

In The Name of Allah
The Compassionate,
The Merciful

Yazd University
Faculty of Language and Literature
English Department

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the
Degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language**

Title:
Acquisition of English Telicity by Persian EFL Learners

Supervisor:
Dr. Ali Akbar Jabbari

Advisor:
Dr. Mohammad Javad Rezai

By:
Behnaz Sarduei

1391 / 2013

کلیه حقوق مادی و معنوی مرتبط بر نتایج مطالعات، ابتکارات و نوآوریهای ناشی از تحقیق موضوع این پایان نامه / رساله متعلق به دانشگاه یزد است و هرگونه استفاده از نتایج علمی و عملی از این پایان نامه / رساله برای تولید دانش فنی، ثبت اختراع، ثبت اثر بدیع هنری، همچنین چاپ و تکثیر، نسخه برداری، ترجمه و اقتباس و ارائه مقاله در سمینارها و مجلات علمی از این پایان نامه / رساله منوط به موافقت کتبی دانشگاه یزد است.

To my Mother

Acknowledgments:

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of many people. First of all, I would like to thank the one above all of us, the omnipresent God, for giving me the strength to continue this study to the final level. Also, I am heartily thankful to my supervisor, Dr. Ali Akbar Jabbari, whose encouragement, guidance, and support from the initial to the final level enabled me to develop an understanding of the subject. I would like to acknowledge my heartfelt gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Mohammad Javad Rezai without whose help and assistance I would not attain the statistical results of this study. Last but not the least, I offer my regards and blessings to my family, especially my mother, who supported me in any respect during the completion of this task.

Abstract

The present study aimed at investigating the role of L1 transfer in the acquisition of telicity in English. For this purpose, the impact of Persian complex predicate constructions in the acquisition of telic and atelic predicates in Vendler's verbal classification (i.e. stative, activity, accomplishment, and achievement) was explored and investigated. Data were elicited from 60 Persian EFL learners that were assigned, after taking Oxford Quick Placement Test, into four different language proficiency groups; namely, elementary, pre-intermediate, upper-intermediate, and advanced group. A Grammaticality Judgment Task and a Translation Test were then administered in order to examine the way of interpretation and production of the above-mentioned structures by participants.

The results were analyzed and interpreted through SPSS software and revealed that participants in both tasks were more successful in interpreting atelic predicates compared to telic ones. The results of the present study showed evidence of learners' transfer of Persian lexical and functional categories into English. These findings provided evidence in support of 'Full Transfer/Full Access Hypothesis' and rejection of 'Minimal Trees Hypothesis'. It is expected that language teachers take advantage of the results of the present study to improve the processes of teaching and learning through explicit teaching methodologies.

Key Words: Telicity, Complex Predicate, L1 transfer, Telic Predicate, Atelic Predicate, Full Transfer/Full Access Hypothesis, Minimal Trees Hypothesis.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	
Abstract	
Table of Contents.....	I
List of Tables.....	V
List of Figures.....	XIII
List of Abbreviations.....	IX
Chapter one: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Preliminaries.....	2
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Purpose of the Study.....	6
1.4 Theoretical Framework.....	6
1.5 Research Hypotheses.....	7
1.6 Significance of the Study.....	8
1.8 Definition of Key Terms.....	9
Chapter Two: Review of the Related Literature.....	11
2.1 UG and Language Acquisition (L1 and L2).....	12
2.2 Logical Problem of Language Acquisition.....	17
2.2.1 First Language Acquisition.....	17
2.2.2 Second Language Acquisition.....	19
2.3 Transfer Considerations.....	21
2.3.1 What is ‘Transfer’?.....	21
2.3.2 Historical Perspectives on the Notion of Language Transfer.....	22

2.3.3 Language Transfer and Access to UG	24
2.3.3.1 No Transfer/No Access	25
2.3.3.2 No Transfer/Full Access	25
2.3.3.3 Partial Transfer/No Access	26
2.3.3.4 Partial Transfer/Full Access	26
2.3.3.5 Full Transfer/No Access	27
2.3.3.6 Full Transfer/Full Access	27
2.4 Tense and Aspect in English	28
2.4.1 Statives	34
2.4.2 Activities	36
2.4.3 Achievements and Accomplishments	37
2.5 Telicity Considerations	39
2.5.1 Origins of Telicity.....	39
2.5.2 Telicity in English.....	41
2.5.3 Telicity in Persian	43
2.6 Considerations of Complex Predicates in English and Persian	46
2.7 Previous Studies Targeting Telicity Acquisition.....	49
2.8 Impetus for the Present Study	53
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	55
3.1 Participants.....	56
3.2 Instrumentation.....	57
3.2.1 Grammaticality Judgment Test.....	57
3.2.2 Translation Task	59

3.3 Procedures	60
3.4 Scoring and Analysis Procedures	63
Chapter Four: Data Analyses and Results	65
4.1 Grammaticality Judgment Test.....	66
4.1.1 Descriptive Results of GJT in Different Contexts	66
4.1.1.1 Grammatical Stative Verbs	70
4.1.1.2 Ungrammatical Stative verbs	71
4.1.1.3 Grammatical Activity verbs	73
4.1.1.4 Ungrammatical Activity verbs	74
4.1.1.5 Grammatical Accomplishment Verbs.....	76
4.1.1.6 Ungrammatical Accomplishment Verbs.....	78
4.1.1.6 Grammatical Achievement Verbs	80
4.1.1.7 Ungrammatical achievement verbs	82
4.1.2 GJT and Telic/Atelic Contexts.....	85
4.2 Statistical Analyses of Translation Test (Production Test)	89
4.2.1 Analysis on Participants' General performance on Translation Test.....	89
4.2.2 Analyses of Production Test on Telic and Atelic Contexts	94
4.3 Statistical Analyses Targeting Participants' Performance on Both Tasks	98
4.3.1 Stative Verb Context	98
4.3.2 Activity Verb Context	99
4.3.2 Accomplishment Verb Context.....	99
4.3.3 Achievement Verb Context.....	100
4.4 Summary of the Results	101

Chapter Five: Discussion & Conclusions	103
5.1 Restatement of the Hypotheses	104
5.2 Role of L1 Transfer in Comprehension of Telic and Atelic Structures.....	106
5.3 Discussion of Grammaticality Judgment Test Targeting Research Hypotheses Three and Four	110
5.4 Role of L1 Transfer in Production of Telic and Atelic Structures	112
5.5 Discussion of Translation Test Targeting Research Hypotheses Seven and Eight	114
5.6 ‘Full Transfer/Full Access’ and ‘Minimal Trees’ Hypotheses Accounts of the Results	115
5.7 Implications of the study.....	117
5.7.1 Theoretical Implications.....	117
5.7.2 Pedagogical Implications	117
5.8 Limitation of the Study	118
5.9 Suggestions for Further Research.....	118
 Appendices	 121
Appendix I: The Grammaticality Judgment Test (GJT).....	123
Appendix II: The Production Test (Translation).....	131
 References	 137

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Boundness and Definiteness Features in Vendler’s Class.....	33
Table 2.2 Some Examples of Vendler’s Classes of Verbs.....	34
Table 2.3 Dynamic, Punctual, Telic Features of Vendler’s class.....	39
Table 2.4 Examples of Complex Predicates Composed of a Preverb + Light Verb..	48
Table 3.1 Distribution of Test Items in the GJT.....	58
Table 3.2 Distribution of Test Items in the Translation Test	60
Table 3.3 Descriptive Data Concerning our Pilot Group.....	61
Table 3.4 Descriptive Data Concerning 60 Participants in Four Proficiency Groups	62
Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics of Four Groups in Eight Contexts.....	69
Table 4.2 One-Way ANOVA on Participants’ Performance on Grammatical Stative Verbs	70
Table 4.3 Multiple Comparisons for Groups’ Performance on Grammatical Stative Verbs	71
Table 4.4 One-Way ANOVA on Participants’ Performance on Ungrammatical Stative Verbs	72
Table 4.5 Multiple Comparisons for Groups’ Performance on Ungrammatical Stative Verbs	72
Table 4.6 One-Way ANOVA on Participants’ Performance on Grammatical Activity Verbs	73
Table 4.7 Multiple Comparisons for Groups’ Performance on Grammatical Activity Verbs	74

Table 4.8 One-Way ANOVA on Participants' Performance on Ungrammatical Activity Verbs	74
Table 4.9 Multiple Comparisons for Groups' Performance on Ungrammatical Activity Verbs	75
Table 4.10 One-Way ANOVA on Participants' Performance on Grammatical Accomplishment Verbs	76
Table 4.11 Multiple Comparisons for Groups' Performance on Grammatical Accomplishment Verbs	77
Table 4.12 One-Way ANOVA on Participants' Performance on Ungrammatical Accomplishment Verbs	78
Table 4.13 Multiple Comparisons for Groups' Performance on Ungrammatical Accomplishment Verbs	79
Table 4.14 One-Way ANOVA on Participants' Performance on Grammatical Achievement Verbs	80
Table 4.15 Multiple Comparisons for Groups' Performance on Grammatical Achievement Verbs	81
Table 4.16 One-Way ANOVA on Participants' Performance on Ungrammatical Achievement Verbs	82
Table 4.17 Multiple Comparisons for Groups' Performance on Ungrammatical Achievement Verbs	83
Table 4.18 Descriptive Information on Groups' Performance in Telic and Atelic Contexts	86
Table 4.19 Interaction Effect of Context and Proficiency Level	87
Table 4.20 Main Effect of Proficiency Level	88

Table 4. 21 Descriptive Data on Groups' Performance in Translation Test.....	90
Table 4.22 Interaction Effect of context and Proficiency Level	91
Table 4.23 Main Effect of Proficiency Level.....	92
Table 4.24 Descriptive Statistics of Telic and Atelic contexts in the production contexts	95
Table 4.25 Interaction Effect of Context and Proficiency Level of the four groups of the study	96
Table 4.26 Main Effect of proficiency Level of the four groups of the study	96
Table 4.27 T-test Analyses on Production vs. Perception of Statives	98
Table 4.28 T-test Analysis on Production vs. Perception of Activities	99
Table 4.29 T-test Analyses on Production vs. Perception of Accomplishments ..	100
Table 4.30 T-test Analyses on Production vs. Perception of Achievements	101

List of Figures

Figure 2.1 Three Different Possibilities for UG Engagement during L2 Acquisition	15
Figure 2.2 Different Manifestation of Present, Past, and Future Tenses.....	30
Figure 2.3 Relationships of R, E, and S in Different Tenses.....	30
Figure 4.1 Groups' Performance on Grammatical and Ungrammatical Stative Verbs	73
Figure 4.2 Groups' Performance on Grammatical and Ungrammatical Activity verbs	76
Figure 4.3 Groups' Performance on Grammatical and Ungrammatical Accomplishment Verbs	80
Figure 4.4 Groups' performance on Grammatical and Ungrammatical Achievement Verbs.....	84
Figure 4.5 Mean Score of each Proficiency Groups in each Contexts.....	84
Figure 4.6 Participants' Performance on Telic and Atelic Contexts.....	87
Figure 4.7 The Impact of Proficiency Level on Increasing Judgment Accuracy.....	88
Figure 4.8 The Impact of Proficiency Level on Production Accuracy of Groups....	92
Figure 4.9 Mean Score of Production accuracy of the Groups in the four Contexts	93
Figure 4.10 The Impact of Proficiency Level on the Production Accuracy of Learners	97
Figure 4.11 The Mean Score of Production Accuracy of Participants in Telic and Atelic Contexts.....	97