



Symposium title: Dynamic Usage Based Principles in L2 Instruction

Coordinator 1 Audrey Rousse-Malpat; European Languages and Culture, University of Groningen, the Netherlands

Coordinator 2 Marije Michel; European Languages and Culture, University of Groningen, the Netherlands

Symposium format (one choice - delete the others):

- **Symposium Multimodal**

Symposium mode (one choice - delete the others):

- **Hybrid**

Sub-themes (multiple choices - delete the others):

- ☐ **LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING:** teacher education, curricula and education, classrooms, instruction, task-based learning, EAP, study abroad, (virtual) exchanges, materials and methods

Short abstract in English (15 lignes) :

Teaching methods in line with Dynamic Usage-based principles do not regard language as a set of rules but as conventionalized routines, where non-linear learning emerges from the dynamic interaction between input and output. Rather than focusing on grammar, DUB methods focus on 'iteration' (Larsen-Freeman 2012), namely, frequently repeated exposure to utterances in meaningful contexts (Verspoor, 2017) to foster automatisisation and routinisation (Rousse-Malpat, Steinkrauss & Verspoor, 2019).

In this symposium we seek papers that (1) extend existing knowledge on the Dynamic Usage Based (DUB) theoretical framework, (2) showcase how DUB principles may be applied to teaching methods, (3) empirically test the efficacy of DUB principles in L2 teaching . We wish to showcase studies that demonstrate how to implement this approach in the classroom and/or provide empirical evidence of how its implementation affects L2 learning.

Argument (2 pages maximum, i.e. about 500 words or 3000 characters including bibliography):

A DUB approach to second language teaching (Verspoor, 2017) takes a holistic approach to language. Conventionalized language units, referred to as Form Use Meaning Mappings (FUMMs), are presented as whole units in meaningful and real-life contexts. In this symposium we seek papers that (1) extend existing knowledge on the Dynamic Usage Based (DUB) theoretical framework, (2) showcase how DUB principles may be applied to teaching methods, (3) empirically test the efficacy of DUB principles in L2 teaching.

There are four key principles to this approach:



Exposure first

There is no doubt that language input is essential in second language development (Gass, 2013; Van Patten, 2004). L2 learners require extensive second language exposure as language input to build their internal linguistic systems. To be processed effectively by learners, the input needs to be easily comprehensible and message-oriented. This view is somewhat in line with Krashen's (1987) input hypothesis: language learners have to be exposed to comprehensible language which is authentic, interesting and/or relevant, not grammatically sequenced, and includes language structures that are beyond their current level. Before being able to produce language, the learner has to hear/see utterances frequently.

Frequency of exposure through repetition

Frequency of exposure is needed for second language acquisition. Ellis claims that "(...) the acquisition of language is exemplar based. It is the piecemeal learning of many thousands of 3 constructions and the frequency-biased abstraction of regularities within them" (2002, p. 143). Learners will have to hear/see expressions at least 8 times (Nation, 2001) before they can be remembered. Therefore, L2 instructional materials should have built-in repetition of FUMMs.

Associative learning through multimodal real life exemplars

To create as many target-like associations as possible with FUMMs, the learner should see them in teaching materials that reflect how real target language users use them meaningfully in real-life contexts. Multimodality—videos, images, gestures, reading & listening—all aid in making stronger associations and help retention. Comprehension and noticing through scaffolding Despite receiving multimodal cues in a meaningful context, an absolute beginner may not be able to understand the meaning of a real-life utterance without help. Leaving the learner at his or her own devices may be demotivating. The teacher needs to scaffold for understanding, preferably but not exclusively in the target language. Also, non-salient forms in the utterances may be written out in full to help learners notice them or iconic gestures may be used. The teacher can point out the pragmatic effects of specific utterances and elaborate on interesting cultural implications.

In this symposium we wish to showcase studies that demonstrate how to implement this approach in the classroom and/or provide empirical evidence of how its implementation affects L2 learning.

References

Ellis, N. C. (2002). Frequency effects in language processing: A review with implications for theories of implicit and explicit language acquisition. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 24(2), 143-188.



- Gass, S. M. (2013). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Routledge.
- Krashen, S. (1987). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Prentice-Hall International.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2012) On the roles of repetition in language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 3(2), 195–210.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rousse-Malpat, A., Steinkrauss, R., & Verspoor, M. (2019). Structure-based or dynamic usage? based instruction: long-term effects on (morpho) syntactic and lexical complexity in writing samples. *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*, 3(2), 181-205.
- VanPatten, B. (Ed.). (2004). *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Verspoor, M., (2017). *Complex dynamic systems theory and L2 pedagogy: Lessons to be learned*. In L. Ortega & Z. Han (Eds.), *Complexity theory and language development: In celebration of Diane Larsen-Freeman* (pp. 143-162) John Benjamins.