

March 2010 – Volume 13, Number 4

Iranian English Major Students' L2 Grammar Development: Linguistic Threshold Hypothesis

F. Behjat
Shiraz Islamic Azad University
fb_304@yahoo.com

F. Sadighi
Shiraz University
firoozsadighi@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present study aimed at finding out whether the Linguistic Threshold Hypothesis (LTH) can account for Iranian EFL learners' grammar development. Four groups of students majoring in English (freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors) enrolled at Shiraz Islamic Azad University were administered a grammaticality-judgment test. They were also asked to provide correct versions of incorrect sentences. The results of the data analysis indicated that transfer of the L1 grammar operates differently at different stages in regard to certain aspects of grammar. The findings also reveal that LTH, which demands a critical level of L2 development for negative language transfer not to occur, can support the Iranian EFL learners' grammar development. On the basis of the findings of this study, language teachers and testers should not rate L1-based grammar problems in the same way at different stages of language acquisition.

Introduction

Instead of focusing on the differences between students' first and second languages, researchers investigating the role of the first language in second language acquisition have turned their attention to the degree that the first language can facilitate the acquisition of the second language. That is, when and how L1 transfer occurs in the language acquisition process. Research has documented that transfer happens when a transitional stage resembles a structure in the first language. If language transfer takes place, the result is that there are more structures that look like first-language structures in that stage (Van Patten, 1992). In other words, transfer does not happen randomly in the learner's developing linguistic system. Transfer can occur when the

conditions are right. Following the Linguistic Threshold Hypothesis (LTH), when a learner reaches a certain level of L2 grammar development, L1 transfer does not occur any more.

Previous research on language contended that the native language acts together with other factors such as age, culture, literacy level, motivation and attitude, just to name a few, to influence the acquisition of a second language (Maitland, 1997). Learners of an L2 have wider grammars than the input would allow. Transfer from an L1 at different stages of inter-language leads learners to produce sentences that are possible in their L1, but not in their L2. According to August (2006), in second language acquisition and bilingualism, there are two different kinds of hypotheses to describe L1/L2 transfer. The Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis (LIH) claims that skills and subskills, such as reading and grammar, are heavily influenced by the transfer of L1 skills, (cf., Snow, 1990; Bernhardt & Kamil, 1995). Another hypothesis, the LTH, looks at skills such as reading and grammar from the perspective of L2 language development. According to LTH, in order for the language learners to use the grammar of the second language correctly, they need a critical level of language development, regardless of their L1 proficiency level. Until this threshold level is reached, the individual will inevitably represent low abilities in grammar knowledge, and usually L1 transfer occurs (Clarke, 1980; Alderson, 1984).

Following the contention made by LTH, this study aimed at finding out whether LTH could account for the Iranian EFL learners' grammar development. Based on the LTH proposed by Clarke (1980) and Alderson (1984), it was hypothesized that Iranian students majoring in English as a foreign language would pass through different stages of L2 grammar development and that the amount of L1 transfer would decrease in their L2 grammar performance as their English linguistic threshold reached a critical level. In other words, they would make fewer grammatical errors as a result of their native language as they were more exposed to the second language.

Literature Review

The role of first language knowledge and its influence on second language acquisition is an important issue in the field of language learning. Nowadays, most teachers and researchers have been convinced that learners draw on their knowledge of other languages as they try to learn a new one (Schmitt, 2002). There are several terms to denote this phenomenon, including language transfer, linguistic interference, the role of the mother tongue, native language influence, language mixing, and cross-linguistic influence (Odlin, 1998). The claim is that none of the terms commonly used by researchers is satisfactory. For example, whereas Van Patten (1992), Chen (1999), Cook (2000), and Ellis (2003) use *transfer* and *cross-linguistic influence*, Schmitt (2002) prefers *L1 influence*, and Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) talk about *interlingual influences*. All the terms, however, refer to the same concept, the impact of first language knowledge on the acquisition of the second language.

To define the concept, Odlin (1989) states that transfer is the influence resulting from the similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously acquired. Selinker (1992) considers transfer to be a cover term for a number of behaviors which intersect with input from the target language and with universal properties of human language. Gass and Selinker (2001) clarify an important aspect of the understanding of the term transfer. To them, the original term used in the literature on transfer did not show a distinction between negative and positive transfer, but implicit in these two terms is that there are two different underlying learning processes, one of positive and another of negative transfer. However, the actual determination of whether a learner has transferred the information positively or negatively is based on the output. There is a process of transfer, not differentiated as negative or positive. An issue which Ellis (2003) also discussed—that L1 transfer refers to the influence that the learner's L1 exerts over the acquisition of an L2. This influence can then be either one of the sources of error in learner language as negative transfer, or a factor to facilitate L2 acquisition, as a positive one. Dae (2003) looks at transfer from a different perspective. According to Dae, central to the idea of transfer of knowledge are theories of how knowledge is encoded, organized and stored in the brain. The commonsense logic is that for transfer to occur, what is transferred must have at some point been learned and stored in memory. By linguistic transfer, Liu (2001) implied what the learners carry over to generalize in their knowledge about native language to help them learn to use a target language. Here, transfer does not indicate whether what is carried over is bad or good. In other words, transfer is a neutral word in origin and nature.

Current research has indicated that first language influence is an evolving aspect of second language development. Learners do not simply transfer all patterns of their first language; there are certain changes over time, as learners come to know about the target language and recognize the similarities and differences between their mother tongue and the second language that were not obvious in previous stages of second language acquisition. Second language often carries traces of the learner's mother tongue. Second language learners have a fully developed L1 system at their disposal, and may switch to their mother tongue either deliberately or unintentionally.

The usual way to determine transfer in second language research is to make an informal estimation (Kasper, 1992). We need to know if a transfer can be established through observing the similarities and differences by which a certain category of inter-language features occur in the native language, target language, and inter-language data. Similar response frequencies in all three sets of data are classified as positive transfer while different ones between inter-language, target language, and native language- target language are considered to be negative transfer (Takahashi, 1995, cited in Liu, 2001).

Whether L1 transfer can affect second language acquisition positively or negatively, Van Patten (1992), in his comprehensive study, tried to answer a set of questions about second language acquisition, particularly about the teaching of grammar. From this he derived six findings, one of which concerned language transfer. He stated that

instead of focusing on differences between the first and second languages, we should look at the degree of similarities between the two. That is, when transfer occurs in the process by which language is internalized, it occurs because of similarities rather than differences.

Van Patten (1992) also documented that transfer occurs when a transitional stage resembles a structure in the first language. If transfer is triggered, the result is either more structures in that stage that look like first language structures, or a long stage of development. This type of transfer, accordingly, is called a psycholinguistic transfer, since it affects how language is internalized or structured during development. Regarding psycholinguistic transfer, it is generally believed that the influence of the first language is limited, as transfer can not violate the natural properties of acquisition. To him, transfer, does not happen randomly in the learner's developing linguistic system.

A number of studies have been carried out in order to show the influence of first language knowledge of pragmatics on target language acquisition. An example to illustrate this point in pragmatics transfer is Beebe, Takahashi, and Weltz's (1990) study of Japanese learners' overuse of the expression "I am sorry" in conversations. Researchers later found out that the learners' were relying on the routine Japanese expression "*sumimasen*" which means literally, "I am sorry." Likewise, Wolfson (1981) analyzed how the transfer of speaking rules from one's own native speech community influences interactions with members of the host community. She said that regarding pragmatics, transfer mainly stands for the use of rules of speaking from one's own native speech community when interacting with members of the host community, or simply when using it in a second language. Thus, the pragmatics knowledge of an L1 can be transferred into the acquisition of a second language.

As L1 transfer can also imply L1 influence, Kellerman and Sharwood-Smith (1986) tried to draw a distinction between the two. To them, transfer is not the same thing as cross-linguistic influence. Transfer refers to the linguistic behaviors conveyed from first language into inter-language without capturing other inter-lingual effects. Cross-linguistic influence, on the other hand, refers to those L1 effects as avoidance, and L1 constraints on L2 learning and performance. Later, Beebe et al. (1990) held that transfer consists of both cross-linguistic influence and cross-cultural transfer elements. L1 transfer can also be considered as the amount of input learners have received on a particular language aspect before, and how they use it in acquiring a second language. Based on a study done by Sadighi and Tagharchi (2000), on the role of input and L1 transfer in the mastery of English phrasal verbs by Iranian EFL learners, it was concluded that prior to instruction students' recognition of correct phrasal verbs is equal. Therefore, input and language transfer are as important in the acquisition of the second language as instruction is.

Language transfer affects all linguistic subsystems such as semantics, syntax, morphology, phonology, and even orthography. In terms of linguistic transfer, on the

syntactical level, Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) talk about two traditional sources of error in a second language learner's speech: inter-lingual and intra-lingual errors. Inter-lingual errors are the result of mother tongue influences. They then refer to Corder's (1983) concepts of transfer and borrowing. Transfer relates to the introduction of an L1 form into the inter-language system; borrowing, on the other hand, involves the temporary use of an L1 form as a communication strategy but does not entail incorporation of form into the inter-language system. The question of why language learners transfer or borrow some forms but not others is answered by Kellerman (1979) who stated that there are two factors involved. The extent to which a linguistic form is perceived as basic and natural, and language distance or the extent to which the L2 is linguistically close or distant from the target language.

Language transfer can also affect the degree to which a language learner gains mastery over a second language. Chen (1999) examined the role of first language transfer and second language proficiency in English as a second language. The results of his study indicated that L1 transfer appears primarily in the beginning of acquisition, and it decreases as the Chinese learners' English proficiency increases. On the acquisition of second language idioms, Sadighi and Fahandezh Sa'di (1999) conducted a study on transfer strategies in the production of idioms and contended that the use of language transfer strategy plays a dominant role in the processing of idiom chunks both positively and negatively.

Based on the pieces of evidence found in the literature on language transfer, it can be concluded that in the long second language acquisition journey, first language transfer plays a vital role both positively and negatively. It affects second language acquisition from different perspectives such as pragmatics, syntax, and morphology. The findings also reveal that as language learners develop their knowledge of the second language, negative transfer from the L1 will diminish. This study, therefore, is an attempt to find out which aspects of Iranian EFL students' grammar knowledge are transferred first and which ones are eliminated as soon as the learners pass a critical level of development in second language acquisition.

Theoretical Framework

In second language acquisition and bilingualism, there are two different kinds of hypotheses to describe L1/L2 transfer (August, 2006): the LIH and the LTH. The justification of the first hypothesis is that some language skills such as reading comprehension and grammar are affected by the transfer of first language skills. Based on the LIH, as the cognitive abilities are built in the L1, they can easily be transferred to the L2. For example, if a person is weak in understanding written texts in the first language, he will have problems in understanding the L2 texts, too. Under this framework, a weak bilingual reader would be best served by a curriculum which emphasizes strengthening language skills in the L1 in order to build a solid cognitive basis for the emerging of the L2.

The second hypothesis is the LTH that takes into account skills and sub-skills like grammar and reading from the L2 development perspective. Based on the LTH, when L2 learners begin to use the grammar of the second language, they should have a critical level of language development. Before this linguistic threshold is achieved, language learners show low abilities in L2 grammar knowledge, and the grammar knowledge of L1 is transferred to their L2. According to the LIH the language knowledge and cognitive abilities of L2 are dependent on those of the L1; in contrast, the LTH states that L1 knowledge is transferred into the L2 until a threshold level in the L2 development is reached.

According to August (2006), both hypotheses have theoretical limitations, and may operate differently in children and adults. The LIH does not specify the cognitive mechanisms for transfer and has not addressed how transfer might differ for individuals at various levels of attainment and maturity. This approach, however, is not always practical and is more suited to children than adults. The limitation for the second hypothesis, LTH, is that it postulates a threshold but does not provide empirical evidence to show what this critical level of L2 proficiency might be.

Considering the Linguistic Threshold Hypothesis, the main objective of this study was, in the first place, to investigate whether the Iranian EFL learners' performance at different stages of language acquisition represents a reduction in L1 transfer with the development of their L2 grammar. Secondly, to investigate if the performance of Iranian EFL learners shows different levels of reduction in grammatical problems influenced by L1 transfer in the process of second language acquisition.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The questions which were raised in this study were:

Q1- Does the Iranian EFL learners' performance at different stages of inter-language represent a reduction in L1 transfer as their L2 grammar develops?

Q2- Does the EFL learners' performance represent different levels of reduction in grammatical problems affected by L1 transfer in the process of learning?

In fact, the problem is that while the LTH supports the fact that EFL learners should reach a threshold level in their language development in order for L1 transfer not to occur, in the case of grammar acquisition, this is unclear. What kind of errors resulting from L1 influence remain longer in the Iranian EFL learners' inter-language system as they develop their knowledge of the second language? Thus, the following null hypotheses were formed:

H0- The Iranian EFL learners' performance at different stages of language acquisition does not represent a pattern of reduction in L1 transfer as their L2 grammar develops.

H0- All grammar problems resulting from L1 transfer are not represented in the same way at different stages of language development.

Method

Participants

The participants of the present study were 172 Iranian male and female students majoring in English at different levels with the age range of 19 to 25. They were studying at Shiraz Islamic Azad University and were selected randomly from different levels of their university education. Table 1 presents the details.

Table 1: The classification of the participants in the study

Level	Total Number	Number of Males	Number of Females
Freshman	47	13	34
Sophomore	34	6	28
Junior	49	10	39
Senior	42	8	34

Instrumentation

A 30-item grammaticality judgment test was developed by the researchers on the basis of common grammar errors transferred from the L1. To examine the content validity of the test, three language instructors at the university were asked to review and edit the test. They all agreed that the test truly represents the common mistakes language learners usually make as the result of their L1 transfer. A number of items, however, were added including those related to pluralization and omission of adjectives.

To see how reliable the newly-developed test was, it was piloted with a group of 42 students similar to one of the groups participating in the study. The internal consistency method used to estimate test reliability was Kuder-Richardson formula 20. The reliability index turned out to be .70.

The test was administered to the 172 study participants to see how much the subjects' first language knowledge affects their performance in deciding about the grammaticality of English sentences. The participants were required not only to determine if a sentence is grammatically right or wrong, but also to write the correct form of the wrong sentences. Ten items were grammatically wrong, and a particular aspect of grammar was under question for each item, which could be transferred from the students' L1, Persian, to their L2, English, as the foreign language they were

learning. The rest of the items, 20 sentences, were grammatically correct. The reason why the distribution of correct and incorrect items was unequal, and the number of correct items was twice as many as the incorrect ones was to expose the learners to correct language as much as possible and serve the purpose of the study at the same time. Meanwhile, an unequal number of correct and incorrect items were used to reduce the washback effect (White, 2003). The specifications of incorrect items are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Specifications of incorrect items

Item Number	Type of Error	Item
2	double negatives	He says he <u>doesn't</u> listen to <u>nobody</u> .
3	misuse of prepositions	This girl is afraid <u>from</u> dogs.
4	misuse of gerunds for purpose	I come here <u>for learning</u> English.
9	Pluralisation	<u>Five bird</u> were flying in the sky as we were looking at the kite there.
13	incorrect use of pronouns	Nobody else was in the room except the teacher and <u>myself</u> .
15	misplacement of adjectives	Is the room <u>enough big</u> for all of them to sleep in?
16	omission of adjectives	My mother is young. She is just forty years?
18	incorrect omission of nouns	The unfortunate ? was shot dead by the robbers.
23	misuse of conjunctions	<u>Till</u> the rain stopped, I had reached the school.
25	double subordinate conjunctions	The question I asked was that how one can be successful.

Procedures

The purpose of the study was to examine the Linguistic Threshold Hypothesis, and to see how long L1 transfer is represented in the grammar of Iranian English language learners, and which aspects of grammar remain longer in the inter-language at different stages of second language acquisition.

Following White (2003), the grammar points which were supposed to be transferred from students' L1 into their L2 included misuse of prepositions, double negatives, pluralization, incorrect use of pronouns, misplacement of adjectives, omission of

nouns, omission of prepositions, misuse of conjunctions, and double subordinate conjunctions. The participants were asked to use a check mark (✓) to show that a sentence was grammatically correct, and to use a cross (x) to indicate incorrect sentences. They were additionally asked to make any necessary changes to correct incorrect sentences. The purpose of correcting the ungrammatical sentences was to make sure that the participants had been able to detect the problem properly. After the administration of the test and the collection of the required data, they were organized for analysis.

Data Analysis and Results

The grammatically incorrect items were made based on the learners' first language grammar, that is, Persian. For example, the transliteration of an English sentence like *Five birds were flying in the sky* is made in Persian as **Five bird were flying in the sky*, or a sentence like *The unfortunate man was shot dead* is transliterated in Persian as **The unfortunate was shot dead*. Transferring Persian grammar into English is manifested here in the incorrect English items which the learners were required to diagnose and correct based on the grammar rules of English. The percentages of correct answers to items affected by L1 transfer in all four groups are as follows.

Table 3: Percentage of students' correct responses in all groups for items affected by L1 transfer

Senior	Junior	Sophomore	Freshman	Item Number
95	75	49	40	2
10	87	49	36	3
98	90	50	36	4
95	89	42	30	9
98	95	53	36	13
95	85	46	38	15
88	80	59	34	16
95	83	50	38	18
100	93	52	40	23
93	85	49	40	25

The descriptive statistics for the performance of all four groups on incorrect items are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Descriptive statistics for correct answers of different groups on the incorrect items

Level	Minimum score	Maximum score	Mean	Std. deviation
Senior	88	100	95.7	3.59
Junior	75	95	86.2	5.09
Sophomore	42	59	49.2	5.09
Freshman	30	40	36.8	3.15

In order to show the significant difference between the freshman-sophomore, sophomore-junior, and junior-senior's performance in the items affected by L1 transfer, a one-way ANOVA was applied. The results are as follows.

Table 5: One-way ANOVA to compare the four groups' performance

	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	24212.075	3	8070.692	380.843	.000
Within groups	762.900	36	21.192		
Total	24974.975	39			

As the table suggests the critical F ($F= 380.843$) is much greater than the significance level; therefore, it can be concluded that the difference between the groups is noticeable. To find out where the differences lie, a *post hoc Sheffe* test was applied with the results shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Sheffe test to compare the groups

95% confidence interval					
Upper bound	Lower bound	Sig.	STD error	Mean difference	Groups
-6.3631	-18.4369	0.00	2.05872	-12.40000*	1 2
-43.3631	-55.4369	0.00	2.05872	-49.40000*	3
-52.8631	-64.9369	0.00	2.05872	-58.90000*	4
18.4369	6.3631	0.00	2.05872	12.40000*	2 1
-30.9631	-43.0369	0.00	2.05872	-37.00000*	3
-40.4631	-52.5369	0.00	2.05872	-46.50000*	4
55.4369	43.3631	0.00	2.05872	49.40000*	3 1

95% confidence interval					
Upper bound	Lower bound	Sig.	STD error	Mean difference	Groups
43.0369	30.9631	0.00	2.05872	37.00000*	2
-3.4631	-15.5369	0.00	2.05872	-9.50000*	4
64.9369	52.8631	0.00	2.05872	58.90000*	4 1
52.5369	3.4631	0.00	2.05872	46.50000*	2
15.5369	3.4631	0.00	2.05872	9.50000*	3

In table 6, the numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4 represent the four groups of participants: freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors respectively. The table shows that in comparison to the mean difference between 1-2 (freshman-sophomore, 12.9) and 3-4 (junior-senior, 9.5), the mean difference between 2-3 (sophomore-junior, 37) is much greater. Thus, as the distance between the percentages of sophomore and juniors' performance was greater than between the freshman and sophomore, or the junior and seniors', it can be concluded that the threshold level for the Iranian EFL grammar development is at its apex in the third year of studying English. Thus, the first null hypothesis stating that the Iranian EFL learners' performance at different stages of language acquisition does not represent a pattern of reduction in L1 transfer as their L2 grammar develops is rejected.

To find out whether all aspects of grammar affected by L1 transfer (i.e., transferring Persian into English grammar) last in the same way in the participants' L2 grammar, one needs to focus on items 2, 3, 4, 9, 13, 15, 16, 18, 23, and 25. What is worth mentioning here is that, except in a few cases, almost all of those who recognized wrong sentences were able to make proper corrections.

Looking back at Table 3 where the percentages of correct answers given by sophomore-junior students are represented, and subtracting the high level of threshold (juniors' percentages) from the minimum level of threshold (seniors' percentages), the following results are achieved:

Table 7: The difference between the maximum and minimum level of threshold

Difference	Junior	Sophomore	Item Number
26	75	49	2
45	87	42	3
40	90	50	4
47	89	42	9
42	95	53	13

Difference	Junior	Sophomore	Item Number
3	85	46	15
21	80	59	16
33	83	50	18
41	93	52	23
36	85	49	25

According to Table 7, the difference between highest and lowest level of threshold, between the second and third year of studying English as a foreign language, which causes L1 transfer for a particular grammar point not to occur is not the same for all items affected by L1 transfer. In fact, item 16 reaches its highest level of threshold with a range of 21 (that is, the difference between the percentage of correct answers to the incorrect item number 16 for juniors and sophomores is 21) while the difference between the percentage of correct answers to the incorrect item number 9 for juniors and sophomores is 47. As distance between the percentage of low and high levels of threshold increases (the distance between the percentage of correct to incorrect answers given by juniors and sophomores), the faster the pace of development would be. So it can be concluded that the Iranian EFL learners' omission of adjectives (item no. 16) lasts longer in their L2 grammar during the process of development compared to pluralization (item no. 9). The order according to which L1 transfer ceases to occur as an Iranian EFL learner develops his knowledge of the L2 grammar would be as follows:

Table 8: The order of the reduction in L1 transfer regarding ungrammatical items

Grammar point	Range	Item Number	Rank
Pluralization	47	9	1
Double negatives	45	3	2
Incorrect use of pronouns	42	13	3
Misuse of conjunctions	41	23	4
Misplacement of adjectives	40	15	5
Double subordinate conjunction	39	4	6
Incorrect omission of nouns	36	25	7
Misuse of gerund for purpose	33	18	8
Misuse of prepositions	26	2	9
Omission of adjectives	21	16	10

According to table 8, the order of reduction of L1 transfer for Iranian EFL students in the development of L2 grammar is pluralization, double negatives, incorrect use of pronouns, misuse of conjunctions, misuse of gerunds for purpose, misplacement of adjectives, double subordinate conjunctions, incorrect omission of nouns, misuse of prepositions, and omission of nouns. In other words, considering the grammar points

referred to in this study, the pluralization error (which is the influence of L1 transfer) is the first to diminish for the Iranian EFL learner reaches a linguistic threshold in the L2, and correspondingly, omission of nouns lasts significantly longer. Thus, the second null hypothesis, stating that all grammar points affected by L1 are acquired at the same rate in the process of L2 development, is rejected.

Conclusion and Pedagogical Implication

This study was an attempt to examine the LTH which states that when language learners reach a critical level of L2 development, the rate of L1 transfer would seem to reduce and in some cases to disappear. The results of this study showed that for Iranian EFL learners studying English at the university, the threshold level is in the interval between the second and third year of studying English at the university. It was also found that all L2 grammar problems caused by the students' L1 do not reduce at the same rate in the process of language development. That is, while some grammar errors influenced by the L1 are corrected by learners in the early stages of reaching the linguistic threshold, others seem to last until higher levels of L2 grammar development are achieved.

As for the pedagogical implications of the present study, it is worth mentioning that teachers should focus on common errors the students make in L2 grammar, due to L1 transfer, to help them reach the critical level of development after which L1 transfer is expected not to occur. As for the language testers, the results of the present study suggest that all grammar problems influenced by L1 transfer should not be rated in the same way for learners at different levels of language acquisition in assessing their L2 grammar knowledge since they are not diagnosed and corrected by the learners at the same level of language development. The results of this study help the materials developers and syllabus designers in writing syllabi and textbooks on grammar for Iranian EFL learners. It can assist the developers to decide when a particular grammar point should be introduced, as the order of acquisition of each grammar point affected by L1 transfer differs.

About the Authors

Fatemeh Behjat is a lecturer and Ph.D. student in TEFL at Shiraz Islamic Azad University, Iran. Her current research interests cover issues in ELT, FLA, and SLA. She has been involved in a range of projects in the area of applied linguistics, and presented papers at international conferences.

Firooz Sadighi is Professor of English language and linguistics at Shiraz University. He received his doctor of philosophy from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA in 1982. He has taught syntax, psycholinguistics, first language acquisition, second language acquisition, and syntactic argumentation in the Ph.D. program in TEFL. His research areas are foreign language learning/ L2 acquisition, linguistics: syntax, semantics, and phonology, psycholinguistics and syntactic argumentation.

References

- Alderson, J.C. (1984). Reading in a foreign language: A reading problem or a language problem? In J.C. Alderson & A.H. Urquhart (eds.), *Reading in a foreign language* (pp. 1–27). London, UK: Longman.
- August, G. (2006). So, what's behind adult English second language reading? *Bilingual Research Journal*, 30(2), 245-64.
- Beebe, L.M., Takahashi, T. & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R.C. Scarcella, E. Anderson, & S.C. Krashen (eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.
- Bernhardt, E. B. & Kamil, M. L. (1995). Interpreting relationships between L1 and L2 reading: Consolidating the linguistic threshold and the linguistic interdependence hypothesis. *Applied Linguistics*, 16 (1), 15-33.
- Chen, J. F. (1999). The role of foreign language transfer and second language proficiency of Chinese learners of English as a second language. *University of Pennsylvania: Electronic Dissertations*.
- Clarke, M. (1980). The short circuit hypothesis of ESL reading or when language competence interferes with reading performance. *Modern Language Journal*, 64 (2), 203-9.
- Cook, V. (2000). Is *transfer* the right word? In C.J. Doughty & M.L. Long (eds.). *The handbook of second language acquisition*. New York: Blackwell Publishing.
- Corder, S. P. (1983). A role for the mother tongue in language learning. In S.M. Gass & L. Selinker (3rd ed.). (2001). *Second language acquisition: an introductory course*. London: Routledge.
- Dae, S. (2003). A study of implicit and explicit memory transfer from L1 to L2 and the effects on form usage. *TESOL Quarterly*, 7(5), 1-49.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analyzing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gass, S. (1996). Second language acquisition and linguistic theory: The role of L1 transfer. In W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*, 8, 3, 203-231

Kellerman, E. (1979). Transfer and non-transfer: Where are we now? *Studies in SLA*, 2, 37-57.

Kellerman, E. & Sharwood-Smith, M. (1986). *Cross-linguistic influence in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liu, S. (2001). Studies on transfer in second language acquisition. *Guangxi Normal University Journal*, 3, 1-29.

Maitland, K. (1997). Adding English: helping ESL learners succeed. Retrieved on 25 November, 2009 from <http://www.ed.uab.edu/esl/comps>.

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Odlin, T. (1998). On the affective and cognitive bases for language transfer. In C.J. Doughty & M.L. Long (eds.) (2005). *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 436-486). New York: Blackwell Publishing.

Sadighi, F. & Fahandezh Sa'di, J. (1999). Transfer strategy and the production of English idioms in a foreign language setting. *Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities of Shiraz University*, 14 (2), 3-15.

Sadighi, F. & Tagharchi, N. (2000). The role of input in the mastery of English phrasal verbs by Iranian EFL learners. *Islamic Azad University: Shiraz. An unpublished MA thesis*.

Schmitt, N. (ed.). (2002). *An introduction to applied linguistics*. London: Arnold.

Selinker, L. (1992). Rediscovering interlanguage. In C.J. Doughty & M.L. Long (eds.). (2005). *The handbook of second language acquisition*. New York: Blackwell Publishing.

Snow, E. (1990). Rationales for native language instruction in the education of language minority children: evidence from research. In H. Padially, H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (eds.), *Bilingual education: issues and strategies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Takahashi, S. (1995). *Pragmatic transferability of L1 indirect request strategies perceived by Japanese learners of English*. In Liu, S. (2001). Studies on transfer in second language acquisition.

Van Patten, B. (1992). Second language acquisition research and foreign language teaching, Part 1. *ADFL Bulletin*, 23(2), 52-55.

White, L. (2003). *Second language and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wolfson, N. (1981). Compliments in cross-cultural perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 117-124.

© Copyright rests with authors. Please cite TESL-EJ appropriately.

Appendix 1: Grammaticality-judgment Test

Directions: Read the following sentences carefully and decide if they are grammatically right or wrong. Then try to correct the sentences which need revision.

1. The scissors are lying on the table.
.....
2. This girl is afraid from dogs.
.....
3. He says he doesn't listen to nobody.
.....
4. I come here for learning English.
.....
5. Look! They have written the letter in ink.
.....
6. Maria was married to a very rich man.
.....
7. His father would not let him go.
.....
8. He always sets his watch by the church bell.
.....
9. Five bird were flying in the sky as we were looking at the kite there.
.....
10. What do you exactly do in that office?
.....
11. Are you trying to answer these questions correctly?
.....
12. All his money is kept in the bank.
.....
13. Nobody else was in the room except the teacher and myself.
.....
14. If you will do me this favor, I shall be very grateful.
.....
15. Is the room enough big for all of you to sleep in?
.....
16. My mother is young. She's just forty years.
.....
17. One should take care of one's health.
.....
18. The unfortunate was shot dead by the robbers.
.....
19. I paid six pounds for the new book.
.....
20. The children are searching for the ball.
.....

.....
21. The music went on playing all day.
.....

22. Somebody is knocking at the door. Can you open it?
.....

23. Till the rain started, I had reached the school.
.....

24. I congratulated you on your success on May, 17th.
.....

25. The question I asked was that how one can be successful.
.....

26. When my mother was sick, I was anxious about her health.
.....

27. My watch is two minutes slow.
.....

28. I'm going to have my hair cut.
.....

29. Can you find the center of a table?
.....

30. He could climb the tree with difficulty.
.....

Appendix 2: Key to Grammar Problems

Type of Error	Incorrect + Correct Form
Misuse of prepositions	This girl is afraid <u>from</u> dogs. This girl is afraid of dogs.
Double negatives	He says he <u>doesn't</u> listen to <u>nobody</u> . He says he doesn't listen to anybody.
Misuse of gerunds of purpose	I come here <u>for learning</u> English. I come here to learn English.
Pluralisation	<u>Five bird</u> were flying in the sky as we were looking at the kites there. Five birds were flying in the sky as we were looking at the kite here.
Incorrect use of pronouns	Nobody else was in the room except the teacher and <u>myself</u> . Nobody else was in the room except the teacher and me.
Misplacement of adjectives	Is the room <u>enough big</u> for all of them to sleep in? Is the room big enough for all of them to sleep in?
Omission of adjectives	My mother is young. She's just forty years? My mother is young. She's just forty years old.
Incorrect omission of nouns	The unfortunate was shot dead by the robbers. The unfortunate man was shot dead by the robbers.
Misuse of sub. Conjunctions	<u>Till</u> the rain stopped, I had reached the school. Before the rain stopped, I had reached the school.
Double subordinate conjunctions	The question I asked was <u>that how</u> one can be successful. The question I asked was how one can be successful.