Sara Samir Eldaly

A Discourse Analysis Study of L₂ers' Interactional Subjectivity across Narrative Writing

Sara Samir Eldaly
Lecturer in English Language and Literature Dep.
Faculty of Arts, Menofia University

Abstract

This study attempts at examining the Second Language Users/L₂ers' delayed narrative discourse genre. The conventionalized narrative genre sheds the light on the memorial attention through the attitudinal-based proposition. Attention control elaborates the 'skill' acquisition across the declarative-/procedure-knowledge (Lyster, 2007). Declarative and procedural knowledge compose the proceduralisation of language rule-based knowledge through the mental map of human cognitive design across; the conceptual lexicon, propositional information, and multi-propositional discourse (Givon, 2005, p. 65). The data of the study are the narrative writings of L₂ers. The narrative discourse is analyzed in terms of Johnstone's componential structure (2002); and the attitudinal content-based information is analyzed following the pragma-appraisal theory (White, 2011). The results of the study depict: 1) on the level of content; a) the pronominal phrases serve the role of an interactional strategy and a conceptualized ego-deictic center; b) the commitment to a temporal-based orientation; c) the topic-selection attainability focus; d) the simplified information chunks; and e) the conventional linear thematic-progression. And on level of structure, the results show; a) the genreic moves' instability across the L2ers writings; b) the consistency of topic selection, participants' identification; and insufficient climax-/resolution-based moves; and c) the deficiency of the procedural knowledge.

Key words: Subjectivity, Narrative discourse, Pragma-Appraisal theory, Cognitive Design, Knowledge Processing

دراسة تحليل الخطاب لمفهوم الذاتية التفاعلية في الكتابات السردية لمستخدمي اللغة الثانية

تحاول هذه الدراسة فحص الكتابة السردية كنوع أدبي لدى مستخدمي اللغة الثانية. فتسلط الكتابات السردية المألوفة الضوء على تقييم المواقف حيث انتباه الذاكرة. فيقوم التحكم بالانتباه بتفسير اكتساب "المهارة" من خلال المعرفة التصريحية/الاجرائية (لايستر, ٢٠٠٧). فتشكل كل من المعرفة التصريحية والاجرائية قاعدة لغوية اجرائية أساسية من خلال الخريطة الذهنية للتصميم المعرفي البشري حيث: المفردات المفاهيمية, المعلومات الموقفية, و الخطاب متعدد-المواقف (جيفون, ٢٠٠٥). تتكون عينة الدراسة من الكتابات السردية لمستخدمي اللغة الثانية.فتم تحليل الخطاب السردي في ضوء البنية التكوينية ل جونستون (٢٠٠٢), و في ضوء حقائب المحتوى المعلوماتية التقييمية لنظرية وايت(٢٠١١) للتقييم التداولي. وقد أظهرت نتائج الدراسة الأتي: فيما يخص المحتوى: ١) تلعب العبارات الضميرية دور الية/استراتيجية تفاعلية و مركز مفاهيمي للذاتية, ٢) الالتزام بالتأصيل الوقتي/الزمني, ٣) الانتباه للاختيار الموضوعي, ٤) استخدام الحقائب المعلوماتية البسيطة, و ٥) التطور التقليدي الخطي لموضوع الكتابات, وفيما يخص التركيب, فأظهرت نتائج الدراسة: ١) عدم ثبات التنقلات النوعية للكتابات السردية لمستخدمي اللغة الثانية, ٢) الثبات على اختيار الموضوع و التعريف بالمشاركين و عدم كفاية التنقلات النوعية لذروة الأحداث و حل المشكلات,و ٣) النقص في المعرفة الاجرائية.

الذاتية, الخطاب السردي, نظرية التقييم التداولي, الهيكلة المعرفية, المعالجة المعرفية

A Discourse Analysis Study of L₂ers' Interactional Subjectivity across Narrative Writing

Sara Samir Eldaly
Lecturer in English Language and Literature Dep.
Faculty of Arts, Menofia University

Introduction

Procedural Knowledge: Defined

The present study is an attempt to approach the meta-practices (Quicke, 1997, p. 154), namely proceduralisation, i.e. procedural knowledge across the human cognitive design system (Givon, 2005). It deals with the conceptualized *content* performativity across the *structural frame* of a goal-oriented situation, i.e. the Second Language/L₂ narrative discourse (Biber & Conrad, 2009). Cognitively, the content of the raised L₂ eco-story operates upon the schematized knowledge. Thus, the Second Language Users/L₂ers' interactional scenarios' structure and content reflect their delayed attitudinal proposition. Thus, the function performed while experiencing the structure and content of the cognitive system refers to; 1) the subjectivity interactional sense of the L₂ers' socio-cultural background in L₁ society and 2) the metalinguistic knowledge across the lexico-grammatical networks and the realized memorial information chunks that construct and construe the human cognitive processing (Mitchell, Myles, & Marsden, 2013, p. 137).

Second Language Learners' Intercultural Skill

The L₂ written outcomes reflect the conceptualized L₂ adopted skills stored at the LAD/Language Acquisition Device or human Language Making Capacity/LMC; the LAD initiates the L₂ knowledge identification for practical use, i.e. functionally known as Inter-language/IL (Meisel, 2011, pp. 2-3). Conventionally, IL represents the patterns of thoughts structured as 'textual propositional chains that provide an interactional subjectivity across the daily activity-based practices (Berns, 1990, pp. 10-38). Analytically, the L₂ schematized experienced interactional subjectivity represents a gestalt representation of L₂ levels that frame the structure and the content of the raised story (Gabrys-Baker, 2011, p. 147 and Otwinawska-Kasztelanic, 2011, p. 37). It activates the 'proposition' mental map in L₁ and L₂ (Otwinawska-Kasztelanic, 2011, p. 35). Interactional subjectivity as a 'concept' construes and constructs the 'utterance processing' as an activity-based practice across the linguistic repertoire (Sbisa, 2011, pp. 7-8). The utterance in its written form relates readers, writers, the initiated arguments, and the raised themes (Bjorklunol, 2011, pp. 42-43). The co-

overt relation across the utterance agents introspects the mind mapping and the schematized knowledge (Chafe, 1998, p. 96).

Cognitively, mind mapping depends mainly on the L_2ers' auto-derived factors such as intention, attainability, motivation, and the vocab-load/intensity (Takac, 2008, pp. 7-8). The L_1/L_2 code level mappings may result in integrated-based mediated mental models where information chunks are experienced in the accessible code level (Shore, 1996, p. 305). The mutual exchanges across the L_1/L_2 code level varieties reflects the hypothetical 'mix and match' conducting the mediated patterns (Barcroft, 2016, p. 5 and Shore, 1996, p. 305). The L_1 and L_2 epistemic knowledge may provide the L_2ers with insufficient code standardized formulae establishing; a) L_2 inappropriate representations; b) L_2 self-common patterns; and c) L_2 habit formation-based ideology (Hoey, 2001, p. 122). Or the IL features provide the learners with 'copy the cue' possibility where matching possibilities are represented across the two codes' Common Underlying Conceptual Bases (CUCBs) (Selinker, 1973, p. 41 and Laufer, 2003, p.11). The available code CUCB access shows the approximative performance (Richards, 1973, pp. 68-73). The approximation-like code level/s-varieties refer to L_2 input reciprocal interaction either in spoken or written discourse (Saville-Troike, 2006, p. 17). The more the valued code approximation-like is, the more the positive code varieties transfer is and the more shared knowledge of L_2 is (p. 19).

Moreover, the represented transfer raised the fixed-/dynamic-narrative knowledge out of the eco-cultural script (Hoey, 2001, p. 121). The L_2 dynamicity-like lexicalization produces the typical knowledge of lexico-grammatical relations (McCarthy, O'Keeffe, & Walsh, 2010, p. 40). Discursively, the L_2 written performances result in a linguaculture-learning based context (Shaules, 2016, pp. 2-3); it develops language learning processes in terms of the intercultural competence across '*Savoir-faire*' (Byram, 1997, p. 103). The savoir-faire aims at learning the standardized rules regarding the registered variations across domains (Cuenat & Bleichenbacher, 2013, p. 64). In this sense, the L_2ers are assumed to serve the role of the user, cultural mediator, and participant across the evoked eco-stories (Dervin & Liddicoat, 2013, p. 4).

Generally, the nature of the L_2 acquisitional process affects the IL prodceduralization, the cognitive forces' representations, and textual inferential proposition (Ortega, 2009, pp. 82-83).The positive/negative code-transfer results in systemic errors across showing up the L_2 in/sufficient declarative and/or procedural knowledge (Corder, 1973, p. 25). Knowledge refers to vocabulary recognition across language levels'

form, attitudinal/meaning, and mapping (Barcroft, 2016, pp. 6-10). Attitudinal meaning displays the meta-prgmatic situational appraisal value through the situation affect, judgment, and appreciation (White, 2011, pp. 14-16).

Subjectivity: Individual/Group Interactional Experience

Subjectivity, as the self-reflection, shows the interactional behaviors due to the experienced skills in terms of discovery, and interaction, i.e. attentional forces and interpretation and interaction, i.e. declarative knowledge forces (Byram, 1997, p. 33). Thus, the skill of L_2 writing represents the conceptualized ability to represent the delayed-narrative as genreic formulae across the textual layers, lexico-syntactic/-semantic appropriacy maps. Generically, the narrative is composed of the form that displays the organizational moves and the content that focuses on the attitudinal meaning (Johnstone, 2002). The L_2 content-based function is realized through the L_2 pedagogical habit formation, e.g., classrooms activities (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, p.122). The incomplete pedagogical habit formation results in the apparent communicative deficiency (Paltridge, 2006, pp. 6-7 and Celce-Murcia, 2007, p. 42). Thus, each compositional element serves a positive transfer or negative interference that serves the acquisitional-based negotiated meaning in L_1, L_2, or IL (Celce-Murcia, 2007, pp. 42-44). The negotiated meaning is the intermediate channel of the code levels' produced and perceived retention from L_1 to L_2 or vice versa (Mondria & Wiersma, 2004, pp. 79-80). The negotiated-meaning shows dialectical 'intercultural' cognitive commitment that represents the real-/hypothetical-self (Berns, 1990, pp. 4-10); thus, it affects the communicative competence (pp. 104-105).

Accordingly, the self in delayed narration serves; 1) the self/subject and 2) the agent-self/the hypothesized space (Fenwick, 2006, p. 34). In this sense, the more the reflexivity of the agent-self is, the more the self-activities elaborations are practiced. The symmetric patterns of the autonomous cognition and the agent-/self-reflections generate the expected socio-cultural behavior as well as the non/linguistic behavior (Billett, 2006, p. 5). Furthermore, the 'subject' possesses its identity-based traits that act as the dual genreic-construal performances and competences, i.e. L_1 and L_2 mediated-space (pp. 6-8). The mediated-space serves two functions; a) knowledge of the L_2 goal-oriented communication and b) the need for intensive practice of attainability, self-regulation, monitoring, and self-efficacy (Schwartz & Perfect, 2004, p. 1). The agent-/self-valued appraisal meanings across the agent-/self-perceived attitude and its constructed image in terms of affect, judgment, and appreciation (White, 2011, pp. 14-15). The appraisal classifications

display the value of experiences that reside in proceduralisation and the code level preferences. Thus, the content of L$_2$ers' writings displays the conceptualized communicative competences.

Generally, studies on SLA have addressed multifaceted topics the behavioral, cognitive, and/or interactional theories such as; A) syntactic-/semantic-acquisitional context and subjectivity discoursal features as an 'act of utterance' in English and Italian (Chan, Chen, Mathews, & Yip, 2017; and De Fina, 2009). B) The role of education reflexive approach in work organization (Duarte & Fitzgerald, 2006); and the annotated corpora are submitted to the learning subjective language (Wiebe, Wilson, Bruce, Bell, & Martin, 2004 and Dias, Lambov, and Noncheva, 2009). In a compatible manner, this study attempts to approach the narrative proceduralization knowledge.

Aim of the Study

This study attempts at conducting the L$_2$ers' narrative genre content and structure. Thus, it addresses; Q.1 to what extent the L$_2$ers' writing does depict the narrative genre? & Q. 2 to what extent the L$_2$ers writing does represent subjectivity?

Method

Design

This study is quantitively and qualitatively framed.

Subjects/Participants

The subjects are 125 English language learners, third grade, the Faculty of Education, Menofia Univ. class/2019-2020. Given that, they may possess the same register features since they belong to the same academic speech community.

Model of Analysis

This study employs an integrated approach of two phases; 1) the Johnstones's genreic moves; abstract, orientation, complicating actions, result, evaluation, and coda (2002, pp. 82-83); and 2) the value-based attitudinal representation through White's "affect", "judgment", and "appreciation" (2011, pp. 22-26).

Procedures of analysis

The students were asked to write an L$_2$ narrative piece of writing. Data analysis passed through two phases; 1) the first deals with the narrative genreic structure. 2) The second deals with the value -based attitudinal meanings. Discoursly, generic moves are identified and morpho-syntactic/semantic networks are excluded, counted and tabulated across the first-and third-voice in text-writings.

Results and Discussion of the Narrative's Genreic Moves

Generically, structural analysis sheds light on the narrative's components in Table (1).

Table (1)

The structural schema of the Narrative

Narrative Structural Schema	N. of Frequencies
Abstract	125
Orientation	125
Complicating actions	81
The Result or Resolution	74
Evaluation	61
Coda	22

The chronological structural schema is adopted from Johnstone (2002, pp. 82-83)

Obviously, the L2ers' possess a symmetric reflection of the situational dots. Table (1) shows stabilized representation of the first three genreic structural moves; e.g., abstract, orientation, and climax. However, the instable narrative chronological structure at the 'climax' move refers to the L2ers' primitive cognitive processing over the experienced situational dots.

Thematically, thematic progression follows the constant theme development, i.e., thematic reiteration; it on the self-/-agent who determines the situational dots (Paltridge, 2006, p. 148). As yet, the coda has not been well-experienced across the L2ers writings. The quasi-a/symmetric narrative moves indicate the L2ers' natural representation of writing as a 'situational folk' reflecting the self-selected background information chunks (Nuti, 1999, pp. 86-87). Functionally, information chunks indicate the descriptive, narrative, expositive, and/or argumentative genres. The integrity of genreic information chunks uncovers the L2ers' fragmented linguistic repertoire of both the learned and/or the acquired input; given the L_1 level-varieties' cognitive operating upon the writing process (Biber & Conrad, 2009, p. 3). The writing-archetype style refers to the L_1 effect on L_2 practices. The L2ers' output reflects the effect of L_1 input on L_2 interactional processes (Saville-Troike, 2006, p. 18). The elementary apparent style of writing refers to; 1) the inability to construct L_1 complex sentences; 2) the lack of L_1 epistemic knowledge and; 3) the limited mental capacity.

Obviously, the first three genreic moves construct and construe the schematic narrative structure; event orientation and the semantic agents through a register shift within the code level and/or the code-level varieties, i.e. L_1/L_2 motivated meta-cognitive linguistic transfer (Biber & Conard, 2009, pp. 72-73). The apparent linguistic transfer uncovers the

L$_2$ers' behavior; the hesitant-based structural frame exposes the L$_2$ers' ill-constructed social view, i.e. the learner-based hesitant identity that affects their competence level (Ortega, 2009, p. 56 and Davies, 2007, p. 67). Narrativity competence calls for the acquired L$_2$ers' L$_2$ informal input and learned L$_2$ formal exposure (Davies, 2007, p. 67).

Concerning the rest of the genreic moves, they have not been experienced regularly since lack of L$_1$/L$_2$ genreic requirements' exposure to narrative moves has framed the eco-inferential mappings. The acculturated L$_2$ linguistic behaviors in L$_1$ society and/or designed-syllabus represent the extent 'linguaculture' is experienced through language learning and culture pedagogy (Shaules, 2016, p. 2). Self-regulated learners reflect conscious access to L$_2$ balanced information processing through the conceptual lexicon, the propositional information, and multi-propositional content layers, i.e. knowledge base (Givon, 2005, pp. 65-66). The in/formal code-levels' knowledge, along with L$_2$ers' regular meta-cognitive processing, establishes a comprehensive linguistic input of the self, agent-self, and the third party across communicative interactions (Byram, 1997, pp. 39-40).

With that, the schematized linguistic socio-cultural behaviors reflect; 1) the conventional significance of narrative moves, e.g. the abstract and the orientation (Biber & Conard, 2009, p. 2) and 2) the deficiency of covering the 'climax'. As a result, climax transitional thematic-progression is partially provided. Generally speaking, the structural moves' depict the L$_2$ers' mastery of re-producing the input with suitable information units (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, p. 3 and Biber & Conrad, 2009, p. 4). L$_2$ linguistic performativity deploys the Interlanguage Pragmatics/ILP nurture's development, i.e. communicative strategy (Kasper &Blum-Kulka, 1993, pp. 3-4). In this sense, the apparent ILP pragmatic processing goes hand with hand to the less cognitive processing experienced through the broad content. Simplified ILP reflects the L$_2$ers' primitivity causing a stumbling block against any new innovative mechanism for elaborating the L$_2$ interactive output (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993, p. 9); it dramatically requires an anthropological cultural representation (House, 2007, pp. 8-9).

Results and Discussion of the Narrative Content

Subjectivity-based content is value-evaluated through the frequently repeated lexico-syntactic/-semantic constructions.

Significant repetitions are realized at the deictic-system realized in Table (2).

Table (2)
The Deictic Referentials across the L2ers' writings

Deictic category	F. of occurrences	Deictic terms examples
Personal deictic	1210	I, my, mine,
Temporal deictic	117	One day, once a time, last…, when, yesterday, today, once, on one day, in the morning, every day, before the lecture
Spatial deictic	6	In Cairo, in the supermarket, on my way, during the way, there was.

Table (2) shows the personal deictics determination over the spatio-temporal deictics. Personal deictics represent the self/-agent voice across the L$_2$ers' writings, i.e. pragma-grammaticalization for the referential/inferential proposition. The extended use of the Pronominal Phrases/ProP$_s$ deploys the internal/external texture; L$_1$ socio-cultural clusivity indexicalities over L$_2$ performance and academic efficacy (Hansen, 2008, pp. 58-59). Moreover, the ProP$_s$ serve the 'primitive' semantic frame providing a sense of simplicity and universality (Wierizbicka, 1985). Additionally, the constructed un/conscious self-image determines the deictic center affecting the readers' attainability (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 228). Accordingly, subjectivity-across the L$_2$ers' writings- widens the intercultural references/inferences.

Moreover, temporal processing is conducted through texture, e.g. temporal/spatial deictics. Temporal deictics serve a pragmatic indicator of the events' chronological linearity; a value-elaborated interactional meaning to the delayed situational dots (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 17). Time span can be determined by tense shift that is employed through reported speech. L$_2$ers employ simple phraseological constituents that rarely possess complex structure. However, the fixed-temporal deliberation reflects the subjects' tense shift from a definite to preterit tense that elaborates temporal deictic-center transfer across two worlds (pp. 228-229).On the other hand, spatial references have not been pragmatically reported equally.

Attitudinal meaning is elaborated through the attitudinal interactive sense of the writer and the third party, i.e. the self and the other. Attitudinal meaning is pragmatically classified into; affect, judgment, and appreciation (White, 2011).

Table (3)

The Pragmatic Appraisal Meaning Distribution

The pragmatic appraisal meaning lexemes				
Affect				
L2ers profiles	Positive attitudinal lexemes		Negative attitudinal lexemes	
	The writer	Third party	The writer	Third party
Frequencies	41	32	20	20
Judgment				
L2ers profiles	Approval		Disapproval	
	Writer	Third party	Writer	Third party
Frequencies	26	19	11	13
Appreciation				
L2ers profiles	Positive value		Negative value	
	Writer	Third party	Writer	Third part
	18	12	8	10
Total	**85**	**63**	**39**	**43**

Generally-speaking positive-attitudinal meaning is presented in Table (3). Delayed narration proposition shapes and is shaped across the participants, temporal connectives, and evaluative stances for the simplified poignant effects (Knapp & Watkins, 2005, pp. 221-222); they evoke the relation between perception, comprehension, performance, and competence (Lindsay, 2009, p. 272). Seemingly, the preferred attitudinal lexemes belong to the 'content' Parts of Speech/POS; Verb Groups/Vgs, i.e., expressive speech acts; epithets, and adverbs. Attitudinal lexemes constitute subjective semantic mapping approaching the interactive sense across the self and the text, i.e. contextualization with personal tastes and epistemic evaluative vocabularies (Silk, 2016, pp. 1-2); as yet, more eco-/co-contextualization reach the audience design for personal involvement (p. 11). L_2 relative-contextualism requires deep pragmatic nurture for more information chunks' appropriacy and evaluated gradable lexicons (White, 2011, p. 20).

Analytically, L_2ers' textual subjectivity reflects; a) the self-representation heterogeneity; b) the diverse schematized socio-cultural beliefs; c) the L_2 self-schematization of scenarios; and d) the primitivity of the L_2 lexicons. Cognitive processing upon the genres' integrity reflects the relation between the perceived L_1 and L_2 input recognition system (Dijkstra, 2009, p. 370). L_2ers experience deploys the counter-balance across content and structure (Lyster, 2007, p. 126). The ease access to the L_2 syntactic and/or semantic networks shows up the extent the word

neighbors are cognates in form and meaning (Dijkstra, 2009, pp. 372-373); two systems' asymmetric linguistic nature causes cognate inhibition (pp. 374-375). Accordingly, L_1 and L_2 deficiency equivalence may be conducted through discursive practices; it is conducted through; a) the L_2ers initial status when losing the morphological boundaries and/or the syntactic shifts (Mitchell et al., 2013, pp. 86-87); and b) the level performance deficiency deploys a systemic error, i.e. competence or a distracted behavior, i.e., performance. The inability to approach the L_2 levels affects the L_2 level actual performance (Bara, 2010, p. 304).The L_2 acquisitional competence reveals elementary level of discourse processing, e.g. grammatical knowledge (Meisel, 2011, p. 91). The IL product refers to the L_2ers' use of L_2 triggered information of the initial exposure to the L_2 Primary Language Data/PLD (p. 53). The L_2 scenarios across 'the evoked eco-stories' can be represented in terms of a matrix of; participants, time, local situationality, the explicit knowledge and the attentional control are developed across the proceduralisation of the topic performativity (Hoey, 2001, pp. 93-97 and Mitchell et al., 2013, pp. 139-140).

Along the texts, discoursal topicality evokes a comprehensive common sense of the L_2ers' socio-semantic frame (Geeaerts, 2008, pp. 25-27). As a result, stereotypical register is conducted through generalized themes, lexical terms, available semantic slots, and the psychological commonality (Stefanowitsch & Gries, 2008). With that, the socio-cultural-based attributes reflect the L_2ers' ideological beliefs (Malrieu, 1999, p. 120). Logically-based, the holistic semantic mental-map designs the human communication system (Givon, 2005, pp. 65-66).

At the level of attitudinal-based information intensity, particular information units are determined in the activation cost to reflect; a) fully-active; b) semi-active; and c) fully inactive (Tomasello, 1998, p. 106). The pattern of the provided interactive input refers to semi-active peripheral processing upon the L_2 input and fully inactive processing upon the L_1. The intercultural performativity requires bi-pragmatic performance to conduct the pragmatic competence managing describing entities, effective results, appraised emotions, personal traits, ideological references (Berns, 1990, p. 10).

Analytically, the semi-active processing reflects the L_2ers' impoverished internal, i.e. the ideal self-pragmatic homogeneity and external attitudes. The deficient performance of content-based delayed narration causes incoherent goal-oriented communicative process; regular performativity produces textual cohesion and genre coherence (Ryshina-Pankova, 2006, p. 166). The actual L_2ers' dilemma results from the inability to employ the procedureal knowledge through the Bilingual Interactive Activation Plus

Model/BIA$^+$ model where the ability to recognize the letter-word activation through equivalent-meaning and orthography (Dijkstra, 2009, pp. 371-375). Furthermore, the comprehension of the linguistic unit demands two basic types of knowledge; a) sentence meaning through the literal meaning of each component, i.e., locutionary; b) and the implicit meaning, i.e. illocutionaly approaching the pragmatic competence (Saeed, 2009, p. 18).

Cognitive processing upon the information unit reflects; a) the self-regulatory pattern /-adaptive controlled (Hoyle, 2010, p. 5); and b) the classrooms' activities elaboration of L$_2$ input amount and code level varieties' co-dependencies (Mitchell et al., 2013, p. 127). The ego-control pattern reflects the exercise of impulsivity, desires, and un/wanted responses across the evaluative self- and the ideal-self representation and the channel of communication (Hoyle, 2010, pp. 4-7).

The input proceduralisation generates a significant output that efficiently describes the learning circuit process where the academics are conducting the epistemic knowledge-based processing across; a) represented self-evaluation and monitoring; b) goal setting, i.e., the L$_2$ assumed context; c) self-evaluation implementation and implementation-based effect (Zimmerman et al., 1996, p. 11). Moreover, the cooperative, unlike competitive classrooms develop the learners' ability to depict their daily strategic interaction (Kao & O'Neill, 1998). The cooperative-based activities along with the pre-experienced narratives provide fluent over accurate-based discoursal performance (p. 64). Furthermore, classrooms' learning outcomes may appear in terms of implicit and/or explicit knowledge frames (Ellis, 2009, pp. 3-5).

Findings of the Study

The results of this study can be interpreted in light of the relationship between language learning and teaching; learners are auto-educational performers (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 81). This tendency calls upon language teaching humanity; learners establish language communities where trust and interaction determine the relations between the teachers, learners, and the eco-world where discovery, i.e. suggestopedia becomes more significant than remembering the retained information (p. 82). In this study, an unimpressive L$_2$ers' performance across the declarative knowledge, i.e. language levels' input and the procedural knowledge, i.e. functional strategies, is experienced.

Generally, the apparent L$_2$ers' performance reflects the nature of the constructed input; the enhanced, i.e. directed attention and the enriched input, structured-intake patterns (Reinders & Ellis, 2009, p. 282). The

L$_2$ers employ simplified negotiated meanings that generate a simplified acquisitional skill of the organizational moves; it reflects the simplified teaching process through the writings' genre knowledge-based moves to a given situation-registered meaning (Devitt, 2004, pp. 16-18). The value-based linguistic behaviors display the L$_2$ers' awareness of language and context; the target culture generates an Egyptian sub-culture reflecting the linguistic un/conscious tendencies to keep the L$_1$ features (Mey, 2007, pp. 169-172). Generally speaking, the subjectivity semi-homogeneity across daily scenes' delayed narration goes hand in hand with Vygotsky's notion of self-regulation in cross-/mixed-deliberative interactions of all the discoursal features (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 45). Meta-cognitively, the L$_2$ers have initially integrated the declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge so as to retell a memorized scene (Mitchell et al., 2013, pp. 131-133). The instabilized-based writings show the L$_2$ers' dependence on the declarative knowledge rather than the procedural knowledge.

Furthermore, the L$_2$ reflected self-subjectivity possesses symmetric-contextual references in the L$_2$ers' mentality through; 1) the intermediate space between two worlds through spatio-temporal deictics; 2) the in/formal cognitive force beyond the actual proceduralisation; 3) the proceduralised IL form and content; 4) the gestalt discourse meaningful relations (Dijkstra, 2007, pp. 218- 219). Thus, l$_1$/L$_2$-based integrated context affects L$_2$ers' cognition. The propositional content- lexical retrieval and grammatical patterns- represent the nature of the reflexive information intensity. Thus, a symmetric mental-map is constructed across the content-/structure-narrativity, learning processes, and teachers' mentality (Agudo, 2018, p. 22). The IL propositional content reflects the facilitatory or inhibitory cognitive processing upon the stored input (Dijkstra, 2007, p. 221). The apparent change results from the registered pragmatic-appraisal descriptive variations (Tomasello, 1998, p. 101).

Subjectivity performances reflect a developed eco-psychological view of the instructed knowledge (Steffensen & Kramsch, 2017, p. 21). Furthermore, the narrative scene/s' partitioning is construed due to the reflexive pronouns (Talmy, 2000, p. 331). Narrative pronouns, i.e. personal deictis, serve the social roles of the self as the L$_1$-experiencer and the L$_2$ self-agent experiencer. The scene partitioning is cognitively developed; a) given the attitudinal taxonomic image schema across affect/evaluate and/or judge Vgp$_s$, and b) the substrate context evoking meta-context (Langacker, 2008, p. 463). The scene partitioning construes a relevant meaning of the self's cognitive-psychological desires across the hypothetical agent world. Moreover, pronouns in the active voice narration create an action-based processing for the scenes' interpretation

(Biber & Conrad, 2009, p. 128). Moreover, the deictic pronouns elaborate the language socialization establishing indexical ties between linguistic structures and socio-cultural practices (Ochs & Schieffeline, 2017, p. 9); they require highly efficient acquisitional skills (Meisel, 2011, p. 3).

Conclusion

This study is limited to declarative and procedural knowledge. The rendered attainability of the delayed-narration reflects the narrative scenes' attitudinal meanings and thematic progression awareness. With that, the pedagogical practices render a commitment sense to reach the textual narrating-genre and the internal lexico-syntactic/-semantic mappings (Knapp & Watkins, 2005, p. 79). Subjectivity reflects; a) the apparent reflexivity of the L_2 practitioners; b) L_2 stereotypical structure; c) the narrative-based genreic declarative/procedural knowledge awareness; d) the hesitant-tone of the delayed-narration language-competency; e) and the overall L_2 product reflects the L_2ers' proficient Second Language Socialization/SLS (Steffensen & Kramsch, 2017, p. 17).

References

Agudo, J. (2018). *Emotions in Second Language Teaching: Theory, Research, and Teacher Education*. Springer.

Bara, B. (2010). *Cognitive Pragmatics: The Mental Processes of Communication*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Barcroft, J. (2016). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. Routledge: New York and London.

Berns, M. (1990). *Social and Cultural Considerations in Communicative Language Teaching*. Springer.

Biber, D. and Conrad, S. (2009). *Register, Genre, and Style*. Cambridge University Press.

Billett, S. (2006). Work, Subjectivity, and Learning. In S., Billett, T. Fenwick, and M. Somerville (Eds.), *Work, Subjectivity and Learning: Understanding Learning Through Working Life*. Springer.

Bjorklunol, M. (2011). Mikhail Bakhtin. In M. Sbisa, J. Ostman, and J. Verschueren (Eds.), Philosophical Perspectives for Pragmatics. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Multilingual Matters LTD: Clevedon. Philadelphia. Toronto. Sydney. Johannesburg.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the Role of Communicative Competence in Language Teaching. In E. Soler and M. Jorda (Eds), *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*. Springer.

Chafe, W. (1998). Language and The Flow of Thought. In M. Tomasello (ed), The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NewJersey. London.

Chan, A., Chen, S., Mathews, S. and Yip, V. (2017). Comprehension of Subject and Object Relative Clauses in a Trilingual Acquisition Context. *Frontiers in Psychology*. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5635684/

Corder, S. (1973). The Significance of Learners' Errors. In J. Richards (ed.), *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Acquisition*. Longman.

Cuenat, M. and Bleichenbacher, L. (2013). Linking Learning Objectives of Linguistic Savior-faire and Intercultural Competence in mobility experiences of Teacher Trainees. In F. Dervin and A. Liddicoat (Eds.), *Linguistics for Intercultural Education*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Davies, A. (2007). *An introduction to Applied Linguistics: from Practice to Theory*. Edinburgh University Press.

De Fina, A. (2009). Language and Subjectivity. *Estudios de Linguistica Aplicada*, Vol. 27 (50). Retrieved from http://www.sil.org/silebr/silebr2007

Dervin, F. and Liddicoat, A. (2013). Introduction: Linguistics for Intercultural Education. In F. Dervin and A. Liddicoat (Eds.), *Linguistics for Intercultural Education.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Devitt, A. (2004). Writing Genres. Southern Illinois University Press.

Dias, G., Lambov, D., and Noncheva, V. (2009). High-Level Features for Learning Subjective Language across Domains. Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence. Retrievedfrom https://www.aaai.org/ocs/index.php/ICWSM/09/paper/download/172/496

Dijkstra, T. (2009). The Multilingual Lexicon. In D. Sandra, J. Ostman, and J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Cognition and Pragmatics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Duarte, F. and Fitzgerald, A. (2006). Guiding Principles for a Reflexive Approach to Teaching Organization Studies. Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, Vol. 3 (1). Retrieved from https://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1040&context=jutlp.

Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and Explicit Learning, Knowledge, and Instruction. In R. Ellis, Sh. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philip and H. Reinders (Eds), *Implicit and Explicit Knowledge in Second Language Learning, Testing and Teaching.* Multilingual Matters.

Fenwick, T. (2006). Escaping/Becoming Subjects: Learning to Work The Boundaries in Boundaryless Work. In S., Billett, T. Fenwick, and M. Somerville (Eds.), *Work, Subjectivity and Learning: Understanding Learning Through Working Life*. Springer.

Gabrys`-Barker, D. (2011). Time as Cultural Construct: Some Preliminary Remarks on the Conceptualization of Time in L1 and L2. In J. Arabski and A. Wojtaszek (Eds.), *Aspects of Culture in Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Learning*. Springer.

Geeaerts, D. (2008). Prototypes, Stereotypes, and Semantic Norms. In D. Geeraerts, R. Dirven, and J. Taylor (Eds.), *Cognitive Sociolinguistics*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. New York.

Givon, T. (2005). *Context as Other Minds. The Pragmatics of Sociality, Cognition, and Communication.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hansen, M. (2008). *Particles at the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface: Synchronic and Diachronic Issues: A Study with Special Reference to the French Phasal Adverbs.* Elsevier Ltd.

Hoey, M. (2001). *Textual Interaction: An Introduction to Written Discourse Analysis*. Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.

House, J. (2007). What is an 'intercultural Speaker'?. In E.Soler and M. Jorda (Eds.), *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*. Springer.

Hoyle, R. (2010). *Handbook of Personality and Self-Regulation*. Wiley-Blackwell.

IRA/NCTE Joint Task Force on Assessment., International Reading Association., & National Council of Teachers of English. (2010).

Standards for the assessment of reading and writing. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishers.

Kao, Sh. And O'Neill, C. (1998). *Words into Worlds: Learning a Second Language Through Process Drama*. Albex Publication Corporation.

Kasper, G. and Blum-Kulka, Sh. (1993). Interlanguage Pragmatics. In G. Kasper and Sh. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Knapp, P. and Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, Text, and Grammar: Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing*. UNSW Press.

Langacker, R. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. and Long, M. (1991). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. Routledge: London and New York.

Laufer, B. (2003). Vocabulary Acquisition in a Second Language: Do Learners Really Acquire Most Vocabulary by Reading? Some Empirical Evidence. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250196400

Lindsay, R. (2009). Perception and Language. In D. Sandra, J. Ostman, and J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Cognition and Pragmatics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and Teaching Languages Through Content: A counterbalanced approach.* John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam: Philadelphia.

Malrieu, J. (1999). *Evaluative Semantics: Cognition, Language and Ideology*. Routledge: London and New York.

McCarthy, M., O'Keeffe, and Walsh, S. (2010). *Vocabulary Matrix: Understanding, Learning, Teaching*. CenGage Learning.

Meisel, J. (2011). *First and Second Language Acquisition: Parallels and Differences*. Cambridge University Press.

Mey, J. (2007). Developing Pragmatics Inter-culturally. In I. Kecskes and L. Horn (Eds.), *Explorations in pragmatics: Linguistic, Cognitive, and Intercultural Aspects.* Mouton de GruyterL Berlin NewYork.

Mitchell, R., Myles, F., and Marsden, E. (2013). *Second Language Learning Theories* (3rd ed). Routledge: London and New York.

Mondria, J. and Wiersma, B. (2004). Receptive, Productive, and Receptive+Productive L2 Vocabulary Learning. What Difference Does it Make?. In P. Bogaards and B. Laufer (Eds.), *Vocabulary in a Second Language*

Nuti, M. (1999). On interpreting 'folk psychology'. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/db9a/1fd8ff65424f29f2297675a2e0f2f187a166.pdf

Ochs, E. and Schieffelin, B. (2017). Language Socialization: An Historical Overview. In P. Duff and S. May (Eds.), *Language Socialzation*. Springer.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Routledge: London and New York.

Otwinowska-Kasztelanic, A. (2011). Do We need to Teach Culture and How Much Culture Do We Need. In: J. Arabski and A. Wojtaszek (Eds.) *Aspects of Culture in Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Learning*. Berlin: Springer.

Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis*: *An Introduction.* Continuum.

Quicke, J. (1997). Reflexivity, Community and Education for the Learning Society. *Curriculum Studies, Vol*. 5 (2), pp. 139-161.

Reinders, H. and Ellis, R. (2009). The Effects of Two Types of Input on Intake and The Acquisition of Implicit and Explicit Knowledge. In R. Ellis, Sh. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philip and H. Reinders (Eds), *Implicit and Explicit Knowledge in Second Language Learning, Testing and Teaching*. Multilingual Matters.

Richards, J. (1973). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Longman.

Ryshina-Pankova, M. (2006). Creating Textual Worlds in Advanced Writing. In H. Byrnes (ed.), *Advanced Language Learning: The Contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky*. Continuum.

Saeed, J. (2009). *Semantics*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.

Sbisa, M. (2011). John L. Austin. In M. Sbisa, J. Ostman, and J. Verschueren (Eds.), Philosophical Perspectives for Pragmatics. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge University Press.

Schwartz, B. and Perfect, T. (2004). Introduction: Toward an Applied Metacognition. In T., Perfect and B., Schwartz (Eds.), *Applied Metacognition*. Cambridge University Press.

Selinker, L. (1973). Interlanguage. In J. Richards (ed.), *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Lingman.

Shaules, J. (2016). The Developmental Model of Linguaculture Learning: An Integrated Approach to Language and Culture Pedagogy. *Juntendo Journal of Global Studies*, Vol. 1, pp. 2-17.

Shore, B. (1996). *Culture in Mind. Cognition Culture and The Problem of Meaning*. Oxford University Press. New York. Oxford.

Silk, A. (2016). *Discourse Contextualism. A Framework for Contextualist Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Stefanowitsch, A. and Gries, S. (2008). Channel and Constructional Meaning: A Collostructional Case Study. In D. Geeraerts, R. Dirven, and J. Taylor (Eds.), *Cognitive Sociolinguistics*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin. New York.

Steffensen, S. and Kramsch, C. (2017). The Ecology of Second Language Acquisition Socialization. In P. Duff and S. May (Eds.), *Language Socialzation*. Springer.

Takac, V. (2008). *Vocabulary Learning Strategies and Foreign Language Acquisition*. Multilingual Matters LTD.

Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Volume II Typology and Process in Concept Structure*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Tomasello, M. (1998). *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure*. Lawerence Erlbaum Associates.

Wierizbicka, A. (1985). 'Different Cultures, different Languages, and different speech acts: Polish VS English'. *Journal of Pragmatics* vol. 9, pp (145-178).

White, P. (2011). Appraisal. In J.Zienkowski, J. Ostman and J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Discursive Pragmatics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wiebe, J., Wilson, T., Bruce, R., Bell, M., and Martin, M. (2004). Learning Subjective Language. *Computational Linguistics,* Vol. 30 (3). Retrieved from https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1162/0891201041850885

Zimmerman, B., Bonner, S. and Kovach, R. (1996). *Developing Self-Regulated Learners: Beyond Achievement to Self-efficacy*. American Psychological Association.