

FORMULAIC SPEECH IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: THE IMPORTANCE OF LANGUAGE CHUNKS IN L2 LEARNING

Unlike many other second language acquisition research topics, formulaic speech or formulaic language has attracted the attention of only a few researchers, and it has been a concern of less importance in the acquisition and learning of a second language. For many researchers, there is not any relationship between the learning of chunks (or pre-fabricated patterns) and language creativity. Among others, Krashen and Scarcella (1978), two prominent researchers in the field of SLA, have simply argued that the learning of language chunks and language creativity are completely independent. The learning of chunk is then relegated to rote learning and used in methods like Audiolingual, where learning is so mechanical that it does not allow the students to meaningfully generate new ideas, new thoughts, and even new patterns. On the other hand, Wong-Fillmore (1976) argued that the acquisition of formulaic speech plays a central role in second language learning. She claimed that the learned language chunks become part of the learners' developing linguistic system.

Today, more and more researchers (Mitchell and Martin, 1997; Myles, Hooper, and Mitchell, 1998) are studying this type of learning under a variety of labels: prefabricated routines and patterns, imitated utterances, formulas, and formulaic units. Formulaic speech can be defined as a "multi-morphemic unit memorized and recalled as a whole, rather than generated from individual items based on linguistic rule".

Recurrent social context is the most visible correlation with most formulaic language, so it is hardly surprising that it is also the most studied. There are a great many habits, work practices, customs, rituals and delicate human relationships which become predictable to members of a culture, and are accompanied by forms of language which are well known to all the participating parties. There is no question that enculturation includes as a central element an internalized discipline on what to say, when, where and in what manner. The ethnography of formal human interaction implies perforce the study of a great deal of formulaic language. Whether formulaic strings play a major part in more relaxed exchanges is another matter. A few linguists (Pawley 1983, 1985, Chafe 1980) have been strongly attracted to the idea that they do. Others have found the evidence more equivocal. To the extent that Pawley's (1985) phrasal formulas are a global linguistic reality, it would seem that like words, they too must be bundles of abstracted indices. Is each formula defined by a single embedded meaning? Or is there a metaset of embedded meanings that is less integrated than a word, but somehow more integrated than a normal sentence string? There is no black and white answer to this. Some differences from a word are immediately evident. There is not a single lexical address for a phrasal formula and this surely will mean processing differences from truly embedded meanings. The bundled indices of a phrasal formula will not be retrieved in a single step by a unitary lexical code, but through a chaining process where use of a particular word

stimulates the recall of previously collocating word-indices, not necessarily in the original order, nor necessarily complete, but still recognisably "native-like" in the pattern of association. In other words, the mnemonic retrieval of a word has a guaranteed shape (even if some internal weight of certain contributing indices is overlooked or misconstrued). The mnemonic retrieval of a "phrasal formula" has no such guaranteed shape to be labelled, and as a surviving entity in mind is therefore likely to remain mostly beyond conscious recognition. Because of their complex structure, the correlation phrasal formulas have with adjacent environments vary. A familiar but not yet ossified formula may allow individual lexical items in its makeup to separately relate to the context. Thus, while "*will you marry me?*" may be a cliché, even culturally demanded, its elements remain sensitive to contextual adjustment (are there girls who answer "no" to "will" but "yes" to "would"?). The particular context where that set of four words applies is common, but not common enough to have yielded a single lexical label. The meaning is not entirely encapsulated prior to processing, but a powerful mnemonic resonance will make processing outcomes more rapid and assured than for a phrase like "*than for a phrase*". On the other hand, a frozen expression like "kick the bucket" has most of the encapsulated qualities of a single lexical item and can in fact be substituted by one (*die*). This means that it can be used almost globally in situations where "die" is appropriate, but rarely where "kick" or "bucket" would otherwise correlate independently with an experience. Pawley has claimed that to learn another language is to learn to speak in a native-like manner, and that this means learning vast numbers of phrasal formulas. Between the invariance of "kick the bucket" and the contingent generation of "*than for a phrase*" may lie a whole continuum of possible phrases with different powers of mnemonic resonance among their constituents. The best that a novice language learner may hope for is to gradually become familiar by osmosis with those phrase formulations which correlate most closely with a particular cultural ambience. A linguist might collect lists of phrase formulations whose meanings seem to be more encapsulated than others, but it will not necessarily be the case that they show common linguistic properties or clear criteria of selection. These are empirical questions. None of the preceding should imply that the style and idiom of any speech community does not have its own cultural distinctiveness. It is obvious enough that formulas, familiar collocations, sentence stems, etc. are an outcome of language flourishing in particular micro and macro environments.

'Multi-word structures', or 'formulaic sequences', are ubiquitous in language use and they make up a large proportion of any discourse. Erman and Warren (2000) calculated that formulaic sequences of various types constituted 58.6% of the spoken English discourse they analysed and 52.3% of the written discourse. Using different criteria and procedures, Foster's raters judged that 32.3% of the unplanned native speech they analysed was made up of formulaic language (Foster, 2001). If formulaic sequences are so widespread in English discourse, it follows that proficient English speakers must have knowledge and mastery of these sequences at some level. A number of scholars claim that this knowledge is extensive. For example, Pawley and Syder (1983, p. 213) suggest that the number of sentence-length expressions familiar to the ordinary, mature English speaker probably amounts, at least, to several hundreds of thousands. Language as a

whole is organised according to two main structuring principles: an *open choice principle* and an *idiom principle*, with the latter involving the widespread use of formulaic stretches of words. Furthermore, this store of formulaic sequences is dynamic and is constantly changing to meet the needs of the speaker. Even if the above claims prove to be somewhat overstated, it is clear that lexical patterning does exist in English, and therefore must have some consequences in terms of how English is acquired, processed and used.

Regardless of the register, an individual's language to self or to others has constant properties which do much to define that individual. Not least amongst these properties are the recognizable turns of phrase, the favourite expressions, in short the considerable formulaic content of any idiolect. The same is true for communities, from subculture to national culture. It is all a matter of remembered identity. Although idiom does imply a history of partial repetition, its very persistence also makes it a vehicle for semantic innovation within recognized frameworks, so the linguist cannot treat it in an entirely synchronic manner. In fact, formulaic sequences seem to exist in so many forms that it is presently difficult to develop a comprehensive definition of the phenomenon. This lack of a clear definition remains one of the foremost problems in the area. Some commonly-used criteria come from the area of corpus linguistics, such as institutionalisation, fixedness, and non-compositionality, which are the characteristics of *multi-word items*. Another often-cited criterion is frequency of occurrence, on the assumption that if a sequence is frequent in a corpus, this indicates that it is conventionalised by the speech community, at least to some extent. These criteria are useful, but are not the only possible way to view formulaic sequences. Psycholinguists and language acquisition specialists focus on criteria which determine whether sequences are known by individual subjects, and whether these sequences are formulaic and stored as wholes in the subject's mental lexicon. Thus, criteria are used such as whether a sequence of words is produced more than once by a subject (indicating that the sequence is known and not just a one-off imitation of a sequence heard by the subject) and whether it is produced with an intact intonation contour (suggesting the sequence is stored as a whole).

The very existence of a large repertoire formulas in a sociolect could be prima facie evidence of some innate predisposition to construct and preserve encapsulated units more extensive than single lexical units. From this perspective, social conditions would not merely give rise to formulas which met particular functional needs. Rather the social condition would suppress a constraint which had prevented phrasal formulas from emerging in less stable environments. One example of a type of social environment which has nurtured a very large number of formulaic structures is found in the management of conversation and discussion. Some researchers have termed a class of regular conversational strategies "gambits", and classified them into an extensive range of subtypes. According to Eric Keller (1981a : 97), gambits are a kind of discourse strategies represented in the form of semi-fixed expressions. Most commonly and most overtly, gambits refer to semantic information. They serve to signal that the stretch of utterance to follow is to be taken in a particular manner, for instance as an opinion, or as a piece of unpleasant realism. Gambits thus do not signal specific meaning, as propositions or

idioms do, but a general frame within such meaning can be conveyed. Keller (1981: 94) identifies the four main functions of gambits:

1. Acting as *semantic introducers*, gambits suggest the overall framework in which the topic is supposed to be placed. Expressions like 'The way I look at it' or 'I have reason to believe' serve to present a personal view, just as a piece of unpleasant realism might be introduced by phrases as 'Whether we like it or not, ...' or 'I be realistic, ...'.

2. The second function of gambits relates to the *social context* of the conversation. The basic moves of turn-taking, i.e. turn claiming and yielding, as well as the wish to end a conversation can be signalled by gambits.

3. Moreover, they may indicate a participant's *state of consciousness*. As outlined above, a person can show his/her willingness to receive information by using expressions like 'Yes, I'm listening' or simply 'Yes?'. This attitude contrasts sharply with the face-threatening comments 'I'm not really interested in that,' or even 'Why don't you just leave me alone'.

4. Finally, the *communicative control* functions of gambits range from pause fillers, i.e. hesitations such as 'you know' and 'you see,' to special gambits checking the continuous flow of communication. Among many others, the phrases 'Are you with me?' and 'Is that clear?' are regularly used for this purpose.

Gambits can either fulfil only one of these functions or combine various strategies. The marked expression 'I'd like to add something to that', for instance, will thus determine the semantic frame of subject-expansion and the social context of turn claiming at the same time.

During data collection it became evident that it is impossible to have a complete list of gambits. This is because these expressions often consist of verbal or nominal elements that allow of morphological and syntactic manipulation. For example, the gambit "I think so" can easily be permuted to "I thought so", "I would think so", "I might think so".... However, because formularized rituals do arise in standard situations, a common approach to their study has been to categorize them by social context, participants, or communicative function. Many of the scholars who have troubled to record such routines have been ethnographers with an eye to social function, rather than linguists alert to syntactic and other regularities in the language used. The observations are often insightful, but only suggestive in terms of language patterning.

The main purpose of this paper is to present some findings on whether or not the learning of language chunks can favor creativity and enhance communication. It is important to keep in mind that for some children, entry into structured language involves their "gaining productive control over 'slots' in previously unanalyzed phrases." Children learn and internalize the language chunks that they hear around them (from parents, friends, etc.) and use these chunks to utter things that they had never heard before. A longitudinal study by Mitchell and Martin (1997) reveals that children from age 11 to 16 make great use of the language chunks in L2 learning. They found that some pupils used those chunks in structured situation while a number of them were quite able to adapt what they learned by replacing things and by putting bits together to express their own ideas in L2. My purpose here then is to contribute to the study on the role of formulas by analyzing them in young adults' L2 learning process and see their effects on learning as well as language teaching.

Many researchers have recognized the importance of formulaic language at early stages but they have disputed its role in the learning process itself. On the other hand, Wong-Fillmore (1976) reported that routines and patterns evolved into creative language in the case of the children she studied. We know that children's learning differs from adults' learning in that the former is mostly unconscious and the second is mostly conscious. Therefore, I was concerned with investigating how conscious language learners, who have the ability to analyze the language in terms of its structure and meaning, use the language chunks they are provided with.

The project was a four-week study conducted on 14 young students (all females) learning English in the Department of Foreign Languages at Yerevan International University Eurasia, Republic of Armenia. The class met four times a week. The 14 students involved in the study were false beginners in that most of them had taken English courses at school. They were from the same culture; their age ranged from 18 to 20.

My task consisted of providing students with language chunks in English, on Mondays, taking 5–10 minutes of the class period. They would then have to prepare, during the week, a conversation or a dialogue that they would perform on Fridays, using those chunks. I decided not to choose the pairs of students who would perform in advance so that all of them would have to prepare, as no one knew in advance who was going to perform and who was not. I asked my students to make a list of several formulas or formulaic units. It is worth mentioning here, that they immediately started with idioms and proverbs, like *"I'm still over the moon."*, *"A friend in need is a friend in need."*, *"Let's throw caution to the wind"*, *"I see light at the end of the tunnel."*, etc. Then I gave them some kind of orientation in order to prevent any confusion on what they should do with the chunks. Not only did I provide the chunks, but also I provided the dialogue situations. Then they added a set of utterances, like *"Are you a student?"*, *"Are they friends?"*, *"Let's go dancing."*, *"Are you still in love with him?"*, etc. From that list, I selected 7 utterances that I deemed useful to them. I would write them on the board and had students write them in a special notebook that they used for that particular purpose.

Just as on Mondays, I reserved ten minutes of the Friday class for the performance of the conversations or dialogues that I asked the students to prepare. All pairs were required to prepare those dialogues or conversations, but because of the time constraint, only 3 or 4 were chosen randomly on Fridays to perform their dialogues. The performers would stand in front of the whole class and perform the dialogue. The other pairs would simply watch and have their turn the following Friday. All the dialogues were tape-recorded to keep record of how previously learned chunks were used by the students. No correction was made during the dialogues, nor was any special feedback given from me except some encouragement.

The study was conducted in two rounds with two different sets of chunks. Each round lasted a week with 2 or 3 pairs performing each week. The first set of chunks, which was used in the first round of conversation, was already designed as a dialogue with 7 utterances for each of the two speakers involved. In fact, with the 7 utterances that I selected from the students' list, they made a dialogue themselves in which each student would have to use 7 chunks. One would ask the questions while the other would answer. Students were supposed to pretend to be meeting for the first time.

When an utterance was new I would not concentrate on it, I was mainly interested in looking at how the students would use the utterances that I gave them myself. Below are the chunks for the first round.

Set of utterances for Round 1:

Group 1:

Q1: Are you a student?

A1: Yes, I am.

Q2: Where are you studying?

A2: I am studying at Eurasia University.

Q3: What languages do you study?

A3: I study English, Persian, and Russian.

Q4: Do you like your lectures?

A4: Yes, of course.

Q5: What are you doing after classes?

A5: I am going home.

Q6: Do you like your country?

A6: Yes, of course.

Q7: What other countries do you like?

A7: I like France and America.

Group 2:

Q1: Are you a student?

A1: Yes, I am a student.

Q2: Where are you studying?

A2: I am studying at Eurasia University.

Q3: What languages do you study?

A3: We study English and Persian.

Q4: Do you like your lectures?

A4: Yes, I like my lectures very much. Our lecturers are very nice and kind to us.

Q5: What are you doing after classes?

A5: Oh, sometimes after classes we go for a walk or organise parties.

Q6: Do you like your country? A6: Yes, of course. I like it because it's my fatherland.

Q7: What other countries do you like?

A7: Oh, I like France and Italy.

Some of the above utterances are ones students usually use in their daily conversations. This is a piece of informal speech, which seemed more authentic and in which students could be better involved.

The second set of chunks, used in the second round was randomly given to the students who had to build a conversation or a dialogue around them. The reason for that change was to see the level of involvement of the students.

Set of utterances for Round 2:

Q1: What are you doing tonight?

A1: I am going to dance with my boyfriend. Will you join us?

Q2: Of course, I will. To tell the truth, I've forgotten your boyfriend's name. Will you, please, remind me his name?

A2: His name's Arthur.

Q3: A beautiful name. Does he drink a lot?

A3: No, he doesn't.

Q4: It's very nice of him. Are you still in love with him?

A4: Oh, yes. I love him very much.

The conversations that were done by the students in this second part had many new utterances.

It was the first time I had made such a study. It was really very interesting and, actually, not far from my expectations. One thing that surprised me most was that the presence of the record player didn't distract their attention to act to the point. They were free and didn't hesitate at all to be recorded. Some of the dialogues sounded just like some kind of recitation. A number of students stuck to the chunks without adding or changing anything. Fillers like "uhm" weren't frequently used. It is explained by the fact that the students had prepared the dialogues beforehand. In answer 1 (A1) most of the respondents gave the following answer "Yes, I am." or "Yes, I am a student." In answer 2 (A2) all the students preferred to give a full answer "I am studying at (in) Eurasia University, evading to give a short one, like "at Eurasia University". Noteworthy is the fact that while answering question 3 (Q3) (What languages do you study?) a student understood that she did not need to re-state the subject and the verb again. She simply deleted them but kept the compliment "English and Persian". She thereby demonstrated her ability to delete words that would sound repetitious and that are not necessary for the expression of an idea. The subject and the verb were simply implied in this answer. In the following answers (A4, A5, A6, A7), I noticed more word addition and chunk combinations. To question 4 (Q4) a student just gave an affirmative answer "Yes, of course". Another student, while answering the same question, gave not only a positive answer, but also provided additional information about her lecturers, that is "Yes, I like them very much. And our lecturers are very nice and kind to us." In answer 5 (A5) two students inserted phrases which were grammatically incorrect "Sometimes after classes we go to walk (go for a walk) and "I go for dancing" (the question was asked in the present continuous, and the answer was in the present simple), but they demonstrated how they could modify the chunk by inserting new words and convey additional messages. In answer 6 (A6) most of the respondents added 'because' "Yes, of course because it's my fatherland." A student provided extra information by adding one more phrase "Yes, I like it very much because it's very nice, and there are many old places." Noteworthy is the fact that while answering question 7(Q7) "I like France because it's a very nice country, and I like their fashion." a student successfully used the conjunctions 'and' and 'because' to connect the phrases in the provided chunks to the new phrases that they were adding. The second round also showed wonderful results. In this round the students were more creative. The students created a new context in order to use the ready-made chunk 2 "What are you doing tonight?". A respondent not only answered question 1 (Q1) "I am going to dance

with my boyfriend", but also provided her answer with an additional question addressed to her addressee "Will you join us?". Another respondent provided question 1 (Q1) both with additional and deep information, like "I may have a date with my boyfriend. Last week he promised to take me to a disco for Latin Dances. As you know I am crazy about wild fragrances." In answering question 4 (Q4) a student preferred not to utter a formula "Yes, I am", but answered the question putting an emphasis on her deep feelings, enlarging the chunk and adding an idiom "Yes, yes, every time we look at stars, and I feel his presence next to me I realise how much I am still over the moon." The student here has combined two utterances provided beforehand "What do you feel when you look at stars" and "I am still over the moon." wishing to colour her language.

Besides these interesting findings, I also noticed that some of the chunks were either not used or used in the exact form in which they were provided. This was the case with "Are you a student?", "Where are you studying?", "I am still over the moon", which had all been used without any change. Actually, these chunks hardly accept any modification. The utterance "Yes, yes, every time we look at stars, and I feel his presence next to me, I realise how much I am still over the moon." was the longest provided, and it was an attemptive reproduction of how it was used. So, there are all the reasons to assume that the shorter a chunk, the most often it is likely to be used and modified by learners.

Now what do all these results tell us in terms of communication and creativity?

The purpose of this research study was to see the impact of language chunks on L2 learning. The question I was trying to address was whether formulaic speech can be used creatively and serve the purpose of communication and learning. Based on the above results, the first observation I can make is that language chunks have a very important role in L2 learning. It seems obvious that language chunks play an important role in communication. There is a great deal of formulaic expressions in natural language. This shows how vital those expressions are for L2 learners in order to be able to meet basic communicative needs. In the study, students demonstrated that they could converse with the chunks that I provided them even when they were given randomly. I could see that students turned those chunks into their own, creating at times some contexts in which they could fit. This study certainly supports the idea that chunks have a useful communicative function, refuting at the same time the belief that it is only during the early stages that they are useful. Some of the chunks that did not deal with the actual lives of students were simply ignored. The hesitations that occurred sometimes were not just a matter of recitation: instead, students tried to simulate the actual communicative settings in which people do not always say things in one trait. Hesitations were also the proof of students' reflection in order to put their ideas or words together and create the sentences. This, of course triggers the process of L2 learning in that the students successfully incorporate the chunks in contextual conversations instead of just reciting them mechanically. They alternate the positions of the chunks according to the context that they create by themselves.

The results also show that language chunks are not always used exactly the way they are provided. This departs from the idea that formulaic speech only serves for rote learning. On the contrary, there is evidence that students did not repeat the chunks mechanically but tried instead to make them meaningful by not only providing contexts in which they could fit, but also, and especially, by either recombining or modifying them. It is

important to mention that the degree of recombination and modification varied according to the levels of students. Most of the students who made the most complex recombinations and modifications were the most successful in class. In addition, some students seemed more enthusiastic about the study; therefore, they had a better preparation and performed better, using more complex utterances. They succeeded in adapting the chunks by either adding new ones or replacing some while adjusting them to their real lives. The students who recombined the least were less proficient. They were the ones who mostly used the chunks without any change. A couple of them also did not seem very enthusiastic about the study. Their performances were often very fast and cold, contrary to the most enthusiastic students who had a very warm performance, which, consequently, aroused more cheers from the class.

Overall, as can be seen in the results, chunks were often put together in the same response to anticipate questions that were likely to be asked. Being creative in language does not necessarily mean that one creates a completely new utterance, both in its form and its meaning. Creativity also occurs when previously heard chunks are associated to generate a new idea or a new thought. Knowing the meaning of each of those chunks, students understood that they could either delete one word or phrase, or replace them by other words or phrase in order to communicate their ideas. By providing some contexts, students transfer their creative thought into their speech, influencing then the chunks they were supposed to use. The findings of this research support the idea that students usually unpack the chunks and use parts of them, sometimes by combining them with other parts, and use them to produce new utterances. It seems obvious, based on the study that not all learners will have the same degree of creativity in recombining and modifying chunks, but at least it shows that creativity is well engaged in the unpacking of chunks. Students did not just give back the chunks as they had received them but tried instead, to use them meaningfully in a context. As a whole, the results from this study suggest that formulaic speech does play an important role in language learning. Contrary to what Krashen and Scarcella (1978) have contended, the findings have indicated that creativity is not independent from the breaking down of chunks. Students do modify the chunks they are provided with so that they can fit in contexts; they do generate new ideas and new thoughts through a process of deletion, addition or replacement instead of just reciting the chunks. I will not deny the fact that some chunks will be reproduced in their original forms. However, this does not make their use less creative or less communicative in that students build some personal contexts around them, turning them into meaningful utterances instead of just detached and meaningless utterances.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Krashen S. & Scarcella R. On routines and patterns in language acquisition and performance. *Language Learning*, 28, 283-300, 1978.
2. Mitchell R. & Martin C. Role learning, creativity and 'understanding' in classroom foreign language teaching. *Language Teaching Research*, 1, 1, pp. 1-27, 1997.
3. Myles F., Hooper J. & Mitchell R. Exploring the role of formulaic language in classroom foreign language learning. London, *Language Learning*, 48; 3, 323-363, 1998. 4. Towell R. & Hawkins R. Approaches to second language acquisition. Clevedon, UK, 1994.

4. Weinert R. The role of formulaic language in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 180–205, 1995.
5. Wong-Fillmore L. Cognitive and social strategies in second language acquisition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, 1976.
6. Chafe W. The deployment of consciousness in the production of a narrative in Chafe 1980a, 1980b.
7. Pawley A. & Syder F. Two puzzles for linguistic theory UK: Longman: pp 191–228, 1983.
8. Pawley A. On speech formulas and linguistic competence 12:84–104; Universidad de Chile 1985.
9. Erman B. and Warren B. The idiom principle and the open-choice principle 20: 29–62. 2000.
10. Foster P. Rules and routines: A consideration of their role in the task-based language production of native and non-native speakers 75–93, Longman, 2001.
11. Keller E. Gambits: Conversational Strategy Signals, 1981.

Մ. Առաքելյան

Բանաձևային խոսքը երկրորդ լեզվում. Խոսքային բանաձևերի կարևորությունը երկրորդ լեզվում

Այս աշխատանքի նպատակն է ցույց տալ, թե արդյոք խոսքային բանաձևերը նպաստում են ստեղծագործական մտքի զարգացմանը և խթանում հաղորդակցումը: Ուսումնասիրությունը կատարվել է երևանի եվրասիա միջազգային համալսարանի օտար լեզուների ֆակուլտետում: Չայնագրվել են 18–20 տարեկան 14 ուսանողուհիներ, որոնք նույն մշակույթի կրողներն են, այսինքն՝ հայեր: Մեր խնդիրն է եղել ապահովել ուսանողներին մի շարք այնպիսի արտահայտություններով, որոնցով նրանք կկարողանային կապակցված խոսք կազմել, այն է՝ գրույց կամ երկխոսություն: Հենց ուսանողներն էլ նախաձեռնեցին արտահայտությունները շարադրելը, որոնցից մենք ընտրեցինք 7-ը և համեմարարեցինք աշխատանքն առաջին փուլի համար: Իսկ երկրորդ փուլի համար ուսանողներն ազատ էին ցանկացած արտահայտություն ընտրելու և ցանկացած գրույց կամ երկխոսություն կազմելու հարցում: Աշխատանքը փուլերով կազմակերպելու նպատակն այն էր, որ պարզեցնեք, թե որ դեպքում ուսանողներն ինչ կակտիվություն կցուցաբերեին, և որքան մեծ կլիներ նրանց հաղորդակցվելու ցանկությունը: Վերլուծությունը ցույց տվեց, որ ուսանողներից մի քանիսն էին կառուցում այդ արտահայտություններից՝ կախված նրանց զիտելիքի մակարդակից: Այլ կերպ ասած՝ պակաս ակտիվություն էին ցուցաբերում արտահայտությունները ձևափոխելու և իրենց տարրերակը ներմուծելու հարցում: Իսկ մեծ մասն ավելի ազատ էր հաղորդակցվում և ավելի շատ օգտագործում նոր արտահայտություններ՝ ձգտելով հարստացնել խոսքը: Հետաքրքիր է այն փաստը, որ ուսանողները ձգտում էին ոչ միայն փոխարինել արդեն սովորած խոսքային բանաձևը նորով, այլև քերականական փոփոխությունների էին ենթարկում գրանք: Օրինակ, չէին կրկնում ենթական ու ստորոգյալը, այլ փոխում էին խնդիրը: Որոշ դեպքերում էլ քերականական սխալներ էին բույլ տալիս, քայքայ չէր խանգարում նրանց խոսքային բանաձևերը նոր բառերով փոխարինելու և լրացուցիչ տեղեկություն տալու ցանկություն դրսևորել: Վերը նշվածը ցույց է տալիս, որ խոսքային բանաձևերը մեծ դեր ունեն երկրորդ լեզվի տիրապետման հարցում: Բանաձևերը խոսքն արտահայտելու այն առաջնային միջոցներն են, որոնք պայմանավորում են հիմնական հաղորդակցումը: Ունենալ ստեղծագործական միտք չի նշանակում միայն ստեղծել նոր արտահայտություններ՝ իրենց և ձևով, և՛ իմաստով: Ստեղծագործ է նաև այն միտքը, որը կապակցում է նախկինում սովորած արտահայտությունները նոր արտահայտություններ կամ գաղափարներ ստեղծելու համար:

Формульная речь во втором языке: Важность речевых формул во втором языке

Цель данной работы – показать, способствуют ли речевые формулы развитию творческой мысли и подстегивают ли они коммуникацию. Данное исследование было проведено на факультете иностранных языков Ереванского международного университета Евразия. Были записаны ответы 14 студентов в возрасте от 18 до 20 лет, которые являются носителями одной и той же культуры – армянки. Моей задачей являлось обеспечение студентов целым рядом таких выражений, используя которые, они смогли бы создать взаимосвязанную речь, т.е. разговор или диалог. Сами студенты предложили некоторое число выражений, из которых были выбраны 7 и была задана работа для первого цикла исследования. При проведении второго цикла студентам была предоставлена свобода выбора для создания любого разговора или диалога. Исследование было проведено в рамках двух циклов с целью выявить различия активности студентов при неоднородных условиях и выяснить насколько высока степень их желания и готовности к коммуникации. Проведенный анализ показал, что некоторые из студентов используют лишь заданные выражения, которые находятся в зависимости от уровня их знаний. Таким образом, их активность в плане изменения заданных фраз и представления своих собственных была на низком уровне. Большая часть студентов была более свободна в процессе коммуникации. Они употребляли большое число новых выражений, стремясь обогатить свою речь. Интересен тот факт, что студенты пытались не только заменить уже выученные формулы на новые, но также пытались изменить их грамматическую форму. Так, например, они не повторяли подлежащее и сказуемое, а заменяли дополнение. В некоторых случаях студенты допускали ошибки, но это не мешало их желанию заменить имеющуюся формулу новыми словами и предоставить дополнительную информацию.

Вышесказанное доказывает, что речевые формулы имеют важное значение при овладении вторым языком. Формулы являются теми первичными методами выражения речи, которые и предопределяют основную коммуникацию. Иметь творческую мысль означает не только способность к созданию новых выражений как в плане формул, так и в плане смысла. Творческая так же та мысль, которая связывает выученные в прошлом выражения для создания новых выражений и идей.