

제 2 언어 습득에서의 발화의 잊혀진 역할과 새로운 역할

변진석*

요약

지난 25년 동안 제 2 언어 습득(Second Language Acquisition; SLA)에서의 발화의 역할은 Swain(1985)에 의해 제안된 발화 가설(Output Hypothesis)의 틀 안에서 여러가지 모양으로 논의 되어 왔다. 하지만 초기 발화 가설에서 제안되었던 발화의 몇 가지 역할들은 제 2언어 습득에서 중요한 의미가 있음에도 불구하고 충분히 연구되지 않았다. 게다가 제 2 언어 습득 최근의 문헌들은 발화에는 현재까지 연구되지 않은 새로운 역할들이 있을 수 있다고 제안을 하고 있다. 따라서 이 논문은 초기와 최근에 제안된 발화 가설을 비교 검토해 보고 현재의 제 2 언어 습득에서 다시 짚어 보아야 할 발화의 역할들과 새로이 연구되어야 할 발화의 역할들을 논의한다.

The Forgotten Roles and New Roles of Output in Second Language Acquisition

Jin-Suk Byun*

ABSTRACT

For the past two and a half decades the roles of output in second language acquisition (SLA) have been discussed in many ways in the framework of the output hypothesis proposed by Swain (1985). However, some roles of output proposed in the early version of output hypothesis have not been investigated enough though they may play important roles in SLA. In addition, recent literature in SLA suggests that there may be some roles of output that have not been investigated so far. Therefore, this paper overviews the roles of output proposed in the early and the recent versions of output hypothesis and discusses the roles that need to be revisited and those that need to be investigated in the current SLA.

Keywords : output, roles of output, output hypothesis, automaticity, auto-input

* Department of Childhood Education, University of North Florida(✉jinsbyun@gmail.com)

· 제1저자(First Author) : 변진석 · 교신저자(Correspondent Author) : 변진석

· 접수일(2010년 11월 3일), 수정일(1차 : 2010년 11월 30일), 게재확정일(2010년 12월 3일)

I. Introduction

It seems that currently studies in SLA need to pay more attention on roles of output for a few reasons.

First,

some roles in the framework of output hypothesis need to be revisited. In a series of papers (Swain, 1985, 1993,

1995, 1998, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1982, 1995, 1998), Swain and her colleagues have argued that output has important roles in SLA. They have discussed various roles of output in SLA in the framework of the output hypothesis proposed by Swain (1985). However, it seems that some of the roles that were discussed in the early version of output hypothesis have been overlooked in the recent version of output hypothesis. Consequently, those overlooked roles have been excluded from the list of hot topics for empirical studies even though they may have important roles in SLA. Secondly, not only are there roles that have been overlooked, but there are also roles that need to be newly investigated in current SLA. Recent literature (Byun, 2009; Swain, 1995, 2000; Shedadeh, 2001; Shoner, 1994) on output suggests that output plays important roles such as 'auto-input' and initiation role that have not been investigated seriously in SLA so far. Lastly, current debate on the effectiveness of structured-input and output-based instruction (Byun, 2007; Erlam, 2003) directs current SLA to pay more attention on roles of output because more thorough investigation of roles of output may solve the issue on the effectiveness of structured-input vs. output-based instruction. Therefore, this paper overviews the roles of output proposed in the early

and the recent versions of output hypothesis and discusses the roles that need to be revisited and the roles that need to be newly investigated in the current SLA.

II. Output Hypothesis

The output hypothesis was formed based on empirical observations and analyses of French immersion education. To evaluate the French immersion programs, Swain (1985) compared 69 sixth grade French immersion students with 10 sixth grade native speakers of French in a unilingual French school in Montreal. She examined the three traits of competence—grammatical, discourse, and sociolinguistic competence—through oral production, multiplechoice, and written production tasks for each trait. The results showed that the native speakers of French performed significantly better than immersion students in terms of grammatical competence and some aspects of sociolinguistic competence, whereas they scored similarly on discourse competence. Further examination of the findings on sociolinguistic competence showed that the immersion students tended to perform as well as native speakers when the aspects of sociolinguistic competence allow formulaic politeness terms. However, when the task involved the aspects of sociolinguistic competence related to grammatical knowledge, native speakers performed better than immersion students. In other words, immersion students did not show native-like language competence in the grammatical domain whereas they developed native-like abilities in other

domains.

Swain (1985) concluded that there was something missing in French immersion education. It could not be comprehensible input because immersion students were provided with enough comprehensible input in the content-based curriculum. Also, the missing element could not be 'interaction' because interaction, namely negotiation of meaning, could be achieved even through grammatically deviant forms. Swain (1985) argued that for a language learner to acquire a native-speaker competence, the usual meaning of "negotiating meaning" was not enough but needed to be modified to include something beyond simply "getting one's message across" because speakers can and do achieve the goal of simply getting one's message across with ungrammatical and sociolinguistically inappropriate language (p. 248).

As for this issue, Swain and Lapkin (1982) stated that though the eighth grade immersion students of an early total immersion program had not acquired native-like speaking and writing skills, they could "convey the meaning of what they want to say (p. 54)." This shows that in addition to simply 'getting the message across' the negotiation of meaning should include the conveying of message in a precise, coherent, and appropriate way. Therefore, Swain (1985) speculated that immersion students might have needed to be "pushed in output" (p. 249) to be fluent speakers or writers of French and proposed the 'output hypothesis.'

2.1 The Roles of Output in Swain's Early Version of Output Hypothesis

In her early version of the output hypothesis

Swain (1985, 1993) suggested that output serves four functions in SLA—to provide opportunities for meaningful use in context, to test out hypotheses about the target language, to move the learner from a semantic processing mode to a syntactic processing mode, and to provide the learner with feedback-generating opportunities. She argued that the first function of output, the meaningful use of linguistic resources in context, involved fluency and automaticity. Learners use language production as an opportunity for meaningful practice of their linguistic resources, developing automaticity in their use. Though strictly speaking automaticity and fluency are not the same, Swain (1985,1993) stated that fluency of a second language increases when the learners use it as frequently as possible. Therefore, in an immersion situation if students were not provided with enough opportunities to use the target language, they were not able to develop as much automaticity as native speakers of French.

The second role of output in the early version is the hypothesis-testing function. Swain (1985, 1993) maintained that through output learners tested out their interlanguage linguistic resources and checked if they worked. In other words, learners, whether they are aware of it or not, test the grammar of their interlanguage by producing utterances or sentences generated by their possibly incomplete interlanguage grammar. When they get external feedback from the interlocutor in response to their speech or when they get internal feedback, they confirm or reject their hypotheses. This is called hypothesis-testing and it has been maintained in the recent version of the output hypothesis (Swain, 1995, 1998, 2000).

The third role of output Swain (1985) suggested in

her early version of the output hypothesis was its role in moving learners from semantic processing to syntactic processing. For comprehension, learners just need to understand linguistic data given to them by comparing it with their already existing linguistic resources (semantic processing). For production, however, they need to combine their linguistic resources to produce oral or written speech in an organized way (syntactic processing). Therefore, when learners comprehend speech, they may not pay as much attention to syntactic features as when they produce speech. For example, learners may comprehend a verb in an utterance without knowing its syntactic properties such as subcategorization information. However, when they produce speech, they should know the syntactic features of the verb because they must combine the verb with other elements which precede or follow the verb.

Finally, Swain (1993) added to her early version of output hypothesis one more function, a feedback-generating function, which might be implied in the argument for the hypothesis testing function. She claimed that producing output may lead native speakers, in response to the learners' speech, to provide feedback about the comprehensibility or well-formedness of the learners' utterances and this feedback, in turn, may help learners to modify or reprocess their output.

2.2 The Roles of Output in Swain's Recent Version of Output Hypothesis

In the recent version of the output hypothesis, Swain (1995, 1998, 2000, 2005) has argued that output plays three major functions: the hypothesis testing function, the noticing or triggering function and the

metalinguistic (reflective) function. The hypothesis testing function that was suggested in the early version of the output hypothesis has been maintained to the recent version of the output hypothesis (Swain, 1995, 1998, 2000, 2005). Also, as mentioned earlier, it may include the feedback-generating function because feedback may be considered to be provided as a part of hypothesis-testing process. Swain (1995) argued that testing a hypothesis requires learners to do something and one way of doing this is to produce oral or written speech. By doing this, learners may test new language forms and structures to check what works and what does not as they develop their interlanguage to meet communicative needs (Swain, 1998).

Swain (1995) argued that the hypothesis testing function of output was supported by the study of modified output following feedback. For example, in a study of how learners make modified output in response to native speakers' different signal types and different communication tasks, Pica, Holliday, Lewis, and Morgenthaler (1989) tested 10 Japanese speakers of English with low-intermediate and mid-intermediate proficiency levels and 10 native speakers of English. They used three tasks – an information-gap task, a jigsaw task, and a discussion – for 10 NNS-NS dyads each. The results showed that in conversation between native and non-native speakers, native speakers' demands such as clarification requests and confirmation checks pushed learners to modify their output. More specifically, native speakers' signals of communication break-down induced either semantic or morphosyntactic modification in over one-third of

learners' utterances

Swain (1995) argued that learners' modified output following feedback showed that they had been involved in a hypothesis-testing process. She noticed that the subjects in the study of Pica et al. (1989) did not modify all of their utterances but only approximately one-third of their utterances. She maintained that this showed that the learners had been testing some but not others. In other words, the process of modifying output was guided by learner-generated hypotheses with selective focus on the linguistic elements in need at that moment according to the learners' developmental stage. Of course, in this case the learner-generated hypothesis testing seems to be done usually at the unconscious level though it may also be possible for the process to occur at the conscious level.

In relation to learner-generated hypothesis testing, Swain (2000) also described her observation of two immersion students. She stated that the errors and corrections learners made in their written or spoken production also showed that they were involved in hypothesis testing about how the target language system worked. In the task of reproducing the text they had just heard, the two students in her study worked together and produced written text, in which they modified the form of the partitive immediately preceding a plural adjective. They crossed out *des* and replaced it with *de*, which was the correct form in the given context. On the basis of the written work, Swain argued that the modified output represented the students' current hypothesis about the form a partitive should take in front of an adjective.

In addition to the hypothesis-testing function, as

mentioned earlier, Swain (1995, 2005) proposed two additional functions in her recent version of the output hypothesis: a noticing or triggering function, and a metalinguistic (reflective) function. As for the noticing function, Swain (1995) argued that by producing output "learners may notice a gap between what they want to say, and what they can say, leading them to recognize what they do not know or know only partially" (pp. 125-126). This is different from Schmidt and Frota's (1986) 'noticing.' Schmidt and Frota stated that for a target-like form to be incorporated into second language learners' interlanguage system, it should be present in the form of comprehensible input and noticed or consciously identified. Here Schmidt and Frota's notice the gap principle focuses on the noticing of input necessary for interlanguage development. However, Swain's noticing function of output focuses on the noticing of a gap in a speaker's output ability or linguistic knowledge. In other words, "the activity of producing the target language may prompt second language learners to consciously recognize some of their linguistic problems; it may make them aware of something they need to find out about their L2" (Swain, 1995, p. 129). This may lead the learners to pay attention implicitly or explicitly to something, possibly in future relevant input, that they need to solve the problems or may lead the learners to refer to a dictionary or a grammar book, or to ask their peers or teachers (Swain, 1998, 2000).

The final role of output in Swain's recent version of the output hypothesis is a metalinguistic role, which is "conscious reflection about language" or "negotiation about form" (Swain, 1995, p. 132). She stated that though learners' hypotheses were not

stated explicitly, under certain language tasks the learners' hypothesis testing process was expressed through learners' output. This is when the learners reflect on and discuss explicitly the target language using language usually related to grammatical terms. In this case, output is playing a metalinguistic role. In other words, learners communicate about language, negotiating the form of the target language in meaningful interaction.

To examine the metalinguistic role of output, Swain analyzed language-related episodes (LREs) (Swain, 1995, 1998; Swain and Lapkin, 1995, 1998), which were learners' conversations about their target language. For example, using dictogloss tasks, Swain (1998) tested two eighth grade classes in early French immersion education. Her research questions were whether the modeling of metatalk by the teacher influenced the students' use of metatalk and whether there was a relationship between metatalk and second language learning. Forty-eight students from different schools within the same school district were assigned to the two classes, one of which was a metalinguistic group and the other of which was a comparison group. In the modeling session, the metalinguistic group was drawn to pay attention to grammatical forms and given explanation for them using grammatical terms. However, though the attention of the comparison group was also drawn to grammatical forms, they were not given explanations for them. Both group's interactions were tape-recorded and their LREs were analyzed.

The results showed that the metalinguistic group had had much more conversation about their target language than the comparison group (by two and half times in terms of the average number of LREs).

Swain (1998) argued that the explicit statement of rules and the use of metalinguistic terminology led learners to pay more attention to their own language use. Also when subjects solved the problems correctly in the experimental session, they had a strong tendency to perform accurately on the relevant posttest questions. However, when they solved the problems incorrectly in the experimental session, they tended to perform inaccurately on the relevant posttest questions. Swain stated that the results strongly suggested that the LREs, where students consciously reflected on their own production, might have functioned as a source of language learning. This suggests that there may be a strong relationship between metatalk and second language learning.

This metalinguistic function of output has been discussed from many different theoretical perspectives (Swain, 1995, 1998, 2000; Swain and Lapkin, 1995, 1998). However, currently Swain mainly focuses on 'collaborative work' in which the metalinguistic function occurs. More specifically, Swain (2000) emphasizes the importance of collaborative work in SLA in the framework of Vygotskian sociocultural theory, which states that the human mind is mediated and meaningful social interaction plays a fundamental role in transforming the second language from interpsychological functioning to intrapsychological functioning (Lantolf, 2000; Ohta, 2000).

According to Ohta (2000), in this approach the distinction between 'speaker' and 'hearer' becomes blurred and the concepts of 'speaker' and 'hearer' converge in the sense that both speakers and hearers collaboratively produce utterances which are jointly

owned. She stated that “language acquisition is realized through a collaborative process whereby learners appropriate the language of the interaction as their own, for their own purposes, building grammatical, expressive, and cultural competence through this process” (p.51).

In relation to the collaborative work, Swain (2000) also emphasized the importance of ‘collaborative dialogue’ in SLA. She defined collaborative dialogue as dialogue where speakers are engaged in problem-solving and constructing linguistic knowledge. Implying the future direction of output hypothesis, Swain (2000) stated that ‘beyond the output hypothesis’ was the collaborative dialogue. This means that collaborative dialogue is a crucial factor for second language learning as seen below:

It is knowledge-building dialogue. In the case of our interests in second language learning, it is dialogue that constructs linguistic knowledge. It is what allows performance to outstrip competence. It is where language use and language learning can co-occur. It is language use mediating language learning. It is cognitive activity and it is social activity. (Swain, 2000, p.97).

As indicated above, performance outstrips competence in collaborative dialogue, resulting in language learning. This is in line with her earlier argument that learners’ conversation about target language, namely LREs, may be a source of language learning (Swain, 1998). When learners reflect on their language use in social interaction through language, there occurs language learning which raises their competence level of the moment.

III. The Roles of Output that Need to be Revisited

As discussed so far, the roles of output have been investigated in the framework of the output hypothesis as it has been developed from early to the recent versions. However, it seems that two of the roles – providing opportunities for meaningful use of linguistic resources, and providing opportunities for change from semantic processing to syntactic processing – have been overlooked though they may have important roles in SLA. In other words, they need to be revisited in the current SLA.

First, the role of output for providing opportunities for meaningful use in context has not been the focus of many empirical studies. However, the role of output as contextualized meaningful use of linguistic resources can be examined in relation to automaticity. This is in line with Muranoi’s (2007) claim that the automatization process is triggered by output. As discussed earlier, in the French immersion situation, if students were not provided with enough opportunities to produce the target language, they were not able to develop as much automaticity in production as native speakers of French. However, this has not yet been examined in an immersion context.

Also the role of output in relation to automaticity seems to be one of the areas in which much more studies are needed. According to DeKeyser (1997), automaticity has not been studied enough in SLA. He also stated that although a number of studies have been done on the automaticity of second language in comprehension, particularly in reading, not much information on the automaticity in listening or

speaking is available. Therefore, studies on the role of output as opportunities for meaningful use in context would contribute to the underdeveloped area of current SLA. For example, Erlam's (2003) study on the effectiveness of structured-input vs. meaningful output-based instruction in French showed that output-based instruction was relatively more effective than structured-input instruction. As she interpreted the result, Erlam suggested three possible reasons for the result, one of which was the automatic use of the target structure. However, there have been only a few studies (Byun, 2009; DeKeyser, 1997) about automaticity and effectiveness of input-based and output-based instruction. Therefore, SLA cannot give a clear answer to the question at this moment.

The other role of output that needs to be revisited is the role of output in promoting syntactic processing. Though it has not been the focus of empirical research, the investigation of this role may contribute to SLA because the role may explain how learners internalize and automatize grammatical knowledge. As discussed earlier, it is not necessary for learners to involve syntactic processing for comprehension whereas for production they need to use syntactic processing. Swain (2005) indicated that there is a fairly large difference in form-meaning mapping between grammatical encoding and decoding because grammatical encoding pushes learners to reorganize it whereas grammatical decoding does not. Gass (1997) also argued that learners need to practice mapping grammar to their output to automatize grammar. In other words, input practice may not be enough for second language learners to acquire or internalize grammatical

knowledge. Output practice may be necessary for the acquisition of grammar. Or at least it may help learners with the grammar acquisition of a target language.

This may be related to the amount of attention to form. As discussed earlier, for comprehension, learners do not need to know subcategorization information of a verb when they hear a sentence. Therefore, when they hear a sentence like John put the ball in the box, they do not need to attend to the configurative relationship between put and in the box. What they need to understand the sentence is just knowing the meaning of the words in the sentence and processing it in the given order. However, when they say the sentence, they must consider the subcategorization information for the verb, put, so that they may not produce a sentence like John put the ball. In other words, learners need to give more attention to form when they process a sentence in a productive way than in a receptive way. Of course, learners give some attention to form for comprehension, but they may need further attention to form through production practice for SLA or to facilitate SLA (Izumi, 2002; Toth, 2006).

In his comparison study between processing instruction and communicative output instruction, Toth (2006), through the analysis of the transcript data of his videotaped lesson, maintains that input alone is not enough but that both input and output practices are necessary to explain language learners' grammatical development. The findings of Jong's (2005) study also imply the possible relationship between output practice and language learners' grammatical development. In the study he investigated two research questions: (a) Is receptive

training through processing of many instantiations of a target structure effective for knowledge base building for both comprehension and production and (b) Is early introduction of production practice for a target structure hinder the knowledge base building. To answer the research questions he had a control group and two experimental groups, receptive training group and receptive + productive training group. The results through the analysis of a self-paced listening test, a match-mismatch test, and a grammaticality judgment task for receptive knowledge and of a picture description task in single- and dual-task conditions for productive knowledge showed that receptive training group had processed target structures faster in comprehension than the control group, but made many errors in production. Also the results showed that the early introduction of production practice had not hindered acquisition. All of the studies above indicate that production practice may be necessary for language learners' grammatical development. However, the role of output related to the issue, promoting syntactic processing, seems to have been overlooked along with the shift of focus of output roles in the output hypothesis framework.

IV. The Roles of Output that Need to be newly investigated

In addition to the two output roles that need to be revisited, there seem to be more output roles that need to be newly included into the output hypothesis framework. They are auto-input role and initiation role of output, which will be discussed in this

section.

First, output has an auto-input role in SLA as some researchers pointed out (Ellis, 1994; Levelt, 1989; Levelt, Roelofs, & Meyer, 1999; Platt & MacWhinney, 1983). Ellis (1994) has stated that a learner's output makes a contribution to the acquisition of implicit L2 knowledge by pushing the learner to produce forms close to the target language norms and by providing 'auto-input'. Here as one of the roles of output in L2 acquisition, he suggests the production of auto-input. When a learner chooses to produce a certain target structure, the next step the learner takes is to process his own utterance as auto-input.

Levelt et al. (1999) have also indicated the importance of output as auto-input to the speaker. They stated that "the person to whom we listen most is ourself" (p. 6). In other words, one of the most important resources for a learner's language development is their auto-input. Levelt (1989) also mentioned the auto-input role of output in his production model:

A speaker is his own listener. More precisely, a speaker has access to both his internal speech and his overt speech. He can listen to his own overt speech, just as he can listen to the speech of his interlocutors. (p. 13)

Though auto-input is conjectured to play at least some role in L2 acquisition, it seems that no studies have been done specifically focusing on the effect of the auto-input in L2 acquisition so far. Only Platt and MacWhinney's (1983) study showed that four 4-year-old children incorporated their auto-input

with grammatical errors into their developing first language system. This suggests that auto-input may play an important role in language learning.

Byun (2009) also suggested the effect of auto-input in SLA. His study explored the effect of input and output practice on the automatization of three Korean morphosyntactic rules. The Input and the output groups with 14 native speakers of English in each group participated in 15 sessions over a 5-week period and were tested on automaticity in oral production of the target structures through the measurement of the length of time of speech, reaction time, and error rate in a dual-task condition. The findings showed that automaticity was acquired through skill-specific processing, especially automaticity in production. This means that automaticity in production is promoted not through comprehension practice but only through production practice. However, automaticity in comprehension showed a little different picture. The findings showed that while the reaction time data had supported skill-specificity, the error rate data had not. As for this result Byun (2009) speculated that such a result might have been caused due to the auto-input role of output, which might have cancelled out the comprehension practice effect. Again, this suggests that auto-input may play an important role in language learning.

The second role of output that should be newly investigated is the initiation role of output. There are some differences between the roles of input and that of output in language learning. One of them is initiability. In other words, in general the language learner does not initiate the process to receive a particular linguistic item selectively. There are some

cases when a second language learner performs selective listening. It is when they listen to a certain linguistic item or a story repeatedly. However, this does not seem to be a typical case in which learners improve their comprehension ability. Usually through comprehension learners do not choose to receive repetitive input for a particular linguistic item. They are just given the input by their interlocutors.

However, production provides a language learner with initiability to learn a linguistic item. As Swain (1995, 2000) states, as far as output is concerned, the learner is in control. The learner "can play more active, responsible roles in their learning" (Swain, 1995, p. 126). In other words, output enables language learners to initiate the use of a particular linguistic item. This means that the particular target item can be repeated whenever the learners want. Especially when the learners have not acquired the item completely, it appears that they tend to do something on the items and one way of doing this is production practice. In this case, the production practice may be involved in hypothesis testing, in which learners test out their interlanguage linguistic resources and check if they work (Swain, 1995) or it may be involved in repeated practice for proceduralization, which will increase automaticity.

Swain (1995) related this initiation role of output to learners' hypothesis testing. She maintained that output functioned as a 'selector' for what to be attended to in the learner-generated hypothesis testing process. This means that learners may select and produce particular linguistic items which they think are necessary to develop their interlanguage or necessary for communication. The initiation role of

output may be supported by the studies of self-repair (Shedadeh, 2001; Shonerd, 1994). Self-repair seems to be a frequently observed phenomenon in second language production as seen in the example below:

NNS: yes because if the woman is (0.8) the wife always go out (0.6) goes

out and left his his husband eh (1.0) her husband and her son in the home

(0.7) at home it's it's not reasonable for for ... (Shehadeh, 2001, p. 437).

Here the nonnative speaker recognizes the ill-formedness of 'go out', 'his husband', and 'in the home' in her own speech and modifies them into 'goes out', 'her husband,' and 'at home' respectively. Shehadeh (2001) claims that this kind of self-initiated modified output may play as important a role in second language learning as other-initiated modified output, which is elicited by the interlocutor's indication to the non-native speaker (NNS) that her or his utterance has not been understood, has been misunderstood, or was ill-formed in some way. In his study, Shehadeh (2001) compared the effect of other-initiation on NNSs' modified output with that of self-initiation. More specifically, he investigated three things: the effect of other-initiation on NNSs' modified output, the effect of self-initiation on NNSs' modified output, and which of the two has the greater effect on eliciting NNSs' modified output. Thirty-five adult participants--8 native speakers (NSs) and 27 nonnative speakers (NNSs)--were asked to perform three different tasks--picture description, and opinion exchange in NS-NNS dyads and in NNS-NNS dyads, and decision making in groups of

NNSs. The results revealed that both other-initiation and self-initiation successfully elicited modified output from the NNSs and that, of the two kinds of initiation, self-initiation elicited greater modified output than other-initiation. This suggests that second language learners do not develop their interlanguage only by receiving comprehensible input and by getting involved in interaction. Second language learners also actively involve production process by initiating their learning selectively. The self-initiation role of output may be another role of output in output hypothesis framework and more research on the role may contribute to understanding how output functions in second language acquisition. Also, the relationship between self-initiated repair or self-initiation and learning appears to have been investigated very little.

After analyzing data from part of a comprehensive study of second language learning strategies of literate adults, Shonerd (1994) reported an interesting point on self-repair. He analyzed more than one thousand self-repairs from ELS learners' spontaneous speech and compared second language learners with NSs in terms of what they focus on in making self-repair, form or meaning. He recorded the spontaneous speech during interviews (two-way dialogue), picture descriptions (monologue), and classroom interaction (one teacher and about ten students) for three months. He analyzed self-repairs in the spontaneous speech into two types, local repairs and global repairs. Here local repairs were attempts to move what they were saying closer to the grammatical form for the intended meaning. In this type of self-repair, what was intended by the speaker was change in form rather than change in meaning.

On the other hand, global repair focused on meaning change. It consisted of a false start and a subsequent alteration of the utterance as seen in two examples below:

I take from the dictionary or *from the ... if the teacher explain something, I write it on the paper And I can't ... then I can understand English.* (Shonerd, 1994, p. 87)

As seen above, global repairs are attempts to change the entire utterance to express a different meaning from the originally intended one.

The results showed that as for NNSs an average of 59 percent of the total of 1,016 self-repairs were local repairs—59 percent of the self-repairs during interview, 53 percent of those during picture descriptions, and 63 percent of those during classroom interaction. This means that NNSs tended to focus on form in making self-repairs. In contrast, as for NSs, they tended to focus on meaning. Shonerd (1994) analyzed self-repairs of a NS interviewer during interviews and of a control group of five English NSs during picture descriptions. The analysis of two of the interviews taken at random showed that the interviewer made only two local self-repairs (or a total of less than three percent) from a total of 75 self-repairs. The analysis of recordings of five NSs during picture description showed that none of a total of 25 self-repairs was a local repair. These results strongly imply that at least through self-repairs, NNSs make a great effort to conform their interlanguage form to that of their target language and that they have a high possibility of repeating the target form because incomplete

acquisition of a target form may lead to repeated errors, which will be, in turn, followed by repeated self-repairs.

The studies on self-repair discussed so far indicate that language learners have initiability through output in second language acquisition and the initiability is often expressed through repetition. However, unfortunately it appears that this initiation role of output has not been investigated systematically in current SLA so far.

V. Conclusion

This paper has overviewed the roles of output proposed in the early and the recent versions of output hypothesis and discussed the roles that need to be revisited and those that need to be newly investigated in the current SLA. A few overall conclusions can be drawn from this discussion of the roles of output in SLA. First, the two roles of output in the early version of output hypothesis, the meaningful use of linguistic resources and syntactic processing, should be re-examined. Much more research is needed to determine how these roles operate with second language learners. The findings may reveal more clearly the process of automaticity acquisition and grammar acquisition. Next, two new roles of output, auto-input role and initiation role, that are implied in the literature need to be investigated in current SLA. Studies on these roles may show a clearer picture of comprehension process and show how self-repair works in second language acquisition. As researchers and practitioners learn more about these roles, the

processes and procedures for helping second language learners acquire their new languages can be further improved.

References

- [1] Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp.235-153). Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- [2] Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 50, 1, 158-164.
- [3] Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds), *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- [4] Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64-81). N.Y.: Oxford University Press.
- [5] Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 97-114). N.Y: Oxford University Press.
- [6] Swain, M & Lapkin, S. (1982).Evaluating bilingual education: A Canadian case study. Clevedon, Avon,England: Multilingual Matters.
- [7] Swain, M & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*,16, 371-391.
- [8] Swain, M & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, pp. 320-337.
- [9] Byun, J. (2009). Skill-specificity in the acquisition of automaticity in L2. *TheLinguisticAssociationofKoreaJournal*,17(3),5778.
- [10] Shehadeh, A. (2001). Self- and other-initiated modified output during task-based interaction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 433-457.
- [11] Shoner, H. (1994). Repair in spontaneous speech: A window on second language development. In V. John-Steiner, C. Panofsky, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Sociocultural approaches to language and literacy: An interactionist perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Byun, J. (2007). Processing instruction and skill-specificity: In which direction should they go? *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*, 15(1), 15-35.
- [13] Erlam, R. (2003). Evaluating the relative effectiveness of structured-input and output-based instruction in foreign language learning: Results from an experimental study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 559-582.
- [14] Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp.471-481). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [15] Pica, T., Holliday, L. Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). 'Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner.' *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 11, 63-90.
- [16] Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- [17] Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 1-26). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- [18] Ohta, A. S. (2000). Rethinking interaction in SLA : Developmentally appropriate assistance in the zone of proximal development and the acquisition of L2

grammar. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), Sociocultural theory and second language learning (pp.51-78). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- [19] Muranoi, H. (2007). Output practice in the L2 classroom. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.), Practice in a second language learning: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology (pp.51-84). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- [20] DeKeyser, R. M. (1997). Beyond explicit rule learning: Automating second language morphosyntax. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 195-222.
- [21] Gass, S. (1997). Input, interaction, and the second language learner. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [22] Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 541-577.
- [23] Toth, P. (2006). Processing instruction and a role for output in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 56, pp.319-385.
- [24] Jong, N. (2005). Can second language grammar be learned through listening?: An experimental study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 205-234.
- [25] Ellis, R. (1994). A theory of instructed second language acquisition. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 79-114). London: Academic Press.
- [26] Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- [27] Levelt, W. J. M., Roelofs, A., & Meyer, A. S. (1999). A theory of lexical access in speech production. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22, 1-75.
- [28] Platt, C. B., & MacWhinney, B. (1983). Error assimilation as a mechanism in language learning. *Journal of Child Language*, 10, 401-414.

변진석(Jin-Suk Byun)



2000년 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (TESOL 석사)
2001년 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (언어학 석사)
2006년 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (언어학 박사)

2007년~현재 University of North Florida TESOL 교수
※ 관심분야: SLA, 응용 언어학, TESOL 프로그램 개발

The early version of the present paper was presented at the annual conference of the American Higher Education, Nashville, in 2009.