

AN OUTLINE ON ACQUISITION AND LEARNING

0 INTRODUCTION

As the title might suggest, some aspects concerning a related area of language development as well as some theoretical background concerning language learning or acquisition are going to be analysed in this short paper. The reason is that I believe that misunderstanding and lack of information, might lead us to one of the main reasons of error production.

A very brief outline from the behavioural to the procedural theory, a very quick look at the subject of acquisition itself versus the professional affair: learning, some references to Skinner's work, several aspects given by Chomsky and arguments for and against in later research will also be considered and briefly analysed.

1. FROM ANIMAL TO HUMAN COMMUNICATION

I would like to begin with some ideas about animal communication and I want to consider what may be innate, what theories of language learning had been performed so far? and what similarities or dissimilarities might have to be analysed between the acquisition and the learning situation in order to clarify this point. Thus, I'd like to begin with some considerations about the animal communication system in concern with language.

Firstly, in animal experience language can't be observed. If there is a use of language it can't be observed. Human language is a very complex form of behaviour and so it is much less easy to say what is actually observed or what a response actually means that it is observed.

Secondly, animal communication does not have all the design features of human language, and researchers are very often optimistic in their claim that there seems to be strong evidence for creativity in some animals, in some high intelligent animals, for instance 'cuckoo'. The way she can repeat words, she might come out with: get out!, get out! and this shows at the same time both a strong knowledge of sentence collocation and a strong unknowledge of language realization and human behaviour. It is an explosive emotional collocation, normally used in a derogatory sense due limited capacity and ability, because, obviously, she is thinking and using of the most insulting words she can find, but perhaps structure dependence has not been proved at all in any animal.

It is not our purpose to enter into a strictly defined behaviour of human language, here, but unlikely animals, how do we get to that? Perhaps we should accept that there must be a different scope for animal communication and that animals may even be aware of some kinds of

communication humans may find too difficult to comprehend. Some scholars have studied the acquisition of science by chips, and asked themselves some questions: what do they mean by chips? and then ask, do they mean the same thing chips and humans? It seems to be accepted that intelligent animals seem to be capable of some of the characteristics of human language, but there is no evidence that they have a free disposition to acquire language, whereas humans acquire language with ease and they seem to have a natural innate program to do so.

The third point might be that there is physiological evidence concerning the fact that the human body is adapted for production speech and this is not so in animals. There is nothing peculiar in the structure of men's lung's but human breathing seems peculiarly adapted to speech. No one teaches us how to breathe in order to speak, though they may teach us how to breathe in order to sing or play flute. We ought to have a vocal auditory tract, lips and tongue and larynx, which appear specially suited for the production speech and this does not seem to have a complete correspondence in animals.

From the work of neurologists we can deduce that there is evidence in human materialisation. There seems to be a natural process occurring between the ages of two and adolescence in the left hemisphere of the brain and the area of control of speech appears to become progressively dominant. Krishna (1977) signals that this is complete by the age of five. (1967) says that this is complete by the age of adolescence. It is then, a fact that brain materialisation is very important for linguists as the division of the brain comprises the left hemisphere being peculiarly adapted to certain kind of development in the personality, since lateralisation may be linked to the critical period for language acquisition and there is no confirmed comparable phenomenon of lateralisation in animals.

2. BIOLOGICAL PROGRAMMING EVIDENCE IN HUMAN'S LINGUISTIC ABILITY

There seems to be evidence of biological programming in humans for innate language. Aitchinson (1983), following Lennberg ideas, suggests that at least six factors need to be present for biologically triggered behaviour. Any concrete manifestation of language seems to fit these characteristics.

Firstly, the behaviour occurs before it is actually necessary. It is a fact that the first thing that happens after birth is the baby starts crying, and the doctor makes sure that this is what happens after the baby is born. It seems that language develops before the child has a need to communicate in order to survive. The second point is, that the appearance of something is not a result of conscious decision. A child does not decide he is suddenly going to start to talk on a specific day. Thirdly, the emergence of something is not triggered by external factors in the environment, nothing in the child environment suddenly sets him off to talking. Fourthly, the biologically triggered behaviour do exist as there is likely to be a critical period for the acquisition of language behaviour. A child brought up in isolation never seems to learn to speak properly and research shows there is a biological starting point for language acquisition but it is very less clear that there is a biologically scheduled finishing point. Thus, it is not easy to

tell when someone has finished acquiring the language. Fifthly, direct teaching and intensive practice have very little effect on acquisition. Inflections may be taught to a child and the child knows the existence of 'held' but he stills says 'hold it'. So, there seems to be an innate syntactic 'block'. The child is waiting for something to happen inside and is not dependant on or influenced by external corrections and in language the correction factor can not be made to work until the child is ready to make a particular linguistic generalization involved. In fact, there are instances when direct teaching and coaching can appear to hinder acquisition. Finally, the sixth factor that needs to be present for biologically triggered behaviour is that there is a regular series of achievement milestones and this can in a general way be correlated with age. Thus, it seems to be evident that all children seem to pass through various stages following a particular order, even though the rate of learning is not identical.

Aitchison (1983) shows the language stage at the biological trigger, the beginning age of the emergence of a particular kind of language and it conceals that by the time we get out to 18 months, we are probably entering the roll of syntax. There is no doubt that children suddenly put together two words, they perform formal telegraphs with a primary collocative sense, but the prepositions are missing, the apostrophes are missing and words expressing grammatical functions may still be missing. Word inflections follow. Not all children follow exactly the same patterns, not have the same rate of progress, and there follow the difficult areas of acquisition, questions and negatives. A lot of research has been done into these areas and then for complex structures at the age of 5, and by 5 a substantial part of the grammatical system of the language has been mastered by children, and from that age one goes on developing

Krashen (1982) has listed the order of acquisition of grammatical morphemes in English as second language in children and adults and he makes the point that the child's second language order acquisition may be different from the first language order. It does not seem to be important if this occurs in that precise order but different roots of 2nd language learners have great similarities in the order in which they seem to acquire the language. Thus, there are similarities and dissimilarities there; what we are concerned with is that language appears to have all the characteristics of biological triggered behaviour as humans do seem to be innately predisposed to acquire language. However, language is not governed only by internal mechanisms, it does require external stimulus and indeed it will not develop fully until that external stimulus is there and that external stimulus must be reached. What seems much more difficult to decide if we accept that there's something innate happening is exactly what is innate, and if it is innate why are we involved in that process, why if we are involved in 2nd *or* foreign language learning, should we look at child acquisition in L1, in the mother tongue. I think you do that for various reasons, and we consider this important for various reasons, but data is immediately accessible for many researchers who have their own children and for many hours the children are there and it seems to be a fact that researchers very often base their research on their own children and the development inside their own child, and children are the best examples of language learners that we actually have.

Therefore, it seems sensible to study how they do it, to see if there are any features that can be generalized to fit language learning at later stages. That is a very good reason why we should look at child acquisition. Another one might be because several 2nd language teaching learners claim that learning a 2nd language recapitulates learning the 1st language and we, therefore, need a description and the comparison of both. It has also been argued that learning a 2nd language derives towards the process by which the 1st language was learnt, during a critical age period. Therefore learning seems to be more efficient if the two experiences are closer in time and this is seen in the introduction of foreign languages, perhaps, at primary school age, and perhaps also in the attempts of some families to make children bilingual at a very young age. There are claims that neither the behaviourist nor the cognitive code information processing of approaches to learning explain all the crucial factors in child's language acquisition. So, a 2nd language teacher needs a description of what happened in language acquisition as far as we know, to understand how learning a new language may be different from the acquisition of the 1st language.

3. SOME THEORIES OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AND ACQUISITION

Needless to say that theories of language learning and acquisition can help us to see what is happening to decide whether a child is born with a blank tablet, a *tabula rasa*, waited to be imprinted or whether it is pre-programmed with a structure of language universals.

What has research into language learning told us so far? Research into language learning has increased enormously in the last 40 years, but since the 1950s, psychologists had been of a very great importance in offering theories of language learning and there had been 3 basic approaches to describe processes of language learning. Firstly, there is language as 'learnt skilled behaviour' and this, based on Skinner's principles, is associated with the behaviourists stimulus-response. This theory of language learning shows the importance of the external factors under the significance of the experience of the environment. It stresses the frequency with which utterances are used in the child environment, their imitation of language uses in his environment and it also stresses the child's learning at the same time that reinforces what is needed to develop language proficiently. This seems to be associated with the automatic way of processing and the person on whom this is developed, of course, remains passive.

The second process of language learning is 'language due as innate behaviour'. This mentalist approach is associated with the linguist Chomsky. Though his ideas took very long time to penetrate into the classroom and he didn't write, specifically, for teachers in the language classroom, Chomsky's review of Skinner did hold a revolution in the ideas about language learning and after 1960, his contribution began to play a dominant role. His theory of transformational grammar (TG) was a sort of exploration, a sort of experience in language. Chomsky (1969) held that, animal behaviour was not relevant to obligations on human language. Language is far more complex, far more unpredictable, less measurable, far more creative than Skinner has suggested. Furthermore, he found that Skinner's observations would be premature because we need a better understanding of the linguistic system before we could begin

to make observations. Skinner by stressing external stimuli misunderstood the nature of language. Chomsky, under the innate hypothesis has signalled that children have an innate knowledge of the properties and structure dependence and that they are genetically pre-programmed to know in advance what language is like. Chomsky (1969) also held that every utterance has inside an internal structure which must be understood by the hearer as for a lot more is going on than what appear to be there on the surface. Thus, an utterance has to be recognized on two levels: 'A surface structure' and an 'abstract deep structure level' where internalized sets of rules are known without there have been conscious knowledge of them. What is important, here, is what the children seem to know about deep structure, surface structure and transformations, or so Chomsky held. According to him, language learning consists in internalizing a transformational generative grammatical model. This is proved to be a very controversial theory and even though Chomsky has now modified his views a little, he still holds to the view that we are innate equipped with knowledge about the grammatical system. At first, we have a special sensitivity to pictures of the grammars of human language that are no specific to any given language, but we are able, then, to recognize how this features manifest themselves in the particular language we are learning, too.

Apart from that, all the child research of the 1960s and the work of people like Piaget, concluded that children under seven were very restricted intellectually. In this line, operating with the transformational grammar, would rather go dramatic. How could a child work out the rules of a highly complex system like language? Chomsky answered that the child must be born with a high specific predisposition to do so and be born, therefore, with a LAD, a language acquisition device. Now, this was an extraordinary compelling idea. You have a box located in the central nervous system in the left hemisphere of the brain and that receives all the linguistic input and that, then, goes to be tested as hypothesis forms, as the child creates his own language system. Certainly, children have need of experience too, but they only survive going to the processes that are already there. Thus, the child is seen as an active and cognitive element in the learning process, but the mentalists denied the roll of external factors and that of the environment in the learning process. Chomsky seems to be substantially correct when he assumes that the child has an innate hypothesis making device and he makes hypotheses about the rules. However, it is very probable that these hypotheses fluctuate in children as they are not rigidly controlled and they do not appear at specific times. Then, this does not seem to be the same sort of hypothesis rigidity that a scientist is accustomed to.

In the 1970s, with the emergence of the process or procedural theory there was a reaction against the other two extreme procedures: the behaviourists and the mentalists. There is a very important shift to emphasis away from the 'innate' versus 'to learn linguistic ability', towards the child's general cognitive capacity to discover structure and meaning in the language around him, and perceivable in a particular situation. This would bring in a lot of non-linguistic features, non-verbal communication, etc. (i.e., the child has general cognitive faculties). It is no just language. It is everything else that he learns in the world around him, everything he sees, the visual impact together with the linguistic impact.

Donaldson (1978), feels that Chomsky's idea of the LAD is in a way as automatic and mechanic as the behaviourist process. She understands that Chomsky's LAD is like a formal data processor, i. e., in goes the linguistic data and out comes de grammar in the child. She feels that one needs to consider the living child in the entirety of his personality with all the stimuli he takes into himself. Aitchison (1983), states that we also need not to go over for, because although it is fashionable now to oppose Chomsky, we do need to keep an open mind. It does not seem true that the child comes equipped with a knowledge of language organization on two layers of surface structure and deep structure, it seems much more probable that the child does treat language as a puzzle to solve and that he uses innate strategies to do this. What are these strategies is not clear and there is very much contradictory research on this. It seems evident that there are great gaps in our knowledge of these strategies and Wilkins (1986) makes the observation that whether human beings have specific innate language learning ability or more general cognitive abilities doesn't really matter when in comes to teaching a language.

4. ACQUISITION VERSUS LEARNING

What do most people understand by 'acquisition and learning? Well, by acquisition we usually think of something of learning as incidental, as a subconscious picking up of the language in naturalistic community situations. Children seem to do this with their mother tongue and quite possible with second language acquisition too; their mother will see they are acquiring the language and that they are only aware that they are communicating. Adults, too, can acquire a language. The ability to pick up a language doesn't seem to disappear at adolescence despite the critical age theory. But the process of adult acquisition may be very different from that of child acquisition. Learning, on the other hand, seems to indicate a conscious deliberate stage formal approach to the knowledge of the rules of grammar. We can refer to an explicit knowledge of the rules, we are aware of them in the classroom, we can talk about them and discussed them if we wish, we can talk a lot about language and about grammar, and language teaching appears to be directed at language learning and not at acquisition, but it is perfectly possible to encourage acquisition acceptably in the classroom. Though there are distinctions between acquisition and learning these two are not opposed factors, although, perhaps they can be considered as two ends of a continuum, and in certain situations they merge very well. I think, one also needs to be aware that the distinction between acquisition and learning can be interpreted differently by different writers according to the situation they are involved in. For instance, acquisition can be acquisition of the mother tongue in an L1 situation and 'learning' can be the 'learning' of L2 in a mother tongue environment. Acquisition can also be the acquisition of a second language in a second language environment, while the 'learning' of L2 is the foreign language learning under different conditions and in different environments. Acquisition and learning can both be used in discussions of simultaneous learning or nearly simultaneous learning of two languages at the same time. Taking this into account, when discussing about 'acquisition and learning' one needs to be very clear about the specific situation one has in mind.

5. CHARACTERISTICS OF ACQUIRING AND LEARNING A LANGUAGE

Let us list some points very briefly to show the differences of behaviour of both 'acquisition and learning, considering 'acquisition' as the 'acquisition' of the mother tongue by a child, and 'learning' as the 'learning' of an L2 in an L1 environment by an older person.

The first point to consider concerns linguistic and cognitive development. From the point of view of acquisition, language development takes place in the infant at the same time as the knowledge about the world development. It is very difficult to separate cognitive from linguistic development in the child when you come to consider learning. In the learning situation, usually, languages are learnt after language acquisition is more or less complete in one or more concrete realizations of language, when the language performance is already established and the mental processes are well developed. However, it is not necessary to make a distinction between the informal and the formal situations. It is probable that the situation of a child acquiring the first language is an informal situation. On the contrary, the older learner, obviously, should have more subtle expectations about language, about the culture of the world, about everything else that goes with the language.

The second point to consider is the effect of the environment. Within the acquisition stage the child is in constant touch with an enormous amount of linguistically unstructured, uncontrolled language in his immediate environment. The emphasis is on speech and the child is obviously subjected to natural speech distortions, he becomes aware of redundancy, without realising it, he becomes aware of elisions, he also becomes aware of the noise disturbance, etc. It is all quite subconscious. The stage of the learning do appear to be sequenced, from oral comprehension, he goes to oral production, so he hears, then speaks, then reads and then writes. However, language learners and I'm talking about native speakers influence, deep back in the time they have spent on actually learning the language. How do we know that this language learning is taking up ones entire time? How do we know how much time any particular infant is busy with the language? He might be busy doing all sort of other things, taking in all sort of other stimuli. In the learning situation: the exposure to the language is smaller, it is also non-continuous, there is not necessarily stress on the spoken language. Older audio-visual or audio-lingual courses maintain the L1 skill order presentation, i. e., oral comprehension, oral production, reading and writing, but this includes flexibility and responds to individual needs. Adults very often prefer simultaneous presentation to facilitate learning. Besides, reliance on speech alone seems to cause problems. It causes problems of memory storage as well, and it may direct students to create their own writing system in order to record what they feel they have learnt and this can create problems later. Language teaching in schools are provided- for about 6 to 9 (3 each concrete manifestations of language) hours a week, over 40 weeks every year. Thus, it seems that one year in the classroom is the equivalent of 1 to 3 weeks contact in an acquisition situation. Therefore, it is necessary in a teaching situation to organize and to restrict sequences of language in the learning situation. As with the infants, the adults can understand what they can produce, but in the learning situation if the learner's exposure of the language is only too carefully controlled language, this might be the only type he will com-

prehend, and, perhaps it is the only type he will want to produce and so the teacher might have the problem of the difficulty of transfer between the class and the world outside. How do we get students to transfer this learning?

The third point, concerns the scope of personal contact. In the acquisition situation, the child contact takes many different contacts, the parents, all the children, all the people he meets, all the different ages; It is also important to remember he often has a very deep link especially with his mother at this point. In the learning situation, the contact will only be with the teacher, and the teacher will be a non-native speaker in most occasions, Teachers and students have a lot of problems: lack of motivation, lack of external stimuli, lack of the variety of linguistic experience and personal contact, the relationship with the teacher, etc. Students certainly lack elements of the rapport they feel with members of their own families and besides, the relationship with the teacher can be very aggressive and, disturbing.

The fourth point concerns the manifestation of the forms. In the acquisition realization, the child produces language for other people and for himself in imaginative monologues. He often talks to himself, makes sad stories; his language is partly imitative and partly his own emergence, but it is the child who selects what to imitate and the language he produces is language for use; thus, performance in the acquisition situation is seen as the manifestation of communicative confidence of language for use. On the contrary, in the learning situation the student does produce language for other people, he doesn't usually involve himself in imaginative monologues in a foreign language, there isn't especially large imitative elements even if the choices appear to be. Of course, there are choices, but those choices are often limited if you really have a free choice of language in the language class. Imitation ensures that the correct form is produced and it seems to be very difficult for the student to try out the occasions when the particular form may be incorrect and it is the teacher who selects whom the student is going to do practical exercises with.

The fifth point concerns the roll of grammatical explanations. In the acquisition system grammatical rules are rarely explained to the child and, there may be many grammatical rules the child mixed all at once, without explanations being given. In the learning situation many older expect a rule to be there and they are expected to be explained. Then, where do you teach deductively or inductively there is no difference, i. e., you can either give the grammar rules at the beginning of the lesson, so that it is there first or you might expect the student to get the rules through a process of problem solving, and this doesn't make any difference. The point is that the grammatical rule is there and it is presented at a particular point to the student and one grammatical rule at a time is the usual order.

The sixth point concerns language learning and language use. Language learning and language use in an acquisition situation are one the same activity. The child generalizes his own knowledge of the language beyond what he has actually experienced. He seems to have his own checking system regards the variation techniques used by adults. In the learning situation, language learning and language use may be quite distinct, perfectly separated activities and the learner too, can make mistakes in overgeneralizing but he makes his mistakes in a

different way from the child in the acquisition situation. Like the child learning his mother tongue he can overgeneralize a rule, he can extend the rule but the learner can also overgeneralize, making mistakes by reference to what happens in his own language, his L1, and that, of course, can not happen in the first language acquisition situation because the child is learning his own language.

The seventh point is related to meaningful context. In the acquisition situation an effort is made to ensure that language is meaningful to the child. Adults point to objects, they simplify their language, they try to get their meanings across and they consciously ask themselves the question, why their children grow up right left and centre? In the learning situation an effort may be made to ensure that language and language practice is meaningful, but it is actually very difficult to select a learning material that is going to be totally meaningful and totally stimulating to every student in your group all the time. It's very much easier to do this in a one off situation, but when you have the same class for a long period of time it's very difficult to ensure that everything works.

The eighth point analyses learning acquisition attitude to the language. On the one hand, in the acquisition situation, there is a possibility of learning two or more languages proficiently in first language-learning conditions. This is very often called 'bilingualism' situation as the child is learning different registers, different languages for different occasions: For example, one language at school, another language for home. Adults can employ languages in bilingual situation as well but it is very commonly observed that the child learns more effectively, especially in the pronunciation system. This may be, of course, apart from linguistic ability, because adults tend to learn L2, a second language, only to the level that it is necessary to be able to communicate or because the conditions to the learning are less favourable. However, adults can call on development learning strategies, they can maintain concentration and motivation and their actual achievement level may be ahead of times. On the other hand, in the learning situation, the teaching of the second language out of the first already learnt is totally different. There seems to be a lot of activity for preparation for language use and not necessarily in the classroom, a great deal of engaging in communication and many times I feel 'roll-play' dialogues and other type of exercises are not real forms of communication at all because the student had not had enough thinking on that kind of language. Teachers may also attempt to state students beyond the level the student himself may have chosen to stop at.

The ninth point concerns mutilation of language. Whereas, in the acquisition situation, language can be mutilated immediately in the environment, in the learning situation language is not necessarily used outside the classroom.

The tenth point refers to the critical age factor as an element of learning control. Language acquisition is possibly completed by puberty although the whole amount of basic language might not be required by then as there is strong evidence for the critical period acquisition of language. However, in language learning the basic amount is not subject to a critical age period. Learning L2, another language, is a matter of reducing, existing conceptual strategies and not starting with structures. A teacher would have to realise that the learner may already

have an acquired store of language; So the language items he is presenting may not necessarily be new to him at all, and he attempts to introduce a second language at an early age because a critical age theory has not been very successful.

The eleventh point exists only under the learning control of language and constitutes a very important element of research because is the emergence of the language learning factor attitude which very rarely might have parallel with acquisition.

6. CONCLUSION

What conclusions can we reach about the acquiring and the learning systems of a language? There has been above too much research into child acquisition of L1 and much recently research into second language learning (error analysis, for instance, has been very useful), but many questions remain totally unanswered. The whole question of whether the process has become articulated in L2 is the same as becoming articulated in the mother tongue has not been satisfactorily resolved. There are obvious differences in the conditions under which acquisition and learning take place, the attempt to recreate first language learning condition in teaching a second language ignores differences that do exist even in a more naturalistic second language learning conditions but the differences do exist because the internal development of the learner is different.

How far age can be used as a factor, as a guide to language development, is available even in the acquisition of the mother tongue. Children vary in this respect as in any others, and if the problem is complex in young children it is even more in adults where the effects of age of speed in the order acquisition is unknown.

Whether the psychological processes involved in acquisition and learning are similar it is not easy to assess either. Similarity does seem to be present in the acquisition of the grammatical system and there are aspects of English Grammar which foreign adults and native children appear to learn in a similar order and researchers have studied samples of this behaviour. Thus, firstly, language stages appear to have a biological trigger related to brain growth, even though the rates of learning vary from child to child, so that by adolescence, a great part of child grammatical knowledge of his mother tongue would have been acquired. Language emergence follows at inner time clock and the six pictures of biologically triggered behaviour seem to be present in language. Secondly, humans unlike other animals seem innately predisposed to acquire language and there seem to be biological adaptations in the human body for this matter. For example, a localisation of language in the left hemisphere of the brain, somewhere between the age of 2 and adolescence. However, lateralisation of the brain is a very controversial view of research. In this situation, what we know is that there seems to be a biological adaptation but at the same time a rich verbal environment is necessary for the development of a language. So, language is natural behaviour, nature triggered up the behaviour, but nature is carefully natured of different elements by people, by environment and immediately, as a result, the correspondent development is being gradually produced.

It is true that there had been extensive research into the child's acquisition of his mother tongue. All this child acquisition is a very valuable study because a language teacher needs a description of what is happening in language acquisition to try and understand how learning a new language might be different or similar. A lot of detailed research has been attempted at all these stages of acquisition, for instance one woman wrote a whole book on her son's memory before he went to sleep, a whole solid book on just one topic, as detailed as that. Many researchers have written on mother ease (i. e., a simplified language a mother uses to a child. Many articles have been written on the child's acquisition of negative and the interrogative because they are difficult areas of language. There are similar patterns in the acquisition for L2 learners, for instance McDonough (1981) also gives good examples, in the work of the English negative, development of the English negative. Thus, it is evident that from theories and research into first language acquisition one might be able to draw conclusions for second language teaching and learning, and for foreign languages too, and through that we can contrast acquisition and learning when they are in clearly opposed settings. It is also evident that for teaching purposes it matters very much whether language is being acquired as a mother tongue or whether is being learnt as a second language or whether is being learnt in a totally vile environment, or whether is being learnt in a foreign country; It also matters in what age it is acquired or learnt, and motivation matters a great deal. Thus, the shading of acquisition into learning is something that happens with different degrees in different situations.

Besides, it seems evident that if you are using the language acquisition device the child can learn any language with ease, but without it, the language acquisition is impossible. This means that a child has a knowledge of language universals which he, then, applies to specific languages. He makes hypothesis about the language and, perhaps he has an evaluation procedure choosing between one kind of rule and another until he comes to the most efficient rule. In this line, children follow rules they devise themselves, they are not copying adults utterances, but this is not a case of language in and grammar out. However, this is where McDonough (1981) criticises Chomsky, interpreting this as a very rigid approach and signalling that this is not like that at all.

What modern researchers have found is that it is not like an absolutely straight fishing line, that you are really in, all at one go, with the nice grammar fish on the end of it, which you, then, put in a bag and you through your line out to catch another rule. That system may be operating but there are a lot of backward and forward movements, ups and downs that go on in between before a hypothesis is finally accepted and children do not make a hypothesis, abandon it like putting a fish in a bag, and then go and look for another one to make. The stages of hypothesis-making are very fluent, the rule waves over a long period of time. It goes backward, it goes forward, It's accepted, It's rejected etc., before it's finally abandoned or adopted, and there may be many situations in between.

It is possible, now, in the light of modern research to reject the extreme form of the assumption that children are born with the knowledge of language universals and to reject Chomsky's view of about 40 years ago, that children are born with the in-built knowledge and the inter-

nalize transformational grammar. It is not very clear the fact that we are moving from the surface structure through a process of transformation until we get to the deep structure through transformation stages as more recent research indicates that children instead seem to have certain expectations about language. In accordance with their expectations they treat language as a puzzle and they acquire mature speech. Children appear to learn separate factors and only later acquire an effective set of rules. What inner strategies they use to do this we do not know, it remains unclear and there is no doubt that there are other ways of explaining language development in a child than to assume an innate knowledge of deep structure and transformational techniques. By 1980, Chomsky is prepared to give more importance to the growth of the child experiencing the world around him in processing language and by the 19-80s the process theory has gained ground. There is a greater move towards the child's cognitive capacity of the world around him in discovering structure and meaning in the situation he is in. The children appear to talk without having intuition about the transformational model of grammar. They can use active and passive quite easily without necessarily thinking of the two with the view of transformation, but it is an open question whether all the children and adults view Chomsky's like deep structure knowledge when they understand and produce speech and it is not easy to assess when they do this but the hypothesis has not been this rule.

Transformational complex sentences are no more difficult to understand than simpler ones. Nevertheless it's possible people do recover the structure in some other way, so we should keep to the idea that transformational grammar represents a persistent store of knowledge about the language. This store of knowledge develops as the person knows more about the language. It develops at one will but more slowly than his ability to encode and decode. It represents the knowledge potentially available to get. But transformational grammar can not give us a direct insight into the psychological processes of speaking and comprehending, and even the newer version or the different interpretations of transformational grammar can not provide these language processes. Everyone who knows the language has available a store of knowledge he could use when he encodes or decodes, but he doesn't have to do this nor does he to unravel and recover deep structure in a series of transformations. Thus, Language Knowledge (knowing that something is grammatical) and language use (knowing how to utter a sentence) are overlapping areas, and the link between them as represented by the transformational grammar model is not easy to support.

According to some scholars it can be deduced that transformational grammar in the classical sense, the earlier sense, seems not to be a satisfactory help in explaining how a person actually uses his language but we should keep an open mind and see the *constructio figurata* of the whole discourse and of various parts of the discourse.

José Oro Cabanas
Universidade de Santiago de Compostela

REFERENCES

- Aitchinson, J. 1983: *The articulate Mammal*. London, Hutchinson.
- Chomsky, N. A. 1959: Review of Skinner's *Verbal Behavior*. *Language* 35: 26-58.
- Chomsky, N. A. 1969: *The Acquisition of Syntax in Children*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1975: *Learninf how to Mean*. London, Arnold.
- Krasen, S. D. 1975: The Critical Period for Language Acquisition and its Possible Bases. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. New York, New York Academy of Sciences.
- Lennenberg, S. H. 1967: *Biological Foundations of Language*. New York, Wiley.
- McDonough, S. H. 1981: *Psychology in Foreign Language Teaching*. London, Allen & Unwin.
- Wilkins, D. A. 1974: *Second-Language Learning & Teaching*. London, Arnold.

* * *