

# 124

prefabricated  
Language and  
maturational  
constraints in  
child second  
Language  
Acquisition

víctor d. meléndez torres

## ABSTRACT

---

THERE ARE TWO MAIN HYPOTHESES with respect to the role of prefabricated routines and patterns in children's second language acquisition process. One hypothesis states that creative language is the result of an internal creative process that takes place prior to the analysis and reanalysis of prefabricated routine and prefabricated pattern elements. A second hypothesis states that prefabricated language is the natural predecessor of creative language. The author concludes that although the evidence seems to suggest that children use prefabricated language frequently in their second language acquisition, this does not conclusively rule out the presence of an automatically occurring internal creative process.

**Keywords:** internal creative process, prefabricated language, prefabricated routines, analysis.

Milenio, Vol. 10, 2006

ISSN 1532-8562

---

## INTRODUCTION

THERE IS MUCH SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE documenting research projects that have sought to shed some light onto the process by which child second language learners become linguistically creative in constructing sentences (i.e., fluent) without formal language instruction<sup>1</sup>. Prefabricated language has been thought to be an essential--probably indispensable--ingredient of second language acquisition in children<sup>2</sup>. However, there isn't a consensus as to its role in the advent of creative language. So, the issue remains a much debated one, to say the least.

The general concept "prefabricated language" (PL) can be defined as "...readymade, memorized chunks of sentences..."<sup>3</sup> and it entails two more specific concepts: "prefabricated routines" and "prefabricated patterns."<sup>4</sup> According to Krashen,<sup>5</sup> "prefabricated routines are simply memorized whole utterances or phrases, such as 'How are you?' or 'Where is your hotel?'. A performer may use prefabricated routines without any knowledge of their internal linguistic structure. On the other hand, prefabricated patterns are utterances where part of the sentence is "flexible," with the rest of the sentence remaining inflexible.<sup>6</sup> "That's a \_\_\_\_" ("car," "balloon," etc.) and "I want

to \_\_\_” (“play,” “go out,” “eat some candy,” etc.) are examples of prefabricated patterns.

#### **THE “INTERNAL CREATIVE PROCESS”**

There are two main hypotheses with respect to the role of prefabricated routines and patterns in the first and second language acquisition process. One hypothesis states that an internal creative process takes place first, and then the combination and recombination of prefabricated routine and prefabricated pattern elements takes place. The combination and recombination processes--or, using Stephen Krashen's terminology, “analysis” and “reanalysis”<sup>7</sup>--are the consequences of an independent creative process, thus indicating that such creative process is growing. In other words, the combination and recombination processes mean that the creative process has already begun internally, and is thus analyzing and reanalyzing prefabricated routines and prefabricated patterns until all of their elements are freed from the linguistic structures in which they used to appear. Once the “freeing” of prefabricated routine and prefabricated pattern elements occurs, they are freely combined into “creative” utterances. Hence, it is reasonable to say that this view is based on the assumption that the analysis and reanalysis of prefabricated routines and prefabricated patterns are not due to the effects of daily socialization, but to an automatic internal (biologic?) analytic process. In other words, the daily use of prefabricated routines and prefabricated patterns with other people does not enable an extraction or deduction of linguistic rules. A pre-experiential, innate, and perhaps genetically programmed language faculty accounts for the analysis and reanalysis of prefabricated language, and the advent of creative utterances.

This assumption seems to explain a further assumption held by this hypothesis, namely, that prefabricated routines and prefabricated patterns are temporary shortcuts to early production beyond the current level of competence, demanded by social and communicative pressures--that is, useful only for satisfying the need for socializing.<sup>8</sup> Hence, “the creative construction process is independent of routines and patterns,”<sup>9</sup> which further implies that prefabricated language plays a non-crucial role in child second language acquisition.

There is a significant amount of scientific literature arguing that the analysis and reanalysis of prefabricated routine and prefabricated pattern elements are the consequences of an independently occurring --perhaps biologic-- creative process.<sup>10</sup> Take, for instance, Hatch's <sup>11</sup> description of the case history of Paul, a 4-year-old Chinese learner of English as a second language.

After arriving in the United States, Paul was exposed to English while interacting with children who were native speakers of that language. He interacted with the English-speaking children in school and in the playground,

and made early use of prefabricated language. During the first month of his arrival, "it seemed as if Paul was learning by imitation. He might repeat the sentence immediately after the other person said it, or he might remember it and use it later in the appropriate situation."<sup>12</sup> "Propositional" speech appeared in the second month. Some prepositional sentences were the following: (1) "This kite."; (2) "Ball no."; (3) "Paper this."; and (4) "Wash hand?". At the same time, Paul was using prefabricated language--specifically, prefabricated routines--such as: (1) "Get out of here." and (2) "It's time to eat and drink." Hatch explains her findings in the following way:

Quite clearly two separate and very distinct strategies were running side by side. After week twelve it became increasingly difficult to separate out imitations since Paul's rule stages moved so fast that he quickly caught up with the language as it was spoken by the children in the playground.<sup>13</sup>

In the same line as Hatch,<sup>14</sup> Wagner-Gough contends that prefabricated patterns do not directly evolve into creative rule-governed language:

It is quite clear that there is no transfer between some imitations and subsequent free speech patterns. For example, a learner may say 'My name is Homer' in one breath and 'He Fred' in another, the former being a memorized pattern and the latter the learner's own rule.<sup>15</sup>

The view that an internal creative process takes place prior to the analysis and reanalysis of prefabricated routine and prefabricated pattern elements is explained succinctly by Krashen and Scarcella:<sup>16</sup> "Prefabricated routines may evolve into patterns, but at the same time, independently, the creative construction process develops. This implies that in some situations propositional language may 'catch up' with automatic speech--that is, the language acquisition process may 'reanalyze' patterns and routines as creative constructions." In other words, the "prefabricated language" mode and the "internal creative process" mode are independent of each other, and the "internal creative process" mode eventually predominates. Prefabricated language serves only as a shortcut, a practical tool to allow social interaction with a minimum of linguistic competence, "...a temporary strategy for the performer to solve certain communication problems that his creative language has not evolved far enough to handle."<sup>17</sup>

Such view is congruent with Chomsky's<sup>18</sup> notion of a "Universal Grammar," in that it assumes a pre-experiential, innate, and perhaps genetically

programmed language faculty that accounts for the analysis and reanalysis of prefabricated language and the advent of creative utterances. However, it should be noted that the role of Universal Grammar in second language acquisition is still unclear, as "...there are still a number of logical possibilities concerning its role in second language learning."<sup>19</sup>

#### **"UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR" AND MATURATIONAL CONSTRAINTS IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION**

It is a common observation that young children construct the complex grammatical system of their primary language without any systematic training or explicit instruction. More importantly, the highly complex nature of the rule systems that govern the child's developing grammar could not emerge from any kind of experience alone.<sup>20</sup> The knowledge that underlies the structures of language that have developed by age six is simply too abstract to have been constructed from the application of general learning strategies, such as comparing and contrasting different kinds of examples, generalization, and analogy, among others. Consequently, linguists propose that a language-specific faculty or module that is pre-experiential, innate, and genetically programmed places at the disposal of the child an elaborate conceptual framework of prior knowledge that assigns structure to linguistic input and builds the complex cognitive network which quickly develops into a complete knowledge system corresponding to the basic grammar of the child's mother tongue.<sup>21</sup>

The idea that children "learn" language suggests that the neural wiring for language is characterized by "plasticity", which refers to the brain's alleged ability to reorganize neural pathways based on new experiences.<sup>22</sup> However, the concept of a language-specific faculty proposes that the neural wiring for language is a trait acquired by humans through an evolutionary process, and is "brought to the surface" or "triggered" by experience.<sup>23</sup> In other words, the concept of a language-specific faculty naturally implies that humans are born with a basic language design –otherwise known as "Universal Grammar"<sup>24</sup>– which eventually evolves into one of the many languages of the world. But this "basic language design" does not evolve into a full-fledged language only through a "learning" process. Rather, it becomes a regular language mostly as a result of receiving input that triggers the further unfolding of the genetically predetermined "basic language design." The proposed existence of a language-specific faculty implies that the idea that children "learn" their first language is misleading.<sup>25</sup>

The existence of a language-specific faculty was hypothesized following the fact that all of the world's languages have some very deep commonalities. These commonalities are called "principles"<sup>26</sup>; they are what make all languages equal, at a very high level of abstraction. For example, one princi-

ple is that of “structure-dependency,” which means that all languages are structured into phrases, and the phrases are themselves structured.

However, languages are different at the surface level. Even if the structure-dependency principle appears to be shared by all languages, there must be many other rules that differ between languages. Otherwise, it would not be possible to distinguish one language from another, as all would work in the same way. What, then, makes one language different from another?

“Parameters”<sup>27</sup> determine the ways in which languages vary. A parameter is a set of options that Universal Grammar makes available with respect to a particular phenomenon. One of many parameters is the “*head parameter*.” To illustrate, consider the following sentences: a) *She* bought a new car yesterday; b) *My friend* bought a new car yesterday; c) *The friend that I met in Australia last year* bought a new car yesterday. “She,” “My friend” and “The friend that I met in Australia last year” are phrases –specifically, noun phrases. The crucial word in these phrases is “friend” (or “she,” if we have already referred to this person earlier in the conversation). Because it is the central element, “friend” (or “she”) is the “head” of the phrase, and “bought a new car yesterday” is the “complement.” So, the head parameter specifies the position of the head in relation to its complements. In other words, the head parameter deals with the way in which phrases are structured, and it can only have two settings: “head-first,” or “head-last.” Consequently, from the “language-specific faculty” point of view, the “basic language design” mentioned previously in this article does not evolve into a full-fledged language merely through a “learning” process. It becomes a regular language mostly as a result of receiving input that triggers the choosing of specific parameter settings. A particular set of parameter settings will result in the evolvment of a specific language. Thus, if anything is learned, that would be the parameter settings.

One logical possibility concerning the role of Universal Grammar in second language learning is that there are maturational constraints that limit learners’ access to certain aspects of Universal Grammar as they mature cognitively.<sup>28</sup> For example, under controlled conditions, older students tend to attain mastery of one or another structural aspect of the target language more rapidly than younger students.<sup>29</sup> However, with respect to the ultimate (long-term) attainment of the second language, the tables are turned: “younger starters” normally outperform “older starters,” controlling for the “length of experience with the second language” variable.<sup>30</sup> Thus, older learners have a short-term advantage in the second language acquisition process; but younger learners have a long-term advantage, meaning that younger learners will ultimately demonstrate better performance in the second language.<sup>31</sup> The earlier the contact with the second language, the more complete the learner’s acquisition of it.

A good illustration of the benefits of early contact with L2 is the study by Newport,<sup>32</sup> in which L2 learners were administered a grammaticality judgment assessment that tested for verb tense, pluralization, verb agreement (morphology), basic word order, permutations involving *wh*- questions, and use of determiners and pronouns. All of the learners were students or faculty at a U.S. university, with an “age of arrival” ranging from 3 to 39 years. The “length of experience with English,” as well as other relevant variables, was controlled for. The study demonstrated that the earlier the age of arrival in the U.S., the better the performance in L2. Specifically, the study demonstrated that a decline in test performance begins to manifest itself at around the age of six, and *not at some point during the pubescent period*. This finding seems to suggest that even if an L2 learner has his/her initial contact with L2 at ages 5 or 6, he/she will eventually perform like a native speaker; that is, the L2 learner’s performance will be indistinguishable from that of a native speaker. It follows that if the initial contact is after the age of six, the ultimate attainment of the L2 learner will be increasingly distinguishable from that of a native speaker.

As has been stated earlier, the idea of a language-specific faculty or module that is pre-experiential, innate, and genetically programmed is congruent with Krashen and Scarcella’s<sup>33</sup> notion of an independently occurring – perhaps biologic– creative process that is responsible for analyzing and reanalyzing prefabricated patterns and routines as creative constructions. However, a second hypothesis about the role of prefabricated language in the second language acquisition process argues that prefabricated language evolves directly into creative language, without the help of an internal, pre-experiential, and innate creative process. The next section of this article will elaborate on the aforementioned view.

#### **PREFABRICATED PATTERNS**

Hakuta<sup>34</sup> and Wong-Fillmore<sup>35</sup> have found that prefabricated language constitutes a major part of the speech behavior of children learning a second language. In addition to using prefabricated language to communicate, children use these lexical phrases as the raw material to be segmented and analyzed in developing the rules of syntax. Hence, when routines and patterns learned in the language acquisition break down into its constituent elements, they become available for use in creative, rule-bound language.<sup>36</sup>

Hakuta<sup>37</sup> and Wong-Fillmore’s<sup>38</sup> findings illustrate a second hypothesis about the role of prefabricated routines and patterns in the second language acquisition process of children. Such hypothesis suggests that the attainment of creative language is based on prefabricated language rather than created from scratch, and that second language learners store and perhaps even acquire most of the target language in this ready-made form. It

further suggests that: (1) prefabricated patterns emerge from the use of prefabricated routines and single-word utterances within the context of daily verbal interaction; (2) once all of the constituting elements of prefabricated routines and patterns are freed from the linguistic structures in which they used to appear, the path is open for creative language, by way of combining these free elements in positions they have never been combined into before; and (3) the constituting elements of prefabricated routines and patterns are freed when learners, through verbal interaction, infer linguistic rules and combine the free elements in positions they have never been into before. Therefore, as soon as all the elements of one or more prefabricated patterns are freed, a creative linguistic construction could be said to have taken place. However, if a recombination takes place where not all prefabricated pattern elements have been freed, then it is not a creative construction in the full sense of the term. Such an occurrence would be more like extracting smaller patterns from longer patterns and using them with other elements. The following example from Wong-Fillmore<sup>39</sup> can illustrate this point.

The multi-word utterances “I wanna play wi’ dese” and “I don’ wanna do dese” are two original patterns used by Nora, Wong-Fillmore’s<sup>40</sup> fastest language acquirer. Eventually, Nora proceeded to say “I don’ wanna play dese” and “I wanna do dese”. Both of these multi-word utterances were analyzed prefabricated patterns, product of a combination of elements between the two original prefabricated patterns. The combination of “do dese” with “I wanna” shows that only smaller patterns have been freed from their original frames. If “do”, “dese”, “I”, and “wanna” were individually combined with each other in positions they had never been into before, then it could be said that a creative linguistic construction has evolved. For a linguistic construction to be “creative,” the words in it should be in positions that are different than the ones they had in each of the prefabricated patterns and routines in which they have occurred. In other words, if an utterance is truly “creative,” it should not make any use of prefabricated patterns or prefabricated routines.

It is important to add that the idea of creative language as a direct product of analyzing and reanalyzing prefabricated language elements, has as a central tenet “...the argument that socialization is at the heart of language acquisition and that verbal interaction during socialization is crucial in the determination of the course of second language acquisition.”<sup>41</sup> In the words of Hatch,<sup>42</sup> “one learns how to do conversation, one learns how to interact verbally, and out of this interaction syntactic structures are developed.” Wong-Fillmore neatly explains second language learners’ need to immediately establish social contact via language:

... what he must do is to acquire some language which will



give the impression of ability to speak it, so that his friends will keep trying to communicate with him. The use of formulas by the learners in this study played an important part in their being able to play with English speakers as they did . . . This kind of language was extremely important, because it permitted the learner to continue participating in activities which provided contexts for the learning of new material.<sup>43</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

Both hypotheses about the role of prefabricated routines and patterns in child second language acquisition have each chosen to make a fundamental assumption. They have assumed either the non-existence of an internal creative process and adjudicate the extraction of linguistic rules and the eventual emergence of creative language solely to the extensive use of prefabricated routines and patterns, or the existence of an omnipresent internal creative mechanism that guides the process by which individuals analyze and reanalyze pattern elements.

On the one hand, the hypothesis that linguistic rules and creative language stem solely from the extensive use of routines and patterns implicates that prefabricated language is the natural predecessor of creative language. Prefabricated language is seen as playing a crucial role in child second language acquisition. On the other hand, the assumption of an internal creative mechanism suggests that children do not “infer” linguistic rules “per se.” Rules, under this assumption, are embedded in the internal creative mechanism itself, therefore only needing certain environmental experiences to trigger or “bring to the surface” that which apparently is purported to be already inside the child’s neuronal wiring: the structure of language. This view suggests that even in the absence of an extensive use of prefabricated routines and prefabricated patterns, learners would eventually acquire the second language.

Although it is evident that child second language learners use prefabricated language frequently,<sup>44</sup> there is no evidence of an external factor—such as verbal interaction—directly associated with prefabricated language analysis and reanalysis, or evidence suggesting that child second language learners “infer” linguistic rules by extensively analyzing and reanalyzing prefabricated language elements. Consequently, the presence of an automatically occurring internal creative process that drives the analysis and reanalysis of prefabricated language elements cannot be ruled out conclusively.

Finally, it can be argued that language development does go hand in hand with socialization in terms of learners being “...attentive to recurrent, useful, or favorite expressions they could or wanted to use for their social

purposes, picking them up from the speech of other people.”<sup>45</sup> However, it cannot be asserted that socialization, via verbal interaction, accounts for the analysis and reanalysis of prefabricated language elements. The results of a study by Shibata<sup>46</sup> on the role of prefabricated language in young children’s second language acquisition “...did not find evidence to support the hypothesis made by Hickey<sup>47</sup> that the learner may receive crucial aid in prefabricated language analysis through interaction.”<sup>48</sup>

## NOTES

- 1 H. ELSEN, *Two Routes to Language: Stylistic Variation in One Child*, *First Language*, Vol. 16, 1996, p. 141-158. S. D. KRASHEN AND R. SCARCELLA, *On Routines and Patterns in Language Acquisition and Performance*, *Language Learning*, Vol. 28, 1978, p. 283-300. E. LIEVEN, J. PINE, AND H. DRESNER-BARNES, *Individual Differences in Early Vocabulary Development: Redefining the Referential-expressive Distinction*, *Journal of Child Language*, Vol. 19, 1992, p. 287-310. J. PINE AND E. LIEVEN, *Re-analysing Rote-learned Phrases: Individual Differences in the Transition to Multi-word Speech*, *Journal of Child Language*, Vol. 20, 1993, p. 551-571. L. WONG-FILLMORE, *The Second Time Around: Cognitive and Social Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 37, 1976, p.6443.
- 2 R. CLARK, *Performing Without Competence*, *Journal of Child Language*, Vol. 1, 1974, p. 9. L. Wong-Fillmore, *loc. cit.*, N. SHIBATA, *The Role of Prefabricated Language in Young Children's Second Language Acquisition*, *Bilingual Research Journal*, Vol. 25, N. 3, 2001, p. 251-280.
- 3 *Ibid*, p. 251.
- 4 S. D. KRASHEN, *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*, New York, Pergamon Press, 1981, p. 83.
- 5 S. D. KRASHEN, *loc. cit.*.
- 6 S. D. KRASHEN, *loc. cit.*.
- 7 *Ibid*, p. 84.
- 8 S. D. KRASHEN AND R. SCARCELLA, *op .cit*, p. 283-300.
- 9 S. D. KRASHEN, *op .cit*, p. 99.
- 10 E. BATES, I. BRETHERTON AND L. SNYDER, *From First Words to Grammar: Individual Differences and Dissociable Mechanisms*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988. O. BOHN, *Formulas, Frame Structures and Stereotypes in Early Syntactic Development: Some New Evidence from L2 Acquisition*, *Linguistics*, Vol.24, 1986, p. 185-202. R. BROWN, *A First Language: The Early Stages*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1973. E. HATCH, *Some Studies in Language Learning*, *UCLA Work Papers in Teaching English as a Second Language*, Vol. 6, 1972, p. 31. P. LIGHTBOWN, *Exploring Relationships Between Developmental and Instructional Sequences in L2 Acquisition*, In H. SELIGER AND M. LONG

- (EDS.), *Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition*, Rowley, Newbury House, 1983, p. 217-245.
- 11 E. HATCH, *loc. cit.*.
  - 12 *loc. cit.*.
  - 13 *loc. cit.*.
  - 14 *loc. cit.*.
  - 15 J. WAGNER-GOUGH, *Comparative Studies in Second Language Learning*, MA Thesis, UCLA, TESL Department, 1975, p. 71.
  - 16 S. D. KRASHEN, *op. cit.*, p. 84.
  - 17 *Ibid.*, p. 89.
  - 18 N. CHOMSKY, *Syntactic Structures*, The Hague, Mouton, 1957, p. 100.
  - 19 R. MITCHELL AND F. MYLES, *Second Language Learning Theories*, London, Arnold Publishers, 1998, p. 61.
  - 20 N. CHOMSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 100.
  - 21 N. CHOMSKY, *Language and Problems of Knowledge: The Managua Lectures*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1988, p. 167.
  - 22 M. S. GAZZANIGA, *Nature's Mind: The Biological Roots of Thinking, Emotions, Sexuality, Language, and Intelligence*, New York, BasicBooks, 1992, p. 30-33, 37-38. M. S. GAZZANIGA, *The Mind's Past*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2000, p. 42-60.
  - 23 *Ibid.*, p. 16-26 and 34-35.
  - 24 N. CHOMSKY, *Syntactic Structures*, p. 100-102.
  - 25 M. S. GAZZANIGA, *op. cit.*, p. 52-54 and 18-19.
  - 26 N. CHOMSKY, *op. cit.*, p. 107-115.
  - 27 *Ibid.*, p. 118-120.
  - 28 R. MITCHELL and F. MYLES, *loc. cit.*.
  - 29 M. LONG, *Maturational Constraints on Language Development*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 12, 1990, p. 251-285.
  - 30 *Ibid.*, p. 251
  - 31 *loc. cit.*.
  - 32 E. L. NEWPORT, *Maturational Constraints on Language Learning*, *Cognitive Science*, Vol. 14, 1990, p. 11-28.
  - 33 S. D. KRASHEN and R. SCARCELLA, *op. cit.*, p. 283-300.
  - 34 K. HAKUTA, *Prefabricated Patterns and the Emergence of Structure in Second Language Acquisition*, *Language Learning*, Vol. 24, N. 2, 1974, p. 287-288.
  - 35 L. WONG-FILLMORE, *op. cit.*, p. 6443.
  - 36 D. BOLINGER, *Meaning and Memory*, *Forum Linguisticum*, Vol. I, 1976, p.1-14. R. CLARK, *op. cit.*, p. 1-10. R. ELLIS, *Can Syntax be Taught? A Study of the Effects of Formal Instructions on the Acquisition of WH Questions in Children*, *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 5, N. 2, 1984, p. 138-155. L. HUANG and E. HATCH, *A Chinese Child's Acquisition of English*, In E. HA-

- TCH (ed.), *Second language Acquisition, A Book of Readings*, Rowley, Newbury House, 1978, p. 76-88. H. ITOH and E. HATCH, *Second Language Acquisition: A Case Study*, In E. HATCH (ED.), *Second Language Acquisition*, p. 76-88. N. SHIBATA, *op.cit.*, p. 251-280. A. PETERS, *The Units of Language Acquisition*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1983. M. VIHMAN, *Formulas in First and Second Language Acquisition*, In L. MENN & L. OBLER (EDS.), *Exceptional Language and Linguistics*, New York, New York Academic Press, 1982, p. 261-284. L. WONG-FILLMORE, *loc. cit.*. C. YORIO, *Conventionalized Forms and the Development of Communicative Competence*. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. XIV, N. 4, 1980, p. 433-442.
- 37 K. Hakuta, *op.cit.*, p. 287-297.
- 38 L. WONG-FILLMORE, *loc. cit.*.
- 39 *Ibid.*, p. 645.
- 40 *loc. cit.*.
- 41 N. SHIBATA, *op.cit.*, p. 252.
- 42 E. HATCH, *op.cit.*, p. 252-253.
- 43 L. WONG-FILLMORE, *op.cit.*, p. 670.
- 44 D. BOLINGER, *loc. cit.*, R. Clark, *loc. cit.*, K. HAKUTA, *loc. cit.*. L. HUANG and HATCH, *loc. cit.*, H. ITOH, and E. HATCH, *loc. cit.*, N. SHIBATA, *loc. cit.*, A. PETERS, *loc. cit.*, M. VIHMAN, *loc. cit.*, L. WONG-FILLMORE, *loc. cit.*.
- 45 N. SHIBATA, *op.cit.*, p. 269.
- 46 *Ibid.*, p. 251-280.
- 47 T. HICKEY, *Identifying Formulas in First Language Acquisition*, *Journal of Child Language*, Vol. 20, 1993, p. 27-41.
- 48 N. SHIBATA, *op.cit.*, p. 265-266.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

BATES, E., I. BRETHERTON and L. SNYDER. *From First Words to Grammar: Individual Differences and Dissociable Mechanisms*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988.

BOHN, O. *Formulas, Frame Structures, and Stereotypes in Early Syntactic Development: Some New Evidence From L2 Acquisition*, *Linguistics*, Vol. 24, 1986.

BOLINGER, D. *Meaning and Memory*, *Forum Linguisticum*, Vol. I, 1976.

BROWN, R. *A First Language: The Early Stages*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1973.

CHOMSKY, N. *Syntactic Structures*, The Hague, Mouton, 1957.

-----, *Language and Problems of Knowledge: The Managua Lectures*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1988.

CLARK, R. *Performing Without Competence*, *Journal of Child Language*, Vol. 1, 1974.

ELLIS, R. *Can Syntax Be Taught? A Study of the Effects of Formal Instructions On the Acquisition of WH Questions in Children*, *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 5, N. 2, 1984.

ELSEN, H. *Two Routes to Language: stylistic variation in one child*, *First Language*, Vol. 16, 1996.

GAZZANIGA, M. S. *The Mind's Past*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2000.

-----, *Nature's Mind: The Biological Roots of Thinking, Emotions, Sexuality, Language, and Intelligence*, New York, Basic Books, 1992.

- HAKUTA, K. *Prefabricated Patterns and the Emergence of Structure in Second Language Acquisition*, *Language Learning*, Vol. 24, N. 2, 1974.
- HATCH, E. "Some Studies in Language Learning", *UCLA Workpapers in Teaching English as a Second Language*, Vol. 6, 1972.
- , *Second Language Acquisition*, A book of readings, Rowley, Newbury House, 1978.
- HICKEY, T. *Identifying Formulas in First Language Acquisition*, *Journal of Child Language*, Vol. 20, 1993.
- KRASHEN, S. D. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*, New York, Pergamon Press, 1981.
- KRASHEN, S. D. and R. SCARCELLA. *On Routines and Patterns in Language Acquisition and Performance*, *Language Learning*, Vol. 28, 1978.
- LIEVEN, E., J. PINE and H. DRESNER-BARNES. *Individual Differences in Early Vocabulary Development: Redefining the Referential-expressive Distinction*, *Journal of Child Language*, Vol. 19, 1992.
- LONG, M. *Maturational Constraints on Language Development*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 12, 1990.
- MENN, L. and L. OBLER (EDS.). *Exceptional Language and Linguistics*, New York, New York Academic Press, 1982.
- MITCHELL, R. and F. MYLES. *Second Language Learning Theories*, London, Arnold Publishers, 1998.
- NEWPORT, E.L. *Maturational Constraints on Language Learning*, *Cognitive Science*, Vol. 14, 1990.
- PETERS, A. *The Units of Language Acquisition*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- PINE, J. and E. LIEVEN. *Reanalysing Rote-learned Phrases: Individual Differences in the Transition to Multi-word Speech*, *Journal of Child Language*, Vol. 20, 1993.
- H. SELIGER and M. LONG (EDS.), *Classroom Oriented Research in Second*

**Language Acquisition**, Rowley, Newbury House, 1983.

SHIBATA, N. *The Role of Prefabricated Language in Young Children's Second Language Acquisition*, *Bilingual Research Journal*, Vol. 25, N. 3, 2001.

WAGNER-GOUGH, J. *Comparative Studies in Second Language Learning*, MA Thesis, UCLA, TESL Department, 1975.

WONG-FILLMORE, L. *The Second Time Around: Cognitive and Social Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*, *Dissertation Abstract International*, Vol. 37, 1976.

YORIO, C. *Conventionalized Forms and the Development of Communicative Competence*, *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. XIV, N. 4, 1980.