

# BAAL PROCEEDINGS STYLE & TASK SHEET

Version 2015

## THE WRITER'S RESPONSIBILITIES

1. THE WRITER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL THE CONTENT IN THEIR PAPER, AND MUST ENSURE ITS ACCURACY AND LEGALITY.
2. Copyright remains with the author of the paper.
3. The paper must be original and not published elsewhere.
4. The writer is responsible for content, consistency and continuity.
5. The complete text must be in a single Word document (format doc or docx). OpenDocument format is also accepted.
6. You must use single line spacing throughout, justified throughout, Times New Roman throughout, 14pt throughout. Do not indent paragraphs.
7. Subheads should be in bold, sub-subheads in bold italics. Subheads and sub-subheads should be unnumbered. If you find you require three levels of subheading, you probably need to revisit your writing plan.
8. Figures and Tables should be included in the text at the approximate point of insertion; the actual point of insertion may need to be changed for publication. Figures should be simple bitmap objects included as in-text objects, and at high resolution. Tables should be presented in standard, simple form: do not use special borders or formats. **DO NOT INCLUDE TABLES AS IMAGES.** Figures and Tables should be given a title in bold, as follows:

### **Figure/Table 1: How the numbers came out**

9. The list of references should include only items referenced in the paper, it is not a reading list.

In-text references can include "et al" where there is more than one author, but the reference list at the end of the paper must fully list all authors and editors.

Listed references **MUST** be in the following format (authors in bold, book title or journal title in italics, everything else in normal font):

**Stephen Budiansky** (1998). *If a Lion Could Talk: How animals think*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson: London, UK.

**Bengt Altenberg & Marie Tapper** (1998). The Use of Adverbial Connectors in Advanced Swedish Learners' Written English. In Sylviane Granger (ed), *Learner English on Computer*. Longman: London, UK, pp80-93.

**Marc D. Hauser, Noam Chomsky & W. Tecumseh Fitch** (2002). The Faculty of Language: What is it, who has it, and how did it evolve? In *Science* vol 298 22 November 2002, pp1569-1579.

The reference list must be in English alphabetical order of surname.

Do not include DOI references. If you use an automated referencing engine like EndNote, ensure that all automated referencing is removed from the in-text references and reference list before submission.

10. FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THESE RULES MEANS THAT YOUR PAPER MAY BE REJECTED FOR PUBLICATION BY THE EDITORS OR BY THE PUBLISHER.

#### **WHAT THE EDITORS WILL DO**

1. The editors ensure that the submitted paper was actually presented at conference as a paper or poster.
2. The editors review the submitted paper to ensure it meets the submission criteria set out above. If it does not, they will return the paper to the writer for correction.
3. The editors may also read the text and make suggestions or instructions for improving it. These will be sent to the writer so that the paper can be amended.
4. The editors can reject a paper at any time if they feel it is not appropriate for their volume. The editors' decision is final.

#### **WHAT THE PUBLISHER WILL DO**

1. The publisher converts the papers submitted by the editors to the final publishable format, then produces and publishes the final volume.
2. The publisher will make a reasonable effort to correct any outstanding issues with the text. However, if the paper received is not in a format which is publishable (e.g. tables have been included as bitmaps, or the referencing is not to the standards required) the publisher reserves the right, in consultation with the editors, to exclude the paper from the volume.
3. The submitted papers will be converted to publication format, as below.

#### **HOW THE PAPER WILL LOOK AFTER EDITING**

## What do adult L2 learners know about phonology after minimal exposure?

Natalia Pavlovskaya<sup>1</sup>, Samawal Jarad<sup>1</sup>, Alex Ho-Cheong Leung<sup>2</sup> & Martha Young-Scholten<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Newcastle University  
<sup>2</sup>Northumbria University

nat.pavlovskaya@gmail.com  
samoe19@yahoo.com  
alex.ho-cheong.leung@northumbria.ac.uk  
martha.young-scholten@ncl.ac.uk

### Introduction

A plethora of research on adult second language (L2) learning capacity often takes as its starting point stages where considerable L2 knowledge has already been accumulated. The present study instead probes the absolute earliest stages of learning and investigates the segmental and phonotactic knowledge of adult English speakers after 'minimal exposure' or 'first exposure' to a new language,<sup>13</sup> viz (Syrian) Arabic and Russian, doing so along the lines of Carroll (2004; 2013) and Gullberg et al. (2010; 2012). Research shows that babies demonstrate sensitivity to linguistic patterns in the ambient input from early on, even before they comprehend their first words (Jusczyk 1997). However, adult L2 learners are assumed to be far less able. With few exceptions, this assumption has not been put to the test under real learning conditions. The current study explores this issue in the context of an actual language course which used a listening comprehension approach, with no focus on forms. English-speaking adults learning either Arabic or Russian were exposed to aural input with the support of pictures in 20-minute classes for 10 weeks. The study reveals that first-exposure learners of Arabic and Russian show some of the same early sensitivity to the phonetic and phonotactic properties of a new language as babies do.

Following this introduction, this paper will proceed to review the relevant literature about first-exposure studies, identify the research question in this study, present the phonologies of the three languages in question (i.e. English, Syrian Arabic and Russian), and finally present the study methodology, results and discussion.

<sup>13</sup> In this paper, 'minimal exposure' and 'first exposure' are used interchangeably to refer to the manner in which learners are exposed to a new language on the basis of minimal input.

say that when we want to know how much learners are aware of and understand the 'coherence' of passages, we can have them predict what comes next or add a couple of following sentences (or utterances). In other words, good students of English can guess the logical development of passages and are creative enough to add appropriate information. Also, the correlation between Section B and D is rather strong (.608). This indicates that if learners can make a logical prediction about information after reading a passage, they can also add logical information to a given key sentence, or vice versa.

### Conclusion (Pedagogical Implications)

The results of this study, especially the figures showing correlations between question types and the total score, indicate that both prediction tasks, which ask students to guess what comes next, and information-adding tasks, which ask students to put in additional information, would be beneficial in helping students understand the process of logical thinking and what 'coherence' is like.

Students should be given more exercises to be aware of 'coherence' in and out of class and to develop their logical thinking and language skills. The test items used in the diagnostic test of this study will give foreign language teachers some ideas about what exercises or tasks they can use and develop when helping students become better communicators in the L2.

### References

- M. Celce-Murcia, Z. Dörnyei & S. Thurrell (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. In *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 1995, pp5-35.
- B. S. Mikulecky & L. Jeffries (1997). *Basic Reading Power*. Addison Wesley Longman: New York, NY, USA.
- M. Tanaka (1994). Test for communicative competence. In Y. Katayama et al (eds) *New research on English education (revised)*. 1994. Taishukan: Tokyo, Japan, pp294-301.
- K. Tsubokawa (2012). Improving logical thinking and developing the ability to express one's ideas effectively in English classes at secondary schools. In *Hiroshima Studies in Language and Language Education* 15, 2012. Institute for Foreign Language Research and Education of Hiroshima University: Hiroshima, Japan, pp1-19.
- H. G. Widdowson (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK.