

Indices of L1 Transfer in EFL Writing: A Study of Japanese Learners of English*

Sakae OKUMA

Summary

Having been interested in language transfer as a Japanese teacher of English at a university, I decided to study this area of language acquisition systematically, hoping to contribute to ELT in Japan.

I started reading relevant literature and found the differences between contrastive analysis, transfer analysis and error analysis. Though these three methods deal with the same target, that is, "learner English" (Swan and Smith, 1987), their standpoints differ from each other. Contrastive analysis compares two language systems and predicts errors. Transfer analysis compares "learner English" with L1 and explains the structure of an error. Error analysis compares "learner English" with English (L2) itself and judge how learners are "ignorant" (James, 1998). I chose the second one as my method.

Then, I established a framework for classifying transfer errors. It consists of five categories: lexical language transfer (LT), phrasal structure grammatical transfer (SGT), sentential SGT, avoidance LT and stylistic LT. These are based on Selinker et al. (1975) and Schachter, (1974). Having established the framework, I made a list of indices (sub-categories) under each category, while reviewing Thompson (1987) critically.

My data, which was "cross-sectional," was collected by myself in 1999, based on a certain method and procedures. Main participants were 33 students in my English class and myself. I first gave them a reading material, and then, asked them to write whatever they had in mind on the material, both in L1 and EFL. I also conducted tests, questionnaires and protocols (interviews).

* This paper is a revised and enlarged version of my MA dissertaion in linguistics (TESOL) submitted to the University of Surrey, UK, in December, 1999. I publish it here believing it still useful for the field of ELT.

I had two findings through data analysis and protocols: the gradations of the importance of each index and what we call the "individual fossilization." My proposal of a dual way of approaching "learner English" may be a contribution to ELT in Japan. It is the way of teaching contrastive grammars based on the theory of the gradations and finding out "individual fossilizations" through transfer analysis. I also suggested the possibility of co-relation between what we call the word-to-word equations, "learner pidgin" (Nemser, 1971) and the grammar-translation method.

List of Contents

Chapter1 Introduction

- 1.1 Purpose and Motivations
- 1.2 Definition of Errors
- 1.3 Brief Overview of the Chapters

Chapter 2 Theoretical Review of Language Transfer

- 2.1 Language Transfer, Contrastive Analysis, Transfer Analysis, and Error Analysis
 - 2.1.1 Contrastive Analysis
 - 2.1.2 Transfer Analysis
 - 2.1.3 Error Analysis
- 2.2 Critical Review of Categorizing Language Transfer
 - Three Categories Proposed by Selinker et al. (1975)
 - 2.2.1 Lexical Language Transfer
 - 2.2.2 Surface Structure Grammatical transfer
 - 2.2.3 Deep Structure Grammatical Transfer
- 2.3 Thompson's Contrastive Analysis
 - 2.3.1 Word Order
 - 2.3.2 Passives
 - 2.3.3 Complementation
 - 2.3.4 Nouns
 - 2.3.5 Pronouns
 - 2.3.6 Adjectives
 - 2.3.6.1 Predicative Adjectives

2.3.6.2 Determiners

2.3.7 Adverbial Phrases

2.3.8 Conjunctions

2.4 Hakuta's Indications of Lexical Language Transfer

2.5 Schachter's Structural Avoidance as Language Transfer

2.6 Our Own Way of Categorization or Making Indices of L1 Transfer in EFL Writing

2.6.1 Five Main Categories

2.6.2 Theoretically Predictable Indices of L1 Transfer

Chapter 3 Research Method and Procedures

3.1 Participants

3.2. Type and Sources of data

3.3 Procedures

3.4 Instruments of analysis

Chapter 4 Results of Corpus Data

4.1 TE and IDE Count

4.2 Classification of the TEs

4.2.1 Classified TEs

4.2.2 Greater Frequency of the Sentential SGT

4.2.3 Phrasal SGT

4.2.4 Lexical LT

4.2.5 Avoidance LT and the Stylistic LT

4.3 Results of Tests

4.3.1 Test 1

4.3.2 Test 2

4.3.2.1 Topic-Comment Structures

4.3.2.2 Passives

4.3.2.3 Predicative Adjectives

4.4 Questionnaires and Protocols

Chapter 5 Conclusion

5.1 Two Findings and Their Implications for ELT

5.2 Lexical LT and Its Relation to the Grammar-Translation Method

Appendix I Text for Reading (abridged)

Appendix II Data 1-33 (abridged)

Appendix III Test 1 and Test 2

Bibliography

Chapter1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose and Motivations

The purpose of this dissertation is to make indices of L1 transfer in EFL writing, which I hope will be useful for ELT in Japan. I, as a Japanese teacher of English at a university, became interested in language transfer while correcting students' "errors" in their EFL writing. I found a variety of "errors," among which I noticed such an erroneous "sentence" as this:

- (1) *The nation and the nation isn't separate. (Old Data¹)

As a native speaker of Japanese, I instinctively understood what happened behind this "error," and judged that it should be called language transfer. There were, in fact, quite a few "errors" like this in students' EFL writing.

My study started with looking for such "transfer errors," analyzing each error mainly by means of Japanese grammar, and classifying it into a certain category. Meanwhile, I read the related literature of interlanguage, contrastive analysis, transfer analysis and error analysis, which helped me to make a framework of classification and to focus on "transfer errors" distinguished from the other types of "errors." I also took into consideration how to research a specific theme by following certain procedures, and decided to collect data in my 1999 class.

This is one of my motivations to study this area of language acquisition. Another is rather a practical one. As the aim of my class is to develop university students' communicative competence, I looked for any effective ways of implementing the aim. In other words, I asked myself what I could do in my class as a Japanese teacher of English. My conclusion was that writing was the most effective way not only of eliciting my best contribution to my class but also

¹ The "Old Data" refers to data from preliminary data I collected prior to this current study.

of developing the students' linguistic competence in the FL settings.

This may sound paradoxical, for, in 1993, the Japanese Ministry of Education recommended all junior and senior high schools to put stress on "cultivation of ability to communicate." The effect of this official effort has not been so evident so far, though. Whatever junior high and high school teachers teach, they teach English grammar in essence and their method is the grammar-translation in essence. As a result, university students in my class, or in any other classes, cannot use English well as a means of communication, nor write in the language properly.

I must confess that my class is in inconvenient situations for language learning, what with the larger number of students (about 30 per class), and what with curricular time and frequency (90 minutes / once a week). Students have little opportunity of speaking English spontaneously except greetings and short conversations, while what they actually need is higher level of language competence for expressing their complex thoughts. So I encourage them to do a spontaneous piece of writing under certain controls and give them some feedback from the point of view of language transfer, believing that transfer analysis is effective and useful for students to develop their own competence of writing in English.

1.2 Definition of Errors

As I said above, I empirically noticed a variety of error types and I know that I am going to discuss a certain type of errors in this dissertation. In any discussion of errors, however, the question of what is meant by an "error" must be addressed, and how an "error" can be distinguished, if it can be distinguished at all, from "slips" and "mistakes".

Related discussions of the distinction found in Corder (1973) and James (1998) reveal a criterion of how to tell an "error" from a "slip" or a "mistake," that is, the criterion of self-correctability. A "slip" or a "mistake" can be more or less self-corrected, while errors are not recognizable by the speaker and are, therefore, not amenable to self-correction. The speaker's instrument of correction is, in this case, his or her grammatical knowledge of the target language.

A further distinction is indicated between errors themselves. Some errors are grammatically correct, but do not match the context. Corder (1973: 272), indicating this covert nature of errors, coined the term "covert errors." The question of covert and overt errors is, however, quite controversial, and we are not going to attempt to distinguish between them so rigorously. Since our aim lies not in error analysis, but in transfer analysis (see Chapter 2), we are not going to attempt to make strict distinctions between slips, mistakes and errors, either. We will use the term "error" throughout this dissertation and will divide the errors into two categories: intralingual and developmental errors (IDEs) and language transfer errors (TEs). We also distinguish grammatically incorrect instances from those which are grammatically passable but semantically incorrect.

We will use, in this dissertation, the mark * for the former and the mark ? for the latter.

1.3 Brief Overview of the Chapters

As our main activity is to analyze TEs from the viewpoint of language transfer, the first thing we have to do in Chapter 2 is to define this central term itself. Then we will go on defining contrastive analysis, error analysis and transfer analysis. This clarification of terminology will be followed by critical reviews on classifying TEs in order to get our own categories of classification. In the special section on Thompson (1987), while categorizing TEs found in it, we will attempt to predict a certain number of sub-categories, or indices, which could cause TEs in learners' EFL writings. A list of indices will be shown at the end of Chapter 2.

Before reporting the results of data, we will describe our sources of data, research method, and instruments in Chapter 3. Our data, originally written by our subjects, came from my class. We will explain who were the participants and what kind of data was collected. I also conducted tests questionnaires and protocols (or interviews) to confirm the results of data. Our instrument called transfer analysis will be shown through analyzing a sample datum.

In Chapter 4, we will report the results of data, beginning with the results of counting TEs and IDEs. Then we will present the results of classifying TEs mainly by means of tables and instances. What we call the Sentential Structure

Grammatical Transfer will be found the most conspicuous category of all and we will discuss some reasons for this. We also discuss word-to-word equations as a cause of the lexical language transfer. After these discussions, we will go on presenting the results of the tests, questionnaires, and protocols. These additional researches will reveal some facts of L1 transfer in EFL writing. One of them is that language transfer is not always a process of translation: it is sometimes "fossilized" in learner English.

In Conclusion, first, we will show a new list of the indices of L1 transfer in EFL writing. Then, we will discuss briefly the meanings of those two indices our study highlighted: Japanese topic-comment structures and predicative adjectives. After confirming these positive aspects of this dissertation, we will attempt to see its implications for ELT in Japan. Finally, we will discuss how to improve our research method and procedures, and will think about areas for a further study.

Chapter 2 Theoretical Review of Language Transfer

We have two aims for this chapter: the literature review on the area of language transfer and the establishment of our framework for analysis in Chapter 4.

Though we need a clear definition of the term "language transfer" because it is our central concept, we can show only a working definition of ours: "the influence resulting from ... differences between the target language and ... (the) language that has been previously ... acquired" (Odlin, 1989: 27). This is to say that, in this dissertation, we do not deal with "positive transfer," which means "the facilitating influence of ... similarities between the native and target language" (Odlin, *ibid.*: 26). Instead, we concentrate on "negative transfer" i.e. "interference" of the native language with the target language (Odlin, *ibid.*: 26). The latter phenomenon takes place when the two languages are different from each other. In such a case, the use of native language patterns or rules inevitably result in errors or inappropriate forms in the target language.

The following survey and discussion of the literature will lead to the theoretical prediction of a framework for language transfer categories or indices for Japanese learners. It is this framework that we will use to analyze our data in Chapter 4.

2.1 Language Transfer, Contrastive Analysis, Transfer Analysis, and Error Analysis

After defining our central concept of language transfer, our end here is to distinguish transfer analysis from other ways of analyzing similar phenomena under the concept.

2.1.1 Contrastive Analysis

The method of contrastive analysis began with Lado (1957), who defined the "fundamental assumption" of language learning as "to transfer the forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of [individuals'] native language and culture to the foreign language and culture" (Lado, 1957: 2). Though this definition seems to be a definition of language transfer, it is obviously ambiguous in that it does not tell positive transfer from negative one.

The comparison of linguistic systems, however, is Lado's method of studying his own area of language learning, so he shows us how to compare two sound systems, two grammatical structures, two vocabulary systems, two writing systems, and two cultures. This method is called contrastive analysis.

Thompson (1987) is a typical example of contrastive analysis between Japanese and English, ranging from phonology to grammar. The grammar part includes such items as word order, verbs, tenses, passives, complementation, nouns, articles, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, determiners, and conjunctions. These items make a list of grammatical domains where Japanese learners, in his view, tend to make errors because of grammatical differences between Japanese (L1) and English (EFL).

It is controversial to what degree those grammatical domains cause language transfer from L1 to EFL. It seems that most of the errors they cause are "intralingual and developmental" (see Richards, 1971:173 and the latter part of this section), but, in our view, quite a few of them could cause language transfer and we will confirm it in 2.3.

Contrastive analysis is presumed to predict certain types of errors, while some scholars suggest that it has no predictive power and that it can only be useful after the fact (cf. Odlin, 1989: 19). But then, any method is meaningless unless it has a certain possibility of prediction. We will challenge prediction in language transfer in our own way (see, 2.3).

The greatest weak point of the contrastive analysis, we believe, lies in that it analyzes learner errors mainly through the FL grammar as Thompson (1987) does. This is why we need another way of viewing things called transfer analysis.

2.1.2 Transfer Analysis

While propounding his own theory of interlanguage, Selinker (1972) proposes transfer analysis. This method is different from contrastive analysis in that it compares learner errors with the actual use of L1. According to Tarone (1988: 8), even Lado (1957) is an early work on interlanguage, for it is a book on those "learner errors." In our view, however, Lado pays little attention to language other than English and Spanish. What is important to us is the relationship between English and quite a "different" language like Japanese.

When learners perform meaningfully in a foreign language, they make errors not simply because of their own personal linguistic competence. Language use is not just a personal matter but also a societal one, so the theories of interlanguage presume that the members of the same language community share a lot of common errors and some of those errors are "fossilized" (Selinker, 1972) and incorrigible. They are "varieties," the theorists contend, not errors. Taking into consideration linguistic situations in the world, for example, in the United States of America and Canada, we find the theories persuasive. There are, in fact, a lot of "varieties" of English spoken there among various linguistic groups such as Hispanic-Americans, or Asian-Americans.

As we do not use English on a day-to-day basis in Japan, we are unlikely to produce "varieties" of English in line with the type of fossilization proposed by Selinker. Fossilization at the level of the individual learner is, however, certainly a possibility. If a certain number of learners make the same type of errors persistently, and if the type has much to do with their L1 grammar, we can regard it an interlanguage phenomenon, though not all instances of error in interlanguage can be ascribed to language transfer.

2.1.3 Error Analysis

In contrast to the foregoing positions, there is another view on interlanguage called error analysis. It is different from both contrastive and transfer analysis in that it studies errors "in relation to the TL (target language)"

(James, 1998: 63). In his view, the TL speaker knows everything and the FL learner is more or less "ignorant". Interlanguage is, therefore, a product of ignorance. In order to "compensate for their ignorance," James contends, learners produce "this substitutive language (called IL)."

After putting such a premise as "The Error Analyst's object of enquiry, then, is the FL learner's ignorance of the TL" (1998: 63), James proposes four measures of "learners' ignorance of TL," consisting of grammaticality, acceptability, correctness, and strangeness / infelicity.

To learn everything correctly and properly is all that James says in his theory, and the point of view such as his amounts to nothing more or less than a traditional view of language learning and teaching. It is true that he teaches us how to become less ignorant through increasing our knowledge about those four categories of measuring our ignorance and through recognizing the differences between slips, errors and attempts (or, more correctly, slips, mistakes, errors and solecisms) (James: 1998, 83). But there remain a lot of questions about his theory, one of which is: how does he assess the role of L1 in the FL learning? Discussing the "mother-tongue influence," he takes up an error made by a Hungarian learner of English such as:

(1) *I am a seventeen years old girl from Gyor. (James: 1998, 180)

According to James, Hungarian has a rule that, unlike English, nouns do not pluralize after a numeral. James's comment on this error is that it is caused by the learner's knowledge of English itself, rather than the ignorance of that language. Moreover, it has nothing to do with the "mother-tongue influence" as far as its surface is concerned. It is a simple grammatical error and easily "corrigible." According to James himself (1998: 65), corrigibility is the best marker of ungrammaticality which is "context-free." Example (1) is especially interesting for us Japanese learners because Japanese has the same rule of nouns and we often make the same type of errors.

James takes up the example to emphasize his standpoint from which he treats language transfer lightly. Example (1) can never be due to native-language transfer any more than the following errors listed by Richards

(1971, in Richards 1984: 172-188):

- (2) Did he comed ?
- (3) What you are doing?
- (4) He coming from Israel.
- (5) Make him to do it.
- (6) I can to speak French. (Richards, 1971, in Richards 1984: 172-188)

These are "typical of systematic errors in English usage," says Richards (1971:173) and he calls them "intralingual and developmental errors." They are "developmental," Richards contends, because they reflect the learner's linguistic competence at a particular stage and are expected from anyone learning English as FL. They are "intralingual," he insists again, because they do not reflect the learner's inability to separate L1 from FL, and their forms are all found within the structure of English.

They can be safely called intralingual, for they are grammatical errors in that they are context-free and easily corrigible. And they are developmental as well because all the rules needed here are all basic. Learners must overcome their ignorance about such errors by repeated practice.

Thus, intralingual and developmental errors can be characterized as grammatical, context-free, easily corrigible and basic.

To sum up, there are learner errors which can be classified as "intralingual and developmental," and as "interlanguage" in the sense of Richards (1971: 173), who admits the existence of "interlanguage errors," defining them as "errors caused by the interference of the learner's mother tongue."

It was once thought as Selinker (1972: 35) points out that all these errors could be "eradicated," or wiped out because they were nothing but errors. This traditional view, as is shown in James (1998), still remains, tempting teachers to correct learner errors and to force learners to acquire right things from grammaticality to felicity. Our view is different from such a traditional one. We analyze whatever error learners make, classify each error and try to elicit certain storable relationships between such errors and the L1 grammar. We can feedback the results of our analysis to learners, hoping their competence in

meaningful performance will be improved. This method does not force learners to memorize all the FL grammar in some way or other, but calls their attention to any crucial differences between L1 and FL. Recognizing difference between two languages should be one of the important aims of learning a foreign language. We agree with James (1998: 180) in that "language awareness" can work as "error remediation," but we think that this awareness should be contrastive. James tries to arouse the awareness of TL only.

We employ transfer analysis as our basic method of analyzing learner errors found in our data. We will focus on such learner errors as are, in a sense, hardly corrigible but attributable to L1 transfer.

2.2 Critical Review of Categorizing Language Transfer

We have four models of categorizing language transfer: Selinker et al. (1975), Winer (1989), Thompson (1987), Hakuta (1986) and Schachter (1974 and 1992). We will review them critically and arrive at our own categorization.

2.2.1 Three categories Proposed by Selinker et al. (1975)

According to Selinker et al. (1975), there are three categories of language transfer: "lexical language transfer" (we call it Lexical LT), "surface structure grammatical transfer" (Surface SGT), and "language transfer occurring in the syntactic derivation of the sentence (deep structure grammatical transfer)" (Deep SGT). Selinker et al. use these terms for analyzing their data obtained from a "French immersion" program in an English-language elementary school in Toronto, Canada. We will accept their way of categorization as the basis of our framework later (see 2.5), but not without certain conditions. We need to review each category critically and to redefine it.

2.2.1.1 Lexical Language Transfer

Examples of Lexical LT are as follows (the marks "<<<" shows a possibly interfering sentence in the native language and sentences in parentheses are "proper" French ones):

- (1) *Elle marche les chats. <<< She's walking the cats. (Elle promene les chats.)
- (2) *Il est trois ans. <<< He's three years old. (Il a trois ans.)

- (2) *Il regarde comme six. <<< He looks like six years old. (Il a l'air de six ans.)

(Selinker, et al, 1975: 143-144)

The error in (1) is the simple identification of the English verb "walk" with the French verb "marcher" which can be used only intransitively. The same thing is true with (2) and (3) where the English verb phrases, "is" and "looks like," are literally translated into French. So we can redefine the Lexical LT as lexical literal translation, or word-for-word translation.

This type of transfer can happen only if both L1 and FL have the same syntactical word order as SVO. In the three examples above, the learners only exchanged verbs without changing the word order. Japanese learners cannot replace an L1 verb with an FL equivalent because they have the SOV word order in their L1. However, we can find in our data the Lexical LT not as a result of replacement but based on a false rule of one-to-one equations. We will discuss this in detail later in Chapter 4.

2.2.1.2 Surface structure grammatical transfer

The following examples illustrate the Surface SGT:

- (4) *Il veut les encore. <<< He still wants them. (Il les veut encore.)
 (5) *Le chat toujours mordre. <<< The cat always bites. (Le chat mord toujours.)

(Selinker, et al., 1975: 145-146)

In both (4) and (5), the English word order concerning a pronoun and an adverb affects the productions in French. Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982: 162) calls this type of error "misordering" and gives us similar examples like:

- (6) *I met there some Germans.
 (7) *another my friend (Dulay, Burt and Krashen, 1982: 162)

These "written misordering errors" are, Dulay et al. (1982: 163) indicates, the result of "word-for-word translations of native language surface structures." This is, in our view, an adequate redefinition of the Surface SGT.

Sentential Structure Grammatical Transfer (Sentential SGT). We also rename the Surface SGT the Phrasal SGT.

This type of transfer often takes place in the Japanese learner's FL writing because of the differences of word order between L1 and FL. In Japanese, as Thompson (1987: 216) indicates, qualifier precedes qualified and subordinate precedes main. A relative clause, then, precedes its head-noun, for example. But the greatest difference lies in the sentence structure itself and it often causes the incomprehensibility of learners' sentences in English. We have already seen an instance in Introduction (see, Example 1), and we have another in our data:

(9) *The needs of English in Japan is more than that of Japan was. (Data 1)

This error can be accounted for only through transfer analysis and it is a typical example of the Sentential SGT, which is the most important category in our analysis because of its greatest frequency. We will discuss Example (9) and other instances in detail in Chapter 4.

2.2.2 Winer's Transfer Analysis

We take up Winer (1989) briefly because he makes an example of transfer analysis aiming exclusively at written "interlanguage." He examines the nature of errors in the written "standard" English by native speakers of an English Creole, paying particular attention to the causes of variation in errors. Each error is categorized according to "Error Type" (morphology, syntax, lexicon, spelling, and punctuation, plus combination) and "Attribution of Error."

What matters from our viewpoint is this latter one, which has four categories: English error, Transfer error, English and Transfer error, and Indeterminate error (which means unanalyzable errors). What matters to us again is the second and third type of error. Other errors are, we believe, all IDEs.

The following is an example of transfer error:

(10) It have too much dogs in our village. (Winer, 1989: 160)

Trinidadian English Creole has the phrase of "it have" in place of "there are"

in "standard" English. As is shown here, transfer is the application of the forms, structures, and rules of the native language for forming the interlanguage "in precisely storable ways" (Winer, 1989: 160). This type of error is categorized, in my view, as the Sentential SGT because it is a syntactical transfer on the sentential level.

What Winer calls English and transfer error is illustrated in:

(11) It has too much cars on our street. (Winer, 1989: 161)

The phrase "It has" is a double error, because they say "it have" in Trinidadian English Creole, and "standard" English has "there are." The form "has" is English only. This error can also be categorized as the Sentential SGT for the same reason as in Example (10).

Like Winer (1989), we are going to analyze written "interlanguage." But this term only means, in our case, "learner English" (Swan and Smith, 1987) because the language is not a usual means of verbal communication in our society.

In order to distinguish the "learner English" in the EFL settings from the "interlanguage" as ESL, we spell our case as "inter-language" hereafter.

2.3 Thompson's Contrastive Analysis

We discuss Thompson (1987) in detail here because this is the only literature in English we have on various grammatical domains where Japanese learners are likely to make both IDEs and TEs. He employs contrastive analysis as his method and mainly compares the two grammars. Though the scope of his examples is somewhat limited, they are nonetheless useful for us to predict to what degree Japanese grammar could interfere in EFL writing.

We saw the list of the domains Thompson presents in 2.1.1. Some of them, in our view, have much to do with language transfer, while others have little. We dare to predict that the most transferable domains are: word order, passives, complementation, nouns, pronouns, adjectives (including nominal adjectives and determiners), adverbs and conjunctions.

2.3.1 Word Order

Thompson (1987: 216) indicates two important syntactic properties of

Japanese: qualifier precedes qualified (we call it the QQ rule) and subordinate precedes main (the SM rule). We can safely predict that these properties could affect FL writing in various ways. As Thompson gives us no example, we cite an instance from our own data as follows:

(1) ?To (be) important is to communicate a lot of country people. (Data 5)

This noun phrase "a lot of country people" is correct in English in vacuum because grammatically it is feasible, but it is not correct in the context of the essay the learner wrote. He wanted to write, in Japanese:

(1') takusan no kuni no hito
 many P country P/GEN people P = particle GEN = genitive
 (people from many countries)

Error analysts like Dulay et al. (1982: 163) may call this an "written misordering error," but we call it the Phrasal SGT because it is a result of transferring one of Japanese surface properties, i.e. the QQ rule, into the English phrasal formation. More instances will be discussed in Chapter 4.

As for the SM rule, we will discuss it later (2.5) in relation with structural avoidance.

2.3.2 Passives

Thompson (1987: 217) indicates that "inanimate subjects take a passive verb less readily in Japanese." This, in his view, may lead Japanese students to construct a sentence like:

(2) The parcel sent last week. <<<Kozutsumi wa sensyuu okutta.
 (The parcel was sent last week.)
 (Thompson, 1978: 217)

This is not an example of omitting an auxiliary, "was," but that of the Sentential SGT, because it is a result of transferring a Japanese word order such as this:

- (2') Kozutsumi wa sensyuu okutta.
 parcel T last week sent (T = topic marker)
 (The parcel was sent last week.)

The sentence has the structure of topic and comment, not of subject and predicate. So the agent of "okutta" (=sent) is not the parcel, but the first person singular "I." If the learner does not understand this structure, he or she might as well construct such a sentence as above, simply transferring the L1 surface structure.

Thompson (1987: 217) also indicates that "a Japanese passive can be used in some cases where it is not possible in English," as in:

- (3) He was stolen his money. <<<Kare wa kane wo nusumareta. (He
 had his money stolen).
 (4) She was died her husband. <<<Kanojo wa otto ni shinareta. (Her
 husband died).

(Thompson, 1978: 217)

The Japanese phrases "nusumareta" (= steal + suffix meaning passive) in (3) and "shinareta" (= die + suffix meaning passive) in (4) are in the passive voice, forming "indirect passives" specific to Japanese (see Tsujimura, 1996: 238). These structures cannot be translated into English literally. Ignorance of this could lead learners to commit the Sentential SGT.

Thus we can confirm that the topics consisting of inanimate nouns and indirect passives, theoretically, could cause the sentential SGT.

2.3.3 Complementation

The term complementation means a combination of an object and an objective complement like "you to go" in "I'd like you to go" (Thompson, 1987: 218). The complementation is, then, equivalent to a clause as a constituent of a complex sentence. Though Thompson gives us no example of this domain, we have one in our data:

- (5) It is impossible for native language to change to English.

《《《Bokokugo wo eigo e kaeru koto wa dekinai.

(It is impossible for us to supplant our native language with English.)

(Old Data)

The Japanese equivalence to the English complementation in the learner's writing, "for native language to change to English," can be analyzed as follows:

(5) bokokugo wo eigo e kaeru koto
 native language P/ACC English P change N

P = particle ACC = accusative T = topic marker N = nominalizer
 (for us to change our native language into English)

Comparing this word order to that of (5), we can clearly see the influence of L1 on the EFL writing.

Thus, we can predict that complementation can be a cause of language transfer, especially of the Sentential SGT.

2.3.4 Nouns

Thompson (1987: 218) shows an example of the TE concerning nouns like this:

(6) ?Tokyo is very safety city. (Thompson, 1987: 218)

The Japanese equivalent to this is:

(6') Tokyo wa taihen-na anzen-toshi da.

Tokyo T very (lit.) safety-city P/COP P/COP = particle/ copula
 (Tokyo is a very safe city.)

The question is whether the nominal compound, "anzen-toshi" (literally, safety-city) can be translated into the English phrase, "safety city," or not.

According to Shibatani (1990: 238), there are three patterns of Japanese nominal compounds: (A) noun + noun (N-N), (B) adjective + noun (A-N), (C) verb + noun (V-N). It is the N-N compounds that could cause TEs. The

first element of this pattern N-N sometimes makes learners to choose an English noun. Hence the example of (6).

We predict that nominal compounds could cause the Lexical LT.

Thompson (1987: 218) also mentions the English stylistic taboo against repeating nouns. This taboo, however, "does not hold in Japanese" as is shown in:

(7) My sister's friends sometimes telephone *my sister early in the morning.

(Thompson, 1987: 218)

Empirically speaking, we Japanese speakers do not mind repeating nouns because we like to avoid using personal pronouns for sociolinguistic reasons (see (g) below). Such stylistic solecisms as we see in (7) can be classified as a category of language transfer.

To sum up, Japanese nominal compounds could cause the Lexical LT and Japanese speakers do not always avoid repeating nouns in English, causing stylistic solecisms.

2.3.5 Pronouns

Japanese has a greater variety of personal pronouns than English, but, as Thompson (1987: 219) indicates, it has no relative pronouns. It does have relative clauses, which function as qualifiers. The Q-Q rule we mentioned above often causes learners to avoid relative clauses. We will discuss this later as structural avoidance as language transfer (see 2.5).

2.3.6 Adjectives

Thompson (1987: 219-220) indicates eight mistakable aspects about adjectives and adverbs. He takes up these two categories in the same section because they are, in his view, somewhat inseparable from each other. In our view, however, only three out of those eight aspects could cause TEs concerning adjectives. In addition to this, his discussion of determiners such as "many" and "few" can be included in this section partly because such words are regarded as adjectives in Japanese and partly because they offer exactly the same problem as we discuss here concerning Japanese predicative adjectives.

2.3.6.1 Predicative Adjectives

The first aspect is related to one of the functions of Japanese adjectives, that is, their predicative function with no copula (English "be"). Hence the possibility of omitting "be" like this:

(8) ?That film good. (Thompson, 1987: 219)

The omission of "be" is just an IDE, but a more serious problem lies behind this. Let us look at a Japanese sentence equivalent to (8) first:

(8') Ano eiga wa yokatta. T = topic marker
 that film T good-PAST PAST= past tense
 (literally, that film was good.)

The real problem hidden in this sentence is the function of the adjective, "yokatta" (good-PAST) itself. The Japanese word in the context of (8') does not work as a factual and objective description of the film. It is, as Thompson (1987: 219) indicates as the second aspect of Japanese adjectives, "subjective, referring to the speaker's feelings." So the sentence (8) is, in fact, incorrect because it does not convey the feelings the Japanese speaker wished to express as manifested in (8').

Discussing the "subjective" meaning of the Japanese adjectives in their predicative use, Thompson gives another example like this:

(9) ?Is Japanese food delicious? (Thompson, 1987: 220)

A Japanese sentence equivalent to (9) is:

(9') Nihon no tabemono wa oisii desu-ka.
 Japan P-GEN food T delicious P/Q
 P-GEN = particle / genitive T = topic marker P/Q = particle / question
 (lit.) (Is Japanese food delicious?)

As we see above, Example (9) is a literal translation of (9') and grammatically

correct. But it is incorrect for the same reason as above in (8). Thomson gives a felicitous English equivalence to (9') like this:

(9'') Do you find Japanese food delicious? (Thompson, 1987: 220)

In the same way, a felicitous English sentence equivalent to (8') must be:

(8'') I found that film good.

Another problem about (8') and (9') lies in the function of the Japanese postposition, "WA," as a topic marker. This postposition is not necessarily a subject marker. Hence we cannot translate the following Japanese sentence literally into English unless it is uttered in an extraordinary context.

(10) Boku wa unagi da.

I T eel P/COP P/COP = particle / copula

(lit.) (I am an eel.) (Shibatani, 1990: 369)

The literal translation, "I am an eel," is a grammatical sentence, but semantically infelicitous. It cannot be context-free and we need a context like in a restaurant where we order something. If we convey the same meaning in English in such a context, we will say, "I like eel," or "Eel for me." In short, we need a context to judge the function of the topic marker, "WA," in a Japanese sentence and we cannot take it as a subject marker mechanically. However, this is what Japanese learners of English sometimes do.

In Examples (8) and (9), the learners took the particle "WA" in (8') and (9') as a subject marker. It is, in fact, a topic marker indicating just a certain theme the speaker is going to take up. Nominative cases, "I" and "you," are hidden in (8') and (9') respectively.

Thompson's third indication about the mistakable aspects of adjectives can be explained exactly in the same way. It is the question of Japanese adjective, "kawai," with a third person subject. For example:

- (11) Kare wa kowai.
 He T afraid T = topic marker
 (lit.) (He is afraid.)

This cannot be translated into "He is afraid" not only because it does not make sense in English but because the postposition, "WA," is a topic marker, not a subject marker, and the noun, "KARE" (he), cannot be a subject in the equivalent English sentence, which goes like this:

- (11') I am afraid of him. (Thompson, 1987: 220)

Thus, the mechanical interpretation of the topic marker, "WA," together with adjectives and nouns as the predicates, could cause L1 transfer concerning the sentential structure. Such TEs are, in other words, a result of neglecting the "subjective" nature of Japanese predicative adjectives (including nominal adjectives).

2.3.6.2 Determiners

Thompson (1987: 220) indicates that the Japanese equivalents to the English quantifiers "much / many" and "little / few," that is, "OOI" (many / much) and "SUKUNAI" (few / little) can be predicative. This is because they are classified as adjectives in Japanese. Hence a sentence like:

- (12) *Mountain is many. (Thompson, 1987: 220)

The Japanese equivalence to (12) is:

- (12') Yama ga ooi.
 Mountain P/NOM many P/NOM = particle / nominative
 (There are many mountains.)

This word order in (12') clearly tells us that (12) is an instance of the Sentential SGT, which, in this case, neglects the rule of English quantifiers that they cannot be predicative.

Thus, Japanese adjectives denoting quantity, "OOI" (many / much) and "SUKUNAI" (few / little) used in the predicate could cause language transfer on the sentential level.

2.3.7 Adverbial Phrases

The next example from Thompson derives from a Japanese postpositional phrase:

(13) *She is in upstairs. (Thompson, 1987: 220)

The Japanese sentence equivalent to (13) is as follows:

(13') Kanojo wa ue ni iru.
 She T upper floor P be T = topic marker P = particle
 (She is on the upper floor.)

The Japanese combination of two words, "UE + NI," makes an adverbial phrase meaning "upstairs" in English. This two-word combination sometimes causes a TE like (13). Thus, the Japanese postpositional phrases of place could cause the Phrasal SGT.

2.3.8 Conjunctions

Thompson (1987: 220) indicates that "English and Japanese conjunctions do not always have simple one-to-one equivalents." The same thing is true with other parts of speech like prepositions. The fact simply means that learners cannot be too careful to learn a foreign language.

A more important indication by Thompson is about complex sentences which Japanese learners tend to avoid. "Japanese students," says Thompson (1987: 221), "do not always appreciate the clause-combining role of English conjunctions." Hence a strong tendency to use conjunctions with one-clause sentences like this:

(13) I am working very hard. *Because I want to succeed an exam.

(Thompson: 1987: 221)

This tendency has much to do with another tendency to use as many one-clause sentences as possible. This stylistic tendency can be construed as negative language transfer just as "avoidance" which we will discuss later in 2.5.

2.4 Hakuta's Indications of Lexical Language Transfer

Hakuta (1976) shows us some examples of the lexical language transfer in the case of "Uguisu," a five-year old Japanese girl learning English as a second language in Cambridge, MA, USA. We take up two types of examples from him to illustrate the false equations of substantial words in both languages and that of Japanese postpositions to English prepositions.

2.4.1 Equations of Substantial Words

The first type concerns Uguisu's use of the English noun, "mistake," as a verb as in:

- (1) *You're mistaking.
- (2) *I just mistake it. (Hakuta, 1976: 343)

Hakuta (1976: 343) indicates that this "error" is "directly traceable to Japanese."

This is because the English verb phrase "to make a mistake" is equivalent to the Japanese main verb "machigaeru" which is not a phrase, but one word. Judging that a single Japanese word should correspond to a single English word, "Uguisu" must have equated "machigaeru" with "mistake."

This type of error is, in our view, grammatical, because it is based on the mistake of categories. We will find other examples of this type later in Chapter 4.

2.4.2 Equations of Japanese Postpositions to English Prepositions

Hakuta shows the exhaustive list of reflexives used by Uguisu in which we can find such sentences as these:

- (3) They have to do it with their-selves.
- (4) Make it with your-self over there.
- (5) I can make toast with my-self. (Hakuta, 1976: 345)

Language transfer is taking place, Hakuta argues, in the use of the preposition "with" (instrumental), which is what the Japanese phrase "JIBUN DE" (self + instrumental particle "DE," meaning for/by oneself) would require. In other words, the five-year old girl equates the Japanese postposition "DE" with the English preposition "with" mechanically.

This type of literal translation is subtler than that of substantial words because it is directly related with the intricate functions of grammatical words. Another example of the "DE-WITH" equation is seen in Kizuka and Verdaman (1997: 674):

(6) Koji washed his clothes with hand. (Kizuka and Verdaman, 1997: 674)

The phrase, "with hand," is a literal translation of the Japanese phrase, "TE-DE" (hand + instrumental particle, meaning "by hand").

We will discuss this type of lexical language transfer as well later in Chapter 4.

2.5 Schachter's Structural Avoidance as Language Transfer

According to Schachter (1974), "structural avoidance" is another manifestation of language transfer. She indicates that Japanese learners have a strong tendency to avoid relative clauses (Schachter, 1974: 209). This tendency is possibly caused by the Japanese structure in which "qualifier precedes qualified" (Thompson: 1987: 216) (see the QQ rule, 2.3.1).

Avoidance of subordinate clauses is also seen in Japanese speakers of English because of the structure of their native language in which subordinate precedes main (the SM rule).

We will discuss structural avoidance language transfer (Avoidance LT, hereafter) by using our data in Chapter 4.

2.6 Our Own Way of Categorization or Making Indices of L1 Transfer in FL Writing

Since our aim is to study language transfer, we will not include the IDE in

those indices of L1 transfer in FL writing which we are going to show below.

The main frameworks of categorization are from Selinker et al. (1975) and Schachter (1974), while our own predictions in the previous sections of this chapter are made use of to the utmost.

2.6.1 Five Main Categories

We employ the five main categories of language transfer: lexical language transfer (Lexical LT), phrasal structure grammatical transfer (Phrasal SGT), sentential structure grammatical transfer (Sentential SGT), structural avoidance language transfer (Avoidance LT) and stylistic language transfer (Stylistic LT).

Let us confirm the definition of each category.

Lexical LT: the lexical literal translation, or word-for-word translation based on the false rule of one-to-one equivalence.

Phrasal SGT: the word-for-word translation of Japanese surface structure on the phrasal level.

Sentential SGT: the word-for-word translation of Japanese surface structure on the sentential level.

Avoidance LT: avoidance of certain structures such as relative clauses and subordinates.

Stylistic LT: stylistic solecisms like repeating one and the same noun within a sentence or two.

2.6.2 Theoretically Predictable Indices of L1 Transfer

Each of the five categories has its sub-categories found in the previous predicting sections.

Lexical LT:

word-to-word equations
postposition-to- preposition equations

Phrasal SGT:

the QQ rule
postpositional phrases of place

Sentential SGT:

predicative adjectives
Japanese topic-comment structures

inanimate nouns as a structural topic
indirect passives
complementation
quantifiers used in the predicate

Avoidance LT:

relative clauses
complex sentences

Stylistic LT:

repeating nouns
one-clause sentences

We theoretically predict these indices. We are not sure for the time being what will come out of our analysis of the data. It will turn out soon whether our prediction is valid or not.

Chapter 3 Research Method and Procedures

Having reviewed the relevant literature, established the framework for error classification and made the theoretically predictable indices in the previous chapter, we describe in detail the basis and nature of our research method.

In the following sections, we describe who the participants were, what types of data were collected, what sources they were from, how they were gathered and what instruments were used for analysis. Data analysis itself will follow this chapter.

3.1 Participants

Our definition of datum is a product of learner English. As our data were constituted of written words, not invisible attitudes, we can see any of them clearly on a sheet of paper.

I collected them in October, 1999. The participants consist of my students as subjects and me as a researcher. I had 33 subjects (including 7 females).

All the subjects have the same general backgrounds. All of them were freshmen at a university in Tokyo, where I taught as a full-time teacher. Their age ranged from 19 to 21. All of them had more than six years of experience in

studying English in the foreign language settings and their level of English was intermediate in the sense that they were not beginners. They were supposed to have the basic knowledge of English morphology and syntax, which they had learned in their junior high and high schools, though we cannot define the meaning of "basic" clearly. Most of them felt it difficult to speak the language. Their level of reading was, however, not so low as that of speaking and writing. They were more or less able to read the given text (see Appendix I, Text for Reading) on which they wrote their essays.

They needed to study English and to participate in writing essays in the language partly because the course was one of their requirements and partly because they felt it more or less necessary to acquire this particular tongue for various reasons. The degree of their enthusiasm for English study, then, was not so high as that of those students' who want to work, for example, as diplomats or UN staff, but not so low as to hate the language.

3.2. Type and Sources of data

Since our way of collecting data was "cross-sectional," not "longitudinal" (Gass and Selinker, 1994: 25-31), a number of data were collected at a single point of time in the written form. It was on October 25, 1999.

As cross-sectional data, they were based on "controlled output" (Gass et al., 1994: 27), not on spontaneous one. They were controlled in the sense that they were produced along a certain procedure. First, the participants were given a text for reading (see Appendix I), then they read the text in class with me, and finally they were asked to write what they had in mind while reading the text. More detailed procedures will be explained in the next section (3.3), but it is clear that the outputs were controlled.

The subjects were given about 30 minutes to complete their essays during a class session. Thus, they had limited time and no means of reference. The collector of the data was myself.

Our data consist of, in fact, the essays the subjects wrote in class. The numbers of them is 33. The number of words per essay is average 100. Since all the subjects had no training of paragraph writing, I did not count paragraphs. They were almost the beginners of writing in English, but they had some training

of free composition in Japanese in their former schools.

Since our main aim is transfer analysis, any information on transfer is important to us. The subjects' productions themselves are the primary information. In addition to this, I collected other pieces of information by means of interviews and tests in the written form. I will describe these additional methods in detail in the next section.

3.3 Procedures

All data came from my English class at the university. The main aim of the class was, and is, to develop students' "communicative performance" in the sense that Paulston (1990) defined it. This is because, as Paulston indicated (1990: 291), we feel it impossible, in the foreign language settings, to develop "communicative competence" in the sense Hymes (1971) defined it. One of the settings is that a class session of 90 minutes takes place only once a week.

I planned a procedure to implement the aim of my class: arranged discussion as a communicative performance. Students had to prepare for the discussion in the written form, in other words, they had to write what they wanted to say in the discussion beforehand. We needed a topic of discussion in the process. I chose an editorial essay from an English newspaper published in Japan, entitled "English and the Future of Japanese" (Appendix I), because the topic suited the class of general English.

It took two class sessions for us to finish reading the text. In the third session, the subjects were asked to write their essays. There were two procedures of writing. First, the subjects were asked to write what they had in mind about the text in Japanese and submitted their papers. Then, they produced English writings.

Thus, I collected both Japanese and English data and could compare an English writing with its Japanese counterpart. This comparison helped me to judge whether a certain English word, or phrase, or sentence was a translation from Japanese or not. The Japanese versions were useful as a kind of "immediate introspection" in the term of Cohen and Hosenfeld (1981: 286)

In addition to this, in the case of 1999, I interviewed 6 subjects during a class session, spending five minutes for each, while the other subjects engaged in

answering those written questions I describe in the next paragraph. In the interviews, I asked them why they wrote what they wrote and whether they translated or thought instantly of the English grammar rules. These protocols took place a month after the event of writing as "delayed retrospection" (Cohen and Hosenfeld, 1981: 286).

As I mentioned above, I gave the subjects two tests in the written form to elicit information on transfer during the same class session.

In the first test (see Appendix III), I asked the 33 subjects how to translate into English seven Japanese phrases and sentences taken from Thompson (1987). I picked them up to know how many subjects really make TEs in each item, for Japanese learners are theoretically expected to make TEs in any of them.

In the second test (see 4.3.2), all of the 10 Japanese phrases and sentences, taken from our Data (Appendix II), belong to the Sentential SGT. Our aim of this test is to know how many subjects share the same TE. The results will be useful, in our view, to judge which sub-categories (or indices) are more important to us. If the number of subjects who share a certain TE is quite small, it will be highly possible that the pertinent TE is a transfer slip, or a transient and frivolous TE.

Another aim of ours is to know to what extent errors they make in this test will overlap with those they made in their original essays. This is a way of finding out personally "fossilized" TEs and our findings will be useful for giving advice to pertinent subjects.

I attached a questionnaire to the second test asking the subjects if they translated Japanese into English while they were doing their own piece of writing.

3.4 Instruments of analysis

The framework we established in Chapter 2 was only a theoretical prediction and we were not sure whether our prediction was valid. Now we describe how we used the framework to engage in an actual analysis of our data.

Our first step was to count the number of errors and to classify them into two categories in order to distinguish between the intralingual and developmental errors (IDEs) and transfer errors (TEs) in each writing in the data. The

following sample taken from the data serves to show our method for counting (the asterisks show IDEs and the italics show TEs):

(1) English is **really* useful, **in* business, **government* and internet communication. English is used as if it **is* **a* official language. If we are in Japan **that* people don't have to use English **in*, we use English without knowing that we use it. If we call "Eizoeishaki", not **call* **"T.V"*, it is **an* only **fully* idea. But we must study **own* country language, before studying other **language*. Because **native* language **does* a **base* role in studying other languages. If a house has **frail* base, it will be **destroyed* very **easily*. So we must study **native* language, acquiring other **language*. (Data 04)

Our counting tells us that there are 20 IDEs and 6 TEs in the sample above. The latter figure may needs some explanations.

The learner repeats the noun "English" four times in the first three consecutive sentences, making a type of error called Stylistic Language Transfer (see 2.5.1) three times. In the same way, he repeats the phrase "other languages" twice in the two consecutive sentences. These facts suggest that this Stylistic LT might well be fossilized in his English language system. This type of language transfer will turn out to be a remarkable phenomenon in our data (Cf. Chapter 4).

The phrase, "(our) own country language," is a result of the Phrasal STG because it is a literal translation of the Japanese word order:

(2) watashitachi no kuni no kotoba
 we P/GEN country P/GEN language

P/GEN = Particle / Genitive

(the language of our country)

The conjunction "because" is used with the one-clause sentence, making the TE classified, in our term, as the Stylistic LT. Thus, there are 6 TEs in the paper above.

In such a way and as correctly as possible, we counted errors in each

writing. The final results of our counting will appear in the next chapter.

Chapter 4 Results of Corpus Data

Having explained the procedures and the instruments of our analysis, we present the results of the study in this chapter. Using tables, we first present in 4.1 the results of counting IDEs and TEs in the corpus, and discuss the significance of the TE frequency. Then, in 4.2, we show not only the classified TEs found in our data but the classified Sentential SGT, Phrasal SGT and Lexical LT with relevant comments. The results of the Avoidance LT and the Stylistic LT will also be mentioned briefly.

The last section (4.3) will deal with the results of Test 1, Test 2, the questionnaires and the protocol-type interviews (mentioned in 3.3).

4.1 TE and IDE Count

The results of counting TEs (italicized parts in Appendix II) and IDEs (marked as * in Appendix II) are as follows:

TABLE 1 TEs and IDEs

	N	W	T	I
Total	33	3599	139	318
Average		109	4	10

N = Number of Scripts, W = Number of Words, T = Number of TEs,
I = Number of IDEs

It is true that the number of the IDEs is much larger than that of the TEs, but the fact does not lessen the fetters of L1 transfer in the FL writing. What is important to us is that the ubiquitousness of language transfer was confirmed by our counting. In fact, every piece of writing includes more than one TE without exception and 143 TEs in total are found in our data.

All of these TEs will be classified, in the next section, into one of those categories that we established in Chapter 2: Lexical LT, Phrasal SGT, Sentential SGT, Avoidance LT, and Stylistic LT.

4.2 Classification of the TEs.

This section begins with a table showing the number of TEs classified into each category, followed by another table showing the number of TEs classified into each index of the Sentential SGT. After presenting the necessary tables, we will speculate on why this category had the greater frequency than the other three (except the Avoidance LT).

4.2.1 Classified TEs

Following the definitions of each category, we classified all the TEs that we recognized in our data into one of those four frameworks (excepting the Avoidance LT). As for this last category, we counted the number of complex sentences and relative clauses for our later discussion. The results are as follows (see Table 2 in Appendix 3).

TABLE 2 TE CATEGORIES

	N	L	P	S	St
Total.	33	21	27	68	23
Average		1	1	2	1

L = No. of Lexical LT, P = No. of Phrasal SGT, S = No. of Sentential SGT, St = No. of Stylistic LT

The results of this classification clearly show that the Sentential SGT occurs with greater frequency than the other three (except the Avoidance LT which we will discuss in 4.2.5). One of the reasons is, in our view, self-evident because it is generally more difficult for anyone to write a sentence than to form a phrase or a word. There must be, however, more specific reasons for this. In order to know why, we conducted a further classification of all the 68 TEs belonging to the Sentential SGT. According to our theoretical prediction, there were six indices under the category. We felt it necessary, however, to add another index called "others," into which we gathered incomprehensible, or unanalyzable, sentences just like Winer (1989) did. We also modified the index of "indirect passives" and included in it direct passives as well.

Table 3 Sentential SGT

	N	S	(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)
Total	33	68	22	27	0	5	4	0	10

(A) predicative adjectives, (B) Japanese topic-comment structures,
 (C) inanimate nouns as a structural topic, (D) indirect passives / passives,
 (E) complementation, (F) quantifiers used in the predicate, (G) others

As we see here, most of the TEs in this category gather at the first two indices, while there are no instances of (C) and (F). Example (5) in 4.2.2, however, partially belongs to (F). Our conclusion of the latter phenomenon is that the number of samples was too small and the topic of writing was not suitable enough to get any examples of those indices.

In the next sub-section, we will speculate as to reasons or a reason for the concentration of TEs on (A) and (B).

4.2.2 Greater Frequency of the Sentential SGT

As we saw in Table 2, the Sentential SGT occurred 68 times in our data, and the Table 3 showed us what indices occurred more frequently than other ones within the same category. Let us consider (A) "predicative adjectives" first, which occurred 22 times. This index has, as we saw in 2.3.6.1, two aspects concerning Japanese adjectives used in the predicate. One is about their semantic function in Japanese and the other about their grammatical function when transferred to English. Here are some examples taken from our data.

- (1) ?I think that only Japanese is *no good*. (Data 14)
 (J) Watashi wa nihongo dake de wa yokunai to omu. (J = the subject's original Japanese)
 (I do not think it good to cope with things by using only Japanese.)
- (2) ?In primary school, that Japanese study English is *good*. (Data 22)
 (J) Shougakkou de Nihonjin ga eigo wo manafu no wa yoi koto da.
 (I think it good for Japanese to learn English at elementary school.)
- (3) *Japanese language is very *pity*. (Data 29)

- (J) Nihongo ga aware da.
 (I feel sorry for Japanese.)

- (4) *Japanese who can use English is *good*. (Data 31)
 (J) Nihonjin wa eigo ga tsukaeta hou ga yoi.
 (I think it better for Japanese to be able to speak English.)

These English sentences are the Sentential SGTs because the Japanese surface structures are transferred into English. Example (3) is an example of double errors concerning the predicative adjective: the nominal form of "pity" is a result of the subject's transferring a Japanese nominal adjective to an English noun. The word should be "pitiful," then. And yet the sentence, "(The) Japanese language is very *pitiful*," proves to be a transfer error because of the order the adjective takes in the sentence. It is only in Japanese that all those adjectives in the examples can refer to the speaker's feelings and judgements *by themselves*. English does not permit adjectives to function like this, but demands us to make it clear *who* feels so, or *who* judges so. If we call the "who" an agent, we can say that a Japanese predicative adjective hides its agent. The question of predicative adjectives, then, reveals the same problem as the Japanese topic-comment structures.

The index, (B) Japanese topic-comment structures, had the greatest frequency of all within the Sentential SGT. As we discussed in 2.3, the most remarkable property of the structures lies in the misleading particle, "WA," which is called a topic marker. This grammatical word often misleads learners into taking a nominal part preceding "WA" as a sentential subject. But the topic marker does not always indicate subjects, and true agents of doing or feeling something are often hidden in Japanese surface structures. It is these hidden agents that cause most TEs concerning the index (B). This structural characteristic is, in fact, reflected in all the following TEs taken from our data. We will add a brief comment to each example.

- (5) *The needs of English in Japan is more than that of Japan was. (Data 1)
 (J) Eigo no hitsuyou wa mae yori ooi.

(I need English more than before.)

We speculate as to the process of language transfer as follows:

(J) Eigo no hitsuyou	wa	<u>mae yori ooi.</u>	
topic	T	comment	T = topic marker

*The needs ... Japan is more than ... was

The first nominal phrase was translated into English as a sentential subject. The topic marker was interpreted as a copula. The Japanese quantifier, "OOI" (many), became the comparative because of the preceding Japanese phrase "MAE YORI" (than before). The writer contrived an expression, "more than that of Japan was," to express the comparison between present and past. This is a typical Sentential SGT, but the writer failed to express what he wanted to say. Thus, what caused this TE is a hidden agent and the predicative quantifier, "OOI" (many).

(6) *The world of that I live in don't need to speak English. (Data 13)

(J) Watashi ga sumu sekai wa eigo wo hanasu hitsuyo ga nai,
(I live in a world where I do not need to speak English.)

The basic structure of the Japanese sentence in (6) is:

(J) sekai	wa	hitsuyou	ga	nai
topic	T	comment		

*world don't need

This simple analysis clearly shows that the Japanese surface structure was transferred to the English counterpart. Here, again, the writer did not notice the agent of "needing."

(7) *Now increasing to meet difference culture. (Data 13)

(J) Ima wa kotonaru bunka tonon deai ga fuete iru.
(Now the occasion in which we experience foreign cultures is increasing.)

No sentential subject is seen in (7) as a result of the literal translation of the Japanese topic-comment structure into English. Schachter (1992: 43) calls this phenomenon "a reflex of subject marking constraints." The basic relationship between Japanese and English in (7) is shown like this:

(J) Ima	wa	fuete iru
Topic	T	comment
*Now		increasing

As far as the surface structure of (7) is concerned, it tells us that the writer did not know *what* was *increasing*.

(8) *English is all and Japanese don't need. (Data 15)

(J) Eigo ga subete de, Nihongo wa hitsuyou nai.

(All that we need is English, and we do not need Japanese.)

The latter parts of both English and Japanese are noticeable.

(J) Nihongo	wa	hitsuyou	nai
topic	T	comment	
Japanese		need	not

The Japanese surface structure was transferred to the English counterpart, again. It is clear that the hidden agent caused the writer to make this TE.

Thus, we conclude that the hidden agent in Japanese is the most remarkable cause of the Sentential SGT. This particular Japanese property is, in our view, central also to the index of passives.

We have no example of indirect passives, but some of direct passives such as follows:

(9) *Children will *be been bilingual* by those things. (Data 20)

(J) Kodomotachi wa sore ni yotte bairingaruru ni narasareru darou.

(That will make children bilinguals.)

- (10) ?Culture is *being lost*. (Data 21)
 (J) Bunka ga ushinawarete iru.
 (We have been losing our own culture.)

The term "agent" is originally related to passives in English grammar, and it is quite natural that, as we see above, the concept should be central to this index as well.

The examples of the index (E) "complementation" are all found only in Data 9. Here are two of them:

- (11) **I heard the thing that* a man who mastered English is profitable.
 (Data 9)
 (12) **I assume the thing that* in Japan, English spreads more and more from now on. (Data 9)

The italicized parts are translated literally from the following Japanese:

- (11') (J) ... to kiita
 P / NOM heard P / NOM = particle / nominalizer
 (I heard that ...)
 (12') (J) ... to omou
 P / NOM think
 (I thin that ...)

This analysis proves that the subject translated all the nominalizers into English as "the thing." This nominalizer, "TO," is sometimes called a "complementizer" (Tsujimura, 1996: 172).

4.2.3 Phrasal SGT

This category occurred 27 times in our data. We predicted two sub-categories under it, but we actually needed one more index. Thus, we have three indices here: the QQ rule, postpositional phrases and verbal phrases. The

following table shows the frequency of each index under the Phrasal SGT.

Table 4 Phrasal SGT

	N	P	QQ	pp	vp
Total	33	27	10	8	9

P = Phrasal SGT, QQ = the QQ rule,

pp = postpositional phrases of place, vp = verbal phrases

Thus, 10 instances were caused by transferring the Japanese QQ rule (see, 2.3.1: Qualifier precedes Qualified) into English. Here are some examples:

(13) ?a lot of country people (Data 5, see 2.3.1)

(J) takusanno kuni no hitotachi

(people from a lot of countries)

(14) ?Japanese interests (Data 10)

(J) nihonn eno kyoumi

(an interest in Japan)

(15) *in abroad business experience (Data 27)

(J) gaikoku deno bijinesu keikenn

(business experiences in foreign countries)

As we predicted in 2.3.7, Japanese postpositional phrases of place did in fact cause TEs such as:

(16) *in world-wide (Data 15)

(J) sekai-juu de

(worldwide)

(17) *to all over the world (Data 16)

(J) zen-sekai ni

(all over the world)

Our new index, "verbal phrases," means the literal translation of Japanese verbal phrases into English. We have such examples as these:

(18) ?English *is becoming* a world language (Data 13)

(J) Eigo wa sekaigo ni *natte iru*.

(English is a world language.)

(19) *A foreign-affiliated firm *is increasing* (Data 14)

(J) Gaikoku kankei no kaisha ga *fuete iru*.

(The number of foreign-affiliated firms has increased.)

(20) ?People that *do national work* need English. (Data 29)

(J) *Kuni no shigoto wo suru* hito wa eigo ga hitsuyou da.

(People working for their country need English.)

4.2.4 Lexical LT

We have two indices for this category: word-to-word equations and postposition-to-preposition equations (see, 2.6.2). The Lexical LT as a whole occurred 21 times in our data and the frequency of each index is shown in the following table:

Table 5 Lexical LT

	N	L	sw	pw
Total	33	21	16	5

sw = substantial words, pw = postpositional words

As for the first index, "word-to-word equations," its most conspicuous phenomenon is the use of English loan words in EFL writing. Some of those words are used differently from the ways they are used in English and could cause TEs (as to how Japanese speakers use English loan words grammatically, see, Stanlaw, 1992). In fact, we have such examples as:

(21) *English is *major* in the world. (Data 28)

(22) *The language have *appealed* the country's existence over the world.

(Data 23)

- (23) *translation *soft* (Data 19)
 (24) *Computer can do only *spell check*. (Data 12)
 (25) *It will be *key-point* whether one be able to speak English. (Data 20)

The adjective "major" in (21) cannot be used in the predicate in English, but the same word can be predicative once it becomes a member of Japanese. Another loan word, "APIIRUSURU" (appeal) in (22), is usually used as a transitive verb in Japanese. Two terms for computers, "soft" (23) and "spell check" (24), mean "software" and "checking spellings" respectively. The last example, "key-point" (25), is treated as one word and an adjective because "a key point" in English becomes one Japanese word of "KIIPPOINTO" and it is often used as a nominal adjective. (21) and (22) are suggestive of the term "learner pidgin" (Nemser, 1971: 58) because the subjects incorporated L1 grammatical elements and EFL lexical elements. We will discuss this concept in Conclusion (5.2).

Another noticeable phenomenon is what we call word-to-word equations. Examples are like these:

- (26) *We want *to grow* the English communication skill. (Data 6)
 (27) *Simply, my world may be *narrow*. (Data 29)
 (28) ?*Japan* also must be able to speak English. (Data 7)

The example (26) is an equation of verb to verb. The original Japanese verb is "SODATERU" (literally means "to grow," but sometimes means "to develop" as in this case). The word "narrow" in (27) is a result of the mechanical, word for word translation of the Japanese adjective "SEMAI" (narrow / small), which, unlike the English counterpart "narrow," can modify the size of land as well. The "Japan" in (28) should be "Japanese" in the sentential context, but we can sometimes say in Japanese like this:

- (28') Nihon wa eigo ga hanasenai to ikenai.
 Japan T English P / ACC be able to speak P must
 T = topic marker P / ACC = particle / accusative
 (People from Japan, too, must be able to speak English.)

The first word is a topic, not necessarily a subject of the sentence. So, in our interpretation, (28) is a result of mechanical transfer of the Japanese topical word to the English subject.

Such word-to-word equations as above are, in Selinker's term, "transfer of training" (Selinker, 1972: 37), because they are "a result of identifiable items in training procedures" (ibid.: 37). The "identifiable item" in this case is, however, not the EFL material to be learned by the learner, but a kind of Japanese traditional method of building up EFL vocabulary. Japanese learners often attempt to memorize a long list of word-to-word equations, especially when preparing for examinations. The problem is, in our view, that they do not usually take any rules of use into consideration. This can lead to the "learner pidgin" again because learners incorporate L1 grammatical elements with EFL lexical elements. We will come back to this discussion in Conclusion (5.2).

What we call the postposition-to-preposition equations is a variation of the mechanism stated above. We have such instances as follows:

- (29) *The Japanese people will have to communication foreigner *with*
English. (Data 2)
- (30) *I studied many things so far and studied English as a second language
from a junior high school. (Data 9)
- (31) *Japanese that have used *from* community society period. (Data 9)
- (32) *Japanese economy contribute *in* the world. (Data 10)
- (33) *people *of* all over the world (Data 11)

The example (29) bears out what we discussed in 2.4, where Hakuta (1976: 345) showed the five-year old girl's mechanical equation of the Japanese particle "DE," with the English preposition "with." The fact that (30) and (31) come from the same subject suggests that the equation of "KARA" (lit. from) to "from" was fossilized in him. The postposition "KARA" should be translated into "since" in English in the contexts above. The last two examples have much to do with Japanese postpositional phrases of place. In fact, those two phrases in (32) and (33) are based on the following Japanese phrases:

(33') sekai ni
 world P P = postpositional particle
 (to the world)

(34') sekai-juu no
 all over the world P
 (all over the world)

We cannot translate "NI" in (33') into "in" because of the preceding verb "contribute." In the case of (34'), we need not translate "NO" (usually means "of") into "of" in the phrasal expression in (34).

Now, we have already stated most of what we found about language transfer in our data, but we need to refer briefly to the Avoidance LT and the Stylistic LT in the next sub-section.

4.2.5 Avoidance LT and the Stylistic LT

While Schachter (1974: 209) compared Japanese learners with Persian, Arab, Chinese and American learners concerning the frequency of relative clauses, we have no data with which we can compare the results of our own research concerning the Avoidance LT. However, we can show the following table:

The Avoidance LT

	N	S	simpl	rltv	cmplx	cmpnd	mixed
Total	33	285	141	32	83	17	12
%			49	11	29	6	5

S = the total number of sentences, simpl = simple sentences,
 rltiv = relative sentences, cmplx = complex sentences,
 smpnd = compound sentences, mixed = mixed sentences

The table tells us that the subjects did not use the relative clauses so often as Schachter (1974) predicted. But they did not seem to avoid complex sentences including mixed sentences. This result suggests that Japanese learners feel not so much difficulty in using conjunctions as Thompson (1987) predicted. On the

contrary, some subjects seem to feel difficulties in using relative pronouns, as is seen in the following examples:

- (35) *The Japanese people which can not use the English will not able to work in the world. (Data 2)
- (36) *Most of the reason that English is important are that English is used in all areas, in the world. (Data 29)

It is clear, however, that these problems belong to the IDE category.

As to the Stylistic LT, we saw a few examples of repeating the same nouns within a sentence in Example (1) in 3.4. In the same example, we also saw an instance of the use of "because" with one clause. The results of counting these TEs are as follows:

Table 6 Stylistic LT

	N	St	repetition	because
Total	33	23	14	9

The figures tell us that the repetition problem is more common than the "because" sentences. This is because, in our view, the Japanese language allows us to repeat the same noun as much as we like. We can reduce these figures if we give some advice to learners about the Stylistic LT. This is because all TEs belonging to this category are easily corrigible, if not self-correctable.

4.3 Results of Tests

So far we have singled out, classified and explained TEs. With one or two exceptions, each TE occurred only once in our data. We decided to extend our research in order to see whether each of the TEs would occur among the subjects under different and even more controlled conditions. Our question was then: if all the subjects wanted to say the same thing at the same time, how many, if any, of them would make the same TE predicted by Thompson (1987) on the basis of contrastive analysis and found in our data? Answers to this question are reported

below.

4.3.1 Test 1

The 33 subjects were asked to translate into English the 7 Japanese phrases and sentences taken from Thompson (1987) (see Appendix III Test 1). The aim of this test is, as we noted (3.3), to check how many subjects really make theoretically expected TEs in each sentence.

The results are as follows:

Table 7 Test 1

Questions (Q)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sub	0	6	1	16	27	15	19

Sub = No. of the subjects who shared the same TE

Q1-3 (Passives), Q4 (Nominal Compound), Q5-7 (Predicative Adjectives)

The figure of Q1 proves that the index of "inanimate nouns as a structural topic" is not so much a problem as we expected together with Thompson (1987: 217). In fact, this bears out the findings of our own data where we could not find any TEs related to this index in our data (see Table 3), either. Other questions have proved to be TE generators, though Q3 may be a transfer slip. The last four figures concerning nominal compounds and predicative adjectives suggest where and how the subjects are prone to TEs. The figure of Q4 has much to do with the learner's habit of one-to-one equations, which we discuss later (4.3.2.1) in relation with Nemser's concept of "learner pidgin" (Nemser, 1984: 58). The results of Q5-7 show that quite a few of Japanese learners do not recognize the special function of predicative adjectives in their own language: the function of "referring to the speaker's or hearer's feelings" (Thompson, 1987: 219). This corroborates one of the most important findings of our own data where we found that the most serious generator of TEs was Japanese adjectives used in the predicate (see, 4.2.2).

4.3.2 Test 2

The results of Test 2 consisting of 10 questions on the Sentential SGT proved to be meaningful in the sense that they gave us a clue to discuss what we call "individual fossilization" (see 4.4). In other words, some of the TEs proved

to be personal ones because no other subjects made the same error except the first person that made that error in our data.

In the following sections, showing the pertinent Japanese sentences at the top, we will cite all the TEs from Test 2 together with the TEs in our data. A brief comment will be added at the end of each subsection and some general comments made on the overall results at the end of 4.3.2.3.

4.3.2.1 Topic-Comment Structures

1. Eigo no hitsuyou wa mae yori ooi. (I need English more than before. Data 01)
2. Watashi ga sumu sekai wa eigo wo hanasu hitsuyo ga nai, (I live in a world where I do not need to speak English. Data 13)
3. Kotonaru bunka tonou deai ga fuete iru. (We happen to experience foreign cultures more often than before. Data 13)
4. Eigo ga subete de, Nihongo wa hitsuyou nai. (All that we need is English, and we do not need Japanese. Data 15)

Table 8 Topic-Comment Structures

Q	1	2	3	4
Sub	2	7	3	*1

* = the same subject

Q1 (OI = the original instance, + = TEs in Test 2)

- (OI) *The needs of English in Japan is more than that of Japan was. (Data 1)
 +English's need is more than before.
 +Necessity of English now is more than that of then.

Q2

- (OI) *The world of that I live in don't need to speak English. (Data 13)
 +The world which I live in does not need to use English.
 +World which I live in don't need to speak English.
 +My world don't need to speak English.
 +World we live don't necessary speaking English.
 +The place in which I live do not have necessity of speaking English.
 +The world we live in is not necessary to speak English.

+The world we live in don't need speak English.

Q3

(OI) *Now increasing to meet difference culture (Data 13)

+It increase meeting with foreign cultures.

+It is increasing to meet other cultures.

+It is increase to see another culture.

Q4

(OI) *English is all and Japanese don't need. (Data 15)

+English is all, and Japanese don't need. (The same subject)

The predicate of each Japanese sentence demands the writer / speaker to understand its real "agent" (see 4.2.2). The writer of Data 15 is unique in the sense that he repeated the same TE, while nobody shared it. We interviewed him about this TE, and knew that he did not notice the error.

4.3.2.2 Pssives

5. Kodomotachi wa sore ni yotte bairingaruru ni narasareru darou. (That will make children bilinguals. Data 20)

6. Bunka ga ushinawarete iru. (We have been losing our own culture. Data 21)

Table 9 Passives

Q	5	6
Sub	4	4

Q5

(OI) Children will be been bilingual by those things. (Data 20)

+The children will be become bilingual by it.

+Children will be become bilingual by it.

+The children will be been bilingual by that. (The same subject)

+The children is becomed bilingual by it.

Q6

(OI) Culture is being lost. (Data 21)

+The culture is being lost.

- +The culture is losing.
- +The culture is losing gradually.
- +The culture is lostting.

We found that the writer of Data 20 repeated exactly the same error (see Q5). We also interviewed him and confirmed that he did not notice the error.

4.3.2.3 Predicative Adjectives

7. Nihongo dake de wa yokunai. (I do not think it a good idea to speak only Japanese. Data 14)
8. Shougakkou de Nihonjin ga eigo wo manabu no wa yoi koto da. (I think it good for Japanese to learn English at elementary school. Data 22)
9. Nihongo ga aware da. (I feel sorry for Japanese. Data 29)
10. Nihonjin wa eigo ga tsukaeta hou ga yoi. (I think it better for Japanese to be able to speak English. Data 31)

Table 10 Predicative Adjectives

Q	7	8	9	10
Sub	2	2	8	*1

Q7

- (OI) ?I think that only Japanese is no good. (Data 14)
- +I think that only Japanese is bad. (The same subject)
 - +I think only Japanese is not useful.

Q8

- (OI) ?In primary school, that Japanese study English is good. (Data 22)
- +The thing Japanese study English in little school is good.

Q9

- (OI) *Japanese language is very pity. (Data 29)
- +Japanese language is poor.
 - +Japanese is poor.
 - +Japanese language is sad.
 - +Japanese is sad.
 - +Japanese is pitiable.

+Japanese language is pity.

+Japanese is gloomy.

+Japanese is not happy.

Q10

(OI) ?Japanese who can use English is good. (Data 31)

+Japanese who can speak English is more good. (The same subject)

The rich variety of responses in Q9 clearly bears out what we discovered in our own corpus data, that is, the importance of Japanese adjectives in the predicate as an obstinate generator of Tes (see 4.2.2).

The overall results including the responses in the questions concerning the Lexical LT and the Phrasal SGT confirm the gradations of importance of each category and of each index which we found in our own corpus data. The most important of the five categories is the Sentential SGT and the most important of all the indices are the topic-comment structures and the predicative adjectives.

A brief comment is needed about the results of the Q4 and the Q10 because they are obviously exceptional in that no other subjects shared those TEs than their original producers. They are, in our view, personally "fossilized" TEs. It is true, as we saw in 2.1.2 concerning Selinker's concept, that Japanese learners are unlikely to produce "fossilized" varieties of English, but, as we see here, "fossilization" at the level of the individual learner is really a possibility. We call this phenomenon the learner's "individual fossilization." The Q5 in 4.3.2.2 is, in our view, another instance of the case.

4.4 Questionnaires and Protocols

In the questionnaires mentioned in 3.3, I asked the 33 subjects the following 3 questions (originally in Japanese):

Q1: Have you ever tried to memorize a long list of word-to-word equations as a means of building up vocabulary?

Q2: When you write in English, do you translate from Japanese to English, or think of things directly in English?

A. from Japanese B. directly in English C. both

Q3: Analyze your own text, if possible. Indicate which part was translated, and which part was written directly in English. (All their written texts were digitized and returned to them.)

The result of the Q1 was that 99% of the subjects answered yes and it confirmed our analysis about the lexical language transfer (4.3.2.1). We will discuss the point of the word-to-word equations in Conclusion (5.2) again.

The answers to the Q2 were as follows:

Table 11 Answers to Q2

Q2	A	B	C
Sub	14	0	19

These answers were proved to be less reliable than those to the Q3, however, because, on analyzing their own texts, 25 subjects indicated at least one or two non-translation parts. This means that at least 25 subjects wrote in the both ways. Thus, the answers to the Q3 were proved to be more reliable than those to the Q2, that is, the former tells us more accurately how the subjects did a piece of writing.

The non-translation parts the subjects indicated proved to be of major interest as they consist mainly of basic words, set phrases and structural expressions such as:

- agree with / make light of / communicate with, etc.
- at the same time / in other words / for example / in the world / all over the world, etc.
- not only A but also B / it is difficult / it is natural / it is said that / I want to do / It is not accurate / I think / I like / This is why / This is to say / it seemed that / we must learn English, etc.

The analyses by the subjects themselves revealed, in our view, an important aspect of their writing process: language transfer did happen in those

parts which were, in some subjects' consciousness, written directly in English. Here are examples:

- *If we are in Japan that people don't have to use English in, we use English without knowing that we use it. (Data 4)
- But I can't agree with the point of accept the idea. *Because, if English be official language, the country's native language will break down that I think. (Data 6)
- *It is not accurate perfectly and low price. (Data 19)
- *It is good for us to tell people in the world with other languages if not English. (Data 21)
- *Most of people think, to use English is Japanese can become more modernized. (Data 24)

Taking these instances into consideration, we conclude that language transfer does not always happen solely in the process of translation. It occurs both in learners' translation and in their direct use of English. The latter case of "individual fossilization" (4.3) is, in our view, more serious than the former because it is an evidence of the fact that learners are affected unconsciously by their own mother tongue.

I interviewed all of those writers of the instances above: the writers of Data 4 (very good student), 6 (weak student), 19 (average student), 21 (very good student) and 24 (average student). They all confessed that they did not know how they came to be influenced by Japanese when writing those non-translation sentences. I also interviewed the three subjects who repeated the same TE both in the original writing and in Test 2. They were the writers of Data 15 (average student), 20 (weak student) and 31(weak student). According to their confessions, they did not know that they had made any errors in the pertinent parts. So we can repeat the same conclusion that learners cause language transfer unconsciously. This increases the importance of indicating language transfer in their EFL writings in order to stimulate learners' "language awareness" (James, 1998: 180) (see, 2.1.3).

Chapter 5 Conclusion

5.1 Two Major Findings and Their Implications for ELT

We started our study with the purpose of making indices and the hope of contributing to ELT in Japan.

We have attained the aim by presenting and checking the indices of L1 transfer in EFL writing (see 2.6 and Chapter 4). Our analyses in Chapter 4 revealed the gradations of the importance of each index, which Thompson (1987) did not mention. The most important indices are the "predicative adjectives" and the "Japanese topic-comment structures," although both of them overlap with one another. This is, we can say, one of our major findings.

Another is that language transfer does not always happen as a conscious process of translation from L1 to EFL. For, as we saw in 4.4, the learner's consciously direct use of English could turn out to be an example of language transfer.

Discussing Selinker's concept of "fossilization" (2.1.2), we indicated that Japanese learners were unlikely to produce "fossilized" varieties of English, but that "fossilization" at the level of the individual learner was a possibility. This indication was confirmed by the fact that some learners made the same type of errors persistently. We called this phenomenon the learner's "individual I'm not sure we can call it fossilization" when I earner's English progruieuuy 13 not hish, mat's, is still derelopmental, Also, this study is crvss-sectional not longitudinal. (4.4).

Thus, transfer analysis can be useful for ELT in a dual way. Since language transfer occurs both in the learner's translation and in his or her direct use of English, it suggests to us a dual approach to the reality: one is to teach the two grammars in a contrastive way based on the gradations of the importance of the indices we indicated, and another is to bring to light the learner's own "fossilized" system of English, or his or her "individual fossilization," through analyzing as many as possible of his or her spontaneous pieces of writing. This is especially effective, we believe, in the case of intermediate learners like the subjects of this study.

In this respect, however, we had only a small corpus of data for this study. We need, obviously, a much larger one for our further study to establish a theory

of the Japanese learner's "individual fossilization." Another limitation of this study was we were limited to one topic. For further research, a variety of topics are needed in the reading materials in order to elicit a variety of spontaneous responses in English. A variety of genres must also be taken into consideration, such as letters, newspaper articles, short stories, and poems. Since what is needed is a variety of stimuli, we can easily make use of films and videos, too, to get various verbal responses from students.

Both of the two findings discussed above concern the Sentential SGT, which had the greatest frequency and significance in our data. We have not so much to say about the Phrasal SGT because it causes no serious problems except the transfer of word order concerning the QQ rule. The Avoidance LT and the Stylistic LT only demands, as we pointed out above (4.2.5), further more technical studies.

It remains for us to discuss the Lexical LT and its relation to the grammar-translation method in Japan, or more specifically, to discuss the word-to-word equation and its relation to "transfer of training."

5.2 The Lexical LT and Its Possible Relation to the Grammar-Translation

Method

The "training" in Selinker's term "transfer of training" has a specific meaning related to "the material to be learned" (Selinker, 1972: 37), but it inevitably includes methodology. Thus, we can say, for example, that Japanese learners are trained by means of the grammar-translation method.

It is in its broad sense that we indicated the relation between the word-to-word equations and the language "training" in Japan (see 4.2.4). The subjects' answers to the Q1 in our questionnaires (4.4) confirmed its possibility.

As I indicated in Introduction (1.1), official efforts have been made to promote communicative approaches in ELT in Japan. But the reality has been changed little and the most prevalent methodology is still in essence the grammar-translation, especially in junior and senior high schools. If we look at any one of the textbooks used there, we will still find that "each new lesson have one or two new grammar rules, a short vocabulary list, and some practice

examples of translate." We borrowed this description from Howatt (1984: 136), who tried to convey the commonest characteristic of this traditional method since the 19th century.

Most Japanese teachers of English employ this method and encourage learners to translate every English sentence into Japanese. When learners write in English, they apply the method in reverse and transfer everything in Japanese sentences to English, from lexis to word order. We witnessed a lot of instances of language transfer, especially those of Lexical LT, in Chapter 4.

The grammar-translation method is, in our view, at least the background of those word-to-word equations we witnessed. Those false equations are a result from learners' desire to simplify grammatical rules of the target language. We can characterize this tendency as a kind of "learner pidgin" (Nemser, 1971: 58). This phenomenon, according to Nemser (ibid.: 58), appears among language learners "who have attained fluency in the target language without mastery of its fundamentals, but have arrived at a stage in instruction where attention has largely shifted from form to content." This description exactly fits our case. University students like our subjects surely learned English grammar in their former schools, but did not master its fundamentals. Now their attention has obviously shifted from form to content because they have something to say in English. So what they do is to incorporate L1 grammatical elements and EFL lexical elements, which, according to Nemser (1971: 58), is one of the main characteristics of "learner pidgin." Let us re-consider the following instances (see 4.2.4):

(1) *English is *major* in the world. (Data 28)

(2) *The language have *appealed* the country's existence over the world.

(Data 23)

(3) *Simply, my world may be *narrow*. (Data 29)

English lexical elements like "major," "appeal," and "narrow" are all used here according to the Japanese grammatical rules. As we indicated before (4.2.4), English loans often function differently from their originals. The case of "narrow" is a bit complicated because its origin is Japanese and it functions in (3) just as its

original Japanese word usually functions. This is a symbolic instance of "learner pidgin" as a result of the word-to-word equation with the grammar-translation method as its background.

The term "grammar" in the grammar-translation method has never contained the field of L1 grammar. But our study highlighted that "learner English" (see 2.1.2) is related with the L1 grammar to a certain degree. This means that we have to arouse learners' "language awareness" (James, 1998: 180) in both L1 and EFL, whether we employ the grammar-translation method or not.

We need, however, a further study for establishing the co-relation between the word-to-word equations, the grammar-translation method and the "learner pidgin." In order to make clear when and how a subject equated "narrow" to "SEMAI" in Japanese, for example, we need to devise suitable research methods and procedures in one of our further studies.

This research proved that the study of language transfer in learner English is a lot more complex than we first predicted with the aid of literature such as Selinker et al. (1975) and Thompson (1987). It is true that, in our study, transfer errors in the learners' performances always took priority over other types of errors, but such errors cannot be a phenomenon independent from other elements of language acquisition. Therefore, as we indicated above, studying this particular area of language acquisition inevitably involves considerations not only of the learners' performances per se but also of the teaching and learning methods which have influenced them to take them to their current level of English.

Appendix I

Text for Reading (abridged)

"English and the future of Japanese" (The Japan Times, October 2, 1997)

Can the Japanese language retain its current monopoly on national discourse?

During the Meiji Period, there was a heated discussion over whether this country should abandon the use of Japanese in favor of English. This proposal was part of the tough-minded assessment of what in the Japanese cultural

heritage could withstand the unforgiving test of modernization. Now it may be time to pose the question again.

Any attempt to cling to the linguistic nationalism that arises in East Asia threatens to marginalize our region's claim to future economic, technological and political greatness.

Appendix II

Data 1-33 (abridged)

(3 Examples representing very good, average and weak students)

(Italics indicate TEs and the mark * indicates IDEs)

4 (very good student)

(See, 3.4)

15 (average student) (abridged because of the word limit)

It is true that English has spreaded all over the world. We need using English when we act *in world-wide*. I think it can't but be so.

But, *what people thinking that English is all and Japanese don't need it, is *problem*. Many English teachers say "When you are *spoken in English by foreigners, you should talk with them in English" as if it were natural. Is this jutified?

What we need is, we don't throw away our pride of *Japanese, and get along with English. the way of English education. *Because, *media *(inter-net) spread to the world and it grow *problem of enviromental disruption in the world*. So we should be able to use English in the future and we should have discussion about it *over the world*. We need English *communication.

31 (weak student)

English is spoken in a lot of countries at present. It *used in business, Internet and *communicate foreign people. English is *very useful language. *But a few people who can speak English in Japan*. When we have a common language, *the *communication is easy. *In the negotiation the one who speak English is more better*.

Therefore *Japanese who can use English is good*. If *there is anxiety* that the

tradition of Japanese is destroyed, it should *learn as *the second language like *the foreign country. English is the language which is the best to *learn as *the second language. So, it is *the best to make *a tradition and *usefulness coexist.

Appendix III

[TEST 1]

1. Nimotsu, okutta. (I sent the parcel. See, 2.3.2)
2. Kare wa kane wo nusumareta. (He had his money stolen. 2.3.2)
3. Kanojo wa otto ni shinareta. (Her husband died. 2.3.2)
4. Tokyo wa anzen-toshi desu. (Tokyo is a safe city. 2.3.4)
5. Ano eiga wa yokatta. (I found that film good. 2.3.6.1)
6. Nihon no tabemono wa oisii? (Do you find Japanese food delicious? 2.3.6.1)
7. Kare wa kowai. (I am afraid of him. 2.3.6.1)

[TEST 2]

[Sentential SGT]

All of the 10 items are shown in 4.3.2.

Bibliography

- Brumfit, C. J. and Johnson, K. (1979) *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford U. P.
- Canale, M., and Swain, M. (1980) "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing." *Applied Linguistics* 1, 1-47.
- Cohen, D., and Hosenfeld, C. (1981) "Some Uses of Mentalistic Data in Second Language Research." *Language Learning*, 31, 2, 285-313.
- Corder, S. P. (1967) "The Significance of Learner's Errors," in Corder (1981), 1-13.
- Corder, S. P. (1971) "Idiosyncratic Dialects and Error Analysis," in Corder (1981), 14-25.
- Corder, S. P. (1973) *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Corder, S. P. (1981) *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M. and Krashen, S. (1982) *Language Two*. Oxford: Oxford

University Press.

Eisenstein, M. R. (ed.) (1989) *The Dynamic Interlanguage*. New York: Plenum Press.

Gass, S., and Selinker, S. (1992) *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Haugen, E. (1956) *Bilingualism in the Americans: A Bibliography and Research Guide*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press / American Dialect Society.

Hakuta, K. (1976) "A Case Study of a Japanese Child Learning English as a Second Language." *Language Learning* 26,2, 321-351.

Hakuta, K. (1986) *Mirror of Language*. New York: Basic Books.

Howatt, A.P.R. (1984) *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D. H. (1971) "On Communicative Competence", in Brumfit and Johnson (1979), 5-26.

James, C. (1980) *Contrastive Analysis*. London: Longman.

James, C. (1998) *Error in Language Learning and Use*. London: Longman.

Kachru, B. B. (1992) *The Other Tongue*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Kizuka, H. and Verdaman, J. (1997) *Common Mistakes in Current English Usage*. Tokyo: Macmillan Language House.

Lado, R. (1957) *Linguistics Across Cultures*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Maynard, S. K. (1997) *Japanese Communication*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Nemser, W. (1984) "Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners," in Richards (1984), 55-63.

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

Ogasawara, L. (1995) "Native Cultural Interference in Japanese English." *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics* 1995, 105-111.

Paulston, C. (1990) "Linguistic and Communicative Competence", in Scarcella, et al., 287-301.

Richards, J. C. (1971) "A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis", in Richards (1984), 172-188.

Richards, J. C. (1972) "Social Factors, Interlanguage, and Language Learning", in

- Richards (1984), 64-91.
- Richards, J. C. (1984) *Error Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Scarcella, R, Andersen, E, and Krashen, S. (1990) *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Schachter, J. (1974) "An error in error analysis." *Language Learning* 24, 205-214.
- Schachter, J. (1992) "A New Account Of Language Transfer", in Gass, S., and Selinker, S. (1992), 46.
- Selinker, L. (1972) "Interlanguage", in Richards (1984), 31-54.
- Selinker, L., Swain, M., and Dumas, G. (1975) "Interlanguage Hypothesis Extended to Children." *Language Learning* 25, 1, 139-152.
- Selinker, L. and Lakshamanau, U. (1992) "Language Transfer and Fossilization," in Gass and Selinker (1992), 197-216.
- Shibatani, M. (1990) *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stanlaw, J. (1992) "English in Japanese Communicative Strategies", in Kachru (1992), 178-208.
- Swan, M., and Smith, B. (1987) *Learner English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarone, E. (1988) *Variation in Interlanguage*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Thompson, I. (1987) "Japanese speakers", in Swan, M. and Smith, B. (1987), 212-223.
- Tsujimura, N. (1996) *An Introduction to Japanese Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Weinreich, U. (1968) *Language in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Winer, L. (1989) "Variation and Transfer in English Creole-Standard English Language Learning", in Eisenstein (1989), 155-175.