The Empirical Study of Krashen's SLA Theory in Junior High School English Teaching- narrow this down!

**I. PRUPOSE:** The purpose of this study is within the framework of Krashen's SLA theory, hope to draw the junior high school English teachers' attention and reflecting on his/her own teaching, and then, ameliorate teaching methods, promote learners' second language acquisition, and improve English language teaching. [1]

**II. RESEARCH QUESTIONS:**

1 .What's the students' attitude towards the English learning?- not relevant

2. Can the method of Krashen's SLA teaching improve students interest in learning English and help them to improve their English proficiency in junior high school?

**III. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND:**

Krashen: 1).the Acquisition-Learning hypothesis; 2).the Monitor hypothesis; 3).the Natural Order hypothesis 4).the Input hypothesis and 5) the Affective Filter hypothesis.[5] Krashen emphasized that mastering language is mostly the result of the use of language in communicative activities. Students must master it through a lot of "comprehensible input". [6]

 In 1981, Long put forward the Interaction Theory: the appropriateness of teachers' language, creating the teaching situation, choosing the appropriate topic, creating a harmonious atmosphere and carrying out communication between students. [7]

In 1993, Swain proposed three functions for learners' output:1)the "noticing/triggering" function; 2) the hypothesis-testing function; 3) the metalinguistic function. [8]

 Ellis (1997) expounded that the second language acquisition is determined by five factors which contact with each other. These five factors are: situational factors, language input, the learners' individual differences, learners' processing and second language output. [2][3]

**IV. RESEARCH METHODS:**

1.The participants are two classes of junior high school at the same level of English. Class A is conducted by the teaching mode which advocated by Krashen' SLA theory, while class B is conducted by traditional teaching methods.

2.Application of the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis – how? Do you want to promote ‘acquisition’ in class? and the Input Hypothesis to the pre-listening stage, while-listening and post-listening activities.

3.Application of the Monitor Hypothesis and the affective Filter Hypothesis to Oral English Teaching. Monitoring includes the monitor among students and the monitor that the teachers to student.- different from the monitor hypothesis! Teachers must change the traditional concept of classroom to a show room, stimulating student's study enthusiasm greatly, enhancing their self-confidence, and reducing their anxiety.

4.Application of Natural Order Hypothesis to Grammar Teaching. First, the English teaching materials should be in accordance with the natural order of language acquisition. Second, the foreign language teaching should respect learners' individual differences.[4]

5.Application of the Input Hypothesis to Writing Teaching. To improve vocabulary & language input and pay attention to the differences of the students, then implement the output tasks.- output is not Krashen’s idea

6.A questionnaire survey- about what? is carried out to get the current situation of English classroom teaching. Then a test – language test? was conducted before the experiment in both of the classes, and followed by the teaching training for 13 weeks. In the 14th week. At last a post-test was conducted in two classes. And the collected data was analyzed by Excel charts and SPSS 17.0.

**V. PREDICTIONS**: Through the analysis of experimental data, it is hopefully predicted that Krashen's SLA theory can arouse the junior high school students' interest effectively in English learning as well as improve their English level.
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**Effective Features of Form Focused Instruction to Teaching Grammar as a Second Language.**

**I. Introduction.**

 Grammar is one of the basic elements of English and how to teach it effectively has been under dispute for a long time. The main purpose of this study is to show the effectiveness of the form focused form teach grammar and its features to improve learners' language proficiency.

 **II. Theoretical background**

 In recent years, many researchers argue that focus on form instruction need to be integrated with communicative approaches ( Doughy and Williams, 1998; N. Ellis,1993) and a number of empirical studies have revealed that form-focus instruction is successful in promoting learners' second language development. Long (1991) proposed two types of FFI: Focus-on-Form, and Focus-on-Forms. . Long (1991) defined Focus-on-Form as "an instruction that draws students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication" (p. 45-46). On the contrary, Focus-on-Forms instruction involves teaching isolated linguistic forms in separate lessons base on a structural syllabus.

 In focus on form lessons learners are engaged in communicative activities and are provided with explicit instruction of language forms only when necessary (Long, 1991). It combines formal instruction and communicative language use in a way that enables learners to recognize the properties of L2 (Hinkel, E.& Fotos, S., 2002) because if learners consider language forms as a means of communication, they are mainly focused on understanding and conveying meaning. On the other hand, if they want the message to be transmitted correctly they will to some extend be attentive to some linguistic structures (Ellis, 2012). One distinction that Ellis points out between the two types is the organization of teaching. While in focus on forms” linguistic targets must be pre-determined, in “focus on form” they are chosen according to mistakes that learners make during tasks (2012). He adds that corrective feedback is employed in both forms of instruction.

 **Research questions**

1.How teaching grammar through form focused instruction can help to improve learners' explicit knowledge

2. How is form focused instruction utilized in terms of instructional activities

 **III. Research Methodology**.

 **1. Participants**

 The study was conducted in a private school in South Korea and three 9th grade classes with 53 EFL learners and one teacher participated. One class (15 learners) was the control group and followed the normal flow of teaching as shown in the course-book. One class (18 learners) received the indirect CR tasks and the other class (18 learners) received the direct instruction.

 **2. Procedure**

 We identify two major divisions of instructional activities: performance options as in “proactive FFI”, and feedback options as in “reactive FFI”. Feedback options involve strategies that teachers use to provide learners with corrective feedback. Performance options consist of two main categories, consciousness-raising options and language performance options. Although the consciousness-raising options can be direct and indirect, they both involve explicit instruction of linguistic forms. They differ in the way this instruction is presented: in the direct option the teacher explicitly explains the language form either by describing it or by giving instructional materials; in the indirect option the learners’ explicit knowledge is developed through consciousness-raising tasks.

 Two target features were covered in the treatment: two past forms would and used to and two familiarity forms be used to and get used to. The selection was due to the annual plan with a distribution of topics based on the above mentioned course book. First, all the three classes took the pretest which consisted of two exercises with questions about the four structures. The following week the direct and indirect forms of instruction were provided in the experimental groups in 2 classes of 45 minutes per each group and they were all observed by the researcher herself. The control group, meanwhile, received the usual instruction in the same period of time as the treatment groups. The immediate post-test was taken the same day soon after the preplanned activities were all covered. The delayed post-test was applied three weeks later.

 **3. Data analysis**

 Mean scores were calculated for each separate group and test which indicated their average knowledge, immediate gain and longer-term gain. The control group demonstrated the lowest prior knowledge and familiarity with the target features (M=39.428) and the high standard deviation (SD= 10.739) denotes variability and dispersion from the average. Despite a much higher mean score (M=49.333) almost the same variability from the average (SD=9.893) was noticed in the indirect group. The direct group displayed a more average level with less dispersion from the average (M=43.555, SD=6.564). The immediate post-test results were very close to each other. The difference between the highest and lowest scores was only (-1.175), with the control group significantly improving its scores (+14,286).

The delayed post-test was taken approximately three weeks (21-23) after the treatment. The order of mean scores is the same as in the immediate post-test with the indirect group scoring the highest (M=53.111, SD=1.525), the direct group the second (M=52.111, SD=1.357) and the control group scoring the lowest (M=51.141, SD=1.157). However, the control group had the highest gains (+11.714) and the indirect group the lowest (+3.778) . Although the difference in the mean scores between the direct and indirect groups is very low, the direct group posted a higher mean gain (+8.556) which is (+4.778) higher than the indirect one.

 **4. Discussion**

This study sought to investigate the effects of direct grammar instruction and indirect consciousness-raising tasks on developing EFL learners’ explicit knowledge of grammar. The findings suggest that they both can significantly improve learners’ knowledge of grammar with slight differences.
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comments

* Research questions and research design should be consistent
1. **The impact of interlanguage on classroom – Is this the title? Too broad!**

***(I.I.) Introduction***

The social aspects of interlanguage is not usual discussed theme among the scholars yet , it has some inflectional sides towards L2 learners . According to the May .B. Frith “ The Interlanguage theory, that assumes that an active and independent learning mind makes its own generalizations upon grappling with a new language, argues that the errors that a learner makes in the rules of the target language are often in fact "correct" by the rules of an "interlanguage" invented by the learner as a provisional and sufficiently workable subculture. “ To insist on penalizing ail such "mistakes" may have the effect of breaking down the learner's a to organize his or her progress in this way. What is the purpose of this study?

*(I.II.)Theoretical* *Background*

The term ***interlanguage*** was first introduced into the literature by Selinker, in an influential paper published in the International Review of Applied Liguistics in 1972, although it was actually written in 1969 while he was on sabbatical leave at Edinburgh University, working closely with Corder. Since then, various terms have been used synonymously with interlanguage, although there are sorne subtle differences between them: approximative systems, Nemser (1969); idiosyncratic dialects, Corder (1971); learner language systems, Richards and Sampson (1973). Ali these descriptions have one thing in common: the fact that second language learning is seen to be moving in the direction of the target language, with the learner constructing successive systems of phonological, grammatical, and semantic usage ruIes. However, these theories have so far received only limited support from empirical studies.

***(I.III.) Research question – not specific!***

***The question of my analytical research is based on finding out the existence of implication of the interlanguage on the specifically mixed class purposed for the language learning . It should be taken in to point that I have chosen my students regardless of their age in order to clarify what consequences I will get .***

***To explore the answer for the question of my research I used some point of Mr. May B.Frith.***

***(I.IV.) Method***

To explore the influence of the interlanguage on classroom 10 participants were chosen in this experiment. None of them were at the same age but, all of them know the English language well—specify!. To clarify the theory about age , level and language , I have split up these participants into three different categories—specify!. .

***(I.V) Subjects*.**

As I mentioned above, it was an urgent point to split up the students into three distinguished groups . To clarify whether students will be able to think as native and use the language as they are or mix their own thinking with foreign language

***(I.VI) Design***

As design of my research I got a short story and made some questioners in their native language but demanded to answer in English .Besides that I did a survey on them to clarify what results I would have.

During the pre-stage all students were able to comprehend the story given except two student who were a little bit older than the others. They were not able to cover up all writings in the story which made them spent more time than expected. After that , I took the story back and gave them handouts in which were question related to the topic . As it was pointed out before the student had to answer not native but in English. – not clear!

As the post stage of my survey I got all answers to the question and at that moment I measured time spent by them to respond the questions given.

**(I.VII) References – not suitable for any academic paper!**

**1.Mr May B Frith “ implication of interlanguage aspects”**

**2. Web site . Thesaurus. Com**

**A Case Study on L2 Development of Children Aged from 2 to 5 Years Old in the Family English Enlightenment Environment- narrow this down!**

**I.Introduction:** At present, more and more Chinese parents expect their children to learn English well. However, language acquisition requires children to have the ability to learn language and the corresponding external environment. Children aged 2 to 5 have the suitable language environment themselves for children’s L2 development. So how 2 to 5 years old children develop their L2 in the family English enlightenment environment was carried on in this case study. Though case study may cost several years, this research conducted follow-up study on the author’s two daughters for as long as 5 years. By observing, interviewing and recording the different stages of their L2 development. Therefore, This study is to explore the possible problems and solutions when ordinary Chinese families create family English enlightenment environment for children from 2 to 5 years old, and to learn the law of children’s L2 development and L2 acquisition strategies in the process of children’s English development, so as to provide a real case of early childhood English enlightenment for early childhood educators and enrich the research content of children’s SLA.

**II.Theoretic background:** Since the 1950s, different researchers have studied the cognitive, psychological and linguistic processes of SLA from the perspectives of sociology, psychology and applied linguistics. Some typical ones are Krashen’s Input Hypothesis, Swain’s Output Hypothesis and Long’s Interaction Hypothesis. Rod Ellis points out that the theory of SLA mainly focuses on the following four aspects to study the process of language acquisition: (1) Interlanguage; (2) External factors affecting SLA: input environment, quality and quantity of input, interaction of various external factors and output of second language, etc. (3) Internal factors of L2 learners including individual differences of L2 learners and the psychological, physiological, cognitive, emotional and cross-cultural factors caused by differences. (4) The Cognitive Mechanism of SLA: Psychological Cognitive Process of SLA, Mother Tongue Transfer Process, Construction Process of Cognitive Mechanism, etc. According to International Reading Association and National Association for the Education of Young Children (1998), the development of language and literacy skills in a child’s first language is important for the development of skills in a second language and, therefore, should be considered the first step in the range of expectations for children learning English as a second language.

**III. Research questions:** 1. what are the characteristics of vocabulary, type of vocabulary and the development of acquired order in kinds’ vocabulary acquisition? 2. what are the characteristics of the development of sentence sequence, sentence pattern and sentence length in the process of kids’ sentence acquisition? Be specific! How can you investigate this comprehensive study?

**IV. Methods:** - participants, research design, data collection! **1**. Combination of Descriptive Research and Interpretative Research(reference!). It not only describes the factual experience, but also explains the actual phenomenon. Describing and explaining the process and manifestations of children’s English language competence development under the English acquisition family environment created by ordinary Chinese families with the application of second language acquisition theory, so as to explore the objective law of children's English enlightenment development- how? Explain it. **2.** Observation method. In the research of this paper, we use listening and watching to observe children’s L2 development directly without interfering with their natural state.- how? Voice recording? **3.** Quantitative analysis method. In the process of researching phonetics and vocabulary, I collated the collected log and record, counted the phonetic errors of my daughter, recognized and output the number of words, and analyzed them with tables.

**V. References**
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Gender and second language acquisition teens and pre-teens- be specific!

**Introduction**

In learning second language genders role is still controversial, researchers seem to be coming round to the idea that some interests and behaviours are naturally more prevalent in one sex than the other. This research will distinguish between male and female in getting knowledge of second language. Differences in second language learning can be found in motivation, attitude, aptitude, personality, learning styles, intelligence, personal beliefs, and identity on second language learning or even first language acquisition.

**Research** **questions- not relevant to your research purpose!**

1. Identify the pupil’s level of speaking- is this the section ‘method’?. Examine pupils body language eye contact?- for what? while answering to the question;

 2. To make an interview with each class’s members;-for what? is this the section ‘method’?

 **Theoretical** **background**

 According to Montse Rivas “Female and male brains are different and programmed for different tasks in language use. The male and female brains had different structures which made them more different. In discourse analysis, men tend to interrupt more, dominate and control conversations and they are better at reasoning and analysis, though women are better at memorizing, which might explain why girls learn their first language earlier and better than boys”. Attitude also effects the value given to the acquisition of the language, personal goals, self-esteem, efficacy, which in return effect motivation. The social construct of language learning as a female activity may have led to the male belief that they will not be successful at language learning ( Kissiau: 2006), which might be explain their much lower motivation for second language learning and consequently their lower rate of success both in acquisition and performance. There are also difference between the genders about their willingness to engage in contacts with other cultures and languages or participation in public.

**Research methodology**

 This study has a qualitative research design. Within this framework, a high qualified English teacher and two classes A and B which both classes consist of 20 elementary school children in the same gender. A class consists of only male and B is only female. The children are teens and pre-teens who has elementary knowledge in English- need score!. The period of each class is 6 months. First step is to observe forty five minute class of each class. Importantly the given materials for them should be the same. Then the interviews are recorded. Content analysis procedures are followed to analyze recorded interviews. Observation notes are utilized to evaluate and triangulate interview data and draw conclusions. It takes 2 months to have hard data from the observation. During the period the answers of the first and second research question are obtained. Before the second procedure a short survey containing harder speaking question is conducted. After having the whole required data about research question one and two, the second procedure is carried**.** The both groups are taught in the current traditional way with CD- books and making discussion about any topics. In your ‘introduction’ -Differences in second language learning can be found in motivation, attitude, aptitude, personality, learning styles, intelligence, personal beliefs, and identity on second language learning or even first language acquisition- then rather than the class observation you might want to conduct a survey.

**Discussion**

 Presumable findings of the study indicate that EFL teacher who are interviewed and whose classes are observed utilized almost the same teaching techniques and materials that are commonly used in Uzbekistan, which is contrary to suggestions in earlier research that the genders have different learning styles. Moreover, they had several challenges or problems and did not know what to do to solve them and simply went on with the help of teacher. However, I presume that group A (male) gets lower result than the group B (female). Female acquire quite stable increase in learning. The idea of the gender gap or the gender differences in language learning are basically the result of social factors: the “socially constructed gender differences” (Sunderland:2000). It might be true that teacher may be more encouraging with girls, being more participative and motivated in the classroom and also by producing tidier and more consistent assignments which unbalance the teacher’s sympathy and might affect school scores, but they also tend to devote more time and attention to male students, which should rebalance the situation. In general, there is little evidence
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**Analysis of**  **grammatical word order in SLA- be specific!**

 1. **Introduction**

 Grammatical rule is among other difficulties found in the process of learning other languages. This truth also applies to those who are studying English in different levels of education. Second language learners usually make mistakes in certain grammatical rules. According to Celce-Murcia and Hilles (1988) language can be seen as a type of rule-governed behaviour, and grammar, then, is a subject of those rules which govern the configurations that the morphology and syntax of a language assume. For example the rules of English word order allow us to accept the following sentences as grammatically correct:

1. Where are you going?
2. The man kicked the ball

 However, those same rules force us to reject the following sentences, which contain typical EFL learner errors, as grammatically correct;

1. Where you are going?
2. The ball kicked the man.

 By changing the word order in the sentences the syntactic relationships between the elements are changed. Of course, such sentences can not be accepted as correct in EFL learners’ production.

**Aim of the study**

 The present research aimed to identify and analyse grammatical difficulties and facilitations of word orders in sentences commonly made by second language learners of English. For the purpose of this research I will investigate two groups of young second language students whose first language Uzbek and Chinese and in particular, I will give data about the acquisition of word order by looking at the subject, verb and object position in sentences.- not clear! Do you mean L1 influence on L2 word order?

 2. **Theoretical background**

 Word order is a part of grammar which plays an important role in information structuring of a sentence because ‘word order is one of the primary devices language offer speacers to express who does what to whom’(Gershko-Stove & Goldin-Medow,2002:377).

 According to Dulay et al (1982) the basic word order is also one of the first rules acquired by learners acquiring English as L2. However, this has been shown for simple declarative sentences only. It is well known that word order in questions (where an auxiliary inversion rule is required) or indirect questions is not controlled until later in the acquisition process, well after the basic word order of simple declarative sentences has been acquired and established. This shows that, as one of the central aspects of SLA, word order acquisition can also be challenging to L2 learners because the word order features of their L1 and L2 are often different.

 3. **Research question**

 In second language acquisition, the knowledge of the native language(L1) in acquisition of a foreign language(L2) can indeed have a facilitation or inhabitation effect on the learner’s progress in mastering a new language. Traditionally, facilitation effect is known as positive transfer, while inhibition is considered negative transfer. This study focuses on errors based on grammatical word order and similarities and differences of L1 and L2 related to SVO position in sentence. From this prospective, this study will answer following questions:

1. What are the most common WO errors in English sentences made by L2 learners in Uzbekistan and China.

2.what are the differences of their English learning process?.

- you need to specify the L1 influence here

 4. **Methodology**

 English word order, compared to other languages, has often been described as fixed. In thi study Contrastive analysis and Misordering methods were used. Learner’s mother tongue and target language are compared in the process of CA. According to CA, similarities and differences between those two languages help to predict errors that learners would be likely to make.

 Participants in this survey were from Uzbekistan and China. The students in both groups are the same old, about 16 years old and the same level. There were 15 students whose first language is Uzbek, and 15 Chinese first language in each group. They were given 20 sentences which was consisted of different aspects such as SVO and adjective, adverb, gerund. They were asked to translate these sentences into English in an hour. After doing this task, the data collected for analysis. According to the result of analysis Chinese students made less errors than Uzbek learners because Chinese sentence word order is same as English word order(SVO) by contrast Uzbek word order(SOV) is different from English. In complex sentences translation like relative clauses both groups errors are same related to misordering.
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**English Learners’ Thinking Characteristics in Extracting Lexical Chunks in Time-Limited Writing – not clear**

1. **Introduction**

In the field of L2 acquisition, more and more attention has been paid to whether L2 learners’ language output process is based on grammatical rules or not. As far as the use of chunks by Chinese college students in English writing is concerned, although some researches helps us to understand some of the situations in which Chinese students use lexical chunks in their L2 writing texts, but how they produce lexical chunks in the process of L2 writing has not been explored.

1. **Theoretical background**

Psycholinguists (Nattinger & DeCarrico, 1992) believe that the normal use of a language is the process of choosing prefabricated chunks and connecting them together, because there are a large number of prefabricated language units in human memory. These prefabricated chunks are frequently used and each consists of several words, but contains more information than individual words. Native speakers’ language output process is usually automated because they store and use a large number of prefabricated chunks rather than follow grammatical rules to create language.

**3. Research question**

This study mainly focuses on the following questions: 1, what are the thinking characteristics of students in extracting chunks in time-limited English writing--- not clear! ; 2, are there any differences in the thinking characteristics of extracting lexical chunks among college students of different grades? – you mean proficiency effect?

1. **Method**

The research materials were collected from the six students during writing experiments. Vocal thinking, retrospective interviews and the observational records of the researchers are applied during their writing process. Firstly, each participant was trained to think aloud separately. The training includes three sub-tasks: first, do a math problem that needs to be solved step by step, and report their thinking process orally while solving the problem; then read an article in an English newspaper and describe the text and content orally while reading; finally, choose an interesting topic in the newspaper article they just read, write down their feelings, and ask them to narrate the thinking while writing. The whole training process is recorded, and the recording is replayed after each task, so that students can understand the quality of the completion of the voiced thinking task and the links needing attention.

Then formal English writing tasks require students to write an English narrative of about 300 words in 45 minutes. Each student completes the writing task independently. In each student's writing, the researcher carefully observed the students’ writing process, recording the pause, self-questioning, tone change, stress, facial expression and so on. At the end of the writing experiment, according to the playback recordings and observation records, the researcher conducted immediate retrospective interviews with the students to enable them to recall and explain the pauses in the writing process.

Then, the researchers translated the students’ voiced thinking into written material. The pauses and facial expressions related to chunk production are also recorded in the transcription materials. In the transcription format, if the student repeats the content of the previous sentence or paragraph, the part of the repetition is in italics. If the student writes down the sentence as he speaks it as part of his composition, the sentence is underlined. If students delete the original sentence or have special facial expressions in their writing, these behaviors are shown in English brackets. Data analysis is a multi-round qualitative analysis of voiced thinking transcribed text.

-I don’t see the relation between your research and the ‘lexical chunks’. Do you want to investigate the effect of ‘thinking aloud’ process on the use of lexical chunks in writing?
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