The Realization of English Dative Case in Iranian EFL Learners

Ferdows Aghagolzade[1*]   Mahmoud Mobaraki[2]

1. Associate Professor, Linguistics Department, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Iran
2. Ph.D. Student, Linguistics Department, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University, Iran
    * E-mail of the corresponding author: aghagolz@modares.ac.ir

Abstract

A cross sectional research was undertaken with sixty university students to know whether levels of proficiency interact with the realization of English dative case in Iranian EFL learners' performance and whether Iranian EFL learners aware of discourse constraint in English dative case. The research shows that Iranian learners learn dative non-alternation first, because dative non-alternation structures are somehow compatible with Persian structures. But, in the case of dative alternation Iranian learners encounter with some problems. So the usage of this English structure depends on the proficiency levels of the learners; the higher of the proficiency level, the more usage of dative alternation. The subjects were aware of discourse constraint in one sentence, but they were not aware of this constraint in the other sentence. It seems that they are not aware of the existence of this constraint; they just intend to use [NP PP] complement.

Keywords: dative alternation, dative non-alternation, discourse constraint, proficiency level Iranian learners'

performance

1. Introduction

English datives refer to the verbs which subcategorize for [NP NP] and [NP PP] complements. In English some verbs such as give, sell, pay, pass, tell, build, etc. accept both complement types, as presented in example (1)

Example (1):

a. John gave a letter to Bill.
b. John gave Bill a letter.

These verbs are called alternating verbs as they accept both complement types (Mazurkewich, 1984). However there are verbs such as address, deliver, demonstrate, describe, etc. which are used only with [NP PP] complements:

Example (2):

a. The president addressed his speech to the senators.
b. *The president addressed the senators his speech.

On the other hand, there are verbs, such as ask, cost, deny, forgive, etc. which are used only with [NP NP] complements:

Example (3):

a. The teacher asked his students a question.
b. *The teacher asked a question to his students.

There is a discourse constraint in the use of [NP NP] & [NP PP] complements; in which the participants in a conversation observe the order of given and new information as the following examples:

Example (4):

a. What did Tom give to <u>his friend</u>?

<div align="center">New</div>

b. Tom gave <u>his friend</u> <u>a rose</u>.

<div align="center">Give   New</div>

Example (5):

a. Who did Tom give <u>the rose</u> to?

<div align="center">New</div>

c.   Tom gave <u>the rose</u> to <u>his friend</u>.

<div align="center">Given   New</div>

   In example (4), the attention is on the indirect object of the sentence answering the question, which is on <u>the roses</u>, that is new information in the sentence; since it is not given in the question sentence like the direct object of the sentence <u>his friend</u>. In example (5), the focus of the attention in the answer sentence is on <u>his friend</u>. It is the indirect object of the sentence that is the new information, whereas <u>the roses</u> is the direct object as it is already given in the question.

   As to the construction of the dative alternation in Farsi, the use of the dative case is represented by a case marker, which indicates the direction of the action or the benefactor of the action; as can be seen in examples (6) and (7); both <u>to</u>-datives and <u>for</u>-datives are exemplified.

        Example (6)

                a.   Ali yek ketâb **be** Hassan dâd-ø

Ali one book **to** Hassan give. Ps-3sg

Ali gave a book to Hassan.

                b.   Ali **be** Hassan yek ketâb dâd-ø
                      Ali **to** Hassan one book give. Ps-3sg

                      Ali gave Hassan a book.

        Example (7)

                a.   Reza yek medâd **barâye** Sahar xarid-ø

Reza one pencil **for** Sahar buy. Ps-3sg

Reza bought a pencil for Sahar.

                b.   Reza **barâye** Sahar yek medâd xarid-ø
                      Reza **for** Sahar one pencil buy. Ps-3sg

Reza bought Sahar a pencil.

   In example (6) the word <u>Hassan</u> in both sentences takes a dative case because, it is the benefactor of the action; although the place of this word is changed in both parts. This case is true for the word <u>Sahar</u> in both parts of the example (7).

   There are [NP NP] or [NP PP] complements in constructing non- alternation dative case in English, it seems there is a non-alternation dative case in Farsi, but the place of the prepositions may be changed, as in example (8):

Example (8):

a. Mahtâb **az** mâdaraš yek soâl porsid-ø

Mahtâb her mother one question ask. Ps-3sg

Mahtâb asked her mother a question.

b. Mahtâb yek soâl az mâdaraš porsid-ø

Mahtâb one question her mother ask. Ps-3sg

Mahtâb asked her mother a question.

The writers of this paper try to answer the following questions considering the above information:

1. How do levels of proficiency interact with the realization of English dative case in Iranian EFL learners' performance?
2. How Iranian EFL learners are confronted with discourse constraint in English dative case?

2. Overview of literature

There are a number of studies on the English dative alternation and non-alternation. These studies can be divided into two groups as the linguistic studies and the acquisition studies. In the first group, Allerton (1978) has cited the problematic situations such as the effect of using pronouns, instead of full noun phrase in the double object constructions; and Falts (1978:76) examined the notion of a syntactic indirect object through scrutinizing a number of unrelated languages and challenged the idea that "indirect objects display a cluster of coherent morphological and syntactic properties, which could be used to define a universal category". There also studies in which the dative alternation was examined in terms of discourse constraint theoretically (Erteschik-shir 1979) or through checking the corpus (Collins 1995).

In acquisition studies, the acquisition of the verbs that occur in the dative alternation has been examined with markedness and Chomsky's Universal Grammar (Mazurkewich (1984), Mazurkewich& White (1985) .Dative is the grammatical case to show the recipient or possessor of the direct object and is realized in two forms:

Example (9):

a) I sent a present to Peter.
b) Alice bought a present for Peter.

Example (10):

a) I sent Peter a present.
b) Alice bought Peter a present.

In (9a, b) the accusative object <u>a present</u> is followed by the preposition <u>to</u> or <u>for</u> followed by the dative object <u>Peter</u>. In (10a, b) the dative object precedes the accusative object in the form of a double object construction. In the lexicalist approach to the study of grammar (Oehrle, 1976), these two realizations are shown by the features [NP PP] and [NP NP] respectively.

Given the frames [NP PP] and [NP NP], Mazurkewich proposes that the former is the unmarked member and is usually acquired earlier than the latter, which is marked. Her proposed order of difficulty is consistent with the results from all her studies where the subjects systematically accepted the [NP PP] pattern more grammatical than the equivalent [NP NP] pattern. Her assumption concerning the markedness degree of the dative forms is based on three different sorts of criteria. The first criterion is that of productivity. While the great majority of the dative verbs take the [NP PP] frame, only a small portion or a subset of them subcategorize for the [NP NP] frame. In other words, the prepositional phrase dative complement is the form that appears in positions of neutralization. The second criterion is that morphological and semantic constraint governing the alternation

applied to the frame [NP NP] rending it more elaborated and marked. Her third criterion is directly related to a principle of Universal Grammar. The [NP PP] pattern is unmarked since it is consistent with the principle of adjacency. This principle states that the categories <u>verb</u> and <u>preposition</u> must assign case to their adjacent noun phrases.

Soozanyar (1988) has studied the acquisition of dative case by Iranian learners. He has tried to re-examine the claim that linguistic universals determine the acquisition order of the English dative constructions. The results of the study show that the learners judge the unmarked [NP PP] patterns as grammatical. This sequence, which mirrors the order obtained by Mazurkewich, is consistent with the Universal Grammar based on markedness prediction.

3.Methodology

In order to find out the answers of the cited questions, a cross sectional study was undertaken with sixty university students. The subjects were all junior students studying English.

3.1. Instruments

Two kinds of tests are used in this study:

A. Proficiency Test

In order to know whether proficiency in English interacts with knowledge of English dative case; a proficiency test, Oxford Placement Test, revised by Allan (1984), was administrated. The obtained reliability (.79) was calculated using KR-21. The subjects were divided into three groups based on their scores in the test: 17 low-proficiency subjects, 28 intermediate- proficiency subjects and 15 high- proficiency subjects.

B. Grammaticality Judgment Task in English

The assumption behind the use of this test is that the subjects' intuitive judgment about the grammaticality of the task items would reflect their linguistic competence at each stage of development.

The use of grammaticality judgment task, especially in second language acquisition research, has been recommended and emphasized by Schachter, Tyson, and Diffly (1979) as a result of work on a project in this respect.

The grammaticality judgment task consists of two sections. The first section includes declarative sentences with the verbs selected from different senses of meaning. These verbs have been divided into three categories based on the complements which they take.

The first category consists of the verbs that undergo the dative alternation. Some of these verbs have monosyllabic bases such as <u>send</u>, <u>buy</u>, <u>lend</u>, etc. These verbs can take both [NP PP] and [NP NP] complement; this means they have two syntactic structures. A list of these verbs is provided in Table 1.

The second category includes the verbs that undergo the dative, but non-alternative. These verbs just take [NP PP] complement. Some of them have monosyllabic bases such as <u>prove</u>, <u>close</u>, etc. and some of the others have polysyllabic bases like: <u>report</u>, <u>create</u>, etc. A list of these verbs is given in Table 2.

The third category consists of the verbs that just take [NP NP] complements. Because the aim of this study is to describe the English verbs occurring in the simple sentences not the expressions, this kind of sentences are not dealt with in this study.

In addition to the inclusion of the alternating and non-alternating verbs, this task also contains a balance of both to-verbs and for-verbs, which are, in turn, of either monosyllabic or polysyllabic bases. Two prepositional datives with for are used instead of prepositional datives with to and three prepositional datives with to are used instead of for in this task, this could be a check on the students to know whether they were aware of the usage of to and for with the dative alternative verbs.

Table1. The used verbs which undergo the dative alternation

TO-VERBS		
	Syllabic base	Example
1	monosyllabic	send, lend, read, give, owe, show
2	polysyllabic	offer, promise, allow
FOR-VERBS		
	Syllabic base	Example
1	monosyllabic	buy, make, save, bake, choose, fly
2	polysyllabic	prepare, reserve

Table2. The used verbs which undergo the dative non-alternation

TO-VERBS		
	Syllabic base	Example
1	monosyllabic	prove, say
2	polysyllabic	report, explain, donate, propose
FOR-VERBS		
	Syllabic base	Example
1	monosyllabic	close, cash, change
2	polysyllabic	create, capture, design, open

The construction of the test items and also instructions given in the second section, are similar to the first section; the only difference is that in the second section short dialogues were included instead of declarative

sentences, since the aim was to measure the learners' awareness of the discourse constraint. The short dialogues contained the following verbs: bring, award, pay, send, give, sell and pass.

In this task, 10 distractor stimulus sentences in the first section and 5 distractor dialogues in the second section that do not contain dative verbs, are included to prevent learners from treating the task purely as a matter of solving the puzzle of the target construction. All the sentences are written using full noun phrases in the sentences, as pronouns may lead learners to make mistakes. A copy of the task is provided in appendix at the end of paper.

3.2. Procedure

The grammaticality judgment task in English was given to the subjects; in the first section, they were asked to judge whether the sentences were written in good English or not. If they believed that a sentence has been written in good English, they were required to put (G) before the sentence, otherwise put (U).

In the case of having no idea, they were asked to put a question mark in the blank before each sentence. In second section, the subjects were asked to read the short dialogues and decide which part of them has not been in good English.

The proficiency test was given before the grammaticality judgment task to divide the subjects into three groups. Each of these groups has their own ability in using English as a second language, so the grammaticality judgment task was taken to account according to the proficiency test.

3.3. Data Analysis

After collecting data, the accurate answers given to each sentence in the first section and each dialogue in the second section, were counted; for example, if the sentence "*The young lady asked the time to her husband.", was marked as not expressed in good English, it was scored 1 point; otherwise, it was considered as incorrect. The dialogues or sentences which were marked with question mark were considered as incorrect and given no point. These points set the basis for statistical analysis, such as the mean and median with standard deviation and also the maximum and minimum scores. These devices were useful to come to a conclusion about the knowledge of the Iranian students about dative case in English.

Another research question was about the relationship between proficiency and the knowledge of dative case. After calculating the obtained scores by students from the proficiency test, the students were divided into three proficiency groups: low, intermediate and high proficiency students; and then the mean scores for each section were calculated. To understand the interaction between learners' proficiency level and whether the test scores were statistically significant a parametric test, i.e. one-way ANOVA, was used.

4. Discussion

There are some verbs which undergo the dative alternation and take both [NP NP] and [NP PP] complement in the first section. In the case of [NP PP] complement some of the verbs take to-preposition and some of the others take for-preposition. Each of these verbs was studied according to proficiency levels of the subjects. The obtained results are provided in Tables 3& 4.

Table 3. Alternating To-verbs

Verb	Complement	Low-Proficiency	Intermediate-Proficiency	High-Proficiency
send	NP NP	5	19	12
	NP PP	15	24	13
lend	NP NP	2	12	10
	NP PP	14	22	12
read	NP NP	3	10	9
	NP PP	11	15	10
throw	NP NP	4	10	12
	NP PP	14	23	13
owe	NP NP	6	13	10
	NP PP	13	24	12
show	NP NP	5	19	11
	NP PP	14	25	13
offer	NP NP	1	8	3
	NP PP	13	20	12
promise	NP NP	2	8	5
	NP PP	14	23	13
allow	NP NP	1	6	6
	NP PP	13	24	11

The average of all percentages for [NP NP] complements for the three groups are: 19% for the low proficiency subjects, 42% for the intermediate and 58% for the high proficiency subjects. As can be seen the percentage of the usage of [NP NP] complement grows from low to high proficiency.

In the case of [NP PP] complement, 81% of high- proficiency students, 79% of intermediate- proficiency students and 79% of low-proficiency students did the task correctly. The observed F-ratio (.0007) obtained by the application of ANOVA, reveals that there is no meaningful difference among the groups' judgments concerning the [NP PP] dative form. This is indicative of the fact that at early stages of development the acquisition of prepositional phrase dative complement poses little difficulty for the learners.

Table 4. Alternating For-verbs

Verb	Complement	Low-Proficiency	Intermediate-Proficiency	High-Proficiency
buy	NP NP	4	18	8
	NP PP	17	24	15
make	NP NP	3	10	9
	NP PP	15	26	13
save	NP NP	3	19	7
	NP PP	15	24	13
bake	NP NP	2	8	6
	NP PP	17	25	13
choose	NP NP	5	10	10
	NP PP	14	23	14
fry	NP NP	1	4	3
	NP PP	15	26	15
prepare	NP NP	4	10	7
	NP PP	14	26	14
reserve	NP NP	2	9	5
	NP PP	13	25	14

According to Table 4, 18% of low proficiency subjects, 27% of intermediate-proficiency subjects and 46% of high proficiency subjects accepted [NP NP] complement grammatical for these verbs. This information is also indicative of the fact the subjects' acquisition of the [NP NP] dative structures grows from the beginning level to high level of proficiency.

In the case of [NP PP] complement 88% of low, 89% of intermediate and 92% of high-proficiency subjects accepted this kind of dative form grammatical for these verbs. The observed F-ratio (.004) reveals that there is no meaningful difference among the groups' judgments concerning the [NP PP] complement.

In short, 79% of low proficiency subjects answered [NP PP] complement with To-verbs correctly, whereas 88% of them answered this kind of complement with For-verbs correctly, in other words the subjects intended to use For-verbs more than To-verbs. This is also true for other groups where the intermediate proficiency subjects answered 89% to For-verbs but 79% to To-verbs; and 92% of the high proficiency subjects answered to For-verbs but 81% to To-verbs correctly.

In the first section, there were some other verbs which undergo the dative non-alternation and take just [NP PP] complement. Some of these verbs take To-preposition and some of the others take For-preposition. Each of these verbs was also studied according to the proficiency levels of the subjects. This is tabulated in Tables 5&6.

Table 5. Non-alternating To-verbs

Verb	Complement	Low-Proficiency	Intermediate-Proficiency	High-Proficiency
prove	*NP NP	1	3	0
	NP PP	13	26	15
say	*NP NP	2	1	0
	NP PP	12	26	15
report	*NP NP	3	5	1
	NP PP	10	23	13
explain	*NP NP	1	2	1
	NP PP	12	22	11
propose	*NP NP	1	1	0
	NP PP	16	26	15
dictate	*NP NP	0	0	0
	NP PP	15	25	14
donate	*NP NP	1	0	0
	NP PP	16	26	15

In table 5. [*NP NP] complement shows the incorrect form for these verbs in dative non-alternation situation. The table shows that the subjects have intended to use [NP PP] complement rather than [NP NP] complement. Only 8% of low, 6% of intermediate and 2% of high proficiency subjects considered [NP NP] complement for these verbs; but 76% of low-proficiency subjects, 87% of intermediate-proficiency subjects and 92% of high-proficiency subjects accepted [NP PP] complement for these verbs. The F-ratio (.047) is also indicative of the fact that there is no meaningful difference among the groups' judgments concerning the [NP PP] complement. Most of the subjects have acquired this dative from the beginning of the acquisition and have kept it in mind.

Table 6. Non-alternating For-verbs

Verb	Complement	Low-Proficiency	Intermediate-Proficiency	High-Proficiency
close	*NP NP	1	3	0
	NP PP	16	27	15
cash	*NP NP	2	3	0
	NP PP	15	25	15
change	*NP NP	1	4	1
	NP PP	16	24	14
create	*NP NP	1	3	1
	NP PP	16	25	14
capture	*NP NP	2	1	0
	NP PP	15	27	15
design	*NP NP	3	5	1
	NP PP	14	23	14
open	*NP NP	1	2	0
	NP PP	16	26	15

9% of both of the low and intermediate-proficiency learners accepted [NP NP] complement for these verbs, but 9% of both of these two levels considered [NP PP] complement for this kind of verbs. The percentage of the high-proficiency subjects who accepted [NP NP] complement was 3%; and the percentage for choosing [NP PP] complement was 97%. It is worth mentioning here that almost all of the subjects, who preferred [NP PP] complement, used For-preposition instead of To-preposition. Table 7 shows the overall results on the grammaticality judgment task in section A:

Table 7. The overall results of section A

	N	N. of Replicates	Mean	Median	STDEV.	Min.	Max.
Alternation	60	17	36	36	2.96	23	44
Non-Alternation	60	14	53	54.5	1.91	45	58

On average, learners answered 60% of the verbs undergoing the dative alternation and nearly 89% of the verbs undergoing the dative non-alternation correctly. As mentioned before there is no meaningful difference between the proficiency levels of the learners to use [NP PP] complement for either alternating or non-alternating verbs, but to know whether proficiency affects subjects' use of [NP NP] complement see table 8.

Table 8. Descriptive statistics for three groups in the use of [NP NP] complement

Proficiency	N.	Mean	Median	STDEV.	Min.	Max.
High	15	8	8	3.08	3	12
Intermediate	28	11	10	3.63	4	19
Low	17	3	3	1.58	1	6

The results show that there is an effect of proficiency on the scores among each proficiency level. To understand if the interaction between learners' proficiency level and test scores is statistically significant the parametric test, one way ANOVA, was used. By applying this test one can come to this conclusion that there is a significant difference (F (2,57) = 6.41 p< .05) among the scores which were obtained by the subjects in each level in the grammaticality judgment task in the case of [NP NP] complement.

The result of the second section according to each verb and each version are given in Table 9.

Table 9. Discourse Constraint

Verb	Complement	Raw scores	Percentage
bring	NP NP	9	15%
*bring	NP PP	51	85%
bring	NP PP	53	88%
*bring	NP NP	2	3%
award	NP PP	15	25%
*award	NP PP	45	75%
pay	NP NP	5	8%
pay	NP PP	54	90%
*pay	NP NP	0	-
*pay	NP PP	55	92%
give	NP NP	4	7%
*give	NP NP	3	5%
sell	NP PP	55	92%
*sell	NP NP	2	3%
*sell	NP PP	56	93%
*pass	NP PP	53	88%
*pass	NP NP	4	7%

There were four dimensions for the verb bring in task. Two of them were correct and two others were incorrect based on the discourse constraint. Just 15% of the subjects selected the sentence "He brought Jane a necklace" as grammatical sentence. This sentence is the answer of the cited question "Do you know what Mike brought to Jane?" In the answer sentence Jane is given information and a necklace is new information; most of the learners were not aware of this constraint. 88% of them accepted the sentence "He brought a ring to Jane", which is the answer of "Who did Jack bring a ring to?" as grammatical one. In this sentence also the given and new information is observed, but most of the learners were aware of this constraint. As can be seen the subjects were aware of the discourse constraint in one sentence, but were not in another one. It seems that they do not know

this constraint at all; they just intend to use [NP NP] complement for the verbs. Where the verb <u>bring</u> with [NP NP] complement was correct the percentage of using this complement was 15 while for [NP PP] complement was 88. Only 3% of the learners accepted the answer "<u>He brought Jane a ring</u>" to the question "<u>Do you know who Jack brought a ring to?</u>" as grammatical sentence. The discourse constraint has not been observed in the answer sentence in this example. 88% of the subjects considered the answer sentence "<u>He brought a necklace to Jane</u>" to the question "<u>What did Mike bring to Jane?</u>" as grammatical sentence. This example like other examples are indicative the fact that learners have intended to use [NP PP] complement rather than [NP NP] complement and they didn't know the discourse constraint in these examples.

5.Conclusion

The average of all percentage for [NPNP] complements for the three groups participated in the English task was: 19% for low, 42% for intermediate, and 58% for high proficiency subjects. As can be seen the percentage of the usage of [NP NP] complement among the subjects grows from low to high proficiency.

81% of the high, 79% of the intermediate, and also 79% of the low proficiency subjects considered [NP PP] complement with <u>To</u>-preposition as grammatical. The observed F-ratio (.0007) obtained by the application of ANOVA, revealed that there was no meaningful difference among the groups' judgments concerning the [NP PP] dative form. That was indicative of the fact that at early stages of development, the acquisition of prepositional phrase dative complement poses little difficulty for the learners.

88% of low, 89% of intermediate, and 92% of high proficiency subjects accepted [NP PP] complement with <u>for</u> -preposition as grammatical. The observed F-ratio (.004) revealed that there was no meaningful difference among the groups' judgments concerning the [NP PP] complement.

79.5% of the subjects considered the preposition <u>to</u> in the case of [NP PP] complement, while 89.4% of them considered the preposition <u>for</u>. In other words, the subjects intended to use <u>For</u>-verbs more than <u>To</u>-verbs.

In the case of choosing dative alternation and dative non-alternation, the average learners answered 60% of the verbs undergoing the dative alternation appropriately, and nearly 89% of the verbs undergoing dative non-alternation correctly. There was no meaningful difference between the proficiency levels of the learners in the use of [NP PP] complement for both of the alternating and non-alternating verbs. But there was an effect of proficiency in using [NP NP] complement. Considering [NP NP] complement as grammatical for the dative verbs grows from low to high proficiency.

In the second section, the subjects were aware of discourse constraint in one sentence, but they were not aware of this constraint in the other sentence. It seems that they are not aware of the existence of this constraint; they just intend to use [NP PP] complement.

So, the research shows that Iranian learners learn dative non-alternation first, because dative non-alternation structures are somehow compatible with Farsi structures. But, in the case of dative alternation Iranian learners encounter with some problems. So the usage of this English structure depends on the proficiency levels of the learners; the higher of the proficiency level, the more usage of dative alternation.

Refrences

Allerton, D., J., (1978), "Generating Indirect Objects in English", *Journal of Linguistics*, Vol.14, 21-33.

Collins, P., (1995), "The Indirect Object Construction in English: An Information Approach", *Journal of linguistics*,

      Vol.33, 35-49.

Eteschik-Shir, N., (1979), "Discourse Constraints on Dative Movement", In T. Givon (ed.), *Discourse and Syntax*,

Vol.12, New York: Academic Press. 441-467.

Falts, L., (1978), "On Indirect Objects in Universal Syntax", *Papers from the 14th Regional Meeting of the Chicago*

Linguistic Society, 76-87.

Mazurkewich, I., (1984), "The Acquisition of the Dative Alternation by Second Language Learners and Linguistic

Theory", *Language Learning*, Vol.2, 91-109.

Mazurkewich, I. & White, L., (1984), "The accusation of the dative alternation: Unlearning overgeneralizations",

Cognition,16, 261-283.

Oehrle, R., T., (1976), *The Grammatical Studies of the Dative Alternation in English*, MIT Press.

Soozanyar, A., K., (1991), "Acquisition of the English Dative Case by Persian Learners", M.A. thesis, Shiraz

University.

Appendix I. Grammaticality Judgment Task in English (First Section)

Name: ……………

Read the following sentences please, put "G" next to the sentences that you think are grammatical; put "U" that are not grammatical, and put "?" next to the sentences that you are not sure.

1. ....Kim reserved Joe a table.
2. ....Susan preserved a meal to Joe.
3. ....George proposed Mary a holiday.
4. ....Betty explained Jane the problem.
5. ....David donated some money to the church.
6. ....Billy reported the police the accident.
7. ....Linda baked a cake for Mary.
8. ....Robert bought a car for Bill.
9. ....Victor saved a seat to John.
10. ....Paul chose a book to Betty.
11. ....Isabel made Alice a dress.
12. ....David promised Linda a dress.
13........... Philip offered the job to Harry.
14..........Ronald allowed a rest to Mary.
15. ....Nancy fried some eggs for Mary.
16. ....Sara created a problem for Nancy.

17........... Alice opened the door for Mary.

18..........Philip looked after John at home.

19..........Tom captured a prize for Canada.

20..........Jack received a letter from Jill.

21..........Betty changed the money for Marry.

22..........David cashed the check for Tom.

23..........Peter closed the door for Marry.

24..........Alice proved her love to George.

25..........Jack always says Jill "Hello".

26..........Bob gave a newspaper to Linda.

27..........Henry read the report for George.

28..........John showed a photo to Bill.

29..........Nora lent Mary some money.

30..........Fred threw a ball to Phillip.

31..........Jack owed Harry thirty dollars.

32..........John showed Bill a photo.

33..........Bob gave Linda a newspaper.

34..........George proposed a holiday to Mary.

35..........Betty explained the problem to Jane.

36..........Billy reported the accident to the police.

37..........David donated the church some money.

38..........Alice proved George her love.

39..........Jack always says "Hello" to Jill.

40..........Kim reserved a table for Joe.

41..........Susan prepared Joe a meal.

42..........Nora lent some money to Mary.

43..........Fred threw Phillip a ball.

44..........Henry read the report to George.

45..........Mary sent a letter to John

46..........Nora lent some money for Mary.

47.......... Rose dictated Mary a letter.

48..........Alice opened Mary the door.

49..........Sara created Nancy some problem.

50..........Rose dictated a letter to Marry.

Appendix II. Grammaticality Judgment task in English (Second Section)

Name: …………..

Read the following dialogues please and decide which one is good and which one is not good in English. Put "G" for the good ones and "U" for the ones which are not good.

………1. A: What did Mike bring to Jane?

       B: He brought a necklace to Jane.

………2. A: Who did Bob give the newspaper to?

       B: Bob gave Linda the newspaper.

……….3. A: What did the judges award both finalists?

B: The judges awarded both finalists equal points.

……….4. A: What did the boss pay to Jane?

B: The boss paid Jane some money.

……….5. A: Do you know when the secretary left the building?

B: Oh yes, she left at 7:30 p.m.

……….6. A: Do you know what Mike brought to Jane?

B: He brought Jane a necklace.

……….7. A: Do you know what Bob gave to Linda?

B: Oh yes, he gave Linda a newspaper.

……….8. A: Where did she go yesterday?

B: She went to the park yesterday.

……….9. A: Who did the boss pay the check to?

B: The boss paid the check to Jane.

……….10. A: What did the judges award both finalists?

B: The judges awarded equal points to both finalists.

……….11. A: Do you know who Jack brought a ring to?

B: He brought Jane a ring.

……….12. A: What did Tom sell to Jack?

B: Tom sold Jack a camera?

………13. A: What did the boss pay to Jane?

B: The boss paid some money to Jane.

………14. A: Do you know what she passed to Mary?

B: She passed a letter to Mary.

………15. A: Who did Jack bring a ring to?

B: He brought a ring to Jane.