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ABSTRACT

This is an attempted scrutiny into various aspects of Arabic-transfer effects upon the English interlanguages of a group of Syrian-Arab adult learners (intermediate to advanced), who are postgraduate students reading for higher degrees in engineering at several universities in Dublin. A multitude of interlingual identifications orally produced by these learners have been collected during a period of eighteen months, and are put forward as the principal focus of this study. By having recourse to both the Standard and Colloquial varieties of Arabic, the areas of language transfer are specified in terms of three linguistic subcomponents: phonology, syntax and semantics (i.e. lexical selection), each categorized within its own taxonomy. Yet, the complexity of the task lies in the tremendous variations Arabic offers between the Standard Variety and the Colloquial Variety at one end, and between the regional dialects of the latter at another. For this reason, such regional dialects are classified into four main dialects constituting Syrian Colloquial Arabic in the sociolinguistic sense. The higher complexity of the task, however, stems from the attempted analysis of specific interlingual identifications which, along the levels of language process and language product, are said to reflect transfer effects from either variety, or from an overlapping existing between the two, or even from a mixture of two or more regional dialects of Syrian Colloquial Arabic.

The attested errors made in the domains of phonology and syntax are allocated in terms of two major categories. First, Interlingual Errors are those attested identifications whose analyses seek to establish the potential for Arabic transfer to be the chief source of learning difficulty. Under this category comes a particular type of errors (termed first-language-error negative transfer) which brings to light the learner’s inherent reliance on typical deviation from the Standard Norm of Arabic. Second, Inter-intralingual Errors are those attested identifications which proceed from either an overt combination of Arabic-based transfer (interlingual solution) and English-based transfer (intralingual solution) or a covert interaction between the two sorts of linguistic solution as there is considerable paucity of research into this category. Since most data from transfer-based empirical research, especially those reported from Arab learners of English, concentrate on the negative effects detrimental to the positive effects of first-language influence, this study — besides the investigation of the negative effects of Arabic influence as evidenced by the two major categories of errors — highlights the positive effects which are mostly discernible in the semantic domain of lexical selection. Such polarity is considered by reference to the complementary alliance of contrastive analysis and error analysis, and to current thinking about learner interlanguage and crosslinguistic influence on second-language learning/acquisition. Hence, for each of the three linguistic subcomponents, a provisional hypothesis, in relation to one or both varieties of Arabic, is enunciated to elucidate to what extent the potential for Arabic transfer triggers inhibition and/or facilitation in the learning of English.

Throughout the discussion of all the interlingual identifications (actual and predicted) made in a proactive direction as well as some others in a retroactive direction, various tentative suggestions concerning the psycholinguistic processes which incorporate into the transfer mechanism are also adduced to excavate several 'invisible' areas of Arabic transfer. These underlying processes, which inextricably co-exist in the immanent organization of the human mind, are dealt with in a rather detailed and modified configuration to provide newly endeavoured information on the linguistic behaviour of the Syrian-Arab learner specifically. Therefore, given both the learner’s first language (within its not easily tractable nature) and the key issues connected with language transfer, it is believed that these information are significant on two different but related accounts. First, they raise to the researcher virtually untouched questions of Arabic transfer for more sophisticated theorization about the Arab learner’s entire system in general. Second, they help the teacher, the Arabic-speaking teacher in particular, to utilize his knowledge of Arabic for tackling those transferable spots, and to supplement his teaching plans with more crystallized objectives. This study claims to extrapolate from rather vague schemes a number of interesting, though highly intricate, parameters concerning Arabic transfer, and seems to be one which may contribute to a rewarding exigency for further research.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Actual Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS</td>
<td>Approximative System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Actual Utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Contrastive Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Creative Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLI</td>
<td>Cross-Linguistic Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Error Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Eastern Colloquial Dialect of SCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Generative Semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Inter-Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISD</td>
<td>Idiosyncratic Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>Idiosyncratic Utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First Language, Home Language, Mother Tongue, Native Language or Source Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1-U</td>
<td>L1-Utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second Language, First Foreign Language or Target Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2-U</td>
<td>L2-Utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Third Language or Second Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>Language Acquisition Device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Language Acquisition System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLS</td>
<td>Latent Language Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPS</td>
<td>Latent Psychological Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Modern Standard Arabic, Classical Arabic or the Written Variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Noun Clause in MSA or SCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCD</td>
<td>Northern Colloquial Dialect of SCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>Native Speaker of Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSE</td>
<td>Native Speaker of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>Negative Transfer, Interference or Inhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Predicted Error or Potential Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Positive Transfer, Non-Interference or Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>Predicted Utterance or Potential Utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QP</td>
<td>Question Particle in MSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Rural Eastern Dialect of ECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Received Pronunciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBE</td>
<td>Standard British English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Syrian Colloquial Arabic, Non-Standard Arabic or the Spoken Variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>Southern Colloquial Dialect of SCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-R</td>
<td>Stimulus-Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Teritium Comparationis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>Translation Equivalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGG</td>
<td>Transformational-Generative Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UED</td>
<td>Urban Eastern Dialect of ECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Verbal Clause in MSA or SCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCD</td>
<td>Western Colloquial Dialect of SCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY TO PHONETIC SYMBOLS

N.B.: In this study, the square brackets [ ] will be used for both the Arabic and learner-interlanguage pronunciation, whereas the oblique dashes / / will be specific for the English and any other Indo-European pronunciation.

Vowels and Diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARABIC CHARACTER</th>
<th>SHORT VOWELS</th>
<th>ARABIC REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>EUROPEAN APPROXIMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>[fat'ha] 'sign of accusative'</td>
<td>a front or back-open-neutral vowel as in [al-ba ba] 'the door' as a definite object in MSA or when preceding the nasal [n] of [tanwi n nasb] 'nunciation of accusative' as in [ba ban] 'a door' as an indefinite object in MSA or when connecting a pair of consonants as in [hasaba] 'counted (he)' in MSA and [bahar] 'sea' in SCA</td>
<td>the short vowel /æ/ as in /kæp/ 'cup' in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>[damma] 'sign of nominative'</td>
<td>a back-close-rounded vowel as in [al-ba bu] 'the door' as a definite subject in MSA or when connecting a pair of consonants as in [hasuba] 'became deemed (he)' in MSA and [kubuz] 'bread' in ECD</td>
<td>the short vowel /ʊ/ as in /put/ 'put' in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>a monophthongal variant of [u] (cf above) occurs in a mid-back-half-open-rounded articulation when preceding the nasal [n] of the case [tanwi n raf] 'nunciation of nominative' as in [ba bon] 'a door' as an indefinite subject in MSA or when following a doubled consonant strengthened by [sadda] as in [saffo] 'his class', [hatto] 'put (he) it', etc in any grammatical case in SCA</td>
<td>the weak form of the quite short diphthong /æʊ/ as in /telrɪf əʊn/ 'telephone' in Hiberno-English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key to Phonetic Symbols

**ARABIC CHARACTER** | **SHORT VOWELS** | **ARABIC REPRESENTATION** | **EUROPEAN APPROXIMATION**
---|---|---|---
[i] | [kasra] 'sign of genitive' a front-close-spread vowel as in [al-ba bi] 'the door' as a definite noun governed by a genitive construction or by a preposition in MSA or when connecting a pair of consonants as in [hasiba] 'deemed (he)' in MSA and [hibir] 'ink' in ECD/NCD | the short vowel /i/ as in /sit/ 'sit' in English
[e] | a monophthongal variant of [i] (cf above) occurs in a mid-front-half-open-spread articulation when preceding the nasal [n] of [tanwi n jarr] 'nunnation of genitive' as in [ba ben] 'a door' as an indefinite noun governed by a genitive construction or by a preposition in MSA or when connecting a pair of consonants as in [kebez] 'bread' in NCD/SCD/WCD (cf [kubuz] above) or when following a doubled consonant strengthened by [sadda] as in [himme] 'zeal', [himme] 'fever', etc in SCA | the weak form of the short vowel [e] as in /ten/ 'ten' in Hiberno-English

### Long Vowels

**ARABIC CHARACTER** | **LONG VOWELS** | **ARABIC REPRESENTATION** | **EUROPEAN APPROXIMATION**
---|---|---|---
[a ] | a back-open-neutral vowel particularly occurring after emphatic consonants such as [s], [d], [t], [Th] and [z] (cf. below) or after the doubled dark [l] as in [alla h] 'God' in MSA/SCA or after the one-glide [r] as in [ra ya] 'flaque' in MSA | the long vowel [a ] as in /la st/ 'last' in English and /pa / 'pas' in French
[a ] | a front-open-neutral vowel as in [a la'w] 'pains', /a/ as in /haet/ [masa ?il] 'problems', etc in MSA/ECD/SCD | the long vowel [a ] as in /la st/ 'last' in English and /pa / 'pas' in French
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARABIC CHARACTER</th>
<th>LONG VOWELS</th>
<th>ARABIC REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>EUROPEAN APPROXIMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>او</td>
<td>[u ]</td>
<td>a back-close-rounded vowel as in [su r] 'fence' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the long vowel /u/ as in /fu d/ 'food' in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>او</td>
<td>[o ]</td>
<td>a mid-back-half-open-rounded vowel as in [ho n] 'here', [lo:n] 'colour', etc. in ECD (UED)/NCD/SCD</td>
<td>the long diphthong /əʊ/ as in /bould/'bold' in Hiberno-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ای</td>
<td>[i ]</td>
<td>a front-close-spread vowel as in [bar id] 'post/mail' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the long vowel /i/ 'as in /si/ 'see' in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ای</td>
<td>[e ]</td>
<td>a mid-front-half-open-spread vowel as in [be:t] 'house' in ECD (UED)/NCD/SCD</td>
<td>the long vowel /e/ as in /ge hin/ 'gehen' in German</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARABIC CHARACTER</th>
<th>SHORT DIPHTHONGS</th>
<th>ARABIC REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>EUROPEAN APPROXIMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>او</td>
<td>[aw]</td>
<td>a diphthong gliding from [a] to [w] as in [lawn] 'colour' in MSA/WCD</td>
<td>the diphthong /əu/ as in /loun/ 'loan' in RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>او</td>
<td>[uwa]</td>
<td>a diphthong gliding from [u] to [a] and passing through [w] as in [suar] 'photos/pictures' in MSA/SCA or [luwan] 'colour' in ECD (RED)</td>
<td>the diphthong /uə/ as in /juə(r)/'sure' in RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ای</td>
<td>[ay]</td>
<td>a diphthong gliding from [a] to [y] as in [bayt] 'house' in MSA/WCD</td>
<td>the diphthong /eɪ/ as in /bɛt/ 'bate' in RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ای</td>
<td>[iya]</td>
<td>a diphthong gliding from [i] to [a] and passing through [y] as in [hiya] 'she' in MSA or [biyat] 'house' in ECD (RED)</td>
<td>the diphthong /aɪ/ as in /hiə(r)/ 'here' in RP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARABIC CHARACTER</th>
<th>LONG DIPHTHONGS</th>
<th>ARABIC REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>EUROPEAN APPROXIMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ای</td>
<td>[a y]</td>
<td>a diphthong gliding from [a ] to [y] as in [ra ya] 'flague' in MSA or as in [ra y] 'going', [tsa y] 'tea', etc in NCD</td>
<td>the diphthong /aɪ/ as in /rɛit/ 'right' in RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARABIC CHARACTER</td>
<td>LONG DIPHTHONGS</td>
<td>ARABIC REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>EUROPEAN APPROXIMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آي</td>
<td>[a y]</td>
<td>a diphthong gliding from [a] to [y] as in [na y] 'flute' in MSA or as in [tša y] 'tea' in ECD, [ja y] 'coming' in SCD, etc</td>
<td>the diphthong /ai/ as in /skai/ 'sky' in Hiberno-English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آو</td>
<td>[a w]</td>
<td>a diphthong gliding from [a] to [w] as in [bada wa] 'Bedouin life' in MSA or [sa. wa] 'made/did/let (he)' in SCD</td>
<td>the diphthong /au/ as in /hau/ 'how' in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consonants and Phonemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARABIC CHARACTER</th>
<th>ROMAN CHARACTER</th>
<th>ARABIC REPRESENTATION</th>
<th>EUROPEAN APPROXIMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ع</td>
<td>[ʔ]</td>
<td>glottal stop, not to be trans-literated initially as in [asfal] 'ask (I)' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the glottal stop /ʔ/ as in [boʔl] 'bottle' in Cockney English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>voiced bilabial stop as in [ba b] 'door' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the sound /b/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>[t]</td>
<td>voiceless dento-alveolar plosive as in [tarak] 'left (he)' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the sound /t/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>[th]</td>
<td>voiceless dental non-sulcal fricative as in [tha lith] 'third' in MSA/ECD</td>
<td>the sound /θ/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>[l]</td>
<td>voiced palato-alveolar affricate as [jama 1] 'beauty' in MSA/ECD</td>
<td>the sound /ðʒ/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١</td>
<td>[j]</td>
<td>voiced palato-alveolar fricative as in [jama 1] 'beauty' in SCD</td>
<td>the sound /ʒ/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>voiceless pharyngeal fricative as in [ahmar] 'red' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the sound /x/ as in 'Tochter' in German and 'Loch' in Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>[k]</td>
<td>voiceless uvular fricative as in [karif] 'autumn' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARABIC CHARACTER</td>
<td>ROMAN CHARACTER</td>
<td>ARABIC REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>EUROPEAN APPROXIMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>voiced dento-alveolar plosive as in [dam] 'blood' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the sound /d/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>[th]</td>
<td>voiced dental non-sulcal fricative as in [thamm] 'dispraise/censure' in MSA/ECD</td>
<td>the sound of /ʒ/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>[r]</td>
<td>voiced velarized dento-alveolar with one-glide articulation as in [bahr] 'sea' in MSA, but often with more-than-one-glide articulation as in [bahr] 'sea' in SCA</td>
<td>the sound /r/ when preceding a vowel in RP for the MSA-variant the linguo-alveolar roll /r/ occurring in Scottish or Italian for the SCA-variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>voiced dento-alveolar fricative as in [zaman] 'time/tense' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the sound /z/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>voiced dento-alveolar emphatic fricative occurring as a substitute for [Th] in NCD/SCD/WCD as in [sa'lem] 'tyrant' and [hafaz] 'learned by heart (he)' (cf [Th] below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>voiceless dento-alveolar fricative as in [sabab] 'reason' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the sound /s/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>[ʃ]</td>
<td>voiceless palato-alveolar fricative as in [sams]/[samis] 'sun' in MSA/SCA respectively</td>
<td>the sound /ʃ/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت/تش</td>
<td>[tš]</td>
<td>voiceless palato-alveolar affricate occurring in ECD as a substitute for [k] (cf below) as in [tšıntu] 'was (I)'</td>
<td>the sound /tʃ/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>voiceless dento-alveolar and sulcal emphatic fricative as in [sa bir] 'patient' in MSA/ECD</td>
<td>the emphatic sound /s/ when preceding /a/ in RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>voiced dental and non-sulcal emphatic plosive as in [bayd] 'eggs' in MSA/WCD and [be d] 'eggs' in NCD/SCD</td>
<td>the emphatic sound /d/ when preceding /a/ in RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARABIC CHARACTER</td>
<td>ARABIC REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>EUROPEAN APPROXIMATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط [t]</td>
<td>voiceless dento alveolar and emphatic plosive as in [ṭālib] 'student' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the emphatic sound /t/ as in 'tie' in Russian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض [Th]</td>
<td>voiced dental non-sulcal emphatic fricative as in [ṭālim] 'tyrant' in MSA/ECD and [ḥafiṭha]/[ḥaftfa] 'learned by heart (he)' in MSA/ECD respectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح [ʔ]</td>
<td>voiced pharyngeal fricative as in [maʔmal] 'factory' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غ [g]</td>
<td>voiced uvular fricative as in [gàyma] 'clouds' in MSA/WCD and [ge m] 'clouds' in ECD/NCD/SCD</td>
<td>the uvular roll /ʁ/ in French and German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ف [f]</td>
<td>voiceless labio-dental fricative as in [fārīd] 'unique' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the sound /f/ in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق [q]</td>
<td>voiceless uvular plosive as in [qalām] 'pen' in MSA/ECD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك [k]</td>
<td>voiceless velar stop as in [kuNTU] 'was (I)' in MSA and [kurNT] (SCD)/[kint] (NCD/WCD)</td>
<td>the sound /k/ in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>گ [g]</td>
<td>voiced velar stop occurring in RED as a substitute for [q] (cf above) as in [gālam] 'pen' or in Egyptian Colloquial Arabic as a substitute for [l]/[j] (cf above) as in [gama] 'beauty'</td>
<td>the sound /g/ in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م [m]</td>
<td>voiced bilabial nasal as in [sali m] 'sound (adj)′ in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the sound /m/ in English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARABIC CHARACTER</td>
<td>ROMAN CHARACTER</td>
<td>ARABIC REPRESENTATION</td>
<td>EUROPEAN APPROXIMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>[n]</td>
<td>occurring in two allophonic variants: voiced dento-alveolar nasal as in [rani n] 'ring/echo' in MSA/SCA and voiced velar nasal in the form of [gunna] 'nasalization' in MSA as in [miŋka] 'of/from you (sing. mas.)'</td>
<td>the sounds /n/ and /ŋ/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ه / ه</td>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>voiceless glottal fricative as in [ih'da?] 'dedication' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the sound /h/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>[w]</td>
<td>voiced bilabial or labio-velar semi-vowel as in [wahi d] 'alone/single' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the sound /w/ in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي</td>
<td>[y]</td>
<td>voiced palatal semi-vowel as in [yuri'd] 'want (he)' in MSA and [tahiyya.t] 'regards' in MSA/SCA</td>
<td>the sound /j/ in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Among the myriad of unsolved problems in applied linguistics and teaching methodology, the challenging question of language transfer seems to occupy a central position. In its general sense, the term language transfer is used to indicate the effects that the learner's already existing L1 knowledge may, to some extent, exert upon his perception and attempted utilization of the rules or items of the L2 he is learning or acquiring. Therefore, as one of the inevitable mechanisms underlying L2-learning/acquisition, the importance of language transfer is universally acknowledged, and, since the mid 1970s, investigations into this mechanism have been propagating both on a theoretical and empirical level.

In the early studies of language transfer, particularly during the 1940s and 1950s when the structural-behavioural model was paramount (and its repercussions could be easily discerned up to the late 1960s), the proponents of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis such as Fries (1945), Lado (1957, 1964) and Banathy et al (1966), among others, sought to test the influence-values of a previous task (L1-acquisition) on the learning of a subsequent and similar task (L2-learning/acquisition). Within the general principle of transfer, these scholars believed that where there were differences between the two tasks, the influence-values of transfer would be negative. Hence, the research was primarily devoted to comparing and contrasting the L1 with the L2 in order to predict learning difficulties on the basis of the formal differences between the two languages in question. From a pedagogical perspective, language teachers were encouraged to focus their teaching plans on these
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...differences to help the L2-learner 'skip over' the obstacles that would be created by L1-influence as a result of negative transfer. Therefore, the theory of transfer was first associated with a particular view of language learning as a series of habits which were assumed to be developed only through imitation, repetition and reinforcement.

With the emergence of the generative-cognitive framework, on the other hand, the intimate relationship between Contrastive Analysis and the structural-behavioural model was demolished, and the theoretical constructs of habit formation were relinquished. In effect, the claim that learning difficulties could be predicted on the basis of linguistic differences appeared increasingly vulnerable, since it was made under the aegis of two schools of linguistics and psychology no longer in favour. In order to refute such a claim it was necessary, therefore, to demonstrate that Contrastive Analysis was in many respects a weak predictor of potential errors, and to assert that L1-influence, even if it might lead to errors, could not be viewed solely as an obstacle to L2-learning. In the late 1960s and early 1970s various reactions emerged, some of which were relatively verifiable, and others which went to extremes due to a misinterpretation of the first proposals introduced by traditional contrastivists. As a result, Contrastive Analysis — and, subsequently, its notion of language transfer — was, as James (1980) puts it, 'in the doldrums', and there were several researchers like Dulay and Burt (1973, 1974a) who tried to deteriorate the role of the L1 in L2-learning/acquisition.

However, within the accommodation of language transfer by cognitive paradigms, the stress on the role of the L1 (which constitutes a fundamental component of the learner's past experience) appears to have been willingly reversed. The turning-point, marked by Schachter's (1974) experimental findings in the fortunes of language transfer, attached relative credence to Contrastive Analysis, and gave rise to serious exploration of far deeper aspects related to the transfer mechanism. Since then, the concept of language transfer has been regaining ground, and, as one significant phenomenon characterizing learner language, has undergone multiplex schemes of revitalization. The awe-inspiring volume of research into this phenomenon can be seen from the comprehensive bibliography and world-wide conferences, as recorded by Ringbom (1987 1).
INTRODUCTION

BIBLIOGRAPHY

— Dechert, Bruggemeier and Futterer's (1984) extensive compilation of *Transfer and Interference in Language: A Selected Bibliography*

CONFERENCES

1 Ann Arbor Conference on "Language Transfer in Language Learning" (1981), with its comprehensive conference volume edited by Gass and Selinker (1983)

2 The Singapore Regional Seminar on "Interlanguage Transfer Processes in Language Learning and Communication" (1982)

3 The Kassel Workshop on "Transfer in Production" (1982)

4 The BAAL Annual Meeting on "Language Description, Language Contact and Language Acquisition: Direction and Influences" (1984)

5 The Nordic Summer School (Nordisk Forskarkurs) on "Transfer in Language Learning" (1986)

From the above documentation, it appears that a conglomerate of great efforts have been, and are in the process of being, made to ascertain the linguistic as well as the non-linguistic causes of language transfer. Several researchers have recently suggested that, in order to illustrate how the quality and quantity of language transfer effects vary from one L2-learning context to another, groups of learners having different L1s and learning a common L2 need to be examined (cf Ard and Homburg, 1983) In such a case, it is argued, the differences in transfer effects between these language groups are largely determined by background variables such as L1-experience, culture, and education in the first place (cf Ringbom, 1987 2) Further, there exist other variables, or sets of variables, that are said to characterize the differences in transfer effects. These can be recognized along at least three intervening strands: individual variation, situational variation, and developmental variation (cf Wode, 1986 174) Clearly, therefore, the intricate and widespread ramifications of transfer-based research arise from a countless number of inter-related factors that play a significant role. Merger, many of these factors are still not fully understood in current thinking about L2-learning/acquisition.
The aim of this thesis is to present a schematized overview of transfer-related issues, and to apply the relevant findings to a learning context where Arabic is the LI and English is the L2. By generalizing across several lines of research in applied linguistics, it will trace, what Singleton (1987) calls, "the fall and rise of language transfer", and will illuminate some of the complexities that are typical of this field of endeavour. The thesis falls into two central parts: Part One, which comprises the first four chapters, is mainly concerned with the theoretical and practical extrapolation of various assumptions underlying the concept of language transfer, and Part Two, which covers the remaining three chapters, pursues some empirical research by a detailed psycholinguistic analysis of the concrete data and touches on some implications for language teaching.

In Part One of this thesis, the first chapter opens the discussion with the history of Contrastive Analysis and how its advocates perceived transfer in the heyday of behaviourism and structuralism. An account of this historical background entails the arguments for and against the legitimate link between Contrastive Analysis and Bilingualism at one end, and the identification of the 'new' phase of the former at another. The discussion moves onto the psychological basis of Contrastive Analysis by introducing exemplified outlines of transfer paradigms, habit formation, and potential errors. Within the linguistic basis of Contrastive Analysis, the concept of interlingual level shift is clarified, and, along Lado's original parameters, the cultural variable is reconsidered from the viewpoint of speech acts. Further, the validity of how both surface structure and deep structure seek to determine the magnitude of transfer effects is intentionally questioned through the constant tertium comparationis. Finally, referring to the changing climates across history and the appearance of the generative-cognitive model, the discussion illustrates that the theoretical criticisms voiced against the behavioural-structural model led, in fact, to a severe devaluation of Contrastive Analysis and, subsequently, of its notion of language transfer.

The second chapter gives a brief account of Error Analysis in its conventional sense and mentions some of the criticisms forwarded against its limitations. Following this, the resurgence of Error Analysis, whose ultimate rationale has been buttressed by the generative-cognitive model, is approached in terms of Corder's valuable insights into the learner's
errors and the distinction between 'errors' and 'mistakes'. As a continuation of the theoretical criticisms launched against Contrastive Analysis, the chapter reviews some of the practical research which, under the guise of Error Analysis, proved that many of the attested errors could not be predicted on the basis of linguistic difference. In its claim to account for such errors, Error Analysis caused several researchers (e.g. Dulay and Burt) to adopt extremely negative attitudes towards Contrastive Analysis and to minimize the role of the L1 in L2-learning. Thus, attempts were made to identify different types of errors and these will be chronologically schematized. However, the discussion shows that, despite the contradictory relationship between Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis, a combination of the two is necessary for more reasonable analyses of language transfer. Hence, as a vindication of Contrastive Analysis, Schachter's argument is outlined and, in refutation of some constructs implemented by Error Analysis, Richards' approach to intralingual errors is re-examined by an attempted analysis of several interlingual identifications. Next, for more precise judgement in the study of interlingual identifications, the re-oriented position of the constant Translation Equivalence discussed by James is highlighted. The chapter finishes with a reconsideration of the major categories of errors and identifies those which are the main concern of this thesis.

The insights put forward into the study of errors have given rise to an exciting line of research, collectively known as Interlanguage. Chapter Three explains this development in detail by reference to four designations (i) Corder's notion of idiosyncratic dialect, (ii) Nemser's concept of approximative system, (iii) Selinker's hypothesis of interlanguage system, and (iv) Dulay and Burt's theory of creative construction. These designations are considered from two different but related perspectives. Firstly, from a L2-perspective where idiosyncratic dialect and approximative system are reviewed by illustrating the similarities and differences between their characteristics and sub-systems. Then, the approach adopted by both Corder and Nemser to the analysis of language transfer is clarified and exemplified. Secondly, from a learner-perspective in which interlanguage system and creative construction are dealt with in a rather detailed and modified configuration. Hence, the chapter investigates in detail and by exemplification the potential for language transfer in the light of both Selinker's views and the counter-criticisms levelled at Dulay and Burt's
approach to the study of transfer 'goofs'. In a series of gradual revitalization that the transfer mechanism has undergone, the chapter concludes with the reaffirmation of such a mechanism as one significant issue in interlanguage research.

Chapter Four draws on the earlier works from which the notion of crosslinguistic influence has grown, and traces its development in current thinking about language transfer. Hence, three aspects of language loss are maintained in this scheme: (1) Newmark's ignorance hypothesis and its revival by Krashen in terms of the monitor model, (2) Schachter's avoidance hypothesis and the empirical corroboration by Kleinmann and others to account for some of the 'invisible' areas of language transfer, and (3) the concept of psychotypology which is associated with the work of Kellerman and supported by researchers like Wode and Zobl among others. The discussion moves onto the treatment of crosslinguistic influence in terms of language process. By reference to Ringbom's most recent contributions, various aspects of crosslinguistic influence are considered both in production and in comprehension. Further, for a deeper understanding of the internal mechanisms incorporating into the 'transfer load', the interaction between comprehension and production is described in relation to the important questions of transfer which concern the magnitude of crosslinguistic influence on L2-learning. Finally, the chapter finishes with an enunciation of three provisional hypotheses for testing the value of Arabic transfer at the three linguistic levels: phonology, syntax, and semantics (lexical choice). Throughout the discussion of all the interlingual identifications cited in Part One (actual, as selected from the concrete data, and predicted, where appropriate), various tentative proposals are put forward to provide new information on the linguistic behaviour of the Syrian-Arab learner specifically.

In Part Two which forms the empirical research of this thesis, the fifth chapter begins with a brief historical account of Arabic, the LI of the learners under discussion, and the relationship between its two varieties: the Classical and the Colloquial Since Syrian Colloquial Arabic constitutes a sub-variety of the latter, the regional dialects of Syria are classified into four main dialects representing the home dialects of the learners. Again, the learners' educational background and the method of data collection are clarified. To avoid possible confusion, the linguistic terms as intended in the present study are
defined in relation to the three hypotheses introduced at the end of Part One. Finally, the chapter makes some preliminary remarks on these hypotheses in order to explore them within a particular approach to the analysis of Arabic transfer.

Chapter Six discusses in detail a selection of the spoken interlanguage data collected from a group of Syrian-Arab adult learners of English in Dublin. By recourse to most of the transfer-related issues reviewed in Part One, the potential for Arabic-influence (Standard Arabic, Colloquial Arabic, or a mixture of both) is scrutinized in terms of the three linguistic subcomponents defined in Chapter Five. Each of these linguistic subcomponents is classified according to its own taxonomy, which relates to the specific nature of the selected interlanguage data. Various manifestations of Arabic transfer (negative and positive) are, then, demonstrated along two distinct dimensions: language process and language product. In addition, the analysis explores some attested identifications which shed light on what is termed L1-error transfer, and some others which are said to be a reflection of both Arabic-based transfer (interlingual solution) and English-based transfer (intralingual solution) since Arabic transfer does not always operate on its own. Therefore, given the unique nature of the learners' LI, it is believed that this kind of analysis contributes to virtually untouched questions about the Arab learner's entire linguistic system in general.

In Chapter Seven, the final chapter, the three provisional hypotheses stated at the end of Chapter Four and taken into preliminary account in Chapter Five, are reconsidered by reference to the conclusions drawn from the discussion of the selected interlanguage data. By focusing on the development of receptive competence in listening and reading as a good basis for productive skills (particularly speaking), several implications are, then, suggested for teaching English to Arab learners specifically. In conclusion, the view that L1-experience constitutes one of the pivotal strategies underlying L2-learning (and, thus, cannot be looked upon as an inhibiting factor) will entail some pedagogical remarks on L1-utilization from two interdependent perspectives: a learning perspective and a teaching one. Chapter Seven is followed by the appendix in which the possible L2-equivalents, or sets of equivalents, of all the interlingual identifications (cited and analyzed in Chapter Six) are listed consecutively within the same numbers.
PART ONE

The Theory of Transfer
Generally speaking, the theory of transfer assumes that the learning of a previous task will influence the learning of a subsequent and similar task. This assumption was derived from the general learning theory of behaviourism and adopted by the proponents of *Contrastive Analysis* (CA), who regarded language transfer as a natural phenomenon in L2-learning.

The first section of this chapter will consider the history of CA under which its reliability in applied linguistics will be approached. In addition, the relationship between CA and bilingualism, and the arguments for and against the historical link between the two approaches will be outlined. Next, the 'new' direction of CA, which started in the mid 1950s, will be clarified.

The second section will be taken up by a consideration of the psychological basis of CA. From a behavioural standpoint, such a psychological basis is formulated by the general principles of transfer. Hence, Osgood's layout of transfer paradigms will be charted. In addition, the two central issues habit formation and potential errors will be discussed.

The third section will specifically probe the linguistic aspects of CA. From a structural standpoint, the three linguistic levels phonology, syntax and lexis will be considered within the concept of *interlingual level shift*. Then, the cultural level, which has not received much attention, will be emphasized along the line of Lado's original parameters, and maintained in terms of *speech acts*. Next, the validity of the two levels surface structure and deep structure will be checked for determining the magnitude of transfer effects through the constant *tertium comparationis* (TC).
The fourth and final section will touch on the theoretical criticisms levelled at the behavioural-structural model within the L1-acquisition literature and trace the subsequent criticisms forwarded against the CA-constructs, which have resulted in a devaluation of transfer within the L2-acquisition literature. A multitude of examples from Arabic and English along the line of both actual/predicted errors and actual/predicted utterances will be cited and analysed elsewhere.

1.1 The History of CA-Research

Contrastive Linguistics or Contrastive Analysis (CA) dates back to the 1940s when structural linguistics and behavioural psychology were strongly influential in the United States specifically. It is said to have been developed as one of the three major types of comparative studies—the other two being Comparative Historical Linguistics and Comparative Typological Linguistics—in order to determine the differences and similarities between two or more languages (Fisiak, 1981b:1). Three topics are put forward in this section: the place of CA in linguistics, the relationship between CA and bilingual studies, and the 'new' direction of the CA-Hypothesis.

1.1.1 CA's Reliability in Linguistics

It has been argued that CA is a 'hybrid' linguistic enterprise, that is, the product of the two schools—structuralism and behaviourism. To begin with, a consideration might be taken up with the provisional definition of CA introduced by Carl James as follows:

CA is a linguistic enterprise aimed at producing inverted (i.e., contrastive, not comparative) two-valued typologies (a CA is always concerned with a pair of languages), and founded on the assumption that languages can be compared.

(James, 1980:3, original emphasis)

Here, the term 'two-valued typologies' specifies the main procedure of CA. Such an enterprise involves two language systems (typically L1 and L2) to be contrasted rather than compared because, as the term contrastive implies, CA is more interested in the differences between L1 and L2 than in their similarities. James has allocated the
above definition in terms of three criteria. Along the first criterion, the writer restates Sampson (1975 4) by making a distinction between two broad approaches to linguistics: firstly, the generalist approach which considers the general phenomenon of human language and is intended to increase our knowledge of what this phenomenon is. Secondly, the particularist approach which deals with individual languages as examples representing that general phenomenon in particular forms. In this context, James argues that CA is neither generalist nor particularist, but rather it sways in an intermediate position between the two extremes (James, 1980 2).

The second criterion is that in modern linguistics, there are two methods of study: comparative and non-comparative. As James restates Ellis (1966), comparative linguistics is generally taken up with the analysis of the structural correspondences between languages in order to classify them into general types. This approach is called typological linguistics whose ultimate aim is to study the universal aspects of human language. In other words, all languages converge at certain common points which then allow linguists to state a degree of comparability, regardless of the individuality of any language. On the other hand, Non-comparative linguistics studies one, or each, language in isolation. It tends to specify the idiosyncratic properties of the language in question and to explore its inherent 'genius' which might help the investigator to scrutinize how the speakers of such a language are endowed with mental and cognitive uniqueness. In this respect, James points out that CA is as concerned with the comparability of languages as it is with the immanent genius of the language under its purview (James, 1980 1-2). However, CA does not address itself to classification with which typological linguistics is concerned. Rather, CA is interested in differences as well as in similarities between a 'pair' of languages, which, in most cases, constitutes a given L1 and a given L2.

The third criterion refers to De Saussure's dichotomy of synchronic and diachronic. He expounded the distinction as follows: "Everything that relates to the static side of our science is synchronic, everything that has to do with evolution is diachronic." (De Saussure, 1959 81, quoted by James, 1980 2, emphasis added) Here, synchronic linguistics coincides with typological linguistics in that both approaches study living languages and classify them into general types, regardless of their history. In other words, languages are classified according to
their present-day features. It follows that CA is not theoretically committed to synchronic linguistics because, as the term synchrony implies, languages are compared in terms of their static phenomena. On the contrary, CA is to be viewed as diachronic, since both approaches (CA and diachrony) deal with the evolutionary and dynamic status of language. While diachrony refers to language change in the phylogenetic sense (that is, it pertains to span generations and centuries), CA is a type of diachronic interlingual linguistics in the ontogenetic sense in that CA investigates language transition within the individual (the L2-learner).

James mentions three branches of interlingual linguistics of which CA is one. The other two branches are Translation Theory which deals with text conversion, and Error Analysis (EA) which has been adduced to examine the language transition of a monolingual learning to be bilingual (James, 1980). It appears that both CA and EA belong to the same type of diachronic interlingual study (cf chapter 2). In addition, the question of language transition, or language instability, has been profoundly theorized by the proponents of Interlanguage (IL) research (cf chapter 3).

The purpose of CA is, therefore, twofold: theoretical and applied. Theoretical CA-based research undertakes an exhaustive account of semantico-syntactic and phonological aspects of pairs of languages to "determine how and which elements are comparable," and to define "such notions as congruence, equivalence, correspondence, etc" (Fisiak, 1981b). Applied or practical CA-studies concern a selective comparison drawn from the theoretical research to show how a given universal category of the LI is realized in the L2, and to serve specific purposes such as pedagogy, bilingual analysis, translation, and so on (Fisiak, 1981b, Sharwood-Smith, 1981, Sajavaara, 1981).

It has been pointed out that the idea of CA is not very recent. In fact, CA has roots which date further back than even the 1940s. This can be seen from the first published works which were predominantly theoretical. For instance, Grandgent (1892), Vietor (1894), Passy (1912), Baudouin de Courtenay (1912), Bojorodickij (1915), and so on (Fisiak, 1981b). All the above works, however, did not seriously investigate the question of a type of CA whose ultimate concern is to predict the areas where L2-learning is influenced to a certain extent by the previous knowledge of the LI. Thus, as Nickel states, the problem of LI-influence was traditionally recognized to a large extent in terms of individual words or idioms (Nickel, 1971b). Furthermore, Singleton
(1981 2, 1987 28) quotes from Postgate to demonstrate that such individual items, when transferred from one language onto another, may cause different psychological impacts upon the receiver. Postgate wrote

[ ] on one occasion the mild expression *demander une explication* used in the French diplomatic note gave dire offence to the Government of the United States because it looked like 'to demand an explanation', while the official English Translation of the Allied Note answering Germany's first offer of peace in January 1917, renders *prétendu* as 'pretended' where it clearly means, as generally, 'alleged' [ ] A few years before the war a German contributed to the daily press a series of articles, written on the whole in excellent English, in the course of which he had occasion to observe that *Germany* was a formidable enemy (Ger *Feind*). What he wrote and the newspaper published was the German was a dangerous *fiend* [ ] It is commonly reported that in the Great War an Anglican prelate concluded an address to French soldiers with the prayer 'Que Dieu vous blesse' (Postgate, 1922 48f, original emphasis)

Moreover, Singleton points out that "the grammar and vocabulary of the learner's L1 will have a bearing on the difficulties posed when he encounters a different language" (Singleton, 1981 1, emphasis added). Here, he refers to another purpose of CA, that is, the identification of possible difficulties created by the L1 when the L2 is being performed. The ultimate tenet put forward by the early contrastivists was, therefore, to determine ease and difficulty "Those structures that are similar will be easy[ ] Those structures that are different will be difficult" (Lado, 1957 59, emphasis added). Put more clearly, those L2-structures which coincide with corresponding L1-structures are assimilated by the learner with great ease as a result of positive transfer, whereas contrasting structures create considerable difficulties and cause errors as a result of negative transfer or 'interference' between two contrasting languages (cf Ellis, 1985 22, Klein, 1986 25). Therefore, the role of the L1 was first seen in terms of the theory of transfer which was derived from the general learning theory of behaviourism (cf section 1 2 below) CA, then, started seriously in the 1940s, and Charles Christopher Fries was one of the first researchers who adopted the more systematic study of the notion of transfer in order to assert language teaching materials based upon the procedures of CA. He pointed out in an oft-quoted excerpt:
The most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner

(Fries, 1945:9, oft-quoted)

So, it can be seen that this 'scientific description' was demanded by the rigorous tradition of both behavioural psychology and structural linguistics for the investigation of the relevance of the 'new' approach to foreign language teaching at the time. The incentive to such a description was pedagogic, and the two slogans "language is a set of habits" and "languages are different" were set up by traditional contrastivists to surmount the difficulties created by negative transfer (Moulton, 1961:24f). The reason for setting up these two slogans was that, in the United States, there were urgent needs for language programmes to be inaugurated due to military requirements at the time of the Second World War (Moulton, 1961:32). Thus, the 'new' approach needed both scientifically and descriptively a relatively well-established analysis of a given pair of languages.

1.1.2 CA's Relation to Bilingualism

In the course of bilingual studies in the 1950s, especially those of Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1953, 1956), there seems to have been a historical link between CA and bilingualism. Although Weinreich and Haugen had worked on the linguistic integration of immigrants to the United States, Lado, who is one of the first proponents of CA, pointed out that their studies supported to a large extent the experimental findings concerning the notion of transfer. Lado wrote:

A practical confirmation of the validity of our assumption has come from the work of linguists who study the effect of close contact between languages in bilingual situations. They report that many linguistic distortions heard among bilinguals correspond to describe differences in the languages involved

(Lado, 1957:1, emphasis added)

However, researchers like Dulay and Burt were sceptical about the truth of such a link between CA and bilingualism. In a critical account of CA, Dulay and Burt raised the questions of directionality and familiarity in both types. As far as directionality is concerned, they claimed that bilingualism, unlike CA, studied interference effects of
the L2 upon the production of the L1. In other words, bilingualism is concerned with the direction (L2 ----> L1), whereas CA works the other way round within the opposite direction (L1 ----> L2). Dulay and Burt supported their caveat by quoting from Haugen who, they claimed, had determined the direction of bilingualism in the following way: "it is the language of the learner that is influenced, not the language he learns" (Haugen, 1956: 370, quoted by Dulay and Burt, 1974a: 102, re-emphasized by Dulay et al., 1982: 99).

With regard to familiarity, Dulay and Burt referred to Weinreich: "those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language" (Weinreich, 1953: 1, quoted by Dulay and Burt, 1974a: 102, re-emphasized by Dulay et al., 1982: 99). By analogy, they linked their objection to the fact that bilingualism is concerned with interference due to 'familiarity' with both languages, so that interference, according to them, is a sociolinguistic phenomenon which refers to language interaction such as linguistic borrowing and code switching. The former is by definition "the attempt by a speaker to reproduce in one language, patterns which he has learned in another" (Haugen, 1956: 363), and the latter "involves the rapid and momentary shifting from one language into another" (Dulay et al., 1982: 114f). On the other hand, CA, Dulay and Burt argued, is concerned with interference due to 'unfamiliarity' with the L2, thus interference is a psycholinguistic phenomenon which refers to the effects of the old habits of the L1 upon the learning of the new habits of a subsequent L2 (Dulay and Burt, 1974a: 102, Dulay et al., 1982: 98f). After a detailed argument against the link between CA and bilingualism, the authors concluded:

The CA notion of interference [as opposed to the bilingual notion of interference] applies to quite different circumstances: the less bilingual speakers are, the more interference there will be when they attempt to communicate with speakers of the target language. (Dulay et al., 1982: 100)

On the question of directionality, James has strongly asserted that neither CA nor bilingualism conceive of interference in one direction only. As for CA, he argues that it has the right to emphasize interference in the direction (L1 ----> L2) to be the principal concern because CA, in its pedagogical applications, is interested in L2-teaching not L1-teaching (James, 1971, reprint 95). Further, the
other direction of interference (L2---->L1), James adds, is not hard to find in the CA-based literature. For instance, Jakobovits, in an analysis of the general principles of transfer, described this direction by coining the term backlash interference, that is, backward interference where a subsequent L2-knowledge influences the learner's L1-production. Thus backlash interference is "expected to be stronger at later stages of L2-learning and to be minimal at the beginning" (Jakobovits, 1969 70, 1970 203, quoted by James, 1971, reprint 95). Recently Py's contribution has demonstrated some of the effects of L2 on L1 in terms of an ad hoc description of attrition in L1-competence caused by the L2. He points out that L1-competence "remains subject to alteration through the effects of positive retroaction" (Py, 1986 166, emphasis added). The term retroaction will be mentioned within transfer paradigms (cf. section 1 2 1)

As for bilingualism, James, in an argument against Dulay and Burt, has also denied that bilingualism comprises interference in the direction (L2---->L1) only. The author restates Weinreich who made no distinct issue of either direction "deviation from the norms of either language" (Weinreich, 1953 1, re-quoted by James, 1980 9, emphasis added). In other words, Weinreich was referring to interference effects in both directions (L1<---->L2). Moreover, Weinreich was conscious of the fact that, in bilingual situations, the magnitude of interference is greatest in the direction (L1---->L2) which is the main concern of CA. In this context, Weinreich stated "the language which has been learned first, or the mother-tongue, is in a privileged position to resist interference" (Weinreich, 1953 88, quoted by James, 1980 9). So, it becomes clear that both CA and bilingualism treat interference effects in the two directions (L1---->L2) and (L1<---->L2). As a consequence, the historical link between the two approaches appears to be legitimate, since they apparently have something in common as far as language transfer is concerned.

With respect to the question of familiarity, it seems misleading to make a global paradox between a bilingual as familiar and a L2-learner as unfamiliar with the L2. To begin with, Crystal points out that "Definitions of bilingualism reflect assumptions about the degree of proficiency people must achieve before they qualify as bilingual" (Crystal, 1985 33). Here, the writer refers to the perfect type of bilingualism which is extremely rare (this term will be discussed
presently) As it is possible to find different levels of L1-knowledge possessed by different monolinguals who all know their L1 internally, it is also possible to find different degrees of L2-proficiency achieved by different bilinguals who know the L2 externally, that is, they have acquired the L2-system after their internalizing the basics of the L1-system. In this sense, a L2-learner is bilingual as well, since he speaks two languages but with a certain degree of L2-knowledge. Similarly, the learner's knowledge of the L2 is by definition external. The distinction between internal and external knowledge is similar to the distinction between pure and non-pure knowledge respectively (cf chapter 3, section 323). Above all, 'familiarity with a language' implies that the language in question is more known externally than it is internally as is the case of a monolingual. It seems, therefore, a L2-learner and a bilingual are distinct from the monolingual in that both of the former share this characteristic of external knowledge. Consequently, both the L2-learner and the bilingual can be viewed as ostensibly familiar with the L2-system even if the degree of L2-proficiency may differ between the two.

Furthermore, Dulay and Burt pointed to the fact that Weinreich and Haugen were describing "the languages and dialects of communities". By quoting Nemser, they asserted that the CA-Hypothesis, on the contrary, "refers to the speech of individuals 'who do not usually form speech communities' (Nemser, 1971 b, reprint 59)" (Dulay and Burt, 1974a 103). In reply, Singleton has strongly criticized their misinterpretation of Nemser's statement. Singleton reports "Immigrant dialects were seen by Nemser as closely related to the systems developed by individual learners [that is, the approximative systems (APSs) (cf chapter 3, section 312)], indeed as evidence for such systems (Nemser, 1971 b, reprint 57)" (Singleton, 1981 17f, original emphasis).

It follows from the above that there are two types of bilingualism: societal bilingualism which addresses itself to the study of the possession of two languages by one community, and individual bilingualism which forms the major concern of CA since it refers to the individual's competence in two languages. However, the central difference between bilingualism and CA is that the former draws on the synchronic or static possession of two languages by either a community or an individual, whereas CA, as discussed in the previous section, studies the dynamic process whereby a monolingual becomes bilingual.
other words, CA, being a form of diachronic interlingual study, is concerned with what James calls an individual's bilingualization in order to indicate such a dynamic process (James, 1980 8) The same writer uses Diebold's (1961) terms to mark the difference between the two approaches: extant bilingualism and incipient bilingualism While the former refers to the main concern of bilingualism, the latter represents another alternative for the concern of CA (James, 1980 51)

Dulay and Burt, then, when making a radical distinction between CA and bilingualism, insinuated that the perfect type of the latter was in question At the outset of their paper, they made the distinction explicit by L2-acquisition (which is, according to them, the only concern of CA) they meant "the acquisition of another language after having acquired the basics of the L1, whereas bilingual acquisition is the acquisition of two languages simultaneously" (Dulay and Burt, 1974 a 95, emphasis added) Implicit in their distinction is that, like a monolingual's L1-knowledge, but unlike a L2-learner's L2-knowledge, the bilingual's L2-knowledge is characterized by an internal nature In this context, James mentions Krzeszowski's term of ideal bilingualism which indicates that the bilingual's competence in two languages is balanced or equal (Krzeszowski, 1976 59f) In such a case, James argues, interference would not exist and the problems of L1-L2 mismatch would have been solved Therefore, ideal bilingualism has nothing to do with CA because the latter addresses itself to such problems as well as to the imbalanced output resulting from the dominance of one of the two languages over the other (James, 1980 51) It follows that Krzeszowski's assumption remains a theoretical ideal, since ideal bilingualism or, as Lyons states, "perfect bilingualism, if it exists at all, is extremely rare" (Lyons, 1981b 282, emphasis added). Ideally, this indicates that Dulay and Burt's radical distinction is not at all absurd, but in practice it is refutable because perfect bilingualism hardly exists

Apart from the 'idealized' concept of bilingualism, the two languages in question are likely to form a logical dichotomy one will frequently be dominant, typically referred to as the L1, and the other tends to be subordinate, suggesting a subsequent L2 The performance of the latter, as Lyons points out, involves a process of translation from the former "at a fairly superficial, though not necessarily conscious, level of the psychological programming of utterances" (Lyons, 1981 b 282) As a consequence, the interaction between domination and
subordination constitutes part of CA's concern. After all, CA has to do with at least one sector of bilingualism, namely, the dynamic side of individual bilingualism which leads to emphasize the legitimacy of the historical link between the two approaches.

1.1.3 The New Phase of CA

Whatever the arguments about CA's relationship to bilingual studies, especially those of Weinreich and Haugen, they seem to have given a considerable impetus to Lado whose book *Linguistics Across Cultures* was published in 1957. This work, in fact, has constituted a turning-point in the history of CA and, according to James, the 'new' direction of CA started with Lado (James, 1980:8). Along the constructs of CA, Lado treated the problem of language transfer both in production and in comprehension, and encouraged foreign language teachers to focus their teaching strategies upon the areas of difficulty that would be created by negative transfer or interference from the LI.

Lado developed Fries' suggestion (cf. section 1.1.1) "by comparing systematically the language and culture to be learned with the native language and culture of the student" (Lado, 1957:vi, emphasis added). Here, the writer, by including the cultural variable, extended the comparison of the L1-L2 corpus which was first suggested to be made solely at purely linguistic levels (cf. section 1.3.2 below). The fundamental assumption of Lado's book was that

[ ] individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture—both productively when attempting to speak the language and to act in the culture, and receptively when attempting to grasp and understand the language and the culture as practiced by natives (Lado, 1957:2, emphasis added)

Therefore, Lado, as well as his followers, looked upon language transfer as a natural phenomenon, and included culture as an indispensable variable within the whole systematic comparison. He seems to have accepted the behaviouristic paradigms of transfer theory, since he viewed the forms and meanings of the native language (LI) and culture as old habits which would get in the way of both producing and receiving the new habits of the foreign language (L2) and culture. As noted above,
the purpose of such a detailed comparison was required to initially identify the structural similarities and differences between L1 and L2. Similarities, it was proposed, will lead to ease of transfer and thus transfer functions positively, whereas differences will create learning difficulty because, in this case, transfer functions negatively in L2-learning (cf. Lado, 1957 59, section 111) It is, therefore, the structural differences which Lado wanted language teachers to focus attention upon, since these differences would constitute "the chief sources of difficulty in learning a second language" (Lado, 1964 21, emphasis added) Lado's proposal, in fact, gained approval from researchers such as Banathy et al who claimed that the language teacher should be prepared to teach L2-learners "the sum of the differences established by the CA" They expounded their statement as follows

The change that has to take place in the language behaviour of a foreign language student can be equated with the differences between the structure of the student's native language and culture and that of the target language and culture (Banathy et al, 1966 37)

It follows from the above that language teaching materials were, in the heyday of the structural-behavioural model, designed on the basis of CA-procedures which, according to Whitman, were classified into four different types

(1) Description which was recommended within the framework of formal grammar in that the opposing systematic structures of the L1 and L2 should be explicitly described by the linguist or the teacher who is highly competent in the two languages

(ii) Selection which entailed selecting particular linguistic items, rules and subsystems for contrast, since it is impossible to draw a comparison between the whole systems of the L1 and L2

(iii) Contrast which, by describing one category of the L1 and its linguistic distribution in the L2, relied on the validity of the reference points made by the linguist or language teacher

(iv) Prediction which, on the basis of the three procedures, concerned the anticipation of the L2-errors learners would make or the difficulty they would have in L2-learning (Whitman, 1970 193f)

There were other researchers such as Stockwell et al (1965) and Prator (1967) who formulated a set of paradigms known as a hierarchy of difficulty for arriving at possible predictions about potential errors (cf. section 123 below) These researchers constructed a hierarchy of
difficulty for phonological systems, grammatical structures and functional/semantic dimensions by reference to the three types of language transfer: positive transfer, negative transfer, and neutral transfer (cf. Brown 1980: 149f). Selinker (1969), based on Selinker (1966), defined these three types as follows:

Positive language transfer is identified as a process which occurs whenever there is a statistically significant predominance in the L1 of one of two alternative linguistic entities, which is then paralleled by such predominance in an analysis of the attempted production of a L2, the predominant entity being a nonerror since it concurs with an experimentally established norm of that L2.

Negative language transfer is identified as a process which occurs whenever there is a statistically significant predominance in the L1 of one of two alternative linguistic entities, which is then paralleled by such predominance in an analysis of the attempted production of a L2, the predominant entity being an error since it deviates from an experimentally established norm of that L2.

Neutral language transfer is identified as a process which occurs whenever there is no statistically significant predominance in the L1 of either of two alternative linguistic entities, which is then paralleled by a lack of predominance in an analysis of the attempted production of a L2, one alternative linguistic entity being a nonerror since it concurs with an experimentally established norm of that L2 and the other being an error since it deviates from that norm.

(Selinker, 1969; reprint: 50-51; emphasis added)

These are, therefore, the basic notions of the transfer of linguistic entities from one language to another, which, as mentioned in the preceding sections, were central to discussion in the literature of two fields of endeavour: bilingual studies (Weireich and Haugen) and applied linguistics/teaching methodology (Lado and his followers). Such notions were essentially derived from the behaviourists' general concept of transfer which was, in fact, the psychological basis of CA. The next section will describe such a basis by reference to Osgood's transfer paradigms and Skinner's views on habit formation.

1.2 The Psychological Basis of CA

As noted above, Lado accepted the behaviouralistic paradigms of the theory of transfer, since he believed that learners tended to transfer the formal features of their L1 onto their L2-utterances. Clearly, therefore, the theory of transfer, which forms part of the general learning theory of behaviourism, can be conceived to essentially
formulate the psychological basis of CA. This approach was exploited by
some educationalists to supply a methodology for education in general. In
this section, three issues are to be considered: Osgood's transfer
paradigms, Skinner's views on habit formation, and the notion of
potential errors.

1.2.1 Transfer Paradigms

In the literature of behavioural psychology, several definitions
of the term *transfer* were introduced to indicate fundamentally the same
concept.

(i) "the effect of a *preceding activity* upon the learning of a given
task" (Osgood, 1953: 520, original emphasis),

(ii) "the impact of prior experience upon current learning" (Ausubel,
1963: 28, quoted by Selinker, 1969, reprint: 34), and

(iii) "the hypothesis that the learning of task A will affect the
subsequent learning of task B" (Ellis, 1965; Jakobovitz, 1970:
188, quoted by James, 1980: 11).

It seems, therefore, that the undefined nature of transfer in
linguistic terms led traditional contrastivists and psycholinguists to
adapt their views on language transfer from this general concept. Thus
'preceding activity', or 'prior experience' (task A), was presumably
identified with the LI, whereas 'given task' or 'current learning' (task
B), was said to be the L2. Essentially, in order to learn a certain
task, two entities are to be associated from the point of view of
behaviourists; these are a stimulus (S) and a response (R). The above
definitions of transfer were, in fact, derived from Osgood's (1949)
insights into human learning. He illustrated the phenomenon of transfer
within three paradigms as visualized in Figure 1.

As Figure 1 illustrates, there is a sequential series of three
learning tasks, and each of the three paradigms (A, B, C) denotes that
Task 1 and Task 3 are identical. There appear two concepts involved in
this scheme. Firstly, *proaction* within which the effects of Task 1 upon
Task 2 are to be treated. It is argued that proaction, in this sense,
is the central concern of CA, since Task 1 and Task 2, as mentioned
Paradigm Task 1 Task 2 Task 3 T-Value
A S1—R1 S2—R1 S1—R1 +T
B S1—R1 S1—R2 S1—R1 -T
C S1—R1 S2—R2 S1—R1 T

PROACTION
RETROACTION

Figure 1 Osgood's transfer paradigms

above, were looked upon as the acquisition of the L1 and the learning, or acquisition, of the L2 respectively. Clearly, therefore, proaction is interested in transfer effects within the direction (L1->L2). Secondly, retroaction, on the other hand, indicates the effects of an interpolated task upon a previously learned task. Here, CA, when being used for pedagogic purposes, is not concerned with the retroactive effects of transfer. Thus, as the term implies, "could handle effects of L2 upon performance in L1" (James, 1980 15) In other words, retroaction addresses itself to bilingual studies which deal with transfer effects in the direction (L1<--L2) as discussed above (cf section 1.1.2) By T-value Osgood means 'transfer value' in the sense that each paradigm has a certain transfer value, that is, either positive transfer (+T) or negative transfer (-T) Thus, a consideration of each paradigm might be useful within its applicability to the situation where Arabic is the L1 and English is the L2

PARADIGM A

L1 L2
S1—R1 S2—R1 +T

Paradigm A is concerned with the formal similarities, where there are similarities, between L1 and L2. Although the stimulus (S1) in the L1 is different from the stimulus (S2) in the L2, they share the same response (R1) in both languages. The stimulus (S), here, represents the intended communicative need, or function, of the utterance in question, while the response (R) refers to its syntactic realization in both languages. Therefore, the hypothesis of paradigm A runs as follows: 

The value of transfer will be positive, if the L1 and L2 employ a pair
of structurally similar utterances though they may serve different communicative functions.

For instance, unlike the case in English, the formation of questions in Arabic does not normally demand subject-verb inversion. However, if a WH-question in English, for example, 'What does he want?' is preceded by a phrase such as 'I know' or 'that is', then this question does not require subject-verb inversion and the resultant utterance. 'I know what he wants' would mark an indirect statement about a question. In this case, both English and Arabic coincide in the structural properties of non-inverted questions, since the Arabic question, whether it is preceded by a phrase such as verbal clause (VC), or not, does not involve inversion. While the English resultant utterance suggests an indirect statement about a question, the Arabic resultant utterance may still be realized as a question. For example:

(1) a [a?rifu ma tha yuri d] (MSA)
b [ba?rif šu bidding] (SCD)
c [ba?rif 1š biri d] (NCD)
d [a?rif šku n yri d] (ECD)

(Lit know (I) what want (he))

Thus, the order of this question type is [verbal clause (VC1) + question particle (QP) + verbal clause (VC2)]. It appears that, in production, the Arabic L1-speaker is familiar with the formal device of the English utterance 'I know what he wants'. Therefore, CA would suggest that he can transfer the Arabic formal device of (1 a-d) and the value would be positive transfer. What the Arabic L1-speaker wants to do is associate such a device with the new function in English. In this context, James points out that the magnitude of the resultant association "reduces as the functional or semantic discrepancy between identical formal devices in L1 and L2 decreases" (James, 1980:16). In comprehension, on the other hand, the Arabic L1-speaker may, upon listening to 'I know what he wants' as a stimulus produced by a native speaker of English, respond to such an utterance as signalling a question, not an indirect statement. If this is the case, then his attention would be more focused on the subordinate clause 'What he wants' than on the main clause 'I know'.

Another example of structural similarity refers to the English WH-questions with (who, what or which) which do not require DO-insertion, particularly when these pronouns function as the subject of a sentence, for example, 'who came?', 'what happened?' Therefore,
questions such as these would be more familiar to the Arabic L1-speaker, since the L1-equivalents do not involve inversion and would always imply direct questions. This indicates that if he happens to transfer the formal device of the L1-equivalent, the resultant value would be completely positive transfer in that both L1 and L2-questions are structurally similar and signal direct questions. Consequently, like the order of the L2-question type, the order of the L1-question type is [question particle (QP) + verbal clause (VC)]. For example

(2) a. [man ja ?a] / [ma tha hadath] (MSA)
b. [mi n ija ] / [šu sa r] (SCD)
c. [minu aja] / [šku n sa r] (ECD)
(Lit. who came (he)?) / (What happened (it)?)

**PARADIGM B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1—R1</td>
<td>S1—R2</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paradoxically, paradigm B is concerned with syntactic differences accompanied by semantic similarities, that is, while the stimulus (S) represents the same communicative function intended by the L1-L2 pair of utterances, the response (R) refers to their different syntactic realizations as (R1) in the L1 and (R2) in the L2. Thus, the hypothesis of paradigm B is as follows:

*The value of transfer will be negative, if the L1 and L2 employ a pair of structurally different utterances though they convey the same intended meaning within the same communicative function.*

For instance, as noted above, Arabic and English employ different structural devices for direct questions. In English the direct WH-question demands DO-insertion and subject-verb inversion when the affirmative sentence has no auxiliary as in 'what does he want?' and only subject-verb inversion when the affirmative sentence has an auxiliary as in 'what can he do?' In Arabic, on the other hand, the equivalent direct question is formulated simply by using the interrogative particle [ma tha ] (MSA), or its SCA-equivalents, followed by the verb inflected according to the pronoun in question. Therefore, like the question type of (2 a-c) above, the order of this question type is [question particle (QP) + verbal clause (VC)]. For example
According to CA, then, the Arabic L1-speaker may face a considerable problem in producing the structure of the English direct question, since DO-insertion and subject-verb inversion exist neither in MSA nor in SCA due to the syntactic realization, that is the verb inflection, in both varieties. In comprehension, however, the magnitude of such a problem may decrease because the Arabic L1-speaker is able to directly recognize the interrogative particle which occurs initially both in English in the form of 'what' and in Arabic in the form of [ma tha] (MSA) or its SCA-equivalents. Consequently, he will realize the interrogative quality of the English utterance and respond accordingly.

Paradigm B also applies to YES/NO questions in English and their counterparts in Arabic. The former involve DO-insertion and subject-verb inversion when the affirmative sentence does not contain an auxiliary as in 'does he want to go?' and only subject-verb inversion when the affirmative sentence contains an auxiliary as in 'can he go?', whereas the latter, the Arabic counterparts, are formulated by using either of the question particles [hal] and [a] in MSA — which are usually dropped in SCA — followed by the verb inflected according to the pronoun in question. Therefore, by looking at the MSA-equivalents in (4a) and (5a) below, the order of this question type appears to follow the same general order [QP([hal]/[a])+VC]. For example:

\[(4)\]
\begin{align*}
a & \text{[hal/a uri du an yath'hab]} & \text{(MSA)} \\
& \text{(Lit QP want (he) to go (he)?)}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
b & \text{[---- biddo ---- yru h]} & \text{(NCD/SCD)}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
c & \text{[---- yr\,d ---- yru h]} & \text{(ECD)}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
& \text{(Lit ---- want (he) ---- go (he)?)}
\end{align*}

\[(5)\]
\begin{align*}
a & \text{[hal/a yasta\,t\,i ?u an yath'hab]} & \text{(MSA)} \\
& \text{(Lit QP can (he) to go (he)?)}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
b & \text{[---- byi\,d\,ir ---- yru h]} & \text{(NCD/SCD/WCD)}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
c & \text{[---- yiq\,dar ---- yru h]} & \text{(ECD)}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
& \text{(Lit ---- can (he) ---- go (he)?)}
\end{align*}

Again, CA would suggest that the Arabic L1-speaker may experience some difficulty in learning L2-questions such as 'does he want to go?' and 'can he go?' due to their application of structural devices different
from those of the L1-counterparts. It is believed, however, that such difficulty seems to be less discernible than the difficulty which would be experienced over the structure of the WH-questions cited above. This may be due to the fact that the co-occurrence of the WH-particle with the remainder of the question makes the distinction between 'what does he want?' as a direct question and 'what he wants' as an indirect statement about a question (when preceded or followed by an embedded sentence) more difficult than the distinction between 'does he want to go?' as a direct question and 'he wants to go' as a declarative statement.

PARADIGM C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1—R1</td>
<td>S2—R2</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As paradigm C illustrates, the realization of both the stimulus (S1) and the response (R1) in the L1 is different from — and therefore cannot be identified with — the L2-counterparts (S2) and (R2) respectively. In such a case, CA does not seem to be sufficiently committed to paradigm C because, as James puts it, "there is no constant, only variables, there are no grounds for comparison" (James, 1980 18, original emphasis). Thus, the relatively slight degree of contrast between the two languages would submit a neutral value (neither positive nor negative) to transfer from one linguistic entity in the L1 to another in the L2.

It appears that, following Selinker's definitions of the three types of transfer (cf. section 1.1.3), positive language transfer and negative language transfer were extrapolated from paradigm A and paradigm B respectively, whereas neutral language transfer was established in terms of paradigm C. Therefore, it is the paradigms A and B which concern the structural similarities and differences between a given pair of languages. Given that there are potential similarities and differences between Arabic and English question types, CA would, on the basis of such paradigms, predict that the former would lead to ease and the latter to difficulty in learning the English question types. Figure 2 tabulates the structural similarities and differences of question types in Arabic and English as cited under the paradigms A and B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type No</th>
<th>ARABIC (MSA)</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>(VCl) + QP + (VC2)</td>
<td>(S1 + V1) + HW + (S2 + V2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH-question preceded by a phrase</td>
<td>[א?רifu ma tha yuri d]</td>
<td><em>I know what he wants</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NO INVERSION)</td>
<td>(NO INVERSION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>QP + (VC)</td>
<td>WH + (VP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH-pronoun functioning as a subject</td>
<td>[man ja ?a]</td>
<td><em>Who came?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NO INVERSION)</td>
<td>(NO INVERSION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>QP + (VC)</td>
<td>WH + DO + (S + V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct WH-questions with DO and AUX</td>
<td>[ma tha yuri d]</td>
<td><em>What does he want?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QP + (VC)</td>
<td>WH + AUX + (S + V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ma tha yaqdiru an yaf'a7al]</td>
<td><em>What can he do?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NO INVERSION)</td>
<td>(INVERSION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>QP ([hal]/[a]) + (VC)</td>
<td>DO + (S + V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES/NO questions with DO and AUX</td>
<td>[hal yuri du an yath'hab]</td>
<td><em>Does he want to go?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QP([hal]/[a]) + (VC)</td>
<td>AUX + (S + V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[hal yastati ?u an yath'hab]</td>
<td><em>Can he go?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NO INVERSION)</td>
<td>(INVERSION)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2** The similarities and differences of question-types in Arabic and English

As Figure 2 illustrates, all question types in Arabic are of the general order [QP + (VC)] whether it is preceded by another verbal clause (VC) or not. In Arabic, VC involves at least a verb and its subject. If, at a surface-structure level, no mention is made of the subject, then the pronoun which stands for the subject is usually implied in the deep structure. Therefore, if the subject of the verb [yuri d] 'want (he)' is not mentioned, then the pronoun [huwa] 'he' would be implied as the latent subject because this verb is already inflected accordingly. This indicates that whether the subject appears or not question formation in Arabic does not require subject-verb inversion. Thus, in order to
function as the subject of a verb like [yuriːd] 'want (he)', a given noun like [zaydon] 'Zaid' (or the implied pronoun [huwa] 'he' standing for it) should follow that verb as in (6 a-b) below. However, if the noun in question precedes the verb, then the former no longer functions as the subject of the verb in question, but rather as the beginning, or subject, of the noun clause (NC) as in (6 c-d) below.

(6) a [yur du zaydon] (declarative) (MSA)
   (Lit want (he) Zaid)
   'Zaid wants'
b [hal yuri du zaydon] (interrogative) (MSA)
   (Lit QP want (he) Zaid?)
   'Does Zaid want?'
c [zaydon yuri du] (declarative) (MSA)
   (Lit Zaid want (he))
   'It is Zaid who wants'
d [hal zaydon yuri du] (interrogative) (MSA)
   (Lit QP Zaid want (he)?)
   'Is it Zaid who wants?'

Given that the question formation of VC in Arabic does not employ inversion, it appears that, in terms of paradigm A, the first two types (Type 1 and Type 2) listed in Figure 2 are said to assign the structural similarity between Arabic and English, whereas, along paradigm B, the second two types (Type 3 and Type 4) constitute the structural difference as far as inversion is concerned.

As noted in the preceding sections, CA is more committed to the structural differences (paradigm B) between LI and L2 than to their similarities, since the former were looked upon as the major source of learning difficulty where the potential for errors could be detected. This was based on the belief that the old habits of the LI would obstruct the learning of the new and different habits of the L2. The following sections will consider the two issues habit formation and potential errors which were central to discussion in behaviouristic thinking about language learning and acquisition.

1.2.2 Habit Formation

Up to the 1960s, behaviouristic views on language and linguistics were predominant. In this context, Lyons summarizes four recognizable principles or tendencies which gave behaviourism its particular impetus at the time (cf Lyons, 1977 121f)
(i) The rejection of mentalism. This rejection was adopted by J.B. Watson (1924) and, in effect, led to the belief that habits could only be scrutinized through observable events. This was applied to the study of language in terms of the rejection of introspection, that is, even internal mental processes such as 'thought' were regarded as instances of inaudible speech behaviour. Consequently, "observable and recordable utterances" were emphasized as well as "their relationship with the immediate situation in which they were produced".

(1) The essential similarity between human and animal behaviour. Such a belief linked behaviourism with evolutionary biology and was supported by scholars such as Morris (1946) "to construct a general theory of semiotics applicable to all natural "signalling-systems" (Lyons, 1977 121).

(11) The tendency to minimize the role of instinct and other innate faculties. This led to stress the acquisition of 'behavioural patterns' within the general process of learning. In other words, "to stress nurture rather than nature" (Lyons, 1977 122).

(iv) The tendency towards mechanism or determinism. This tendency was based on the belief that every event "in the universe is casually determined according to the same physical laws". Such a view caused behaviourists to lay special emphasis upon predictability as "the principal criterion for the evaluation of any behaviour" (Lyons, 1977 122).

It follows from the above that three significant characteristics of habits were identified. First, habits, are observable in Watson's sense of observable events. Second, habits, according to Skinner, can be automatized and self-activated by means of imitation. Third, habits, within the principle of probability, are predictable in that "the presence of a given stimulus raises the probability of occurrence of a given form of response" (Skinner, 1957 82).

Skinner's speculation on habit formation was, in fact, one of the serious attempts to construct a 'neo-behaviouristic' model of linguistic behaviour. His theory of verbal behaviour was an extension of his general theory of learning by operant conditioning, that is, a verbal operant "in which the response is reinforced by a characteristic consequence and is therefore under the functional control of the relevant
conditions of deprivation or aversive stimulation" (Skinner, 1957. 35f). In other words, an operant suggests the "activities which operate upon the environment" as contrasted with the activities "which are primarily concerned with internal economy of the organism" (Skinner, 1957 20). Operant conditioning, therefore, dictates that the organism (that is, the human being) produces a verbal operant or response (for example, a word or an utterance) without necessarily observable stimuli. Such an operant is sustained by reinforcement and conditioned over repeated instances. Thus, verbal behaviour, like any other behaviour, is determined by its consequences, that is, behaviour is maintained when consequences are in the form of reward, whereas it is blocked when consequences are in the form of punishment. For instance, in order to learn 'fox' as a word-form, it has to be associated with the animal in question and established upon its occurrence in utterances that have already been "reinforced by seeing a fox" (Skinner, 1957 88).

There are three major entities which co-exist in the formation of habits. These are the stimulus (S), the response (R) and reinforcement. The relationship between stimulus and response is casual, and their association represents a 'S-R reflex', since the entity (S) represents a 'cause' and the entity (R) its 'effect'. Reinforcement is determined by the environment in which the (S) occurs. Verbal behaviour, then, was assumed to be learned through a series of S-R reflexes, as illustrated by the following formula:

\[(S_1 \rightarrow R_1) \rightarrow (S_2 \rightarrow R_2) \rightarrow (S_3 \rightarrow R_3) \rightarrow \]

As Lyons re-states, "The first word of an utterance is produced as the response (R1) to some external stimulus (S1), the production of (R1) then serves as a stimulus (S2) to which the second word is a response (R2), and so on". To reinforce the association between a given word and its possible successors depends solely upon "the frequency with which they have been associated in the past" (Lyons, 1977 124). Therefore, frequency enables the organism to produce the same (R) and (S) on future occasions.

Up to the 1960s, specifically before Chomsky's (1959) criticism of Skinner's views had its own effects (cf. section 14.1 below), the theory of habit formation was central to the discussion which dominated the research into both L1-acquisition and L2-acquisition. With regard to L1-acquisition research, behaviouralists looked upon the child as an
organism born with, what Brown calls, a mental 'clean slate', that is, the child is born with no notions about the world or about language. Then, he is shaped by environment and gradually conditioned through various schemes of reinforcement Behaviours examined L1-acquisition as an essential part of human behaviour and considered language to be the production of correct responses to stimuli (cf Brown, 1980 18f).

In the course of L2-acquisition research, the applied linguists who were dominated by the behaviourist constructs of L1-acquisition assumed that L2-learning involved the same constructs Consequently, researchers tried to draw direct global analogies between L1-acquisition and L2-acquisition For instance, Stern summarizes the behaviouristic accounts of L2-acquisition He records some of the common assumptions which were made to justify a L2-teaching method on the basis of the behaviouristic approach to L1-acquisition Stern writes

1 In language teaching, we must practise and practise, again and again Just watch a small child learning his L1 He repeats things over and over again During the language-learning stage he practises all the time This is what we must also do when we learn a L2
2 Language learning is mainly a matter of imitation You must be a mimic Just like a small child He imitates everything.
3 First, we practise the separate sounds, then words, then sentences That is the natural order and is therefore right for learning a L2
4 Watch a small child's speech development First he listens, then he speaks Understanding always precedes speaking Therefore, this must be the right order of presenting the skills in a L2
5 A small child listens and speaks and no one would dream of making him read and write Reading and writing are advanced stages of language development The natural order for L1 and L2-learning is listening, speaking, reading, writing
6 You did not have to translate when you were small If you were able to learn your L1 without translation, you should be able to learn a L2 in the same way
7 A small child simply uses language he does not learn formal grammar You don't tell him about verbs and nouns Yet he learns the language perfectly It is equally unnecessary to use grammatical conceptualization in teaching a L2

(Stern, 1970 57f, quoted by Brown, 1980 42)

It should be noted, however, that the so-called behaviourist applied linguists were not the only ones who drew direct analogies between L1 and L2-acquisition There were other researchers such as Dulay and Burt (1974a) who, along the generative-cognitive model, tried to do so in their theory known as the L2-L1 Hypothesis This matter will
be discussed later (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2.2)

These are, therefore, the most significant aspects of habit formation theory within the behaviouristic approach to L1-acquisition and their applicability to the process of L2-acquisition. The following section will consider the notion of 'potential errors' which is mainly based on these behaviouristic aspects.

1.2.3 Potential Errors

Following the three general definitions of transfer recorded above (cf. section 1.2.1), Corder expounded the term with reference to the L2-learning process "learners transfer what they already know about performing one task to performing another and similar task" (Corder, 1973:132). It now becomes clear that the question of LI-influence was encapsulated in the notion of transfer in that L2-learners tend to apply the old habits, or behavioural patterns, of their LI where new habits are needed in L2-performance. According to paradigm A, if both old and new rules coincide, then L2-patterns are easily assimilated as a result of positive transfer or facilitation and therefore errors will not occur. According to paradigm B, on the other hand, if these rules do not coincide, then errors will appear as a result of negative transfer or proactive inhibition, so that "making errors in [the L2] can, in part, be explained by the notion of transfer" (Corder, 1973:132). Therefore, since it was believed that the potential areas of learning difficulty could be explored in terms of paradigm B, CA was taken as a necessary component for the prediction of the potential errors (cf. Hamp, 1968, James, 1971, reprint 90) which were assumed to emerge from the conflict between two different systems (cf. Stockwell, 1968:19).

It seems the case that the global analogies recorded by Stern (1970) in the preceding section dissuade the L2-learner from the process of 'translation' drawn upon his LI (cf. item 6). In other words, to eradicate the negative effects of the LI, the old habits, which might constitute the potential for error making, should be 'forgotten' during L2-learning. This is, of course, far from reality since it is virtually impossible to completely ignore the already existing knowledge of the LI when a given L2 is being learnt (cf. Baddeley, 1972:41).

From a behaviouristic perspective, some applied linguists warned language teachers against the danger of tolerating errors because in such
a way errors would be established as habits. For instance, Brooks stated
that "like sin, error is to be avoided and its influence overcome, but
its presence is to be expected" (Brooks, 1960 56, emphasis added).
Therefore, CA was, at the time, the only possible procedure which
enabled both language teachers to direct classroom practice on the basis
of transfer paradigms and L2-learners to overcome the areas of potential
errors. The presence of errors should, then, be expected and, according
to CA, this could be guarded against through predicting interference or
interlingual errors (cf chapter 2, section 2 4 1). It is, therefore,
the psychological paradigms of CA which were proposed to account for the
conditions and circumstances of these errors. This is because a mere
linguistic description is insufficient to identify which errors are due
to transfer from the LI and which others are not. Naturally, not all
LI-categories will cause errors (cf Corder, 1973 284), since there are
other types of errors known as intralingual errors which do not correlate
with LI-influence (cf chapter 2, section 2 4 2).

The theory of habit formation provided a theoretical account of
how the old habits of the LI would intrude into L2-learning/acquisition
and the errors, that would appear as a result of this intrusion, where
attributed to the structural differences between LI and L2. Therefore,
within the procedures of CA (cf Whitman, section 11 3), a comparison
of the two languages could be made to identify their structural
differences and to predict areas of potential errors.

From a cognitive perspective, potential errors are likely to
emerge because the grammatical apparatus of the LI — which is programmed
in the learner's mind — would interfere with the process of L2-learning
(cf Bright and McGregor, 1970 236). Ellis calls this apparatus a
realization device of the LI (the generative-cognitive model will be
discussed in more detail throughout the next chapters). For instance, in
the domain of syntax, a French learner of English may express the idea of
being cold as *'I have cold'. Such an error may occur due to the
syntactic realization of the structural device governing the equivalent
French utterance 'J'ai froid' (cf Ellis, 1985 22).

In the domain of phonology, Lehn and Slager pointed out that
Egyptian learners of English might find it difficult to produce some
English contrasts such as 'thistle - this'll', 'ether - either', 'think-
sink' and 'breathe - breeze'. One possible interpretation is that the
English phonemes /θ/ and /ð/ do not usually occur in the colloquial
dialects of Upper Egypt, though they occur in the forms of [th] and [θ].
in Classical Arabic. The result is that the English phonemes are usually substituted by the consonants /s/ and /z/ respectively (cf. Lehn and Slager, 1959 reprint 34). This is ascribable to the colloquial production of [s] and [z] in place of the classical counterparts [th] and [th] respectively. Similarly, the articulation of /θ/ and /ð/ creates considerable difficulty for the Syrian learners whose dialects are NCD, SCD and WCD specifically (for detailed analyses cf. chapter 6, section 6.11, sub-section (C)).

The final point to be made here is that, besides the psycholinguistic variables discussed above, there are non-linguistic variables which may add information on how and when transfer from the LI takes place. These variables are the setting of L2-learning/acquisition and the development of the individual learner (cf. Ellis, 1985 24). With regard to the first variable, it has been argued that the extent of interference — and therefore the number of interlingual errors — in formal settings (classroom settings) is much larger than it is in informal settings (naturalistic settings). In formal settings L2-learners tend to use their LI which augments proactive inhibition, whereas in informal settings they are much more exposed to the L2 and thus the magnitude of proactive inhibition decreases.

Concerning the second variable, there seem to be rather contradictory opinions about the learner's stage of development. Taylor (1975), for instance, pointed out that the elementary learners were more liable to make interlingual errors than intermediates who showed larger scope of overgeneralization from L2-rules (intralingual errors). In other words, according to Taylor, the possibilities of language transfer decrease as the learner's knowledge of the L2 increases. On the other hand, researchers like Anderson suggest that the possibilities of language transfer increase as the learner's knowledge of the L2 increases. Though, in this case, he may be more susceptible to recognize interlingual errors (cf. Anderson, 1983 181f). This matter will be discussed later (cf. chapter 2, section 2.4.1).

These are, therefore, the psychological aspects of CA which have been considered in terms of Osgood's transfer paradigms, Skinner's theory of habit formation, and the notion of potential errors. The next section will draw on the linguistic aspects of CA and trace their development through structuralism and generativism.
1.3 The Linguistic Basis of CA

In the opening section of this chapter it has been noted that CA is a hybrid linguistic enterprise (cf section 1.1.1) As one of its concerns, CA is said to examine L1-influence on L2-learning along with the behavioural paradigms of transfer As another, the 'scientific description' proposed by Fries (1945) was undertaken in the heyday of structural linguistics In this respect, Bloomfield was the well-known figure who developed the 'scientific study' of language in terms of inductive categorization, that is, "the establishment of a set of classificatory units or properties used in the description of language, which have the same basic distribution, and [ ] occur as a structural unit" (Crystal, 1985 43f) It has been suggested that Bloomfield, too, was, more than anyone else, "responsible for introducing the behaviourist point of view into linguistics" (Lyons, 1977 125) This can be seen in Bloomfield's definition of an utterance meaning in terms of S-R associations "the situation in which the speaker utters it and the response which it calls forth in the hearer" (Bloomfield, 1935 26). Further, it was Bloomfield "who set for linguistics, especially in America, the ideal of being truly scientific" with reference to "empiricism and positivism" (Lyons, 1981b 42) Bloomfield also emphasized the 'differences' between languages, which might hinder the researcher from setting up a systematic classification applicable to all languages (cf Ellis, 1985 25) Therefore, the comparison between languages was believed to be far from utility This assumption was supported by other structuralists like Sapir and Whorf as will be discussed presently

In this section four topics are to be dealt with (1) the linguistic levels which CA draws on by reference to Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis and the concept of interlingual level shifts, (11) the cultural level as suggested by Lado within his original parameters, (111) the surface-structure level from the structuralist point of view, and (iv) the deep-structure level within Chomsky's approach to generative linguistics Both the surface-structure and the deep-structure levels will be considered through the constant tertium comparationis (TC) to see to what extent the magnitude of language transfer can be determined
1.3.1 The Linguistic Levels of CA

Following Bloomfieldian descriptivism, a particularly American version of structuralism, the approach advocated by Sapir and Whorf also stressed the fact that languages are different. Within a descriptive model, their approach aimed at what is called 'language-specific' features which CA focused upon for its models of analysis. Language-specific features were explicitly expressed in their hypothesis in terms of 'uniqueness' of categories and distinctions. Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, as put by Lyons in its most extreme version, states:

(a) We are, in all our thinking and forever, "at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression of [our] society", because we cannot but "see and hear and otherwise experience" in terms of the categories and distinctions encoded in language, (b) the categories and distinctions encoded in one language-system are unique to that system and incommensurable with those of other systems.

(Lyons, 1981b 304-305)

From this perspective, CA held the position that L2-learners tend to employ the categories and distinctions encoded in their L1 and transfer them onto the L2. Errors will consequently occur simply because the categories and distinctions of the L1 are 'incommensurable' with those of the L2. It appears that traditional contrastivists such as Fries, Lado, Banathy et al, and Stockwell et al were indebted to Bloomfieldian descriptivism and Sapir-Whorf structuralism. Despite the belief that languages are incomparable, contrastivists set up their research on the assumption that, by means of language-specific features, a comparison of L1 and L2 is utilizable for determining their structural differences.

As it is traditionally conceived, the procedural orientation of CA dictated that the descriptive comparison of L1 and L2 should be ordered into, at least three manageable linguistic levels: phonology, syntax, and lexis. James argues that this order was a logical injunction in the sense that these levels should not be mixed. This is because the sound-system of any language is more amenable to complete description than its syntactic system. The latter, in turn, demands less exhaustive description than the lexical system does and so on (James, 1980 29). However, mixing of linguistic levels is permitted these days and, depending on the intention of a particular description, is sometimes necessary to show how a given communicative function is realized in terms.
of one linguistic level in the L1 and distributed along with another linguistic level in the L2. In such a case, CA involves two procedural stages: description and juxtaposition. While the former determines whether the L1-utterance or the L2-utterance is to be described on the appropriate linguistic level, the latter refers to the interlingual level shifts which help the contrastivist measure the degree of interlingual contrast between L1 and L2 (James, 1980: 30). Some examples may make this notion of level shifts clear.

(7) a. [aʔa ra al-kita b] (MSA)
   'He lent the book'

   b. [istaʔa ra al-kita b] (MSA)
   'He borrowed the book'

(8) a. [zaydon jaʔaʔani ] (MSA)
   'Zaid came to me'

   b. [jaʔaʔani Zaydon] (MSA)
   'Zaid came to me'

(9) a. [ʔail y'i d y'sa fir] (ECD)
   'Ali wants to travel' (\)

   b. [ʔail y'i d y'sa fir] (ECD)
   'Does Ali want to travel?' (\)
   or 'Ali wants to travel?' (\)

As the above examples illustrate, while in the L2-equivalents of (7a-b) the two L2-verbs 'lent' and 'borrowed' are distinct lexical items, the L1-verbs [aʔa ra] and [istaʔa ra] are expressed through morphological contrast within MSA, that is, both L1-verbs are derived from the same root or triliteral verb [ʔ-y-r]. The morpheme [ista] is prefixed into the L1-verb [aʔa ra] 'lent (he)', which belongs to one verb group, to form the L1-verb [istaʔa ra] as belonging to another verb group. Thus, the L1-utterances (7 a-b) and their L2-counterparts represent an interlingual level shift from syntax (morphology) in the L1 to lexis in the L2.

In the L1-utterances (8 a-b), semantic variation is configured through word-order contrast within MSA, whereas in the L2-counterparts this variation is expressed by the use of stress-pattern. Therefore, there appears an interlingual level shift from syntax (word-order) in the L1 to phonology in the L2.

With regard to the L1-examples (9 a-b), the distinction between a declarative and an interrogative statement in SCA is usually expressed by a falling tone (\) in (9a) and a rising tone (\) in (9b) respectively, though in MSA interrogation is marked by the use of the question particle.
In the L2-equivalents of (9b) interrogation is represented by either the use of the structural device 'DO-insertion' associated with a rising tone or simply a rising tone without a syntactic change. Therefore, concerning the L1-utterance (9b) and its L2-counterparts, there is an interlingual level shift from phonology in the L1 to either syntax accompanied by phonology or just phonology in the L2.

It has been mentioned earlier that Whitman (1970) classified four distinct procedures under CA-constructs (i) description, (ii) selection, (iii) contrast, and (iv) prediction (cf. section 1.1.3). It is the third procedure whose task is to draw a comparison between LI and L2 and to identify their differences and similarities along the three linguistic levels discussed above. Such a procedure may, therefore, help the contrastivist to test the value of transfer from one linguistic entity to another. The following are some of the possible comparative parameters adopted by CA Ellis, for instance, mentions six parameters with examples from different LIs (Ellis, 1985:26). In this study, they have been extended to seven by including parameter (iv) specifically. In addition, Arabic examples will be substituted for those of the LIs used in Ellis' original ones (cf. also Brown, 1980:152f).

(i) No difference between an item of LI and L2

This parameter concerns the degree of similarity between LI and L2 (cf. section 1.2.1, paradigm A). The learner, in this case, can simply transfer a sound, structure, or lexical item from the LI to his interim knowledge of the L2, and the resultant utterance would signify positive language transfer. For example, both the particle [an] in MSA and the preposition 'to' in English coincide in that the verb that follows marks infinitiveness.

\[(10)\]  
\[\text{a) [yurī du an yath'haba] / [al-thaha b]} \]  
'he wants to go' / 'going'  
\[\text{(MSA)}\]  
\[\text{b) [yajibu (?alayhi) an yath'haba]/[al-thaha b]} \]  
'he has to go' / 'going'  
\[\text{(MSA)}\]  
\[\text{c) [mina-ddaru riyyī an yath'haba]/[al-thaha b]} \]  
'it is necessary for him to go' / 'going'  
\[\text{(MSA)}\]
It follows that since the particle [an] is usually dropped in SCA, infinitiveness would still be marked by the second verb while the first verb is recognized as a modal auxiliary in the L2-equivalent. For example:

(11) a [yastati ?u an yath'haba] (MSA)
    b [yi'dir y'ru h] (NCD/SCD)
    'he can go'

(12) a [la budda (min) an tath'haba] (MSA)
    b [biddak tru h] (SCA)
    c [liza man/la zimon ?alayka an tath'haba] (MSA)
    d [la zim tru h] (SCA)
    'You (sing masc) must/should go'

(ii) No similarity between an item of L1 and L2
This parameter is traditionally identified with the level of overdifferentiation. Therefore, according to CA, the new L2-item in question should be learned. For example, in the case of negation in Arabic, the negation particle usually stands on its own and only governs the verb that follows (pre-verbal). In English, on the other hand, it is the auxiliary, or 'DO' if the affirmative sentence has no auxiliary, which is governed by the negation particle that follows (post-verbal):

(13) a [lam yastati? an yath'haba] (MSA)
    b [ma -sta'a ?a an yath'haba] (MSA)
    c [ma ?i'dir/hisin y'ru h] (NCD/SCD)
    (Lit not could (he) go (he))
    'he could not go'

(14) a [la yuri du an yath'haba] (MSA)
    b [ma biddo y'ru h] (NCD/SCD)
    c [ma y'ri d y'ru h] (ECD)
    (Lit not want (he) go (he))
    'he does not want to go,'

(iii) An item in the L1 is absent in the L2
Within traditional CA, this parameter is normally recognized as the level of underdifferentiation within a proactive direction. Thus, the learner, upon producing the L2-utterance, should exclude the item in question. For example, in both varieties of Arabic, the resumptive pronoun (that is, the object of the relative clause) usually appears particularly when it is prefixed to the preposition of a phrasal verb as in (15b), whereas in English it is obligatorily deleted (cf. example (41) below).
(15) a [irrīsa 1 illī katabta] (SCA)
   (Lit the letter which/that wrote (I) it)
   'the letter (which/that) I wrote----'

   b [al-mawdu ?u al-lāthī’ tahaddathna. ?anhu] (MSA)
   (Lit the matter which/that talked (we) about it)
   'the matter (which/that) we talked about ----'

(iv) An item in the L2 is absent in the L1
Similarly, this parameter can be identified with the level of underdifferentiation but within a retroactive direction. In such a case, CA would suggest that the item in question must be learnt. For example, the grammatical device of the perfective aspect of the verb in English is normally expressed by the simple past form of the verb in Arabic, though the particle [qad] in MSA is used to denote both the completion and nearness of a past action (for further information, cf. chapter 6, section 6.2.3)

(16) a [lam arahū min qabl] (MSA)
   b [ma ra‘aytuhū min qabl] (MSA)
   c [ma shī‘to min ‘aabil] (SCA)
   (Lit not saw (I) him before)
   'I haven't seen him before'

(17) a [qad thahaba zaydon munthu ga dart] (MSA)
   b [---- ra h zeī d min (wa‘it ma ) tarakīt] (SCA)
   (Lit went (he) Zaid since (the time) left (you))
   'Zaid has gone since you left'

(v) An item in the L1 has a different distribution from that of the L2
This parameter is traditionally known as the level of reinterpretation. Although this parameter is difficult to distinguish from any other, it has been argued that a given L2-item may sometimes be perceived as a reinterpretated form of the L1-counterpart. For example, while in Arabic the indefinite noun is represented by the omission of the definite article [al] and, particularly in MSA, the insertion of the phonological device nunnation [on] finally, in English it is determined by the indefinite article (for a detailed analysis of articles, cf. chapter 6, section 6.2.2)

(18) a [---- wāladon---- jāmi‘ lōn] (MSA)
   b [---- wālad ---- jāmi‘l] (SCA)
   (Lit ---- boy ---- beautiful)
   'a beautiful boy'
(vi) Two items in the LI coalesce into one item in the L2
This parameter is known as the level of coalescence and identified in terms of convergent phenomena. For instance, both [ʔam] 'the father's brother' and [ka l] 'the mother's brother' in Arabic become coalesced into 'uncle' in English, both [kusu f] 'eclipse of the sun' and [kusu f] 'eclipse of the moon' in Arabic become coalesced into 'eclipse' in English, and so on.

(vii) One item in the LI becomes two items in the L2
Paradoxically, this parameter is known as the level of split and identified in terms of divergent phenomena. For instance, the word [tawi l] in Arabic splits into 'long' and 'tall' in English; the word [isba?] in Arabic splits into 'finger' and 'toe' in English, the word [kabi r] in Arabic splits into 'big' and 'old' in English; and so on.

As noted earlier, the hierarchy of difficulty formulated by Stockwell et al. (1965) and Prator (1967) are largely based on the above comparative parameters (cf. section 1.1.3). Therefore, along with such a hierarchy, these parameters would follow the order of learning difficulty as illustrated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Difficulty</th>
<th>The Corresponding Parameter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 0 - Positive Transfer</td>
<td>Parameter (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 - Coalescence</td>
<td>Parameter (vi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 - Underdifferentiation</td>
<td>Parameters (i1), (iv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 - Reinterpretation</td>
<td>Parameter (v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4 - Overdifferentiation</td>
<td>Parameter (vi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5 - Split</td>
<td>Parameter (vii)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 The hierarchical order of learning difficulty

This table indicates that, according to Stockwell et al. and Prator, the first level, or parameter (i), represents the smallest degree of difficulty since it concerns the one-to-one correspondence between LI and L2, whereas the last level, or parameter (vii), is assumed to be the height of learning difficulty as the largest scope for negative transfer would be anticipated. Thus, within a selective comparison between LI
and L2, such a hierarchy is said to be applicable to any pair of languages for the prediction stage of CA-procedures. However, the comparison between L1 and L2 was predominantly descriptive (that is, along the three linguistic levels: phonology, syntax and lexis) and the cultural level, which refers to the socio-cultural context of a given utterance, has been overlooked for a long time. The next section will deal with the cultural level by recourse to Lado's original parameters.

1.3.2 The Cultural-Behaviour Level

Implicit in the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis quoted at the outset of the previous section is the cultural variable added by Lado to the CA-based project. The statement that "the particular language which has become the medium of expression for [our] society" implies the language-specific features which are characteristic of the language in question, especially when expressing the socio-cultural context. The key-word here is 'society' in the sense that a natural interaction between language and society is inevitable. This interaction would subsequently result in a kind of sociolinguistic representation which consists of unique cultural features specific to that society. In effect, any other language is incapable of expressing or understanding such cultural features.

Within the rigorous tradition of linguistic CA, Lado included the cultural variable as a factor of special significance in L2-learning. Besides the structural comparison of the L1 and L2, he suggested that the 'cultural' comparison would also enable the analyst to determine the differences as well as the similarities between the two cultures, and thus to predict trouble spots in L2-culture learning. This cultural analysis was based on the assumption that L2-learners might tend to transfer the habits of their native culture onto the foreign culture. Lado wrote:

"When the individual of Culture A trying to learn Culture B observes a form in Culture B in a particular distribution spot, he grasps the same complex of meaning as in his own culture. And when he in turn engages actively in a unit of behaviour in Culture B he chooses the form which he would choose in his own culture to achieve that complex of meaning."

(Lado, 1957 114, emphasis added)
According to Lado, "cultural behaviour is patterned", a statement already made by Sapir (1949 566). Therefore, every unit of patterned behaviour has a particular form, bears aspects of a particular meaning, and is represented by a particular distribution. Hence, Lado's example 'eating breakfast' is a behavioural unit whose form may be identified as 'the morning meal' in culture A, or 'the evening meal' in culture B. The meaning of this behavioural unit may simply be modified "to provide food and drink for the body" in culture A, or to establish social, moral or religious identifications in culture B. Depending on the culture of the society in which such a unit is performed, 'eating breakfast' may also show time distribution, for example, on a daily cycle, or space distribution, for example, in a kitchen (Lado, 1957 113).

It seems, however, that Lado is describing the functions or needs that are actually done on special occasions such as birth, marriage, death and so on. Therefore, upon producing their formal realizations, these functions are emphasized to arrive at a structural description as a criterion for cultural analysis. By extension of Lado's examples in the current study, the utterances that are actually said on these occasions are to be stressed, since they represent two complementary dimensions: a linguistic dimension, that is, the linguistic realization of the utterance in question, and a socio-cultural dimension which refers to the communicative purpose or purposes of that utterance. Recently, Riley has called this latter dimension the 'social patterning of discourse' to indicate both the pragmalinguistic aspects of utterances such as language functions and the communicative acts in context (Riley, 1981 121).

The term utterance, throughout the analysis of both actual and predicted interlingual identifications, will be focused upon as it refers to a stretch of speech whose assumptions are no longer expressed in terms of linguistic theory. Therefore, unlike a sentence, an utterance can be looked upon as a unique speech event resulting in a particular behaviour when two persons are engaged in interpersonal communication. Lyons, for instance, makes a clear distinction between sentence meaning and utterance meaning. The former is directly predictable by the grammatical and lexical interrelationships between the words of a sentence, whereas the latter, which is the concern here, includes all the possible types of meaning that imply communicative needs or purposes (Lyons, 1977 643). The types of meaning of an utterance will be discussed later (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3.3).

It follows from the above that Lado's conception of a behavioural
unit is by no means interpretable in terms of sentence meaning, but rather it lies at the heart of utterance meaning for utterance itself is by definition a 'behavioural unit' as well (cf Crystal, 1985 322)

Therefore, with reference to the notion of speech acts introduced by Austin (1962) and developed by Searl (1969), a behavioural unit can be re-defined as a speech act in that the utterance in question entails a communicative activity or a locutionary act, that is, the act of saying something for a particular purpose. A speech act also involves both an illocutionary force and a perlocutionary effect. While the former causes the speaker to perform the act upon making the utterance in question (for example, commanding, promising, requesting, and so on), the latter, the perlocutionary effect, refers to the effect that the utterance and its performance achieve on the behaviour and/or feelings of the hearer or the interlocutor such as utterances which are used for apologizing, frightening, sympathizing, and so on (cf Palmer, 1981 162f, Lyons, 1981a 175f). Furthermore, there are at least five recognizable categories of speech acts: (i) commissives for example, guaranteeing, promising; (ii) declaratives for example, christening, marrying, resigning, (iii) directives for example, begging, commanding, requesting, (iv) expressives for example, apologizing, sympathizing, welcoming, and (v) representatives for example, asserting, hypothesizing and so on. The verbs which are used to convey speech acts are known as performative verbs, and the criteria for the success of their effects are identified as felicity conditions (cf Crystal, 1985 285)

Therefore, in the light of the above argument, Lado's suggestion may be re-stated in this way: Every speech act has a given form, bears aspects of a particular meaning, and is represented by a particular distribution. Within the three parameters proposed by Lado, some utterances, or speech acts, produced both in Arabic and in English can be exemplified (cf Lado, 1957 114f). In this context, Riley discusses two parameters: (i) same form, different functions and (ii) same function, different forms (Riley, 1981 125). These correspond to Lado's first two parameters as will be explained presently. To avoid terminological confusion, Lado's original terms will be used here.
(i) Same form, different meaning

This parameter is concerned with a given L1-utterance and its L2-counterpart whose linguistic (that is, syntactic and lexical) shapes are similar but serve different communicative functions. For example:

(19) a \([\text{kalll ni afar}ji \text{k il-ba b}]\) (NCD/SCD/WCD)
b \([\text{kalll ni a}\text{sawfak il-ba b}]\) (ECD)
c \text{Let me show you the door} (PU)

In SCA the L1-utterances (19 a-b) are sometimes said to a visitor when he/she wants to leave the host. Thus, as a matter of courtesy, the host is willing to accompany the visitor until the latter goes out through the door, though, depending on the context, these L1-utterances may imply that the host indirectly requires the visitor to leave. It appears that when these L1-utterances are transferred onto English by means of a word-for-word translation, the resultant utterances (19c) will always have unfortunate effects upon the addressee because 'showing someone the door' in English suggests throwing someone out or getting rid of someone. The equivalent L2-utterances to be made on the same occasion are 'to walk or conduct someone to the door' in British English and 'to leave someone to the door' in Hiberno-English, though the L1-utterance \([\text{kalll ni awaslak il1-ba b}]\) is possible in SCA and thus can be included in parameter (iv) below (cf. example (33))

(20) a \([\text{far}ji \text{n a ?urf kta fak}]\) (NCD/SCD)
b \([\text{sawwifna ?ard t}\text{sta fak}]\) (ECD)
c \text{Show us the breadth of your shoulders} (PU)

In SCA the L1-utterances (20 a-b) suggest that the addressee is to be thrown out, a similar meaning intended by 'to show someone the door' as discussed above. Thus, upon transferring these L1-utterances onto English, the resultant utterance (20c) will no longer convey the same intended meaning, but rather 'to have broad shoulders' in English indicates either literally being able to bear much weight or figuratively being able to bear much responsibility. In SCA the L1-utterance \([\text{far}ji \text{n a kta fak l1}?\text{ra d}]\) 'show us your broad shoulders' (PU) may also indicate but only the literal meaning intended by 'to have broad shoulders'.
A further example is the situational context where two native speakers of Arabic are engaged in an argument over some problem. The speaker wants to ensure that the listener is following what is going on. This refers to the process of feedback whereby the speaker is looking for a reaction (or response) from the listener to check on the efficiency of communication. The speaker, then, pauses for a while and produces an utterance like ['am tif'ham ?alay] 'do you understand me?' as a stimulus. Therefore, if the listener has indeed understood what the speaker is talking about, then the former would in turn produce either of the L1-utterances (21 a-b) as a response to assure the latter that the argument has been followed. Since these L1-utterances seem to have been transferred onto English to convey the meaning intended in Arabic, the resultant actual utterance (21c) does not appear to imply such a meaning. Rather, 'to be on the line' in English is usually used as a general statement about spatial arrangements of objects or persons. The corresponding though outmoded L2-utterances might be 'I'm on the beam' or 'I'm on your track', which indicate the same meaning intended by (21 a-b).

(ii) Same meaning, different form
As opposed to parameter (i), this parameter is concerned with a given L1-utterance and its L2-counterpart whose linguistic (that is, syntactic and lexical) shapes are different but serve the same communicative function. For example

(22) a ['l-ba?iyye b'haya tak] (NCD/SCD)
b ['l-baqiyye b'haya tak] (ECD)
c (May) the rest be in your life (PU)

(23) a [atamanna al-baqiyyata (baqiyyata haya ti il-faqi d) fi haya tik] (MSA)
b I wish the rest (the rest of the dead person's life) to be (included) in your life (PU)

In SCA the L1-utterances (22 a-b) are usually said to console someone on a death occasion in the sense that the speaker wishes the remainder of the dead person's life to be 'added' to the addressee's
life, so that the former wishes the latter a longer life than the dead person's. Therefore, upon transferring the L1-utterances (22 a-b), which seem to be the surface structure of (23a), onto English by means of a word-for-word translation, the resultant utterance (22c) or its deep structure (23b) may serve the same communicative function intended by each of the following L2-utterances

(24)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a} & \quad \text{I am sorry for your bereavement} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{I am with you in your sorrow} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{I offer you my sympathy on your great loss} \\
\text{d} & \quad \text{I offer you my condolences} 
\end{align*} \]

Similarly, if any of these L2-utterances happens to be retroactively transferred onto Arabic by means of a verbatim translation, then the resultant utterance would serve the same communicative function conveyed by any possible L1-utterance produced in either variety. It seems, however, the difference between the L1-based utterances (22c), (23b) and their L2-counterparts (24 a-d) is linguistic, that is, syntactic and/or lexical. Further, while the L1-based L2-utterances (22c), (23b) are statements indicating a subjunctive mode, the L2-counterparts, (24 a-d) are statements indicating a declarative mode.

(25)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a} & \quad [\text{hut rije k b'may ba rde}] \quad \text{(SCA)} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{Put your feet in cold water} \quad \text{(AU)} 
\end{align*} \]

In SCA the L1-utterance (25a) is usually said to a person, the addressee, who is advised to relax and take it easy. Given that this L1-utterance has been transferred onto English, it has been attested that the resultant actual utterance (25b) did really serve its communicative function as intended by the L1-counterpart. Further, since, depending on the context, the L1-lexical item [rijl] in SCA means either a 'leg' or a 'foot', the learner seems to have correctly realized the deep structure of [rije k] in (25a) as rendered into 'your feet' in (25b) (for further information, cf chapter 6, section 6.3.1, example (2)). Again, the difference between the L1-based utterance (25b) and its L2-counterpart 'put your feet up' is only linguistic. While the former employs a verb 'put' to which a prepositional phrase 'in cold water' is related, the latter involves a phrasal verb 'put up' only.

(26)  
\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{a} & \quad [\text{?e nak fa}j'\text{?a ne}] \quad \text{(SCD)} \\
\text{b} & \quad [\text{?e nak fa} \text{r'ge}] \quad \text{(ECD)} \\
\text{c} & \quad \text{Your eye is empty} \quad \text{(FU)} 
\end{align*} \]
(27) a [ʔe nak mu šabʔa ne] (SCA)
b Your eye is not full (PU)

Particularly, in SCA the L1-utterances (26 a-b) and (27a) are usually said to a temporarily gluttonous person, the addressee, who has a ravenous appetite assuming that the food, which is still being prepared, is not enough for his/her hunger. Thus, upon transferring these L1-utterances onto English, the resultant utterances (26c) and (27b) may convey the same meaning intended by the L2-counterpart 'Your eye is bigger than your belly' which is usually said in colloquial English as well. However, both 'eyes', in this context, can be figuratively modified by L2-lexical adjectives such as 'greedy', 'ravenous', 'voracious', and so on. Such modification is also possible in Arabic, that is, the L1-equivalents of these L2-lexical adjectives such as [šariha] and [nahima] in MSA can figuratively modify the eye (singular), the two eyes (dual), or more than two pairs of eyes (plural). Concerning the linguistic difference between the L1-based utterances (26c), (27b) and the L2-counterpart cited above, either of the former involves a coular verb 'is' and a complement 'empty'/'not full' whereas the latter employs a comparative-degree device 'bigger than'.

(iii) Same form, same meaning, different distribution
This parameter is concerned with a given L1-utterance and its L2-counterpart whose syntactic shapes and communicative functions are similar but employ different lexical items. For example

(28) a [ma biʔdir ʔistirī samak bil-bahar] (NCD/SCD)
b I can't buy fish in the sea (AU)
c I can't buy a pig in a poke (L2-U)

In SCA the L1-utterance (28a) is usually said by a person, the speaker, who refuses to buy something unknown to him/her. Given that this L1-utterance has been transferred onto English, the resultant actual utterance (28b) seems to employ the same syntactic structure of the equivalent L2-utterance (28c) and to convey the same meaning, albeit the difference in lexical selection between the two utterances is apparent. It may be the case that this difference is attributable to religious differences between the Arab communities where Islam is the predominant religion and the English communities where Christianity is pervasive. Thus, unlike in Christianity and therefore unlike the case in English, the prohibition of pork in Islam might extremely lessen the
use of the L1-lexical item [kanzi r] 'a pig' (which indicates either the animal or its flesh) in the socio-cultural sense discussed here except perhaps some derogatory uses in SCA though they are very rare in MSA

(29) a [tišrab mith'1 il-?uqrūqqa] (ECD)
b She drinks like a frog (PU)
c She drinks like a fish (L2-U)

Particularly, in ECD the L1-utterance (29a) is sometimes said to indicate that the person in question drinks far too much but normally water. Thus, upon transferring this L1-utterance onto English, the resultant utterance (29b) appears to involve the same syntactic structure of the L2-counterpart (29c), albeit the lexical difference between 'frog' and 'fish' is considerable. However, although either of the two utterances (29b) and (29c) implies the same meaning, that is, drinking a lot, the difference seems to be identified with the type of liquid for drinking in language-specific terms. While the L1-based identification 'drinking like a frog', within the idiosyncratic meaning of (29a) in ECD, is normally associated with excessive amounts of water, the L2-identification 'drinking like a fish' is always associated with excessive amounts of alcohol. As analogous with the previous example (28), such a difference may be ascribed to the religious differences between the Arab communities and the English communities. Thus, unlike in Christianity, the prohibition of alcohol in Islam might extricate its figurative implication from the collocational use of the L1-based lexical items 'drinks' and 'frog'. However, like the case in English, if no mention is made of [?uqrūqqa](ECD) / [difda tast](MSA) 'a frog', L1-expressions such as [b'yišrab (kti r)] (NCD/SCD) 'he drinks (a lot)' and [šarri b] (SCA) 'he is a (heavy) drinker' can imply alcoholic liquors. This indicates that, depending on the context of the L2-utterance (29c) which always implies alcohol, the L1-based utterance (29b) may serve the same communicative function in English.

(30) a [maktu bon ?ala a-rramî] (MSA)
b It is written on sand (PU)
c It is written in water (L2-U)

In MSA and in some dialects of SCA, the L1-utterance (30a) is sometimes produced to indicate that something will be soon forgotten. Thus, upon transferring this L1-utterance onto English, the resultant utterance (30b) seems to employ the same syntactic structure of the
L2-counterpart (30c), that is, both utterances involve a prepositional phrase related to the nomen patientis or passive participle 'written'. Again, the difference in lexical selection between 'on sand' and 'in water' might be attributed to the geographical variation between the Arab environment and the English environment. The existence of deserts in the former may result in many figurative as well as literal uses of [raml] 'sand' in Arabic due to the abundance of this element, whereas, on the other hand, the non-existence of deserts in the latter may lead to an extremely rare use of 'sand' in the socio-cultural sense.

(31) a [ḥibīr ʔal waraʔ/waraq] (SCA)
   b It's (only) ink on paper (PU)
   c It's only a piece of paper (L2-U)

In SCA the L1-utterance (31a) is usually said to indicate that something is unimportant or unworthy. Therefore, if such an utterance is transferred onto English, the resultant utterance (31b) would employ the same syntactic structure of the L2-counterpart (31c), that is, both utterances involve a copular verb 'BE' and a complement 'ink on paper'/"a piece of paper". However, although the difference in lexical selection is clear, the two utterances (31 b-c) seem to combine lexical items (such as 'ink', 'paper' and 'a piece of paper') which are inherently associated with 'writing', since the L2-utterances 'it's not worth the paper it's written on' and 'Paper won't refuse ink' can also be used to indicate the same underlying meaning.

(32) a [ʃiʔ'fit waraʔa] (NCD/SCD)
   b [ʃiq'fat waraq̱a] (ECD)
   c [wis'lat waraq̱a] (ECD)
   (Lit piece of (a sheet of) paper)

Moreover, if the L2-utterance (31c) happens to be retroactively transferred onto Arabic, the resultant L1-utterances (32 a-c), which are possible though less often than (31a) in SCA, would, within such a context, imply the same underlying meaning.

It appears that Lado's three parameters can go some way towards determining the degrees of difference (either in form, or in meaning or in distribution) between certain L1-utterances and their L2-counterparts in relation to their socio-cultural backgrounds or contexts. Thus, the analysis enables the contrastivist to test the value of language transfer, where there is actual transfer from one speech act in the L1 to
the equivalent one in the L2, by recourse to such degrees of difference
On the other hand, the degrees of similarity can also be identified in
terms of these three parameters since a pair of utterances, as
illustrated, may differ in form but resemble each other in meaning and/or
distribution and vice versa. Hence, with regard to the complete
similarity between a given pair of utterances, a fourth parameter may be
included to test the value of completely positive transfer

(iv) Same form, same meaning, same distribution
This parameter is clearly concerned with a given L1-utterance and its
L2-counterpart whose syntactic shapes and communicative functions are
similar and employ more or less the same lexical items. For example:

(33) a [kallı·ni awaslak lil-ba b] (SCA)
   (Lit Let me guide/lead (I) you to the door)
b Let me conduct you to the door (L2-U)

(34) a [atamanna laka a-śšifi.a al- vå jil] (MSA)
   (Lit wish (I) to you the recovery the quick)
b I wish you a speedy recovery (L2-U)

(35) a [kallı na n'šu f wiššak/wiį'hak] (SCA)
   (Lit let us see (we) your face)
b [far'ji na wičšak/wiššak] (NCD/SCD)
c [šawwif'na wiį'hak] (ECD)
   (Lit show us your face)
d Show your face. (L2-U)

Clearly, therefore, the above analysis, within the domain of
lexical selection, addresses itself very closely to the study of the
underlying level which will be identified with the term semantics in Part
Two (cf chapter 5, section 5.2) Contrastivists still admit that there
is little, if any, attention paid to the investigation of the lexical
level, since the problematic nature of CA is fraught with controversy on
a large scale. The paucity in the study of lexis may result from the
researchers' preoccupation with phonology and syntax and, in effect,
Lado's suggestion of the cultural variable has not received remarkable
contributions which may help CA to some extent stabilize its significance
(cf Ellis, 1985 27, Huxley, 1986 71) Eventually, most of the
CA-based research was conducted on the study of surface-structure
categories (that is, along the phonological and syntactic levels) which
were undertaken within the descriptive procedures of structuralism. This
might be a natural consequence of the assumption that "speakers equate
items in one language with items in another because of their similarities
in shape, distribution, or both" (Haugen, 1956 67, emphasized by James, 1980 170) Such an assumption led contrastivists to compare the phonological systems of a given pair of languages due to the observable influence of the L1 manifested in 'foreign accents' on the one hand, and to the systematic nature of phonology in that it is possible to arrive at a finite description of the phonological systems of the two languages in question on the other (cf Stockwell and Bowen, 1965, Agard and Di Pietro, 1965a) This was followed by full-length studies carried out in the United States into the syntactic systems of English as a L2 and some other Indo-European languages as L1s (cf Stockwell et al, 1965, Agard and Di Pietro, 1965b) In Europe, especially in the 1970s onward, CA-based research seems to have gained much more momentum than in any other continent James, for instance, lists some of the CA-projects that have been conducted on English with a wide range of Indo-European languages (cf James, 1980 205)

However, despite the relative paucity of studies into lexis, several researchers have attempted to examine the semantic features of lexical items Among them are Hadlich (1968), Rodgers (1969), Kalisz (1976), Roos (1976), Lehmann (1977), Nowakowski (1977), Kellerman (1978a, 1982), and Ringbom (1978a, 1983, 1987) For example, Kellerman has pointed out that, within the notion of transferability in lexis, Dutch learners of English " would react to picturesque Dutch idioms if they were translated into English" (Kellerman, 1982 198) This is due to the fact that L2-idioms are very often 'semantically intractable' for the learner though they may reveal 'syntactic idiosyncrasies' Like many language-specific items, such L2-idioms, too, may constitute special 'neurological status' (Kellerman, 1982 198-199) The same writer has taken up the various contextual meanings, or the 'sorts of senses', subsumed under one lexical item Apart from the concepts of homonymy and polysemy, he has tried to establish a possible criterion whereby the value of his investigation can be measured He has made a CA between the various contextual meanings of both 'breken' in Dutch and 'break' in English to discuss such notions as 'language-distance' (cf chapter 4, section 4 13), 'specificity', 'neutrality', 'transferability' and 'markedness' within the two languages (Kellerman, 1982 200) Such an attempt, in fact, signals a serious contribution to fill the gap of contrastive semanticity between languages
As far as L1-Arabic and L2-English are concerned, most of the CA-based studies also seem to have followed the same lines of the traditional approach, that is, they compared the surface-structure categories of both Arabic and English on the basis of the phonological systems and/or the syntactic systems of the two languages with very little interest in the research into contrastive semanticity. This, perhaps, might be due to three possible reasons:

1. The possibility of assigning a finite description of the *phonological* system of Arabic, as contrasted with that of English, regardless of "the bewildering chain of regional dialects" constituting the Colloquial variety of Arabic over the vast area from Morocco to the Persian Gulf (cf. Ferguson, 1970: 359).

2. The possibility, again, of arriving at a sufficient contrastive description of the *syntactic* systems of Arabic and English. Such a description is primarily based on Classical Arabic (MSA) since most, if not all, grammatical structures of Colloquial Arabic—and SCA is one regional dialect—have derived their syntactic representations from Classical Arabic. In this context, there are a considerable number of books on the Arabic grammar written in English such as Kapliwatsky (1940-1946), Cowan (1958), Scott (1962), Bulos (1965), Wright (1967), Nasr (1967), Beeston (1968) among others.

3. The exhausting complexity imposed by the *semantic* systems of any pair of languages as Corder put it "Where systems are semantically equivalent but not superficially so in form, the matter becomes more complicated. There is no utility in such comparisons where the realization of a semantic property is formally very different" (Corder, 1973: 288). Particularly, therefore, the highly exhausting complexity arising from the intricate overlap between the semantic system of Classical Arabic and that of Colloquial Arabic makes it almost impossible to provide an adequate description of the semantic system of Arabic by reference to its two main varieties. In effect, an examination of the contrastive semanticity of Arabic and English has been attenuated except for a few projects such as Huxley (1972, 1986).

Hence, the evidence for the consequences of the above three reasons (that is, pre-occupation with phonology and/or syntax and subsequent neglect of lexis) can be seen in Table 2 which is merely a chronological list of the available CA-based research of L1-Arabic and L2-English undertaken on both theoretical and empirical grounds. This table shows the varieties of Arabic (that is, colloquial Arabic within its regional dialects and/or Classical Arabic) as contrasted with English in addition to the linguistic levels investigated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR(S)</th>
<th>VARIETY</th>
<th>LINGUISTIC LEVEL(S)</th>
<th>DOCUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasr (1955)</td>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>Phonetics/Phonology</td>
<td>Ph D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malick (1956-57)</td>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>Consonant Clusters</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehn &amp; Slager (1959)</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Segmental Phonemes</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satterthwaith (1962)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Sentence Constructions</td>
<td>Ph D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greis (1963)</td>
<td>Cairene</td>
<td>Grammar/Phonology</td>
<td>Ph D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasr (1963)</td>
<td>MSA/Lebanese</td>
<td>Phonology/Syntax</td>
<td>Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickso (1965)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Verbal Morphology</td>
<td>Ph D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratton (1967)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Structures/Messages</td>
<td>Ph D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox (1970)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Relative Clauses</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dannan (1971)</td>
<td>MSA/Kuwaiti</td>
<td>Yes/No Questions</td>
<td>M A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley (1972)</td>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>Semantic Structures</td>
<td>M A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim (1973)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Relative Clauses</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dannan (1973)</td>
<td>Kuwaiti</td>
<td>Modal Auxiliaries</td>
<td>Ph D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aziz (1974)</td>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>Diphthongs</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanania (1974)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Syntactic Structures</td>
<td>Ph D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henkes (1974)</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
<td>Syntax/Compulsar Verbs</td>
<td>Ph D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott &amp; Tucker (1974)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukattash (1977)</td>
<td>MSA/Jordanian</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tadros (1979)</td>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td>Relative Clauses</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Wedyani (1982)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Syntax/Morphology</td>
<td>Ph D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broselow (1983)</td>
<td>Egyptian/Iraqi</td>
<td>Epenthetic phenomena</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karma (1983)</td>
<td>MSA/Kuwaiti</td>
<td>Verb Forms</td>
<td>Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meziani (1983)</td>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holes (1984)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Textual Approximation</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huxley (1986)</td>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>Semantic Structures</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karma (1987)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Relative Clauses</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammander (1987)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Syntax/Cohesive Ties</td>
<td>Ph D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostler (1987)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Rhetoric Syntax</td>
<td>Ph D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Hassan (1987)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Grammar/Aspect</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anani (1988)</td>
<td>MSA/Jordanian</td>
<td>Imperative Structures</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anani (1989)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Stress Placement</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa'Adeddin (1989)</td>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Text Development</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  Some CA-based research on L1-Arabic and L2-English
As Table 2 illustrates, there appear to be relatively few works which, on the semantic or the underlying level of language, have dealt with lexical selection, a domain already emphasized along with Lado's comparative parameters Huxley (1972, 1986), for instance, has conducted his research on Lebanese Colloquial Arabic which can be equated with some sub-dialects of WCD in Syria. Within the study of the 'common feature' of synonyms such as 'wrath', 'ire' and 'anger', Huxley argues that it is possible to analyze sets of contrasting features in order to detect transfer effects in the erroneous L2-utterances previously collected (Huxley, 1986). The notion of common feature, here, is similar to Kellerman's notion of core meaning in that "a polysemous lexical item will have a field of meaning in which the 'core' meaning may be more likely to be transferred than more idiomactic or figurative meanings" (Kellerman, 1978a).

On the other hand, a significantly large number of the works listed in Table 2 seem to have concentrated on surface-structure categories in order to identify the differences as well as the similarities of either phonological aspects such as diphthongs, segmental phonemes, epenthetic phenomena and consonant clusters, or syntactic aspects like verb forms, copular verbs, Yes/No questions, sentence constructions, and so on. In CA-terminology, the differences are called variables and the similarities are abstracted as 'sameness' for which the term constant is used. Such a constant is known in traditional CA as tertium comparationis (TC). It has been argued that TC can be applied to two linguistic levels. Firstly, the phonological level whereby 'language-specific' features are determinable, for example, the consonants [t], [d], [s], [z], [n], [l] and [r] in Arabic are dento-alveolars, whereas in English they are only alveolars (cf Lehn and Slager, 1959, reprint 35). Secondly, the semantic level where 'non-language-specific' (cf Sridhar, 1981 213), or 'language-neutral' (cf Kellerman, 1982 198), or 'language-universal' aspects can be contrasted. For instance, as noted above, the common feature, or core meaning, of the English lexical items 'anger', 'indignation', 'ire', and 'wrath' can be compared with the common feature of the Arabic lexical items [gadab], [sukt], [gayTh] and [hanaq] in MSA.

Concerning the syntactic level, it has been argued that contrastivists have almost entirely failed to arrive at obvious TCs between languages, especially those belonging to completely different families where language relatedness such as cognate elements is absent.
In order to solve such a problem, James discusses three candidates which have been proposed in this respect. These are surface structure, deep structure, and translation equivalence (James, 1980: 169f). The first two candidates will be considered here specifically whereas the third candidate will be discussed later (cf chapter 2, section 2.3.3).

1.3.3 The Surface-Structure Level

As noted at the end of the preceding section, most contrastivists focused on the description of surface-structure categories, since it was believed that learners tended to equate the 'shapes' and/or 'distributions' of their L1-structures with those of the L2-counterparts because of the superficial similarity between the two (cf Haugen, 1956: 67). Therefore, in the case of difference, on the other hand, the errors that learners made were also reflected in the surface structures of the L2-utterances they produced. It follows that it is the surface structures of L2-utterances which, being different from those of the L1-counterparts, were assumed to be taught to the learner. This belief was supported by Jakobovits who pointed out that, in relation to transfer effects, the study of surface structures might be more relevant than the study of deep structures (Jakobovits, 1969: 73).

From a structuralist perspective, traditional contrastivists looked upon surface structure as "the devices of form and arrangement" (Fries, 1952: 6, quoted by James, 1980: 39, emphasis added). It appears that Fries' terms form and arrangement coincide with Haugen's terms shape and distribution respectively. Further, Fries' definition of surface structure seems to have been re-stated by Lado as "the systematic formal devices [which] convey certain meanings and relationships" (Lado, 1957: 52, emphasis added). Therefore, any structure, according to Lado, consists of form and meaning. The former refers to such 'relationships', 'distributions' or 'arrangements' which constitute a unit or a pattern called a structure (for example, a word or a sentence), whereas the latter indicates the 'grammatical meaning', as opposed to the lexical meaning, which is carried by that structure. For instance, the meaning of 'book' is contrasted with that of 'books'; that is, singular versus plural. It follows that the formal devices of one structure may signal a variety of grammatical meanings which must be accounted for as they were assumed to be the source of 'many learning...
problems', and "the use of different devices by two languages will [also] constitute a problem" (Lado, 1957 53)

Moreover, for surface-structure description, Lado identified seven formal devices: word order, inflection (bound morphemes), correlation of forms, function words, intonation, stress, and pause (Lado, 1957 53). Stockwell et al condensed them into four devices: word order, affixation, function words, and intonation (Stockwell et al 1965 2). Similarly, within Fries' classification, his definition of surface structure refers to four devices: word order (that is, the devices of arrangement), morphological markers, function words, and suprasegmentals (cf James, 1980 39). These four devices seem to correspond to those identified by Stockwell et al. In the current study, they can be regarded as derived from two linguistic levels, that is, the phonological level and the syntactic level. This leads to conclude that, in the light of the above argument, surface structure is only interpretable in terms of these two levels (cf Chomsky, 1965 16). To make it clear, Figure 3 illustrates the classification of formal devices as identified by the above contrastivists. This will be followed by a brief definition of each device with some examples from Arabic and English.

It is, therefore, the task of CA to probe the way the LI and L2 employ these formal devices, and to determine the degree of contrast when both languages use the same device for a given pair of utterances. For instance, both in [man ja ?a] (MSA) and 'who came?' (cf section 1 2 1, example (2)), the same word order is employed, and the learner, in this case, needs only to "learn the new items to be fitted into the pattern with which he is already familiar in his LI" (James, 1980 41). Given that contrast results or negative transfer effects disappear, a pair of utterances such as these can be viewed as examples of Paradigm A of Osgood's transfer paradigms. Paradoxically, along with Paradigm B, Arabic employs suprasegmental features such as intonation to mark another type of questions [ma tha yun d] (cf example (2), Figure 2), whereas, in addition to such features, the English equivalent 'what does he want?' requires DO-insertion and subject-verb inversion. This also refers to the notion of interlingual level shift discussed earlier (cf section 1 3 1). Thus, the magnitude of contrast is greater and the learner, in this case, finds it more difficult to learn or acquire the structure in question.
Suprasegmentals: are elements indicating to the hearer whether the structure is an utterance such as a question, a statement and so on (cf. section 1.3.1, example (9)) or a word such as the distinction between a verb and a noun having the same root, for example, [sajja] 'recorded (he)' and [sij] 'a record' in Arabic (SCA) and /r'ko d/ and /r'ko d/ in English.

Morpho Markers: are the smallest distinctive units of grammar functioning in the composition of words. While in English morphological interrelationships are represented by means of affixation (that is, the morphological marker is recognizable as either a prefix or a suffix), in Arabic they are distributed in terms of infixation which indicates that an affix is sometimes inserted into the root or stem (cf. Crystal, 1985: 157). For example, in [tadši n] in Arabic and 'inauguration' in English both affixes [ta-ı-] and '-tion' mark nouns.

Function Words: are grammatical words, as opposed to lexical words, which signal what classes of elements are likely to precede or follow, for example, [al], [wa] and [aw] in Arabic, and 'the', 'and' and 'or' in English respectively.

Word Order: refers to the interrelationships between the elements of a structure. For example, [bahron jami lon] (Lit. sea beautiful) in Arabic (MSA) and 'a beautiful sea' in English.
described by the linguist (Stockwell et al., 1965). For instance, within the surface-structure level, TC says little, if anything, about how the Arab learner equates the following pairs of structures.

\[
\begin{align*}
36a & \quad [\text{futih}a \text{ al-ba bu}] \\
& \quad \text{(MSA)} \\
& \quad \text{The door was opened} \\
37a & \quad [\text{infatah}a \text{ al-ba bu}] \\
& \quad \text{(MSA)} \\
& \quad \text{The door opened}
\end{align*}
\]

On the one hand, the L1-passive structure [futih] in (36a) is rarely used in SCA except on very special occasions where MSA is required. On the other, English imposes on the Arab learner the acquisition of the L2-passive structure 'was opened' in (36b) which calls for an 'abstract' grammatical structure in MSA. Thus, TC implies, at a surface-structure level, the equations (36) and (37) with reference to MSA, whereas in the 'actual' use of SCA the structure [infatah], which is derived from [infataha] in (37a), is usually maintained for both cases, albeit if the 'unknown' agent is emphasized, the active L1-structure [wa hid fatah il-ba b] (SCA) 'someone opened the door' is sometimes used instead of (36a) (for further information about the 'unknown', cf. chapter 2, section 2.3.3).

Naturally, the failure of surface-structure TCs led to a subsequent need for a more satisfactory account of the constant TC. It has been suggested by Di Pietro (1968), James (1969), Wagner (1970) among others that such an account would be the Chomskyan concept of deep structure, as will be discussed in the next section, and research gained considerable momentum on the part of other scholars such as Krzeszowski (1971), Denison (1973), and Widdowson (1974). In addition, several projects had already been carried out on some aspects of the Arabic syntax as contrasted with their English equivalents on theoretical grounds. For instance, Snow (1965), Killean (1966) and Lewkowicz (1967) were among those who conducted their research on the application of some transformational rules to MSA (cf. Kharma, 1983).

1.3.4 The Deep-Structure Level

Chomsky (1957), the proponent of Transformational Generative Grammar (TGG), coined the terms surface structure and deep structure to distinguish between 'language-specific' features and 'language-universal'
aspects respectively. The theory of TGG was in fact the result of mounting controversies in structuralism. In Chomsky (1965), the author expanded the theory from a broader perspective and, although it was exposed to some criticisms, TGG received considerable corroboration at the time. According to Chomsky, the principal notion of deep structure is to determine the 'logical' subject and object of the verb in ambiguous sentences such as (38a)

(38) a The man was good to leave.
    b It was good of the man to leave
    c It was good to leave the man

Therefore, it is the deep-structure configuration which upholds this type of interpretation in that 'the man' is the logical subject of the verb 'leave', as in (38b), and the logical object of the same verb as in (38c). More explicitly, deep structure accounts for the logical subject in pairs of passive/active sentences such as the following

(39) a The door was opened by him
    b He opened the door

While surface-structure representation marks two different surface subjects in (39a) and (39b), deep-structure configuration identifies only one logical subject for both sentences, that is, the person who opened the door. Hence, the notion of logical subject is traditionally recognized as the 'doer of the action' or the 'experiencer of the state' (cf. Smith and Wilson, 1979 101f). It seems, therefore, unlike surface structure, deep structure "is interpreted by the semantic component" (Chomsky, 1965 16, emphasis added).

As far as language transfer is concerned, CA looks at pairs of sentences such as (39a-b) as intralingual paraphrases within the L2, since "they convey the same ideational content [that is] they [. . .] share the same deep structure" (James, 1980 171, emphasis added). It follows that a given LI-sentence and its L2-counterpart could be regarded as interlingual paraphrases if they are said to hold the same ideational content. Chomsky, within the concept of language universals, stated that "the underlying deep structures vary slightly, at most, from language to language" (Chomsky, 1987: 80). In other words, interlingual paraphrases, as opposed to intralingual paraphrases which are assumed to imply language-specific features, have something to do with 'language-independent' aspects or language universals. As noted above,
the constant TC stands for the similarities between L1 and L2, and the variables refer to the differences. Therefore, it is presumed that deep structure, if it is indeed universal, would serve as the constant TC shared between L1 and L2, while, on the other hand, interlingual surface structures, where they differ, are the variables. Hence, Whitman (1970 40) and Di Pietro (1971 26) argued that such variables should converge at 'intermediate structures' or, in Krzeszowski's (1971 38f) terms, 'congruent deep structures'. By recourse to the transformational rules extrapolated from the theory of TGG, contrastivists tried to compare pairs of L1-L2 sentences sharing common intermediate structures and to identify the degrees of difference in rule application (cf James, 1980 45f). Several transformational rules were applied in this context. Two types of these rules will be considered here with some examples from Arabic and English.

(i) The L1 applies rule X, the L2 does not (or vice versa)

\[(40)\]

\(a \) [al-kila bu wafiyya] \(\text{(MSA)}\)

(Lit the dogs ---- faithful)

\(b \) ---- Dogs are faithful \(\text{(L2-U)}\)

As noted above, while Arabic in \((40a)\) applies the rule of retaining the definite article [al] to denote a generic noun, English is characterized by the non-use of 'the' in the L2-equivalent \((40b)\). Conversely, Arabic does not maintain the use of 'BE' as a copular 'verb, whereas English does.

(ii) In the L1, rule X is obligatory, in the L2 it is optional (or vice versa)

\[(41)\]

\(a \) [arsaltu ar-risa lata al-latî katabtu (ha )] \(\text{(MSA)}\)

(Lit sent (I) the letter which/that wrote (I) \(\text{(it)}\))

\(b \) I sent the letter \((which/that)\) I wrote ----

From the viewpoint of MSA, if the antecedent of the main clause is definite as is the case of [ar-risa lata] in \((41a)\), then the relative pronoun [al-latî.] that follows is obligatory, whereas in the L2-equivalent \((41b)\) the relative pronoun 'which/that' is optional since it stands for the object of the relative clause. Further, in MSA the resumptive pronoun [ha] (the object of the relative clause) is
optionally inserted, and in SCA it is usually inserted in the form of [a] as is the case of example (15a) above (cf. section 13.1, parameter (11i)), while in English the L2-equivalent 'it' is obligatorily deleted (for a detailed analysis of relative-clause formation, cf. chapter 6, section 6.2.4)

In such a way, transformational rules may be thought of as determining the difference in rule application between L1-surface structures and their L2-counterparts, regardless of the common intermediate structures they share. Transformational rules were, on the other hand, employed to determine the similarity in rule application. For example

(42) a [arbahani ar-riha nu nuqu dan kathi ratan] (MSA)
   b [ar-riha nu arbahani nuqu dan kathi ratan] (MSA)
   (Lit: the bet won (he/it) me money much)
   c The bet won me much money (L2-U)
(43) a [rabihtu nuqu dan kathi raman bi-rrriha ni] (MSA)
   (Lit: won (I) money much with the bet)
   b I won much money with the bet (L2-U)
(44) a [rabihtu bi-rrriha ni nuqu dan kathi ratan] (MSA)
   (Lit: won (I) with the bet money much)
   b. I won with the bet much money (L2-U)
(45) a [bi-rrriha ni rabihtu nuqu dan kathi ratan] (MSA)
   (Lit: with the bet won (I) money much)
   b. With the bet I won much money (L2-U)

As the above L1-L2 structures illustrate, the word [ar-riha n] 'the bet' functions as the instrument and the pronouns [ni ] 'me' in (42) and [u] 'I' in (43-45) stand for the logical subject or the experiencer of the state whatever transformational rules can be applied to both Arabic and English (for a similar analysis of German/English structures, cf. Konig, 1970 45, 1972 57)

Within traditional TGG, some researchers such as Klima (1962) represented a straightforward procedure to check for the degrees of rule applicability and inapplicability in a given German/English pair of structures (cf. James, 1980 172f) Such a procedure can also be exemplified through the transformation of the Arabic counterpart

(46) a [ysaf'aluha du'na an yarawhu] (MSA)
   (Lit: does (he) it without to see (they) him)
   b He does it without their seeing him (L2-U)
### Arabic Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Rules</th>
<th>English Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)  $ \rightarrow [\text{yaf''aluha du na}] + [\text{Comp}]$</td>
<td>(1)  $S \rightarrow (\text{he does it without}) + (\text{Comp})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)  $\text{Comp} \rightarrow [\text{yarawnahu}]$</td>
<td>(2)  $\text{Comp} \rightarrow (\text{they see him})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)  $\text{Embed (2) in (1)} \rightarrow [\text{yaf''aluha du na}] + [\text{yarawnahu}]$</td>
<td>(3)  $\text{Embed (2) in (1)} \rightarrow (\text{he does it without}) + (\text{they see him})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)  $\text{Convert Verb into Accusative governed by Particle of Infinitiveness [an]}$</td>
<td>(4)  Replace Tense by Gerund Marker (-ING)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow [\text{an yaraw----hu}]$</td>
<td>(they see him) $\rightarrow (\text{they seeing him})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)  N/A</td>
<td>(5)  Convert Subject Pronoun of embedded sentence into (OBJ/POSSESS) form (they seeing) $\rightarrow (\text{their seeing him})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)  N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, transformational rules such as (1) to (6) are assumed to be examined within the deep structures of a given pair of L1-L2 sentences until the ultimate surface structures as in (46 a-b) are reached. These rules show that the L1-sentence (46a) and the L2-sentence (46b) converge in the application of the first three rules (1) to (3), whereas the former begins to diverge in rule (4) which is not applicable (N/A) to the latter. Again the L2-sentence (46b) continues its divergence through rules (5) to (6) which, in turn, are not applicable to the L1-sentence (45a). With regard to the German/English examples cited by Klima, the transformation rules illustrate exactly the same degrees of convergence and divergence, that is, both sentences converge in rules (1) to (3) and diverge in rules (4) to (6). It may be the case that in German there is only one syntactic option as an equivalent to the English sentence (46b) 'Er tut es, ohne dass sie ihn sehen' 'He does it without their seeing him.' Surprisingly, the flexibility of the Arabic syntax permits another option which by far assigns a greater degree of convergence through all the above six rules, albeit both Arabic and English are totally unrelated languages. For example

(47)  a  [yaf'\'aluha du na ru\'yatihim lahu] (MSA)  
       (Lit: 'he does (he) it without their seeing (of) him')

       b  He does it without their seeing him (L2-U)
This indicates that both \([\text{an yarawhu}] \ 'to \ see \ him' \) in (46a) and \([\text{ru'yatihim lahu}] \ 'their \ seeing \ him' \) in (47a) share the same deep structure, that is, the infinitiveness of the verb \([\text{yarawhu}] \) which is governed by the particle \([\text{an}] \) (cf rule (4)) or the infinitiveness of the noun \([\text{ru'yat-}] \) which is traditionally known as \([\text{al-masdar}] \) the verbal noun (cf Kharma, 1983 46) Consequently, the deep structures shared between pairs of L1-surface structures such as these can be equated with those of the L2-counterparts where verbs (for example, 'hate', 'like', 'prefer' and so on) can be followed by either 'To + Infinitive' as in 'I like to see him' \([\text{uhibbu an ara hu}] \) or a gerund with no change of meaning as in 'I like seeing him' \([\text{uhibbu ru'yatahu}] \)

It now becomes clear that the difference and similarity in rule application can be taken at various levels of linguistic realization within deep structure, thus enabling the analyst to determine the degrees of divergence and convergence in a given pair of L1-L2 surface structures. In other words, the earlier the transformational rules applied to a pair of L1-L2 sentences diverge, the greater the difference there will be, the later the greater the similarity (cf James, 1980 172) Deep structure was, therefore, said to be a more convenient TC than surface structure as the universal aspects of the L1 and L2 were deemed to be the contrastive issue at hand, regardless of the interlingually divergent surface structures the two languages have. Hence, investigation of deep structure would, in such a view, yield better insights into transfer effects, since some empirical research, for example Ferguson (1971), was endorsed by the evidence "that learners, at least those left to their own devices to pick up an L2 in a natural way, instinctively return to deep structure" (James, 1980 174, emphasis added) These instinctive tendencies were observed in the learner's misuse of formal devices such as articles, conjunctions, inflections which, as seen in the preceding section, are characteristic of surface-structure description (cf Figure 2) It appears that a certain utterance produced by the learner in the L2 may sometimes reflect the deep structure of the L2-equivalent due to his falling back on the surface structure of the L1-counterpart In this context, the following actual utterance produced by an Arab learner can be exemplified

\(48\) * I shall see him \( \text{like} \) this day the next week (AE)
Following the two types of transformational rules discussed above, Arabic transfer effects are detectable by recourse to the possible L1-utterances (49 a-b) as compared with the L2-equivalent (49c) below

(49) a [b’su fo mitl hal-yo m il-ʔisbu ? il-ja y] (NCD/SCD)

b [ra h ʔasu:fo mithil hal-yo m il-ʔisbu ? il-ʔa dim] (ECD)

(Lit shall see (I) him like this the day the week the next)

c I shall see him ---- this day ---- (next) week (L2-U)

Although the actual utterance (48) deviates superficially from the syntactic system of English, it may be looked upon as the deep structure, or as derived from the deep structure, of the L2-utterance (49c), whilst at the same time reflecting many of the surface-structure constituents of the L1-counterparts (49 a-b) This assumption might be justified on two accounts First, the redundant use of the conjunction 'like' and the article 'the' in (48) is ascribable to the use of [mitl]/[mithil] and [il] in (49 a-b) the rules of which are applicable in the L1 and inapplicable in the L2 (cf type (i) of transformational rules) Second, the use of the adjective 'next' in (48) reflects the learner's resort to [ja y]/[qa dim] in (49 a-b) the rule of which is obligatory in the L1 and optional in the L2 (cf type (ii) of transformational rules) It appears, therefore, that if (48) is not indeed the deep structure of (49c), both identifications would at least be regarded as interlingual paraphrases due to the common deep structure they share, that is, the one which is responsible for all possible interpretations of the two However, in addition to Corder's (1973 234) caution about the comparison of L1-L2 surface structures as mentioned in the previous section, it is felt that one must also be wary of relying on deep-structure identity in that a pair of interlingual surface structures with a common deep structure may imply different communicative purposes (cf section 1 3 2, parameter (i)) Hence, from a pedagogical perspective, it has been emphasized that the relevance of deep structure in CA is limited, since interlingual errors are superficially observable in the surface structures of the utterances produced by the learner This means that, where transfer effects are attested, it is the surface structure which triggers negative transfer as a result of the structural discrepancies between L1 and L2, whereas deep structure has to do with positive transfer From such a conclusion, surface structure, not deep structure, is said to be taught to the learner as he would eventually recognize the latter if it is indeed
universal (cf James, 1980 175) Although deep-structure identity may contribute to how transfer operates in the learner's mind, the limitation of its relevance in CA may well be due to, as Halliday (1970) pointed out, its concern with only one kind of meaning, that is the abstract or ideational content, and neglect of others (for further information, cf chapter 2, section 2.3.3).

Finally, CA, like any other theory in applied linguistics, was not without its critics. This is because CA, in its inextricable association with behaviourism, did not provide an adequate framework for the processes underlying L2-learning and, therefore, the mechanisms of transfer were not scrutinized from a deeper perspective. The next section will consider the theoretical criticism of CA.

1.4 The Theoretical Criticism of CA

As discussed earlier, CA was the product of two schools of thought: behaviourism and structuralism. While the former looked upon language as 'a set of habits', the latter emphasized 'the diversity of languages'. These are the two tenets which were set up by traditional contrastivists (cf section 1.1.1). In the field of L1-acquisition research, Chomsky, more than anyone else, demonstrated the sterility of the behavioural-structural model. His own writings, mainly within his theory of TGG, also pioneered a far more profound approach to psycholinguistics known as cognitivism. In effect, TGG was re-examined from a rather complex perspective to formulate the theoretical basis of Generative Semantics (GS) and to consider the acquisition of meaning an essential part of the child's cognitive abilities to process his L1. Such speculations soon spread into the field of L2-acquisition research and, accordingly, the rejection of the behavioural-structural model resulted in a severe attack on CA which, in turn, led the notion of transfer to fall into disfavour.

In this section, the strictures of the behavioural-structural model will be considered by reference to both fields L1-acquisition and L2-acquisition to show that the devaluation of CA— and therefore of language transfer— was merely a devaluation of the theoretical basis drawn upon such a model.
1.4.1 L1-Acquisition Research

Chomsky (1959), in his articulate denunciation of Skinner's *Verbal Behaviour*, substantially argued that language, not languages, could not be scrutinized solely in terms of S-R associations "because all the information for the processing of speech is not present in observable behaviour" (Slobin, 1979: 25). Thus, according to Chomsky, every utterance one produces is novel and has never been heard or uttered before; nor will it ever be repeated exactly the same on future occasions. This is the basic concept of generativism in the sense that the organism, or the human being, always generates novel utterances in his L1. As opposed to behaviourism, the child, here, is no longer deemed to be born with the 'clean slate' mentioned earlier (cf. section 1.2.2), but rather with a 'built-in' device which predisposes him to language acquisition resulting in the construction of an internalized system of languages. Chomsky termed this device *Language Acquisition Device* (LAD) or, as others called it, *Language Acquisition System* (LAS) (for other alternatives, cf. chapter 3, sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2). In this context, McNeill provided a full account of LAD, as discussed by Chomsky (1961; 1965) and Katz (1966), and represented it schematically as follows:

Primary Linguistic Data ----> LAD ----> Grammatical Competence

Thus, the internal structure of LAD, that is the content of the box, is characterized by four innate properties: (i) the ability to distinguish speech sounds from other sounds; (ii) the ability to organize linguistic events into classes; (iii) the ability to know the linguistic system; and (iv) the ability to develop linguistic data constantly (cf. McNeill, 1966: 38f). It follows that the behaviouristic principles of imitation and reinforcement were rejected because "what the child learns is not a set of utterances, but a set of rules for processing utterances" (Slobin, 1979: 25). Hence, Chomsky claimed that these principles could not account for the creativity of language, nor for the child's mastery of his L1 in such a short time despite the highly abstract nature of linguistic rules. Child language is, therefore, creative and 'free from stimulus control'; it is also 'rule-governed'; that is, the utterances the child makes have a certain grammatical structure (cf. Lyons, 1981b: 230). This indicates that
language is, at any stage, systematic, and the child is constantly forming hypotheses on the basis of the input he receives and testing them in his speech. Testing hypotheses develops as the underlying and unobservable linguistic structures develop in the child's mind (cf. Brown, 1980 22f) Clearly, therefore, linguistic theory has witnessed a turning-point in search for a formal set of rules to constitute a generative grammar.

As noted above, one of the tendencies which gave behaviourism its particular impetus was 'the rejection of mentalism' (cf. section 12.2). In the light of what precedes, Chomsky underlined the fact that linguistic theory, too, has an important role to play in the examination of the human mind. His contention was to restore under consideration the previously rejected mentalist approach in that the internal mental processes are by no means regarded as 'inaudible' speech behaviour, but rather the study of language would help the researcher to investigate such mental processes. Chomsky stated:

There are any number of questions that might lead one to understand a study of language. Personally, I am primarily intrigued by the possibility of learning something, from the study of language, that will bring to light inherent properties of the human mind (Chomsky, 1975 103, emphasis added).

The study of language, therefore, may very well "provide a remarkably favourable perspective for the study of human mental processes" (Chomsky, 1975 98). It follows that the main distinction between Bloomfieldian structuralism and Chomskyan generativism is that the former stressed the structural diversity of languages or language specifics, whereas the latter had to do with the attitudes towards language universals, that is, generativists, unlike structuralists, were concerned with what languages have in common. It has been argued, however, that the American structuralists Sapir and Whorf, who emphasized language specifics (cf. section 13.1), foreshadowed the study of language universals which, recently, has imposed a new phase of exhausting complexity on the task of CA (cf. Sajavaara, 1981 40). As noted above, traditional CAs were conducted on the surface-structure categories of the L1 and L2, and, within the descriptive procedures of structuralism, these CAs failed to establish surface structures as TCs (cf. section 13.3). Further, the theoretical schemes of CA were paralleled with the conspicuous change of linguistic theory in that contrastivists moved their research onto the application of the
deep-structure principle which, being more convincing though still unsatisfactory, looks upon the language universals of the L1 and L2 as examples of the constant TC for CA (cf. section 13.4).

It follows from the above that the two predominant schools, structuralism and behaviourism, were superseded by generativism and mentalism respectively. Within the notions of competence and innateness, Chomsky and his followers explicitly outlined the theoretical parameters of mentalism which, as mentioned above, gave rise to a more complex approach referred to as cognitivism, a seemingly supplementary version of the former. Hence, cognitivists realized that language was difficult to consider separately from the cognitive and affective framework. They tried to probe "the very deepest level [...] where memory, perception, thought, meaning and emotion are all interdependently organized in the superstructure of the human mind" (Brown, 1980, 25). In TGG, on the other hand, the syntactic component was taken as central to all linguistic components of utterances "syntax is prior to both semantics and phonology prior in the sense that there are phonological and semantic processes which depend for their statement on syntactic facts" (Smith and Wilson, 1979, 66). The same writers pointed to the fact that syntactic priority has nothing to do with the order of events which occur in actual speech production or comprehension. This priority lies in the abstract level of the linguistic realization of utterances, whereas, in actual speech processing, it would be absurd to state that the syntactic representation of utterances had to be realized by the speaker before deciding the intended choices of message (Smith and Wilson, 1979, 66, a footnote). However, in actual utterances "the complexities of syntax remain, but it may be possible to trace them back to the underlying mental configurations" (Slobin, 1979, 27). It seems, therefore, that such configurations forced researchers like Lakoff (1968, 1970), McCawley (1971) and Dowty (1972) to develop a deeper and more complex approach known as Generative Semantics (GS). Thus, unlike TGG, GS puts aspects of meaning in the foreground. In Slobin's words, because [GS] breaks sentences down into underlying propositions and primitive meaning components, it has become a useful tool for cognitive psychologists [e.g., Norman et al. (1975)] and investigators of child language development (Slobin, 1979, 27, emphasis added).
It should be noted, however, that Chomsky in recent writings still emphasizes the autonomy of syntax, that is, in speech processing syntax maintains its independence from semantics (cf Chomsky, 1977 36f) Although both TGG and GS converge at stressing language universals, the main distinction between the two approaches is that TGG describes the ideational content in terms of grammatical notions such as NP, VP and PP within their syntactic relationships (cf section 13.4); whereas GS often uses 'idea-like' terms borrowed from logic such as those discussed by Fillmore (1968, 1971a, 1971b) in his theory of Case Grammar Among these terms are predicate-argument notations and the common dimensions or features of meaning which are used to describe the semantic structures of language It is worth mentioning here that, within the CA-based studies of lexis, the core meaning and the common feature analysed by Kellerman (1978a) and Huxley (1986) respectively are examples of investigating the L1-L2 semantic structures (cf section 13.2) Therefore, cognitive psychologists "have used such structures to represent thought patterns which underlie speech and comprehension" (Slobin, 1979 28)

As a consequence, the learning of meanings, in all languages, is assumed to depend on cognitive development whose sequences (that is, the choices of message referred to above) are determined more by semantic than syntactic complexity Such an assumption was also adopted by Piaget (1951, 1955) who described overall development as a result of the child's interaction with his environment This interaction, it is believed, acts as a complementary interface between the child's cognitive capacities—which are always developing— and his linguistic experience Hence, what the child learns about language is usually determined by what he already knows about the world in general (cf Slobin, 1979 81, Brown, 1980 26)

So far the criticisms levelled against behaviourism and structuralism have been put forward with reference to L1-acquisition research The next section will consider the results of such criticisms with reference to L2-acquisition research

1.4.2 L2-Acquisition Research

As mentioned earlier, the applied linguists who were influenced by the behaviouristic constructs of L1-acquisition assumed that L2-acquisition involved the same constructs (cf Stern (1970), section
1.2 2) It appears that these constructs, together with the impact of structuralism, strongly buttressed the audio-lingual approach to L2-teaching during the 1940s and the 1950s. Thus, within the belief that language is a set of habits, the audio-lingual approach was based on "mimicry, memorization, and over-learning of sets of phrases and patterns" (Celce-Murcia, 1984 3). Following Chomsky's (1959) criticism of the behavioural-structural model as discussed in the preceding section, there appeared pioneering attempts by more cognitively-oriented psycholinguists like Miller (1967) who "foreshadowed the decline in popularity of the audio-lingual approach" (Celce-Murcia, 1984 3).

Accordingly, the applied linguists who were strongly influenced by the new generative-cognitive model recognized the pitfalls of drawing direct global analogies between L1 and L2-acquisition (cf Brown, 1980. 43). For instance, Ausubel was one of the first psycholinguists who, from a cognitive perspective, warned language teachers of the limitations of the audio-lingual approach. In a critical account of this approach, Ausubel outlined five characteristics as being incompatible with the effective learning process in adults. These are (i) rote learning, (ii) the inductive learning of grammar, (iii) the neglect of the mediational role of the L1, (iv) the presentation of spoken before written forms, and (v) an insistence on exposing the beginner to the natural speed rendition of spoken production (Ausubel, 1964 420). Clearly, therefore, the third characteristic is reminiscent of one of the behaviouristic global analogies which inherently supersedes any role of the L1 (cf Stern (1970), section 1 2 2, item 6). This seems to have been a logical consequence of traditional CA's concern with mainly the inhibiting effects of the L1 to avoid the risk of potential errors (cf section 1 2 3). On the contrary, Ausubel emphasized the facilitating factor of the L1 which only adults are capable of utilizing in L2-learning compared with children acquiring their L1. In other words, adults, unlike children, enjoy a larger range of potential L1-vocabulary which could help them produce particularly abstract concepts in the L2. Furthermore, adults are more efficient at conscious grammatical generalizations than children, so that the former can make use of the structural patterns which are identical or nearly identical in the two languages because the L1-patterns, in this case, are directly transferable onto the L2 (Ausubel, 1964 422). According to this view, if both adults and children share the same L1 and happen to learn a given L2, then the former would achieve a better degree of L2-profiency than
the latter. By focusing on the facilitative role of the L1, Ausubel seems to have foreshadowed the re-orientated position adopted by researchers of today for the re-affirming of language transfer (cf chapter 3)

Following Ausubel's speculations, there were other researchers such as Corder (1967), Jakobovits (1968), Cook (1969) and Macnamara (1975) who, from a generative perspective, also criticized the behaviouristic global analogies between L1 and L2-acquisition, whilst at the same time recognizing that a comparison of the two processes could throw light on the legitimate similarities which may help to conceive of the underlying processes of L2-learning. For instance, Corder pointed out that the differences between the two processes are obvious but not easy to explain. L1-acquisition is inevitable and constitutes part of the whole maturational process of the child, whereas L2-acquisition is not inevitable as it normally begins after the completion of the maturational process. Further, it is often unknown when L1-acquisition starts with overt language behaviour, while in the case of L2-acquisition such behaviour exists. However, these differences, Corder argued, do not convey information about the underlying processes of L1 and L2-acquisition (Corder, 1967, reprint 6f). With regard to the similarities in internal mechanisms, on the other hand, Corder suggested that both the L1-acquirer and the L2-learner might adopt fundamentally the same procedures or strategies. Hence, if L1-L2 utterances differed, as clearly they did, the "differences could be accounted for by differences in maturational development, motivation for learning and the circumstances of learning" (Corder, 1975 62).

Moreover, Macnamara discussed three central issues which had been raised as objections against the direct global analogies drawn by the behaviourists. First, the age constant which, unlike the belief that children are faster at learning than adults, was investigated through experimental research to prove that adults are much better than children, especially at deciphering instructions given in the L2. Second, the attitudes which correlate with success in L2-learning. Thus, an integrative attitude is said to be more fruitful in L2-learning than an instrumental or a utilitarian one (cf also Dulay et al., 1982 47f).

Third, the time spent on L2-learning constitutes the major difference between formal (classroom) and informal (naturalistic) settings (Macnamara, 1975 75f).

It follows from the above that the facilitative role of the L1
stressed by Ausubel appears to be extrapolated from the language universals which address themselves to the linguistic similarity between L1 and L2. Further, the internal mechanisms referred to by Corder and the ability to decipher instructions discussed by Macnamara imply that the process of language learning is mainly a possession of linguistic knowledge (linguistic competence), that is, the organism acquires or learns a language via a set of cognitive structures (cf. Corder, 1975: 62) This brings to light the two general tenets aimed at within the new generative-cognitive framework first, language universals, and second, language is a set of cognitive structures. It now becomes clear that the attack made against CA was essentially against the two slogans language specifics and language is a set of habits which were set up by traditional contrastivists at the time of the Second World War (cf. section 111) Such an attack was in fact a result of sceptical attitudes towards the validity of CA's global parameters as postulated under the impact of the structural-behavioural model. These can be classified into three major parameters

(1) The correlation of difference with difficulty

The term difference is a linguistic term borrowed from structuralism, whereas difficulty is a psychological term derived from the general learning theory of behaviourism. In opposition to this parameter, it has been argued that the degree of difference between L1 and L2 does not necessarily correspond to the magnitude of difficulty in L2-learning (cf. Ellis, 1985: 30f). For instance, the morphological system of the past, or perfect, form of the verb in MSA is considerably different from that of the English equivalent. While the former is inflected by a different infix for each personal pronoun, the latter, in the case of a regular verb, is simply marked by the morpheme -ed suffixed to it for all pronouns as in the following examples

(50) a  [laʔibtu] 'I played'
    b  [laʔibtna] 'we played'

(51) a  [laʔibta] 'you played' (singular, masculine)
    b  [laʔibti] 'you played' (singular, feminine)
    c  [laʔibtuma] 'you played' (dual, masculine/feminine)
    d  [laʔibcum] 'you played' (plural, masculine)
    e  [laʔibcumna] 'you played' (plural feminine)
As the above examples illustrate, the significant difference between the two verb forms cannot be viewed as a source of difficulty in learning the morphological endings of the L2-verb which simply involves the suffixing of the morpheme -ed for all pronouns.

(ii) The correlation of similarity with ease

Again, this is not always the case as it is quite possible to find L1-L2 pairs of superficially similar utterances which, however, perform different communicative functions. For example

(52) a [laʔiba] 'he played'
b [laʔibat] 'she played'
c [laʔiba] 'they played' (dual, masculine)
d [laʔibata] 'they played' (dual, feminine)
e [laʔibu] 'they played' (plural, masculine)
f [laʔibnα] 'they played' (plural, feminine)

Although these two utterances resemble each other in lexical selections, the predictively L1-based L2-word 'cool' in (53a) suggests that the person, that is the addressee, is calm, unexcited or does not get agitated, whereas the L1-equivalent [ba rid] in (53b) is usually said in SCA to indicate that the person in question is silly or obnoxious.

(53) a Don't be cool
     b [la t'ku n ba rid]/[la titba rad]
     (Lit not be (you, sing, masc) cool)

(54) a The food is on the fire
     b [lʔakil ?anna r]
     (Lit the food on the fire)

Given that the utterance (54a) was actually produced by an Arab learner, it seems that the meaning intended, as it has been attested, is evidence of his resort to the L1-utterance (54b) by means of a verbatim translation strategy. In English, the utterance 'the food is on fire'—notice the nonuse of the definite article—indicates that the food is burning, whereas, upon producing (54a), the context suggests that the food in question was being cooked which refers to the same meaning intended by (54b) in SCA. As a consequence, the superficial similarity of L1-L2 pairs of utterances such as (53 a-b) and (54 a-b) may be the key to ease of learning but the surface structures of utterances however, ignoring the difference in the intended meaning may very well lead to miscommunication (for further examples, cf section 1.3.2,
TRANSFER AND CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Moreover, the term similarity as proposed in its simplified sense seems to be misleading since the magnitude and type of similarity between L1 and L2 were not clearly identified. Recently, the term has received much attention in that the scope of similarity is looked upon as one of the strongest preconditions for language transfer to occur (for detailed information, cf. chapter 4).

The predictions of errors and nonerrors on the basis of difficulty and ease respectively

The criticisms levelled against this parameter arose from the empirical research conducted during the late 1960s and the early 1970s. The research demonstrated that certain L2-structures which had been predicted as difficult did not in fact produce errors. Paradoxically, several erroneous examples were actually produced more easily than those which had been predicted as easy (cf. Ellis, 1985:31). For example:

(55) a He prescribed some medicines for me (L2-U)  
    b [wasafa lī baʔarth al-adwiya] (MSA)

(56) a He wrote some medicines for me (AU)  
    b [katab lī ṣwayyet adwiye] (SCA)

Since both the L1-noun [wasfa] in Arabic and the L2-noun 'prescription' in English can be verbalized as [wasfa] in (55b) and 'prescribed' in (55a), CA would suggest that [wasfa] is directly transferable to 'prescribed' due to the syntactic and lexical correspondence between the two. Therefore, the L2-utterance (55a) would be predicted as easy for the Arab learner because it resembles the L1-utterance (55b) in the verbal and lexical use of the item in question. This prediction might not be absurd if the L1-verb [wasafa] was the only lexical item used in such a context. However, the domination of SCA results in a much more frequent use of the L1-verb [katab] in (56b) than [wasafa] in (55b), though both verbs are possible in SCA and MSA. This does not necessarily mean that, within the use of Arabic as a L1, the verb [katab] is easier than the verb [wasafa], but rather, in the case of English as a L2, the transferability of the former as 'wrote' in the actual utterance (56a) is much easier than that of the latter as 'prescribed' in (55a). It may be the case that the L1-based L2-verb 'wrote' demands less phonological efforts than does 'prescribed' in the first place as it has been attested that the learner, that is the producer of (56a), knows the latter as a lexical item. Consequently, the
actual utterance (56a) clearly indicates an easier attempt at producing 'wrote' than 'prescribed'; albeit the former does not usually occur in such a context in English, and the latter would be predicted as easy because it coincides with [wasafa] both in syntactic and lexical representations (for further analysis, cf. chapter 6, section 6.3.1, example (18)).

To conclude, the CA-Hypothesis, in its association with the behavioural-structural model, was vulnerable to criticism before empirical research proved many of the logical flaws in its theoretical constructs. The 'crisis' of the CA-Hypothesis was also augmented by the practical investigations which showed that a large number of learners' actual errors were not traceable to LI-influence, nor could they be predicted or explained by CA. On the other hand, many of the errors which were predicted on the basis of difference did not, in fact, appear in actual production. As a result of such investigations, the CA-Hypothesis was almost demolished and researchers such as Dulay and Burt (1973, 1974a) tried to minimize the role of the LI. In a plea for a more feasible procedure to study and analyse learners' errors, the theory of Error Analysis (EA) emerged as an alternative to CA when linguistic theory was still in a state of flux. The next chapter will consider the theory of EA and the attitudes struck by its proponents towards language transfer.
Like the CA-Hypothesis, the theory of Error Analysis (EA) has had a long tradition in L2-learning/teaching research. It dates back to the 1940s when interest in EA-based techniques was little more than an impressionistic collection of 'common' errors or mistakes and their mere structural classification to meet the requirements of both the teacher to monitor his students, and the learner to help him correct his errors (cf. for example, French, 1956, Fitikides, 1963).

The first section of this chapter (section 2.1) will consider briefly the procedures of EA in its conventional sense. It will open the discussion about the aims and methodology of such procedures. The section will finish with a review of some of the criticisms voiced against the limitations of conventional EA.

The second section (section 2.2) will approach the resurgence of EA whose ultimate rationale was essentially formulated by the constructs of the generative-cognitive model. It will draw on Corder's pioneering insights into the significance of errors and the distinction between errors and mistakes. The discussion will move onto the practical research (for example, Dulay and Burt) which, under the guises of EA was mainly a dire reaction against the shackles of CA, a seemingly logical continuation of its theoretical criticisms outlined in the previous chapter. Hence, the 'crisis' of CA during the late 1960s and early 1970s and the playing down of the role of the L1 will be traced. In addition, the identification of errors by several researchers will be chronologically schematized.

The third section (section 2.3) will be taken up by a consideration of the relationship between CA and EA. By reference to
both a contrastive and a non-contrastive approach to EA, the complementary link between the two will be emphasized as a more fruitful criterion for the analysis of language transfer. Within the contrastive approach to EA, Wardhaugh's critical account of the CA-Hypothesis (the strong version versus the weak version) as well as the counter-criticism spelled out by Schachter to vindicate CA will be outlined. Within the non-contrastive approach to EA, reference will be made to Richards' identification of intralingual errors which exclude any connection with L1-transfer. Conversely, an attempted analysis of some deviant utterances produced by Arab learners will bring to light a particular type of errors which can be viewed as examples of L1-error transfer. In addition, the Translation Equivalence (TE) discussed by James as the best available candidate for the constant TC will be highlighted.

The fourth and final section (section 2.4) will carefully identify the major categories of errors: interlingual errors and intralingual errors. Since there is considerable paucity of research into the interaction between these two categories, an attempt will be made to identify inter-intralingual errors as such in the current study. These will be explored throughout the discussion of the data in Part Two.

2.1 The Conventional Schemes of EA

As noted in the preceding chapter, from a behaviouristic perspective, researchers such as Brooks (1960) warned against the danger of establishing errors as habits. This indicates that, up to the mid 1960s, specifically when behaviourism was still pervasive, research rested on the elimination rather than on the study and analysis of errors. The prevention of errors was the central concern of CA which claimed the ability to predict potential errors on the basis of the difference between L1 and L2 (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2.3). Therefore, most errors were ascribed to L1-interference and, in effect, 'appropriate' steps were taken to minimize the learning problems caused by such errors. However, there were no serious attempts to provide an adequate definition for error in either linguistic or psychological terms as the remedy was more precautionary than explanatory at the time. Three issues are put forward in this section: the pedagogic aims of EA, the methodology of EA, and some of the criticisms of EA.
2.1.1 The Pedagogic Aims of EA

EA was conventionally conceived of for its long-term value in designing and organizing teaching materials. The aims of error collection were, therefore, purely pragmatic taken on the assumption that actual errors may elucidate the difficulties the learner experiences over certain aspects of the L2 (cf. Sridhar, 1981: 221). Hence, researchers like Corder suggested that "if learning were efficient, errors would not occur" (Corder, 1975: 60). As noted above, learning difficulties, according to CA, could be described by the persistence of the old habits of the LI and their interference with the new habits of the L2. From the viewpoint of EA, it is the learning difficulties which, after close observation, were looked upon "...as a basis for planning the time and emphasis to be placed on particular teaching points, as well as their sequencing" (Robinett and Schachter, 1983: 145). For instance, Lee advocated the term mistake analysis which, within both systematic and global collections, was proposed to excavate the most troublesome areas and to help the learner skip over the mistakes such areas created. Lee's underlying assumptions, however, seem to have been drawn upon CA's parameters. He pointed out that certain features of the L2 (English in this case) might be a 'mountain' for speakers of some LIs and a 'molehill' for speakers of other LIs; that is, difficulty and ease have their varying degrees in accordance with the learner's LI (Lee, 1957; reprint: 149). Yet the author did not recommend a comparison between LI and L2 for analysing the learners' language, but rather he suggested a mutual co-operation between the English-speaking teacher and, what he called, the 'local' teacher; that is, sharing the same LI of the learners he teaches. While the former, Lee argued, is qualified to list and describe the mistakes linguistically, the latter is better qualified to identify the causes underlying such mistakes, particularly those which are traceable to LI-influence. This mutual co-operation was regarded as an essential component for obtaining a maximum benefit in language teaching. Therefore, every mistake, according to Lee, can be seen from two angles: the English-speaking teacher and the 'local' teacher in that "...the resulting account of major types of mistakes will show clearly ...what is most difficult in English for the learners and what in the home language
It now becomes obvious that the approach to conventional EA had had its own practical implications even before the generative-cognitive model was influential. By identifying the difficult spots that the learner would encounter in L2-learning, it was believed that such an approach, as Sridhar has put it, could enable both the researcher and the teacher to achieve four distinct goals:

1. Determining the sequence of presentation of target items in textbook and classroom, with the difficult items following the easier ones.
2. Deciding the relative degree of emphasis, explanation, and practice required in putting across various items in the target language.
3. Devising remedial lessons and exercises.
4. Selecting items for testing the learner's proficiency.

(Sridhar, 1981 221-222)

2.1.2 The Methodology of EA

Together with EA in its 'modern' sense as will be discussed presently (cf. section 2.2 below), conventional EA is said to have followed a uniform methodology. In order to investigate the learner's language referred to by Lee in the previous section, a study and analysis of the learner's speech—as the only available source of data collection—should be carried out. It has been argued that the 'correct' utterances the learner produces convey little information about the 'new' language system he has developed at a given stage because these utterances "do not necessarily give evidence of the rules the learner is using or the hypothesis he is testing" (Richards, 1974. 1). A similar point had already been made by Corder (1967) as will be discussed presently (cf. section 2.2.1 below). It seems, therefore, that the study of the learner's speech is largely determined by the examination of the actual errors he makes, that is, the errors manifested in the production mode of his 'new' language. It follows that a number of researchers realized that these errors needed to be observed, analysed and classified as they may bring to light some of the keys to a better understanding of the processes and strategies underlying L2-learning/acquisition. Therefore, with regard to EA in its conventional sense, Sridhar has
mentioned six steps which are said to constitute the uniform methodology of EA (cf also Ellis, 1985 53f) These, in fact, had been previously spelled out in Corder (1971a, 1971b, 1973, 1974)

1 Collection of data (either from a 'free' composition by students on a given theme or from examination answers)
2 Identification of errors (labelling, with varying degrees of precision depending on the linguistic sophistication brought to bear on the task, with respect to the exact nature of the deviation, e.g. dangling preposition, anomalous sequence of tenses, etc).
3 Classification into error types (e.g. errors of agreement, articles, verb forms, etc.)
4 Statement of relative frequency of error types
5 Identification of the areas of difficulty in the target language.
6 Therapy (remedial drills, lessons, etc.)

(Sridhar, 1981 222, emphasis added)

The same writer refers to the more sophisticated empirical research as conducted by Duškova (1969) and Rossipal (1971) Within the study of the errors made by learners of English, these researchers went further to include one or both of the following steps

1 Analysis of the source of errors (e.g. mother tongue interference, over-generalization, inconsistencies in the spelling system of the target language, etc.)

2 Determination of the degree of disturbance caused by the error (or the seriousness of the error in terms of communication, norm, etc.)

(Sridhar, 1981 222, emphasis added)

It appears the case that all the above mentioned steps were established on the assumption that error making is a natural phenomenon. Thus, the possibility of error making exists whether the errors are attributable to L1-influence or not. Such a possibility has, in fact, forced several applied linguists to broaden, though recently, the theoretical basis of EA

2.1.3 Some Criticisms of EA

Three important issues have been emphasized in the methodological steps of EA (i) frequency of L2-errors, (ii) difficulty in L2-learning; and (iii) interlingual errors. These issues, in fact, have been mostly vulnerable to the criticisms levelled against conventional EA.
Along the first issue, it has been argued that the frequency of L2-errors correlates with learning difficulty, that is, the more frequent an error is, the more difficult its pattern will be in the production of the L2. Indubitably, the making of errors brings to light a certain degree of inherent difficulty in L2-learning, but conventional EA on its own is insufficient to provide an adequate explanation for the correlation between frequency and learning difficulty. Hence, in an analysis of the errors made by Czech learners of English, Dušková pointed to the fact that the "lower frequency of an error need not necessarily mean that the point in question is less difficult" (Dušková, 1969, reprint 218) This indicates that conventional EA on its own conveys little information, if any, about how and why certain types of errors are more, or less, frequent than others (cf also Ringbom, 1987 69f)

With respect to the second issue, EA, as noted above, laid special emphasis on learning difficulty in order to plan the time needed for particular teaching points and their sequencing (cf section 2 1 1) In opposition to this, empirical research has shown that EA on its own also provides inadequate explanation of what the learner is incapable of handling. For instance, in an exploration of the phenomenon of avoidance, Schachter (1974) and subsequently Hakuta (1976) and Kleinmann (1977, 1978) found out that the learner tended to avoid producing certain L2-structures simply because they were difficult, and thus the learner is said to have "at least some very faint idea of what the target L2-structure is like" (Kellerman, 1983 128) Schachter concluded that EA alone could not account for the learning difficulty leading to avoidance (for detailed information, cf chapter 4, section 4 1 2) Further, Ringbom re-states Palmberg (1985 35f) by citing another criticism cast against EA's inadequacy in explaining learning difficulty. Ringbom argues that considerable problems are likely to arise for researchers when they involve in the identification of learning difficulty. In his words "There seem to be no safe ways of measuring difficulty. The time taken to learn might be chosen as one way of measuring, but very often we cannot determine exactly when learning starts" (Ringbom, 1987 70)

The third issue concerns the errors which have connection with LI-influence, that is, interlingual errors (cf section 2 4 1 below) As noted at the outset of this chapter, most errors were, in the heyday of CA, ascribed to LI-interference and the research was primarily devoted to
comparing L1 and L2, and, therefore, predicting the potential areas of difficulty that would lead to such errors. However, although these errors were described in terms of linguistic difference, the issue rested on their eradication rather than on their explanation. Thus, the augmentation of enthusiasm for CA up to the mid 1960s had led to the relative neglect of EA due to its lack of both a theoretical and a psychological framework for explaining the role of errors in L2-learning/acquisition (cf Ellis, 1985: 51). Hence, in a discussion of the limitations of conventional EA, Ringbom emphasizes its one-sided and incomplete approach to the errors which are said to reflect L1-influence. He confirms the validity of his statement by reference to the notion of Crosslinguistic Influence, a relatively new concept in current thinking about language transfer (cf chapter 4). Ringbom states:

[ ] description and analysis of errors entail the risk of giving a distorted picture of the role of L1-influence. L1-influence does not manifest itself exclusively, probably not even primarily, in errors. Not all errors in learner language are due to transfer, and not all instances of transfer lead to errors. (Ringbom, 1987: 69)

However, although EA has its limitations, it is still considered an indispensable tool for a better understanding of the processes underlying L2-learning/acquisition, particularly when it is supplemented by other types of analysis such as frequency counts, CA and so on (cf Ringbom, 1987: 71). It seems, therefore, that these limitations have impelled several applied linguists to extend the theoretical basis of EA from a deeper and more complex perspective. Among them, probably the most prominent, is S. Pit Corder whose series of articles (for example, 1967, 1971a, 1971b, 1974, 1975) have initiated the revival of EA within the framework of the generative-cognitive model. The next section will approach such a revival and trace the position of transfer in the new direction of EA.

### 2.2 The Impending Resurgence of EA

As mentioned above, up to the mid 1960s, a preoccupation with CA resulted in the subsequent neglect of EA (cf section 2.1.3). On the other hand, Chomsky's attack on the structural-behavioural model led to,
at the very least, a rejection of the two slogans, which were set up by traditional contrastivists, and their substitution by the new slogans under the guises of the generative-cognitive model (cf. chapter 1, section 1.4). As a consequence, EA came back into existence with its new measures to meet the exigencies of the L2-errors that could not be accounted for by CA. Therefore, the theoretical climate of the 1960s seems to have provided the ultimate rationale for EA, albeit linguistic theory was still in a state of flux (cf. Dulay et al., 1982: 140f). In this context, Corder's series of articles referred to above as well as those of Selinker (1969), Strevens (1970) and Richards (1971a; 1971b; 1972) did in fact revolutionize the whole concept of EA. By generalizing across various but related aspects, this section will present a schematized overview of such a concept. Four issues will be considered: (i) the significance of errors; (ii) the distinction between errors and mistakes; (iii) the fall of transfer in the new direction of EA; and (iv) the identification of errors.

2.2.1 The Significance of Errors

Corder emphasized the significance of the errors observed in the learner's speech in that their study and analysis are central to the investigation of the linguistic data on which the learner has reconstructed his L2-knowledge; that is, his linguistic competence. Thus, the insights obtained from the study of errors might help to devise a teaching methodology and to facilitate the learning process. Corder clarifies the significance of errors to the teacher, the researcher and the learner as follows:

A learner's errors [...] are significant in three different ways. First to the teacher, in that they tell him [...] how far towards the goal the learner has progressed and, consequently, what remains for him to learn. Second, they provide to the researcher evidence of how language is learnt or acquired, what strategies or procedures the learner is employing in his discovery of the language. Thirdly [...] they are indispensable to the learner himself, because we can regard the making of errors as a device the learner uses in order to learn.

(Corder, 1967; reprint: 10f; emphasis added)
The making of errors, therefore, is not only inevitable but also necessary for the process of L2-learning/acquisition. Within the generative-cognitive model, the learner is assumed to possess a set of cognitive structures rather than a set of habits. Hence, unlike the behavioural belief that language is learnt by means of habit formation, cognitive structures are said to be internalized by means of data processing and hypothesis formation. The making of errors is, therefore, evidence of the learner's testing his hypotheses about the 'new' language he is learning (cf. Corder, 1967, reprint 11, 1975 62). Furthermore, the learner's errors, or hypotheses, are significant in that correct utterances cannot be taken as proof that the learner has learnt the systems which would generate [these utterances] in a native speaker (Corder, 1967, reprint 12). Mention has already been made of Richards (1974) who adopted a similar point (cf. section 2.1.2). Correct utterances, therefore, do not necessarily elucidate the nature of learner language, since he may merely be repeating or imitating an utterance heard from a native speaker of the L2. Repeating or imitating a correct utterance may constitute, as Corder used Spolsky's (1966) term, 'language-like' behaviour rather than language, unless otherwise the utterance in question is processed and formed as a hypothesis to be tested.

Moreover, Corder underlined the fact that the superficially well-formed utterances produced by the learner do not necessarily indicate his mastery of the 'new' language system. This seems to be verifiable in relation to the underlying meaning intended by the learner in a particular situational context. For example

(1) I want to know the English

The learner may produce this well-formed utterance to express the wish to know the English language, whereas the native speaker of English would receive it as implying the learner's sentimental wish to know the English people (Corder, 1967, reprint 12). In the light of the above example, the author made a distinction between overt errors and covert errors. While the former are ostensibly observable deviations from the standard norm of the L2, the latter "are not appropriate in the context in which they occur" (Corder, 1973 272f). As a consequence, the example (1) is perfectly acceptable if it is interpreted independently of...
its context, that is, the wish to know the English people; whereas it constitutes a covert error so long as it implies the wish to know the English language.

In fact, Corder put forth such an argument to justify his speculations on the significance of the learner's errors. It appears that these speculations were fundamentally based upon the 'substantial similarities' between the internal strategies or procedures employed by the L1-acquirer and those employed by the L2-learner, regardless of the conspicuous differences between the two (cf chapter 1, section 1.4.2). Clearly, therefore, Corder's influential writings on EA have, to a large extent, contributed to the new techniques of EA adopted by researchers of today. Apart from the conventional approach to EA, he looked at the learner's errors from a generative-cognitive perspective. Most of Corder's proposals were centered upon the relationship between what is taught and what is learnt on the one hand, and between what to correct and how to correct on the other. Such relationships can be studied more systematically through scrutinizing the entity of error both in linguistic and psychological terms. The next section will consider this entity from a deeper perspective.

2.2.2 Insights into Errors vs. Mistakes

Following his argument about the significance of the learner's errors, Corder also claimed that the learner, at any stage of development (learning), uses a definite system of language, and the errors he makes "are evidence of this system and are themselves systematic" (Corder, 1967, reprint 10, emphasis added). Here, the writer emphasizes the uniqueness of this system, that is, being incomplete, it represents neither the adult system nor that of the L2, a point that has received special attention in the study of learner language (cf chapter 3, section 3.1.1). As the term systematic indicates, the learner's errors are, at any stage of development, systematic as long as they convey information about the system of language the learner uses. This means that if there are other kinds of errors which cannot be evidence of such a system, then these errors are non-systematic or random.

The notion of systematicity is, in fact, derived from Chomsky's speculations on child language which is characterized by rule-governedness at any stage of acquisition (cf chapter 1, section...
Thus, the errors that the adult continually commits in his LI do not normally reflect a defect in his competence; that is, the underlying knowledge of his LI. Rather, these errors are due to such conditions as memory lapses, fatigue, and distractions which are said to be accidental in actual use (cf. Chomsky, 1965: 3). In the case of L2-acquisition, the learner is not expected to be void of such 'errors' as he is exposed to more or less the same conditions upon performing in the L2. Hence, Corder made a careful distinction between the "errors which are the product of such chance circumstances and those which reveal [the learner's] underlying knowledge of the language to date" (Corder, 1967; reprint: 10). Therefore, the author reserved the term error to refer to the systematic errors which reflect the learner's underlying knowledge of the L2, and used the term mistake to refer to errors of performance.

It follows that errors are by definition the consistent deviations which are evidence of the learner's still developing knowledge of the L2 or, as Corder called it, his transitional competence. In other words, systematic errors are symptomatic in that they enable the researcher to reconstruct what the learner has internalized at a given stage of learning. Therefore, errors cannot be corrected by the learner because they are a reflection of the only rules known to him in his transitional competence.

Mistakes, on the other hand, are inconsistent deviations due to the performance conditions referred to above. These may result in instances such as the failure to observe the sequence of tenses and to maintain spelling pronunciation or agreement in long sentences as demanded by the rules of the L2. Mistakes are typically random and adventitious, and do not represent a defect in the learner's underlying knowledge of the L2, since they are "causes of failure (for whatever reason) to follow a known rule" (Corder, 1971a; reprint: 18; original emphasis). In such a view, mistakes are readily corrected or correctable by the learner himself if attention is drawn to them. Because they suggest temporal or ephemeral deviations from presumably known L2-rules, mistakes are said to be of no significance to L2-learning/acquisition as the learner is "immediately aware of them when they occur" (Corder, 1967; reprint: 10).

Consequently, it is the systematic errors, not mistakes, which are central to the investigation of learner language. As mentioned in the preceding section, the study of errors has both theoretical and practical relevance for L2-teaching; that is, it is beneficial to the researcher at
one end and to the teacher and the learner at another. It should be noted, however, that to determine what is an error and what is a mistake constitutes a problem of some difficulty, since research into the underlying processes of L2-learning/acquisition has not yet provided an adequate framework. Such a problem involves, perhaps in the first place, much more sophisticated theorization of the learner's linguistic competence and performance in the L2.

Another line of thinking was endeavoured by Dulay and Burt who referred to errors as *goofs*, a term adopted from Burt and Kiparsky (1972). In an investigation of the languages of children learning a L2, Dulay and Burt defined the term as signifying "deviation from syntactic structures which native adult speakers consider grammatically correct" (Dulay and Burt, 1974a: 95). Thus, by reference to many of the facets of the generative-cognitive model, the researchers looked upon goofs as productive errors made by the child during L2-acquisition. They cited longitudinal empirical studies from a variety of languages to demonstrate that the goofs the child makes in the L2 indicate the same deviations of the goofs made by the child acquiring that L2 as his LI. Hence, in a critical account of CA, Dulay and Burt proposed an alternative approach to the prediction of goofs known as the L2=LI Hypothesis or, as others call it, the *Identity Hypothesis* (cf. Klein, 1986: 23). In such a hypothesis, Dulay and Burt almost entirely overlooked the role of the LI and ascribed the majority of goofs to other factors operating in L2-learning (cf. sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 below). Within the assumption that LI and L2-acquisition are basically two similar processes governed by the same laws, Dulay and Burt held the position that "children actively organize the L2-speech they hear and make generalizations about its structure as children learning their LI" (Dulay and Burt, 1983: 55). This position is, of course, different from the behaviourists' where the direct global analogies between LI and L2-acquisition were recommended (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2.2), even though neither position did fully acknowledge the role of the LI in L2-learning. While the behaviourists ignored LI-influence as a facilitating factor in L2-learning, Dulay and Burt, who brought with them a cognitively-based theory, reported the least percentage of interference goofs assuming that children (whatever the language they learn or acquire) follow the same routes of development. Thus, the similarities between the goofs made by a group of children learning a given L2 and those made by another group acquiring that L2 as their LI were attributed to the identical
internal mechanisms operating in L1 and L2-acquisition, that is, the same procedures or strategies discussed by Corder (cf chapter 1, section 142)

It should be noted, however, that despite the considerable influence that the writings of Dulay and Burt had in the field of L2-acquisition research, their sceptical attitudes towards language transfer do not seem to have gained approval from the researchers who, in recent years, have committed themselves to reconsider the theoretical basis of CA and therefore of transfer (for detailed information, cf chapter 3) The following section will consider some of the practical EA-based research and those 'extreme' results reported on language transfer

2.2.3 EA and the Controversy on CA

As noted above, the rejection of the behavioural-structural model and the development of the generative-cognitive framework were the theoretical climate which gave a particular impetus to the concept of EA The new direction of EA was remarkably enriched with a tremendous corpus of both theoretical and empirical research into the study of the learner's error Thus, the two goals of EA, that is theoretical for the researcher and practical for the teacher and the learner, were specified by Corder (cf section 2.2.1) However, beginning with the late 1960s, EA-based research was almost entirely concerned with the practical objectives such as 'planning remedial syllabuses' and 'devising appropriate techniques of correction' Hence, Corder pointed out that the exclusively practical concern of EA had long been detrimental to the researcher's prior task of evolving an adequate theory for the description of the learner's performance (Corder, 1971b, reprint 28f)

This may yield more profound insights into the strategies that the learner adopts during his intermediate functional-communicative system and what he has internalized from the input he receives, that is, his intake The learner's performance in the L2, Corder argued, may constitute a right or wrong system, and a wrong system may be legitimate 'sporadically and by chance' (Corder, 1973 274) Such occasional legitimacy seems to be resulting from, as Sridhar put it, "holophrastic learning or systematic avoidance of problem structures (Sridhar, 1981 225)"

Clearly, therefore, the ultimate objectives of EA were to describe,
in more detail, the nature of what the learner knows about the L2, that is his transitional competence, and to compare such knowledge with the standard norm of the L2 he is learning. This is, in fact, one of the logical reasons which led researchers to consider EA "a brand of comparative linguistic study" (Corder, 1973: 274). In this respect, both CA and EA appear to follow the same routes of research since the former, too, was developed as one of the major branches of comparative linguistics (cf. chapter 1, section 1.1), not withstanding that the techniques of the two approaches are paradoxical. While CA was postulated as a pre-procedural device to compare the learner's LI with the L2 he is willing to learn, EA was adopted as a post-procedural task to compare learner language with the L2 he is learning. In the CA-based literature, such a dichotomy was later spelled out in terms of the distinction between CA a priori and CA a posteriori (cf. section 2.3.1 below).

Therefore, the considerable difference in techniques between CA and EA entailed the emergence of the latter with its new measures as a logical reaction against the former in the first place. That is, the initial concern of EA, as discussed, rested on the treatment of the learner's actual errors which could not be explained by CA. In effect, there were a number of researchers who, from a pedagogical point of view, voiced their criticisms against the predictability of traditional CA, whilst at the same time accepting the indubitable fact of LI-influence. Such practical criticisms seem to have been a chronological continuation of the theoretical criticisms levelled at the behavioural-structural model on which CA's parameters were based (cf. chapter 1, section 1.4). Eventually, with the rejection of any approach to L2-teaching drawn upon such a model, there was a subsequent appeal for a change of pedagogical tactics.

One line of criticism comes from Newmark, who demonstrated the sterility of CA-based teaching tactics in dealing with the linguistic form to the detriment of its communicative function or functions. He pointed out that CA "leads to structural drills designed to teach a set of specific 'habits' for the well-formation of utterances, abstracted from normal social context" (Newmark, 1966, reprint 162). The author's suggestion was that the teaching methodology employing such structural drills was creating its own problems which were not difficult to discern in the learning process. Therefore, language teachers, Newmark argued, should not exert themselves to exclusively combat LI-intrusion, but focus
upon controlling the size of the input displayed for receptive skills, since interference might simply be a result of ignorance (Newmark, 1966, reprint 164, Newmark and Reibel, 1968 159-160) Recently, within the cognitive re-orientation of language transfer, Newmark and Reibel's ignorance hypotheses has been maintained by Krashen (1983) in terms of the monitor model and thus can be viewed as one of the related aspects of language loss (for detailed information, cf chapter 4, section 4.1.1)

Another line of criticism was voiced by Corder who pointed out that CA's parameters were inadequate to account for the prediction of the learning difficulties actually encountered by the learner. According to CA, these difficulties were deemed to be the prime source of errors. In Corder's words:

Teachers have not always been very impressed by this contribution from the linguist for the reason that their practical experience has usually already shown them where these difficulties lie and they have not felt that the contribution of the linguist has provided them with any significantly new information. They noted for example that many of the errors with which they were familiar were not predicted by the linguist anyway.

(Corder, 1967, reprint 5, emphasis added)

This type of criticism was clearly reported from teachers' practical experience which proved that many of the predictions made by CA were not verifiable. From a pedagogical perspective, the doubt cast about CA lied in the changing attitudes towards the role of errors in L2-learning (cf Ellis, 1985 32). As discussed above, in the heyday of CA, the attitudes towards errors were negative, and the pedagogical issue was merely preventative as most of the errors that the learner would make were attributed to L1-influence. On the contrary, with the resurgence of EA, the attitudes towards errors were positive, since the study of actual errors would provide invaluable insights into the nature of learner language (cf section 2.2.1)

The 'crisis' of CA was also brought about by the practical research conducted on the study of the learner's errors in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. Following Corder's criticism, there appeared other researchers (for example, Baird, 1967, Wilkins, 1968, Lee, 1968, and Duškova, 1969) who made similar points about CA as a weak predictor of errors. Wilkins, for instance, restated Upshur's (1962) critical account of CA by raising the following question
Yet is it true that by listing the areas of differences between languages we are listing all the linguistic difficulties that will occur? This is surely an over-simplified view. Many errors occur when students overgeneralize a new pattern into an area where the two languages are, in fact, similar. This cannot be predicted from a simple contrastive analysis.

(Wilkins, 1968, 101)

...The same writer noted that most of the learner's errors were ascribable to psychological and pedagogical problems rather than to linguistic aspects. Lee appears to have echoed the same statement by claiming that errors would emanate not only from L1-influence but also from false analogy between newly absorbed L2-items or rules. Such a statement, though carrying veritable conviction, was mainly a reaction against the seemingly 'misinterpreted' belief that "the prime cause, or even the sole cause, of difficulty and errors in L2 learning is interference coming from the learner's L1" (Lee, 1968, 180, emphasis added). Hence, Duškova, in her analysis of the grammatical and lexical errors made by Czech learners of English, reported "A large number of errors seem to have little, if any, connection with the L1" (Duškova, 1969, reprint 222). She listed separately those errors which were attestedly traceable to L1-influence and concluded that "while interference from the L1 plays a role, it is not the only interfering factor" (Duškova, 1969, reprint 228).

It seems, therefore, the above researchers were among many who discounted a great deal of CA's parameters as globally conceived differences will lead to negative transfer and are the sole source of difficulty. Their contention, as James put it, was that "There are other sources, which CA fails to predict. Even the unsophisticated teacher who knows no linguistics is conscious of more errors than CA can predict." (James, 1971, reprint 88). Consequently, the role of the L1 in L2 learning was played down and, in effect, there was an appeal for a more sophisticated study of the learner's actual errors. However, although it is quite true that there are certain types of errors which do not reflect L1-interference and therefore cannot be predicted by CA, the interpretation of CA's claim about L1-interference as the sole source of errors seems to be misleading. A plain answer to this point was articulated by James who precisely identified what in fact CA claimed:
patterns of a foreign language is their similarity to or difference from the patterns of the native language" (Lado 1964, pp 21 and 91) 'Chief source' and 'most important' imply that L1-interference is not conceived to be the only source

(James, 1971, reprint 88)

Accordingly, at about the same time, researchers such as Lance (1969), George (1971) and Brudhiprabha (1972) reported that one third of the learner's errors could be attributed to L1-influence (cf Richards and Sampson, 1974 5) This indicates that the supersession of the behavioural-structural model from which CA derived its psycholinguistic bases did not entail the rejection of the inevitable fact of language transfer in L2-learning Even researchers like Dulay and Burt (1973) who held rather extreme views in their disparagement of language transfer did not entirely deny this fact In an analysis of the production of syntax in the speech of Spanish children learning English, Dulay and Burt calculated the frequency of goof types (cf section 2.2.4 below) and recorded the least percentage of interference goofs (3%), whilst at the same time conceding that the major impact of the LI on L2-learning may have to do with phonology Dulay and Burt's approach will be discussed in further detail (cf chapter 3, sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3)

It seems, however, that several researchers did not bear out the results documented to minimize the role of the LI, particularly those reported by Dulay and Burt Through the analysis of grammar production specifically, these results showed considerable discrepancy in the proportions of interference errors Ellis argues that such discrepancy is, in fact, due to significant variables like 'the age of the learner', 'the degree of contrast between LI and L2' and 'the type of data collected' (Ellis, 1985 28f) Hence, the same writer mentions the different percentage of interference errors as listed in Table 3

As Table 3 illustrates, although these projects considerably vary in their results (notice the lowest rate recorded by Dulay and Burt), the average percentage of interference errors is almost 33% which is similar to the proportion reported by Lance (1969), George (1971) and Brudhiprabha (1972) referred to above Nevertheless, it is believed that to reach a final conclusion about an accurate percentage of interference errors is somewhat abstract, since the three variables (age, contrast and data) always play an important role Given the chance of assigning what errors are due to L1-influence, the results listed in Table 3 indicate that, in support of James' answer to the strictures of CA, L1-interference, whatever the exact percentage may be, is an inevitable
Table 3: Percentage of interference errors reported by various studies of L2-English grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Percentage of interference errors</th>
<th>Type of learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grauberg (1971)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>L1: German — adult, advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George (1972)</td>
<td>33% (approx)</td>
<td>Mixed Lls — adults, graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulay and Burt (1973)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>L1 Spanish — children, mixed level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tran-Chi-Chau (1974)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>L1 Chinese — mixed level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukattash (1977)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>L1 Arabic — adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flick (1980)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>L1 Spanish — adult, mixed level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lott (1983)</td>
<td>50% (approx)</td>
<td>L1: Italian — adult, university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

factor in L2-learning on the one hand and is not the sole source of L2-errors on the other. However, to distinguish interference errors from non-interference errors is a task fraught with some difficulty. For instance, while Butterworth and Hatch (1978) put down the omission of 'BE' to L1-interference from Spanish, Felix (1980) ascribed such a deviation to developmental factors. Further, Jackson (1981) found that non-inverted WH-questions were triggered by L1-interference from Punjabi, whereas recent research has established this deviation as a universal phenomenon (cf Ellis, 1985 29). The next section may make this point clear. It will consider interference errors as well as those error types which have no connection with L1-interference.

2.2.4 The Identification of Errors

As discussed above, there are indeed certain types of errors which could not be predicted or explained by CA and, therefore, EA re-emerged with its claim to account for such errors. Eventually, the learner's errors were often classified into two major categories – errors...
which reflect L1-influence and errors which do not reflect L1-influence. Under the latter category, several attempts were made to identify other types or sub-categories. These were assumed to appear due to pedagogical, psychological, or developmental factors. However, this does not indicate that the first category (the errors which reflect L1-influence) has nothing to do with these factors (cf. interlingual errors, section 2.4.1 below). Thus, in order to trace the development of error identification, a schematized overview will be chronologically presented by reference to those who tried to specify possible causes for the occurrence of errors.

One of the first attempts was made by Brooks who, from a behaviouristic perspective, pointed out that the learner's errors were likely to be the result of four distinct causes:

(a) The student may make a random response, that is, he may simply not know which of many responses is the right one.
(b) The student may have encountered the model but not have practised it a sufficient number of times.
(c) Distortion may have been induced by dissimilar patterns in English.
(d) The student may have made a response that follows a sound general rule but, because of an anomaly in the new language, is incorrect in this instance.

(Brooks, 1960, emphasis added)

By identifying cause (c), the author refers to those errors which are due to L1-influence, since distortion may be induced by the L1. Paradoxically, the other three causes have to do with the factors mentioned above. Cause (a) is psychological as it refers to the learner's lack of knowledge of the L2-item or rule, cause (b) is clearly attributable to pedagogical factors, and cause (d) seems to inherently imply the term overgeneralization as will be seen presently.

In his review of Valdman (1966), Wilkins (1968) reported some of the criticisms launched against CA's claim to predict interference errors as mentioned in the preceding section. He, then, concluded that many of the learner's errors were due to three causes:

(a) Overgeneralization of a new pattern into an area where the L1 and L2 are similar (cf. Brooks, causes (c) and (d))
(b) **Interference** between items within the L2; that is, between the forms and functions of the L2. This refers to the term *intralingual interference* coined by Richards as will be discussed presently.

(c) Confusion of previously learned correct items with others that the learner has failed to learn. Confusion is, therefore, due to psychological causes or inadequate learning (*cf* Brooks, causes (a) and (b)).

From a generative-cognitive perspective, Corder (1967) identified two major types of errors whether they are due to L1-influence or not (*cf* section 2.2.2)

(a) **Linguistic errors** are those systematic errors which reflect a defect in the learner's knowledge of the L2, that is, his *transitional competence*. Systematic errors are also classified into two sub-types, **overt errors** and **covert errors** (*cf* section 2.2.1, example (1))

(b) **Psychological mistakes** are those non-systematic errors which occur as a result of performance conditions such as memory lapses, fatigue, distraction and so on.

Another attempt was made by Richards who coined the term *intralingual interference* (Richards, 1971a, reprint 174). Hence, he identified four types of developmental errors (*cf* intralingual errors, section 2.4.2), whilst at the same time acknowledging the fact of interference errors. Developmental errors seem to be an extension of those types reported by Wilkins.

(a) **Overgeneralization** covers instances where L2-items do not carry any obvious contrast for the learner. For example, the '-ed' marker may be overgeneralized either morphologically into irregular verbs as in *'goed'* and *'meeted'*, or semantically because it often carries no meaning in the context, since pastness can be indicated lexically as in the use of *'yesterday'* in the following example.

(2) *Yesterday* I go to the university and meet my new professor.
(b) *Ignorance of rule restriction* is closely related to over-generalization. It occurs when certain rules are extended (or generalized) to contexts where such rules do not apply in L2-usage. For example:

(3) *I made him to do it*

The learner, here, ignores restriction on the distribution of 'make'. This can result from faulty analogy or the rote learning of rules.

(c) *Incomplete application of rules* occurs when deviant structures represent the development of correct rules, but the learner's focus on communication is clear. For example:

(4) a Teacher: *What was she saying?*
   Student: *She saying she would ask him*

   b Teacher: *What does she tell him?*
   Student: *She tell him to hurry*

(d) *False concepts hypothesized* refer to errors derived from faulty comprehension of L2-distinctions. For example, 'is' may be treated as a marker of the present tense.

(5) *He is speaks English*

Developmental errors are, therefore, typical errors reflecting the general characteristics of learner language, the strategies he employs, and the rule learning he acquires. Clearly, developmental errors can be grouped under the type systematic errors or competence errors as identified by Corder.

Dulay and Burt set out to investigate error types on empirical grounds. In an analysis of the goofs made by children learning English, the researchers identified four distinct types in relation to their psycholinguistic origins (cf Dulay and Burt, 1974a 115f, Dulay et al, 1982 165f)
(a) *Interference-like goofs* reflect L1-structure, and are not found in L1-acquisition data of the L2, that is, the acquisition of the L2 by its natives. For example

(6) *hers pajamas*

produced by a Spanish child reflects Spanish structure and was not produced by other children acquiring English as their L1

(b) *LI-developmental goofs* do not reflect L1-structure, but are found in L1-acquisition data of the L2. For example

(7) *He took her teeths off*

produced by a Spanish child, does not reflect Spanish structure, but an overgeneralization typically produced by other children acquiring English as their L1

(c) *Ambiguous goofs* can be categorized as either interference-like or LI-developmental goofs. For example

(8) *I no have a car*

produced by a Spanish child, reflects Spanish structure, and is also characteristic of the speech of children learning English as their L1

(d) *Unique goofs* do not reflect L1-structure and also are not found in L1-acquisition data of the L2. For example

(9) *He name is Victor*

produced by a Spanish child, neither reflects Spanish structure nor is found in L1-acquisition data of English

So, it can be seen that the study of errors is indispensable to both assessing the rule learning adopted by the learner and to the degree of match between the data he receives (his input) and the type of knowledge he has internalized (his intake). Hence, two justifications
were proposed for EA theoretical in that the study of errors is part of the study of learner language, and practical in that a good comprehension of the entity of error may serve as a feedback to design remedial courses, rather than implementing mere eradication of errors as had been recognized during the domination of the behavioural-structural model. However, EA on its own still makes no claim of giving a complete explanation of what is happening in the learner's mind. In this respect, three central issues have been put forward as evidence of the limitations of EA. These are frequency of L2-errors, learning difficulty, and interlingual errors (cf section 2.1.3). Although EA proved to explain many of the errors which could not be accounted for by CA, one of the shackles of the former, perhaps the most serious, is that it mainly concentrates on language production and leaves unsolved questions about language comprehension, particularly concerning language transfer. Such a problem was realized in the early 1970s and there was a subsequent entreaty to link EA with CA for a more reasonable analysis of language transfer despite the contradictory relationship between the two, since research demonstrated that CA was indeed able to account for some of the aspects which have to do with language comprehension. This appears to be the first serious attempt to vindicate CA in the new direction of linguistic theory. The next section will consider such an appeal for the complementary link between CA and EA.

2.3 CA and EA: An Interdisciplinary Approach

In this section, three objectives will be discussed. First, the contrastive approach to EA by reference to Wardhaugh's critical account of the CA-Hypothesis within its two versions the strong version (CA a priori) and the weak version (CA a posteriori). At one end, the scepticism of the strong version and the relative allegiance to the weak version will be outlined. At another, the defence of the former and the criticism of the latter by Schachter will be traced to arrive at the legitimate alliance of the two. Second, the non-contrastive approach to EA which was advocated by Richards to identify intralingual errors without conducting a prior CA. An attempt will be made to analyse some errors (already identified as intralingual) and some others actually made by the Syrian learner, and to extrapolate their origins from 'common'
deviations usually occurring in Arabic. Thus, in opposition to Richards' approach, the analysis will show that these errors (which can be viewed as examples of L1-error transfer) do in fact reflect L1-influence though similar deviations had already been identified as intralingual errors. Third, the procedure of Translation Equivalence (TE) discussed by James as the best available TC for CA Hence, the complementary link between CA and EA within the re-oriented procedure of TE will be considered as a possible methodology for the analysis of the data.

2.3.1 A Contrastive Approach to EA

As discussed above, the empirical and practical criticisms launched against CA rested mostly on its claim to predict errors. Therefore, many a researcher seems to have relinquished a prior comparison of the L1 and L2, since the empirical and practical studies reported that a large proportion of the learner's actual errors could not be traced back to L1-influence. This was also expressed by Wardhaugh who suggested that the CA-Hypothesis existed in two versions: a strong version and a weak version. The former, Wardhaugh argued, claims to predict the areas that will cause errors by simply identifying the differences between L1 and L2. He held the view that "the strong version is quite unrealistic and impracticable." The weak version, on the other hand, claims to diagnose actual 'interference' errors by recourse to the learner's L1. Therefore, "the weak version does have certain possibilities of usefulness [though] suspect in some linguistic circles" (Wardhaugh, 1970; reprint. 7).

The strong version had already inspired the earlier work of traditional contrastivists such as Fries, Lado, and Banathy et al. (cf chapter 1, sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.3) Thus, the postulation of CA was common before empirical and practical research established that many of the learner's errors could not be predicted by CA. The strong version, Wardhaugh argued, is highly theoretical in that, besides a theory of contrastive linguistics, it demands of analysts that they should have wide knowledge of generative linguistics such as language universals. Therefore, linguistic theory and knowledge were not in a position to meet the ultimate requirements of the strong version, and the writers of CAs were indulging in a 'pseudo-procedure' in linguistics, that is, a procedure which linguists claim they could follow in order to achieve
definitive results if only there were enough time" (Wardhaugh, 1970; reprint: 8). The author concluded that the strong version could only work for those who were "...prepared to be quite naive in linguistic matters" (Wardhaugh, 1970; reprint: 13).

The weak version of the CA-Hypothesis, on the other hand, was seen as less vulnerable and more realistic. It requires of the analyst only the linguistic knowledge available to him in order to account for learning difficulty. It is, therefore, less demanding than the strong version. Within an opposite direction, the weak version "... starts with the evidence provided by linguistic interference and uses such evidence to explain the similarities and differences between systems "(Wardhaugh, 1970; reprint: 10). Thus, the writer pointed out that the weak version could be used most often and proved to be helpful to language teachers as it explains and attributes actual errors rather than predicts them.

In so doing, the weak version, as opposed to the pre-procedural device of the strong version, seems to adopt the post-procedural task of EA as referred to earlier (cf. section 2.2.3). This distinction was plainly allocated by Gradman (1971a) in terms of distinction between CA a priori and CA a posteriori.

CA a priori, or the strong version, is said to be purely linguistic through a one-to-one CA of the phonological, syntactic and lexical sub-systems of the L1 and L2. The investigator could, therefore, discover their differences and similarities and make predictions about what would be the areas of difficulty and ease. However, according to its advocates, the a priori form did not claim to account for all learning problems, since intervening variables such as previous teaching and motivation always play a role (cf. Schachter, 1974; reprint: 354).

CA a posteriori, or the weak version, is assumed to be explanatory within a different methodology. By resorting to the techniques of EA, the investigator could compare the deviant structures actually produced in the L2 with their L1-counterparts in order to explain the origins of these errors. Thus, CA a posteriori, under the guises of EA, was mainly a reaction against CA a priori as this latter focused on "predicting what the learner will do" to the detriment of "the study of what the learner actually does" (Schachter, 1974; reprint: 354). Researchers like Ritchie (1967), Gradman (1971a-b), Whitman and Jackson (1972) were among those who adopted a more extreme attitude towards the CA-Hypothesis. In their observation of the numerous actual errors which could not be predicted by
CA *a priori*, these researchers suggested that the only valid form of the
CA-Hypothesis might be CA *a posteriori*. Therefore, it was necessary to
make explicit the assumptions behind CA *a posteriori* as a sub-component
of EA. To avoid possible confusion, the abbreviations CA and EA will be
used in place of CA *a priori* and CA *a posteriori* respectively. Hence, Schachter pointed out

The main assumption is that EA will reveal to the investigator just what difficulties the learners in fact have, that difficulties in the L2 will show up as errors in production. The second assumption is that the frequency of occurrence of specific errors will give evidence of their relative difficulty (Schachter, 1974, reprint. 355, emphasis added)

Schachter believed, however, that both CA and EA have their own weaknesses whilst at the same time recognizing their merits. She even stressed that the weaknesses of EA are sometimes more serious than those of CA. In an analysis of the relative clauses produced by different groups of learners, Schachter observed that certain learners experienced tenacious difficulty over processing the structure in question because of its radical difference from the LI-counterpart. The result was that these learners avoided producing the structure. She argued that EA, which only deals with errors in production, could not explain avoidance, a phenomenon lying at the heart of comprehension, whereas the predictive power of CA was able to do so. Thus, neither approach on its own could give a complete picture of language transfer. Rather, a combination of the two as well as comprehension testing would be the most fruitful line of research for scrutinizing learning difficulty both in production and in comprehension (cf Schachter, 1974, reprint 362, Kleinmann, 1977, reprint 375)

As a consequence, both CA and EA seem to constitute an interdisciplinary approach that may serve as a reliable source of study. It is believed that the need for such an approach is in fact due to two polar justifications. First, there are errors which CA cannot handle whereas EA can. This does not necessarily imply that all such errors have connection with LI-influence. It is worth reiterating Ringbom's (1987) statement that LI-influence does not always cause errors and not all errors reflect LI-influence (cf section 2.1.3). Second, there are certain instances of LI-influence such as avoidance phenomena which EA fails to account for whereas the attested predictive power of CA proves to do so. In current thinking, the notion of avoidance is still held in
good esteem for the significant role it has played in the reappraisal of CA and therefore of language transfer (for detailed information, cf chapter 4, section 4.1.2)

It seems, however, there were several attempts to study and analyse errors without conducting a prior CA. One of these attempts, perhaps the most important, is Richards' identification of what he called developmental or intralingual errors which seem to have been overemphasized at the expense of interlingual errors. The next section will consider Richards' approach to intralingual errors and trace the mounting controversy about his identification.

2.3.2 A Non-Contrastive Approach to EA

'A non-contrastive approach to EA' is the title of Richards' (1971a) article which is based on a paper delivered at the TESOL convention held in San Francisco in 1970. While concurring with the fact of interlingual errors, he identified four strategies associated with developmental or intralingual errors: (1) overgeneralization, (2) ignorance of rule restrictions, (3) incomplete application of rules, and (4) false concepts hypothesized (cf section 2.2.4). Richards distinguished these as being systematic errors from non-systematic errors which would result from the learner's failure to memorize the L2-pattern, or from such occasional conditions as memory lapses, fatigue and the like. Thus, systematic errors represent errors in competence, transitional or final, whereas non-systematic errors are mistakes in performance (cf Corder, section 2.2.2). Further, Richards looked upon the former category as universal errors because they appeared "in numerous case-studies of the English errors of speakers of Japanese, Chinese, Burmese, French, Czech, Polish, Tagalog, Maori, Maltese, and the major Indian and West African languages" (Richards, 1971a, reprint 173). Clearly, therefore, the four types of errors listed exclude any connection with L1-influence.

As mentioned earlier, one of the problems of error identification is to determine what errors are due to L1-influence and what others are not (cf section 2.2.3). For instance, some researchers regarded the omission of 'BE', the misuse of prepositions, and non-inverted WH-questions as interlingual errors, while Richards, among others, seems to have identified such deviations as universal or intralingual errors. In an argument against Richards' assumptions, James, who is notorious for
his strong allegiance to CA, pointed to the fact that a given error made by speakers of many different L1s does not necessarily signify a non-contrastive or intralingual error. In James' words "it is possible that all of the languages sampled contrast with English with respect to the particular structure involved" (James, 1980 185f, original emphasis) By quoting French (1956) who had already inspired the distinction 'interlingual/intralingual', James demonstrated that Richards' inference was not new in itself

"If errors are due, as unmistakeably as the best authorities would have us believe, to cross-association (i.e. LI-interference) then the Japanese form of error should be one thing and the Bantu form quite another. But the plain fact is that Japanese and Bantu alike say *Yes, I didn't" (French, 1956 6, quoted by James, 1980 186)

Therefore, in accordance with Richards' conclusion, the deviant structure *Yes, I didn't suggests an intralingual error. On the contrary, James argued that such an apparently 'universal' error (which concerns the answer to questions of negative polarity such as Didn't you go?) could be a plausible instance of LI-interference. In languages like English, the answer to these questions is expressed by either accepting (Yes, I did) or rejecting (No, I didn't) the intended fact. Whereas in other languages such as Japanese, Swahili, Akan (cf Chinebuah, 1975) and Korean (cf Bouton 1976) — including Arabic — the answer depends on the form of the interrogative. Thus, the particle 'No' in English may coincide with the superficial LI-equivalent of 'Yes' in the other language group. For this reason, James cited a pair of English/Sudanese answers to the negative question "Doesn't he go to school?"

(10) a [aywa ma bimši] (Sud)  
(Lit Yes not go (he))

b No, he doesn't (L2-U)

Here, James rightly uses the LI-answer (10a) from Sudanese Colloquial Arabic to demonstrate that LI-influence is well detectable in already identified intralingual errors such as *Yes, I didn't. However, it might be useful to discuss (10a) from a different angle by testing its linguistic value within the exhaustive boundaries of MSA. Depending on the form of the interrogative in MSA, there are two typological answer-particles for expressing affirmation or agreement. The first type
includes [na?am], [ajal] or [i?] for affirmative interrogatives, and the second type signifies [bala] for negative interrogative. With regard to the first type, while [na?am] is better for answering a question than [ajal], the latter is better for answering a request than the former (cf. Al-Bustani, 1977:4). The particle [i], on the other hand, only precedes an oath. For example

(11) a  [i walla hi] (MSA)  
[Lit. Yes by God]

b  Yes —I swear by God— (L2-U)

In Colloquialism, the answer-particles [e wa] or [aywa] (cf. 10a)), which seem to descend from [i ] and [wa] in (11a) as being diphthongized by a glide, are used in most of the modern dialects of Arabic (cf. Al-Bustani, 1977:22). Thus, in SCA, the particles [na?am], [e wa], [aywa], [e ], and [i] stand for the first type (affirmative interrogatives), whereas [mbala], which seems to descend from the MSA-form [bala], stands for the second type (negative interrogatives) as illustrated in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Variety</th>
<th>Answer-particles for Affirmative Interrogatives</th>
<th>Answer-particles for Negative Interrogatives</th>
<th>English Equivalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>[na?am] (question) [ajal] (request) [i] (oath)</td>
<td>[bala]</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>[na?am] (MSA/SCA) [e wa] (SCD) [aywa] (NCD/ECD)</td>
<td>[mbala]</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[e ] (NCD/SCD/WCD) [i ] (ECD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4  The Arabic answer-particles for expressing agreement

Again, both particles [e ] and [i ] in SCA descend from the original form [i ] in MSA. It seems, therefore, the use of either particle without a following oath, which is very common in SCA, would
suggest a slight deviation from the norm of MSA. Further, the speaker's realization of either particle as synonymous with \[\text{[na^am]}\] in SCA (cf. Table 4) would lead to a logical error from the viewpoint of MSA when answering questions of negative polarity. For instance, by employing \([e]\) or \([i]\) —or any of the SCA-counterparts such as \([\text{aywa}]\) (cf. (10a))— the answer to the negative question \([\text{su ma rh\text{'}it}]\) 'Didn't you go?' would be either (12) for agreement or (13) for disagreement.

\[
\begin{align*}
(12) & \quad \text{a} \quad * \ [e \ \text{rih\text{'}it}] \quad (NCD/SCA) \\
& \quad \text{b} \quad * \ [i \ \text{rih\text{'}tu}] \quad (ECD) \\
& \quad \text{c} \quad * \ [\text{aywa} \ \text{rih\text{'}it}] \quad (NCD) \\
& \quad \quad \text{(Lit: Yes went (I))} \\
& \quad \text{d} \quad * \ Yes, \ I \ did \quad (L2-U) \\
(13) & \quad \text{a} \quad * \ [e \ \text{ma} \ \text{rih\text{'}it}] \quad (NCD/SCD) \\
& \quad \text{b} \quad * \ [i \ \text{ma} \ \text{rih\text{'}tu}] \quad (ECD) \\
& \quad \text{c} \quad * \ [\text{aywa} \ \text{ma} \ \text{rih\text{'}it}] \quad (NCD) \\
& \quad \quad \text{(Lit: Yes not went (I))} \\
& \quad \text{d} \quad \text{No,} \ I \ \text{didn't} \quad (L2-U)
\end{align*}
\]

The logical errors suggested by the L1-utterances (12a-c) and (13a-c) will be discussed presently. As Table 4 illustrates, the particle \([\text{bala}]\) in MSA is only used for answering negative interrogatives to express agreement. However, if the particle \([\text{na^am}]\) in MSA happens to be used for answering negative interrogatives, then the resultant response would imply disagreement. To begin with, consider the following negative question as produced in MSA:

\[
\begin{align*}
(14) & \quad \text{a} \quad [\text{a lam tath'hab}] \quad (MSA) \\
& \quad \text{b} \quad \text{Didn't you go?} \quad (L2-U)
\end{align*}
\]

The answer to such a question would be either \([\text{bala}]\) in (15a) below to imply agreement with 'going' or \([\text{na^am}]\) in (16a) to imply disagreement with 'going' (or rather, agreement with 'not going'); even though both answer-particles mean 'yes' at a surface-structure level:

\[
\begin{align*}
(15) & \quad \text{a} \quad [\text{bala}] \quad (MSA) \\
& \quad \quad \text{(Lit: Yes)} \\
& \quad \text{b} \quad \text{Yes, I did} \quad (L2-U) \\
(16) & \quad \text{a} \quad [\text{na^am}] \quad (MSA) \\
& \quad \quad \text{(Lit: Yes)} \\
& \quad \text{b} \quad \text{No, I didn't} \quad (L2-U)
\end{align*}
\]
It appears the case that [bala:] in (15a) does not mean 'yes' in the sense of the word, but at a deep-structure level it implies the meaning of 'yes without no'. In other words, [bala:] is in fact negating the negative mode of the question (14a) in order to achieve affirmation; that is, agreement with 'going'. Thus, it focuses its semantic space upon the negative particle [lam] in (14a), which is the most important constituent of the structure. On the other hand, [na?am] in (16a) implies the meaning of 'yes with no' at a deep-structure level, rather than being represented as meaning 'yes' at a surface-structure level. In other words, [na?am] is, in this case, affirming the negative mode of the question (14a) and the result is agreement with 'not going'; that is, disagreement with 'going'.

By analogy, the uses of [e:], [i:] and [aywa] in (12 a-c) and (13 a-c) as synonymous with [na?am] would suggest logical errors on two syntactic levels respectively. First, deep-structure level where each answer-particle implies agreement with 'not going'; that is, disagreement with 'going' and in both cases the fact of 'going' is rejected which is paradoxical with its surface-structure representation in (12 a-c). Second, surface-structure level where the use of each answer-particle in (13 a-c) obtains what is implied in the deep structure as is the case of the first level. In the surface structure, however, the co-existence of the answer-particle (which expresses affirmation) with the negated remainder of (13 a-c) seems to be logically absurd. Therefore, the meaning of 'not going' is only implied in the deep structure which refers to the concept of [attaqdi:r] in MSA. The term [attaqdi:r] is by definition the implication of the intended meaning of a deleted item or items (cf. Al-Busani, 1977: 719 and 904). Thus, the deep structure is interpreted by the semantic component, whereas the surface structure is determined by the phonological component, since the deleted item is not verbally articulated in the surface structure but the speaker is aware of its meaning implied in the deep structure (cf. also Chomsky, 1965: 16).

It follows that the surface structure of (12 a-c) should not employ the answer-particles [e:], [i:] or [aywa] which are synonymous with [na?am], but rather [mbala] which, at a deep structure level, implies agreement with 'going' as is the case of the MSA-form [bala:] in (15a), otherwise all the L1-utterances (12 a-c) would signal a logical error as shown above. With regard to the L1-utterances (13 a-c), the surface structure should only employ the answer-particle [e:] [i:] or [aywa] (cf. (10a)) as synonymous with [na?am], since agreement with 'not going'
is already implied in the deep structure as is the case of (15a). It seems, therefore, the answer-particle does not directly govern the negated remainder, but a deleted syntactic part such as 'I mean that' or 'I agree that'. Thus, the deep structures of (10a) and (13 a-c) would be (17a) and (17b) respectively.

(17) a. Yes, I mean/agree that he doesn't
   b. Yes, I mean/agree that I didn't

Consequently, the use of [naʔam], or anyone of its counterparts listed in Table 4, as directly co-occurrent with a negated clause would suggest a logical error as discussed above. However, if the speaker's attention was focused on the negated remainder, it would be more reasonable to substitute the answer-particle by [la] 'no' for more emphasis on the negative mode of the remainder. Thus, the surface structures of (10a) and (13 a-c) would be (18a) and (19 a-b) respectively.

(18) a. [la ma bimš1] (Sud)  
   (Lit no not go (he))
   b. No, he doesn't (L2-U)

(19) a. [la ma rihit] (NCD/SCD)
   b. [la ma rih'tu] (ECD)
   c. No, I didn't. (L2-U)

In the light of the above argument, a particular type of language transfer would emerge, if the Arab learner's response to the question Didn't you go? happened to be one of the following.

(20) a. Yes, I went. (PU)
   b. * Yes, I didn't (PE)

Surprisingly, the predicted acceptable utterance (20a) would suggest what can be called L1-error positive transfer, that is, an attestedly established common deviation from the standard norm of the L1 such as (12 a-c) which, upon its transfer onto learner language, results in positively structural accordance with the standard norm of the L2. On the other hand, the predicted erroneous utterance (20b) (cf French's example above) would refer to what can be called L1-error negative transfer, that is, an attestedly established common deviation from the standard norm of the L1 such as (13 a-c) which, upon its transfer onto
learner language, results in a **negatively structural deviation** from the standard norm of the L2. Therefore, like James, but unlike French and Richards, it is believed that some already identified deviations as intralingual errors such as (20b) could be traced back to L1-influence.

Having specified what the term **L1-error transfer** precisely means, an analysis of a few utterances actually produced in English by the Syrian learners will, in opposition to Richards' approach, elucidate this type of language transfer on empirical grounds. Thus, with regard to the two varieties of Arabic, these utterances (erroneous or correct) are said to be a reflection of **either** common L1-errors committed within MSA (that is, in the Arab speaker's attempt to perform MSA) or L1-errors commonly made within SCA as so judged from the viewpoint of MSA. To begin with, consider the following example:

(20) * I shall not to smoke again, never \((AE)\)

The learner, upon producing this utterance, seems to have fallen back to a common deviation usually recurrent in MSA rather than in SCA as the L1-equivalent is often rendered in the former into

(21) a * [sawfa lan udakkina ] \(\text{MSA}\)
(Lit shall not smoke (I) )

b  I shall not/never smoke \(\text{L2-U}\)

From the viewpoint of MSA, the co-occurrence of the two particles [sawfa] and [lan] as in (21a) marks a common error and it often goes unnoticed not only by ordinary L1-speakers, but also by most of the 'modernized' writers of Arabic. Eventually, this augments the making of such an error in general situations where MSA is used as an instructive medium and in particular cases such as translation from foreign languages into MSA, writing personal letters, and the like. It appears that both 'not' and 'to' in (20) are realized as [lan] in (21a). In order to explain why the co-existence of [sawfa] with [lan] signals an error, another utterance actually produced by a Syrian learner will be analysed for testing the linguistic value of [lan] in MSA. For example:

(22) * I must to go to the Language Centre \((AE)\)

(23) a [yajibu (2alayya) an ath'haba ] \(\text{MSA}\)
(Lit must (I) to go (I) )

b  I must ---- go to \(\text{L2-U}\)
By misusing the preposition 'to' in (22), the learner seems to have resorted to the LL-particle [an] in (23a) and thus such a deviation can be viewed as a reflection of MSA-influence rather than SCA-influence, since [an] is not normally used in SCA. In MSA, this particle, which is known as [an al-masdariyya], involves the infinitiveness of the simple present verb [al-mudarri?u] that follows. This indicates that both the verb [an ath'haba] in (23a) and its derived verbal noun [al-thaha bu] 'going' have basically the same grammatical meaning or deep structure, since the latter, too, is referred to as [al-masdar] 'the infinitive' (cf. Kharma, 1983:44f). At first glance, the misuse of the preposition 'to' in (22) appears to be overgeneralized from L2-identifications such as 'I like to go' in which 'to' also denotes infinitiveness. However, even in the case of the equivalent LL-identification [uhibbu an ath'haba] (cf. (23a)), the particle [an] is rendered into 'to' as both indicate infinitiveness when preceding a simple present verb (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3.4, examples (46) and (47)).

Concerning the actual utterance (20), the misuse of 'to', rather than the use of 'shall', seems to impose infinitiveness on the verb 'smoke' as the function of 'to' was grammatically realized by recourse to [an] as in (23a) but, together with 'not', the meaning was lexically realized by recourse to [lan] as in (21a). However, unlike [an], [lan] in MSA does not maintain infinitiveness, but rather it denotes negation and futurity at the same time (cf. Al-Bustani, 1977:826). Therefore, to render, for example, the erroneous LL-utterance *[sawfa lan ath'haba] into the well-formed L2-utterance 'I shall not go' (AU) would suggest LL-error positive transfer on two levels. First, the L2-verb 'go' implies infinitiveness since it is governed by 'shall', whereas the LL-verb [ath'haba] which is governed by [lan] has no connection with infinitiveness, even though both 'shall' and [lan] express futurity. Second, as their grammatical meanings indicate, the co-existence of [sawfa] with [lan] marks an error from the logical point of view. While both particles express futurity, [sawfa] implies affirmation as opposed to [lan] which implies negation. By analogy, the actual utterance (20) seems to reflect two phases of LL-error negative transfer: an overt phase and a covert one. The paradoxical co-occurrence of [sawfa] and [lan] in the LL-equivalent (21a) signifies overt LL-error negative transfer when both are realized as *'shall not to', and rendering [lan], which does not indicate infinitiveness, into 'not to' as governing the verb 'smoke' refers to covert LL-error negative transfer.
Therefore, in the light of the above analysis, the erroneous actual utterances (20) and (22), which concern the misuse of 'to' as a marker of infinitiveness, can be safely identified as interlingual errors, though Richards had already classified similar deviations such as (24 a-b) below under intralingual errors:

\[(24)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{* She cannot to go} \\
\text{b} & \quad \text{* We can to see}
\end{align*}
\]
\[(cf \text{ (20))}
\[(cf \text{ (22))}

According to Richards, the misuse of 'to', or as he put it, the wrong form after modal verb is a result of an overgeneralization strategy faultily applied by the learner, whereas in other structural deviations such as *'I made him to do it' the learner ignores restrictions on the distribution of 'make' (cf Richards, 1971a, reprint 175 and 183).

Following the argument against Richards' approach, James posed a further problem of conducting EA in isolation from CA by reference to Corder's notion of covert errors (cf section 2.2.1). James' view runs as follows: although one of the tasks of EA is to explain covert errors which, in most cases, could not be predicted by CA, it is quite possible that the former sometimes fails to do so without the expectancies generated by the latter. By citing some examples, James argued that a German learner of English, upon producing the well-formed utterance 'Will we go for a walk?', would make a covert error if the invitation, as implied in the L1-counterpart 'Wollen wir spazieren gehen?', was actually intended. Hence, the English interlocutor, particularly a native speaker of Hiberno-English, might not receive the utterance as an invitation, but rather as a request for prediction (James, 1980 186). More explicitly, actual utterances such 'I'm on the line' (cf chapter 1, section 1.3.2, example (21c)) and predicted utterances such as 'Don't be cool' (cf chapter 1, section 1.4.2, example (53a)) are perfectly acceptable if they are abstracted from the context. However, it is CA, not EA, which recognizes them as covert errors, since the initial device of the former rests on contrasting what they mean in English with what their L1-counterparts mean in Arabic. In fact, James' contention was not to relinquish EA, but rather he seems to have echoed Schachter's entreaty for a combination of CA and EA as discussed in the preceding section. In James' words...
I have no wish to vindicate CA at the expense of EA each approach has its vital role to play in accounting for L2-learning problems. They should be viewed as complementing each other rather than as competitors of some procedural pride of place. (James, 1980 187)

It should be noted, however, that Richards, when devoting himself to the study of intralingual errors, made no denial of the existence of interlingual errors. In a subsequent article, Richards, together with Sampson, considered language transfer one of the several factors which might influence and characterize learner language. The other factors are 'intralingual interference', 'sociolinguistic situation', 'modality of exposure to the L2', 'instability of learner language' and 'inherent difficulty in learning L2-items'. These reflect most of the insights put forward into the study of the learner's system (cf. chapter 3). Under the factor of language transfer, Richards and Sampson also distinguished the methodology of contrastive analysis from that of interference analysis. The former, as discussed in the preceding section, corresponds to the strong version or CA a priori, and the latter to the weak version or CA a posteriori (cf. Richards and Sampson, 1974 5).

It seems, therefore, that, according to Schachter (1974), James (1980) and subsequently Ringbom (1987), any two extremes representing the polarity of CA and EA should be reconciled with each other for a better account of language transfer, particularly within the two distinct dimensions language process and language product. In the current study, such a reconciliation will be adopted for the analysis of a selective number of interlingual identifications actually produced by some Syrian learners in their spoken production of English. By resorting to the re-oriented constant Translation Equivalence, the analysis will be made to scrutinize the potential for Arabic transfer and how this internal mechanism operates within these two dimensions. The next section will consider the procedure of Translation Equivalence and its re-oriented position in the literature.

2.3.3 The Translation Equivalence Constant

In fact, all the Arabic/English pairs of utterances cited throughout this study are basically drawn upon the procedure of Translation Equivalence (TE). As discussed in the previous chapter, traditional contrastivists failed to establish surface-structure representations as
satisfactory TCs (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3.3) In effect, with the emergence of Chomsky's theory of TGG, some other contrastivists moved their research onto the application of the deep-structure principle as a more reliable, though still insufficient, TC for CA (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3.4) It seems, therefore, deep-structure identity did not in fact meet the ultimate exigencies of CA even though semantic structures, within the framework of GS, were probed by Fillmore, Lakoff and others from a more profound perspective to include more facts of meaning in deep structure (cf. chapter 1, section 1.4.1) Here, both the treatment of deep-structure identity in GS and its inadequacy for CA will be considered.

Generally speaking, the term TE is looked upon as being responsible for 'sameness of meaning' From this point of view, the task of CA rests on contrasting pairs of L1-L2 utterances which are said to convey identical meanings though they may differ in structural properties It has been argued, however, that one of the serious problems which arise for contrastivists is to decide whether a given pair of L1-L2 utterances do in fact convey the same meaning. Therefore, contrastivists as well as translation theorists were impelled to look for an appropriate definition of the term TE (cf. James, 1980: 175) By reference to Chomsky, James mentions one of the first attempts to provide a possible account of TE, that is, deep structure which was assumed to incorporate "all information relevant to the single interpretation of a particular sentence" (Chomsky, 1965: 16) Chomsky's grammatical models were extended by, for instance, Fillmore (1968) whose proposal of *case grammar* was to accommodate additional dimensions of meaning within deep structure Hence, according to Fillmore, there are consistent semantic relationships latent in deep-structure identity which cannot be traced by TGG (cf. Slobin, 1979: 25) To begin with, a consideration of Fillmore's familiar examples may clarify the point (cf. Crystal, 1971: 237)

(25) a) He opened the door with the key.  
b) He used the key to open the door.

By introducing 'idea-like' terms or semantic roles in place of purely syntactic terms as in TGG, Fillmore underlined the fact that examples such as (25 a-b) share one deep structure due to the common underlying meaning they have He used terms like 'agent', 'instrument' and 'patient' referring to them as cases in order to assign these
semantic roles Cases are, in such a perspective, notions responsible for maintaining the underlying meaning of, for example, (25 a-b) whatever transformational rules can be applied Fillmore wrote

The case notions comprise a set of universal, presumably innate, concepts which identify certain types of judgements human beings are capable of making about the events that are going on around them, judgements about such matters as who did it, who it happened to, and what got changed

(Fillmore, 1968 24, quoted by Slobin, 1979 26)

Therefore, Fillmore's proposition was that if such case notions are available for (25 a-b), as they clearly are, then no transformational rule can affect the common underlying meaning, since He' always performs the case role of the 'agent', 'key' is always the 'instrument', and 'door' is always the 'patient' In support of Fillmore, Lakoff (1968) argued that examples such as (25 a-b) share the same deep structure because they undergo the same selectional and co-occurrence restrictions In other words, within a given language, any pair of utterances having a common underlying meaning seem to be, according to the proponents of GS, nothing more than a pair of paraphrases (cf James, 1980 176)

In CA-research, deep-structure identity, within the theoretical schemes of both TGG and GS, was applied as a result of the unconvincing solutions provided by the application of surface structure In relation to TGG, contrastivists looked upon pairs of L2-utterances as intralingual paraphrases if these are said to imply the same ideational content Therefore, any pair of L1-L2 utterances, sharing the same ideational content would be regarded as interlingual paraphrases (cf. chapter 1, section 13 4) It follows that, with respect to GS, some contrastivists appear to have drawn similar analogies by reference to the semantic roles as discussed above For instance, Krzeszowski suggested that pairs of L2-utterances such as (25 a-b) are special cases of intralingual translation Thus, the equivalent pair of L1-utterances (Polish in this case) would be, according to him, the interlingual TEs of (25 a-b) as both pairs of utterances imply a common deep structure " even if on the surface they are markedly different" (Krzeszowski, 1971 38) Following Lakoff's argument, Krzeszowski claimed that the underlying meaning shared by these two pairs would not be affected by any transformational rule, since they are subject to the same selectional and co-occurrence
restrictions referred to above. To test this hypothesis, the Arabic L1-counterparts of (25 a-b) will be analysed through the same restrictions applied by Krzeszowski to the Polish L1-counterparts.

(26) a [fataha al-ba ba bi il-mifta hi] (MSA)
(Lit. opened (he) the door with the key)

b [ista?mala al-mifta ha liyaftaha al-ba ba] (MSA)
(Lit. used (he) the key to open the door)

Accordingly, the English L2-pair (25 a-b) and the Arabic L1-pair (26 a-b) would be thought of as deriving from a common deep structure as they undergo the following selectional and co-occurrence restrictions:

1. In Arabic and English the verbs [fataha]/[liyaftaha] in (26a-b) and 'opened/to open' in (25 a-b) must be [+ Active]
2. The NPs [al-ba ba] and 'the door' must not be co-referential with the NPs [il-mifta hi]/[al-mifta ha] and 'the key'
3. The questions derived from each pair are equally ambiguous, that is, the scope of interrogation can govern either the instrumental NP or the whole predicate. For example

(27) a hal (fataha al-ba ba [bi il-mifta hi])? (MSA)

b. Did he (open the door [with the key])? (L2-U)

4. The negative versions of each pair are equally ambiguous, that is, the scope of negation can govern either the instrumental NP or the whole predicate. For example

(28) a ma (fataha al-ba ba [bi il-mifta hi]) (MSA)
   or lam (yaftah al-ba ba [bi il-mifta hi]) (MSA)
   b He did not (open the door [with the key]) (L2-U)

Up to this stage, like the Polish/English pairs analysed by Krzeszowski, the Arabic/English pairs (26 a-b) and (25 a-b) clearly indicate that they undergo the same selectional and co-occurrence restrictions. However, Krzeszowski's analogies drawn on the basis of Lakoff's conviction were vulnerable to criticism in that although the Polish/English pairs are similarly subject to the above rule restrictions (which assign the degree of convergence between L1 and L2), there is other information that can be detected in the deep structure of the
L1-pairs but is not traceable in that of the L2-pairs or vice versa. This seems to be a result of Chomsky's (1969) argument against Lakoff's assumption that both (25 a-b) derive from a common deep structure. In brief, Chomsky pointed out that the optional use of the preposition 'with' in examples such as (25b) entails another alternative. He used the key to open the door (with). The existence of 'with' denotes that both the verb 'use' and the instrumental NP 'the key' can co-occur in surface structure. Thus, the insertion of adverbs such as 'over and over again' before the instrumental NP in (25a) and after the instrumental NP in (25b) will mark a considerable difference in meaning between (29a) and (29b) respectively.

(29) a He opened the door over and over again with the key
b He used the key over and over again to open the door

Consequently, examples such as (25 a-b) cannot be viewed as deriving from a common deep structure (cf James, 1980 177).

Moreover, in an argument against Krzeszowski's analogies, James restates Bouton (1976) by pointing to the fact that verbal aspect is an integral part of deep structure identity. Slavonic languages such as Polish (and this also applies to Arabic) mark verbal aspect, that is, the perfective aspect is implied in deep structure, whereas in Germanic languages such as English the difference between perfective and imperfective is marked morphologically in surface structure (James, 1980 176). It follows that, with regard to the Arabic L1-utterances cited above, Krzeszowski's assumptions are not applicable for two underlying reasons. First, like the Polish L1-utterances, the Arabic L1-utterances imply perfective aspect forms in that the action of [fat'h] 'opening' is complete, whereas the English L2-utterances lack this information. Second, which seems by far the more important, in the application of [al-majhu l] and passive transformations to the Arabic L1-utterance (26a) and the English L2-utterance (25a) respectively.

(30) a [futiha al-ba bu bi ll-mifta h i  
(MSA) (Lit was opened (it) the door with the key----)

b The door was opened with the key (by him)  (L2-U)

the agent in MSA is obligatorily deleted, while in English it is optionally inserted. This indicates that the presence of the L2-prepositional phrase 'by him' in (30b) entails the speaker/hearer's knowledge of the agent even if passive transformation is applied in
The term [al-majhu'1] in MSA, on the other hand, literally means the unknown in the sense that, upon applying [al-majhu 1] transformation as in (30a), the agent is unknown to both the speaker and the hearer (cf Bulos, 1965 30) However, some Arabic translations erroneously use the Ll-prepositional phrases [bi wa si'tatihi] or [min qibalihi] as literally translated from 'by him' This seems to reflect the phenomenon of backlash interference in Jakobovits' terminology (cf chapter 1, section 112) In such a case, the [al-majhu 1] form of the Ll-verb [futiha] in (30a) implies the unknownness of the agent, whereas the use of either Ll-prepositional phrase as is the case of 'by him' in (30b) entails the knownness of the agent which is absurd

Clearly, therefore, in relation to Chomsky's definition of deep structure, the above two reasons illustrate that all the information relevant to the interpretation of the Arabic L1-pair (26 a-b) are not incorporated into the interpretation of the English L2-pairs (25 a-b) Consequently, these two pairs do not have the same underlying meaning and thus they cannot be taken as deriving from a common deep structure

It seems, however, although deep-structure identity accounts for information relevant to the interpretation of a given pair or pairs of utterances in the sense discussed above, its representation is still considered insufficient to be the constant TE, since the ideational content is the semantic issue at hand Hence, James explains the insufficiency of deep structure by reference to Halliday (1970, 1976) and Widdowson (1974, 1978)

According to Halliday, deep structure is concerned with the propositional or ideational meaning which underlies isolated utterances There are at least two further types of meaning that may be incorporated into utterances interpersonal and textual meanings While the interpersonal meaning assigns the kind of speech act it performs for its user such as apologizing, agreeing, refusing and so on (cf chapter 1, section 13 2), the textual meaning determines the type of information it contributes to the message, that is, how the message maintains cohesion and coherence (cf James, 1980 178)

Cohesion, in Halliday's sense, refers to those surface-structure categories which are labelled as grammatical units in an utterance or text Such units link different parts of utterances or larger units of discourse Cohesion features, therefore, maintain formal appropriacy to linguistic context (or context) For example, the cross-referencing functions of pronouns, articles, and some adverbs as in
(31) a The man went to town  
b However, he did not stay long

Coherence, on the other hand, has to do with factors postulated to account for the underlying functional appropriacy of the text or discourse. Coherence, therefore, maintains the way in which communication is mediated through the use of speech acts (cf. Crystal, 1985 53f). For instance, as responses to the question (32a) below, the utterances (32b) and (32c) are said to be incohesive and incoherent respectively (cf. James 1980 103)

(32) a Who switched off the lights?  
b What Mary did was switch off the lights  
c There are fairies at the bottom of our garden

Consequently, in order to arrive at a far more reasonable L1-TE of a given L2-utterance, both the L1-L2 utterances should sustain at least the same three types of meaning the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual, one of which deep structure is responsible for. Nevertheless, deep structure, though insufficient on its own, still serves as a useful criterion for determining the magnitude of convergence and divergence between L1-L2 utterances (cf. chapter 1, section 13 4).

The other attempt made by Widdowson (1974) was to identify two levels of translation the semantic level and the pragmatic level. It appears that the semantic level refers to both the ideational meaning (deep structure) and one part of the textual meaning, that is, cohesion, whereas the pragmatic level seems to comprise both the interpersonal meaning and the other part of the textual meaning, that is, coherence. Thus, in order to achieve an objective TE, contrastivists, in this sense, should equate L1-L2 utterances which are both semantically and pragmatically equivalent. Further, by making a distinction between usage and use, Widdowson (1978) seems to have paralleled Halliday's distinction between cohesion and coherence. Similarly, while usage refers to the formal use or grammaticality of utterances (cf. cohesion), use has to do with the communicative use of utterances and their appropriateness to the context (cf. coherence). In such a re-oriented perspective, that is incorporating the three possible types of meaning, TE can be taken as the best available TC for CA (cf. James, 1980 178). For instance, through this constant, the answer-particle [bala] in MSA or [mbala'] in SCA, rather than [na?am] or anyone of its counterparts listed in Table 4, ought to be equated with 'yes' in answering negative interrogatives for
expressing agreement (cf section 2 3 2, examples (12f))

Since emphasis has been laid on the legitimate coalition of CA and EA in the preceding section, it is felt that, by relying on the constant TE within its re-oriented position, this coalition serves as a reasonable methodology for the analysis of interlingual errors. By recognizing intralingual errors, such a methodology is also utilizable for the investigation of any other category that might reflect the interaction between the two. The following section will be taken up by a mere identification of the main categories of errors.

2.4 The Categorization of Errors

In section 2 2 4 of this chapter, error types have been chronologically schematized according to their identification by several researchers. These can be classified under two major categories: errors that are traceable back to L1-influence commonly referred to as interlingual errors, and errors which have no connection with L1-influence generally known as intralingual errors. In this final section, these two categories will be briefly re-considered in order to identify a third major category termed inter-intralingual errors in the current study.

2.4.1 Interlingual Errors

Interlingual errors, the main concern here, are by definition those deviant structures produced in the L2, which are attestedly established to be a reflection of L1-influence. These are usually called interference errors or transfer errors as mentioned elsewhere. Errors of this category, therefore, result in one sort of linguistic solutions, which involves hypotheses about "the application of categories, distinctions, rules, or properties of rules by generalization from another familiar language, typically L1" (Hammarberg, 1979 7). It has been argued that, in the early stages of L2-learning, a good deal of interlingual errors appear because the L1, in these stages, is the only already existing knowledge that the learner can draw upon as long as he is not familiar with the L2. This assumption was adopted by researchers.
such as Taylor (1975) who pointed out that the predominance of *interlingual transfer* decreases gradually as the learner progresses in the L2. The learner's experience at later stages, Taylor argued, begins to include new items or rules of the L2 and thus *intralingual transfer* would be apparent (cf. Brown, 1980: 173). Other researchers such as Bates *et al.* (1982) and Anderson (1983) have shown the reverse: the learner tends to apply his L1-strategies even when he is quite familiar with the L2, and in order to recognize interlingual errors, he must generally know a lot about the L2. Thus, according to this view, the possibilities of *interlingual transfer* increase as the learner's knowledge of the L2 increases (cf. also Klein, 1986: 27).

It is believed that language transfer operates at any stage of development but the quantity and quality of transfer vary from one stage to another. Hence, it is quite reasonable to assume that the possibilities of *negative transfer* in the early stages are greater than they are at later stages or, put the other way round, the possibilities of *positive transfer* are greater at advanced stages. This seems to be well applicable to a learner of a totally unrelated L2 (for example, an Arab learning English). At advanced stages, such a learner possesses the relatively extensive knowledge of the L2 which enables him to make the necessary crosslingual tie-ups between L1 and L2, so that it is the type of L2-knowledge which may determine the occurrence of positive and/or negative transfer (for detailed information, cf. chapter 4). As there is always a considerable discrepancy between exact percentages of interlingual errors, there is always agreement about the fact of L1-influence on L2-learning/acquisition. Such a discrepancy is subject to the three important variables: the age of the learner, the degree of contrast between L1 and L2, and the type of data collected (cf. section 2.2.3, Table 3). Therefore, language transfer is an inevitable internal mechanism as will be discussed in the next chapter, but whether this mechanism facilitates the learning of a L2 seems to be the more important question in current research into L2-learning/acquisition.

### 2.4.2 Intralingual Errors

Conversely, the term *intralingual errors* refers to those deviant L2-structures which are attestedly established by-products to be a reflection of not L1-influence, but other factors based on partial
exposure to the L2 Errors of this category, therefore, result in another sort of linguistic solutions, which implies testing hypotheses about rule conditions and rule application by generalization from observation in the L2 (cf Richards and Sampson, 1974 6, Hammarberg, 1979 7)

Intralingual errors, if they do not in fact reflect L1-influence, are sometimes called non-contrastive errors or universal errors because they are commonly produced by speakers of a multitude of unrelated L1s (cf Richards, section 2 3 2) In such a case, the L2-learner, like the L1-acquirer, attempts to derive the rules behind the input he receives and to develop hypotheses on the basis of the intake he has internalized (cf Corder, sections 2 2 1 and 2 2 2) Several researchers such as Cook (1969), Stern (1969), Menyuk (1969) and Richards (1971a) seem to have adopted Corder's views on systematic errors in the sense that intralingual errors bring to light some of the general characteristics of learner language and of the strategy or strategies whereby the L2 is learned and taught (cf Richards, 1971a reprint 173)

It is worth noting, here, that the various types of intralingual errors were also identified in terms of the general principle of transfer theory, that is, the learning of task A will affect the subsequent learning of task B (cf chapter 1, section 1 2 1) This can be seen in transfer-based terms like overgeneralization, intralingual interference, and intralingual transfer which were used by different researchers to refer to the same sort of linguistic solutions Hence, Jakobovits expounded this phenomenon as "the use of previously available strategies in new situations [ ] In L2-learning [ ] some of these strategies will prove helpful in organizing the facts about the L2, but others, perhaps due to superficial similarities, will be misleading and inapplicable" (Jakobovits, 1969 55, quoted by Richards, 1971a, reprint 174) Clearly, therefore, the same general principle of transfer theory was applied to the two sorts of linguistic solutions interlingual and intralingual While in the former task A is regarded as the L1 and task B as the L2, in the latter task A is looked upon as the learner's intake and task B as the subsequent input he receives from the L2 Thus, intralingual errors, like systematic errors, are evidence of some of the general laws governing L2-learning such as faulty generalization from newly absorbed L2-rules, incomplete application of L2-rules, and failure to learn conditions under which other L2-rules apply They are also evidence of the learner's attempt to build up
hypotheses about the L2 from his limited experience in formal settings such as classroom or coursebook (cf. Richards, 1971a, reprint 174)

However, as there is always a divergence of opinion about the exact percentages of interlingual errors (cf. section 2.2.3, Table 3), there is a subsequent divergence of opinion about the exact percentages of intralingual errors. Likewise, to determine what errors are intralingual and what others are not seems to be one of the most controversial issues. It may be the case that if there is an extremely radical difference between the structure of a given erroneous utterance produced in the L2 and the structure or structures of all its possible L1-TEs (particularly in the case of L1-Arabic with its varieties and sub-varieties), then the erroneous L2-utterance in question would most likely be identified as an intralingual error. The following are some of the deviant structures which have been found in the data collected from a number of Syrian learners. Accordingly, these structures can be viewed as examples of intralingual errors, since, by recourse to their L1-TEs, they could not be traced back to L1-influence.

(33) * There are many *mices* in the house

(34) * He *want* to study in England

(35) * Do you *afraid* of the window?

(36) * Where are you *come* from?

(37) * Sorry, I give you trouble last time

(38) NSE * When did Roger call? NSA * Just five minutes after you go * Maybe he *call* at nine

It should be noted, here, that although mere intralingual errors are not the concern of the present study, their identification seems, however, to be necessary for the distinction between them and interlingual errors. Their identification is also necessary to provide possible analyses of those actually produced erroneous utterances that are said to be a reflection of an overlap between the two sorts of linguistic solutions, for which reason they are called inter-intralingual errors in this study.
2.4.3 Inter-Intralingual Errors

The term *inter-intralingual* errors, as it can be generally defined, refers to those two-dimensional deviant structures produced in the L2, which are attestedly established to be a reflection of both L1-influence and other factors based on partial exposure to the L2. Errors of this category, therefore, result in an interaction between the two sorts of linguistic solutions: interlingual and intralingual. Such an interaction involves testing two-dimensional hypotheses about rule conditions and rule application by generalization from intervening observation in the L1 and L2. It appears the case that, apart from the psychological and pedagogical variables, three linguistic sources may interact and constitute the learner's interim linguistic knowledge which underlies the emanation of inter-intralingual errors. These sources are: (i) the learner's already existing knowledge of the L1; (ii) the learner's transitional competence or his intake; and (iii) the 'new' linguistic material of the L2 which the learner still receives as an input. Therefore, in relation to the general concept of systematic errors, one part of the deviation of an inter-intralingual error can either overtly or covertly be detected by recourse to the learner's L1, and another part of the deviation is attributable to one of the strategies adopted by the learner during L2-learning since its origin or origins can either overtly or covertly be explained by reference to the standard norm of the L2. Hence, inter-intralingual errors are a reflection of either an overt combination of interlingual and intralingual errors or a covert interaction between the two.

As noted above, there was an urgent need for a reconciliation between CA and EA since they both serve as a far more reliable approach to the extrapolation of the 'invisible' areas of language transfer (cf. section 2.3.1). Again, the study and analysis of inter-intralingual errors seem to be another objective reason for such a reconciliation. It has been argued that even in current thinking about language transfer there are no serious attempts to investigate this category of errors. For instance, Ringbom states: "If error causes were dealt with, they were all too frequently divided into 'intralingual' and 'interlingual' categories, with no possibility given of interaction between the two" (Ringbom, 1987: 70; emphasis added). In the discussion of the data in Part Two, an attempt will be made to analyse a number of overt and covert inter-intralingual errors. These will be referred to where appropriate.
Such an attempt appears to be a serious contribution to Arabic-English transfer studies specifically, and to provide an interesting area for further research.

Having identified the three major categories of errors, two of them will be the concern of this study. The first category refers to interlingual errors, and this category also includes those errors which are examples of what has been called LI-error transfer (cf section 2.3.2). The second category refers to inter-intralingual errors. In corroboration of the hypotheses enunciated at the end of this part (cf chapter 4, section 4.3), interlingual identifications will be scrutinized in terms of the three linguistic subcomponents. First, the phonological subcomponent to show to what extent SCA-influence rather than MSA-influence interferes with the learner's attempt to utilize the phonological system of English. Second, the syntactic subcomponent to explain to what extent LI-influence (MSA/SCA) intrudes into the learner's attempt to process the syntactic rules of English. Third, the semantic subcomponent to demonstrate to what extent LI-influence (MSA/SCA) aids the learner's attempt to test hypotheses about the semantic representations of English.

In conclusion, the theory of EA appeared at first mainly as a reaction against traditional CA when linguistic theory was still in a state of flux. This was, of course, inevitable as the empirical and practical research, under the guises of EA, proved many of the logical shortcomings of CA. Eventually, the structural-behavioural model together with all the pedagogical tactics based on its theoretical constructs were demolished and thus the 'crisis' of the CA-Hypothesis had been brought to a climax, particularly during the late 1960s and the early 1970s. However, although the researchers' commitment to the generative-cognitive model was the main cause of the strictures launched against CA and subsequently against language transfer, no one made an articulate denial of the unavoidable fact of LI-influence on L2-learning/acquisition. Hence, in order to provide a full account of this fact, neither the conventional nor the resurgent schemes of EA could serve as the ultimate remedy. As it is quite true that many of the production errors could not be predicted by CA, it is equally true that most of the learning difficulties, especially those which lie at the heart of comprehension, could not be explained by EA. This indicates
that each approach had its weaknesses but at the same time had its merits. Therefore, a combination of the two, though contradictory, for a better account of language transfer was recommended. After all, within the generative-cognitive framework, the invaluable insights put forward into the study of the learner's errors (for example, Corder and subsequently Selinker, Nemser among others) forced the research not only to revolutionize the whole concept of EA, but also to provide more sophisticated speculations on the entity of learner language, an exciting phenomenon in L2-acquisition collectively referred to as interlanguage. The next chapter will explain this phenomenon in detail and approach the new position of language transfer in the literature.
The term interlanguage was first introduced by Selinker (1969) and subsequently it appeared as the title of his seminal paper "Interlanguage" in 1972. At about the same time, other researchers coined several alternative terms to refer to somewhat the same phenomenon. As a continuation of his speculations on the learner's errors, Corder (1971a) postulated the concept of idiosyncratic dialect, and, within a similar perspective, Nemser (1971b) proposed the notion of approximative system. Further, in their attempt to identify the goofs made by children during L2-learning, Dulay and Burt (1974b) enunciated a theory known as creative construction, which, in many ways, resembles the theory of interlanguage. Within the generative-cognitive framework, the learner was seen as a creative organism processing language via a set of cognitive structures rather than acquiring a set of habits. Hence, the above researchers looked upon learner language as "a legitimate system of language in its own right" (Brown, 1980, 162). This positive attitude held the learner in great esteem in that, by means of hypothesis formation and hypothesis testing, he laboriously internalizes his system and gradually moves towards closer and more successive approximations to native mastery of the L2.

In this chapter, learner language, by reference to the four designations (idiosyncratic dialect, approximative system, interlanguage system, and creative construction) will be scrutinized within a diachronic framework as they all emphasize the dynamic nature of this system. While all designations converge at the common assumption that the learner is establishing his own self-contained system, they seem to represent two different but interrelated trends of endeavour. Along the
first trend, the two designations (*idiosyncratic dialect* and *approximative system*) lean towards the treatment of learner language from the viewpoint of the L2. Whereas, within the second trend, the other two designations (*interlanguage system* and *creative construction*) connote neutrality of emphasis on probing learner language from the viewpoint of the learner himself. For this reason, the discussion will present a schematized overview of all four designations from these two angles in order to elucidate the 'new' insights about language transfer in this interesting line of research.

The opening section of this chapter (section 3.1) will be taken up with a detailed examination of learner language within the first trend. It will draw on Corder's notion of *idiosyncratic dialect* and Nemser's concept of *approximative system*, and will seek the similarities as well as the differences in perspective between the two designations. In reference to Corder's distinction between *idiosyncratic dialect* and *idiolect*, an example of the latter will be cited from a Syrian context. Further, within Nemser's notion of *immigrant speech* (a class of speech system representing one of the stable varieties of *approximative system*), an exemplified utterance produced by a Syrian 'immigrant' in his LI will illustrate a retroactively intruded L2-item which can be viewed as an instance of linguistic stability due to environmentally imposed intrusion. Next, the approach adopted by both researchers to the investigation of language transfer effects will be highlighted and exemplified by an attempted analysis of some utterances actually made by the Syrian learners in their own L2-system.

Following the line of the second trend, the other section (section 3.2) will be a scrutiny of learner language from a much deeper perspective. At one end, by recourse to Selinker's hypothesis of *interlanguage system*, the five central internal processes, of which the mechanism of language transfer is one, will be carefully discussed in a modified configuration. These central processes, together with some other minor processes, are said to formulate the linguistic knowledge which underlies the learner's *interlanguage continuum*. At another, with reference to Dulay and Burt's theory of *creative construction*, the five general factors, of which the learner's LI-experience is one, will be described as these factors are assumed to specify particular discrepancies between the input and the output. The discussion will, then, show that even researchers such as Dulay and Burt (who considerably played down the role of the LI in L2-learning as a result of their severe
criticism of the CA-Hypothesis) made no articulate denial of language transfer as an internal mechanism. Hence, the section will finish with a profound and exemplified scrutiny of the potential for such a mechanism with reference to both Selinker's speculations and the counter-criticisms levelled against Dulay and Burt's approach.

The final section of this chapter (section 3.3) will touch on the rehabilitation of language transfer as an important issue, among others, in interlanguage studies. Mention will be made of some recent researchers who assert that, far from its association with behaviourism, the issue is worth examining from a cognitive perspective to arrive at a better account of learning difficulty. The term interlanguage (IL) will sometimes be used as a neutral term to refer to all four designations.

3.1 IL in an L2-Centred Perspective

In very much the same approach, Corder and Nemser defined learner language in terms of several aspects such as systematicity/patternedness, instability/transiency, structural uniqueness/structural independence, and so on. However, the main distinction between the two is that Corder eschewed considering the utterances produced by the learner erroneous, but rather he stressed their grammaticalness, whereas Nemser regarded them as deviant though they are systematic in *suis generis* terms. In a tendency to relinquish the prior predictions claimed by traditional CA, both researchers seem to have paralleled their approaches with CA *a posteriori* for the analysis of interlingual identifications. By reference to these issues, three topics are put forward in this section: Corder's notion of *idiomatic dialect* (ISD), Nemser's concept of *Approximative System* (APS), and transfer effects on both designations.

3.1.1 Idiosyncratic Dialect (ISD)

In an argument about the control of input, Corder suggests that it is the learner who is responsible for this control, since the actual input is 'what goes in' (that is, what is internalized as intake) not
'what is available for going in' In such a strategy both the L2-learner and the L1-acquirer coincide with each other. Several scholars such as Carroll (1955), Mager (1961) and Ferguson (1966) made similar assumptions about the control of input in that to determine the 'learner-generated sequence', his intake, would be entirely plausible to determine, what Corder calls, the learner's 'built-in syllabus' (Corder, 1967, reprint: 9). In other words, the learner's internal strategies, which affect the structural properties of the utterances he produces, are directly pertinent to his built-in syllabus (cf. Selinker, 1972, reprint 39). Thus, as noted earlier, the study of the learner's errors is part of the study of the definite system of language he is using at every stage of development. This system represents the learner's underlying knowledge of the L2, that is, his transitional competence (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2.2)

Corder, in a subsequent paper, assumes that the learner's transitional competence can be regarded as 'a special sort of dialect' of the L2 in the linguistic sense as both dialects, that is the learner's system and the standard norm of the L2, share some of the grammatical rules of the L2. Clearly, therefore, the author's conviction is to probe learner language from the standpoint of the L2. His proposal is based on two considerations:

firstly, any spontaneous speech intended by the speaker to communicate is meaningful, in the sense that it is systematic, regular, and consequently is, in principle, describable in terms of a set of rules, i.e., it has a grammar. Secondly, since a number of sentences of [the learner's] language are isomorphic with some of the sentences of his L2 and have the same interpretation, then some, at least, of the rules needed to account for the learner's language will be the same as those required to account for the L2

(Corder, 1971a, reprint 14, emphasis added)

In this respect, Corder makes a distinction between social dialect which is a social term and refers to a language used by a social group, and non-social dialect which is a linguistic term and does not refer to a language used by a social group. Therefore, it is the non-social dialect in terms of which Corder defines learner language as a special sort of dialect coined idiosyncratic dialect (ISD). Hence, the author makes another distinction between ISD and idiolect. While both terms identify forms of personal dialect, idiolect is characterizable by the fact that all the rules needed to account for it exist somewhere in the set of
rules of one or another social dialect. Thus, unlike ISD, idiolect is said to be a mixture of social dialects in that it may possess rules drawn from two or more overlapping social dialects, but it does not employ rules which do not exist in anyone of these social dialects (Corder, 1971a; reprint 15).

A vivid example of idiolect in Corder's sense can be found in an Arabic-speech community such as Syria. Although this exemplification may sidetrack the discussion a little, the relevant information that follow would, at least, serve as a preliminary consideration of one of the three hypotheses proposed in the current study (cf chapter 5, section 5.3.1, Hypothesis One). The example concerns a native of Syria, typically a university student from the city of Dayr azZawr, commencing his studies at, for instance, the University of Aleppo. Here, there appear two distinct social dialects. ECD, the student's home dialect and NCD, the dialect of the new environment in which he studies (cf chapter 5, section 5.1, the Map of Syria). These two regional dialects descend from the earlier language through a form of conversational Arabic known as the koine. This form, as Ferguson puts it, "was not identical with any of the earlier dialects and [ ] differed in many significant respects from Classical Arabic but was used side by side with the Classical language during early centuries of the Muslim era" (Ferguson, 1959a, reprint 49). It follows that most modern dialects of Colloquial Arabic, and ECD and NCD are instances, are said to be continuations of the koine. Thus, in order to be communicatively intelligible in the new environment, the student in question tends to fluctuate between ECD, the home dialect, and MSA, the standard dialect of Arabic. Such a fluctuation is well observable in the early stages as the student is not yet extemporaneously able to use the rules which are identified with NCD, the host dialect. As a result, a form of personal interdialect known as, what Blanc calls, the middle language emerges and represents two tendencies. The first tendency is classicization whereby the student's interdialect, or by analogy his idiolect, is modified in the direction of MSA particularly in the early stages of living in the new environment (cf Blanc, 1960-83). This modification correlates with the student's competence in MSA; the more competent he is the more modified his idiolect will be, and in such a case a form of 'elevated' Colloquial Arabic is recognizable (cf Blanc, 1960 152). The second tendency is koineization whereby the student's
idiolect is homogenized at later stages and becomes more stable by the elimination, retention and modification of certain rules or items which are said to be characteristic of the home dialect ECD and/or the host dialect NCD (cf. Blanc, 1960. 84f). This indicates that the student's idiolect would be a mixture of, at least, these two social dialects. For example

(1) a [ha y šku n qultu lak ma biddi ah’kī] (Idio U)
b [ha y šku n qultu lak ma ari d ah’tši] (ECD)
c [iššu ha d ʔiltillak ma biddi ih’k’i] (NCD)

'What's that, I said (to you) I don't want to talk'

As the above examples illustrate, the idiolect utterance (1a) is characterized by three aspects (i) the elimination of an item of the home dialect such as [ari d] in (1b) and its substitution by the counterpart of the host dialect [biddi] in (1c), (ii) the retention of an item of the home dialect as in [ha'y Škin], and (iii) the modification of an item of the home dialect [ah'tši] as [ah'k’i] in the direction of the counterpart of the host dialect [ih’k’i]. So, it can be seen that the rules required to account for an idiolect utterance such as (1a) are employed somewhere in the counterparts of two or more social dialects of the L1.

On the other hand, the notion of ISD, the main concern here, applies to quite different circumstances. It refers to such an exemplified student when he learns a L2. If this is the case, he will then possess an ISD whose linguistic value, according to Corder, is testable in the direction of the L2 itself, that is, although some of the rules needed to account for ISD coincide with those required to account for the L2, other rules needed to account for ISD exist neither in the standard dialect of the L2 nor in any of its social dialects. Thus, ISD is peculiar to the learner alone in that some of the utterances he produces cannot be readily interpreted, whereas all idiolect-utterances are interpretable since there exist members of the same speech community who internalize the knowledge of the conventions underlying these utterances (Corder, 1971a, reprint 16). Further, unlike idiolect, ISD is normally characterized by an unstable or transitional nature due to the learner's communicative intentions for intelligibility. Corder argues, however, that learner language is not the only type of ISD to which EA is
applicable. Hence, the author mentions three other types of ISD existing within the same speech community, and thus they can be called intralingual ISDs.

(i) The language of poems which sometimes contain linguistic sequences deviant from the standard dialect. As the poet is presumably in possession of the underlying knowledge of the standard dialect, these linguistic sequences are said to be deliberately deviant.

(ii) The speech of an aphasic who is assumed to be, before his disease, a native speaker of a given social dialect. Thus, the linguistic sequences he produces after his disease, can be looked upon as pathologically deviant.

(iii) Child language which is said to create typical problems of interpretation perhaps more acutely than the other two types. In a footnote to the same paper printed in (Richards, 1974 171), Corder points to the surprisingly observable fact that "three-year-olds can understand each other better than adults understand them or than they can understand adult speech." Child language is, therefore, intractable for the adult, and, like the learner's ISD, it is obviously unstable (Corder, 1971a; reprint 17).

With respect to the third type of intralingual ISD, Corder notes, however, that it would be undesirable to refer to the utterances produced by the child as deviant or erroneous, since this organism has not been yet a normal speaker of a given social dialect. By analogy, the author argues that it would be misleading to consider the idiosyncratic utterances of the learner deviant or erroneous because the L2-rules, from which such utterances deviate, are not yet known to him. This indicates that the only utterances that can be viewed as deviant are those which proceed from non-systematic errors or mistakes of performance (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2.2). It seems the case that the learner's ISD, being a definite system, involves systematic errors of which he is unconscious and thus he cannot rectify them because they follow the only rules internalized in his transitional competence. In this sense, the learner's idiosyncratic utterances are 'grammatical' in *suis generis* terms, since superficially ill-formed utterances cannot be accounted for by the L2-rules (Corder, 1971a, reprint 19).

Following his argument about the significance of errors put forward in the preceding chapter, Corder points out that both superficially well-formed utterances—as so judged from the viewpoint of the L2—and...
Idiosyncratic utterances are significant in that they are evidence of what the learner knows and what he does not know respectively. The significance of the former type lies in the fact that a superficially 'well-formed' utterance might be covertly idiosyncratic (cf. covert vs overt errors, chapter 2, section 2.2.1). Therefore, the task of EA is to study and analyse overt idiosyncracy and covert idiosyncracy, and, as both types convey valuable insights into the learner's ISD, every utterance he produces should in principle be scrutinized (Corder, 1971a, reprint 21). Clearly, the analysis of the learner's ISD requires a longitudinal study of his development, which is assumed to be possible by relying heavily on EA-techniques, since there is still considerable paucity of sophisticated research into the development of the individual learner in naturalistic settings. For this reason, Corder puts forth three stages of investigation, which EA is primarily responsible for:

(i) Recognizing idiosyncracy. That is, an utterance is normally considered idiosyncratic until evidenced to be otherwise. Thus, by recourse to the context, it would be plausible to recognize both overt and covert idiosyncracy. For example:

(2) a After an hour it was stopped. (ISU)
b After an hour it stopped (L2-U)

This illustrates that the superficially well-formed utterance (2a) could only be recognized as idiosyncratic if the context was referring to, for instance, the 'wind' upon producing 'it' (Corder, 1971a, reprint 21).

(ii) Accounting for ISD. A comparison between the learner's ISD and the L2 he is learning can be drawn by equating a given idiosyncratic utterance with the L2-equivalent which have the same meaning intended within the same context. Thus, if the context of the above example (2a) was indeed suggesting the 'wind', then this utterance should be equated with the L2-equivalent (2b) for determining the magnitude of idiosyncracy.

(iii) Explanation. This stage constitutes the ultimate objective of EA and involves an exhaustive psycholinguistic analysis of the idiosyncratic utterance in question. The first two stages, which demand merely linguistic analyses, serve as an ad hoc device for accomplishing this stage, otherwise EA would be useless. Explanation is beneficial for two
interdependent justifications theoretical to elucidate what and how the human being learns L2; and practical to enable him to learn more efficiently by exploiting the insights gained from probing his ISD (Corder, 1971a, reprint 24).

It seems, therefore, a scrutiny of the learner's ISD is, according to Corder, attainable by EA-techniques in the first place However, bearing in mind the caution mentioned earlier that EA deals with language production at the expense of language comprehension, such a scrutiny entails the risk of conducting CA a posteriori when language transfer effects are to be detected (cf. Schachter, chapter 2, section 2.3.1). Hence, Corder views on language transfer, together with those of Nemser, will be discussed later (cf. section 3.1.3 below) The following section will describe Nemser's concept of approximative system

3.1.2 Approximative System (APS)

In almost the same approach, Nemser introduced another line of research into the developmental nature of learner language He postulated the existence of an evolving series which the learner's entire system formulates at successive stages of L2-learning. For such an evolving series Nemser advocated the term approximative systems (APSs) to stress the closer approximations to native mastery of the L2-system driven by the inner dynamism of learner language In 1961 Nemser's experimental findings were first submitted as a PhD dissertation followed by a slightly revised version (Nemser, 1961a, 1961b) A full decade later, Nemser carried out another project as a continuation of his phonological research conducted on Hungarian learners of English (Nemser, 1971a) In this work, the author provided an extensive critical account of Briere's (1964, 1966, 1968) studies into phonological interference (cf. Selinker, 1989 269) In a subsequent paper, Nemser allocated an epitome of his theoretical perspective where he defined APS as.

[ ] the deviant linguistic system actually employed by the learner attempting to utilize the L2 APSs vary in character in accordance with proficiency level, variation is also introduced by learning experience (including exposure to a L2-script system), communication function, personal learning characteristics, etc (Nemser, 1971b; reprint 55, emphasis added)

Clearly, therefore, in contrast with Corder who is unwilling to consider
the idiosyncratic utterances of the learner deviant or erroneous, Nemser emphasizes the deviancy of the learner's APS; even though both researchers converge in stressing the 'grammaticalness' or 'patternedness' of the learner's spontaneous speech in sua generis terms. Hence, Nemser states that the assumption underlying the notion of APS is threefold:

(i) Learner speech at a given time is the patterned product of a linguistic system, an APS, distinct from the L1 and the L2 and internally structured.
(ii) APSs at successive stages of learning form an evolving series [that is] the earliest occurring when a learner first attempts to use the L2, the most advanced at the closest approach of APS to the L2 (merger, the achievement of perfect proficiency, is rare for adult learners).
(iii) In a given contact situation, the APSs of learners at the same stage of proficiency roughly coincide, with major variations ascribable to differences in learning experience.

Implicit in Nemser's statement is that the learner's APS is identified with three distinct issues. Along the first issue, the learner's speech is characterized by a systematic nature, that is, the utterances he makes are 'structurally organized' and manifest the 'order and cohesiveness' of his entire system. In such a view, both designations ISD and APS, being systematic, connote the structural independence of learner language. While ISD implies the uniqueness of the rules employed by the learner, APS refers to the 'structural autonomy' of learner language; that is, the definite system the learner possesses at any stage of development is structurally independent of his L1 and the L2 he is learning (Nemser, 1971b, reprint 57). This structural independence is also characteristic of Selmker's designation of interlanguage as will be discussed later (cf. section 3.2.1 below).

With respect to the second issue, the learner's extemporaneous speech is inherently transient, and, through longitudinal investigation, it brings to light the 'evolving' nature of his APS towards native-like competence in the L2. Thus, both ISD and APS share this characteristic as the former, too, is similarly modified to show evidence of a transitional or unstable nature, and, by diligent efforts, the learner tends towards better mastery of the L2-rules. Further, Nemser refers to the scope of the learner's attempted processing of the L2 and the significant role it plays in determining the level of L2-proficiency, that is, the earlier the learner's APS proceeds to utilize the L2, the
more approximations to native mastery of the L2 it will achieve. This indicates that the adult learner, whose APS normally starts at later stages, hardly attains to perfect L2-proficiency. A similar point was made by Selinker (cf. section 3.2.1 below).

The third issue concerns the similarity of linguistic aspects which APSs tend to have inherent in them, that is, both the deviant and well-formed utterances produced by learners having the same LI manifest common features at the same level of L2-proficiency. Again, such an assumption was adopted by Corder as will be discussed in the next section. Nemser's conclusions derive directly from his empirical research conducted on Hungarian learners of English. Hence, in a critical account of traditional CA, Nemser, in accordance with Corder, points out that "learner speech should be studied not only by reference to the LI and the L2, but in its own terms as well" (Nemser, 1971b, reprint 56). Therefore, the similar features that APSs reflect are essentially due to the same laws governing learner language, a point that most L2-acquisition researchers seem to concur with. However, if APSs reveal considerable variations in L2-proficiency, as they clearly do, then these are ascribable to pedagogical factors such as differences in learning experience or to other psychological factors such as motivation, intelligence and the like.

So, it can be seen that the learner's APS, like any of the designations put forward in this chapter, is a legitimate system in its own right. Being a structurally independent system, it is systematic, regular and structurally organized in *sui generis* terms. Because APS is transient or unstable, it has a dynamic nature which is eventually manifest in the evolving series formulated at successive stages of L2-learning. However, such an evolutionary system, Nemser argues, is not void of stability of linguistic deviations. In his words: "while effective language teaching implies preventing, or postponing as long as possible, the formation of permanent intermediate systems or subsystems (deviant phonological and grammatical structures) [would be anticipated]" (Nemser, 1971b, reprint 57, emphasis added). Permanent or stable subsystems, in this sense, are pertinent to the phenomenon of fossilization expounded by Selinker within his hypothesis of interlanguage (cf. section 3.2.1 below). It is, therefore, these stable subsystems which, according to Nemser, constitute the major source of permanent errors, and the systematic nature of the learner's APS is abundantly present in the patterning of errors in the perception
and production of a given L2 by learners sharing the same L1" (Nemser, 1971b, reprint 57) Thus, like Corder who states that to recognize the idiosyncratic utterances the learner makes is largely to determine his ISD, Nemser argues that patterned errors are significant for the useful information they convey about the stable areas of the learner's APS (cf also Corder's argument of systematic errors, chapter 2, section 2.2) An apparent example of such stable areas can be taken as the 'foreign accent' which is typical of L2-learners as well as of some bilinguals whose L2-knowledge is normally characterized by a static nature as it pertains to linguistic stability in Nemser's sense. Hence, as opposed to Corder's three types of intralingual ISD which exist in the same speech community referred to in the previous section, Nemser exemplifies three classes of interlingual speech systems in which stable varieties of APS can be found. These are immigrant speech, utility systems and learner pidgin.

(1) Immigrant speech
Along the first class, Nemser defines immigrant speech as "...the speech of long-time users of the L2 who, often having attained considerable fluency in this language, have yet obviously reached a plateau in their learning" (Nemser, 1971b, reprint 57). Thus, in the speech of European immigrants to the United States, the typical rendition of the English initial cluster /sw/ as /v/ by Germans and the regular omission of the plural marker '-s' by Hungarians are among many other observable instances of proactive interference (L1---->L2) which are characteristic of immigrant speech. This speech system, on the other hand, often reveals examples of retroactive interference (L1<----L2) which can be identified with Haugen's notion of linguistic borrowing (cf. chapter 1, section 1.1.2). In such a case, English is the dominant language of the environment in which these immigrants settle, so that when they communicate in their L1s (German or Hungarian), their speech tends to reflect 'systematic intrusion' of certain English items and thus both the L1 and L2 interchangeably play a role. These socio-linguistic factors interact with other psycholinguistic factors to constitute a natural status for the learner's APS to emerge from the L2 as a new and autonomous speech system. To make the point more explicit, an example of this systematic intrusion can be cited from a similar situation where a group of Syrian postgraduate students (who are 'immigrants' in this case) live on a long-term basis in Ireland (cf chapter 5, section 5.1). Thus upon
communicating with each other in the L1-SCA, these students tend to produce certain L2-English items retroactively intruded into their LI-utterances. For instance, they tend to produce the non-pure LI-utterance (3a) rather than the pure LI-utterance (3b)

(3) a [kam šابتاركلاسيتالاحالا؟] (AU)
   b [kam فسيلكلاسيتالاحالا؟] (SCD)
   c How many chapters have you finished so far? (L2-U)

This illustrates the lexical intrusion of the L2-item 'chapters' in (3c) upon the LI-utterance (3b), and its rendition within the linguistic boundaries of SCD as [šابتار] in the actual utterance (3a). It appears that the linguistic representation of [šابتار] can be accounted for on two levels. First, phonological whereby the L2-phonemes /tʃ/ and /p/ in /tʃemptæz/ are substituted by the LI-phones [ʃ] and [b] respectively simply because neither of the former occurs in the phonological system of SCD, the home dialect of the producer of (3a). In addition, the L2-vowels /æ/ and /ə/ are both modified in the direction of the short LI-vowel [a] and realized within the same articulation of two-syllable LI-words such as [šافتار] 'pouted (he)', [عابكار] 'earlier, [أحمار] 'red' and so on. Second, morphological where the plural marker '-s' is omitted due to the fact that in Arabic, unlike the case in English, countable nouns such as [فسيل] in (3b), when preceded by the interrogation particle [kam] 'how many', are rendered as singular and indefinite at a surface-structure level, since the speaker, upon asking such a question, does not know which quantitative aspect (singular/dual/plural) is implied. Consequently, the phonological and, perhaps, morphological deviations of [šابتار] as so judged from the viewpoint of the L2 tend to belong as stable interlingual identifications to the Arab learner's APS when he attempts to communicate in the L2 (cf example (4) below).

It should be noted, however, that the motives underlying the retroactive intrusion of [šابتار] as in (3a) are different from those which relate to linguistic borrowing as identified with immigrant speech in Nemser's terms, albeit both types are instances of cultural diffusion. The retroactive intrusion of certain L2-items upon the LI-speech of European immigrants to the United States is generally characterized by the individual's conscious attempt to borrow these L2-items due to historical-linguistic factors, perhaps in the first place, such as the existence of cognate elements between related languages (as if a German
immigrant were to say 'Wann kam meine Tochter' instead of 'Wann kam meine Tochter') On the contrary, the retroactive intrusion of some L2-items upon the L1-speech of the Syrian 'immigrant' to Ireland may reflect his subconscious attempt to borrow these L2-items by means of temporal code switching within the host environment. In other words, when this Syrian 'immigrant' goes back to his home country, he would no longer tend to produce non-pure L1-utterances such as (3a), but rather the pure L1-equivalents such as (3b), particularly in situations where his interlocutor has no knowledge of English. Consequently, the retroactive intrusion of L2-items in the host country is triggered by geographical factors, not historical-linguistic factors, since Arabic and English are totally unrelated languages, and thus the lexical borrowing of [šabtar] in (3a) is an instance of what can be called environmentally imposed intrusion. It seems, therefore, this type of intrusion is worthy of scrutiny for the important role it plays in determining inherent effects of language transfer, especially when already retroactively intruded L2-items such as 'chapters' are to be processed within the Syrian learner's APS. For example


Apart from the omission of 'BE' and 'there', the deviation of [šabtar] in this actual example can be accounted for by reference to its retroactive intrusion as in (3a). At one end, the single borrowing of 'chapters' is represented as [šabtar] both phonologically and morphologically deviant from the former in order to fit into the grammatical system of SCD as discussed above. At another, the double borrowing of [šabtar]—that is, the borrowing of 'chapters' as a pure L2-item through shifting from the L2 to the L1, and the borrowing of [šabtar] as an 'Arabicized' L2-item through processing in the APS—suggests transfer effects already caused by environmentally imposed intrusion.

(ii) Utility systems

The second class which Nemser identifies as forming subgroups of stable APS refers to what he calls utility systems. These are by definition "specialized 'little' languages of limited semantic function, and requiring limited grammars and lexicons" (Nemser, 1971b, reprint '57). As the term utility indicates, this class of speech systems is used for utilitarian purposes through 'circumscribed' or economized communication.
exigencies such as the systems often used by taxi-drivers, hotel-reservation clerks, and bar-tenders, which are beyond the concern of the present study

(iii) Learner pidgin
The third class, Nemser argues, pertains to the stable subsystems "often employed by language students who have attained fluency in the L2 without mastery of its fundamentals, but have arrived at a stage in instruction where attention has largely shifted from form to content" (Nemser, 1971b, reprint 58) For learner pidgin, Nemser exemplifies a piece of question/answer dialogue between a teacher and an Arab learner of English:

(5) Student  *Same?*  [i.e. Are the two words pronounced in the same way?]
Teacher  *Same*
Teacher  *Short answer*  [i.e. Use the short answer form]
In conversation very good

As the above dialogue illustrates, even language teachers sometimes tend to participate in the learner's deviations and seem to extemporaneously adopt this variety of APS as a means of communication in a classroom setting. It appears that, if no transfer effect could be detected, the errors committed by the learner in such a variety correspond to Richards' third type of intralingual errors, namely, incomplete application of rules, where structural deviancy represents the learner's interest in communication rather than in the rules of question usage, with the exception that the teacher does not seem to participate as a user of learner language (cf chapter 2, section 2.2.4, example (4))

It now becomes clear that the above three classes are indications of stable deviations from the structure of the L2-system, albeit language transiency and language instability characterize the nature of the learner's APS as a whole. Such classes, as discussed, have to do with sociolinguistic factors which interact with others to establish the stable areas formulating part of the learner's APS. Therefore, the entire system of APS is not deliberately deviant as is the case of the language of poems, nor is it a system of pathologically deviant sequences which are typical of the speech of an aphasic as discussed by Corder in the previous section, but rather APS is naturally deviant.

One final point is that, according to Nemser, the learner's APS reflects stable deviations because it is mostly conditioned by two
interacting forces. First, communication requirements which impel the learner to establish particular linguistic identifications whose function is to concentrate on the content to the detriment of the formal rules governing such identifications. Second, economization requirements where the balance and order of the linguistic system are imposed by the elimination and/or modification of certain phonological, syntactical, and lexical categories for the achievement of intelligibility in natural speed conditions.

So far, apart from Corder and Nemser's speculations on language transfer, a schematized overview of the two designations ISD and APS has been presented. This is because, in their critical accounts of traditional CA, both researchers seem to suggest a similar approach which, in many respects, coincides with the *a posteriori* form of the CA-Hypothesis (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3.1), but with some procedural variations between the two. Hence, the following section will go into details about transfer effects on ISD and APS and how Corder and Nemser proposed to tackle this problem. Throughout the discussion, some tentative proposals will be put forward to maintain the logical succession of the conclusions drawn in the preceding two chapters.

### 3.1.3 Transfer Effects on ISD and APS

As noted earlier, Corder, among others, assumes that the strategies or procedures adopted during L1 and L2-acquisition are fundamentally the same (cf. chapter 1, section 1.4.2). The main distinction between the two processes, however, is that the task of L2-acquisition is comparatively simpler than the task of L1-acquisition, merger. The former is not a simple task, particularly for adults, even though it is somewhat simpler than the latter. While L1-acquisition involves the testing of an unlimited number of hypotheses about the nature of the L1-system, L2-acquisition requires that the only hypotheses to be tested are about the differences and/or similarities between the 'old' L1-system and the 'new' L2-system. The differences, in CA-literature, were misleadingly deemed to be the sole source of learning difficulty (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2.3). With the emergence of the new linguistic theory, the learner is looked upon as constructing for himself a definite system via a set of cognitive structures, and the errors he makes are best regarded "as signs that [he] is investigating the systems of..."
the new language" (Corder, 1967, reprint 12) Hence, the author refers to Saporta who, from a generative perspective, clarified this point. In Saporta's words

The internal structure of the [LAD or LAS], i.e., the learner, has gone relatively unexplored to point out that one of its components is the grammar of the learner's LI. It has generally been assumed that the effect of this component has been inhibitory rather than facilitative

(Saporta, 1966, 91, quoted by Corder, 1967, reprint:12)

Here, Saporta alludes to traditional CA which, from a behaviouristic standpoint, rested on the belief that the old habits of the LI inhibit the learning of the new habits of the L2. Paradoxically, within the generative-cognitive model, the learner's LI is viewed as formulating a major sector of his previous knowledge, which may facilitate rather than inhibit the learning of a subsequent L2. This is reminiscent of Ausubel (1964) who emphasized the facilitating effects of LI-influence in that the 'adult' learner can process the structural devices of the L2 which are identical to those of his LI because these latter are directly transferable (cf. chapter 1, section 1.4.2). Therefore, the errors the learner makes cannot only be traced back to LI-influence but also to the strategies or procedures he adopts during L2-learning.

As discussed at the outset of this chapter, the learner's idiosyncratic utterances are 'temporarily' erroneous or deviant since they derive from the only rules known to him, for which reason they are 'grammatical' in sui generis terms. Because the learner's ISD is characterized by a transitional and unstable nature, his diligent efforts entail the movement of his idiosyncratic utterances towards acceptability in relation to the L2-system (cf. section 3.1.1). From this point of view, Corder suggests that both the language teacher and the researcher can investigate the learner's IL to check for transfer effects or other variables associated with the process of L2-learning. As for the teacher, his task would be carried out

[ ] on the assumption that a group of learners having the same LI and having had the same experience of learning the L2 speak more or less the same IL at any point in their learning career, and that what differences there are can be ascribed to individual variation in intelligence, motivation, and perhaps attitude. This belief is inherent in the notion of 'teaching a class' as opposed to an 'individual', and indeed, it is difficult to see how one could proceed otherwise

(Corder, 1971a, reprint 20)
Such an assumption was made by Nemser as discussed in the preceding section. It seems, therefore, upon indulging in the study of transfer effects, the teacher should bear in mind the notion that the similar strategies or procedures employed by learners (whatever their L1s) would imply the formulation of fundamentally common underlying L2-knowledge, if such learners possess the same previous knowledge; that is, the L1. In other words, learners sharing the same L1 would apply their strategies within a similar route of development upon learning a given L2. However, this does not necessarily indicate the same structural deviations of the errors committed by such learners. This point will be discussed presently.

As for the researcher, his task seems by far the more exhaustive of the two. By comparing overtly idiosyncratic utterances (which are superficially 'ill-formed') with their L2-counterparts, the researcher can determine the degrees of 'ill-formedness' of the former, and by reference to the context, he can also make plausible interpretations of covertly idiosyncratic utterances which are only superficially 'well-formed' (cf section 3.11). If, however, a plausible interpretation of an overtly idiosyncratic utterance cannot be readily made, then the researcher's task would be more difficult. Corder argues that one possible way to arrive at such an interpretation is by recourse to the learner's L1, that is, the magnitude of overt idiosyncracy is testable by conducting the L1-TE of the idiosyncratic utterance in question. In Corder's words:

If the L1 is not known, then the analysis of that [utterance] may have to remain in abeyance until we have learnt more of the ISD of the learner. If, however, the L1 is known, we may be able, by a process of literal translation, to arrive at a means of interpreting the [utterance] plausibly. If we can do that, then, by translating the L1-sentence back into a well-formed sentence of the L2, we have available a reconstructed sentence which once again we can compare with the original overtly idiosyncratic [utterance] of the learner.

(Corder, 1971a, reprint 22, emphasis added)

Clearly, therefore, the methodology suggested by Corder for detecting overtly idiosyncratic transfer coincides in many respects with that of CA a posteriori, since this latter, being a subcomponent of EA, rests on a comparison of the errors actually produced by the learner in his IL and their L1-TEs in order to determine to what extent overt
language transfer has operated (cf chapter 2, section 2.3.1) Hence, a consideration of an overtly idiosyncratic utterance actually produced by a Syrian learner may clarify this point.

(6) a * I dreamed with my father yesterday (AE)  
   b [halamtu bi?abi al-ba ri?ah] (MSA)  
   c [h'limt b'?abi mba re h] (SCD)

Concerning the misuse of the preposition 'with' (the use of the adverb 'yesterday' will be discussed presently), the utterance (6a) suggests an effect of overtly negative transfer triggered by the learner's reliance on the L1-preposition [bi] in MSA as in (6b), or its colloquial form [b] in SCD, his L1-dialect, as in (6c). Such a colloquial form is also the same representation used in any other dialect of SCA. In MSA, the L1-preposition [bi] has fourteen grammatical functions or meanings. The first of these is to indicate what is traditionally known as [il'sa q] 'connection/association' which is by far one of the commonest uses in SCA (cf Al-Bustani, 1977 25). It seems, therefore, the L1-notion of [ma?iyya] 'withness', which associates the dreamer (the agent) with the dream (the patient) in Arabic, signifies an automatized linguistic unit internally conceptualized in the learner's L1-LAD, that is, his previous knowledge of the L1. Upon communicating in English, on the other hand, the learner does not seem to have internalized the L2-notion of 'ofness' or 'aboutness', though he may have the L2-prepositions 'of' and 'about' at his disposal but as lexical items for other grammatical meanings known to him. This means that it is the grammatical meaning of the L1-preposition [bi], rather than its lexical representation, which caused the learner to rely on the L2-preposition 'with' in (6a). Therefore, neither of the L2-prepositions 'of'/ 'about' would come into the learner's mind as an automatized linguistic unit, if both were not internalized to him within such a grammatical meaning (cf also chapter 6, section 6.2.1, sub-section (B), examples (20-23)).

However, with the proviso in mind that CA a posteriori concentrates on language production to the detriment of language comprehension, certain aspects of covertly idiosyncratic transfer will indeed go unnoticed without drawing on the initial expectancies generated by CA a priori though, within its traditional schemes, the exclusively structural comparison between L1 and L2 was relinquished (cf James, chapter 2, section 2.3.2). This indicates that instances of covertly idiosyncratic transfer (that is, superficially well-formed L2-rules or items such as
'yesterday' in (6a), but attestedly processed by resorting to the LI-counterparts such as [mba're h] in (6c) above) would not be accounted for by CA *a posteriori* unless otherwise the pre-procedural devices of CA *a priori* together with the underlying processes incorporating in the realm of comprehension are carefully conducted. It appears that the researcher's task, with indulgence in the analysis of _covertly_ idiosyncratic transfer, would be far more difficult compared with that of _overtly_ idiosyncratic transfer as discussed above. Therefore, in the case of Arabic as the LI in question, a seemingly unique language offering tremendous variations between the Standard and the Colloquial (*cf* chapter 5, section 5.1), the analysis of _covertly_ idiosyncratic transfer demands of the researcher that, besides the wide knowledge of the Standard Variety (MSA), he has available a set of paradigms in terms of which he is able to elucidate how a given MSA-item is realized within the highly flexible boundaries of the Colloquial Variety and processed when being a trigger of _covert_ transfer. This refers to the learner's lexical use of the adverb 'yesterday' in (6a) which will be analysed in more detail.

By looking at the LI-TEs (6b-c) of the idiosyncratic utterance (6a), it appears that the learner, upon producing the L2-item 'yesterday' in (6a) which does not mark a superficial error, had fallen back on the surface structure of the LI-item [mba re h] in (6c) as usually used in SCD, albeit the context, at a deeper level, suggests that the adverb 'last night' was intended. This is because both the L2-adverbs 'yesterday' and 'last night' are often rendered into [mba re h] in SCD or any of its counterparts in SCA. In MSA, however, the LI-item [al-ba rih] (which is the MSA-form of [mba re h] in (6c)) is syntactically and semantically different from the LI-item [al-ba:rihah] as in (6b), though both items mean 'last'. While the former [al-ba rih] is a masculine adjective only modifying the deleted masculine adverb [[al-yawm] 'the day', the latter [al-ba:rihah] is a feminine adjective and thus modifies the deleted feminine adverb [al-laylah] 'the night'. Hence, the deep structure of [al-ba rih] would be [al-yawm al-ba:rihah] 'last day' which is synonymous with [al-yawm al-ma dij], and the deep structure of [al-ba:rihah] would be [al-laylah al-ba'rihah] 'last night' which is synonymous with [al-laylah al-ma diyah]. Therefore, depending on the context, the SCD-item [mba re h] in (6c), or any of its SCA-counterparts, implies the meaning of either 'last day' or 'last night'. At a surface-structure level, however, the LI-item [mba re h] in SCA usually
refers to the meaning of 'last day' including its twenty-four-hour period unless otherwise particular times are indicated by other adverbial phrases such as the following:

(7) a. [mba:re:h  issubuh] (SCA)  
    (Lit.: the last day the morning)  
b. [mba:re:h  idduhur] (SCA)  
    (Lit.: the last day the noon)  
c. [mba:re:h  il-?ager] (SCA)  
    (Lit.: the last day the after noon)  
d. [mba:re:h  il-masa] (SCA)  
    (Lit.: the last day the evening)  

(8) a. [mba:re:h  bin-naha:r] (SCA)  
    (Lit.: the last day in the day (time))  
b. [mba:re:h  bil-le:l] (SCA)  
    (Lit.: the last day in the night (time))  

It follows from the above that although the Ll-word [yo:m] (SCA)/[yawm] (MSA) 'day' refers to a twenty-four-hour period, the adverbial phrase [yo:m  mba:re:h], which is synonymous with [naha:r  mba:re:h] in SCA, is usually used to imply the meaning of 'the day of yesterday'; that is, the day time of the twenty-four-hour period just past (cf. example (8a) above). By analogy, the adverbial phrase [le:l ti  mba:re:h] in SCA implies the meaning of 'the night of yesterday'; that is, the night time of the twenty-four-hour period just past (cf. example (8b) above). Consequently, if no mention is made of any particular time associated with [mba:re:h] in SCA, then, at a surface-structure level, this item would very likely refer to the meaning of 'last day'; that is, the day just past or the day before today. The evidence for such surface-structure representation is the learner's lexical use of the adverb 'yesterday' in (6a) though, at a deep-structure level, the context suggests that 'last night' was the adverb in question. This indicates that, in comprehension, the learner seems to have realized the meaning of the Ll-item [mba:re:h] in SCA as if it were [al-ba:rih] 'last day' (rather than [al-ba:rihah] 'last night') in MSA; and, in production, he matched such realization with the L2-item 'yesterday' as visualized in Figure 4.

As Figure 4 illustrates, the mechanism of language transfer is one of the highly complex and intricate processes underlying L2-learning. Behind the production of the L2-item 'yesterday', there appear two linguistic units: the Ll-item [mba:re:h] (SCA) and the Ll-based L2-item 'yesterday'. These are stored in the input for language processing and,
Figure 4: The linguistic processing of an L1-based L2-item both in L1-comprehension and in L2-production with reference to the surface structure and deep structure of the L1-counterpart.
by recourse to the surface structure of the former, that is [al-ba rih] (MSA), perceived as superficially similar as they clearly are. In comprehension, however, it is the learner's intralingual realization of the surface structure, rather than the deep structure, of [mba re h], which, in the output, causes him to make the interlingual tie-up with the L2-item 'yesterday' though the context refers to 'last night' at a deep-structure level.

In the light of the above analysis, it is believed that although the approach suggested by Corder contributes greatly to the investigation of overtly idiosyncratic transfer (cf. the misuse of 'with' in (6a)), the researcher's exclusive reliance on EA-techniques entails the risk of overlooking aspects of covertly idiosyncratic transfer such as the use of 'yesterday' in (6a). It appears that such an extensive analysis not only determines the magnitude of idiosyncratic transfer, but also provides useful insights into how a given L1-based L2-item is processed by recourse to the L1-counterpart and its realization both in MSA and SCA. Further, within Corder's recommendation, a translation of the L1-TEs (6b-c) of the idiosyncratic utterance (6a) back into their possible well-formed L2-equivalents such as (9a-b)

(9) a I dreamed of/about my father last night
b I had a dream of/about my father last night

would indicate the fundamental similarity in meaning between the idiosyncratic utterance (6a) and the L2-equivalents (9a-b). That is, by reference to the grammatical meaning of the L1-preposition [bi] in (6b), the L1-based L2-preposition 'with' in (6a) corresponds to the L2-preposition 'of' or 'about' in (9a-b), and, by reference to the deep structure of the L1-adverb [mba re h] in (6c) and to the context underlying the lexical use of the L1-based L2-adverb 'yesterday' in (6a), this latter coincides with the L2-adverb 'last night' in (9a-b); albeit the superficial difference between either pair is apparent. Therefore, if the learner's L1 (that is, both the Standard variety and the Colloquial one) is well-known to the researcher, a plausible interpretation of particular idiosyncratic utterances can be made because "there is not always in the L2-context any factor which will make one interpretation more plausible than another" (Corder, 1971a, reprint: 22). This means that the researcher's knowledge of the learner's L1, in such an extensive perspective, is indispensable to more sophisticated.
analyses of idiosyncratic transfer as there is always a certain number of idiosyncratic utterances which have connection with L1-influence. In Corder's words "It is a generally agreed observation that many—but not necessarily all—the idiosyncratic [utterances] of a L2-learner bear some sort of regular relation to the [utterances] of his L1" (Corder, 1971a; reprint 24).

It appears that Corder, who was one of the first researchers to criticize CA as a weak predictor (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2.3), has never been in a position to deny the existence of L1-influence. As mentioned at the outset of this section, Corder assumes that speakers of the same L1 learning a given L2 within the same circumstances would possess roughly the same IL (cf. Corder, 1971a, reprint 20). Implicit in such an assumption is the significance of L1-knowledge to the learners themselves though it does not necessarily indicate that they would commit the same interlingual errors and/or would make use of the L1 as a facilitative reference within the same constructs. From this latter point, it is quite possible to suggest that, apart from the individual variations referred to above, a learner who is competent in his L1 (particularly the standard norm) can draw upon his L1-knowledge more facilitatively than another learner who is less competent even if both are at the same level of L2-proficiency. By reference to the examples (6a-c), the learner, upon matching [mba re h] (SCA) with 'yesterday', does not seem to have realized the linguistic difference between [al-ba rih] and [al-barīhah] (MSA) in that the former modifies the deleted masculine adverb [al-yawm] 'the day' and the latter modifies the deleted feminine adverb [al-laylah] 'the night' as shown above. However, in his ordinary L1-speech, such a learner intrinsically knows that [yo m] 'day' is masculine and [le le ] 'night' is feminine. This is well observable from the extemporaneous L1-utterances he makes in his home dialect. For example

\[(10)\]
\[
a \quad [kɪ f k a n h a d a k ɪ l- y o . m ] \quad (S C D)
(Lit how was (he) that (he) the day?)
\]
\[
b \quad [kɪ f k a n h a d i k ɪ l- l e \ l e : ] \quad (S C D)
(Lit how was (she) that (she) the night?)
\]

The morphological forms of [k a n] 'was (he)'/[hada k] 'that (he)' in (10a) and [ka net] 'was (she)'/[hādi k] 'that (she)' in (10b) are proof
enough that the learner internalizes in his L1 the masculinity of [yoːm] and the femininity of [leːleˑ] respectively, leading one to believe that the Arab learner, when producing 'day' and 'night' in English, already perceives the former as masculine and the latter as feminine. Therefore, the learner's lack of knowledge of the difference between [al-ba rih] and [al-baːrīḥah] caused him to resort to [mbaːrē h] in its masculinity which is evidenced by the use of 'yesterday' in (6a) though the context suggests that the action of dreaming occurred during the night. Had he known such a difference or, at least, had he realized the deep structure of [mba reˑh], he would have been more likely to produce 'last night' in place of 'yesterday', that is, he would have resorted to [al-ba rīḥah] or its SCA-form ['l-ba rhe] as a feminine adjective modifying the deleted feminine adverb [leˑle ], since he already conceptualizes 'night' as feminine. Consequently, the significance of the learner's knowledge of his L1, in such a view, can be justified on, at least, two accounts. First, to the researcher in that it determines part of the learner's IL-continuum, and, therefore, possible shortcomings in L1-competence are manifest in some of those transfer-based utterances which are a reflection of L1-error transfer (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3.2). Second, to the learner himself for it enables him to perceive the similarities, where there are complete similarities, between L1 and L2, and, thus, to make the relevant crosslingual tie-ups (cf. chapter 4, section 4.1.3). In this context, the learner's L1-competence should not be accounted for in its own terms as is the case of L1-teaching programmes and L1-learning tests, but rather in terms of the strategies whereby the learner draws upon his L1 when employing his IL.

Clearly, therefore, far from the severe criticisms leveled at the CA-Hypothesis, particularly within its strong version or CA a priori (cf. chapter 1, section 142, chapter 2, section 2.3.1), investigation into learner language along with the knowledge of his L1 would yield concrete information on his linguistic behavior and situate the question of transfer within a broader context. In other words, investigation into the learner's APS, as Nemser points out, is "a prerequisite for the validation of both the strong and weak claims of the contrastive approach" (Nemser, 1971b, reprint 60). This generally accepted statement was made not to forcefully invalidate the CA-Hypothesis, but to concede that language transfer is an inevitable mechanism underlying L2-learning and to validate the CA-Hypothesis within the generative-cognitive model for a better account of this mechanism (cf.
Therefore, since L1-knowledge is an entity already existing in the learner's LAD, transfer effects can be detected at any stage of L2-learning. Following his argument about the stable varieties of APS reviewed in the preceding section, Nemser states that the magnitude and type of linguistic deviation vary systematically. Earlier stages are normally characterized by the process of underdifferentiation (or syncretism) at the three linguistic levels of the L2-system. Here the learner, by recourse to his L1, tends to extend the distribution of certain L2-categories, and the semantic domains of the limited formal elements he has already learnt (cf chapter 1, section 1.3.1, parameters (iii) and (iv)). Later stages, Nemser argues, are generally identified with other processes such as the following:

1. **Reinterpretation.** For example, phonemizing /dz/ as [j] by Syrian speakers of SCD and as approximately [tʃ] by Syrian speakers of NCD (cf chapter 1, section 1.3.1, parameter (v), cf also chapter 6, section 6.1.1, sub-section (B) for further information).
2. **Hypercorrection:** As is the case of the regular substitution of /tʃ/ for approximately [ʃ] by Syrian speakers of SCD as discussed in the examples (3a) and (4) cited in the previous section (cf also chapter 6, section 6.1.1, sub-section (A) for further information).
3. **Analogy** such as any attestedly established intralingual error committed as a result of overgeneralization from the L2-rules already learned (cf Richards, chapter 2, section 2.2.4).

It seems, therefore, that in relation to the CA-Hypothesis, the structural comparison postulated to invoke upon prediction of difficulty prior to the learning process subsumes stability of the learner's IL though the ultimate concern of CA seeks to study the individual's bilingualization (cf James, chapter 1, section 1.1.2). Put another way, if prediction of negative transfer were globally verified on the basis of L1-L2 differences, then the same previously predicted errors would be regularly anticipated to be made by any speaker of the same L1 during the learning of the same L2. Hence, Nemser, like any other IL-specialists who emphasize the instability of learner language, is looking for an appropriate definition of the CA-Hypothesis as the structural comparison on its own is in many respects invalid (cf Selinker's exemplification of asymmetrical fossilization, section 3.2.3 below). From this point, Nemser argues that linguistic items in one system may have no counterparts in the contrasted system, particularly in...
the case of unrelated languages such as L1-Arabic and L2-English. Further, the cultural variable may impose certain linguistic representations (form, meaning and/or distribution) which are specific to one system and, thus, incommensurable with those of the opposing system (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3.2). Therefore, although Nemser's approach to the study of transfer effects is somewhat identical with that of Corder, Nemser's entreaty appears to inherently moderate CA's claim to predict and explain learner behaviour rather than to entirely reject the hypothesis. The application of traditional CA, Nemser states:

\[\text{[...]} \text{often depends on what can be called the 'blinding flash' fallacy — the supposition that L1 and L2 come into total contact— so far as overlap permits— from the outset of learning, with L1-categories fusing with their L2-counterparts throughout the systems. Actually, of course, the learner's exposure to L2 is necessarily gradual. This fact entails a dilemma for CA which can only be resolved by reference to APS. At post-initial stages of language learning, the 'prior' learning which conditions 'subsequent' learning includes not only the learner's knowledge of L1 but his own recent experience in language acquisition —his knowledge of APS— as well.}\]

(Nemser, 1971b; reprint: 61f; emphasis added)

It is true that learner behaviour cannot be fully accounted for by a merely structural comparison between L1 and L2, since experimental and practical observation proved many of the logical flaws in this recommendation. It is equally true that investigation of the learner's APS (or ISD) yields valuable insights into the linguistic knowledge underlying his behaviour, and, therefore, seeks to crystallize the vague parameters of the CA-Hypothesis, which were globally conceived (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2.3). Hence, within an approach similar to CA a posteriori, Nemser suggests that the ultimate purpose of L2-acquisition research "...might be the reformulation of L1 and L2-descriptions in terms permitting the accurate projection of APS throughout its successive stages in each contact situation" (Nemser, 1971b; reprint: 63). Projection of APS in this sense, however, seems to coincide, though from a different angle, with Selinker's commitment to the psychological unification of the three systems (L1, IL and L2) as will be discussed presently. Again, although Nemser's assumptions entail procedural reliability in interpreting the overtly negative effects of L1-influence, it is hard to believe that instances of covertly negative transfer as well as positive transfer could receive equal attention without the initial expectancies of CA a priori. After all, in situations where the
LI is well-known and so tractable to the analyst, there appears to be a sort of impressionistic and momentary prediction preceding his intent to set up the projection of the APS-utterance in question. In other words, how can the analyst choose to investigate a given transfer-based utterance without such a prediction generated by his knowledge of the LI-counterpart? Therefore, if the structural deviation of that utterance is indeed a reflection of overtly negative transfer, then it must be in an automatized position to remind the analyst of the LI-counterpart of which he is previously well aware (cf. the use of 'with', example (6a) above) Consequently, the pre-procedural devices of CA a priori cannot be totally neglected as there is more than an impressionistic prediction before dealing with covertly transfer-based instances (cf. the use of 'yesterday', example (6a) above)

So far the discussion has been concerned with the principal features of ISD and APS and the transfer effects on both designations. From a L2-perspective, both designations appear to allocate learner language in terms of a number of similar characteristics such as systematicity/patternedness, instability/transiency, structural uniqueness/structural independence, and so on. However, the main distinction between the two is that ISD is non-deviant, whereas APS is deviant though both systems are grammatical in suis generis terms. For the analysis of transfer effects, Corder and Nemser suggest a methodology similar in many respects to that of CA a posteriori. Hence, mention has been made of the one-sidedness of this approach and the relative utility of CA a priori, particularly for detecting the effects of covert transfer. The next section will deal with learner language from a learner perspective by reference to Selinker's hypothesis of interlanguage system and Dulay and Burt's theory of creative construction.

3.2 IL in a Learner-Centred Perspective

In this section, the two designations—Selinker's hypothesis of interlanguage system (IL) and Dulay and Burt's theory of creative construction (CC)—will be approached as they both seek to investigate learner language from a different but related angle. As discussed in section (3.1), Corder and Nemser tend to linguistically assess the learner's errors (idiosyncratic utterances and permanent deviations) by
looking at his self-contained rules from the viewpoint of the L2; whereas, here, Selinker and Dulay and Burt hold a seemingly neutralized position within the purview that fossilizable structures and goofs respectively are psychologically so judged from the viewpoint of the learner himself, albeit all these researchers propose several common qualities by which the learner-language continuum is characterized (cf. Figure 7 below) Such speculative dichotomization is significant and can be justified on two interdependent accounts

Firstly, to consider learner language (ISD or APS) from a L2-centred perspective involves a process of comparison in Corder's terms, or projection in Nemser's terms, of the two systems (IL and L2) in order to interpret intralingual idiosyncracy/deviancy, and, by recourse to the learner's LI, to check for interlingual identifications within an approach similar in many respects to that of CA a posteriori Yet, the initial steps are purely linguistic (recognition and comparison/projection) followed by psycholinguistic analyses (explanation) to be carried out under the guises of EA-techniques The device is, therefore, diagnostic and the results are explanatory in nature

Secondly, to consider learner language (IL or CC) from a learner-centred perspective involves a process of prediction, different from that of CA a priori, in order to establish anticipated developmental or intralingual fossilizability/goofability (that is, the potential for fossilization in Selinker's terms or the emergence of goofs in Dulay and Burt's terms) due to the learner's activation of the "latent psychological structure" (Selinker, 1972, reprint 34) and the "innate mental organization which causes him to use a limited class of processing strategies" (Dulay and Burt, 1974a 109, emphasis added) It appears that the initial steps are purely psychological and, by a psycholinguistic unification of the three systems (L1, IL and L2), interlingual identifications can be described where possible The device is, therefore, predictive and the results are descriptive (not explanatory) in nature

Given the nature of this speculative dichotomization, learner language will be justifiably scrutinized in terms of the second account It should be noted, however, although both designations (IL and CC) stress the learner's mental organization, they seem to essentially differ in relation to his age While Selinker's proposals were put forward with reference to adult learners (typically over the age of twelve), Dulay and Burt derived their assumptions from empirical studies conducted on
children learning a L2. In addition, the question of prediction which was posited as a substitute for that of CA a priori will be examined throughout the discussion of both IL and CC. The section concludes with a thorough account of the potential for language transfer with reference to both Selinker's insights into this mechanism and the counter-criticisms levelled against Dulay and Burt's devaluation of L1-influence on L2-learning.

3.2.1 Interlanguage System (IL)

In 1972, Selinker introduced the term interlanguage to suggest the structurally intermediate status between L1 and L2 proceeding through developmental stages observable in learner language. In this remarkable contribution, Selinker makes a distinction between a teaching perspective and a learning one, and focuses on probing learner language from the latter perspective, regardless of the learner's failure or success in L2-learning. Selinker assumes that the psychologically relevant data, on which theories of L2-learning should draw, has to do with the learner's real or "attempted meaningful performance" in the L2. This type of communication is distinct from that which occurs in formal settings (classroom) by means of drill-performance, and which, therefore, does not imply meaningful communication (cf. Selinker, 1972, reprint 31f). Investigation of learner language from a learning perspective constitutes in fact an important line of research, since there is considerable paucity of information about the development of L2-learners outside the classroom (cf. Corder, section 3.1.1). Therefore, given the chance to collect a plethora of data from a number of Syrian learners in naturalistic settings, it is felt that the issues raised by Selinker would serve to a large extent for the analysis of these data in Part Two.

In order to account for learner language in such a view, Selinker postulates that the adult learner is genetically endowed with an internal and complex ordinance called the latent psychological structure (LPS) which is gradually activated whenever he attempts to express instances of meaningful proceeding during the L2-learning process. For the majority of L2-learners, such an ordinance, Selinker argues, is different and exists in addition to what Lenneberg has already called the latent language structure (LLS). Selinker (1972, reprint 33) re-states Lenneberg who pointed out that the LLS...
(a) is an already formulated arrangement in the brain, (b) is the biological counterpart to universal grammar, and (c) is transformed by the infant into the realized structure of a particular grammar in accordance with certain maturational stages.

(Lenneberg, 1967 374f, original emphasis)

Clearly, therefore, by allocating the main characteristics of the LLS, Lenneberg appears to refer to Chomsky's concept of the LAD or LAS mentioned earlier (cf chapter 1, section 1 4 1) It also refers to the notion of the organizer discussed by Dulay and Burt in their theory of creative construction as will be seen in the following section. Selinker's argument rests on the assumption that, besides the LLS, there exists the LPS, a highly complex ordinance which cannot be maintained as a direct counterpart to any grammatical abstraction such as universal grammar. Nor does there seem to be a concrete guarantee that the LPS will be activated or 'realized' in terms of an actual structure to prove that attempted learning will be successful. Rather, Selinker proposes that such an ordinance, being psychological, may overlap with other mental and intellectual structures.

The crucial point Selinker is making here is that the adult learner who successfully achieves native-like mastery of the L2 has to some extent re-activated the LLS — in Lenneberg's terms — through various psycholinguistic processes which are inherently responsible for such mastery. However, as practical and empirical research has reported, this type of 'successful' learner hardly ever exists, merger, even in the case of bilingual situations, perfect bilingualism is extremely rare (cf. chapter 1, section 1 1 2) It is argued that, in L1-acquisition research, the 'idealized' L1-acquirer is the one who knows his L1 perfectly (cf. Chomsky, 1965 3), whereas, in L2-acquisition research, the 'idealized' L2-learner is the one who will not achieve native speaker competence in the L2, whenever he attempts to express meanings, which he may already have, in a L2 he is learning, i.e., whenever he attempts to produce a L2-norm" (Selinker, 1972, reprint 47) It follows that such an 'idealized' L2-novice represents the vast majority of L2-learners who fail to attain to native-like mastery of the L2, and thus they form the principal concern of Selinker's perspective. To him, these learners, when attempting to produce meaningful utterances in the L2, are more likely to activate the LPS referred to above (Selinker, 1972, reprint. 34) So, it can be seen that the state of the issues
Selinker is enunciating puts the learner in the forefront. From this standpoint, what the learner comes into possession during his attempted learning of the L2 is said to restrictively formulate one norm of one dialect—or a special sort of dialect in Corder’s sense (cf. section 3.11)—which only exists within his focus of attention. Therefore, the utterances produced by the learner in the L2 he is attempting to learn are not identical with the corresponding utterances produced by a native speaker of that L2 to convey the same meaning or meanings. Again, a similar point was made by Corder in that the learner’s idiosyncratic utterances and their well-formed L2-counterparts are superficially different though they have basically the same meaning (cf. section 3.11). It follows that the utterances, or the output, which are the only data observable in the learner’s production mode bring with them inherent characteristics of “a separate linguistic system” proceeding as a unique norm of the L2-system termed interlanguage (IL) (Selinker, 1972, reprint 35). It appears that a more explicit notion of the structural independence discussed by both Corder and Nemser can be construed from Selinker’s hypothesis, that is, the utterances which are typical of the learner’s IL are independent of the equivalent utterances produced by the same learner in his LI on the one hand, and of those produced by a native speaker of the L2 to express the same meaning or meanings on the other. In this context, Selinker refers to Jakobovits (1969) who had already expounded the concept of such a separate linguistic system from a similar perspective (Selinker, 1972, reprint 51, a footnote).

According to Selinker, one of the main themes of the IL-hypothesis is that the utterances made by the learner in his IL are also the only observable data to which theoretical predictions can be related. Here, the author does not seem to rule out on the a priori form of the CA-Hypothesis (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3.1), but rather he suggests that predictions about the learner’s behavioural events should primarily pertain to the linguistic shapes of his utterances as the actual by-products of his IL. In Selinker’s words “Successful predictions of such behavioural events in meaningful performance situations will add credence to the theoretical constructs related to the LPS” (Selinker, 1972, reprint 35). Therefore, the psycholinguistic processes which establish the underlying knowledge of IL-behaviour could, at best, be investigated by two methods if proper experimental stipulations were available. First, setting up the three sets of utterances (LI, IL and L2) within a unified theoretical framework. These sets of behavioural
events are the psychologically relevant data of L2-learning, and what predictions concern is the surface structures of IL-utterances; that is, the surface structures employed in the IL are predictable. Second, collecting, so long as the researcher can observe, the utterances which bear in them specific structural properties These structural properties are unique to the IL-system alone, and are related to the structural properties of the L1-L2 counterparts

Clearly, therefore, Selinker postulates a theoretical framework to describe the real operation of the IL in L2-learning, and prediction is one of the main assumptions in this scheme To him, the most crucial fact that any adequate description of the IL should account for is the phenomenon of fossilization Selinker defines the term as follows

[ ] a mechanism which is assumed [ ] to exist in the LPS [ ]
Fossilizable linguistic phenomena are linguistic items, rules, and subsystems which speakers of a particular L1 will tend to keep in their ILs relative to a particular L2, no matter what the age of the learner or amount of explanation and instruction he receives in the L2

(Selinker, 1972; reprint 36, emphasis added)

It seems, therefore, like Corder and Nemser who note that characteristics such as transitionality and transiency essentially specify learner language (ISD and APS), Selinker emphasizes the need for a diachronic model where fossilizable structures can be described as the entire IL-system is also characterized by a dynamic nature (cf Figure 7 below) It is worth mentioning that Nemser, when defining the stable varieties of APS as those "permanent intermediate systems and subsystems", seems to implicitly refer to the phenomenon of fossilization in the sense discussed here (cf section 3.1.2 above) Therefore, both permanent deviations (Nemser) and fossilizable structures (Selinker) are not only observable at a phonological level, but also at syntactic and lexical levels Further, permanent deviations tend to remain as stable identifications in the learner's APS, likewise, "fossilizable structures tend to remain as potential performance, re-emerging in the productive performance of an IL even when seemingly eradicated" (Selinker, 1972, reprint 36) Hence, both permanent deviations and fossilizable structures entail patterned and regular re-emergence respectively (cf also Corder's notion of systematic idiosyncratic utterances)
It should be noted, however, that, according to Nemser, there appears to be an inextricable connection between permanent deviations and errors (which, according to Corder, are evidenced by idiosyncratic utterances as temporal deviations only), whereas in the case of fossilizable structures, Selinker argues: "This connection is not intended since it turns out that 'correct' things can also re-emerge when thought to be eradicated, especially if they are caused by processes other than language transfer" (Selinker, 1972, reprint 51, a footnote)

For this reason, Selinker, in a recent paper, underlines the fact that, despite the inherent similarities between APS and IL mentioned above, the two designations differ "in several important respects, a central one being Nemser's emphasis on the learner's language being deviant" (Selinker, 1989 269; original emphasis) The writer also makes reference to Tarone et al (1976 96) who have already presented other similar points of contrast Therefore, like Corder, but unlike Nemser, Selinker has no tendency to regard IL-utterances as being deviant or erroneous since they derive from a separate linguistic system Because all the structures employed by IL-utterances have the potential to fossilize, their regular re-appearance mirrors the inner systematicity of the entire IL-continuum. Thus, the potential for fossilization and the linguistic knowledge underlying IL-utterances exist side by side within the LPS referred to above Selinker assumes that such a genetically determined structure contains five central processes (and a few minor ones (cf section 3 2.3 below)) which are inherently responsible for the systematic re-emergence of fossilizable structures that is, " .each process forces fossilizable material upon surface IL-utterances, controlling to a very large extent the surface structures of these utterances" (Selinker, 1972, reprint 37) These five central processes are

(i) Language transfer
The term refers to interlingual transfer, an internal mechanism whereby fossilizable items, rules and subsystems re-emerge regularly in IL-performance due to L1-influence As it is the main concern of the current study, the potential for this mechanism will be explained in detail later (cf section 3 2.3 below)
(ii) Overgeneralization of L2-linguistic material
A type of intralingual transfer which is related to the notion of developmental or intralingual errors (cf Richards, chapter 2, section 2 2 4)

(iii) Transfer of training
Another type of transfer which is quite different from the above two types. It refers to those fossilizable aspects resulting from identifiable items in training procedures (cf Selinker, 1969). Although the reflections are fossilizations seen from a L2-perspective, the effects are not said to be intralingually operating within the L2, but rather they are extralingually associated with the teaching methods of the L2. Hence, Selinker cites an example from Serbo-Croatian learners of English, who, in the case of animateness, tend to regularly produce 'he' for either gender (masculine/feminine), albeit the distinction between 'he' and 'she' is identical in the two languages (Serbo-Croatian and English). Although CA a priori would predict such a distinction as easy to learn, practical observations reported that the use of he/she animation created difficulty for the learners in question. It may be the case, Selinker suggests, that textbooks and subsequently teachers were relying on a much wider range of drills with 'he' than with 'she' (Selinker, 1972, reprint 39)

(iv) Strategies of L2-learning
A class of strategies triggering those fossilizable aspects which are connected with an identifiable approach adopted by the learner to the learning of particular L2-material. By reference to Jain (1969), Selinker argues that, in the ILs of Indian speakers of English, these strategies reflect fossilizations in the domain of syntax specifically. For instance, if the learner realized within his own strategy that all verbs are either transitive or intransitive, he might produce fossilizable structures such as (11 a-b) below assuming that the progressive aspect should always be marked by '-ing'.

(11) a. * I am feeling thirsty
b. * Don't worry, I'm hearing him
A further example refers to the strategy adopted by Russian learners of English to disregard morphological markers such as '-ed' when the past aspect had already been realized in the use of prioritized items such as 'was' in (12) below (cf Coulter, 1968 36, Selinker, 1972, reprint 40):

(12) * I was in Frankfurt when I fill my application

(v) Strategies of L2-communication

Another class of strategies reflecting fossilizable aspects due to an identifiable approach applied by the learner to communicating with native speakers of the L2. In these strategies, learning does not seem to proceed any further since they dictate to the learner, internally as they were, that he knows enough of the L2 in order to communicate (Selinker, 1972, reprint 37). Strategies of learning and communication are closely related, though randomly, to the notions of the filter and the monitor as will be discussed in the following section.

Having identified the five central processes which function as internal operators in the LPS, Selinker argues that "Each of the analyst's predictions as to the shape of IL-utterances should be associated with one or more of these, or other, processes" (Selinker, 1972, reprint 35f). It seems, therefore, the psycholinguistic unification of the three systems (LI, IL and L2) referred to above and the five central processes (which interchangeably interact in the LPS to implant and/or enlarge the psychologically established quantum of fossilized IL-competence) are all involved in the formulation of the linguistic knowledge underlying the entire IL-continuum. Selinker, in recent writings, emphasizes the term fossilized IL-competence as a viable and widely used concept, and makes an appeal for more sophisticated research into such an entity. In his words:

[ ] we need to know about fossilized forms Why these and not others? The very possibility of the cessation of IL-learning, often far from IL-norms, leads to thoughts about its inevitability and about innateness, which makes some colleagues nervous. It is impossible to show innateness so I guess that is where matters will stand. We can skirt this issue empirically by agreeing that 'non-development' in IL is an important search area and try to describe and understand that

(Selinker, 1984 335, emphasis added)
For a deeper understanding of the internal mechanisms incorporating into the entire IL-system, and therefore of the fossilized IL-competence, the three systems (L1, IL and L2) and the five central processes can be visualized in Figure 5. This modified configuration is, in fact, a considerably extended adaptation of Krzeszowski's (1981) visualization.

As Figure 5 illustrates, the smaller arrows meeting the radii at the circumference represent two contrasting forces of the IL-core first, a centrifugal force whereby fossilizable structures are produced, and, second, a centripetal force whereby new L2-material is received and processed through the corresponding L1-material. These smaller arrows revolve uprightly around the circle and, at the same time, change direction constantly to maintain the dynamic and systematic nature of the entire IL-continuum. The source of the two contrasting forces lies at the heart of the small box (IL) and formulates the potential for fossilization which, by means of the centrifugal force, invokes the

Figure 5. A dynamic model for the IL-system and fossilization mechanisms
regular re-emergence of fossilizable structures through the five central channels or processes (P1, P2, etc) and some other minor processes (mps). As the graphic configuration shows, the first three of the five central processes are represented in horizontal axes directed only towards the IL-system because each of these processes is associated with the general principle of transfer either interlingually (P1) or intralingually (P2) or extralingually (P3). On the other hand, the remaining two processes (P4 and P5) are represented in vertical axes and their directions alternate constantly (from the IL to the L2 and vice versa), but their processing mechanisms are always modified in the direction of the L2-standard norm (L2-SN). This graphic polarity of direction indicates the relative separation of the horizontal-configurated processes (P1, P2 and P3) from the vertical-configurated processes (P4 and P5) simply because these latter do not involve any type of transfer, rather, they are evidence of the learner's identifiable approach (learning/communication) to the processing of the input he receives from the L2.

It has been argued that the five central processes suggested by Selinker are basically connected with the notion of simplification, which, logically speaking, subsumes the existence of a non-simplified language system, that is, the learner's IL is the simplified system whereas the L2 he is learning is the non-simplified one. In this respect, Widdowson (1977) points out that "all the processes which Selinker refers to are tactical variations of the same underlying simplification strategy and [...] in general EA is a partial account of basic simplifying procedures which lie at the heart of communicative competence" (quoted by Krzeszowski, 1981 74, emphasis added). According to Widdowson, the strategy of simplification entails a psycholinguistic adjustment of learner-language behaviour for purposes of communication in the L2. Hence, the author makes a distinction between expression rules and reference rules while the former are rules in presentio actually used by the learner to express his communicative needs, the latter are rules in absentio constituting his existing knowledge of the L2. Therefore, the errors that the learner makes, or the fossilizable structures which regularly re-emerge, may reflect his attempt to use reference rules as expression rules. In an optimistic attitude towards the learner, Widdowson concludes that the making of errors is an indication of the learner's success not his failure in the sense that "the failure to conform to given reference rules is the consequence of success in developing expression rules" (cf Krzeszowski, 1981 75f).
It follows from the above that Widdowson's conclusion seems to have been derived from Selinker's notion of 'successful learning' which, for most L2-learners, "involves, to a large extent, the reorganization of linguistic material from an IL to identify with a particular L2" (Selinker, 1972, reprint 44, emphasis added). From a similar perspective, Nemser points out that learner speech is "frequently changing with typical rapidity and subject to radical reorganization through the massive intrusion of new elements as learning proceeds" (Nemser, 1971b, reprint 56, emphasis added). It seems, therefore, reorganization, or restructuring, is a total learning strategy which encompasses the five central processes incorporating into the LPS. Given that Widdowson refers to these five processes as tactical variations of simplification, he appears to have conceived of such a phenomenon as a total learning strategy as well. Along the same line of thinking, Richards (1974b) describes simplification as "one way in which speakers of different languages can make a new language easier to learn and use" (quoted by Corder, 1981: 88). In an unorthodox argument, Corder holds the view that simplification is "the result of a learning strategy or process: it cannot be a learning strategy itself, though it may well be a 'strategy of communication' [in Widdowson's terms]" (Corder, 1981: 88f, original emphasis). Corder assumes that it might be possible to define simplified codes or registers —such as baby talk (Ferguson, 1964), foreigner talk (Ferguson, 1975), and pidgins (Hall, 1966)— in terms of complexification (not simplification) as a set of universal processes of elaboration, that is, language learning in general. Corder's assumption is based on the fact that these simplified or reduced codes, being in a state of flux, lean towards a more complex code and are modified in the direction of the non-implified standard code. For instance, the development of a pidgin into a 'post-pidgin continuum' known as creole is clear evidence of this progressive complexification. Likewise, the development of an IL-continuum (in Selinker's terms) through an evolutionary series of a more complex APS (in Nemser's terms) to be modified in the direction of the non-simplified standard norm of the L2 is an apparent instance of this complexification (Corder, 1981: 79f)

The author concludes that simplified codes or registers represent the permanent/fossilized subsystems (which Nemser and Selinker refer to respectively) in the complexification of a special language behaviour "which has become institutionalized and stereotyped" (Corder, 1981: 82).

It is believed that complexification phenomena, where they exist in the
learner's IL, are noticeable at a lexical level in the first place. To make the point more explicit, an actual utterance produced by a Syrian learner can be exemplified:

(13) A small lake in the desert

In this utterance, the context suggests that the learner attempted to express the L1-lexical item [wa ha] (MSA/SCA) in English. Because the learner, at least at the time of speaking, was not able to conjure up the L2-lexical item 'oasis' for whatever reason, he seems to have had recourse to what can be called an interpretation strategy. Therefore, from a lexical standpoint, the learner's lack of knowledge might cause him to adopt this strategy and to produce in his IL a more complex lexical code such as (13) than the equivalent L2-code 'oasis', though he already has the simplified L1-code [wa ha] at his disposal. Nevertheless, in reply to Corder, Selinker still believes that, despite the existence of complexification, there is a place for simplification in the learner's IL. In Selinker's words:

One argument says that central to a theory of IL must be complexification and the second, is that 'simple codes' do not necessarily mean simplification has occurred. This is insightful. But the argument 'how can one simplify what one does not know, i.e. the L2?' is too general. Of course we get simplification of the L1; that is not in dispute. I would like to claim that learners, sometimes, and maybe quite consciously, also simplify L2-information.

(Selinker, 1984, 340, original emphasis)

In the light of the above argument, one might come to the conclusion that both types of strategies are applicable by the learner in his IL but their underlying domination varies from one level of linguistic processing to another. Thus, complexification strategies can, at best, be noticed at a lexical level, particularly in the learner's attempt to express unknown L2-lexical items as shown above (cf. example (13)); whereas simplification strategies, generally speaking, are well observable at a syntactic level in the first place. This can be seen in the Syrian learner's frequent use of simple tenses and sentences in situations where pragmatic contexts require more complex identifications (cf. chapter 6, section 6.2.3).

It follows from what precedes that, of the five central processes which Selinker refers to, strategies of L2-learning and strategies of
L2-communication seem to be directly connected with the polarity of simplification/complexification. As noted earlier, the strategies adopted during L1-L2 acquisition are fundamentally the same in that both the LI-acquirer and the L2-learner follow identical routes of development (cf. Corder, chapter 1, section 1.4.2). In the case of LI-acquisition, such routes start with a very simplified code known as the base form and gradually shift up towards a more complex form through strategies of acquisition and communication in order to institutionalize and stereotype this code (Corder, 1981 84f). So long as the IL-continuum is characterized by the regular reorganization mentioned above, strategies of learning and communication should also pass through, but various, schemes of simplification/complexification. As far as one can judge from the logical point of view, the reason why strategies of learning and communication are represented in vertical directions (cf. Figure 5) is that this polarity, when operating through the natural routes of development, involves vertical dimensions as well, that is, simple, complex, more complex, and so on. With regard to LI-acquisition, the development of child language is, beyond question, clear evidence of this vertical representation. Similarly, it has been assumed that the process of L2-learning/acquisition entails the same vertical representation, even if this process is distorted by other processes including those that can be described horizontally [i.e. the first three processes (cf. Figure 5)] (Krzeszowski, 1981 78, emphasis added). Processes such as these latter are associated with the general principle of transfer and result in the regular re-emergence of fossilizable structures within a horizontal dimension, that is, certain aspects of a previous task (the learner's LI, his knowledge of the L2, or the way he is trained to learn the L2) are faultily overgeneralized into their counterparts of a subsequent task (the new material received from the L2). However, fossilizable structures, within a horizontal dimension, can only be seen at a surface-structure level which is insufficient to be taken up as the constant TC for CA (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3.3). Consequently, the re-oriented constant TE which, at a far deeper level, incorporates the three types of meaning ideological, textual, and interpersonal (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3.3) must be taken into account to scrutinize the potential for language transfer within a vertical dimension. This highly complex analysis will be attempted later (cf. section 3.2.3 below).

To sum up Selinker's theoretical perspective, the principal tentative assumptions can be recorded as follows.
The three sets of utterances (L1, IL and L2) are the psychologically relevant data of L2-learning.

The learner focuses on one form of the L2, and his IL-identifications are what unites the three systems (L1, IL and L2) psychologically.

Theoretical predictions should concern the surface structures of IL-utterances, and each prediction must be relevant to one of the five central processes.

The five central processes incorporate into the LPS which is different from, but exists in addition to, the LLS.

Fossilization accounts for the regular re-emergence of IL-productive performance.

Successful learners reorganize the linguistic material from the ILs to identify with a given L2.

Of the five central processes, three (language transfer, overgeneralization, and transfer of training) represent horizontal directions, and two (strategies of L2-learning and strategies of L2-communication) represent vertical dimensions.

Since strategies of L2-learning and strategies of L2-communication represent vertical dimensions, they are primarily associated with the polarity of simplification/complexification.

### 3.2.2 Creative Construction (CC)

One of the most severe attacks on the theoretical assumptions behind CA, and subsequently on its notion of transfer, was launched by Dulay and Burt during the 1970s and the repercussions of their analyses are still to be seen today. A great deal of their critical survey, however, does not seem to have received endorsement in transfer-based studies. Hence, the counter-criticisms levelled at their sceptical attitudes towards the historical link between CA and bilingualism have been outlined earlier (cf chapter 1, section 112). Mention has also been made of how the findings of several researchers have not borne out the results of Dulay and Burt's empirical studies which reported the least percentage (3%) of interlingual goofs among those which were made by children during L2-learning (cf chapter 2, section 223). It is worth noting, however, despite the relative validity of such counter-criticisms, Dulay and Burt's writings have been extremely influential in the field of
L2-acquisition, particularly IL-research, and thus, by re-reasoning out their theoretical speculations carefully, language transfer can be considered from a far more convincing perspective.

The most exciting line of thinking among Dulay and Burt's theoretical purview is the enunciation of a cognitively-based theory in L2-acquisition research known as creative construction (CC). It appears that such a theory is in many respects a reflection of the theoretical issues (for instance, innateness, creativity, systematicity, and so on) put forward by Chomsky in L1-acquisition research, and of Piaget's complementary views on developmental psychology (cf. chapter 1, section 14). This can be explicitly seen in Dulay and Burt's own writing where they define the CC-theory as follows:

Creativity in language acquisition derives from the linguistic notion, it is also attributed to all normal learners. It too refers to a degree of learner independence from external input factors such as the exact form of modeled utterances, frequency of occurrence, or rewards for correctness. While for mature speakers, creativity stems from a control of the rules of the language they speak, for language learners, creativity stems from the structure of those mental mechanisms responsible for learning the rules of a new language. Thus [...] "creative construction" in language acquisition refers to the process by which learners gradually reconstruct rules for speech they hear, guided by innate mechanisms which cause them to formulate certain types of hypotheses about the language system being acquired, until the mismatch between what they are exposed to and what they produce is resolved.

(Dulay and Burt, 1977, reprint 67; emphasis added)

The striking point here is that many of the general facets which characterize the CC-theory conform, to a large extent, to those which characterize the IL as a uniform system, even though the methodological differences between the two, particularly concerning the approach to language transfer, are clear as will be seen in the next section (cf. also Figure 7 below). Of prime interest here is to discuss some of the theoretical issues of CC which conform to those of IL.

One of these issues, perhaps the most important, is the focus of attention upon the learner, the central perspective from which Selinker considers learner language, as shown in the preceding section. Similarly, Dulay and Burt look upon the learner as a creative organism generating utterances from an internalized rule system rather than merely imitating previously heard utterances. CC is, therefore, a subconscious process whereby the learner reconstructs rules and organizes the linguistic data he receives from the input. As the above excerpt from Dulay and Burt
indicates, the form of these rules is determined by innate mental mechanisms which are inherently responsible for the formulation of learner language (cf. also Dulay et al., 1982 11). In other words, following Brown's (1973) argument about the L1-acquirer, the L2-learner is seen as constructing for himself a special type of grammar essentially derived from the L2 due to the gradual reconstruction of rules and the production of "systematic deviations from the structure of the L2-sentences" (Dulay and Burt, 1977, reprint 72). This type of grammar is evident in the two designations (ISD and APS) in that both idiosyncratic utterances and permanent deviations are "grammatical" and 'patterned' in *suis generis* terms. This grammar is also evident in the IL-system whose potential for fossilization reflects the regular re-emergence of fossilizable structures which are also reorganized within a cohesive system in language-specific terms. It should be noted, however, that, like Nemser, but unlike Corder and Selinker, Dulay and Burt seem to regard learner language as a deviant system, since the L2-goofs children make signify those systematic deviations "which native adult speakers consider grammatically correct" (Dulay and Burt, 1974a 95).

A further important issue concerns Dulay and Burt's views on the learner's internal processing mechanisms which interact with the input to formulate his own speech. In this respect, the authors identify five general, but distinct, factors as constituting a working and dynamic model for CC in the L2-learning process: (i) the socioaffective filter; (ii) the cognitive organizer, (iii) the editing monitor, (iv) personality, and (v) past experience. Dulay and Burt suggest that certain discrepancies between the input the learner receives and the output he produces are attributable to such five internal factors which represent a myriad of conscious and unconscious processes operating in the learner's mind (Dulay and Burt, 1977, reprint 68). The five general factors can be visualized in the form of Figure 6 which is a combination of several diagrams introduced by the same writers (cf. Dulay and Burt, 1977, reprint 70, Dulay et al., 1982 6 and 46).

As Figure 6 illustrates, the input the learner receives from the L2 undergoes the three internal operators: the filter, the organizer, and the monitor consecutively. These operators are all constantly influenced by the other two factors: personality and past experience in order to constitute a highly intricate network underlying the learner's production
Figure 6: A working model for CC in the L2-learning process

of the output. Here, the potential for language transfer can be detected by a complete scrutiny of the last internal factor, since the learner's past experience refers to his previous knowledge of the L1 in the first place (this matter will be discussed in detail in the next section). In conformity with most of the general facets proposed by IL-specialists, Dulay and Burt stress that the observable discrepancies between the input and the output are clear indications of learner language as a distinct system characterized by independence, systematicity, transitionality and the like, as will be seen presently. It appears that the first three internal mechanisms incorporating into CC comprise both the LLS (in Lenneberg's terms) and the LPS (in Selinker's terms) referred to in the preceding section. To make this point clear, a brief outline of each of these three mechanisms might be useful:

(i) The socio-affective filter
This mechanism is mainly associated with psychological factors such as the learner's conscious or unconscious motives for learning, attitudes towards learning, or emotional states. As the term filter implies, such factors screen out what is received from the input and affect the rate and quality of the L2-learning process. Thus, the filter determines "(a) which L2-models the learner will select; (b) which parts of the language will be attended to first; (c) when language acquisition efforts should
cease, and (d) how fast a learner can acquire the language" (Dulay et al 1982: 46, cf also Dulay and Burt, 1977, reprint 68). It seems, therefore, by means of these internal psycholinguistic factors along with other external sociolinguistic factors such as the environment, the learner may employ certain types of verbal routines which give his speech system its own independence, a common feature that all IL-specialists appear to concur with.

(ii) The cognitive organizer
This mechanism is based on a set of cognitive principles or structures which already exist in the learner's mental ordinance and are responsible for the formulation of his special grammar mentioned above. The organizer, therefore, refers to Chomsky's notion of the LAD, or to what Lenneberg called the LLS, since it can be maintained as a direct counterpart to an abstract system such as universal grammar. According to Dulay and Burt, the functioning of the organizer is reflected in three pervasive phenomena "(a) the systematic progression of changes in interim rules, or transitional constructions that learners use before a structure is finally acquired, (b) the errors that systematically occur in learner speech, and (c) the common order in which mature structures are learned" (Dulay et al, 1982. 54, emphasis added, cf also Dulay and Burt, 1977, reprint 69) Here, the authors stress the systematicity of learner language, thus allowing the investigator to carry out a systematic study of this continuum, and to discover many of the aspects which underlie the learning process. In very much the same concept of transitional competence proposed by Corder, Dulay and Burt also emphasize transitionality, another common feature suggested by all IL-specialists, and use the term transitional constructions "to refer to the interim structures learners regularly use during the acquisition of a particular L2-structure" (Dulay et al, 1982 54) Moreover, the evolutionary nature of these transitional constructions is identical with that of APSs in Nemser's terms (cf section 3.1.2 above) While APSs form an evolving series through successive stages of learning (which Selinker also refers to), transitional constructions entail progressive steps where "Language development is not a series of plateaus [or stable varieties in Nemser's sense], but a continuum made up of blending the beginnings and ends of several successive phases" (Dulay et al, 1982 55, emphasis added).
(iii) The editing monitor

The notion of the monitor was first invoked by Krashen (1975; 1977) to stress its responsibility for 'learning' or conscious linguistic processing in Dulay and Burt's sense. As the term indicates, this internal mechanism refers to "the conscious editing of one's own speech" (Dulay and Burt, 1977, reprint 69), and the degree to which it is employed is determined by the following stipulations: "(a) the learner's age, (b) the amount of formal instruction the learner has experienced, (c) the nature and focus required by the verbal task being performed; and (d) the individual personality of the learner" (Dulay et al., 1982, 59).

Further, the degree to which learner speech is edited depends upon the type of verbal task, and, in this context, Dulay and Burt point out that "tasks which cause [the learner] to focus on communication tend to bring on less self-editing, while tasks whose focus is linguistic analysis [...] seem to invite more editing" (Dulay and Burt, 1977, reprint 69).

Recently, with reference to some of the current research into crosslinguistic influence, Krashen has extensively refined Newmark and Reibel's ignorance hypothesis in terms of the conscious monitor (cf chapter 4, section 4.1.1).

Clearly, therefore, the organizer, as shown above, is directly pertinent to Lenneberg's notion of the LLS, whereas both the filter and the monitor appear to lie at the heart of the LPS referred to by Selinker. In relation to the two types of strategies which exist in the LPS, it seems that while the filter deals with strategies of L2-learning in the first place, the monitor can, at best, be seen as relevant to strategies of L2-communication, though there is no necessary one-to-one relationship between either pair. Nevertheless, what is reasonably acceptable is that the learning of particular L2-material precedes the learner's communication in the L2 by using that material. Therefore, the priority of the filter over, at least, the monitor as shown in Figure 6 is a clear indication of this relationship. As noted above, the filter dictates to the learner how to select, what to prioritize, and when novicice stops, whereas the function of the monitor is to consciously edit during communication what has already been learnt, regardless of the extent of editing which correlates with the type of linguistic material being processed.

It follows that, according to Selinker, if an exact decision were available for a given fossilizable structure to be ascribable to one of
the central processes which are described horizontally, then such a structure might be related to another process but described in the same dimension as separate from those which are represented vertically (cf. Figure 5). This of course can only be taken up with IL-identifications on the level of product. In other words, if a fossilizable structure is said to be a reflection of language transfer, then this structure could be related to either transfer of training or overgeneralization or both (and vice versa), but neither to strategies of L2-learning nor to strategies of L2-communication. For instance, the collocation 'drive a bicycle' frequently produced by Indian speakers of English was identified by Jain (1969: 24) as a result of overgeneralization; whereas, according to Selinker, such a collocation may well be attributed to language transfer or transfer of training or even, perhaps, to both but not, it is believed, to either of the other two processes (cf. Selinker, 1972; reprint: 42).

On the level of process, however, the mechanism of language transfer is not said to be functioning in isolation from any other internal processes existing in the web of the LPS. Rather, Selinker underlines the fact that "language transfer interacts with other processes and constraints throughout the IL-experience" (Selinker, 1984: 335). By analogy, what seems to be deduced from Dulay and Burt's argument turns out that none of the internal mechanisms (such as the filter, the organizer and the monitor) is separable from language transfer, where there are transfer effects, since the learner processes the linguistic data he receives from the input through successive proceedings by means of these internal mechanisms together "...with personality factors and L1-experience influencing the operation of all three" (Dulay and Burt, 1977; reprint: 70; emphasis added). By introducing such a statement, Dulay and Burt appear to lay particular stress on the fact that any strategy (such as learning and communication) applied by the learner cannot be abstracted from L1-influence; although the authors, in their empirical research conducted on children learning a L2, reported the least percentage (3%) of interlingual goofs among others. This matter will be addressed in the next section.

So far two important issues have been put forward as similar in both designations (IL and CC): first, the focus of attention upon the learner; and second, the three internal mechanisms (the filter, the organizer, and the monitor) which are a psycholinguistic concatenation between Lenneberg's notions of the LLS and Selinker's concept of the LPS.
In Selinker's perspective, language transfer, as one of the five central processes, plays a significant part in determining the IL-system and interacts with other processes such as strategies of L2-learning and strategies of L2-communication. Likewise, according to Dulay and Burt, L1-experience is one of the five major internal mechanisms which incorporate into the CC-model and characterize particular discrepancies between the input and the output, merger, L1-experience also affects the filter, the organizer and the monitor constantly. A further important issue which seems to be methodologically commensurable in the two approaches is the notion of prediction. Dulay and Burt set up an alternative approach to CA a priori known as the L2=L1 Hypothesis in order to predict the goofs that are likely to be made by children learning a L2 (cf chapter 2, section 2.2.2). As seen from the discussion, the theoretical assumptions behind CC have been carefully compared with those which concern the other three designations put forward in this chapter. Hence, Figure 7 sketches out the main characteristics of all four designations (ISD, APS, IL and CC).

As Figure 7 illustrates, learner language (whether it be considered from a L2-perspective or a learner-perspective) is indeed "a legitimate system of language in its own right" (Brown, 1980 162). Thus, even in the case of linguistic deviancy as so judged from L2-grammar, the systematic appearance of errors/fossilizations/goofs (which are themselves describable in terms of a specific grammar) brings to light the 'indigenous' systematicity of all the internal mechanisms integrated into the learner-language continuum. Given that language transfer—the main concern of the current study—is one such mechanism, the transfer-based utterances produced by the learner must also have inherent in them systematic identifications. While these identifications can be diagnosed in ISD and APS by means of symptomatic comparison (in Corder's sense) or symmetrical projection (in Nemser's sense), their psycholinguistic repercussions can be predicted in IL and CC through the careful unification of L1/IL/L2 (in Selinker's sense) or through the analysis of both the goofs collected from the learning/acquisition data of a given L2 and the goofs collected from the L1-acquisition data of the same L2 (in Dulay and Burt sense). The next section will scrutinize the potential for language transfer both in IL and in CC, and will consider the notion of prediction suggested by Selinker and Dulay and Burt.
**L2-Perspective**

**LINGUISTIC CONSIDERATIONS**
- **Diagnostic Device**
- **Explanatory**

1. A special sort of dialect
2. Unique/peculiar/distinct
3. Non-deviant
4. Systematic and grammatically structured in sui generis terms
5. Transitional/unstable moving towards acceptability from an L2-perspective
6. Idiosyncratic utterances are generally temporal systematic errors
7. By recourse to the L1 certain idiosyncratic utterances can be interpreted to check for idiosyncratic transfer
8. The approach to the analysis of idiosyncratic transfer is diagnostic and coincides with the *a posteriori* form of the CA-Hypothesis

**Learner Perspective**

**PSYCHOLINGUISTIC CONSIDERATIONS**
- **Predictive Device**
- **Descriptive**

1. One norm of dialect
2. Separate
3. Non-deviant
4. Regularly re-organized and re-structured as a system in its own right
5. Diachronic dynamic in nature
6. In fossilizable sub-systems, the regular re-emergence of fossilizable constructions is internally centrifugalized by the fossilized IL-competence
7. Language transfer mechanism is one of the five central internal processes existing in the LPS
8. The approach is predictive different from the *a priori* form predictions depend on the psychologically relevant data (i.e. the unification of the three systems: L1/IL/L2) and coincide with the surface structures of IL-utterances

**Figure 7** The learner-language continuum in two perspectives the main characteristics of the four designations (ISD, APS, IL and CC)
3.2.3 Transfer Potential in IL and CC

Having reviewed the main theoretical assumptions behind these two designations, it appears that L1-influence is one of the central factors which determine learner language. A comparative survey of the internal mechanisms operating in IL and CC has shown that language transfer is indeed a real entity bound up with the previous knowledge of the L1 either horizontally on the level of product or vertically on the level of process. Since IL-research offers a cognitively based theory of L2-acquisition, dynamic and evolutionary in nature, the potential for language transfer can be considered within a perspective much deeper than what had been recognized during the predominance of behaviourism up to the late 1960s. Potentiality stems from the fact that, for the IL-system, language transfer is a central internal process interacting with others in the LPS; and, for the CC-model, L1-experience is a major internal mechanism influencing others constantly. The potential for language transfer in the IL-system will be addressed first.

As noted above, fossilization is a total internal mechanism which, by means of its centrifugal force, triggers the regular re-emergence of fossilizable structures through one, or more, of the five central processes (cf. Figure 5). Given the operation of fossilization and language transfer (being one of these five central processes) takes place only in the ordinance of the LPS, it is felt that L1-experience has more potential to affect L2-learning than language transfer. This is because L1-experience, or more specifically, what is internalized as L1-knowledge does not belong to the LPS, but rather to a more genetically determined structure such as the LLS referred to by Lenneberg (cf. Selinker, 1972; reprint: 33f). From this point of view, L1-experience exists in the LLS as a type of pure linguistic knowledge in its own terms and is continuously peculiar to the individual alone even if he happens to be a L2-novice. Clearly, therefore, since the mechanism of fossilization is part of the LPS, L1-knowledge is said to be separate from such a mechanism. This can be analogously extrapolated from particular schemes of L2-learning but in the domain of lexical selection in the first place. Hence, what is received from the L2 as an input (on the stipulation that it is perceived by reference to the initiating L1-counterpart but not yet produced in the output) also tends to remain, for an unknown period of time, as a type of pure linguistic knowledge from a L2-perspective; but not necessarily peculiar to the individual learner since what he receives
is usually bound up with at least one social dialect of the L2, typically the standard norm. In such a case, L2-knowledge, too, is said to be abstracted from fossilization and thus, before being produced, it very likely occupies a temporal position in the LLS. It seems, therefore, at a reception level, there exist in the LLS two types of pure linguistic knowledge (L2-knowledge and L1-knowledge) as being isolated from fossilization before the productive reorganization of the L2-material. An attempted analysis of some examples may clarify this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L2-English</th>
<th>L1-SCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(14) a the player</td>
<td>(15) a [illa ?ib]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. was dismissed</td>
<td>b [intarad]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. after</td>
<td>c [ba?id]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d two warnings</td>
<td>d [inza're.n]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the discussion of the actual IL-utterances (16a-b) below will illustrate, the Syrian learner seems to have received the L2-set of lexical items (14a-d) in a given order (not necessarily in the same order given above) and, before being produced, these lexical items were stored in the LLS as pure knowledge from an English perspective, that is, they were received as they are usually produced within different identifications by a native speaker of English. In addition, the learner in question already possesses in the LLS the L1-set of lexical items (15a-d), which are the initiating counterparts of (14a-d) in his focus of attention, as part of his pure knowledge of Arabic (SCA). It appears that, at this point, at a reception level, both sets of lexical items still remain isolated from the mechanism of fossilization. At a production level, however, the learner's attempt to reconstruct a meaningful utterance out of the L2-items (14a-d) —founded on the assumption that these items are in any order available to him— entitled him to produce (16a) at a surface-structure level and (16b) at a deep-structure level when the situational context (watching a televised football-match) required more information.

(16) a The player was dismissed (AU)
    b The player was dismissed after two warnings (AU)

As the contextual meaning of these IL-utterances suggests, neither of them seems to be a reflection of pure L2-knowledge in the sense discussed above, even though both utterances are grammatically correct and reconstructed out of the L2-items (14a-d) which were stored as pure...
lexical knowledge. This is because, from the viewpoint of English, these lexical items do not usually collocate with each other as in (16a-b) to convey the same contextual meaning. From the viewpoint of SCA, on the other hand, the L1-items (15a-d) can collocate with each other as in (17a-b) below to express the same meaning whose reconstruction still represent pure L1-knowledge.

(17) a [illa ?ib in.tarad] (SCA)
b [illa ?ib in.tarad ba?id inza re n] (SCA)

It appears that the IL-utterances (16a-b) are merely the verbatim translations of the L1-utterances (17a-b) for which reason the former represent non-pure L2-knowledge. Hence, if a native speaker of English was exposed to the same context and induced to express the same meaning, he might well produce the L2-utterances (18a-b) below—taking into account that the L2-items 'sent off' and 'bookings' may exist in the learner's LLS but to be rendered into different semantic manifestations.

(18) a The player was sent off (L2-U)
b The player was sent off after two bookings. (L2-U)

The distinction between pure knowledge and non-pure knowledge in the sense discussed above seems to be similar, but not exactly symmetrical, to the distinction between declarative knowledge and procedural knowledge respectively (cf Faerch and Kasper, 1983, 1986). It follows that the non-pure knowledge which underlies the IL-utterances (16a-b) is no longer part of the learner's L2-knowledge internalized in the LLS, but rather it is formulated in the LPS as being creative in Dulay and Burt's terms. Put more precisely, this non-pure knowledge is formulated by the mechanism of fossilization (which exists in the LPS) and centrifugalized through the channel of language transfer as there is no direct connection between fossilization and errors (cf Selinker, 1972, reprint 51, footnote 14).

It appears that IL-utterances such as (16a-b) are evidence of a highly structured speech system (cf Selinker, 1969 71) and of the facilitative role of the L1 which caused the learner to reconstruct meaningful and well-formed utterances out of what is available to him or what is in presentio (cf Widdowson, section 3 2 1). Therefore, Selinker points out, 'whatever the cause, the well-observed phenomenon of 'backsliding' by L2-learners from a L2-norm is not, as has been generally
believed, either random or towards the speaker's LI, but towards an IL-norm" (Selinker, 1972; reprint 36, emphasis added) Hence, transferable fossilizable structures, whether they re-emerge as well-formed or ill-formed from a L2-perspective, are not only observable in the lexical domain, that a particular collocation of a set of LI-lexical items is replicated in the IL as shown above, but also in the syntactic domain where "the interlingual unit of surface syntactic structure [is] transferred from LI to IL (not to L2)" (Selinker, 1972, reprint 45, original emphasis) This indicates that it is the grammatical function of the fossilized IL-item in question which is to be modified in the direction of the grammatical function of the LI-counterpart (cf chapter 6, section 6.2) Transferable fossilizable structures can also be noticed in the phonological domain, and, in this respect, Selinker identifies several minor processes which exist beyond the five central processes and affect the phonological shapes of IL-utterances (i) spelling pronunciation for example, most learners, particularly Arab learners, tend to pronounce the final ' -er'; (ii) cognate pronunciation for example, the tendency to substitute /b/ for /p/ by most Arab learners in general, or to substitute /s/ and /z/ for /θ/ and /ð/ by Syrian learners whose home dialects are NCD/SCD/WCD (cf chapter 6, section 6.1.1); and (iii) hypercorrection: in the sense discussed by Nemser (cf section 3.1.3 above)

Selinker argues that there are some other minor processes which may influence the syntactic shapes of IL-utterances. A vivid instance of these has to do with holophrastic learning, a term used by Jain (1969) to refer to certain phrases such as 'one and half-an-hour' frequently produced by Indian speakers of English. Analogously, the Syrian learner tends to regularly reconstruct holophrases such as the following

(19) a. One space and a half (AU)
b. One pound and a half (AU)

Selinker asserts the significance of research into these minor processes among others for they ostensibly "affect by themselves the shape of English IL-utterances [ ] or at least reinforce some important processes such as language transfer" (Selinker, 1972; reprint 41; original emphasis) Following this conviction, the potential for Arabic transfer can be recognized by a detailed analysis of the linguistic knowledge underlying the IL-holophrases (19a-b) with reference to the LI-counterparts. It is well observed that the Syrian learner
specifically tends to produce holophrases such as (19a-b) instead of 'one and a half spaces/pounds'. One possible interpretation is that this tendency stems from the presence of the dual case [al-muthanna] in Arabic, which is absent in English. To begin with, consider the following examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L2-English</th>
<th>L1-SCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(20) a. One and a half spaces (21) a. [fara g w nus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Two spaces</td>
<td>b. [fara ge n]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Three spaces</td>
<td>c. [tlat fara ga \textsuperscript{t}]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice here the English phrases (20a-c) indicate that the grammatical form of 'spaces' is plural in all three cases, whereas in the Arabic phrases (21a-c) the counterparts are singular, dual and plural respectively. It seems, therefore, the addition of 'a half' into 'one' in (20a) renders the counted noun 'spaces' into the plural case because plurality in English starts with the association of two entities whether the second entity is equal to or half of the first. Thus, 'one' is an entity and 'a half' is another entity, and both entities impose plurality upon 'spaces' due to the absence of the dual case in English. On the other hand, plurality in Arabic starts with the association of three equal entities either in quality or in quantity. Hence, the morphological form of [fara ge n] in (21b) or in the phrase [fara ge n w nus] (SCA) 'two spaces and a half' still indicates duality since it would be absurd to quantify the plural form [fara ga t] 'spaces' by means of the phrase [tne n w nus] (SCA) 'two and a half' simply because this phrase does not indicate three equal entities least. It follows that, if no mention is made of the number, the English plural form 'spaces' would, at a deep-structure level, denote 'one and a half' least, whereas the Arabic plural form [fara ga t] in (21c) would imply at least three equal entities of the singular form [fara g] in (21a). With regard to duality in Arabic, the main concern here, it only indicates the association of two equal entities in the sense that the dual form [fara ge n] in (21b) only involves two equal entities of the singular form [fara g] in (21a). A consideration of some examples concerning the co-occurrence of the phrase [wa hid w nus] (SCA) 'one and a half' with each of the three cases may help clarify the point.

| (22) a. [wa hid w nus fara g] (singular) |
| b. * [wa hid w nus fara ge.n] (dual) |
| c. * [wa hid w nus fara ga t] (plural) |
Given the ideational implications of duality and plurality in Arabic, it would be incorrect to identify duality with the phrase (22b) because it exactly means 'one and half of (only two spaces)' which equals 'only two spaces' from the mathematical point of view. Nor would it be correct to identify plurality with the phrase (22c) because, at a deep-structure level, it implies 'one and half of (at least three spaces)' which equals 'at least two and a half spaces'. However, it is possible to identify singularity with the phrase (22a) since it exactly means 'one and half (a space)' which equals the same number intended.

Concerning the phrase (22a), the singular form [fara g] is not quantified by the whole number [wa hid w nus] 'one and a half', but rather it is only bound up with its direct quantifier [nus] 'a half' which cannot be considered an entire entity as discussed above. It appears that, at a deep-structure level, the word [wa hid] 'one' is in fact a quantifier standing for another preceding, but deleted, entity [fara g]. The former [wa hid] quantifies the latter [fara g] as an entire and separate entity to which the remainder [nus fara g] 'half a space' is added. Thus the deep structure of (22a) would be (23a)

(23) a [(fara g) wa hid w nus fara g]
   (Lit (space) one and half space)
   b One space and half a space

By analogy, the singular form [fara g] in (21a) is, at a deep-structure level, directly associated with another following, but deleted, quantifier [wa hid] 'one' which quantifies the former as an entire and separate entity. The added remainder [nus] 'a half' is also quantifying another following, but deleted, entity [fara g] quantified by [wa hid] as shown above. Thus, the deep structure of (21a) would be (24a)

(24) a [fara g (wa hid) w nus (fara g)]
   (Lit space (one) and half (space))
   b One space and half a space

As a consequence, the structural properties which concern the real existence of [wa hid] at a deep-structure level as in (24a) and the functioning of the added remainder [nus] on its own at a surface-structure level as in (21a) seem to have been positively transferred onto the IL-holophrases (19a-b). Further, the structural properties which concern the singularity of [fara g] as in (22a) are, at best, said to be negatively transferred onto the following IL-utterance.
Having scrutinized the potential for Arabic transfer in some IL-utterances by recourse to their L1-L2 counterparts, it seems that investigation of the context within its linguistic and non-linguistic paradigms indubitably constitutes an integral part of transfer analysis through the intricacy of vertical dimensions as seen above. Hence, Selinker emphasizes the significance of the context, a related aspect which has not received much attention since Lado's inclusion of the cultural variable in CA's parameters (cf chapter 1, section 132). Selinker states

In arguing for IL-studies to look to well-defined and socio-functionally real areas of context, the area of what we are calling specific-purpose acquisition comes to mind. Do specific-purpose contexts shape IL-behaviour? Is complexification of IL different in specific-purpose contexts? Are language transfer effects, fossilization effects and so on related in such contexts? I have a strong feeling that the answer is 'yes', in each case, and that IL-specialists have been blind to this.

(Selinker, 1984 342, emphasis added)

Therefore, Selinker's contention of data collection is to unify the psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic aspects integrated into the contexts of a given IL-utterance and its L1-L2 counterparts. By this unification, it is believed, Selinker seeks to investigate the linguistic and non-linguistic interaction between the learner's pure L2-knowledge and his already existing pure L1-knowledge, which gives rise to the creative reconstruction of the non-pure knowledge underlying his IL. Thus, the L2-items (14a-d), as discussed above, are, at a reception level, stored in the learner's LLS as pure lexical knowledge, merger, the L1-items (15a-d) as well as their collocational representations (17a-b) are already internalized in his LLS as pure lexical knowledge too. At a production level, however, the internal processing of the two types of knowledge takes place in the learner's LPS upon reconstructing the non-pure knowledge underlying the IL-utterances (16a-b).

It seems the case that, for the reconstruction of a given transfer-based IL-utterance, the centripetal force of fossilization 'attracts' the L2-items or rules which are in presentio to fit into that utterance and the linguistic solutions that govern the corresponding L1-utterance to convey the same meaning within the same context. Then, the centrifugal force of fossilization 'boosts' the re-emergence of the
IL-utterance through the channel of language transfer which is inherently responsible for what can be matched between the L2-items or rules and their L1-counterparts (cf Figure 5). Eventually, the resultant utterance bears in it certain surface-structure properties which are not identifiable with those of the L2-counterpart, but are traceable back to those of the L1-counterpart. In such a view, the three sets of utterances (L1, IL, and L2) are, according to Selinker, the psychologically relevant data which enable the analyst to provide an adequate description of the linguistic knowledge underlying IL-utterances, and to make more precise decisions that particular fossilizable structures are attributable to language transfer. Moreover, along with this adequate description, predictions that certain items or rules will be fossilized are also verifiable. Predictions, in this case, correlate with how to systematically account for the phenomenon of fossilization on the basis of the theoretical constructs derived from the psychologically relevant data. To illustrate the complexity of this task, Selinker cites an example of asymmetrical fossilizability for no distinct reason.

According to CA, Spanish speakers should have no difficulty with the he/she distinction in English, nor should English speakers have any difficulty with the corresponding distinction in Spanish. The facts are quite different, however. Spanish speakers do, indeed, regularly have trouble with this distinction, while the reverse does not seem to occur with English learners of Spanish (Selinker, 1972, reprint: 42).

Therefore, predictions of interlingual fossilizations constitute a serious problem, and a prior comparison between L1 and L2 is in many respects unreliable, a point which all the proponents of IL-research appear to concur with. Interlingual fossilizations cannot be predicted solely on the basis of differences between L1 and L2 because of several reasons — an important one is that a difference may not cause the learner to reconstruct the related fossilizable structure, but to avoid producing that structure (cf chapter 4, section 4 1 2). Further, language transfer, as an inevitable process operating in the LPS, may override many other considerations referred to throughout this chapter such as the learner's knowledge of his L1, his aptitude for language learning in general, his internal factors, and so on. Hence, Selinker emphasizes the need for an adequate description of fossilization which may help resolve the problem of prediction. He concludes:
The major justification one has for writing about the construct 'fossilization' at this stage of knowledge is that descriptive knowledge about ILs which turns out to suggest predictions verifiable in meaningful performance situations, leads to a systematic collection of the relevant data; this task, one which is impossible without this construct, is expected to be relevant to serious theory construction in a psychology of L2-learning (Selinker, 1972, reprint: 43)

So far the potential for language transfer in the IL-system has been extensively scrutinized on both theoretical and empirical grounds. Given the tentative assumptions behind the CC-model, the potential for language transfer can also be established by carefully figuring L1-experience out. As noted in the preceding section, Dulay and Burt make an articulate enunciation that L1-experience is a major internal mechanism constantly affecting the operation of other mechanisms such as the filter, the organizer and the monitor (cf. Figure 6). Since particular discrepancies between the input and the output are ascribable to these mechanisms, it appears that an inextricable proportion of such discrepancies can be traced back to the learner's L1-experience. While it is generally agreed that approximately one-third of the learner's errors have direct connection with L1-influence, Dulay and Burt, in their empirical research, recorded a considerably low percentage (3%) of interlingual goofs (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2.3). However, through their theoretical speculations, Dulay and Burt pointed to the fact that L1-influence is well observable in the phonological domain. In their words:

[...] the past experience of having learned one's L1 is integrated into some of the organizing strategies used by a learner to acquire a L2. This is evident, for example, in certain aspects of the acquisition of phonology and the use of code alternation as a L2-learning device. (Dulay and Burt, 1977, reprint 70, emphasis added)

The controversial point which should be addressed here is that although Dulay and Burt, like all IL-specialists, reject the behaviouristic paradigms from which transfer theory essentially derived its principles (and, in the light of the generative-cognitive model, this rejection is undoubtedly true), they do not seem to deny the fact of L1-influence on L2-learning/acquisition. Rather, Dulay and Burt look upon reliance on the L1 as a strategy adopted by the learner not only in the phonological domain as shown above, but also in the syntactic domain and/or the
lexical one As noted in the preceding section, the monitor is a major internal mechanism responsible for conscious linguistic processing. Hence, Dulay and Burt admittedly state:

Conscious learning may also underlie a learner's use of his or her L1-structure to formulate L2-sentences in particular situations. When called upon to produce structures that are not yet part of the subconscious linguistic system, some learners—adults in particular—tend to plug L2-vocabulary words into their consciously available L1-syntax. This conscious word-for-word translation process may be a communication strategy of last resort (Dulay et al., 1982 59, emphasis added).

So, it can be seen that the learner's reliance on his L1-experience during L2-learning is noticeable on the three linguistic levels: phonology, syntax and lexis. Accordingly, this reliance is integrated into the two types of strategies employed by the learner: learning and communication (cf. also Selinker, Figure 5). Therefore, by looking at the two excerpts cited above, one may notice the remarkable contradiction between Dulay and Burt's theoretical assumptions concerning language transfer and their empirical research which tried to play down the role of L1-influence in L2-learning/acquisition.

With regard to their theoretical assumptions, it appears that, like Selinker who identifies language transfer as one of the five central processes, Dulay and Burt establish L1-experience to be one of the five major factors which characterize certain discrepancies between the input and the output. Again, like Selinker when referring to language transfer as an internal process interacting with others during IL-experience, Dulay and Burt assume that L1-experience is an internal mechanism which constantly influences the operation of others during L2-learning/acquisition. Clearly, therefore, within more or less the same equilibrium, language transfer can process through the strategies of L2-learning and L2-communication which are pertinent to the psychology of the learner. According to Corder, while strategies of L2-learning refer to "the mental processes whereby a learner creates for himself or discovers a language system underlying the data he is exposed to," strategies of L2-communication have to do with "the devices whereby [a learner] exploits whatever linguistic knowledge he possesses to achieve his communicative ends" (Corder, 1981 89, emphasis added). Explicitly, the author associates language transfer with strategies of L2-communication (cf. the monitor), since L1-experience occupies a central position in his already existing linguistic knowledge. Implicit
in Corder's definition of strategies of L2-learning (cf. the filter), language transfer can also be related, particularly at a reception level. In other words, since strategies of L2-learning refer to the mental devices whereby the learner processes what he receives from the input, they can well be viewed to have connection with language transfer as they form a central internal process operating in the LPS. This can be justified in terms of the results of Schachter's (1974) project conducted on distinct groups of learners of English. In brief, Schachter observed that the Chinese and Japanese learners avoided producing the relative-clause structure, whereas the Arab and Persian learners made errors over the same structure, in spite of the fact that in comprehension, all these learners were aware of the correct rules governing that structure. This indicates that, at a reception level, the pure linguistic knowledge of this L2-structural device was stored in the learners' LLSs (cf. the organizer) for an unknown period of time, but processed differently at a production level, that is, resorting to paraphrase by the former group due to the radical difference between Chinese/Japanese and English relative clauses, and making much more attempts at reconstruction by the latter group due to the crucial similarity between Arabic/Persian and English relative clauses (cf. chapter 4, section 4.1.2). Therefore, the two different types of strategies adopted towards the learning of this L2-structure were determined by the learners' previous knowledge of the L1-counterparts, leading one to conclude that strategies of learning are by no means separable from language transfer even if interlingual errors do not occur. This also applies to strategies of communication as the distinction made by Selinker between the two types of strategies is not always justifiable. Here, the same writer appears to reconsider this point.

I feel as if I raised a hornet's nest when I suggested long ago (Selinker, 1972) the distinction communication strategies versus learning strategies. The distinction in principle is seductive, but seems to have proved impossible to distinguish in practice. Empirically, it appears that the only way out is to clearly operationalize what one means for each study [...] I agree that a definition of strategy must be cognitive and not L2-specific [...]. Additionally, it is reasonable to suppose that IL-communication strategies must at times further learning, but apparently no one has any idea how this happens.

(Selinker, 1984, 339-340)
With respect to Dulay and Burt's empirical research, on the other hand, the results they reported about what they called interference-like goofs extremely trivialized the role of L1-influence in L2-learning. As noted earlier, satisfactorily conclusive statements about the exact percentages of interlingual errors are far from issuing, since the three variables (contrast, data, and age) often face the analyst and place restrictions on maintaining objective attitudes accordingly (cf. chapter 2, sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4). Therefore, the results of Dulay and Burt's empirical research are questionable in terms of these three variables:

(i) The degree of contrast between L1 and L2
Along this variable, the investigation of learner language was confined to "the production of syntax in L2-acquisition by children, from the viewpoint of 'goofs' children make during the acquisition process" (Dulay and Burt, 1983:54, emphasis added). Thus, within the procedures of goof analysis (EA), the syntactic domain, without taking into consideration the phonological and lexical domains, is insufficient to give a complete picture of L1-influence as the role it plays in L2-learning may be mostly an inhibitor in one linguistic domain, but mostly a facilitator in another (cf. chapter 5, section 5.3). In this respect, Dulay and Burt themselves point out that the major impact of the L1 has on L2-learning may have to do with phonology rather than with grammar or syntax. In their words "Pronunciation is more susceptible to L1-crossover than grammar" (Dulay et al., 1982:5; a footnote, cf. also. 96). Therefore, if, for instance, Dulay and Burt had aimed at analysing phonological goofs, the percentage of the 'putatively' interference-like goofs would have been much higher than 3% or 5%.

(ii) The collection of data
This variable which concerns the type of data collected need not be proved here, that it is not necessary to examine in detail the nature of the data Dulay and Burt intended to analyse, but it should be noted that the authors admittedly reported "The data we have were not systematically collected, therefore, a frequency count is not appropriate. There were, however few interference-like goofs relative to the number of non-interference goofs" (Dulay and Burt, 1983:63). Consequently, one can apparently notice that relatively few.
interference-like goofs do not necessarily lead to absolutely conclusive statements about language transfer and, therefore, a disparagement of the role of the L1 in L2-learning

(iii) The age of the learner
Concerning the age variable, Dulay and Burt cited empirical studies from the learning of English by several groups of children whose L1's are Spanish, Japanese, Chinese, Norwegian and so on. As mentioned elsewhere, Dulay and Burt brought with them a cognitively-based hypothesis known as the L2=L1 Hypothesis to stress that L2-acquisition and L1-acquisition do essentially comply with the same laws. In its strongest claim, this hypothesis exists in two versions: firstly, "Children below the age of puberty will make goofs in L2-syntax that are similar to L1-developmental goofs"; secondly, "Children below the age of puberty will not make goofs that reflect transfer of the structure of their L1 onto the L2 they are learning" (Dulay and Burt, 1983:59) Given the theoretical assumptions behind L1-experience, it appears that the remarkably low percentage of interference-like goofs in syntax specifically indicates no more than a child's reduced susceptibility to cognitive reliance on the L1 compared with an adult's. Here, it is worth recapitulating Ausubel (1964) who pointed to the fact that the adult is more capable of syntactic generalizations than the child in that the former can draw on his L1-structural devices which are identical with their L2-counterparts (cf chapter 1, section 1.4.2). Therefore, since the adult's L1-knowledge is assumed to be broader than the child's L1-knowledge (provided that L1-experience affects the operation of other internal mechanisms constantly), language transfer appears to have more potential in the adult's CC that it has in the child's CC.

It should be noted, however, that the goofs collected from children were analysed only in terms of the L2=L1 Hypothesis whose ultimate aim holds that "children actively organize the L2-speech they hear and make generalizations about its structure as children learning their L1 do. Therefore, the goofs expected in any particular L2-production would be similar to those made by children learning that same language as their L1" (Dulay and Burt, 1983:55, emphasis added) Hence, with the rejection of the behavioural-structural model, the L2=L1 Hypothesis was apparently postulated as an alternative predictor of L2-goofs to CA a priori, by relying heavily on the developmental L1-goofs made by children during L1-acquisition. For instance, Dulay and Burt report, "the
CA-Hypothesis predicts that Spanish-speaking children will delete subjects, as in *Wants Miss Jones*, while the L2-L1 Hypothesis predicts that children will omit functors, as in *He want Miss Jones* (Dulay and Burt, 1983: 55). Apart from Dulay and Burt's neglect of language transfer, which has not gained much approval, as will be seen presently, their approach to the prediction of interlingual goofs appears to roughly coincide with that of Selinker. As discussed above, Selinker's intention is to found the three sets of utterances (L1, IL and L2) within a unified framework and—by collecting as data, utterances related to certain surface-structure devices employed in each of these three systems—to predict interlingual fossilizations where necessary. Likewise, Dulay and Burt seek to collect the goofs that a group of children make during L2-learning and the developmental goofs which another group of children make when acquiring that L2 as their L1, and to project the structures of the former goofs on the L1-counterparts for deciding which interlingual goofs are *predictable*. In other words, if the structures of the L2-goofs reflect the learner's L1-corresponding structures and are not found in the L1-acquisition data of the L2 he is learning, then *predictions* of interlingual goofs can be made. It seems, therefore, the unification of the three systems (L1, IL and L2) is implicit in Dulay and Burt's approach to the prediction of interlingual goofs specifically; whereas, according to Selinker, such unification in general establishes the psychologically relevant data on which theories of L2-learning should be based as the entire system of the IL-continuum stresses the structurally intermediate status between L1 and L2.

Since the mid 1970s, particularly when studies into crosslinguistic influence began to proliferate as will be discussed in the next chapter, there have been a great number of researchers who have frequently forwarded their criticisms against Dulay and Burt's empirical findings which attempted to severely discount L1-influence and the inevitable role it plays in L2-learning/acquisition. Among these researchers are: Kennedy and Holmes (1976), Larsen-Freeman (1976), Van Els et al. (1984), Kellerman (1978b; 1984), and Ringbom (1987). For instance, Kellerman and Ringbom point out respectively:

Dulay and Burt re-analyse a number of L1-like errors in the only terms their hypothesis allows, namely as parallel to attested L1-acquisitional forms or as overgeneralizations of L2-material. Some of their analyses fail to convince because they fail to provide the critical supporting evidence for them (see the comments in e.g.
Kellerman 1974; 1975), but the overall impact was enormous, and it was only a matter of time before the morpheme studies were underway (Kellerman, 1984: 99)

[ ] when [Dulay and Burt] compare Spanish and Chinese children learning English they do not pay attention to the fact that the Spanish children in their data constantly perform better than the Chinese children. A natural explanation of this, as far as one can judge from a distant perspective, would be that the Spanish children can make much more use of their LI when learning English than the Chinese children. The difference can, in other words, be referred back, if not to transfer in a narrow sense, at least to cross-linguistic influence (Ringbom, 1987: 48)

Nevertheless, Dulay and Burt's unconvincing disparagement of LI-influence appears to be one of the incentives which have encouraged IL-specialists to deeply investigate this fact and to re-affirm its credibility. Therefore, despite the wide gap between what Dulay and Burt theorized on LI-experience and what they reported about interference-like goofs, language transfer can be considered from a much broader perspective by re-estimating the internal mechanism of LI-experience within cognitive circumscription. The next section will draw on some of the recent research which has been primarily devoted to this matter.

3.3 IL and the Reaffirmation of Transfer

At this point, a brief outline chronologically schematizing the theory and methodology of the three lines of research (CA, EA and IL) may be considered to trace, in as much it includes, the changing attitudes towards the question of language transfer through the extensive developments in linguistic theory which were in fact the recipes for such attitudes.

Beginning with the mid 1950s, CA essentially relied on a prior comparison between LI and L2 to identify their structural differences and to predict interlingual errors on the basis of these differences. The psychological constructs of CA were, in the heyday of behaviourism, derived from transfer paradigms (the learning of task A will affect the subsequent learning of task B), and the linguistic criteria for CA were demarcated within the rigorous tradition of structuralism. Therefore, LI-influence was deemed to be the chief source of difficulty in L2-learning, and the pedagogical issues rested on mere elimination of
interlingual errors. With the emergence of TGG and GS, and as a result of the contrastivists' failure in determining surface structure as the constant TC for CA, a number of researchers tried to apply the deep-structure principle which, though still insufficient, added valuable information on how the magnitude of transfer effects could be tested. Following Chomsky's rejection of the structural-behavioural model, CA and eventually its notion of language transfer were fraught with severe criticism from a theoretical standpoint (cf. chapter 1).

Up to the late 1960s, EA in fact witnessed two conflicting phases of endeavour: the structural-behavioural model and its successor, the generative-cognitive framework. During the first phase, the procedure of EA was little more than an impressionistic collection of the common L2-errors made by speakers of different LLs. In very much the same pedagogical tactics implemented in the guise of CA, EA's plea was precautionary in the sense that researchers warned teachers against tolerating errors to avoid the risk of the learner's establishing them as 'habits'. In the second phase, EA was mainly a reaction against CA as practical and empirical research demonstrated that a large number of 'actual' errors could not be predicted by CA. However, EA's objectives could not be the ultimate remedy, since there are many of the 'invisible' aspects of language transfer which could not be accounted for by its post-procedural techniques either. Hence, a complementary coalition of CA and EA was recommended along with the re-oriented position of the constant TE which, in addition to the deep-structure identity, incorporates more existing facts of meaning in order to give more convincing decisions on language transfer (cf. chapter 2).

However, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the pioneering insights into the entity of error did not only revolutionize the approach to EA, but also contributed a great deal towards highly profound studies into learner language, and, since then, IL-research has grown to be an area of prime concern in the literature of L2-learning/acquisition. Because IL-research offers a cognitively-based theory, dynamic and evolutionary in nature as discussed throughout this chapter, language transfer is no longer conceptualized as the automatic activation of habitualized linguistic behaviour, rather—in Faerch's and Kasper's words—

With a cognitive paradigm, transfer has been characterized as a problem solving procedure, or 'strategy', utilizing L1-knowledge in order to solve a learning or communication problem in the L2 (Jordens, 1977, Kellerman, 1977, Sharwood-Smith, 1979). As transfer is here seen as primarily a decision-making procedure, rather than
an automatic process, an important issue is what factors condition the learner to transfer. (Faerch and Kasper, 1986:49, original emphasis)

Clearly, therefore, with the circumscription of the transfer mechanism by a cognitive aura, IL-research stresses the facilitative role LI-influence plays in L2-learning, a point which has been made by Ausubel (1964) for a long time (cf chapter 1, section 1.4 2) In such a view, the potential for language transfer does not only function as an automatic inhibitor as had been believed under the constructs of habit formation, but as a facilitator, it is rehabilitated in its own esteem to be one of the central internal mechanisms which characterize the linguistic knowledge underlying the learner's IL-utterances.

From the initial work of IL-specialists reviewed in this chapter, there seem to be two distinct trends concerning the approach to the analysis of interlingual identifications (cf Figure 7) The first trend is explicitly adopted by Corder and Nemser and coincides in large measure with CA a posteriori in that investigation of learner language (ISD and APS) is a pre-requisite for CA In other words, without permitting the projection of the learner's actual utterances, CA, according to Corder and Nemser, is unable to account for interlingual idiosyncracy and deviancy However, CA, here, is not an initial device, since the research focuses on the analysis of production errors and, thus, allows almost no room for the study of comprehension errors The second trend pertains to the credentials of an approach suggested by Selinker and Dulay and Burt to the investigation of language transfer. It represents a willingness to formulate two distinct but, in principle, related predictors as alternatives to CA a priori, albeit EA-techniques are still employed to check for interlingual fossilizations and goofs. While the first trend involves contrast between the learner's IL and the L2 he is learning, and then explains interlingual idiosyncracy/deviancy by recourse to his LI, the second trend establishes all three systems within a unified framework, and, from the beginning, incorporates CA as an initial filtering device, making way for the testing of hypotheses about other determinants of the learner's language" (Sridhar, 1981:232)

It now becomes clear that, from the discredited behaviouristic notion of language transfer, IL-studies bring with them crucial psycholinguistic issues in L2-acquisition which aim at re-affirming language transfer as an inevitable variable among others and serve other important related notions such as crosslinguistic influence as will be
seen in the next chapter. These issues concern the highly intricate network where the two distinct predispositions (language process and language product) interact as long as the learner attempts to utilize the L2 by means of strategies of learning and communication as discussed on both theoretical and practical grounds throughout this chapter. It appears that, for the observable functioning of language product, language process manoeuvres a wide range of skill-interactions within different dimensions of cognitive control. In such a perspective, the transfer mechanism being primarily a decision-making procedure can both be conceived of as the creative activation of L1-knowledge at different levels of consciousness and the activation of highly automatized L1-knowledge in the absence of conscious control (Faerch and Kasper, 1986, 49), similar points have already been made by researchers such as Vogel (1976), James (1977), Kellerman (1978a) and Sharwood-Smith (1979).

Therefore, the potential for language transfer can process through conscious activation and unconscious activation. As noted above, the monitor has to do with the conscious processing (activation) of whatever linguistic knowledge the learner possesses, whereas the unconscious processing (activation) of automatized linguistic knowledge constitutes part of the internal operation of the filter in that the learner, according to Dulay and Burt, seems to adopt certain types of verbal routines which enhance this unconscious activation (cf. Dulay and Burt, sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3). Mention has also been made of how both the filter and the monitor lie at the heart of the LPS referred to by Selinker because they are inherently responsible for strategies of learning and communication. In this respect, researchers like Faerch and Kasper appear to conceive of the IL-hypothesis and the CC-theory as derived from common psychological propositions, while liberating the transfer mechanism from its initial behaviouristic constraints. Thus, language transfer has come under reconsideration to be one of the significant variables underlying the L2-learning process, since L1-knowledge forms an essential part of whatever linguistic knowledge the learner has at his disposal. In Faerch and Kasper's words, "from a cognitive point of view it makes considerable sense to assume that learners in principle make use of any prior linguistic knowledge they have as 'input' to the CC-process, one important knowledge source being the L1" (Faerch and Kasper, 1987, 111, original emphasis).
Another endeavour which draws on IL-research comes from Wode's series of writings (for example, 1977; 1981; 1986 and so on), who emphasizes the need for a scrutiny of language transfer within cognitive dimensions. Wode points out that, for a deeper understanding of how the transfer mechanism functions internally at all levels of linguistic processing, it seems logically inadequate to exclusively relate the state of issue to L2-learning situations. Among bilinguals and/or bidialectals, language transfer may also occur in language contact situations such as linguistic borrowing and code switching as mentioned earlier (cf. Nemser, section 3.1.2). Apparently, this leads to a reinforcement of the legitimate link between CA and bilingualism which has been strongly attacked by Dulay and Burt (cf. chapter 1, section 1.1.2). Furthermore, language transfer, Wode argues, may also take place in pidginization which has been explicitly referred to by Nemser as one of the stable varieties of APS (learner pidgin) and implicitly by Selinker through several examples of the English ILs of Indian speakers. It follows that the general processing strategies employed in language-contact situations such as these formulate a vital component within the overall proceeding of the transfer mechanism. Therefore, language-contact situations contribute to the transfer mechanism on two underlying levels: "first, to determine its part within the design of natural language; and, second, to specify the nature of the linguo-cognitive system(s) underlying transfer" (Wode, 1986: 173; emphasis added). The same writer expounds the term linguo-cognitive system as follows (cf. also Wode, 1981: 55):

> It is [...] used to stress the fact that the cognitive capacities enabling human beings to process language data very likely constitute a special type of cognition not to be equated with general intelligence, concept formation, or the ability to think logically. It seems that the ability to handle the formal properties of linguistic devices used in natural languages constitutes a specific type of cognition especially geared to that purpose.

(Wode, 1986: 182; a footnote; emphasis added)

It may be the case that, by using the term linguo-cognitive system as being directly relevant to the transfer mechanism, Wode appears to inherently refer to Selinker's notion of the LPS which exists in addition to a more genetically determined organization such as the LLS in Lenneberg's terms (cf. section 3.2.1). In other words, the centripetal force of fossilization (which exists in the LPS and is responsible for constituting this special type of cognition) attracts from the LLS
certain L2-items which are stored as pure L2-knowledge and, for the process of matching, the corresponding L1-items which already exist as pure L1-knowledge. Then, by means of the centrifugal force, fossilization causes the reconstructed utterance in question to re-emerge through the channel of transfer (cf. section 3.2.3). This indicates that behind the production of a given transfer-based utterance, there are regiments of cognitive capacities and skill-interactions which characterize the transfer mechanism as a potential ordinance in its own right. Without question, therefore, it should be established—Wode writes

1) that transfer does occur in learner languages,
2) that transfer is developmental, i.e., that it is an integral part of how people learn languages,
3) that the occurrence of transfer is systematic and not random,
4) that transfer is constrained by the formal properties of the linguistic devices of the languages involved, and
5) that there is variation in the use of transfer along several dimensions: individual variation among the transfer-based learner utterances, situational or task-specific variation in the sense that certain situations are more prone to trigger transfer-based utterances than others, and developmental variation as a function of the state of the development of the learner's L1 and/or L2

(Wode, 1986 174)

From this schematized overview of the three approaches (CA, EA and IL), it can be seen that, apart from Dulay and Burt's empirical research which played down the role of L1-influence by recording the least percentage of interlingual goofs, the rehabilitation of language transfer has in fact started with IL-research, particularly within the second trend. Therefore, Selinker as well as Dulay and Burt (in relation to their theoretical assumptions behind L1-experience) considers language transfer one of the central processes which underlie L2-learning. The extension of the cognitive bases of language transfer by researchers like Faerch and Kasper, and Wode among others clearly indicates that investigation of this mechanism has become one of the central strands of IL-research. This exciting but highly complex scrutiny of language transfer has in great measure contributed towards recent studies into crosslinguistic influence on L2-learning/acquisition. The next chapter will consider the earlier works which were in fact the seeds from which the notion of crosslinguistic influence has grown, and will trace its development in current thinking about language transfer.
4

TRANSFER AND CROSSLINGUISTIC INFLUENCE

In IL-studies, language transfer has been looked upon as one of the central internal mechanisms underlying L2-learning, and, finally, the importance of CA has emerged as part of the new direction of linguistic theory. More recently, many of the issues put forward by IL-specialists have given rise to an interesting concept, collectively referred to as Cross-linguistic Influence (CLI). Since the mid 1970s, research into CLI has been proliferating and the concept, especially during the last decade, has come under consideration to be a vital connecting set of parameters each playing a significant role in L2-learning/acquisition. However, before the 1970s, specifically before the contributions of IL-specialists, problems associated with CLI were not taken seriously and their theoretical and practical treatments were, it is true, relatively imperfect. As Ringbom argues, the one-sidedness of research into CLI was in fact due to four reasons: First, within traditional contrastive studies, emphasis on the inhibitive factor of the L1 and neglect of the facilitative role it plays in L2-learning resulted in a severe devaluation of the notion of language transfer, even though the existence of positive transfer was commonly mentioned among researchers. Second, the domination of syntax in applied linguistics up to the 1980s led to preoccupation with the analysis of syntactic interlingual identifications and subsequent neglect of semantic problems such as the domain of lexical selection. Third, concentration on language transfer in production distracted researchers from probing its internal mechanisms in comprehension for a deeper understanding of the underlying processes of L2-learning. Fourth, L1-influence findings, whatever the results,
were assumed to be eventually applicable to other completely different languages and learning situations, regardless of the distance between L1 and L2 (Ringbom, 1987 48-49).

Beginning with the mid 1970s, the speculations of IL-specialists and the subsequent contributions of researchers such as Schachter, Kellerman, Krashen among others were, in fact, the seeds from which studies into CLI have grown and developed on a large scale. In this respect, the turning point was the important event (The Ann Arbor Conference on Language Transfer in 1981) which brought about a new approach to the study and analysis of language transfer. In effect, the concept of transfer within the extended boundaries of CLI has re-emerged as a widespread set of topics of serious discussion.

The first section of this chapter (section 4.1) will be a description of some of the most important aspects which affect the learning, or loss, of the L2. Such aspects are said to formulate the general basis from which CLI-research draws. Hence, by recourse to Newmark and Reibel's ignorance hypothesis, the notion of lack of knowledge and its relationship with the concept of borrowing will be considered in the light of current thinking about language transfer. In addition, Schachter's avoidance hypothesis as well as the empirical support undertaken by Kleinmann will be highlighted as a prerequisite for scrutinizing the less tangible areas of language transfer. Finally, with reference to the work of Kellerman, Wode, Zobl among others, the concept of psychotypology will be outlined.

The second section (section 4.2) will touch on the most recent work of Ringbom whose invaluable insights into CLI-research contribute to many of the aspects that have been overlooked for quite a long time. With reference to the main issues put forward in the first section, CLI will be treated in terms of language process. Hence, the various facets of CLI will be considered both in production (such as the distinction between overt and covert CLI) and in comprehension. Furthermore, for a deeper understanding of the internal mechanisms of CLI (that is, the transfer load), the interaction between comprehension and production will be discussed in the light of the two important questions of transfer which concern the amount of CLI on L2-learning/acquisition.

The third and final section (section 4.3) will introduce three provisional hypotheses to be tested in Part Two. These hypotheses concern the value of Arabic-transfer potential at the three linguistic levels (1) where the potential for Colloquial Arabic influence (SCA),
rather than Classical Arabic influence (MSA), interferes mostly in the phonological processing of the English IL, (ii) where the potential for Arabic transfer (MSA/SCA) is mostly an inhibitor in the syntactic processing of the English IL, and (iii) where the potential for Arabic transfer (MSA/SCA) is mostly a facilitator in the semantic processing of the English IL.

4.1 CLI and Aspects of Language Loss

In an introduction to CLI on L2-acquisition, Sharwood-Smith and Kellerman point out that the term transfer, in its traditional sense, is not broad enough to account for all aspects of L1-influence on L2-learning/acquisition. They focus attention upon the need for a broader term such as CLI which subsumes, "under one heading, such phenomena as 'transfer', 'interference', 'avoidance', 'borrowing' and L2-related aspects of language loss and thus [permits] discussion of the similarities and differences between these phenomena" (Sharwood-Smith and Kellerman, 1986).

In this section, three topics will be considered as subheadings of CLI: ignorance, avoidance and psychotypology. With regard to the first topic, Newmark and Reibel's ignorance hypothesis will be outlined in its strong version. Then, its revival by Selinker will be mentioned with reference to James' interpretation of ignorance as a precondition for language transfer to occur. Further, other views on the phenomenon will be touched on, since researchers such as Corder prefer the term borrowing as an alternative on the assumption that ignorance is an insufficient precondition and, thus, lack of knowledge cannot always trigger language transfer. Hence, the re-orientation of the ignorance hypothesis by Krashen will be considered in terms of the monitor model. The second topic will draw on Schachter's avoidance hypothesis and Kleinmann's findings specifically. In addition, mention will be made of further opinions about the importance of the phenomenon which, it is believed, seems to be the forerunner of the concept of psychotypology. For this reason, the third topic will deal with such a concept by reference to the work of Kellerman, Wode, Zobl and others.
4.1.1 *Ignorance Compensations*

It has been mentioned earlier that one of the influential criticisms levelled against the behaviouristic paradigms of CA was voiced by Newmark (1966) and subsequently by Newmark and Reibel (1968) whilst at the same time conceding the inevitable fact of LI-influence (cf chapter 2, section 2.2.3). In a plea for a change of teaching methods, Newmark pointed out that the structural drilling designed on the basis of these paradigms could not in fact surmount the problem of LI-interference. Rather, such drilling was over-emphasizing the linguistic form to the detriment of the social context, a matter that has received special attention since the initial work of IL-researchers (cf section 3.1.3, Corder, 1971a, reprint 24, and section 3.2.3, Selinker, 1984: 342). According to Newmark, therefore, a decontextualization of the L2-linguistic material and the overloading of the learner’s cognitive capacities with chunks of such material may cause the learner—who is unable to absorb everything he receives due to the nature of his short-term memory—to fall back on his LI-experience, as the only resource available for communication. In such a perspective, Newmark saw LI-interference simply as a result of the learner’s ignorance of certain L2-items. He stated:

If what the learner observes is such that he cannot absorb it completely within his short-term memory, he will make up for his deficiency if he is called on to perform before he has learned the new behaviour by padding with material from what he already knows, that is, his own language. This padding—supplying what is known to make up for what is not known—is the major source of 'interference', the major reason for 'foreign accents'. Seen in this light, the cure for interference is simply the cure for ignorance learning.

(Newmark, 1966, reprint 164, emphasis added)

From a theoretical standpoint, one can apparently notice that Newmark’s proposal was merely a logical continuation of the strictures spelled out against the belief that most L2-errors were attributed to LI-interference. Hence, the inextricable association of LI-interference with the theory of habit formation was almost entirely demolished, and Newmark and Reibel were conscious of the fact that the learner, by means of his cognitive capacities, would ensure success in L2-learning "if his own particular acts using the language are selectively reinforced"
(Newmark and Reibel, 1968 149). The authors' arguments, therefore, rested on controlling the input modelled for the learner, rather than combating L1-intrusion because the corpus of actual L2-errors could be ostensibly observed and identified "with characteristics in the learner's own language" (Newmark and Reibel, 1968 158). By this conviction, the authors appear to have initiated one of the common characteristics of the IL as a uniform system, that is, the structural independence of learner language (cf Table 7) In its strongest claim, the ignorance hypothesis was enunciated as follows (quoted by Singleton, 1981 14, 1987 38)

[ ] a person knows how to speak one language, say his L1 Now he tries to speak another one [L2], but in his early stages of learning the new one, there are many things he has not yet learned to do, that is, he is grossly undertrained in the new one. But he is induced to perform [ ] in that new one by an external teacher or by his internal desire to say something. What can he do other than use what he already knows to make up for what he does not know? To an observer who knows the L2, the learner will seem to be stubbornly substituting the L1-habits for L2-habits. But from the learner's point of view, all he is doing is the best he can to fill in his gaps of training. He refers for help to what he already knows. The problem of 'interference' viewed thus reduces to the problem of ignorance [ ]

(Newmark and Reibel, 1968: 159-160; emphasis added)

As discussed above, there are two types of linguistic knowledge that the learner can draw on pure knowledge and non-pure knowledge (cf chapter 3, section 3 2 3) Therefore, inherent in Newmark and Reibel's hypothesis, it seems that they are ambivalently alluding to these issues. Thus, the statement 'what the learner does not know' implies his ignorance of those L2-items or rules that can be classified under pure knowledge or, as James calls it, analytic knowledge of L2-items or rules. On the other hand, 'what the learner has not learned to do' suggests that he possesses the L2-items or rules in question as a type of pure knowledge but has not learned the new behaviour into which these items or rules can fit to convey the intended meaning. Therefore, what the learner is induced to perform in the L2 and to reconstruct out of such pure knowledge available to him is a language-specific behaviour which reflects a type of non-pure knowledge or what James calls skills or manipulative knowledge in that "having analytic knowledge of a L2 will not produce the required behaviour equatable with such knowledge" (James, 1971, reprint 99). The same writer presumes that "Newmark and Reibel intend by knowledge the unformulated consciousness of linguistic rules


which determine acceptable performance, namely competence. So they are saying that learners' performance is bad because their competence is bad" (James, 1971, reprint, 99, original emphasis). In other words, to use Selinker's terminology, inadequacy of what exists in the LLS as pure knowledge leads to an augmentation of the fossilized IL-competence in the LPS. In effect, such fossilized IL-competence invokes more re-emergence of fossilizable structures which are evidence of non-pure knowledge.

It appears, then, that the ignorance hypothesis was not exclusively centred upon the "reality of the phenomena that are referred to by the term interference" (Newmark and Reibel, 1968, 158, original emphasis), since, as mentioned above, the authors did not reject the fact of L1-influence on L2-learning. Rather, the attractive side of the hypothesis, being one of the most valuable strictures of CA, was taken up with a search for an appropriate description of the term interference, precisely because, within its behaviouristic paradigms, it was looked upon as an otiose concept (cf James, 1971, reprint, 98f). James' initial position was that ignorance could, at best, be equated with interference (James, 1971, reprint, 100), a point which was later criticized by Kellerman in that lack of knowledge might obstruct the occurrence of interference (cf Kellerman, 1977, 70f). Almost a decade later, James, in the light of Selinker's perspective, referred to ignorance as a precondition for transfer (this point will be discussed presently).

It is believed that beyond all question, Newmark and Reibel brought with them a cognitively-based theory which needs to be re-oriented in the light of current thinking since it is able to explain at least one of the causes underlying the learners' actual errors. A possible explanation may run as follows: given that the learner's memory is characterized by a short-term nature, it cannot retain everything he receives from the input. So that when the learner is induced to perform a particular L2-utterance (whose rules or items are not retained in his memory), he will be prone to committing errors though he relies on his cognitive capacities to process the language. In this case, the errors that the learner produces are creatively constructed in Dulay and Burt's terminology. Accordingly, these cognitive capacities pertain to whatever means the learner has at his disposal. His LI-experience is one major resource which he may fall back on. Thus, according to Newmark and Reibel, the psychological accommodation for language transfer does not
seem to be vulnerable as is the case of "the unnecessary hypostatization of competing linguistic systems", which, as mentioned above, situates the linguistic form in the foreground at the expense of the social context.

As far as one can see throughout Part One of this study, the criticisms of CA were voiced not because of the irrelevance of language transfer, but axiomatically because of CA, in its theoretical and practical implications, was bound up with behaviourism. As shown in the history of CA (cf chapter 1, section 1.11), the phenomenon of language transfer had been familiar long before behaviouristic views on L2-acquisition were pervasive. Behaviourists did in fact coin the terms transfer, interference, facilitation, and so on, to describe the effects of Task A (LI) on the learning of Task B (L2), but they certainly did not invent the reality of the phenomenon. Thus there seems never to have been any logical impediment to incorporating a more adequate account of language transfer into a cognitive model of L2-acquisition and use (cf. Singleton, 1987:36).

As noted in the preceding chapter, the resurgence of language transfer in IL-studies has been the pioneering and innovative contribution to CLI-research since the mid 1970s (cf. chapter 3, section 3.3). This resurgence has led to a more sophisticated scrutiny of those cognitively-based issues that play a significant role in the internal processing of language transfer, and the analysis of its mechanisms in such a perspective indubitably maintains a far more balanced view in order to fully recognize the facilitative as well as the inhibitive functioning of language transfer in L2-acquisition and use (cf. Singleton, 1987:37).

It follows from the above that because Newmark and Reibel proposed a cognitive alternative to language transfer, their ignorance hypothesis has been considerably revived by several IL-specialists and subsequently modified along with CLI-research to be one of the related aspects of language loss. For instance, Selinker, as discussed above (cf. chapter 3, section 3.2.3), points out that a description of strategy should be circumscribed by a cognitive aura since it is not a L2-specific facet. As James (1980:22) argues, Selinker alludes to the notion of ignorance as a precondition for the development of the internal strategies (learning/communication) which determine the learner's own approach to the processing of L2-material, or which determine what
Corder calls the learner's built-in syllabus (cf chapter 3, section 3.1.1). Selinker states:

Crucially, it has been argued that strategies for handling L2 linguistic material evolve whenever the learner realizes, either consciously or subconsciously, that he has no linguistic competence with regard to some aspect of the L2. It cannot be doubted that various internal strategies on the part of the L2-learner affect to a large extent the surface structure of sentences underlying IL-utterances.

(Selinker, 1972, reprint 39, emphasis added)

Clearly, 'no linguistic competence' entails the learner's ignorance of certain L2-items or rules as pure knowledge or, in James's terms, analytic knowledge. It is, therefore, the learner's ignorance which forces him to manoeuvre, by means of his cognitive capacities, whatever prior linguistic knowledge he has at his disposal. In this case, the L1-knowledge, as Larsen-Freeman restates Newmark, "is not a source of proactive inhibition, but rather something the learner relies on less and less as he becomes increasingly proficient at expressing himself in the L2" (Larsen-Freeman, 1978 128).

Later, James appears to alter his initial position that ignorance is an alternative to language transfer as mentioned above. By reference to Selinker, James prefers to see ignorance as a precondition for the occurrence of language transfer since this latter can be viewed as an internal strategy (learning/communication) applied by the learner (cf chapter 3, section 3.2.3). James expounds this point as follows:

[ ] if L1 and L2 formal devices for a particular function are identical—the 'ordinary learning' subparadigm—the learner will merely successfully transfer the L1-item to L2-use. It is only when they are different, and he nevertheless transfers the L1-item, that interference—and with it, error—accrue.

(James, 1980 22)

However, it should be noted that, according to Newmark and Reibel, padding (that is, resorting to what is known to compensate for what is unknown), is the major source of interference, but not the sole source. As discussed above, the statement 'interference reduces to ignorance' was only spelled out as a reaction against the structural drilling which had been designed on the basis of traditional CA to surmount the problem of interference. Therefore, it should not be conceived that whenever the learner is called upon to produce an 'unknown' L2-pattern he resorts to his L1-experience. There are many observed instances of what James...
calls ignorance-without-interference and interference-without-ignorance (James, 1980 22-23)

On the question of ignorance-without-interference, James argues that the avoidance strategies explored by Schachter and subsequently by Kleinmann can be taken as evidence of ignorance without interference. James' exemplification, however, does not seem the case (this point will be discussed in the next section). Rather, it is believed that, following Corder's argument, the learner is unaware of his systematic errors and therefore he cannot correct them since they are a reflection of the only rules known to him (cf chapter 2, section 2.2). That is, systematic errors recur because the correct rules or items which relate to these errors do not exist in the learner's linguistic repertoire. Therefore, many of the attested systematic errors that have no connection with L1-influence (intralingual errors) are clear examples of ignorance-without-interference.

With respect to the question of interference-without-ignorance, it is believed that this type manifests itself only in interlingual mistakes — in Corder's sense of the term mistake — since they are known to the learner and thus he can readily correct them. However, James insists on the occurrence of interference-without-ignorance in interlingual errors for no distinct reason. He points out:

It often happens that students are drilled in a particular L2-pattern until their performance is error-free they have learnt it 'to criterion'. They are no longer ignorant of the pattern. Nevertheless, two minutes later they produce errors over that very same pattern. Not that they are ignorant of the pattern they can easily self-correct when the teacher expresses his dismay. The errors will often have clear indications of L1-transfer-without ignorance.

(James, 1980 23, emphasis added)

Although they are self-correctable, I would not agree with Corder (1967; reprint 10) that they should be viewed as 'mistakes' [of Performance] rather than 'errors' [of Competence].

(James, 1980 26, a footnote)

The writer goes on to claim that, in the case of retroactive or backlash interference (cf chapter 1, section 1.1.2), "since no native speaker can properly be said to be ignorant of the central structures and the lexis of the L1, any interferences in L1 and L2 will normally have to be accepted as constituting interference without ignorance." (James, 1980. 23, emphasis added). Here, the definition of the term without
ignorance, or knowledge, seems to be ambiguous in either direction. proactive interference (L1---->L2) and retroactive interference (L1<----L2) To avoid possible confusion, the term 'interference with knowledge' instead of interference-without-ignorance will be used

As far as proactive interference is concerned, one might notice that, following Schachter's argument, the Arab learner is said to have knowledge of the English relative-clause structure due to its similar properties in Arabic which are internalized as part of his pure knowledge in the LLS Thus leading one to believe that any interlingual error the Arab learner commits on the relative-clause structure is an example of interference with knowledge But what sort of knowledge is this? Is it item knowledge? Or is it structure knowledge? If a given norm of syntactic formation is interpreted as the structure in question and an item as a sub-constituent of that structure, then it appears that the answers to these questions depend to a large extent upon the type and frequency of the errors committed on the structure in question For instance, Schachter (1974, reprint 359) has recorded (la) below as an actual IL-utterance produced by an Arab learner of English

(1) a * education which they don't work for *it
b [ittarbiyi 1ll1 ma. bištiglu minša na] (SCA)
c [attarbiyatu allatî la ya?malu na li?aj'liha'] (MSA)

As the above example illustrates, the sort of knowledge of the relative-clause structure is determined by the process of pronominalization, that is, the retention or deletion of the resumptive pronoun 'it' in (la) To clarify the point in terms of this example, item-knowledge refers to the learner's knowledge of the correct rendering of the resumptive pronoun, whereas structure-knowledge involves knowledge of relative-clause formation, regardless of one or more of its items being unknown If the recurrence of retention was quite frequent, then it would most likely be considered a systematic interlingual error due to the learner's ignorance of 'it-deletion' in English and his internalizing of '[a]/[ha ]-retention' in Arabic, and, in this particular case, 'it-retention' in (la) clearly indicates 'interference resulting from item-ignorance', the central concern of Newmark and Reibel's hypothesis. Because the other items or sub-constituents of the relative-clause structure are similar in both languages and thus are known to the learner, such an error would more accurately be an example
of interference with partial knowledge, that is, knowledge of some items or constituents of a given L2-structure (e.g., the placement of the relative pronoun) and ignorance of other items of the same structure (e.g., the deletion of the resumptive pronoun). However, if the recurrence of 'it-deletion' was considerably more frequent than that of 'it-retention', then the latter would clearly signal an interlingual mistake as a result of interference with total knowledge, that is, both item-knowledge and structure-knowledge. As a consequence, only interlingual mistakes can be taken as examples of this type, since interference with partial knowledge—which is evidence of interlingual errors—does not precisely imply interference-without-ignorance from the logical point of view.

Concerning the notion of retroactive interference, it appears that, in the case of L2-learning, most of the instances, if not all, which represent the effects of the L2 on the L1 are counted neither among interlingual errors nor mistakes. Rather, such instances reflect positive retroactive transfer and, therefore, they can be safely described as non-deviant interlingual identifications resulting from the learner's unconscious activation of the L2-verbal routines he adopts on the one hand, and from the subsequent attrition in his L1-competence caused by the L2 on the other. Thus the learner's L1-competence "remains subject to alteration through the effects of positive retroaction" (Py, 1986, 166, emphasis added). Accordingly, even at later stages of L2-learning where retroactive transfer is expected to be stronger (cf. Jakobovits, 1969 70, 1970 203), the learner's knowledge of his L1 is still considered a pure type of linguistic knowledge. It has been mentioned earlier that L1-knowledge is characterized by an internal nature, whereas L2-knowledge is said to be external (cf. chapter 1, section 112). Therefore, equating the two types of knowledge as shown in James' excerpts seems to be misleading. It is true that any retroactive interferences can signify what may be called 'interference with L1-knowledge' (or without L1-ignorance), but it would be more useful to specify the type of knowledge as well as the degree of transfer when citing examples of 'retroactive interference without ignorance' than to coin ambiguous terms which leave the reader in a disturbing 'impasse'.

Following Selinker's revival of the notion of ignorance, Newmark and Reibel's initial account has been subject to considerable modifications and has become far more tenable in current thinking. There have been a number of very recent attempts which serve in great measure
as an important source of theoretical and empirical corroboration to the phenomenon (cf., for example, Singleton, 1983) Of prime concern here is the pioneering work of Corder, who adopts the first trend of IL-research, and Krashen, who seems to be in line of with much of the work of Dulay and Burt, and thus can be said to represent the second trend (cf. chapter 3, section 3.3) Corder's views on ignorance will be mentioned first

As discussed at the outset of this section, the learner's ignorance of specific L2-items or rules does not preclude him from performing such unknown items or rules, but rather leads him to employ his cognitive capacities and therefore to manoeuvre whatever linguistic knowledge he possesses in order to fill in gaps of his L2-knowledge (cf. Newmark and Reibel's quotation above) Corder suggests that the learner's gap-filling from L1-resources can be viewed more precisely as linguistic borrowing rather than what had been misleadingly interpreted as interference or transfer He emphasizes the communicative function of borrowing in the first place, suggesting that when it is successfully realized it might lead to a learning strategy. Corder points out

[ ] an [IL] speaker may, in his attempts to communicate, simply 'borrow' for immediate purposes items or features of his [L1] (or any other language he knows) without incorporating them into his [IL] system 'Successful borrowing', that is when a 'borrowed' item is 'accepted' by the interlocutor as 'well formed' in the [L2], may lead to that item being incorporated into the speaker's [IL] repertoire This could be regarded as 'learning' (Corder, 1981: 104)

In such a perspective, learning progress proceeds only when successfully borrowed items or rules are modified in the direction of the L2-standard norm and are eventually established as part of the linguistic knowledge underlying the learner's IL-system For this reason, Corder seeks to relocate the position of language transfer in the new cognitive aura; that is, to illustrate with special reservation what the term transfer exactly means

Generally speaking, borrowing, according to Corder, "is a performance phenomenon, not a learning process, a feature, therefore, of language use not of language structure" (Corder, 1983: 92, original emphasis). It could only be considered a learning strategy in the case of successful borrowing as shown above The term, of course, was described by Haugen in the course of bilingual studies (cf. chapter 1, section 1.1.2), whereas in L2-learning/acquisition literature Corder argues.
the process refers to the use of items from a [L2], typically the [L1], particularly syntactic and lexical, to make good the deficiencies of the [IL]. This is a process which has long been recognized as a source of so-called interference, a totally inappropriate name for the phenomenon, since nothing whatsoever is being interfered with (Corder, 1983 92, emphasis added)

It should be noted, however, that the writer does not intend to reject the reality of interference, but rather he is trying to describe the term more precisely and compare and contrast it with borrowing; perhaps because researchers like Dulay and Burt, in their argument against the link between CA and bilingualism, have referred to linguistic borrowing as interference in the sociolinguistic sense. So that, from a psycholinguistic standpoint, borrowing and interference do not necessarily involve the same interlingual identifications, even though the two phenomena are both instances of CLI. Moreover, Corder does not concur with describing L1-transfer as a one-to-one relationship between the learner's realization of his gaps (that is, ignorance) and his resorting to the L1 in order to fill in such gaps. In other words, while Corder refers to gap-filling from L1-resources as borrowing, the term L1-transfer is inadequate for interpreting this process. He writes:

An explanation of the process [i.e. borrowing] has also been called the "ignorance hypothesis" of language transfer. Again the term "transfer" is inappropriate for reference to the phenomenon, since nothing is being transferred from anywhere to anywhere. What is happening is that the speaker is using certain aspects of his [L1] to express his meaning because his [IL] lacks the means to do it (Corder, 1983 92)

It seems the case that the learner who does not know, or is in ignorance of, a given L2-structure and is induced to perform its L1-counterpart is not transferring from his L1, but retaining the L1-structure and using L2-lexical items. Zobl refers to this process as relexification which is, according to Corder, the most extreme form of borrowing. However, according to Zobl, relexification is a kind of transfer viewed as a communication strategy "since it generally involves a copying of L2-lexical items into an L1-syntactic structure" (Zobl, 1980a 471, a footnote). Krashen implicitly refers to the phenomenon of relexification as an example of non-acquisition (this point will be discussed presently).
It appears from what precedes that, unlike Selinker, Corder and researchers like Tarone (1977), Kellerman (1977; 1978a), Wode (1978), Zobl (1980a) among others believe that ignorance cannot be a sufficient precondition which triggers the occurrence of language transfer. Rather, transfer-based IL-utterances may be performed at certain stages of development. However, Corder looks upon the learner's gap-filling as borrowing since the LI is not the only source of borrowing behaviour. He argues "Any other languages known to the learner are also a source of forms when he is casting around to supplement his [IL]." (Corder, 1983 93) Whereas the above researchers have recognized the phenomenon under the name of transfer, albeit both borrowing and transfer can be viewed as communication strategies. In fact, strategies of communication were first invoked by Selinker (cf chapter 3, section 3 2 1) who defined them as a reflection of a particular approach adopted by the learner. Therefore, such strategies would not be the same for all learners. Likewise, borrowing phenomena, Corder argues, "are highly variable and clearly situation-dependent. This means they cannot be a by-product of learning but must be a performance phenomenon." (Corder, 1983 93, emphasis added) Such variability and situation-dependence play a significant role in psychotypology or perceived language distance, a topic which has become associated with the work of Kellerman. In brief, he has shown that the possibilities of borrowing decrease where the distance between LI and L2 is great. On the other hand, the heaviest incidence of borrowing is observable where languages are moderately similar or related (cf section 4 1 3 below).

So far Corder's theoretical speculations on the ignorance hypothesis have been considered. Reference has also been made to other researchers such as Tarone, Kellerman and Zobl who, unlike Corder, prefer the use of the term transfer rather than borrowing. It is believed that, in the case of L2-learning, the two terms are fundamentally the same since all the above researchers refer to the same phenomenon, that is, language transfer either from the LI or from any other languages available at the learner's linguistic repertoire.

Another line of thinking concerning the ignorance hypothesis has been enunciated by Krashen who is well-known for his monitor model (cf chapter 3, section 3 2.2). Krashen has attempted to provide empirical support for the hypothesis in terms of the conscious monitor. The issues
he puts forward rest basically on how and where L1-influence fits into a theoretical framework for L2-performance Krashen maintains the position by Newmark and Reibel as follows

"interference" is not the [L1] "getting in the way" of [L2] skills Rather, it is the result of the performer "falling back" on old knowledge when he or she has not yet acquired enough of the [L2] In terms of the Monitor performance model, interference is the result of the use of the [L1] as an utterance initiator [L1] competence may replace acquired [L2] competence in the performance model [ ] (Krashen, 1981 7, emphasis added)

It appears that, within Krashen's perspective, ignorance can be a direct precondition for the occurrence of language transfer, a point implicitly suggested by Selinker above strategies of communication (performance) evolve whenever the learner realizes his ignorance In such a perspective, however, language transfer in Corder's sense does not seem to take place

According to Krashen, the learner's IL-utterances at a competence level are invariably initiated by the L1-counterparts Since the two unconsciously acquired systems (that is, L1-competence and 'L2-competence') lie at the heart of the organizer or the LLS, " the L1 may substitute for the acquired L2 as an utterance initiator" (Krashen, 1981 67) due to the dominance of L1-competence at one end and the deficiencies of the unconsciously acquired L2-system at another A similar point has been made by Singleton (1987 38) With regard to performance, unlike Corder who refers to borrowing as a performance phenomenon, Krashen points out

It may in fact be the case that the domain in L2-performance is the same as those rules that are most prone to L1-influence, while aspects of the [L2] that may be learned (late acquired, easy to conceptualize, e.g. bound morphology) are relatively free of L1-influence

(Krashen, 1981 67)

As discussed above, the ignorance hypothesis was first postulated to explain the 'real' causes of L2-errors as indications of low learning in general due to factors such as inadequate teaching (structural drilling) which relied on the overburdening of the learner's short-term memory Thus, the control of the input was recommended for that reason It
follows that, in terms of the monitor model, the issue has been questioned by reference to naturalistic settings, that is, interlingual errors may also be a reflection of low acquisition. If this is the case, Krashen argues, then "it can be eliminated or at least reduced by natural intake and language use" (Krashen, 1981 67, emphasis added). Therefore, the re-organization of the input in such a view may be profitable for adults learning a L2 in formal settings. However, it is possible for a learner to produce IL-utterances without any acquisition. For instance, Krashen notes, the learner can insert the L2-lexis into the L1-surface structure. This process pertains to what Zobl calls relexification, which is, according to Corder, the most extreme form of borrowing, as mentioned above. Because the monitor is responsible for conscious linguistic processing, that is, learning/acquisition (cf. chapter 3, section 3.2), such an internal mechanism "may then be used to add some morphology and do its best to repair word order where it differs from the L1" (Krashen, 1981 68).

More recently, Krashen has refined this position in the light of the CLI-research conducted by several scholars, notably Zobl (1980a, 1980b, 1980c), who have pointed out that the ignorance hypothesis is somewhat too strong. Krashen still maintains Newmark and Reibel's characterization in terms of the conscious monitor and the role it plays in dealing with interlingual errors. Accordingly, he describes the potential for language transfer on the fundamental assumption that "[L1] interference in the syntactic domain is the use of a rule of the [L1] in place of some transitional form or mature form of the L2" (Krashen, 1983 141, emphasis added). The author suggests that ignorance triggers language transfer when the acquirer has not yet acquired the new rules that could be added to those constituting his competence up to the current stage of acquisition. In other words, the acquirer tends to substitute a L1-rule for the L2-rule, the counterpart, which he does not acquire in the proposed next stage of acquisition. However, this does not exclude any L1-rule substitution for a previously acquired L2-counterpart since the L1 acts invariably as an utterance initiator and thus can replace both transitional (not acquired) and mature (acquired) L2-rules but the possibilities of transfer in the former case may be greater, that is, the possibilities of transfer as a result of ignorance are greater. Hence Krashen restates Zobl (1980b) by pointing out that when a L1-rule is similar to an attested transitional rule, the new IL-structure emerging from the replacement of the two is prone to
fossilization because, it is assumed, the L1-rule functions differently in the acquisition process (Krashen, 1983, 142). Therefore, the 'new' rule governing such an IL-structure cannot operate as a rule 'acquired' most recently.

It follows from the above that the conscious monitor, Krashen argues, is not always responsible for the full repair of interlingual errors. In cases where the repair task appears to be complex, the performer's self-editing may cause him to abort the structure in question and to rely on simplification (cf. chapter 3, section 3.2.1). Krashen points out that the monitor, when facing a difficult repair task, might be one of the bases for an avoidance strategy (this matter will be discussed in the next section). As a consequence, it seems that not all interlingual errors are a result of ignorance and Newmark and Reibel's hypothesis, in its strong version, predicts more errors than actually occur. Krashen concludes:

Transfer, according to this view, can still be regarded as padding, or the result of falling back on old knowledge, the L1-rule, when new knowledge [the transitional rule] is lacking. Its cause may simply be having to talk before "ready", before the necessary rule has been acquired. When this happens, if the conditions are met, the performer may very well fall back on old knowledge.

(Krashen, 1983, 148, emphasis added)

4.1.2 Avoidance Strategies

Throughout the discussion of a contrastive approach to EA, special emphasis has been placed on a reconciliation between CA and EA for a more fruitful analysis of interlingual identifications (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3.1). Such a reconciliation was in fact recommended by several researchers in vindication of the a priori form of the CA-Hypothesis. Although CA proved to have many logical flaws in its predictive power, the diagnostic nature of the a posteriori form was not an alternative remedy for these flaws. One of the researchers who sought to vindicate CA a priori to some extent was Schachter in her exploration of avoidance strategies. Schachter's argument arose out of the insight that some of the difficulties predicted by CA on the basis of differences between L1 and L2 might simply cause the learner to avoid the difficult areas and to resort to a paraphrase of the avoided construction. This
was a serious attempt to rehabilitate the validity of CA and therefore of language transfer on empirical grounds.

Schachter believed that CA, in its ability to account for avoidance, could be tenable; even though its prediction, as traditionally postulated, was conditioned by the learner's tendency to commit errors whenever he faced a L2-structure different from the L1-counterpart. Hence, Schachter recognized the weaknesses of CA, whilst her contention was that such weaknesses were less calamitous than those of EA (Schachter, 1974 reprint, 355). To test her hypothesis, she made a CA between the major restrictive relative-clause-formation strategies of four unrelated languages (Arabic, Persian, Chinese and Japanese) at one end and those of English at another. The results of her analysis illustrated two different facts: firstly, Arabic and Persian resemble English in the relative-clause structure. Secondly, Chinese and Japanese do not resemble English in the relative-clause structure. Schachter then, predicted possible areas of difficulty that would arise for native speakers of the four LIs when constructing English relative clauses (Schachter, 1974, reprint 357).

In an analysis of the relative clauses actually produced by members of each language group, Schachter observed that the native Chinese and Japanese learners made considerably fewer errors than did the native Arab and Persian learners. A strictly EA, or the a posteriori form, might lead one to believe that the English relative-clause structure was far less difficult for the native Chinese and Japanese learners. If this were the case, then CA a priori would be useless because its prediction was that the Chinese and Japanese learners would have more problems with the structure in question due to the radical differences between their LIs and English, specifically a switching from prenominal to post-nominal position. Schachter's explanation, however, was that the Chinese and Japanese learners did in fact experience tenacious difficulty with relative-clause formation. Such learners made fewer errors simply because they were trying to avoid the relative-clause structure, so that the differences referred to above actively dissuaded them from attempting to produce the structure.

These learners, however, produced the relative-clause structure only when they were quite sure that it was correct. This is a clear indication that the learners were aware of the structure and, therefore, in contrast with James, any alternative strategy they resorted to cannot be viewed as an instance of ignorance-without-interference as will be
Schachter argued that the learners' fewer attempts were a direct reflection of an *avoidance* strategy and thus would account for the significantly small number of errors they made. She pointed out "What we encounter is a phenomenon of avoidance due to a difficulty which was predicted by the *a priori* approach, but which the *a posteriori* approach can not handle at all" (Schachter, 1974 reprint, 359).

It follows that the Chinese and Japanese learners *avoided* to great measure producing the relative-clause structure in English because they found it to be so different from the equivalent structure in their L1s. The reason why the errors they committed were fewer was that they made fewer attempts at producing the structure which nevertheless they were not ignorant of. The Arab and Persian learners, on the other hand, perceived relative-clause formation in English to be very similar to the counterpart in their L1s, mainly the postnominal position. Because this structural device has been internalized or conceptualized in the Arab and Persian learners' LLSs, they made more attempts at producing the structure and subsequently more errors cropped up, especially in pronominalization, and this was precisely what Schachter's data illustrated (cf section 4.1.1, example (1)). However, there have been a number of researchers such as Fox (1970), Ibrahim (1973), Tadros (1979), Mukattash (1982) among others who have tackled different aspects of the difficulties with relative-clause formation encountered by Arab learners of English. More recently, Kharma, in a very comprehensive study, has dealt with a variety of errors committed by Arab learners on relative-clause formation. He has classified the errors collected from essay-writing and text translation into fourteen possible types to ascertain the relative difficulty faced in the structure and by recourse to MSA, to arrive at a possible source for each type (Kharma, 1987: 258).

In the analysis of IL-data in Part Two, three types of errors will be examined by reference to the crucial similarities and radical differences between Arabic and English relative-clause formation (cf chapter 6, section 6.2.4)

Given that the structural placements of relative-clause formation are identical in English and Arabic/Persian, the speakers of the latter language group can directly transfer their L1-patterns to English. The interlingual errors that may emerge—mainly in pronominalization due to the usual retention of the resumptive pronoun in Arabic and Persian—could be accounted for by the *a posteriori* approach since its EA-techniques only rely on the analysis of errors made upon the
production mode. However, this approach is unable to handle phenomena such as the avoidance strategies adopted by the Chinese and Japanese learners simply because these strategies lie at the heart of comprehension, that is, the learner avoids a L2-structure simply because he finds it difficult to process. It follows that the internal processes of avoidance entitle the learner to paraphrase whether erroneously or correctly the avoided structure in order to convey the same meaning. Possibilities of paraphrase can exist only in the syntactic subcomponent since it is difficult to imagine any circumstances where phonological paraphrase would appear. Hence, the evidence from Schachter’s experimental project strongly corroborated the a priori approach as it stands in a neutral position between comprehension and production. She argued:

The learner apparently constructs hypotheses about the [L2] based on knowledge he already has about his [L1]. If the constructions are similar in the learner’s mind [i.e., LLS], he will transfer his [L1] strategy to the [L2]. If they are radically different, he will either reject the new construction or use it only with extreme caution. On the other hand, [EA] without a priori predictions simply fails to account for the avoidance phenomenon. If the student does not produce the constructions he finds difficult, no amount of [EA] is going to explain why.

(Schachter, 1974; reprint, 360)

The question, then, arose from a plea for a reconsideration of the predictive power of CA in the light of the new position of L2-acquisition research. The strictures of CA were in fact an outcome of "poor analysis or poor predictions about what is difficult and what is not" (Schachter, 1974, reprint 361). The author suggested, therefore, that the a posteriori form of the CA-Hypothesis was indeed the problematic approach and should be abandoned, whereas a combination of CA a priori, EA techniques and the comprehension testing proved to be extremely tenable to provide information that could be necessary for a more thorough understanding of the L2-learning process.

It appears that avoidance, in such a perspective, cannot be conceived of as an example of what James (1980) calls ignorance-without-interference as noted in the preceding section. According to Schachter, learners tend to avoid a given L2-structure not because they are said to be ignorant of that structure, but because they find it difficult to process—and therefore to produce—due to its radical difference from the L1-counterpart, the already internalized structural
device in their minds (LLSs). For instance, had the Chinese and Japanese learners been indeed ignorant of the relative clause structure, they would not have made any attempt to produce that structure. Thus, the fewer attempts these learners made at producing the relative-clause structure, particularly when they were certain of its correct placements, are proof enough that they were conscious of the rules which govern the structure.

More empirical experimentation on the same phenomenon has been carried out by Kleinmann who supported in large measure Schachter's findings. He reported: "...[L2] learners resort to an avoidance strategy that cannot be attributed to a lack of knowledge of the avoided structure" (Kleinmann, 1977; reprint; 375; 1978: 165; emphasis added). In other words, the learner is said to be avoiding a certain syntactic structure simply because he is unable to perform it in particular contexts (Kleinmann, 1978: 158). Therefore, the type of syntactic avoidance explained by Schachter and Kleinmann cannot be taken as evidence of ignorance without interference. Rather, James' suggestion appears to conform to other types of avoidance such as semantic avoidance and topic avoidance which in most cases reflect the learner's lack of lexical knowledge (Tarone et al., 1976; cf. also Corder, 1981: 105). Types of avoidance such as these "...discuss situations which deal with a learner's ignorance of some linguistic item and his concomitant nonuse thereof, which in turn is interpreted as avoidance" (Kleinmann, 1977; reprint: 365; emphasis added).

Following Schachter's conclusions, Kleinmann made CAs between English and some other languages — of which Arabic was one — for syntactic structures such as passive voice, infinitive complement and present progressive. Likewise, he predicted certain areas of difficulty for each language group. For instance, he predicted that Arab learners would experience relative difficulty with passive construction and present progressive constructions. In addition, the comprehension testing recommended by Schachter was conducted to ensure that the Arab learners did in fact comprehend the structure in question so that their nonuse could not be ascribed to ignorance but to avoidance (Kleinmann, 1978: 159). As Kleinmann's results demonstrated, the prediction was confirmed by observing that the Arab learners made significantly fewer attempts at producing, for example, the passive construction than did other language groups (Kleinmann, 1978: 162). It may also be the case that the Arab learners' avoidance of the passive construction could
not only be attributed to the structural differences between Arabic and English, but also to the extremely infrequent use of this structural device, especially in Colloquial Arabic. This suggests that even if there were crucial similarities between the Arabic and English passive-voice structure, the Arab learner might still tend to avoid that structure due to its rare use in everyday Arabic. Again, in the analysis of IL-data in Part Two, there are a number of attested interlingual identifications which are said to be a reflection of avoidance strategies in such a perspective (cf. chapter 6, section 6.2.3, examples (89-92), (96), (100)). By realizing the relative validity of CA a priori in the light of his findings, Kleinmann concluded

[...] CA is a fairly good predictor of potential cases of avoidance, although admittedly, it cannot predict when a given structure will be avoided as opposed to when it will be produced with the likelihood of error [ ] we must re-evaluate the generally unquestioned assumption that low frequency of errors implies relatively minor learner difficulty. It may be the case that errors that do not make a quantitative impression are just as or even more symptomatic of difficulty than those which do, if an avoidance strategy is operating

(Kleinmann, 1978: 165-166)

Investigation of avoidance strategies, therefore, would yield valuable insights into the potential for L1-influence since this internal mechanism cannot be entirely detected solely at a production level and, as shown above, CA a posteriori on its own is by no means the solution to the problem. Since the late 1970s Schachter's avoidance hypothesis has been central to discussion in CLI-research, and work on exploring the existence of such a phenomenon is still proliferating (cf. Kellerman, 1979). The same writer points out that the possibility of avoidance appears to increase as the learner's perception of differences between L1 and L2 increases. Perception of differences and similarities is what is meant by the learner's psychotypology, the topic of the next section. According to Kellerman the significance of language transfer and cross-linguistic analysis in current thinking is clear evidence that the question of how previous knowledge of the L1 can affect the learning, or loss, of the L2 is no longer the salted mine (Kellerman, 1983 112). The question is in fact a viable reactor which constantly receives and derives shrewd notions in order to arrive at a deeper comprehension of
the underlying learning processes. It seems that the potential for avoidance is one of the these notions which should gain a more sophisticated scrutiny. Kellerman adds:

The problem with 'avoidance', as is generally acknowledged, is that it needs to be pinned down by indirect means. Avoidance becomes 'visible' only by virtue of the relevant structure being underrepresented by one group of learners with a particular L1 in terms of other groups with different L1s or with a group of native speakers of the L2 (Kellerman, 1983: 113)

It has been mentioned at the end of the preceding section that, according to Krashen, the difficulty over the repair of syntactic processing experienced by the monitor may underlie the avoidance phenomenon. Krashen's interpretation of Schächter's study runs as follows: the Chinese and Japanese learners consciously knew correct relative-clause formation in English but had not acquired it; even though, in their fewer attempts, they utilized their L1-counterpart. The repair task was, therefore, too complex for their monitor, that is, to switch from prenominal to postnominal position. Krashen states:

Avoidance is thus predicted in cases where a rule has been consciously learned, but not acquired, when the conditions for L1-use are met, and when the L1 and L2-rules are quite different, where 'repair' by the Monitor requires difficult mental gymnastics (Krashen, 1983: 148)

Here, the author makes a slight distinction between Schächter and Kleinmann's perspectives on avoidance. Krashen argues that, according to Kleinmann, the Arab learners, for instance, consciously knew the passive construction imperfectly, that is, they did not know it well enough to process the relevant syntactic device in the L2. However, they knew the construction well enough to comprehend a mismatch between L1 and L2. As long as their monitor found such a mismatch difficult to repair, the Arab learners would resort to avoiding the construction.

It appears that, both in Schächter and Kleinmann's perspectives, the learner—or the acquirer in Krashen's terms—is consciously aware of the structure in question. This is proof enough that the avoidance phenomenon, in such a view, cannot be an example of ignorance-without-interference as James has seen it. Instead, the learner's conscious
knowledge of the structure serves as a filtering device whereby he perceives the differences between LI and L2 in Kellerman's sense. Krashen (1983, 149) summarizes the two types of avoidance in Table 5 which has been extended a little here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>At a comprehension level:</th>
<th>The performer avoids if:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schachter</td>
<td>The performer consciously knows the L2-rule well enough to make the repair</td>
<td>The repair is too difficult, i.e., it involves complex operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleinmann</td>
<td>The performer knows only enough of the L2-rule consciously to note a difference between the L1-rule and the actually (unacquired) L2-rule</td>
<td>An LI-L2 difference is noted since repair is not possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1977)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1978)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 *The Monitor and the two types of avoidance*

As a consequence, the avoidance phenomenon is indeed worth examining since Schachter's initial insight, as Kellerman (1984, 112) puts it, 'still seems unassailed.' The importance of the phenomenon, Singleton argues, arises from the fact that

> LI-influence may be operating less observably, but no less significantly, in the comprehension process and/or as a kind of preproductive filter with a tendency to allow through only those forms which are not sufficiently different from their LI-counterparts to pose major difficulties

(Singleton, 1987, 39)

As seen throughout this section, attention has been focused upon the learner who tends to avoid a specific L2-structure because he perceives the radical differences between LI and L2. This is one of the less tangible aspects of language transfer. The next section, on the
other hand, will describe how the situation where the learner perceives the relative similarities between L1 and L2 can trigger language transfer with more tangible results.

### 4.1.3 Psychotypological Constraints

The concept of psychotypology has been particularly associated with the work of Eric Kellerman and gained considerable approval in CLI-research. In a series of articles referred to elsewhere, Kellerman essentially defines the term as the learner's own perception of the relationships between L1 and L2, that is, the learner's notion of the distance, or difference (cf. Corder, 1981: 96), between rules or items in his existing knowledge of the L1 and their counterparts in a subsequent L2 he is willing to learn or acquire. Psychotypology is, therefore, one factor that plays a significant role in L2-learning in general and, depending on the magnitude of typological relatedness, may act as either a trigger or a constrainer of language transfer in particular (Kellerman, 1983: 113). The author has already suggested that when L1 and L2 are closely related (for example, L1-Italian and L2-Spanish), the potential for language transfer would have larger scope than when L1 and L2 are radically unrelated (for example, L1-Italian and L2-Chinese). The learner in the former case would have a relative opportunity to identify cognate elements across the two languages. Consequently, both positive and negative transfer would be anticipated as a natural by-product of such an opportunity to establish cross-linguistic identifications (Kellerman, 1977: 77f). On the other hand, with regard to the latter case where cognate elements across languages are absent, Kellerman points out:

> [ ] if L1 and L2 were very different [e.g. L1-Italian and L2-Chinese], the lack of available correspondences would, in the initial stages at least, act as a bar to transfer, since the learner is unable to make the necessary cross-lingual tie-ups (Kellerman, 1983: 114)

The learner's psychotypology is, then, one of the elements which potentially control the degree of transferability, that is, the probability with which a given L1-structure will be transferred in relation to other L1-structures. The crucial point here is that,
according to traditional CA, formal similarity is the key to facilitation and thus the condition for transfer to operate is minimal. Paradoxically, CLI-research holds the position that:

[...]

any occurrence of linguistic equivalence between L1 and L2, which thus provides the potential for transfer between L1 and L2, will nevertheless not guarantee that facilitation will take place, since L1-induced constraints may act to limit theoretically possible IL-forms to an attested subset.

(Kellerman, 1983: 117; emphasis added)

Kellerman's tentative proposals have given rise to several long-term empirical studies into the question of typological relatedness. In support, a conglomeration of interesting research into the effects of a L2 on a L3 has substantially demonstrated a genuine existence of the potential for language transfer within such a parameter. For instance, Ringbom and his colleagues have carried out a number of projects in Finland where Finnish and Swedish are the two official languages: Swedish-speaking Finns learn Finnish as a L2 and Finnish-speaking Finns learn Swedish as a L2. Ringbom stresses the cultural and educational homogeneity of these two groups, despite the fact that their L1s are vastly structurally different, a seemingly unique situation in the world (cf. Ringbom, 1976: 1; 1987: 2). Ringbom and other researchers such as Sjöholm (1979) have conducted a long programme of research on members of each group learning English as a L3. They pointed out that there were considerable variations between L1-influence and L2-influence upon L3-learning for both groups. Ringbom and Sjöholm found that Swedish-speaking Finns were prone to make errors in English which reflected transfer from their L1-Swedish. These researchers also observed that Finnish-speaking Finns, however, tended to make errors in English which reflected larger scope for transfer from their L2-Swedish (chronologically) than from their L1-Finnish. Ringbom and Sjöholm concluded that both groups seemed to have resorted to Swedish, the language they perceived as typologically closer to English than Finnish, even though the former (Swedish) was not the Finnish-speaking Finns' L1 (cf. Ringbom, 1985: 39f). Therefore, in the precise nature of this relationship, the formal similarities between Swedish and English —both are Germanic languages— acted as a trigger of language transfer; whereas the radical differences between Finnish and English proved to be a constrainer of language transfer. Consequently, Swedish —whether it be the L1 or the L2— becomes a source of CLI on learner English (L3)
identifiable in cross-lingual tie-ups at particular linguistic levels.

According to this view, if an Arab learner—who has a certain degree of proficiency in, for example, French as a L2—happens to learn English as a L3, then, upon communicating in English, he would be more prone to proactive transfer from L2-French to L3-English than from L1-Arabic to L3-English, due to his perception of the typological relatedness between French and English. Naturally, the magnitude of this type of transfer correlates with the degree of proficiency the learner attains in the L2 chronologically (French), that is, the larger the degree of proficiency in the L2, the greater the magnitude of proactive interference from the L2 to L3 that will occur. This can be observed within the phonological domain in the first place. For example, the first vowel of the French word 'lettres' is articulated as a slightly long monophthong /e/ as in /le trə/, whereas the same vowel of the English counterpart 'letters' is articulated as a shorter monophthong /e/ between the half-open and half-closed positions as in /letəz/ in RP. Therefore, upon performing such an item in L3-English, the learner in question tends to modify it in the direction of L2-French as in *[le tarz] (AE). However, this does not entirely constrain proactive transfer from L1-Arabic which can be seen on two levels: a direct level where transfer operates directly from L1 onto L2, and an indirect level where the effects of transfer from L1 onto L2 appear to be activated upon producing the same identification in the L3.

Along the first level, the learner seems to positively transfer the long vowel [e] and the more-than-one-glide consonant [r] from L1-SCA onto L2-French. This appears the case that the diphthong [ay] as in [bayt] 'a house' in MSA is usually rendered into [e.] as in [be t] in SCA, and the consonant [r] is always pronounced even in clusters like [-tr-] as in [bitri d] 'you want' in SCA (for a detailed analysis of [r] and [e.], cf. chapter 6, section 6.1.1, sub-section (E) and section 6.1.2, sub-section (A) respectively). With regard to the second level, the learner negatively transfers the Franco-Arabicized interlingual identifications of [e] and [r] onto L3-English due to the learner's opportunity to make the relevant cross-lingual tie-ups between L2-French and L3-English.

On the other hand, examples of cross-lingual tie-ups in such a perspective can also take place in retroactive transfer, that is, transfer from L3-English to L2-French. For instance, the second syllable of the English word 'Hebrew' is articulated with a back-close-long vowel...
/u/ as in /hi·bru/, whereas the same syllable of the French counterpart 'Hebreu' is articulated with an open-rounded-long vowel /œ/ as in /brœ/. Thus, upon performing such an item in L2-French, the articulation */i bru/ (AE) was the resultant identification. Again, even in examples of retroactive transfer such as this, L1-influence can also be observed on the two levels referred to above: direct, from L1 onto L3, and indirect, from the effects of L1-L3 transfer onto the L2. Hence, at one end, the syllable [bru] (two-segment cluster followed by a vowel) as in [əabr] 'let (pl) him cross/pass' and [dabr] 'manage (pl) him' was positively transferred from L1-SCA onto L3-English. At another, the Anglo-Arabicized interlingual identification of [·bru] was negatively transferred onto L2-French due to the relevant cross-lingual tie-ups between L3-English and L2-French.

It follows from the above that language transfer appears to be more likely when there is what Wode has called a 'crucial similarity measure' between L1 and L2. The author argues that certain types of interlingual errors do not occur at any developmental stages of the English ILs of German-speaking learners. Rather, for an interlingual error to occur, L1-structure and L2-structure should meet a crucial similarity measure at certain stages of development (Wode, 1978 116). Wode's data come from his German-speaking children learning English as a L2. For instance, negation in English is pre-verbal as in 'I don't know', and in German it is post-verbal as in 'Ich weiss nicht'. Wode has observed examples of post-verbal negation in his children's ILs such as (2) below.

(2) *John go not to the school

Wode points out that the IL-negation rule was in no way similar to the L1-counterpart at early stages, but it became similar when his children progressed to the acquisition of the [Auxiliary + Negative] rule at later stages. Thus, language transfer only operated when there was a crucial similarity between L1 and L2-structures perceived by the learner at certain stages of development. Although Wode's data are reported from children, developmentally interlingual identifications such as (2) above cannot be restricted to children since the same negation structure is also discernible in the English ILs of adult learners (cf Wode, 1984 166).

Other researchers such as Zobl appear to have taken a rather similar
line of research. As mentioned earlier, Zobl defines *relexification* as a transfer strategy adopted by the learner (cf. section 4.1.1). He distinguishes this type of transfer from *structural transfer* which has to be developmentalized if it is to provide the analyst with any fruitful insights. Structural transfer, Zoble states

[... is developmentally selective [i.e.] the learner must previously have acquired certain crucial structural knowledge about the L2 before it can arise. It is also probably unconscious, forming an integral part of the learner's mental representation of an L2-structure]

(Zobl, 1980a, 471, a footnote, emphasis added)

Zobl's studies have been conducted on certain English IL-structures produced by learners with different L1s. One of these structures is the negation structure recorded from the English ILs of Spanish-speaking learners. In Spanish, negation formation is preverbal. Thus the resultant IL-structures reflected specific distributions such as (3) below

(3) *The glass no will break*

Similarly, Zobl points out that where there is a crucial concatenation between CLI and developmental realization in the learner's focus of attention, then LI-retardation may function in the resultant IL-structures which in turn "show a tendency towards fossilization" (Zobl, 1980a, 477). As has been mentioned earlier, Dulay and Burt identified IL-structures similar to the above example (3) as ambiguous goofs *'I no have a car' (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2.4, example (8)). On the other hand, Zobl argues that "influence from Spanish is unmistakable once these utterances are seen as part of the entire developmental pattern" (Zobl, 1980a, 471). Accordingly, the preverbal-negation IL-structures produced by the Spaniard could be regarded as both developmental and interlingual errors simultaneously.

What the above scholars collectively emphasize is that the occurrence of language transfer is not random but systematic, a point that has been made by Wode (1986) as referred to earlier (cf. chapter 3, section 3.3). Thus, for language transfer potential to be activated, certain conditions which essentially pertain to the learner's psychotypology have to be met. However, the notion of psychotypology is not only restricted to merely linguistic skills by which the learner
perceives cross-linguistic relations, but it also exceeds that scope to be concomitant with other metacognitive skills, which provide natural and efficient feedback to the mechanisms of learning. In this respect, Kellerman points out "The development of a psychotypology will inevitably be fostered by the possession and development of metacognitive skills [ ] under which may be subsumed metalinguistic awareness" (Kellerman, 1983 116, emphasis added) The author restates Marshall and Morton (1978 228) by stressing such metalinguistic awareness as a significant source of linguistic monitoring, control, and repair which affect the process of language learning/acquisition (cf Krashen, section 4.1.1).

It seems, therefore, that the notion of psychotypology has already inherently inspired Schachter and Kleinmann's empirical findings as discussed in the previous section. In such a perspective, the Arab learner, for instance, committed a considerable number of interlingual errors on relative-clause formation because he perceived the structural similarity, or more specifically, crucial similarity measure between English and Arabic relative clauses with the result that, at certain stages, he had an opportunity to make the necessary cross-lingual tie-ups. Conversely, the Arab learner tended to avoid the passive construction—in Kleinmann's data—because he perceived the radical differences (or there was no crucial similarity measure to be perceived) between English and Arabic in that structure. Although the interlingual errors which appeared with the former structure (relative clause) were greater in number, cross-linguistic similarities did in no way preclude the Arab learner from producing the structure in his English IL; and, in this case, the learner's psychotypology was a 'visible' trigger of language transfer in production. With regard to the avoidance of the passive construction, on the other hand, transfer effects could only be detected at a comprehension level as an 'invisible' precondition for such a strategy. Consequently, it is the similarities and lack of similarities—rather than differences— which concretely activate and constrain language transfer respectively. Such issues seem to steal the limelight in current thinking about CLI. Ringbom adds

In particular, the importance of perceived linguistic similarities should be discussed in terms of the learning processes. The question of whether or the extent to which cross-linguistic similarities facilitate L2-learning is of great practical and theoretical interest, but it should be discussed in terms of what is known about how the learning processes are affected by
similarities or the lack of similarities
(Ringbom, 1987 134, original emphasis)

It is worth noting, here, that the above statement, especially concerning similarities and lack of similarities has been more recently emphasized by the same author (cf. Ringbom, 1990) Perceived similarity between L1 and L2 is, therefore, an internal factor which plays a very significant role in how the learner processes the L2-material at both levels production and comprehension. The next section will consider CLI on production and comprehension, and will probe the interaction between the two processes.

4.2 CLI and Aspects of Language Process

Knowledge of the L2 is what determines the learner's degree of proficiency at all linguistic levels phonology, syntax and semantics (lexis). Such knowledge is a total system formulated out of these levels, each including a number of subsystems that exist in the learner's repertoire and enable him to process the language both in production and comprehension. Ringbom identifies the main distinction between these two processes as follows: "comprehension refers to the learner's ability to process incoming data, relating to previous knowledge structures, whereas production means ability to activate knowledge structures without a direct linguistic stimulus from outside" (Ringbom, 1987 36, emphasis added).

In this section CLI on production and then on comprehension will be outlined in terms of the main aspects reviewed in the first section of this chapter (section 4.1). Next, by reference to the questions of language transfer which concern the magnitude of CLI, the interaction between comprehension and production will be considered.

4.2.1 CLI on L2-Production

It is widely accepted that L2-learners who have different L1 backgrounds and learn the same L2 produce IL-utterances in completely different ways due to the structural differences between these L1s (and, therefore, to the relative variations in the degrees of difference.
between these L1s and the L2) as well as to the natural individual variations among L2-learners. This can be observed when, for example, an Indian, a Japanese, a Russian, an Italian, an Arab and so on happen to learn English as a common L2. Such learners behave differently even if they attain more or less the same level of L2-proficiency, that is, the same linguistic knowledge underlying their ILs. As mentioned elsewhere, there are countless variables which interact and play a part in determining the differences in linguistic behaviour in general. With respect to the use of language transfer, Wode (1986) identifies such differences, even among L2-learners sharing the same L1 along three dimensions: individual variation, situational variation, and developmental variation (cf chapter 3, section 3.3). However, in CLI-research Ringbom points out:

Inevitably the differences in the linguistic products of L2-learners must be largely due to the different starting points they have the way in which their L1 influences L2-learning. But L1-influence can manifest itself in many ways, depending to a great extent on whether and how various perceived similarities affect the learning process. (Ringbom, 1987:50, emphasis added)

At a production level, Ringbom makes a distinction between overt and covert CLI. Essentially, overt CLI is based on the learner's perception of cross-linguistic similarity between L1 and L2, whereas covert CLI is due to the learner's lack of perceived cross-linguistic similarity (Ringbom, 1987:50). For the distinction between overt and covert CLI, Ringbom refers to a similar distinction made by Kean between 'short-sighted transfer' and 'blind transfer' respectively. In her application of Chomsky's (1981) recent ideas on universal grammar to the analysis of transfer, Kean argues that these two types are the potential for two sources of transfer. Blind transfer refers to the learner's failure "to take cognizance of some relevant property of the [L2] which is at variance with the [L1], and so [he] is only capable of exploiting [L1] knowledge when the linguistic exigencies demand exploitation of that property" (Kean, 1986:87, emphasis added). Here, there is no cross-linguistic similarity perceived and the resultant transfer product would be an example of covert CLI, so that the learner is forced to exploit his L1-knowledge in order to compensate for L2-limitations (cf Newmark and Reibel, section 4.2.1). Short-sighted transfer, on the other hand," arises not through failure to note some property of the [L2], but rather an inability to (fully) make the necessary distinction between the [L1] realization of the property and
the [L2-realization]" (Kean, 1986 87) Therefore, the resultant transfer product, in this case, would be an example of overt CLI, since perceived cross-linguistic similarity, or markedness considerations, plays a significant role.

With regard to overt CLI, Ringbom argues that all cross-linguistic examples cited by Faerch and Kasper (1987) are examples of overt CLI. The three languages (Danish, English and German), which these researchers are concerned with, are such closely related languages in that the transfer-based utterances produced are due to overtly perceived cross-linguistic similarity (cf Ringbom, 1987 51). According to Ringbom, overt CLI can be divided into two types: transfer and borrowing. For the first type, Ringbom expounds the term transfer as follows:

Transfer does not mean a carrying over of surface forms or unanalysed chunks from LI to L2, but involves an analysis of patterns. The L2-pattern is assumed to be similar to or identical with the L1-pattern. L1-procedures may, however, be used either on their own or in conjunction with L2-procedures. In the area of lexis, semantic extensions on the basis of L1 and loan translations are examples of transfer deriving from such analysed knowledge. Transfer, reliance on L1-patterns which are assumed to be similar in L2, is one way in which the learner tries to cope with a gap of knowledge.

(Ringbom, 1987 51-52, emphasis added)

Inherent in Ringbom's argument is the distinction between analytic knowledge and manipulative knowledge made by James (1971) with reference to Newmark and Reibel's ignorance hypothesis (cf section 4 1 1). It has been mentioned earlier that certain L2-items or rules remain for an unknown period of time as part of the learner's pure linguistic knowledge (unanalysed) on the one hand, and as being the new concomitants of their already existing L1-counterparts in the LLS on the other. This can only be understood at a reception level (cf chapter 3, section 3 2 3). Therefore, as linguistic exigencies require the learner to produce such L2-items or rules, the linguistic knowledge underlying the resultant IL-utterances becomes a type of non-pure knowledge (analysed) belonging to the LPS. It follows that, in the domain of lexical selection in particular, any transfer-based IL-utterances produced overtly by Arab learners can in no way be viewed as a result of unanalysed L1-knowledge due to the total unrelatedness, and therefore the absence of cognate
elements, between Arabic and English. Thus, in the case of borrowing in the sense discussed here, Arabic transfer, if it operates at all, is extremely rare (this point will be explained presently).

The second type of overt CLI concerns the phenomenon of borrowing as referred to earlier (cf. section 4.1.1). Corder (1983) argues that Newmark and Reibel's notion of gap-filling could be considered, at best, as borrowing which, in its most extreme form, is referred to by Zobl (1980a) as relexification. Borrowing is, therefore, a phenomenon manifesting itself only in the domain of lexis. According to Ringbom, borrowing "... may result not from a gap in knowledge, but from inadequate control" (Ringbom, 1987, 52).

It appears that, unlike transfer which reflects analysed L1-knowledge, borrowing is due to unanalysed L1-knowledge. Such a phenomenon may well occur when the L1 and L2 are closely related (for example, L1-Swedish and L2-English), especially in types of borrowing such as complete language shift, or in intermediate forms between transfer and borrowing such as hybrids, blends, relexifications, and false friends (cf. Ringbom, 1987, 112f). For example,

(4) a. I fikk a job last week (Sw fikk = got) (p 149)  
b. . two asks a day (Sw ask = packet) (p 153)  
c. a big inkomst (Sw inkomst = income) (p 155)  
d. As a barn I was (Sw barn = child) (p 156)

However, in the case of L1-Arabic and L2-English which are totally unrelated, examples of borrowing such as (4a-d) will hardly occur at all due to the absence of cognate elements as mentioned above. Hence, upon communicating with native speakers of English, no Arab learner tends to produce examples such as (5a-d) below by means of what can be called pseudo-relexification, that is, a carrying over of the L1-surface forms of lexical items unanalysed as in the following examples:

(5) a. I [rihīt] to college (SCA [rihīt] = went)  
b. I went [ʔal] college (SCA [ʔal] = to the)  
c. I went to [l'kiliyye] (SCA [l'kiliyye] = the college)  
d. and borrowed two [kta bs] (SCA [kta b] = book)

Because aspects of linguistic relatedness, such as cognate elements, between Arabic and English are absent (Semitic versus Germanic), it is difficult to envisage examples like (5a-d) as actually occurring though they may appear in such cases as slips, jokes and the like. Pseudo-relexification may also occur in retroactive borrowing due to
environmentally imposed intrusion (cf. chapter 3, section 3 1 2, example (3a))) Moreover, a carrying over of the surface forms of L1-items unanalysed may take place in some phonological interlingual identifications. These will be referred to in the discussion of the IL-data where appropriate (cf. chapter 6, section 6 1) It follows that in the domain of lexis, this type of transfer is extremely rare; so that all of the L1-items in (5a-d) which reflect unanalysed L1-knowledge are only imaginable. However, in the domain of syntax, it is quite possible for a certain rule of L1-grammar to be transferred onto the Arab learner's IL without being analysed. For example

(6) * I went to the college (AE)

As the above actual example illustrates, the article 'the' reflects a particular L1-item [-1-] 'the' as in (5b-c) Clearly, from a lexical point of view, the L1-based L2-item 'the' in (6), as opposed to the pure L1-item [-1-] in (5b-c), is not carried over as unanalysed L1-knowledge, but rather somewhat transferred or 'translated' as an analysed lexical item. What seems to be carried over as unanalysed L1-knowledge is, then, the grammatical function of the definite article [al] which is the MSA-form of [-1-] in (5b-c) Therefore, it is the syntactic conceptualization of [al]—not its lexical representation—that caused the Arab learner to 'define' the noun 'college' in (6) Consequently, two types of L1-knowledge seem to underlie the resultant L1-based L2-item 'the': analysed lexical knowledge and unanalysed syntactic knowledge (cf chapter 6, section 6 2 2 for a detailed analysis of articles)

So far the two types of overt CLI have been considered. With regard to covert CLI, on the other hand, Ringbom stresses that this type does not seem to be recognized by researchers of today. Analogous with Kean's notion of blind transfer, covert CLI, Ringbom states

[ ] means that L1-based procedures are used to compensate for gaps of L2-knowledge. The learner's underlying knowledge remains unanalysed in the sense that it has not been placed in relation to L2 because of the lack of a common reference frame. The speaker/writer needs fairly thorough mastery of the structural details of L2. Mere learning of a number of basic lexical items works only to a very limited extent. The learner also has to cope with the demands of giving these items their proper forms and, hence, indicate their syntactic relationships accurately [ ] Covert CLI is thus relevant to the problem of avoidance [ ]

(Ringbom, 1987 51, emphasis added)
It should be noted, however, that if one accepts such a relationship between covert CLI and avoidance strategies as discussed by Schachter and Kleinmann (cf section 4.1.2), then 'gaps of L2-knowledge', especially in the syntax of the avoided structure, should not be conceived as a reflection of the learner's ignorance of that structure. Rather, since covert CLI is due to lack of perceived similarity, phenomena such as avoidance are only a result of inadequate control. Finally, Ringbom, in Figure 8 below, summarizes the different types of CLI as discussed in the process of production.

**Figure 8: CLI in L2-Production**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Covert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL-similarity perceived</td>
<td>No CL-similarity perceived, unanalysed knowledge as far as relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Perceived L1-L2 similarity of patterns, knowledge-based procedures used to fill gaps of knowledge,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>analysed knowledge reflects lack of control rather than lack of knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.2 CLI on L2-Comprehension

As mentioned at the outset of the preceding section, learners with different L1s, learning a common L2, produce their ILs differently. Again, there are considerable differences in learning to process a L2 at a comprehension level. A group of learners sharing the same L1 and having no prior knowledge of any language other than their L1 will ostensibly vary in their comprehension strategies if each one is learning a different L2. In the light of what precedes, differences in L2-comprehension are primarily determined by the existence or
non-existence of cross-linguistic similarities between L1 and L2. The learner of a closely related L2 previously knows in large measure about this L2 such as the linguistic categories and functions in addition to the extensive potential for L2-vocabulary, so that he has great opportunities to make the relevant cross-lingual tie-ups even at the early stages of learning (cf Ringbom, 1987:53).

As the degree of L2-comprehension correlates with the speed of L2-learning/acquisition and the differences in both depend on the so-called language distance, the heuristic and facilitative role of the L1 can be stressed within this formulation. Corder writes:

The more distant linguistically from the [L1] the longer a [L2] takes to learn. This can be explained simply by saying that the more similar [L1] and [L2] the greater help the [L1] can give in acquiring the [L2]. The less similar, the less help it can give. [ ] failure to facilitate is by no means the same thing as inhibition or interference. Where languages are distantly related there is no inhibition, simply little facilitation, which is not at all the same thing.

(Corder, 1983:88, emphasis added)

Therefore, in the case of learning a closely related L2 even from the start, CLI-research rests on the facilitating effects of the L1 on L2-comprehension. Since the use of the L1 may act as an utterance initiator in Krashen's terms (cf section 4.1.1), L1-influence in L2-comprehension can be observed in the learner's attempt or attempts to interpret incoming L2-utterances by recourse to his L1-knowledge (cf Faerch and Kasper, 1987:6). On the other hand, in the case of learning a totally unrelated L2 (L1-Arabic and L2-English), the facilitative role of the L1 is not always guaranteeable, particularly at the early stages of L2-learning. In such a case, the beginning learner— unlike the learner whose L1 is closely related to the L2— does not possess the extensive L2-knowledge referred to above and, therefore, he is not in a position to comprehend cross-linguistic similarities, where they exist, between L1 and L2. In Ringbom's words,

If we deal with the learning of a totally unrelated L2 [ ], mastering grammar even for receptive use becomes an important problem for the beginning learner. He will find it difficult to establish over-simplified one-to-one equivalences between lexical items when he cannot rely on finding the same grammatical categories in the L2 as in his L1. Above all, the understanding of the meanings and functions of high frequency words such as articles, prepositions and pronouns becomes a task of some complexity, since it forces the learner to try and make sense of a
linguistic reality quite foreign to the linguistic organization with which he is familiar

(Ringbom, 1987 55, emphasis added)

However, this does not imply that cross-linguistic similarities between unrelated languages are entirely absent. Rather, the potential for such similarities exists between any pair of languages but the degree of cross-linguistic similarity varies from one pair to another. Therefore, for a learner of a totally unrelated L2 to perceive cross-linguistic similarities, a certain degree of L2-knowledge should exist in his linguistic repertoire in addition to his already existing L1-knowledge (this point will be discussed presently)

Researchers like Winitz and Reeds believe that totally unrelated languages are easier to learn than closely related languages. "We believe that the more the two languages differ in structure the more rapid the acquisition of the [L2]" (Winitz and Reeds, 1975 69, quoted by Ringbom, 1987 56) Ringbom's critical account of their statement runs as follows ideally, if the purpose of L2-learning is to attain native-like competence in the L2, then Winitz and Reed's claim is somewhat verifiable. However, even in the case of bilinguals, perfect bilingualism where L1-competence and L2-competence are equal is extremely rare (cf. chapter 1, section 112) Further, if the learner had really possessed native-like competence, then his stages of development would have subsumed that cross-linguistic L1-L2 similarities were either of no significance at all or they might have predominantly negative effects on the learning process. In both cases, the facilitative role of the L1 seems to be disregarded and the so-called negative effects of L1-influence could easily be eradicated (cf Ringbom, 1987: 57) What is quite reasonable to assume is that both related and unrelated L2s present their own learning problems. The efficiency of learning these two types of L2s, therefore, depends primarily on the goal of language learning. If the goal is intentionally the bare bones of communication, then, in this case, the learning of a related L2 would be more helpful than the learning of an unrelated L2. For example, when a tourist knowing some lexical items such as 'where' and 'bus-station' juxtaposes them in the IL-question (7a) below, instead of producing a well-formed utterance such as (7b):

(7) a. *Where bus-station?
   b Excuse me, could you tell me where the bus-station is?
If, however, the goal of language learning is what can be called grammatical correctness, then neither type would appear to be more efficient than the other (cf Ringbom, 1987 67-68, footnote 11) Hence, a reconsideration of Winitz and dreeds' statement has been made by Ringbom as follows:

[ ] to focus exclusively on the last stage of learning [ ] is [ ] to give a grossly misleading picture of what language learning really is about. The earlier stages of productive competence as well as the development of receptive competence (and its influence on productive competence) must be considered. What is perfectly possible, and even probable, however, is that knowledge of a related language may be more easily fossilized at a stage where communication generally works, compared with the learning of an unrelated language, where the learner is used to putting a great deal of effort into learning [ ]

(Ringbom, 1987 57, emphasis added)

Within the view that the learner of an unrelated L2 makes a greater effort to arrive at a fairly acceptable level of L2-proficiency, the learning of an unrelated L2 (such as an Arabic speaker learning English) should be emphasized as the principal concern in the current study. Thus, in order to give more balanced decisions on the value of language transfer, the learner in question is to be viewed as passing through a particular stage (or stages) of L2-learning, that is, development (cf Wode and Zobl, section 4 1 3). In other words, the learner of an unrelated L2 who learns its grammatical rudiments such as linguistic categories and their functions and potentially possesses a wide range of its vocabulary would have a greater opportunity to comprehend cross-linguistic similarities, where there are, between L1 and L2 and to make use of his L1 as a dynamic reference frame, so that positive as well as negative transfer would be anticipated. It follows that cross-linguistic similarities can occur between typologically unrelated pair of languages such as Arabic and English, since, as Corder puts it "It is possible that languages which are unrelated may resemble each other in respect of some features of their systematic structure, whilst genetically related languages may differ quite markedly in the same features" (Corder, 1973 227)

In the domain of syntax, for instance, Schachter's data demonstrated that the Arab learner had fairly acceptable knowledge of the English structural devices (cf section 4 1 2). Such knowledge seems to have acted as the inherent preconditions which enabled him to make the
relevant cross-lingual tie-ups between Arabic and English relative-clause formation. Had the Arab learner not perceived the crucial cross-linguistic similarity (that is, the postnominal position in both languages), he would not have attempted to produce the relatively large number of relative clauses which, in most cases, reflected negative transfer from Arabic in relation to pronominalization (cf Schachter, 1974, reprint 359). For example

(8) *The time I spent it in practice

Therefore, the Arab learner's attempts to produce the structure in question reflected nothing more than a certain degree of knowledge of L2-syntax, and, thus, his perception (comprehension) of cross-linguistic similarity between L1 and L2 was the underlying precondition.

In the domain of lexis, which is classified under semantics in the current study, the Arab learner should, in addition to his syntactic knowledge, internalize the necessary potential for L2-vocabulary at a comprehension level in order to activate the L1-semantic extensions or idiosyncracies when producing IL-utterances. In this respect, such IL-utterances are said to be an attested reflection of L1-based L2-lexical items whose knowledge seems to be the strongest trigger of positive transfer. Therefore, the knowledge of certain L2-vocabulary is a must for the Arab learner; otherwise language transfer in the domain of lexis would be far more complex to investigate (cf chapter 5, section 5.3.3, examples (7-9) for an analysis of lexical selection).

It appears the case that the learner of a totally unrelated L2 who possesses the L2-linguistic knowledge referred to above coincides with the learner of a closely related L2 in that both of them are able to perceive the crosslinguistic similarity, where there is similarity, between what they know about the L2 and what they already know about the L1. From this point of view, the Arab learner of English, the Syrian learner specifically, is the focus of attention in the present study (cf chapter 5, section 5.1). Perceived cross-linguistic similarity is, therefore, one of the most significant aspects in L2-comprehension as well as in L2-production. As the analysis of IL-data in Part Two will illustrate, although perceived cross-linguistic similarity can be a
relevant precondition for language transfer, such an important aspect, however, is not always a trigger of positive transfer. In Ringbom's words:

[...] it seems that when perceived similarities to the L1 lie behind the influence of the L1 — i.e. when it is a question of overt cross-linguistic influence — there is, in principle, as much corresponding positive transfer as negative transfer. Covert cross-linguistic influence, on the other hand, is entirely negative, since the underlying cause here is that no similarity between L1 and L2 has been perceived, and the L1-procedures have been used because no L2-procedures were available.

(Ringbom, 1987: 59)

In the next section, the interaction between L2-comprehension and L2-production as a much more complicated process will be considered by reference to the important questions raised in current thinking. Such questions concern the amount of CLI on both processes for a deeper understanding of transfer mechanisms. Since the present study is concerned with the oral English ILs a group of Syrian learners, the terms 'speaker' and 'listener' will be restricted to production and comprehension respectively.

4.2.3 The Interaction between Comprehension and Production

It has been mentioned at the outset of section (4.2) that the main distinction between comprehension and production is that comprehension refers to data-based processing, whereas production involves self-activated mechanisms. It follows that the learner, in production, is required to make a greater effort and to keep, in larger scale, control of linguistic procedures because the speaker "not only has to activate the impulses himself but also has to make a definite choice between a number of activated items and between different forms of the same item" (Ringbom, 1987: 62).

Swain (1982), for instance, argues that the speaker often encounters problems which are primarily due to the insufficient L2-knowledge he has at his disposal, so that, in such a case, he has to develop a number of alternative strategies where there is communication breakdown in order to cope with the situation. In her argument about
language process at a production level, Swain suggests that the output may force the speaker to move from semantic processing to syntactic processing. Thus, the speaker is as concerned with the meaning of content words as he is with their formal features. Further, the speaker, upon using the language, has a chance to test out a variety of hypotheses about the different linguistic levels of the L2 (cf. Ellis, 1985: 159).

The learner in comprehension, on the other hand, is required to make a relatively less effort, since the listener can process the language—as produced by the speaker—simply in terms of attending to the meaning of content words without paying much attention to formal details. However, perceived cross-linguistic similarities as well as lack of similarities are more significant for comprehension than for production. This is due to the fact that similarities between incoming data (input) and already existing knowledge structures are more tangible than similarities between the existing knowledge structures themselves. Ringbom adds:

Existing knowledge structures are more easily activated by the linguistic cues of incoming data if similarities, cross-linguistic or intralinguistic, can be perceived by the learner. Lack of linguistic similarity means that the learner has to rely on extra-linguistic cues for inferencing, but if he can perceive cross-linguistic similarities at different linguistic levels this will facilitate comprehension, even if this comprehension is often only approximate, and occasionally even incorrect.

(Ringbom, 1987: 136; emphasis added)

As discussed in the previous chapter, it is relatively plausible, at a production level, to test the value of transfer effects by comparing the learner's IL-utterances with their well-formed L2-counterparts. Thus, leading one to make conclusive statements about positive and negative transfer on the basis of the linguistic convergence and divergence respectively when specified between IL-identifications and L2-well-formedness (cf. chapter 3, sections 3.1.3 and 3.2.3). However, one of the highly complex tasks is to precisely pinpoint where or how positive transfer mechanisms have operated in L2-comprehension or L2-production. For this reason, Ringbom restates Faerch and Kasper (1987) by posing the two important questions which concern the magnitude of CLI; that is, the transfer load:
(a) How much of the learner's automatized L1-knowledge can be usefully employed by extending it to L2-learning? Or phrased in a different way, when do L1-based procedures actually work in L2-comprehension and L2-production?

and

(b) How much of the learner's controlled effort is needed to free himself from the constraints of the L1, where there are constraints?

(Quoted by Ringbom, 1978 59)

In her adaptation of Levine's (1975 271) hypothesis theory, Schachter suggests that transfer is not in, and of, itself a process, but rather it is more appropriately viewed as both a facilitating and an inhibiting condition on the learner's hypothesis testing process (Schachter, 1983 98). Thus transfer, in the case of inhibition (cf. Question (b) above), is in fact a constraint imposed by the learner's already existing knowledge on a more general process, that is, inferencing. In Schachter's words, "The learner infers from previous knowledge [which includes L1-knowledge] the domain within the universe from which the solution to the current L2 problem will be taken. Then, the learner samples hypotheses from that domain" (Schachter, 1983: 103).

As has been mentioned earlier, the ultimate aim of the CA-Hypothesis was to identify learning difficulty on the basis of linguistic differences and to help the learner overcome such difficulty. Although the behaviouristic paradigms with which CA was bound up were relinquished, this ultimate aim seems to remain unchanged. It is, therefore, the approach to the identification of learning problems (and subsequently the approach to pedagogical tactics) that have been entirely reconsidered, whereas the aim which has rested on the part of the learner is still set up, albeit in a new perspective, by researchers of today, and the two questions above are clear evidence of that aim. However, because traditional CA-based research concentrated on the negative effects of L1-influence, the aim was, in fact, set up solely in terms of Question (b). Again, despite the leading contributions of IL-specialists towards the investigation of language processing at both levels (comprehension/production) and towards the facilitative role of the L1, most of the empirical findings of transfer researchers, especially those reviewed throughout this chapter, have also been carried out in terms of Question (b), that is, they emphasized the negative constraints of the L1 without paying much attention to the facilitating triggers (positive transfer).
As far as the linguistic subcomponents are concerned, Ringbom argues that while Question (b) may well be the more important of the two questions for phonology and pragmatics, Question (a) appears to be the more relevant for syntax and lexis. In other words, the facilitative effects of automatized L1-knowledge is more readily explicable in terms of grammar and lexis than in terms of phonology and pragmatics. In grammar and lexis, the learner's effort is fraught with considerable difficulty in processing the L2 (comprehension and production). In such a case, the learner has a large number of opportunities to establish simplified cross-linguistic equivalences between L1 and L2. As learning proceeds and progresses and the underlying knowledge of his IL becomes quite extensive, linguistic reconsiderations start with modifying such equivalences in the direction of the standard norm of the L2 (Ringbom, 1987: 60). In this context, Swan states:

> When we set out to learn a new language, we automatically assume (until we have evidence to the contrary) that meanings and structures are going to be broadly similar to those in our own language. The strategy does not always work, of course — that is why languages are different to learn — and it breaks down quite often with languages unrelated to our own. But on balance this kind of 'equivalence assumption' puts us ahead of the game [ . ]

(Swan, 1985: 85f, quoted by Ringbom, 1987: 68, footnote 12)

In phonology and pragmatics, on the other hand, the learner's task seems to be less exhausting, particularly in acquiring what Ringbom calls a superficial receptive competence which is the least required achievement in these areas. However, although the learning of a closed system such as phonology is less difficult, this superficial receptive competence is insufficient for Arab learners specifically. For instance, even at advanced stages of learning most Arab learners tend to pronounce the strong form of one-syllable words such as 'can', 'have', 'was', 'and' and so on for all phonological identifications in connected speech. Such a tendency may create pragmatic problems at a comprehension level because the Arab listener, in this case, assumes that even the native speaker, his interlocutor, has a 'permanent' tendency towards the strong form upon producing one-syllable words. For example:

(9) You can't have wars without killing (AU)
The learner's well observable 'permanent' tendency to produce 'can' as /kæn/ (strong form) rather than /ken/ (weak form) may cause him to receive the negative form 'can't' in (9) as the affirmative and strong form /kæn/ even if such an utterance is actually produced by a native speaker of English (cf chapter 6, section 6.1.2, sub-section (F) for a detailed analysis of this example as an attestedly received IL-identification). Phonological aspects such as these reflect highly automatized LI-identifications which are in many respects unnoticeable not only by learners, but also by analysts. Thus, such a phonological pragmatic aspect will be prone to fossilization of no proper effort is made. Ringbom adds

[ ] the learner's real problems lie in the development of his own ability to use the phonological and pragmatic systems underlying L2-production. The highly automatized LI-systems in these areas are not changed or modified for actual productive use without considerable controlled effort.

(Ringbom, 1987:60; emphasis added)

In the light of the above two questions which concern the amount of CLI, Ringbom assumes that comprehension generally precedes production in the learning process. This assumption is not very recent in itself. It even dates back to behaviourists who, within the constructs of habit-formation theory, proposed this order as one of the direct analogies drawn between L1 and L2-acquisition "understanding always precedes speaking" (cf. Stern (1970), chapter 1, section 1.2.2). Therefore, the general order (comprehension/production) seems to be constant and even in some examples which occur in the domain of cognate vocabulary, this general order remains unchanged. However, Ringbom argues that an exception may be constituted by some cognate words in the learner's potential vocabulary. For instance, the Swedish learner of English who perceives the cross-linguistic similarities between Swedish and English words such as 'hat-hate', 'stat-state', may produce the English word 'rate' for the Swedish word 'rat' before he has come across 'rate' (Ringbom, 1987:62). It is believed that this particular instance does not seem to be an exception to the general order as stated by Ringbom. It is quite possible that the Swedish learner may produce the English word 'rate' before he has received it, but his previous perception of cross-linguistic correspondences between pairs of cognate words such as 'hat-hate', 'stat-state' may well act as a precondition which causes him to apply the principle of analogy at a comprehension level; that is, an
analogy between already perceived L1-L2 pairs of cognate words and the new L1-L2 pairs of which the L1-words, at least, already exist in the learner's linguistic repertoire. After all, if it is allowed to isolate L1-comprehension from L2-comprehension, then the order for this particular case would be (L1-comprehension ----> analogy ----> L2-production). Nevertheless, whether it be an exception to the general order or not, this kind of psycholinguistic self-activation may very well contribute to effective learning.

It has been mentioned in the previous section that the learner of an unrelated L2 who knows a good deal about the L2 can be equated with the learner of a related L2 in that both learners are able to perceive cross-linguistic similarities where there are crucial similarities between L1 and L2. Therefore, most of the insights into CLI reviewed in this chapter can be applied to the Arab learner in question. By reference to Ringbom's (1990) lecture, the relationship between comprehension and production can be summarized in the following points:

(i) In comprehension, most of the simplified cross-linguistic equivalences between L1 and L2-items which have been established by the learner are legitimate, though they should be modified at later stages. However, in production, L1-based L2-items may not be available to the same extent, because of the usual gap between comprehension and production.

(ii) When the learner encounters problems in comprehension, he makes use of inferencing, where L1-knowledge often provides successful cues. In production, L1-strategies may compensate for gaps in L2-knowledge but to a lesser extent than inferencing does in comprehension.

(iii) The crucial congruence of syntactic structures (cf. the Arab learner's attempts to produce the relative-clause structure in Schachter's data) allows the learner to adopt a meaning-oriented approach to comprehension. Such an approach can be well applied to the use of L1-based L2-lexical items (cf. chapter 5, section 5.3.3, examples(7-9)) without a great measure of precaution taken about syntactic relations, since these lexical items are easily recognizable and their contexts do not normally impede...
communication. However, formal accuracy (syntax) is much more important for production. Syntactic representations in production cause greater problems for all learners than in comprehension.

(iv) In comprehension, some linguistic aspects of the L1 can be incorporated into the learner's potential L2-knowledge without much learning effort being involved. In production, the potential for L1-knowledge does not aid to the same extent, since L1-L2 correspondences may not be available for production.

(v) In comprehension, the activation of potential L2-knowledge can be easily automatized if controlled efforts are involved. Such automatized knowledge facilitates the learner's procedures for assessing L2-knowledge and enables him to cope with the time pressure inherent in listening comprehension. In the oral production of ILs, the learner's more automatized procedures lead to better L2-fluency.

From the discussion of the key issues put forward in this chapter, it has become clear that the mechanism of language transfer is by far one of the most complex processes underlying L2-learning/acquisition. There are boundless factors that trigger or constrain the operation of this internal mechanism. Although the proponents of IL-research have contributed in large measure to the study of language processing and emphasized the facilitating effects of the L1, most of the empirical findings conducted during the last decade have concentrated on the negative effects of L1-influence to the detriment of the positive effects. Hence, research into CLI—and Ringbom is one of the leading figures in this field—is as concerned with the inhibiting aspects of L1-influence as it is with the facilitating aspects. The notion of perceived language distance seems to have originated with the initial work of Schachter. This notion has been developed by researchers such as Kellerman and Wode in terms of psychotypology and crucial similarity measure respectively. Again, in CLI-research, this notion has been emphasized in terms of perceived cross-linguistic similarity, which is the most significant precondition for overt CLI (the transfer load). Given that such a precondition plays a more important role in comprehension than in production, the scope of transfer is assumed to be larger in the comprehension process, and its value (positive or negative or a mixture
of both) is determined by the degree of perceived cross-linguistic similarity. Above all, the magnitude of CLI is subject to a great many inter-related variables which, in turn, formulate a far more intricate network of factors generally pertinent to the L2-learning process. Such variables may be linguistic such as the learner's previous linguistic knowledge (his LI, the L2 he is learning, and any other languages has has knowledge of) or non-linguistic such as age, personality, style of learning, and many other internal variables referred to throughout Part One of this study.

In conclusion, the position of language transfer in the L2-acquisition research of today seems much more respectable and recognized than it was during the late 1960s and early 1970s. The inextricable association of CA with habit formation and Chomsky's criticisms of the behavioural-structural model caused the pendulum to swing away from the notion of language transfer (cf. chapter 1 and chapter 2). Surprisingly, perhaps, it was also Chomsky's ideas on mentalism and cognitivism which encouraged researchers to reconsider the whole concept of language transfer from a far deeper perspective. Therefore, despite the severe attacks launched by researchers like Dulay and Burt, the concept has slowly regained ground through the work of IL-specialists (cf. chapter 3). The situation of language transfer today in all the guises of CLI reviewed in this chapter appears to confirm its own important niche, and, beyond all question, language transfer is a central and inevitable mechanism (among others) which underlies —and therefore plays a significant role in— the process of L2-learning/acquisition.

4.3 Hypotheses of Arabic-Transfer Potential

As seen throughout Part One of this study, the key issues connected with language transfer have been dealt with in a rather detailed and modified configuration. In addition, the new direction of transfer-based research (which, it is believed, has started with IL-specialists onward) has been carefully traced within a schematized overview. It seems, therefore, in the light of these key issues and in relation to the IL-data collected from a number of Syrian-Arab adult learners, three major provisional hypotheses can be proposed in terms of the three
linguistic subcomponents phonology, syntax and semantics (lexical selection) In Part Two, these hypotheses will, first, be taken under preliminary consideration (cf chapter 5, section 5.3) and, then, explored by a detailed analysis of the Syrian learners' interlingual identifications along the three linguistic subcomponents (cf chapter 6)

Hypothesis One: Phonology

The potential for Colloquial-Arabic transfer (SCA), rather than Classical-Arabic transfer (MSA), will be mostly an interfering factor (that is, a non-facilitator rather than an inhibitor) in the phonological processing of the English IL

Hypothesis Two: Syntax

The potential for Arabic transfer (SCA/MSA) will be mostly a non-facilitator rather than an inhibitor in the syntactic processing of the English IL

Hypothesis Three: Semantics

The Potential for Arabic transfer (SCA/MSA) will be mostly a facilitator in the semantic processing of the English IL
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In corroboration of the three hypotheses proposed in this study, various linguistic aspects of the spoken ILs of some Syrian-Arab learners will be examined in detail. Attempts will be made to extrapolate the possible source or sources from which interlingual identifications, erroneous or non-erroneous, may flow. Hence, this introductory chapter presents all the possible information which may help clarify the initial stages of undertaking this revealing, if complex, analysis.

The opening section (section 5.1) of this chapter will be taken up with a brief historical background of Arabic, the LI of the learners in question, and the relationship between the two varieties: the Classical and the Colloquial. As Syrian Colloquial Arabic is a sub-variety of the latter, the regional dialects of Syria will be specified in terms of four main dialects representing the learners' home dialects. Next, a brief outline of the learners' educational background and the way the concrete IL-data was collected will be considered.

The second section (section 5.2) will identify the potential areas of Arabic transfer which will be investigated throughout the discussion of a selective number of the concrete IL-data. Thus, to avoid possible confusion, the linguistic terms used in this study will be defined with reference to the three hypotheses introduced at the end of Part One.

The third and final section (section 5.3) will provide some preliminary remarks on these hypotheses in order to explore them within a particular approach to the analysis of Arabic transfer.
5.1 Arabic, Learner and IL-Data Background

Arabic is one of the Semitic languages spoken by some two hundred millions of Arabs over the vast area extending from Morocco to the Arabian Gulf. This language has appeared in literature (mainly poetry) for approximately one and a half millennia. In the pre-Islamic period, Arabic was of two major sets of dialects or varieties used in and around the Arabian Peninsula: the dialects of southern Arabs and the dialects of northern Arabs. As a result of many intervening objective factors (such as socio-economic, political, cultural, religious, etc.), most dialects, especially those of northern Arabs, were historically integrated into the Qureishi Dialect which became the typical form of Arabic due to the particular influence Mecca had at the time. In the Islamic period, the historical integration of Arabic dialects into this form was gradually identified in the sociolinguistic sense, and, as a result of historical inevitability, was supported by the Holy Koran and Hadith since Muhammad, the Prophet of Islam, belonged to the Qureish Tribe. Thus, Arabs from other different tribes were unified by the Islamic Vocation and consequently they adopted Qureishi Arabic as a common dialect, although members of each tribe were still using their own dialects in ordinary speech.

Having been developed down through ages, Arabic was governed by various linguistic rules along the written and spoken forms. Arabic now offers a bewildering range of linguistic variation. There are two main varieties of Arabic: first, the Classical or the Standard written language which extends from pre-Islamic poetry to modern books and journals. This variety shows essentially the same sound system and morphology but with considerable variation in lexis, syntax and forms of discourse. The second variety, or set of varieties, is the Colloquial or the Spoken language which descends from the koine (cf. Ferguson, 1970, 358f) and constitutes the intricate chain of regional dialects all over the Arab World (cf. Ferguson, 1970, 358f).

It has been argued that these two varieties, the Classical and the Colloquial, exist side by side in a diglossic relationship in the Arab speech community, and there are extensive differences between the two varieties in phonology, lexis, and grammatical structures (cf. Ferguson, 1959b). Above all, the extent of variation between the
colloquial dialects themselves seems to be more enormous. For instance, the extent of variation between Syrian Colloquial Arabic (SCA) and Egyptian Colloquial Arabic is even greater than between, for example, Swedish and Norwegian which belong to the same origin (Germanic) and are historically recognized as separate languages (cf. Ferguson, 1970:358). Such variation is considerable not only between the regional dialects of the Arab countries, but also between the sub-dialects of the same country.

In the current study, the potential for Arabic transfer will be scrutinized by recourse to two varieties: the classical or written variety which is referred to as Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), and the spoken variety in Syria which is called Syrian Colloquial Arabic (SCA). However, during the 1950s, the term Syrian Arabic had been recognized to include any variety of Arabic spoken by the settled populations of the area formerly comprising Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, and Transjordan (Ferguson, 1955:187). The term SCA refers, here, to the Arabic variety spoken by any native of the Syrian Arab Republic. This variety can be identified in terms of four main dialects or sub-dialects as visualized in the Map of Syria.

As the Map of Syria illustrates, the four main regional dialects of SCA can be classified as follows:

(i) Eastern Colloquial Dialect (ECD) which comprises Urban Eastern Dialect (UED), the dialect of Dayr az-Zawr, and Rural Eastern Dialect (RED), the dialect of its environs including Ar-Raqqah.

(ii) Western Colloquial Dialect (WCD), the dialect of Tartus.

(iii) Northern Colloquial Dialect (NCD), the dialect of Aleppo.

(iv) Southern Colloquial Dialect (SCD), the dialect of Damascus.

Therefore, given the chance of obtaining a multitude of interlingual identifications from a number of Syrian-Arab learners having different L1-dialects, these four main dialects are said to constitute SCA in the
The Map of Syria

The four main dialects of Syrian Colloquial Arabic

sociolinguistic sense and to represent the home dialects of the learners under discussion. Further, the interlingual identifications selected from the concrete data can be generally viewed as typical examples of the linguistic representation of the Syrian-Arab learner's English IL. It should be noted, however, that, for any interlingual identification cited throughout this thesis, the following points are established:

(a) The term Arabic, when used solely for some L1-example as the constant TE, indicates that the example in question can occur both in MSA and SCA.

(b) The abbreviation SCA, when used solely for some L1-example as the constant TE, indicates that the occurrence of the example in question is possible in all the four dialects of SCA.
(c) The abbreviation ECD, when used solely for some L1-example as the constant TE, indicates that the occurrence of the example in question is possible in ECD but rare in other dialects. This point applies to the other three dialects NCD, SCD and WCD.

(d) When a given L1-example used as the constant TE is recurrent in two or three dialects of SCA, these dialects will be mentioned consecutively.

(e) In all the phonetic transliterations and transcriptions recorded throughout this study, the square brackets [ ] are used for both the Arabic spelling pronunciation and the phonological representation of the English IL, whereas the oblique dashes / / are specific for the English spelling pronunciation.

The interlingual identifications which will be tabulated and analysed along the three linguistic dimensions in the next chapter (chapter 6) have been selected from a wide range corpus of IL-utterances produced orally by a group of Syrian full-time post-graduate students during their research careers at three universities in Dublin, the Republic of Ireland. These universities are Dublin City University, University College Dublin, and Trinity College Dublin. The students are still reading for higher degrees such as M Sc and Ph D (by research) in the following areas:

(i) Mechanical Engineering (M Sc and Ph D)
(ii) Civil Engineering (M Sc)
(iii) Electronics (M Sc and training courses)

Some of the students commenced their studies in the academic year 1987/1988 at Dublin City University specifically. These got M Scs in mechanical engineering in the academic year 1989/1990, and since then they have been studying for Ph Ds in the same field and at the same university. In the academic year 1988/1989, other students commenced studying for M Scs in the above mentioned areas (including mechanical engineering) at the three universities and are expected to graduate in the academic year 1990/1991. During their research careers in Ireland, all the students are totally funded by the Scientific Studies and
Research Centre (SSRC), the Syrian Arab Republic. The students are fifteen males and one female in number, and the average of their ages is twenty nine years.

From the long-term basis the students live on in Ireland, ranging from one to three years, it can be seen that the scope of their formal exposure to English (classroom settings) is quite extensive and reasonably uniform. That is, before the students had commenced their studies, particularly in mechanical engineering and electronics, they pursued an approximately four-month English course at the Language Centre of Ireland in Dublin. In addition, their formal exposure to English was and is still re-inforced by the large number of lectures and seminars the students attended and are attending during their long-term research careers. Essentially, these lectures and seminars cover the area of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) due to the specific nature of the students' studies. The extent and uniformity of such formal exposure were also sustained by the lectures of English as a L2, which the students attended during their undergraduate study careers at different Syrian universities such as the University of Damascus and the University of Aleppo. According to the educational system of the Syrian universities, the L2, English or French, is a compulsory subject (often 2 hours per week, that is, a total of approximately 300 hours over a five-academic-year duration). Out of the sixteen students, there were only two students, whose L2s chronologically were not English—one whose L2 was French in some measure of familiarity (cf. the example of this particular student, chapter 4, section 4.1.3) and the other whose knowledge and fluency in Serbo-Croatian were quite extensive. Furthermore, during their working careers at the Scientific Studies and Research Centre (SSRC), these students—including those whose L2s chronologically were not English—had an opportunity to do a number of English courses (beginner, intermediate and upper-intermediate) each covering a total of approximately 160 hours over a four-month period. The students also had to do a compulsory intensive course due to the regulations of scholarship candidature in the Scientific Studies and Research Centre (SSRC). Such an intensive course preceded, as it normally does, the candidates' preparation for travelling abroad.

So far a brief account of Arabic (within its main varieties and
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sub-varieties) and the students' educational background has been considered. In addition, an extensive view of the students' formal exposure to English both in the home country and in the host country has been outlined. With regard to their informal exposure (naturalistic settings), on the other hand, it seems that the scope is much wider and more uniform. The students' long-term residence in Ireland is a clear indication of how the width and uniformity of such scope are maintained, especially at a reception level. That is, besides the time they spend reading their assignments and listening to their tutors or supervisors, the students have greater opportunities to listen not only to native speakers of English, but also to mass media such as the radio and the television. This means that the students' receptive competences are much more viable in the host country than they are in the home country. For instance, most learners, even advanced learners, rely mainly on the Arabic subtitles when watching an English-speaking film in Syria (and in this case many aspects of reception are prone to fossilization), whereas in Ireland the students in question are forced to operate their cognitive capacities both in listening when watching English-speaking programmes or films and in reading when watching a non-English-speaking film with English subtitles.

It seems, therefore, the Syrian learners' formal and informal exposure to English is, in this perspective, proof enough that they know a great deal about English such as the linguistic categories and their functions, the relevant syntactic constructions in addition to the necessary potential for L2-lexical items. Such extensive knowledge entitles these learners to be equated with learners of a closely related L2 in that both types of learners achieve a fairly acceptable level of L2-proficiency, even though the latter may not have been exposed to the L2 in the same measure (cf. chapter 4, section 4.2.3).

It follows that the Syrian learners who possess such L2-knowledge are able to make the necessary cross-lingual tie-ups between Arabic and English at various linguistic levels, and this is precisely what the concrete IL-data have illustrated. These IL-data have been collected randomly from the learners' casual conversations with native speakers of English and sometimes with each other during a period of almost eighteen...
months (from January 1989 to August 1990) This indicates that the study and analysis of the IL-data are said to contribute to some information about a longitudinal investigation into the individual learner's IL-development outside the classroom setting (cf Corder, chapter 3, section 3.1.1) However, it should be made clear that the method of data collection was more than simple No recording devices were used, of course, to ensure that the speakers under discussion were not monitored at all and thus their actual IL-utterances would be entirely naturalistic Neither was deliberate attention paid to them, so that they would more confidently feel at ease while conversing with native speakers of English specifically In fact, the method of data-colection was, as far as possible, implemented spontaneously It was essentially relying on memory but for a short term when precaution was needed, that is, while during the conversations it was felt that certain actual IL-utterances of some importance might be forgotten, it was necessary, therefore, to discreetly note them down. In such a way, the whole corpus of the concrete IL-data was collected during the period mentioned above. The next step, then, was to select particular interlingual identifications for analysis in this study Some of them have been cited and analysed throughout Part One, the others will be tabulated and analysed along the three linguistic subcomponents in this part (cf chapter 6). The sources of the IL-data selected are specified in terms of several forms of discourse arranged as follows

1. In support of Hypothesis One, certain interlingual identifications have been selected for phonological analysis such as phonemes, diphthongs, forms of epenthesis, suprasegmentals, and so on

2. In corroboration of Hypothesis Two and Hypothesis Three, certain interlingual identifications have been selected for syntactic and semantic analysis respectively These identifications are mainly based on three sources.

(a) Spoken forms of the English IL (phrases and utterances).
(b) Short pieces of dialogue between the Syrian learners and native speakers of English
(c) Short pieces of dialogue between the Syrian learners themselves
5.2 Areas of Arabic Transfer: Terminology

Following the hypotheses of Arabic transfer potential which have been formulated at the end of Part One (cf chapter 4, section 4.3), it seems that the interlingual identifications selected from the concrete IL-data should be analysed in terms of three linguistic dimensions. These are phonology, syntax and semantics (lexical selection). Along the first dimension, attempts will be made to investigate some interlingual identifications produced by the Syrian learners upon their phonological performance of the English IL. These will illustrate to what extent the phonological system of SCA is much more conducive to language transfer than the phonological system of MSA. With regard to the second and third dimensions, there will appear three types of interlingual identifications so far as transfer effects from Arabic (MSA/SCA) are concerned.

(I) Interlingual identifications which reflect transfer from SCA
(II) Interlingual identifications which reflect transfer from MSA
(III) Interlingual identifications which reflect transfer from an overlap existing between SCA and MSA as it is not always possible for either variety to operate in isolation

These three types of interlingual identifications will be clarified throughout the discussion of the IL-data in the next chapter. Depending on the specific nature of the IL-data previously collected, each dimension has its own linguistic taxonomy. Therefore, by reference to Crystal (1985), it seems necessary that a brief definition should be provided for each linguistic dimension as it is intended in the current study.

The term phonology, as it is used here, indicates both phonetic and phonological aspects. Phonetic aspects are those which concern the description, classification and transcription of speech sounds and how they are used in speech. In this respect, three characteristics of speech sounds are normally identified:

(I) Articulatory sounds which refer to the process whereby speech sounds are articulated by the vocal organs. For example, the
consonants [t], [d], [s], [z], [n], [l] and [r] are dento-alveolars in Arabic and alveolars in English (cf chapter 1, section 1.3.2)

(11) Acoustic sounds which concern the physical properties of speech sounds, that is, how they are transmitted between mouth and ear. For example, the Arab learner tends to pronounce the strong form of one-syllable words such as 'can', 'have', 'and', 'was' and so on for all phonological identifications (cf chapter 6, section 6.1.2, sub-section (F), example (63))

(11i) Auditory sounds which deal with the learner's receptive competence. These concern the perceptual response to acoustic speech sounds and how they are mediated by ear, auditory nerve and brain. Following the above example, since the Arab learner tends to produce the strong form of 'can', it is well observed that this tendency may sometimes cause him to receive 'can't' as the strong form of 'can' (cf the above example (63))

Within the phonological aspects, as contrasted with the syntactic and semantic components in the theory of TGG, two types of phonological units are generally recognized

(1) Segmental units which refer to the analysis of speech into discrete segments such as phonemes, diphthongs, formed epenthesis and so on. For example, the Syrian learners whose L1-dialects are NCD, WCD and SCD tend to substitute the consonants [s] and [z] for the phonemes /θ/ and /ʃ/ respectively. Further, the Syrian learners in general also tend to substitute [o] for the diphthong /au/, and so on

(11) Suprasegmental units which concern the analysis of connected speech, that is, those units extending over more than one segmental unit such as intonation, rhythm, contours (primary stress, secondary stress and terminal stress), and so on. Although there are some similarities between Arabic and English intonation patterns, the contour system of English seems one of the most problematic areas encountered by the Arab learner
The term **syntax**, as it is intended in this study, is used to refer to those syntactic aspects which concern the grammatical rules governing the interrelationships between 'elements of sentence structure' at one end and between sentences in sequences at another. Among these are tense construction, question formation and word-order formation. Syntax is also used to indicate those morphological aspects which determine the interrelationships between 'morphemes of word structure' such as the omission of the plural marker 's' or the third-person-singular marker 's'. In the domain of syntax, functional or grammatical markers are also included. These markers are words (such as prepositions and articles) having no lexical meanings but grammatical meanings, thus, their sole function is to signal grammatical relationships between elements of sentence/utterance structure.

The term **semantics**, as intended in this study, concerns the semantic extensions and/or restrictions of lexical words in general. This domain will be allocated in terms of three major parameters:

1. **Lexical representation**
2. **Collocational representation**
3. **Contextual representation** This comprises:
   a. Situational context
   b. Contextual meaning

Along the first parameter, lexical representation is confined to the use of 'lexical words' as opposed to the notion of 'grammatical words' mentioned above. Here, lexical words refer to the lexical meaning of words, that is, words which have semantic content such as (IL-*shelf* vs L2-*sill/ledge*), (IL-*took* vs L2-*followed/did/pursued*), (IL-*wrote* vs L2-*prescribed*) as in the following examples:

1. a. It is on the *shelf* of the window (AU)
   b. It is on the window *sill/ledge* (L2-U)
   (cf. section 5.3, example (7) below)

2. a. I *took* an English course in London (AU)
   b. I *followed/did* an English course in London (L2-U)
   (cf. chapter 6, section 6.3, example (16))

3. a. He *wrote* some medicines for me (AU)
   b. He *prescribed* some medicines for me (L2-U)
   (cf. chapter 6, section 6.3, example (18))
As this applies to all the interlingual identifications cited in this study, the abbreviation (AU) indicates that the example in question is an actual utterance produced by the learner in his IL by recourse to the L1-counterpart which is the source L1-identification, whereas the abbreviation (L2-U) represents the equivalent utterance which is usually produced in the L2 by its natives.

With regard to the second parameter, collocational representation is a type of syntagmatic lexical relations referring to the habitual co-occurrence of individual lexical items in a particular language. For example, in English the lexical word 'open' (as a verb) can collocate with lexical nouns such as account, book, debate, door, eye, fire, flower, road, story, view and possibly with umbrella, whereas 'open' does not collocate with other lexical nouns such as *appetite, *fortune, *radio, *tap, and so on. Concerning the L1-lexical verb [fataha] 'opened (he)', collocational representation in Arabic, on the other hand, depends on the morphological form of the triliteral root or the three-radical stem [f-t-h], as each form has its own grammatical meaning in addition to its lexical meaning. Table 6 illustrates the collocation and non-collocation of the above lexical items with some of the morphological forms of [f-t-h] that are possible both in MSA and SCA. Notice that there are other morphological forms which have different grammatical meanings such as [fa taha] Form III, [aftaha] Form IV, [istaftaha] Form X and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[fataha]</th>
<th>[fataha]</th>
<th>[tafattaha]</th>
<th>[infataha]</th>
<th>[iftataha]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form I</td>
<td>Form II</td>
<td>Form V</td>
<td>Form VII</td>
<td>Form VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>account</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>book</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>debate</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>debate</td>
<td>debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>door</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>door</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye</td>
<td>eye</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>eye</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>flower</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>flower</td>
<td>flower</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appetite</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>appetite</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fortune</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>fortune</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radio</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>radio</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umbrella</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>umbrella</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tap</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>tap</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Some collocational and non-collocational aspects of different morphological forms of the triliteral root [f-t-h]
Finally, with respect to the third parameter, contextual representation sometimes refers to the situational context which concerns the total non-linguistic background to an utterance; that is, where, how, and why such an utterance is performed. Contextual representation also refers to the contextual meaning; that is, the 'information signalled about the kind of use' which an utterance conveys in its social context within the intended meaning. These will be mentioned throughout the discussion of the IL-data where necessary.

5.3 An Approach to Arabic-Transfer Analysis

An issue concerning the interdisciplinary approach to transfer analysis has been put forward and emphasized in Part One. It addresses a combination of CA a priori (the original approach adopted by Lado and his followers) and CA a posteriori as a subcomponent of EA for a more appropriate and fruitful investigation into language transfer on both levels comprehension and production (cf chapter 2, section 2.3.1, cf also chapter 4, section 4.1.2). In current transfer-based research, Kohn, for instance, suggests that, like any other processes characteristic of IL-behaviour, language transfer undergoes three levels of linguistic analysis. First, the structural transfer potential which refers to the possible preconditions, that is, the inherent similarities and differences existing between L1 and L2, for language transfer to operate. This level of analysis corresponds to CA a priori. Second, the structural transfer pattern which emerges from a structural comparison between a given IL-utterance and its available L1-TE or L1-TEs. As this level is identifiable with language production, its approach coincides with CA a posteriori. Third, the level of transfer process which, though the most problematic area, seems to be the true object of psycholinguistic analysis (Kohn, 1986 21f). With this level, Kohn states:

The problem involved is simple to pinpoint, but difficult to solve. Transfer processes are only 'visible' in terms of what they produce, i.e. in the transfer pattern. Therefore, information about the learner's linguistic, developmental and attitudinal predisposition, along with a careful analysis of transfer patterns, constitute the empirical basis on which insight about transfer processes are.
founded. Regardless of how strong the emphasis on transfer processes might be, there is no way around the unwanted limitation that it will always be transfer patterns which steal the limelight (Kohn, 1986 22)

Having pinpointed what IL-utterances may be overbearingly conducive to transfer potential, attempts will be made to extrapolate some of the 'invisible' areas (or transfer processes) which underlie these IL-utterances; that is, the transfer patterns With regard to the erroneous IL-utterances as they are viewed from the L2-perspective, two major categories of errors will be analysed The first category deals with the interlingual errors which are themselves forms of transfer patterns Under this category comes a particular type of interlingual errors which can be taken as instances of Ll-error transfer (cf chapter 2, section 2 3 2) These will be referred to throughout the discussion of the IL-data where appropriate Since it is not always possible to isolate interlingual from intralingual errors, some attempts will be made to investigate examples of the second category which concerns inter-intralingual errors These errors result from either an overt combination of interlingual and intralingual solutions or from a covert interaction between the two (cf chapter 2, sections 2 4 1 and 2 4 3) Further, because not all interlingual identifications lead to errors as evidenced by the IL-data, the criterion for assigning an error will always be considered from the viewpoint of the standard norm of the L2, that is, the Received Pronunciation (RP) for phonology and Standard British English (SBE) for grammar

Given the nature of the information relevant to the psycholinguistic analysis of Arabic-transfer potential, it is felt that, at this stage, a preliminary consideration of the three hypotheses put forward at the end of Part One is necessary

5.3.1 Hypothesis One: Phonology

The potential for Colloquial-Arabic transfer (SCA), rather than Classical-Arabic transfer (MSA), will be mostly an interfering factor (that is a non-facilitator rather than an inhibitor) in the phonological processing of the English IL
In the intralingual identification of Arabic phonology (that is, the phonological deviation from the MSA-norm within Arabic as a L1), it is observed that the potential for Colloquial-Arabic phonology is prone to interfere even with the oral performance of Classical Arabic. This can be seen when a group of L1-Arabic speakers having different colloquial dialects are called upon to orally perform a given text written in Classical Arabic. For such manifestation it is not hard to find empirical support in the literature of Arabic linguistics. Harrel, for instance, points to the fact that "any Arab's use of spoken Classical Arabic is always influenced in some way by his native colloquial dialect" (Harrel, 1960). Further, in naturalistic settings, where the intralingual solutions of Arabic as a L1 operate, the potential for Colloquial-Arabic phonology can be more ostensibly observed in the Arab's tendency towards classicization as mentioned earlier (cf. chapter 3, section 3.1.1).

It appears the case that, with regard to the phonological sub-component whose interpretation can be determined by surface-structure constituents (cf. Chomsky, 1965, 16), the Arab's native colloquial dialect represents his L1 whereas Classical Arabic represents his L2 (or rather his second L1). Therefore, in such a perspective, any foreign language such as English will be to him the L3 chronologically. This position is different from that of psychotypology (cf. section 4.1.3), since both L1 (SCA) and L2 (MSA) are used by the same speech community and are typologically distant from the L3 (English) within somewhat the same linguistic measure. It follows that the Arab's phonological knowledge of the L1 (SCA) is characterized by an internal nature as opposed to his phonological knowledge of the L2 (MSA) which is by definition external, even though both types of knowledge are pure in suis generi terms. The only type of knowledge that can be specified as non-pure (that is, a mixture of both SCA and MSA identifications) is the phonological knowledge underlying those 'phonologically deviant' utterances which proceed from the speaker's attempts to orally perform MSA, or those utterances which are modified in the direction of classicization (cf. chapter 3, section 3.1.1).

In the case of learning a L3 (English), however, the internalized variety L1 (SCA) seems to be the strongest trigger of language transfer at a phonological level in the first place. In this context, an attempt
was made by Broselow to analyse the epenthesis errors committed by members of two Arabic-dialect groups *Iraqi Colloquial Arabic* (the dialect of Baghdad and environs) and *Egyptian Colloquial Arabic* (the dialect of Cairo and lower Egypt) Broselow found that the epenthesis of vowels into two-segment and three-segment clusters differed in treatment by members of the two dialect groups (Broselow, 1983 271f) For example

**Errors by Egyptian speakers**

(4) a [filo r] 'floor'
b [0ir1] 'three'
c [tšildir1n] 'children'

**Errors by Iraqi speakers**

(5) a [iflo r] 'floor'
b [iřiri] 'three'
c [tšildir1n] 'children'

Such a phonological aspect is distinct in both IL-dialects For instance, in their colloquial dialect, the Egyptian speakers tend to insert the short vowel [i] between the first and second consonants of the initial two-consonant cluster as in [tši1] 'she carries' (cf examples (4 a-b)) They also tend to insert the short vowel [i] after the second of a three-consonant cluster as in [katšti1] 'I wrote to him' (cf example (4c)) Epenthesis in the Egyptian dialect seems to be the nearest to the standard norm of the Arabic koine (cf chapter 3, section 3 1 1), since [tši1] and [katšti1] are pronounced as [taši1] and [katšba lahu] in MSA respectively

The Iraqi speakers, on the other hand, tend to insert the short vowel [i] before the initial two-consonant cluster as in [itš1] 'she carries' (cf examples (5 a-b)), and after the first of a three-consonant cluster as in [kitšiti] 'I wrote to him' (cf example (5c)) The above examples (4 a-c) and (5 a-c) are, among many others, clear indications that the potential for the phonological influence of Colloquial Arabic is much more liable to transfer onto the phonological performance of the English IL than that of Classical Arabic In the IL-data collected from the Syrian learners, there appeared some attested examples of epenthetic phenomena which will be explained in detail (cf chapter 6, section 6 1 2, sub-section (E))
However, besides the examples which are said to be in corroboration of Hypothesis One, there are a few interlingual identifications reflecting an influence from a mixture of both varieties (MSA/SCA), and a few others which, as an exception to Hypothesis One, are said to have direct connection with 'pure' MSA. These will be discussed at the end of each section of phonological interlingual identifications (cf chapter 6, section 6.1.1, sub-section (E), and section 6.1.2, sub-section (F)).

5.3.2 Hypothesis Two: Syntax

The potential for Arabic transfer, that is either MSA or SCA or a mixture of both, will be mostly a non-facilitator rather than an inhibitor in the syntactic processing of the English IL

In corroboration of this hypothesis, the term syntax, as intended here, has been carefully identified in the previous section (cf section 5.2). There are countless psychological and socio-affective factors such as intelligence, motivation and so on that determine the Arab learner's own strategies and play a significant role in the syntactic domain. These factors are heterogeneously conditioned by other psycholinguistic factors such as the following:

(i) Lack of L2-knowledge (ignorance) of the L2-item or structure. This can be seen mainly in the domain of prepositions and articles.

(ii) Lack of control rather than lack of L2-knowledge, which may result from the learner's involvement in relatively long utterances.

(iii) Perceived cross-linguistic similarity (that is, crucial similarity) between Arabic and English structures such as relative clause formation. However, the resultant errors, particularly in pronominalization, may be due to the learner's lack of knowledge of the resumptive pronoun deletion (item ignorance), or they may be due to his lack of control over the item and/or the structure in question (cf chapter 4, section 4.1.1, example (1)).

(iv) No cross-linguistic similarity perceived (that is, radical difference) between Arabic and English structures. As evidenced by the IL-data, the following syntactic structures will be investigated.
It follows that the Arab learner in question is assumed to know these syntactic structures (namely, (a), (b) and (c)), from the perspective of English but he does not seem to have acquired them completely. Therefore, the overt or covert interlingual errors committed over these structures are said to be examples of syntactic avoidance in Schachter and Kleinmann's sense (cf. chapter 4, section 4.1.2). Here, an example will be considered to make the point clear:

(6) a. * I walk on my nerves. (AU)

Both the situational context and the contextual meaning of this IL-utterance will be explained within the analysis of its semantic dimensions in support of Hypothesis Three (cf. example (9) below). As the syntactic deviation is the concern here, the learner's resort to the simple form of the verb 'walk' in (6a) suggests a covert interlingual error, or covert negative transfer, because the context involved the progressive form. It may be the case that although the form [maːṣi] in the L1-TE (6b) —which descends from the nomen agentis or active participle [maːṣīn] in MSA— also indicates progressiveness, the learner's attempt to produce the simple form of 'walk' (transfer pattern) seems to have been easier to process than the progressive form 'BE + walking' (transfer process), though, it has been attested, he is not ignorant of the latter form. In Ringbom's sense, this can be viewed as an example of covert CLI resulting from unanalysed L1-knowledge; that is, the L1-nomen agentis, which indicates progressiveness, was not analysed into the L2-present participle to cope with the context (cf. chapter 4, section 4.2.1). Consequently, the learner's nonuse of the progressive form 'BE + walking' can be reduced to a syntactic avoidance strategy due to a lack of cross-linguistic similarity between the structural properties of the L1-nomen agentis in Arabic and those of the L2-present
participle in English, albeit both structural devices can be used to indicate progressiveness (for further analysis, cf. chapter 6, section 6.2.3, examples (89-92), (96) and (100)).

One final point to be made here is that Hypothesis Two does not exclude any facilitating effects of Arabic-syntax influence. Hence, as an unavoidable exception to the hypothesis, such facilitating effects may apparently result from perceived cross-linguistic similarity (that is, complete similarity) between particular Arabic structures and their English counterparts such as the following:

a. The use of some prepositions; for example, 'from' and 'on' (cf. chapter 6, section 6.2.1, sub-sections (C) and (D) respectively).
b. The formation of non-inverted WH-questions when preceded by a phrase.
c. The formation of non-inverted WH-questions with 'who', 'what' and 'which' when anyone of these stands for the subject of a sentence (for (b) and (c), cf. chapter 1, section 1.2.1).
d. The use of some holophrases (cf. chapter 3, section 3.2.3, example (19)).
e. Other syntactic aspects which will be referred to throughout the analysis of interlingual identifications in semantics.

5.3.3 Hypothesis Three: Semantics

The potential for Arabic transfer, that is either MSA or SCA or a mixture of both, will be mostly a facilitator in the semantic processing of the English IL.

Having identified what the term semantics precisely indicates, the relevant aspects which will be investigated in this study are tabulated along three parameters: lexical representation, collocational representation, and contextual representation (cf. section 5.2). Such parameters depend largely on the learner's potential knowledge of L2-vocabulary. Therefore, as has been mentioned earlier, any transfer-based utterance produced in these three aspects cannot be taken as an example of borrowing due to unanalysed L1-knowledge in Ringbom's sense (cf. chapter 4, section 4.2.2). Rather, at a comprehension level,
the learner's perception of the crucial similarities in the domain of syntax and, at a production level, his self-activated control over certain syntactic aspects may cause him to adopt a meaning-oriented approach drawn essentially upon L1-based L2-lexical items. Thus, the learner's resort to such lexical items—which are a reflection of analysed L1-knowledge—is in many respects subject to semantic avoidance (cf. chapter 4, section 4.1.2), since the learner's linguistic repertoire lacks the exact lexical distribution imposed by L2-semantic idiosyncrasies. That is, the learner lacks knowledge of the L2-lexical item in question and/or its semantic extensions.

The facilitating effects of Arabic are, therefore, due to the crucial congruences of its semantic idiosyncrasies with those of English. Such crucial congruences, whether they are perceived by the learner or not, enable him at least to make the necessary cross-lingual tie-ups which, in most cases, lead to positive transfer. To clarify the point, an example of each parameter will be considered.

(i) Lexical representation

Following the IL-utterances which have been analysed within the domain of lexical selection (cf. for instance, chapter 3, section 3.1.3, example (6), and section 3.2.3, example (16)), under this parameter comes any IL-utterance which is said to contain an attestedly L1-based L2-lexical item, or items, realized by recourse to the lexical meaning of the L1-counterparts. For example

(7) It is on the shelf of the window (AU)

This IL-utterance suggests, as it has been attested, that the learner's linguistic repertoire lacked the lexical knowledge of the L2-items 'sill' or 'ledge'. Thus, unlike borrowing in Ringbom's sense (cf. chapter 4, section 4.2.2), the IL-utterance (7) can be viewed as an example of semantic avoidance, a strategy adopted by the Syrian-Arab learner due to his ignorance of certain lexical items (cf. chapter 4, section 4.1.2). However, the lexical knowledge of 'shelf' was enough for him to make the necessary cross-lingual tie-up between [raf] in Arabic (MSA/SCA) and 'shelf' in English for the intended IL-utterance (7). Had the learner not known, at least, the lexical item 'shelf', he would not have been
able to comprehend the cross-linguistic similarity between [raf isibba k], which is frequently recurrent in SCA, and the IL-utterance as rendered into 'the shelf of the window' in English. Therefore, it is this knowledge (that is, the lexical knowledge of 'shelf') which impelled the learner to activate his L1-semantic idiosyncracy as a facilitative reference frame. As a consequence, such knowledge positively triggered transfer effects, otherwise the learner would not be able to produce (7) in its current lexical representation and thus, by resorting to whatever procedure, language transfer would be a very complex type of covert CLI which is far more difficult to detect (cf chapter 6, section 6.3.1 for further examples).

(ii) Collocational representation

This parameter refers to any IL-utterance which is said to contain attestedly two or more L1-based L2-lexical items realized by recourse to the habitual co-occurrence of the L1-counterparts. For example

(8) He let my blood boil (AU)

This IL-utterance reflects two dimensions of semantic representation: lexical representation in the use of 'let' and collocational representation in the co-occurrence of both 'blood' and 'boil'. With regard to the lexical representation, the concern of the first parameter, the lexical use of 'let' suggests that the learner made a cross-lingual tie-up between the L1-word [kalla] and the L2-word 'let' (a verbatim-translation strategy). Given that the L2-word 'made' was known to the learner as a lexical item, it seems, however, his linguistic repertoire lacked the semantic idiosyncracy of English which imposes the lexical use of 'made' rather than 'let'. Therefore, within such a context, the less often use of [sa wa] or [imil] 'made (he)' and the more often use of [kalla] 'let (he)' in SCA appear to have dissuaded the learner from the use of 'made' and entitled him to resort to the L1-based L2-lexical item 'let'. This implies that the L1-utterance [kalla dammi yaglı] (SCA), which is the L1-TE of (8), acted as an utterance initiator in Krashen's terms (cf chapter 4, section 4.1.1).
Along the second parameter, the collocational use of the L2-lexical items 'blood'/'boil' and that of the L1-counterparts [dam]/[yigl] denote that, both in English and in SCA, one's blood boiling is a symbol of great anger. Consequently, whether the learner had perceived such complete similarity or not, the IL-utterance (8) was actually produced as a clear indication of positive transfer (cf chapter 6, section 6.3.2 for further examples).

(iii) Contextual representation

The third parameter deals with any IL-utterance which is said to contain an attestedly L1-based L2-lexical item, or items, realized within the contextual representation of the L1-counterparts. As noted above, this parameter involves two aspects related to the context: a non-linguistic aspect which refers to the situational context of a given utterance, and a linguistic aspect which concerns the contextual meaning of that utterance. These will be referred to throughout the discussion of the IL-data where necessary. For example,

(9) I walk on my nerves (AU)

The situational context of this IL-utterance indicates that the speaker was obliged to walk in a street which he did not like to frequent, assuming that he would be seen by certain undesirable persons. The contextual meaning suggests, therefore, that the speaker entertained an apprehension of being seen. It appears that his knowledge of 'nerves' as a L2-lexical item and his ignorance of the L2-semantic idiosyncracy (which imposes the relevant lexical distribution of, for example, 'to walk on glass' or 'to walk on egg-shells' in such a context) were a strong trigger of his reliance on the L1-semantic idiosyncracy which, instead, involves the lexical distribution of [ma š1 ʔaʔaʔa'ga b1] (SCA) in the same context. Consequently, the contextual use of the L1-based L2-lexical items 'on my nerves' suggests positive transfer though the learner lacked the knowledge of the L2-semantic idiosyncracy, since the lexical distribution of 'to live on one's nerves' may be used to express the same feeling but not in this particular context (cf chapter 6, section 6.3.3 for further examples).
It follows that, in relation to Hypothesis Three, semantic facilitation refers to the linguistic configuration whereby the potential for Arabic transfer leads to more or less the same lexical distribution in order to convey the same meaning, regardless of the structural properties of the resultant IL-utterance. For instance, if the learner had produced (9) as *'I walking on my nerves', this proposed utterance would still have marked positive transfer in the contextual use of 'on my nerves', whereas the omission of 'BE'—which would have marked overt negative transfer in the domain of syntax—would be the concern of Hypothesis Two. One final point to be made here is that, since Hypothesis Two does not exclude any facilitating effects of Arabic-syntax transfer, nor does Hypothesis Three exclude any negative effects of Arabic-semantics transfer. These will be referred to throughout the analysis of the IL-data where appropriate.
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THE ANALYSIS OF
ARABIC TRANSFER POTENTIAL

This chapter will provide a detailed discussion through attempted analyses of a selective number of the IL-data which have been collected from the spoken production of the English ILs of the Syrian-Arab learners in question. In order to test the three provisional hypotheses on empirical grounds, the chapter will consider the attested interlingual identifications within the polarity of negative and positive transfer. Therefore, along the levels of language process (transfer process) and language product (transfer pattern), it will seek to scrutinize the possible source or sources which underlie the flowing of these identifications. The analysis will, of course, draw upon many of the theoretical and practical issues that have been put forward in Part One.

The opening section of this chapter (section 6.1) will, in corroboration of Hypothesis One, show to what extent the potential for SCA-influence, rather than MSA-influence, interferes in the phonological performance of the English IL.

The next section (section 6.2) will examine the attested interlingual identifications in syntax and will, in support of Hypothesis Two, illustrate to what extent the potential for Arabic-influence (MSA/SCA) inhibits, or rather does not facilitate, the syntactic performance of the English IL.

The final section of this chapter (section 6.3) will analyse the attested interlingual identifications in semantics (lexical selection) and will, in support of Hypothesis Three, illustrate to what extent the potential for Arabic-influence (MSA/SCA) facilitates the semantic performance of the English IL.
6.1 Arabic-Transfer Identifications in Phonology

In this section, two main aspects of phonology as observed in the oral ILs of the Syrian learners will be examined to check the validity of Hypothesis One. The first aspect concerns the areas of difficulty the learners experience with the articulation of consonants and phonemes. The second aspect deals with the areas of difficulty encountered in the articulation of vowels and diphthongs in addition to some suprasegmental aspects elicited from the learner's superficial receptive competence. To avoid possible confusion, each of these two aspects will be classified according to its own taxonomy. Notice that for every interlingual identification, the asterisk (*) indicates an actual error (AE) as observed in the learner's English IL and so judged from the viewpoint of RP.

6.1.1 Consonants and Phonemes

Consonants and phonemes are tabulated in the following sub-sections:

(A) The English phoneme /tʃ/ which is the approximate equivalent of the Arabic phoneme [ṭʃ] occurring frequently in ECD and less frequently in NCD.

(B) The English phoneme /dʒ/ which is the approximate equivalent of the Arabic phoneme [j] occurring equally in MSA and ECD and approximately in NCD.

(C) The English phonemes /θ/ and /ʃ/ which are the approximate equivalents of the Arabic phonemes [th] and [ṭh] respectively, occurring equally in MSA and ECD.

(D) The English nasal /n/ which is the approximate equivalent of the Arabic nasal [ŋ] occurring specifically within the term [gūnna] 'nasalization' in the art of reciting the Koran in MSA.

(E) Miscellaneous consonants such as the English phoneme /p/ which does not occur in Arabic, the English alveolar /r/ which occurs in the form of the dento-alveolar [ɾ] in Arabic, and so on.
(A) $/tʃ/ \text{ (ENGLISH)} = [t\ddot s] \text{ (ECD/NCD)}$

It is observed that learners whose dialects are SCD and WCD have some problems articulating the voiceless palato-alveolar affricate $/tʃ/$. This can be ascribed to the fact that this sound does not occur in SCD and WCD. Therefore, these learners lean towards producing the voiceless palato-alveolar fricative $[s]$ which they perceive to be safely the L1-equivalent in their focus of attention. For example

1. a * [šabtar] 'chapter' (AE)
   b * [šenj] 'change' (AE)
   c * [šob] 'chop' (AE)
   d * [šestarfi ld] 'chesterfield' (AE)

However, the English phoneme $/tʃ/$ occurs very approximately in some words in NCD, and more frequently in ECD, and, in all its natural articulation, this sound occurs in dark phonemicized junctures of $[t]$ and $[s]$. It follows that such phonemicized junctures are extremely rare in SCD and WCD specifically. For example

2. a [ša y] 'tea' (SCD)
   b [še y] 'tea' (WCD)
   c [tša y] 'tea' (NCD)
   d [tša y] 'tea' (ECD)

3. a [ka n] 'he/it was' (SCD)
   b [ke n] 'he/it was' (NCD/WCD)
   c [tša n] 'he/it was' (ECD)

It appears the case that the learners whose dialects are ECD and NCD will face no serious problems articulating the English phoneme $/tʃ/$. This seems to be one of the verified predictions postulated first by CA a priori. However, even advanced learners (SCD/WCD) who recognize this phoneme tend to produce it with a high degree of accuracy, but, in most cases, the articulation operates in clear phonemicized junctures of $[t]$ and $[s]$ as in

4. a * [t-še nj] 'change' (AE)
   b * [t-še r] 'chair' (AE)
   c * [t-ša t] 'chat' (AU)
   d * [t-šalinj] 'challenge' (AE)
The interlingual errors suggested by (4a), (4b) and (4d) do not concern the clear phonemicized articulation of [t-š]. Rather, example (4a) refers to both the phoneme [ʃ] (cf (6a-d)) and the vowel [e] (cf (29a-d), example (4b) refers to both the phoneme [r] (25a-b)) and the vowel [e] (cf (33a-d)), and example (4d) refers to [ʃ] as is the case with example (4a).

This kind of articulation (i.e., the clear phonemicized juncture of [t-š]) may even occur in cases when a Syrian (SCD/WCD) attempts to 'imitate' the ECD accent which is distinguished by the articulation of phonemes such as the voiceless palato-dental affricate [tʃ] and the voiceless uvular plosive [q]. For instance, some Syrians (SCD/WCD) tend to say [ʃlo nəʃ] 'how are you?' (feminine) and [ʃinət] 'I was' (cf (1a-d), others tend to say [ʃlo nt-ši] and [t-šinət] (cf (4a-d)) when trying to imitate the ECD-articulation which involves dark phonemicized junctures as in [ʃlo nt-ši] and [t-šintu] respectively. Consequently, the examples (1a-d) mark apparent NT from SCD and WCD, whereas the examples (4a-d) signify PT from a mixture of SCD/WCD and ECD. Since the learners, at a reception level, are said to be aware of the correct phonemicization of the junctures, these interlingual identifications are by-products attributable to inadequate control rather than to a gap in L2-knowledge. However, the type of transfer which triggers the processing of (1a-d) seems to be a result of unanalysed L1-knowledge, whereas in the case of (4a-d) transfer effects are clear evidence of analysed L1-knowledge (cf chapter 4, section 4.2.2).

Another problem concerning the English phoneme /tʃ/ is worth considering here. It refers to the learner's complex task of grasping the unpredictable distinction between 'ch' as /tʃ/ and 'ch' as /k/ on the one hand, and between 'ch' as /tʃ/ and 'ch' as /ʃ/ on the other. For example:

(5) a * [dɪt-ʃətomɪ] = /k/ 'dichotomy' (AE)
    b * [t-ʃɪvalrɪ] = /ʃ/ 'chivalry' (AE)
    c * [t-ʃət ʃ] = /ʃ/ 'chute' (AE)

Although these identifications may at first glance appear to mark intralingual errors due to overgeneralization from the L2-phoneme /tʃ/, they may well mark covert inter-intralingual errors due to an overlap between the transfer-based clear phonemicization of the juncture [t-š],...
and the faulty generalization of /tʃ/ over 'ch' in the L2-items 'dichotomy', 'chivalry' and 'chute'. In other words, had these L2-items involved the articulation of /tʃ/, the clear phonemicization of the juncture [t-ʃ] would still have marked PT from a mixture of SCD/WCD and ECD. In the light of the above argument, the potential for SCA-transfer can be seen at three hierarchical levels of phonological influence on the English IL:

1. Transfer from one representation in two dialects (SCD/WCD) of the LI as in (1a-d)
2. Transfer from a mixture of this representation and another representation in another dialect (ECD) of the LI as in (4a-d)
3. Transfer from an overlap between the resultant representation of the LI and the overgeneralized representation of the L2 as in (5a-c)

(B) /dʒ/ (ENGLISH) = [ʃ] (MSA/ECD) & (NCD)

Another problematic area encountered by the Syrian learners (SCD/WCD) is the articulation of the voiced palato-alveolar affricate /dʒ/. These learners also tend to substitute this phoneme by the voiced palato-alveolar fricative [ʃ] as is the case of the English phoneme [ʃ]. For example:

(6) a * [jo n] 'John' (AE)
b * [kolej] 'college' (AE)
c * [je rim] 'germ' (AE)
d * [brej] 'bridge' (AE),

(cf also (1b), (4a), (4d))

Again, this tendency is observable in the learners' (NCD/WCD) attempts to perform spoken MSA in which the voiced palato-alveolar affricate [ʃ] occurs as the English phoneme /dʒ/. Such a phoneme also occurs in ECD and approximately in NCD. For example:

(7) a [jama l] 'beauty' (SCD)
b [jame l] 'beauty' (WCD)
c [jame l] 'beauty' (NCD)
d [jama l] 'beauty' (MSA/ECD)

(8) a [ja y] 'I'm/he's/you're (sing) coming' (SCD)
b [je y] 'I'm/he's/you're (sing) coming' (WCD)
c [je y] 'I'm/he's/you're (sing) coming' (ECD/NCD)
Similarly, in ECD/NCD as well as in MSA, the natural articulation of the sound [j] is characterized by a dark phonemicized juncture of [d] and [j]. On the other hand, this juncture does not occur in SCD and WCD, so that when speakers of these two dialects are called upon to pronounce such a phoneme they usually drop the voiced dento-alveolar emphatic plosive [d] and resort to the voiced palato-alveolar fricative [j]. From the point of view of MSA, to substitute [j] for [j] upon performing spoken MSA would mark a common phonological LI-error since the phoneme [j] does not exist in the phonological system of MSA. It follows that Egyptians, too, tend to commit the same LI-error over [j] but resort to another alternative commonly used in their colloquial dialects, namely, the voiced velar stop [g], which does not exist in the phonological system of MSA either. For instance, upon performing spoken MSA, most Egyptians, if not all, tend to pronounce (7d) as [gama 1] rather than [jama 1]. The supposition, therefore, runs as follows: if, for example, an Egyptian had produced (6a) as * [go n], then this interlingual identification would have been a clear indication of LI-error NT. For precisely the same reason, the actual interlingual identifications (6 a-d) can be safely viewed as phonological errors reflecting LI-error NT (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3.2). It seems, therefore, this type of transfer (that is, the tendency to produce [j] instead of [j]) is typical of most Syrian learners whose dialects are SCD and WCD, and even in the case of advanced learners—who recognize the English phoneme /dʒ/ as a juncture of /d/ and /ʒ/—the articulation is still distinguishable by clear phonemicization of the juncture. For example

(9)  
   a * [d-jo n]  'John' (AE)  
   b [d-jad-j]  'judge' (AU)  
   c * [d-je 1]  'jail' (AE)

[N.B. Analogous with the examples (4 a-b) and (4d) above, the interlingual errors suggested by (9a, c) here do not concern the clear phonemicized juncture of [d-j]. Rather, example (9a) refers to the vowel [o ] (cf. (38 d-e)), whereas example (9c) refers to the vowel [e ] (cf. (29 a-d)).]

Therefore, from the point of view of these learners (SCD/WCD), the examples (9 a-c) are not said to have connection with language transfer, since the clear phonemicization of the juncture [d-j] can
neither occur in their colloquial dialects nor in their attempts to perform spoken MSA in which the juncture exists in dark phonemicization [1]. Given that the learners (SCD/WCD) do not internalize the phoneme [tʃ] in their LLSs (and this, too, can be analogous with the phoneme [tʃ]), the resultant interlingual errors as in (6 a-d) are in many respects indications of lack of control rather than lack of L2-knowledge because the learners in question are said to be conscious of the juncture but they find it difficult to process or, put another way, their monitor finds it difficult to repair (cf Krashen, chapter 4, section 4.1.2) It should be noted, however, although the carrying over of the L1-item [j] in (6 a-d), or [ʃ] in (1 a-d), is an apparent example of unanalysed L1-knowledge, these transfer-based phonological identifications cannot be viewed as a type of covert CLI, since the learners (SCD/WCD), in their focus of attention, are supposed to perceive a cross-linguistic similarity between the L1-item [j] and the L2-item /dʒ/ at one end, and between the L1-item [ʃ] and the L2-item /tʃ/ at another. Therefore, this perceived similarity seems the only stipulation which gave the learners a chance to make the relevant cross-lingual tie-ups (cf chapter 4, section 4.2.1)

(C) /θ/ and /ʃ/ (ENGLISH) = [th] and [tʃ] (MSA/ECD)

In (chapter 1, section 1.2.3) mention has been made of how Egyptian learners face considerable difficulty in producing some English contrasts such as 'thistle-this'll', 'think-sink', 'breathe-breeze', and so on. One possible interpretation of this difficulty is that the voiceless dental fricative /θ/ and the voiced dental fricative /ʃ/ do not occur in the colloquial dialects of Upper Egypt specifically, in spite of the fact that Egyptians are exposed to the equivalent L1-phonemes [th] and [tʃ] respectively in the study of Classical Arabic (MSA).

Some Egyptian learners of English tend to substitute /θ/ and /ʃ/ by the voiceless dento-alveolar fricative [s] and the voiced dento-alveolar fricative [z] respectively. Others resort to the voiceless dento-alveolar plosive [t] and the voiced dento-alveolar plosive [d] respectively.

Similarly, among the Syrian learners who find the phonemes /θ/ and /ʃ/ troublesome are those whose dialects are NCD, SCD and WCD.
However, in all interlingual identifications, these phonemes are substituted by [s] and [z] rather than by [t] and [d] due to the more frequent occurrence of the former pair than the latter pair in these dialects. For example:

(10) a * [sa nk yu] 'thank you' (AE)
    b * [so rin] 'thorn' (AE)
    c * [sre d] 'thread' (AE)
    d * [ze m] 'them' (AE)
    e * [za t] 'that' (AE)

Although the phonemes [t] and [d] are substituted for [th] and [th] in some L1-words by these learners (NCD/SCD/WCD), their tendency to use the phonemes [s] and [z] is well observed in their attempts to perform spoken MSA. For example:

(11) a [lthnayn] 'two (masc)' (MSA)
    b * [isnayn] (MSA performed by NCD/SCD/WCD)
    c [\t\n\e n] (NCD/SCD)
    d [\t\n\e n] (WCD)
    e [\t\e n] (ECD)

(12) a [ha tha] 'this (masc)' (MSA)
    b * [ha za] (MSA performed by NCD/SCD/WCD)
    c [ha da] (NCD/SCD)
    d [hayda] (WCD)
    e [ha tha] (ECD)

As the above examples illustrate, the phonemes [th] and [th] only occur in MSA and ECD, as in (11 a, e) and (12 a, e), so that the learners whose dialect is ECD specifically will face no difficulty producing such phonemes either in their performance of spoken MSA or in their phonological performance of their English ILs. This is apparently because, like the phonemes [t\$] and [j], these two phonemes ([th] and [th]) are internalized in these learners' LLSs. On the other hand, with regard to the learners whose dialects are NCD, SCD and WCD, the problem lies in the fact that the phonemes [th] and [th] are not internalized in their LLSs, thus the corresponding pairs of phonemes in their dialects are either '[s]-[z]' or less frequently '[t]-[d]' These latter phonemes occur as substitutes for [th] and [th] in some L1-words such as (l1c-d) for [t] and (12 c-d) for [d]. However, even in the learners' (NCD/SCD/WCD) attempts to perform these L1-words (which contain [t] and [d] as substitutes for [th] and [th] respectively) in spoken MSA, the articulation is in most cases prone
to the phonemes \([s]\) as in (11b) and \([z]\) as in (12b). This indicates that these learners (NCD/SCD/WCD), upon the phonological performance of their English ILs, are more susceptible to transfer the phonemes \([s]\) and \([z]\) than \([t]\) and \([d]\) (cf examples (10 a-e) above).

It follows that, from the point of view of MSA, examples such as (11b) and (12b) would also mark common phonological Ll-errors. As discussed above, to render \([jama\ l]\) (MSA) into either \([jama\ l]\) (SCD/WCD) or \([gamma\ l]\) (Egyptian Colloquial Arabic) would mark a phonological Ll-error because neither of the two phonemes \([j]\) and \([g]\) exists in the phonological system of MSA. In the case of (11b) and (12b), however, to substitute \([th]/[th]\) by \([s]/[z]\) would be a phonological Ll-error because both pairs of phonemes exist in the phonological system of MSA but in different distributions. Thus, in each of the following pairs, (a) and (b) are different in meaning (cf Wehr, 1961):

\[
\begin{align*}
(13) & \quad a \ [thm] \quad 'sin/offence/misdeed, etc' \quad (MSA) \\
& \quad b \ [ism] \quad 'name/noun/appellation, etc' \quad (MSA) \\
(14) & \quad a \ [thalla] \quad 'to degrade/humiliate/be low, etc' \quad (MSA) \\
& \quad b \ [zalla] \quad 'to make a mistake/to slip up, etc' \quad (MSA)
\end{align*}
\]

It appears that any Syrian learner's resort to \([s]/[z]\) when called upon to perform \([th]/[th]\) in his English IL would be seen as another example of Ll-error NT. It should be noted, however, that the learners (NCD/SCD/WCD) are not always unable to produce the English phonemes /\(\Theta/\) and /\(\j/\). Rather, the correct articulation is noticeable in the highly frequent words which the learners use in their linguistic repertoires such as 'think', 'thing', 'this', 'those', and so on. It seems, therefore, the examples (10 a-e)—which sometimes occur in 'correct' forms—are, among many others, clear evidence that the learners in question have learned or 'known' the phonemes /\(\Theta/\) and /\(\j/\) but have not yet acquired them (cf Krashen, chapter 4, section 4 1 2). Such non-acquisition may well be suggested by their randomly 'correct' and 'erroneous' articulation of these phonemes upon the phonological performance of their English ILs. However, their tendency to resort to \([s]\) and \([z]\) or sometimes to \([t]\) and \([d]\) seems to be constant in their home dialects (NCD/SCD/WCD). This tendency remains constant even when these learners converse with native speakers of English and are induced to produce an Arabic proper noun (containing either of the phonemes \([th]/[th]\)) during their conversations. For example
As the above examples illustrate, the substitution of [s] for [th] in the L1-proper noun (15c) is a clear indication that the learners' tendency to use [s] instead of [th] is constant in their L1-dialects, since this L1-proper noun (as produced in their L1-dialects) remains unchanged when used in their English ILs. On the other hand, the correct articulation of the phonemes in (15b) as well as the erroneous articulation in (15d) indicates that the learners' tendency to produce [s] and [z] instead of [th] and [th] is variable. Both L1-constancy and L2-variability, therefore, provide evidence that the learners (NCD/SCD/WCD), even at advanced stages, have not yet acquired the English phonemes /θ/ and /ʃ/. As a consequence, the learners' variable resort to [s] and [z], like their resort to [ʃ]/[j] versus [tʃ]/[j], can be taken as another example of lack of control rather than lack of knowledge. However, unlike their resort to [ʃ]/[j], their resort to [s] and [z] can also be viewed as a type of covert CLI because, in this case, there is no cross-linguistic similarity perceived between the L1-phonemes '[s]-[z]' and the L2-counterparts '/θ/-/ʃ/'.

(D) /ŋ/ (ENGLISH) = [ɡ] in [gunna] (MSA)

These examples concern the articulation of the voiced velar nasal /ŋ/ which most Arab learners find troublesome. Notice that, in all three interlingual identifications (16 a-c), the voiced velar stop [ɡ] and the voiceless velar stop [k] are pronounced in clear phonemicized junctures with the voiced alveolar nasal [n]. One possible interpretation is that although the appropriate nasalization is found in MSA in the form of [gunna], most Arab speakers neglect this process when performing spoken MSA assuming that [gunna] is only specific for the art of reciting the Koran [tajwīd]. Thus, upon performing
[gunna] 'nasalization' in spoken MSA where the Arabic phoneme [j] involves more than an approximation to the English phoneme /j/, Arab speakers tend to say (18 a-b) (cf (15 a-b)) rather than (17 a-b)

(17)  
  a [mîŋka] 'from/of you (sing masc )' (MSA by [gunna])  
  b [ʔaŋka] 'about you (sing masc )' (MSA by [gunna])

(18)  
  a [mîŋka] (MSA performed by SCA)  
  b [ʔanka] (MSA performed by SCA)

This indicates that the neglect of [gunna] 'nasalization' as in (18 a-b) is a colloquial feature, since no Arab speaker attempts to process such articulation in the home dialect. Rather, he tends to double the alveolar nasal [n] and insert a vowel (epenthesis) between the two radicals [n] and [k] as in (19 a-b)

(19)  
  a [minnak] 'from/of you (sing masc )' (SCA)  
  b [ʔannak] 'about you (sing masc )' (SCA)

Therefore, it is SCA which, by means of phonological 'simplification', neglects many of the linguistic aspects of the surface structure of MSA and [gunna] is one of these aspects. However, apart from the religious implication of the term, [tajwîd] in Arabic is normally concerned with the proper articulation of vowels and consonants. It is, then, a highly organized set of phonological rules such as intonation, contour, rhythm, stress pattern, and so on. Thus, it would be very useful if the learners in question knew some of these rules before indulging the risk of making phonological errors such as (16 a-c). Had these learners internalized (or at least been familiar with) the process of [gunna], and, therefore, perceived the cross-linguistic similarity between the L1-L2 identifications, they would have faced no tenacious difficulty in producing the phoneme /j/ in their English ILs. It appears that, in most interlingual identifications, the resultant phonological errors such as (16 a-c) reflect the learners' inadequate control over the processing of /j/. Consequently, their monitor will find it difficult to repair unless otherwise great effort is being made.
(E) Miscellaneous Consonants

In all the preceding transfer-based examples, the analysis has shown that the potential for SCA-influence, rather than MSA-influence, is a strong trigger of language transfer mechanisms. In this final sub-section, some interlingual identifications will be analysed to demonstrate that the internal mechanisms of SCA-influence does not always operate in isolation from MSA-influence, but rather both varieties share in the trigger of transfer. Essentially, these interlingual identifications concern the consonants /p/, /r/ and /s/. These will be discussed consecutively.

(i) The voiceless bilabial stop /p/

This consonant exists neither in the phonological system of SCA nor in that of MSA. The only L1-counterpart, which occurs in both varieties, is the voiced bilabial stop [b]. Such a consonant, therefore, gives the Arab learner (who finds the production of /p/ troublesome) the only opportunity to make the necessary cross-lingual tie-ups between L1-[b] and L2-/p/ as in (20 a-d) below (cf also example (la)). Further, since both [p] and [b] are randomly produced as allaphonic in the Arab learner's English IL (cf Smith, 1987, 144), the problem seems to be greater in the distinction between some contrasts such as (21 a-d) and far greater when both phonemes occur in the same word or when the phoneme /p/ occurs twice in the same word as in (22 a-c)

(20) a * [bre ʒas]  'precious' (AE)
b * [bra kts]  'practice' (AE)
c * [sabliment]  'supplement' (AE)
d * [styu bid]  'stupid' (AE)

(21) a * [bo st]/[bo st]  'post/boast' (AE)
b * [ba wnd]/[ba wnd]  'pound/bound' (AE)
c * [ba rk]/[ba rk]  'park/bark' (AE)
d * [bre y]/[bre y]  'pray/bray' (AE)

(22) a * [ribablik]  'republic' (AE)
b * [ke babel]  'capable' (AE)
c * [pa rtisib et]  'participate' (AE)
(ii) The voiced gliding alveolar /r/

This consonant occurs both in SCA and in MSA but as a voiced gliding dento-alveolar [ɾ]. There are two positions of this phoneme within which transfer from Arabic can be detected: 'before consonants' and 'in final position'. Concerning the first position, of the two varieties, SCA-influence seems by far the stronger trigger of language transfer. For example:

(23) a * [fe rim] 'firm' (AE)  
    b * [le rin] 'learn' (AE)

Because of the dento-alveolar characteristics of the Arabic consonant [ɾ], most learners, upon producing it before nasals specifically, tend to insert a short vowel [i] into the two-segment clusters [ɾ-m] and [ɾ-n] as shown in (23 a-b) above (cf. also examples (6c), (10b)). The insertion of the short vowel [i] is a clear indication of epenthesis which appears to occur only in SCA if no vowel is added to the final radical. For example:

(24) a [farm] (MSA)/[farim] (SCA) 'mincing/chopping'  
    b [qarn] (MSA)/[qarim] (SCA) 'horn/tentacle'

Here, the epenthesis of [i] is directly attributable to the inappropriate articulation of [ɾ]. Some epenthetic phenomena will be discussed in detail (cf. section 6.1.2, sub-section (E) below). In MSA, the articulation of [ɾ] involves only one glide, that is, the tip of the tongue taps only once against the dento-alveolar ridge. In SCA, on the other hand, most speakers, if not all, tend to produce more than one glide, so that the insertion of [i] makes the two-segment clusters [ɾ-m] and [ɾ-n] easier for them to pronounce as in (24 a-b). Such more-than-one-glide articulation of [ɾ] seems to be directly transferable by most Arab learners, regardless of their home dialects.

With regard to the final position of [ɾ], it appears that both SCA and MSA share in the trigger of transfer, since [ɾ] in final position occurs in the two varieties. Similarly, most learners tend to transfer this aspect onto their English ILs. For example:

(25) a * [ti tʃar] 'teacher' (AE)  
    b * [fa thar] 'father' (AE)  
    (cf. also (1a), (4b))
(26) a [ahmar] 'red' (MSA/SCA)
b [akbar] 'bigger/older' (MSA/SCA)
c [aštár] 'incomplete' (MSA)

(iii) The voiceless alveolar fricative /s/

This consonant exists both in SCA and in MSA but as a voiceless dento-alveolar sulcal fricative [s], and, therefore, it is presumed to cause no difficulty at all. However, when, in particular cases, it occurs after the more-than-one-glide [r], most Arab learners—including advanced learners—tend to render the consonant /s/ into the voiced dento-alveolar sulcal fricative [z]. For example

(27) a * [konvarze ŝin] 'conversation' (AE)
b * [kompa rizon] 'comparison' (AE)
c * [mكريزنج] 'increasing' (AE)

One possible reason for such covert transfer-based identifications can be attributed to the fact that, in SCA, the articulation of [r] is characterized by a more-than-one-glide nature as discussed above. It suggests that this L1-articulation of [r] acts as a phonological precondition for the voiceless /s/ to be substituted by the voiced /z/ which appears to be easier for the learners to produce as in (27 a-c)

One final point to be mentioned here is that there are some attested interlingual identifications in phonology which can be viewed as an inherently direct operation of transfer from MSA, rather than from SCA, a seemingly established exception to Hypothesis One. This can only be observed in the learners' attempts to read aloud something written in English such as a newspaper, a sign, a label and so on. For example

(28) a * [po ses] 'possess' (AE)
b * [indoni sya] 'Indonesia' (AE)
c * [smithwiks] 'Smithwicks' (AE)

MSA-influence on these examples is, then, explicable in terms of the one-to-one relationship between what is written and what is read in MSA. Hence, the written forms of 'ss' and 's' in 'possess' and 'Indonesia' respectively have induced the 'reader' to resort to [s] as in (28 a-b). Again, the written form of 'thw' in 'Smithwicks' has induced the 'reader' to resort to the voiceless dental fricative [th] as in 'Smith' on its own, and to retain the labio-velar semi-vowel [w]
as in (28c) above. Therefore, the above examples can be said to reflect Arabic-reading strategies and the phonological errors identified are in many respects due to the learner's lack of L2-knowledge, that is, his ignorance of the L2-phonological pattern in question (cf. chapter 4, section 4.1.1).

### 6.1.2 Vowels and Diphthongs

Vowels and diphthongs are tabulated in the following sub-sections:

(A) The English diphthong /ei/ which is the approximate equivalent of the Arabic diphthong [ay] occurring in MSA and in some sub-dialects of WCD.

(B) The English diphthong /aw/ which is the approximate equivalent of the Arabic diphthong [aw] occurring in MSA and in some sub-dialects of WCD.

(C) The English diphthong /le/ which is the approximate equivalent of the Arabic diphthong [le] occurring exactly in RED, the rural sub-dialects of ECD, and approximately in the form of [iya] in MSA.

(D) The English diphthong /oe/ which is the approximate equivalent of the Arabic diphthong [ue] occurring exactly in RED and approximately in the form of [uwa] in MSA.

(E) Some epenthetic phenomena observed in the learners' phonological performance of their English ILs.

(F) Miscellaneous suprasegmentals such as the strong and weak forms of one-syllable words, and some other observed deviant stress representations in the learner's English ILs.

(A) /ei/ (ENGLISH) $\approx$ [ay] (MSA/WCD)

The L2-diphthong /ei/ is often mispronounced by the Syrian learners whose dialects are ECD, NCD, and SCD specifically. Thus, when they are called upon to produce /ei/ they do not seem to realize that there is a glide from the simple vowel /e/ to another short simple vowel /i/.
Instead, these learners tend to drop this glide and produce a long spread flat vowel [e] which is not found in the phonological system of MSA. For example

$$\begin{align*}
(29) & \text{a} * [\text{me k}] & '\text{make}' & (\text{AE}) \\
& \text{b} * [\text{bre k}] & '\text{break}' & (\text{AE}) \\
& \text{c} * [\text{we t}] & '\text{wait}' & (\text{AE}) \\
& \text{d} * [\text{re z}] & '\text{raise}' & (\text{AE})
\end{align*}$$

(cf also (1b), (4a), (9c), (21d), (22b))

In MSA, the nearest approximation to /eɪ/ is the clear glide linking the short simple vowel [a] with the palatal semi-vowel [y]. This diphthong also occurs in some sub-dialects of WCD which are in many respects similar to Lebanese Colloquial Arabic. For example

$$\begin{align*}
(30) & \text{a} [\text{?ayn}] & '\text{where}' & (\text{MSA}) \\
& \text{b} [\text{wayn}] & '\text{where}' & (\text{WCD}) \\
& \text{c} [\text{?ayn}] & '\text{eye}' & (\text{MSA/WCD}) \\
& \text{d} [\text{bayt}] & '\text{house}' & (\text{MSA/WCD}) \\
& \text{e} [\text{sayf}] & '\text{sword}' & (\text{MSA/WCD})
\end{align*}$$

(cf also (11a, d), (12d))

In their dialects, the learners (ECD/NCD/SCD) usually drop the glide from [a] to [y] and resort to the long flat vowel [e], so that they produce the above L1-words as follows

$$\begin{align*}
(31) & \text{a} [\text{we n}] & '\text{where}' & (\text{ECD/NCD/SCD}) \\
& \text{b} [\text{?e n}] & '\text{eye}' & (\text{ECD/NCD/SCD}) \\
& \text{c} [\text{be t}] & '\text{house}' & (\text{ECD/NCD/SCD}) \\
& \text{d} [\text{se f}] & '\text{sword}' & (\text{ECD/NCD/SCD})
\end{align*}$$

(cf also (11c, e))

It seems the case that the tendency to use the SCA-item [e] as in (31 a-d) instead of the MSA-item [ay] as in (30 a-e) is directly transferable onto the English ILs of the Syrian learners (ECD/NCD/SCD) as in (29 a-d), in spite of the fact that these learners particularly are able to produce the diphthong [ay] when called upon to perform spoken MSA. As a result of this tendency, the problem becomes greater in that it is very hard to distinguish the learners' attempts to produce /eɪ/ from their attempts to produce the diphthongs /æ/ and /eɪ/ specifically. This can be ascribed to their permanent tendency to produce the dento-alveolar [r] in more-than-one-glide articulation both
before consonants as in (32 a-d) and in final position as in (33 a-d) below (for the analysis of \([\text{r}]\), cf section 6.11, sub-section (E))

For example

(32)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \ast [\text{se rv}] & \text{'serve'} & (\text{AE}) \\
\text{b} & \ast [\text{me rdar}] & \text{'murder'} & (\text{AE}) \\
\text{c} & \ast [\text{pe rs}] & \text{'purse'} & (\text{AE}) \\
\text{d} & \ast [\text{fe rzar}] & \text{'further'} & (\text{AE}) \\
& (\text{cf also (6c), (23 a-b)})
\end{align*}
\]

(33)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \ast [\text{we r}] & \text{'where'} & (\text{AE}) \\
\text{b} & \ast [\text{fe r}] & \text{'fair'} & (\text{AE}) \\
\text{c} & \ast [\text{ke r}] & \text{'care'} & (\text{AE}) \\
\text{d} & \ast [\text{be r}] & \text{'bear'} & (\text{AE}) \\
& (\text{cf also (4b)})
\end{align*}
\]

The linking between \([\text{e}]\) and \([\text{r}]\) is well noticeable in the colloquial pronunciation of some L1-proper nouns such as \([\text{zuhe r}]\), \([\text{zube r}]\) and \([\text{nuse r}]\) (SCA). It also occurs in some other colloquial words such as \([\text{be rik}]\) 'sitting' (NCD), \([\text{se rif}]\) 'spending' (NCD/ECD), and \([\text{se rib}]\) 'drinking' (NCD/ECD). It also occurs even in some foreign loan words used in SCA such as \([\text{sbe r}]\) 'spare', \([\text{sute r}]\) 'cistern/water store', and so on.

It seems the case that interlingual errors such as those cited in (29), which are a reflection of SCA-transfer, can be viewed as examples of covert CLI, since the learners in question are, in most cases, unaware of the cross-linguistic similarity (crucial similarity) between the L1-item \([\text{ay}]\) and the L2-item /\text{e i}/. Consequently, as the phonological errors cited in (32) and (33) appear to be over-generalized from such non perceived cross-linguistic similarity between \([\text{ay}]\) and /\text{e i}/, the resultant IL-identifications can be well seen as types of covert inter-intralingual errors.

(B) /\text{o u}/ (ENGLISH) = [\text{aw}] (MSA/WCD)

Analogous with the diphthong /\text{e i}/ discussed above is the diphthong /\text{o u}/ which most learners whose dialects are ECD, NCD, SCD find difficult to pronounce. Similarly, this diphthong is formulated by uttering the vowel /\text{a}/ and then gliding away to the short vowel /\text{u}/. Thus, most
learners, if not all, tend to drop the glide linking the two vowels and resort to a long rounded vowel [o] which does not exist in the phonological system of MSA. For example

(34) a * [ho m] 'home' (AE)
b * [jo k] 'joke' (AE)
c * [bo t] 'boat' (AE)
d * [abro tš] 'approach' (AE)
(cf also (21a))

In MSA, the nearest approximation to /ëw/ is the diphthong [aw] which is formulated by uttering the short vowel [a] and then clearly gliding away to the labio-velar semi-vowel [w]. This diphthong, like [ay], also occurs in some sub-dialects of WCD which are similar to Lebanese Colloquial Arabic. For example

(35) a [nawm] 'sleeping' (MSA/WCD)
b [lawn] 'colour' (MSA/WCD)
c [lawz] 'almonds' (MSA/WCD)
d [lawh] 'board' (MSA/WCD)
e [hawn] 'here' (WCD)

Again, the learners (ECD/NCD/SCD), when attempting to produce these LL-words in their dialects, usually drop the glide from [a] to [w] and resort to the long rounded vowel [o] For example

(36) a [no m] 'sleeping' (ECD/NCD/SCD)
b [lo n] 'colour' (ECD/NCD/SCD)
c [lo z] 'almonds' (ECD/NCD/SCD)
d [lo h] 'board' (ECD/NCD/SCD)
e [ho n] 'here' (ECD/NCD/SCD)

From the above examples, it appears that the tendency to use the SCA-item [o] as in (36 a-e) in place of the MSA-item [aw] as in (35 a-e) is directly transferable onto the English ILs of Syrian learners (ECD/NCD/SCD) as in (34 a-d), even though these learners are able to produce [aw] in their attempts to perform spoken MSA. Likewise, this tendency leads to a far greater problem in that it is very difficult to distinguish the way the learners pronounce /ëw/ from the way they pronounce /o/ specifically. For example
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(37) a * [fio r] 'floor' (AE)
b * [fo rk] 'fork' (AE)
c * [fo rj] 'forge' (AE)
d * [po rk] 'pork' (AE)
e * [so ] 'saw' (AE)

(cf also (10b))

It is also difficult to distinguish this vowel from the way they produce /a/, /o/ and /o/ in some phonological identifications. For example,

(38) a * [wo rd] 'word' (AE)
b * [wo rk] 'work' (AE)
c * [divilo b] 'develop' (AE)
d * [alo ng] 'along' (AE)
e * [lo St] 'lost' (AE)

(cf also (9a))

Following the phonological identifications cited in the preceding section, interlingual errors such as (34 a-d) are other examples of covert CLI because the learners do not seem to have perceived the cross-linguistic similarity (crucial similarity) between the L1-item [aw] and the L2-item /»/ Again, since the phonological errors (37 a-d) and (38 a-e) suggest an over-generalization from the non-perceived cross-linguistic similarity between [aw] and /»/, they can therefore be viewed as other examples of covert inter-intralingual errors.

(C) /ie/ (ENGLISH) = [ie] (RED) = [iya] (MSA)

Another problematic area encountered by most Syrian learners is the articulation of the diphthong /ie/. This diphthong is formulated by gliding from the short vowel /i/ to a shorter vowel /e/ Thus, most learners find it difficult to pronounce, particularly when it precedes the phoneme /r/, with the result that they tend to drop the glide and resort to a long spread flat vowel [i ] which occurs both in MSA and SCA. For example,

(39) a * [bi rd] 'beard' (AE)
b * [bi r] 'beer' (AE)
c * [di r] 'dear' (AE)
d * [fi r] 'fear' (AE)
e * [hi r] 'here' (AE)
f * [klı r] 'clear' (AE)
The learners' resorting to [i:] may be ascribed to the articulation of the more-than-one-glade [r] as discussed above (cf section 6.11, sub-section (E)). It seems the case that when the learners attempt to perform /ɪə/ as preceding /r/ they make cross-lingual tie-ups between this diphthong and the LI-long vowel [i] followed by the dento-alveolar [r]. For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(40)} & \quad \text{a} & [\text{kabir}] & \quad \text{big/old}' & \quad (\text{MSA}) \\
& & [\text{tshabir}] & \quad \text{big/old}' & \quad (\text{ECD}) \\
& & [\text{kibir}] & \quad \text{big/old}' & \quad (\text{NCD/SCD/WCD}) \\
& \quad \text{b} & [\text{kathir}] & \quad \text{much/lot}' & \quad (\text{MSA}) \\
& & [\text{tshathir}] & \quad \text{much/lot}' & \quad (\text{ECD}) \\
& & [\text{kthir}] & \quad \text{much/lot}' & \quad (\text{NCD/SCD/WCD}) \\
& \quad \text{c} & [\text{mudir}] & \quad \text{manager'} & \quad (\text{MSA/SCA}) \\
& & [\text{amir}] & \quad \text{prince'} & \quad (\text{MSA/SCA}) \\
\end{align*}
\]

In MSA, however, the only approximation to /ɪə/ is the diphthong [iya] which is formulated by gliding down from the short vowel [i] to the palatal semi-vowel [y] and then gliding up to the short vowel [a]. For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(41)} & \quad \text{a} & [\text{hiyal}] & \quad \text{tricks'} & \quad (\text{MSA}) \\
& & [\text{riyab}] & \quad \text{suspicions'} & \quad (\text{MSA}) \\
& & [\text{siyar}] & \quad \text{biographies'} & \quad (\text{MSA}) \\
& & [\text{siya}] & \quad \text{adherents'} & \quad (\text{MSA}) \\
& & [\text{diyaka}] & \quad \text{cocks/roosters'} & \quad (\text{MSA}) \\
& & [\text{hiya}] & \quad \text{she'} & \quad (\text{MSA}) \\
\end{align*}
\]

Moreover, in the rural sub-dialects of ECD (referred to as RED in this study) there seems to occur a far nearer approximation, if not a complete equivalence, to the English diphthong /ɪə/. This can be observed when speakers of RED produce the LI-diphthong [ay] as discussed above (cf section 6.12, sub-section (A)). These speakers tend to reverse the diphthong by gliding from the short vowel [i] to a much shorter vowel [e] which can be equated with the English vowel /æ/. Therefore, the examples (30 a-e) cited in (sub-section (A)) of this section are pronounced by these speakers as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(42)} & \quad \text{a} & [\text{wiem}] & \quad \text{where'} & \quad (\text{RED}) \\
& & [\text{tiem}] & \quad \text{eye'} & \quad (\text{RED}) \\
& & [\text{biet}] & \quad \text{house'} & \quad (\text{RED}) \\
& & [\text{sief}] & \quad \text{sword'} & \quad (\text{RED}) \\
\end{align*}
\]
Further, these speakers tend to *intralingually* 'transfer' the diphthong [ie] when they perform L1-words containing the long vowel [i:]. It seems, therefore, that such a long vowel is subject to segmentation into two short vowels ([i] + [i]) of which the second is replaced by the very short vowel [e] referred to above. As a consequence, the examples (40 a-d) would be pronounced by speakers of RED as follows:

(43)    a [tʃibİr]    'big/old' (RED)  
        b [tʃɪthiɛr] 'much/lot' (RED)  
        c [mɪdɪɛr]    'manager' (RED)   
        d [lmɪɛr]    'prince' (RED)    

In the light of the above analysis, it appears that the Syrian learners in question, upon making the interlingual errors (39 a-f), did not perceive the cross-linguistic similarity either between the L2-item /ie/ and the MSA-item [iya] as in (41 a-f) (crucial similarity), or between the L2-item /ie/ and the RED-item [ie] as in (43 a-d) (complete similarity), though they are familiar with at least [iya] as they use some of the MSA-words (41) such as (41a), (41c), (41d) and (41e) in their home dialects. Their seemingly constant resort to [i:] as in (40 a-d) appears, then, to be attributable to the fact that the existence of /r/ in the L2-words (39 a-f) dissuaded them from making the relevant cross-lingual tie-ups between, at least, the MSA-item [iya] and the L2-item /ie/. Consequently, interlingual errors such as (39 a-f) can be regarded as other examples of covert CLI:

(D)    /οι/ (ENGLISH)=[ue] (RED)= [uwa] (MSA)

Analogous with the diphthong /ie/ discussed above is the diphthong /ue/ which is very often mispronounced by most Syrian learners. This diphthong is formulated by gliding from /u/ to /e/. Paradoxically, these learners tend to drop the glide and to resort to the long rounded vowel [u] preceding [r]. For example:

(44)    a * [ku r] 'cure' (AE)  
        b * [pu r] 'poor' (AE)   
        c * [su r]    'sure' (AE)

Similarly, the learners seem to have made cross-lingual tie-ups between /ue/ and the L1-long vowel [u] followed by [r]. For example:

(45)    a [ku u]    'cure' (AE)  
        b [pu u]    'poor' (AE)   
        c [su u]    'sure' (AE)   

Further, these speakers tend to *intralingually* 'transfer' the diphthong [ie] when they perform L1-words containing the long vowel [i:]...
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(45) a \([\text{sur}]\) 'fence' (MSA/SCA)
b \([\text{nu r}]\) 'light' (MSA/SCA)
c \([\text{mabsur}]\) 'shredded' (MSA/SCA)
d \([\text{maksur}]\) 'broken' (MSA/SCA)

Both in MSA and SCA, an approximation to /oə/ is \([\text{uwa}]\) as formulated by gliding down from the short vowel \([u]\) to the labio-velar semi-vowel \([w]\) and then gliding up to the short vowel \([a]\). For example

(46) a \([\text{suwar}]\) 'photographs/pictures' (MSA/SCA)
b \([\text{fuwat}]\) 'napkins/towels' (MSA/SCA)
c \([\text{suwak}]\) 'forks' (SCA)
d \([\text{quwat}]\) 'boxes' (ECD)

Again, a far nearer approximation to /oə/ occurs when speakers of RED attempt to produce the LL-diphthong \([\text{aw}]\) as referred to above (cf section 6 1 2, sub-section (B)). These speakers tend to reverse \([\text{aw}]\) by gliding from \([u]\) to a very short vowel \([e]\) as is the case of /e/. Thus, the LL-examples (35 a-d) cited in (sub-section (B)) would be pronounced by these speakers as follows

(47) a \([\text{nuem}]\) 'sleeping' (RED)
b \([\text{luen}]\) 'colour' (RED)
c \([\text{luez}]\) 'almonds' (RED)
d \([\text{lueh}]\) 'board' (RED)

(Notice that these speakers pronounce (35e) as \([\text{hien}]\) 'here' for no distinct reason)

Moreover, these speakers tend to intralingually 'transfer' \([\text{ue}]\) when performing \([u]\) within their home dialect. Thus, the LL-examples (45 a-d) would be pronounced as follows

(48) a \([\text{suer}]\) 'fence' (RED)
b \([\text{nuer}]\) 'light' (RED)
c \([\text{mabsuer}]\) 'shredded' (RED)
d \([\text{maksuer}]\) 'broken' (RED)

Following the conclusion drawn in the preceding section, phonological interlingual identifications such as (44 a-c) can be viewed as examples of covert CLI, since the learners in question do not seem to have perceived the cross-linguistic similarity between the L2-item /uə/ and the RED-item \([\text{ue}]\), or, at least, the MSA-item \([\text{uwa}]\).
(E) Epenthetic Phenomena

Epenthesis is one of the two types of phonological intrusion, the other one being prothesis (cf. Crystal, 1985:163). Epenthesis refers to such intrusion where an extra vowel is inserted initially or medially into a consonant cluster. The interlingual identifications cited by Broselow from Egyptian and Iraqi learners are clear examples of this phenomenon as put forward in support of Hypothesis One (cf. chapter 5, section 5.3.1). As far as the Syrian learners are concerned, epenthetic phenomena are observable in their attempts to produce some final consonant clusters. For example:

(a) *[bo rm] 'born' (AE)
(b) *[spe rim] 'sperm' (AE)
(cf. also (6c), (10b))

As discussed above, the insertion of the very short vowel [i] into the two-segment cluster ([r] + [nasal]) is due to the inappropriate articulation of the phoneme [r] (cf. examples (23 a-b), (24 a-b)). Therefore, when this phoneme precedes another two-segment cluster such as /k-t/, the learners tend to insert [i] into this cluster. For example:

(a) *[wo rkid] 'worked' (AE)
(b) *[ma rkid] 'marked' (AE)

It seems, therefore, because the English phoneme /r/ is clearly articulated by the learners through the phonological patterning of the Arabic dento-alveolar [r], the resultant IL-cluster will seem (in their attempted utilization) to be a three-segment cluster [r-k-d] in final position. Thus, the learners' tendency to insert the short vowel is systematic, that is, the insertion normally occurs before the final segment of the final cluster whether it consists of two or three segments. For example:

(a) *[a skid] 'asked' (AE)
(b) *[monthiz] 'months' (AE)
The tendency to insert a short vowel in such a position appears to be uniquely recurrent in the phonological system of SCA compared with that of MSA. This is to demonstrate that, in support of Hypothesis One, it is SCA-influence (not MSA-influence) which underlies the operation of epenthesis in the learners' English ILs. For example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCA</th>
<th>MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a [sakabit]</td>
<td>[sakabt]  'poured out (I)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b [tahit]</td>
<td>[taht] 'under/beneath'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c [sabit]</td>
<td>[sabt] 'Saturday'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d [ism]</td>
<td>[ism] 'name/noun'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e [masir]</td>
<td>[misr] 'Egypt/metropolis'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f [bahar]</td>
<td>[bahr] 'sea'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g [raqam]</td>
<td>[raqm] [raqm] 'number/numeral'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, epenthetic phenomena are also noticeable in the learners' attempts to produce three-segment clusters in initial position. These, too, appear to be systematic, that is, vowel-insertion normally occurs between the first and second segments of the initial three-segment cluster. For example

(53) a * [sikr n] 'screen' (AE)
    b * [sipring] 'spring' (AE)
    c * [sitn n g] 'string' (AE)

Epenthetic phenomena are more apparent in the learners' ILs when they are induced to produce initial four-segment clusters preceded by a vowel. Again, vowel-insertion occurs systematically after the second segment of these clusters. For example

(54) a * [iksikyu z] 'excuse' (AE)
    b * [iksiprešin] 'expression' (AE)
    c * [iksiplo jin] 'explain' (AE)
    d * [iksiplo jin] 'explode' (AE)
    e * [iksiplo jin] 'extremely' (AE)

To avoid possible confusion, it will be helpful to employ some abbreviations here: (v) stands for a short vowel, (V) for a long vowel, and (C) for a consonant. In MSA, some verbs are governed by the structure (CVVVC) as in (55 a-c) below

(55) a [turi d] 'you (sing masc) want' (MSA)
    b [taru h] 'you (sing masc) go' (MSA)
    c [tana m] 'you (sing masc) sleep' (MSA)
In MSA, in particular, one of the interrogation rules is formulated by adding the question particle [a] initially to these verbs. This particle is phonologically a glottal stop [ʔ]. Since it always occurs initially, its structure is simply described by the short vowel [a]. Thus, the structure of the above verb class will be (vCvCVC)

(56) a [atun d] 'do you want?' (MSA)
b [ataru h] 'do you (want to) go?' (MSA)
c [atana m] 'do you (want to) sleep?' (MSA)

In SCA, on the other hand, the structure of the verb class (CvCVC) as in (55 a-b) is changed by dropping the short vowel (v), and the resultant structure will be (CCVC)

(57) a [tn d] (SCA)
b [tru h] (SCA)
c [tna m] (SCA)

Particularly, the initial two-segment clusters as in (57 a-c) seem to occur only in SCA, though the clusters in MSA can occur medially as in [taskub] 'pour out (you)', or finally as in (52 a-g). It follows that when speakers insert, for example, the consonant [b-] (one of whose functions is interrogation) initially into the verb class (CCVC) as in (57 a-c), the result would apparently lead to a formulation of three-segment clusters initially occurring within the structure (C-CCVC)

(58) a [b-tri d] (NCD/SCD/WCD)
b [b-tru h] (NCD/SCD/WCD)
c [b-tna m] (NCD/SCD/WCD)

However, although [b-] (as derived from [biddak] (SCA)/[abiwiddika] (MSA) 'do you like/want?') can express interrogation on its own, speakers tend to retain the question particle [a] as in [abiwiddika] (cf 56 a-c), but render it into a very short vowel [i] inserted after [b-]

(59) a [bitri d] 'do you want?' (NCD/SCD/WCD)
b [bitru.h] 'do you (want to) go?' (NCD/SCD/WCD)
c [bitna.m] 'do you (want to) sleep?' (NCD/SCD/WCD)
If, however, the above processes (that is, starting with (55) and ending in (59)) are, more or less, applied to other verb classes such as (CvCCvC):

(60) a. \(\text{[tadrus]}\) 'you (sing. masc.) study' (MSA)
b. \(\text{[taskob]}\) 'you (sing. masc.) pour out' (MSA)
c. \(\text{[taksab]}\) 'you (sing. masc.) win' (MSA)

then the resultant colloquial representations of these verbs will involve initial four-segment clusters of which the short vowel [a] as in (60 a-c) will be a substitute by a shorter vowel [i] as in (59 a-c). Thus, the SCA-identification will be governed by the structure (CCvCCvC):

(61) a. \(\text{[btidros]}\) (NCD/SCD/WCD)
b. \(\text{[btiskob]}\) (NCD/SCD/WCD)
c. \(\text{[btiksab]}\) (NCD/SCD/WCD)

Further, [i]-insertion in (61 a-c) will still remain in its place even if these verbs are affirmed by colloquial particles such as [e]:

(62) a. \(\text{[ebtidros]}\) (NCD/SCD/WCD)
b. \(\text{[ebtiskob]}\) (NCD/SCD/WCD)
c. \(\text{[eb tiksab]}\) (NCD/SCD/WCD)

Notice that all the colloquial representations cited in (59), (61) and (62) are typical of speakers whose dialects are NCD, SCD and WCD specifically. It now becomes clear that epenthetic phenomena, which occur systematically in L1-examples such as (59 a-c) and (62 a-c), seem to be systematically transferable onto the learners' ILs as in (53 a-c) and (54 a-e) respectively. In other words, when the learner attempts to produce L2-words beginning with three-segment clusters: /skri:n/, he usually inserts the vowel [i] between the first and second consonant of this cluster by falling back on a systematic SCA-phonological identification as in (59 a-c). When the learner attempts to produce L2-words containing four-segment clusters in medial position: /iks\textaju:z/, he tends to segment the cluster into two two-consonant clusters and insert the vowel [i] medially by resorting to a systematic SCA-phonological identification as in (62 a-c).
(F) Miscellaneous Suprasegmentals

The preceding sub-sections have dealt with the main English diphthongs such as /eɪ/, /œ/, /ɪe/ and /u/ which are often mispronounced by Syrian learners. Some epenthetic problems observable in the learners' ILs have also been considered by reference to equivalent phenomena realized in NCD, SCD and WCD. In support of Hypothesis One, the analysis has demonstrated that the potential for SCA-influence, rather than MSA-influence, is a strong trigger of language transfer mechanisms. However, in phonological interlingual identifications, SCA-influence does not always operate on its own. In this final sub-section, two important aspects will be analysed: one will show transfer effects from an overlap between SCA and MSA, the other (as an exception to Hypothesis One) will illustrate that, in particular interlingual identifications, MSA-influence is more prone to transfer than is SCA-influence. These two aspects will be mentioned consecutively.

(1) Transfer from an overlap of SCA and MSA

Following the notion of what Ringbom calls a superficial receptive competence, the learner's 'permanent' tendency—at a production level—towards the strong form of some one-syllable words (such as 'and', 'can', 'have', 'was', etc.) may result in considerable pragmatic problems encountered by such a learner at a reception level (cf. chapter 4, section 4.2.3, example (9)). In this context, an actual example will demonstrate how the learner may faultily receive a given L2-item produced naturally by a native speaker of English. Because of the influence of an equivalent L1-item realized phonologically both in MSA and SCA, this faulty reception can be attributed to a defect in the learner's listening skill. To begin with, consider the following actual example.

(63)  a  NSE  You can't have wars without killing (/kʌnt/)  
    b  NSA  This is wrong  
    c  NSE  Why?  
    d  NSA  Because last time you said 'You cannot have wars without killing' ([ka nnot])  
    e  NSE  Yes, that's what I said
Inherent in the above example is that the Arab listener faultily received the contracted form 'can't' in (63a) and realized it as the strong form of 'can' in the affirmative mode, since what the native speaker of English had already said was the same negative statement in (63d). It seems the case that most Arab learners, if not all, tend to produce the strong form of one-syllable words such as /kәn/ rather than the weak form /kәn/ for all phonological identifications in connected speech. For instance, when these learners attempt to perform affirmative statements such as (64 a-c) below, they tend to 'permanently' produce the strong form of 'can' without really paying attention to pragmatic exigencies. That is, when the context requires them to produce the weak form, they still lean towards the strong form of 'can' even if the main verb is stressed:

(64) a. You [kә:n] go to the city centre. (/kәn/)
    b. You [kә:n] have this book. (/kәn/)
    c. You [kә:n] stay here. (/kәn/)

Because the contracted form 'can't' in (63a) involves the strong form /kәn/ connected with a slight articulation of /t/ as is the case in Hiberno-English and American English, the Arab listener seems to have received (63a) as 'You /kәn/ have wars without killing' assuming that the affirmative mode was in question. Thus, his superficial receptive competence (that is, his auditory receptive skill) told him—as he usually does in speaking (production)—that even his native interlocutor had a tendency to produce the strong form of 'can' in affirmation. Moreover, in terms of such a superficial competence, the Arab listener will face a greater problem in receiving 'can't' when it negates main verbs beginning with /t/ such as 'take', 'tell' and 'teach' due to the inseparable link, or liaison, between the final /t/ of 'can't' and the initial /t/ of these verbs. For example:

(65) a. You can't-tell...
    b. You can't-take...
    c. You can't-teach...

It appears the case that, neither in MSA nor in SCA, is there such a thing as a strong form and a weak form of the same one-syllable word in connected speech. For instance, in SCA the Ll-word [kә:n] 'was (he)' represents the same accentuation imposed by the phonological system of MSA in which the word consists of two syllables [kә:na]. So that the
SCA-word [kaːn] — which is still characterized by the long open vowel [aː] though the second syllable [a] is dropped — is always pronounced as the strong form of the L2-word 'can' whether it be accentuated or not. For example:

(66) a. [kaːn biddoː] (interrogative) = /kæn/ (SCD/NCD) 'did he want?'
b. [eː kaːn biddoː] (affirmative) = /kæn/ (SCD/NCD) 'Yes, he did'
c. [ maː kaːn biddoː] (negative) = /kæn/ (SCD/NCD) 'No, he didn't'

It seems, therefore, such a phonological L1-aspect is one of the highly automatized L1-identifications which the Syrian learner, even at advanced stages of learning, unconsciously transfers onto his IL. Consequently, the learner's permanent tendency towards the strong form may lead to overt PT at a production level, but it may well lead to covert NT at a reception level as shown in (63) and thus will be liable to fossilization if no proper action is taken to remedy the situation.

(ii) Transfer from MSA rather than SCA:

The second aspect deals with some attested interlingual identifications which, it is believed, have direct connection with the spelling pronunciation of MSA rather than SCA. In the preceding section, mention has been made of some interlingual identifications in consonants, which reflect an Arabic-reading strategy adopted by the learner (cf. section 6.1.1., sub-section (E)). Thus, transfer effects are more pertinent to MSA-influence than to SCA-influence (cf. examples (28 a-c)). Likewise, some 'seen' written forms and some other 'known' written forms of L2-words may reflect an influence from the MSA spelling pronunciation when these words are read aloud or spoken by the Syrian learners. For example:

(67) a.* [priːliminari] 'preliminary' (AE)
b.* [biːlateral] 'bilateral' (AE)
c.* [riliːabiliti] 'reliability' (AE)

Again, following the interlingual identifications cited in (28 a-c), transfer effects on (67 a-c) are ascribable to the one-to-one relationship between written and read forms in MSA. Hence, (67a) suggests that the 'reader' knows the 'correct' pronunciation of the
prefix 'pre-' as /pri./ from which [pri ] in (67a) seems to have been overgeneralized. Thus, overgeneralization from a L2-item within an Arabic-reading strategy indicates an inter-intralinguial error. Concerning (67b), the existence of 'i' in the written form and perhaps the absence of 'e' after the consonant that follows may induce the reader to render 'i' into [i] rather than [ai]. This would be more apparent when 'i' is followed by 'a' in some words such as (67c). In this case, the reader, or the learner who orally performs already-known written words containing 'ia', seems to resort to an Arabic-reading strategy. Such a strategy tells him, as a phonological rule in MSA, that if the palatal semi-vowel [y] is followed by the short vowel [a] or the long vowel [a ], then the resultant identification will be either [ya] or [ya ] as in [al-yam] 'the sea' and [al-?al?ya f] 'the fibres'. Therefore, the unpredictable nature of pronouncing the English 'ia' (sometimes /jæ/ and other times /æ/) confuses the learners and impels them to apply such a confidently predictable L1-strategy to at least those L2-items of which they are not entirely sure, since some of these learners produce examples such as *[liyabl] 'liable' (AE) and *[dyæ'lekt] 'dialect' (AE). Even advanced learners—who know the correct pronunciation of these words as /læbə/ and /dælekt/—appear to render, by false analogy, some L2-words containing /jæ/ into the reverse /æ/. For example

(68) *[zoda yak] 'zodiac' (AE)

Another Arabic-reading strategy can be detected in some L2-words orally produced by advanced learners. For example

(69) a *[kom'pi tans] 'competence' (AE)
b *[pri'fe  rans] 'preference' (AE)

These examples may, at first glance, lead one to believe that the learner knew the correct pronunciation of the two verbs 'compete' and 'prefer' (whose second syllables are stressed) but, at least up to the time of uttering (69 a-b), his linguistic repertoire lacked the correct stress-patterning demanded by the pronunciation of 'competence' and 'preference', since the advanced learner in question produced (69 a-b) several times before outside correction was made. These examples also suggest that he might have known some other verbs and the correct phonological representations of their derived nouns such as (70 a-c)
below. Given that these forms follow a regular phonological stress-pattern (that is, the primary stress occurs on the same syllable of the verb and its noun), it seems that the learner drew a false analogy between (70) and (71).

(70)  
  a  /ˈpreɪz/ 'appraise'  ---->  /ˈprɛriz/ 'appraisal'
  b  /ˈprərv/ 'approve'  ---->  /ˈprərl/ 'approval'
  c  /ˈəkɔːd/ 'accord'  ---->  /ˈəkɔdəns/ 'accordance'

(71)  
  a  /kəmpɪt/ 'compete'  ---->  * /kəmpı tens/ 'competence'
  b  /prɪf3/ 'prefer'  ---->  * /prɪf3 rɛns/ 'preference'

If this is the case, then the examples (69 a-b) would mark intralingual errors due to overgeneralization from similar but correct L2-identifications such as (70 a-c). However, since regularity of spelling pronunciation in MSA is much more predictable by the learner than that of the L2, it seems that he was more amenable to overgeneralization from an Arabic-reading strategy in that word structures such as (CvCCVC), of which the second vowel is accentuated as in (72a), would retain that structure even if regular morphological rules of femininity, duality of femininity and plurality of femininity operate. For example

(72)  
  a  [tərnı m]  'hymning'  (verbal noun, sing masc)
  b  [tərnı matən]  'a hymn'  (indefinite noun, sing fem)
  c  [tərnı mata nı]  'two hymns'  (indefinite noun, dual,fem)
  d  [tərnı ma tən]  'hymns'  (indefinite noun, pl, fem)

Therefore, such structure retention in MSA, being much more predictable by the learner, seems to have acted as a precondition for the structure retention realized in 'prefer' and 'preference' at one end, and perhaps in 'compete' and 'competence' at another. In the light of this reasoning, interlingual identifications such as (69 a-c) can be taken as other types of covert inter-intralingual errors due to overgeneralization from previously known L2-material preconditioned and activated by more predictable L1-material.
6.2 Arabic-Transfer Identifications in Syntax

In this section, five central aspects of syntax as observed in the spoken production of the Syrian learners' English ILs will be carefully studied and analysed in corroboration of Hypothesis Two. These five aspects concern the areas of difficulty the learners experience over the following structural devices:

- prepositions and prepositional phrases (section 6.2.1),
- definite and indefinite articles (section 6.2.2),
- the verb form construction (section 6.2.3),
- the relative-clause formation (section 6.2.4),
- and the word-order formation (section 6.2.5)

Again, to avoid possible confusion, each of these areas will be classified according to its own taxonomy. Notice that for every interlingual identification, the asterisk (*) indicates an actual error (AE) as attested in the learner's English IL and so judged from the viewpoint of the SBE-grammar.

6.2.1 Prepositions and Prepositional Phrases

Prepositions are tabulated in the following sub-sections:

(A) The English prepositions 'at', 'on', 'by', 'around', and 'with' are interlingually rendered into the IL-preposition 'in'.

(B) The English prepositions 'to', 'on', 'of', 'about', and 'at' are interlingually rendered into the IL-preposition 'with'.

(C) The English prepositions 'at', 'with', 'by', 'of', 'about', and 'through' as well as the English conjunction 'than' are interlingually rendered into the IL-preposition 'from'.

(D) The English prepositions 'to', 'of', 'for', 'by', and 'with' are interlingually rendered into the IL-preposition 'on'.

(E) Miscellaneous IL-prepositions such as 'in' which suggests an overlap between the learner's intralingual and interlingual solutions.
(A) at/on/by/around/with (ENGLISH) = \[bi\]/[fi.] (ARABIC)

(1) * He is good in Maths (AE)
(2) * You are quick in reading (AE)
(3) * He was in the work (AE)
(4) * We travelled in the day to Sligo (AE)
(5) * I saw him in that day (AE)
(6) * He is in a mission (AE)
(7) * Put it (necklace) in your neck (AE)
(8) * Put it (watch) in your hand (AE)
(9) * Can we buy it (TV) in debt (AE)
(10)* I bought my TV in ---- cheap price (AE)
(11)* Stop playing in your teeth (AE)
(12)* He wants to subscribe in the newspaper (AE)

As the above examples illustrate, the potential for Arabic transfer can be detected in the misuse of the preposition 'in'. The learner's recurrent misuse of 'in' suggests a reflection of his inherent reliance on either of two prepositions in Arabic [bi] and [fi]. In MSA, each preposition has a multitude of grammatical functions or meanings fourteen functions are indicated by the use of [bi] and ten functions by [fi] (cf Al-Bustani, 1977 25 and 707). However, both prepositions resemble each other in expressing several functions within either the restrictive boundaries of MSA or the flexible rules of SCA. These will be considered with reference to the above interlingual identifications. Notice that the L1-examples below are transliterated from MSA only, whereas the uses of the L1-prepositions are maintained both in MSA and SCA.

(i) In both varieties (MSA/SCA), [bi] and [fi] are used before knowledge (13a), skill (13b), training (13c), or state of motion (13d). For example

(13) a [kibra/kabi r] [bi/fi-zzira ?a] 'experience/an expert in agriculture'

b [sur?a/sari ?] [bi/fi-1kita ba] 'being quick/quick at writing'

c [Ju da/Jayyid] [bi/fi-1?amal] 'being good/good at work'

d [Zayd bi/fi-1?amal/ššugul] 'Zaid is at work' (cf examples (1), (2), (3))
(ii) In both varieties (MSA/SCA), [bi] and [fi] can act with certain words as adverbial clauses (place and time) either literally [haqi qatan] as in (14 a-b) or figuratively [ma^a zan] as in (14 c-e)

(14) a [bi/fi-lbayt] (place) 'at home/in the house'
   b [bi/fi-nnaha r]/[bi/fi tha lika-lyawm] (time) 'by day'/‘on that day' (cf examples (4), (5))
   c [tadakkala bi/fi su'u ni gayr1h1] 'he interfered in/with somebody's affairs'
   d [bi/fi-lkala m/hadi th] 'in/on a conversation'
   e [ka na bi/fi muhimmah] 'he was on a mission' (cf example (6))

(iii) However, for an adverb of place, [bi]/[fi] in SCA and [fi] in MSA are used to indicate either perversion [qalb] as in (15 a-b), or overness and onness [lsti^ la], that is, both [bi] and [fi] are synonymous with the preposition [?ala] 'over/on' as in (15c) and (15e)

(15) a [adkala-lkala tama bi/fi 1gba2ihi1] (Lit inserted (he) the ring in his finger)
   b [adkala 1gba2ahu bi/fi-1ka tam] (Lit inserted (he) his finger in the ring) 'he put the ring on his finger' or 'he put on the ring'
   c [wada^a-at1-ttawqa bi/fi /?ala ?unuqiha ] 'she put the necklace around her neck'
   d [labisat1-ttawqa/lqila data (bi/fi ?unuqiha )] 'she wore the necklace (around her neck')
   e [wada^a-ssa ?ata bi/fi /?ala yadihi/mi^.' sam1h1] 'he put the watch on his arm/wrist'
   f [labisa-ssa ?ata (bi/fi yadihi/mi^.' sam1h1)] 'he wore the watch (on his arm/wrist)' (cf examples (7), (8))
(iv) Both [bi] and [fi:] in MSA and [bi] in SCA are used to indicate exchange [muqā:bala] or compensation [taʾwi:d]. For example:

(16) a. [ištarawhu bi/fi: thamanen baksen] 'they bought it at a very low price'

b. [yaštaru:na bi/(fi)-ddayn] 'they are buying on credit/on tick' (cf. examples (9); (10))

(v) In both varieties (MSA/SCA), [bi] and [fi:] are used to denote concomitance [muqā:haba] or withness [maʾiyya]; that is, both [bi] and [fi:] are synonymous with [maʾa] ‘with’ as in (17a); whereas only [bi] is used to indicate utilization [istiʿa:na] as in (17b). However, both [bi] and [fi:] can be used to indicate amusement or entertainment [lahwon] as in (17c):

(17) a. [qa:ma bi/fi:/maʾa tuluː?[i-ššams] 'he got up at sunrise/at dawn' 'he rose with the sun'

b. [kataba bi-lqalam] 'he wrote with the pen'

c. [la: talʔab bi/fi-nna:r] 'don’t play with fire' (cf. example (11))

(vi) In both varieties (MSA/SCA), [bi] and [fi:] can be used to denote continuity [muwā: sala]. For example:

(18) a. [ištaralsala bi/fi-1kitaːb] 'he made a long speech'

b. [ištaraka bi/fi-1majalla] 'he subscribed to the magazine' (cf. example (12))

Concerning the interlingual identifications (1-12), it appears that two types of L1-knowledge may be specified. First, analysed lexical knowledge where, from the point of view of relexification, the L1-items [bi] and [fi:] have been rendered or analysed as lexical items into the L2-item 'in' (cf. chapter 4, section 4.2.1). Second, unanalysed syntactic knowledge which represents a carrying over of the grammatical functions of the L1-prepositions [bi] and [fi:] in place of the grammatical functions of the L2-prepositions 'at' (1-3), 'by' (4), 'on' (5-6), (8-9), ‘around’ (7), ‘with’ (11) and ‘to’ (12).
Therefore, at a comprehension level, the learner seems to have made crosslingual tie-ups between [bī]/[fī] and 'in' as shown in the above L1-examples. In the first six interlingual identifications (1-6), it is believed that the learner's cognitive processing of these two prepositions lay essentially at the heart of the general grammatical function inclusion [ḥīṭa] by which [fī] in MSA and [bī], being more frequent in SCA, are characterized. For instance, with regard to example (1)—and this can be applied to the other first five—the preposition [fī] in MSA normally indicates that something is included or 'contained' in a 'container'. Thus, 'Maths', here, is figuratively a field of knowledge, and 'he' occupies a 'good' position [fī] in this field. Concerning the other six examples (7-12), transfer effects can be easily detected by looking at the L1-examples (15 a-f), (16 a-b), (17 a-c) and (18 a-b).

(B) to/on/of/about/at (ENGLISH) = [bī] (ARABIC)

By recourse to the last two interlingual identifications (11) and (12), it seems that inherent in the learner's focus of attention is the rendering of [bī] specifically into either 'in' or 'with', since both [bī] and [fī] have been realized to denote concomitance or 'withness' as mentioned in the preceding sub-section (cf sub-section (A), item (v)). This rendering can apparently be seen in the recurrent use of these two prepositions ('in' and 'with') in the same interlingual identification. For example,

(19) * He's going to subscribe with the newspaper  
(AE)  
(cf examples (12), (18b))

Again, one of the commonest uses of [bī] in MSA and particularly in SCA is to denote connection and association [līṣā q]—which has been mentioned earlier through the analysis of 'I dreamed with my father yesterday' (cf chapter 3, section 3 1 3, example (6))—or to denote utilization as mentioned above (cf sub-section (A), item (v), example (17b)). Such denotations can be expressed either literally as in (20 a-b) or figuratively as in (20 c-d).

(20) a [amsaka bī zayd]  
(connection/association)  
'he got hold of Zaid'
b \( \text{[qata\'a bi-ssikki n]} \) (utilization)
'he cut with a knife'
(cf example (17b))

c \( \text{[halama bi-\'ab\'i hi]} \) (connection/association)
'he dreamed of/about his father'
(cf example (22) below)

d \( \text{[halla-llugza bi-\'istidla l]} \) (utilization)
'he solved the riddle by reasoning'

It follows that these denotations seem to act as cognitive preconditions or, put another way, as L1-realization initiators when the learner is called upon to produce the following interlingual identifications (notice that (22) is re-recorded for the sake of clarification)

(21) * You can dry your hands with this towel (AE)
(\text{literal utilization (cf (17b), (20b)})

(22) * I dreamed with my father yesterday (AE)
(\text{figurative association (cf (20c)})

(23) * I was amazed with the Irish accent (AE)
(\text{figurative association (cf also (24), (25c)})

(C) \text{at/with/by/of/about/through/than (ENGLISH) = \[min\] (ARABIC)}

Following (12) and (19) in which \([\text{fi }1]\) has been rendered into 'in' and \([\text{bi}\] into 'with' respectively for the same interlingual identification, it appears that \([\text{bi}\], too, can be rendered into both 'with' as in (23) and 'from' for the same interlingual identification For example.

(24) * I was really astonished \text{from} the Irish accent (AE)

This can be attributed to the fact that both L1-prepositions [bi] as rendered into 'with' in (23) and [min] as rendered into 'from' in (24) coincide with each other in denoting grammatical functions such as \text{figurative association} For example

(25) a \( \text{[na\'Thara bi/min taraf\'en kafiyy]} \) (MSA)

b \( \text{[talla\' b-/min taraf \?'e no]} \) (SCA)
'he glanced furtively at'
'he took a furtively glance'
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However, at a deep-structure level, the main difference between [madhu š b1/min] and [madhu š min] in (25c) is that the former indicates a usual association between the agent (the person who is amazed) and the patient (the thing or person that the agent is amazed at), whereas the latter [madhu š min] is, at best, looked upon as indicating a cause-and-effect relationship [ta'li], that is, the patient is the cause [?illa], and 'amazement' is the effect [mu?lu] that the patient has on the agent. Such a cause-and-effect relationship is apparently observable in the following interlingual identifications:

(26) * I got bored from them (AE)
(27) * He is tired from studying (AE)
(28) * I am frustrated from the education in this college (AE)
(29) * I complain from the pain (AE)

In all these interlingual errors the learner seems to have relied on the L1-preposition [min] which can only express the cause-and-effect relationship referred to above. Therefore, both in MSA and SCA, the L1-verbs [malla] 'he got bored with', [ta?iba] 'he got tired of', [uhbita] 'he was frustrated with/by' and [šaka]/[?a na] 'he complained of/about'/'suffered from' can only take the L1-preposition [min] in order to indicate, at a deep-structure level, such a cause-and-effect relationship. For instance, concerning example (29)—and this is applicable to all three (26 - 28)—the 'pain', here, is an effect triggered by a certain cause (a wound or a disease), and 'complaining' is the effect of the pain which is also a cause in relation to complaining. The pain is something felt inside the body, whereas complaining is the result which occurs outside the body by means of facial expressions, groaning or even verbal expressions. Thus, to denote such an inside-outside event figuratively, the preposition [min] in both varieties (MSA/SCA) appears to be the only alternative. Moreover, [min] can also be used to indicate this inside-outside event literally. For example:

(30) * He entered from the window (AE)
Similarly, this interlingual error seems to reflect the learner's resort to the L1-preposition [min], though, like the English counterpart 'through', the underlying meaning—whether it lies in the learner's LPS or in the deep structure of this IL-utterance—shows that the action of 'entering' started at one side (outside) and ended at another (inside) In MSA, the underlying meaning of the preposition [min] is generally known as [ibtida ?u-lga ya] (cf Al-Bustan, 1977:864), that is, most of the grammatical functions of [min] are essentially based on a beginning-to-end relationship which is made explicit in the following interlingual identification

(31) * From the first sight

Thus, implicit in the interlingual identifications (24), (26-29) and their L1-counterparts, the cause [?illa] is the beginning and the effect [ma?lu l] is the end, and this is also analogous with the inside-outside relationship mentioned above It follows that this general relationship (that is, the beginning-to-end relationship) seems to be the most internalized aspect of [min] in the Arab learner's LLS It is, therefore, highly automatized and may well be, among other aspects of [min], the strongest precondition for language transfer In other words, most of the attested interlingual identifications in which 'from' is used either erroneously (NT) or correctly (PT) can be said to reflect this kind of relationship For example

(32) * Do you pass from Botanic Road?

(33) * Anyway, it is better from nothing?

Given the fundamental grammatical function of [min] in MSA, it appears that inherent in these two interlingual errors is the beginning-to-end relationship referred to above Although the L1-preposition [bi] can be used in the L1-counterpart of (32), the learner's resort to [min] as rendered into 'from' is also evidence that such a relationship is the strongest trigger of language transfer As noted above, one of the commonest uses of [bi] is to indicate association [ilaa q] (cf (20a-b)) Thus, at a deep-structure level, the main distinction between (34a) and (34b) below is that the former simply indicates figurative association [ilaa q maja z1], whereas the latter—which is the more internalized of the two—denotes a beginning-to-end relationship [ibtida ?u-lga ya]
(34) a. [marra bi-ssa:ri?]  
(Lit: he passed with the street)  
(bi-assari?  (association))

b. [marra mima-ssa:ri?]  
(Lit.: he passed from the street)  
(he passed by the street)

It follows from the above that in SCA, speakers usually use both prepositions [bi] and [min] for the same indication (beginning-to-end), albeit the distinction in MSA is made clear. It appears that, when the learner attempts to perform IL-utterances such as (32), the LI-utterance (34b) is more prone to language transfer than (34a) even though both utterances are possible. This means that, within the learner's data processing, the cross-lingual tie-ups between [min] and 'from' is more utilizable and thus more self-activated than between [bi] and 'with' upon producing (32). Consequently, in the light of the above argument, since, from the point of view of the learner, resort to [min] rather than [bi] is evidenced by the recurrent IL-utterance (32), the possibilities of transfer from [min] are much greater than the possibilities of transfer from [bi] though both prepositions can be used for the same grammatical function in SCA.

With regard to (33), transfer effects are also attributable to the LI-preposition [min] which is used in both varieties (MSA/SCA) to denote that someone (A)/something (A) is more, or less, modified than someone (B)/something (B). While in English this relationship is known as comparison, in MSA the beginning-to-end relationship is still implied because the term [muja:waza] may indicate either an increase beginning [ibtida:?u-1?irtifa:2] or a decrease beginning [ibtida:?u-1?inhita:t] as in the polarity of (35a) and (35b) respectively:

(35) a. [zaid ahsan min ?amr]  
(Zaid is better than Amr)  
(increase beginning)

b. [zaid aswa? min ?amr]  
(Zaid is worse than Amr)  
(decrease beginning)

Although the learner may know the correct rendering of 'than' in (33), the highly automatized LI-item [min] seems to be subconsciously self-activated for particular IL-utterances such as (33). That is, while the correct use of ('-er' + 'than') is considerably recurrent in the learner's IL, the grammatical function of [min] may sometimes intrude into such a well-known L2-structure due to the highly
automated nature of [min] which does not only seem to be reinforced by the attested interlingual errors cited above, but also by other interlingual identifications which mark PT from [min]. For example

(36) He jumped from the wall (place) (AU)
(37) From the childhood (time) (AU)
(38) A present from my sister (action) (AU)
(39) He draws from imagination (source) (AU)
(40) The prices are from five and above (limit) (AU)
(41) Suras from the Koran (source) (AU)
(42) From this point of view (source) (AU)
(43) It is made from the wood (result) (AU)

As an exception to Hypothesis Two, it appears that [min] as rendered into 'from' does not always trigger NT as shown in the previous interlingual errors, but rather the actual utterances (36-43) are clear indications that this highly automatized L1-preposition may well lead to PT due to the complete cross-linguistic similarity between [min] and 'from' in particular grammatical functions.

It has been attested that almost all the interlingual errors cited above —except perhaps (8), (11) and (33)— are in many respects a reflection of the learner's lack of knowledge (ignorance) of the correct L2-prepositions, so that the L1-counterparts seem to have been the only recourse available to the learner in order to fill in such gaps (cf. Newmark and Reibel, chapter 4, section 411). There are a number of factors which play a part in the learner's lack of knowledge of the prepositions in question. Among them are, perhaps the most significant, the highly automatized nature by which L1-prepositions are characterized and the unpredictable nature of L2-prepositions. Therefore, the complex nature of prepositions in any language —associated as they are with literal, figurative and idiomatic uses—and their universality (commonness) seem to invoke the learner's automatized one-to-one tie-ups between, L1 and L2-prepositions, and to constitute a proper atmosphere for transfer to operate.

(D) to/of/for/by (ENGLISH) = [...alā] (ARABIC)

(44) * Let me read this letter on you (AE)
(45) * We have no hatred on anyone (AE)
(46) * He went for a walk on the light of the moon (AE)
(47) * Let me sleep on the music (AE)
These interlingual errors suggest the learner's falling back on the L1-preposition [?ala'] which has been rendered into the L2-preposition 'on'. Thus, some of the grammatical functions of [?ala] seem to have been carried over onto the learner's IL as unanalysed L1-knowledge. Within the grammatical functions of [bi] and [fi], it has been noted that both prepositions can be used to indicate overness and onness [isti?la ?] in which use they are synonymous with the preposition [?ala'] (cf sub-section (A), item (111), examples (15c) and (15e)). It follows that the term [isti?la ?], which is morphologically derived from [?ala], can be expressed either literally as in (48 a-b) or figuratively as in (48 c-d) (cf Al-Bustani, 1977 630).

(48) a [?ala-lfulk tühmalu n] 'you are carried on ship-board' (literal onness)
b [?ala Thahri-lkayl] 'on horseback' (literal onness)
c [tala/qara?a ?alaykum-rrisa la] 'he read the letter to you' (figurative onness) (cf example (44))
d [assala mu ?alaykum] '(may) peace be upon you!' (figurative onness) (cf example (45))

Moreover, it has been mentioned that the prepositions [bi] and [fi] can be used to denote concomitance [muṣa haba] or withness [ma?iyya] in that both prepositions resemble [ma?a] 'with' in such a denotation (cf sub-section (A), item (v), example (17a)). By analogy, one of the grammatical functions of [?ala] also involves concomitance or withness. For example

(49) a [j álasa ?ala-nnar] 'he sat by the fire' (literal concomitance)
b [?ala daw?i ma taqaddam] 'in the light of what precedes' (figurative concomitance)
c [qara?a ?ala daw?i-ššam?a] 'he read by candle-light' (literal concomitance) (cf example (46))
d [na ma ?ala angami-lmo si qa ] 'he slept with the (tune of) music' (literal concomitance) (cf example (47))
It follows from the above that, with regard to (44), the effects of MSA seem to be greater than those of SCA. Although the preposition [ʔala-], in SCA, is frequently used for literal and figurative onness, the preposition [li] is much more frequently used for L1-utterances such as (48c). For example

(50) a [qaraʔtu laka] (MSA)  
   b [ʔare tlak] (NCD/SCD/WCD)  
   c [qare tu lak] (ECD)  
   'I read (to) you'

Therefore, the learner's resort to [ʔala] upon producing (44) suggests that he did not perceive the cross-linguistic similarity between [li] and 'to' and thus no opportunity was available to make the necessary tie-up which would have led to complete PT.

With regard to (45), (46) and (47), transfer effects are clearly ascribable to both MSA and SCA, since [ʔala-], which the learner appears to have drawn on, is equally used in both varieties for L1-utterances such as (48d) and (49 a-c). Furthermore, it has been observed that such a L1-preposition does lead to PT when it denotes figurative onness in particular utterances. For example

(51) Don't let them walk on you  (AU)  
(52) She is spying on me  (AU)

Surprisingly, like the L2-utterance which involves the same distribution as (51) in colloquial English, the L1-counterpart [yamassu ha ʔale k] (Lit let (they) it walk on you) is only recurrent in SCA. Again, like the L2-utterance (52) which occurs in written and spoken English, the L1-counterpart [taʔassasa ʔala] (Lit spied (he) on) is equally recurrent in MSA and SCA. As an exception to Hypothesis Two, this perhaps leads to a confirmation of Ringbom's statement that L1-influence is not the only source of errors, and not all instances of language transfer signify errors (cf. chapter 2, section 2 1 3).

(E) Miscellaneous Prepositions

(53) * He threatened her in death  (AE)
[Reference the learner was retelling the plot of a film he had seen recently]

According to CA a posteriori which is a subcomponent of EA (cf chapter 2, section 2.3.1), such an attested error would not have any connection with Arabic transfer, since the LI-counterparts (54 a-b) below involve only the preposition [bi] in both varieties

(54) a [haddadaha bi-lmawt]
   b [haddadha bi-lmawt]
   (Lit threatened (he) her with the death)

It follows that such a preposition—which only denotes figurative association [ilgā q māja zā] in this context (cf (20 c-d))—would be, if the learner really relied on it, rendered into 'with' as in '*I dreamed with' specifically (cf (22)), and the resultant utterance would mark PT. Therefore, in the light of this analysis, EA-techniques would not identify (53) as an interlingual error, but rather as an intralingual error due to ignorance of rule restriction, that is, the learner ignored restrictions on the distribution of the L2-preposition 'with' (cf Richards, chapter 2, section 2.2.4). It seems, however, that such an identification is one-sided, since EA only deals with the analysis of errors at a production level without really paying attention to what is happening in the learner's mind at a comprehension level. To begin with, consider the following 'imagined' errors

(55) * I'm suffering of the pain (PE)
(56) * I'm suffering about the pain (PE)

The supposition for such predicted errors may run as follows if these errors were actually made by the Arab learner in question, then the misuse of 'of' and 'about' would suggest that he had already realized the 'correct' restriction of these prepositions on the verb 'complain'. Thus, 'of' and 'about' in (55)/(56) would appear to have been overgeneralized from the previously and correctly learned restriction 'to complain of/about', and the verb 'suffer' would seem to have been learned only as a lexical item meaning 'complain'. However, by reference to the attested interlingual error *'I complain from the pain' (cf (29)), the LI-utterance [ašku mina-l'alam] might not act as an utterance initiator in Krashen's terms (cf chapter 4, section 4.1.1) as it really did for (29), but rather its negative effects
might serve in the learner's monitor as a precaution against anticipated errors in later attempts. In such a perspective, the learner, being aware of interlingual errors such as (29) at a comprehension level, seems to take up a negative attitude towards the L1-preposition [min] when rendered into 'from' in (29), albeit this rendering, when transferred onto (55) and (56), would lead to complete PT. Consequently, deviant structures such as (55) and (56) would mark neither solely intralingual errors nor solely interlingual errors, but rather inter-intralingual errors resulting from a covert interaction between the two sorts of linguistic solution.

For precisely the same reason, the learner in (53) seems to have adopted such a negative attitude towards [bi] (when rendered into 'with' as in * 'I dreamed with ' (22)), so that the L1-counterpart (54 a-b) did not act as an utterance initiator (and if it did, the result would be PT), but the negative effects of [bi] on certain interlingual identifications might be stored in the learner's monitor for later repair. Above all, the learner's resort to 'in' in (53) seems to be evidence that he did not perceive the cross-linguistic similarity between 'with' and [bi] which is only used to denote figurative association in such a context. Similarly, the misuse of 'in' can be viewed, in this regard, as an instance of covert inter-intralingual errors, though it may still be due to the learner's ignorance of 'with' restriction.

(57) * I only know her in the face (AE)

Another interlingual error concerning the misuse of 'in' suggests a direct translation of an adverbial phrase used in SCA to indicate that the person in question (the patient) is only known to see. For example

(58) a [baʔrifə bi/fi-ɬwɪʃ] (NCD/SCD/WCD)
b [aʔrif'ha bi-ɬwɪliθ] (ECD)
(Lit know (I) her in/by the face)

The learner, here, seems to have had recourse to the L1-preposition [bi] and rendered it into 'in' in (57). As noted above, one of the grammatical functions of [bi] is to denote utilization [istiʔa na] (cf. sub-section (A), item (v), example (17b)). Therefore, in the learner's focus of attention, the prepositional phrase 'in the face'
would lead to the same intended meaning. In English, however, the meaning of such a prepositional phrase does not accord with what is implied by [bi-lwiš] in this context, since, for instance, 'to look someone in the face' would only mean to stare at someone steadily, though the L1-counterpart [tallâ't bwâšâ] (Lit looked (I) at his face) may imply this meaning. The SCA-phrase [bi-lwiš] (58a), in fact, originates from the MSA-phrase [bi-lwâjh] which is in turn derived from [wâjhâ] as in (59a).

(59) a [a?rifuhu wâjhâ]  
(Lit know (I) him by face)

The grammatical form of [wâjhâ], here, is traditionally known as the sub-verbal object [na ?ib maf?u l mutlaq] At a deep-structure level, this sub-verbal object is genitively governed by the deleted noun [ma?rifa] 'knowing' which is the real verbal object [maf?u l mutlaq] as in (59b)

b [a?rifuhu ma?rifata-lwâjh]  
(Lit know (I) him (by) knowing of the face)

The grammatical function of [ma?rifa] is to emphasize the action of the verb from which this noun is morphologically derived. Therefore, to emphasize the verb in such a syntactic configuration would imply that the agent only knows the face of the patient, and this is precisely what the learner in (57) intended to say. Consequently, the carrying over of the surface structure (58a) through the parallelled intended meaning refers to Chomsky's (1977 36) statement that syntax is autonomous, that is, independent of semantics (cf chapter 1, section 1.4.1), since what the learner did was entertain the meaning underlying (59b)—which is the same meaning underlying the L2-utterance 'I only know her face'—whilst at the same time transferring the surface structure of the SCA-utterance (58a).

6.2.2 Definite and Indefinite Articles

The misuse of articles, as processed in the learners' English ILS, will be analysed in terms of three dimensions of syntactic realization
(1) The learner's reliance on the grammatical function of the LI-definite article may lead to redundancy in the resultant IL-utterance due to the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA (cf examples (60-64) and (67-75) below)

(11) The learner's reliance on the grammatical function of indefiniteness in the LI may lead to a deficiency, or loss, of the indefinite article in the resultant IL-utterance due to the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA (cf examples (76-78) below)

(111) The learner's reliance on the countability of certain LI-nouns (whose L2-equivalents are uncountable in the L2) may lead to the redundant use of the indefinite article in the resultant IL-utterance (covert inter-intralingual solution) due to his resort to the surface structure of the LI-equivalents (cf examples (82) and (83)), or to the attested countability of the LI-equivalents (cf example (86-88) below)

(60) * The man will not live forever
(61) * All the birds are beautiful
(62) * The petrol is very expensive in Ireland
(63) * It is made from the wood
(64) * From the childhood

[Reference The speaker in (60) was implying generalization with a singular countable noun]

The misuse of definite articles is another problematic area in the English grammar encountered by most Syrian-Arab learners. The difficulty with this domain stems, in many respects, from the learner's lack of control particularly over the English definite articles whose grammatical functions are radically different from their LI-counterparts. Although there are some similarities in the uses of Arabic and English definite articles, the differences appear to be much greater. Apart from the various grammatical functions which the definite article in Arabic enjoys, there are two major types of definition by [al] 'the' which are said to be the commonest in both varieties (MSA/SCA). These will be briefly considered by reference to the above interlingual identifications.

The first type is traditionally known as [taʔriʔ ʔahdiy] 'definition of someone or something known' (cf Al-Bustani, 1977:13)
Thus, [al] is used for someone/something already mentioned as in (65a), or known in the speaker/listener's mind as in (65b), or in the presence of the speaker/listener as in (65c)

(65) a  [iştiraytu farasan thumma bītu al-faras]  (mentioned)
'I bought a horse and I sold the horse'

b  [ja 'a-al-qā dī ]  (known)
'The judge came'
(i.e. a particular judge known to the speaker/listener)

c  [ja ?a- hatha -al-walad]  (present)
('This boy came to me')

L1-examples such as these seem to resemble some of the uses of the English definite article, so that the learner in question can be said to have no considerable difficulty in grasping most of the L2-counterparts. This seems to be one of the verified predictions of CA a priori

With regard to the second type, on the other hand, it is well observed that the learner finds most of the L2-counterparts troublesome, and the attested recurrent errors (60-64) are clear evidence of such difficulty. Again, this appears to be one of the verified predictions of CA a priori. In MSA, the second type of definition is known as [taʔri f jinsiy] 'definition of generic nouns' which comprise animate objects as in (66 a-d), inanimate objects as in (66e), and properties of mankind as in (66f)

(66) a  [kuliqa -al-qinsa nu min tī n]  (man-sing)
(Lit was created (he) the man from clay)
'----- man was created out of clay'
(cf example (60))

b  [kuliqa -al-bašaru min tī n]  (man-pl)
(Lit were created the men from clay)
'----- men were created out of clay'

c  [al-kalbu hayawa non ali f]  (animal-sing)
(Lit the dog animal domestic)
'the dog is a domestic animal'

d  [al-kila bu hayawa na ton ali fa]  (animal-pl)
(Lit the dogs animals domestic)
'----- dogs are domestic animals'
(cf example (61))
e \[\text{al-ma } \overset{?}{\text{u}} \text{ daru } \overset{r}{\text{riyyon}} \text{ l1l-haya }\] (inanimate)
'(Lit the water necessary for the life')
'---- water is necessary for ---- life'
(cf examples (62), (63))

f \[\text{al-?unu } \overset{\text{th}}{\text{a}} \text{ wa-al-rruju la}\] (property)
'(Lit the feminity and the manhood')
'---- feminity and ---- manhood'
(cf example (64))

It seems the case that, like the L1-prepositions considered in the preceding section such as [b1]/[fi] and [min], the definite article [al], in the second type, is one of the highly automatized L1-items which trigger language transfer both in comprehension and in production. Thus, the selected interlingual errors (60-64) are, among many other attested errors, said to be a result of two underlying factors the learner's lack of control over the restrictions in English and the automatized self-activation of [al]-realizations in Arabic, since all the above grammatical functions of [al] are frequently recurrent in SCA. It follows that this kind of self-activation does not only affect examples such as (60-64), but also many other interlingual identifications whose L1-counterparts retain the definite article [al]. For example

(67) * He was in the work
\[\overset{\text{fi-l-2am}}{\text{al}}/\overset{\text{bi/fi-l-}}{\text{I-}}\overset{\text{ssugul}}{\text{I}}\] (cf (3)) (MSA/SCA)

(68) * We travelled in the day to Sligo
\[\overset{\text{bi/fi-l-}}{\text{I-nnaha r}}\] (cf (4)) (MSA/SCA)

(69) * We travelled in the day and the night
\[\overset{\text{bi/fi-l-}}{\text{I-nnaha r w fi/bi-l-}}\overset{\text{11e}}{\text{I}}\] (AE) (MSA/SCA)

(70) * All the day and I was on my feet
\[\overset{\text{tiwa}}{\text{la-l-}}\overset{\text{I-nnaha r}}{\text{I}}/\overset{\text{tu l1-l-yo}}{\text{I}}\overset{\text{m/nnaha r}}{\text{I}}\] (AE) (MSA/SCA)

(71) * I came from England by the boat
\[\overset{\text{fi/bi-l-}}{\text{I-ba kira}}\] (AE) (MSA/SCA)

(72) * He went to the college
\[\overset{\text{11a-l-}}{\text{kulliyya}}/\overset{\text{2a-l-}}{\text{killiyye}}\] (AE) (MSA/SCA)

(73) * My wife is still in the hospital
\[\overset{\text{fi/bi-l-}}{\text{I-mustašfa }}\] (AE) (MSA/SCA)

(74) * Mandela stayed in the prison for 27 years
\[\overset{\text{fi/bi-l-}}{\text{I-}}\overset{\text{ssijji}}{\text{I}}/\overset{\text{fi/bi-l-}}{\text{I-}}\overset{\text{habis/sijin}}{\text{I}}\] (AE) (MSA/SCA)

(75) * From the first sight
\[\overset{\text{mina-l-}}{\text{nnaThra-l-}}\overset{?}{\text{u l1a }}\] (cf 31)) (MSA/SCA)
Similarly, recurrent errors such as these reflect at least the learner's lack of control over many aspects of 'the' in English, so that, up to this stage of learning, he does not seem to have acquired the-restriction in Krashen's sense (cf chapter 4, section 4.1.1). Given that in all the LI-counterparts of the IL utterances (60-64) and (67-75) the definite article [al] does occur in MSA and SCA, these interlingual identifications can be looked upon as examples of transfer from an overlap between the two varieties. It appears that, from the point of view of English, 'the' in (60-64) and (67-75) is redundant, whereas [al] in the LI utterances is obligatory (cf chapter 1, section 1.3.4). Thus, some instances reflecting unanalysed knowledge of the LI-syntactic representation are explicable in terms of redundancy in the learner's IL not only in the domain of definite articles, but also in other functional markers such as conjunctions (cf 'and' in (70)), prepositions (cf 'of' in (46)), and so on. Some other instances reflecting unanalysed knowledge of the LI-syntactic representation may, on the other hand, lead to a deficiency of particular L2-functional markers such as indefinite articles. For example

(76) * I have ---- headache (AE)
(77) * I saw ---- big carnival in the city centre (AE)
(78) * I bought my TV in ---- cheap price (cf (10))

One possible explanation of such a deficiency is that in Arabic the indefinite article does not exist. Thus, the indefinite noun is simply expressed by the non-use of [al] and, in MSA specifically, by the insertion of the nunnation marks [on], [an] and [en] in place of the final short vowels [u], [a] and [i] respectively. For example

(79) a [al-waladu-l-`amal lu] (def nominative)
(Lit the boy the beautiful) 'the beautiful boy'

b [waladon `amal lon] (indef nominative)
(Lit ---- boy ---- beautiful) 'a beautiful boy'

c [ra?aytu-l-walada-l-`amal la] (def accusative)
(Lit saw (I) the boy the beautiful) 'I saw the beautiful boy'

d [ra?aytu waladan `amal lan] (indef accusative)
(Lit: saw (I) ---- boy ---- beautiful) 'I saw a beautiful boy'
e \[marartu bi-l-w aladi-l-am\ i li\] (def dative)
(Lit passed (I) by the boy the beautiful)
'I passed by the beautiful boy'

f \[marartu bi waladen jami\ len\] (indef dative)
(Lit passed (I) by ---- boy ---- beautiful)
'I passed by a beautiful boy'

In SCA, nunation-marks are usually dropped, not only in the Arab speakers' everyday use of their colloquial dialects, but also in their attempts to perform spoken MSA, except perhaps the nunation-mark \[an\] as in the accusative case (cf (79d)) The retention of \[an\], in this case, may be due to the fact that the written form involves, at least, the alphabetical letter \[a'\] which appears in final position and is diphthongized with \[an\], so that the importance of \[a'\] always induces the speaker —who performs spoken MSA—to produce \[an\] Thus, the above MSA-utterances (79 b, f) are often produced as (80a), whereas (79d) is more often produced as it is in spoken MSA Thus, the example \[waladan jami\ lan\], whether it is performed in pure MSA as in (79d) or in the speaker's attempt to perform spoken MSA as in (80b), usually remains unchanged due to the existence of \[a\]

(80) a \[walad jami 1\] (spoken MSA)
(cf examples (79b), (79f))

b \[waladan jami lan\] (spoken MSA)
(cf example (79d))

However, in the case of SCA, speakers tend to produce (80a) for all the three grammatical cases cited in (79b), (79d) and (79f), therefore these are rendered into (81a), (81b) and (81c) respectively

(81) a \[walad jami 1\] (SCA) (indef nominative)
(cf example (79b))

b \[ṣifit walad jami 1\] (SCA) (indef accusative)
'I saw a beautiful boy'
(cf example (79d))

c \[marre t b-walad jami 1\] (SCA) (indef dative)
'I passed by a beautiful boy'
(cf example (79f))

It now becomes clear that no article is used for indefinite nouns in all three grammatical cases whether they are produced in MSA or SCA Therefore, by reference to the above interlingual errors
(76-78), the three grammatical cases of the indefinite noun (81a), (81b) and (81c) in SCA (which are derived from MSA) seem to be transferred as unanalysed L1-knowledge onto the learner's IL as in (76), (77) and (78) respectively. Such unanalysed L1-knowledge, as shown above, leads to a deficiency of the indefinite article 'a/an' in the English IL.

In the case of uncountable nouns, on the other hand, the indefinite noun in English, according to the CA-Hypothesis, is said to cause no difficulty for Arab speakers, since in both languages no indefinite article is used. If this were always the case, then the attested errors (82) and (83) below—as so judged from the viewpoint of the L2-standard norm—would be treated by EA and identified as intralingual errors due to overgeneralization from the L2-use of 'a' as in, for example, 'I need a beer/coke' which, at a deep-structure level, means 'I need a (glass/bottle of) beer/coke'.

(82) * It's a very strong beer (AE)
(83) * It's really a nice coke (AE)

As these utterances are possible when the context refers to a certain brand of beer or coke, it seems that the use of the indefinite article 'a' is unacceptable since the actual context suggests that the indivisible substance was in question. Therefore, it is quite true that even the advanced learner who has relative control over a-restriction may commit such errors by means of false analogy drawn between some previously learned, or acquired, aspects of a-restriction such as 'I need a drink' and other aspects such as (82) and (83) of which he seems to have been uncertain. Again, following the analysis of (53) in the domain of prepositions, this error-identification, which is the task of EA, is still considered one-sided, since the analysis rests only on the production mode. By looking at their equivalent LI-utterances, (82) and (83) will appear to be probed from a different angle.

In SCA, in particular, the loan words [bɪ ra] 'beer' and [ka zo z] 'any kind of carbonated drink such as coke' tend to follow the same rule restriction of uncountable nouns (such as [sukkar] 'sugar', [tahı n] 'flour', [ʔasi r] 'juice') in that it is impossible to pluralize these nouns when they refer to the indivisible substance.
However, the popular use of [bi ra] and [ka zo z] specifically imposes the countable SCA-derivatives [bi ra ye] and [ka zo za] which, at a deep structure level, mean (84a) and (84b) respectively

(84) a [zuja jat/qanni nat bi ra] ---- [bi raye] (SCA)
    (Lit. bottle (countable) of beer (uncountable))
    'a bottle of beer'

b [zuja jat/qanni nat ka zo z] ---- [ka zo za] (SCA)
    (Lit. bottle (countable) of coke (uncountable))
    'a bottle of coke'

Hence, it is quite frequent in SCA to employ the surface-structure utterances (85 a-b) as implying the meanings intended in their deep-structure configurations

(85) a [āribit bi ra ye]/[ka zo za] (singular)
    'I drank a (bottle of) beer/coke'

b [ištare t kamis bi ra ya t]/[ka zo za t] (plural)
    'I bought five beers/cokes'
    or 'I bought five bottles of beer/coke'

Therefore, it would be PT if, at a surface-structure level, the countability of [bi ra ye] and [ka zo za] was transferred onto utterances such as 'Can I have a beer/coke?' in which the deep structure of 'a beer/coke' coincides with the deep structure of [bi ra ye]/[ka zo za]. Consequently, at a comprehension level, such countability in SCA appears to be covertly transferred onto the learner's IL as unanalysed L1-knowledge and, at a production level, realized within the overgeneralized indefinite articles in (82) and (83). The influence of countability, in this sense, is more explicitly observable in covertly transfer-based identifications such as the following

(86) * I want to give you an advice
(87) * It's a lovely weather, isn't it?
(88) * I need a fresh air

By analogy, the countability of [nasi ha] 'advice (one)' as rendered into [nasaЗа bi] 'advice-s (more than two)' both in MSA and SCA on the one hand, and the countability of [jaw]/[taqas] 'weather' and [hawa] 'air' when realized in SCA specifically as in [hawa ya t] 'fresh air-s' (though it is not possible in MSA) on the other seem to be the
strongest preconditions underlying the redundant misuse of indefinite articles in (86-88)

As a consequence, the IL-utterances (82-83) and (86-88) may, in the light of the above analysis, mark examples of covert inter-intralingual errors, since parts of the learner's linguistic solutions (interlingual solution) are inherently attributable to his realization of countability in SCA through the MSA rule restriction. This countability might, then, act as a precondition for the superficially overgeneralized use of 'a/an' with countable nouns in English (intralingual solution). Therefore, like the complex nature of prepositions in any language, the complex and unpredictable system of L2-articles as well as the highly automatized nature of L1-articles may together establish a congenial atmosphere for transfer to take place.

6.2.3 The Verb-Form Construction

In this section five types of verb-form constructions as processed in the learner's IL are to be investigated:

1. The learner's resort to the simple past form in place of the present perfect form (cf. examples (89-92) below)
2. The learner's resort to the simple present form in place of the present progressive form (cf. example (96) below)
3. The learner's resort to the active construction in place of the passive construction (cf. example (100) below)
4. The learner's resort to the gerund in place of the infinitive when joined, by a conjunction, with another infinitive (cf. example (103) below)
5. The learner's resort to the modal present in place of the modal past after 'I wish' and in if-clauses (cf. examples (105) and (108) below)

(89) * I didn't see him for more than three years (AE)  
     (cf. also example (74) above)  
(90) * She is the most beautiful girl I saw her in my life (AE)  
(91) * It was a long time I didn't go to the college (AE)  
(92) * He was working all the day (AE)
As the above examples illustrate, the learner's resort to the past form in place of the perfect form of the verb may well indicate a strategy of syntactic avoidance in Schachter's sense (cf. chapter 4, section 4.1.2). That is, the learner, it has been attested, avoids the English perfect form not because of his ignorance of this L2-structural device, but because of his inherent perception of its radical difference from the LI-counterpart. Hence, the highly automatized nature of the LI-counterpart seems to activate its structural properties in the learner's IL and thus dissuade him from processing the L2-structure. However, unlike the avoidance strategies explored by Schachter, the learner here does not resort to paraphrase (where avoidance, in such a case, would be discernible only in terms of another group, or groups, of learners whose LIs significantly resemble English in the perfect form), but rather alternatively to the past form as a result of his seemingly automatized reliance on the LI-counterpart. Therefore, upon conducting CA a posteriori (as a sub-component of EA), the IL-utterances (89-92) would be sufficiently identified as overt interlingual errors made in production (transfer pattern) without really paying attention to what is happening in comprehension (transfer process).

Although the learner in question may have received extensive information on the English perfect form and thus is said to have learnt its rule-restrictions, his recurrent misuse suggests that he has not yet acquired the correct use of the construction in Krashen's sense (cf. chapter 4, section 4.1.2). One possible explanation of this avoidance strategy, and therefore of this non-acquisition, is that the perfect form construction has no equivalent in Arabic grammar at a surface-structure level. Concerning the LI-counterparts of the IL-utterances (89-92), the perfective aspect of the verb in MSA can only be expressed by the past form construction at a deep-structure level (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3.3). For example:

(93) a [lam arahu munthu thala th1 sin1 n] (MSA)  
   [ma ra’yatuha] (MSA)  
   (cf example (89))

b [ajmalu fata ten ra’yatuha fi haya t1] (MSA)  
   (cf example (90))

c [munthu zamanen tawi len lam ath’hab ila-1kulil1yya] (MSA)  
   [ma thahabtu] (MSA)  
   (cf example (91))
Furthermore, in SCA, the perfective aspect of the verb is also indicated by the past form construction which is in common use as in (94 a-d) below; albeit the nomen agentis, or active participle [ismu-lfa:?il], such as [ma:li ša:yo:] (Lit.: not (I) seeing him) in (94a) and [ma:li ra:yeh] (Lit.: not (I) going) in (94c) is sometimes used for the Ll-equivalent of (89) and (91) but still denotes pastness of action completion in these contexts (for further information, cf. Kharma, 1983: 71f):

(94) a. [ma: šifto mni-tlat sni:n] (NCD/SCD/WCD) (Lit.: not saw (I) him for three years) [ma:li ša:yo... ] (Lit.: not (I) seeing him) (denoting pastness) (cf. example (89))

b. [ahla b in it šifta b-hayati] (NCD/SCD/WCD) (Lit.: (she) most beautiful girl saw (I) her in my life) (cf. example (90))

c. [min zama:n ma: rihit ?al-killiyye] (NCD/SCD/WCD) (Lit.: for long time not went (I) to the college) [...] [ma:li ra:yeh... ] (Lit.: not (I) going) (denoting pastness) (cf. example (91))

d. [ka:n bištigil tu:li-lyo:m] (NCD/SCD/WCD) (Lit.: was (he) work (he) all the day) (cf. example (92))

[Note that, as discussed earlier, the definite article in (91) and (92) appears in the Ll-counterparts (93c) (MSA)/(94c) (SCA) and (93d) (MSA)/(94d) (SCA) respectively (cf. section 6.2.2). Again, the resumptive pronoun 'her' in (90) is also retained in the Ll-counterpart (93b) (MSA)/(94b) (SCA). The interlingual error committed over pronominalization in the relative clause structure will be analysed in the next section (cf. examples (110-111))].

It follows from the above Ll-utterances that neither in MSA (93 a-d) nor in SCA (94 a-d) is the perfect form construction employed due to its absence in Arabic grammar at a surface-structure level. It seems that, unlike the case in English, such a structural device does not exist in the Arab learner's Ll-LLS. Thus, for certain pairs of L2-utterances such as (95 a-c) below, the use of the past form in the
equivalent pairs of LI-utterances such as (95 b-d) is a clear indication of the high frequency, and subsequently of the highly automatized nature, of the past form construction in Arabic

(95) a I didn't see him yesterday (L2-U)
b [mašifto mba reh] (SCA)
c I haven't seen him before (L2-U)
d [mašifto min abil] (SCA)

Eventually, when the learner is called upon to produce IL-utterances such as (89-92), the Arabic past form, being more internalized than the English perfect form, appears to act as a strong structural-device initiator due to its high frequency in the LI and its self-activation in the attempted IL-utterances. Consequently, the underlying reason for the learner's avoidance of the perfect form can be attributed to two relevant conditions. First, the perceived cross-linguistic similarity between the Arabic and English past form as in (95 a-b), which allows the learner to make the necessary cross-lingual tie-ups. Second, the lack of cross-linguistic similarity (surface-structural similarity) between the Arabic and English perfect form as in (95 c-d), which, in most cases, impels the learner to avoid the perfect form in English and, at a surface-structure level, to have recourse to the past form as in Arabic. In such a perspective, the potential for Arabic transfer in the 'apparently' overt interlingual identifications (89-92) can partly be said to be a type of covert CLl (cf. chapter 4, section 4.2.1)

Furthermore, it may also be the case that, in certain intralingual identifications in Hiberno-English specifically (such as *'I saw this before' and *'Look what you did' which are the verbatim translations of the LI-counterparts), the native speaker's frequent resort to the past form where grammatical accuracy demands the perfect form appears to enhance the learner's automatized reliance on the LI-structural device at a reception level. Thus, acting as another pre-condition for the learner's avoidance of the perfect form at a production level.

Avoidance phenomena, in such a perspective, are not only observable in the learner's 'supposed' attempts to produce the perfect form construction, but also in some other attempts to produce IL-utterances which, from the point of view of English, should have employed constructions such as the progressive and the passive (cf
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Kleinmann, chapter 4, section 4.2) These will be considered by reference to the interlingual identifications (96) and (100) respectively.

(96) * You wear your jumper upside-down

Following the analysis of *'I walk on my nerves' whose interim structure suggests avoidance of progressive tense formation (cf chapter 5, section 5.3.2, example (6)), the above interlingual error also suggests the learner's dissuasion of its progressive tense exigency. Analogous with the perfect form construction discussed above, the progressive form construction, as is the case in English, is also absent in the grammatical system of Arabic at a surface-structure level. Thus, the progressive aspect of the verb in both varieties (MSA/SCA) can be indicated, at a deeper level, by either the simple present form [al-muda ri?] or the nomen agentis [ismu-lfa ?il] (cf Kharma, 1983 77f) For example

(97) a [ma tha taf?al] (MSA)
    b [su ?am bitsa wi ] (SCD)
    c [sku n qa m ti?mal] (ECD)

    (Lit 'What do (you)')
    'What are you doing?'

(98) a [yalbasu qami san abyada] (MSA)
    b [la bison qami san abyada] (MSA)
    c [la bis ?ami s abyad] (SCD)

    (Lit 'Wearing (he) shirt white')
    (Lit 'Wearing (he) shirt white')
    'he is wearing a white shirt'

As the above L1-utterances illustrate, the simple present form is most commonly used in both varieties (MSA/SCA) for verbs denoting prolonged actions such as [qra?]a 'read (he)' [kataba] 'wrote (he)', [akala] 'ate (he)', and so on (cf (97 a-c)). Further, in MSA, both the simple present form and the nomen agentis are interchangeably used for verbs denoting dynamic actions such as [thahaba]/[ra ha] 'went (he)' and other verbs denoting prolonged actions such as [na ma] 'slept (he) '[jalasa] 'sat (he)', [labisa] 'wore (he)', and so on (cf (98 a-b)). However, in SCA in particular, the nomen agentis is most frequently used for the last two verb classes (cf (98c))
With regard to the attested interlingual identification (96), the nomen agentis \textit{[la bis]} 'wearing (you)' in the LI-counterpart (99) below implies either of, or both of, two aspectual elements, namely, \textit{progressive} and \textit{perfective}.

(99) \textit{[la bis kanıztak bil-ma?lu b]}  
\textit{(Lit Wearing (you) jumper your in the opposite)}

Here, the \textit{progressive} aspect is inherently related to the \textit{state of wearing} (the present state whereby the jumper is on), whereas the \textit{perfective} aspect is, at a deeper level, related to the action of wearing which has been complete when the jumper is first on, though this latter aspect can be more explicitly indicated by the past form of the verb \textit{[lbisit]} 'wore (you)' as discussed above. However, the learner's resort to the simple present form of 'wear' in (96) may well indicate that his attention was more focused on \textit{progressiveness} than on \textit{perfectiveness}. This means that the learner, upon producing (96), seems to have relied on the surface structure of the LI-counterpart (99). Had he relied on the deep structure (which, in this case, implies \textit{perfectiveness}), he would perhaps have produced the past form 'You wore your' instead of the present form as in (96). This leads to say that the interlingual identification (96) — as well as others in the domain of articles (cf section 6.2.2, examples (82-83)) — is one of the IL-utterances indicating that even the learner who is left to his own devices does not always return to deep structure (cf James (1980 174) for contrast, chapter 1, section 1.3.4). Concerning the adverbial phrase 'upside-down' in (96), its contextual meaning will be analysed later (cf section 6.3.3, example (60) below).

As a consequence, apart from the misuse of the adverbial phrase 'upside-down', the learner's 'use' of the simple present form of the verb 'wear' would be evidence of a \textit{covert} error since the context refers to the progressive aspect (cf Corder, chapter 2, section 2.2.1, chapter 3, section 3.1.1). However, Arabic-transfer effects would indeed go unnoticed if the analysis exclusively relied on EA-techniques. Plus, the processes underlying the learner's avoidance of the English progressive form would not receive any attention if the procedure of CA \textit{a posteriori} was implemented only. Hence, the learner's perception of the surface-structural difference (or, rather, lack of cross-linguistic similarity) between the English and Arabic progressive form appears to act as the main precondition for this
avoidance strategy. Thus, leading to suggest that the resultant IL-by-product is partly another instance of covert CLI. Above all, the learner in (96) does not seem to have full control over the English progressive form, though he has learnt the rule 'to criterion.' Therefore, this lack of control can, at best, be looked upon as another precondition activating and enhancing the learner's avoidance of the English progressive form.

Another example of avoidance strategies, in the sense discussed here, can be detected in the learner's extremely rare attempts to produce the passive construction in his IL. Such strategies seem to be 'permanently' adopted due to two possible underlying reasons. First, the radical structural differences between the Arabic [al-majhu 1] construction and the English passive construction. Thus, even in correctly attempted structures such as 'they told me' — whose contexts suggest that the agent is not known — the only cross-linguistic similarity that the learner perceives is the one which entitles him to make tie-ups between the LI-[al-ma^'lu m] construction and the L2-active construction. The second reason, which seems by far the more important of the two, is that although the LI-equivalent of the English passive exists in the form of [al-majhu 1] 'the unknown' in MSA (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3.3), the infrequent use of the structure, particularly in SCA, seems to constitute a logical impediment of its automatization and therefore of its self-activation in the learner's IL. Hence, the learner's seemingly permanent resort to the active construction — except in a few cases — may sometimes lead to serious miscommunication. For example,

(100) * If anyone wants to type something, my wife
is a typist

[Reference A Syrian postgrad studying electronics helps his wife, who
is a typist, in her search for work]

Again, this IL-utterance appears to suggest one of the covert errors discussed by Corder in that if such an utterance [a co-occurrence of the conjunction 'if' + the main clause + the subordinate clause] is interpreted in isolation from its context, then it would signify a perfectly acceptable structure (cf. chapter 2, section 2.2.1, chapter 3, section 3.1.1). Therefore, neither CA a
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A posteriori (being a sub-component of EA) on its own nor CA a priori on its own could provide a full account of such an attested interlingual identification. Rather, a combination of the two approaches together with the analysis of all possible stipulations (which act as a set of feedback mechanisms) may help detect the 'invisible' processes underlying the learner's resort to the active construction. Therefore, such 'invisible' processes can, at best, be looked upon as 'invisible' tokens of the learner's avoidance of the passive construction.

At a surface structure level, the main clause of (100) means 'if anyone wants to do the job of typing' (active construction), whereas, at a deeper level and as the context illustrates, the learner intended to say 'if anyone wants the job to be done' (passive construction). It seems that the surface structure of (100) reflects to a large extent the surface structure of the corresponding LI-utterance usually produced in SCA, though the deep structure can be inherently implied. For example:

(100) a. 

It seems that the surface structure of (100) reflects to a large extent the surface structure of the corresponding LI-utterance usually produced in SCA, though the deep structure can be inherently implied. For example:

(101) a. 

Again, (100) is another example which shows the learner's explicit resort to the surface structure of the LI-counterpart (101a) (cf. (96) above) Therefore, NT effects are attributable to the influence of SCA rather than MSA, since (101b) below—which is the literal MSA-equivalent of (101a)—is syntactically acceptable but semantically unacceptable within the same context:

(101) b. 

Hence, both the surface and deep structures of this utterance would mean 'if someone wants to do the job of typing' (active construction) which does not accord with the meaning intended by the context of (100) However, it would be PT if the learner relied on the MSA-equivalent which, at both levels, implies the meaning 'if anyone wants the job to be done' (passive construction). In this case, the word [sayaan] 'something' is the direct object of the verb [yur du] 'want (he)' and 'the job of typing' would be either expressed by a nomen patientis [ismu-lmaf_w u l] (that is, the passive participle which
is morphologically derived from \([y\text{atba}^\text{?}]\) 'type (he)' and functions as an adjective modifying \([\text{\textit{say?>an}}]\) 'something') as in (102a), or by a dative noun \([\text{\textit{tiba} \text{?}_a}]\) 'typing' governed by the preposition \([\text{\textit{li}}]\) 'for' as in (102b), or, though less frequently, by the passive construction of the verb \([y\text{atba}^\text{?}]\) 'type (he)' as in (102c)

(102) 

\begin{align*}
&\text{a [itha yuri du ahadon } \text{\textit{say?>an matbu ?an}]} \quad \text{(nomen patientis)} \\
&(\text{Lit if want (he) someone something typed}) \\
&b [ \text{\textit{say?>an li-tytiba \text{?}_a}] } \quad \text{(dative noun)} \\
&(\text{something for typing}) \\
&c [ \text{\textit{say?>an liyutbu?}]} \quad \text{(passive)} \\
&(\text{something to be typed})
\end{align*}

As a consequence, this indicates that all the possible underlying processes that can, at best, be looked upon as those 'invisible' preconditions for the learner's avoidance of the passive construction are identified as follows:

(1) The highly automatized nature of L1-utterances such as (101a) which employs the \([\text{al-ma?'lu m}]\) 'active' construction and is very often produced in SCA specifically to convey the same meaning intended by the context of the IL-utterance (100)

(11) The learner's perception of the radical structural difference (or, rather, there is no cross-linguistic similarity to be perceived) between the \([\text{al-majhu l}]\) construction in Arabic and the passive construction in English

(111) The extremely rare use of the \([\text{al-majhu l}]\) construction in Arabic (particularly in SCA) and the speaker's frequent resort to the \([\text{al-ma?'lu m}]\) construction for the equivalent L1-identification

Such 'invisible' preconditions appear to have acted as a set of feedback mechanisms which actively dissuaded the learner in question from consciously and/or sub-consciously processing the passive construction in his IL, not withstanding that he is not said to be ignorant of this structural device

It follows from the above analysis that it is the surface structures of the L1-utterances (99) and (101a) in SCA, not the deep
structure, which were a strong trigger of the transfer-based utterances (96) and (100) respectively. Transfer effects, in such a perspective, can more explicitly be examined in the following interlingual identification:

(103) * Do you want to go by bus or walking? (AE)

Similarly, this example suggests a carrying over of the surface structure of the L1-equivalent usually produced in SCA rather than MSA. For example:

(104) a [biddak tru h bî-lba s willa ---- mâshi] (SCA)  
   (Lit: want (you, sing masc) go (you, sing masc) by the bus or ---- walking (the verbal noun of [mâsha] 'he walked')?)

By looking at the pair of utterances (103) and (104a), one notices that the learner, in his data processing, seems to have rendered the [al-mâdâr] 'infinitive' (that is, the verbal noun [mâshi]) into the English gerund 'walking' as an item reflecting unanalysed L1-knowledge from a syntactic point of view. As noted above, such a verbal noun [mâshi] is known as the verbal object [mâfi u l muqlâq] whose grammatical function is to emphasize the action of the verb [timâsi] 'walk (you, sing masc)' (SCA) from which the noun is morphologically derived (cf. section 6.2.1, sub-section (E), example (59b)). It seems, therefore, the verb [timâsi] is, at a surface-structure level, deleted from (104a), whereas, at a deep-structure level, it will appear in both (104b) and (104c):

b [biddak tru h bî-lba s willa timâsi mâshi] (NCD/SCD)
c [biddak tru h bî-lba s willa timâsi ---- ] (NCD/SCD)

Given that all three L1-utterances (104 a-c) are possible in SCA, it appears that both the verbal object [mâshi] and its verb [timâsi] are alternately obligatory and optional; that is, while [mâshi] is obligatory in (104a) and optional in (104c), [timâsi] is optional in (104a) and obligatory in (104c). From the point of view of MSA, however, the verbal object [mâshîyân] 'walking' in (104d) below is optional when it follows its verb [tamâsiya] 'walk (you)'. If, however, [tamâsiya] is deleted, then [mâshîyân] is obligatory, although the latter occurs less often than the former.
d [hal tur du an tath'haba bi-lba si am tamšiya (mašyan)]
   (MSA)
   [hal] a question particle (QP)
   [tur du] want (you, sing masc) (the main verb or [al-musnad])
   [an] a particle of infinitiveness which governs the simple present verb [tath'haba] that follows
   [tath'haba] go (you, sing masc) (an infinitive verb governed by [an])
   [bi-lba si] by the bus (prepositional phrase)
   [am] a conjunction 'or'
   [tamšiya] walk (you, sing masc) (another infinitive verb joined by [am])
   [mašyan] walking (a verbal object emphasizing the verb [tamšiya])

However, in this particular example, the verb [tamšiya] appears to be only obligatory due to the existence of the conjunction [am], or [willa] in SCA, which joins the two grammatically equal verbs [tath'haba] and [tamšiya] in that both verbs are governed by the particle of infinitiveness [an] (cf chapter 2, section 2 3 2, example (23a)). Because [am] in MSA, like 'or' in English, denotes grammatical equivalence between the two joined items, the deletion of the verb [tamšiya] and the retention of its verbal object [mašyan] in (104d) seems to constitute a logical LI-error. By analogy, the deletion of the verb [timši] in (104a) would mark a logical LI-error from the point of view of MSA. Given that the LI-utterance (104a) represents a carrying over of its surface structure as unanalysed LI knowledge, it appears that the interlingual identification (103) can, at best, be viewed as an example of LI-error NT.

The last-mentioned type of verb-form construction is the recurrent misuse of the English modal past after 'I wish' denoting an unrealized or unrealizable desire as in (105), and after 'if' in conditional clauses where the condition is not likely to be fulfilled as in (108) below.

(105) * I wish I can go to America (AE)

In MSA, such a desire is expressed in either of two ways. The first way involves a member of a set of particles traditionally known as [al-huru fu-1mušabbahatu bi-1fi_? li] 'verb-like particles', for example, [layta] 'wish', [la_?alla] 'hope', and so on. These particles are usually followed by a nominal sentence whose predicate [al-musnad]
may be a verb. In such a case, the verb is generally in the simple present form when the desire refers to the present or future time as in (106a), and rarely in the simple past form as in (106b).

(106) a [laytani astat _u ]
   (Lit wish (I) can (I) )

   b [laytani istata^tu ]
   (Lit wish (I) could (I) )

The second way employs lexical verbs such as [wadda] or [tamanna] 'wished (he)' followed by a particle of infinitiveness called [law al-masdariyya] and a verbal clause whose verb is either in the simple present or in the simple past form depending on the time the desire refers to (cf Kharma, 1983 64f). For example

   c [awaddu/atamanna law astat _u ]
   (Lit wish (I) can (I) ) (present/future)

   d [awaddu/atamanna law-istata^tu ]
   (Lit wish (I) could (I) )

Likewise, in SCA, either of the verb forms is used depending on the time the wish refers to. For example

(107) a [ya re t bi?dir/?dirit ]
   (Lit wish (I) can (I)/could (I) )

   b [?alawwa ba?dir/?dirit ]
   (Lit wish (I) can (I)/could (I) )
   (cf examples (106 a-b))

   c [bitmanna law bi?dir/?dirit ]
   (Lit wish (I) can (I)/could (I) )
   (cf examples (106 c-d))

It seems the case that the learner, upon producing the present form of 'can' in (105), was entertaining a wish referring to either the present or future time. This indicates that both the past form 'could' in English and the present form [bi?dir] in SCA coincide in, at least, expressing a present meaning, that is, the two verbs are semantically convergent but syntactically divergent. Therefore, the only similarity that the learner seems to have perceived was the semantic intention at which both verbs converge, while the syntactic realization of the Ll-verb was the unanalysed linguistic knowledge underlying (105). Following the concept of interlingual level shift discussed by James
(cf chapter 1, section 1 3 1), the learner's lack of control over the modal past can be ascribed to the automatized shifting from convergence at a semantic level to divergence at a syntactic one. Consequently, the possibility of using the modal present in the Arabic structure may well be the relevant trigger of the learner's resort to the present form of 'can' in (105). This trigger is also detectable in his observed misuse of the English modal past in if-clauses where the condition is unfulfilled or cannot be fulfilled. For example

(108) * If I can drive, two minutes and I'll be there (AE)

Similarly, in both varieties (MSA/SCA), such a condition is expressed by the use of the particle [law] —which is, in this case, a particle of conditionality [law assartiyya]— in the main clause, and the verbs in both clauses can generally take the simple present form, though the past form is also possible (cf Kharma, 1983 65f). For example

(108) a [law bi?dir su ?, da?i ?te n wu bku n hni k] (SCD) (Lit if can (I) drive (I), two minutes and will be (I) there)

b [law kint bi?dir su ?, bda?i ?te n kint hni k] (SCD) (Lit if [was (I) + can (I) = could] drive (I), in two minutes [was (I) + (will) = would be] there)

By analogy, the usual use of the modal present in L1-utterances such as (108a) might have acted as a strong structural-device initiator which induced the learner to automatically realize the present form of 'can' in the interlingual identification (108). The word-order in the subordinate clause will be considered later (cf section 6 2 5, example (118) below)

6.2.4 The Relative-Clause Formation

In this section, three types of errors appearing in relative-clause formation will be analysed

(i) Retention of the subject of the relative clause as in (109)

(ii) Retention of the object of the verb in the relative clause as in (110) and (111)
Deletion of the relative pronoun as a linking element between the main clause and the relative clause which modifies the antecedent. This type will be analysed within the IL-utterance (115) which is said to mark an overt inter-intralingual error.

(109) * Aren't these the papers which they were in your desk? (AE)
(110) * This is the man we met him yesterday (AE)
(111) * She is the most beautiful girl I saw her in college (AE)
(cf example (90), its MSA-TE (93b), SCA-TE (94b))

Following Schachter's research into the transfer errors committed by Arab learners over pronominalization in relative clause formation (cf chapter 4, section 4.1.2), the above interlingual identifications illustrate, among many others, that at least two types of errors seem to be the most persistent examples of language transfer. The first type refers to the retention of the subject of the relative clause as in (109) and the second type concerns the retention of the object of the verb in the relative clause as in (110) and (111). In a comprehensive study of Arab students' problems with the English relative clause formation, particularly in their written ILs, Kharma has classified fourteen error-types of which (type 1) and (type 3) pertain to the above mentioned first and second types respectively, though these latter were made in the spoken ILs of the Syrian learners in question (cf Kharma, 1987: 258).

Concerning the first type (that is, the retention of the subject of the relative clause as in (109)), the cross-linguistic similarity between the English and Arabic (MSA/SCA) structures seems to be considerably evident on two syntactic levels. Firstly, in English the relative pronoun is obligatorily inserted as a linking element (for example, 'which' or 'that' in (109)), whereas in Arabic this linking element is obligatorily inserted when the antecedent (that is, the head-noun of the main clause) is defined by [al] 'the' (for example, [al-'awra q]/[lura ?] 'the papers' in (112 a-b) below) and obligatorily deleted when the antecedent is indefinite [nakira], that is, neither defined by [al] nor by a genitive added to it. This will be clarified by the IL-TEs of the second type (cf 114 a-b) below. Secondly, concerning the IL-utterance (109), in neither language does the resumptive pronoun (that is, the subject of the relative clause) appear at a surface-structure level. For example
(112) a [a laysat ha thihi hiya-l’awraqu-llati ka’nat] (MSA)

[a] a question particle (QP)
[laysat] not to be (conjugated according to [hiya] 'she' when standing for an inanimate plural subject)
[ha thihi] either 'this' for 'she' or 'these' for an inanimate plural noun
[hiya] either 'she' or 'they' for an inanimate plural noun
[al-’awra q] 'the papers', an inanimate plural noun
[allati] either 'who' for 'she' or 'which' / 'that' for an inanimate plural noun
[ka nat] either 'was' for 'she' or 'were' for an inanimate plural subject

b [mu hay lura ? illi ka nit] (SCD)
(Lit not these the papers which were ?)

As the above LI-equivalents illustrate, the relative pronoun [allati]/[illi] is obligatory and the resemptive pronoun does not appear since the verb [ka nat]/[ka nit] is conjugated according to the latent or implied pronoun [dami r mustatir] [hiya] (MSA)/[hay] (SCD) 'she' standing for the inanimate plural noun [al-’awra q] (MSA)/[lura ?] (SCD) 'the papers'. However, one possible interpretation of the retention of 'they' in (109) is that, in the English non-relative clause, the pronoun of the verb usually appears both in the surface and deep structures when it refers to the agent in question (for example, 'I went', 'he went', 'they went'), whereas in Arabic, on the other hand, the pronoun of the verb is usually implied in the deep structure whether the clause is relative or not because the verb is, at a surface-structure level, conjugated according to the pronoun which stands for the agent in question (for example, [rihit] 'went (I)', [ra h] 'went (he)', [ra hu] 'went (they)' (SCA)). It appears the case that the learner, upon producing the 'visible' pronoun in the English non-relative clause, is inherently manipulating the deep structure of the L1-counterpart whose pronoun is usually 'invisible' in the surface structure. By analogy, the 'invisible' pronoun of the verb [ka nat] in (112a), or [ka nit] in (112b), seems to have been transferred as unanalysed L1-knowledge onto the IL-utterance (109) and rendered into 'they' as standing for an inanimate plural subject. In other words, the retention of 'they' might have been overgeneralized from the usual appearance of the pronoun in the English non-relative clause by recourse to the deep structure of the L1-counterpart. Thus, the deep structure of the L1-counterpart normally leads to PT when
transferred (or carried over as unanalysed syntactic knowledge) onto the English non-relative clause and to NT when transferred onto the English relative clause. Consequently, the redundant use of 'they' in (109) can be viewed as one of the examples which reflects the learner's resort to the LI-deep structure rather than to surface structure as shown in the preceding sections (cf. section 6.2.2, examples (82) and (83), section 6.2.3, examples (96), (100) and (103)).

With respect to the second type (that is, the retention of the object of the verb in the relative clause as in (110) and (111)), the cross-linguistic similarity between the English and Arabic (MSA/SCA) structures seems to be significantly absent on two syntactic levels, although the identical noun (that is, the noun in the embedded relative clause) is postnominally pronominalized in both languages. Along the first level, 'who', 'whom' or 'that' for both (110) and (111), is optional, whereas in Arabic, like the case of the first type, the relative pronoun is obligatorily inserted when the antecedent is defined by [al] 'the' as in the LI-TE of (110) (cf. (113 a-c) below) and obligatorily deleted when the antecedent is indefinite [nakira] as is the case of [fata ten] (MSA)/[binit] (SCD) 'girl' in the LI-TE of (111) (cf. 114 a-b) below.

\[
\begin{align*}
(113) &\quad a \quad [\text{ha tha huwa-rrajulu-llathi-1llathi-lltaqayna (hu)} ] \quad (\text{MSA}) \\
&\quad (\text{Lit} \quad \text{This he the man who(m)/that met (we) (him)}) \\
&\quad b \quad [\text{ha tha huwa-rrajulu-llathi-lltaqayna bhi} ] \quad (\text{MSA}) \\
&\quad (\text{Lit} \quad \text{This he the man who(m)/that met (we) with him}) \\
&\quad c \quad [\text{le ko-rr1ja 1-illi-lta?e na fi} ] \quad (\text{SCD}) \\
&\quad (\text{Lit} \quad \text{This the man who(m)/that met (we) with him})
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(114) &\quad a \quad [\text{innaha ajmalu fata ten ra?aytu(ha)} ] \quad (\text{MSA}) \\
&\quad (\text{Lit} \quad \text{she most beautiful girl saw (I) (her)}) \\
&\quad b \quad [\text{hiyye ahla binit } \text{f1t a}] \quad (\text{SCD}) \\
&\quad (\text{Lit} \quad \text{she most beautiful girl saw (I) her})
\end{align*}
\]

The second level is that, in English, the resumptive pronoun (that is, the object of the verb in the relative clause) is obligatorily deleted, whereas in Arabic it is usually suffixed to the verb as in (113a) and (114a-b) or to the preposition of a phrasal verb as in (113 b-c) In MSA, however, it is possible to delete the resumptive pronoun suffixed to the verb particularly when there is nothing inserted after it in the embedded relative clause as in (113a) and (114a), while in SCA, its retention is more common. On the other
hand, in neither variety is it possible to delete the resumptive pronoun suffixed to the preposition of a phrasal verb as in (113 b-c)

It now becomes clear that the crucial similarity between the English and Arabic relative clause structure, especially in the post-nominal position of the relative clause, seems to have been perceived by the learner and, therefore it acted as a strong precondition for the retention of the resumptive pronouns 'him' and 'her', in the IL-utterances (110) and (111) due to the highly automatized nature of the LI-counterparts

(115) * You are the most country ---- benefit from ---- EEC (AE)

This IL-utterance reflects two phases of the learner's linguistic solutions first, interlingual solutions which manifest themselves in the misplacement of 'most' and the loss of the obligatory relative pronoun 'which/that' before the verb 'benefit' Second, intralingual solutions which concern the loss of the third-person-singular 's' of the verb 'benefit' and the loss of the definite article with the abbreviation 'EEC' To begin with, consider the following LI-TEs

(116) a [antum aktharu dawlaten tastafi du min-al'1 i s1 ] (MSA)  
  [antum]/[intu] you (plural, masculine)  
  [aktharu]/[aktar] an elative noun [ismu-llaal1]  
  [dawlaten]/[dawle] country (a noun not defined by [al] 'the' but genitively governed by the elative noun)  
  [tastafi.du]/[btistifi d] benefit (she/it (feminine))  
  [min]/[mn] from  
  [al]/[il] the  
  [i 1 s1 ] ECC

b [intu aktar dawle-btistifi d mn-il'i i s1 ] (SCD)  
  With regard to the learner's interlingual solutions, the misuse of 'most' and the loss of the relative pronoun will be discussed consecutively In English, the word 'most', when forming a superlative degree, can only function as an adverb modifying another adverb, an adjective, or a verb In MSA, on the other hand, the [ismu-llaal1] such as [akthar] is treated as an indeclinable noun but functions grammatically as a declinable noun through the four main cases (nominative, accusative, genitive and dative) When forming a superlative degree, the word [akthar], within the morphological pattern
(vCCvC) \([af\dot{a}l]\), should be defined by either the definite article \([\text{al}]\) prefixed to it or a following genitive added to it. If \([\text{akthar}]\) is directly followed by a word, then this word should be one of the three grammatical items:

1. A derivative noun \([\text{ism mu\textsuperscript{s}taq}]\) which is accusatively specified by \([\text{akthar}]\) as in \([\text{in\textnaha-al-}\text{-aktharu jama lan}]\) (Lit. she the most beauty) where \([\text{jama lan}]\) 'beauty' is a derivative noun and its grammatical function is known as specification \([\text{tamyi\text{z}}]\)

2. A primary noun \([\text{ism jama mid}]\) which is genitively governed by \([\text{akthar}]\) as is the case of \([\text{dawlaten}]\) in (116a)

3. A suffixed pronoun \([\text{dami r muttasil}]\) which is genitively governed by \([\text{akthar}]\) as in \([\text{aktharu hum/hunna jama lan}]\) (Lit. (he/she) most them (masc/fem) beauty) where \([\text{hum/hunna}]\) 'them (masc/fem)' is suffixed to \([\text{akthar}]\) and, at a deep-structure level, stands for a primary noun as is the case of (11)

In SCA, in particular, the last two items (11) and (111) are in common use. Therefore, the word that follows \([\text{akthar}]\) in (116b) is either a primary noun or a suffixed pronoun standing for a primary noun. It now becomes clear that the positioning of 'most' in (115) before 'country' reflects an Arabic word-order strategy carried over as unanalysed syntactic knowledge, since the rendering of 'country' into \([\text{dawle}]\) functions as a primary noun as shown above (cf. item (11)).

Concerning the loss of the relative pronoun, it has been mentioned above that, in Arabic, the relative pronoun is obligatorily deleted if the antecedent is indefinite \([\text{nakira}]\), that is, neither defined by \([\text{al}]\) 'the' nor by a genitive added to it as is the case of \([\text{fata ten}/ \text{binit}]\) in (114 a-b). By analogy, the antecedent \([\text{dawlaten}/\text{dawle}]\) in (116 a-b) is indefinite, so that the relative pronoun is obligatorily deleted in both varieties (MSA/SCA). Therefore, the IL-utterance (115) clearly shows a carrying over of relative pronoun deletion due to the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA. However, the retention of 'the' in (115) — and, as discussed, the relative pronoun is obligatorily inserted if the antecedent is defined by \([\text{al}]\) — may well indicate that the learner, at a comprehension level, was focusing upon \([\text{dawle}]\) 'country' not \([\text{aktar}]\) 'most', since it is this latter which is genitively defined by the former. It seems, therefore, the learner correctly realized the
genitive definiteness of [aktar] in the L1 as the definite article in the L2 (PT), whilst at the same time falling back on the indefiniteness of [dawle] which was the strongest trigger of relative pronoun deletion (NT). Of the fourteen error types classified by Kharma, this deletion error is similar to (type 4) specifically (cf Kharma, 1987:258).

With respect to the learner's intralingual solutions, the loss of the third-person-singular '-s' may be due to lack of control rather than lack of knowledge, since the IL-utterance (115) is relatively long on the one hand and the correct use of the '-s' is observed particularly in shorter IL-utterances on the other. It seems difficult, however, to relate '-s' omission to Arabic transfer because, by means of affixation and infixation, the morphological system of the Arabic verb is totally different from that of the English verb. Thus, no morphological similarity exists to induce the learner to make the relevant cross-lingual tie-ups between the two types of verb-formation.

As for the loss of the definite article before the abbreviation 'EEC', again, this omission cannot be looked upon as an interlingual error, since 'EEC' is usually preceded by [al] if it happens to be used in an Arabic context. In English, abbreviations such as 'BBC', 'IRA', 'UN' can take 'the', whereas acronyms such as 'NATO', 'UNESCO', 'UNO' do not normally have articles because they are treated as proper names. In Arabic, on the other hand, loan abbreviations and acronyms do not seem to follow a distinct rule. For example,

(117) a [mn-il bi bi si] (Abbreviation) (Lit from the BBC)

b [mn-il yu nisko] (Acronym) (Lit from the UNESCO)

c [mn-il-nna to] (Acronym) (Lit from the NATO)

d [min ---- sa na] (Acronym) (Lit from ---- SANA) (SANA Syrian Arab News Agency)

It may be the case that the rule is phonological rather than grammatical in that three-long-syllable abbreviations such as 'BBC' and 'EEC' normally take [al] as they are simpler to articulate in certain phonological identifications, especially when they are preceded by prepositions like [min] and [bi] in SCA. If this is the case, then the result would lead to PT in phrases such as 'from the EEC' (cf (115))
From a phonological point of view, the learner might have 'avoided' producing 'the' due to two underlying reasons: first, the prioritized production of 'the' in the main clause and the pronunciation of 'the', as discussed earlier, involves the phoneme /j/ which constitutes phonological difficulty for learners whose dialect is, for example, SCD (cf section 6.1.1, sub-section (C)). Second, the phonological difficulty the learner experienced over the first 'the' might dissuade him from experiencing another difficulty over the second 'the'. Again, if this is the case, then the omission of the second 'the' would reflect two types of linguistic solutions: overtly intralingual (syntax) and covertly interlingual (phonology). Consequently, from a syntactic point of view, the IL-utterance (115) is one of the attested errors which can be regarded as examples of inter-intralingual errors reflecting an overt combination of the two types of the learner's linguistic solutions.

6.2.5 The Word-Order Formation

Concerning the interlingual identifications cited in this section, the literal translation of their L1-TEs will clearly illustrate transfer effects from the Arabic word-order strategies. The nearest possible TEs to these interlingual identifications will be cited from both varieties (MSA/SCA) to show to what extent the mis-placement of certain L2-items (upon the learner's processing them in his IL) is attributable to the syntactic realization of the L1.

(118) * If I can drive, two minutes and I'll be there (AE)

(119) a [ daʔaʔ te n w bku n hna k]
    (Lit) two minutes and will be (I) there) (NCD)
b [ bdaʔaʔ te n w'ku n hna k]
    (Lit) in two minutes and be (I) there) (NCD)
c [ baʔaʔa daq₁ qatayn₁ saʔaku nu huna k]
    (Lit) after two minutes will be (I) there) (MSA)
d [ saʔaku nu huna ka baʔaʔa daq₁ qatayn]
    (Lit) will be (I) there after two minutes) (MSA)
e [ daq₁ qata n wa aku nu huna k]
    (Lit) two minutes and be (I) there) (MSA)
As the above TEs illustrate, the adverbial phrase 'two minutes' is more flexible in Arabic than it is in English. In MSA, both positions (that is, initial and final positions in the subordinate clause) are possible, whereas in SCA the occurrence of the initial position is the more frequent of the two. In addition, the insertion of the conjunction 'and' is more recurrent in SCA than it is in MSA. Therefore, the syntactic realization of SCA seems to be the strongest precondition for the production of (118).

(120) * I came to Dublin before Christmas in four days  (AE)

(121) a ['abl-il^i d b'?arba?t-yya m]  (SCD)
b [qabla-?l di bi-?arba?at? ayya m]  (MSA)

(Lit before the feast in four days)

As discussed earlier, the misuse of the L2-preposition 'in' suggests the learner's resort to the L1-preposition [bi] (cf section 6 2 1, sub-section (A)), since it is usually realized in both varieties (MSA/SCA) as the TEs (121 a-b) illustrate. Therefore, in such a particular word order the prepositional phrase [b'?arba?t-yya.m] usually occurs in final position which is exactly the same position in the IL-utterance (120).

(122) * You see how much it is difficult  (AE)

(123) a [sa yef ?adde $ sa?be]  (SCD/WCD)

(Lit see (you) how difficult)
b [ala tara kam hiya sa?ba]  (MSA)

(Lit see (you) how it difficult)

Because both 'how much' and 'how many' in English are usually rendered into ['?adde $] (SCA) or [kam] (MSA), the learner, at a deep-structure level, seems to treat 'difficulty' as an uncountable entity. As the L1-TEs illustrate, the MSA-utterance (123b) appears to be the deep structure (or, rather, an utterance derived from the deep structure) of the SCA-utterance (123a) because the pronoun [hiya] 'it (fem)' is superficially inserted in the former and is only implied in the latter. In both cases, the pronoun [hiya] is the subject, or the beginning [mubtada?], of the noun clause which follows the particle [kam]/['?adde $] 'how', and the noun [sa?ba] is the predicate [kabar], so that the normal order of the noun clause (NC) in Arabic is the subject followed by the predicate. It seems, therefore, the learner,
upon producing the IL-utterance (122), might well resort to the MSA-equivalent (123b) which is directly associated with the syntactic properties of the deep structure of the SCA-equivalent (123a).

(124) * I won't break it, I'm careful more than you (AE)

(125) a [ana mintibih aktar minnak] (NCD/SCD/WCD)
(Lit I careful more from you)
b [ana aktharu intiba han minka] (MSA)
(Lit I more carefulness from you)
c [ana ahrasu minka] (MSA)
(Lit I more careful from you)
d [ana har s aktar minnak] (NCD/SCD/WCD)
(Lit I careful more from you)

In the preceding section, the [ism u-ttafdi 1] 'relative noun' [akthar] has been discussed when forming a superlative degree 'most' (cf examples (115) and (116 a-b)). The comparative degree in Arabic is usually formed by the pattern [af'al] —of which [akthar] 'more' in (125 a-b) and [ahras] 'more careful' in (125c) are examples— followed by the preposition [min] 'from'. There are certain derivative nouns of the pattern [fa?i 1] such as [kar1 m] 'generous', [sa?i d] 'happy', [sari f] 'honest' and so on. These can be inflected according to the morphological pattern [af'al] in order to form a superlative degree as shown earlier and a comparative degree as is the case of the above examples. These derivatives are in common use both in MSA and SCA and the pattern [af'al] can easily be derived [akram] 'more generous', [as?ad] 'happier' and so on. However, there are other derivatives which are not of the morphological pattern [fa?i 1] such as [masru r]/[mabsu t] 'pleased', [muntabih] 'careful' (cf this latter's SCA-equivalent in (125a)), and so on. In order to form a comparative degree in MSA, these derivatives, as analogous with the superlative degree, are normally accusatively specified by [akthar] as in (125b) specifically where [akthar] is always followed by the newly specified noun [tamy1 z] Such formation in SCA, however, is extremely rare and, instead, speakers tend to retain the original derivative like [mintibih] followed by [aktar] as in (125a), though this formation is also possible in MSA. There are also other derivatives such as [har1 s] 'careful' (meaning [mintibih] and following the pattern [fa?i 1]) which can take the pattern [af'al] as [ahras] (cf (125c)) but are less frequent in SCA. The result is that speakers tend to resort to the original derivative as in (125d) following the same.
formation of (125a) as discussed above, though this formation is also possible in MSA. It appears the case that the frequent use of the comparative formation as in (125a) and (125d), where [aktar] follows the original derivative, was the L1-linguistic solution underlying the IL-utterance (124)

(126) *(AE)
What you want more?

(127) a [ṣu biddak kama n] (NCD/SCD)
(Lit what want (you) more?)
b [ma ṭha turū du aydan] (MSA)
(Lit what want (you) more?)

This interlingual identification suggests direct cross-lingual tie-ups with its L1-counterparts (word-for-word translation) within two syntactic dimensions first, the non-inversion of the subject and its verb in interrogation and, second, the misplacement of 'more' due to the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA.

(128) NSE You are rude *(a joke)
NSA * Who is the rude between us? (AE)

(129) a [mī n il-ġallīz be na tna] (SCD)
(Lit who the rude between us)
b [man il-ṯalfū baynana] (MSA)

Analogous with the previous example, this interlingual identification reflect direct cross-lingual tie-ups with the sub-constituents of its L1-counterparts except the realization of the auxiliary 'BE' which appears neither in MSA nor in SCA. Although the word order [man minna-l-ṯalfū] (Lit who of us the rude) is possible in MSA, the word order as cited in (129 a-b) seems to be the more frequent of the two particularly in SCA. Therefore, transfer effects are directly ascribable to the syntactic realization of the L1-counterparts (129 a-b) in MSA and SCA.
6.3 Arabic-Transfer Identifications in Semantics

As noted in the previous chapter (cf Chapter 5, section 5.3.3), in order to check the validity of Hypothesis Three, interlingual identifications in the semantic domain of lexical selection will be analysed in terms of three parameters: lexical representations (cf Section 6.3.1), collocational representations (cf Section 6.3.2), and contextual representations (cf Section 6.3.3). Along these parameters, transfer mechanisms depend largely on the learner's potential knowledge of L2-vocabulary. Therefore, most of the interlingual identifications cited in this section are said to be a reflection of semantic avoidance, that is, either the learner's ignorance of the L2-semantic idiosyncrasy which places the L2-word within a specific semantic restriction and/or extension though it may exist in his linguistic repertoire but only as a lexical item (cf examples (1), (2), (3), (4), etc.), or his ignorance of the L2-word as a lexical item (cf examples (5), (6), (8), (9), etc.).

Further, the analysis will explore another type of avoidance in Schachter and Kleinmann's sense (cf Chapter 4, section 4.1.2), which can be called lexical avoidance in the context of the current study. Paradoxically, lexical avoidance is said to be a reflection of the learner's resort to the L1-word in question not because of his ignorance of the L2-counterpart, but because of the highly automatized nature of the L1-word which activates the production of the IL-word, that is, the L1-based L2-lexical item in question. Therefore, possibilities of paraphrase do not only exist in the syntax of the avoided L2-structure as shown in Schachter's argument (cf Chapter 4, section 4.1.2), but also in the lexical distribution of the attempted L2-utterance (cf for instance, 'wrote' in (18), 'know' in (22), 'true' in (48), etc.). Finally, those aspects that are related to Hypothesis Two in the domain of syntax —either in corroboration of or as an exception to the hypothesis— will be referred to where appropriate.

Notice that, from a pedagogical perspective, the term 'complete PT' indicates that the IL-item, or items, in question should be over-emphasized, since both the L1-L2 identifications being talked about coincide significantly in their lexical distribution (complete cross-linguistic similarity). Whereas the term 'crucial PT' indicates
that the IL-item, or items, in question should be modified in the direction of the standard norm of the L2-identification as both the L1-L2 identifications being talked about coincide roughly in their lexical distribution (crucial cross-linguistic similarity). On the other hand, the term negative transfer (NT), which signifies an attested error as so judged from the viewpoint of the L2-identification, constitutes an established exception to Hypothesis Three, since the L1-L2 identifications being talked about do not coincide in their lexical distribution (radical difference or lack of cross-linguistic similarity).

6.3.1 Lexical Representations

(1) Let's turn a new page

Upon using the L2-lexical item 'page', this IL-utterance suggests the learner's reliance on the L1-lexical item [safha] as in the following L1-TE

(1a) [kalli na ni?lib safha jdi de]

Like the L2-utterance, this L1-utterance, whose lexical distribution is possible in MSA, is said when someone wants to make a fresh start. Although the learner may have the L2-lexical item 'leaf' at his disposal, his linguistic repertoire seems to lack the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which imposes the lexical use of 'leaf' rather than 'page' in this context (semantic avoidance). In SCA, the word [safha] is usually used if the context refers to one side of a leaf of a book or to an entire leaf of a copy-book and the like, whereas the word [wara?a] is usually used when the context refers to an entire leaf (not one side) of a book, tree, bank-note and so on. It may be the case that since the learner is assumed to have known the L2-word 'leaf', as a lexical item, he does not seem to have had it as, at least, a reference to a book, but as a reference to a tree or a plant only (cf section 6.3.3, example (79) below). The result is that his lexical knowledge of 'page' on the one hand and the cross-semantic tie-up he
made between L1-[safha] and L2-'page' on the other may act as the strongest precondition for the production of the IL-utterance (1), because the word [safha] in the ordinary use of MSA and SCA does not normally refer to a tree or a plant. Consequently, the L1-based L2-lexical item 'page' is acceptable and leads to crucial PT.

(2) I made him stand on his legs. (AU)

The lexical use of the L1-based L2-item 'legs' seems to reflect an influence from SCA rather than MSA as it is apparent in the following L1-TE:

(2a) [kalle:to ywa??if ?arijle:] (NCD/SCD/WCD)

Again, like the L2-utterance, this L1-utterance is said to refer to a person, that is the patient (him) in the IL-utterance (2), who has been made self-supporting and is no longer in need of help. The reason why the lexical use of 'legs' reflects transfer from SCA rather than MSA is that the MSA-words [sa:q] 'leg' and [qadam] 'foot' are usually rendered into [rijil] in SCA, though this latter is also recurrent in MSA in the form of [rijil] but as synonymous with [sa:q] not with [qadam]. Thus, depending on the context, [rijil] in SCA means either a leg or a foot in that both [sa:quhu tu?limuhu] 'his leg is sore' and [qadamuhu tu?limuhu] 'his foot is sore' in MSA converge at one frequent utterance in SCA: [rijle:to buja?o] which carries both meanings. The convergent use of [rijil] in SCA is more observable in utterances such as [rijle: t?wa:l] 'his legs are long' and [issabba:t dayye? ?arijil:] 'the shoe is tight on my foot'. This indicates that the surface structure of [rijil] in SCA is 'leg', whereas the deep structure is either 'leg' or 'foot' depending on the context.

It follows that the learner, upon producing the IL-utterance (2), seems to have had recourse to the surface structure of [rijle:] in (2a) resulting in an acceptable identification and leading to crucial PT. However, it would be complete PT if the deep structure—which involves [qadam] as is the case in MSA—was the direct trigger of transfer. Given that the words 'foot/feet' exist in the learner's repertoire as lexical items, the lexical use of 'legs' in (2) can also be viewed as an example of semantic avoidance due to his ignorance of the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which involves the use of 'feet' in this context.
(3) It's clear (the problem) like the sun

The lexical use of 'sun' suggests the learner's reliance on the L1-lexical item [šams] which is frequently used in both varieties

(3a) [wa dihaton wudu ha-ššams] (Lit clear (it, fem) (as the) clearness of the sun) (MSA)

(3b) [wa dihaton ka/mithla-ššams] (Lit clear (it, fem) as/like the sun) (MSA)

(3c) [wa d'he mithli-ššams] (Lit clear (it, fem) like the sun) (SCA)

Therefore, the lexical use of 'sun' in (3) marks crucial PT from both MSA and SCA, since the L1-lexical adjective [wa dih] 'clear (masc)' is derived from the L1-lexical noun [wadah] 'light' which can collocate with [naha r] as in [wadahu-nnaha r] 'daylight'. Thus, the underlying meaning of [šams] in the above L1-TEs is (the appearance of the sun during daylight), that is, between sunrise and sunset, which is the same meaning underlying the word 'day' in English. Although it has been attested that the learner knows the L2-item 'day', he appears to lack the L2-semantic knowledge which requires the lexical use of 'day' rather than 'sun' (semantic avoidance).

[Note: With regard to Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the comparative form 'clear like' marks NT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA]

(4) The air turned the umbrella

The lexical use of 'air' appears to reflect the learner's resort to the L1-lexical item [hawa?] (MSA)/[hawa] (SCA) as realized to be the real agent which does not usually appear in the L1-TE due to the frequent intransitive use of the verb [inqalaba] 'turned (he/it)' in this context

(4a) [inqalabat1-l-miThalla] (MSA)

(4b) [n?albet-ıššamsıyye] (SCA)

[inqalabat]/[n?albet] turned (it, fem), an intransitive verb [al-miThalla]/[ıššamsıyye] the umbrella
Thus, the real agent in the deep structure of the above TEs is normally conceived of as [hawa] 'air' rather than [r1 h] 'wind'. This agent superficially appears when the verb in question is used transitively as is the case in English.

(4c) [qalaba-1-hawa ?u-1-miThalla] (MSA)
(4d) ['l-hawa-?alab-iššamsiyye] (SCA)

Although the word [r1 h] 'wind' is possible in MSA in that both [r1 h] and [hawa ?] are semantically synonymous, the frequent lexical representation of [hawa] in (SCA) —particularly in utterances such as ['l-hawa tayyar ta ?1 to] 'the wind blew his hat off'— seems to be the underlying lexical representation of 'air' in the IL-utterance (4) as an example of crucial PT. Again, this is also an example of semantic avoidance as discussed in the preceding interlingual identifications.

[NB With regard to Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the verb 'turned' as a non-phrasal verb signifies NT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA as shown above]

(5) Can we use a finger of dynamite? (for fishing) (AU)

The lexical use of 'finger' suggests the learner's reliance on the L1-lexical item [isba?] which is borrowed from the military jargon in SCA.

(5a) [isba? diname t]/[asa bi? diname t] (SCA)
(Lit 'a finger of dynamite'/'fingers of dynamite')

Therefore, the learner's ignorance of the lexical representation of 'stick' in this context indicates that both 'finger' and 'stick' coalesce into 'finger' in his linguistic repertoire due to the lexical representation of [isba?] in SCA. This refers to what is known as split or divergent phenomena, that is, one item in the L1 becomes two items in the L2, whereas the preceding IL-utterance (4) refers to convergent phenomena, that is, two items in the L1 [hawa] 'air' and [r1 h] 'wind' coalesce into one L1-based L2-item 'air' in the learner's IL (cf chapter 1, section 1.3.1). Consequently, the lexical use of 'finger' in (5) leads to crucial PT from SCA and is an example of semantic avoidance.
(6) The referee was bad and Lendl lost his nerves

[Reference watching a televised tennis match]

The lexical use of 'referee' and 'nerves' suggests the learner's resort to the L1-lexical items [hakam] and [aʔ'asab] respectively. Concerning the use of 'referee', there seems to be two reasons underlying such an interlingual identification. First, the learner might well lack the knowledge of 'umpire' as a lexical item, so that the word 'referee' was the only reference available to him (semantic avoidance). Second, the two L2-items 'umpire' and 'referee' coalesce into one item [hakam] both in MSA and SCA (split). Thus, such an available reference is a clear indication that the learner made a cross-lingual tie-up between [hakam] and 'referee' whose resultant representation leads to crucial PT from both MSA and SCA.

The lexical use of 'nerves', on the other hand, seems to reflect influence from SCA rather than MSA, since [faqad aʔ'asab] 'he lost his nerves' in SCA implies a feeling of anger and irritation whereas the MSA-equivalent is [faqadasa wabahu] 'he lost his mind'. As the context of (6) refers to a feeling of both irritation and loss of self-confidence, the lexical use of 'nerves' signifies complete PT from SCA.

[N.B. With regard to Hypothesis Two, the plural form of 'nerve' marks NT from the syntactic realization of SCA as shown above]

(7) Put the watch in your hand

Analogous with the lexical use of 'legs' in (2) above, the L1-based L2-item 'hand' indicates an influence from SCA rather than MSA because both [yad] 'hand' and [thira ʔ] 'arm' in MSA usually coalesce into [i d] 'hand' in SCA. Therefore, depending on the context, [i d] means either 'hand' or 'arm' in that both [thira ʔu hu maksu ra] 'his arm is broken' and [yaduhu fi jaybih1] 'his hand is in his pocket' in MSA are usually rendered into [i do maksu ra] and [i do bje bto] in SCA respectively. This means that the surface structure of [i d] in SCA is 'hand', whereas the deep structure is either 'hand' or 'arm' depending on the context. Thus, the lexical use of 'hand' in the IL-utterance (7) may well reflect the learner's resort to the surface structure of [i d]
which is attributable to crucial PT from SCA, though the position 'your arm' is usually implied in the deep structure of the L2-equivalent of (7)

[N B In the domain of prepositions, the misuse of 'in' has been discussed within the concern of Hypothesis Two (cf section 6.2.1, sub-section (A), example (8))]

(8) I want to buy a new belt for my watch (AU)

The lexical use of 'belt' suggests the learner's reliance on [se r] or [ʔsa t], since both are interchangeably used for the waist and the wrist in SCA. Therefore, in the learner's focus of attention, the coalescence of [se r] and [ʔsa t] into 'belt' and his ignorance of 'strap' as a lexical item (semantic avoidance) seem to constitute the direct process (linguistic and psycholinguistic respectively) which may underly the production of 'belt' in (8). Consequently, the learner's lexical knowledge of 'belt' was the only reference which enabled him to make the necessary cross-lingual tie-up resulting in crucial PT from the interchangeable lexical use of [se r] and [ʔsa t] in SCA.

(9) I can drive the car without jumping (AU)

The lexical use of 'jumping' suggests the learner's resort to the LL-lexical item [tnattiʔ] 'stall (it, fem)' or [tantiʔ] 'stalling' as they are usually used in the following SCA-TEs

(9a) [bahsin su ? issayya ra bidu n ma bitnattiʔ] (SCA) (Lit Can (I) drive (I) the car without not stall (it fem))

(9b) [bahsin su ? issayya ra bidu n tantiʔ] (SCA) (Lit Can (I) drive (I) the car without stalling)

It seems the case that the learner conceived the lexical meaning of [tnattiʔ] as 'jump', since the LL-word [tnut] 'jump/spring/leap (it, fem)' in SCA can also be used in this context. Again, his ignorance of 'stalling' as a lexical item (semantic avoidance) and his 'intralingual' conception of [tnattiʔ] as [tnut] within SCA might have been the strongest trigger of the lexical use of 'jumping' which marks crucial PT from SCA rather than MSA.
The lexical use of 'more' seems to reflect the learner's reliance on the L1-word [aktar] which has been discussed when forming a superlative degree (cf. section 6.2.4, examples (115) and (116 a-b)) and when forming a comparative degree (cf. section 6.2.5, examples (124) and (125 a-d)) in the domain of syntax. Although the deep structure of the L1-TE [mu: aktar mn-issab?a] (Lit.: not more than 7.00) implies the lexical meaning of [aktar] as 'later', the IL-utterance clearly shows the learner's falling back on the surface structure of [aktar] due to its lexical representation both in MSA and SCA, which leads to crucial PT. Given that the learner, as it has been attested, knows the L2-lexical item 'later' and its semantic exigencies, his resort to 'more' in (10) can be ascribed to lack of control rather than lack of knowledge.

(11) She is building her hopes to marry him. (AU)

[Reference: talking about a film on TV.]
With respect to Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the infinitive 'to marry' marks NT from the syntactic representation of (11b) in SCA, since it would have been PT if the learner had resorted to the structure of (11a) in MSA.

(12) Will you put the alarm at nine?

In this IL-utterance, the learner seems to have relied on the lexical meaning of the LI-verb [hut] 'put (imperative, sing masc)' which is more frequently used than [?ayyir] 'set (imperative, sing masc)' in SCA.

(12a) [hut-issa ?a ?a-ttis?a]
    (Lit put the clock on nine)
(12b) [?ayr-issa ?a ?a-ttis?a]
    (Lit set/time the clock on nine)

Again, like his ignorance of the figurative use of the lexical verb 'set' in (11), the learner appears to have no knowledge of the flexible meaning of this verb which can fit into the IL-utterance (12). Although the two LI-verbs [hut] and [?ayyir] are internalized as synonyms in the learner's LLS, the recurrent use of this utterance is proof enough that both these verbs coalesce into one L2-verb 'put' in his focus of attention (convergent phenomena). In comprehension, therefore, the more frequent use of [hut] in SCA acted as the strongest precondition for the production of the LI-based L2-lexical verb 'put' which, in this case, leads to crucial PT.

[N.B. In the domain of syntax, the misuse of the preposition 'at' may indicate the learner's relative control over its rule restriction in recurrent utterances such as 'see you at nine', 'I got up at ten' and the like. It appears that although the learner might have overgeneralized the use of 'at' in (12) from its correct uses in these utterances, he might well have perceived the cross-linguistic similarity between 'at' in (12) and [?a] in (12 a-b) — whose MSA-form is [?ala] — as denoting figurative onness (cf section 6.2.1, sub-section (D)). In such a case, and in corroboration of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of 'at' can be viewed as an example of covert...
inter-intralingual errors, since it would have marked an overt interlingual error if the learner had superficially rendered [ʔa] into 'on' as shown in the above TEs.

(13) This drink is nice. It kills my thirst

In this IL-utterance, the learner seems to rely on the figurative use of the L1-lexical verb [ʔiʔtol] 'kill (he/it)' as in [ʔiʔtol il-ʔataš] (Lit kill (he/it) the thirst), a phrase commonly used in SCA. Similarly, his ignorance of the L2-lexical verbs 'quench' and, less frequently, 'slake' might be the strongest trigger of his falling back on the cross-lingual tie-up between [ʔiʔtol] and 'kills' which is acceptable and leads to crucial PT from SCA. However, it would have been complete PT if the learner had known these L2-lexical verbs and perceived their cross-linguistic congruences (complete similarity) with the L1-lexical verb [ʔyuffl] (MSA)/[ʔtaffl] (SCA) 'quench/slake' which is equally used in both varieties.

(14) This is a heavy coat. It kills the cold

Like the L2-lexical item 'heavy', the L1-lexical item [tʔi1] in SCA refers to something of good quality; so that 'a heavy coat', here, is intended to be warm and to withstand bad weather. Therefore, the lexical use of 'heavy' marks complete PT from SCA. Again, analogous with the lexical use of 'kills' in (13), this IL-utterance reflects the learner's reliance on the figurative use of the L1-lexical verb [ʔiʔtol] (SCA)/[ʔyaqtul] (MSA) in [ʔiʔtol/yaqtul-il-bard] (Lit kill (it) the cold), a phrase frequently used in both varieties. Thus, as an exception to Hypothesis Three, the lexical use of 'kills' in (14) signals NT due to the learner's lack of perception of the cross-linguistic similarity between the L2-lexical verb 'keep out' and the L1-lexical verb [ʔitrod] 'dismiss/keep out (he/it)' in [ʔitrod-il-bard] (Lit keep out (it) the cold) which would lead to complete PT from SCA.

(15) You'll learn this bad habit

[Reference the speaker was referring to the habit of smoking]
In this IL-utterance, the lexical use of the verb 'learn' seems to reflect the learner's automatized resort to the Ll-lexical verb [tit'allam] (SCA)/[tata'allam] (MSA) 'learn (you, sing, masc)' which is equally used in both varieties to express the intended meaning. Thus, the learner's ignorance of the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which imposes the lexical use of verbs such as 'pick up', 'be in', 'fall into' or 'get into' (semantic avoidance) forced him to make a cross-lingual tie-up between [tit'allam] and 'learn' which signals crucial PT from both MSA and SCA.

(16) I took an English course in London

The lexical use of the verb 'took', here, suggests the learner's reliance on the Ll-lexical verb [akadit] 'took (I)' which leads to complete PT from SCA as shown in the following Ll-TE:

(16a) [akadit dawra]  
(Lit took (I) course)

Surprisingly, all the possible Ll-lexical verbs that can be used in both varieties (MSA/SCA) to express the same intended meaning will lead to complete PT if they happen to be transferred onto the learner's IL. For example:

(16b) [sa wēt dawra]  
(NCD/SCD/WCD)
(16c) [milit dawra]  
(NCD/SCD/WCD)
(16d) [miltu dawra]  
(ECD)
(Lit did (I) course)

(16e) [ittaba?tu dawratan]  
(MSA)
(Lit followed/pursued (I) course)

Surprisingly, too, in SCA the least frequently used lexical verb [akadit] in (16a) among the other synonyms cited in (16 b-e) seems to have been rendered into the least frequently used L2-lexical verb 'took' among other synonyms such as 'did', 'follow' and 'pursue'

(17) I bought a house and I wrote it in my father's name

[Reference: for the duration of his study in Ireland, a Syrian student (i.e. the speaker) deputed his father to act on his behalf]
In this IL-utterance, the learner appears to have recourse to the L1-lexical verb [katab] 'wrote (he)' in [katabt-l-il-be t b'?ismo] (SCA)/[katabtu-l-bayta bismihi] (MSA) (Lit wrote (I) the house in his name), a phrase equally used in both varieties to indicate that the patient is either heir to the house as is the case in English 'I put the house in his name' or deputy for the agent during his absence as the context of (17) suggests. Therefore, the lexical use of the verb 'wrote' marks crucial PT from both MSA and SCA, and it would have marked complete PT if the learner had really perceived the complete cross-linguistic similarity between the L1-lexical verb [hat] (SCA)/[wada?] (MSA) and the L2-lexical verb 'put' for expressing the intended meaning.

[N B As an exception to Hypothesis Two, the prepositional phrase 'in one's name' leads to PT due to the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA. In support of Hypothesis Two, on the other hand, the redundant use of the pronoun 'I' with the joined verb 'wrote' suggests a carrying over of the subject of [katab], which does not appear in the surface structure but only is implied in the deep structure (cf section 6.2.4, example (109)].

(18) NSE Did you go the doctor? NSA Yes He wrote some medicines for me (AU)

Within the strictures of the learning difficulty and ease predicted by transitional CA, this IL-utterance has already been analysed at the end of the first chapter to show that prediction of learning ease on the basis of structural similarity (that is, both [wasafa] in Arabic and 'prescription' in English are verbalized into [wasafa] and 'prescribe' respectively) is not always verifiable (cf chapter 1, section 1.4.2).

As the above IL-utterance illustrates, the lexical use of the verb 'wrote' reflects the learner's reliance on the L1-lexical verb [katab] 'wrote (he)' which is more recurrent in SCA than the L1-lexical verb [wasaf] (SCA)/[wasafa] (MSA) 'prescribed (he)' in both varieties as in the following L1-TEs:

(18a) [katab-l-li swayyit idiwyen] (SCA)
(Lit wrote (he) to me some medicines)

(18b) [wasaf -li swayyit idiwyen] (SCA)
(Lit prescribed (he) to me some medicines)
Given the fact that the L2-verb 'prescribe', as has been attested, does exist in the learner's linguistic repertoire as a lexical item, it may be the case that, upon producing the IL-utterance (18), he adopted an avoidance strategy—in Schachter and Kleinmann's sense of the term—which can be called lexical avoidance for this particular instance. There seems to be two reasons underlying the avoidance of 'prescribed' and therefore the production of 'wrote' in (18). Firstly, as shown in its analysis earlier, the more phonological effort that the articulation of 'prescribed' requires. While this lexical item involves three consonant clusters /pr-/ /-skr-/ and /-pt/ (which do not occur in the phonological system of Arabic) and a vowel /i/ and a diphthong /ai/, the lexical item 'wrote' only involves two consonants /r/ and /t/ (which exist in the form of dento-alveolars in Arabic) and a diphthong /ou/ (cf chapter 1, section 1.4.2, example (56a)).

Secondly, the more frequent use of the L1-lexical verb [katab] and therefore its highly automatized nature appear altogether to strongly activate the learner's opportunity to make a cross-lingual tie-up between [katab] and 'wrote'. Consequently, the IL-lexical use of 'wrote' in (18) can be viewed as an example of crucial PT from SCA rather than from MSA.

In this IL-utterance, the lexical use of the verb 'growing' suggests the learner's automatized resort to the L1-lexical item [rabba] 'fostered/grew/reared/brought up (he)' which is equally used both in MSA and SCA. The resultant IL-use of 'growing' might be ascribed to the learner's ignorance of L2-lexical verbs such as 'rear' (semantic avoidance) and, thus, can be viewed as an example of crucial PT from both varieties.

I think too much Maalox makes diarrhoea (AU)

[Reference Maalox is a kind of antacid drug]
Analogous with the interlingual identification (16), the lexical use of 'makes' reflects the learner's reliance on the L1-lexical verb \([\text{bisa } \text{wi}]/\text{yi?mal}\) 'make/do (he/it)' which is acceptable and leads to crucial PT from SCA

\[(20a) \ [\text{bisa } \text{wi}/\text{yi?mal is'ha 1}] \quad \text{(SCA/NCD/WCD)}\]
\[(20b) \ [\text{yi?mal is'ha 1}] \quad \text{(BCD)}\]

\[(\text{Lit: make (it) diarrhoea})\]

However, it would be complete PT if the learner realized the complete cross-linguistic similarity between the L2-lexical verb 'cause' and the L1-lexical verb \([\text{yusabbib}]\) in MSA and its SCA-form \([\text{ysabbib}]\) which is less frequently used than those cited in (20 a-b) above

\[(21) \ \text{Will you extinguish that cigarette?} \quad \text{(AU)}\]

In this IL-utterance, the lexical use of 'extinguish' suggests the learner's ignorance of, for instance, the L2-lexical verbs 'stub' and 'put something out' (semantic avoidance). Therefore, his knowledge of 'extinguish' seems to be the underlying trigger which gave him an opportunity to make a cross-lingual tie-up between the L2-lexical verb 'extinguish' and the L1-lexical verb \([\text{yutfi}]\) (MSA)/[\text{ytaffi}] (SCA), a lexical verb equally used in both varieties (cf example (13)). Consequently, the IL-use of 'extinguish' here can be taken as a result of crucial PT from MSA and SCA

\[(22) \ \text{Can I know the reason?} \quad \text{(AU)}\]

[Reference the speaker was asking about the reason for his interlocutor's refusal of an invitation]

The learner, here, appears to have fallen back on the L1-lexical verb \([\text{a?rif}]\) 'know (I)' which is equally used in both varieties

\[(22a) \ [\text{mumkin a?rif-issabab}] \quad \text{(SCA)}\]
\[(22b) \ [\text{a-yumkinuni an a?rifa-ssabab}] \quad \text{(MSA)}\]

\[(\text{Lit: Can (me) know the reason?)}\]

Therefore, by perceiving the cross-linguistic similarity between the two verbs, the learner seems to have avoided the L2-lexical verb 'have', that is, a lexical avoidance strategy in the sense mentioned
above (cf. example (18)) It should be noted, however, that such a strategy is said to be adopted not because the L2-lexical verb 'have' in more difficult to produce, but rather, perhaps, because the L1-lexical verb [aʔrif] is one of the highly automatized L1-items, and thus its self-activation results in complete PT from both varieties.

(23) Can you know the time? (AU)

[Reference the speaker was asking an English-speaking child, who was wearing a new watch, about his ability to tell or read the time]

Again, the learner, here, relied on the L1-lexical verb [teʔrif] 'know (you, sing, masc)' which is usually used in the following L1-TEs

(23a) [b'teʔrif bɪssaʔaʔa] (SCA) (Lit: know (you) in/by the watch?)

(23b) [b'teʔrif bɪlwaʔiʔiʔ] (NCD/SCD/NCD) (Lit: know (you) in/by the time?)

Although the L2-verbs 'tell' and 'read' exist in the learner's linguistic repertoire as lexical items, his ignorance of the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which requires the lexical use of either verb (semantic avoidance) can, at best, be looked upon as a precondition for making a cross-lingual tie-up between the L1-lexical verb [teʔrif] and the L2-lexical verb 'know'. The attempted utilization of such a tie-up was, therefore, due to the highly automatized nature of the L1-source lexical item as mentioned in the preceding example. Consequently, the L1-based L2-lexical item 'know' is an indication of crucial PT from SCA.

(24) My passport will finish in September (AU)

This IL-utterance reflects crucial PT from the lexical use of the L1-verb [yantahi] (MSA)/[yɪntɪhɪ] (SCA) 'finish (he/it)' due to its realization in L2-utterances such as 'have you finished' and other utterances such as the L2-equivalent of the above IL-utterance where the L2-verb 'expire' is more suitable. This indicates that, in such contexts, the semantic extensions of the L1-verb [yantahi] coincide with those of the L2-verbs 'finish' and 'expire' (divergent phenomena).
(25) Next week she will complete five months

[Reference the speaker was referring to a baby's age]

As an exception to Hypothesis Three, the lexical use of 'complete'
makes NT from the L1-lexical verbs [tkammîl] (SCA)/[tukmîl] (MSA) and
[ttammîm] (SCA)/[tutammîm] (MSA) 'complete (she)' which are recurrently
used in this context

(26) Did you wound yourself?
(27) Did I wound your feeling?

In these IL-utterances, the learner seems to have made a cross-lingual
tie-up between the L1-lexical verb [jarâha] (MSA)/[jarâh] (SCA) and the
L2-lexical verb 'wound'. While in the L1-TE of (27) this L1-lexical
verb is figuratively used more frequently in SCA, in the L1-TE of (26)
it is equally used in both varieties. Given that the L2-lexical verb
'hurt' exists in the learner's linguistic repertoire, the IL-use of
'wound' can be viewed as another example of lexical avoidance leading
to crucial PT from the semantic realization of both MSA and SCA in (26)
and of SCA in (27)

6.3.2 Collocational Representations

(28) I let his hair stand

Analogous with the example 'He let my blood boil' analysed earlier (cf
chapter 5, section 5.3.3, example (8)), this IL-utterance reflects two
types of semantic representations: lexical in the use of 'let' and
collocational in the use of 'hair/stand'. Along the first parameter,
the lexical use of 'let' suggests crucial PT from the L1-lexical verb
[kalla] which is frequently recurrent in the following L1-TE

(28a) [kalla t šaʔr(ra s)o ywaʔʔef]
(Lit let (I) the hair of his (head) stand (it))
Concerning the second parameter, the collocational representation of 'hair' and 'stand' indicates that, both in SCA and English, to make one's hair stand (on end) is to fill one with fright or horror. As a consequence, whether the learner perceived such cross-linguistic similarity or not, the actual IL-utterance (28) signifies complete PT from the semantic realization of SCA.

[N B In support of Hypothesis Two, the learner's non-use of the L2-prepositional phrase 'on end' reflects NT from the usual non-use of the LI-counterpart in SCA ]

(29) You're right I withdraw my word (AU)

In SCA, both LI-lexical verbs [saḥab] 'withdrew/pulled out/took back (he)' and [balaʔ] 'swallowed (he)' collocate with [kilme] 'word' to indicate that the speaker expresses regret and apology for what he said or admits that what he said was wrong. It seems that the learner, upon producing the IL-utterance (29), made a cross-lingual tie-up between [saḥab] and 'withdrew' which leads to crucial PT from the usual collocational representation [saḥab kilime] 'he withdrew his word', though it would have marked complete PT if the learner had had recourse to [balaʔ] 'swallowed (he)' which is also in common use in SCA.

[N B In support of Hypothesis Two, the learner's resort to the singularity of the L2-noun 'word' suggests NT from the usual singularity of the LI-counterpart in SCA ]

(30) NSE Why don't you want to get married? NSA Because marriage will cut my wings (AU)

Both in MSA and SCA, the LI-lexical verb [qaṣṣa] 'cut (he/it)' collocates with [jana h] 'wing' to indicate that one's freedom or activities will be limited. Thus the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [yaquss] 'cuts (he/it)' and 'cut' signifies crucial PT from both varieties. This is because the learner, it has been attested, ignores the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which requires the lexical use of the verb 'clip' in this context (semantic avoidance).

(31) Stop your breath and you'll get rid of it (AU)

[Reference the addressee had the hiccups ]
Both in MSA and SCA, the lexical L1-verbs ['awqafa] 'stopped (he)' and [qata'a] 'cut (he)' collocate with [nafas] 'breath' to indicate that the person in question stops breathing for a while. Thus, the learner's reliance on ['awqif] (MSA)/[wa?qif] (SCA) 'stop (you, imperative)' leads to crucial PT from both varieties. Again, this is due to the learner's ignorance of the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which requires the lexical use of either of the two verbs 'hold/catch' in this context (semantic avoidance).

[N.B. Since the L1-word [ha zu qa] 'hiccup (sing fem.)' is usually used in the singular form, it seems that the learner, by using the pronoun 'it', adopted the structural properties of the L1-pronoun [ha] in [minha] 'of it (fem.)' referring to [ha zu qa]. Therefore, with regard to Hypothesis Two, the use of the pronoun 'it' in (31) can mark either NT when the reference is made to the plural form 'the hiccups' and in this case the pronoun should be 'them', or PT when the reference is made to the attack of hiccups.]

(32) The eyes are the mirror of the hearts (AU)

In MSA, the L1-lexical item [?uyu n] 'eyes' can collocate with [qulu b] 'hearts' to indicate that the former may reflect what is hidden in the latter, so that the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [qulu b] and 'hearts' signals crucial PT from MSA. As analogous with the previous example, this can be ascribed to the learner's ignorance of the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which involves the lexical use of the noun 'soul' (semantic avoidance).

[N.B. Concerning Hypothesis Two, the plural form 'eyes' in English refers to one's two eyes which 'are the mirror of one's soul', whereas the plural form [?uyu n] 'eyes' in Arabic implies, at a deep-structure level, at least three pairs of eyes in this context since the plural form [qulu b] 'hearts' also implies at least three hearts due to the existence of the dual form. Thus, the L1-TE of (32) indicates that 'each pair of eyes (that is, the dual form [?ayna n] 'two eyes') is the mirror of one heart'. It follows that the learner, upon producing the plural form 'hearts' in (32), seems to entertain the L1-deep structure of [?uyu'n] as rendered into the plural form 'eyes' in (32). Consequently, 'hearts' in this case marks NT from the syntactic...
realization of MSA, since the plural form 'eyes', in the L2-equivalent of (32), refers to one's pair of eyes which reflects what is hidden in his/her soul (sing ) ]

(33) You'll eat your fingers after this food (AU)

In SCA, the L1-lexical verb [ta kul] 'eat (you, sing masc)' can collocate with [asa b'ak] 'your fingers' as in (33a) below to indicate that the food in question is very delicious. Thus, after finishing a good meal, this collocational representation figuratively suggests that the delicious flavour of the food can be re-tasted by 'eating the fingers'. For example

(33a) [ra h ta kul asab?ak wara ha] (SCA) (Lit will eat (you) your fingers after it (food))

Therefore, from the point of view of British English 'to lick one's fingers', the L1-based L2-lexical item 'eat' in (33) signifies crucial PT from the lexical representation of [ta kul] which collocates with [asa b'ak] in SCA to convey the intended meaning. Whereas, from the point of view of Hiberno-English 'to eat one's nails', the L1-based L2-lexical item 'fingers' also signifies crucial PT from the lexical representation of [asa bi?] which collocates with [ta kul] in SCA.

(34) The sound of this car (motor-horn) beats on my nerves (AU)

In SCA, the L1-lexical verbs [yidrub]/[y'du?] 'beat/hit (he/it)' and [y'fazziz] 'stir up (he/it)' can collocate with [?asab] 'nerve' or [?a?_sa b] 'nerves' to indicate that the person in question is annoyed.

(34a) [yidrub/y'du? _al ?asab/?a?_sa b] (SCA) (Lit beat/hit (it) on the nerve/nerves)

(34b) [y'fazziz-ll ?asab/?a?_sa b] (SCA) (Lit stir up (it) the nerve/nerves)

Thus, the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [yidrub]/[y'du?] and 'beats' in (34) leads to crucial PT from the collocational representation of [yidrub]/[y'du?] and [?a?_sa b] in SCA. Again, this
is due to the learner's ignorance of the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which requires the lexical use of the phrasal verb 'get on' in this context (semantic avoidance).

[N B As an exception to Hypothesis Two, both the Ll-preposition [?a'?a b] 'nerves' —as transferred negatively onto the IL-utterance (6) above (cf section 6 3 1)— are said to lead to PT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA.]

(35) That work broke my back (AU)

In both varieties, the Ll-lexical verbs [kasar] (SCA/MSA) and [qasam] (MSA) can collocate with [dahr] (SCA) or [Thahr] (MSA) to refer to a very strenuous type of work

(35a) [kasar dahrı] (SCA)
(35b) [qasama Thahrı ] (MSA)

(Lit broke (it) my back)

('it' ----> [sugul]/[?amal] 'work')

The result is that the learner, upon producing the IL-utterance (35), seems to have had recourse to the collocational representation of the Ll-lexical items which signal complete PT from both SCA and MSA

[N B. As an exception to Hypothesis Two, the agent of the IL-utterance (35) is 'work' as is the case of [sugul]/[?amal] in the L1-TEs (35 a-b) and the patient is 'back' in (35) or [dahrı]/[Thahrı ] in (35 a-b) Whereas in the L2-equivalent the usual syntactic realization is that 'I' is the real agent, 'back' is the real patient, and 'work' is the instrument This suggests that the syntactic realization of Arabic also leads to PT, albeit the co-occurrence of cases in the Ll-TEs differs from the co-occurrence of cases in the L2-equivalent]

(36) They erased the traces of the crime (AU)

[Reference talking about a film on TV ]
In both varieties, the LL-lexical verbs [maḥu] 'erased (they)', [aza lu] 'removed (they)' and [akfu] 'hid (they)' interchangeably collocate with [a thār] 'traces' to express the meaning intended in this IL-utterance. Therefore, the learner appears to have relied on the collocational representation of [maḥu] and [a thār] which results in crucial PT from both MSA and SCA. This is another example of semantic avoidance since the learner, it has been attested, ignores the lexical use of, at least, 'evidence' in this context, though he knows it as a lexical item.

(37) He is nice, but he puts his nose in everything  

[Reference the speaker was giving his opinion of his friend]

In SCA, the LL-lexical verbs [hat] 'put (he)' and [ḥāšar] 'poked (he)' can collocate with [anf] 'nose' to indicate that the person in question interferes in other people's affairs.

(37a) [yhuṭ anfo b-kul šī]  
(Lit put (he) his nose in everything)  

(37b) [yuḥšur anfo b-kul šī]  
(Lit poke (he) his nose in everything)

Thus, the cross-linguistic tie-up the learner made between [yhuṭ] and 'puts' as collocating with [anf] 'nose' leads to crucial PT from SCA when viewed from the perspective of British English, and to complete PT when viewed from the perspective of Hiberno-English.

(38) She stole the lights

In MSA, the LL-lexical verb [saraqat] 'stole (she)' usually collocates with [adwa?] 'lights' as in the LL-TE [saraqat il-?adwa?] (Lit stole (she) the lights) to indicate that the person in question attracts all the attention. Therefore, the learner seems to have resorted to such a collocational representation which leads to complete PT from SCA/MSA. However, the lexical use of 'lights' marks crucial PT from the lexical use of [adwa?]

(39) I trod on my dignity
Like the L2-equivalent of this IL-utterance, the collocational representation of [disit] 'trod (I)' and [kara ma] 'dignity' is in common use in SCA to indicate that the person in question insists upon being treated with proper respect. It appears that the learner relied on such a representation as in the L1-TE [disit ?al-kara mt] (Lit. trod (I) on my dignity) which leads to crucial PT from SCA.

[NB. As an exception to Hypothesis Two, the use of the preposition 'on' in (39), which indicates figurative onness (cf section 6.2.1, sub-section (D)), marks PT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA.]

(40) My situation is hanged by a hair (AU)

Like the L2-equivalent of this IL-utterance, the collocational representation of [m?alla?] 'be hanged (he/it)' and [sa?ra] 'a hair' is commonly used in SCA to indicate that the person in question is in a dangerous or precarious state. Thus, the resultant IL-collocation of 'hanged' and 'a hair' in (40) suggests crucial PT from SCA (cf example (45) below). This is another example of semantic avoidance since the learner, it has been attested, ignores the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which requires the lexical use of the noun 'thread' in such a context.

[NB. As an exception to Hypothesis Two, the use of the preposition 'by', whose L1-equivalent [b] in [m?alla? b-sa?ra] indicates figurative utilization (cf section 6.2.1, sub-section (A)), item (v), sub-section (B)), signals PT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA.]

(41) The blood does not become water (AU)

Although the structure of the L2-equivalent is syntactically different from the structure of this IL-utterance, the cross-semantic similarity between the two is due to the same collocational relationship between [dam] 'blood' and [may] 'water' which, in both languages, indicates that the ties of family relationship are real. It appears that the learner, upon producing the IL-utterance (41), made cross-lingual tie-ups with the SCA-equivalent [iddam ma bsi r may] (Lit the blood...
not become (it) water) by means of a word-for-word translation process as shown in the above IL-utterance Consequently, such cross-lingual tie-ups signify complete PT from the collocational representation of both items in SCA, not withstanding that the structural properties of the IL-utterance (41) should be modified in the direction of the L2-counterpart

[N.B In support of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the definite article 'the' in (41) with a generic noun suggests NT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA (cf section 6.2.2)]

(42) Come on now Don't be lazy Move your blood

Particularly in SCA, the L1-lexical verb [harrak] 'moved (he)' usually collocates with [dammak] 'his blood' to indicate that the person in question is in a state of revival and activity after having been lazing away for a while

(42a) [harrik dammak]

It seems the case that the learner, upon producing the IL-utterance (42), adopted a word-for-word translation strategy by relying on the L1-example (42a) Therefore, the L1-based L2-items 'move' and 'blood' mark crucial PT from the L1-equivalents in (42a) which are in common use in SCA Since it has been attested that the learner lacked the knowledge of the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which imposes the collocational use of, for example 'pump' or 'rouse' with 'blood', his resort to 'move' in collocation with 'blood' can be viewed as another example of semantic avoidance

(43) Will you open the umbrella?
(44) It's not raining now You can close the umbrella

In both varieties, the L1-lexical verbs [fta h] (SCA)/[iftah] (MSA) 'open (you, imperative, sing, masc)' and [sakkir] (SCA)/[agliq] (MSA) 'close/shut (you, imperative, sing, masc)' usually collocate with [miThalla] (MSA)/[samsiyye] (SCA) 'umbrella' to express the meaning intended in this IL-utterance It appears that the learner, upon
producing (43) and (44), made cross-linguistic tie-ups between [fta h]/[sakkir] and 'open/close' which lead to crucial PT from SCA as realized in MSA (cf. chapter 5, section 5.2, Table 6) Again, this is due to the learner's ignorance of the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which requires the lexical use of the phrasal verbs 'put up/put down' in these contexts (semantic avoidance).

(45) I'll open the tap for cold water

In SCA specifically, the LI-lexical verb [aftah] 'open (I)' usually collocates with [hanafiyye] 'tap' to indicate the meaning intended in this IL-utterance (cf. chapter 5, section 5.2, Table 6) Thus, as an exception to Hypothesis Three, the learner seems to have had recourse to this LI-lexical verb which leads to NT because, from the L2-semantic point of view 'to open a tap' and 'to run a tap' are quite different things.

(46) There isn't even a thread of hope

This IL-utterance reflects complete PT from the collocational representation of [kayt amal] 'a threat of hope', a common phrase equally used both in MSA and SCA (cf. Wehr, 1961:267), even though this IL-utterance seems to be a verbatim translation of the LI-counterpart.

(47) She was looking from the tip of her eye

Both in MSA and SCA, the LI-lexical item [taraf] 'tip' usually collocates with [ʔayn] (MSA)/[ʔe n] (SCA) 'eye' as in [bitalliʔ min/b-taraf ʔe no] (Lit. look (he) from/by tip (of) his eye) to indicate that the person in question glances furtively (i.e., looks out of the corner of one's eye). Therefore, the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [taraf ʔe na] and 'the tip of her eye' signifies crucial PT from both varieties.

[N.B.. In support of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the preposition 'from' in (47) reflects the learner's resort to the LI-preposition [min] which leads to NT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA (cf. section 6.2.1, sub-section (C))]
(48) I think his moustache is not true

Both in MSA and SCA, the possible collocational representations of the source L1-lexical items are illustrated in the following L1-TEs

(48a) [šawa rbo mu haʔi ʔiyye] (SCA) (Lit his moustaches not true)

(48b) [šawa rbo istiʔaʔiyye/mzayyaʔa/mustaʔa ra] (MSA/SCA) 'his moustache is artificial/false/(Lit borrowed)'

As the context of the IL-utterance (48) suggests, the learner seems to have been stressing the negative mode of the L1-based L2-lexical item 'true' (which reflects a direct translation of [haʔi ʔiyye] in (48a)) rather than its antonym since he should have produced, at least, 'his moustache is false' which would lead to complete PT from MSA and SCA. Given that the L1-lexical item [haʔi ʔiyye] (SCA)/[haqi qiyya] (MSA) is rendered into L2-lexical items such as 'true', 'real', 'genuine', 'authentic' and so on, the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [haʔi ʔiyye] and 'true'—which marks crucial PT from both varieties—may reflect his lexical avoidance of at least 'real', since it has been attested that he had 'real' but not 'authentic' at his disposal (cf examples (18) and (22) above)

(49) Her face became red from shyness

This IL-utterance reflects the learner's reliance on the collocational representation of [ahmar] 'red' and [kajal] 'shyness' both in MSA and SCA

(49a) [sa r wiʔsa ahmar min-l-kajal] (SCA) (Lit became (it) her face red from the shyness)

(49b) [ihmarra wajhuha min-al kajal] (MSA) (Lit reddened/blushed (it) her face from the shyness)

(49c) [ihmarra wajhuha kajalan] (MSA) (Lit reddened/blushed (it) her face (with) shyness)

Therefore, this collocational representation of both L1-lexical items
can be seen as crucial PT from both varieties. Again, a type of transfer such as this can be viewed as another example of semantic avoidance since the learner, it has been attested, ignores the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which involves the lexical use of, at least, the verb 'blush'.

[NB In support of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the preposition 'from', which suggests the learner's resort to the L1-preposition [min] as in (49 a-b), marks NT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA (cf section 6 2 1, sub-section (C)), though [min], at a deep-structure level, means 'because of' due to the grammatical function of [ka'alan] in (49c) which is known as [maf?u 1 lahu], that is, an object 'shyness' triggering the effect of the action 'blushing'. This indicates that the learner did not realize the meaning implied in the L1-preposition [min] otherwise he would have produced the IL-utterance (49) as 'her face became red because of shyness' which would lead to PT from the deep structure of [min] in this context.

(50) This is a clear robbery (AU)
[Reference the speaker was referring to the excessive price charged for a meal]

In this IL-utterance, the learner seems to have had recourse to the collocational representation of the L1-lexical items [sariqa] (MSA)/[sir?e] (SCA) 'robbery' and [wa diha] (MSA)/[wa d'he] (SCA) 'clear/plain' (cf section 6 3 1, examples (3 a-c)) which indicate that such an excessive price is easily recognizable as robbery. Therefore, the resultant IL-utterance signifies crucial PT from both MSA and SCA.

[NB Since the noun 'robbery' is usually used as uncountable in this context, the countability of [sariqa] in Arabic may be the underlying trigger of the learner's retention of the indefinite article 'a' which, in support of Hypothesis Two, suggests NT from the syntactic realization of both varieties (cf section 6 2 2)]

(51) Do you believe he's dead?
They shot false cartridges (AU)
[Reference watching a film on TV]
This IL-utterance reflects transfer along two semantic parameters, the lexical representation of 'shot' and the collocational representation of 'false/bullets'. In terms of the first parameter, the learner seems to have made a cross-lingual tie-up between the L1-lexical verb [atlaqu] and the L2-lexical verb 'shot' which can be seen as crucial PT from both varieties. Since it has been attested that the learner knows the L2-verb 'fire' as a lexical item, his use of 'shot' can be viewed as a type of lexical avoidance as mentioned above (cf examples (18), (22)).

With regard to the second parameter, the L1-lexical items [faśag], [rsa 5] and [talaqa t] 'cartridges' can collocate with [kullabi]/[kullabiyye] 'blank' to indicate that the cartridges have no bullets in them. Such a collocational representation is commonly used within the military jargon of SCA/MSA

(51a) [faśag kullabi] (SCA)
(51b) [rsa 5 kullabi] (SCA)
(51c) [talaqa t kullabiyye] (MSA/SCA)
(Lit cartridges blank)

By rendering [kullabi] into 'false', the learner seems to have adopted a semantic avoidance strategy due to his ignorance of the L2-lexical item 'blank'. Consequently, the LI-based L2-lexical item 'false' suggests crucial PT from both varieties as shown in the above LI-examples

(52) I can't remember, my mind is tired (AU)

In both varieties, the L1-based L2-lexical item 'tired' can collocate with [muk] 'brain/mind' and [tha kira] 'memory' to indicate the meaning intended in this IL-utterance

(52a) [mukki ta?ba n] (SCA)
(52b) [dima gi mut?ab] (MSA)
(Lit my brain/mind tired)

(52c) [za kirti ta?ba ne] (SCA)
(52d) [tha kirati mut?aba] (MSA)
(Lit my memory tired)

Therefore, the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [ta?ba n] and 'tired' marks complete PT from the former's lexical representation both in MSA and SCA. However, the IL-collocation of both 'mind' and
'tired' suggests crucial PT from both varieties as shown in the above L1-examples. Since it has been attested that the learner's linguistic repertoire lacks the knowledge of the L2-semantic idiosyncrasy which involves the collocational use of 'blank' in this context (cf. example (51) above), his use of the L1-based L2-lexical item 'tired' in collocation with 'mind' can also be taken as an example of semantic avoidance.

(53) Will you give me a white paper?  

In both varieties, the L1-lexical item [be da] (SCA)/[bayda ?] (MSA) 'white' usually collocates with [wara?a]/[taba?a] (SCA)/[safha] (MSA/SCA) 'a sheet of paper' to indicate that the sheet is blank.

(53a) [wara?a/tab? a/safha be da]  
     (Lit. (a sheet of) paper white (fem))

(53b) [safha bayda ?]  
     (Lit. (a sheet of) paper white (fem))

Thus, the L1-based L2-lexical item 'white' reflects crucial PT from the collocational representation of (53 a-b) both in MSA and SCA. Again, such an item can be seen as an example of semantic avoidance in the sense that the learner ignores the lexical use of 'blank' in this context.

[NB In support of Hypothesis Two, the countability of [wara?a], [taba?a] or [safha] seems to be the underlying precondition for the learner's misuse of the indefinite article 'a' in (53) which marks NT from the syntactic realization of both varieties.]

(54) I left this card empty for your notes  

(55) I'll bring you an empty tape to record it (a song)

Similarly, in SCA in particular, the L1-lexical item [fa d? ]/[fa rig] 'empty' usually collocates with [karit] 'card' or [s? ar? t] 'tape' to indicate the blankness of the card or the tape. Therefore, the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [fa d? ]/[fa rig] and 'empty' signifies crucial PT from the former's usual collocation with [karit] or [s? ar? t] in SCA. Analogous with the interlingual identifications (51), (52) and (53), the L1-based L2-lexical item 'empty' reflects a semantic avoidance strategy adopted by the learner.
In SCA in particular, the L1-lexical item [tawi 1] 'long' can collocate with [lsa n] 'tongue' to figuratively indicate that the person in question usually speaks sarcastically and bitterly. Therefore, the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [tawi 1] and 'long' marks crucial PT from the former's usual collocation with [lsa n] 'tongue' in SCA. However, it would have marked complete PT from MSA if the learner had relied on the L1-lexical item [ha dd] 'sharp' which usually collocates with [lsa n] 'tongue' to express the same intended meaning. Since it has been attested that the learner knows the L2-lexical item 'sharp' and its usual collocation with 'tongue' in English, the L1-based L2-lexical item 'long' can be taken as another example of lexical avoidance (cf examples (18), (22) and (48) above).

(57) Now my appetite is open

[Reference the speaker was referring to a strong drink which made him feel hungry]

In this IL-utterance, the learner seems to have adopted a word-for-word translation strategy by relying on one of the following L1-TEs:

(57a) [halla? infat'het šahī tī] (SCA)
(57b) [al-ʔa na infatahas šahīyyatī] (MSA)

Therefore, as an exception to Hypothesis Three, the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [infat'het] and 'is open' suggests NT due to a semantic avoidance strategy (cf chapter 5, section 5.2, Table 6). That is, the learner's ignorance of the lexical use of verbs such as 'stimulate' and 'whet' in this context.

[N.B In support of Hypothesis Two, the learner's resort to the present-tense construction in place of the perfective construction marks NT due to a syntactic avoidance strategy (cf section 6.2.3)]

(58) He has a good experience in nuclear physics. If he works in France, his salary will be an open cheque.
Similarly, the learner, upon producing 'open cheque', seems to have adopted a word-for-word translation strategy by relying on the L1-lexical item [maftu h] 'open (nomen patientis)' Such an item usually collocates with [ṣi k] 'cheque' in SCA to indicate that the amount of the cheque in question is left for the payee to fill in Therefore, the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [maftu h] and 'open' suggests crucial PT from the collocational representation of [ṣi k maftu h] in SCA Analogous with the above examples (cf (51), (52), (53), (54), and (55)), the L1-based L2-lexical item 'open' in (58) reflects a semantic avoidance strategy due to the learner's lack of knowledge of the L2-semantic idiosyncracy which imposes the collocational use of 'blank' in this context

[N B. In support of Hypothesis Two, the countability of the L1-noun [kibrə] 'experience' as in [ʔindo kibrə t] (SCA)/[ʔindohtml kibrə t] (MSA) (Lit have (he) experiences) seems to act as a precondition for the learner's misuse of the indefinite article 'a' in (58) and thus suggests NT from the syntactic realization of both varieties (cf section 6.2.2)]

6.3.3 Contextual Representations

(59) I can't see, you're standing in front of me (AU)

[The situational context of this IL-utterance refers to the speaker who was watching TV The addressee was standing in the speaker's way and thus preventing him from watching The contextual meaning entails that the speaker, upon producing such an utterance, wanted the addressee to move]

The learner, upon producing this IL-utterance, seems to have had automatic recourse to the L1-adverbial phrase [udda m1] (SCA)/[qudda m1]/[ama m1] (MSA) 'in front of me/before me' which leads to crucial PT, since the contextual representation of 'in front of me' in (59) does not entirely destroy the semantic system of the possible L2-equivalents holding the same intended meaning. It appears that the underlying factors which caused the learner to produce such an
L1-adverbial phrase were incorporating into a semantic field different from that which underlies the L2-counterparts usually produced in English. In other words, the suggestion is that the internal processes triggered by these factors operated outside the semantic field which underlies the English counterparts, simply because the adverbial phrase 'in front of me' is not usually used as a substitute for the L2-equivalents within such a situational context to convey such a contextual meaning. Therefore, the L1-TE [waːʔif uddaːmiː] (Lit.: standing (you) in front of me) seems to act as an utterance initiator for two underlying reasons. First, the adverbial phrase [uddaːmiː] is normally rendered into either 'in front of me' or 'before me', so that its contextual representation was the only available linguistic knowledge which the learner could draw upon. Second, in Arabic, this L1-adverbial phrase is usually used within such a situational context to convey such a contextual meaning. Consequently, the L1-based L2-adverbial phrase 'in front of me' reflects a semantic avoidance strategy due to the learner's ignorance of the L2-equivalents such as 'in my way', 'in my line of vision', and so on, albeit his linguistic repertoire may have the subcomponents of these prepositional phrases as individual lexical items.

(60) You wear your jumper upside down. (AU)
(61) Your jumper is the other way round. (AU)

[The situational context of the IL-utterance (60) is that the addressee was wearing the jumper with the inner side out (inside-out); whereas in the IL-utterance (61) it indicates that the jumper was on back to front; that is, its label was to the front. The contextual meaning indicates that the speaker in both utterances wanted the addressee to put on the jumper right way round.]

The learner, here, seems to have relied on either of the two L1-prepositional phrases [bil-ʔakis] and [bil-maʔluːb] (SCA) which, depending on the situational context, are interchangeably used to express the meaning intended. These L1-prepositional phrases, whose MSA-forms are [bil-ʔaks] and [bil-maqluːb] respectively, are usually rendered into 'upside-down', 'wrong side out', 'the other way round', 'reversely', 'conversely', 'vice versa', and so on (cf. Wehr, 1961: 631 and 785). Therefore, the cross-lingual tie-ups the learner made between L1 and L2 in both IL-utterances lead to crucial PT from SCA and
reflect semantic avoidance strategies due to his ignorance of the L2-items which are usually used as the second part of the phrasal verb, that is, 'inside-out' for 'wear' in (60) and 'back to front' for 'Be on' in (61)

[N.B Concerning Hypothesis Two, the learner's avoidance of the progressive aspect of the verb 'wear' in (60) has been discussed earlier (cf section 6 2 3, example (96)) Again, the omission of the preposition 'on' in (61), which is the first part of the phrasal verb, suggests NT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA ]

(62) I laughed at him in my heart  

In this IL-utterance, the learner seems to have resorted to the contextual use of the L1-prepositional phrase [b'?albi] 'in my heart' as in the following L1-TE

(62a) [d'hikit ?ale b'?albi]  
  (Lit laughed (I) at him in my heart)

This indicates that the person in question (the agent) laughs at someone secretly (i.e. laughs at someone to himself) Therefore, the word-for-word translation strategy the learner adopted leads to crucial PT from the contextual use of [b'?albi] in SCA Again, the L1-based L2-prepositional phrase 'in my heart' reflects a semantic avoidance strategy due to the learner's ignorance of the contextual use of L2-phrases such as 'to myself', 'up my sleeve', 'under my breath', and so on

(63) This woman behaves behind her husband  

This IL-utterance suggests the learner's reliance on the contextual use of the L1-prepositional phrase [min wara] as in the following L1-TE

(63a) [btitsarraf min wara jo za]  
  (Lit behave (she) from behind her husband)

The contextual meaning of this L1-utterance indicates that the person in question (she) is doing something unpleasant without her husband's knowledge (i.e goes behind his back) Thus, the IL-use of 'behind her
husband' signifies crucial PT from the contextual meaning of (63a), a common utterance produced in SCA. Further, the lexical use of 'behaves' also signifies crucial PT from the Ll-lexical verb [btitsarraf] in (63a).

(64) NSE I don't know what to do with Barbara
NSA Just turn your back to her (AU)

In this piece of dialogue, the native speaker of English (NSE) was referring to an obnoxious or a difficult friend and the native speaker of Arabic (NSA) was advising his interlocutor to ignore such a friend. The contextual use of 'turn your back to her' suggests the learner's resort to the Ll-TE (64a) rather than (64b) though both are equally used in SCA.

(64a) [di rla dahrak] (SCA)
(Lit turn (you, sing, masc) to her your back)

(64b) [2'ti ha dahrak] (SCA)
(Lit give (you, sing, masc) her your back)

Therefore, the IL-use of 'turn your back to her' signals complete PT from the lexical distribution of (64a) which holds the same contextual meaning intended by the NSA in (64).

[N.B. In support of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the preposition 'to' in (64) marks NT from the Ll-preposition [l] in (64a) due to the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA]

(65) Let me remember you with the good things (AU)

In this IL-utterance, the learner seems to have had automatic recourse to the contextual use of the Ll-prepositional phrase [b1.iṣṣayliḳwayyes]/[b1-iṣṣ ilinmi h] 'with the good thing' which is commonly used in SCA as derived from MSA [b1-iṣṣay1.l-ḥasan/mali h]. Thus, the contextual representation of 'with the good things' in (65) marks complete PT from both MSA and SCA.

[N.B. In support of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the preposition 'with' —which suggests the learner's reliance on the Ll-preposition
[b1] as indicating **figurative association** (cf section 6.2.1, sub-section (B))—marks **NT** from the syntactic realization of both **MSA** and **SCA**

(66) Everyone behaves **according to his origin**

The learner, here, seems to have adopted a word-for-word translation strategy by relying on the following **L1-TE**

(66a) [kul wa hid bitsarraf hasab aslo]

(67) I don't feel **at rest** when I look at him

Thus, the contextual use of 'according to his origin' signifies **complete PT** from the contextual use of [hasab aslo] in **SCA** which is derived from [hasba aslihi] in **MSA**. Further, the lexical use of 'behaves' suggests **crucial PT** from the **L1-lexical verb** [bitsarraf] in (66a) or its **MSA-form** [yatasarrafu] (cf example (63) above)

(68) She was looking at everyone **with hate**

This **IL-utterance** suggests the learner's resort to the contextual use of the **L1-prepositional phrase** [b'kuruh] (SCA)/[bikurh]/[bi hiqd] (MSA) 'with hatred/hate' which leads to **complete PT** from both varieties

[N B As an exception to **Hypothesis Two**, the use of the preposition 'with'—which reflects the learner's resort to the **L1-preposition** [b1]
as indicating figurative association (cf section 6.2.1, sub-section (B))—also signals PT from the syntactic realization of both varieties ]

(69) I'm really shy from you

([The situational context of this IL-utterance refers to the speaker who borrowed some money from the addressee. The contextual meaning, therefore, indicates that the speaker was in a state of apology for not giving the money back on time as promised]

The learner, here, seems to have adopted a word-for-word translation strategy by relying on the following LI-TE

(69a) [ana fī‘lan kajla n minnak] (SCA)
(69b) [ana bīl-fī‘īl kajla n minnak] (SCA)

(Lit I really/indeed shy from you)

Thus, depending on the context, the LI-lexical item [kajla n] 'shy' can be used to indicate

a. Self-consciousness and uncomfortableness in the presence of others,
b. Hesitation about something such as speaking to others,
c. A feeling of awkwardness or ashamedness,
d. Mental discomfort or anxiety (embarrassment),
e. Distressed feeling, or feeling of apology, caused by undesirable behaviour, and so on

Since this LI-item is usually rendered into 'abashed', 'ashamed', 'shy', 'embarrassed' and so on (cf Wehr, 1961 228), the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [kajla n] (SCA/MSA) and 'shy'—within such a situational context—can be viewed as an example of crucial PT from both varieties

[N.B. In support of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the preposition 'from', which suggests the learner's resort to the LI-preposition [min], marks NT from the syntactic realization of both varieties (cf section 6.2.1, sub-section (C))]
[The situational context of this IL-utterance refers to the speaker who had already got involved in a particular problem. The contextual meaning connotes his statement that he was no longer responsible for such a problem]

Similarly, the learner, here, seems to have applied a word-for-word translation strategy by recourse to the following L1-TE

(70a) [gassalt 1 day min hadi k-1l-misikle] (SCA)
(Lit washed (I) my hands from that the problem)

Therefore, within the collocational representation of [gassalt] 'washed (I)' and [1 day] 'my hands' in SCA, the IL-utterance reflects complete PT from the contextual meaning indicated by these two L1-lexical items.

[N B In support of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the preposition 'from' which suggests the learner's resort to the L1-preposition [min], signals NT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA (cf section 6.2.1, sub-section (C))]

(71) a NSA What happened to him? 
    b NSA They tied his hands and legs (AU)

[The situational context of this piece of dialogue refers to both interlocutors who were watching a film on TV. The speaker in (71a) left the room for a while and when he came back he asked to know what he had missed of the film. The contextual meaning is apparent in the speaker's IL-utterance (71b)].

In this IL-utterance (71b), the learner seems to have had recourse to the following L1-TE

(71c) [rabbatu i de w rijle] (SCA)
(Lit tied (they) his hands (dual) and his legs (dual))

From the point of view of the L2-utterance, 'they tied his arms and legs' which is possible in this context, the L1-based L2-lexical item 'hands' in (71b) suggests crucial PT from the lexical use of [1 de ] in SCA specifically (cf section 6.3.1, example (7)). However, from the point of view of the L2-utterance 'he was tied/bound hand and foot' which is more recurrent in this context, the L1-based L2-lexical item
'legs' in (71b) marks crucial PT from the lexical use of [r1j1e] in SCA (cf section 6.3.1, example (2)). It appears that the contextual use of 'hands and legs', within the alternately collocational representation of both L1-based L2-lexical items, signifies complete PT from SCA.

[N.B. Since the question in (71a) focuses on the object 'him', the passive construction which requires such an object to function as a subject would be more logical as an alternative to the answer in (71b). Therefore, the learner's tendency to produce the active construction rather than the passive construction suggests another example of syntactic avoidance in Kleinmann's sense (cf chapter 4, section 4.1.2, and section 6.2.3, example (100)), though the resultant IL-utterance (71b) does not mark an overt syntactic error.]

(72) I know you from your head to your feet

The contextual meaning of this IL-utterance indicates that the agent (I) knows the patient (you) completely. The learner, here, seems to have relied on the following LL-TE:

(72a) [min ra sak la r1j1e k]

(LIT from your head to your legs)

If this is the case, then the learner, by recourse to the L1-lexical item [r1j1e k], appears to have realized its 'correct' meaning within Arabic since, depending on the context, the singular form [r1j1il] in SCA means either 'leg' or 'foot' as discussed earlier (cf section 6.3.1, example (2)). This can be seen more explicitly in the LI-equivalent (72b) as usually used in MSA:

(72b) [min-arra?si ila-l-qadam]

(LIT from the head to the foot)

The reason why the possibility of transfer from (72a) is greater than from (72b) is that the redundant use of the possessive pronoun [k] 'your' is more frequent in SCA than it is in MSA. Therefore, the resultant IL-utterance (72) suggests crucial PT from the contextual representation of (72a) in SCA. However, within the 'correct'
realization of \([\text{raj\text{\textdagger}}]\) as 'foot', it would have been complete PT if the learner had rendered \([\text{isba\text{\textdagger}}-\text{rra\text{\textdagger}}]\) (SCA) in (72c), which originates from \([\text{akmas}-\text{il-qadam}]\) (MSA) in (72d), into the L2-lexical item 'toes'

(72c) \([\text{min ra sak la isba\text{\textdagger} rija\text{\textlak}}]\) \(\text{(SCA)}\)
    \((\text{Lit from your head to finger of your foot})\)

(72d) \([\text{min-arra\text{\textdagger}si ila akmas-\text{il-qadam}}]\) \(\text{(MSA)}\)
    \((\text{Lit from the head to hollow of the sole of the foot})\)

(73) I am frozen until the bone \(\text{(AU)}\)

In this IL-utterance, the learner seems to have adopted a word-for-word translation strategy by relying on the L1-phrase \([\text{hatta-l-\text{\textdagger}adm}]\) (SCA/MSA). Like the L2-equivalent, the contextual meaning of such a phrase indicates that the action (freezing) is modified to be completely penetrating. Thus, the resultant IL-utterance (73) marks complete PT from the contextual representation of the L1-phrase in both varieties.

[N.B In support of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the IL-preposition 'until', which suggests the learner's reliance on the L1-preposition [hatta], signifies NT from the syntactic realization of both SCA and MSA. However, it would have been PT if the learner had adopted a literal translation strategy by recourse to the L1-preposition [li] which is more recurrent in SCA within such a context]

(74) Write them on my account \(\text{(AU)}\)

[The situational context of this IL-utterance refers to the speaker who usually buys on credit from a corner shop. The contextual meaning indicates that the speaker wanted the addressee (the shop-keeper) to put the bought goods onto the former's account.]

Similarly, the learner, here, seems to have adopted a word-for-word translation strategy by recourse to the following L1-TE

(74a) \([\text{sajlon ?ala-h'\text{\textdagger}sa b1}]\) \(\text{(SCA)}\)
    \((\text{Lit: Write (imperative sing, masc) them on my account})\)
Therefore, from the point of view of the possible L2-equivalents, both the lexical use of 'write' and the contextual use of 'on my account' suggest complete PT from SCA and MSA, since both uses are possible in both varieties. However, the collocational use of both 'write' and 'on my account' reflects crucial PT as they do not usually collocate with each other to form an established L2-identification.

(75) Can we buy it (a television) in debt? (AU)

In this IL-utterance, the learner seems to have resorted to the L1-prepositional phrase [bidde n] (SCA)/[fiddayn] (MSA) (Lit in debt) whose contextual meaning indicates that the television in question would be either bought on credit or paid for by instalments [bittaq’al t] (MSA/SCA). Thus, the resultant IL-use of 'in debt' in (75) suggests crucial PT from both varieties. This can also be viewed as an instance of semantic avoidance.

[N B The misuse of the preposition 'in' has been discussed earlier (cf section 6 2 1, example (9))]

(76) If she continues in this behaviour, she will bring shame to herself (AU)

In this IL-utterance, the learner seems to have resorted to the contextual use of the L1-prepositional phrase [b’ha-ttasarruf] (SCA)/[bi ha tha-ttasarruf] (MSA) 'in this behaviour' which leads to crucial PT from both varieties. Further, the collocational representation of 'bring' and 'shame' can be seen as an example of complete PT from the collocational use of the L1-lexical items [ta‘lib] 'bring (she)' and [al-؟a r] 'the shame' which are usually recurrent in MSA specifically.

[N B In support of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the preposition 'to', which suggests the learner's reliance on the L1-preposition [l], signifies NT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA]

(77) You should go to the hospital It's not a game! (AU)
In the second part of this IL-utterance, the learner seems to have adopted a word-for-word translation strategy by recourse to the LL-phrase [mi li^be] (SCA) 'it's not a game'. The contextual meaning of such a phrase indicates that the matter in question (infection) is serious and the addressee should not neglect proper treatment. Therefore, within this situational context, the resultant IL-use of 'it's not a game' suggests crucial PT from its LL-equivalent as it is normally used in SCA.

[N.B In support of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the definite article 'the' marks NT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA (cf section 6.2.2)]

(78) NSA (A) Do you know Mazin Ashter?
    NSA (B) This name *is not strange to me* (AU)

Similarly, the learner (B), here, seems to have applied a word-for-word translation strategy by relying on the following LL-TE

(78a) [hal isim mu gar1 b ?alay] (SCA)
    (Lit this name not strange to me)

Thus, within this context, the resultant IL-use of 'is not strange to me', which indicates that the name in question is familiar to speaker (B), suggests crucial PT from (78a) in SCA and its LL-equivalent [laysa ha tha-1?-ismu gar ban ?alay] in MSA. Again, this can be looked upon as an instance of semantic avoidance.

(79) Next month it (a house-plant) will have leaves (AU)

In this IL-utterance, the learner seems to have made a cross-lingual tie-up between [yitla^la wara?] (SCA) (Lit appear (he) to it (plant) leaves) and 'have leaves' in that both lexical items [wara?] and 'leaves' are not verbalized. Although there is nothing wrong with the contextual use of 'have leaves' which clearly leads to complete PT from SCA, the learner's lack of knowledge of the L2-phrasal verbs 'be in leaf' and 'come into leaf' as well as the less frequent use of the verbalized MSA-form of 'leaf' [tu riq] in SCA than the non-verbalized form may be the logical impediment of making the relevant cross-semantic tie-ups (semantic avoidance).
(80) I said a word and that's all

Again, the learner, here, seems to have made a direct cross-lingual tie-up between [kala $]$ as in the L1-TE (80a) and 'that's all'

(80a) [?âlît kilme w kala $]$  
(Lit said (I) word and that's all)

Thus, depending on the context, the L1-word [kala $]$ means either 'that's all' or 'that's enough', and, in this particular context, it indicates that the 'word' in question will be kept. Although it has been attested that the L2-idiom 'to keep one's word' exists in the learner's linguistic repertoire, the cross-lingual tie-up made between [kala $]$ and 'that's all' can be ascribed to the more automatized nature of [kala $]$ on the one hand and to the greater effort demanded by the cross-lingual tie-up between [ana ?inda] as in (80b) and, at least, 'I am upon it' or 'I'll keep it' on the other

(80b) [?âlît kilme w ?âna ʔinda]  
(Lit said (I) word and I (be) upon it)

Consequently, the resultant IL-use of 'that's all' can be viewed as an example of crucial PT from the contextual representation of [kala $]$ in SCA

(81) Be with me, please

The learner, here, seems to adopt a word-for-word translation strategy by recourse to the L1-phrase [kallî k maʔî] (SCA) (Lit Let yourself (be) with me) or [ku n maʔî] (SCA)/[kun maʔî ] (MSA) 'be with me'. Thus, depending on the context, such a phrase may mean either 'be in my presence/company' or 'listen to me attentively and patiently'. The contextual meaning of the IL-utterance (81) suggests the latter and therefore marks crucial PT from both MSA and SCA

(82) He seems empty

Similarly, this IL-utterance reflects a word-for-word translation strategy applied by the learner in his reliance on either of the two L1-lexical items [fa di] and [fa rig] which are equally recurrent in
MSA and SCA One of the contextual uses of these items in SCA refers figuratively to a witless or stupid person who is extremely silent due to lack of common sense. Therefore, the contextual representation of the L1-based L2-lexical item 'empty' can be seen as an example of complete PT from SCA, since, at a deep-structure level, the L1-lexical items [fa di] and [fa rig] figuratively modify one's head, mind, and so on, in such a context.

(83) She kept silent from the fear

(AU)

A further word-for-word translation strategy adopted by the learner in his resort to the following L1-TE

(83a) [kirset mn-il-ko f] (SCA)
(Lit became/kept (she) silent from the fear)

Thus, the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between [kirset] and 'kept silent' leads to crucial PT from the contextual representation of (83a) in SCA and its L1-equivalent in MSA. As it has been attested, the lexical representation of 'kept silent' can be viewed as a result of a semantic avoidance strategy.

[N B. In support of Hypothesis Two, the misuse of the preposition 'from', which reflects the learner's reliance on the L1-preposition [min], marks NT from the syntactic realization of both MSA and SCA (cf section 6 2 1, sub-section (C)). Again, the misuse of the definite article 'the' suggests NT from the normal use of [al] with generic nouns (cf section 6 2 2)].

(84) Look at this weather!

(AU)

As its contextual meaning indicates, this IL-utterance suggests complete PT from both MSA and SCA in which the L1-TE [tallī? ʔaʔi su f ha-l'jaw] 'look at/see this weather' is usually used as an exclamatory utterance about the unreasonably changeable weather.

(85) When I love a certain tune, it sticks to my tongue

(AU)
[The situational context of this IL-utterance refers to the speaker in question who heard a song and admired it. The contextual meaning indicates that the speaker keeps singing it.]

The learner, here, appears to have adopted a word-for-word translation strategy by recourse to the following L1-TE

\[(85a) \text{ [til'za}/\text{ti}_2\text{'la} \text{ b1 (taraf) l'sa ni]} \] (SCA)

\[\text{ (Lit stick (it) to (tip of) my tongue)}\]

Therefore, the cross-lingual tie-up the learner made between at least [\text{til'za b1'sa ni}] (cf. (85a)) and 'it sticks to my tongue' suggests crucial PT from the contextual use of the former which is recurrent in SCA to convey the meaning intended. This also can be viewed as an instance of semantic avoidance.
CONCLUSIONS AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

With respect to the intended methodology for the empirical research in this study, a combination of CA a priori (transfer potential) and CA a posteriori (transfer pattern) has been maintained in an interdisciplinary approach to the analysis of language transfer. Further, by means of the re-oriented position of the constant TE (cf. chapter 2, section 2.3.2), a selective number of the concrete IL-data have been discussed and analysed within the two distinct dimensions language product (transfer pattern) and language process (transfer process). Such an interdisciplinary approach is felt to be utilizable for scrutinizing the tangible as well as the less tangible preconditions which are said to be the strongest triggers of language transfer. With the identification of the two major categories of errors [first, interlingual errors which comprise instances of L1-error NT, and second, inter-intralingual errors (cf. chapter 2, section 2.4)] and of the IL-utterances that do not signify errors from the viewpoint of L2-syntax, a few preliminary remarks on the three provisional hypotheses have been made and exemplified by an attempted analysis of some attested interlingual identifications (cf. chapter 5, section 5.3). These have been followed by detailed psycholinguistic analyses of the selected IL-data which essentially constitute Part Two of this thesis (cf. chapter 6).

In this final chapter, the opening section (section 7.1) will be taken up with a reconsideration of the three provisional hypotheses which have been formulated at the end of Part One of the current study. By drawing upon the results of the empirical research as evidenced by
the detailed psycholinguistic analysis of the concrete IL-data in the previous chapter, the section will identify the exact type of L1-knowledge whose underlying 'preoccupation' is prone to language transfer and will, therefore, re-issue the statements of the three hypotheses from a more explicit perspective.

The second section (section 7.2) will make some comments on the natural order of language learning skills, and will offer some tentative suggestions for L2-teaching, particularly to Arab learners of English, since Arabic and English are totally unrelated languages. Given that active production cannot be attained without a necessary predisposition to active comprehension, special emphasis will be placed on the development of receptive competence for more efficiency of learning. For this reason, Delayed Oral Practice (which appeared as one of the extensions to the Communicative Approach and mainly a reaction against the Audiolingual Approach) will be recommended to Arab students as a necessary procedure for activating and improving listening comprehension at least at the initial stages of L2-learning. In addition, extensive reading will also be recommended to Arab students as a complementary procedure for widening their receptive competence. Thus, active reading, together with active listening, can be taken as constituting a favourable starting point for the productive skills of speaking in particular and writing in general.

The third and final section (section 7.3) will estimate the role of the L1 both in L2-learning and L2-teaching manifestations. With the changing climates across linguistics and language teaching methodology, the section will refer to some of the negative and positive attitudes towards the use of the L1 and will conclude that the role of the L1 should not be trivialized but at the same time should not be overused in the classroom setting. It will show that to exploit the L1 fruitfully depends largely on the effectiveness of the language teacher whose mastery of the L1 (besides his mastery of the L2) is indispensable to the treatment of those transferable spots on the one hand, and to the control of L1-utilization in the classroom setting on the other. This chapter is followed by the appendix in which the L2-equivalents or possible equivalents of all the IL-examples cited and analysed in the previous chapter are listed under the same numbers.
7.1 A Reconsideration of the Three Hypotheses

At the end of Part One of the present study, three central provisional hypotheses have been enunciated in the light of the theoretical assumptions behind the new direction of transfer-based research (cf chapter 4, section 4.3). These hypotheses concern the potential for Arabic-influence upon the spoken production of the Syrian learners' English ILs at the three linguistic levels phonology, syntax and semantics (lexical selection). Each of these linguistic levels has been identified within its own taxonomy due to the specific nature of the IL-data which were collected from a number of Syrian adult learners (cf chapter 5, sections 5.1 and 5.2). The three hypotheses have also emerged from the perceived, though highly intricate, parameters of Arabic which offers enormous variations between the Standard Variety (MSA) and the Colloquial Variety (SCA) at one end, and between the regional dialects of the latter variety at another, a seemingly unique language situation in the world. Thus, for a rather systematic methodology of research, these regional dialects have been classified into four main dialects (ECD, NCD, SCD and WCD) which are adduced to constitute the Colloquial Variety (SCA) and to represent the home dialects of the learners in question (cf chapter 5, section 5.1, The Map of Syria). This classification is felt to be necessary to illustrate to what extent and at what linguistic level MSA, SCA, or a mixture of both, are conducive to negative and/or positive transfer. Therefore, following the detailed discussion of the selected IL-data in the previous chapter, it seems appropriate to return to the three hypotheses and to reconsider the tentative assumptions which underlie their general principles.

So far as Hypothesis One is concerned, it seeks to establish the potential for SCA-influence in the learner's attempted articulation of phonological aspects such as consonants/phonemes, vowels/diphthongs, and some other suprasegmental units to be a significantly stronger trigger of language transfer than the potential for MSA-influence (cf chapter 6, section 6.1). Given that the term SCA refers to the four main regional dialects mentioned above, any attested interlingual identification reflecting phonological transfer from one or two, or more, of these regional dialects is assumed to be in corroboration of Hypothesis One. The analysis of the selected IL-data has illustrated that, in most
cases, attested examples of phonological transfer result in erroneous interlingual identifications as so judged from the viewpoint of the RP-identifications of the L2-counterparts (cf. the appendix). Some negative effects, therefore, are ascribable to the learner's lack of control rather than lack of L2-knowledge; others to his lack of L2-knowledge (that is, his ignorance); and others to his unavailable perception of the crosslinguistic similarities between specific L2-items and the L1-counterparts which occur either in the phonological system of the MSA-dialect or in the phonological systems of SCA-dialects other than his home dialect. Yet, had the learner indeed relied on these L1-counterparts (which have the potential for crosslinguistic similarity), the resultant interlingual identifications would have reflected positive transfer as likely as not.

Moreover, the discussion of the attested transfer-based identifications in phonology has also illustrated that the potential for SCA-influence does not always function in isolation, or even, as an unavoidable exception to Hypothesis One, does not function at all. Thus, some particular examples actually produced by the Syrian learners are said to be a reflection of transfer from an overlapping existing between SCA and MSA (cf. chapter 6, section 6.1.2, examples (63 a-e)); others are indications of transfer from MSA rather than SCA due to an Arabic-reading strategy inherently applied by the learner even at advanced stages of development (cf. chapter 6, section 6.1.1, examples (28 a-c); section 6.1.2, examples (67 a-c) and (69 a-c)). These are, in many respects, attributable to the learner's lack of L2-knowledge (that is, his ignorance) of the phonological patterning demanded by the L2-items in question.

Therefore, given the unique nature of the tremendous variations Arabic offers between MSA and SCA and between the regional dialects of the latter, it appears that what the learner usually falls back on, when performing the L2 phonologically does not necessarily entail what he previously knows about the phonological system of SCA as a whole to be a permanent reference frame. Rather, what the learner usually tends to transfer from the L1 seems to actually correlate with his past experience (that is, what he really knows) of the phonological system of his home dialect due to its highly automatized nature in his focus of attention compared with any other regional dialects of SCA and the
standard dialect of MSA. Consequently, in the light of this justification, the statement of *Hypothesis One* can be relocated as follows:

**Hypothesis One: Phonology**

The potential for the phonological knowledge of Colloquial Arabic [that is, the learner's actual previous knowledge of the phonological system of his home dialect not any other regional dialects] rather than the potential for the phonological knowledge of Classical Arabic is mostly discernible in the *negative-transfer-based identifications* which result from the learner's lack of control over, his lack of knowledge about, and/or his lack of psychotopological cross-lingualization of the phonological distributions of the English sound-system upon processing the target material in his interlanguage continuum.

In the domain of syntax, *Hypothesis Two* addresses itself to the attested interlingual identifications reflecting transfer from the grammatical structure of Arabic as evidenced by the discussion of the selected IL-data *(cf. chapter 6, section 6.2)*. Hence, Arabic-transfer effects have been detected in the learner's attempts to employ several structural devices of English such as prepositions (section 6.2.1), articles (section 6.2.2), verb-form construction (section 6.2.3), relative-clause formation (section 6.2.4), and word-order formation (section 6.2.5). Unlike *Hypothesis One* in the domain of phonology, the assumption behind *Hypothesis Two* does not intend to constantly specify which of the two varieties (MSA/SCA) of Arabic is a stronger trigger of transfer than the other, since what the learner already knows about the grammatical system of Arabic is basically associated with (or rather, is basically internalized from) the Standard Variety (MSA). This can be identified either with the Syrian speaker's attempt to perform spoken MSA, or with the tendency to modify his colloquial speech in the direction of MSA (*classicization*), or even with the every-day use of his regional dialect which constitutes part of SCA *(cf. chapter 3, section 3.1.1)*. Therefore, transfer-manifestations from Arabic, whether it be MSA or SCA, are well
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examinable in the learner's use of the English prepositions and articles in the first place. They are also examinable in the learner's use of other English structural devices. Among them are:

(a) The simple past form in place of the present perfect form suggesting an *avoidance strategy* (*cf* section 6.2.3, examples (89-92))

(b) The simple present form in place of the present progressive form suggesting an *avoidance strategy* (*cf* section 6.2.3, example (96))

[NB: The learner's resort to the active construction in place of the passive-construction also suggests an *avoidance strategy* (*cf.* section 3, 6.2 example (100)).]

(c) The modal present in place of the modal past after 'I wish' and in *if*-clauses (*cf* section 6.2.3, examples (105) and (108))

(d) The retained object of the verb in the relative clause (*cf* section 6.2.4, examples (110) and (111))

(e) The deleted *relative pronoun* which links both the main clause and relative clause modifying the *antecedent* (*cf* section 6.2.4, example (115))

(f) Some other structures reflecting Arabic *word-order* identifications (*cf* section 6.2.5, examples (120), (124), (126) and (127))

It should be noted, however, that there appear some specific interlingual identifications which are said to be an indication of transfer from MSA rather than SCA. These identifications bring to light the learner's inherent reliance on either systematic deviation from MSA as thought to be correct (*cf* LL-error transfer, chapter 2, section 2.2.3, examples (20) and (22)) or the deep structure of a given SCA-identification as correctly realized within MSA (*cf* chapter 6, section 6.2.4, example (109), section 6.2.5, example (122)) Conversely, the discussion of the IL-data has explored some other attested interlingual identifications which are viewed as instances of transfer from SCA rather than MSA. These can be ascribed to several psycholinguistic factors such as (a) the learner's automatized resort to the surface structure of a given SCA-identification (*cf* chapter 6, section 6.2.3, example (100)), (b) the learner's automatized resort to a LL-error typically occurring in SCA (*cf* section 6.2.3, example (103)); (c) the flexible rules of SCA and, therefore, the higher recurrence of SCA-items than MSA-items in the learner's every-day use of his L1 (*cf* section 6.2.5, example (118)), and so on.
The conclusion to be drawn from this perspective is that *Hypothesis Two* appears to restrictively concern the learner's IL-utterances which are attestedly established as evidence of grammatical transfer from Arabic (MSA/SCA). Moreover, these utterances clearly indicate that the learners in question possess fairly acceptable knowledge of the L2-syntax such as the linguistic categories and their grammatical functions, phrase construction, sentence construction, and so on. It follows that any of these utterances which result in typical deviations from the standard norm of the L2 are said to be in support of *Hypothesis Two*. Thus, some deviations are due to the learner's lack of L2-knowledge (*ignorance*), which is mainly noticeable in his attempts to utilize prepositions and articles, other deviations are attributable to the learner's lack of control rather than lack of knowledge, particularly when being involved in relatively long utterances, and others are explicable in terms of the absence of crosslinguistic similarity (*covert CLI*) such as those structural devices which cause the learner to adopt *avoidance strategies*. These factors (*ignorance, lack of control and avoidance*), among others, appear to be quite strong preconditions which provide a proper atmosphere for LI-knowledge to be self-activated as a reference frame. Nevertheless, there are a number of interlingual identifications which do not bear in them structural deviations from the standard norm of the L2. These, in many respects, stem from the learner's perceived crosslinguistic similarity (*complete similarity*) between certain L2-structures and their L1-counterparts (cf. for instance chapter 6, section 6.2.1, sub-section (C), examples (36-43) and sub-section (D), examples (51-52); cf. also section 6.3.1, example (17 N B.), section 6.3.2, examples (35 N B) and (39 N B); section 6.3.3, example (68 N B)). Consequently, like *Hypothesis One* in the domain of phonology, *Hypothesis Two* can be re-stated as follows:

*Hypothesis Two: Syntax*

The potential for the syntactic knowledge of Arabic [that is, the learner's actual knowledge of the syntactic system of either Classical Arabic in *suis generis* terms, or Colloquial Arabic within some restrictions of the Classical rules as in *classicization*, or Colloquial Arabic within its flexible rules originally derived from the Classical rules] is mostly discernible in the *negative-transfer-based*
identifications which proceed from the learner's lack of control over, his lack of knowledge about, and/or his lack of psychotypological cross-lingualization of the syntactic realizations of the English grammar-system upon processing the target material in his interlanguage continuum.

In the domain of semantics as specified in the present study, Hypothesis Three, on the other hand, is concerned with the learner's IL-utterances which are looked upon as instances of lexical transfer from Arabic (cf. chapter 6, section 6.3). These utterances have been allocated in terms of three parameters:

(a) Lexical representation where the semantic features of a given L2-lexical item are realized or extended by recourse to the source model of the corresponding L1-lexical item (cf. section 6.3.1)

(b) Collocational representation where two or more L2-lexical items are collocationally restricted or extended by recourse to the habitual co-occurrence of the source L1-lexical items within the intended meaning (cf. section 6.3.2)

(c) Contextual representation: where a given IL-utterance employs a L2-lexical item, or items, whose semantic features are realized or extended within a particular situational context and/or a contextual meaning by recourse to the L1-counterpart (cf. section 6.3.3)

Again, like Hypothesis Two in the syntactic domain, but unlike Hypothesis One in the phonological domain, the proposal of Hypothesis Three does not seek to maintain either of the two varieties of Arabic to be the strongest trigger of lexical transfer. Some attested interlingual identifications appear to be a reflexion of lexical transfer from SCA, others from MSA, and others from a mixture of both varieties. As noted at the beginning of Part Two of this thesis, the criterion for deciding what IL-identifications are errors and what others are non-errors has nothing to do with the L2-grammar which is the task of Hypothesis Two. Rather, the semantic extensions of IL-lexical items (that is, L1-based L2-lexical items) can be taken as instances of positive lexical transfer since they lead to more or less the same meaning intended by the L2-counterparts, regardless of the structural
shapes of IL-utterances (cf chapter 5, section 5.3) Hence, there are at least two recognizable dimensions within which lexical transfer may operate. In Ringbom's words:

One is when semantic features are taken over, i.e., the semantic range of a target language word is modified on the model of an equivalent source language word, which in some contexts can be used as an equivalent. The other is when translation equivalence is assumed between source language and target language, so that existing lexical items in the target language are combined into compounds or phrases analogical with the source language structure (Ringbom, 1983: 207, emphasis added).

It appears that all the interlingual identifications reflecting lexical transfer in such a perspective depend largely on the learner's extensive knowledge of L2-vocabulary and, therefore, cannot be viewed as examples of borrowing due to pseudorelexification or unanalysed LI-knowledge (cf chapter 4, section 4.2.2). Rather, the learner's self-activated control over particular features in the syntactic domain may cause him to consciously adopt a meaning-oriented approach to IL-lexical items. Furthermore, the analysis of the selected IL-data has explored two distinct types of avoidance: First, semantic avoidance which concerns either the learner's ignorance of the semantic extension of a given L2-word though he may know it but only as a lexical item (cf. chapter 6, section 6.3.1, examples (1), (2), (3), (4), etc.) or his ignorance of the L2-word as a lexical item (cf. section 6.3.1, examples (5), (6), (8), (9), etc.) Second, lexical avoidance, on the other hand, does not entail the learner's ignorance of the L2-word or its semantic extension (as is the case of the first type), but it pertains to the highly automatized nature of the source LL-word which activates the production of the IL-lexical item (cf. section 6.3.1, 'wrote' in (18), 'know' in (22), section 6.3.2, 'true' in (48), etc.) It follows that, in order to process lexical approximations by recourse to the potential knowledge of L1-vocabulary, the learner may apply one, or more, of the following strategies in his choice of words (cf. Ringbom, 1978a: 88 by extension):

(a) Synonymy. The learner may select an IL-lexical item that has the same meaning of the L2-lexical item as in 'page' for 'leaf' (cf. section 6.3.1, example (1)), 'took' for 'did' or 'followed' (cf. section 6.3.1, example (16)), 'cut' for 'clip' (cf. section 6.3.2, example (30)), and so on.
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(b) **Antonymy:** he may select the opposite by 'not' rather than the lexical opposite of the L2-lexical item as in 'not true' for 'false' or 'artificial' (cf section 6.3.2, example (48))

(c) **Co-hyponymy** he may select an IL-hyponym which, together with the L2-hyponym, belongs to the same superordinate as in 'feet' (cf section 6.3.1, example (2)), 'hand' for 'wrist' or 'arm' (cf section 6.3.1, example (7)), 'fingers' for 'nails' (cf section 6.3.2, example (33))

(d) **Overspecification** he may choose an IL-lexical item which is too specific compared with the L2-lexical item as in 'shelf' for 'sill' or 'ledge' (cf chapter 5, section 5.3, example (7)), 'referee' for 'umpire' (cf section 6.3.1, example (6)), 'belt' for 'strap' (cf section 6.3.1, example (8)), 'wound' for 'hurt' (cf section 6.3.1, examples (26) and (27)), and so on

(e) **Underspecification** he may choose an IL-lexical item which is too general compared with the L2-lexical item as in 'sun' for 'day' (cf section 6.3.1, example (3)), 'air' for 'wind' (cf section 6.3.1, example (4)), 'jumping' for 'stalling' (cf section 6.3.1, example (9)), 'finish' for 'expire' (cf section 6.3.1, example (24)), and so on

(f) **Analogy** he may coin IL-lexical items analogous to familiar L2-lexical items as in 'finger' for 'stick' (cf section 6.3.1, example (5)), 'makes' for 'causes' (cf section 6.3.1, example (20)), 'beats on' for 'gets on' (cf section 6.3.2, example (34)), and so on

(g) **Paraphrase** he may resort to an interpretation of an unknown L2-lexical item (complexification) as in 'a small lake in the desert' for 'oasis' (cf chapter 3, section 3.2.1, example (13))

From the above strategies, it can be concluded that the learner, when relying on his potential knowledge of LI-vocabulary, successfully establishes specific lexical approximations whose semantic relations, though basically drawn upon the semantic relations of the source LI-lexical items, are still recognized as similar to those of the L2-lateralives. In so doing, the learner seems to inherently accommodate his IL to communicative exigencies when he is confronted with a situation where he does not know a particular L2-lexical item and/or its semantic extension, where he feels that the lexical
resources of what he knows about the L2-vocabulary are inadequate, or rather where he is not in full control of the extemporaneous activation of a given L2-lexical item.

Apparently, besides the previously existing knowledge of L1-vocabulary, accommodation, in such a view, correlates with at least a threshold level of fluency in the lexical domain of the L2 and fairly automatized proficiency in its semantic restrictions and extensions, otherwise the learner would not be able to make the necessary crosslingual tie-ups. Perhaps with few exceptions inescapable from negative transfer (cf. for instance, section 6.3.1, examples (14) and (25), section 6.3.2, example (45)), this indicates that the potential knowledge of L1-vocabulary—be it MSA, SCA or a mixture of both—does not preclude the learner from achieving his communicative ends successfully. Nor do the resultant lexical approximations, which are basically drawn upon the semantic extensions of the source L1-words, lead to a significantly negative impact on the semantic extensions of the L2-alternatives. Rather, the positive effects of lexical transfer (crucial or complete) which are well noticeable in the learner's IL-utterances may be due to the fact that, in the semantic domain of lexical selection, congruences, or language universals, across languages are boundless (compared with any other linguistic domains which are amenable to finite description such as phonology and syntax) and, therefore, contributory towards much more opportunities for the learner to make the relevant crosslingual tie-ups. From this point of view, the discussion of the selected IL-data has shown that, unlike the case in the domains of phonology and syntax, the typological distance (real and perceived) between Arabic and English in the semantic domain of lexical selection is much more conducive to positive transfer than it is to negative transfer. This is precisely what the assumptions behind Hypothesis Three are actually addressing. Consequently, the statement of such a hypothesis can be re-issued in the following way:

Hypothesis Three: Semantics

The potential for the lexical knowledge of Arabic (that is, the learner's actual knowledge of the lexical domain of either Classical Arabic within its semantic extensions in sui generis terms, or Colloquial Arabic within some semantic restrictions of the Classical
lexis as in classicization, or Colloquial Arabic within its semantic extensions in *suis generis* terms] is mostly discernible in the positive-transfer-based identifications which emerge from the learner's attempts to successfully utilize what is already known about and/or his available psychotypological cross-lingualization of the semantic representation of the English vocabulary-system upon processing the target material in his interlanguage continuum, albeit he may not know the English lexical item in question and/or its semantic extension, or he may know it within its semantic extension but he may not have control over its extemporaneous activation.

### 7.2 The Relevance for Language Teaching

As noted at the end of Part One of this study, the generally accepted order of the learning process is that comprehension skills normally precede production skills (cf. chapter 4, section 4 2 3). This order of skills had long been recognized with consensus even before the generative-cognitive model came into existence. Within the constructs of *habit formation*, behaviourists also postulated this general order "Understanding always precedes speaking" to be one of the global analogies drawn between L1-acquisition and L2-learning/acquisition (cf. Stern (1970 57f), chapter 1, section 1 2 2, item 4). Further, mention has also been made of how the availability as well as lack of crosslinguistic similarities plays a more important role in comprehension than in production, merger, if the learner is able to perceive crosslinguistic similarities, where they exist between L1 and L2, then this perception will facilitate the comprehension process. If, however, crosslinguistic similarities are not available for the learner to perceive (or if the learner is not able to perceive available crosslinguistic similarities), he will, then, be in a position to draw upon 'extralinguistic cues for inferencing' (cf. Ringbom (1987 136), chapter 4, section 4 2 3). According to this view, comprehension provides the transfer mechanism, whatever the linguistic value of its effects, with a much more 'congenial' atmosphere to function than does production, since the trigger and constrainer of language transfer are largely determined by the learner's perception and non-perception of crosslinguistic similarities respectively. Given the fact that language
transfer is a central internal mechanism and many of the stipulations underlying the L2-learning process are still vague in current research, a better understanding of the transfer mechanism would without question yield more fruitful insights into the L2-learning process, and would, therefore, help language teaching methodologists (who often rely on abstract suppositions of what this process is all about) to derive their teaching perspectives from more tangible parameters.

As the main concern of the present study has been to investigate (along the two distinct dimensions: language process and language product) the potential for Arabic transfer in the spoken IL-production of English by a group of Syrian-Arab adult learners, it seems that many of the up-to-date views on L2-teaching methodology are inherently pertinent to what this argument seeks to suggest with reference to the new direction of transfer-based research (cf. chapter 3 and chapter 4). Apart from the multitudinous number of existing ideas which appear to stand most at odds with each other, there has been a considerable focus on research into the cumulative process of comprehension to be a feasible yardstick for more efficiency of learning and, therefore, of productive skills such as speaking in the first place.

Within a typical Audiolingual Approach to L2-teaching (cf. chapter 1, section 1.4.2), language students are usually exposed to the natural speed rendition of oral production and, subsequently, are required to speak in the L2 right away. From a generative-cognitive perspective, however, experimental observations have substantially demonstrated that asking the student to practice L2-material orally as soon as he attempts to develop listening comprehension does in fact lead to serious interference with his learning as a whole process. This seems to be one of the major sources from which fossilizable structures may re-emerge as established instances of transfer of training (cf. Selinker's third central process, chapter 3, section 3.2.1). In this respect, beginning with the mid 1970s, several researchers have thoroughly and convincingly worked out an approach to L2-teaching known as Delayed Oral Practice which has proved and is still proving to be extremely effective (cf. for example, Postovsky, 1974, 1975; Nord, 1976; Asher, 1977; Davies, 1978; Cary, 1975, 1978). Essentially, Delayed Oral Practice emerged as one of the extensions to the Communicative Approach and mainly as a reaction against the Audiolingual Approach. The rationale
and strategies of Delayed Oral Practice rely heavily on expanding the student's receptive competence by primarily prioritizing active listening not as a process of merely hearing meaningless sounds, but as "a process whereby the student is actively attempting to understand and respond effectively to oral communication carefully presented in a meaningful context" (Gary, 1978 186) Therefore, carefully organized and selected L2-material which places a premium on different tasks associated with aural comprehension appears to be so significant a testing ground, since what the student already knows about the L2 normally permits him conscious and/or sub-conscious access to such material even if he responds nonverbally The assumptions underlying Delayed Oral Practice as an indispensable approach to L2-learning comprise the following

1 Language is not speech It is a set of principles establishing correlations between meaning and sound sequences or other overt forms of communicative language such as sign language

2 Learning a L1 or L2 does not occur through habit formation Rather, it occurs by an inductive-deductive process whereby the learner starts with a general theory of grammar and, given the linguistic data of a particular language, constructs a grammar for the language based on this theory

3 The development of receptive skills is necessary for the development of productive skills That is, speaking is a result, not a cause of language learning, and therefore should be postponed, at least in the early stages of language learning

4 Effective listening comprehension training must be meaningful, challenging, require learner response, and provide immediate feedback to the learner as to the correctness of his response (Gary, 1978· 192, original emphasis)

It follows from the above assumptions that, for a prolonged implementation of nonverbal responses activating and enhancing a variety of listening strategies, several possible techniques have been set in motion as mediums of instructions There are at least three recognizable techniques in this scheme
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(i) Pictorial-audio matching
(ii) Physical response-audio matching
(iii) Graphic-audio matching

Within these techniques, carefully organized and selected sets of tape-recorded L2-utterances accompanied by related pictorial items for visual reinforcement could be utilized to test the student's ability to match what he hears with what he sees without speaking. The utterances employed are unequivocal speech acts, mainly directives such as commands, orders, requests, questions and so on (cf. chapter 1, section 132). Thus, when the student is asked to match a given audible utterance with the appropriate pictorial item, he can respond nonverbally by marking (technique (i)), pointing to or touching (technique (ii)) the relevant pictorial item on a worksheet containing a set of different items. Further, depending on the first two techniques, the student may be simultaneously exposed to an audible utterance, not necessarily a directive, and a pictorial item which 'correctly' visualizes the action being talked about. The student is, then, given a set of different written responses to an audible question concerning that action, and is asked to nonverbally check (technique (iii)) the appropriate written response. Correct nonverbal responses indicate that the student does in fact demonstrate comprehension of the speech act in question. Therefore, in order to inherently familiarize the student with a wealth of received structural shapes, the selected sets of utterances should always employ novel combinations of familiar lexical items which have been previously learned through this approach (cf. Gary, 1978 186f).

Prioritizing listening comprehension, in such a perspective, still stems from the obvious fact that one cannot produce what one does not know, or rather, one cannot have control over the production of items or rules that one already has no control over their assimilation in comprehension. In Ringbom's words "Control is more important for oral than for written communication, because of the constant time pressure in an oral situation. We may therefore assume that the difference in the relation between comprehension and production between learners of related and unrelated languages would appear even more clearly if it were tested in spoken language" (Ringbom, 1987 138). This leads to suggest that a defect in processing a given item or rule in aural
comprehension may well entail a subsequent defect in processing that item or rule in oral production, albeit correctly produced items or rules to be in token of full control over their comprehension are not always warranted. For instance, within his superficial receptive competence, the learner's perception of the orally produced contracted form 'can't' as the strong form of 'can' (/kən/) is clear evidence that he does not pay much attention to pragmatic exigencies where the distinction between the weak and strong forms of one-syllable words such as 'can' ought not to be negligible in oral communication (cf. chapter 6, section 6.1.2, sub-section (F), example (63)). Whereas, at a production level, relatively correct restrictions on a certain item, which signify positive transfer (cf. for instance, the preposition 'from', section 6.2.1, examples (36-43)) do not necessarily turn out that, at a comprehension level, the learners know and/or have control over the relevant distributions of the same item, since examples of negative transfer have already been detected in its use by the same learners (cf. section 6.2.1, examples (24), (26-29) and (30-33)). Therefore, Delayed Oral Practice, as an effective approach to L2-teaching/learning, seems to be indispensable, particularly to learners of totally unrelated languages such as Arab learners of English. Hence, the following characteristics are said to be the main advantages of a delayed-oral-practice approach to L2-teaching/learning (cf. Gary, 1978 190f).

(1) The affective advantage
It has been argued that many of the adult learners, when required to orally produce L2-material immediately in the presence of others, feel embarrassed and self-conscious under the stress of overemphasizing verbal performance. This leads to a reduction in the learner's concentration and, eventually, to a reduction in successful learning. Thus, the discrepancies between what the learner cannot learn and what he prefers not to learn would, in this case, become very serious as mere production of linguistic items, whatever the simplicity of the task, demands considerable effort, particularly when these items are undesirable (cf. Dulay and Burt's notion of the socio-affective filter, chapter 3, section 3.2.2).
(ii) The cognitive advantage
Empirical research has strongly demonstrated that overemphasizing oral production and listening comprehension simultaneously results in the learner's distraction from the principal objective of initial learning, that is, his active perception of the language system underlying the aural material he is exposed to. Hence, researchers like Postovsky (1975) have pointed out that asking the learner to orally produce L2-items or rules he has not yet absorbed would lead to overburdening of his short-term memory and, thus, interlanguage interference and/or intralanguage interference would be anticipated (cf. Newmark and Reibel's ignorance hypothesis, chapter 4, section 4.1.1). Further, the overload of short-term memory would, in this case, be a trigger of extralanguage interference (transfer of training) between listening comprehension and other language skills.

(iii) The efficiency advantage
Again, experimental studies have shown that learning proves to be much more efficient in cases where the learner is induced to rely heavily on receptive skills (decoding) and not to bother about encoding all the data he is receiving as a lag between the development of receptive competence and that of productive competence is inevitable for any language learning situation (cf. Ervin-Tripp, 1974). Thus, when the learner is not required to speak for an extended lag, the development of receptive competence would be much faster as the time of exposure to much more of L2-material is very short compared with the time needed for verbal retrieval.

(iv) The utility advantage
Many researchers have pointed to the fact that, even in oral communication, the scope of listening exceeds the scope of speaking. That is, the learner normally employs a very limited number of simplified IL-structures upon speaking to native speakers of the L2, whereas the need for listening comprehension seems by far much greater as he would be in a position to decode much more complexified L2-structures produced by his native interlocutor (cf. Selinker, chapter 3, section 3.2.1). Another utilitarian merit is that, after a certain period of delayed oral practice, the learner can improve his receptive competence on his own by listening to the radio/tapes, watching L2-speaking programmes or films, and by extensive reading.
From the above sketch of the techniques and advantages of Delayed Oral Practice, it appears that prioritized active listening plays the most significant role in the development of receptive competence, and is, therefore, an integral part of the whole process of efficient learning. Carefully organized and selected L2-material as well as a battery of comprehension tests has been widely emphasized, in recent years, as a pre-requisite for this objective. No doubt, neat organization and selection of L2-material depend on the shrewdness of the researchers and fully-fledged teachers who are highly competent in the two languages, the learner's LI and the L2 he is learning, and are well aware of the learner's difficulties and of those transferable aspects that would occur either overtly or covertly in his IL-continuum. It may be assumed, therefore, that, for learners of totally unrelated languages such as Arab learners of English, to design L2-material carefully on the basis of the researcher and the teacher's experience of transferable areas would seem more fruitful if such material were put in action for Delayed Oral Practice. This assumption is derived from the fact that the scope of language transfer, be it positive, negative or a mixture of both, is much larger in comprehension than it is in production. In such a case, the learner's receptive competence may be somewhat safeguarded against the negative effects of LI-influence in that his evolving perception of the L2-system would, at least at a comprehension level, enable him to know more about his interlingual errors, and thus effort can be made for self-rectification in later production tasks. The development of receptive competence should, therefore, be strongly encouraged through active listening comprehension as well as through extensive reading due to its constant significance in the learner's IL-experience. Ringbom states:

The receptive skills of listening and reading are more important than the productive ones of speaking and writing in the sense that without having a basic ability to understand a language you cannot keep up a conversation in it, whereas it is perfectly possible to understand a language without being able to speak it.

(Ringbom, 1978b: 21)

Receptive competence undeniably and incontestably implies a necessary interface between listening and reading abilities in the sense that the learner, by means of the already existing linguistic knowledge and the mental activities involved in comprehension, can access the text at either phonemic levels through recorded or spoken material or
graphemic levels through written material (cf Sticht, 1972), albeit there may well exist differences between spoken text and written text that have significant implications for listening and reading as separate receptive skills (cf Widdowson, 1984)

It seems, therefore, whatever the differences that may exist between the two skills, active reading, analogical with active listening, has also its important role to play in the development and improvement of receptive competence. During the past ten years there has been an increased interest in thinking about the nature of reading and in investigating experimental evidence for the competing hypotheses concerning such a complex activity which subsumes a variety of strategies and subskills. The unique compilation edited by Alderson and Urquhart (1984) is a clear indication of the awe-inspiring volume of research into the formidable question "What is reading?" As explicitly as possible, Alderson and Urquhart's compilation goes deeply into this question and, by drawing on a myriad of past and recent empirical research, tends to carefully mark out the salient features of three centres: (i) the reader, an active organism whose psychological and socio-cultural background needs special attention as it is far from adequate generalization by the writer of the text and the teacher, (ii) the text and to what extent its readability provides the learner with an identifiably meaningful and informative message, and (iii) the interaction between the reader and the text which, beyond the writer of the text, has been thoroughly addressed and explained in terms of cooperation and negotiation for a residual quantum of meaning within the ongoing text (cf Alderson and Urquhart, 1984 xvf)

Therefore, a highly procedural scrutiny into this triangulation appears to be of paramount significance for the language teacher specifically to encourage his students to actively interact with the text as another indispensable source contributory towards enlarging their receptive competence and, subsequently, towards more efficiency of learning. Extensive reading also helps learners towards the great need to widen their potential knowledge of L2-vocabulary, since experimental studies have demonstrated that, for foreign language readers in general, the lexical and conceptual difficulties of the reading text are much more tenacious than the grammatical or syntactic difficulties, though
several readers who do not have considerable linguistic problems still experience some inherent difficulty over text processing (cf Alderson and Richards, 1977; Alderson, 1984).

From this point, it can be stated that, for readers of totally unrelated languages, particularly the case with Arab learners of English, lexical and conceptual difficulties would appear to be far greater than those encountered by learners of related languages. Apart from the individual problems with eye fixations and regressions whose high frequencies are normally symptoms, rather than causes, of poor comprehension (cf Alderson and Urquhart, 1984), the lexical and conceptual difficulties that Arab learners face in reading are ascribable to a number of existing variables. Among them are absence of cognate elements (Semitic vs Germanic) and morphological congruences across the L1 and L2 lexical systems (infixation vs affixation), the easily noticed graphemic differences between the L1 and L2 alphabetical systems (Arabic vs Latin), the polarity of writing/reading directions in the L1 and L2 orthographic systems (right --> left vs left --> right), and so on. These are among other variables which tend to gradually and constantly augment the elusiveness of even easy-to-recall words (not to mention words that are elusive in nature) if no continuous effort to promote direct access to the reading text is made at high levels of elaboration. One of the main purposes of such continuous effort is, therefore, to activate and enhance automatized familiarization of the reader's eye-span with much of the orthographic shapes of L2-words, thus, leading to implant their lexical and conceptual dimensions in his mind.

Here, again, with the importance of active reading comprehension, the responsibilities of the language teacher seem to be much heavier to encourage and stimulate the students to gain a lot of profit from extensive reading is not a quite easy task, but certainly is one of the best characteristics in a good language teacher. Hence, analogous with the numerous advantages of active listening adumbrated above, the strategies and subskills underlying active reading should also be set in motion for such advantages as both skills take part in the development of receptive competence. Thus, active reading, both in formal and naturalistic settings, enables the learner to extend his receptive competence not only in vocabulary, but also in grammar and syntax. In
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this context, it is argued that active reading, too, provides useful and ad hoc foundations for listening comprehension and, subsequently, for productive skills. In Ringbom's words:

Extensive extra-curricular foreign language reading enlarges the learner's knowledge of the language. Exactly how much it also contributes to improving the efficiency with which this knowledge is retrieved, the learner's control, is not fully clear. We may assume that a good reading knowledge facilitates listening comprehension. Listening, however, is more demanding in the sense that it also requires considerable automatization and thus better control, than does reading. Further, if a learner's knowledge is sufficiently thorough and extensive, even though it is available only for reading purposes, there should be no doubt that it will facilitate production too, although practice in the production skills is absolutely necessary for turning good readers into good speaker or writers.

(Ringbom, 1987 141-142)

In sum, a better understanding of the L2-learning process would undoubtedly lead to much improvement in L2-teaching methodology. Although the L2-acquisition researchers of today concede that many of the parameters underlying L2-learning are still vague, a better understanding can be achieved by a highly sophisticated scrutiny into language transfer since it is indeed a pivotal internal mechanism that overrides many of the considerations associated with L2-learning as a total process. It is quite true that current research overemphasizes the theoretical and practical studies into the skills and subskills incorporated into the comprehension process as much of the vagueness of L2-learning lies at the heart of comprehension. One of the practical incentives to this overemphasis is the great importance of listening and reading comprehension, particularly for learners who study a L2 for academic purposes. Another incentive is that, in language tests, merely 'produced' material does not fully bring to light the learner's real command of the L2. The learner, in this case, may lack knowledge of an item or rule, he may avoid an item or rule he is not able to handle; he may unconsciously rely on a highly automatized L1-item or rule which leads to completely positive transfer, or even he may lack control over a known item or rule due to other psychological factors which create some constraints in the production process. After all, mastery of good comprehension would in the long run lead to mastery of good production, however, 'good' production does not necessarily entail mastery of good comprehension. The possibility of being able to understand a language without being able to produce it is certainly a token of the initial
stages of efficient learning no matter how long the time has been spent to arrive at these stages. Since the purpose of Delayed Oral Practice is to activate and enhance the learner's ability to understand, this possibility indicates that the purpose has been achieved as efficient learning, at these stages, has in fact proceeded and, therefore, should be encouraged and developed in the sense discussed above.

7.3 The Role of the Mother Tongue

Within the rigorous tradition of the behavioural-structural model, one of the common beliefs was that the old 'habits' of the LI are, in most cases, looked upon as obstacles to the learning of the new 'habits' of a subsequent L2. According to this view, successful L2-learning cannot thrive without completely forgetting about the old 'habits' of the LI (cf. Stern (1970 57f), chapter 1, section 1.2.2, item 6). With the emergence of the generative-cognitive model, particularly when the 'crisis' of the CA-Hypothesis was brought to a climax, recognition of the strictures of the behaviouristic paradigms (from which the transfer theory first derived its principles) led to an extreme down-playing of the role of the LI in L2-learning/acquisition (cf. Dulay and Burt, chapter 2, section 2.2.3 and chapter 3, section 3.2.3), even though researchers like Ausubel (1964) had already foreshadowed the facilitative effects of LI-influence from a cognitive perspective (cf. chapter 1, section 1.4.2). This indicates that interlingual errors were, according to traditional contrastivists, assumed to be a reflection of proactive inhibition triggered by LI-influence, and, in order to overcome such inhibition, language teachers were advised to focus their teaching plans on the areas where negative transfer would be anticipated (CA a priori) or would actually occur (CA a posteriori). From a pedagogical point of view, this seems to be the ultimate objective of transfer-based research, however, the conspicuous and dramatic change of linguistic theory has resulted in no more than a different perspective on language transfer and subsequently on teaching tactics to arrive at such an objective. Thus, with the resurgence of language transfer—as it has undergone multiple forms of revitalization—the negative attitudes towards LI-influence have not
received unanimous approval, since L1-knowledge occupies a central position in the learner's past experience on the one hand, and not all interlingual identifications lead to errors on the other.

In this connection, it is argued that if L1-influence were globally accepted as an inhibitive factor, then there would be no remarkable distinction between the learning of related and unrelated L2s so far as the facilitative role of the L1 is concerned. Hence, researches such as Ringbom and Corder among others subscribe to the view that the real distinction between these two learning situations is basically determined by the indigenous crosslinguistic similarity and lack of crosslinguistic similarity, rather than the existence of difference, between L1 and L2. In such a case, when the negative effects of L1-influence on L2-learning are discernible, as they quite probably are, the internal mechanism of L1-experience cannot be regarded as a source of proactive inhibition, but generally as an adjunct to linguistic facilitation whose scope correlates with the potential for crosslinguistic similarity. Ringbom reports:

Even if it is inevitable that students produce a fair number of erroneous constructions in the foreign language through direct influence of the mother tongue, the mother tongue is above all an aid, not an obstacle, to learning another language. This aid is all the more tangible, the more closely related the two languages are.

(Ringbom, 1978b: 21)

In support of this view, Corder, with reference to his notion of the built-in syllabus (cf. chapter 3, section 3.1.1), has already suggested that 'failure to facilitate' does not necessarily coincide with 'inhibition/interference' (cf. Corder (1983: 88), chapter 4, section 4.2.2). In other words, Corder prefers to use the polarity of facilitation and non-facilitation rather than that of facilitation (positive transfer) and inhibition (negative transfer) in the sense that L1-influence furthers L2-learning through the built-in syllabus when L1-L2 structures are similar; however it has no effect when L1-L2 structures are different. In this latter case, Corder argues, the learner does not need to feel chagrined at a different L2-structure, but has to figure out its nature by manoeuvring his own cognitive capacities. Yet, an inescapable proviso dictates that neutralizing L1-influence in terms of linguistic difference is not always warranted.
as the comprehension process always plays an important role in L2-learning. This is explicable by reference to Schachter's hypothesis of avoidance where there is an extremely radical difference between a given pair of L1-L2 structures (Chinese/Japanese vs English relative clauses). At a production level, and if it were to be abstracted from comprehension, the learner's resort to paraphrasing as a result of this difference (mainly in the prenominal position) may lead to believe that Corder's conviction is not at all vulnerable. However, since the learner's avoidance of the English relative clause was largely determined by his L1 at a comprehension level, it seems misleading to envisage a global generalization that the L1 has no influence when there is a difference between L1 and L2. More explicitly, even in the case of crucial similarity, there is still a tendency to transfer negatively where there is crucial difference (Arabic/Persian vs English relative clause), that is, similarity in the postnominal position which acted as a precondition for the learner's attempts to make the necessary crosslingual tie-ups, and difference in pronominalization which was the strongest trigger of negative transfer (cf. chapter 4, section 4.1.2).

Hence, researchers such as James point to the fact that Corder's notion of non-facilitation is not hard to find in the behaviouristic paradigms of transfer. Osgood himself referred to this notion as zero transfer and neutral transfer in terms of Paradigm C, though under different conditions (cf. chapter 1, section 1.2.1, Figure 1). James asserts, however, that the learner's long experience of error-making will inherently cause him to gradually evade negative transfer as his knowledge of the L2 increases and so does his consciousness of interlingual errors. Yet, Corder does not appear to have a willingness to 'reify' these stipulations as a set of feedback mechanisms, though his dichotomy (facilitation vs non-facilitation) has gained corroboration from researchers like Kellerman (1977, 1978a, 1982, 1983) in that the learner —through the procedure of grammaticality judgements— does normally have previous intuitive knowledge of what L1-words are transferable and what others are not (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3.2, cf. also chapter 4, section 4.1.3). James concludes

But it is still difficult to see why only positive transfer should be amenable to Behaviourist explanation, and zero transfer has to be accommodated by Cognitive psychology. Corder claims this is so in saying that where L1 and L2 forms are different the learner has to figure out the nature of the L2-rule "with his own unaided cognitive
capacities" Of course he must, ultimately, if he is to learn the L2, but these are not grounds for denying that the learner's initial tendency is to transfer from LI

(James, 1980 145, original emphasis)

It seems that the cumbersome controversy does not engage the credibility of the inevitable fact of LI-influence (this is not in dispute), but lies in the use of the appropriate term or terms to describe this fact (cf also James (1971), chapter 4, section 4 11) Therefore, whether it be behaviouristic or cognitive interpretation, the greater the potential for cross-linguistic similarity between LI and L2, the larger the scope of facilitation (positive transfer) there will be in the process of L2-learning, merger, this scope of facilitation is also conditioned by the learner's perception of such similarity. In this case, the possibilities of negative transfer decrease and the pedagogical issue should place special emphasis on the utilization of the LI-items or rules that are considerably similar to their L2-counterparts, thus, widening the learner's perception of these tie-ups, since the ability to associate incoming data with already existing linguistic knowledge is a natural tendency In Ringbom's words

[ ] it may be good for the foreign language teacher to over-emphasize the cross-linguistic similarities between the learner's LI and the target language at the early stages of learning by explicit reference whenever possible to the relevant aspects of the LI This will facilitate learning in that the learner can draw more upon what he already knows The learner's natural tendency is to relate new material to existing linguistic knowledge, which at the early stages of learning is primarily LI-knowledge The relevance of this LI-knowledge depends on how much cross-linguistic similarity to the target language the learner can perceive Over-simplification in the establishing of cross-linguistic equivalences are inevitable in the learner, but during the whole process of L2-learning cross-linguistic relations are constantly being modified

(Ringbom, 1987 143-144)

With respect to the closed system of L2-phonology whose learning problems are less tenacious at advanced stages compared with syntax and semantics (lexical selection), it is the task of the language teacher to affirm the facilitative role of Arabic (the Colloquial as well as the Standard) by inducing his students to make cross-linguial tie-ups between the difficult phonological items of the L2 and their similar LI-counterparts, since the data reported from Arab learners of English and those collected from the Syrian-Arab learners for analysis in the
current study indicate that, in most cases, the attested interlingual identifications are erroneous (negative transfer) due to direct influence of Colloquial Arabic rather than Standard Arabic (cf Hypothesis One). For this reason, most of the phonological items that were actually produced by these learners have been accompanied by the L1-equivalents and/or approximate equivalents of the standard L2-items taken from the viewpoint of RP (cf chapter 6, section 6.1 and the appendix). Thus, to relate, for instance, the L2-phoneme /tʃ/ to the L1-phoneme [ʈʂ] as a dark phonemicized juncture of [ʈ] and [ʂ] as in ECD/NCD is much better than to leave the student to his own devices to pick up the fricative [ʂ] or the clear phonemicized juncture of [ʈ-ʂ] instead (cf section 6.11, sub-section (A)). Further, the role of Arabic will prove facilitation if the student has already perceived the crosslinguistic similarity between the L2-phoneme /ʃ/ and the L1-phoneme [g] as in [gunna] 'nasalization' in MSA (cf section 6.11, sub-section (D)). Arabic will also enhance efficient learning if the student has realized the crosslinguistic congruences between pairs of L2-L1 diphthongs such as /æə/ in English and [əy] in MSA/WCD (cf section 6.12, sub-section (A)), /ɔu/ in English and [aw] in MSA/WCD (cf section 6.12, sub-section (B)), /ɪə/ in English and [iə] in RED or [iya] in MSA (cf section 6.12, sub-section (C)), and so on. Given that a limited number of phonological items are to be learnt at initial stages and therefore evading the constraints of the LI is attainable in later modification, the learner is still in need of controlled effort, even at advanced stages, to develop his automatized competence both receptively and productively in utilizing those suprasegmental units which are characterized by an unpredictable nature in connected speech such as intonation, rhythm, stress pattern and the like (cf section 6.12, sub-section (F)).

In relation to L2-syntax which demands much greater effort to achieve successful learning, the language teacher's task of exploiting the inherent crosslinguistic similarities between Arabic and English should neither be seen as banal nor be detracted from their pedagogical merits. Such similarities, particularly in highly untractable domains such as articles and prepositions, will constitute tangible exceptions to Hypothesis Two (that is, the possibilities of positive transfer will be greater) if the learner does in fact make the relevant crosslinguual tie-up in actual speech behaviour. As it is readily observable that most
of the attested interlingual identifications reflect negative transfer from the Standard and/or Colloquial varieties of Arabic, the learner's automatized perception of crosslinguistic similarities will indubitably accelerate the control aspects against some syntactic devices that have the potential for positive transfer and will, therefore, act as a necessary precondition for figuring out the syntactic natures of other devices that are superficially different. This includes the confusing grammatical functions of certain articles and prepositions (cf. sections 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 respectively) in addition to those of structural devices such as verb form, relative clause and word order (cf. sections 6.2.3, 6.2.4 and 6.2.5 respectively). It is argued that, even in the case of learning a related language, formal accuracy in the learner's utterances is unattainable without a fairly controlled quantum of explicit knowledge of L2-grammar. Hence, in the case of learning an unrelated language, Ringbom adds, the learner "is probably in more need of explicitly formulated rules and may find it too difficult to cope solely on the basis of memorized examples" (Ringbom, 1987: 143). Therefore, to place a premium on well-selected grammatical examples for pedagogical purposes is certainly one of the most significant qualities in the foreign language teacher.

In the domain of L2-semantics (lexical selection), on the other hand, the lexical and conceptual difficulties the Arab learner experiences seem by far greater than the phonological and grammatical difficulties, particularly at a comprehension level, a point referred to in the preceding section. The remarkably discernible positive effects of lexical transfer (crucial and/or complete) in most of the attested interlingual identifications purport that, whether the learner has perceived the linguistic values of his attempted tie-ups or not, there is indeed a surprisingly large number of crosslinguistic congruences in the use of lexis between Arabic and English (cf. Hypothesis Three). Therefore, the language teacher's task of over-emphasizing these congruences (especially those which would lead to complete PT) should occupy a central position due to the paramount significance of lexical items for the comprehension process specifically, since "grammaticality and acceptability are concepts far less important to the reader or listener than to the speaker or writer" (Ringbom, 1987: 55). Again, such over-emphasis will activate and enhance the learner's automatized perception of lexical items which
intrinsically allow him efficient access to the text (spoken or written) and will, eventually, act as a necessary precondition for self-modification (in the case of those congruences which would lead to crucial PT) at later stages. Thus, the learner, at later stages, will be well-prepared to keep abreast with the natural rendition of hierarchical complexification that, after having had sovereign control over the most familiar and salient lexical items, he will find much opportunity for handling difficult as well as elusive words. This includes synonyms, antonyms, co-hyponyms, overspecified items, underspecified items, and so on (cf. section 7.2).

It follows from the above that the teacher of an unrelated language should be highly competent in the two languages, the learner's LI and the L2 he is learning, and in the case of Arab learners of English, the Arabic-speaking teacher should be in possession of extensive knowledge not only about the Standard Variety of Arabic but also about the main regional dialects of the Colloquial Variety, particularly when teaching Arabic-speaking students who have different home dialects. Therefore, extensive knowledge of the learner's LI, in such a perspective, is a must especially for those teachers who indulge in contrastive studies to grapple with the transferable areas and to supplement their teaching methods and strategies with more crystallized objectives. Teachers who are highly competent in the learner's LI are well qualified to detect and analyse positive/negative interlingual identifications, a similar point had already been made by Lee (1957) who suggested a mutual cooperation between, what he called, the 'local' teacher and the English-speaking teacher (cf. chapter 2, section 2.1.1).

In the Arab World in general, it is widely believed that the English-speaking teacher is able to teach English to Arabic-speaking students more efficiently and effectively than the Arabic-speaking teacher (cf. El-Sayed, 1988: 67). If such a belief were tenable, then knowledge of the LI, in the sense referred to above, would not play a significant role, and knowledge of the L2 (as well as the methodologies and techniques usually derived from general assumptions) would be a sufficient stipulation for a successful language teacher. In El-Sayed's words...
This fallacy has been recently called in question. It is not true that every speaker of English, like every speaker of Arabic, is capable of teaching his [L1]. This is due to the fact that, in addition to the knowledge of a [L2] required to be taught to students, teachers who teach that specific [L2] should be adequately prepared for that task and should also be familiar with the relevant methodologies and techniques of teaching the [L2]. Thus, knowledge of the [L2] concerned is not enough to make an efficient and effective teacher.

(El-Sayed, 1988: 67)

By reference to a number of researchers such as Wilkins (1975), Alptekin and Alptekin (1984) and Strevens (1984), El-Sayed asserts that, besides the significance of the linguistic variable as discussed above, the need for an Arabic-speaking teacher (who masters the two languages) is justifiable in terms of at least two other important variables.

Firstly, the socio-cultural variable in that L2-learning/teaching must not be completely divorced from the 'local' cultural values (such as traditions, conventions and customs) of the students in question. With a few modifications, the English-speaking teacher often tends to impose his native cultural values (which are above all too culture-specific) on such students. In effect, the students find these western values quite 'alien' and incommensurable, and therefore unacceptable, to their native culture. This will inherently attenuate efficient learning as the students' natural reaction leads them to grumble over many of these western values or even to reject them (cf. Wilkins, 1975 49). One possible solution to such a problem is that curriculum and syllabus designers are advised to carefully organize and select L2-material essentially based on culture-neutral considerations, and to place more emphasis on the learner (cf. Alptekin and Alptekin, 1984 14f, El-Sayed, 1988 66). This position is, of course, different from the socio-cultural level in Lado's sense which has been re-addressed from a linguistic perspective (cf. chapter 1, section 1.3.2).

Secondly, the psycho-affective variable whose part in activating and enhancing the whole process of L2-learning/teaching can never be generalized or trivialized by language teaching methodologists. Commonsense and specialized experience demonstrate that, from the cognitive and affective standpoint, the most effective and successful language teacher is the competent bilingual, that is, the one who
possesses wide and extensive knowledge of his L1 (which is the same L1 of the students) in addition to his mastery of the L2 he teaches. According to this view, the competent Arabic-speaking teacher of English is the most convenient model for teaching Arabic-speaking students in that he would be in a better position to stimulate and motivate his students to enlarge their knowledge of English on their own, particularly outside the classroom setting (cf. also Ringbom, 1987: 140). Further, the Arabic-speaking teacher, in such a perspective, is better aware of the psychological and linguistic difficulties the Arab students have in learning English. Thus, his knowledge of Arabic would enable him to conceive a great deal of transfer-based identifications and would, therefore, contribute to a proper treatment of an inevitable proportion of these difficulties (cf. Strevens, 1984: 30f; El-Sayed, 1988: 69f).

More recently, a comprehensive field-study seriously conducted by Kharma and Hajjaj (1989) has lent credit to the use of the L1 (Arabic in this case) as an aiding factor in L2-teaching classrooms (English in this case). By reviewing the place of the L1 in past and present approaches to L2-teaching/learning and identifying the positive and negative attitudes towards its actual use in L2-teaching classrooms, Kharma and Hajjaj come to the conclusion that the crucial distinctions between English-speaking teachers and Arabic-speaking teachers have not been given sufficient attention by language teaching methodologists. One of these crucial distinctions is the Arabic-speaking teachers' utilization of their L1 which plays an important part in the whole process of L2-learning/teaching. These researchers point to the fact that language teachers have been, and are still, employing their L1 whatever the approach or method they adopt to L2-teaching. Further, the dramatic changes in linguistic theory and subsequently in pedagogical tactics (e.g. from the Audiolingual Approach, which came as an extension to the Direct Method and a reaction against the Grammar-Translation Method, to the Communicative Approach within its extensions such as the Silent Way, the Natural Approach, Suggestopedia, etc. and its versions as in ESP, EAP or EOP) may in principle have reflected changing attitudes towards learner needs but not necessarily towards strategies of L2-learning provided that the learner's reliance on his L1 represents one such strategy (cf. Kharma and Hajjaj, 1989: 231). Therefore, far from extreme and rigid arguments for or against
the use of the L1, the researchers recommend language teachers to carefully systematize and control L1-utilization for a maximum benefit of L2-teaching/learning. On this account, Kharma and Hajjaj suggest several teaching strategies where the L1 may be discreetly and moderately utilized in the L2-teaching classroom:

1. In the early stage, as a "framing function, at the beginning and end of the lesson, chatting with students, establishing contact and a relaxed atmosphere in which the core of the lesson is embedded" (Aston, 1983: 105). However, as soon as a few phrases and expressions have been learnt by the students, e.g. greetings, routine expressions, it is advisable to start with these as a means of "warming up" for the new activity.

2. To provide context for presentation and practice where otherwise the use of the L2 would be time-consuming.

3. To provide explanation for certain new items (e.g. abstract words) or complicated grammatical structures.

4. To draw comparisons between the structure of the L2 and that of the L1.

5. As comprehension checks where the sole purpose of reading/listening exercise is purely comprehension.

6. As partial checking of students' out-of-the-classroom reading e.g. supplementary or free reading.

7. For explaining some of the L2 cultural aspects which would otherwise be difficult for the students to understand or appreciate.

8. As a parallel activity, e.g. translation.


(Kharma and Hajjaj, 1989: 231-232)

In conclusion, it is generally accepted that the learner's past experience of his L1 constitutes a central internal mechanism or strategy among others. From a learning perspective, this mechanism has its relative effects at any stage of development whether there may exist structural similarities or differences between L1 and L2. The quality and quantity of such effects, however, are conditioned by a highly complicated network of boundless variables such as the learner's knowledge of the L1, his knowledge of the L2 (or any other language), his perception/non-perception of crosslinguistic similarity, his language aptitude, motivation, intelligence, personality, age, style, and so forth. Therefore, apart from the linguistic value of L1-influence on L2-learning (that is, apart from its negative effects and/or positive effects that have to be modified in the direction of the L2), the learner's L1-experience is an aiding factor, particularly in cases where the sole purpose of learning is mere communication. Hence,
it is much better to fall back on interlingual solutions (when the learner does not have any other linguistic solutions at his disposal) than to reluctantly cease from communicating at all. For instance, the learner's resort to paraphrasing when he finds it difficult to process the relative clause structure due to its radical difference (cf. avoidance, chapter 4, section 4.1.2) or to complexifying an IL-code 'a small lake in the desert' when he does not know a specific L2-word 'oasis' (cf. chapter 3, section 3.2.1, example (13)) is much more communicatively purposeful than to make no attempt at producing any other alternatives.

From a teaching perspective, on the other hand, it would be the responsibility of the teacher (that is, the bilingual teacher in the sense discussed above) to reinforce the facilitative role of the LI by enlarging the student's perception of crosslinguistic similarities where they exist between LI and L2: similarities that would lead to complete PT for activated automatization, and similarities that would result in crucial PT for self-modification at later stages (cf. particularly the domain of lexical selection, chapter 5, section 5.3; chapter 6, section 6.3). No doubt, perception of crosslinguistic similarity is of paramount importance to the student to be in automatized control of particularly a fairly aligned quantum of oral performance where time pressure puts him under abrupt constraint. Perception of crosslinguistic similarity can thus be viewed as an initial filtering device for accessing more of the L2 so long as this perception is augmented, and therefore as a necessary precondition which stimulates the student to figure out, on his own, the linguistic natures of L2-structures that are superficially different from their LI-counterparts. In formal settings, again, it is the task of the teacher to systematize and control LI-utilization where he feels that the use of the LI is both inevitable and contributory towards efficient L2-teaching. Consequently, apart from a strict adherence to a specific approach to language teaching, the role of the LI cannot be deteriorated, whilst at the same time its linguistic as well as extralinguistic cues should not be overused in any teaching strategy or tactic, since the student's requisites for LI-mediation will become fewer as his knowledge and experience of the L2 become wider.
In this appendix, the possible L2-equivalents, or sets of L2-equivalents, of all the interlingual identifications cited and analysed in Chapter Six are listed consecutively under the same numbers. These may serve as a key guide to further CA-based analyses by those Arabic-speaking researchers and language teachers who are interested in language transfer studies. With regard to the interlingual identifications in phonology (cf section 6.1), the L2-equivalents are allocated by recourse to the Received Pronunciation (RP). In relation to the interlingual identifications in syntax (cf section 6.2) and in semantics (cf section 6.3), the criterion for the L2-equivalents is essentially taken as the standard norm of British English. In addition, a few options in the semantic domain of lexical selection, which are said to be characteristic of Hiberno-English, are included.

L2-Equivalents in Phonology (section 6.1)

(1)  a  /tʃəptə(r)/
     b  /tʃəndʒ/  
     c  /tʃəp/  
     d  /tʃəstəfi ld/

(4)  a  cf (la)
     b  /tʃə(r)/  
     c  /tʃət/  
     d  /tʃələndʒ/
(5)  a /darkotemt/
b /jvlrlr/
c /Ju t/

(6)  a /djon/
b /kolridg/
c /d33 m/
d /d3ens/

(9)  a cf (6a)
b /d3adg/
c /d3erl/

(10) a /Θmŋk ju /
b /Θŋ n/
c /jem/
d /jem/

(15) b /Θŋk/ + cf (10e)
c /grmŋ/
d cf (10d)

(16) a /brjŋʃʃ/
b /Θŋkŋʃʃ/
c /ʃŋk/

(20) a /prʃʃs/
b /prɔktriʃ/
c /sɔplimɔnt/
d /stju prd/

(21) a /pœust/ + /bœust/
b /paʊnd/ + /baʊnd/
c /pa k/ + /ba k/
d /prei/ + /brei/

(22) a /rrpəblrik/
b /kerpəbl/
c /pa trspert/
(23) a /f3.m/
b /l3 n/

(27) a /konveseq1n/
b /kemperisn/
c /inkri siŋ/

(28) a /poezen/
b /inden1 ziø/
c /smiÌiks/

(29) a /meirk/
b /breirk/
c /werp/
d /reiz/

(32) a /s3 v/
b /m3 de(r)/
c /p3 s/
d /f3.3e(r)/

(33) a /weə(r)/
b /fes(r)/
c /keə(r)/
d /bee(r)/

(34) a /hœum/
b /dʒœuk/
c /bœut/
d /apreutʃ/

(37) a /flɔ (r)/
b /fɔ k/
c /fɔ dʒ/
d /pɔ k/
e /sɔ /
(38) a /ˈwɜːd/  
b /ˈwɜːk/  
c /ˈdrivələp/  
d /ˈslon/  
e /ˈlost/  

(39) a /ˈbriːd/  
b /ˈbɪə(r)/  
c /ˈdɪə(r)/  
d /ˈfɪə(r)/  
e /ˈhɪə(r)/  
f /ˈklɪə(r)/  

(44) a /ˈkjuːə(r)/  
b /ˈpjuə(r)/  
c /ˈjuə(r)/  

(49) a /ˈbɔn/  
b. /ˈsp3m/  

(50) a /ˈwɜːkt/  
b /ˈmaкт/  

(51) a /ˈa skt/  
b /ˈmæntʃəs/  

(53) a /ˈskrɪn/  
b /ˈsprɪŋ/  
c /ˈstrɪŋ/  

(54) a /ˈrskskjuːz/  
b /ˈrskpreʃn/  
c /ˈrkspləm/  
d /ˈrkspləʊn/  
e /ˈrksstri mɪl/  

(63) a /ˈkænt/  
b /ˈkænst/  

L2-Equivalents in Syntax (section 6.2)

(1) He is good at Maths

(2) You are quick at reading

(3) He was at ---- work.

(4) We travelled by ---- day to Sligo

(5) I saw him on that day.

(6) He is on a mission

(7) Put it around your neck

(8) Put it on your arm (cf. section 6.3.1, example (7))

(9) Can we buy it on credit/tick (cf. section 6.3.3, example (75))

(10) I bought my TV at a cheap price

(11) Stop playing with your teeth

(12) He wants to subscribe to the newspaper

(19) He's going to subscribe to the newspaper
(21) You can dry your hands on this towel.

(22) I dreamed of/about my father last night.
    or. I had a dream of/about my father last night

(23) I was amazed at the Irish accent

(24) I was really astonished at the Irish accent

(26) I got bored with/of them.

(27) He is tired of studying

(28) I am frustrated with/by the education in this college

(29) I complain of/about the pain

(30) He entered through the window

(31) At ---- first sight

(32) Do you pass by Botanic Road?

(33) Anyway, it is better than nothing

(37) From --- childhood

(43) It is made of/from ---- wood

(44) Let me read this letter to you
    or Let me read you this letter

(45) We have no hatred of/for anyone
    or We don't have hatred towards anyone

    cf We don't have/bear a grudge against anyone
    cf We have/bear no grudge against anyone
    cf We bear no one a grudge
    cf We don't bear anyone a grudge.
cf We don't have/bear malice towards anyone
cf We have/bear no malice towards anyone
cf We act with malice towards none
cf We don't act with malice towards anyone

cf We don't have/bear a spite against anyone
cf We have/bear a spite against none/no-one
cf We have/bear no spite against anyone
cf We bear no one a spite
cf We feel no spite towards anyone

cf We don't have/bear/feel resentment against anyone
cf We don't have/bear/feel resentment towards anyone
cf We have/bear/feel no resentment against anyone.
cf We have/bear/feel no resentment towards anyone

(46) He went for a walk by moonlight

(47) Let me sleep with the music

(53) He threatened her with death
    or He threatened to murder her.
    or He threatened to kill her
    or He gave her a death threat

(57) I only know her face
    or I only know her to see
    or I only know her by sight

(60) ---- Man will not live forever

(61) All ---- birds are beautiful

(62) ---- Petrol is very expensive in Ireland

(63) cf example (43)

(64) cf example (37)
(67) cf example (3)

(68) cf example (4).

(69) We travelled ---- day and ---- night

(70) All ---- day I have been on my feet
or I have been on my feet all ---- day

(71) I came from England by ---- boat

(72) He went to ---- college

(73) My wife is still in ---- hospital

(74) Mandela has stayed in ---- prison for 27 years
or Mandela has been in ---- prison for 27 years

(75) cf example (31)

(76) I have a headache

(77) I saw a big carnival in the city centre

(78) cf example (10).

(82) It's ---- very strong beer.
cf I want to drink a (bottle/a can/a glass of) beer
cf I want to drink some beer

(83) It's really ---- nice coke
cf Can I have a (bottle/a can/a glass of) coke?
cf Can I have some coke?

(86) I want to give you ---- advice
cf I want to give a piece/bit/word of advice

(87) It's ---- lovely weather, isn't it?

(88) I need ---- fresh air

(89) I haven't seen him for more than three years
(124) I won't break it, I'm more careful than you (are)

(126) What more do you want?
    or What else do you want?

(128) Who is the rude one?
    or Which one of us is rude?

L2-Equivalents in Semantics (section 6.3)

(1) Let's turn over a new leaf.

(2) I made him stand on his (own two) feet
    or I set him on his feet

(3) It's as clear as day/day-light
    or It's as plain as day/day-light

(4) The wind turned the umbrella inside-out
    or The wind blew the umbrella inside-out

(5) Can we use a stick of dynamite?
    or Can we use a ---- dynamite?

(6) The umpire was bad and Lendl lost his nerve (self-confidence)
    or The umpire was unjust and Lendl lost his nerve (self-confidence)
    or and Lendl lost his temper (self-control)
    or and Lendl lost his head/cool reason (irritation)
    or and Lendl couldn't control his temper (self-control)
    or and Lendl couldn't keep his temper (self-control)
    or and Lendl got/flew into a temper (anger)
    or and Lendl was out of temper (anger)

(7) Put the watch on your arm/wrist
    or Put your watch on
    or Wear your watch
(8) I want to buy a new strap for my watch

(9) I can drive (the car) without stalling
    or I can change gear without stalling

(10) Not later than 7 00

(11) She is pinning her hopes on marrying him/getting married to him
    She is setting her hopes on marrying him/getting married to him
    or She is setting her heart on marrying him/getting married to him
    or She is setting her mind on marrying him/getting married to him

(12) Will you set the alarm for nine?

(13) This drink is nice It quenches my thirst
    or This drink is nice It slakes my thirst

(14) This is a heavy coat It keeps out the cold
    or This is a heavy coat It keeps the cold out

(15) You'll pick up this bad habit.
    You'll be in this bad habit
    or You'll fall into this bad habit
    or You'll get into this bad habit

(16) I did an English course in London
    or I followed an English course in London
    or I pursued an English course in London
    or I took an English course in London

(17) I bought a house and put it in my father's name
    or I bought a house and made it over to my father

(18) He prescribed some medicines for me
    or He prescribed me some medicines.
    or He wrote a prescription for me
    or He wrote me a prescription.
(19) She is rearing a cat
    or She has got a cat
    or She keeps a cat as a pet

(20) I think too much Maalox causes diarrhoea

(21) Will you stub that cigarette out?
    or Will you put that cigarette out?

(22) Can I have the reason?
    or Can you give me the reason?
    or Can I know the reason?
    or Will you let me know the reason?

(23) Can you tell the time?
    or Can you read the time?
    or Can you read the watch?
    or Can you read the clock?

(24) My passport will expire in September

(25) Next week she will be five months
    or Next week she will be five months already

(26) Did you hurt yourself?

(27) Did I hurt your feelings?

(28) I made his hair stand on end

(29) You're right I take my words back
    or Your're right I swallow my words
    or You're right I eat my words

(30) Because marriage will clip my wings

(31) Hold/catch your breath and you'll get rid of them/it.
    or Hold/catch your breath to get rid of them/it
(32) The eyes are the mirror of the soul

(33) You’ll eat your nails after this food (Hiberno-English)
    or You’ll lick your fingers after this food (British English)

(34) The sound of this car gets on my nerves

(35) I broke my back in that work
    or That work broke my back

(36) They got rid of all evidences of the crime
    or They got rid of all the evidence surrounding the crime

(37) He is nice, but he pokes his nose into everything
    or He is nice, but he sticks his nose into everything
    or He is nice, but he puts his nose into everything

(38) She stole the limelight
    or She stole the show
    or She took the spotlight
    or She held the spotlight
    or She was in the spotlight

(39) I stood on/upon my dignity
    or I abandoned my dignity
    or I swallowed my pride

(40) My situation is hanged by a thread
    or My situation hangs by a thread
    or I’m hanging by a thread

(41) Blood is thicker than water

(42) Pump the blood (Hiberno-English)
    or Rouse the blood cells (Hiberno-English)
    or Get the circulation going (British English)
    or Wake the circulation (British English)
    or Work the circulation (British-English)
(43) Will you put the umbrella up?

(44) You can put the umbrella down

(45) I'll run the tap for cold water
   or I'll turn on the tap for cold water

(46) There isn't even a glimmer of hope
   or There isn't even a ray of hope
   or There isn't even a spark of hope
   or There isn't even a shred of hope
   or There isn't even a thread of hope

(47) She was looking (at me) out of the corner of her eye

(48) his moustache is not real
    or his moustache is artificial
    or his moustache is false
    or his moustache is not authentic
    or he's wearing a false/ an artificial moustache

(49) Her face was red with shyness
    or Her face went red with shyness
    or Her face blushed with shyness
    or She blushed with shyness

(50) This is daylight robbery

(51) They fired blank cartridges
    or They fired blanks

(52) I can't remember, my mind is blank/a blank
    or I can't remember, my memory is blank/a blank
    or I can't remember, my mind/memory has gone blank
    or I can't remember, my brain is tired/worn out

(53) Will you give me a blank sheet of paper?

(54) I left this card blank for your notes
(55) I'll bring you a blank tape to record it

(56) He has a very sharp tongue
    or He has a very caustic tongue

(57) This drink has (really) stimulated my appetite
    or This drink has (really) whetted my appetite
    or This drink has (really) sharpened my appetite

(58) He is well experienced in nuclear physics
    If he works in France, his salary will be a blank cheque
    or He is a highly qualified nuclear physicist
    If he works in France, he will write his own salary cheque
    or If he works in France, he will earn/make a fortune

(59) I can't see, you're standing in my way.
    or I can't see, you're in the way
    or I can't see, you're (standing) in my line of vision
    or I can't see, you're blocking my vision/view
    or I can't see through you; please move

(60) You're wearing your jumper inside-out
    or Your jumper is on inside-out

(61) Your jumper is on back to front, (it should be the other way round)
    or You're wearing the jumper back to front

(62) I laughed at him to myself  (British English)
    I laughed up my sleeve at him.  (British English)
    or I laughed at him under my breath  (British English)
    or I laughed at him behind his back  (Hiberno English)

(63) This woman goes behind her husband's back
    or This woman does that behind her husband's back

(64) Just turn your back on her
(65) Let me remember you by the good things
or Let me remember the good time I had with you
or Let me remember the good time we had/spent together
or Let me remember you fondly.
or Let me have good/fond memories of you

(66) Everyone shows his origin
or Everyone shows his up-bringing.
or Everyone shows what he comes from
or Everyone shows where he comes from
or Everyone shows what he is made of

(67) I don't feel at ease when I look at him
or I don't feel comfortable when I look at him.
or I can't relax when I look at him
or I feel uneasy when I look at him
or I feel ill-at-ease when I look at him
or He makes me feel uneasy

(68) She was looking at everyone with hatred
or She was looking at everyone with hate

(69) I'm really embarrassed because I'm late.
or It embarrasses me not to be on time
or I'm really ashamed of my lateness
or I'm really ashamed at being late

(70) I washed my hands of that problem

(71) He was tied hand and foot /They tied him hand and foot
or He was tied up /They tied him up
or He was bound hand and foot /They bound him hand and foot.
or His wrists and ankles were tied up /They tied up his wrists and ankles
(72) I know you from head to toe.
or I know you from top to toe
or I know you like the palm of my hand.
or I know you like the back of my hand
or I know you inside-out

(73) I am frozen to the bone.

(74) Write them on the slate
or Put them on the slate.
or Put them on my account.
or Credit them to me.

(75) Can we buy it on credit?
or Can we buy it on tick?
or Can we buy it in instalments?
or Can we pay for it by instalments?

(76) If she continues to behave in this way, she will bring shame on herself

(77) You should go to hospital It's not funny!
or You should go to hospital It's serious!

(78) That name rings a bell
or I have heard of that name
or He sounds familiar.

(79) Next month it will be in leaf
or Next month it will come into leaf
or Next month it will have leaves.

(80) I gave you my word and I'll keep it
or I gave you my word and I won't break it
or I gave you my word and I won't go back on it
or My word is my bond.
(81) Bear with me, please
   or Give me your attention, please
   or May I have your attention, please

(82) He seems empty-headed

(83) She was struck dumb with fear
   or She was dumb founded with fear

(84) Look at this weather?
   or Look at this for weather!

(85) When I love/admire a certain tune/song, it stays on my lips
   or When I love/admire a certain tune/song, it stays in my head
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