

# SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AMONG ADULT LEARNERS: A DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE STRATEGIES, MODES AND HINDRANCES FOR ACQUIREMENT.

Smrutisikta Mishra<sup>a</sup> and Velmurugan, K.<sup>b</sup>

a. Department of English, NIT Puducherry, Karaikal

b. Ph.D. Scholar, Department of English, NIT Puducherry, Karaikal

---

**Abstract-**The most fundamental of all the hypotheses to be present in the Linguistics domain is the language acquisition-learning difference. There are two distinct and independent ways in the development process of competence among adults in a second language teaching and learning. Second language acquisition theory and learner is dependent on a linguistic system which rests on the social and cultural identity impact on language learning, and intensity of exposure and use of the language along with interplay of psychology. This paper statistically illustrates on (Focus on Form) FonF used in different language and communicative context. It may have the divergence for different categories of technical terms and bring of various productivity. The paper focuses on the specificity of the technical terms of the category Linguistic, psychological and other factors with the technical terms of some other categories that they have the potential to establish.

**Key words:** Linguistic system, Inter-language development, Language hindrances, grammatical sensitivity, Self-regulated learner.

---

## Introduction

The most fundamental of all the hypotheses to be present in the Linguistics domain is the language acquisition-learning difference. They are distinct and independent ways in the development process of competence among adults in a second language teaching and learning. The first way is language acquisition, a process similar, to the way children develop ability in their first language. Language acquirers are only aware of the fact that they are using the language for communication in which language acquisition is a subconscious process where they do not have awareness of the fact usually that they are acquiring language. The result of language acquisition also takes place subconsciously to acquire the competence. In general we are not consciously aware of the rules of the languages we have acquired. Instead, we would feel for correctness. The hypothesis of acquisition-learning claims that the adults also acquire, that the ability to 'follow-up' languages does not disappear at puberty. It does not mean that adults will always be able to achieve native-like levels in a second language. It is meant that adults can access the same natural language acquisition device that children use. In later part, the adult's language acquisition is considered to be very powerful process.

## English Language Teaching and Teacher Training

English language teaching needs to be given assurance on an acquisition of linguistic features, inter-language patterns which are emerging as a linguistic system mostly on the second language learner, the social and cultural identity impact on language learning, and intensity of exposure and opportunities that are needed in the language. With the knowledge of these concepts, teachers can frame a structure in order to learn the language appropriately for their learners, help them set in a realistic goals for achieving the levels of proficiency in all time, and understand why some materials and methods work better with particular groups of students and why some students progress faster than with others (Adger, Snow, & Christian, 2002). Opportunities should be provided for English teachers to reflect on their own language learning experiences as they implement the same strategies with their learners in their classes (Richards & Farrell, 2005; Smith, Harris, & Reder, 2005). Here the solution lies not in expensive equipment to our problems in language teaching, non-native methods, sophisticated linguistic analyses, or new language laboratories, but in utilization, speakers of the languages using them for real communication, what we already have in their native methods. It is concluded that the best methods might also be the most suitable or sophisticated, and that may seem strange when the language is used for what it was designed for and here the language acquisition occurs in communication. Second language acquisition theory, as advanced today, can have notion as a part of 'theoretical linguistics', in such way it can be studied and developed without regard to practical application. This is the case with any scientific theory; it consists of a set of hypotheses, or generalizations, that are accordant with experimental data.

## Acquisition of components of Language

Second language speakers in India (Hindi/Regional language), learn elements of English language (vocabulary, grammar, and accent) differently (Burt, Peyton, & Adams, 2003; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Eskey, 2005; Flahive & Bailey, 1993; Folse, 2004; Nation, 2000, 2005). The non-native language speakers may not know enough words in English to be able to use it correctly.

Adult teachers of English language learners need to know which strategies for teaching listening, speaking, reading, and writing are most effective with adults learning English.

Here it examines the evidence offered that supports claims concerning instructed Interlanguage (IL) development. Some recent studies are summarized which elucidate the potential of formal instruction in four areas: (1) sequence of acquisition, (2) process of acquisition, (3) rate of acquisition, and (4) SLA attainment level. Here it is concluded that the claimed similarities between instructed and naturalistic Second Language Acquisition rely on insufficient and weak proof where the instruction cause learning positively in three of the above four stages, and that the prescriptions for language teaching, therefore, are certainly premature and probably wrong.

### Choice of Linguistic Form

In this paper, choice of focusing on a linguistic form focuses on these four different sets of either linguistically, psychologically or other developed criteria for the determination. They are: 1) learners' developmental readiness 2) universal relevance of typological, 3) inherent difficulty of rules, and 4) reliability and scope of rules.

**Table 1. Linguistic, Psychological and 'Other' communicative hindrance**

S.No.	Students	Linguistic(L)	Psychological(P)	Other factors(O)
1	A	4	4	2
2	B	7	3	0
3	C	1	4	5
4	D	4	3	3
5	E	4	2	4
6	F	4	1	5
7	G	1	3	6
8	H	3	6	1
9	I	5	2	3
10	J	4	2	4
	Average	3.7	3	3.3

(A - Average student B- Poor student C- Good student D- Vernacular student E - Rural (Male) student F- Rural (Female) student G- English medium student H- student with disability I- Non English student J- Tribal student.)

The Table 1 represents ten different student types such as good, average, poor, vernacular, rural (male), rural (female), medium in English, student with disability non-English student and tribal student are analyses to view the linguistic, psychological and 'other' factors of communicative hindrances. The said hindrances clearly describe the effectiveness of its language output and usage. The desired linguistic form, sometimes fails to be achieved due to the above cited hindrances. Some students in "other factors" category have some other sociological, environmental and cultural constraints, which makes them less competent or inadequately prepared for the intended language output. The competency level of language acquisition is also examined simultaneously with the help of this analysis.

### Results and Discussions linguistic, psychological and other hindrances

Table 2 presents the results with standard deviation and probability that generalizes a conclusion, describe that any students selected randomly among the said Student type A-J will face the Linguistic, Psychological and miscellaneous hindrances with the same probability. For instance, if we select a student from Category A (average student), anywhere in India, in probability of 0.0001% and 0.0001% he would face the Linguistic and psychological communicative hindrance and 0.0540% will be other factors affecting.

**Table 2. Standard Deviation and Probability of communicative hindrance.**

S.No	Students	Linguistics (L)	Psychological (P)	Other factors (O)
1	A	0.0001	0.0001	0.0540
2	B	0.0000	0.0044	0.3989
3	C	0.2420	0.0001	0.0000
4	D	0.0001	0.0044	0.0044
5	E	0.0001	0.0540	0.0001
6	F	0.0001	0.2420	0.0000
7	G	0.2420	0.0044	0.0000
8	H	0.0044	0.0000	0.2420
9	I	0.0000	0.0540	0.0044
10	J	0.0001	0.0540	0.0001

It was measured by a *Normal distribution*. From the result of normal distribution for independent samples, which was significant ( $P=0.4227$ ).

### Focus on Forms condition

The FonFs group were not allowed to read the text, but given a list of the 10 target English words with their translations along with explanations. The teacher took over the list which he/she or the learners wanted to provide any additional information with explanation. Then students worked on two word/ phrases focused exercises. During the exercises they had the word list with them and could refer to it for any clarification. One exercise required for them with four options to choose the correct meaning of the word, as in the following example:

#### Word = Diligent

Options: a. quiet    b. sincere    c. hardworking    d. shy

The other exercise consisted of 10 sentences with gap or dash. Participants were required to complete each sentence with one word from the list of the target words, as in the following example:

The \_\_\_\_\_ chosen for the construction of the building is in the heart of the city.

### Scoring

The class and teacher checked the answers, and clarifications were provided when students required them to complete the task. Time on task was kept identical in the two conditions. All materials were collected at the end of the respective tasks and an unexpected test was given to the group. Learners were required to provide the meaning for the 10 target words in English or in their mother tongue i.e., L1. Each correct response on translation/explanation received two points, an incorrect response on translation or a blank were given no points, and a semantically approximate response explanation/translation received one point. An example of an approximate response for *grind* is *to reduce into small particles*, while the explanation provided on the list of the target words was *to powder by crushing it*. Individual word scores were added up for each student. The maximum score was 25, which meant that a student who received 25 would have provided the precise meanings for all 10 target words.

Results of incidental acquisition study:

The Table 3 presents the results which answer the question raised on research one about the difference between FonF and FonFs conditions when new words are acquired incidentally. As can be seen from the below given table, the FonFs group outperformed FonF group, and the difference as measured by a *normal distribution* for independent samples was significant ( $p < 0.0001$ ).

**Table 3. Incidental acquisition scores (maximum = 25)**

Content	N	M	SD
Reading (FonF)	54	11.2 (44.8%)	15.90
List of word-focused tasks (FonFs)	55	17.2 (68.8%)	16.44
Difference		6***	

\*\*\* $p < 0.0001$

To start with, learners' developmental readiness, which has to do with the staged acquisition of a system (e.g., English negation), can be one of the crucial criteria for the choice of form to focus on. Doughty and Williams and Lightbown address this issue, drawing on Pienemann's (1989) teachability hypothesis which states that "within developmental sequences, it is not possible for learners to acquire, and therefore, it is not possible to teach, structures that are far beyond the learners' current stage of development". Doughty and Williams, at least, regard Pienemann's accounts as sensibly appetizing that they furnish an independent explanation of learner data, from prediction which the learner performance can be made.

Since Krashen dispense no proficiency scores for the learners in question, nor defines what he means as a 'beginner', his dissension is difficult to evaluate. One notes that students who were classified as 'at various levels' of proficiency in the original reports are now categorized as 'beginners' or as in 'the lower levels'. Further, while instruction was originally claimed to be useful only for beginners, Krashen (1985) assert that "language classes are useful primarily for the beginner, and are consistent with the interpretation that their value is in the comprehensible input they supply".

### Effects of Conscious Rules

We have maintained the use of the conscious grammar which is limited to easily learn, acquired rules, simple morphological additions that do not make an overwhelming contribution to communicating the speaker or writer's message. For most people, only "local" rules can be learned and used (Burt and Kiparsky, 1972). Certainly, speakers of English comprehend sentences with dropped regular past endings by missing third person singular markers fairly well, credit goes to the presence of other markers of tense and pragmatic knowledge. For example; 'We saw he' - In this sentence instead of using 'him', the word 'he' is used and 'I gave she the book' - In this sentence the word 'she' must be replaced with the word 'her'.

Many people with type of instruction which grammar-only who are victimised, have not had the possibility to acquire much of the second language, and sustained on learning as they have no choice. Another type may be related to personality. These over

users have had a chance to acquire, and may actually have acquired a great deal of the second language. Sure to say that they simply do not assure this acquired competence and feel secure when they refer to their observer. In other words, we acquire only when we understand language that contains structure that is "a little beyond" where we now can comprehend the meaning with much possibilities. How is this possible? We use more than our linguistic competence to help us to understand as the answer to this is apparently conundrum. The context is used by our knowledge of the world, as our extra-linguistic information is ready to help us that comprehend language directed at us.

**Table 4. SLA stages and aptitude constructs**

S.No.	SLA stage	Corresponding aptitude constructs
1.	Input processing strategies, such as segmentation	<i>Attention control</i> <i>Working memory</i>
2.	Noticing	Phonemic coding ability <i>Working memory</i>
3.	Pattern identification	Phonemic coding ability <i>Working memory</i> Grammatical sensitivity Inductive language learning ability
4.	Pattern restructuring and manipulation	Grammatical sensitivity Inductive language learning ability
5.	Pattern control	<i>Automatization</i> <i>Integrative memory</i>
6.	Pattern integration	<i>Chunking and Retrieval memory</i>

The correlation of linguistic variables with social variables has begun from the presumption that social groups are identifiable and that are well known. However this is a case much in dispute in the social sciences. That is, the question of what a social group or subgroup is has been very problematic, especially in urban areas, where much sociolinguistic work has focused. For example; *You are going to Chennai today na?*, I am coming *na*. and You know *na*. I gotcha. (I've got you), T'aint whatcha do. (It ain't (isn't) what you do) and It don't mean a thing. (It doesn't mean a thing).

Secondly, as it is considered to be crucial that responses truly reflect their habitual performance and knowledge rather than being an artifact of the interview situation especially the elicitation of valid information from large numbers of speakers is a vast problem. For example; For the word 'evening' in tamilnadu, rural area people used say 'saayangaalam' whereas in urban area people call it as 'saayanthiram', same like for the word 'noon', 'mathiyam' and 'mathiyanam' respectively and also for 'Have you swept the house?' in villages the people used say it as 'veeta perukittiya?' whereas in urban areas people used to say it as 'veeta kootitiya?' and 'to open the door', in rural area 'kathava neeku' whereas in urban area 'kathava thira'.

Carroll (1965) proclaimed how he and Sapon started by devising a large number of potential predictor tests of foreign language learning. They then administered these tests to learners, and gathered data on the achievement scores of the learners at the end of the course of instruction. Armed with those data, Carroll and Sapon then analysed: Which potential aptitude sub-tests correlated with one another highly; when sub-tests actually correlated highly with end-of-course performance on achievement tests.

As a result of this work, those sub-tests which did not correlate with end-of course performance were removed, along with those which correlated with one another, whatever their correlations with achievement, since they were clearly replicating one another. In this way each of which made sufficiently separate contributions to the prediction of end-of course performance by taking a small group of sub-tests that was preferred.

**Table 5. Carroll's four-component model of aptitude**

S.No.	Component Name	Nature and function
1.	Phonemic coding ability	Capacity to code unfamiliar sound so that it can be perpetuated to over more than a few seconds and subsequently retrieved or redeemed.
2.	Grammatical sensitivity	Capacity to identify the grammatical functions that words fulfill in sentences.
3.	Inductive language learning ability	Capacity to extract syntactic and morphological patterns from a given corpus of language material and to extrapolate from such patterns to create new sentences.
4.	Associative memory	Capacity to form associative bonds in memory between L1 and L2 Vocabulary items.

### Self-regulatory learning

Self-regulation refers to the proportion to which individuals are active participants in their own learning as it may view a more dynamic concept than learning strategy, highlighting the learners' own "strategic efforts to manage their own achievement through specific beliefs and processes" (Zimmerman and Risemberg, 1997, p. 105). The learners can use to enhance academic achievement to have presumption of self-regulation in academic learning which could also be perceived as a multidimensional construct, including cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, behavioral, and environmental processes. Weiner (2000) describes learning motivation as intrapersonal as well as inter-personal. Motivation is intrapersonal when the driving force is within the students themselves. As Winne outlines when they begin to study, self-regulating learners set goals for extending knowledge and sustaining motivation. They are aware of what they know, what they believe, and what the differences between these kinds of information imply for upcoming tasks. Each one is able to support the progress towards chosen and upcoming tasks as they are also in position to preconceive with small tactics and all strategies which help in selecting some instead of all deployed on predictions (Winne, 1995, p.173). Sadler-Smith (1996) argues that successful application of learning styles and strategies can be validated on the learners' reaction to the learning processes, the attainment of new knowledge, competencies and desired attitudes, and the learners' ability to apply the acquired knowledge, skills and attitudes to new situations.

### Conclusion

There are also some interesting connections among the individual differences variables covered. It is clear that foreign language aptitude and cognitive style have some degree of relationship (Gardner, Tremblay, and Masgoret, 1997). It has been insisted (Chapelle and Green, 1992) that the connection is considered for by the way each draws upon the common underlying factor of intelligence. In slight disparity, Skehan (1998) proclaimed that the connection arises because within aptitude, one can propose an analytic learner type and a memory-oriented learner type. Not identically, this is related to the analytic-holistic contrast in the style literature. As indicated above, Skehan proclaims that if cognitive style is interpreted as not one continuum but two, this, combined with a style vs. predisposition interpretation, can accommodate, separately, both aptitudinal and style concepts. More interesting, it is the potential connection between motivation and learning strategies. The strategies are surveyed in this form may create an opportunity and also increase the level of competency for the students to re-emerge within a more elaborated theoretical framework.

### REFERENCES

1. Adger, C., Snow, C., & Christian, D. (Eds.). (2002). *What teachers need to know about language*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
2. Batia Laufer-Dvorkin. (2014). *Comparing Focus on Form and Focus on FormS in Second-Language Vocabulary Learning*. DOI: 10.1353/cml.2006.0047
3. Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education*. New York: Continuum.
4. Burt, M. and Kiparsky, C. (1972). *The Gooficon: A Repair Manual for English*. Rowley, Ma: Newbury House.
5. Burt, M., Peyton, J. K., & Adams, R. (2003). *Reading and adult English language learners: A review of the research*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
6. Carroll, J. B. (1965). The prediction of success in intensive foreign language training. In R. Glaser (ed.), *Training, Research, and Education*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
7. Charles J. Fillmore, Daniel Kempler, and William S. Y. Wang, eds., (1979). *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior*. New York: Academic, pp. 305-325.
8. Chapelle, C. and Green, P. (1992). Field independence/dependence in second language acquisition research. *Language Learning*, pp. 42, 47-83.
9. Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp.114-138). New York: Cambridge University Press.
10. Flahive, D. E., & Bailey, N. H. (1993). Exploring reading/writing relationships in adult second language learners. In J. Carson and I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom* (pp. 128-140). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
11. Folse, K. S. (2004). *Vocabulary myths: Applying second language research to classroom teaching*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
12. Freeman, D. E., & Freeman, Y. S. (1994). *Between worlds: Access to second language acquisition*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
13. Gardner, R. C., Tremblay, P. F., and Masgoret, A.M. (1997). Towards a full model of second language learning: an empirical investigation. *Modern Language Journal*, pp. 81, 344-62.
14. Khare, Asha. (2011). *Teaching English Language Skills for School Teachers: CTE Programme of IGNOU*. India. doi:10.7575/aiac.all.v.2n.1p.1
15. Krashen, Stephen D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. University of Southern California. Pergamon Press Inc.
16. Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis*. New York: Longman.
17. Lightbown, P. (1993). Input, instruction and feedback in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), ii-iv.
18. Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native Language and Foreign Language Acquisition*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 379, pp. 259-278.

19. Long, M. H. (1985). A role for instruction in second language acquisition: task-based language teaching. In K. Hyltenstam and M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modelling and Assessing Second Language Development*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
20. Long, M. H. (1988). Leslie Beebe (Ed.), *Issues in Second Language; Multiple Perspectives*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publications.
21. Latu, Maxim and Alina Levit (2017). "Technical Terms of the Category Locus and Their Semantic Relations within a Terminology". *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*.9(2017). 11 June 2018. DOI: <<https://dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n1.04>>
22. Nation, I. M. P. (2000). Learning vocabulary in lexical sets: Dangers and guidelines. *TESOL Journal*, 9(2), 6-10.
23. Nation, I. M. P. (2005). Teaching and learning vocabulary. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 581-595). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
24. Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? *Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), pp. 52-79.
25. Pintrich, P. R., 2003. A Motivational Science Perspective on the Role of Student Motivation in Learning and Teaching Contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, (4), pp. 667-686
26. Richards, J., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
27. Sadler-Smith, E. 1996. Learning Styles: a Holistic Approach. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 20 (7), pp. 29-36
28. Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
29. Smith, C., Harris, K., & Reder, S. (2005). *Applying research findings to instruction for adult English language learners*. Washington, DC: Center for Adult English Language Acquisition.
30. Weiner, Bernard. 2000. Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Theories of Motivation from an Attributional Perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, 12 (1), pp. 1-14.
31. Winne, P. H. (1995). Inherent details in self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 30, pp. 173-87.
32. Zimmerman, B. J. and Risemberg, R. (1997). Self-regulatory dimensions of academic learning and motivation. In G. D. Phee (ed.), *Handbook of Academic Learning*. San Diego: Academic Press, pp. 105-25.

