knowledge of the field has seen increased sophistication.

We are far from a complete theory of SLA, but there is progress. By approaching SLA from a variety of disciplinary perspectives, as we will see in this chapter and in the remainder of this book, we have come a long way from pure descriptive studies to research that connects with other disciplines.

What is the scope of SLA? What does the study of SLA consist of? It is the study of how second languages are learned. In other words, it is the study of the acquisition of a non-primary language; that is, the acquisition of a language beyond the native language. It is the study of how learners create a new language system with only limited exposure to a second language. It is the study of what is learned of a second language and what is not learned; it is the study of why most second language learners do not achieve the same degree of knowledge and proficiency in a second language as they do in their native language; it is also the study of why only some learners appear to achieve native-like proficiency in more than one language. Additionally, second language acquisition is concerned with the nature of the hypotheses (whether conscious or unconscious) that learners come up with regarding the rules of the second language. Are the rules like those of the native language? Are they like the rules of the language being learned? Are there new rules, like neither language, being formed? Are there patterns that are common to all learners regardless of the native language and regardless of the language being learned? Do the rules created by second language learners vary

according to the context of use? Do these rules and patterns vary more in individuals in a second language than they vary in the native language? Given these varied questions, the study of second language acquisition draws from and impacts many other areas of study, among them linguistics, psychology, psycholinguistics, sociology, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, conversational analysis, and education, to name a few.

Given the close relationship between second language acquisition and other areas of inquiry, there are numerous approaches from which to examine second language data, each one of which brings to the study of second language acquisition its own goals, its own data-collection methods, and its own analytic tools. Thus, second language acquisition is truly an interdisciplinary field. This introductory text attempts to shed light on the nature of second language acquisition from multiple perspectives.

One way to define second language acquisition is to state what it is not. Over the years, the study of second language acquisition has become inextricably intertwined with language pedagogy; in the current text, one goal is to disentangle the two fields. Second language acquisition is not about pedagogy unless the pedagogy affects the course of acquisition (this topic will be explored in chapter 11). Although it may be the case that those who are interested in learning about how second languages are learned are ultimately interested in doing so for the light this knowledge sheds on the field of language teaching, this is not the only reason second language acquisition is of interest, nor is it the major reason scholars in the field of second language acquisition conduct their research.

Let us briefly consider some of the reasons why it might be important for us to understand how second languages are learned and what is not learned.

Linguistics

> When we study human language, we are approaching what some might call the human essence, the distinctive qualities of mind that are, so far as we know, unique to [humans].
>
> (Chomsky, 1968, p. 100)

The study of how second languages are learned is part of the broader study of language and language behavior. It is not more central or peripheral than any other part of linguistic study, which in turn has as its larger goal the study of the nature of the human mind. In fact, a major goal of second language acquisition research is the determination of linguistic constraints on the formation of second language grammars. Because theories of language are concerned with human language knowledge, one can reasonably assume that this knowledge is not limited to first language knowledge, and that

linguistic principles reflect the possibilities of human language creation and the limits of human language variation. This scope of inquiry includes second languages.

Language pedagogy

Most graduate programs whose goal is to train students in language teaching now have required course work in second language acquisition, unlike a generation ago. Why should this be the case? People have come to realize that if one is to develop language-teaching methodologies, there has to be a firm basis for those methodologies in language learning. It would be counterproductive to base language-teaching methodologies on something other than an understanding of how language learning does and does not take place. To give an example, some language-teaching methodologies are based exclusively on rule memorization and translation exercises. That is, a student in a language class is expected to memorize rules and then translate sentences from the native language to the language being learned and vice versa. However, studies in second language acquisition have made language teachers and curriculum designers aware that language learning consists of more than rule memorization. More important, perhaps, it involves learning to express communicative needs. The details of this new conceptualization of language learning have resulted in methodologies that emphasize communication. In other words, pedagogical decision-making must reflect what is known about the process of learning, which is the domain of second language acquisition.

A second, perhaps equally important but less assuming, rationale related to language pedagogy has to do with the expectations that teachers have of their students. Let's assume that a teacher spends a class hour drilling students on a particular grammatical structure. Let's further assume that the students are all producing the structure correctly and even in an appropriate context. If, after the class is over and the drill is finished, a student comes up to the teacher and uses the incorrect form in spontaneous speech, what should the teacher think? Has the lesson been a waste of time? Or is this type of linguistic behavior to be expected? If a student produces a correct form, does that necessarily mean that the student has learned the correct rule? These sorts of issues are part of what teachers need to be aware of when assessing the success or failure of their teaching. Or, to take an example from a mystery novel, *Speaker of Mandarin* by Ruth Rendell, Inspector Wexford is in a museum and accompanied by Mr. Sung who is showing him the well-preserved body of a woman who had lived 2000 years earlier. Mr. Sung says "Let's go" and Inspector Wexford takes the opportunity to provide an English lesson (p. 4).

Wexford: I wish you wouldn't keep saying that. If I may suggest it, you should say, "Shall we go? Or "Are you ready?"
Sung: You may suggest. Thank you. I am anxious to speak good. Shall we go? Are you leady?
Wexford: Oh, yes, certainly.
Sung: Don't reply, please. I practice. Shall we go? Are you leady? Good, I have got it. Come, let's go. Are you leady to go to the site? Reply now, please.

Thus, after practicing "Shall we go?", Sung, when it is time to make a spontaneous utterance, reverts back to "Let's go." Further, when Sung believes that he is repeating, and therefore, practicing, his repetition of "Are you ready?", his utterance is no different than his original faulty utterance.

Cross-cultural communication and language use

We have noted some expectations that teachers have about students. Similarly, in interactions with speakers of another language/culture, we have certain expectations and we often produce stereotyped reactions. For example, we may find ourselves making judgments about other people based on their language. It turns out that many stereotypes of people from other cultures (e.g., rudeness, unassertiveness) are based on patterns of nonnative speech. These judgments in many instances are not justified, because many of the speech patterns that nonnative speakers use reflect their nonnativeness rather than characteristics of their personality. As an example, consider the following exchange between a teacher and a former student (NNS = nonnative speaker; NS = native speaker):

(1-1) From Goldschmidt (1996, p. 255)
NNS: I have a favor to ask you.
NS: Sure, what can I do for you?
NNS: You need to write a recommendation for me.

Many teachers would, of course, react negatively to the seeming gall of this "request," perhaps initially thinking to themselves, "What do you mean I *need* to write a letter?" when most likely the only problem is this nonnative speaker's lack of understanding of the forceful meaning of *need*. A second example occurred in the life of one of the authors. An international student whom the professor did not know emailed to ask the professor for an appointment, stating that she was interested in the discipline of SLA. The professor wrote back with a suggestion of a time that they finally agreed on. The student arrived at the appointed time and said:

(1-2) NNS: You wanted to see me?

Many would, of course, also react negatively to the seeming strangeness of the introduction, probably initially thinking, "What do you mean I *wanted* to see you; it's you who wanted to see me." So, understanding second language acquisition and, in this case, how nonnative speakers use language, allows us to separate issues of cross-cultural communication from issues of stereotyped behavior or personal idiosyncrasies.

But it is not only cross-cultural questions that are at issue. In the following example, understanding L2 phonology could have helped in the recent but brief horse-racing scandal when a Chilean jockey, after winning the Kentucky Derby, was accused of carrying something in his hand other than his whip. Apparently, he had told a reporter that he wore a Q-Ray, which is a therapeutic bracelet used for arthritic conditions. What had been understood was a "Q-ring," which apparently the reporter had never heard of, probably because it doesn't exist. So, despite the fact that he didn't know what it was, the reporter assumed it to be something illegal. Had the reporter minimally recognized that perception of nonnative speech often occurs through the filter of our native language phonological system and that that perception is not always accurate, the problem might have been avoided. That coupled with the fact that he had never heard of a Q-ring might have suggested the need to seek greater clarification and the two or three day scandal could have been avoided.

Language policy and language planning

Many issues of language policy are dependent on a knowledge of how second languages are learned. For example, issues surrounding bilingualism, such as the English Only Movement in the United States, or the many different types of bilingual education (including immersion programs) can only be debated if one is properly informed about the realities and constraints of learning a second language. National language programs often involve decision making that is dependent on (a) information about second language learning, (b) the kinds of instruction that can be brought to bear on issues of acquisition, and (c) the realities and expectations one can have of such programs. All too often, these issues are debated without a clear understanding of the object of debate; that is, the nature of how second languages are learned.

In sum, second language acquisition is a complex field whose focus is the attempt to understand the processes underlying the learning of a second language. It is important to reemphasize that the study of second

language acquisition is separate from the study of language pedagogy, although this does not imply that there are not implications that can be drawn from second language acquisition to the related discipline of language teaching.

Many disciplines quite clearly find themselves as part of the humanities (e.g., literature) or part of the sciences (e.g., biology). Second language acquisition, because of its complexity and its reliance on and import for other disciplines, is not placed so easily. SLA is part of the humanities, in the sense that it is part of the branch of "learning (as philosophy, arts, or languages) that investigate[s] human constructs and concerns as opposed to natural processes (as in physics or chemistry) and social relations (as in anthropology or economics)" (from Merriam-Webster online dictionary), although clearly there are areas of the field that do consider social relations as an integral part of learning. Given that the humanities are concerned with human constructs and concerns, language acquisition is relevant, for one way of understanding the human condition is through an understanding of language. While this is probably uncontroversial, unfortunately this central area of humanistic study is often confined to general issues of language and the human capacity for language as referring to studies of primary language knowledge and the acquisition of primary language. But this book assumes that we cannot adequately examine the nature of language knowledge if we confine ourselves to only a small portion of the world's population; that is, monolingual native speakers.

Second language acquisition, while rightfully part of the humanities, is also part of the social sciences, defined (Merriam-Webster online) as "a branch of science that deals with the institutions and functioning of human society and with the interpersonal relationships of individuals as members of society." Given that second language acquisition deals with interpersonal relations as it does when studying many issues of language use, it is definitely part of the social sciences. Interactions involving nonnative speakers of a language are undoubtedly highly frequent in the broader context of the world's interactions, and, thus, the study of these interactions has a central place in the social sciences and cognitive science. Finally, since some SLA research focuses on the biology of the brain, and what SLA neurophysiology can show about neural workings, SLA itself can be considered a part of the developing cognitive neurosciences.

1.2 Definitions

The study of any new discipline involves familiarizing oneself with the specific terminology of that field. In this section, we present some basic terminology common to the field of second language acquisition,

accompanied by brief definitions. Other terms are introduced and defined as the text progresses.

Native Language (NL): This refers to the first language that a child learns. It is also known as the primary language, the mother tongue, or the L1 (first language). In this book, we use the common abbreviation NL.

Target Language (TL): This refers to the language being learned.

Second Language Acquisition (SLA): This is the common term used for the name of the discipline. In general, SLA refers to the process of learning another language after the native language has been learned. Sometimes the term refers to the learning of a third or fourth language. The important aspect is that SLA refers to the learning of a nonnative language *after* the learning of the native language. The second language is commonly referred to as the L2. As with the phrase "second language," L2 can refer to any language learned *after* learning the L1, regardless of whether it is the second, third, fourth, or fifth language. By this term, we mean both the acquisition of a second language in a classroom situation, as well as in more "natural" exposure situations. The word *acquisition* in this book is used broadly in the sense that we talk about language use (sometimes independently from actual acquisition). Some might prefer the term *Second Language Studies* (SLS) as it is a term that refers to anything dealing with using or acquiring a second/foreign language. However, in this book, we continue to use the term *SLA* as a cover term for a wide variety of phenomena, not because the term is necessarily the most descriptively accurate, but because the field has come to be known by that acronym.

Foreign Language Learning: Foreign language learning is generally differentiated[1] from second language acquisition in that the former refers to the learning of a nonnative language in the environment of one's native language (e.g., French speakers learning English in France or Spanish speakers learning French in Spain, Argentina, or Mexico). This is most commonly done within the context of the classroom.

Second language acquisition, on the other hand, generally refers to the learning of a nonnative language in the environment in which that language is spoken (e.g., German speakers learning Japanese in Japan or Punjabi speakers learning English in the United Kingdom). This may or may not take place in a classroom setting. The important point is that learning in a second language environment takes place with considerable access to speakers of the language being learned, whereas learning in a foreign language environment usually does not.[2]

1.3 The nature of language

Fundamental to the understanding of the nature of SLA is an understanding of what it is that needs to be learned. A facile answer is that a second language learner needs to learn the "grammar" of the TL. But what is meant by this? What is language? How can we characterize the knowledge that humans have of language?

All normal humans acquire a language in the first few years of life. The knowledge acquired is largely of an unconscious sort. That is, very young children learn how to form particular grammatical structures, such as relative clauses. They also learn that relative clauses often have a modifying function, but in a conscious sense they do not know that it is a relative clause and could presumably not state what relative clauses are used for. Take as an example the following sentence:

(1-3) I want that toy that that boy is playing with.

A child could utter this fully formed sentence, which includes a relative clause ("that that boy is playing with"), without being able to articulate the function of relative clauses (either this one, or relative clauses in general) and without being able to easily divide this sentence into its component parts. It is in this sense that the complex knowledge we have about our native language is largely unconscious.

There are a number of aspects of language that can be described systematically. In the next few sections we deal with the phonology, syntax, morphology, semantics, and pragmatics of language.

1.3.1 Sound systems

Knowledge of the sound system (phonology) of our native language is complex. Minimally, it entails knowing what sounds are possible and what sounds are not possible in the language. For example, a native speaker of English knows that the first vowel sound in the name *Goethe* [œ] is not a sound in English. This knowledge is reflected in recognition as well as in production, as generally a close English sound is substituted when one attempts to utter that word in English.

Phonological knowledge also involves knowing what happens to words in fast speech as opposed to more carefully articulated speech. For example, if someone wanted to express the following idea:

(1-4) I am going to write a letter.

That person, assuming a U.S. English speaker, would undoubtedly say something like the following.

(1-5) I'm gonna wriDa leDer.

Consider the following exchange:

(1-6) Tom: What are you gonna do?
Sally: I'm gonna wriDa leDer.
Tom: You're gonna do what?
Sally: I'm gonna wriDa leDer.
Tom: What? I can't hear you.
Sally: I'm going to write a letter [articulated slowly and clearly].

We can see that speakers know when to combine sounds and when not to. We know that in "normal, fast" speech we combine words, but that in clearer, more articulated speech we do not.

A final point to make is that, as native speakers of a language, we know not only what are possible sounds and what are not possible sounds, but we also know what are possible combinations of sounds and what sounds are found in what parts of words. We know, for example, that in English, while [b] and [n] are both sounds of English, they cannot form a "blend" in the way that [b] and [r] can: **bnick*[3] versus *brain*. Or to take another example, consider the sound at the end of the word *ping* [ŋ], which is frequent in English. However, it cannot appear in the beginning of words in English, although it can in other languages.

1.3.2 Syntax

In this section, we briefly describe what speakers know about the syntax of their language. This is what is frequently known as grammar, referring primarily to the knowledge we have of the order of elements in a sentence. We point out briefly that there are two kinds of grammar that are generally referred to: (a) prescriptive grammar and (b) descriptive grammar. By prescriptive grammar, we mean such rules as are generally taught in school, often without regard to the way native speakers of a language actually *use* language. We have in mind such rules as "Don't end a sentence with a preposition," "Don't split infinitives," "Don't begin a sentence with a conjunction," "Don't use contractions in writing," and "Use *between* with two items and *among* with more than two" (Associated Press rule; as cited in Safire, 1999, p. 24). To illustrate that these so-called rules are something other than appropriate, McCawley (also cited in Safire) gives the following example: *He held four golf balls* between *his fingers*. Even though there are more than two fingers involved, one cannot say: **He held four golf balls* among *his fingers*.

On the other hand, linguists are concerned with descriptive grammars:

They attempt to describe languages as they are actually used. Thus, when talking about knowledge of syntax, we are referring to descriptive grammars. The rules just stated are not true of descriptive grammars because native speakers of English frequently violate the prescriptive rules.

As with phonological knowledge discussed in section 1.3.1, native speakers of a language know which are possible sentences of their language and which are not. For example, below, we know that sentences 1-7 and 1-8 are possible English sentences, whereas 1-9 and 1-10 are not possible or are ungrammatical:

(1-7) The big book is on the brown table.
(1-8) The woman whom I met yesterday is reading the same book that I read last night.
(1-9) *The book big brown table the on is.
(1-10) *Woman the met I yesterday whom book same the is reading read I last night that.

So part of what we know about language is the order in which elements can and cannot occur. This is of course not as simple as the preceding examples suggest. Are sentences 1-11 and 1-12 possible English sentences?

(1-11) Have him to call me back.
(1-12) That's the man that I am taller than.

For many speakers of English these are strange sounding, for others they are perfectly acceptable.

Not only do we know which sentences are acceptable in our language, we also know which sentences are grossly equivalent in terms of meaning. For example, sentences 1-13 and 1-14 have the same general meaning in the sense that they refer to the same event:

(1-13) Tom was hit by a car.
(1-14) A car hit Tom.

While we know that both sentences above can be assumed to be paraphrases of one another, we also know that they have slightly different functions in English. If someone asks, *What did that car hit?*, the most likely answer would be *It hit Tom* rather than *Tom was hit by it*. Thus, we as native speakers know not only what is equivalent to what, but also when to use different grammatical patterns.

Another aspect of language that we know is how meaning is affected by moving elements within a sentence. For example, adverbs can be moved in a sentence without affecting the meaning, whereas nouns cannot. Sentences 1-15 and 1-16 are roughly equivalent in meaning:

(1-15) Yesterday Sally saw Jane.
(1-16) Sally saw Jane yesterday.

but 1-17 and 1-18 do not share a common meaning.

(1-17) Yesterday Sally saw Jane.
(1-18) Yesterday Jane saw Sally.

Thus, knowing a language entails knowing a set of rules with which we can produce an infinite set of sentences. In order to see that language is rule-governed and that we can comprehend novel sentences, consider sentence 1-19:

(1-19) The woman wearing the green scarf ran across the street to see the gorilla that had just escaped from the zoo.

Even though this sentence is probably one you have never encountered before, you have little difficulty in understanding what it means.

But it is important to note that syntax is complex, often abstract and in many instances difficult to describe. For example, we typically think that the subject of a sentence is the performer of some action, as in 1-18 above where Jane is doing the action of seeing, but what about *Josh seems happy*? We know that Josh is the subject, but he isn't performing any action, nor is *it* performing an action in the sentence *it's raining cats and dogs*.

1.3.3 Morphology and the lexicon

The study of morphology is the study of word formation. In many cases, words are made up of more than one part. For example, the word *unforeseen* is made up of three parts: *un*, which has a negative function; *fore*, which means earlier in time; and *seen*, which means visualized. Each part is referred to as a morpheme, which can be defined as the minimal unit of meaning.

There are two classes of morphemes that we can identify: bound and free. A bound morpheme is one that can never be a word by itself, such as the *un* of *unlikely*. A free morpheme is one that is a word in and of itself, such as *man*, *woman*, *book*, or *table*. Words can be created by adding morphemes, as in the following children's favorite:

establish
establish + ment
dis + establish + ment
dis + establish + ment + ari + an + ism

Not only do we know how to form words using affixes (prefixes, suffixes, infixes), but we also know what words can go with other words, as in *Mt. Everest is a high mountain*, but not **The Empire State Building is a high building*.

1.3.4 Semantics

The study of semantics refers to the study of meaning. This, of course, does not necessarily correspond to grammaticality because many ungrammatical sentences are meaningful, or at least interpretable, as can be seen in the following sentences.

(1-20) *That woman beautiful is my mother.
(1-21) *I'll happy if I can get your paper.

These and many other sentences that are uttered by nonnative speakers of a language are perfectly comprehensible, despite the fact that they do not follow the "rules" of English. The reverse side of the picture is the sentence that is grammatically formed but that, because of the content, is meaningless (at least without additional contextualization), as in 1-22:

(1-22) That bachelor is married.

Knowledge of the semantics of a language entails knowledge of the reference of words. For example, in English we know that a *table* refers to an object with a flat top and either three or four legs and that a *leaf* most often refers to part of a tree. But as native speakers we also have to be able to distinguish between the meaning of the *leaf* of a tree and the *leaf* of a table. When we hear an advertisement on television for a table with extra *leafs*, it is this knowledge of homonyms that comes into play to help us interpret the advertisement in the manner intended. For a learner, of course, it is not so easy, as he or she might struggle to imagine a table with tree leaves.

Additionally, it is important to note that the limits of a word are not always clear. What is the difference between a *cup* and a *glass*? For many objects it is obvious; for others it is less so.

Referential meanings are clearly not the only way of expressing meaning. As native speakers of a language, we know that the way we combine elements in sentences affects their meaning. Sentences 1-23 and 1-24 are different in meaning. Thus, we understand that syntax and meaning interrelate.

(1-23) The man bit the dog.
(1-24) The dog bit the man.

In some languages the translation equivalents of those sentences (with possibly different intonation contours) can be interpreted as referring to the same event.

1.3.5 Pragmatics

Yet another area of language that we consider and that is part of what second language learners need to learn has to do with pragmatics, or the way in which we use language in context. For example, when we answer the telephone and someone says *Is John there?*, we understand that this is a request to speak with John. It would be strange to respond *yes* with the caller saying *thank you* and then hanging up unless the caller did not want to carry on the conversation with John present or only wanted to know whether or not John was present. Clearly, the phrase *Is X there?* in the context of telephone usage is a request to speak with someone and not an information question. When the intent is the latter—as for example, a parent checking on the whereabouts of a child—the conversation might be slightly modified.

(1-25) Father 1: This is John's father. Is John there?
Father 2: Yes.
Father 1: Thanks, I just wanted to know where he was.

Similarly, word order, as discussed earlier, may have an effect on meaning (see sentences 1-23 and 1-24) in some grammatical contexts, but in others it does not.

The following conversation exemplifies this:

(1-26) (Setting: Ice cream store; child, age 4)
Child: I want a raspberry and vanilla cone.
Shopkeeper: OK, one vanilla and raspberry cone coming up.
Child: No, I want a raspberry and vanilla cone.
Shopkeeper: That's what I'm getting you.

In this instance, the child is using word order to reflect the ordering of scoops of ice cream; the shopkeeper is not. Thus, what we have learned as adult native speakers of a language is the function of word order in our language. In English, it does not necessarily refer to the ordering of physical objects.

1.4 The nature of nonnative speaker knowledge

We have briefly characterized some areas of language knowledge that a native speaker has of a language. Knowing a second language well means knowing information similar to that of a native speaker of a language. Given the complexity of the knowledge that must be learned, it should be clear that the study of the acquisition of that knowledge is a highly complex field.

The basic assumption in SLA research is that learners create a language system, known as an interlanguage (IL). This concept validates learners' speech, not as a deficit system, that is, a language filled with random errors, but as a system of its own with its own structure. This system is composed of numerous elements, not the least of which are elements from the NL and the TL. There are also elements in the IL that do not have their origin in either the NL or the TL. These latter are called new forms and are the empirical essence of interlanguage. What is important is that the learners themselves impose structure on the available linguistic data and formulate an internalized system (IL).[4] Central to the concept of interlanguage is the concept of fossilization, which generally refers to the cessation of learning. The *Random House Dictionary of the English Language* (Flexner and Hanck, 1988, p. 755) defines fossilization of a linguistic form, feature, rule, and so forth in the following way: "to become permanently established in the interlanguage of a second language learner in a form that is deviant from the target-language norm and that continues to appear in performance regardless of further exposure to the target language."

Because of the difficulty in determining when learning has ceased, some hold (e.g., Long, 2003) that it is more appropriate to refer to stabilization of linguistic forms, rather than to fossilization or permanent cessation of learning. In SLA, one often notes that learners reach plateaus that are far from the TL norms. Furthermore, it appears to be the case that fossilized or stabilized interlanguages exist no matter what learners do in terms of further exposure to the TL. Unfortunately, a solid explanation of permanent or temporary learning plateaus is lacking at present due, in part, to the lack of longitudinal studies that would be necessary to create databases necessary to come to conclusions regarding "getting stuck" in another language.

1.5 Conclusion

In this chapter we have presented a series of basic definitions to help the reader begin the journey of the study of second language acquisition. As has been seen, inherent in an analysis of interlanguage data is a focus on the learner and on the processes involved in learning. In the following

chapters we present additional information about interlanguages, beginning with a discussion of ways of analyzing second language data.

Suggestions for additional reading

Inside Language. Vivian Cook. Edward Arnold (1997).
Language: Its Structure and Use, 5th ed. Edward Finegan. Heinle (2008).
An Introduction to Language, 8th ed. Victoria Fromkin, Robert Rodman and Nina Hyams. Heinle (2007).
Essential Introductory Linguistics. Grover Hudson. Blackwell (2000).
Linguistics: A Very Short Introduction. P. H. Matthews. Oxford University Press (2003).
Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction. William O'Grady, John Archibald, Mark Aronoff, and Janie Rees-Miller. Bedford/St. Martin's Press (2005).
The Language Instinct: How the Mind Creates Language. Steven Pinker. Morrow (1994).
Linguistics: An Introduction. Andrew Radford, Martin Atkinson, David Britain, Harald Clahsen, and Andrew Spencer. Cambridge University Press (1999).

Points for discussion

1 A teacher has drilled students in the structure known as indirect questions:

> Do you know where my book is?
> Do you know what time it is?
> Did he tell you what time it is?

As a direct result of the drills, all students in the class were able to produce the structure correctly in class. After class, a student came up to the teacher and asked, "Do you know where is Mrs. Irving?" In other words, only minutes after the class, in spontaneous speech, the student used the structure practiced in class incorrectly. Describe what you think the reason is for this misuse. Had the lesson been a waste of time? How might you go about finding answers to these questions?

2 Consider the distinction between *second language acquisition* and *foreign language learning* as discussed in this chapter. Take the position that they are fundamentally different. How would you defend this position? Now take the opposite position. Consider how the position you take might is affected by the linguistic areas of phonology, syntax, morphology, semantics, and pragmatics.

Next, look at the distinction from a social point of view. Discuss your answers in terms of specific examples from your experience, such as the learning of Spanish in Spain versus the learning of