

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910461801903321
Titolo	Dimensions of L2 performance and proficiency [[electronic resource] ] : complexity, accuracy and fluency in SLA // edited by Alex Housen, Folkert Kuiken, Ineke Vedder
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Amsterdam ; ; Philadelphia, : John Benjamins Pub. Co., 2012
ISBN	1-283-89482-3 90-272-7326-X
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (317 p.)
Collana	Language learning and language teaching ; ; v. 32
Altri autori (Persone)	HousenAlex <1964-> KuikenFolkert <1953-> VedderIneke
Disciplina	418.0072
Soggetti	Second language acquisition - Research - Methodology Language and languages - Research - Methodology Literacy - Research Electronic books.
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and index.
Nota di contenuto	Dimensions of L2 Performance and Proficiency; Editorial page; Title page; LCC data; Table of contents; Acknowledgements; Notes on contributors; Complexity, accuracy and fluency; 1. Introduction; 1.1 The origins of CAF; 1.2 Complexity, accuracy and fluency as research variables; 2. Challenges for CAF research; 2.1 How can complexity, accuracy and fluency be conceptualised and defined as constructs?; 2.2 What are the cognitive, linguistic and psycholinguistic correlates and underpinnings of CAF?; 2.3 How are the CAF components interconnected?; 2.4 How can CAF be operationalised and measured? 2.5 Which factors affect CAF?3. This volume; 4. Conclusion; References; Defining and operationalising L2 complexity; 1. Complexity in SLA research; 2. Defining complexity; 3. L2 complexity; 4. A survey of complexity measurement; 5. A closer look at syntactic complexity measures; 6. Conclusion; References; Complexity, Accuracy and Fluency from the perspective of psycholinguistic Second Language Acquisition research; 1. Introduction; 2. A model of second language

acquisition; 2.1 Mental representation; 2.2 Kinds of learning; 2.3 Frequency; 2.4 Memory

3. Definitions of the constructs and relationship with the background assumptions 3.1 Accuracy; 3.2 Complexity; 3.3 Fluency; 4. Empirical investigations; 4.1 Linguistic competence: Triggering in L2; 4.2 Building mental representations for learned linguistic knowledge; 4.3 Mental representations in language processing: Proceduralisation; 5. Conclusion; References; Complexity, accuracy and fluency\*;

1. Introduction; 2. Methodological issues; 2.1 Definition; 2.2 Identification; 2.2.1 Greater length and complexity; 2.2.2 Greater phonological coherence

2.2.3 Inappropriate use and overgeneralization 2.2.4 Non-substitutability; 2.2.5 Accuracy; 3. The study; 3.1 Participants; 3.1.1 Beginners; 3.1.2 Post-beginners; 3.2 Formulaic sequences investigated and their development; 3.2.1 Verb sequences: j'aime, j'adore, j'habite (I like, I love, I live); 3.2.2 Interrogative sequences; 3.2.2.1 Development of the interrogative system. Thirteen out of the sixteen beginner learners produce comment t'appelles-tu from the very first round of data collection, without any internal modification. By contrast, if we examine the interrogative

3.2.2.2 The development of interrogative sequences. This section analyses the development of the formulaic sequence comment t'appelles-tu? ("what's your name?"), as well as the different contexts in which it is used. More specifically, as this FS is in t4. Discussion; 4.1 Relationship between learnt knowledge and acquired knowledge; 4.2 Grammatical status of formulaic sequences; 4.3 Contribution of FS to the development of complexity, accuracy and fluency; 5. Conclusion; References; The growth of complexity and accuracy in L2 French; 1. Introduction

2. Past observations on developmental stages

---

### Sommario/riassunto

This chapter presents the results of a study on interlanguage variation. The production of four L2 learners of Italian, tested four times at yearly intervals while engaged in four oral tasks, is compared to that of two native speakers, and analysed with quantitative CAF measures. Thus, time, task type, nativeness, as well as group vs. individual scores are the independent variables and complexity, accuracy, and fluency are the dependent ones. Results show how both L2 learners and native speakers display situational variation, but with clear differences amongst the two groups. Longitudinally

---