Adverb placement,

[incorporation:
• verbs
• adverbs
• nominative, accusative, direct objects i.e., case terminology]


Je bois du café tous les jours. I drink coffee every day.
Je bois tous les jours du café. *I drink every day coffee.

Piję kawę codzienne. I drink coffee every day.
Piję codzienne kawę. *I drink every day coffee.

Notice that, for the English learner of French, the second French example has the adverb phrase tous les jours ‘every day’ in place where English does not allow an adverb between the verb and the direct object. For the English speaker learning the less-restricted French placement pattern only requires noticing that it occurs in French, that is, French will provide positive evidence for the existence of the pattern. In fact, for the English speaker learning French, this new pattern is hardly a problem at all. Even if the English learner fails to learn the pattern at all, the consequences are minimal. If this learner simply transfers the English pattern to French, in this case the resulting adverb placement falls within the constraints of French. Aside from the occasional linguist or a language teacher, who is likely to notice that there are no examples of adverbs placed between the verb and the direct object?
However, for the French learner of English, the story is quite different. The transfer of the French pattern to English immediately results in an incorrect sentence *I drink every day coffee. It is, of course, unlikely that communication will be affected, but it is noticeable. The question is how can the French speaker learn the English constraint? It is not likely that the French speaker will slowly come to notice that verb+adverb+direct object sequences do not occur in English. For some older learners, having someone explicitly point out that this pattern does not exist in English may help; for the majority, however, this particular error is fairly resistant to correction. Nonetheless, without explicit, negative feedback, how can the French learner of English come to know that *I drink every day coffee is not an acceptable alternative to I drink coffee every day?¹

Cf. also He opened carefully the door.

**UG.** (DeKeyser (1998:43), in Doughty and Williams (1998)): “If a structure is part of UG, and UG is accessible to the second language learner, then all that is needed is sufficient input to trigger acquisition, unless L2 is a subset of L1. In the later case, negative evidence is required; examples in English L2 are adverb placement or interrogative structures for native speakers of French (L. White 1991; L. White, Spada, Lightbown, and Ranta, 1991). If a structure is not part of UG or cannot be acquired without negative evidence, then a rather strong variant of focus on form, including rule teaching and error correction, will be required.”

“These two ways of reasoning have become widely accepted; the only controversial aspect is finding out what exactly is part of UG, how accessible it is in SLA, and consequently, what structures cannot be learned without negative evidence. The tendency on this point seems to be to see more and more parts of grammar as falling within the domain of UG; even morpheme acquisition order have received explanatory support from recent developments in syntactic theory (Zobl, 1995).”

**A different adverb placement problem:** Doughty and Williams (in Doughty and Williams (1998:226)): First language influence and UG, multiple pressures. Selinker and Lakshmanan (1992, cited in Doughty and Williams (in Doughty and Williams (1998:226)) argue that the first language acquired has a privileged status. Of particular interest are instances

¹. A separate question, but one of interest, is how did first language English speakers and first language French speakers come to have such distinct constraints on adverb placement in the first place? It certainly was not because the English speakers were given negative feedback on this type of adverb placement when they were first learning English.
where the L1 interacts with UG. In this context, L. White (e.g. 1988, 1989) has argued that (Doughty and Williams (in Doughty and Williams (1998:226)) “one of the most intractable difficulties that learners face is having to retreat from a UG-based grammar, that is, when the L1/IL form is part of a less conservative grammar than the L2 form. In this case, the learner must notice that the IL form is not present in the L2; positive evidence will not supply this information. In the case of adverb placement in L1 French/L2 English, the learner must notice the absence of utterances such as “*He gobbled hungrily the doughnut,” which display word order that is grammatical only in the L1. In these instances, L. White (1991) argues, explicit and negative evidence may be required, or at least helpful.”

**Short-term treatment with long-term results.** Experimental results but with a different adverb placement problem and involving input flooding: Doughty and Williams (in Doughty and Williams (1998:251)): Trahey (1996) following up on an earlier study (Trahey and White, 1993) which showed the effectiveness of an implicit, relatively short-term FonF treatment of some adverb placement orders but not others (xxx exactly which adverb orders). In the earlier study Trahey and White (1993) learners noticed (because it was explicitly pointed out to them) that English had a word order not found in their L1, that is, English has subject-adverb-verb-object; in the follow-up study, Trahey (1996) found that even a year later, learners not only accepted but continued to use this order.

**Agreement,**

[incorporation
• third person singular indicative
• see also third person singular -s]

Doughty and Williams (1998:221) write that, as DeKeyser (1998) points out, English subject-verb agreement is formally simple — just a predictable choice between Ø and -s — but for many learners it seems quite hard to learn.

see pronouns and possessive determiners

**Articles,**

see also determiners
[incorporation:
• possessive pronouns
• countable vs. uncountable
• nominative, accusative, direct objects i.e., case terminology
• see also body parts and articles

Articles in German. Doughty and Williams (1998:221) describe the article system in German as functionally complex because each article is associated with several meanings: case, number, gender, and definiteness. Further, they note, each form may have several meanings, for example, the form *die* marks both the feminine singular and the plural in the both the nominative and accusative cases.

gender-marked 158-59 (half done), 162-65, 220, see also gender, grammatical

Harley (1998:158-59) writes that “Native French-speaking children reportedly acquire the essential characteristics of [the] French grammatical gender by the age of 3 (e.g. Clark, 1985; Grégoire, 1947; Karmiloff-Smith, 1979). According to Clark (1985), for example, “By age 3, children appear to make few errors in their choices of articles,” though they may still have problems with adjective agreement (p. 706). And, as Karmiloff-Smith (1979) has shown, native speakers as early as 3 are able to predict the gender of unfamiliar nouns from reliable noun-ending clues, thus demonstrating system learning.” Nonetheless, SL learners of French have considerable problems with French gender and articles. xxx And so on

Natural gender. There is a greater tendency to transfer natural gender than grammatical gender.

[incorporation:
• see articles
• also, phonology

Articles in English. Doughty and Williams (1998:201) describe the English article system as “strangely impermeable to instruction” and suggest that because of this “should not take up valuable class time (Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, 1983; although see Master 1994, 1995; Mellow, Reeder, and Forster, Marano, 1996)”. 
The semantics and difficulty. Doughty and Williams (1998:222) citing Westney (1994) describe English articles as formally simple but semantically complex; while they have simple forms, the semantic and discourse motivations for their use are fairly complicated and difficult for learners to grasp (even in those cases where the teacher has grasped them). Westney, thus, recommends presenting the general idea and then repeated exposure to relevant examples. In contrast, Master (1994, 1995) and Murano (1996) claim success at teaching articles, part of which Doughty and Williams attribute to the “fact that Master successfully reduces this complex system to a few reliable rules of thumb — that is, that all NPs can be categorized as ± classified and ± identified — that work most of the time”, which is essentially what Hulstijn suggests for such cases.

Feedback and correction. Murano (Doughty and Williams 1998:242-243), in teaching articles, gave explicit rule description and explicit correction when the semantics of the communication was not accurate. Cf. also Chaudron and Parker, 1990; Takashima, 1994). Master (1995; in Doughty and Williams 1998:253) reported considerable success in article choice; the instructional treatment included “detailed feedback, error awareness logs, and metalinguistic discussions that emphasized form-meaning relationships. Crucially, his Fonf techniques tied article choice to the expression of meaning and continued over the period of an entire semester.” There was no control group for comparison with the treatment group.

Dative alternation,

[incorporation:
• basic introduction to morphology
• basic transitivity

Dative alternation is described by Westney (1994, cited in Doughty and Williams 1998:222) as so complex that it cannot be stated clearly or exhaustively. Cf. Fotos and R. Ellis’s work on dative alternation, in which they noted that learners were unable to generalize their knowledge much beyond remembering the examples they were taught.

Determiners,

160, 164, see also articles; possessive determiners
French articles and gender. Harley (1998:56) ran an experiment drawing student attention to the formal properties of the gender of French nouns, in particular the information provided by the determiners *le/un* (masculine) and *la/une* (feminine) and to the morphological clues provided by some of the noun endings. As she notes (159), grammatical gender is not something that English-speaking children appear to learn incidentally “simply from exposure to the language from kindergarten on, even though immersion teachers, by using French day in and day out, are bound to expose students to numerous French nouns marked for gender. Frequency in teacher talk is clearly not enough in this instance.”

Developmental stages,

20, 21-22, 25, 37, 73n, 97-98, 99, 100n, 104-6, 195, 198, 206, 213-16

Pervasiveness. Long and Robinson (1998:16-17) in Doughty and Williams (1998) write that “Instead of learning discrete lexical, grammatical, or notional-functional items one at a time, research shows that both naturalistic and classroom learners rarely, if ever, exhibit sudden categorical acquisition of new forms or rules (for review see, e.g., R. Ellis, 1994a; Gass and Selinker, 1994; Hatch, 1983; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). Rather, they traverse what appear to be fixed developmental sequences in word order, relative clauses, negation, interrogatives, pronouns, and other grammatical domains (Brindley, 1991; R. Ellis, 1989; Felix and Hahn, 1985; Hytenstam, 1997, 1984; Johnston, 1985; Meisel, Clahsen and Pienemann, 1981; Pavesi, 1986; Schumann, 1979), with L1-L2 relationships affecting the rate of progress through a sequence and sometimes leading to additional substages within a sequence, but not altering the sequences themselves (Zobl, 1982). Far from moving from zero knowledge of a rule to mastery in one step, moreover — the result that language teaching methodologies associated with synthetic approaches try, and fail, to achieve — learners typically pass through stages of nontargetlike forms (see, e.g., Anderson, 1984; Huebner, 1983; Kumpf, 1984; Meisel, 1987; Sato, 1986, 1990). In other words, morphosyntactic development involves prolonged periods of form-function mapping. Progress is not necessarily unidirectional. There are often periods of highly variable, sometimes lexically conditioned, suppliance of even supposedly easily taught items like English plural *-s* (Pica 1983; Young, 1988), zigzag developmental curves (Sato, 1990), temporary deterioration in learner performance (Meisel, Clahsen, and Pienemann, 1981), backsliding (Selinker and Lakshamanan, 1992), and so-called U-shaped behavior (Kellerman, 1985). Even a good deal of lexical acquisition is not sudden and categorical but exhibits developmental patterns (Blum and Levenston, 1978;
Laufer, 1990; Meara, 1984; Shirai, 1990). None of this sits well with simplistic notions of “what you teach, when you teach it, is what they learn.”

encouraging later-stage development, 180-84

matching instruction to,

177-80, 206, 213, 215, 227

teaching advanced features and,

188-89, 216

see also order of acquisition

Garden path,

208-9, 241, see also overgeneralization

Gender,

72-73

articles and, 159-63, 220

grammatical, 9, 86-87, 88, 97, 99, 105, 156-74, 220, 227, 240-41

Gender in Polish. Fisiak (1999:xv) “Gender. A Polish noun has one of three genders: masculine, feminine, or neuter. It most cases the gender of a noun is determinable by its ending”:

masculine: a consonant (e.g. człowiek ‘man’, dom ‘house’, wilk ‘wolf’)
feminine: -a, -i (e.g. kobieta ‘woman’, Pani, ‘Mrs, Ms’, lampa ‘lamp’)
neuter: -o, -e, -ę, -um (e.g. dziecko ‘child’, zdanie ‘sentence’, ciełu ‘calf’, muzeum ‘museum’ )
“Exceptions to this rule include masculine nouns ending in -a (e.g. artysta ‘artist’) or -o dziadzio ‘grandpa’), as well as feminine nouns ending in a consonant (e.g. noc ‘night’, twarz ‘face’).”

Examine the description above. It is unquestionably accurate; that is not the problem. Even for the relatively sophisticated learner, the examples—but not particularly the basic text—invite misunderstanding. What is the problem? And, perhaps the same question, what might invite a misunderstanding on the part of a reader? xxx this needs some full declensions for illustration

**French gender.** Doughty and Williams (1998:222) citing Hulstijn (1995) suggest that, instead of learning the phonological and morphological rules for French gender, students should learn (memorize) the gender along with the word.

natural, 86-87, 88

semantics and, 160-61, 164-65

**Imparfait,**

see imperfect tense

**Imperfect tense,**

37, 38, 39, 72, 220-21, 231, 255

**Interrogatives,**

215, 218, see also question formation


**Intonation,**

124, 245

**Linguistic variables and Focus on Form,**

The three variables are discussed most frequently with reference to Focus on Form are (1) the relevance of Universal Grammar (UG), the need for negative evidence (see discussion of adverb placement), and (3) the degree of complexity of the target language feature (DeKeyser, in Doughty and Williams (1998:43)).

Influence of L1. Zobl, cited in Doughty and Williams (1998:227), noted that Spanish L1 speakers stayed in the No V stage longer than learners of English whose L1 did not contain this type of negation.

**Negation,**

227

**[incorporation:]**
- needs to be expanded into a short chapter


**markedness.** Doughty and Williams (1998:226-27): “Hyltenstam (1987) uses this notion [markedness] to explain acquisition order and difficulty for postverbal and postauxiliary negation, which is marked in relation to preverbal negation, and for inversion in [27] in interrogatives, another marked form.” My comment: This so-called explanation is not an
explanation at all—instead, it is a case of mistaking terminology for an explanation: markedness itself is what needs an explanation and once the explanation of markedness is found, the explanation of the acquisition order will also be found.

**Number,**

24, 44, 72-73, 88

**Objects,**

210

**participial adjectives,**

140-41, 143-45

[incorporation:

- after basic case notions are discussed
- has to go beyond the basics, however

**passé composé,**

37-38, 73, 251, 255

**passives,**

141, 144, 145-46, 147-50, 154, 220, 225, 244-45, 253

**past tense,**

46, 118-19, 120, 123, 125, 127-28f, 132, 135-36, 223, see also preterite
person,  
88  
pied-piping,  
220  
pluperfect tense,  
142, 217  
plural,  
24, 28, 46, 220, 224  
possessive determiners,  
see pronouns and possessive determiners,  
preposition stranding,  
220, see also pied-piping  

[incorporation:  
• prepositional phrases  
• see pied-piping  
pronouns and possessive determiners,  

[incorporation:  
• nominative, accusative, direct objects i.e., case terminology  
• natural gender vs. grammatical gender
In general (which makes me nervous, as the databases could not be ‘in general’). Joanna White (1998:88-9) writes that “SLA research suggests that learners in naturalistic as well as classroom contexts pass through a series of stages as they attempt to make sense of the personal and possessive pronoun systems of the target language. There is evidence that learners begin by avoiding pronouns and PDs [Possessive Determiners] and using nouns (Felix, 1981) or the definite article (Martens, 1988; Zobl, 1985) instead. Once they begin to use pronominal forms, they may substitute one for another in apparently free variation (Felix and Hahn, 1985; Nicholas, 1986), or they may overgeneralize one all-purpose pronoun to all contexts (Butterworth, 1972; Wong-Fillmore, 1976).”

German learners of English. “The systematicity underlying avoidance, substitution, and overgeneralization has been demonstrated in a number of studies. Felix (Felix, 1981; Felix and Hahn, 1985) inferred the following acquisition order for the semantic features of English pronouns and PDs from the errors made by German high school learners: case before number, then person, and finally gender.”

French learners of English.

The problem. Joanna White (1998:86-87) writes that native speakers of French learning English have difficulties with his and her, particularly when these are used as possessive determiners [PDs].

Part of the problem lies in the differences between French and English PDs. “English uses an agreement rule referring to the natural gender of its possessor: The masculine form his is used when the possessor is masculine; the feminine form her is used when the possessor is feminine. [In short, the so-called natural gender of English essentially codes the sex of the referent.] “French, on the other hand, requires agreement between the grammatical gender of the noun naming the possessed entity (person or thing): The masculine form son is used when the possessed noun is masculine; the feminine sa is used when the possessed noun is feminine.” [In fact, the so-called grammatical gender of French has little to do with the sex of the referent and much to do with the two noun classes of French. Thus, the so-called grammatical gender of French refers to word classes; here, the term gender refers to word classes, perhaps unfortunately called genders. {footnote: “Gender distinctions disappear in French when the possessed object is plural. The plural form ses is used with both masculine and feminine possessed nouns.}
**Some data.** “The examples all involve kinship terms (e.g., mother, father), which have natural as well as grammatical, gender. [capital letters represent the gender required in English; lower case letter represent the gender required in French]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mf} & \quad 1a \quad \text{Robert sees his mother.} \\
& \quad \Rightarrow \\
& \quad 1b \quad \text{Robert voit sa mère.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Fm} & \quad 2a \quad \text{Alice sees her father.} \\
& \quad \Rightarrow \\
& \quad 2b \quad \text{Alice voit sa père.}
\end{align*}
\]

In the above examples, the natural gender of the possessor and the grammatical gender of the possessed are distinct; because of this, it is clear when a mistake is being made. These examples, of course, give the most problem to learners.  
In examples such as those below, the French learner can apply the French pattern to English and, despite a misanalysis, still get the ‘right’ answer. These examples, although for the wrong reasons, give the learner (and the teacher) the impression that the students are getting it right half the time.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mm} & \quad 3a \quad \text{Robert sees his father.} \\
& \quad \Rightarrow \\
& \quad 3b \quad \text{Robert voit sa père.}
\end{align*}
\]
An aside on noun classes. Languages with a two-way noun classes distinction often term the two classes masculine and feminine; if the two-way distinction is essentially natural-gender based, this causes little trouble, but when the basis is something other than natural gender, the use of the terms masculine and feminine can be misleading. Languages with a three-way distinction often label these with the terms masculine, feminine, and neuter; here, the analogy with natural gender are inevitably misleading. Once a language has four or more noun classes, the terminology tends to shift from terming these genders to noun classes; aside, from certain parts of California, it is transparent that correlating four, five, eight, or twenty some odd noun classes with natural gender is at the very least misleading.

Body parts and articles. Joanna White (1998:87) notes that French and English differ in how they mark possessed body parts. French tends to mark possessed body parts with the definite article (les in the example given); English tends to use a possessive form.

[1] Alice is washing her hair. [feminine PD]
[feminine subject; third person singular reflexive pronoun; definite article]

{footnote: The English is slightly complicated by the fact that the definite article is used in prepositional phrases where the body part is the object of the preposition “She took me by the hand”, including things like “I was hit on the head with a baseball.”} Joanna White (1998:97) notes that in her experimental research, Zobl’s prediction that body parts would show the most lasting effects of transfer from French; many of the learners continued to mark body parts with definite articles long after they had begun to mark gender elsewhere in English.

Practical English Grammar

Chapter 17: pronouns and possessive determiners,

marking of PDs into subrules that they apply in the following sequence, moving from the most general to the most specific:

1. definite article
2. person/possessive marking, for example, your
3. third person marking, for example, his overgeneralized
4. French agreement rule
5. mature English rule

[Note: From this five-part sequence, Joanna White (following Zobl, 1994 and Lightbown and Spada, 1990) sketches an eight-part developmental sequence, see Developmental sequence, below].

Joanna White (1998:94-95) discusses intralearner variability, in the process providing some clear examples of the first three categories above. She writes (94), “The most striking characteristic of oral production data was the enormous variability in the use of his and her. Grammatical and ungrammatical uses of these forms frequently co-occurred in the same utterance, and learners used his and her along with developmentally earlier forms like your and the to describe a single picture. The following examples, from the immediate posttest, illustrate this phenomenon. Each PD context established by the learner is underscored.”

[3] This learner used his and her in a context for his.

Learner: The boy have his first bicycle and he go in the street and he have a rock and fell with her bicycle a lot of time. [end of 94]

[4] This learner used both your and her in the same sentence in a context for her.

Learner: Ok, the, the girl ah make up ah in her face and ah not just your face and ah all over her body.

[5] Sometimes learners revealed that their hypotheses about his and her were exactly reversed, as in this example. Note that the learner did not pick up on the interviewer’s unintended cue:
Interviewer: So what is the girl doing to celebrate her birthday?

Learner: Go at the zoo with his big sister and his father and they took the giraffee.

Interviewer: Okay, good. And what does the boy do?

Learner: Uh, in her hand he has a balloon and he go uh at the stadium with the Expo.

Interviewer: Who is he with?

Learner: With her little brother and the mother.

[88 again] “Zobl predicted that beginning learners of English would not transfer grammatical gender from French to inanimate entities (see Kellerman, 1978) but might retain natural gender for some time, since it is both meaningful and grounded in perception. Because kinship terms conflate grammatical and natural gender in French, Zobl predicted that learners would have more difficulty discarding the French agreement rule in the human domain than in the nonhuman (inanimate and body part domains).

“In his pedagogical studies, Zobl found evidence to support his predictions; that is, learners applied each of the subrules systematically, first in the nonhuman domain and then in the human domain (1984, 1985). Since learners also tended to overgeneralize the masculine form within each domain, there was considerable intralearner variability in rule application across domains.

“In addition, Zobl observed interlearner variability in the extent to which individuals applied the French agreement rule. This was particularly evident with regard to the use of the definite article with body parts. Some learners held on to their L1 rules even though they had reached high levels of accuracy in their use of Fm and Mf forms (1984) [capital letters represent the gender required in English; lower case letter represent the gender required in French].

[89] **Developmental sequence.** From the five-part sequence given above, Joanna White (1998:98 (following Zobl, 1994 and Lightbown and Spada, 1990)) sketches an eight-part developmental sequence: xxx need these two sources

Stage 1: Preemergence: avoidance of his and her and/or use of definite article
Stage 2: Preemergence: use of *your* for all persons, genders, and numbers
Stage 3: Emergence of either or both *his* and *her*
Stage 4: Preference for *his* or *her* (accompanied by overgeneralization to contexts for the other form)
Stage 5: Differentiated use of *his* and *her* (not with kin-different gender)
Stage 6: Agreement rule applied to *either his* or *her* (kin-different gender)
Stage 7: Agreement rule applied to *both his* and *her* (kin-different gender)
Stage 8: Error-free application of agreement rule to *his* and *her* (all domains, including body parts)

Lightbown (1998:187) made up some illustrative examples for six of the eight stages. Determine which examples go with each stage and, of course, which two stages are not accompanied by examples. If two sentences occur together, they both illustrate the same stage.

no example

The boy gave his boat to his mother.
The girl gave his [girl’s] boat to his [girl’s] mother.

The boy gave the boat to the mother.

The boy gave the boat to her [boy’s] mother.
He has Band-Aids on the arm

The boy gave his boat to the mother.

His [boy’s] father put Band-Aids on the arm.

The boy gave your boat your mother.

no example

**Experimental evidence.** “Lightbown and Spada’s (1990) descriptive classroom-based study suggests the possibility of a role for focus-on-form instruction. They analyzed instances
of *his* and *her* in the speech of francophone learners in four intensive ESL classes in grades 5 and 6. Although their data did not permit a full-stage analysis using the developmental framework they had inferred from Zobl (1985), the researchers suggested that learners in the lowest accuracy group may have “been at a different level of development from the others” (p. 42), since they made fewer attempts to use PDs and since those attempts were less successful. They concluded that the observed differences between the classes may have been due to variations in the amount and type of formal instruction and corrective feedback offered by the four teachers within similar communicative language teaching contexts. These differences suggested that some types of instruction may be more effective than others in contributing to the acquisition of PDs and other forms.”

“The quasi-experimental study described here built on that descriptive research by investigating the effects of instruction on the acquisition of PDs. It provided opportunities for learners to focus on these forms by drawing their attention to them through typographical enhancement. The specific research question that the study addressed was: Would typographically enhanced input promote acquisition, which has been said to require the learner’s focused attention?”

**Experimental stages and production.** Joanna White (1998:97) correlated the eight stages with production during a communicative task.

- **Preemergence:** Learners in preemergence do not use gender-marked PD forms.
- **Stage 1:** Preemergence: avoidance of *his* and *her* and/or use of definite article
- **Stage 2:** Preemergence: use of *your* for all persons, genders, and numbers

- **Emergence:** Learners in Stages 3 and 4 use *his* and/or *her* but show no evidence of applying the English rule.
- **Stage 3:** Emergence of either or both *his* and *her*
- **Stage 4:** Preference for *his* or *her* (accompanied by overgeneralization to contexts for the other form)

- **Postemergence:** Learners in Stages 5 to 7 gradually develop the ability to use the English rule.
- **Stage 5:** Differentiated use of *his* and *her* (not with kin-different gender)
- **Stage 6:** Agreement rule applied to **either** *his* or *her* (kin-different gender)
- **Stage 7:** Agreement rule applied to **both** *his* and *her* (kin-different gender)
Targetlike performance. (in all domains, inanimate, kinship, and body parts)

Stage 8: Error-free application of agreement rule to *his* and *her* (all domains, including body parts)

Note that some learners reverted to the Emergence stage from postemergence during the course of the experiment. This is not atypical; it involves restructuring, simplifying, and then moving on again.

Joanna White (1998:90) describes the experiment from 89ff, specifically describing the type of enhancement: "xxx"

**Question formation,**

see also interrogatives

**[incorporation:**
- basic word order
- subject-verb inversion
- do-insertion
- auxiliaries

**Markedness.** Doughty and Williams (1998:226-27): “Hyltenstam (1987) uses this notion [markedness] to explain acquisition order and difficulty for postverbal and postauxiliary negation, which is marked in relation to preverbal negation, and for inversion in [27] in interrogatives, another marked form.” My comment: This so-called explanation is not an explanation at all—instead, it is a case of mistaking terminology for an explanation: markedness itself is what needs an explanation and once the explanation of markedness is found, the explanation of the acquisition order will also be found.

**Experimental results:** Long and Robinson (1998:36-37) in Doughty and Williams (1998). “L. White (1991) compared performance by two intact classes receiving formal instruction in question formation with three uninstructed classes. Instruction took place over 2 weeks during which explicit rule presentation was provided on the use of the auxiliaries *can*, *be*, and *do*, and question words *what*, *where*, and *when*, followed by corrective feedback on
subsequent learner errors in the use of questions during class activities. Posttest scores on a sentence-correction activity immediately following the 2-week treatment showed significantly higher accuracy for instructed learners, with the uninstructed learners tending to form questions with subject-verb inversion [37] wrongly. A similar advantage for instructed learners was found in phase 2 of the study, which extended the range of testing procedures and examined the longer-term effects of instruction using a follow-up test 5 weeks after the period of instruction ended. After 2 weeks of instruction, the three [?] treatment classes and the control class performed two written tasks and an oral communication task. On the first task, subjects corrected scrambled sentences and matched them with cartoon pictures. Instructed subjects, in contrast to the control group, made significant pretest to posttest gains in accuracy. These gains were maintained on the follow-up test. A similar pretest to posttest gain, maintained on the follow-up test, was made by the instructed group in performance accuracy on a preference-rating task of grammatical-ungrammatical pairs of questions and also in accuracy on the oral production task requiring them to use questions to match one of three sets of four pictures with pictures held by the researcher.”

“Spada and Lightbown (1993) provided further evidence of the long-term effects of instruction on question formation. Using similar groups of subjects to those used in the previously described studies, and again following a 2-week period of explicit instruction and corrective feedback, Spada and Lightbown found that the subjects in two classes demonstrated pretest to posttest gains in accuracy on the oral production task, and maintained this gain on the follow-up test 5 weeks later. Subjects continued to improve after entry into regular content classes, during which they received no ESL instruction, increasing in accuracy relative to the posttest on a final test administered 5 months later.”

“Unfortunately, no comparison with a control group was possible in this study, since analyses of the classroom data revealed that the supposedly meaning-focussed control group teacher had in fact been delivering extensive focus on form, with corrective feedback on the targeted question forms.

“In an analysis of the use of questions according to developmental stage, using the Pienemann and Johnston (1986) six-stage model for the acquisition of word order, Lightbown and Spada also showed that greater numbers of subjects in the instructed conditions shifted developmental stages between the period from pretest to posttest, that is, the 2-week period of instruction, than between the posttest and the follow-up 5-week test or long-term 5-month test, suggesting the powerful influence of FonF instruction in accelerating development.” [37]
Lightbown (1998:181-84) in Doughty and Williams (1998) describes a study in which the instructional content was geared to the instructional stage of the learners, specifically their stage of question formation (see Figure 1 below). The instruction was explicit, aimed at developing Stage 4 or 5 competency, and succeeded. Thus, the intervention was targeted; however, even intervention that is not so specifically targeted to a stage seems to have a benefit.

Stage 1
Single words or fragments (with intonation)
A spot on the dog?
A ball or a shoe?

Stage 2
Subject-verb-object with rising intonation
A body throw the ball?
Two children ride a bicycle?

Stage 3
Fronting:
Do-fronting
Do the boy is beside the bus?
Do you have three astronaut?
Does in this picture there is four astronauts?
Other fronting
Is the picture has two planets on top?
Wh- fronting
What the boy is throwing?
Where the children are standing?
Where the kids are playing?

Stage 4
Wh- with copula BE
Where is the ball?
Where is the dog?
Where is the shoe?
Where is the space ship?
Where is the sun?
Yes/no questions with AUX inversion
Is the boy beside the garbage can?
Is there a dog on the bus?
Is there a fish in the water?

Stage 5
Wh- with AUX second
What is the boy throwing?
What is the boy doing?
How do you say *lancer*?
How do you say *tâches* in English?
How do you say *extra-terrestre*?

Stage 6
So-called ‘embedded’ questions
Can you tell me what the date is?
Does he know what the answer is?

Figure 1. Developmental stages in English questions (adapted from Lightbown 1998:182 in Doughty and Williams (1998), which Lightbown adapted in turn from Piene- mann, Johnson, and Brindley, 1988)).

**Other inversions.** Hammarberg (1985) cited in Doughty and Williams (in Doughty and Williams (1998:221)) “notes that learners of L2 Swedish invert the subject and verb in questions long before they do in declarative statements containing adverbials or other items preceding the subject. Inversion is required in both structures in Swedish. Why is there a lag in applying the exact same strategy to one of the contexts? Hammarberg argues that it is because learners perceive a pragmatic function—questioning—for the interrogatives but not for declaratives with preposed items, in which inversion is a purely formal requirement.”

**Acquisition order and processing constraints.** Wolfe-Quintero (1992) argues that the order of acquisition for complex WH-questions and for relative clauses is based on processing constraints (Doughty and Williams (in Doughty and Williams (1998:216))).
preterite,

38-39, 220-21, 237, 247-48

Relative clauses,

31, 32-33n, 184-86, 214, 217, 218-19

relative clauses in English, 31, 214

[incorporation:
  • relative clause chapter

Acquisition order and processing constraints. Wolfe-Quintero (1992) argues that the order of acquisition for complex WH-questions and for relative clauses is based on processing constraints (Doughty and Williams (in Doughty and Williams (1998:216)).

Stress patterns,

124

Subject-verb inversion,

30, 182f, 183, 221, see also interrogatives; question formation

Tense and aspect,

[incorporation:
  • after tense labels
  • after discussion of aspectual considerations

Learners seem to notice a function and try to mark it in some way. The more salient the function, the earlier it is likely to be marked.

conditional, 118-19, 120, 123, 125, 126f, 127-28f, 132, 135-36, 210, 218, 223
Developmental sequences. The focus has mainly been on untutored learners (see e.g., Andersen, 1993, for summary; Meisel, 1987). Bardovi-Harlig (Doughty and Williams, 1998:217-18) has extended the examination of acquisition to classroom learners (Bardovi-Harlig, 1995; Bardovi-Harlig and Reynolds, 1995). Instructed learners, like uninstructed learners, tend to “follow a predictable order of acquisition of lexical verb classes based on the internal structure of events and situations. Learners begin by marking simple past on achievement verbs (those with an endpoint but no duration, e.g. *find something*), then on accomplishment verbs (those with an endpoint and duration, e.g., *eat dinner*), and, finally, activity verbs (those with duration but no end point, e.g. *eat*)” (Doughty and Williams, 1998:218).

The learners in the Bardovi-Harlig and Reynolds study characteristically marked the activity verbs with the progressive *-ing* but only rarely with the past.

In a study of the emergence of the pluperfect [e.g. *had given*, that is, the past perfect], Bardovi-Harlig (1995; cited in Doughty and Williams 1998:217) found two requirements for the emergence: (1) stable use of the of the simple past (defined as 80% in obligatory contexts), and (2) a communicative need, which Bardovi-Harlig characterized as reverse order reports. Without these two prerequisites, the past perfect did not emerge. Thus, once past tense marking is stable, an obvious need is for communicative contexts where reverse order reports are needed, for example, storytelling that involves flashbacks (which are, in effect, violations of the normal chronological order that are a defining characteristic of a narrative).
third-person singular -s,

43-44, 49, 220, see also agreement

vocabulary acquisition,

23, 43, 170, 212, 222

The core meanings of some vocabulary are acquired before the more peripheral meanings.

word order,

37, 213, 224-25

see also adverb placement
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Once upon a time there was a king. **He** had a beautiful young daughter. For **her** birthday, the king gave **her** a golden ball that **she** played with every day.
The king and his daughter lived near a dark forest. There was a deep well near the castle. Sometimes, the princess would sit by the well and play with her ball. One day, the princess threw her gold ball in the air but it did not fall into her hands. It fell into the well. Splash! The well was deep and the princess was sure she would never see her ball again. So she cried and cried and could not stop.

“What is the matter?” a voice behind her said. The girl looked around, and she saw a frog. He was in the well, his head sticking out of the water.

“Oh, it’s you,” said the girl. “My ball fell into the well.”

“I can help,” said the frog. “I can get your ball. What will you give me if I do?”

“Whatever you want,” said the princess. “I’ll give you my beautiful gold ring. I’ll give you flowers from my garden.”

“I do not want your beautiful gold ring or flowers from your garden,” said the frog. “But I would like to live with you and be your friend.”

He continued, “I would like to eat from your dish and drink from you cup. I would like to sleep on your bed. If I get your ball, will you promise me all this, Princess?”

“Oh, yes,” said the Princess. “I’ll promise.” But she thought, “Silly frog! I could never live with him!”

When the frog heard her promise, he went down the well. He soon came up with the golden ball in his mouth. He put it at her feet.

She was happy when she saw her ball. She picked it up and ran away.

“Wait,” cried the frog. “Wait for me! Take me with you!”

But she did not listen. She just ran home. She soon forgot the poor frog. That night, the princess was eating dinner when — plop-plop, plop-plop — something came climbing up the steps. When it reached the door, it knocked. It cried out in a loud voice.

“Daughter of the king,
Open the door for me.”

The princess ran to the door. There was the frog, wet and green and cold! She slammed the door in his face.

The king saw that she was afraid.

“My daughter, what are you afraid of?” he asked.

“It’s a fat, old frog,” said the princess.

“And what does he want from you?” asked the king.
The princess explained what had happened, how her ball had fallen into the well and the frog had brought it back to here; how she had promised him he could be her friend; how she said he could eat from her dish, and drink from her cup. But she never thought he would leave his well. She said she have even promised that he could sleep in her bed!

The frog knocked again and said,
“Daughter of the king,
Open the door for me.
You promised I could be your friend.
Open the door for me.”
Then the king said, “You know that if you make promises, you must keep them. So you must open the door.”

The princess listened to her father. She knew that she had to do what he said. She opened the door. The frog said, “Pick me up. I want to sit by you at the table.” She shook her head and turned away from him. But her father looked at her and said, “You must keep your promise.”

Then the frog said, “Now push your dish to me.” Again, the princess looked away. But she had to do it. The frog ate and ate, but princess could not eat a thing.

At last the frog said, “I feel tired. Take me to your room. I want to sleep now.”

The princess looked at her father. It was bad enough to touch the frog. But she did not want him in her bed. The king said, “The frog helped you when you needed him. Now, you must keep your promise to him.”

The princess was angry. But she put the frog at the foot of her bed. Then she went to sleep. The next day, the frog went away. She did not know where. But the next night, he came back. He knocked at the door, and she had to let him in. Again, he ate out of her dish, and he drank from her golden cup. Again he went to sleep at the foot of her bed. In the morning he went away again.

The third night he said, “I want to sleep at the head of your bed. I think I would like it better there.” The girl thought that she would never be able to sleep with a cold, wet frog near her face. But she put him there. Then she cried herself to sleep again.

In the morning the frog jumped off the bed. But when his feet touched the floor, something happened. He was no longer a cold, green frog, but a young prince!
He looked at the princess and smiled. “I was not what I seemed to be!”, he said to the princess. “I was turned into a frog by magic. No one but you could help me. I could only turn back into a prince if you kept your promise.”

He smiled. “I waited and waited at the well for you to help me.”

The princess was so surprised she did not know what to say.

“Will you let me be your friend now?” said the prince, laughing. “You promised.”

The princess laughed too. She ran to tell the king what had happened. For years they were the best of friends. And when they grew up, they were married and lived happily ever after. The End.

**Princess, King, or Frog**

Who does the underlined word refer to? Write P in the blank if it refers to the princess, write K in the blank if it refers to the king, and write F in the blank if it refers to the frog. If necessary, look back at the story. The first one is done for you.

1. For her birthday, he had given her a golden ball. ___K___
2. The princess lived with him near a dark forest. __________
3. She played with her golden ball. __________
4. She dropped her golden ball into the well. __________
5. He was in the well, sticking his head out of the water. __________
6. She offered to give him her fine golden ring and flowers from her garden. __________
7. The frog said he wanted to be her friend. __________
8. She thought she could never live with him. __________
9. He soon came up with the golden ball in his mouth. __________
10. She slammed the door in his face. __________
11. He was that she was afraid. __________
12. The princess listened to him. She knew she had to do what he said. __________
13. The king told her that she must keep her promises. __________
14. The frog ate from her plate and drank from her cup. __________
15. The king said, “He helped you when you needed him. Now you must keep your promise to him.” __________
Chapter 17: Developmental sequences (incorporation into a course):

16. **He** slept at the foot of **her** bed. ________
17. When **his** feet touched the floor, something happened. ________
18. The prince looked at **her** and smiled. ________
19. No one but the princess could help **him**. ________
20. For years, **he** was **her** best friend. ________

Note: Joanna White (1998:90) says that since the PDs were the target linguistic feature, they were enlarged more than subject and object pronouns, but the sample in the Appendix has both PDs and object pronouns enlarged. I have adjusted the Appendix, as I suspect that it is the incorrect section.

**Developmental sequences (incorporation into a course):**

Adverb placement
- verbs
- adverbs
- nominative, accusative, direct objects i.e., case terminology

Agreement
- third person singular indicative
- see also third person singular -s

Articles
- possessive pronouns
- countable vs. uncountable
- nominative, accusative, direct objects i.e., case terminology
- see also body parts and articles

Gender
- see articles
- also, phonology

Dative alternation
- after basic introduction to morphology
Chapter 17: Developmental sequences (incorporation into a course):

Negation
- needs to be expanded, perhaps a chapter on it

Participials
- after basic case notions are discussed
- has to go beyond the basics, however

Possessive pronouns
- nominative, accusative, direct objects i.e., case terminology
- natural gender vs. grammatical gender

Question formation
- basic word order
- subject-verb inversion
- do-insertion
- auxiliaries

Relative clauses
- relative clause chapter

Tenses
- after tense labels
- after discussion of aspectual considerations
Chapter 17: Developmental sequences (incorporation into a course)