

Exploratory Pathways to Foreign Language Learning through Natural and Virtual versus Pedagogical Settings دروب استكشافية لتعلم اللغة الأجنبية عبر الأوساط الطبيعية والافتراضية مقابل الأوساط البيداغوجية

SAAIDIA BACHIR*

Mohamed El-Cherif Messaadia University, Soukahras, Algeria, Email: bachir.saaidia@univ-soukahras.dz

Date de réception : 09/05/2022

Date d'acceptation : 31/07/2022

date de publication: 31/07/2022

الملخص:

تتلاقى الدراسات في مجال اكتساب اللغة الأجنبية في تأثير البيئة اللغوية على الأداء. نظراً لنقص المادة اللغوية الأصلية والمواقف التواصلية. تناقش هذه المقالة المسارات الاستكشافية باعتبارها مناهج بديلة لتعلم اللغة الأجنبية. إلى جانب ذلك، فإن المقال يدرس عدد من المفاهيم مثل التعلم الضمني؛ التعلم الطبيعي العفوي؛ والتعلم التلقائي عبر الفضاء الافتراضي. تسعى المقالة إلى تفعيل استخدام المدخلات اللغوية الافتراضية من خلال تقنيات إجرائية تكيفية جديدة. من خلال الإجراء الوصفي والتحليلي، تقدم هذه الورقة البحثية وصفاً كاملاً لكيفية تحسين أداء المتعلمين في المهارات اللغوية. في مجال اكتساب اللغة الأجنبية، تؤثر البيئة اللغوية بشكل كبير على نتائج التعلم بشكل رئيسي في الإنتاج الشفوي. يُظهر البحث أن المتعلمين، عندما يُعرضون إلى حد كبير لمجموعة واسعة من المدخلات اللغوية في وسطها الطبيعي، يمكنهم الأداء بشكل أفضل. من أجل اغتنام الفرص التي يوفرها موردو الشبكة، يجب أن تعيد وجهات نظر التدريس واستثمار الإمكانيات العالية للتطبيق لتحسين الأداء اللغوي

الكلمات المفتاحية: الوسط، التعلم، الوسط

الافتراضي، الطلاقة، المدخلات.

Abstract

Studies in foreign language acquisition converge at the influential quality of the linguistic setting on foreign language acquisition. Due to the lack of authentic documents, and real communicative situations, this article discusses exploratory pathways as alternative approaches to language learning. Besides, it exposes a plethora of concepts like implicit, informal learning and virtual exposure. This position article highlights the effectiveness of virtual linguistic inputs used through new adaptive procedural techniques. Through the descriptive and analytical procedure, this research paper gives an account of how to improve learners' performances in language skills. The linguistic environment weighs significantly on learning outcome mainly in oral production. Research shows that learners, when exposed permanently to authentic language inputs, perform better in a foreign language. To seize the opportunities provided by net suppliers, teaching perspectives have to reinvest high potentials for application.

Keywords: Settings, learning, virtual setting, fluency, input, informal Settings

*Auteur correspondant

Introduction

Learning a foreign language in an academic setting shows its limit in a context where learners are exposed to a variety of language network providers. The paucity of authentic documents that enable learners to improve their communicative skills has conceded in favour of expanding virtual networks. It is a common sense that a foreign or second language is usually learnt but to some degree may also be acquired or "*picked up*" depending on the environmental setting. The implicit-explicit learning processes form the whole spectrum of a learner's knowledge of his/her language potential.

Second language acquisition theories have underlined the quintessential impact of natural settings, implicit learnings, fluency, and automaticity on learners' performances. As an illustration, the Comprehensible Input Hypothesis (C.I.H.) showed the process of acquiring a foreign/second language naturally (Krashen, 1982), rather than learning it consciously. Adaptive Control of Thought (ACT) (Anderson, 1992) theory provided a complete account of how the application of rules became automatic. However, some scholars, Ellis (2004) and Krashen. (1982) acknowledged explicit learning of language fundamentals as necessary for learner's development, and improvement. Besides, they claimed convincingly that the process of explicit language learning might overcome the setbacks of insecure formulation of new patterns learnt outside classroom settings.

Relying on insufficient language data does not help learners to cope with contact situations accessible through the network, or to communicate ideas in writing. To overcome this stance, this article provides an insight of the different dichotomies that explain thoroughly their impact on learners' performances in language skills. Moreover, the article explores pathways to foreign language fluency that answer recurrent questions on the poor performances of foreign language learners.

I. Foreign/Second Language Learning in Natural Setting

The natural setting arises in the course of the learners' contact with other speakers of the target language in a variety of situations, in the workplace, through the media, at international conferences, and in business meetings. Learners experience a foreign language in a natural setting when they are exposed to authentic materials, net conversation, attending some debates, and talk shows. The great advantage of natural, idiomatic texts over artificial 'methods' or 'series' is that they do justice to every feature of the language [...] the artificial systems. On the other hand, *they* tend to cause incessant repetition of certain grammatical constructions, certain elements of the vocabulary, certain combinations of words to the almost total exclusion of others that are equally or perhaps even more, essential. (Sweet 1899:177)

The net provides a variety of natural sources via versatile faces and moments. Learners who spend much of their time clung to their visual display

screens tend to excel in oral communicative competence. Yet, learners prefer receiving information quickly, relying on communication technologies as well as performing multiple tasks (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005).

Authentic or authentic-like discourse and materials in communicative language teaching are crucial. Authentic materials are potential learning tools due to the authenticity of the language and their intimate relation with the communicative language teaching approach (Hall, 1995; Tomlinson, 1998). Course books used in schools reflect this concern by providing some activities that serve a communicative purpose. Learners perceive the language used as being much simpler and easier to comprehend than similar input found in non-pedagogical sources (Nunan, 1989). We should introduce learners to source of input a native speaker of a language might come across in daily life, such as maps, schedules, and other listening and reading materials.

What we mean by foreign language learning, which takes place in settings where the language plays no major role in the community, is primarily rule-based and learnt in the classroom. When contrasted with foreign language acquisition, it includes limitless contexts and open to lunatic learners. Foreign language learners could not understand idiomatic expressions used by natives, as part of native culture heritage. An example of idioms: *It cost an arm and a leg/ I ain't got no dough* –expressions belong to language but could not be decoded using do-dads, or

transformation or any teaching technique (Keiko, 1991). Language should be treated as a series of natural chunk, i.e., a (raw language: slangy, coarse, crude, and quick). Then, raw language means coarse and crude language with all its imperfections and irregularities. It is not the idealized form used in academic setting. There is no need, then, to slow down speaking speed because one may jeopardize learning a foreign language. Also, slowing down may harm the natural rhythm and intonation of the language. In connected speech, speed is a factor of language fluency.

We intend to invest in this area for the sake of making students aware of their learning by expanding their foreign language learning outside the boundaries of classes, i.e., autonomous acquisition of foreign languages. According to Judd (1978), three broad types of natural L2 learning settings can be identified:

- A) Acquisition is the natural process in which human beings learn to speak or make meaning of a language based on exposure to the natural environment.
- B) The penguin edition dictionary of psychology: Generally, gaining, acquiring, incorporating...hence, a common and loose synonym for learning
- C) Acquiring a foreign language implies a random incorporation of rough and pure language; it is not selective.

Then, natural L2 learning settings are as important as informal learning situations. Obviously, foreign language learners can attain autonomous

learning when they are constantly exposed to native language repertoires and registers.

II. Informal versus Formal Language Learning Settings

Knowles (1950) introduced the term informal learning to reveal the essence of informal environment in many learning situations, the flexibility of the process, and the use of experience. According to him, language learning can be obtained progressively from interaction in society. Unconsciously, foreign language learners can develop language communicative skill mechanisms without reference to formal and rules constraints. In the same vein, Coombs and Ahmad (1974) referred to informal education as a process of developing knowledge and skills of people in highly un-institutional and un-structured settings. However, formal education is highly institutional and occurs in structured settings. A body of research, devoted to formal and informal settings, was clearly portrayed in seminal findings of a group of scholars (Lightbown & Spada, 2001; Marsick & Watkins, 1990; Rogers, 2004). For this concern, Rogers (2004) consolidated previous arguments, saying that informal language learning is unstructured and unpurposeful but is the most extensive and essential part of all the learning that all of us do every day of our lives. On the contrary, formal language learning is structured, purposeful, and school-based.

There is a clear cut between formal and informal language learning. A significant difference is found in terms of the settings of the learning (in-or-outside the class environments), and instruction which refers to focus on language

mechanics, as grammar and vocabulary (Lightbown & Spada, 2001; Marsick & Watkins, 1990). Informal setting includes the context in which language learners use language actively, at school, home, and work or in social interaction and formal setting as the context where the target language is being taught to a group of second or foreign language learners (Lightbown & Spada, 2001).

Both formal and informal language learning settings overlap as they represent a communicative skill. While formal language learning takes place in the academic environment, i.e. classroom; informal language learning, mostly, takes place out of the class environment where language learner is exposed to raw language impurities. In this respect, Marsick and Watkins (1990) claimed that informal language learning occurs in a class setting when the focus is not on the form of the language; that is, informal language learning occurs in casual forms when classmates interact with each other, but it is not typically classroom-based or highly structured .

The use of English as a foreign language is limited to language classrooms (Freed, 1995). In EFL context, English language has no major role in society and is learnt in the classroom setting (Ellis, 2008). Hence, the absence of the social value of English language should be seen as a psychological drive to find substitutes outside the classroom settings. The net provides opportunities to immerse in order to improve not only the speaking abilities but the writing skill as well. The virtual interaction in EFL contexts is one of the authentic sources of language input, which can help language learners acquire the language in informal settings .

In an EFL context, social interaction as a source of language input in an informal language learning setting is lacking. In Algeria, mother language or L1 is used as a medium of communication or for other purposes in society. English language is mainly limited to formal settings at universities, language institutes or language classrooms. Actually, in EFL contexts, limited usage of English language can only be observed when language learners use English language in interactions with their instructors and their peers. In fact, learners use different technologies at home or at work to watch a movie or listen to music or song, which provide appropriate language input is considered as another example of language learning in informal settings (Lightbown & Spada, 2001).

From another perspective, foreign language learning may occur when implicit learning is shaped in favour of a structural and procedural method. In the same vein, scholars like Dörnyei (2009), Perrig (2000) and Boyer (1998) insisted on the unconscious process of language acquisition.

III. E

Explicit-Implicit Language Learning Dichotomy

In his book, *The Psychology of Second Language Acquisition*, Dörnyei (2009) made a clear-cut between explicit, conscious process of learning, and implicit learning, which denotes the unconscious, automatic, or indirect process. The terms were defined, in the second language acquisition, with reference to learning with or without the aid of grammar rules. Dörnyei (2009) expanded his explanation to explicit-implicit dichotomy when related to three different concepts- learning,

knowledge, and memory-. Perrig (2000) described how these concepts are interconnected in the literature of Second Language Acquisition:

The fluent speech between notion like ‘implicit knowledge,’ ‘explicit learning,’ and ‘implicit memory’ either confronts us with the fact that psychology has- despite precision at the operational level – weakness at the terminological level, or it asks for synthesis in the explanation of implicit phenomena or implicit cognition .

Dörnyei (2009: 135) views learning, as the process of acquiring or encoding new information- that is ‘knowledge’- and ‘memory’ is the storage and retrieval of this knowledge. Explicit knowledge, then, is acquired through explicit learning and stored in explicit memory; and implicit knowledge is acquired through implicit learning and stored in implicit memory. However, actual learning sequences which occur in real life situations do not reflect the two relational chains studied so far. In the same way, Cleermans, Destrebecqz and Boyer (1998) claim that the field (implicit knowledge and memory) is divided into ‘implicit’ or ‘unconscious’ knowledge and how it can be operationalized in measurement terms. They also suggest the existence of an independent and distinct ‘implicit’ memory’. Implicit learning is defined with reference to its outcome, which correlates with the definition of explicit learning, ‘the construction of explicit, verbalized, metalinguistic knowledge in the form of symbols (concepts) and rules, specifying relationships between concepts’ (Hulstijn 2011).

As the scope of the study is implicit-explicit learning dichotomy, a special focus will be on explicit versus implicit learning. Then, the two concepts will be studied

thoroughly with examples from real life situations.

IV. Explicit Learning versus Implicit Learning

Hulstijn (2005) explicitly distinguished between the two concepts, “definitions of learning whether implicit or explicit—as a process (how) can easily become contaminated with the object of learning (what)” (p. 133). This is how Hulstijn defined explicit and implicit learning:

Explicit learning is input processing with the conscious intention to find out whether the input information contains regularities and, if so, to work out the concepts and rules with which these regularities can be captured. Implicit learning is input processing without such an intention, taking place unconsciously. (p. 131)

Learning language items, like vocabulary, stress and intonation patterns, and grammar rules, by means of overt strategies, such as techniques of memorizations, drills or frequency pattern practice are the fundamentals to explicit learning (Sweet, 1899). It is characterized by the learners’ conscious and deliberate attempt to master some material (learning new techniques, controlled practice, and in-depth analysis). It aims at finding

regularities, identifying rules and concepts that are used to capture these regularities (Hulstijn 2005). Form-focused L2 instruction results in substantial target-oriented outcomes that explicit types of instruction are effective in language learning, and the effectiveness of L2 instruction is resilient and sustainable. Form-focused instruction can help to achieve this by employing learners’ explicit, conscious processing to allow them to consolidate focused form-function bindings of novel L2 constructions (Ellis, 2005). The process of explicit language learning may overcome the setbacks of insecure formulation of new patterns learnt outside classroom settings. Conscious immersion in L2 acquisition is synonymous with explicit learning when involved in the initial registration of pattern recognizers for constructions; which are then regulated and integrated into the system by implicit learning during subsequent input processing. Reber (2003) cast his conclusion that real-life tasks cannot be regarded as ‘pure’ in terms of requiring either explicit or implicit mechanisms because they usually involve a mixture of these. He concluded:

Virtually everything cognitively interesting that people do is a complex blend of consciously controlled processing that is declarative in nature and implicit, automatic functioning that lies largely outside of awareness...(p.488)

It is then worth noting that, in explicit learning, learners incorporate language layers, as language rules, phonetic supra-segmental features, and vocabulary items in symbolic terms by committing these to memory through practice and rehearsal (R. Ellis, 2004; Hulstijn, 2005). Several researchers have pointed to the fact that the output of explicit and implicit learning processes is highly different in nature and therefore difficult to align: “It is not easy to see how knowledge as weighted content can be anything other than separate from knowledge of linguistic facts” (R. Ellis, p. 234). Ultimately, goal of explicit learning is not simply knowledge of concepts and rules. Instruction aiming for explicit learning is mostly provided to help learners process the input in ways that are thought to be conducive to the L2 acquisition process, a notion that is central to processing instruction approaches (VanPatten, 2006; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993).

Some of the cognitive skills and performances that make learners smart enough to communicate and interact with the environment are not exclusively explicit learning processes but without their conscious awareness. A body of research , devoted to implicit learning, showed that individuals may learn to perform complex skills without first obtaining a large amount of explicit declarative knowledge (e.g., Berry and Broadbent, 1988; Stanley et al., 1989; Lewicki et al., 1992; Willingham et al., 1989; Reber, 1989). In the same vein, Berry and Broadbent (1988), Willingham et al. (1989), and Reber (1989) expressly set a dissociation between explicit knowledge and skilled performance, in

a variety of tasks (dynamic control tasks (Berry and Broadbent, 1988), artificial grammar learning tasks (Reber, 1989), and serial reaction tasks (Willingham et al., 1989). In non-explicit learning, Reber (1967) reported that people were unable to describe some grammar rules even they could understand novel strings of some system patterns. Therefore, those people learnt the rules at an unconscious rather than a conscious level. “Most knowledge is tacit knowledge; most learning is implicit; the vast majority of our cognitive processing is unconscious” (N. Ellis & Wulff, 2015, p.89). This statement is both intriguing and convincing, according to Dörnyei. Henceforth, cognitive psychology endeavored to set elicitation on implicit learning with a significant body of research. The main properties of implicit learning are explicitly mentioned below:

Bottom up mechanism: ‘implicit learning mechanisms are ‘bottom-up’ systems’ as ‘they function by picking up patterns of covariation in environment displays’ (Reber et al., 2003:201-225). Similarly, Hulstijn (2002 : 205) redefined implicit learning as ‘the construction of knowledge in the form of neural network’.

No conscious attempt to learn the target material: implicit learning takes place naturally, without conscious of the specific target material.

Lack of awareness of learning: learning takes place with no conscious attempt from learners in implicit learning.

Automatic process: as the second defining criterion of implicit learning, Frensch (1998) pointed out that implicit learning is an automatic process that occurs with no conscious part on the part of individuals.

Lack of awareness of the result: actually, definitions of implicit learning converge to results that the individual is unaware of. That is, implicit learning leads to implicit knowledge.

The implicit mechanism operates when linguistic inputs are available for foreign language learners. Hence, the availability of foreign language contacts helps learners to develop new strategies in learning. The lack of natural setting of foreign language is ideally substituted with virtual settings, social networks, vlogs, synchronous learning...then, to what extent do virtual settings sustain foreign language learnability?

V. Virtual Settings Substitution to Natural Settings

In contexts where the social value of English language is limited, the virtual world substitutes genuinely the lack of sources, and provides an authentic language input for enhancing language learning in both formal and informal learning settings. Learning technologies are not innovations that intrinsically generate learning; rather they are catalysts that, when used efficiently, can enable high engagement, active learning, authentic assessment, and links between schooling and life (Dawley & Dede, 2014). Virtual worlds have many

affordances that provide potential for these dimensions of effective learning.

The net offers learners a variety of opportunities in language learning and language acquisition. The bulk of information needed in daily connections, entertainment that enables learners to breath after tough daily routines of language learning; and interaction with outer world via social networks, videos, tick-tock shows, television debates at the reach of everyone. Social media applications allow users to cross the boundaries of their countries, connect and express themselves on a global scale (Thorne, 2010). All of this means greater flexibility and freedom for individuals, and mainly for autonomous learners.

Progressively, the net moved from a mere supplier of information in web 1.0; as the web was featured by simple connections of information, a displayer of web sites providing content portals, databases...Learners have been fascinated by the variety of data scattered here and there. They have been passive learners as they could not interact or comment on content that are above their learning objectives and expectations. On the other side, teachers seized this inexhaustible source to improve their teaching techniques and to develop the quality of their teaching practices. This web paved the way for other extensions and ideas in favor of massive use of net exposure.

A succession of web versions emerges substituting the web 1.0 to meet the needs and requirements of a range of net users. For instance, web 2.0, known as social software, stressed

the importance of groupware, collaborative assistance, community portals, e-mails, social networks. Web 2.0 tools enable the user to create content and interact with other users. They therefore differ from Web 1.0 tools, which allow the user to receive information through the web. The user is no longer a passive receiver of information; he is rather an active producer of content. For Lin et al. (2016), social media, such as Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube, not only give users the possibility to generate information but also to share it with other users around the globe....More effectively, web 3.0 was characterized by semantic webs that collect knowledge; artificial intelligence, taxonomies, knowledge bases... However, web 4.0; called the meta-web, connected intelligence, semantic weblogs, knowledge networks...In the same vein, Wang and Woo (2007) maintain that multimedia materials can enhance learners' motivation to learn the language. Kamnoetsin (2014) found that the net platform assisted learners in developing their grammar, vocabulary, and writing, as it helped them share information and acquire new knowledge.

This digital revolution affords possibilities of blossoming in foreign language learning. Learners are, now, free from procedural constraints; their unstable beliefs and attitudes are set on how well they succeed in foreign language mastery. In distance online learning courses, used intensively in universities and high schools, the web can facilitate individual expression and collaborative activities, or in blended

learning environments. It can complement face-to-face teaching. Moreover, in this digital era, we are moving from an individualistic knowledge acquisition culture towards a collaborative knowledge creation culture of learning. However, one of the conspicuous caveat to net using for the sake of improving communicative competence is infobesity (too much information may hinder the process of foreign language acquisition). When refined, the net content may serve as data mining for teachers. Henceforth, new approaches and methods have to be set to tame language wild gamblers, and to redirect learners' attention towards the rational use of net content. In foreign language development, this means studying how learners deploy the new language to regulate their behaviour when confronted with communicatively or cognitively challenging tasks.

The scope of enquiry in second language acquisition extensively and intrinsically probes not only into the process of language acquisition, but idiosyncratic potential when appropriating the language mechanisms. L2 fluency and automaticity are part of this linguistic attainment.

VI. L2 Fluency and Automaticity

The scope of the article will concentrate on the correlation between foreign language fluency and automaticity in both natural and academic setting. L2 fluency in natural setting seems to equal global oral proficiency; then fluency represents a component of oral performance.

Fillmore (1979) argued that the term fluency could have four different interpretations. First, he defined fluency as “the ability to talk at length with few pauses and to be able to fill the time with talk”. Second, a fluent speaker expresses ideas without hesitations, and produces messages, when communicating, in a coherent, lucid, and of “semantically dense” manner. Third, a person is considered fluent if he is a well versed in a wide of range of contexts. Finally, Fillmore maintained that fluent speakers are creative and imaginative in their language use and a maximally fluent speaker has all of the aforementioned abilities. In natural settings and from academic rule constriction of grammar, spelling, and vocabulary choice, fluent speakers roughly produce acceptable utterances as long as they meet the objectives of communicative situations.

Actually, it all depends on one’s definition of language and of the content of foreign language acquisition. If language is seen as a means of initiating, regulating relationships or dealing with business, then implicit learning is appropriate. Conversely, in explicit learning, language is seen as a system of elements and rules; then, fluency is delayed to advanced levels. As an illustration, Schmidt (1983) studied the English of “Wes,” a Japanese immigrant to Hawai‘i. Wes depended overwhelmingly on formulaic expressions—multi-word chunks that worked well in social situations. Schmidt hypothesized that missing from Wes’s SLA process was “attention to form, which could be

accomplished through . . . using conscious learning strategies such as . . . asking questions of native speakers, consulting available sources, and actively using deductive reasoning to look for general rules and exceptions” (p. 172). However, Wes’s English was fundamentally deficient. Schmidt’s subject, Wes, controlled well over a hundred memorized sentences and phrases, and this repertoire considerably enhanced his fluency. For Wes, Schmidt concludes, memorization appeared to be a more successful acquisition strategy than rule formation. In that case, sociolinguists do not adhere the idea that Wes is a weak learner, but a superior language learner who does not care about the grammatical do-dads. However, grammar teacher evaluate Wes’ performance as a disaster. In settings, whether natural or academic, language fluency depends on a set of criteria, some of which were mentioned above. For example, Lennon (1990) claimed that fluency differs from the other scores in oral language exams (e.g., accuracy, appropriacy) hence, it is purely a performance phenomenon, and consequently defined fluency as “an impression on the listener’s part that the psycholinguistic processes of speech planning and speech production are functioning easily and efficiently” (p. 391). When speech production is concerned, L2 is performed with cognitive and linguistic efforts; as it comprises a set of layers, phonologic, syntactic and semantic. Then, the speech rate delivery is subject to L2 speaker’s attention and the communicative settings. Studies have

shown that speech rate and the mean length of runs is substantially low in L2 (Deschamps, 1980; Raupach, 1984; Wiese, 1984). The speech production mechanisms in L2 run with the speaker's conscious supervision. Syntactic and phonological encoding might only be partially automatic even in the case of advanced learners (de Bot, 1992; Rehbein, 1987; Sajavaara, 1987). Foreign language speakers' speech can be affected by cognitive and affective factors such as the deficient of individual competence of L2, linguistic strata, and personal involvement in a speech communication.

The use of formulaic language, internalized through contact, and the automatization of encoding processes reveal the language user's capacity to cope with different communicative situations. Then, the interrelation of the two processes are strategic to the development of fluency in L2. Anderson's (1983) ACT* (adaptive control of thought) and his (1995) ACT-R theory (adaptive control of thought-revised) provided a complete account of how the application of rules became automatic. After a period of correct use (automatization), L2 speakers implement qualitative changes in the application of a rule. Initially this might result in incorrect productions, and certain time is needed before the correct form reappears. Language users who do not care of sentence structures and other language points constraints tend to adjust continually and progressively their linguistic heritage. They grow up with confidence as long as they attain acceptance and fulfill their

communicative needs. Promoting automaticity in learning will allow learners to process information quickly and accurately which will in turn help with fluency.

VII. Exploratory Pathways and Pedagogical Implications

The new generation of learners prefers receiving information quickly, relying on communication technologies as well as performing multiple tasks (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005). However, Learners who are obsessed with understanding all the various aspects of the grammar of a language slow down the rhythm of their foreign language development. They struggle to cope with novel communicative situations because of language deficiency in different skills. Explicit learning, as revealed above, cannot cover the whole spectrum of language proficiency. Even when exposed to virtual settings, learners, helplessly, try to grasp a minimum outcome of the displayed content. Despite teachers' enthusiasm for the foreign language classroom, the outside world clearly excels in a fascinating way. Obviously, implicit learning can go beyond classroom walls and provide more language input. That is why language course designers rush up to net opportunities in order to improve the quality of their teaching, and to enhance learners' performances in different skills. Because of the paucity of authentic documents and natural settings, the web provides alternative approach to meet learners' expectancy in foreign language learning.

This paper highlights and explores some pathways that answers recurrent questions on the poor performances of foreign language learners. Besides, it provides some efficient strategies to be implemented in EFL course design.

▪ **Authentic Documents:**

Teachers use authentic documents meaningfully by watching over the rhythm of their learners in acquiring the target language. ‘Authentic’ here refers to raw language (Raw language: slangy, coarse, crude, and quick). Then raw language mean the coarse, and crude language with all its imperfections and irregularities.

▪ **Learning Collocation :**
Learning collocation can:

a)- give you the most natural way to say something: ***smoking is strictly forbidden*** is more natural than ***smoking is strongly forbidden***.

b)- give you alternative ways of saying something, which may be more colourful/expressive or more precise: instead of repeating: ***it is very old and very dark*** ; we can say ***it was bitterly cold and pitch dark***.

c)- improve your style of writing; instead of saying: ***poverty causes crime***, you can say instead ***poverty breeds crime***; instead of saying ***a big meal***, you can say ***a substantial meal***.

- Capturing exploratory paths. The paths that a learner takes in exploring a virtual world to determine the contextual situation, adjust anomalies, and collect data related to his/her

inquiry are an important predictor of the learner’s understandings of specific field of interest. Directing learners towards the core study of intended objectives, or refining procedures for better use. Besides, a teacher complements the needs of his/her learners by updating his/her role.

- Procedural practice of individualized systems. By providing diagnostic insights, teacher can help through adjusting, monitoring instructions, and providing learners with direct feedback. While learners are simulating immersive communication, a teacher formalizes learning behaviours towards an autonomous practice.
- Interacting with animated pedagogical agents (APAs). APAs are “life like autonomous characters [that] co-habit learning environments with students to create rich, face-to-face learning interactions” (Johnson, Rickel, & Lester, 2000, p. 47). APAs scattered through an immersive authentic simulation can collect diagnostic information in various ways.
- Documenting progress and transfer in similar settings. The net is undoubtedly a source of documents that enables teachers to trace back learners’ lines of interest. The net provides insights into a learner’s progress and aid transfer. Further,

teachers can help synthesize new levels of understanding through a formative assessment.

- Overcoming classroom limitations. Classroom goal is not to substitute for the outside world, but to bring learners to the point where they can begin to use the outside world for further acquisition, to where they can begin to understand the language used on the outside. Learners cope with different communicative situation by practising language with all its “impurities”. Communicative Language is in constant development, so is learning competence. Implicit and explicit language learning should co-exist in the intimate world of every learner.

The virtues of the network require curriculum developers, syllabus designers and educators’ commitment to challenge the setbacks of the wild use of net supplies. In terms of pedagogical practices, teaching shift from the prevailing methods, communicative, competency-based, and skill-based methods, i.e., behaviourism and cognitivism (Felix, 2005) to participatory ones such as social constructivism in virtual worlds can be challenging (Reeves & Minocha, 2011). Consequently, teachers need professional development in the virtual-based instructional approach.

Conclusion

One of the pivotal issues in EFL learning is the language natural settings and their significance for both researchers and educationalists. A plethora of researchers in the field of ESL/EFL acquisition highlights the worth of an informal environment in language learning and fluency. Many scholars claim that language acquisition can occur in formal and informal language learning settings only if language learners are directly involved in intensive exposure to a type of input that is comprehensible. The input, in our educational case, is real texts that are substantially based on linguistic reinforcement, language structure, vocabulary development; i.e., an obsession with structuralism ideals. However, authentic language materials have the potential to be used as sources of language input for language acquisition that can indirectly involve the language learners in the language learning process. The paucity of authentic documents gave rise to alternative approaches that enable learners to cope with different communicative contacts. Nowadays, new approaches appear to meet the challenges learners are facing. Among these approaches are Process Oriented Guided Inquiry (constructivist and social component), Project-Based Learning (exploration of real-world problems and challenges), Reality Pedagogy (understanding of student realities), Hip-Hop Education (hip-hop culture), and Flipped Classroom

(blended learning, at home and school).

Foreign language learning is a painstaking task as it involves attention, commitment and willingness on the part of learners. The explicit and implicit learning dichotomy has shown the basic components necessary for learner's development; whether explicit, in academic settings, or implicit, in social networks, casual talk with foreigners via web media, or lunatic readings for leisure.

To achieve FL fluency and automaticity, learners need more exposure to foreign language communicative situations both implicitly and explicitly.

This article endeavours to motivate researchers in the field of foreign language learning and acquisition to investigate new paths and set up new paradigms. Through the participatory constructivist approach, teachers can explore the virtue of the net and authentic documents to the advantage of foreign language learners.

-Références:

1. Anderson, J. R. (1983). *The architecture of cognition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc
2. Anderson, J. R., Matessa, M., & Douglass, S. (1995, July). The ACT-R theory and visual attention. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 61-65). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Applied Linguistics,13, 1-24.
3. Berry, D., & Broadbent, D. (1988). Interactive tasks and the implicit-explicit distinction. *British Journal of Psychology*, 79, 251-272
4. Cleeremans, A., Destrebecqz, A. & Boyer, M. (1998). Implicit learning: Newsfrom the front. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 2, 406-416.
5. Coombs, P. H. & Ahmed, M. (1974). *Attacking rural poverty: How nonformal education can help*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press
6. Dawley, L., & Dede, C. (2014). Situated learning in virtual worlds and immersive simulations. In *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 723-734). Springer, New York, NY.
7. de Bot, K. (1992). A bilingual production model: Levelt's "speaking" model adapted.
8. Deschamps, A. (1980). The syntactical distribution of pauses in English spoken as a second language by French students. In H. Dechert & M. Raupach (Eds.), *Temporal variables in speech* (pp. 255-262). The Hague: Mouton
9. Dörnyei, Z. 2009. *The psychology of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

10. Dörnyei, Z. (2009b). The psychology of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
11. Ellis, N., & Wulff, S. (2015). Usage-based approaches to SLA. In B. VanPattern & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition. An introduction* (pp. 75-93). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
12. Ellis, N. (2005). At the interface : dynamic Interactions of Explicit and Implicit Knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*
13. Ellis, R. (2008). The study of Second language acquisition (Second Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press
14. Felix, U. (2005). E-learning pedagogy in the third millennium: the need for combining social and cognitive constructivist approaches. *ReCALL*, 17(1), 85-100.
15. Fillmore, C. J. (1979). On fluency. In *Individual differences in language ability and language behavior* (pp. 85-101). Academic Press.
16. Freed, B. F. (1995). What makes us think that students who study abroad become fluent. *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context*, 9, 123-148.
17. Frensch, P. A. (1998). *One concept, multiple meanings: On how to define the concept of implicit learning*. Sage Publications, Inc.
18. Hall, D. (1995). Materials production: Theory and practice. In A. C. Hidalgo, D. Hall, & G. M. Jacobs (Eds.), *Getting started: Materials writers on materials writing* (pp. 8-14). Singapore, SG: SEAMO Regional Language Centre
19. Hulstijn, J. H. (2005). Theoretical and empirical issues in the study of implicit and explicit second-language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 129-40
20. Hulstijn, J.H. (2002). "Towards a unified account of the representation, processing and acquisition of second language knowledge". *Second Language Research* 18/3: 193-223.
21. Hulstijn, J. H. (2011). Language proficiency in native and nonnative speakers: An agenda for research and suggestions for second-language assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 8, 229-249.
22. Johnson, W. L., Rickel, J. W., & Lester, J. C. (2000). Animated pedagogical agents: Face-to-face interaction in interactive learning environments. *International Journal of Artificial intelligence in education*, 11(1), 47-78.
23. Judd, E. (1950) cited in Beebe, L. M. & Zuengler, J. (1983) Accommodation theory: an explanation for style shifting in second language dialects. In N. Wolfson & E. Judd (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition* (pp. 195-213). Rowley, MA: Newbury House
24. Kamnoetsin, T. (2014). Social media use: A critical analysis of facebook's impact on collegiate EFL students' English writing in Thailand. Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1986). From meta-processes to conscious access: evidence from children's metalinguistic and repair data. *Cognition*.
25. Knowles, M. S. (1950) *Informal Adult Education*, New York: Association Press. Guide for educators based on the writer's experience as a programme organizer in the YMCA.
26. Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Child-Adult Differences in Second Language Acquisition. Series on Issues in Second Language Research*. Newbury House Publishers, Inc., Rowley, MA 01969.
27. Keiko, A. (1991) *Teaching English to Children in an EFL Setting*. English Teaching Forum. Volume 29, Number 4, October 1991.

28. Lennon, P. (1990). Investigating fluency in EFL: A quantitative approach. *Language learning*, 40(3), 387-417.
29. Lewicki, P., Hill, T., & Czyzewska, M. (1992). Nonconscious acquisition of information. *American Psychologist*.
30. Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (2001). *How Languages are Learned*, Second edition, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
31. Lin, X., Spence, P. R., Sellnow, T. L., & Lachlan, K. A. (2016). Crisis communication, learning and responding: Best practices in social media. *Computers in human behavior*, 65, 601-605.
32. Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. (1990). *Informal and Incidental Learning in the Workplace*. London and New York: Routledge.
33. Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge university press.
34. Oblinger, D.G. & Oblinger, J.L. (Eds) (2005). *Educating the Net Generation*. Boulder, CO: EDU-CAUSE.
35. Perrig, A. Canetti, R. Tygar, J and Song, D. Efficient authentication and signing of multicast streams over lossy channels. In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, May 2000.
36. Raupach, M. (1984). Formulae in second language speech production. *Second language productions*, 114-137.
37. Reber, A. (1989). Implicit learning and tacit knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*.
38. Reber, R. (2003). Why untrained control groups provide invalid baselines: A reply to Dienes and Altmann. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Experimental Psychology*, 56A(1), 201-225
39. Reeves, A. J., & Minocha, S. (2011). Relating pedagogical and learning space designs in Second Life. In *Teaching and learning in 3D immersive worlds: Pedagogical models and constructivist approaches* (pp. 31-60). IGI Global.
40. Rehbein, J. (1987). On fluency in second language speech. In H. W. Dechert & M. Raupach (Eds.), *Psycholinguistic models of production* (pp. 97-105). Norwood, NJ: Ablex
41. Rogers, A. (2004). Looking again at non-formal and informal education - towards a new paradigm, the encyclopaedia of informal education, www.infed.org/biblio/non_formal_paradigm.htm. Last updated: June 04, 2004
42. Sajavaara, K. (1987). Second language speech production: Factors affecting fluency. In H. W. Dechert & M. Raupach (Eds.), *Psycholinguistic models of production* (pp. 45-65). Norwood, NJ: Ablex
43. Schmidt, R. (1983), 'Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence'. In N. Wolfson and E. Judd (eds), *Sociolinguistics and second language acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
44. Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied linguistics*, 11(2), 150-172.
45. Stanley, W., Mathews, R., Buss, R., & Kotler-Cope, S. (1989). Insight without awareness: on the interaction of verbalization, instruction and practice in a simulated process control task. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*.
46. Sweet, H. (1899). *The practical study of languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
47. Thorne, S. L. (2010). The intercultural turn and language learning in the

- crucible of new media. In F. Helm & S. Guth (eds.), *Telecollaboration 2.0 for Language and Intercultural Learning* (pp. 139-164). Bern: Peter Lang.
48. Tomlinson, B. (1998). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
49. VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 225-241
50. VanPatten, B. (2006). *Input processing and grammar instruction*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
51. Wang, Q., & Woo, H. L. (2007). Systematic planning for ICT integration in topic learning. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 10(1), 148-156.
52. Wiese, R. (1984). Language production in foreign and native languages: Same or different. *Second language productions*, 11-25.
53. Willingham, D., Nissen, M., & Bullemer, P. (1989). On the development of procedural knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*.

Web References

1. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303907548_Teaching_and_Learning_in_digital_worlds_strategies_and_issues_in_higher_education
2. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303989392_LEARNING_IN_VIRTUAL_WORLDS_RESEARCH_AND_APPLICATIONS].