

2026 年度神戸市外国語大学大学院 入学試験

文化交流専攻 (言語コース)

解答例・出題意図

問題 I

1) [Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

2) [Redacted text block]

文化交流専攻（言語コース）

解答例・出題意図

Gile's Comprehension Equation ( $C = KL + ELK + A$ ) offers a useful framework for understanding this overload. In this equation, comprehension (C) depends on knowledge of the language (KL), extra-linguistic knowledge (ELK), and analytical ability (A). Language knowledge alone is therefore insufficient to guarantee successful comprehension or interpreting.

The model highlights the importance of preparation and strategic skills. Extra-linguistic knowledge—such as familiarity with the topic, prior contact with the speaker, or exposure to a speaker's accent—can significantly reduce processing load. Similarly, analytical strategies like anticipating upcoming content help interpreters (and L2 learners) manage cognitive demands more efficiently and improve overall performance.

So, the student might suggest in this response that we do class activities that familiarize the student with the input in several ways before trying to process it in its real form in the target language, with all the functional features.

- 3) I give here an account of several theories of attention and L2 acquisition. The student may refer to one or several of these theories in his/her answers.

Research on attention in L2 acquisition has consistently shown that attention plays a central role in learning. A foundational contribution is Richard Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (1990, 2001), which argues that conscious attention to linguistic form in the input is a necessary condition for learning. According to Schmidt, learners must *notice* specific features of the L2—such as grammatical forms or phonological contrasts—for these features to become intake. While noticing does not guarantee acquisition, learning cannot occur without it. This hypothesis shifted the field away from purely implicit views of acquisition and placed attention and awareness at the center of SLA research.

Building on this cognitive turn, researchers such as Michael Sharwood Smith emphasized how instructional manipulation of input can guide learner attention. Sharwood Smith's work on input enhancement proposed that making certain linguistic forms more salient—through typographical, acoustic, or contextual means—can increase the likelihood that learners will notice them. Importantly, he distinguished between *attention* and *awareness*, arguing that learners may attend to forms without full metalinguistic awareness. His later work on input processing and modularity further explored how attentional resources are distributed during real-time language processing.

文化交流専攻（言語コース）

解答例・出題意図

Subsequent research refined these ideas by examining the limits of attention and its interaction with processing capacity. Scholars such as Tomlin and Villa (1994) proposed that attention suggesting that detection of form may occur without conscious awareness. Other studies, including work by VanPatten, demonstrated that learners have limited attentional resources and tend to prioritize meaning over form during comprehension, which constrains form learning in real time. Together, this body of literature converges on a key insight: attention is necessary but limited, and effective L2 learning depends on how attentional resources are allocated between meaning and form—a perspective that aligns closely with processing-capacity models such as those proposed by Gile.

In this regard of limited processing resources, we can also mention Susanne Carroll's Autonomous induction theory (AIT), which is a psycholinguistic model of second language acquisition that emphasizes the role of parsing and representation-building in learning. Carroll argues that L2 acquisition is driven by learners' attempts to *parse the input* using the language-specific processing mechanisms available to them. Rather than acquiring rules directly from input or instruction, learners inductively build grammatical representations as a by-product of real-time sentence processing.

A central claim of AIT is that input is not automatically equivalent to intake. Only those elements of the input that are successfully parsed by the learner's processing system can contribute to acquisition. When learners encounter L2 input, they rely on existing parsing procedures—often transferred from their first language—to assign structure and meaning. If these procedures fail or misanalyze the input, learning may be blocked, regardless of exposure or explicit explanation. Acquisition, therefore, depends crucially on whether the learner's parser can detect relevant morphosyntactic contrasts in the input.

Importantly, Carroll's model assigns a limited role to attention and explicit knowledge. Unlike noticing-based approaches, AIT does not require conscious awareness of linguistic forms for learning to occur. Instead, learning is autonomous in the sense that it emerges internally from the interaction between input and the learner's processing architecture. This view highlights the importance of input characteristics (such as clarity of form–meaning mappings) and helps explain why some grammatical features are persistently difficult to acquire: they are not easily recoverable by the learner's parser during online processing.

Focus on Form (FonF) is an instructional approach in second language acquisition that seeks to integrate attention to linguistic form within meaning-focused communication. The concept was

## 2026 年度神戸市外国語大学大学院 入学試験

### 文化交流専攻 (言語コース)

#### 解答例・出題意図

first clearly articulated by Michael Long, who distinguished Focus on Form from both Focus on Forms (traditional, isolated grammar instruction) and Focus on Meaning (purely communicative approaches). In FonF, learners' primary attention remains on meaning, but their attention is briefly and strategically drawn to specific linguistic features as they arise incidentally during communicative interaction.

A key theoretical motivation for FonF comes from research on attention and processing limitations. Since learners have limited cognitive resources and tend to prioritize meaning over form, purely communicative input often fails to promote grammatical development. FonF addresses this by creating moments where learners *notice* form meaning relationships without interrupting communication. These moments can be reactive (e.g. corrective feedback, recasts, clarification requests) or pre-emptive (e.g. brief explanations or questions about form before errors occur). Work by Catherine Doughty and others has shown that such brief attentional shifts can facilitate acquisition, especially when learners are developmentally ready.

Empirical research on FonF suggests that it may be effective for promoting grammatical accuracy while maintaining communicative fluency. Meta-analyses indicate that FonF generally outperforms meaning-only instruction and is often more effective than isolated grammar teaching, especially for complex or non-salient features. Overall, Focus on Form represents a compromise between implicit and explicit approaches, aligning with cognitive models of SLA by acknowledging both the necessity of attention to form and the primacy of meaning in language use.

The student may answer with any of these theories or others. As long as she reasons what she wants to say, there is no right or wrong answer.

## 問題 II

- 1) The student will present one or more typical mistakes that Chinese students make while producing English sentences.
- 2) The most probable explanation she/he will give is that Chinese does not have the relevant feature involved in the construction, and that therefore the error is mainly due to the L1.
- 3) The student might be able to identify that the mistake may be due to the student ignoring some functional features (plural markers, third person *s*, etc.), due to an overload in processing

2026 年度神戸市外国語大学大学院 入学試験

文化交流専攻（言語コース）

解答例・出題意図

resulting from the default strategies mentioned by VanPatten. the student should reason his/her answer.

- 4) About the strategies to lead students to better input comprehension, the student might refer back to Gile's model in Question I or suggest activities to make students pay attention to the form, along the lines of Focus-on Form theories, etc. As long as the student reasons his/her proposal, there is not a right or wrong answer.