



BT spol. Vol. 17: 1984 v.

30

1985

425 82,1 IV

K

GLOTTODIDACTICA

VOL • XVII



Wydanie
Napis
Uwagi:

GLOTTODIDACTICA

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS

VOLUME XVII

Editor — Waldemar Pfeiffer, Poznań
Assistant to the editor — Barbara Skowronek, Poznań

Editorial Advisory Board

Albert Bartoszewicz — Warszawa	Jacek Fisiak — Poznań
Stanisław Gniadek — Poznań	Franciszek Grucza — Poznań
Leon Kaczmarek — Lublin	Waldemar Marton — Poznań
Aleksander Szulc — Kraków	Władysław Woźniewicz — Poznań



POZNAŃ 1985

Okladkę projektowała

MARIA DOLNA

GLOTTODIDACTICA
AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS

VOLUME XVII

Editor - Waldemar Pfeiffer, Poznań
Assistant to the editor - Barbara Skowrońska, Poznań

Editorial Advisory Board

Albert Barborszewski - Warszawa
Stanisław Górnik - Poznań
Leon Kaszmarek - Lublin
Alexander Szulc - Kraków
Włodzisław Dąbrowski - Warszawa
Marek Maron - Poznań
Wojciech Wójcicki - Poznań



Redaktorzy: Anna Gierlińska, Andrzej Pietrzak

Redaktor techniczny: Jacek Grześkowiak

425 821 II | 1984

WYDAWNICTWO NAUKOWE UNIwersYTETU IM. ADAMA MICKIEWICZA W POZNANIU

Nakład 820+80 egz. Ark. wyd. 15,25. Ark. druk. 10,50. Papier druk. sat. kl. III. 80g, 70×100 cm.

Oddano do składania w lipcu 1984 r. Podpisano do druku w czerwcu 1985 r. Druk ukończono w

lipcu 1985 r. Zam. nr 471/68. S-7/73. Cena zł 150,-

DRUKARNIA UNIwersYTETU IM. ADAMA MICKIEWICZA W POZNANIU

Bibl. UAM

85 EO 1835

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

Waldemar PFEIFFER, Unterrichtsphasen bei der Beherrschung einer Lehrinheit	5
Antoni DĘBSKI, Valenztheorie und Konfrontation	13
Andrzej Z. BZDĘGA, Zusammenbildungen in der deutschen und polnischen Gegenwartssprache	31
Barbara SKOWRONEK, Der sprachliche Fehler im gesteuerten Fremdsprachenunterricht im Gefüge der Interimsprache und der Sprachnorm	39
Lewis MUKATTASH, Errors made by Arab university students in the use of English prepositions	47
Janusz ARABSKI, The role of age in second/foreign language acquisition	65
Józef SYPNICKI, Les traits prosodiques dans l'enseignement d'une langue étrangère, à l'exemples du français	73

II. NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

Björn EKMANN, Zum Problem Landeskunde. Bericht über einen Geschichtskurs mit Texten und Materialien aus Museumsausstellungen in West-Berlin und Berlin DDR	79
Dorota ZARĘBSKA-PIOTROWSKA, Suggestology — suggestopedy, a general theoretical outline	95

III. REVIEWS

T. Bungarten (Hrsg.), Wissenschaftssprache. Beiträge zur Methodologie, theoretischen Fundierung und Deskription (Tadeusz ZGÓŁKA)	105
K. Hyldgaard-Jensen, F. Schmöe (Hrsg.), Der Bedarf der Gesellschaft an Fremdsprachenkenntnissen (Janusz ZYDRON)	107
M. Uesseler, Soziolinguistik (Marian SZCZODROWSKI)	109
W. F. W. Lohnes, E. A. Hopkins (ed.), The Contrastive Grammar of English and German (Andrzej Z. BZDĘGA)	114
Polnisch-deutscher Sprachvergleich I. Arbeitsbuch für Fortgeschrittene (Izabela PROKOP)	117
Deutsch-polnischer Sprachvergleich. Linguistische Studien, Reihe A (Andrzej KAŃNY)	119
H. Ramege, R. Rigol, A. Tarantowicz (Hrsg.), Deutsch als Fremdsprache: Probleme und Verfahren am Beispiel des Deutsch-Polnischen (Andrzej KAŃNY)	121
H.-J. Krumm, Lehrweikforschung — Lehrwerkkritik. Deutsch als Fremdsprache (Jan KORZENIEWSKI)	123

A. Raasch, W. Hüllen, H. J. Zapp (Hrsg.), Beiträge zur Landeskunde im Fremdsprachenunterricht (Barbara SKOWRONEK)	127
U. Förster, Landeskunde und Entwicklung sprachlichen Könnens, (Czesław KAROLAK)	132
N. Damerau, Langenscheidts praktisches Lehrbuch Polnisch (Wanda KUBICKA-PRZYWARSKA, Barbara SKOWRONEK)	133
G. Neuner, P. Desmarests, H. Funk, M. Krüger, T. Scherling, Deutsch konkret. Ein Lehrwerk für Jugendliche (Barbara SKOWRONEK)	137
Rahmenrichtlinien Sekundarstufe I. Neue Sprachen (Barbara SKOWRONEK)	139
P. Hubbard, H. Jones, B. Thornton, R. Wheeler, A training course for TEFL (Jadwiga NAWROCKA-FISIAK)	143
A. P. Cowie, R. Mackin, I. R. McCaig, Oxford dictionary of current idiomatic English (Alfred F. MAJEWICZ)	145
B. Abbs, V. Cook, M. Underwood, Authentic English for Reading (Wojciech MEHL)	146
J. Eastwood, R. Mackin, A Basic English Grammar (Wojciech MEHL).	147
A. C. Gimson, S. M. Ramsaran, An English Pronunciation Companion to the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (Wojciech MEHL)	147
P. L. Sandler, C. L. Stott, Manage with English (Ligia ROZWADOWSKA)	148
L. A. Hill, Ch. Innes, Oxford Children's Picture Dictionary (Ligia ROZWADOWSKA).	149
J. Blundell, N. Middlemiss, Career prospects; J. Higgins, Career prospects. Teacher's book (Ligia ROZWADOWSKA)	149
Обучение иностранному языку как специальности (немецкий язык) (Marek SZALEK)	150
A. S. Hornby, A. P. Cowie, Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English; A. Underhill, Use your dictionary — a practice book for users of "Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English" and "Oxford student's dictionary of current English" (Alfred F. MAJEWICZ)	153

IV. REPORTS

Обучение иностранным языкам в Чехословакии в основной средней школе (Marek SZALEK)	155
Bericht über die VII. Internationale Deutschlehrertagung des IDV in Budapest (Barbara SKOWRONEK)	160
Bericht über das III. Internationale Lehrbuchautorensymposium des Internationalen Deutschlehrerverbandes (Horst BREITUNG, Ingrid KELLING)	162
International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language: Seventeenth International Conference (Halina MAJER).	165
Societas Linguistica Europaea, XVI-ème Congrès annuel, (Poznań 19 — 21 août 1983 (Wanda KUBICKA-PRZYWARSKA)	166

V. PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

THE ROLE OF AGE IN SECOND/FOREIGN LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

JANUSZ ARABSKI

University of Silesia, Katowice

Received October 13, 1983

ABSTRACT. The article starts with the traditional notion of the critical period hypothesis (Lenneberg) showing its limitations as the only explanation of children being better language learners than adults. The latter portions are devoted to the description and interpretation of variety of studies which show different factors responsible for the fact that children are not necessarily superior acquirers to adults. The decisive factors causing the differences between the two groups are: 1. physical, cognitive and psychological differences, 2. different conditions in which they acquire a language, 3. different inputs they are exposed to.

The age of the learner is one of the most important factors deciding about the degree of success in second and foreign learning and teaching.

It has been known for a long time that children acquire language faster and better than adults. This belief, however, is not very precise and only within the last 20 years has research concerning the problem of age in second language acquisition made it possible to see the complexity of the problem and made us aware of its many aspects.

In this presentation we would like to discuss some of those aspects and present the results of the most recent research.

The first important step concerning the role of age in second language acquisition was the research done by Penfield and Roberts (1959) and *the critical period hypothesis* presented by Lenneberg (1967).

Penfield and Roberts (1959) found out that children have a unique capacity to shift linguistic abilities to the right hemisphere and restore them after the left one has been damaged. In the case of adult aphasiacs this shifting does not occur. They are neither able to restore linguistic abilities in the right hemisphere nor to shift them from the left to the right hemisphere in the same degree as children. Penfield and Roberts claimed that this plasticity of the brain ends at the age of ten and recommended that this information be utilized in second/foreign language teaching, i.e. the process of teaching should start before that age.

1-6	1-4 yrs. (N=2)	B	50%
	5-8 yrs. (N=7)	B	71%
	1-4 yrs.	C	50%
	5-8 yrs.	C	29%
	1-4 yrs.	D	
	5-8 yrs.	D	
7-12	1-4 yrs. (N=9)	B	22%
	5-8 yrs. (N=28)	B	46%
	1-4 yrs.	C	45%
	5-8 yrs.	C	43%
	1-4 yrs.	D	33%
	5-8 yrs.	D	11%
13-19	1-4 yrs. (N=9)	B	0%
	5-8 yrs. (N=6)	B	17%
	1-4 yrs.	C	11%
	5-8 yrs.	C	50%
	1-4 yrs.	D	89%
	5-8 yrs.	D	33%

Note: The A category for native pronunciation was 0% in all cases.
English pronunciation as a function of entry and length of time in the United States.

The experiments of Fathman (1975) brought similar results. She studied two age groups of immigrant children with different native languages. The group including children between ages 6 and 15 acquired American pronunciation much faster and better than the one with children between 11 and 15 years old.

An experiment by Oyama (1976) with 60 Italian immigrants shows that it was the subjects' age of arrival in the United States more than the length of their stay in the United States which influenced their understanding of a text recorded with different types of interference. The subjects were divided into three groups according to the age at which they entered the United States:

- 6 - 10 years old
- 11 - 15 years old
- 16 - 20 years old.

The immigrants who arrived before age 11 did better than others in recognizing sentences obstructed by interference.

The experiments of Asher and Garcia (1969), Fathman (1975), and Oyama (1976) do support the critical period hypothesis with reference to pronunciation. The earlier one is exposed to L₂ pronunciation the better or the better and faster he acquires it.

Opposite results are provided by the experiments described below.

Olson and Samuels (1973) conducted an experiment with three 20-subject groups, teaching the pronunciation of 33 German phonemes for a period of three weeks. The learners from group II (14 - years old) and those from group III (18 - 26 years old) achieved better pronunciation than those from group I (9.5 - 10.5 years old).

Olson and Samuels suggest that in learning situations where both children and adults are exposed to the same conditions, adults achieve better results. It is only in the natural acquisition situation when children are better. Here they are usually exposed to their L_2 with more intensity and frequency than adults. Adults usually live in ethnic ghettos and are not exposed to L_2 structures with the same intensity.

Snow and Hoefnagel-Hohle (1977) investigated the acquisition of Dutch pronunciation in natural conditions by 51 English speakers. The best results in their experiment were achieved by adolescents between 12 and 15 years old and the poorest ones by the youngest group consisting of children between 3 and 5 years old.

These two experiments bring results opposite to critical period hypothesis expectations. In the case of Olson's and Samuels' study we can classify it as a study of learning (versus acquisition) processes. The study by Snow and Hoefnagel-Höhle investigates the acquisition processes in natural conditions and that is why it is a serious argument against Lenneberg's thesis. However, there are many more works which support the critical period hypothesis (e.g. Oyama 1973, Seliger, Krashen, Ladefoged 1974) but there is no need to discuss them here in detail.

The acquisition of L_2 pronunciation is not only controlled by neurolinguistic processes but also by purely physical ones. Second and foreign language sounds and their combinations are produced by learner's speech organs. Involved in pronunciation are hundreds of muscles which produce about 14 sounds a second. Their plasticity and efficiency directly influence the quality of speech produced. The muscles of speech organs undergo the same physiological processes as other human muscles. They are easier to shape in young individuals than in older ones, i.e., it is easier to learn new muscle movements when one is young and it is much harder to reshape them when one is old.

In studying the speech of language learners, it is difficult to decide to what extent their pronunciation is influenced by their neurolinguistic state of development and to what extent by the physical state of their speech organs.

There is, however, much more to language than its pronunciation. We will now look briefly at some studies concerning morphology and syntax.

One of the earliest works which investigated the acquisition of syntax and morphology from the point of view of the critical period was that by Fathman (1975). Her conclusions were that older children acquired morphology and syntax faster than younger children. She suggested that there may be different critical periods for the different aspects of language.

The works by Asher and Price (1967), Ervin-Tripp (1974) show that the best age for syntax and morphology is between ages 11 and 15. Teenagers have a better

memory span than children and they organize their memory better. Their semantic system in L_1 is much fuller, so when learning L_2 their only effort is to learn the syntactic representation of that system. Children, on the other hand, have to develop two systems simultaneously. Also, after having been at school for several years teenagers handle testing techniques better. Their ability to generate grammatical rules and their ability to make associations are better than those of children.

In learning situations (in school conditions) teenagers are more successful than children. Children, however, are thought to be superior in natural acquisition situations.

Asher and Garcia (1969) conducted an interesting experiment creating natural conditions of acquisition for both children and adult subjects, teaching them Russian structures. The results show that adult subjects achieved better results and the authors claim that in the same conditions adults are better than children and that usually adult learners are taught in different (worse) conditions than children.

It is often suggested that children are exposed to simpler input and that is why they learn (acquire) faster. An experiment by Scarcella and Higa (1982) investigated the differences between the input children receive when they acquire a second language and the input adult learners are exposed to during their process of acquisition. The results of the experiment confirmed that children are exposed to simpler input and that they receive many more reinforcements than adults. Repetitions, exaggerated intonation, and special gestures appeared in children's input and they were rare in the input adult learners received.

According to Krashen (1978, 1980a, 1980b) the "optimal" input has to be:

- 1) sufficient in quantity
- 2) given in a non-threatening atmosphere
- 3) both attended to and understood by the language learner
- 4) at an appropriate level (just a little beyond the learner's current linguistic competence).

Both children's and adult learner's input has to fulfil the above conditions to be utilized in the acquisition process.

Adults when exposed to an inappropriate input know how to deal with the situation. They know techniques to elicit proper input from the speakers around them (asking questions, acting puzzled, etc.). Children usually do not know how to make their environment aware that the input is too difficult or too easy. Adults know the strategies of communication from their L_1 and they use them with great success while learning L_2 . According to Krashen, this is one of the most important reasons that adults are better learners than children.

Someone who starts learning a second language as a two-year old child and continues it until he/she is 20, achieves a level of competence which is not much higher than another person who starts learning at 16 and continues for about six years in proper conditions and with high motivation. This fact is well known in general education. Adult illiterates need 300 - 1000 hours to cover the program of

American grades 1 - 8. Children need about 9000 hours for the same education.

How can one explain, then, the well known fact that immigrant children learn a second language better and faster than their parents? There are at least two reasons: the conditions in which those two groups learn L_2 and their motivation.

Children integrate with their L_2 peers without any prejudices and they stay with them most of the day. Parents, however, protect their linguistic past, their L_1 , with great care. They usually live in ethnic ghettos and do not have opportunities to speak the new language.

In our civilization linguistic behavior reflects the speaker's social class, professional group, the geographical area he comes from, etc. The adult speaker is aware of the identification function of language. When learning L_1 this awareness is a great obstacle to integrating with L_2 speakers. An adult does not want to sound like someone who comes from a low social class or a professional group with low prestige. With this kind of attitude the solution is to avoid contacts with L_2 , and adult learners very often choose this alternative.

The work of Schumann (1978) proves that one condition for fully acquiring L_2 is to integrate with L_2 speakers. For adults this is a very difficult process. In spite of the fact that the majority of people in Western civilization live in bilingual situations, only one language is considered the native, first or mother tongue. Since the Renaissance language has served as a criterion for identifying a nation, culture and tradition. Adult learners, especially educated adult learners, start their language education with the awareness that the code they are about to acquire serves as their identification with a French, German or English tradition. They do not identify themselves with the L_2 tradition and they do not want to. Some purposefully preserve their L_1 accent to show their origin and their identity as outsiders. With this kind of attitude it is hardly possible to expect complete acquisition of L_2 . Children are not aware of the above language functions while acquiring L_2 . They are not even aware that they deal with a new language. Their attitudes to L_2 are much more relaxed.

Adult learners can have a positive identification with a second language. An example from outside our civilization is described by Sorenson (1967). He studied the Tukano, a South American tribe, who speak over 20 languages. According to tradition young Tukano males have to marry women from outside their villages who speak different languages. It is a normal thing for a Tukano male to learn a second language when is mature. The acquisition process takes place without any hesitation and without the negative attitudes characteristic of our civilization and, according to Sorenson, it is completely successful.

The problem of age in second and foreign language acquisition has, then, at least four aspects:

- 1) neurolinguistic
- 2) physical
- 3) psychological (cognitive and psycholinguistic)
- 4) sociolinguistic (cultural)

Neurolinguistic and physical plasticity influences good pronunciation. Cognitive development helps in understanding semantic and syntactic relations and their understanding in turn helps acquisition. The attitude towards the language to be acquired either facilitates the process or slows it down. The learner's L₂ competence is influenced by all these factors in different degrees.

REFERENCES

- Asher, J. and Garcia, G. 1969. "The optimal age to learn a foreign language". *Modern Language Journal* 38.
- Asher, J. and Price, B. 1967. "The learning strategy of total physical response: some age differences". *Child Development* 38.
- Ervin-Tripp, S. 1974. "Is second language learning like the first?" *TESOL Quarterly* 8.
- Fathman, A. 1975. "The relationship between age and second language productive ability". *Language Learning* 25.
- Fromkin, V., Krashen, S., Curtis, S., Rigler, D. and Rigler, M. 1974. "The development of language in Genie: a case of language acquisition beyond the critical period". *Brain and Language* 1.
- Krashen, S. 1973. "Lateralization, language learning and the critical period: some new evidence". *Language Learning* 23.
- Krashen, S. 1978. "Adult second language acquisition and learning. A review of theory and practice". In R. Gingras (ed). *Second language acquisition and foreign language learning*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Krashen, S. 1980a. "The input hypothesis". Paper presented at the Georgetown 1980 Roundtable Discussion. Georgetown University Press.
- Krashen, S. 1980b. "The theoretical and practical relevance of simple codes in second language acquisition". In R. Scarcella and S. Krashen (eds.) *Research in second language Acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Lenneberg, E. 1967. *Biological foundations of language*. New York:Wiley.
- Olson, L. and Samuels, S. 1973. "The relationship between age and accuracy of foreign language pronunciation". *Journal of Educational Research* 66.
- Oyama, S. 1973. *A sensitive period for the acquisition of a second language*. PhD dissertation. Harvard University.
- Oyama, S. 1976. "A sensitive period for the acquisition of a non-native phonological system". *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 5.
- Penfield, W. and Roberts, L. 1959. *Speech and brain mechanisms*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.
- Scarcella, R. and Higa, C. 1982. "Input and age differences in second language acquisition". In S. Krashen and R. Scarcella (eds.) *Series on issues in second language acquisition research*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Schumann, J. 1978. "The acculturation model for second language acquisition". In R. Gingras (ed.) *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching*. Arlington, Va.: CAL.
- Seliger, H., Krashen, S. and Ladefoged, P. 1975. "Maturational constraints in the acquisition of second language". *Language Sciences* 38.
- Snow, C. and Hoefnagel-Hohle, M. 1977. "Age differences in the pronunciation of foreign sounds". *Language and Speech* 20.
- Sorenson, A. 1967. "Multilingualism in the northwest Amazon". *American Anthropologist* 69.

