

1998

On Grammaticality Judgement Tasks in Second Language Acquisition Research

Brahim SIMOUR

Université de paris 8, France

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/dirassat>



Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), and the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

SIMOUR, Brahim (1998) "On Grammaticality Judgement Tasks in Second Language Acquisition Research," *Dirassat*: Vol. 8, Article 9.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/dirassat/vol8/iss8/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Arab Journals Platform. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dirassat by an authorized editor. The journal is hosted on [Digital Commons](#), an Elsevier platform. For more information, please contact rakan@aarj.edu.jo, marah@aarj.edu.jo, u.murad@aarj.edu.jo.

«ON GRAMMATICALITY JUDGMENT TASKS IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION RESEARCH»

Brahim SIMOUR
Université de Paris 8,
FRANCE

1. Introduction

The purpose of the present article is to consider some important methodological problems having to do with the techniques of elicitation of interlanguage (henceforth IL) data. Researchers in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) generally make use of two main sorts of data : intuitional data and textual data. The former broadly refer to learner's metalinguistic judgments and represent the dominating trend in the eighties, whereas the latter consist primarily of learner productions and were dominating in the seventies. Here, we will be particularly interested in the elicitation of intuitional data because of two fundamental reasons : the first of which is that intuitional data have been used widely in SLA research, and the second of which is that their use has been, over the past few years, the subject of hot debate and much controversy more than any other research method (Ellis (1991), Hedgcock (1993), Birdsong (1989)... among others).

The organization of the paper is as follows. In the first place, we briefly deal with some methodological problems linked to IL data elicitation. In the second place, we try to explain what is meant by grammaticality judgment tasks. Thirdly, we consider some theoretical and practical arguments advanced by advocates of these judgments. There then follows a discussion of some shortcomings of this procedure. The paper concludes by arguing that grammaticality judgments are complex behavioural activities that elicit a particular kind of performance which needs to be understood more thoroughly before being used as an instrument or investigating SLA.

2. On the elicitation of interlanguage data some methodological problems

One of the very important methodological problems that any SLA researcher has to settle in priority concerns the elicitation of IL data. He must explicitly indicate which type of data he considers as particularly relevant for research in SLA. Selinker (1972), addressing the question as to which data more psychologically relevant to SLA research, argues that the clarification of this problem should be given logical priority, for it is only after identifying precisely the phenomenon we wish to study that we are able to understand how people learn languages and hence hope to contribute to developing a theory of SLA. A distinction⁽¹⁾ is generally made between intuitional data-learners' metalinguistic judgements⁽²⁾ and intuitions based on introspection and reactions to already produced and fabricated sentences-and textual data - learners' written and oral productions which, contrary to grammaticality judgments, are based on learners' real performance⁽³⁾. These two different conceptions of data elicitation can be considered as a direct consequence of the widespread influence of two dominating linguistic schools, namely the Chomskyan Generative Grammar school⁽⁴⁾ and the Labovian Sociolinguistic school.

Generativists adopting a formal framework (i. e., Adjémian (1976, 1982), Flynn (1988), Felix (1988), White (1985, 1986b)... to mention but a few examples) adhere to the idea that grammaticality judgments provide a relatively direct (and privileged) access into the learner's IL and, more precisely, his intuitive activity⁽⁵⁾. Conversely, researchers working within a functional framework (i. e., Tarone (1979, 1982), Schumann (1976), and the great majority of researchers of the E.S.F.⁽⁶⁾ project,...) clearly prefer textual data, that is spontaneous language⁽⁷⁾ produced by the learner. Tarone (1979), argues that there should be conditions in which the learner pays less attention to what he says. These authors stipulate that the best way to approximate naturally occurring spontaneous data, and thus learn much about the second language(L2) learner's IL system, is to observe (record or film) his naturally occurring conversations. Thus the learner can be asked to tell a story, provide an oral or written report on a movie, write a composition, or converse with a partner. However, this type of data is largely unpredictable in terms of specific grammatical structures. The arguments of these scholars thus join those of Selinker (1972) who, in his founding article «Interlanguage», argues that the psychologically relevant data⁽⁸⁾ for the study of IL should be «*spontaneous speech utterances*» . SLA researchers,

then, according to Selinker (1972 : 213 - 214), should *«focus... analytical attention upon the only observable data to which we can relate theoretical predictions : the utterances which are produced when the learner attempts to say sentences of a target language»* ; that is, utterances produced by the L2 learner under the pressure of natural communicative needs. It should be noted that material produced as exercises in classroom conditions is excluded not only because of the consequent variety of artificial constraints imposed on them, but also because learner's attention is obviously very often drawn to the formal language properties, and consequently, the researcher cannot make sure that he gets a true picture of their linguistic knowledge.

Rather than opposing these two sorts of data, certain researchers, notably Corder (1973), consider then as being complementary. For Corder, the reliability of intuitional data lies in the fact that they help the researcher interpret textual data. It is then essential to work with a mixed bag of data, that is to complete each type of data with the other⁽⁹⁾. This is also the same conclusion Schachter, Tyson and Diffley come to in their (1976) article :

«In order to characterize learner transitional competence adequately and to identify particular learning strategies of students learning a second language, both the actual performance of the learners and their intuitions about the target language must be taken into consideration».

Only in this way can we have a representative sample of the learners' IL, and hence hope to come up with reliable results.

3. What are metalinguistic judgments ?

It should be made clear from the beginning that grammaticality judgments are one, but certainly not the only, form of metalinguistic performance, and that intuitional data therefore are not only limited to grammaticality judgments.

In a comprehensive review of research on metalinguistic judgments, Chaudron (1983) argues that metalinguistic judgments vary on the levels of **i)** tasks, **ii)** learner's responses, and **iii)** the procedures and measures followed.

i) First, metalinguistic judgments vary on the level of **tasks**. There are at least four types of tasks which differ according to whether they require the learner to a) discriminate between well-formed and deviant sentences, b) find the errors in the deviant sentences, c) correct the errors, or d) provide grammatical descriptions of the errors.

ii) Second, metalinguistic judgments vary considerably according to the resulting **responses**. These can be either analytical or intuitive. In a discrimination task, for example, learners' responses are generally intuitive as they stem from learners' implicit knowledge. In other tasks (b, c, and d), however, responses are based on an explicit analysis because they require access to conscious knowledge, (task (d) necessitates verbalisable knowledge in addition.)

The following table, adapted from Ellis (1991 : 163), summarizes these differences in tasks and responses :

| Types of responses | task requirement | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------|------------|-------------|
| | Discrimination | Location | Correction | Description |
| A - Intuitive responses | + / - | - | - | - |
| - Analytical responses | - / + | + | + | + |
| B - Non verbalisable Knowledge | + | + | + | - |
| - Verbalisable knowledge | - | - | - | + |
| C - Recognition | + | + | + | + |
| - Production | - | + | + | + |

From this table, it clearly appears that the first tasks (a and b) necessitate that the learner distinguish between grammatical sentences and deviant ones, whereas the last two (c and d) additionally require production on the part of learners.

iii) In addition to differences in tasks and responses, grammaticality judgments also vary on the level of the **linguistic material** (measures and procedures) used in the organization of tasks. Chaudron (1983 : 367) writes in this respect :

«One of the most noticeable features of the studies reviewed here {that is his survey} is that variety of judgment tasks employed and the simultaneous variety of measures of those task types».

There are several factors that may sway learners' linguistic behaviors. These cover, for instance, a) the target item studied (generally syntactic, sometimes lexical, and rarely morphological or phonological), b) the medium of presentation of test items, (either written or aural material), c) the presence or the absence of distractor⁽¹⁰⁾ items, d) the level of contextualisa-

tion of sentences (whether they refer to a particular context or not), and e) the order of presentation of sentences of the test, (whether randomized or not). Task procedures, in their turn, vary with regard to a certain number of dimensions : i) the nature of the responses requested which may take different forms⁽¹¹⁾, ii) the immediacy of responses, (whether a time limit is imposed or not), and iii) learners' prior experience or their degree of familiarization with task requirements.

Having illustrated some aspects of variation in grammaticality judgments (the types of tasks, the linguistic materials and the procedures followed in their organization, and the resulting responses), we now discuss some theoretical arguments advanced in favor of intuitional data, and then examine the types of problems these data pose.

4. Why grammaticality judgments ?

4.1. Some advantages of grammaticality judgments

According to Ellis (1991 : 162), *«The use of metalingual judgment tasks has both a practical and theoretical rationale»*

A) From a **theoretical** point of view, there are at least three major arguments. First of all, generativists have always strongly advocated the thesis according to which metalingual judgments provide *«a direct window into the learner's grammatical competence»*, (Bley-Vroman, Felix and Ioup (1988), Felix (1988), White (1985, 1989b)). In different words, they provide a direct access to the learner's subjacent mental structures and processes that make learning possible. Second, metalinguistic judgments enable the researcher to get rid of the deficient data which are the result of the limits of memory or attention. This is what Kellerman (1989 : 36) means when he writes that such judgments allow us *«to cut a swathe through the large number of performance variables that intervene between knowledge and the processing of that knowledge»*. Last but not least, they permit one to have access to some phenomena that are normally inaccessible to investigation in production data as they occur either rarely or not at all. These inaccessible phenomena include, for example, knowledge of ambiguity, synonymy, contradiction, entailment and other relations between sentences which appear only rarely in everyday language. What operates in the individual, then, can be accessed only by developing indirect methods, and metalinguistic judgments constitute valid means for this access. Hyams (1986 : 9) summarizes the above arguments as follows :

«In studying adult linguistic competence, one most often uses gram-

maticality judgments as data base. This is not because introspective evidence has some privileged status in the study of grammar, but rather because it has proved an effective method of tapping linguistic knowledge. First, in using grammaticality judgments, we eliminate from the data base many 'data', for example, data which are the result of limitations in memory or attention. Second, it provides access into otherwise inaccessible aspects of linguistic knowledge, such as knowledge of ambiguity, synonymy, and perfectly acceptable sentences which for one reason or another simply do not occur; or occur only rarely in actual speech».

Grammaticality judgments, following Hyams' argumentation, are both advantageous and essential in that they allow the L2 researcher to author points out three main arguments against this type of data. The first argument is that the L2 researcher, when attempting to elicit intuitional data from L2 learners, will have only incomplete and distorted information about another system, the one learners are struggling with, but not about the IL they know. Actually, learners are asked to evaluate sentences of a language that they do not have total control over, and some task items are even beyond the domain of their knowledge base. Responses thus are more than guesses. This is known as the issue of indeterminacy : it refers to the incomplete (or lack of) language knowledge. The second argument states that it is difficult to determine whether learners perceive or understand an utterance. The third argument is that predictions based on intuitions are hardly reliable as they cannot be tested in real situations of performance⁽¹⁴⁾. To these we may also add other problems having to do with tests. As Corder (1973) argues, the learner often places limitations upon his performance by selecting from his repertoire only certain aspects of his knowledge which, rightly or wrongly, he has more confidence in. The same author further argues that data elicited are only what the task selects or what the learner chooses to show us, this is why forced elicitation data are necessary. Corder (1973 : 41) writes in this respect that *«elicitation procedures are used to find out something specific about the learners' language, not just to get him to talk freely. To do this, constraints must be placed on the learner so that he is forced to make choices within a severely restricted area of his phonological, lexical or syntactic competence.»* Additionally, the main problem with tests is that they ask wrong questions of a yes/no type such as, *«Does the learner know this or that category in L2 ?»* They are not devised to ask the most relevant questions such as *«what does the learner know ? What are the rules he is using ?...»*

Two other authors, namely Ellis (1991) and Hedgcock (1993), chal-

lenge the basic thesis advocated by generativists to justify the use of grammaticality judgments. Hedgcock (1993 : 12), for example, maintains that «metalingual judgments cannot be assumed to provide direct evidence of underlying competence», because they pose at least three main (theoretical) problems having to do with (i) the effects to performance constraints, (ii) the sources of learners' judgments, and (iii) the considerable variation in these judgments. These three points will be developed below.

(i) Effects of performance factors

The first problem concerns the precise effects of performance variables. Several authors - starting with Labov (1975) - have demonstrated that grammaticality judgments may be inconsistent and unstable from an individual to another, for they are influenced by a wide range of learner internal and external variables. These variables include, as already noted, situational factors, the medium of presentation of task items and their sequence, the learners' stage of development, their degree of familiarization with similar tasks, time allowance, ... among others. Clearly then, these factors do affect learners' judgments in a way or another. What is not yet clear, however, is their exact effects, and this is what makes the interpretation of learners' judgments difficult and complex. Hedgcock (1993 : 4) suggests in this way that learners' judgments «should be viewed as complex behavioral performances which occur on levels of consciousness which are as yet unspecified». Because L2 learners' judgments are altered by many extraneous factors, very little is known about the knowledge from which they emanate. This is the second problem with grammaticality judgments.

(ii) Sources of learners' judgments

There is much persisting disagreement as to the sources of knowledge on which learners base their decisions when faced with judgment tasks. In Ellis' own terms (1991 : 164), «*it is not at all clear what subjects base their judgments on*». Thus, when a subject correctly judges a sentence, we know almost nothing about the process that conducted him to such a decision⁽¹⁵⁾. There is currently no way of determining a) whether the learner actually consults his grammatical competence or another component, b) whether he makes use of implicit or explicit L2 knowledge, c) whether he judges a particular sentence for the good reason or whether his judgment is simply the result of a vague impression, and finally d) whether he bases his judgment on an intermediate theory of language, or on what he thinks L2 norms are. In Hedgcock's (1993 : 4) own words :

«When a subject correctly identifies a test string as well-formed or ill-formed, we know very little about the processes that led to that decision. We do not know whether that subject actually recognized (or even noticed) a malformation, much less whether that decision was informed by a stable or identifiable base of knowledge. Consequently, it is essential to analyze the outcomes of judgment tests for what they reveal about linguistic, metalinguistic and cognitive behaviors before assumptions can be made about the source of knowledge from which judgments emanate.»

Hedgcock (1993), following Birdsong (1989, further argues that the linguistic behaviors elicited by most grammaticality judgments are, by definition, *«intermediate»*. It is then necessary to carefully consider the types of mental activities involved in these tasks. However, the characterization of L2 intuitions is not as easy as it appears to be, because of the high levels of variability attested across and within learners. This brings us to the last, but not the least, problem with metalingual judgments, namely the great variation within learners' judgments.

(iii) Variation in learners' judgments

Several previous studies have reported considerable variation within results from grammaticality judgment tasks. This incontrovertible fact can be explained by several linguistic and cognitive factors connected with, for instance, specific task features (discussed above), and learners who, despite being identical in all obvious respects (age, proficiency, first language background and years of formal instruction), still display as much variability in their judgments as in their L2 productions. It has been reported on a number of occasions that L2 learners vary along the expectations and habits they bring to the test setting. By way of illustration, certain learners may have the capacity to guess more than others, some others may attempt to establish a symmetric balance between the number of sentences they judge grammatical or those they think are aberrant, and others may become frustrated at the length of a test. These arguments are well developed by Ellis (1991 : 164) in the following way :

«Learners are likely to bring a variety of test-performing strategies to bear in order to carry out the tasks required of them. They may guess if they are not sure, they may lose patience if the test is too long, they may try to ensure that there is a balance between the number of sentences they judge to be grammatical and deviant, they may avoid judging more than a certain number of consecutive sentences as ungram-

matical, and they may or may not try to access explicit knowledge. All of these constitute test performing strategies.

Besides, grammaticality judgments, as suggested by Labov (1975) and Birdsong (1989), may be inconsistent and unstable within learners because of contextual variables and extraneous factors. Within-learner variation occurs when a learner evaluates well formed strings exemplifying the same structures as acceptable in one instance and deviant in another.

Thus far, we have been arguing that L2 learners show significant differences in their grammaticality judgments because of their different expectations and hypotheses. Whether they find easy or difficult the identification of grammatical forms or deviant ones is another debatable issue. Two main different view points can be distinguished here.

a) A first group of authors (i.e., Bialystock (1986) and Ellis (1991)) stipulate that L2 learners frequently respond with greater certainty and accuracy to grammatical forms than to deviant ones. This sensitivity to grammatical forms can be traced to the fact that it is often easy for learners to confirm well formed sentences, because after all it is this type of sentences which are available (to them) in the input. Said otherwise, learners are more apt to confirm well formedness as exemplified in the available input and in their own L2 repertoires. Recognition of ill-formedness, on the other hand, seems to require highly developed levels of both linguistic knowledge and critical ability and, as we know, L2 learners cannot always have access to this knowledge particularly in their first stages of learning. Of particular interest is Nagata's (1988) finding that the delectability of ungrammaticalities depends on the level of complexity of test strings⁽¹⁶⁾. In fact, a learner who is confronted with highly complex or lengthy sample of sentences may reject or accept them because of processing difficulties rather than an (in) ability to assess grammaticality based on L2 knowledge. In addition to this, some target language errors appear to be glaringly obvious to learners : those that are more subtle and complex may cause marked difficulties. This pattern can be attributable to over reliance on explicit L1 rules and the method of presentation of L2 rules in the formal input. It should be noted, however, that there is only a small body of evidence supporting the claim that ill-formedness imposes greater linguistic and cognitive demands than well formedness does.

b) A second group of researchers (Gass (1983), Birdsong (1989)), on the other hand, adhere to the idea that learners find the identification of ill-formed sentences easier than the approval of well-formed sentences. In a

study by Bley Vroman, Felix and Ioup (1988), for example, subjects have demonstrated low accuracy in identifying grammatical sentences because they have a tendency to «*reject when uncertain*». Several other explanations can be advanced. One of these is that certain types of errors are naturally more salient because of their presence in the input and their frequency of use. Linked to this is Perdue's (1979) proposal that L2 learners are more likely to recognize the erroneous forms more easily since these belong to their idiosyncratic dialects. Another explanation has to do with the complexity or simplicity of test sentences. Actually, an error that occurs in a simple structure is obviously easier to identify than another one occurring in a complex structure.

Concluding remarks

In summary we would like to make the following concluding remarks:

- It is interesting to stress that the choice of the procedures of data elicitation is a crucial step as it determines, in different degrees, the nature of data collected and hence the results obtained.
- There are good reasons to suggest that grammaticality judgments are influenced by a wide range of learner-internal and contextual variables (i.e., the learner's stage of development, the grammatical items being tested, and the nature of the test). It should be noted however that only little is known about the very precise effects of these factors.
- The L2 researcher therefore has to carefully manipulate these different variables when devising his tasks. He should examine, with great precision, the well formed and deviant sentence stimuli used to test learners' intuitions. Next, he should complete with follow-up think-aloud procedures (Ellis (1991)). This will enable him to investigate what learners actually do when asked to judge the acceptability of correct and incorrect sentences, and thus understand their reactions quite well, because after all the question to which there is not yet a decisive answer is : *how do people think under the conditions of grammaticality judgment tasks* ? Besides, he should devise pilot tests with native speakers to avoid inconsistency in judgements.

Finally, as it has been argued above, the idea that grammaticality judgments provide one of the best ways of studying the mental structures and processes that make learning possible is really debatable. While it is incontrovertible that they are a useful instrument in SLA research, and that they do help us understand something about the process of second language acquisition, they are clearly insufficient and, accordingly, the confidence placed in them by some L2 researchers, notably generativists, still needs to be justified.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This article is an extended and revised version of the second chapter of my maîtrise : *On some implications of parametric variation for Second Language Acquisition*, (Octobre 1993). I should particularly like to thank an anonymous reviewer for his insightful comments on an earlier version of this paper. I would also like to express my great indebtedness to my supervisors Mr. Jo ARDITTY and Mr. Jean-Yves DOMMERGUES for their invaluable criticisms and helpful suggestions. Needless to say, errors and inconsistencies that remain are my own.

Notes

- (1) In addition to this division in terms of types of data, we can also mention another distinction in terms of ways of collecting IL data. These can be either longitudinal or cross-sectional. Longitudinal studies are generally case studies with data collected from a single or a small number of speakers, over a prolonged period of time. Here data come from spontaneous speech and are collected at regular intervals. Longitudinal studies raise several problems. First, there is no guarantee that certain IL forms will appear in spontaneous speech. This is a serious problem, although some researchers argue that one way of remedying for this is to ask specific questions in the course of data collection that will likely lead the learner to produce the structures needed. A second major drawback is that conducting longitudinal studies require much time in data collection as well as in speech transcription. Another problem is the lack of generalisability, that is, we cannot always generalise the results of long studies, and say that they are characteristics of a wide range of learners, because these are often limited in the number of participants. With regard to Cross sectional studies, they consist of data gathered from a large number of learners at a single point in time. Such studies are often (but not always) based on controlled output. Thus data come from learners' performance on some prespecified task. Here results tend to be more quantitative and less descriptive than in longitudinal studies. One advantage of cross-sectional studies is precisely the disadvantage of longitudinal studies, that is given large numbers of speakers, the results can easily be generalised to wider groups. However, cross-sectional studies, in their turn, pose some problems. In most cases, there is no detailed information about the learners themselves nor about the linguistic environment in which production is elicited, though these are central to an appropriate interpretation of the data.
- (2) Ellis (1991), following Chaudron (1983), argues that metalinguistic judgments broadly fall into two categories : judgments about grammaticality and sentiments about language and its use. The former (the concern of this paper) involve the learners deciding whether a sentence is grammatical or deviant, while the latter consist of an attitude or opinion about language and its use.
- (3) It should be made clear that there is no term-to-term correspondence between, on the one hand, productions and textual data, and on the other hand, intuitions and intuitional data.

- (4) Actually, the popularity of research based on learner's metalinguistic judgments owes a lot to the rapid developments of the generative grammatical theory, as Labov (1971 : 438) himself recognizes when he writes that the use of such data *«has gained support on the positive side from the great success of generative grammar in discovering new facts about English syntax, developing new grammatical formulations, and uncovering deeper theoretical intuitional data»*.
- (5) Intuitive activity, to quote Corder (1973 : 62), is *«l'activité consistant à prendre conscience de la connaissance, à la consulter pour porter des jugements, à la formuler, à l'explicitier sous forme linguistique, métalinguistique»*.
- (6) E.S.F. : European Science Foundation.
- (7) Spontaneous speech utterances should be understood here as opposed to learner utterances which are gathered in experimental contexts.
- (8) Selinker (1972) cites three sets of behavioral events which are the psychologically relevant data for SLA, and which reflect the three types of knowledge any L2 learner has. These are L2 utterances by native speakers, and L1 and IL utterances by second language learners.
- (9) Even researchers who argue that ideally all L2 data should come from natural conditions - a view which has never been entirely accepted- do not hesitate to elicit judgments in order to assemble a relevant corpus.
- (10) Distractors consist of sentences exemplifying some grammatical structures other than that (or those) which is (are) the focus of the study. The aim of their inclusion is to prevent the learner from easily identifying the target structure and thus from accessing explicit knowledge.
- (11) It can take the form of *i*) a binary choice (in which case subjects have to say whether a sentence is grammatical or not (GR or UNGR), *ii*) a multiple choice, requiring subjects to decide whether sentences in a series are well-formed, ill-formed or somewhere in between, (Gr, Agr or Not Sure), or *iii*) a preference choice (ask which version of the same sentence is preferable).
- (12) This is partly due to the fact that learners often have a tendency to avoid structures which they find difficult.
- (13) We agree with Labov (1972 : 203) that the reasons that motivate the restriction of linguistic data to intuition were generally exaggerated.
- (14) Corder, however, doesn't share Selinker's arguments. In an attempt to refute the first argument, he states that the learner's grammaticality *«judgments and responses can only be based upon the grammar of this interlanguage. To suggest otherwise is to suggest that a learner might say «that is the form a native speaker would use but I this form instead»*. (1973 : 41)
- (15) What is clear is that at least concerning children and adults whose only access to the target language is via classroom contact, formal instruction is logically where L2 knowledge must originate.
- (16) Nagata (1988) suggests that learners encounter some difficulty in detecting malformations not only because the errors themselves are inherently problematic but also because such malformations escape learner's attention when embedded in syntactically complex strings.

REFERENCES

- ADJEMIAN, C.** (1976). «On the nature of Interlanguage systems», in *Language Learning* 26 : 297-320.
- ADJEMIAN, C.** (1982). «La spécificité de l'interlangue et l'idéalisation des langues secondes», in J. Guéron. & T. Sowley. (eds.) (1982). *Grammaire Transformationnelle : Théorie et Méthologies*, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 421-440.
- BLEY-VROMAN, R.; FELIX, S & IOUP, G.** (1988). «The accessibility of Universal Grammar in adult language learning», in *Second Language Research* 4 : 1-32.
- BIRDSONG, D.** (1989). *Metalinguistic Performance and Interlinguistic competence*. New york : Springer.
- BIALYSTOCK, E.** (1979). «Explicit and implicit judgments of L2 grammaticality», in *Language Learning* 29 : 81-103.
- BIALYSTOCK, E.** (1986). «Factors in the growth of Linguistic awareness», in *Child Development* 57 : 498-510.
- CHAUDRON, G.** (1983). «Research on metalinguistic judgments : A review of theory, methods and results», in *Language Learning* 33/3 : 343-377.
- CORDER, S.P.** (1967). «The significance of learners' errors», in *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 5 : 161 - 170.
- CORDER, S. P.** (1971). «Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis», in *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 9/2 : 141 - 160.
- CORDER, S. P.** (1973). «The elicitation of interlanguage», in J. STARTVIK (ed.), *Errata*. Lund : Gleerup. (36 - 47).
- CORDER, S. P.** (1980). «La sollicitation des données d'Interlangue», in *Langages*, 57.
- ELLIS, R.** (1991). «Grammaticality judgments and Second Language Acquisition», in *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 13 : 161 - 186.
- FELIX, S.** (1988). «UG generated knowledge in adult second language acquisition», in S. Flynn, & W. O'Neill, (eds.) (1988). *Linguistic theory and Second Language Acquisition*, Dordrecht. Reidel.

FLYNN, S. (1989). «Second language acquisition and grammatical theory», In F. Newmyer (ed.) (1989). *Linguistics. The Cambridge Survey*. Cambridge University. Press.

FLYNN, S. & ONEIL, W. (1988). (eds.). *Linguistic Theory and Second Language Acquisition*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

GASS, S. 1979 «Language transfer and universal grammatical relations», in *Language Learning* 29 : 327 - 344.

GASS, S. (1984) «The emperical basis for the universal hypothesis in interlanguage studies», in A. DAVIES, C. CRIPER & A.HOWAT, (eds.). (1984). *Interlanguage*. Edinburgh University Press. 3 -24.

GASS, S. & SCHACHTER, J. (eds.) (1988). *Linguistic Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

HEDGCOCK, J. (1993). «Well-formed vs ill-formed strings in L2 metalingual tasks specifying features of grammaticality judgments», in *Second Language Research* 9/1 : 1-21.

HILLES, S. (1986). «Interlanguage in the PRO-drop parameter», in *Second Language Research* 2/1 : 33 - 52.

HYAMS, N. (1986). *Language Acquisition and the Theory of Parameters*. Dordrecht.

KELLERMAN, E. (1986). «An eye for an eye : Cross Linguistic constraints on the development of L2 lexicon», in E. Kellerman, & M. Sharwood Smith (eds.). (1986). *Crosse Linguistic influence in Second Language Acquisition*, Oxford, Pergamon.

LABOV, W. (1971) «Methodology», in Dingwall (ed.) (1971). *A. survey of linguistic science*. College Park Maryland. University of Maryland Press.

LABOV, W. (1975). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. University of pennsylvania. Press philadelphia.

NAGATA, H. (1986). «The reliability of linguistic intuitions : the effects of repetition in grammaticality judgements», in *Journal of psycholinguistic research*, 17 : 1 - 17.

PERDUE, C. (1979). *Acquisition d'une Langue Seconde : Analyse d'erreus d'une Population d'Anglicistes Francophones*. Thèse. de Doctorat. Université PARIS 8.

PERDUE, C. (1982). *Second language Acquisition by Adult immigrants: a Field Manual*, Starsbourg, E.S.F.

SCHACHTER, J. & TYSON, A. & DIFLEY, F. (1976). «Learner intuitions of grammaticality», in *Language Learning* 26 : 67 - 76.

SCHACHTER, J. (1988). «Second language acquisition and its relationship to Universal Grammar», in *Applied Linguistics* 9/3 : 219 - 235.

SELINKER, L. (1971). «The psychologically relevant data of Second Language Learning» In P. PIMSLEUR, & T. QUINN, (eds.). (1971). *The psychology of Second Language Learning*. Cambridge University Press.

SELINKER, L. (1972). «Interlanguage», in *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10/3 : 209-231.

SCHUMANN, J. (1976). «Second language acquisition : the pidginization hypothesis», in *Language Learning* 26 : 2 391 - 408.

SHARWOOD SMITH, M. (1988). «On the role of linguistic theory in explanations of Second Language Development Grammars», In S. FLYNN, & W O'Neill, (eds.). (1988). *Linguistic Theory and Second Language Acquisition*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 173 - 198.

TARONE, E. (1979). «Interlanguage as a chameleon», in *Language Learning* 29, 181 - 191.

TARONE, E. (1982). «Systematicity and attention in interlanguage», in *Language Learning* 32 : 69 - 84.

WHITE, L. (1985). «The PRO-drop parameter in adult second language acquisition», in *Language Learning* 35/1 : 47 - 71.

WHITE, L. (1986b). *Universal Grammar and Second Language Acquisition* Amsterdam : John Benjamins.

ABSTRACT

The present article considers some methodological problems having to do with the elicitation of interlanguage data. One of the basic ideas advocated here is that the choice of procedures of data elicitation is a critical step, for it determines, in different degrees, the nature of data collected, their analysis, and the results obtained. SLA researchers generally make use of either spontaneous textual data (the result of natural activity) or controlled intuitional data (provoked by different artificial and experimental procedures). Many researchers, notably Corder and Schachter, adhere to the idea that these two types of data are complementary, that is intuitional data help us interpret and understand textual data.

One of the most controversial methods of doing second language research is undoubtedly through the use of grammaticality judgments. This has become over the past few years the subject of a hot debate (see particularly Ellis (1991) and Hedgcock (1993). This paper, rather than trying to validate or invalidate grammaticality judgments, is a contribution to this debate. Examples of questions addressed here are : which methodological problems of questions addressed here are : which methodological problems should be settled in priority ?, what are grammaticality judgements ?, what advantages do they have ?, what problems do they pose ? ... to name a few.

RESUME

Le propos de cet article est d'étudier quelques problèmes méthodologiques touchant à la sollicitation des données d'interlangue. Ici l'accent est mis sur le fait qu le choix des procédures de sollicitation des données est une étape critique car il détermine, à différents degrés, la nature des données recueillies, le traitement qui en est fait, et les résultats obtenus. Les chercheurs en acquisition des langues étrangères s'appuient généralement soit sur des données spontanées (qui résultent de l'activité naturelle du langage), soit sur des données provoquées (suscitées par diverses procédures artificielles ou expérimentales). Ces deux types de données (textuelle et intuitionnelles) sont, aux yeux de nombreux chercheurs, notamment CORDER et SCHACHTER, complémentaires ; c'est à dire que les données intuitionnelles nous aident à mieux interpréter et donc à mieux comprendre les données textuelles, et à tester leur validité.

Sous l'impulsion des travaux des générativistes, l'emploi des jugements grammaticaux est devenu, ces dernières années, le sujet d'un grand débat (voir en particulier les articles de Ellis (1991), et de Hedgcock (1993)). Cet article se veut un enrichissement et une contribution à ce débat et non une tentative pour valider ou invalider les données intuitionnelles.