T.R.

MUSTAFA KEMAL UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

THE ROLE OF SEMANTIC UNIVERSALS IN L2 ENGLISH ARTICLE CHOICE OF L1 SPEAKERS OF TURKISH IN AN EFL SETTING

MASTER'S THESIS

Submitted by

Neşe BÜYÜKAŞIK

Advisor

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali BIÇKI

Co-advisor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bilal KIRKICI

Hatay, 2015

T.R.

MUSTAFA KEMAL UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

THE ROLE OF SEMANTIC UNIVERSALS IN L2 ENGLISH ARTICLE CHOICE OF L1 SPEAKERS OF TURKISH IN AN EFL SETTING

MASTER'S THESIS

Submitted by

Neşe BÜYÜKAŞIK

Advisor

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali BIÇKI

Co-advisor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bilal KIRKICI

Hatay, 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

between us, they were always there in times of despair, and they always gave me hope with their encouraging, sincere conversations and constant support.

Last, but not least, I'm indebted to my fiancé Mehmet GÜZELŞEMME for his love, unceasing support and help with the format of the thesis. He was always there whenever I lost confidence in myself. He has also been a source of inspiration and a role-model as a self-disciplined and ambitious researcher himself.

İNGİLİZCENİN YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENİLDİĞİ ORTAMDA TÜRKÇE KONUŞUCULARININ İNGİLİZCE TANIMLIK SEÇİMİNDE SEMANTİK EVRENSELLERİN ROLÜ

Neşe BÜYÜKAŞIK

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 2015

Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ali BIÇKI

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen, anadilinde tanımlık sistemi bulunmayan Türkçe konuşucularının BELİRLİLİK ve ÖZGÜLLÜK arasında dalgalanma yaşayıp yaşamayacaklarını incelemektir. Çalışma aynı zamanda dalgalanma yapılarının açık (çıkartım) ve örtük (üretme) testlerinde değişiklik gösterip göstermeyeceğini incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Buna ek olarak, tanımlıkları cümleden çıkarma oranları test ve bağlam türüne dayalı olarak incelenmiştir. Yeterlilik seviyesinin doğru tanımlık tercihi ile nasıl etkileştiği de araştırılmıştır. Katılımcılar Türkiye'de bulunan Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümünde okuyan 50 öğrenciden oluşmaktadır. Öğrenciler, her bir grup 25 kişiden oluşmak üzere iki yeterlik seviyesine (temel seviye ve orta seviye) ayrılmışlardır. Veriler, Ionin ve yardımcı yazarların çalışmalarında yer alan (2004a, 2004b, 2009) bir boşluk doldurma testi ile bir yazılı anlatım testi aracılığıyla toplanmıştır. Katılımcıların [-belirli, +özgül] ve [+belirli, -özgül] bağlamlardaki tanımlık kullanımları incelenmiştir. Bulgular t-testleri ile analiz edilmiştir. Elde edilen sonuçlar, Dalgalanma Hipotezini desteklememiştir. Katılımcıların tanımlıkları genellikle BELİRLİLİK özelliğine dayanarak kullandıkları ortaya çıkmıştır. Tanımlıklar hem boşluk doldurma hem de yazılı anlatım testlerinde cümleden çıkarılmıştır. Temel seviyedeki öğrencilerin tanımlıkları [+belirli] bağlamlarda [-belirli] bağlamlardan daha sık çıkardıkları gözlenmiştir. Ancak, tanımlıkları cümleden çıkarma eğilimi orta seviyede dikkate değer bir oranda azalmıştır. Orta seviyedeki öğrencilerin doğru tanımlık kullanım oranları ve tanımlıkları cümleden çıkarma oranındaki kayda değer düşüş doğru tanımlık kullanımı ile yeterlik seviyesi arasında pozitif bir korelasyona işaret etmiştir.

ANAHTAR KELİMELER

İngilizce Tanımlık Sistemi, Belirlilik, Özgüllük, Dalgalanma, Tanımlık Çıkarma, Test Türü, Yeterlik Seviyesi

THE ROLE OF SEMANTIC UNIVERSALS IN L2 ENGLISH ARTICLE CHOICE OF L1 SPEAKERS OF TURKISH IN AN EFL SETTING

Master's Thesis, Neşe BÜYÜKAŞIK

Department of English Language Teaching, 2015

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali BIÇKI

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to investigate whether Turkish-speaking L2 English learners, whose L1 lacks an article system, would fluctuate between DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICTY. It also aimed to explore whether fluctuation patterns would differ in explicit (*i.e.,* elicitation) and implicit (*i.e.,* production) tasks. Furthermore, the study examined article omission rates based on task and context type. How proficiency level interacts with target-like article choice was also investigated. The participants were 50 learners at the English Language Teaching Department of Mustafa Kemal University in Turkey. They were divided into two proficiency levels (*i.e.*, elementary and intermediate), each group consisting of 25 participants. Data were collected via a written elicitation and a written narrative task from Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b, 2009). Article use of the participants in [-definite, +specific] and [+definite, -specific] contexts was examined. The findings were analyzed with t-tests. The results did not support the Fluctuation Hypothesis. Participants were found to choose articles based on the DEFINITENESS setting, and in general they were target-like in using articles. Article omission emerged in both the written elicitation and the written narrative tasks. Elementary level learners were found to omit the definite article more frequently than the indefinite article. However, the rates of article omission decreased remarkably at the intermediate level. Overall rates of article usage accuracy and the considerable decrease in article omission rates of the intermediate level learners signaled a positive correlation between target-like article use and proficiency level.

KEY WORDS

English Article System, Definiteness, Specificity, Fluctuation, Article Omission, Task Type, Proficiency Level

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABIL	Ability
ABL	Ablative Case
ACC	Accusative Case
ACP	Article Choice Parameter
ADJ	Adjective
ANOM	Action Nominal
AOR	Aorist
ART	Article
CONJ	Conjunction
DAT	Dative Case
DE	Definiteness Effect
DP	Determiner Phrase
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
ENUM	Enumerator
ESK	Explicitly Stated Knowledge
ESL	English as a Second Language
FA	Full Access
FH	Fluctuation Hypothesis
FNOM	Factive Nominal
FTFA	Full Transfer Full Access
FUT	Future
GEN	Genitive Case
GM	Generalizing Modality
HK	Assumed Known to the Hearer
ILG	Interlanguage Grammar
J1	Japanese High School Students
J2	Japanese College Students
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
L3	Third Language
LOC	Locative Case

METU	Middle East Technical University
MSIH	Missing Surface Inflection Hypothesis
N	Noun
NEG	Negative
NMN	Nominalization
NMP	Nominal Mapping Parameter
NP	Noun Phrase
OQPT	Oxford Quick Placement Test
P. COP	Past Copula
PART	Participle
PASS	Passive
PAST	Past
PL	Plural
POSS	Possessive
PPART	Past Participle
PROG	Progressive
PSB	Possibility
Q	Interrogative Particle
REP. PAST	Reported Past
RQ	Research Question
SBJP	Subject Participle
SD	Standard Deviation
SG	Singular
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SMH	Syntactic Misanalysis Hypothesis
SOC	Supplied in Obligatory Contexts
SOV	Subject-Object-Verb
SR	Specific Referent
SVO	Subject-Verb-Object
T	T-value
TLU	Target-Like Use
TRNC	Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
UG	Universal Grammar
UOC	Used in Obligatory Contexts

V2	Verb-second
VN	Verbal Noun Marker
WET	Written Elicitation Task
WNT	Written Narrative Task
WPT	Written Production Task
1	First Person
2	Second Person
3	Third Person

INTRODUCTION

1. Background to the study

It is frequently mentioned in the literature that L2 English article acquisition is a difficult task (see *e.g.,* Butler, 2002; Master, 2002; Bergeron-Matoba, 2007; Ekiert, 2007; Humphrey, 2007; and Dikilitaş and Altay, 2011 among others). Master (1988) indicated that *the* and *a* rank among the most frequently used words in English. Nevertheless, despite this high frequency, most L2 learners, –even those with native-like attainment– fail to use these function words properly. According to Master (2002), three principle facts regarding the English article system account for the difficulty of L2 English article acquisition. Firstly, articles (*a/an, the* and the invisible *zero article Ø*) are among the most frequent words, and this makes continuous conscious rule application difficult for the L2 learner during verbal communication. Secondly, as function words, articles are unstressed. Thus, in most cases, they are perceptually non-salient to the L2 speaker, and this affects the availability of input during natural discourse. Thirdly, in the English article system, a single morpheme is assigned multiple functions, and this leads to confusion on the part of the L2 learner who generally seeks one-to-one form-function correspondence.

Research on the issue has shown that the problem of L2 English article acquisition is further compounded for speakers whose L1s do not have a corresponding article system (see *e.g.,* Jarvis, 2002; Liu and Gleason, 2002; Master, 1997; Robertson, 2000; Tarone and Parish, 1988; and Thomas, 1989 among others). According to Pienemann (1998), with regards to articles, it is the novelty and abstractness of the concept that determine the difficulty of meaning. In the same vein, in his study which addresses the reasons of L2 learning difficulty, DeKeyser (2005: 5) indicated that:

> *"Where the semantic system of the L1 is different from that of the L2, as is very often the case for aspect, or where equivalent notions do not get expressed overtly in L1, except through discourse patterns, as may be the case for ESL articles for native speakers of most Slavic languages or Chinese, Japanese, or Korean, the learning problem is serious and long-lasting."*

Turkish is among the languages that lack "an exact syntactic and semantic symmetry" to that of English in terms of reference systems (Tura, 1975: 2). Unlike English which has overt markers for the definite and the indefinite articles, Turkish expresses DEFINITENESS through different syntactic devices such as word order, sentence stress, tense-aspect-modality or case markers.

Previous research has shown that speakers from non-article L1 backgrounds substitute or omit articles in L2 English (see *e.g.,* Huebner, 1983; Robertson, 2000; Ionin, 2003; Ionin, Ko and Wexler, 2004; Ekiert, 2004; Snape, 2005; and Pongpairoj, 2007b among others). There is no consensus as to the reasons of article misuse and omission. Researchers have tried to explain erroneous article choice from syntactic (*e.g.,* Leung, 2001), phonological (*e.g.,* Goad and White, 2008) or semantic (*e.g.,* Ionin, Ko and Wexler, 2004) perspectives.

A recent view proposed by Ionin, Ko and Wexler (2004) is that article choice is UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR[1] (henceforth UG) constrained. Under this view, L2 article choice is affected by the semantic universals DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY[2]. Therefore L2 English learners' article choice errors are non-random and predictable.

In their original proposal, Ionin *et al.* (2004b) suggested that languages with two articles encode either the DEFINITENESS or the SPECIFICITY setting in their article choice, but not both. They illustrated this via English and Samoan. Drawing on data from Mosel and Hovdhaugen (1992), Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b) formulated the FLUCTUATION HYPOTHESIS (discussed in Chapter 2) on the assumption that

---

[1] In the Routledge Language and Linguistics Dictionary (Bussmann, 1996: 1249), UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR, a theory put forward by Chomsky, is defined as "[…] the genetically determined biological foundations of language acquisition. The goal of linguistic description is to postulate general traits and tendencies in all languages on the basis of studies on grammars of individual languages."

[2] Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b) propose that languages with two articles encode their articles based either on DEFINITENESS or SPECIFICITY. The former refers to *the state of hearer knowledge* (mutual knowledge between the speaker and the hearer) while the latter takes only *the state of speaker knowledge* (speaker intent to refer) as a basis. At the initial stages of L2 English article acquisition, learners whose L1s do not have an article system, encode the English articles based on DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY interchangeably due to not knowing which one is the correct value for English. This leads to an association of 'the' with the feature [+specific] at times and [+definite] at other times. Likewise, it leads to an optional association of 'a/an' with the features [-specific] and [-definite]. This, in turn, results in overuse of 'the' in indefinite/specific and overuse of 'a/an' in definite/non-specific NP environments. This issue will be further elaborated on in Chapter 2.

Samoan marks the SPECIFICITY distinction with both definites and indefinites. Hence, learners substitute *'the'* for *'a'*, and *'a'* for *'the'* in [-definite, +specific] and [+definite, -specific] contexts, respectively as a result of encoding articles based on the *state of speaker knowledge* (speaker intent to refer) at times and on the *hearer knowledge* (shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer) at other times. In contrast, recent work by Fuli (2007) and Tryzna (2009) revealed that Samoan makes the SPECIFICITY distinction with indefinites only. That is, overuse of *the* with specific/indefinites has natural language parallels whereas overuse of *a/an* with non-specific/definites does not.

In a series of studies, Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b, 2008) have shown that learners infelicitously use *'the'* in indefinite/specific contexts. In the same vein, they inappropriately use *'a/an'* in definite/non-specific contexts. In the light of the new Samoan data, Ionin, Zubizarreta and Philippov (2009) suggested that, adult learners are influenced by both natural language patterns and explicit strategies. While they overuse *the* in [-definite, +specific] contexts due to fluctuating between English and Samoan options, they overuse *a* in [+definite, -specific] environments due to extending the SPECIFICITY distinction to definites by using explicit strategies. Ionin *et al.* (2009) state that "[…] these strategies do not come out of thin air, but are based on learners' intuitive understanding of what languages are like – in our case, of what distinctions articles can in principle mark" (p. 46). That is, the researchers maintain that both types of overuse are actually rooted in learners' "underlying sensitivity to SPECIFICITY" (p. 47).

In addition to article substitution, it has also been shown that L2 English learners with non-article L1s omit articles more frequently than those whose L1s have an article system (see *e.g.,* Huebner, 1983; Robertson, 2000; and Trenkic, 2007 among others).

Given that Turkish is also an article-less language, and it differs from English in its representation of DEFINITENESS, we predict that similar misuses of articles may be observed in Turkish native speakers who are in the course of learning English as a foreign language.

On the basis of the discussion above, this study aims to examine L1 Turkish speaking L2 English learners' knowledge of the English article system

within the generative framework. More specifically, it aims to investigate the roles of the semantic universals DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY on L1 Turkish-L2 English learners' article choice. The study employs an explicit (*i.e.,* written elicitation) and an implicit (*i.e.,* written narrative) task to explore learners' conscious as well as unconscious knowledge of the L2 English article system, and thereby delineate a more complete picture of L1 Turkish speaking L2 English learners' article choice. We examine the rates and types of article use errors that L2 English learners with L1 Turkish make in the two tasks, and investigate whether these errors can be tied to the semantic universal SPECIFICITY. Finally, we aim to explore whether there is a correlation between correct article usage and proficiency level. To this end, in this study we address the following research questions:

RQ1. Does SPECIFICITY as a semantic universal affect the acquisition of the English articles by L1 Turkish speaking learners of L2 English in an EFL setting?

-How do learners of L2 English with L1 Turkish mark [-definite, +specific] contexts in English?

Based on Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b), and Ionin, Zubizarreta and Phillippov (2009), we expect that learners, whose L1 (Turkish in this case) does not have an article system, will have direct access to UG, and they will fluctuate between DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY while using the English articles. Hence, at times they will associate *the* with SPECIFICITY, and consequently will overuse *the* in [-definite, +specific] contexts.

RQ2. Do L1 Turkish speaking learners of L2 English misuse articles by overextending the SPECIFICITY distinction to definites?

-How do learners of L2 English with L1 Turkish mark [+definite, -specific] contexts in English?

As in Ionin, Zubizarreta and Philippov (2009) and Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b), we hypothesize that learners will diverge from natural language patterns and overextend the SPECIFICITY distinction to definites through explicit strategies. Consequently, they will associate *a* with non-specificity, and overuse the indefinite *a* in [+definite, -specific] contexts.

RQ3. Given the distinct nature of the tasks in the study, do L1 Turkish speaking learners of L2 English display fluctuating use of 'a' and 'the' in both the written elicitation and written narrative tasks?

- How do learners of L2 English with L1 Turkish mark [-definite, +specific] and [+definite, -specific] contexts in the explicit and the implicit tasks?

Ionin *et al.* (2009) showed that L2 English learners converge with natural language data in more implicit tasks, thus they mostly display *the* overuse in such tasks. On the other hand, they also exhibit *a* overuse in explicit tasks. We hypothesize that the L1 Turkish speaking L2 English learners in our study will follow a similar pattern due to the lack of an article system in their L1. Therefore, they will overuse *the* and *a* in the explicit task, but mainly *the* in the implicit one.

RQ4. Does task type (explicit vs. implicit) affect article omission?
- Do learners of L2 English with L1 Turkish omit articles more frequently in the implicit written narrative task than in the explicit written elicitation task?

Drawing on previous research (*e.g.,* Huebner, 1983 and Robertson, 2000) that suggests omission occurs very frequently in natural tasks, we assume that a higher rate of article omission will be observed in the written narrative task. Since this task type is implicit, there will be no overt focus on articles; and therefore, learners will not be aware of the fact that their article knowledge is being tested. In line with Ionin *et al.* (2004b), we predict that this will result in a higher rate of article omission in the written narrative task.

In addition, based on Ionin *et al.* (2004b), omissions are expected to occur more frequently in singular indefinite contexts due to the fact that the [+definite] article is more informative than the [-definite] article. While the indefinite article indicates only the singularity of the noun phrase –which can be clear from the NP itself–, the definite article also conveys the presupposition of uniqueness. Thus, under performance pressures, it is hypothesized that learners will omit the article with the least amount of information; that is, the indefinite *a/an*.

RQ5. Does L2-proficiency level affect article choice of L1-Turkish learners of L2-English?

- Do intermediate level L1 Turkish learners of L2 English overall use the English articles more accurately than their elementary level counterparts?

A myriad of research studies (see *e.g.,* Ekiert, 2004; Dağdeviren, 2010 and Yılmaz, 2006 among others) have shown that proficiency level positively correlates with target-like article use. Therefore, we predict that intermediate level learners will use the English articles more accurately than their elementary level counterparts.

CHAPTER 1
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1. Introduction

This chapter will deal with the semantic universals DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY within the framework of the definitions proposed by Ionin *et al.* (2004a). Next, it will explain the ARTICLE CHOICE PARAMETER and the FLUCTUATION HYPOTHESIS (Ionin, 2003), which form the basis for this study.

Ionin *et al.* (2004a) state that both DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY are discourse related: that is, "they are related to the knowledge/mind state of the speaker and/or the hearer in the discourse" (p. 5). In this sense, while DEFINITENESS is based on the *uniqueness presupposition*, and is related to the knowledge state of both the speaker and the hearer, SPECIFICITY is viewed as *speaker intent to refer*, and reflects the speaker's state of knowledge only. Below are Ionin *et al.*'s (2004a) definitions of DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY.

1.1. Definiteness as a Semantic Universal

In their informal definition of DEFINITENESS, Ionin *et al.* (2004a) propose that:

"If a Determiner Phrase (DP) of the form [D NP] is [+definite], then the speaker assumes that the hearer shares the speaker's presupposition of the existence of a unique individual in the set denoted by the NP".

(Ionin *et al.* 2004a: 5)

As the definition above suggests DEFINITENESS is based on the presupposition of uniqueness, and requires a common ground between the speaker and the hearer.

1.2. Specificity as a Semantic Universal

SPECIFICITY has been interpreted in multiple ways (see Enç, 1991 for a review of interpretations). For the purposes of this study, Ionin *et al.*'s (2004a) definition of SPECIFICITY, which is based on Fodor and Sag (1982) will be adopted. In their informal characterization of SPECIFICITY, Ionin *et al.* (2004a) suggest that:

"If a Determiner Phrase (DP) of the form [D NP] is [+specific], then the speaker intends to refer to a unique individual in the set denoted by the NP and considers this individual to possess some noteworthy property".

(Ionin *et al.,* 2004a: 5)

Fodor and Sag's (1982) focus on '*speaker intent to refer*' constitutes the core of the definition above. Ionin (2003) broadens this definition by adding the concept of '*noteworthy property*'.

These semantic notions are important because they are the core elements of Ionin's (2003) ARTICLE CHOICE PARAMETER and the FLUCTUATION HYPOTHESIS. The next section deals with a detailed discussion of the ARTICLE CHOICE PARAMETER and the FLUCTUATION HYPOTHESIS.

1.3. The Article Choice Parameter and the Fluctuation Hypothesis

The ARTICLE CHOICE PARAMETER (henceforth ACP) and the FLUCTUATION HYPOTHESIS (henceforth FH) proposed by Ionin (2003) constitute the backbone of this study. The existence of the semantic universals described above (*i.e.,* DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY) along with the views of FULL ACCESS (henceforth FA) (see *e.g.,* Epstein *et al.,* 1996, 1998; Flynn and Martohardjono 1994; Flynn 1996; Schwartz and Sprouse, 1994, 1996) and OPTIONALITY (see *e.g.,* Eubank, 1993/1994; Prévost and White, 2000; Sorace, 2000) paved the way to the conception of the ACP and the FH.

Building on the work that reveals L2-learners have access to parameter settings not instantiated in their L1s, and on the grounds that it "makes testable predictions, since it predicts L2-acquisition to always be UG-constrained", Ionin

(2003) adopted the FA view, one of the basic assumptions of UG access (Ionin, 2003: 20). Under the FA view, all aspects of UG are available to L2-learners. In this line, proponents of FA (see *e.g.,* Epstein *et al.,* 1996, 1998; Flynn and Martohardjono, 1994; Flynn, 1996; Schwartz and Sprouse, 1994, 1996) maintained that L2 acquisition, like L1 acquisition, is fully UG-constrained. Eubank, Bischof, Huffstutler, Leek and West (1997) have shown that during the course of L2-acquisition process L2-learners have access to parameter settings not instantiated in either their L1 or the target language (L2), and this provided further support for the FA view.

Besides FA, the notion of OPTIONALITY has also been shown to affect L2-acquisition in some domains. Ionin (2003) suggests that the OPTIONALITY phenomenon refers to cases where L2 learners optionally adopt more than one setting of a certain parameter at the same time. For instance, as Ionin (2003: 21) puts it, learners may display optional adherence to "Setting 1 of Parameter X some of the time, Setting 2 of Parameter X some of the time, Setting 3 of the same parameter some of the time, and so on." This may be manifested through parameter resetting from the L1 value to the L2 value. In this case, the behavior of L2 learners is not 100% consistent with either the L1 or the L2. For instance, speakers of Subject-Verb-Object (henceforth SVO) L1s who are acquiring Subject-Object-Verb (henceforth SOV) L2s may go back and forth between SVO and SOV settings while forming sentences in the target language (Vainikka and Young-Scholten 1996: 15, cited in Ionin, 2003: 22). Likewise non-V2 L2 learners with V2 L1s may at times adhere to the V2 setting instantiated in their first language and generate infelicitous sentences in the L2 whereas they may produce target-like sentences congruent with the non-V2 setting of the L2 at other times (Robertson and Sorace, 1999, cited in Ionin 2003: 22).

Based on the discussion above and within the context of article acquisition, Ionin (2003) and Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b, 2009) suggested that the semantic universals DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY underlie article choice cross-linguistically, and languages that have two articles choose their articles based on either of these universals. English and many other Western European languages encode DEFINITENESS whereas languages such as Samoan base their article choice on SPECIFICITY. This binary distinction and previous research in various domains

of syntactic parameter setting in L2 acquisition (Finer and Broselow, 1986; White, 1990/91; and Robertson and Sorace, 1999 among others) led Ionin *et al.* (2004a: 3) to explore "L2 learners' ability to acquire a new value for a *semantic* parameter –the *Article Choice Parameter*". Hence, Ionin (2003) formulated the ACP which embraces the DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY settings (discussed below).

1.3.1. Article Choice Parameter

Ionin (2003) indicates that the ACP is distinct from parameters that are related to syntactic properties. The ACP deals with lexical specifications of articles and their interaction with the properties of discourse. More specifically, as Ionin (2003) puts it: "The Article Choice Parameter is discourse-related: it dictates whether articles encode the state of hearer knowledge or the state of speaker knowledge" (Ionin, 2003: 30).

According to the ACP, a language which has two articles distinguishes them as follows:

Setting I. Articles are distinguished on the basis of specificity.
Setting II. Articles are distinguished on the basis of definiteness.

(Ionin, 2003: 79)

Ionin (2003) suggested that among languages which have two articles some adopt Setting 1 of the ACP whereas others adopt Setting 2. For instance, Samoan has the first setting, and marks its articles based on the SPECIFICITY feature. English on the other hand, has the second setting and encodes the DEFINITENESS setting. During the course of article acquisition process, L2 English learners who do not have an article system in their L1, have access both to the DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY settings of the ACP as a result of full access to UG. Thus, they display optional adherence to either setting in marking the English articles. This optionality observed in L2 English learners' article choice at early stages of acquisition further led Ionin (2003) to formulate the FH (discussed below).

1.3.2. The Fluctuation Hypothesis

The FH as posited by Ionin (2003: 23) assumes the following arguments:

1) L2-learners have full access to UG principles and parameter settings.

2) L2-learners fluctuate between different parameter settings until the input leads them to set the parameter to the appropriate value.

Those arguments above iff true will logically lead to the following in the context of L2 English article acquisition:

1) L2 learners have full UG access to the two settings of the ACP (*i.e.,* DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY).

2) L2 learners fluctuate between the two settings of the ACP until the input leads them to set this parameter to the appropriate value (*i.e.,* DEFINITENESS).

(adapted from Ionin *et al.,* 2004a: 17)

In line with these assumptions, the interlanguage grammar (henceforth ILG) of L2 English learners is at all times constrained by the semantic universals of DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY (Ionin *et al.,* 2004b). Hence, article choice of L2 English learners is non-random, and reflects access to semantic universals. At the initial stages of their article acquisition process, learners who do not have an article system in their L1 will have access both to the DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY settings of the ACP through full access to UG. However, as learners progress in proficiency, they should drop optionality and set the ACP to the target value (*i.e.,* DEFINITENESS), and consequently start to use English articles more accurately.

1.3.3. Fluctuation Hypothesis and Article Choice

Based on recent work by Fuli (2007) and Tryzna (2009), Ionin *et al.* (2009) illustrated the cross-linguistic differences in the realization of reference systems via English and Samoan as in the following tables:

Table 1: Article Grouping by Definiteness (English)

	+definite	-definite
+specific	the	A
-specific		

Table 2: Article Grouping by Specificity (Samoan)

	+definite	-definite
+specific	le	
-specific		Se

(adapted from Ionin *et al.* 2009: 341)

Based on these groupings, it is predicted that L2-English learners will use articles felicitously in contexts where the two values are in agreement as in (1) and (2). In contrast, it is predicted that they will misuse articles in contexts like (3) and (4) due to SPECIFICITY effects:

(1) *[+definite, +specific]: correct use of 'the'*

Kathy: My daughter Jeannie loves that new comic strip about Super Mouse.

Elise: Well, she is in luck! *Tomorrow, I'm having lunch with (a, <u>the</u>, --) creator of this comic strip – he is an old friend of mine.* So I can get his autograph for Jeannie!

(2) *[-definite, -specific]: correct use of 'a/n'*

Chris: I need to find your roommate Jonathan right away.

Clara: He is not here – he went to New York.

Chris: Really? In what part of New York is he staying?

Clara: I don't really know. *He is staying with (<u>a</u>, the, --) friend – but he didn't tell me who that is.* He didn't leave me any phone number or address.

In the contexts above, both DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY have the same value ((+) in the former and (-) in the latter). Thus, whichever setting learners adopt, they should be able to choose the correct article in such contexts. This being the case, they are expected to make few or no errors in these environments.

(3) *[-definite, +specific]: overuse of 'the'*

Meeting on a street

Roberta: Hi, William! It's nice to see you again. I didn't know that you were in Boston.

William: I am here for a week. *I am visiting (<u>a</u>, the, --) friend from college – his name is Sam Brown, and he lives in Cambridge now.*

(4) *[+definite, -specific]: overuse of 'a/n'*

Bill: I'm looking for Erik. Is he home?

Rick: Yes, but he's on the phone. It's an important business matter. *He is talking to (a, <u>the</u>, --) owner of his company!* I don't know who that person is – but I know that this conversation is important to Erik.

(adapted from Ko, Ionin and Wexler, 2009: 10-11)

In (3), where the features of DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY have different values, it is predicted that learners will adopt the two settings interchangeably and choose *the* and *a* optionally. They are also predicted to overuse *the* due to optionally associating it with the feature [+specific]. Similarly, in (4) learners are assumed to go back and forth between the two settings, and overuse *a* due to extending the SPECIFICITY feature to definites via explicit strategies[3].

These predictions regarding L2 English article choice is represented in the following table:

Table 3: Predictions for Article Choice in L2-English: Singular Contexts

	+definite (target: *the*)	-definite (target: *a*)
+specific	correct use of *the*	**overuse of *the***
-specific	**overuse of *a***	correct use of *a*

As illustrated above, it is predicted that fluctuation will occur in [-definite, +specific] and [+definite, -specific] contexts. Consequently, this will result in *the* and *a* overuse in the contexts under discussion.

---

[3] See Chapter 3 Ionin *et al.* (2009) for details.

CHAPTER 2
REPRESENTATIONS OF SEMANTIC UNIVERSALS
IN ENGLISH AND TURKISH

2. Introduction

In the preceding chapters, it was stated that article choice in languages with two articles is constrained by either DEFINITENESS or SPECIFICITY. It was also mentioned that some languages do not have overt article systems. Consequently, languages differ in their representation of DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY. This chapter covers the representation of these two semantic features in English and Turkish.

2.1. Definiteness in English

English belongs to the class of languages that encode their articles based on the DEFINITENESS setting. Thus, it has an overt lexical item (*i.e.,* the) for definite NPs and another (*i.e.,* a/an) for indefinite ones. As Abbott (2006: 131) indicates:

> "*'Definite' and 'indefinite' are terms which are usually applied to noun phrases (NPs). In English, 'the' is referred to as 'the definite article', and 'a/an' as 'the indefinite article'. Noun phrases (NPs) which begin with 'the' (e.g. the Queen of England, the book), which are also called (especially in the philosophical literature) 'definite descriptions', are generally taken to be prototypical examples of definite NPs in English. [...] Similarly NPs which begin with 'a/an' (an elephant, a big lie), 'indefinite descriptions', are prototypical examples of indefinite NPs.*"

There have been various attempts to explain what distinguishes definite from indefinite descriptions. Some researchers (see *e.g.,* Christophersen, 1939 and Heim, 1982) claimed that the proper use of *the* requires the *familiarity* condition. On the other hand, Chafe (1976) and Du Bois (1980) maintained that *identifiability* is the prerequisite for felicitous use of *the*. Some others approached the issue from the perspective of *uniqueness* (see *e.g.,* Russell, 1905; and Kadmon, 1990). Hawkins (1978) later broadened the scope of this view by adding the idea of *inclusiveness*.

Among linguists, grammarians and researchers in search of a definition of DEFINITENESS, the *familiarity* and *identifiability* hypotheses have been the most widely acknowledged ones. According to the *familiarity hypothesis*, which is ascribed to Christophersen (1939), "*The* signals that the entity denoted by the noun phrase is familiar to both speaker and hearer, and *a* is used where the speaker does not want to signal such shared familiarity" (Lyons, 1999: 3). The following sentences exemplify the *familiarity* view:

(5) Just give **the shelf** a quick wipe, will you, before I put this vase on it.

(6) I had to get a taxi from the station. On the way **the driver** told me there was a bus strike.

(from Lyons, 1999: 3)

Sentence (5) illustrates situational use of *the*, and the physical situation in which the speaker and hearer are present ensures that the referent of the NP is familiar to both. In (6), familiarity is ensured via associative use of *the*. Although the driver under discussion is not known nor has been seen by the hearer, the mention of a taxi leads the hearer to be familiar with the associated NP *driver*, and therefore licenses the use of *the*. While in (5) there is direct acquaintance in that the hearer is familiar with the referent as is the speaker, in (6) the fact that taxis always have drivers lends the referent familiarity on the part of the hearer. On the view of *identifiability,* on the other hand, "the use of the definite article directs the hearer to the referent of the noun phrase by signaling that he is in a position to identify." (Lyons, 1999: 5-6). Sentence (7) exemplifies how *identifiability* operates:

(7) Pass me **the hammer**, will you?

Suppose that this sentence was uttered in a setting where the speaker is trying to put up a picture on the wall. Without turning, the speaker utters this sentence to the hearer who has just entered the room. At the time the speaker addresses the hearer, the hearer does not know that there is a hammer in the room and "has to look for a referent, guided by the description *hammer*" (Lyons, 1999: 7). The use of the DEFINITE article before the noun phrase 'hammer', signals to the hearer that he can identify the referent. Unlike examples about familiarity (*i.e.,* 5 and 6), the use of the definite in the sample sentence above (*i.e.,* 7) suggests that although the referent is not familiar to the hearer, he can *identify* it.

Uniqueness, another view of DEFINITENESS, suggests that the definite noun phrase refers to 'just one entity'. In that case, uniqueness of the entity under discussion "is generally not absolute, but is to be understood relative to a particular context" (Lyons, 1999: 8) as illustrated in (8) and (9):

(8) *[Nurse entering the operating theatre]*

    I wonder who **the anesthetist** is today.

(9) I've just been to a wedding. **The bride** wore blue.

In (8), although the identity of the referent denoted by the definite noun phrase is not known, it is assumed that only one anesthetist will take part in the operation. Therefore, the use of the definite description satisfies the view of *uniqueness*. Similarly, in (9) the definite description "the bride" refers to a unique bride in the given context.

As the examples above suggest, the view of *uniqueness* holds for only singular noun phrases. The question of "How does *uniqueness* apply to definite *plural and mass* noun phrases?" led to the idea of *inclusiveness*. Proposed by Hawkins (1978), I *inclusiveness* suggests that "the reference is to the totality of the objects or mass in the context which satisfy the description" (Lyons, 1999: 11). The following sentences exemplify *inclusiveness*:

(10)   a. *[Nurse about to enter operating theatre.]*

      I wonder who **the anesthetists** are.

    b. *[Examining restaurant menu.]*

      I wonder what **the pâté** is like.

(11)   a. We're looking for **the vandals** who broke into the office yesterday.

    b. I can't find **the shampoo** I put here this morning.

In (10a), the definite plural noun phrase refers to the totality of the anesthetists about to take part in the operation, and in (11a) the definite description denotes all the vandals who broke into the office. In (10b), the definite mass noun phrase denotes all the pâté served in the restaurant. Similarly, in (11b), reference is to all the shampoo that was left in the given context. These uses suggest that when the referent of the definite description is plural or mass, *inclusiveness* offers a better explanation than *uniqueness*, since the latter applies to singular definites only.

Evidently, these views of DEFINITENESS evolved as a reaction to one another, and are related to each other. As Lyons (1999: 253) indicates DEFINITENESS "is not straightforwardly characterized". Thus, taken singly, no view is adequate to capture the meaning of DEFINITENESS, and each contributes to the understanding of DEFINITENESS from a different perspective.

Besides attempts that were directed to elucidate what accounts for DEFINITENESS theoretically, some attempts were to categorize the English article system. Among researchers who provided a classification of the English articles, Huebner (1983; based on Bickerton, 1981) and Hawkins (1978) have been the most influential.

Drawing on Bickerton's (1981) taxonomy of noun phrases, Huebner (1983) developed a semantic wheel by which noun phrases are classified according to their semantic function. In Huebner's (1983) model the semantic function of the noun phrase (henceforth NP) in discourse determines the use of the English articles, and the classification of the semantic function of an NP is based on two binary discourse features: (a) whether the noun is a specific referent ($\pm$SR), and (b) whether the hearer knows the referent ($\pm$HK). Huebner (1983) suggested that, guided by different combinations of these discourse features, NPs can be divided into four semantic types: Type 1 [-SR, +HK] which stands for generics and requires the indefinite *a*, the definite *the* or the *zero article* (Ø); Type 2 [+SR, +HK] which represents referential definites and requires the definite article *the*; Type 3 [+SR, -HK] which represents referential indefinites and requires the indefinite *a* or the *zero article* (Ø) and Type 4 [-SR, -HK] which stands for noon-referentials and requires the indefinite *a* or the *zero article* (Ø). In addition to these four NP environments, idiomatic expressions and conventional uses were later added as Type 5 (see Thomas, 1989 and Goto Butler, 2002). Huebner's model is summarized below in Table 4:

Table 4: Huebner's Classification of the English Articles

Environments for the Appearance of *a*, *the*, and 0

Features	Environment	Articles	Examples
Type 1 [-SR, +HK]	Generic nouns	a, the, 0	*0Fruit* flourishes in the valley. *The Grenomian* is an excitable person. *A paper clip* comes in handy.
Type 2 [+SR, +HK]	Referential definites Previous mention Specified by entailment Specified by definition Unique in all contexts Unique in a given context	the	Pass me *the pen*. *The idea* of coming to the US was… I found a book. *The book* was… *The first person* to walk on *the moon*…
Type 3 [+SR, -HK]	Referential indefinites First-mention nouns	a, 0	Chris approached me carrying *a dog*. I keep sending *0messages* to him.
Type 4 [-SR, -HK]	Nonreferential indefinites attributive indefinites	a, 0	Alice is *an accountant*. I guess I should buy *a new car*. *0Foreigners* would come up with a solution.
Type 5	Idioms Other conventional uses	a, the, 0	*All of a sudden*, he woke up. *In the 1950s*, there weren't many cars. His family is now living *0hand to mouth*.

Adapted from Ekiert (2004), Butler (2002), Huebner (1983) and Thomas (1989)

Hawkins (1978) also provided an account for the functions of the English articles. Nevertheless, his classification involved the use of non-generic definite descriptions only. Hawkins (1978) proposed the LOCATION THEORY, under which the referent of the definite NP should belong to a shared set such as the previous discourse, the immediate/larger situation, or an association set. In line with the LOCATION THEORY, "The definite article instructs the hearer to infer which shared set is intended and locate the referent in it (that is, understand the referent to be part of it)." (cited in Lyons, 1999: 261). Within his LOCATION THEORY, Hawkins (1978) classified the non-generic uses of *the* in eight categories as shown below:

1. ***Anaphoric use:*** This includes use of the definite article with a second-mention NP which had earlier been introduced for the first time in the discourse.

e.g. I read a book about Napoleon. **The book** was really well written.

2. ***Visible situation use:*** This refers to use of *the* with a NP mentioned for the first time in a context where the referent is visible both to the speaker and the hearer.

e.g. Pass me **the bucket.**

3. *Immediate situation use:* This use is very similar to the use in (2). The only difference is that in this use, the referent of the definite NP may not be visible.

e.g. Don't go in there chum. **The dog** will bite you. (J. Hawkins, p. 112; cited in Dikilitaş and Altay, 2011: 186).

4. *Larger situation use relying on specific knowledge:* This refers to use of *the* with a first-mention noun which licenses the use of the definite article due to being known in the community.

e.g. You don't have to leave so early. **The bank** doesn't open till 9 o'clock.

5. *Larger situation use relying on general knowledge:* This includes use of *the* with something that is assumed known by people from a country or around the world.

e.g. **The moon** does not appear every day.

6. *Associative anaphoric use:* This use is very similar to the use in (1). Nevertheless, unlike (1), the first-mention *the* is used with a noun that is related to a previously mentioned noun, rather than being the same noun.

e.g. We went to a wedding. **The bride** was very tall.

7. *Unfamiliar use in NPs with explanatory modifiers:* This refers to use of *the* with a first-mention noun that has an explanatory or identifying modifier in the form of a clause, prepositional phrase, or noun.

e.g. **The people who have been invited to the party** have not turned up yet.

8. *Unfamiliar use in NPs with non-explanatory modifiers:* This use is similar to (7) with the only difference being that the modifier does not provide explanatory information.

e.g. My wife and I share **the same** secrets.

(from Dikilitaş and Altay, 2011: 186-187 and Lyons, 1999: 261-263)

Though not uniform, the theoretical assumptions regarding DEFINITENESS (*i.e.,* familiarity, identifiability etc.), and classification of the English articles have guided learners, researchers and linguists in making sense of the English article system. Next is a discussion of SPECIFICITY and its representation in English.

2.2. Specificity in English

It was stated earlier that English encodes its articles based on the DEFINITENESS setting, and it has overt markers for definite and indefinite descriptions (*i.e., the* and *a/an*, respectively). Although Standard English does not have an overt marker for SPECIFICITY, colloquial English employs the demonstrative *this* on its indefinite referential use to signal SPECIFICITY. This use is illustrated in (12):

(12) a. John has **a/this** weird purple telephone.

b. John has **a/#this** telephone, so you can reach me there.

(from Maclaran, 1982: 88, ex. 85; cited in Ionin *et al.,* 2004a: 8)

In (12a), reference is to a particular phone which the speaker assumes to have the noteworthy property of being a weird purple. Therefore, in this sentence the conditions of SPECIFICITY are met and the use of referential *this* is licensed. In (12b), on the other hand, the referent does not have a noteworthy property on the part of the speaker; that is, the speaker does not intend to refer to a particular telephone. Thus, the use of referential *this* is infelicitous in this sentence. These examples reveal that referential *this* bears the feature [+specific]. For this reason, it cannot be used in [-specific] contexts. On the contrary, the indefinite article *a/an* is not marked for SPECIFICITY, and as Fodor and Sag (1982) indicates English indefinites can have both *referential (specific)* and *quantificational (non-specific)* readings as in (13a) and (13b) respectively:

(13) a. *specific (referential) indefinite*

A man just proposed to me in the orangery (though I'm much too embarrassed to tell you who it was).

b. *non-specific (quantificational) indefinite*

A man is in the women's bathroom (but I haven't dared to go in there and see who it is).

(Fodor and Sag,1982, ex. 7 and 8, cited in Ionin *et al.,* 2003: 246)

In (13a), the speaker refers to a particular man, and therefore the referent of the indefinite NP 'A man' is [+specific]. In (13b), on the other hand, the identity of the referent is not important and reference is not directed to a particular man, thus the indefinite description 'A man' is non-specific in this sentence.

As with indefinite descriptions, definite descriptions can also have both [+specific] and [-specific] interpretations as illustrated in (14a) and (14b):

(14) a. I'd like to talk to **the winner of today's race** – she is my best friend!
b. I'd like to talk to **the winner of today's race** – whoever that is; I'm writing a story about this race for the newspaper.

(from Ionin *et al.,* 2004b: x)

In (14a), the speaker intends to refer to a particular individual whose identity is important from the speaker's perspective in that the referent has the noteworthy property of being the speaker's best friend. Hence, the NP in (14a) is both [+definite] and [+specific]. In contrast, the referent of (14b) is not known by the speaker and its identity is irrelevant. Therefore, in this context, the definite NP is [-specific].

Based on the examples given above, Ionin *et al.* (2004b) conclude that the SPECIFICITY distinction operates independent of the DEFINITENESS distinction. That is, conditions on SPECIFICITY can be satisfied or not regardless of a definite or indefinite context.

2.3. Definiteness in Turkish

Göksel and Kerslake (2005) suggest that a definite NP refers to an entity or entities which the speaker assumes to be unambiguously identifiable by the hearer. Kornfilt (1997: 273) states that DEFINITENESS does not have overt markers in Turkish. If an NP is not marked with an indefinite determiner and can freely move within its clause, it is considered as definite. Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 323) also indicate that in order for an NP to be definite in Turkish, at least two conditions are to be satisfied: (1) the absence of an indefinite determiner, (2) accusative case marking where the NP is functioning as a direct object. The following sentence exemplifies this:

(15) Garson temiz tabak-lar-ı masa-ya koydu.

waiter clean plate-PL-ACC table-DAT put-PAST

'*The waiter* put *the clean plates* down on *the table*.'

In sentence (15), the direct object 'temiz tabakları' is marked with accusative case, and it is not modified by an indefinite determiner; therefore, it is assumed to bear the *uniqueness presupposition*, and accordingly has a definite interpretation. The noun 'Garson' is also definite because in Turkish a bare noun in subject position has an exclusively definite reading. Finally, the noun 'masaya' is definite, also due to the fact that it is not preceded by the indefinite determiner *bir*.

On the contrary, an NP is assumed to be unambiguously indefinite if it is modified by *bir* [4] (*i.e.,* a/an) or any other indefinite determiner as in (16):

(16) Çekmece-de **bir** defter bul-du-k.

drawer-LOC a notebook find-PAST-1PL

'We found *a* notebook in the drawer.'

Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 372) provide a similar example where a plural noun is preceded by the indefinite quantifier "some" as in example (17):

(17) Çekmecede **birtakım** defterler bulduk.

drawer-LOC some notebook-PL find-PAST-1PL.

'We found *some* notebooks in the drawer.'

---

[4] Kornfilt (1997) warns that in Turkish *bir* is used both as a determiner (*i.e.,* a/an) and as a numeral (*i.e.,* one). The author indicates that the position of *bir* within the NP has a decisive effect on its function as illustrated below:

(a) bir çürük elma	**(b)** çürük **bir** elma
one rotten apple	rotten **an** apple
'*one* rotten apple'	'*a* rotten apple'

In phrase (a), *bir* is placed initially and it precedes the adjective phrase therefore *bir* is interpreted as a numeral in this phrase. In (b), on the other hand, *bir* is placed between the adjective and the noun within the adjective phrase, thus it is considered as a determiner (*i.e.,* indefinite article). Kornfilt (1997) adds that in plural NPs, indefinite quantifiers like *bazı* (*i.e.,* some) indicate INDEFINITENESS as illustrated in (c):

(c) bazı elma –lar
some apple –PL.
'*some* apples'

(from Kornfilt 1997: 274; ex. 1015a, 1015b and 1016)

Göksel and Kerslake (2005) give further details about the representation of INDEFINITENESS in Turkish. They state that an NP including a cardinal or distributive numeral gains an indefinite reading if a definite determiner (*e.g.,* the, this, that *etc.*) is not present or the NP is not followed by the clitic *dA* as shown in (18):

(18) Çekmecede **dört (tane)** defter bulduk.

drawer-LOC four ENUM notebook find-PAST-1PL.

'We found *four* notebooks in the drawer.'

NPs with the plural marking –*lAr* are also regarded as indefinite in some contexts (*e.g.,* where they occur as non-case-marked direct objects) as illustrated in (19):

(19) Çekmecede defter-**ler** bulduk.

drawer-LOC notebook-PL find-PAST-1PL.

'We found *notebooks* in the drawer.'

In addition to the points stated above, in Turkish some other cues indicate whether an NP has a definite or indefinite reading:

2.3.1. Word Order

The position of the subject NP in the sentence may determine the referential status of that NP. The examples below illustrate this:

(20) a. Buradan **hırsız** girmiş. (cf. (43))

here-ABL burglar(s) get in-REP. PAST

'*A burglar/Burglars* got in through here.'

b. **Hırsız** buradan girmiş.

burglar here-ABL get in-REP. PAST

'*The burglar* got in through here.'

(21) a. Arka sıra-lar-da **öğrenci-ler** otur-acak.

back row-PL-LOC student-PL sit-FUT

(i) '*Students* will sit in the back rows.'

(ii) 'It's *the students* who will sit in the back rows.'

b. **Öğrenciler** arka sıralarda oturacak.

student-PL back row-PL-LOC sit-FUT

'*The students* will sit in the back rows.'

In (20a) where the non-plural marked subject NP is placed just before the verb, the NP has a categorical[5] reading. In (20b) on the other hand, it has a definite interpretation since it is sentence-initial, and in Turkish subject NPs placed at the beginning of a sentence are generally regarded as definite. Likewise, in (21a) where the plural-marked subject NP is placed pre-verbally, the subject NP (*i.e.,* öğrenciler) has an indefinite or (contrastive) definite reading. Nevertheless, in (21b), it has an exclusively definite reading because it is placed at the beginning of the sentence.

Tura (1973) provides similar examples to show the word order effect on referentiality status of NPs in Turkish:

> **(22)** a. Çocuk yerde yatıyordu.
>
> child ground-LOC lie-PROG-PAST
>
> '*The child* was lying on the ground.'
>
> b. Yerde çocuk yatıyordu.
>
> ground-LOC child lie-PROG-PAST.
>
> 'On the ground *a child* was lying.' or
>
> 'On the ground *children* were lying.'

In (22a) the subject NP 'çocuk' is placed sentence-initial, thus it is definite. This use suggests that the referent is known by both the speaker and the hearer. In (22b), it immediately precedes the verb, and therefore it is indefinite.

2.3.2. Stress Patterns

In a sentence with only a plural-marked subject NP and a verb, stress patterns determine the referential status:

---

[5] Göksel and Kerslake (2005) indicate that a categorical NP refers to "an unspecified quantity, or number of items of a certain kind, or an unspecified quantity of a certain substance". As opposed to generic NPs, categorical NPs do not refer to a whole class of entities. In addition, categorical NPs (1) cannot be modified by determiners, (2) cannot be plural marked, (3) must be placed pre-verbally when used as subjects and (4) unless topicalized, should not be conjugated with the accusative case marker when used as direct objects as in the following examples:

(1) Şu anda konuşamayacağım, **müşteri** var.
'I can't talk now; I've got *customers/a customer*.'
(2) O gün **kar** yağmıştı.
'*Snow* had fallen on that day.'

(from Göksel and Kerslake, 2005: 328, ex. 30 and 31).

(23) a. Rapor**LAR** yazıldı.

Report-PL write-PASS-PAST

'*Reports* were written.'

b. Raporlar yazıl**DI**.

Report-PL write-PASS-PAST

'*The reports* were written.'

In the examples above, sentence (23a) has an indefinite interpretation because the stress is on the subject NP (*i.e.,* Rapor**LAR**) itself. In (23b), the stress is placed on the verb (*i.e.,* yazıl**DI**), therefore the subject NP gains a definite reading.

2.3.3. Tense, Aspect and Modality

Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 334) suggest that tense, aspect and modality is the most important indicator of referential status. It distinguishes between definite and generic readings of a NP as shown in (24):

(24) a. **Bilgisayar** hepimizin işini kolaylaştır**dı**.

computer all of us-GEN work-3SG-POSS-ACC make easier-PAST

'*The computer* has made things easier for all of us.'

b. **Bilgisayar** Kenan'ın odasına kon**du**.

computer Kenan-GEN room-3SG-POSS-DAT put-PAST

'*The computer* was put in Kenan's room.'

In both (24a) and (24b), the verbs 'kolaylaştır**dı**' and 'kon**du**' have perfective aspect. Perfective aspect (*i.e., DI*, *mIş*) or future tense (*i.e., (y)AcAK*) are usually not compatible with a generic reading; however, since the predicate (*i.e.,* kolaylaştır**dı**) of (24a) can be applied holistically to an entire class of entities, in this sentence, the subject NP (*i.e.,* Bilgisayar) may denote either a generic (computers in general) or definite (a particular computer) reading depending on the context. On the contrary, the subject NP (*i.e.,* Bilgisayar) in (24b) has a definite interpretation because the predicate 'kon**du**' refers to an individual entity (a particular computer) not to an entire class (computers in general).

The aorist marking *(A/I)r/-mAz* expresses general or permanent states, and a bare generic subject almost always appears in sentences including predicates with the aorist marking. At the same time, Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 335) state that the

aorist marking also indicates the characteristic behavior or qualities of an individual. Thus, it may render a subject NP both indefinite and definite as shown in (25i) and (25ii) respectively:

> **(25) Kedi** süt iç**er**.
>
> cat milk drink-AOR
>
> (i) '*Cats* drink milk.'/'A *cat* drinks milk.'
>
> (ii) '*The cat* drinks milk.'

When the predicate of the same sentence is conjugated with the present continuous tense marker *-(I)yor* instead of the aorist marker *(A/I)r/-mAz* on the other hand, the subject NP gains an exclusively definite interpretation as in (26):

> **(26) Kedi** süt iç*iyor*.
>
> cat milk drink-PROG
>
> '*The cat* is drinking (some) milk.'

The accounts given above hold for nominal sentences, as well:

> **(27)** a. **Hanımeli**-nin koku-su çok güzel.
>
> honeysuckle-GEN smell-3SG.POSS very beautiful
>
> 'The smell of *(the) honeysuckle* is lovely.'
>
> b. **Hanımeli**nin kokusu çok güzel-**dir**.
>
> honeysuckle-GEN smell-3SG.POSS very beautiful-GM
>
> 'The smell of *honeysuckle* is lovely.'
>
> c. **Hanımeli**nin kokusu çok güzel-*di*.
>
> honeysuckle-GEN smell-3SG.POSS very beautiful-P.COP
>
> 'The smell of *the honeysuckle* was lovely.'

In (27a), the nominal predicate 'güzel' is not followed by the generalizing modality marker –DIr hence the processor/modifier 'hanımelinin' may be interpreted either as generic (honeysuckle plants in general) or as definite (a particular honeysuckle plant). In (27b), the generalizing modality marker –DIr is attached to the nominal predicate 'güzeldir', which leads to a generic interpretation. As with the verbal predicate illustrated in (24b) (*i.e.,* kondu) the nominal predicate with perfective aspect in (27c) (*i.e.,* güzeldi) favors a definite reading in which the NP 'hanımelinin' refers to a particular honeysuckle plant.

2.4. Specificity in Turkish

One of the most cited accounts about SPECIFICITY and its representation in Turkish comes from Enç (1991). Enç (1991: 2) opposes to the view minimizing SPECIFICITY to "simply the wide-scope reading of an NP" on the grounds that it does not fully capture the notion of SPECIFICITY. The researcher suggests that SPECIFICITY should be identified independent of scope relations.

Enç (1991) states that in English, SPECIFICITY is assumed to be signaled only through adjectives like 'certain', 'specific' and 'particular' while indefinites without such adjectives are ambiguous between specific and non-specific interpretations. The researcher maintains that, in some other languages on the other hand, certain positions and case marking indicate SPECIFICITY. For instance, in Turkish a NP in the direct object position is assumed to be obligatorily specific if it bears the accusative case marking *-(y)i*, and obligatorily non-specific if it is non-accusative marked as shown in (28) and (29), respectively:

> **(28)** Ali bir piyano-yu kiralamak istiyor.
>
> Ali one piano-ACC to-rent want-PROG
>
> 'Ali wants to rent *a certain piano*.'

> **(29)** Ali bir piyano kiralamak istiyor.
>
> Ali one piano to-rent want-PROG
>
> 'Ali wants to rent *a (non-specific) piano*.'

In (28), the direct object NP (*i.e.,* bir piyano-yu) is accusative marked therefore it denotes a specific entity (a particular piano). The direct object in (29) (*i.e.,* bir piyano), in contrast, is non-accusative marked, and as a result it does not refer to a specific entity.

Adopting a more cautious approach as to the role of accusative case, Göksel and Kerslake (2005) indicate that in a limited range of contexts accusative marked object NPs in Turkish favor a specific reading as demonstrated in (30):

> **(30)** Gürcistan folkloruyla ilgili bir kitab-ı arıyorum.
>
> Georgian folklore-3SG.POSS-CONJ about one book-ACC look
>
> for-PROG-1SG

'I'm looking for *a [certain] book* about Georgian folklore.'

In the example above, the accusative case marked NP (*i.e.,* kitabı) implies that the speaker has a specific book in mind. Below, in sentence (31), on the other hand, the bare NP (*i.e.,* kitap) refers to *any* book about Georgian folklore, and therefore has a non-specific reading:

(31) Gürcistan folkloruyla ilgili bir kitap arıyorum.

Georgian folklore-3SG.POSS-CONJ about one book look for-PROG-1SG

'I'm looking for *a book* about Georgian folklore.'

In Enç's (1991) view, DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY are intertwined. Following Heim (1982) and Kamp (1981), Enç (1991) advocates a view of DEFINITENESS in which all definites meet the familiarity condition, and the indefinites satisfy the novelty condition. In this regard, the researcher states that (1991: 7):

> *"All indefinites in a sentence must be familiar, in the sense that they must introduce into the domain of discourse referents that were not previously in the discourse. All definites must be familiar, in the sense that the discourse referents they are mapped onto must have been previously introduced into the discourse. In other words, indefinites cannot have antecedents in the discourse, whereas definites must."*

Based on these accounts, the researcher indicates that both DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY require D-linking, and the nature of D-linking distinguishes between the two notions. While DEFINITENESS entails the *identity relation* for D-linking, SPECIFICITY requires the *inclusion relation*. On this view, the discourse referents of both definite and specific NPs must be linked to previously established discourse referents. The referents of indefinite and non-specific NPs, on the other hand, must not be D-linked to a discourse referent in a previously given set. Enç (1991) holds that it is the accusative case marker that triggers D-linking and establishes familiarity in Turkish. Hence, all accusative case marked NPs are obligatorily specific, and all the non-accusative marked NPs are non-specific.

Görgülü (2009) comes up with a counter argument and argues that accusative case marking is not a prerequisite for establishing familiarity and denoting DEFINITENESS or SPECIFICITY in Turkish. That is, not every accusative marked

NP in Turkish has to be discourse familiar by virtue of being co-referential with a NP in previous discourse. As a result, contra Enç (1991), the researcher maintains that not all NPs that bear the accusative case marker indicate SPECIFICITY in Turkish. He gives the following examples to illustrate that:

(32) Ülke-deki en iyi *doktor-u* bulmak isti-yor-um.

country most best doctor-ACC find want-PROG-1SG

Henüz başar-a-ma-dı-m.

yet succeed-ABIL-NEG-PAST-1SG

'I want to find the best doctor in the country. I have not been able

to succeed yet'

(33) Cem ilk gör-düğü *araba-yı* beğen-di.

Cem first see-NMN car-ACC like-PAST

'Cem liked the first car he saw.'

Although the NPs in the object positions in (32) and (33) are both accusative marked, neither is co-referential and neither denotes a specific entity, thus the accusative case marker does not necessarily denote discourse familiarity or SPECIFICITY. Özge (2011) also opposes to the view that equates D-linking with SPECIFICITY, and supports Görgülü (2009) with the following examples:

(34) a. John bir işadamın-ı kaçırmış.

John a businessman-ACC kidnap-REP. PAST

'John has kidnapped a businessman'

b. John bir avukat-ı dolandırmış.

John a lawyer-ACC swindle- REP. PAST

'John has swindled a lawyer.'

In (34a) and (34b), the object NPs 'işadamını' and 'avukatı' bear the accusative case marker but they do not necessarily refer to specific individuals. The businessman and lawyer mentioned do not have to belong to a set of previously mentioned individuals, and these NPs can well be used as discourse initiators. Hence, Özge (2011: 255) suggests that "Accusative marking does not necessarily induce D-linking" and "non-D-linked Acc-indefinites are also possible." In this line, Özge (2011: 266) maintains that "Enç's (1991) notion of D-linking does not uniformly

apply to Acc-marked indefinites, but is highly contingent on contextual factors". A supporting statement about the prominence of context comes from Tura (1973: 3) who indicates that "[…] without considering the corresponding contextual features of discourse in Turkish and English, it is impossible to interpret noun phrases properly and transfer them meaningfully from either language".

Enç's (1991) association of SPECIFICITY with D-linking is obviously rooted in the notion of PARTITIVITY[6], and the researcher assumes that "accusative case marked objects in Turkish are specific and that semantically they are interpreted as partitives". She provides the following examples to support her argument:

(35) Odama birkaç çocuk girdi.

    room-1SG POSS-DAT several children enter-PAST

(36) a. *İki kız-ı* tanıyordum.

      two girl-ACC know-PROG-PAST-1SG

  b. *İki kız* tanıyordum.

     two girl know-PROG-PAST-1SG

Enç (1991) indicates that the accusative case marking on the NP in (36a) (*i.e.,* iki kızı) suggests that the two girls talked about in this sentence belong to the set of children mentioned earlier in (35). The girls talked about in (36b), on the other hand, are excluded from the set of children mentioned in (35) because the NP 'iki kız' does not bear the accusative case marker. Therefore, (36b) is not a felicitous continuation to the utterance in (35). On the contrary, (36a) has a covert partitive reading, and is equivalent to (37) which includes a partitive NP:

(37) *Kızlardan ikisini* tanıyordum.

    girl-PL-ABL two-3SG POSS-ACC know-PROG-PAST-1SG

Görgülü (2009) maintains that Enç's (1991) referring to the accusative case marker as a means of D-linking to previous discourse leads to the assumption that NPs that do not bear the accusative case marker cannot introduce entities from an immediately previous discourse. The researcher opposes to this argument and

---

[6] Ko, Perovic, Ionin and Wexler (2008) regard PARTITIVITY as a sub-type of presuppositionality. The reserachers define presuppositionality as:
"If DP of the form [D NP] is [+presuppositional], then the speaker assumes that the hearer shares the presupposition of the existence of a unique individual in the set denoted by NP." Nevertheless, as the researchers also suggest, Enç (1991) equates PARTITIVITY with SPECIFICITY.

maintains that non-accusative case marked NPs may also introduce NPs from a previously given discourse and gives the following example based on Enç (1991) to illustrate that:

(38) Odama birkaç çocuk girdi.

    My room-1SG POSS-DAT several child enter-PAST

'Several children entered my room.'

(39) a. *İki kız-ı* tanı-yor-du-m.

    two girl-ACC know-PROG-PAST-1SG

'I knew two girls.'

  b. *İki kız* tanı-yor-du-m.

    two girl know-PROG-PAST-1SG

'I knew two girls.'

(40) İçlerinden *iki kız* tanı-yor-dum.

    Among them two girl know-PROG-PAST-1SG

'Among them, I knew two girls.'

Unlike Enç's account of the non-accusative marked NP in (39b), Görgülü (2009) suggests that the non-accusative case marked NP in (40) still refers to the set of children talked about in (38) due to the prepositional phrase 'İçlerinden'. This example suggests that a NP may belong to a set of entities in previously introduced discourse despite the lack of accusative case marker.

Göksel and Kerslake (2005) contribute to the accounts regarding the nature of the accusative case marking attached to indefinite object NPs in Turkish. They state that accusative marker is not necessarily linked to SPECIFICITY as shown in the following examples:

(41) a. Bazen masaya bir örtü yayardık.

    sometimes table-DAT a cloth spread-AOR-PAST-1PL

'Sometimes we would spread *a cloth* on the table.'

  b. Bazen masaya sarı çiçeklerle işlenmiş bir örtü-**yü** yayardık.

    sometimes table-DAT yellow flower-PL embroider-PART a cloth-ACC spread-AOR-PAST

'Sometimes we would spread on the table *a cloth embroidered with*

yellow flowers.'

c. Bazen masaya Ayşe-nin biz-e Meksika-dan getir-diğ-i bir örtü-**(yü)**

yayardık.

sometimes table-DAT Ayşe-GEN we-DAT Mexico-ABL bring-

PART-3SG POSS a cloth-ACC spread-AOR-PAST

'Sometimes we would spread on the table *a cloth that Ayşe had*

brought us from Mexico.'

The three sentences above show a gradation of SPECIFICITY from totally ambiguous (a) to unambiguously specific (c). In (41a) no descriptor modifying the object NP is available therefore the use of accusative case is not an obligatory requirement. In (41b) the NP is accusative marked and modified with a detailed description. Thus, it most probably refers to a specific entity. The NP in (41c) bears accusative case as well, and both the case marking and the relative clause render the NP specific. Göksel and Kerslake (2005) state that the non-accusative-marked versions of these sentences are equally felicitous, and that even when they do not bear the accusative case marker, the object NPs in (41b) and (41c) still have a specific interpretation. The researchers further provide the following examples on the functions of the accusative marker in Turkish:

(**42**) a. Program-da bazı değişiklik-ler yap-ma-mız gerek-ebil-ir.

programme-LOC some change-PL make-VN-1PL POSS be

necessary-PSB-AOR

'It may be necessary for us to make *some changes* to the programme.'

b. Programda şu anda akılda olmayan bazı değişiklik-ler**-i** yapmamız

gerekebilir.

program-LOC this moment-LOC mind-LOC be-NEG-SBJP some

change-PL-ACC make-VN-1PL POSS be necessary-PSB-AOR

'It may be necessary for us to make *some changes to the programme*

that are currently unpredictable.'

c. Programda yetkililerin istediği bazı değişiklikler**-i** yapmamız

gerekebilir.

program-LOC authority-PL want-FNOM some change-PL-ACC

make-VN-1PL POSS be necessary-PSB-AOR

'It may be necessary for us to make *some changes to the programme*

that are required by the authorities.'

All three sentences in (42) are modalized statements expressing a conjecture about the future. Hence, despite the accusative marking in (42b) and (42c), the indefinite direct object NPs in (42) can only be interpreted as non-specific. Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 327) suggest that as in (41), in these sentences the accusative case marking is a "function of the complexity of the noun phrase itself" rather than an indicator of SPECIFICITY.

Drawing on the examples reported above, it is fair to state that accusative case marker alone does not indicate SPECIFICITY or DEFINITENESS. Rather, as Özge (2011) suggests referentiality status is best interpreted in relation to the context of a given NP.

Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 325) give further details about the SPECIFICITY status of indefinite NPs irrespective of accusative case marking. The researchers indicate that an indefinite NP can refer either to a specific entity as in (43) and (44) or a non-specific as in (45) and (46):

(43) Dün sokakta çok eski **bir** arkadaşım-la karşılaştım.

yesterday very old a friend-CONJ come across-PAST-1SG

'Yesterday I bumped into *a* very old friend of mine in the street.'

(44) Yarınki toplantıya **birkaç** kişi gelemeyecekmiş.

tomorrow-ADJ meeting-DAT several people come-PSB-NEG-FUT-REP.PAST

'It seems *several* people are not going to be able to get to the meeting tomorrow.'

(45) Daha büyük **bir** araba almay-ı düşünüyoruz.

more large a car buy-ACC think-PROG-2PL

'We're thinking of buying *a* larger car.'

(46) Yeni **bir** şey söyle-me-di.

new a thing say-NEG-PF

'He didn't say *any*thing new.'

In (43) and (44), the indefinite NPs (*i.e.,* 'çok eski **bir** arkadaşımla' and '**birkaç** kişi') are newly introduced into the discourse. Their referents are known by the speaker but assumed to be unfamiliar to the hearer. In addition, the speaker most probably has a particular individual(s) in her/his mind. Therefore, these indefinite NPs encode specific entities. In (45) and (46), on the other hand, the indefinite NPs (*i.e.,* 'Daha büyük **bir** araba' and 'Yeni **bir** şey') are unknown by the speaker and the hearer, and the speaker does not seem to refer to particular entities. Therefore the NPs in these sentences are indefinite and non-specific. In addition, sentence (45) exemplifies a future hypothetical construction, and sentence (46) is a negative construction. The researchers state that non-specific indefinites commonly occur in such constructions and in questions.

Some other constructions also constitute clues as to whether an indefinite NP is specific or non-specific in Turkish:

If the object NP is plural marked and is not preceded by a determiner, it has an indefinite specific reading as in (47):

(47) Dün Korkut-a **yeni gömlek-*ler*** al-dı-k.

yesterday Korkut-DAT new shirt-PL buy-PAST-1PL

'Yesterday we bought *(some) new shirts* for Korkut.'

In (47), the object NP 'yeni gömlekler' bears the plural marking (*i.e., -ler*), and it has no determiner. Hence, the indefinite object NP (*i.e.,* shirts) refers to specific entities.

On the other hand, when the predicate is changed and the NP gains a non-specific interpretation, categorical form would be preferred to indefinite form as in (48):

(48) a. Korkut'a **yeni gömlek** almamız lazım.

Korkut-DAT new shirt buy-ANOM-3PL need to

'We need to get *a new shirt/(some) new shirts* for Korkut.'

b. Korkut'a **yeni gömlek** almadık.

Korkut-DAT new shirt buy-NEG-PAST-1PL

'We didn't buy Korkut *[any] new shirts.*'

c. Korkut'a **yeni gömlek** aldın mı?

Korkut-DAT new shirt buy-PAST-2SG Q

'Did you buy Korkut *[a] new shirt/[any] new shirts*?'

In (48a), the predicate is modalized therefore the object NP is categorical and has a non-specific interpretation. Similarly, in (48b), the predicate is negative hence the object NP is categorical and non-specific. (48c) is a question therefore the NP talked about is again non-specific and categorical.

In sentences with a relative clause, if the relativized constituent has a non-specific reading, the omission of 'olan' is preferred in verbs of the form '*-mIş olan*' or '*-(y)AcAk olan*' as in (49):

(49) a. Masaya **bırakılmış** bir not yeterli olurdu.

table-DAT leave-PASS-PPART a note enough be-AOR-PAST

'A note *left* on the table would have been enough.'

b. Masaya **bırakılmış** *olan* bir not-ta kaloriferler, çöplerin toplanması, pencerelerin kilitlenmesi gibi konularda bilgiler vardı.

table-DAT leave-PASS-PPART be-SBJP a note-LOC central heating-PL rubbish-GEN collect-ANOM-3SG window-PL-GEN lock- ANOM-3SG such as issue-PL-LOC information-PL exist-PAST

'In a note *that had been left* on the table there was information about the central heating, rubbish collection, locking of windows, etc.'

(49a) refers to a hypothetical situation and no note has been left thus the NP is non-specific and the word 'olan', one of the elements of the relative clause, is omitted. (49b) on the other hand, has an affirmative past tense predicate (*i.e.,* vardı) and refers to a real situation in which a specific note has been left. Hence, the NP in (49a) favors an indefinite non-specific interpretation whereas in (49b) it has an indefinite specific reading.

Based on the discussion about the representation of DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY in Turkish, it is clear that these semantic universals are expressed through the same means (*i.e.,* accusative case marker, word order, tense, aspect and modality etc.). Nevertheless, such cues alone do not indicate (NON)SPECIFICITY or (IN)DEFINITENESS. To determine the referentiality status of an NP in Turkish,

DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY should be considered in relation to the context in which that NP appears.

CHAPTER 3
LITERATURE REVIEW

3. Introduction

Article acquisition has been a very fruitful research topic in the domain of Second Language Acquisition (henceforth SLA). This topic has aroused interest in many researchers resulting in a myriad of studies. The studies in this area have dealt with various aspects of article acquisition. Some researchers have explored the developmental stages in article acquisition by child and adult populations, both in L1 and in L2 (Brown, 1973; Maratsos, 1976; Warden, 1976; Zehler and Brewer, 1980; Huebner, 1985; Master, 1987; Thomas, 1989; Zdorenko and Paradis, 2008, 2011 and Morales, 2011 among others). Some researchers have inquired the role of semantic features and L1 interference in article acquisition (Ionin, 2003; Ionin *et al.,* 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009; Snape, 2005; Hawkins *et al.,* 2006; Kim and Lakshmanan, 2008 and Sarko, 2009 among others). Still others have attempted to provide pedagogical guidelines geared to teach the unanimously difficult English article system to L2 learners (Whitman, 1974; McEldowney, 1977; Pica, 1983 and Master, 1988, 1990, 1997, 2003 among others).

This chapter is an overview of prominent work in article acquisition**.** Firstly, studies on L2 child article acquisition and child-adult article acquisition comparisons will be reported. The studies that deal with article semantics and the classification of articles will be presented next. After that, article acquisition studies with a generative perspective will be reviewed. Finally, studies that have pedagogical concerns will be reported.

In their longitudinal study, Zdorenko and Paradis (2008) examined child L2 English article acquisition with the following rationale:

> *"Child L2 acquisition is a good testing ground for investigating structures that are problematic for all learners of a language, because it enables us to determine whether difficulties with a target structure are inherent in the process of learning that structure, rather than stemming from cognitive immaturity (i.e.,*

L1 acquisition), on the one hand, or age-based limitations for native-like attainment (i.e., adult L2 acquisition), on the other (compare Schwartz, 2004)."

(Zdorenko and Paradis, 2008: 228-229).

The researchers aimed to investigate article acquisition of both [+ART] and [-ART][7] L1 child learners of L2 English and determine whether L1 transfer, fluctuation or both have a role in child article acquisition. They also attempted to explore whether there would be any parallels between their findings and the results of previous adult L2 English article acquisition studies. With these aims in mind, they collected data from [-ART] (*i.e.,* Chinese, Korean and Japanese) and [+ART] (*i.e.,* Spanish, Romanian and Arabic) L1 child learners over an approximate period of two years. The number of the subjects was 17 and they were children of various families who had newly immigrated to Canada. The researchers collected data from the subjects every six months at five rounds. At the initial stage of the data collection procedure, the mean age of the participants was 5.4, and they had been exposed to English for nine months. At the end of this process, the mean age was 7.4 and the mean length of exposure to English was almost three years (34 months). The children were presented with two picture books and asked to tell the stories depicted. Each session was videotaped and the narratives were transcribed. Article usage of the subjects in these narratives was then analyzed. The use of *a, the* and the *zero article* in the first and subsequent mentions of the NPs were analyzed. Only singular common nouns were included in the analysis and the article usages in two main contexts (*i.e.,* definite and indefinite) were examined. Due to the task's nature, all the contexts were specific, thus the researchers could not make a specific/non-specific distinction. As a result, instances of fluctuation were expected only in specific indefinite contexts in the form of 'the' misuse. The results demonstrated that all through the sessions, both [-ART] and [+ART] groups, could use the definite article more accurately than the indefinite article. This revealed that L1 background did not influence article acquisition much and that article type mattered more in acquisition patterns and rates. The results also showed that substitution of 'the' for 'a' was by far the most frequent error for both L1 background groups; that is, L1 transfer effects were not observed much. Article omission, on the other hand, appeared more frequently in the data provided by the [-ART] group. This error did not emerge much

---

[7] [+ART] languages refer to languages which have an article system while [-ART] languages denote those that do not include an article system.

subsequent to Round 2, which indicated it was peculiar to early stages of acquisition. Overall, the findings revealed both similarities and differences between child and adult populations. On the one hand, both child and adult learners of article and article-less L1 backgrounds seemed to achieve a higher accuracy rate in the use of 'the' than in 'a'. Similarly, the [-ART] child participants exhibited more omissions of articles than their [+ART] counterparts, duplicating the results found in adult learner studies. On the other hand, unlike [+ART] L1 adult L2 English learners who transferred the article semantics of their L1s to L2 English article acquisition (*e.g.,* Ionin *et al.,* 2008), children with a [+ART] L1 in this study did not rely on their mother tongue in article choice and underwent fluctuation just as children with [-ART] L1s did. That is, fluctuation overrode L1 transfer. In addition, unlike the adult learners with non-article L1s in Hawkins *et al.* (2006), the participants with non-article L1s in this study did not differ significantly from their counterparts whose L1 has articles in terms of developmental patterns and accuracy rates. Furthermore, child learners appeared to acquire the English article system faster than the adult learners reported in prior studies.

In another study, Zdorenko and Paradis (2011) set out to investigate the same issues with child L1 and child L2 English learners. The researchers attempted to find out whether there were any parallels between these two groups in terms of article acquisition/error patterns and whether the L1 has any effects on L2-English article choice. The participants were 40 child L2 learners living in Edmonton, Canada and had a range of 2-18 months of exposure to English. They belonged to different L1 backgrounds with articles and no-articles (Spanish and Arabic; Mandarin/Cantonese, Hindi/Urdu/Punjabi) and were divided into groups accordingly. The story-telling task mentioned in the former study (Zdorenko and Paradis, 2008) was employed by the investigators as a data collection instrument. The findings showed that the participants were more accurate in their use of the definite *the* than the indefinite *a* following the developmental pattern their L1 English counterparts demonstrated in previous studies of L1 English acquisition. Likewise, substitution of *the* was more common than substitution of *a* in the data elicited from the participants. Moreover, as shown in previous L1 English acquisition studies (Brown, 1973; Maratsos, 1974; Schafer and de Villiers, 2000), L2 English child learners also seemed to have less difficulty acquiring the SPECIFICITY distinction. Regarding the L1 influence in

child L2 English acquisition of articles, L1 interference appeared in the form of article omissions in the production of Chinese and Hindi/Urdu/Punjabi participants, whose L1s lack articles. This finding was consistent with the findings regarding adult L2 English article acquisition. On the other hand, all children including Spanish-speaking children, whose L1 has an article system similar to that of English, had problems in supplying *a* in indefinite contexts. Unlike adult L1 Spanish speakers of L2 English, child L1 Spanish speakers appeared to omit the indefinite article. These seemingly inconsistent L1 transfer patterns led the researchers to assume L1-transfer in child L2 English acquisition is more limited than in adult L2 English acquisition. They observed that child speakers of L1 Spanish transferred the DP structure, but not the semantic distinctions between definites and indefinites from their L1. On the contrary, adult L2 English learners whose L1s had an article system manifested target-like article usage transferring the semantics of articles from their L1s. In this sense, child L2 learners who have an L1 with articles diverged from the adult participants with an article-L1 reported in former studies. Based on a comparison of these findings with the findings of previous child L1 and adult L2 acquisition studies, the researchers reached the conclusion that "due to the interface nature of the phenomenon", L2 child article acquisition could share features of both child L1 and adult L2 article acquisition patterns in different domains of the process.

Zehler and Brewer (1980) were also interested in article acquisition of child and adult learners. They aimed to compare article acquisition from the first moments it appears in child language acquisition and on, as well as in adults. To this end, the authors worked with 10 younger age and 10 older age children besides 20 adults. The mean age was 2.8 in younger age participants and 3.2 in the older age group. The child subjects were all from day care centers in the Champaign-Urbana area, and the adult subjects were college students. The data collection instruments were designed to elicit the use of *a, the* and the *zero article* in introduction/anaphoric reference, context frame and generic contexts. Since the researchers were interested in both eliciting naturalistic data, and at the same time having control over participants' production, play sessions where certain sentences would be produced were organized. By using toys, the researchers set contexts directed to elicit the relevant article. They formed one or more sentences about a toy, and left the last sentence with a slot to be filled by the child participants. Thus, the test was designed as a

sentence completion task. The adult participants were presented with the same sentences in a booklet form and asked to complete the sentences as if they were producing them in natural contexts. The responses of adults provided a baseline for evaluating the child participants' data. The results showed that *a* and the *zero article* appeared at early stages of child article acquisition, followed by *the*. *A* was still accurately used when *the* began to appear in the production of the more mature children. Nevertheless, after having acquired and used *the* appropriately in necessary contexts, the most mature children were observed to overuse this article selectively in the context-non-specific category which required *a*. This pattern displayed by the most mature children, compared to that of the less mature ones, led the researchers to rule out the egocentrism view supported by researchers like Maratsos (1976) and Warden (1976). Instead, the researchers put forward that the advanced child participants may have adopted adult participants' patterns, and thereby used the definite article in context-unique and context-intermediate categories. However, unlike the adults, the children extended the use of the definite article to the context-non-specific category, as well and this resulted in overuse of *the*. In sum, *a* and the *zero article* were found to be the first articles to emerge in younger children's data. *The* emerged in later stages, contrary to Zdorenko and Paradis (2008, 2011) who found a reverse trend in their studies. Nevertheless, a period of *the* overuse by the more mature children was also observed. Since this trend occurred in only one category, researchers rejected the egocentrism view, and attributed this pattern to the overextension of adult patterns. This study provided evidence to the line of thought that erroneous child article usage cannot be linked to the egocentrism view which was widely accepted in previous studies. Rather, as some other researchers contend (*e.g.,* Schaeffer and Mathewson, 2005; Ionin *et al.,* 2009) some pragmatic or semantic factors may be at play.

Morales (2011) dealt with the UG-regulated processes in L2 English learners' article acquisition in line with Ionin *et al.*'s proposals (2004a, 2004b, 2008). Focusing on child L2 article acquisition, the researcher attempted to explore whether the FH holds for child L2 English learners whose L1 (Spanish in this case) has an article system based on the DEFINITENESS setting. 30 Spanish-speaking children learning English as an L2 and a small control group containing 5 native child speakers of English participated in the study. The participants were chosen based on

Schwartz's (2003) definition of *L2 child*. Thus, their age range was between 8 and 10, the mean age being 9 years old for the experiment group and 9.02 for the control group. Length of exposure to English was also a criterion in choosing the participants. The experiment group had a mean of 4.6 years of exposure to English at the time of testing. A fill-in-the blanks task designed by Ionin *et al.* (2004a) was used to collect data. Originally, the test included 76 items; however, since the sample was composed of children, only 16 items were included in the study. These items were divided into four different semantic contexts; [+definite, +specific], [-definite, +specific], [+definite, -specific] and [-definite, -specific]. The participants were instructed in their L1 to fill in the blanks with the words they deemed most appropriate or leave it blank if no word was necessary. It was observed that the child learners could supply articles appropriately in general. Nevertheless, they were more accurate in supplying the definite article *the* than the indefinite *a*, in support of Maratsos (1976); Anderson (1978), Ionin *et al.,* (2004a), Lardiere (2004b), Robertson (2000), White (2003); and Ionin *et al.* (2009), Zdorenko and Paradis (2008) who found similar patterns in their studies with L1, adult L2 and child L2 learners, respectively. Although *the* overuse was observed in the [-definite, +specific] contexts as in Zdorenko and Paradis (2008) and Ionin *et al.* (2009), this observation was reported not to be statistically significant. That is, the participants were shown to be affected more by the DEFINITENESS feature than the SPECIFICITY feature. Finally, article omission, an error common among those whose L1s lack articles, did not occur in the participants' data.

Besides child article acquisition research, adult L2 English article acquisition has also been a widely addressed issue. Bickerton's (1981) and Huebner's (1983) studies regarding article acquisition were a milestone in this area. Bickerton (1981) proposed a framework whereby article choice is determined according to the semantic function of the NP. The researcher maintained that the semantic functions of [±Specific Referent] and [±Assumed known to the hearer] influence the interpretation of the NP as definite or indefinite. Elaborating on this work, Huebner (1983) developed a Semantic Wheel with different combinations of the features [±SR] and [±HK]. He offered four NP context types with the article(s) which are felicitous in these contexts. Bickerton's (1981) and Huebner's (1983) models have

proved to be well-accepted by many researchers, and formed a basis for numerous article acquisition studies.

Lu (2001) was among the researchers who adopted Bickerton's (1981) framework as a basis for their work. The authors drew attention to the fact that although Chinese learners are exposed to English articles at early stages of their English acquisition process, this domain remains one of the most problematic ones for them. Taking this case as a departure point, the researchers attempted to investigate L1 Chinese L2 English learners' article acquisition order and the processes involved in terms of article accuracy and use.

The study was carried out with the participation of 40 university and 15 high school students with L1 Mandarin Chinese. The ages of participants varied between 17 and 37. The participants were divided into advanced (n=21), upper-intermediate (n=19) and lower-intermediate (n=15) proficiency groups. A multiple-choice cloze test which was previously used by Yamada and Matsuura (1982), Master (1994), and Takahashi (1997) was utilized to collect data. The test instrument consisted of two parts; 28 discrete sentences and a paragraph. There were 58 blanks to be filled with the appropriate article. The participants were asked to circle the best choice among *a/an, the* and *Ø* on an answer sheet to complete the sentences. The results showed that the acquisition order across groups was *the=a>Ø* on the SOC (*i.e.,* Supplied in Obligatory Contexts) measure. According to this pattern *the* and *a* were acquired earlier than *zero article (Ø)*. This order appeared to be *the>a>Ø* on the TLU (*i.e.,* Target-Like Use) measure across all groups. According to the UOC (*i.e.,* Used in Obligatory Contexts) measure which accounts for overuse and underuse of an article, overuse of *a* decreased as proficiency increased whereas overuse of *zero article* correlated with proficiency. As for the association of articles with certain contexts, the findings of the study appeared to support Parrish (1987) and Thomas (1989). The UOC measure revealed that *the* was slightly overused in [+SR] contexts whereas it was underused in [+HK] contexts across the three proficiency groups. The misuse or overgeneralization of *the* for *a* or *zero article* was found to stem from Chinese learners' difficulty in distinguishing [±HK]. They also observed that Chinese learners had trouble in distinguishing countability of an NP, and therefore they substituted articles even when they could distinguish the [±HK] feature. They found that the learners misused *a* for *Ø* or vice versa in [+SR, -HK] contexts. Following Master

(1997), this observation was linked to participants' failure in distinguishing [±Countability] and [±HK] distinctions of an NP.

Another study with similar purposes was conducted by Chan (2005). Chan attempted to study Hong Kong students' English article acquisition from several perspectives such as the accuracy order, the developmental pattern of articles and noun phrase function relationship, the acquisition order of different uses of the definite article, and the task type effect. In addition to Bickerton's (1981) framework, the researcher also utilized Liu and Gleason's (2002) model. 20 L1 Chinese (Cantonese) learners of L2 English took part in the study. A story-retelling test and a grammatically judgment test were employed as data collection instruments. The elicited data were analyzed within the framework of Bickerton's (1981) and Liu and Gleason's (2002) models. The researcher observed that task type had an influence on correct article usage since the overall accuracy of the story-telling (production) task was higher than the grammatical judgment (objective) task. The order of accuracy also differed depending on the task. While the accuracy order was observed to be *the>Ø>a* on the story retelling task, it appeared to be *a>Ø>the* on the grammatical judgment task. As for the acquisition patterns, it emerged that, on the story retelling task, referential definites [+SR, +HK] and generics [-SR, +HK] were relatively easy, whereas referential indefinites [+SR, -HK] appeared to be the most difficult contexts. The findings were somehow reversed in the grammatical judgment test in that generics and referential definites were the most challenging categories for the students, whereas referential indefinite contexts were the ones with the second highest score. Overgeneralization of *the* was observed in the referential indefinite [+SR, -HK] context. Finally, the acquisition of the definite article appeared to be acquired with varying levels of difficulty. While the cultural and generic uses were the most difficult type of *the* use, textual use was found to be the easiest type, with the exact order being *cultural use>generic use>structural use>situational use>textual use*.

Yılmaz (2006) was among the researchers who explored L2 English article acquisition in relation to NP context type. The researcher sought to examine L1 Turkish learners' article usage within Bickerton's (1981) framework. While doing so, she laid focus on possible L1 transfer effects. She aimed to figure out whether L1 transfer influences learners' article choice or not. 40 adult participants, of whom 20

were beginner and 20 were advanced level learners contributed to the study. A fill-in-the-article, a written-production, and an elicited oral production task were employed as the data collection tools. The items of the fill-in-the-article task were constructed based upon three contexts from Bickerton's (1983) taxonomy: [+SR, +HK], [+SR, -HK] and [-SR, -HK]. Since generics were not within the scope of this study, the fourth category [-SR, +HK] was not included. The results revealed that learners from both groups were able to distinguish between semantic distinctions and different contexts in general. Thus, they could usually supply the target article. The rate of *the* omission was low in the fill-in-the-article task, which could be due to the task's nature. That is, as the researcher indicated, learners may have felt obliged to use an article in every context as an artifact of the task. In the other two tasks, *the* was omitted at a higher rate -particularly by beginner learners- in support of Huebner (1983), and Robertson (2000) who have shown articles to be omitted more frequently in spontaneous production (cf. Ionin *et al.,* 2008). In the fill-in-the-article task, *zero article* contexts were problematic for both groups. Learners tended to substitute *zero article* for *the* and at times for *a/an*. In on-line production task, *zero article* contexts were problematic only for the advanced learners who preferred to use *the* instead of *zero article*. Beginners were more successful but this could be a result of the high rate of article omission by these learners, as well. In the on-line production task, L1 transfer effects emerged. Both advanced and beginner groups seemed to omit *the* in subject NPs. In addition, advanced learners seemed to prefer *the* to the *zero article* with [+specific] object NPs. In the judgment task, no L1 transfer effects were observed. In sum, *zero* article was problematic for both groups supporting Liu and Gleason (2002), Ekiert (2004) and Siu (2010). Learners tended to use *the* in [-definite, +specific] and *zero article* contexts, and this suggests that they associated *the* with SPECIFICITY. No persistent L1 transfer effects were observed, and in general the advanced level learners had a higher rate of article usage accuracy.

The studies above dealt with L2 English article acquisition either in an EFL or an ESL setting[8]. Being interested in developmental patterns in L2 English acquisition like Lu (2001) and Chan (2005), and with the aim of examining the effects of different exposure settings (*i.e.,* EFL vs. ESL) on the order of article

---

[8] An ESL (English as a second language) setting is where English is taught to non-native learners in an English-speaking country. An EFL (English as a foreign language) setting, on the other hand, refers to a context where English is taught to non-native speakers in a non-English-dominant country.

acquisition, Ekiert (2004) investigated article acquisition of adult L1-Polish speakers both in EFL and ESL settings. The investigator worked with 10 adult L1 Polish learners of ESL, 10 adult L1 Polish learners of EFL and 5 native speakers of English as a control group. The ages of the participants ranged from early 20s to late 30s. A grammar placement test was administered to determine proficiency levels. According to this test, 3 learners fell into the low-ability, 3 into the intermediate-ability and 4 into the high-ability category. The data collection instrument included 42 sentences adapted from Goto Butler (2002), Liu and Gleason (2002), and Master (1994). The test was missing 75 obligatory articles (*i.e., a/an, the*, or *zero article*) across four NP contexts (*i.e.,* [-SR, +HK], [+SR, +HK], [+SR, -HK], and [-SR, -HK]) based on Huebner (1983). The test also included an additional context instantiating idiomatic and conventional uses as proposed by Goto Butler (2002) and Thomas (1989). The task was not designed as a fill-in-the-blanks test; instead, participants were instructed to insert articles wherever they felt necessary. The results revealed some similarities pertaining to the accuracy levels of both groups. For instance, participants from both ESL and EFL settings displayed the highest accuracy rate in the use of non-referential *a* and the *zero article*. Referential indefinites, which also required the use of *a* and the *zero article* proved to be more problematic for low-ability participants of both groups; however, the rates of correct article use in these settings increased in parallel with the L2 proficiency level. Different from prior research which showed that *the* is acquired earlier than *a*, the findings of the present study revealed that at early stages of acquisition, the indefinite *a* was dominant. This finding provided supporting evidence for Liu and Gleason (2002) and Young (1996), who found that *a* is acquired at early stages. As for the acquisition of the definite *the*, a U-shaped development seemed to emerge. The data provided by intermediate level learners included instances of *the* overuse, a pattern which suggested 'the-flooding' as in Huebner (1983) and Master (1987). It was observed that generics and idioms were the most problematic and lastly acquired NP environments in support of Thomas (1989), and Liu and Gleason (2002). Finally, overgeneralization of the *zero article* emerged across the three proficiency levels. The researcher favored Odlin's (1989) negative L1 transfer account for this case, and suggested that this also lends support to the idea that "interlanguage is a natural language" (Ekiert, 2004: 18). Thus, following Jarvis (2002: 416), the researcher indicated that the use of the *zero article* by [-ART] learners should not be regarded as a sign of ignorance or carelessness, but

as "quite intentional, or at least rule-governed" (cited in Ekiert, 2004:18). In sum, Ekiert's (2004) study revealed that setting did not have much an influence in article acquisition and usage. Both ESL and EFL learners followed a similar path while learning the English article system.

Like Ekiert (2004), Önen (2007) also adopted Huebner's (1983) semantic wheel as a theoretical framework to her study. The investigator attempted to explore L1Turkish EFL learners' article usage. She examined Turkish learners' article acquisition in relation to task type, proficiency level, and NP context within Huebner's (1983) model. She also tried to explore the types of article usage errors (*i.e.,* substitution vs. omission) made by the learners. With this purpose in mind, the researcher employed a written production task (henceforth WPT), and a multiple-choice task to beginner, intermediate, and advanced level participants as determined by means of a proficiency test. Each proficiency group consisted of 10 subjects whose ages ranged between 17 and 22. In the multiple-choice task that comprised of 44 sentences, subjects were expected to choose among *a/an, the*, and Ø to complete the given sentences. The sentences were adapted from Ekiert (2004). Two more items were adapted from Murcia and Freeman (1999), and another one from Hawkins (2001). All the sentences provided contexts for the four NP environments in Huebner's semantic wheel. A fifth environment including idiomatic and conversational uses of articles was added as in previous studies (*e.g.,* Ekiert, 2004; Goto Butler, 2002; and Thomas, 1989). In the written production task, subjects were presented with two topics. They were asked to choose one and write a one-page essay about it. The results showed that the NP context influenced learners' accuracy of article usage. In the multiple-choice task, learners' correct article usage rate was highest in [+SR, -HK] contexts, and lowest in [-SR, +HK] contexts. Their performance in [+SR, +HK] and [-SR, -HK] contexts did not differ much. As for the WPT, the context type did not seem to have much influence on article usage accuracy. Nevertheless, learners were more accurate in [-SR, +HK], and less accurate in [+SR, +HK] contexts. The researcher warned that the findings related to the WPT should be approached with caution since the WPT did not generate enough contexts. Thus, she indicated, reliable generalization could not be drawn from these findings. The order of accuracy observed in Önen's study diverged from previous research (*e.g.,* Huebner, 1983; Master, 1997) which showed that *the* is acquired earlier than

a/an. The findings of the present study revealed that, learners were more successful in [+SR, -HK] NP environments requiring the indefinite article *a/an*. The researcher indicated that this pattern may result from the fact that Turkish includes an equivalent of the indefinite article but not the definite one. In addition, while teachers tend to teach the indefinite article at early stages, the definite article comes in later. Thus, learners may have acquired *a/an* before *the*. The learners made both omission and substitution errors. Nonetheless, the type and frequency of these errors changed with respect to proficiency level. Contra Liu and Gleason (2002), who found that overuse of the definite article increased in parallel with the proficiency level, the author reported that overuse of *the* decreased significantly as proficiency increased. Proficiency level was observed to have an effect on learners' performance. Beginner level learners were less successful in all context types except for [-SR, -HK] in the multiple-choice task. In the WPT, beginners were again the least successful, but only in [+SR, +HK] and [-SR, -HK] contexts. The researcher suggested that, the varying accuracy of learners across the two tasks may stem from the receptive/productive understanding of English articles. While the multiple-choice task may correspond to receptive knowledge of articles, the WPT may represent the productive knowledge. Hence, the author suggested that articles be presented along a continuum from receptive towards productive usage.

Siu (2010) conducted a similar study in a different EFL context. The researcher explored the English article usage of L1 Cantonese and/or Mandarin-speaking learners of L2-English in individual NP contexts provided by Huebner's taxonomy. 30 Form 2 students studying in a Chinese-medium school in Hong Kong participated in the study. Data collection materials were a demographic questionnaire, three production tasks (*i.e.,* an error correction task, a writing task, and an oral production task), and a comprehension task. Following the administration of the tasks, the emerging data were analyzed through TLU and UOC. The results revealed that *zero article* was the most problematic of all the articles for the participants. In both the production and comprehension tasks, learners were more accurate in using *a(n)* in first-mention and non-referential contexts than in generics. This finding regarding generics supported Liu and Gleason (2002) who labeled generics as 'cultural use', and who indicated that this context was the most challenging context type for learners. Participants were also better in using *the* with

referentials than in generics in both task types. This again showed that generics cause the biggest problems for EFL learners. *The*-flooding did not occur in the data; however, as in Ekiert (2004) and Thomas (1989) overgeneralization of the *zero article* occurred in high rates in both comprehension and production tasks. The researcher associated this pattern with transfer from the L1. Since the mother tongue (*i.e.,* Mandarin and Cantonese) of the participants does not have an article system, participants may have opted for the *zero article Ø* more frequently than the definite or indefinite articles. Unlike the studies mentioned above, *a/an* was also found to be overused across all tasks, which as the research suggests, is important to note. The investigator maintained that in line with Young (1996), this tendency could have stemmed from learners' problems with defining the ±countablity status of NPs.

Butler (2002) contributed to the line of research which adopted Huebner's (1983) model. Nevertheless, the main contribution of her study to the literature was her primary concern in the 'metalinguistic knowledge' employed by L2 English learners, and the methodology she followed. Unlike previous researchers who investigated acquisition orders, patterns, accuracy *etc.*, Butler (2002) attempted to explore the processes that take place in learners' minds while they are trying to make sense of the English article usage. The researcher utilized qualitative besides quantitative research methods in order to have a better insight into the metalinguistic knowledge of the learners. 100 students 80 of whom were native speakers of Japanese and 20 of whom were native English controls took part in the study. 60 among 80 Japanese participants were college students living in Japan. The learners were given a proficiency test and divided into three proficiency groups, each group having 20 participants. The groups were labeled as J1, J2 and J3, with J1 representing the lowest-level. The remaining 20 L1-Japanese learners of English were university students living in the US. During data collection, in addition to a language background questionnaire, a fill-in-the-article test in which subjects had to insert *a/an, the* or *Ø* (*zero article*) to fill the gaps was administered. The test had 100 items which were based on the contexts in Huebner's semantic wheel. An additional category which covered the idiomatic and conventional usages of articles was also included. After subjects had completed the fill-in-the-article test, they were interviewed by the researcher pertaining to the reason of their article choice. If they were not able to provide an explanation, that is, if they had inserted an article merely

by guessing, they were instructed to indicate that. The coding procedure involved classifying the reasons that the participants stated for their article choice as specific and non-specific. As a result of this coding system, four main categories regarding learners' article usage errors emerged: (1) problems with referentiality, (2) misdetection of countability, (3) nongeneralizable or idiosyncratic hypotheses, and (4) other reasons. The analysis of the coding system revealed five findings. First, it was shown that participants with higher proficiency levels provided specific reasons in accounting for their article choice more frequently than the lower-proficiency level participants did. Second, on average, there were 10 target-like and 8 non-target like items out of 100 items for which the participants could not provide a specific reason for their article choice. Third, among the specific reasons the participants stated, referentiality accounted for the largest ratio of non-target like article choice errors. Referentiality-related errors appeared either when the subjects could not detect at least one of the features [SR] and [HK] or when they could not identify any of these two features. Subjects' failure in determining whether a noun is countable or uncountable also hindered their correct use of articles. Even advanced-level participants had problems with noun countability. The final finding suggested that as the level of proficiency increased, a notable decrease emerged in the non-generalizable or idiosyncratic hypotheses that the learners generated and used. This case accounted for the lower rate of article misuse at the J3 and J4 levels. The analysis of the interview data further showed that the issues of referentiality and noun countability were a block on the way of learners in terms of correct article usage. It was shown that, depending on their proficiency level, participants formulated the following hypotheses while trying to figure out the semantics of the English determiner phrase: (a) context-insensitive hypotheses, (b) hypotheses that showed sensitivity to inappropriate contextual clues, and (c) hypotheses that showed sensitivity to a range of relevant contexts. The first type of hypotheses involved lower level participants' adhering to the article usage rules that they learnt through instruction from their teacher, textbooks or other sources. The second type of hypotheses was most frequently used by lower to intermediate level proficiency learners. Realizing that the former rules that they employed did not apply to all contexts, these learners felt confused with the features [SR]-[HK] and noun countability, and they formulated some tentative, ad hoc hypotheses for their article choice. For instance, some were observed to form word-collocation rules and tended

to use articles with certain verbs, nouns, adjectives adverbs or prepositions. The last type of hypothesis was typical in higher proficiency learners' data. These learners came to realize that rules alone were not sufficient for correct article choice, but the contexts in which they emerged also mattered. They based their article choice and identification of [SR]-[HK] and noun countability on more dynamic and context-based conceptions. Still, even advanced learners were reported to have problems with the correct identification of [HK], and noun countability as in Lu (2001). The researcher indicated that the structural, pragmatic and semantic differences between Japanese and English may have prevented the learners in this study from grasping the associations between HK and DEFINITENESS.

Similarly, Humphrey (2007) set out with a more specific concern in his study. The researcher aimed at exploring the factors that play a role in the article choice of Japanese Speakers of English with a particular focus on the locality of lexical items occurring in the immediate environment of the article in question. 50 Japanese high school students (labeled J1), 52 Japanese college students (labeled J2), and a control group of 15 native speakers were the participants of the study. A data collection task comprised of two sections was administered to the participants. The participants were instructed to fill in the blanks in the task with *a/an, the* or *Ø*. The test items were categorized according to Huebner's semantic wheel (1983, 1985). The results revealed that although some patterns were based on Huebner's model, the majority of participants from both groups were influenced by the lexical items either preceding or following the node article. Reminiscent of the participants in Butler (2002), the learners in this study also seemed to form erroneous rules about article usage, and the rules they formed were largely determined by the word occurring before or after the node article. For instance, they tended to choose the definite article in the presence of a word with *-est* ending in the context even if the word was not a superlative (*e.g., modest*). Likewise, some J1 participants were shown to overgeneralize the indefinite article in idiomatic contexts where "have" precedes the article (*e.g.,* Do you have the time?) or in generic contexts including an adjective (*i.e.,* Dogs make Ø good pets). The researcher maintained that these patterns may stem from "the subjects' belief that the article is forming a collocation with the preceding and/or following lexical item" (p. 313). Thus, based on the erroneous collocations "have+a" and "a+good", learners opt for the indefinite article whether the context in question requires the

indefinite article or another one. The researcher concluded that neither group had obtained a grasp of the discoursal English article usage yet. Furthermore, in their article choice, learners were influenced to a large extent by the lexical items emerging before or after the node article.

Ionin and colleagues have contributed to the domain of article acquisition research, as well. Nevertheless, they followed a different path in their conceptualization of the L2 English article acquisition process. Unlike Bickerton (1981) and Huebner (1983), Ionin, Ko, and Wexler approached the issue from a generative perspective. They proposed that article acquisition is a UG-regulated process, and therefore learners' errors regarding article usage are predictable. Drawing on data from languages like English and Samoan, Ionin (2003) suggested that [+ART] languages with two articles may distinguish their articles either based on SPECIFICITY or DEFINITENESS, but not on both settings. Therefore, in the absence of articles in their L1s, L2 English learners should have access to both SPECIFICITY and DEFINITENESS settings during article acquisition, and exhibit optional adherence to these settings. Consequently, this should lead to an association of *the* optionally with the features [+specific] and [+definite], and an association of *a* optionally with the features [-specific] and [-definite] which results in systematic article use errors. Taking these assumptions as a departure point, Ionin *et al.* conducted a series of experimental studies on the acquisition of articles.

In one of their earliest studies, Ionin and Wexler (2003) aimed to show that unlike previous research (*e.g.,* Huebner, 1983; Thomas, 1989) which based L2-English article choice on *de re/de dicto*[9] distinction, L2-English article choice is in fact UG-constrained, thus it is affected by parameter settings (DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY in this case) provided by the UG. The researchers maintained that L2-English learners' article usage errors stem from their associating *the* with referentiality. They reported two studies administered to adult L1-Russian speakers of L2-English to support their view. In the first study, the participants were 12 adult L1 Russian speakers of L2 English. A written translation task was used to explore whether referentiality and *de re/de dicto* distinction plays a role on L2 English article

---

[9] Ionin and Wexler (2003: 150) state that "[…] an indefinite DP is <u>de re</u> if it is not in the scope of an operator such as an intensional verb, a modal, or negation. Otherwise, the DP is <u>de dicto</u>."

choice. The participants were instructed to read a story in their L1 (Russian). 56 of the sentences in the story were underlined. The participants were asked to translate these sentences in English. The target contexts included definite, referential indefinite, non-referential *de re* indefinite and non-referential *de dicto* indefinite categories. The results showed that participants overused *the* in referential indefinite contexts, but they didn't use *the* frequently in non-referential contexts whether the contexts were *de re* or *de dicto*. These findings supported the researchers' prediction that L2 English learners are affected by the feature referentiality in their article choice rather than *de re/de dicto* distinctions. In order to be sure that the results did not stem from the nature of the task[10], a supplementary study was conducted. In this study, an elicitation task was administered to 27 L1 Russian participants. The Michigan test of proficiency was conducted to determine the proficiency levels of the participants. According to the test, 1 participant was categorized as beginner, 10 were classified as intermediate and 16 as advanced learners. In the elicitation task, participants were presented with 52 dialogues in their L1-Russian. The last sentence of each dialogue was in English and lacked an article. The participants were instructed to complete the sentences with the appropriate article based on the preceding context. The participants exhibited overuse of *the* in referential indefinite contexts with wide-scope and/or relative clause modification. The participants were shown to access UG and to be sensitive to referentiality rather than *de re/de dicto* distinction contrary to what previous literature suggested. Associating *the* with referentiality, participants used *the* and *a* interchangeably in referential indefinite contexts. This provided further support to the researchers' proposal that L2-English learners access UG, and are sensitive to different semantic options in their article choice. Finally, no significant correlation was found between proficiency level and article use because although advanced learners were overall more accurate in their article choice than the beginner and intermediate learners, they still had a high rate of *the* overuse.

In 2004, Ionin *et al.* conducted another study to solidify their previous findings. The researchers aimed to explore whether learners can access parameter

---

[10] The referential indefinite contexts in the task included the modifiers "certain" and "specific". The researchers suspected that the participants' interpretation of the sentences and accordingly their translations might have been affected by these words. For the sake of clarity, the investigators administered a supplementary task with and without the words "certain" and "specific". (Ionin and Wexler, 2003: 153-154).

values (*i.e.,* DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY) offered by the UG in the absence of articles in their L1s, and if they can, how this interacts with their article acquisition process. Ionin and coauthors (2004a) worked with L1 Korean and L1 Russian speakers of L2 English on the grounds that the two languages were typologically different and both lacked overt markers for articles. Thus, any parallelism between the two groups' results would not be attributed to L1 transfer; rather, it would provide support for the researchers' proposals.

30 adult speakers of L1-Russian and 40 adult speakers of L1-Korean were recruited for the study. Based on their the written portion of the Michigan test, of the 30 Russian participants 4 were grouped as beginner, 11 as intermediate and 15 as advanced level learners. In the Korean group, 1 participant fell into beginner, 6 into intermediate, and 33 into advanced level groups. The beginner level learners were excluded from the study. Only the intermediate and advanced-level learners' scores were evaluated. In addition to the experiment groups, 14 adult L1-English speakers took part in the study as a control group. A forced-choice elicitation task and a written production task were employed as data collection instruments. The forced-choice elicitation task consisted of 76 short dialogues. Each dialogue included a target sentence missing an article. The participants were asked to supply the appropriate article by choosing between *a, the* or *zero article (--)* based on the preceding context. Four definite and four indefinite context types were generated in order to investigate and compare article choice of the learners across different contexts. The definite and indefinite categories were further divided into an equal number of specific/non-specific and wide-scope/narrow-scope, or no scope context types. The results of the elicitation task revealed that learners had access to the UG, and fluctuated between the two settings of the ACP. They optionally overused *the* in specific/indefinite and *a* in non-specific/ definite contexts due to the SPECIFICITY effects. Overall, the accuracy rate of Korean participants was higher, which according to the researchers may be due to their higher proficiency levels. However, there was similarity in the patterns that were observed in Russian and Korean data. Since both Russian and Korean lacked an article system, and since the two languages were typologically different, this similarity was tied to UG access and the effects of semantic universals rather than L1-transfer effects. In order to supplement the result of the elicitation task, the researchers administered a written production task. In

doing so, they also wanted to test the unconscious knowledge of the participants regarding article usage. They presented learners with five questions and asked them to provide written answers to the questions. It was found that learners adhered either to the DEFINITENESS or the SPECIFICITY setting while marking [-definite, +specific] contexts. Thus they optionally used *the* in such contexts. On the other hand, the predictions regarding *a* overuse in [+definite, -specific] contexts could not be tested since such contexts were not generated much. In sum, though partially, the results of this task lent support to the findings of the elicitation task, and suggested that article choice of L2 English learners is determined by UG-constraints.

The findings of the written production task were discussed in more detail with particular focus on article omissions in Ionin *et al.* (2004b). The researchers had predicted that in this task learners would omit articles more in singular [-definite] contexts than in singular [+definite] ones. It was shown that both L1 Russian and L1 Korean learners tended to omit articles in indefinite contexts rather than definite ones, in line with predictions. Furthermore, participants overused *the* in wide-scope indefinite [-definite, +specific] contexts to a much greater extent than narrow-scope indefinite [-definite, -specific] contexts. All of these findings suggested that learners have direct access to UG and fluctuate between the SPECIFICITY and DEFINITENESS settings, which induces non-random article usage errors.

Having revealed the effects of the semantic feature SPECIFICITY on L2 English learners' article choice, Ko *et al.* (2006) attempted to figure out whether some other semantic feature (*i.e.,* PARTITIVITY) also has a role in L2 English article acquisition. Building on the early work (*e.g.,* Karmiloff-Smith, 1979 and Maratsos, 1976) that demonstrated child L1 English learners overuse *the* in [-definite, +partitive] contexts, the researchers set out to explore whether a similar pattern will also be observed in adult L2 English learners.

In his study in 2003, Wexler suggested that L1 child learners' associating PARTITIVITY with *the* is rooted in semantic rather than pragmatic factors. Since child learners do not entertain the knowledge that *the* requires *maximality* (uniqueness), they overuse this marker with partitive indefinites. The present study by Ko *et al.* (2004) was an attempt to investigate whether adult L2 English learners possess the *maximality* knowledge or not, and whether there are parallels between

child and adult learners in relation to PARTITIVITY effects. This study differed from the previous ones in that it captured both explicit and implicit partitives[11]. As the Ko *et al.* (2004: x) put it, if overuse of *the* appeared in both explicit and implicit partitives, this would indicate that "the effect of PARTITIVITY is tied to a semantic factor, rather than a reflex of plural morphology in English." 20 adult L1-Korean learners of L2-English were chosen as subjects. According to the Michigan proficiency test, 16 participants were grouped as advanced-level learners and 4 as intermediate-level learners. A forced-choice elicitation task was administered to collect data. Participants were presented with 80 short dialogues all of which included a target sentence missing an article. The learners were asked to choose between *a, the* or the *zero article (--)*. The dialogues fell into 20 context types; 10 targeting *a,* and 10 targeting *the*. The crucial items were designed to test the PARTITIVITY effect in subjects' article choice. In addition, some items were generated to test PARTITIVITY-SPECIFICITY, and PARTITIVITY-scope interactions. The findings revealed that, the participants overused *the* in [-definite, +partitive] contexts more than in [+definite, -partitive] contexts. As mentioned above, a similar pattern was reported in earlier child L1 acquisition studies and some researchers had tied it to 'egocentricity'. Nevertheless, since this view did not hold for adults who "have full pragmatic knowledge", an alternative account was provided by the researchers. The investigators maintained that this finding lent support the role of semantic universals' on article acquisition. Moreover, the results showed that participants chose *the* frequently both in explicit and implicit contexts. This suggested that PARTITIVITY is a semantic effect rather than a reflex of plural morphology in English. In addition, the subjects tended to erroneously choose *the* in [+partitive, +specific], [+partitive, -specific] and in [-partitive, +specific] contexts. Nevertheless, SPECIFICITY and scope were not observed to interact with PARTITIVITY. That is, PARTITIVITY was found to be an independent semantic feature like DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY.

---

[11] Partitives are divided into two categories as explicit partitives (e.g. *four boys - a boy*) and implicit partitives (e.g. *orchestra – a musician*). While explicit partitives include both morphologic (*i.e.,* the plural marking on the noun phrase *four boys*) and semantic indication of a set membership between a DP in the previous discourse and the target DP, implicit partitives do not morphologically (*i.e.,* no plural marking on the noun *orchestra*) indicate a set membership.

As shown above, previous research has revealed that L2-English learners tend to associate *the* with the features SPECIFICITY and PARTITIVITY instead of DEFINITENESS. Thus, they use *the* erroneously in [+specific,-definite] or [+partitive, -definite] contexts. However, as Ko, Perovic, Ionin, and Wexler (2008) stated, it hasn't been investigated whether these two features equally affect L2-English learners' article choice. Ko *et al.* (2008) attempted to shed light on this issue by exploring whether learners are more sensitive to SPECIFICITY than PARTITIVITY or vice versa. Furthermore, by working with two groups of participants with typologically different L1s, they attempted to explore whether PARTITIVITY effects emerge regardless of L1 background.

30 L1-Serbo-Croatian learners of L2 English and 20 L1-Korean learners of L2-English took part in the study. The Korean participants had formerly participated in Ko *et al.*'s (2006) study (reported above) and the data gathered from that study was utilized. The participants' proficiency level was determined via the Michigan test. Accordingly, the Korean speakers had been grouped as advanced (n=16) and intermediate (n= 4) learners. On the other hand, all of the Serbo-Croatian participants were categorized advanced.

The data collection instrument was a multiple choice test which consisted of 80 English dialogues with missing articles. The participants had to choose between three choices; *a, the* and *- (no article)* to complete the dialogues.

The study revealed that PARTITIVITY as a semantic universal affected both Serbo-Croatian and Korean learners' article choice. This finding suggested that this feature is accessible to L2-English learners regardless of their L1. The study also showed that the semantic features SPECIFICITY and PARTITIVITY operate independently in L2-English article choice. The findings signaled an important interaction between language and SPECIFICITY. While Korean participants were affected by both the SPECIFICITY and PARTITIVITY features, Serbo-Croatian learners seemed to be influenced by the PARTITIVITY effect to a much greater extent. Both Serbo-Croatian and Korean being article-less languages, the researchers did not consider the L1-effect as a possible cause for this pattern. Rather, they suggested that learners come across two problems while acquiring the English article system. They do not immediately learn that using the definite article *the* requires

both the *uniqueness (i.e., maximality) presupposition* and a *common ground* between the speaker and the hearer. The researchers held that learners overcome the uniqueness presupposition (PARTITIVITY effect) later than the common ground (SPECIFICITY effect) problem. Since the L1- Serbo-Croatian participants in this study are all advanced level learners, they may have overcome SPECIFICITY effects more easily than PARTITIVITY effects. Thus, they may have exhibited fewer problems with the SPECIFICITY feature whereas the PARTITIVITY effects persisted in their article usage.

Ionin *et al.*'s (2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2008) predictions regarding SPECIFICITY effects were largely based on Mosel and Hovdhaugen's work (1992). Drawing on Mosel and Hovdhaugen (1992), Ionin *et al.* (2003) held that Samoan, a language based on the SPECIFICITY setting, makes the SPECIFICITY distinctions both with definites and indefinites. In line with this view, Ionin *et al.* (2003) had examined L2 learners' English article choice within the framework of the ACP and the FH proposed by Ionin (2003). Under these proposals, overuse of *the* and *a* by L2 English learners was associated with learners' optionally adopting the SPECIFICITY and DEFINITENESS settings as instantiated in Samoan and English, respectively. Nevertheless, a study by Tryzna (2009) revealed that was not the case. A data-elicitation test with 34 mini-dialogues in English conducted to a native Samoan speaker showed that contrary to Mosel and Hovdhaugen (1992), Samoan makes the SPECIFICITY distinction only with indefinites. Thus, it came out that L2 English learners' overuse of *the* in [+specific, -definite] contexts was in line with natural language data whereas overuse of *a* in [-specific, +definite] contexts could not be explained within the borderline of natural language patterns. This being the case, Tryzna (2009) adopted a reduced ACP by which the SPECIFICITY distinction is made with indefinites only. The researcher attempted to test the predictions of the FH on L2 English article acquisition of L1 Polish and L1 Mandarin-Chinese speakers. A forced-choice elicitation task modeled after that of Ionin *et al.* (2003) was employed to collect data. The findings demonstrated that overall, advanced L1 Mandarin-Chinese advanced speakers were more accurate than the L1 Polish advanced group. Nevertheless, L1-Chinese learners were observed to overuse *the* more frequently in specific/indefinite contexts than in non-specific/indefinite contexts suggesting fluctuation. In L1 Polish learners' data, on the other hand, no fluctuation emerged.

The individual analysis revealed that the behavior of L1-Chinese learners was more consistent with the predictions of fluctuation whereas the L1 Polish data exhibited more variability. This indicated a developmental pattern through which learners optionally use *the* in all contexts at initial stages. Nevertheless, as proficiency increases, they restrict the use of *the* to specific/indefinites and definites, and finally fluctuation between SPECIFICITY and DEFINITENESS determines use of *the*. All in all, in the light of the new Samoan data, the researcher offered a reduced ACP, and interpreted her results accordingly. Based on the findings regarding L1 Polish data in the study, she also concluded that FH alone does not fully account for the article usage patterns of L2 English learners.

Tryzna's (2009) work led Ionin *et al.* (2003, 2004a, 2004b) to revise the predictions of their FH. Ionin, Zubizarreta and Philippov (2009) carried out a research to explore whether there are any parallels between child and adult L2-learners' acquisition of English articles in the light of the new Samoan data. More specifically, the researchers attempted to find out whether child and adult L2-English learners make the same errors of *the* overuse with specific/indefinites and *a* overuse with non-specific/definites. 26 adult participants and 58 child participants aged 10-12 took part in the study. All of the participants were L1-Russian speakers of L2-English. An elicitation task modeled after those employed in Ionin *et al.* (2003) was used to elicit data. Adult learners took an additional cloze test generated by William Rutherford for L2-proficiency. The elicitation task was comprised of 60 short dialogues with a blank in the target sentence of each dialogue. Different from earlier tests, this test did not provide choices to participants. Instead, learners were asked to fill in the blanks with any word appropriate in the given context or to insert a dash (-) if no word was necessary. In addition, apart from articles, it included filler items such as pronouns, prepositions and auxiliaries. The results showed that the patterns of article acquisition of child and adult L2-English learners of L1-Russian were to some extent similar. Both participant groups overused *the* in [+specific,-definite] context, which finds parallels in natural language (*i.e.,* Samoan) data. However, unlike child participants, the adult subjects deviated from natural language patterns, and overextended the SPECIFICITY distinction to definites, as well. That is, they overused *a* in [-specific, +definite] contexts. The researchers proposed that the reason behind adults' adopting this pattern was the use of explicit strategies. While (most)

child learners relied on domain-specific knowledge[12], thus made the SPECIFICITY distinction only with indefinites in line with the natural language data, adults formulated an explicit strategy which triggered the use of *a* when the speaker does not have a specific referent in mind. Nevertheless, the researchers attributed this behavior of adults to SPECIFICITY effects. They argued that this error type is rooted in learners' sensitivity to SPECIFICITY. Extending the SPECIFICITY distinctions to definites, adult learners associated *a* with non-specific definites, and overused *a* in such contexts.

Up to that point, studies in which Ionin and coauthors worked with L2 English learners whose L1 lacks an article system have been reported. In an earlier work, Ionin, Zubizarreta and Maldonado (2008) sought to identify the sources of knowledge in L2 English article choice. More specifically, they attempted to investigate the role of L1, UG-access and input processing in L2-English article acquisition. Thus, in addition to a non-article L1 group, they included an article-L1 group to their study. The experiment groups consisted of 23 adult speakers of [-ART] L1 Russian and 24 adult speakers of [+ART] L1 Spanish. In addition, 6 adult native speakers of English took part as controls. An elicitation test of article use and a cloze test of L2-proficiency were administered as data collection instruments. Based on the proficiency test, three proficiency levels (*i.e.,* beginner, intermediate and advanced) were drawn. The elicitation test which was used in previous studies by Ionin *et al.* (*i.e.,* 2003, 2004) was employed with the changes reported in the preceding study. The analysis of the results showed that Russian learners, whose L1 lacks an article system, were influenced by both input processing and UG-access in their choice of L2-English articles. Through UG, they could access both DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY settings, and therefore they exhibited fluctuation at initial stages. Nevertheless, as a result of increased exposure to L2 input, in time, they could realize that English distinguishes its articles based on the DEFINITENESS setting. Hence, they could finally set the ACP to the correct value. Spanish speakers, on the other hand, were not affected by the SPECIFICITY setting in their article choice. Having an article system which, like English, is based on the DEFINITENESS setting, L1-Spanish learners of L2-English could transfer the article semantics from their mother

---

[12] Ionin *et al.* (2009: 40-41) state that 'domain-specific knowledge' refers to 'implicit knowledge', and involves access to the semantic universals DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY.

tongue; hence, were able to use the English articles felicitously. In sum, article acquisition process was shown to be influenced by UG-access, input-processing and L1 transfer effects.

This thread of generative-based research by Ionin and colleagues opened up a new avenue for the researchers interested in article acquisition. Subsequent to Ionin and coauthors' work, a plethora of studies, that adopted a generative framework were documented.

Kim and Lakshmanan (2009) were among the investigators who adopted the generative paradigm in article acquisition research. The investigators pursued to test the predictions of SPECIFICITY proposed by Ionin *et al.* (2004a) in the context of L1 Korean L2 English learners' article acquisition. The authors attempted to explore the connection between L2 English learners' interpretation of article semantics and real-time online sentence processing. 14 native speakers of English and 18 adult speakers of L1 Korean-L2 English took part in the study. The former group served as controls, and the latter group was divided into intermediate and advanced proficiency levels based on a cloze test. A real time online reading experiment and an offline semantic acceptability rating experiment were employed as the main data collection instruments.

The results demonstrated that, in the real time online reading test, the native controls and the advanced-level participants exhibited similar patterns in terms of sentence-processing times. Based on this pattern, the authors suggested that adult L2 Korean learners, and though speculative native speakers may have shown traces of SPECIFICITY. The intermediate group, on the other hand, was observed to be clearly affected by the SPECIFICITY feature duplicating Ionin *et al.*'s (2004a) finding. Based on their sentence-processing times, learners seemed to associate *the* with the feature [+specific] rather than [+definite], and *a/an* with the feature [-specific] rather than [-definite]. Nevertheless, in the offline semantic acceptability rating test, native speakers and the advanced group appeared to adhere to the DEFINITENESS setting in their judgment of the sentences, and exhibited no traces of SPECIFICITY effects. On the contrary, the intermediate group went on to fluctuate between DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY. Based on these findings, the researchers offered some sort of developmental account. They concluded that Korean

L2 English speakers may initially distinguish between *a/an* and *the* based on the SPECIFICITY setting rather than the DEFINITENESS setting. However, as their proficiency increases, they may undergo a fluctuation period resulting in going back and forth between the SPECIFICITY and DEFINITENESS settings.

Treichler, Hamann, Schönenberger, Voeykova and Lauts (2009) aimed to test Ionin *et al.*'s proposals, as well. In a series of studies, Treichler *et al.* (2009) explored article acquisition of English both as an L2 and L3, and this enabled the researchers to examine the interaction between UG, L1 and L2. The authors investigated L3 English article acquisition by L1 Russian-L2 German speakers who live in Germany. With the aim of determining L2 German effect and the effect of the ambient language on article usage, the investigators compared the results of this group with those of L1 Russian-L2 German speakers learning English as an L3 and living in Russia, and L1 Russian-L2 English learners residing in Russia. The researchers assumed that L2 German would contribute to the acquisition of the English article system due to including a similar system. Thus, L3 English learners would be more accurate than the L2 English participants in their article usage. In addition, the L2 German group living in Germany would perform better than the L2 German group in Russia due to being exposed to German in an environment where it is spoken as the native language.

In the study conducted in Germany, 20 L1 Russian-L2 German speaking students and young adults who were learning English as an L3 took part as participants. They were divided into three proficiency groups as G1 (n=7), G2 (n=7) and G3 (n=6). G1 included the youngest learners with least exposure to English.

Spontaneous production tasks which consisted of free talk and picture-story telling activities were employed to collect data. The results of spontaneous production tasks revealed that in the [-definite, +specific] context, one of the relevant contexts for the study, only 12% *the* misuse was observed. In addition, omission emerged at a rate of 17% in this context. As the researchers indicated, these small percentages of article misuse did not suggest fluctuation, but that the correct article was successfully used due to language transfer from L2 German. The other context which mattered for this study was [+definite, -specific]. However, no instances representing this context were retrieved from the data due to the nature of the task.

The number of participants with L3 English, L1 Russian L2 German speakers in Russia was 19. The participants were divided into three groups based on their ages and the amount of their exposure to English as G1 (n=6), G2 (n=9) and G3 (n=6). The first group represented the youngest subjects with the least amount of exposure to English.

As in the previous group, this group was also engaged in a free talk and a picture-story telling activity. Likewise, no [+definite, -specific] context emerged in subjects' data. In the [-definite, +specific] context, misuse *the* was so rare that it could not be attributed to the FH. However, the results showed that this group omitted articles more frequently (24%) than the former group (12%). The researchers maintained that this difference stemmed from the difference in the amount and quality of the L2 German input between the two groups. The subjects who were living in Germany had better and longer exposure to German as an L2, and this affected their L3 English article choice positively.

The L2 English L1 Russian speakers living in Russia were comprised of 14 adolescent participants. Here, two groups were formed based on the length of participants' English study as an L2: G1 (n=3), with the least amount of exposure, and G2 (n=11).

The analysis of the data provided by this group did not support the FH, either. In Group 1, misuse of *the* occurred only once in the relevant context [-definite, +specific] and in Group 2 it occurred only 10 times. Sentences falling into the [+definite, -specific] context did not occur at all. The indefinite article *a* was misused by Group 2 in 3 out of 105 contexts; however, the researchers proposed that this low ratio could be regarded as noise rather than article misuse. That is, as in the former groups, no fluctuation was observed in the target contexts. The rate of article omission was quite high in this group, and that was considered as striking by the investigators. Omission was 69% even in the [-definite, +specific] where fluctuation was expected. The Russian teachers who interviewed the participants of this study also omitted articles during their interaction with the learners, and the high rate of omission by the participants was deemed to be related to this.

In order to eliminate the problems that could stem from the nature of spontaneous production data, two supplementary forced-choice tasks were

conducted. The first task was conducted by Schönenberg (2009), one of the investigators of the present study. Schönenberg (2009) tested two groups of learners; 113 students of economics and 41 students of English. These learners were all L1 Russian-L2 English speakers. A 32-item forced-choice task including the four contexts from Ionin *et al.* was administered to the subjects. The two groups differed in performance. The students of economics performed at chance level in all four contexts, and there was not much difference in the percentages of article misuse across all contexts. The low article misuse ratios ruled out the possibility of fluctuation between the DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY settings. Instead, these findings indicated effects of L1 transfer. The students of English outperformed the former group in all contexts. Their rate of article omission was lower, too. However, they had higher ratios of article misuse in the relevant contexts (*i.e.,* [+definite, - specific] and [-definite, +specific]), and this higher percentage of article misuse in the crucial contexts led the researchers to conclude that fluctuation occurs in more proficient learners rather than low-proficiency ones as reported by Peters (2007). Another forced-choice task with 28 items taken from Ionin *et al.* was conducted to two L1 Russian-L2 German- L3 English learners. The overall performance of the two participants was good but there were 4 instances of article omission which indicated L1 effect. The researchers concluded that the L2 German knowledge of the determiner system which bears similarity with that of English facilitated learners' acquisition of the L3 English article system. In addition, the quantity and quality of the L2 appeared to increase target-like article usage, as was the case with L2 German speakers living in Germany. One of the findings that should be noted is that fluctuation requires "a certain level of overall proficiency" (p. 10) because as in Peters' study (2007), only the more proficient learners exhibited evidence of fluctuation in the present study (cited in Treichler *et al.,* 2009: 10).

A study partly supporting Treichler *et al*. (2009) was reported by Atay (2010). Atay (2010) attempted to explore the role of DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY on English article acquisition of L1 Turkish-L2 English speakers. The researcher also aimed to examine whether proficiency leads to variations in L2 English article choice. With these aims in mind, she carried out a study with the participation of 40 elementary level, 40 intermediate level and 40 upper-intermediate level participants with an age range of 18-20. The participants were all students at an

English-medium university (*i.e.,* METU) in Turkey. They were preparatory class students at Basic English Department and were divided into three proficiency groups according to the proficiency test they were administered at the beginning of the term. In addition, 5 adult native speakers from England contributed to the study as a control group. A 40-item forced choice elicitation task based on Ionin and Wexler (2003) and generated by the researcher herself was employed to elicit data from participants. The test items included [+definite, +specific], [+definite, -specific], [-definite, +specific] and [-definite, -specific] feature combinations, as in Ionin *et al.* (*e.g.,* 2004a, 2008). The findings revealed that all participants scored fairly well in the [+definite, +specific] contexts. At the same time, the accuracy rates increased in parallel with the proficiency level showing that proficiency has a positive effect on article choice in this context. As for article omissions, the elementary level learners appeared to omit articles at a significant rate (17.3%). In the [-definite, +specific] contexts, upper-intermediate learners proved more accurate than intermediate and elementary level learners. Elementary level learners scored better than their intermediate level counterparts in this context, which was interpreted as surprising by the researcher (p. 76). Intermediate level participants were shown to overuse *the* at a significant rate (36.3%) in this context. Though at smaller percentages (11.0% and 15.0% respectively), the upper-intermediate and elementary level participants also seemed to substitute *the* for *a*. As reported in the study above (Treichler *et al.,* 2009), this pattern has been observed before. In their studies, Peters (2007) and Treichler *et al.* (2009) reported that a certain level of proficiency is required in order for fluctuation to occur in learners' article usage. As in the previous context, in this context the highest omission rate emerged in the elementary level, as well. The other two groups' omission rates were insignificant. In [+definite, -specific] contexts, similar findings were reported. The upper-intermediate level learners had the highest scores, followed by the elementary and intermediate level learners. Thus, *a* overuse was most frequent in intermediate level learners (30.3%) followed by elementary level (16.0%) and upper-intermediate level learners (8.0%). As for article omissions, the overall rate of omissions was higher in this context than in the previous one. According to Atay (2010), this suggests that L1 Turkish learners omit articles more in definite contexts than in indefinite contexts, suggesting that they are "definiteness-sensitive" (p. 79-80). The participants were observed to have the highest score in the [-definite, -specific] context. The upper-intermediate learners performed native-like

(96.8%). The intermediate and elementary level groups had similar accuracy rates, scoring 83.0% and 88.8%, respectively. Article omission rates were similar in elementary and intermediate groups (6.8% and 6.5%, respectively). This rate was 4.9% for the upper-intermediate group. As for substitution, the intermediate level learners had a significant rate of substitution (10.5%) whereas the upper-intermediate group had a substitution percentage of only 1.8. To sum up, in line with previous research, a positive correlation was found between proficiency level and article usage accuracy. Thus, upper-intermediate learners proved to be the most successful across all contexts. Furthermore, L1 Turkish learners of L2 English were shown to fluctuate between the two settings of the ACP; DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY. Contrary to the expectations of the researcher, this pattern was observed in intermediate level learners rather than in the elementary level group. Furthermore, in support of Ekiert (2004) and Önen (2007) learners were shown to be better in supplying the indefinite article, which stems from transferring the existing parameter for the L1, according to the author. Surprisingly, most article omissions were reported to occur in the [+definite, +specific] contexts by the elementary group.

In another study carried out in Turkish EFL context, Dağdeviren (2010) also aimed to explore the role of semantic notions on article choice. Nevertheless, unlike Atay (2010) who focused on the DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY features alone, Dağdeviren (2010) also dealt with the PARTITIVITY effects on Turkish speakers' article usage. A low-proficiency and a high-proficiency group, each with 30 participants, took part in the study. All the participants were students at METU. A fill-in-the-blanks test modeled after Ionin *et al.* (2009) served as the data collection instrument. The original test included 60 items; however, only 40 of them were employed in the present study in order to prevent lack of concentration and fatigue on the part of the learners. 30 out of 40 items were critical and the remaining 10 items were fillers. The target contexts were designed to observe DEFINITENESS, SPECIFICITY and PARTITIVITY effects on learners' article choice. The results revealed that, as in Huebner (1983), learners supplied *the* successfully in definite contexts associating *the* with DEFINITENESS as opposed to SPECIFICITY or PARTITIVITY. Naturally, overuse of *a/an* and the *zero* articles was low in definite contexts. In indefinite contexts, participants were observed to predominantly supply *a/an* even when the context was specific. Therefore, the rates of *the* and the *zero*

article overuse were low, too. As for partitive indefinites, similar rates of correct *a/an* usage were reported suggesting that, like SPECIFICITY, PARTITIVITY is not a determinant factor in L1 Turkish learners' L2 English article choice, either. Thus, the findings showed that subjects were affected by the feature DEFINITENESS rather than PARTITIVITY or SPECIFICITY in their choice of articles. Finally, a positive correlation between proficiency level and correct article usage was observed, providing supporting evidence for previous research. Although both the low-proficiency and high-proficiency groups were successful at supplying the correct articles in the target contexts, overall, the high-proficiency group was more target-like in their article usage. In sum, contra Ionin *et al.* (2008) and Ko *et al.* (2008), this study demonstrated that despite being a non-article L1, speakers of L1 Turkish could distinguish between different semantic features governing article choice, and they could base their choices on the correct parameter (*i.e.,* DEFINITENESS) rather than other semantic features (*i.e.,* SPECIFICITY or PARTITIVITY).

Besides the role of semantic features reported in the aforementioned studies, some other aspects of article acqusition were also investigated. For instance, White (2009) attempted to investigate the article choice of nonnative speakers' of L2 English with a special emphasis on countability effects. Mentioning the bulk of research which examined article choice in relation to semantic features and a smaller number of research studies investigating the role of noun countability, the researcher set out to study whether there is a relationship between article choice/omission and countability besides semantic features. Pursuant to this goal, the researcher administered a forced-choice elicitation task which consisted of the six semantic contexts used in Ionin *et al*. The test included three noun types (imaginable count, abstract count, and non-count). The participants were also given explanation sheets to indicate their confidence levels regarding their article choices. The test was administered to 41 participants who were L1-speakers of non-article languages. They belonged to five distinct L1 backgrounds. In addition, 20 native speakers of American English took part as the control group. The results revealed that in the choice of the definite article, noun type did not have any role. Only the semantic context influenced participants' choice. In the choice of the indefinite article, on the other hand, both factors (semantic context and noun type) were determinant. However, when compared to each other the former had a more significant role. In the

choice of *zero article*, again both factors proved to influence article choice. Nevertheless, in these items noun type appeared as a stronger influence than the semantic context. As for participants' confidence levels about their choices, the analysis showed that nearly half the participants considered themselves most confident with imaginable nouns and least confident with abstract nouns. Nevertheless, they were observed to misdetect the countability status of abstract countable nouns and uncountable nouns. The relationship between distinguishing countability status of a noun correctly and using articles felicitously was also examined. The findings revealed that when non-countable nouns were mislabeled as countable, *a* was chosen 100% by participants, and when countable nouns were labeled as non-countable erroneously, *zero* article was opted for 81% of the time. In sum, countability distinctions appeared to affect article choice as semantic features do.

As in Ionin, Zubizarreta and Maldonado (2008), some studies have shed light on L1 transfer effects on article acquisition. In one such study, Mayo (2009) indicated that Ionin and coauthors predicted in cases where the L1 and the L2 distinguish their articles on the same parameter setting, no fluctuation emerges. Nevertheless, subsequent work by Zdorenko and Paradis (2008) showed that child L2 English learners exhibited signs of fluctuation irrespective of their L1 background. That is fluctuation was observed to override transfer. Drawing on this finding, Mayo (2009) set off to investigate whether adult L1 Spanish speakers of L2 English would follow the same pattern during article acquisition. More specifically, the researcher wanted to elucidate whether speakers of L1 Spanish, an [+ART] language which distinguishes its articles on the basis of the DEFINITENESS setting, would transfer the article semantics of their L1 to their initial L2 grammars. She also aimed to explore whether the participants would exhibit DIRECTIONALITY[13] by scoring more accurately in definite contexts than in indefinite ones, replicating previous research (*e.g,.* Robertson, 2000; Lardiere, 2004b and White 2003). To this end, Mayo conducted a study with 60 L1 Spanish-L2 English informants and 15 native speakers of English as a control group. The experiment group was divided into

---

[13] Previous work (*e.g.,* Robertson, 2000; White, 2003 and Lardiere, 2004b) had shown that L2 English learners whose L1 lacks an article system go through a developmental process where they use the definite article *the* more accurately and more frequently than the indefinite *a*. This phenomenon was labeled as 'DIRECTIONALITY' by Mayo (2009: 22).

30 lower-intermediate and 30 advanced-level groups as determined by the OQPT. Ionin *et al.*'s (2004a) forced-choice elicitation task was employed as the data collection instrument. In line with Schwartz and Sprouse (1996) and Ionin *et al.* (2008), but contra Zdorenko and Paradis (2008), the researcher revealed that both low-intermediate and advanced level groups transferred the semantics of articles from their L1, and supplied articles in the relevant contexts with high levels of accuracy. Moreover, DIRECTIONALITY was observed only in low-intermediate group's data, but ceased to exist in the advanced-level group. In sum, L1 Spanish-L2 English speakers appeared to transfer the semantics of articles to their ILG, and this contributed to the overall accuracy of learners.

Snape (2005) had also formerly compared the article acquisition of L2 English learners with and without article L1s. The researcher investigated the article choice of [-ART] L1 Japanese and [+ART] L1 Spanish speakers of L2 English under the predictions of Ionin *et al.*'s ACP and Chierchia's (1998) NOMINAL MAPPING PARAMETER (henceforth NMP). He worked with intermediate and advanced level Japanese and Spanish learners of L2 English whose proficiency level was tested by means of the OQPT. Each proficiency group contained 5 participants. 5 native speakers of English also participated in the study as controls. A fill-in-the gaps test similar to the one used by Ionin *et al.* (2004a) was used in the study. Different from Ionin *et al.*'s task which contained only singular contexts, this task contained definite anaphoric plural and mass, indefinite specific plural and mass, and indefinite non-specific plural and mass contexts. The results revealed that, in line with Ionin *et al.*'s (2003) FH, Japanese intermediate and advanced learners of L2 English exhibited more fluctuation between DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY than their L1 Spanish L2 English counterparts. This suggested L1 transfer on the part of the Spanish participants. in addition, both of the experiment groups were observed to have problems with indefinite mass contexts. The NMP, which suggests that languages differ in terms of the reference they allow their NPs to have, was adopted to explain the reasons of this difficulty. Under the NMP, Japanese is a [+arg, -pred] language, Spanish is a [-arg, +pred] language and English is a [+arg, +pred] language. L1 transfer from Japanese to English, and from Spanish to English was observed in the form of Japanese participants' using *a*, and Spanish participants' overusing articles in mass contexts due to adopting the NMP of their L1s rather than that of English. All

in all, Snape's (2005) study yielded both positive and negative transfer effects on L2 English article acquisition process. While L1 Spanish overall facilitated correct parameter setting (*i.e.,* DEFINITENESS) in English, it led to incorrect article usage due to negative transfer of NMP in indefinite mass contexts. Similarly, L1 Japanese also caused infelicitous article usage in these contexts due to the nature of its NPs.

The following year, Hawkins and coauthors (2006) studied the article use patterns of [-ART] L1 Japanese and [+ART] L1 Greek speakers with similar purposes. By including these two groups of learners they attempted to clarify whether having an article system in the L1 leads to tendencies of fluctuation reported in earlier studies (Ionin *et al.,* 2004a). Each L1 group consisted of 12 participants. There was also a native English control group with 5 participants. The experiment groups were classified as Upper Intermediate or Advanced level learners as determined by the OQPT.

A forced-choice elicitation task similar to that of Ionin *et al.* (2004a) was employed to collect data. In addition to singular contexts, plural contexts were also included in the task to determine the interaction between number distinction and semantic notions. Contra Zdorenko and Paradis (2008), and in support of Schwartz and Sprouse (1996) and Mayo (2009), the findings revealed that the L1-Greek learners did not appear to be influenced by SPECIFICITY. As the researchers stated, this suggested that "fluctuation is not a general L2 developmental phenomenon" (p.18). On the contrary, the L1-Japanese group fluctuated between DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY features, associating *the* with the feature [+definite] at times, and [+specific] at other times. This lent support to Ionin *et al.*'s (2004a) view that L2 English learners with a non-article L1 undergo a stage of fluctuation between the target setting and a setting not available either in their L1 or in the target language. However, the researchers pointed out that, individual results of the Japanese group yielded important observations that are unexplainable under the ACP or the FH. Due to the individual variation in this group, the authors suggested that "theories of SLA that avoid, where possible, construction specific parameters and devices specifically designed to handle aspects of SLA, are to be preferred over those that do not" (p. 24).

Sarko (2009) contributed to this line of research by investigating the acquisition of English articles by L1 Syrian Arabic and L1 French speakers of

English. The researcher indicated that although English and French have overt markers for both definite and indefinite articles (*i.e.,* 'the/a' and 'la/une' respectively), Arabic only has the definite article (*i.e,* 'al'), and unlike English/French, it does not lexicalize the indefinite article in singular NPs (p. 208-209). Based on these differences and previous work dealing with L1 transfer effects on article acquisition (*e.g.,* Hawkins *et al.,* 2006; Snape, 2005; Snape, 2006), the researcher aimed to clarify whether the phonological absence of the indefinite article in Syrian Arabic affects the acquisition of English articles.

57 L1 Syrian Arab and 18 L1 French learners of English took part in the study. 9 native speakers of English also participated in the study as a control group. The participants were divided into different proficiency levels ranging from Lower-Intermediate to Very-Advanced based on the OQPT.

The data collection instruments were a forced-choice elicitation task, an oral production task and a written production task. The forced-choice elicitation task was modeled after Ionin *et al.* (2004) and included 88 short dialogues. The sentences in the dialogues were presented in the participants L1s (French and Arabic) except for the target sentence where they had to choose between *the, a/an* or *Ø.*

All proficiency levels both in the L1 Syrian Arab and L1 French groups were observed to be target-like in their choice of article in [+definite, +/-specific] contexts in singular NP environments, which signaled L1 transfer. In [-definite, -specific] singular, plural and mass contexts, both groups were almost target-like, as well. All participants successfully chose the indefinite article *a* with singulars and the *null article Ø* with plurals or mass nouns. In other words, in [-definite, -specific] contexts, Syrian Arab learners were able to choose *a* in a target-like way despite not having and overt marker for the indefinite article in their L1. In the [-definite, +specific] contexts, however, there appeared to be significant differences between the two groups. While L1 French learners were able to choose the correct article in these contexts, L1 Syrian Arabs showed traces of fluctuation at the initial stages. An additional analysis revealed that the use of *a* with indefinite specific NPs not modified with a RC was native-like. Thus, it came out that for L1 Syrian Arab learners RC modification of the NPs rather than SPECIFICITY triggered the choice in favor of the definite article in such contexts. This suggested that L1 Syrian Arab

learners could transfer the syntactic properties of [-definite] from their L1 to L2 English inter-language grammar, supporting Schwartz and Sprouse's (1994, 1996) Full Transfer Full Access (henceforth FTFA) view.

Research on L1 transfer effects reported heretofore (*e.g.*, Hawkins *et al.,* 2006; Mayo, 2009; Sarko, 2009; Snape, 2005) has shown that adult L2 English learners whose L1 has an article system based on the DEFINITENESS setting like that of English do not fluctuate between the DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY settings. Rather, they transfer article semantics from their L1 into L2 English, and therefore use articles appropriately. An exception was the study of Zdorenko and Paradis (2008), in which child L2 English learners, even those with an [+ART] L1, exhibited patterns of fluctuation. Guella, Deprez and Sleeman (2008) who studied adult L2 Arabic acquisition of articles by L1 Dutch speakers provided supporting evidence for Zdorenko and Paradis (2008). They found that even when both the L1 and the L2 were based on the same setting (*i.e.*, DEFINITENESS), UG-access overrode transfer.

The researchers set out find out whether L1-Dutch learners of L2-Arabic -two typologically different languages both of which are based on the DEFINITENESS setting- would transfer the semantics of their L1-Dutch or fluctuate between DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY during the course of their L2-Arabic article acquisition. The authors suggested that if the second possibility (*i.e.,* fluctuation) emerged, this would provide further support for the UG-access view proposed by Ionin (2003). 11 L1-Dutch speakers of L2-Arabic with an age range of 22 and 29 participated in the study. The participants had taken 100 hours of Standard modern Arabic and 140 hours of Egyptian Arabic lessons at the University of Amsterdam by the time of testing. The researchers designed a written forced-choice elicitation task with twelve context types in order to elicit data. Each context included a target sentence missing an article. The informants were instructed to complete the target sentences with the appropriate article. They had to choose between either the definite article *el* or the indefinite article *Ø* based on the given context. As mentioned above, the results were surprising in that although both Arabic and Dutch base their article choice on the DEFINITENESS setting, the participants in this study were affected by the SPECIFICITY distinction in their article choice. The study revealed that UG-access overrode L1-transfer. Instead of transferring the DEFINITENESS setting of

their L1 Dutch which converges with the setting of the target language −Arabic−, participants relied on a setting (SPECIFICITY) that is absent both in their L1 and their L2. They associated the indefinite article *ø* with the feature [-specific], and the definite article *el* with the feature [+specific]. Thus, diverging from the DEFINITENESS pattern, they overused the indefinite article Ø in [+definite, -specific] contexts and the definite article *el* in [-definite, +specific] contexts. This finding provided support for Ionin (2003) and Ionin *et al.*'s (2003, 2004) view that UG is accessible in L2 acquisition and affects learners' article choice by offering various values of the ACP including those not present in the L1 or the L2 of learners.

Some researchers came up with counter evidence to Ionin and colleagues' assumptions regarding article acquisition, and accordingly provided alternative accounts for L2 English learners' article usage/error patterns. Among these researchers was Kaku (2006), who investigated the role of L1-Japanese on L2 English article acquisition. The researcher focused on whether L1 Japanese learners of L2 English are influenced by SPECIFICITY in specific indefinite contexts, and explored how Lardiere's (2004a) view of 'reassembling of features' operates in the ILG of L1 Japanese learners. Kaku (2006) adopted Lardiere's (2004a) view on the grounds that Ionin and Wexler's (2003) parameter-setting proposal does not account for variability in L2 morphological inflection. Under the 'reassembling of features' view "L2 learners need to develop the knowledge of which linguistic forms in their L1 go with which features in their L2." (p. 64). 5 adult L1 Japanese participants whose ages ranged between 16 and 29 contributed to the study. 3 of the participants were classified as advanced learners and the remaining 2 as intermediate learners. In addition, 2 native speakers of English served as a control group. An elicitation task modeled after Ionin and Wexler's (2003) elicitation task, and a translation task were employed as data collection instruments. The elicitation task consisted of 52 dialogues falling into fourteen different contexts where the participants were asked to choose the most appropriate article (*a, the* or *no article*). The translation task, in which 1 advanced and 1 intermediate participants took part, aimed at elucidating whether the Japanese demonstrative *ano* 'of that over there' which bears the features [+referential] and [+definite] (Kuno, 1973, cited in Kaku, 2006: 64), converges with the semantic features of the English definite article *the* which has the same features. The participants were asked to translate the last sentences of the dialogues. It was

predicted that participants would insert *ano* where *the* appeared if these lexical items shared the same semantic features. The results of the elicitation task showed that the participants used articles accurately in general. Regarding the use of *a* in specific indefinite contexts, it was observed that advanced learners had no difficulty supplying the target article in these contexts. However, intermediate learners associated *the* with SPECIFICITY in support of Ionin and Wexler (2003). Despite the fact that the L1 of the participants had no articles, the choice of the *zero article* was rare in the participants' data, contradicting the recurring trend that L2 English learners whose L1s lack an article system opt for the *zero article* predominantly during acquisition. The translation task demonstrated that participants did not supply '*ano*' in any of the contexts where '*the*' would have appeared. This finding suggested that these two lexical items have different semantics. Finally, the relationship between Japanese demonstratives and the articles in English revealed that, Japanese includes some structures (*i.e.,* case markers and demonstratives) that have the features essential for the definite article *the*. Thus, following Lardiere's (2004a) argument, the researcher indicated that for the case of L1 Japanese speakers, it is not the lack of ability to re-set parameters, but reassembling the features constituting the English article system that causes variability in article usage (p. 73).

Pongpairoj (2007a) also came up with counter evidence to the claim that L2 English article choice is UG-governed. The investigator drew attention to some problems with Ionin *et al.*'s ACP and FH. She stated that the data collection materials used by Ionin *et al.* include items in which SPECIFICITY and explicitly stated knowledge (henceforth ESK) about the referent both have plus or minus values. In other words, if a certain item is [+spec], the ESK also bears the positive value. If, on the other hand, the SPECIFICITY feature has the negative value, the ESK is negative, too. The researcher argued that a context may be [+specific] even when ESK is denied. Hence, following Trenkic (2007b), Pongpairoj (2007) claimed that what affected learners' article choice may be ±ESK rather than ±SPECIFICITY. She added that learners should be tested on items where SPECIFICITY and ESK have different values (*e.g.* [+spec, -ESK] or vice versa) in order to understand what the real motive behind learners' article choice is (*i.e.,* ±SPECIFICITY vs. ±ESK). Semi-replicating Ionin *et al.*'s (2004) forced choice elicitation task, Pongpairoj added items where SPECIFICITY and ESK have counter values both in [+definite] and [-

definite] contexts. She worked with [-ART] L1-Thai and [+ART] L1-French learners at intermediate or advanced proficiency levels. The results showed that Thai participants followed the same patterns as Ionin *et al.*'s participants in contexts taken from Ionin *et al*. In additional contexts, on the other hand, their article choice was based on ESK, but not on the SPECIFICITY feature. In indefinite contexts, they were shown to overuse *the* only when both SPECIFICITY and ESK had the positive value. In addition, they supplied *a(n)* excessively in all the definite context with [-ESK] whether the SPECIFICITY feature was positive or negative. These findings suggested that participants' article choice was influenced by ±ESK rather than SPECIFICITY. Thus, SPECIFICITY and the predictions of FH were contradicted. The results obtained from the French group revealed no overuse of articles in the target contexts, and this suggested no influence of ESK or SPECIFICITY on the part of the L1-French learners.

In the same year, Pongpairoj (2007b) carried out another study to explore L2 English article omission. Unlike previous research that investigated omission in the production of [-ART] L1 speakers, Pongpairoj worked with two distinct learner groups. The author aimed to compare article omissions of a [-ART] L1 and a [+ART] L1 group (*i.e.,* Thai and French, respectively) in two contexts, 'Art + N' and 'Art + Adj + N'. To this end, the researcher worked with 10 intermediate-level and 10 advanced-level L1 Thai, and 10 advanced-level L1 French learners. While the Thai participants constituted the experiment groups, the L1 French group took part as a control group. 5 native speakers of English also participated in the study as a control group. The researcher attempted to find out whether the SYNTACTIC MISANALYSIS HYPOTHESIS[14] (henceforth SMH) by Trenkic (2007) or the MISSING SURFACE INFLECTION HYPOTHESIS (henceforth MSIH) by Prevost and White (2000) accounts for variability in the participants' article usage.

---

[14] The SYNTACTIC MISANALYSIS HYPOTHESIS (SMH) (Trenkic, 2007) suggests that article omission occurs due to non-article L1 speakers' misanalyzing L2 articles as adjectives. The MISSING SURFACE INFLECTION HYPOTHESIS (MSIH) (Prevost and White, 2000) assumes that L2 English learners have the necessary underlying knowledge (*i.e.,* definiteness and count/mass distinctions) required for the correct use of articles; nevertheless, they have problems in mapping this knowledge with surface morphology, and this leads to article omission. (Pongpairoj, 2007b; Bergeron Matoba, 2007)

A spontaneous oral article production and a written article production task were used to collect data. Each task included a set of cartoon strip sequences which would elicit article production data both on non-modified and adjectivally pre-modified contexts. The participants were instructed to describe the pictures in detail at their natural speed.

The results demonstrated that native English controls did not make any article omissions in either task, whether the contexts were modified or non-modified by an adjective. As for the experiment groups, the data elicited from both of the tasks seemed to yield similar results. In both tasks, L1 intermediate Thai learners tended to omit articles more frequently in 'Art + Adj + N' contexts than in 'Art + N' contexts. Although at a lower rate, L1 advanced Thai learners exhibited a similar pattern, as well. L1 French participants also supplied more articles in bare NPs than in modified ones. However, they did not appear to be influenced by pre-modification as much since the difference between the two NP contexts was not statistically significant in this group. The researcher held that these findings ruled out the MSIH, but provided support for Trenkic's (2007) SMH. If the article omission of the participants were tied to the MSIH, all participants, irrespective of their L1 background, would make more omission errors in complex NP environments than in simple ones. On the contrary, learners of L1 Thai, which is an article-less language and has determiner-like structures with an adjectival nature, misanalyzed English articles as adjectives in line with the SMH. Hence, they attributed the feature identifiable to the definite article *the* and unidentifiable to indefinite *a*, and used articles on a lexical basis. Nevertheless, the use of articles in this way was largely constrained by the cognitive resources available to the learners. In other words, when the NP was adjectivally modified, thus included more elements to be encoded, L1 Thai learners' attentional resources did not suffice to "cope with the cognitive demands of the tasks" and articles were omitted (p.116). The findings of this study suggested that absence of articles in L1 may lead to lexically-based, faulty interpretations of L2 English learners as to the nature of English articles, and result in more article omissions in the L2 data.

Bergeron-Matoba (2007) also dealt with article omission patterns through the lens of the MSIH (Prévost and White, 2000) mentioned above. Focusing on NP properties, the researcher investigated the difficulties that L2-English learners with

an article-less L1 (*i.e.,* Japanese) face while acquiring the English article system. Based on the differences between the NP properties of English and Japanese, the researcher stated that a twofold task awaits learners in the process of choosing articles: (1) determining whether the noun phrase is countable or mass, and (2) whether it is definite or indefinite. In light of this assumption, Bergeron-Matoba attempted to find out whether L1 Japanese learners of L2 English would recognize that unlike Japanese, some nouns (*i.e.,* +pred nouns) in English require a determiner to be an argument. Following this, whether they could distinguish between countable and mass nouns in English, and also whether they would realize that the English language distinguishes its articles based on the DEFINITENESS setting. The researcher explained that although Japanese does not have overt markers for articles, it includes the features (*i.e.,* countability and DEFINITENESS) necessary for the appropriate use of articles. This being the case, she predicted that Japanese learners' problems regarding the use of English articles would be related to mapping the underlying knowledge of articles to surface forms (lexical representations) of articles.

8 Japanese speakers took part in the study as an experiment group and 1 native speaker of English as a control. As a data collection instrument, the researcher used Hawkins *et al.*'s (2005) forced-elicitation task where learners were instructed to choose the most appropriate article (*i.e,* a/an, the and Ø) for the given dialogues. The test consisted of 72 items classified into five contexts. Being definite, anaphoric, encyclopedic and larger situation uses targeted *the.* Indefinite contexts (*i.e.,* specific indefinites, non-specific *de re* and *de dicto*), on the other hand, aimed at eliciting *a* or the *zero article (Ø).* The contexts included singular countable, plural and mass nouns. The results revealed that even participants with low proficiency levels chose the Ø article only 3-4 times among the 24 singular countable noun contexts. This finding signaled that even at the initial stages of ILG development, the learners were aware of the fact that in contrast to their L1, in English some nouns may be +pred, thus require an article. The results also indicated that use of the Ø article with singular countable nouns declined as learners' ILG developed, and it finally ceased to emerge. As to the second aim of this study, the researcher stated that the nature of the task used in the study made it a bit difficult to find out whether learners can differentiate between countable (+pred) and mass (+arg) nouns. However, as the

researcher suggested, participants' use of *a* with mass nouns may be indicative of how they consider nouns (+pred vs. +arg). The study showed that the use of *a* with mass nouns appeared in 1 to 16 contexts among 24 mass noun contexts regardless of the proficiency level. Namely, some high proficiency learners used *a* in mass noun contexts more than low proficiency learners did. This suggested that learners consider some mass nouns as countable nouns. The choice of the indefinite article in such context was found to be non-random, though. Learners supplied *a* in *de re* contexts which may be specific or non-specific. On the other hand, in *de dicto* contexts, which are non-specific, they appeared to use the *zero article*. Though suggestive, the researcher assumed that learners may be affected not only by count/mass but also by *de re/de dicto* distinctions in their choice of the indefinite article with mass nouns. The participants' choice of articles in the [+definite, +specific], [-definite, +specific], and [-definite, -specific] contexts was investigated to find out their sensitivity to DEFINITENESS. It emerged that high level learners used *the* with definites, and and *a/ø* with indefinites. Still, they were not successful in all the definite contexts. Their behavior was similar that of learners who omitted articles in previous studies. This indicated that omission is a characteristic problem that L2 learners with non-article L1s face during article acquisition. With regards to article omission, the study of Bergeron-Matoba provided supporting evidence for the MSIH (Prévost and White 2000). It was found that the participants in this study had the count/mass and DEFINITENESS distinctions underlying the use of articles in their ILG. Despite this knowledge, however, they were not target-like in all of the items, and as the MSIH suggests this may be tied to the difficulties they face while mapping the knowledge they have to related surface forms. In the case of low-level participants, on the other hand, SPECIFICITY effects were observed. In line with the Korean and Russian participants of Ionin and Wexler (2003), the low-level participants in the present study used *the* dominantly in [+definite, +specific] and [-definite, +specific] contexts. This finding led the researcher (2007: 19) to conclude that "[…] to mark specificity rather than definiteness appears to be a general tendency for learners of [- ART] languages."

Like Pongpairoj (2007b) and Bergeron-Matoba (2007), Robertson was also interested in article omission. Based on observational data that show L2 English learners of L1s with no articles exhibit optionality in their use of the English articles

and following the assumption that L2 learners' article omission is systematic, Robertson (2000) attempted to identify the reasons underlying omission of articles by L1-Chinese-L2-English learners through an experimental study.

The participants were 18 L1 Mandarin Chinese. Robertson employed a task developed by Gillian Brown and her colleagues as a data collection instrument. The version employed by Robertson required participants to work in pairs. Each pair (9 pairs in total) consisted of a Speaker and a Hearer. As in a picture-dictation task, the Speaker was given a sheet of paper with a diagram drawn in blue and red, and was asked to give instructions to the hearer so that s/he will draw the diagram as similar to the original one as possible. The participants were involved in four dialogues-two in English and two in Chinese. Each pair swapped roles; as a result, each participant had twice adopted the role of Speaker and twice the role of Hearer, and in each role was involved in one Chinese and one English dialogue.

The 18 dialogues produced by 9 pairs of participants resulted in 1884 NPs. These were coded in four categories; definite, demonstrative, indefinite and the numeral 'one'. Definite and indefinite NPs were further categorized according to Hawkins' (1978) taxonomy, and learners' article use in these contexts was compared. The study yielded significant results. Accuracy rates were found to be fairly consistent within subjects and across tasks. Participants, whose accuracy rates as a Speaker were high, exhibited similar levels of accuracy in the Hearer role, or vice versa. The researcher also ran analyses to find out accuracy in linguistic (definite vs. indefinite) and pragmatic (echo vs. non-echo) contexts. The findings demonstrated that, in line with previous studies (Platt, 1977; Huebner, 1985; Parrish, 1987: 376, cited in Robertson, 2000: 157), participants attained a higher level of accuracy in definite contexts (79.7%) than in indefinite contexts (72.1%). At the same time, accuracy rates turned out to be remarkably lower in echo contexts[15] than in non-echo context. Most of the omission cases seemed systematic and the researcher provided three explanations to account for article omission patterns displayed by the subjects:

---

[15] An echo context refers to a context "where two coreferential NPs with the same head noun occur separated by a turn-boundary, and where the second occurrence of the NP functions as a comprehension check […]" as in:
A: Okay? + + + er, under, un, under the blue line, go(t) *one box, rectangular*.
B: *Rectangular box*.
A: Er, red colour, rectangular (Robertson, 2000: 156).

'determiner drop', 'recoveribility principle' and 'lexical transfer principle'. Within the 'determiner drop' view, "the determiner of the second and subsequent NP in a chain of coreferential NPs may be omitted because it is within the scope of the determiner governing the first NP" (p. 162). According to the 'recoveribility principle', a NP does not need to be marked for ±DEFINITENESS if the 'definite' or 'indefinite' status of the NP is clear and unambiguous from the context. Under the third principle, some learners may use demonstratives instead of the definite article, and the numeral 'one' for the indefinite article, which leads to omission of articles. Some of the omission cases seemed to be non-systematic, and therefore could not be accounted for with the explanations above. Although they provided evidence from domains other than articles, following Haznedar and Schwartz (1977), Lardiere (1998) and Prevost and White (this issue), Robertson suggested that these cases may be a result of learners' "difficulty acquiring the correct mapping from the surface features of DEFINITENESS and referentiality (*the*, *a*, and the *zero article* Ø) onto the abstract features of the DP" (p. 135-139).

Some researchers inquired different dimensions of article acquisition. For instance, White (2008) attempted to figure out whether L1-Mandarin speakers of L2-English are sensitive to the DEFINITENESS restriction or DEFINITENESS EFFECT [16] (henceforth DE) in their article usage. The researcher stated that this notion appears in existential sentences (*i.e., there*-constructions) and added that, except a few exceptions, such sentences allow the use of indefinite determiner phrases rather than definite determiner phrases. The investigator indicated that though Mandarin does not have an article system, it does not differ from English drastically in terms of existential structures in relation to the interpretation of DEFINITENESS. The researcher worked with 15 L1-Mandarin speakers who had been living in Canada for approximately 2 years at the time of the test. According to the results of a cloze test, the proficiency level of the participants ranged between low to high intermediate. Participants were presented with an elicited production task

---

[16] Proposed by Milsark (1977), the DEFINITENESS-EFFECT categorizes expressions as strong and weak, and maintains this difference to be the core of the restriction on DEFINITENESS. Within this view, only weak expressions are licensed in existential constructions, but strong expressions are not. Indefinite DPs being weak, and definite DPs strong, only indefinites are assumed felicitous in such constructions whereas definites are prohibited. This is true for both affirmative and negative existential constructions in English (White *et al.,* 2011: 267).

in which they were required to tell a story following a sequence of 63 pictures. The data were audio-taped and transcribed for analysis. The results suggested that despite their general non-native like performance, the participants could successfully supply indefinite articles in existential sentences. The use of the definite article in such sentences occurred in a very small number of cases (only 2%). Based on these findings, the author argued that although native speakers and L2 learners of English differ from each other in article usage overall, there is little or no difference in the interpretation of definite-indefinite articles, or the DE in existential constructions between the two populations. In sum, as the researcher put it: "[…] L2ers will not necessarily have difficulties across the board. Learners might be (fundamentally) different in one domain and fundamentally similar in another." (p. 259)

In 2011, White and colleagues attempted to investigate Milsark's (1977) DE with learners of L2 English from two different L1 backgrounds. The investigators sought to explore the effects of DE in the use of English articles in negative existential constructions by L1-Turkish and L1-Russian speakers. The authors indicated that, within the DE, English allows only the indefinite article, both in affirmative and negative existential constructions. However, there seems to be a crosslinguistic difference between English on the one hand, and Turkish and Russian on the other in terms of DEFINITENESS restrictions in existential constructions. In the case of affirmative existentials, both Turkish and Russian allow only indefinite DPs as is the trend in English. In contrast, in negative existentials, where English licenses the use of only indefinite DPs, Turkish and Russian allow both definite and indefinite DPs. Drawing on these differences, the researchers explored whether L1-Turkish and L1-Russian speakers of L2-English are able to distinguish between the differences in DE in affirmative and negative existential constructions and whether they demonstrate L1 effects in the use of articles/determiners in negative existentials. For these purposes, the authors conducted a series of tasks. Two of the acceptability judgment tasks, employed earlier in White, Belikova, Hagstrom, Kupisch, and Özçelik (2009) and Belikova, Hagstrom, Kupisch, Özçelik, and White (2010) were administered to the participants. The Turkish participants were students at an English-medium university in Turkey. Their mean age was 21.6 and they had an average of nine years and six months of exposure to English. Based on the results of a cloze test, they were divided into intermediate (n=12) and advanced (n=10) groups.

The L1-Russian group included adult speakers of L2-English with a mean age of 32.10. These participants were residing in Canada. In addition to EFL instruction they had received in their country, they were also exposed to English in a naturalistic environment. Native speaker groups also took part in the two tests as control groups. The results obtained from both L1 groups showed that, although Turkish and Russian allow the use of strong determiners with negative existentials, both intermediate and advanced level groups successfully rejected the use of strong determiners in negative existentials as is entailed in English. Advanced level groups were observed to exhibit native-like performance. The results from these two tasks suggested that the participants could recognize the DEFINITENESS restrictions in affirmative and negative existentials irrespective of L1 effects. As a follow-up and to better understand learners' sensitivity to DE in an area where the L1 and the L2 differ from each other *(i.e.,* negative existentials), the test items in the tasks reported above were translated in Turkish and Russian, and divided into relevant subtypes. This version of the tasks was conducted to adult L1 monolingual Turkish and L1 Russian speakers. These subjects were expected to read the sentences translated into their L1 and to decide whether they were grammatical or not. The analysis of the results revealed that participants considered negative existentials with strong determiners as acceptable diverging from the patterns exhibited by L2 learners. This provided support to the proposal that the two languages differ from English in the use of determiners with negative existential and thus, the successful performance of learners cannot be attributed to their L1. The overall results from all the tasks showed that L2 English and L1 Turkish/L1 Russian participants did not differ from L2 English native speakers in accepting weak determiners in affirmative and negative existential and rejecting strong determiners in affirmative existentials. Nevertheless, while L2 learners rejected negative existentials with strong determiners conforming to L2 norms, the L1 Turkish and L1 Russian participants regarded such constructions as acceptable following the L1 patterns. These findings suggested that L1-Turkish and L1-Russian learners of L2-English could evaluate their mother tongues and L2 in their own right. Thus, they could allow the necessary forms in their L2 even when these forms conflicted with those licensed by their L1. This being the case, these findings provided counter evidence to the propositions of the FTFA, and showed that L2 English learners with non-article L1s "are very sensitive to subtle restrictions on DEFINITENESS in the L2" (p. 275).

The studies reported up to now have no doubt brought forth important pedagogical implications and may have contributed to teaching the English article system in one way or another. Nevertheless, their main concern was not article pedagogy. Below are some of the influential studies which have addressed pedagogical issues and offered article teaching models.

Master, one of the highly cited researchers in the domain of English article acquisition research has carried out many studies on article pedagogy. In one of his earliest work, Master (1988) suggested that a step-by-step path should be followed in teaching the article system. To this end, he generated the following six questions which help gain the mastery of articles gradually by acquiring items underlying article usage from less to more complex: (1) Is the noun countable or uncountable?, (2) Is the noun definite or indefinite?, (3) Is the noun postmodified or not?, (4) Is the noun generic or specific?, (5) Is the noun common or proper?, (6) Is the noun part of an idiomatic phrase or not?

In this particular study, the researcher covered only the first four questions in the given order (from easier to more difficult). In a nutshell, the author proposed that the distinction between countable and uncountable nouns should be taught in the very first place. Nevertheless, teachers should go beyond teaching the simple distinctions between countable and uncountable nouns. They should draw attention to dual nouns, which can be used both as countable and uncountable (e.g. iron, change etc.). Learners should be guided to find out that the uncountable form usually has a generic meaning whereas the countable form has a more specific one (e.g. stone-the generalized material vs. a stone- a specified object). At this stage, learners should also be informed about the derivation of *a/an* from *one*, and they should be taught that, as a result, *a/an* can only be used with singular countable nouns, not with plurals or uncountables. He also warned that only after all aspects of countable/uncountable nouns have been taught, should teachers move to the distinction between definite and indefinite. While teaching the indefinite-definite distinction, presenting contexts as first-mention indefinites and second-mention definites can be a good step because this is the easiest rule for nonnative speakers to understand and apply. Nevertheless, contexts should be chosen carefully at this stage and learners should not be presented with isolated sentences since such sentences do not provide good examples for second mention definite. As for pre and

postmodification, the author indicated that learners should be taught that adjectives preceding uncountable nouns do not determine DEFINITENESS of that noun unlike what they tend to believe. Rather, they should be informed that postmodification usually limits an uncountable noun or makes it definite. Lastly, after all the aspects of the article system have been covered, learners should be given information about generic and specific nature of nouns. Master indicated that generics are not dealt with as required in most ESL grammar books and he suggested that exercises on article usage should thoroughly focus on the area of article usage being taught rather than embodying all aspects of it at initial or intermediary stages. He indicated that exercises containing all areas of article usage should be seen as an endpoint step. Furthermore, the author recommended that generics be divided into abstract generics and concrete generics for ease of understanding on the part of learners.

In a subsequent work, Master (1990) proposed a Binary Schema for teaching the English article system to nonnative speakers of English. Based on Bolinger's (1977) view that "the natural condition of a language is to preserve one form for one meaning, and one meaning for one form" (p. x) (cited in Master, 1990: 465) as a motive, Master suggested that "A one form/one function correspondence can be approximated when $Ø$ is used to classify a noun and *the* to identify it (as *a* is derived from the word *one* and therefore only applies to singular countable nouns, it is considered a variant form of $Ø$ rather than a separate category of articles)." Thus, the researcher developed a dichotomy by which articles are categorized as *classification* and *identification*. Master proposed that within this simplified schema of the English articles, notions of classification and identification can be taught to learners before articles themselves are introduced. Following this, learners' attention can be drawn to countable noun/uncountable noun distinction as a subset of classification, and finally to singular/plural noun distinction as a subset of countability. As the next step, straightforward "rules of thumb" of article usage can be taught to learners under the categories of classification and identification. The researcher concluded with the advantages of this framework. He suggested that the binary schema provided a framework whereby a different role of $a/Ø$ and *the* is defined. In addition, the schema combined the features of definite and specific under the *identification* category; hence, no further generic/specific distinction was required. On the other

hand, the investigator mentioned a limitation of this schema. He stated that proper nouns and idiomatic phrases should be treated separately.

In another study, Master (1997) attempted to cover the three English articles (*a, the* and *Ø*) in terms of acquisition, function and pedagogy. As in his earlier studies, Master suggested that teaching the English article system should be gradual; that is, it should be extended over a period of time. For these purposes, he proposed a guideline for teaching the English article system, which can be followed from the beginning to the advanced level. He proposed that rules of article usage should not be accentuated for beginner level learners at the onset of their article acquisition process. Instead, a teacher should introduce articles through lexical items by distinguishing, for instance, between *a banana* and *spaghetti* rather than *banana* and *spaghetti*. The researcher suggested that the teacher can use pictures or realia to draw attention to ±countability of a noun. Food, materials and mass nouns can be introduced in contrast to their countable representatives. Master advised that, at this stage the teacher should refrain from introducing the definite article *the* except when it appears with certain country names such as *The United States of America* and *the People's Republic of China*. At the intermediate level, metacognitive methods of teaching such as Master's (1990) binary system can be resorted to. A variety of exercises such as those that promote comprehension and entail application of the article system (Berry, 1991), and those that require input processing (VanPatten and Cadierno, 1993) can be used along with fill-in-the blanks exercises. According to Master, at the advanced level, adopting a lexical approach for teaching the article system would be appropriate. At this stage, it would not be fruitful to expose learners to rules of article usage. Rather, it would prove more helpful to encourage learners to learn articles through lexical items in contexts with particular attention to the use of *Ø* and *the* in particular phrases. As the researcher suggested, in line with Lewis (1993), learners should also be guided to learn from their mistakes by noting down and examining the article usage errors they have made.

Having offered various models for teaching the English article system, Master (2003b) carried out a pilot study with nonnative English speakers of various L1 backgrounds to test how effective these models are. He tested the effects of different pedagogical frameworks in teaching subjects the English article system. The participants were 75 intermediate-level international subjects enrolled in an intensive

English program. Their average age was 24.11 and the average reported years of English study was 7.18. The participants were given a 15-minute pre-test with 60 items which included 12 generic, 12 shared knowledge, 12 ranking-adjectives and 24 post-modified noun phrase contexts. Following that, they were exposed to three treatments, each of which was generated by Master, and provided a different pedagogical framework for teaching English articles. Treatment A involved the above-mentioned binary system that divided articles as classification (*a* and the *zero*[17] *article*) vs. identification (*the* and the *null article*) (Master, 1990). Treatment B represented articles according to the information structure as new information (*a* and the *zero article*) vs. given information (*the* and the *null article*) (Master, 2002). Treatment C was based on the six-question approach designed to teach English articles (Master, 1994). The subjects were divided into five groups and exposed to four treatment combinations. Group 1 received A alone, Group 2 received B alone, Group 3 received both A and B, and Group 4 received only C. Being the control group, Group 5 received no treatment. Each experimental group was administered treatment one hour per week, which went on for three successive weeks. The same groups also spent an additional one hour per week doing exercises on articles as an in-class activity. The 15-minute test which was previously conducted was administered again after four weeks. The findings showed that there was improvement in the performance of all the groups including the control group which received no treatment as shown in Master (1994). The difference between pre and post-tests was highest in the binary system framework followed by the binary system together with the information structure framework, the information structure framework alone, the six-question framework and the control group. Further analysis showed that the binary system framework was the only treatment with a significant difference. Thus, it was shown "to have produced the greatest pedagogical effect." (p.5)

---

[17] Following Chesterman (1991), Master (2003a) distinguished between *zero* and *null articles*. According to Chesterman (1991) *zero article* occurs with indefinite uncountable (*e.g.,* milk) and plural countable nouns (*e.g.,* eggs) whereas *null article* emerges with bounded singular proper nouns (cited in Master, 2003a: 3-4). In this study, the terms *zero* and *null article* were used interchangeably to refer to cases where no article is required without making uncountable/plural countable and singular proper noun distinction (*see* Master, 2003a for further details).

3.1. Conclusion

In this chapter, outstanding work documented in article acquisition domain has been reported. Clearly, article acquisition research has yielded competing findings as to the order/accuracy of article acquisition; the factors that play a role in the acquisition of articles, and child/adult article acquisition processes. While some investigators found that *the* is acquired earlier and more easily than *a*, others have claimed the reverse. Similarly, while some researchers have acknowledged noun phrase function relationships, some have adopted a UG-rooted approach as to the sources of knowledge or errors in article acquisition. In this line, they proposed that semantic features other than DEFINITENESS (*i.e.,* SPECIFICITY and PARTITIVITY) influenced article acquisition such that L2 English learners made non-random article usage errors at early or intermediary stages of their ILG development. Again, while some researchers provided counter evidence to the assumption that child and adult article acquisition are similar, some have shown that these two populations follow the same path during article acquisition, and this was taken as further support for UG access view.

The purpose of the present study is to examine L1 Turkish-L2 English learners' article acquisition within the generative tradition. It aims to explore the role of semantic universals in article choice, and hereby, contribute to the domain of article acquisition research.

CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY

4. Introduction

The present study investigates article acquisition of L2-English learners with L1-Turkish background from a generative perspective. It aims to investigate whether the universal semantic features DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY have any roles on L1 Turkish learners' article acquisition process. In order to provide a thorough picture of L1-Turkish speaking L2-English learners' knowledge and use of the English articles, both their conscious and unconscious knowledge of the English article system was examined via a written elicitation task and a written narrative task. Based on research (*e.g.,* Huebner, 1983; Robertson, 2000, cited in Ionin *et al.,* 2004a, 2004b) that shows learners omit articles more frequently in spontaneous production, learners' rates of article omission in the written narrative task was also investigated. Finally, whether proficiency level has an effect on correct article usage or not was also explored.

4.1. Setting and Participants

The study was carried out in the English Language Teaching (ELT) Department of Mustafa Kemal University in Hatay, Turkey. Data was collected from two proficiency groups as determined by the Oxford Quick Placement Test (henceforth OQPT). According to the OQPT, 25 learners were at elementary level, and 25 were at intermediate level.

Elementary level learners consisted of 20 females and 5 males. Their age range was 20-24 years with a mean of 21.60 (SD 1.56). Their OQPT score (maximum 60 points) ranged between 23 and 29, and the mean score was 27.44 (SD 1.91). At the time of testing they had been exposed to English for a mean duration of 11.16 years (SD 1.65). The intermediate level learners included 18 females and 7 males. Their age ranged between 19 and 29 years, and the mean age was 23.24 years (SD 2.31). They scored between 40 and 47 with a mean score of 42.92 points (SD

2.30). Their mean length of exposure to English was 12.76 years (SD 3.15) at the time of testing.

4 out of the 25 elementary level learners and 6 out of the 25 intermediate level learners reported to have stayed abroad (*i.e.,* in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus[18], Saudi Arabia, Spain, Greece, Qatar, England and Germany). The shortest length of stay abroad was 3 days and reported to be in TRNC, and the longest time spent abroad (20 years) was reported to be in Saudi Arabia. 8 elementary level and 19 intermediate learners reported to speak an additional foreign language (Arabic, French, German or Spanish) other than English. Participants were also asked to self-rate their overall English proficiency. 14 elementary level learners rated themselves as intermediate-level, 9 as advanced-level and 1 as a near native learner. 1 participant was found to skip this part. 11 intermediate level learners rated their overall proficiency as intermediate; 12 as advanced and 2 as native-like. Detailed information about the participants is provided in Appendix 1.

Prior to the main study, a pilot study was conducted with 5 elementary level and 5 intermediate level learners at Mustafa Kemal University. The proficiency level of the learners was determined by the OQPT. The pilot study and reliability statistics revealed that there were no problematic items in the tasks. The rate of Cronbah's Alpha in the written elicitation task was found to be 0.86 (see Appendix 2). This rate suggests that the task can be considered as a reliable instrument. On the basis of the pilot study, the procedure of the main study was specified. Time allotment of each task was determined, and a small change[19] was made to the instructions of the written narrative task.

4.2. Procedure

At the beginning of the data collection procedure, learners were informed about the aim of the study, and were told that participation was voluntary. Before the administration of the test instruments, learners signed consent forms. Next, they

---

[18] Henceforth TRCN

[19] In the pilot study, learners were instructed to provide three-six sentences to each question in the written narrative task as in the original study (Ionin *et al.,* 2004). It was observed that learners avoided writing much and kept the number of their sentences to a minimum (three sentences only) when instructed so. Since the aim of the task was to observe learners' unconscious article usage, we aimed to elicit as many sentences as possible. Therefore, the instruction was altered so that learners would write at least five sentences to each question.

filled in a form about demographic data such as age, gender and length of exposure to English. After that, participants were given a written elicitation task. Finally, a written narrative task was administered. The data collection session took approximately two hours, and was conducted in the presence of the learners' instructors.

4.3. Data Collection Instruments

As stated previously, two types of tasks (*i.e.,* a written elicitation task and a written narrative task) designed by Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b, 2009) were utilized as data collection instruments. Each task is described in detail below.

4.3.1. Written Elicitation Task

Ionin, Zubizarreta and Philippov (2009) developed a written elicitation task (henceforth WET) modeled after the forced-choice elicitation tests used by Ionin *et al.* (2003, 2004a, 2004b) (see Appendix 3). The 2009 version differed from pervious tasks in that (1) it did not provide learners with choices to fill in the gaps in the contexts, but asked learners to fill in the blanks with *any* word that they deemed appropriate, and (2) it included contexts with filler words such as prepositions, auxiliaries, pronouns *etc.* besides articles. These changes made the task more objective since they prevented learners from focusing on articles while doing the task and also prevented them from finding the correct article merely by guessing.

The task included 60 items. Each item was designed in the form of a short dialogue with four turns maximum. One of the last sentences of each dialogue included a blank and targeted a particular word. The dialogues created contexts that help eliminate possible ambiguities in the interpretation of sentences. Among the 60 items, 24 were of particular interest for the purposes of this study. These items included six [+definite, +specific], six [+definite, -specific], six [-definite, +specific] and six [-definite, -specific] contexts. The former two contexts targeted the definite article *the*, and the latter two were designed to elicit the indefinite article *a/an*. The dialogues below exemplify these four context types:

(50) *[+definite, +specific]: target article 'the'*

At the end of a running race

Laura: Are you ready to leave?

Betsy: No, not yet. First, I need to talk to _____ winner of this race – he is my good friend, and I want to congratulate him!

(51) *[+definite, -specific]: target article 'the'*

After a girls' soccer game at school

Child: Excuse me! Can you please let me in?

Coach: What do you need?

Child: I am a reporter for my school newspaper! I need to talk to_____ winner of this game – I don't know who she is, so can you please help me?

(52) *[-definite, +specific]: target article 'a(n)'*

Grandfather comes for a visit

Grandfather: Where is my little granddaughter Beth? Is she home?

Father: No… She is not going to be back till late. She is having dinner with _____ girl from class – her name is Angie, and Beth really likes her.

(53) *[-definite, -specific]: target article 'a(n)'*

Mother comes home

Mother: How did Peter spend the day at his grandmother's?

Father: He had a good time. He did his homework for tomorrow. Then he went outside and played with _____ little girl – I don't know who it was. Then he came back inside; and then I came and took him home.

(from Ionin *et al.,* 2009: 339-340)

In addition to the context types above, twelve items were designed to test learners' use of articles in different contexts. Of the twelve contexts, six represented previous-mention definite and the other six represented partitive-indefinite contexts. These contexts were intended to elicit *the* and *a/an*, respectively. The remaining 24 contexts were *fillers*, and as stated previously, they targeted words other than articles such as auxiliaries, prepositions and pronouns.

In the WET, participants were asked to fill each blank with the word that they thought was most appropriate in the given context. They were asked to fill in the blank with the word that they felt was best if they thought more than one word was possible in a given context. They were instructed to put a dash (-) in a context to indicate that no word was needed in that context. In this way, these responses would be distinguished from contexts which were deliberately or unintentionally skipped by the participants. Finally, learners were asked to answer the questions in the given order and not to change their earlier responses because the focus of the task was on learners' intuitions about article usage and not on grammar accuracy.

After the data were collected, each participant's number of errors in each of the contexts mentioned above was typed into a computer file. In addition, each context, with the exception of fillers, was divided into three subtypes as 'number of substitution errors', 'number of omission errors' and 'number of other errors' to help define each participant's number of errors by type (*i.e.,* substitution, omission, other). Next, Kolmogrov-Smirnov and Levene's tests were run to find out whether the scores in the critical categories were normally distributed and whether the variances were homogenous or not. In accordance with the results of these tests, independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare the scores of the two proficiency groups in each context. For the comparison of two different contexts or the subtypes of the same context within one sample, paired samples t-tests were run.

4.3.2. Written Narrative Task

The written narrative task (henceforth WNT) was designed by Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b). As in Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b), this task was employed to test the unconscious knowledge of L2-learners' article use, and hence to supplement the WET. Unlike WETs, in WNTs there is no direct focus on the feature being tested. This enables the researcher to have access to the unconscious knowledge of learners regarding the feature in question. Therefore, in the context of this study, as Ionin *et al.* (2004b: x) state, WNTs "give us a better indication than the formal written elicitation studies of how L2-English learners use articles in daily life."

In order to collect written narratives from participants, the following five questions were presented to the learners in the given order:

1. Talk about some valuable object that you own or owned in the past: either (1) talk about something that you received as a gift, and tell about how you received it; or (2) talk about something valuable that you lost, and tell about how you lost it.

2. (*For those who come from other cities*) Talk about the day when you first arrived in Antakya. Describe your experiences of that day – what you did, where you went, to whom you talked, etc./ (*For those who are from Antakya*) Have you ever been abroad or to another city in Turkey? Describe your experiences of that time – what you did, where you went, whom you met, *etc.*

3. Describe your room – talk about what objects you have in your room, and describe them.

4. Talk about what you did on one of your recent vacations (*e.g.,* summer vacation) or at the week-end. Talk about where you went and what you did.

5. Imagine that you get $1000 as a gift, and you have to spend it right away (you can't put it in the bank). Talk about how you would spend this money.

Small changes such as city names as in question 2 were made to the original task (Ionin *et al.,* 2004b) with the permission of the researchers so that the questions would be adapted to the participants of the present study.

Although it is difficult to thoroughly control the contexts in such tasks, some of the questions were designed to elicit particular contexts. Question 1 was designed to elicit [-definite, +specific] contexts because learners would write about an object to which they attach some importance but which at the same time is unknown by the hearer. Questions 2 and 4 did not aim a particular context and were designed to elicit both definite and indefinite descriptions. Question 3 targeted non-specific indefinites in there-have constructions where no importance is attached to the entities listed as a response to this question. Question 5 was designed to elicit narrow-scope indefinites and also possibly definites as learners would write about a hypothetical, unreal situation in which they would win $1000. All of these questions, with the exception of Question 5, were expected to elicit previous-mention definite contexts.

As in Ionin *et al.* (2004b), learners were instructed to provide written answers to these five questions in the given order. Nevertheless, unlike the original test which asked for three to six sentences, learners were instructed to provide at least five

sentences in the present study because in the pilot study learners were observed to limit their answers to three sentences. Since the task was geared to test learners' article use, learners were asked not to worry about grammar or spelling and not to change their previous responses. Crucially, they were not told that the task aimed to test their knowledge of English article usage. The time limit for the task was 30 minutes, and participants were instructed not to spend too much time on any given question.

4.3.2.1. Determining Definiteness and Specificity in the Written Narrative Task

Ionin *et al*. (2004b: x) state that, as opposed to formal WETs, in the WNTs, researchers have limited control over the contexts produced by the testees. Thus, determining DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY of a context may pose some problems. While it is possible to check a context as [+definite] or [-definite] by asking native speaker coders to insert *the* or *a/an* in a given context, labeling it as [+specific] or [-specific] may be challenging as SPECIFICITY is largely in the mind of the speaker. Still, there are some ways to find out whether a context is [+specific] or [-specific]. In the case of indefinites for instance, an indefinite DP with narrow-scope[20] is obligatorily [-specific] as illustrated in (54):

> **(54)** So, I would spend 1000 dollars to get *a* **passport,** *a* **plane ticket,** *a* **camera**.

Sentence (54) was produced by one of the participants as an answer to Question 5. In this sentence, the learner is talking about an unreal situation in which she would get 1000 dollars, and the sentence has narrow-scope reading. Therefore, the referents of the indefinite descriptions (*i.e.,* a passport, a plane ticket, a camera) do not denote specific entities.

An indefinite DP with wide-scope however may be [+specific] or [-specific] as shown below in participants' written production:

> **(55)** After practicing with my sister's guitar, I really wanted my own and

---

[20] In the Routledge Language and Linguistics Dictionary (Bussmann, 1996: 1033), *scope* is defined in the following way: "In analogy to formal logic, where 'scope' denotes the range governed by operators (logical connective, quantifier), in linguistics 'scope' denotes the range of semantic reference of negation, linguistic quantifiers, and particles […]."

after a while, I've got really good and covered ***a really nice song that my parents really love.***

In sentence (55), the DP has wide-scope. The referent of the indefinite description is most likely to be [+specific] because on the part of the learner, it seems to have the noteworthy property of being a song which his parents like.

In the following wide-scope indefinite context, on the other hand, the referent of the indefinite description does not seem to have a noteworthy property on the part of the speaker. Hence, it is likely to be non-specific.

(56) I climbed ***a mountain*** a few weekends ago.

Another clue is the use of indefinites in there-have constructions. Such constructions allow the use of referential *this* in contexts where the speaker intends to refer to a particular individual or object in mind:

(57) There is *this* peculiar bird in the garden – it doesn't look like anything I've ever seen!

(58) I have *this* really neat new coffeemaker in my kitchen – it has a timer and it turns itself off automatically.

(from Ionin *et al.,* 2004b: x)

Nevertheless, there-have constructions are primarily used to list descriptions with no noteworthy property attached to the listed entities. Therefore the use of referential *this* is not felicitous in contexts that simply include listing as shown in (59b) and (60b):

(59) a. There are *a* bird and *a* squirrel in the garden.
b. # There are this bird and *this* squirrel in the garden.

(60) a. In my kitchen, I have a stove, a refrigerator, and a large round table.
b. # In my kitchen, I have this stove, this refrigerator, and this large round table.

Given that referential *this*, which is a SPECIFICITY marker in colloquial English, is licensed in some there-have constructions as illustrated in (57) and (58), it

is not possible to assert that such constructions are always [-specific]. Nonetheless, since in the WNT, learners are simply expected to list descriptions as an answer to Question 3 and produce there-have sentences as in (59a) and (60a), for the purposes of this study all there-have constructions will be labeled as [-specific] (Ionin *et al.,* 2004b: x).

4.4. Coding Procedure

To determine whether a context was definite or indefinite, the collected data had to be prepared and presented to coders (*i.e.,* English native speakers). For this purpose, the following procedures were followed as in Ionin *et al.* (2004b). After participants had completed the WNT, the data provided were typed and organized separately in two groups (*i.e.,* elementary level learner data and intermediate level learner data). Following that, each participant's answers were removed, and a blank was inserted before each NP regardless of whether it required an article or not, or whether the participant had originally used an article or not. These versions were e-mailed to four remote coders. All of the coders were native speakers of English. They were told that the narratives were all produced by L2-English speakers, and that all the articles, with the exception of those in formulaic expressions, were removed. They were instructed to write the definite *the,* indefinite *a/an* or the *null article (--)* in the blanks so that we would be able to find out the unambiguously definite and indefinite contexts, and determine whether learners have used articles felicitously in the narratives that they produced. The coders were asked to fill in the blanks with articles whenever possible but were reminded that they could use another word such as a numeral, demonstrative or possessive pronoun if it sounded better. Crucially, they were told to ignore grammatical errors and focus on the meaning that the subject was trying to convey since the meaning of the context would help determine the appropriate article. They were warned about not paying attention to capitalization and instructed to insert an article when necessary even if a blank was placed sentence initial with a capitalized word as in "_____ People of Izmir are very kind and friendly". Finally, they were told to insert a question mark (?) if they could not understand a context due to the grammatical errors on the part of the learner and also to work individually to provide an unbiased baseline. Unfamiliar Turkish words such as *döner, künefe* and *sanal bebek* that emerged in the narratives

were described in English so that the coders would be able to understand the narratives better (See Appendix 4 for more details about the instructions).

After each narrative was coded by four coders, the unambiguously definite and the unambiguously indefinite contexts were specified. In an unambiguously definite context, all four coders used *the* whereas in an unambiguously indefinite context, they used *a/an* with singular NPs, and the *zero article* or *some* with plurals. The contexts where the coders supplied different articles; that is, where, for instance, three coders used the definite article while the other used the indefinite one (or vice versa) were excluded from the count due to ambiguity. Furthermore, contexts in which at least one coder used a demonstrative or a possessive pronoun were excluded from further analysis. As for contexts with a question mark (?), if only one coder used a question mark and the other three agreed on the same article, the choice of the three coders was accepted as correct. On the other hand, if only one coder used a question mark and the choices of the other coders differed from each other, that context was excluded from further analysis. Contexts where more than one coder used a question mark were also excluded.

After the contexts were separated as unambiguously definite and unambiguously indefinite, they were further divided as *countable noun singular*, *countable noun plural* and *mass noun* as a post-coding procedure. Contexts where all four coders used *a/an* were classified as *indefinite countable noun singular*. Contexts where all the coders used no article *(--)* or *some* were categorized either as *indefinite mass noun* or *indefinite countable noun plural* depending on the NP. Contexts in which all four coders consistently used *the* were classified as definite. Depending on the NP, definite contexts were also subdivided as *countable noun singular, countable noun plural* and *mass noun*.

4.5. Article Use with Indefinites

In this section, L2-English learners' indefinite article use and possible SPECIFICITY effects on L2-English article choice will be sketched. Singular and plural/mass indefinites will be reported separately.

4.5.1. Types of singular indefinites:

The unambiguously indefinite contexts were those in which all the coders used the indefinite 'a/an'. These contexts were divided into the following categories as in Ionin *et al.* (2004b: x):

4.5.1.1. Wide scope indefinites

As in Ionin *et al.* (2004b), most of the wide-scope indefinite contexts occurred in sentences with no intensional operators as in (61a-d), and few were in sentences scoping over an intensional verb or modal as in (61e-f).

(61) *Singular wide-scope indefinites: correct use of 'a':*
a. My boyfriend gave me *a beautiful necklace* in 2008.
b. I met *a Scottish girl*.
c. After *a terribly long car drive* (14 hours), we finally arrived to Hatay.
d. He heard that and when he couldn't reach me, he sent me *a new mobile phone.*
e. When I came in Antakya, firstly I met *a man who was my father's friend.*
f. He gave me *a necklace which was silver as a present.*

As already stated, a wide-scope indefinite may be [+specific] or [-specific]. In (61a-d-e-f), the speakers seem to attach some importance to the NPs in question. For instance, in (61a) the speaker might think the necklace given to her by her boyfriend has a noteworthy property distinguishing it from other necklaces. Thus, the indefinite NPs in (61a-d-e-f) are most likely to be [+specific]. In (61b-c), however, it seems no importance is attached to the NPs in question hence these sentences might be regarded as [-specific]. As Ionin *et al.* (2004b) state, since it is impossible to be certain about whether a wide-scope indefinite is [+specific] or [-specific], for the purposes of this study, all wide-scope indefinites were regarded as potentially but not necessarily [+specific].

4.5.1.2. Narrow scope indefinites

The indefinites in the narrow-scope category take scope with respect to another scope-bearing element. As in Ionin *et al.* (2004b), most instances of this

category occurred as an answer to question (5) which asked learners to write what they would do if they were given $1000. Below are some instances[21] of narrow-scope indefinites taken from learners' narratives:

(62) *Singular narrow-scope indefinites: correct use of 'a':*

a. If I had 1000 dollars, firstly I'd buy *a* **car,** *a* **house** for my family, and I then, I would use it for my school.

b. I'll buy *a* **huge house** for my mother and buy *a* **good car** for my elder brother.

c. At first, I buy *a* **car whose brand is Peugeot 407**. And then maybe I buy *a* **good computer.**

d. Firstly, I would buy *a* **mobile phone** for my sister.

e. I will buy *a* **ticket** to London and I have good holiday.

f. I would spend all of it for *a* **new guitar.**

g. I would definitely get *a* **motorcycle**. With 1000 bucks, I could get myself *a* **nice one** I believe.

In the aforementioned sections, we stated that following Ionin *et al.* (2004b), we regarded narrow-scope indefinites as obligatorily [-specific] because the referent of the indefinite NP is part of a hypothetical world and does not exist in the real world. Thus, the indefinite NP in a narrow-scope indefinite context is most likely to refer to a non-specific individual or entitiy who/which has no importance from the speaker's perspective.

4.5.1.3. Indefinites in "*there* construction" and as "objects of *have*"

Singular indefinites in there-have constructions mainly occurred as a response to question (3) as shown in (63a-b-f-g-h). In their responses, learners simply listed items to which they attach no importance. Therefore, indefinites in "*there-have* constructions" were considered as [-specific].

(63) *Indefinites in there construction and as objects of have: correct use of 'a'*

a. I have *a* **bed,** *a* **wardrobe**, my computer etc.

---

[21] The sample sentences were taken as they occurred in learners' narratives.

 b. I have *a* **small table lamp** in my desk.

 c. We had *a* **good time** there.

 d. Because I have *a* **weak memory**, I hardly remember where I put them.

 e. My room has *a* **big window**.

 f. There is *a* **small table** and *a* **blue chair**.

 g. In my room, there is *a* **bed,** *a* **wardrobe,** *an* **armchair,** *a* **chair,** *a* **table**.

 h. There is *a* **TV** next to my desk, but I almost never turn it on.

4.5.1.4. Indefinites in post-copular position

As their name suggests, post-copular indefinites, the last type of singular definite contexts, occurred in post-copular positions of copular constructions. Some examples of this context type are given in (64):

(64) *Indefinites in post-copular position: correct use of 'a':*

a. She is *a* **nurse** in the hospital at Gazi University.

b. I am *a* **shopaholic**.

c. When I was *a* **child**, I had a lot of buckles.

d. I think Antakya is *a* **very mysterious city**.

e. Then we visited the Planetoryum, it is *a* **science house** and really there are very interesting objects there.

f. It was *an* **enjoyable memory**.

g. It was four years from now and it was *a* **winter night**.

h. My first gift was *an* **earphone** from my girlfriend.

Ionin *et al.* (2004b) suggest that predicational copular[22] constructions (64a-d) are necessarily [-specific]. On the contrary, identificational copular[23] constructions (64e-h) may be [+specific] as in (64h) where the narrator most probably has a specific earphone in mind which is singled out with the noteworthy property of being given by his girlfriend.

---

[22] Citing Higgins's (1979) taxonomy of copular constructions, Ionin *et al.* (2004b) state there are different types of copular constructions such as *predicational, identificational, equative/identity* or *specificational*. Referring to Higgins (1979), Ionin *et al.* (2004b) state that predicational copular constructions include sentences like "*She is a teacher*".

[23] As cited in Ionin *et al.* (2004b), the sentence "*This is Kim*" exemplifies identificational copular constructions.

4.5.2. Types of plural/mass indefinites

Plural and mass indefinites were marked with the *zero article (--)* or *some* by the coders. Different from singular indefinites, the category of post-copular position was absent here because there were no mass or plural post-copular indefinites in learners' narratives. As in the original study, there were more plural indefinites than mass indefinites. Following Ionin *et al.* (2004b: x), these indefinite contexts were also divided into subcategories:

4.5.2.1. Wide scope indefinites

As was the case with singulars, plural/mass wide-scope indefinites in learners' narratives did not scope over intensional operators. Like wide-scope singular indefinites, wide-scope plural/mass indefinites may be [+specific] or [-specific].

(65) *Plural/mass wide scope indefinites: correct article omission*
a. And also I read *Ø* **books**, too.
b. Even if we are from *Ø* **different countries**, we love each other more than enough.
c. Last semester I went to Istanbul. *(A long description of what the learner did there follows).* I saw *Ø* **new places.**
d. I ate *Ø* **fish** and I went to my cousin's house.
e. My room is full of *Ø* **junk** to be honest.

4.5.2.2. Narrow scope indefinites

Plural/mass narrow-scope indefinites took scope under an intensional operator, and were exclusively [-specific] as in singular indefinites. The following sentences, which were generated as answers to Question 5, exemplify plural/mass indefinite nouns with narrow-scope.

(66) *Plural/mass narrow scope indefinites: correct article omission*
a. I would get *Ø* **gold**.
b. Secondly I take me *Ø* **jewelry, *Ø* clothes**…
c. I would like to spend all my time in this house alone and read these books, watch *Ø* **films** or etc.

    d.   If I got 1000 dollars as a gift, I spent it buying *Ø* **gifts** to my
           classmates because it is a long time I am thinking but I haven't done
           yet because I don't have enough money.

    e.   I will buy a ticket to London and I have good holiday. Going to
           another place and meeting with *Ø* **new people** must be amazing!

4.5.2.3. Indefinites in *there* construction and indefinites as objects of *have*

Elementary level learners did not produce any sentences with these structures. The examples below are all from intermediate level learners' narratives. Following Ionin *et al.* (2004b), the verb *include* was added to this category since it denotes possession like *have*. As was discussed above, the indefinites used in these constructions are likely to be [-specific].

(67) *Plural/mass indefinites in there-constructions and as objects of 'have': correct article omission*

    a.   There is a couch, and desk and table. Also there are *Ø* **flowers.**

    b.   It includes *Ø* **trousers,** *Ø* **jeans,** *Ø* **shirts,** *Ø* **pullovers**.

    c.   Apart from that, we have some gifts such as *Ø* **teddy bears,** *Ø* **photos**
           and a computer and a radio.

4.6. Article Use with Definites

Following Ionin *et al.* (2004b), all the contexts labeled as unambiguously definite by native-speaker coders, were classified into subtypes in order to analyze whether there is a relationship between these categories and L2 English article choice.

4.6.1. Anaphoric definites

Anaphoric definites are previous-mention definites. These definite descriptions appear in contexts where the referent of the DP had been explicitly introduced in the previous discourse. Anaphoric definites are inherently [+specific] as in (68a). In (68a), the referent of the definite NP *the pen* was introduced earlier in discourse, so it is anaphoric. In addition, it has the noteworthy property of being the pen given to her by her teacher, and therefore interpreted as [+specific].

(68) *Anaphoric definites: correct use of 'the'*

a. *[The learner writes about a pen given to her by her teacher. The learner also mentions that she has a weak memory and therefore forgets where she puts some objects.]* Anyway, I lost **my pen**. Then after 6 months I found it in a book. It is very precious to me. Because I love my teacher so much. So I love *the* **pen**, too.

b. I've watched **a film** recently. *The* **film** was shot in Italy's streets, villages.

c. I lost **my ring** last month and I was very sad because *the* **ring** was given by my friend.

d. I have **a small car**. It is a police car and blue. It was given me by a girl 2 years ago. She is very important for me so *the* **car** is important, too.

4.6.2. Definites unique by entailment

Definites that are unique by entailment occur in DPs with a complement phrase. Although there is no previous-mention of the referent, or the hearer has no knowledge of it, the complement phrase "narrows down the domain of the discourse sufficiently to allow the hearer to share the speaker's knowledge of uniqueness" (Ionin *et al.,* 2004b: x).

(69) *Definites that are unique by entailment: correct uses of 'the'*

a. I have a beautiful town with so many trees. I like to spend my holidays there cause that town is gather my family. **All of *the* people that I live** is together in that town.

b. *[The learner writes about a travel to Antalya and gives details about this experience.]* It was great experience to watch Fire of Anatolia in ***the* antique theatre of Aspendos!**

c. There is a TV **at the corner of *the* room**.

d. I would give *the* **rest of it** to my sisters.

e. Or maybe I can bury it and **all of *the* money which is on the universe** because of capital system.

Ionin *et al.* (2004b: x) indicate that this type of definites may be either [+specific] or [-specific] depending on whether or not the speaker attaches

prominence the referent due to some noteworthy property. For instance, in (69a), the speaker may have in her/his mind a noteworthy property about the referent. *The people* refers to his family, he loves them and they live in town x which he likes a lot. This may a noteworthy property on the part of the speaker, and therefore, may give the referent a [+specific] interpretation. In (69c-d-e), on the other hand, the speaker may not have a specific entity in her/his mind. Ionin *et al.* (2004b) warn that one cannot be certain about the intentions of the speaker; however, they state that definites unique by entailment are most likely to be [+specific].

4.6.3. Associative use of definites

Ionin *et al.* (2004b: x) suggest that associative use of definites are similar to the associative anaphoric use of definites (cf. Poesio and Vieira, 1997). Referring to Poesio and Vieira (1997: 6), Ionin *et al.* (2004b: x) states that when associative anaphoric definites are used, "Speaker and hearer may have (shared) knowledge of the relations between certain objects (the triggers) and their components or attributes (the associates): associative anaphoric uses of definite descriptions exploit this knowledge".

(70) *Associative use of definites: correct uses of the*

a. I went to Arsuz in which we have a house for summer holiday *(Details of how the speaker spent her/his days there follows).* After having a dinner, I walked with my friends and twin, and we sit **on *the* beach**.

b. There is huge bed and near to my bookcase and **on *the* wall**, there a lot of posters.

c. I went to Istanbul on my recent vacation. I visited Eminönü. I visited my mother and my elder brother. ***The* voyage** was very long.

d. I climbed a mountain a few weekends ago. My cousins, brothers and my sister joined that activity. I had good times with them. We had a nice picnic **on *the* way.**

Ionin *et al.* (2004b: x) suggest that "Definites on their *associative use* are more likely to be [+specific] than [-specific], since the referent of the definite DP can usually be singled out via some noteworthy property […]." In our case for

instance, the beach talked about in (70a) may have the noteworthy property of being the beach in Arsuz where the participant has a summer house.

4.6.4. Obligatory unique definites

Obligatorily unique definites signal DPs whose referents are unique in the actual world. Although definites of this type are likely to be [+specific] since they have certain referents, they may also be [-specific] if the identity of the entity in question (*e.g.*, world, sun etc.) is not singled out via some noteworthy property.

(71) *Obligatory unique definites: correct uses of the*
a.   I want to travelling on *the* **world.**
b.   But what I loved most about my vacation is that to stay all night under *the* **moon light and stars** on the beach with a beer.

4.6.5. Narrow scope definites

Ionin *et al.* (2004b: x) state that narrow-scope definites are those that take scope under an intensional verb or modal. While other types of definites that were discussed above are most likely to be [+specific], narrow-scope definites are the only type that are obligatorily [-specific] because the speaker does not have in mind a particular individual or entity in the actual world as the referent of the DP.

(**72)** *Narrow scope definites: correct uses of the*
a.   I would spend all of *the* **money** in a one day
b.   I give poor people the rest of *the* **money.** *The* **homeless, hungry people** need it.
c.   I will buy a ticket to London and I have good holiday. I will go sightseeing and try to see all the beautiful places there. *The* **time I will spend there** can arouse my belief in myself.

Ionin *et al.* (2009) reported that adult learners had a greater tendency to display article misuse with specific indefinites than with non-specific definites in the more implicit task (*i.e.,* WNT). To explore whether learners in the present study exhibited similar patterns, article choice in [-definite, +specific] and [+definite, -specific] contexts were to be examined. As discussed previously, based on Ionin *et al.* (2004b), we considered all wide-scope contexts as [+specific]. In contrast, we

took narrow-scope indefinites and indefinites with there-have construction as [-specific]. As for definites, we considered narrow-scope definites as [-specific], and all other definite categories as most likely [+specific]. Consequently, we intended to examine article choice of learners mainly in these contexts. Nevertheless, we observed that as in the pilot study, learners did not produce an adequate number of sentences particularly in definite contexts, and hence only descriptive statistics could be conducted on the obtained data (discussed in detail in the next chapter).

4.7. Conclusion

This chapter included a description of the methodology adopted in the present study. The study was administered at the ELT department of MKU in Turkey. 50 ELT students divided into two proficiency levels (elementary and intermediate) took part in the study. OQPT was employed to determine learners' proficiency levels. As data collection instruments, a WET and a WNT designed by Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b, 2009) were adopted. Four native English speakers provided a baseline for determining the unambiguously definite and unambiguously indefinite contexts in the WNT. These contexts were classified into subtypes for ease of analysis. Nevertheless, the WNT yielded a limited number of contexts; therefore, only descriptive statistics could be run.

CHAPTER 5
RESULTS

5. Introduction

In this chapter the results of the data analyses are presented. Initially, the findings of the WET will be reported, and then the findings of the WNT will be presented.

5.1. Written Elicitation Task

Before moving to the results of the statistical analyses, overall article use of the learners will be reported. Table 5 shows the total number of article use by all the participants in the four contexts relevant to the purposes of the study:

Table 5: Rates of Learners' Article Use across Four Contexts

Context	Target article	Articles supplied by learners			
		The	**A/An**	**Zero Article**	**Other**
[+definite, +specific]	The	**215/300** **71.7%**	16/300 5.3%	31/300 10.3%	38/300 12.7%
[+definite, -specific]	The	**231/300** **77.0%**	15/300 5.0%	42/300 14.0%	12/300 4.0%
[-definite, +specific]	A/an	24/300 8.0%	**243/300** **81.0%**	11/300 3.6%	22/300 7.4%
[-definite, -specific]	A/an	17/300 5.7%	**245/300** **81.7%**	16/300 5.3%	22/300 7.3%

As illustrated in Table 5, the first context type is [+definite, +specific], and it requires the use of the definite article 'the'. Participants supplied 'the' at a ratio of 71.7% (215 out of 300 times) in this context. Their 'a/an' overuse ratio was 5.3% (16 out of 300 times). Omission of articles emerged at a rate of 10.3% (31 out of 300 times), and the rate of 'other' responses supplied by learners, which was the second most frequently occurring pattern, was 12.7% (38 out of 300 times). Looking at article use rates in this category, learners can be considered successful at supplying the correct article in [+definite, +specific] contexts. The contexts below illustrate the errors observed in this context:

(73) Louise: Where's your mother?

Julie: She is meeting ***a*** principal of my brother's elementary school. He is a very nice man. He is talking to my mother about my brother's grades.

(74) Eric: I really liked that book you gave me for my birthday. It was very interesting!

Laura: Thanks! I like it too. I would like to meet ***with*** author of that book some day – I saw an interview with her on TV, and I really liked her!

In this context type, article misuse errors were not expected because DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY were in agreement; that is, both had the positive value. Nevertheless, though with a low frequency, such errors were observed in both proficiency groups.

In the second context type, which represented [+definite, -specific] NPs, the target article was 'the' as well, and it was used felicitously at a rate of 77.0% (231 out of 300 times). Overuse of 'a/an' occurred at a rate of 5.0% (15 out of 300 uses). When compared to the previous context, omission of articles had a greater ratio (14.0%; 42 out of 300 uses) in this context type, and this rate should not be underestimated. In the category of 'other' responses, 12 out of 300 uses emerged, which amounted only to 4.0% of all the uses. These ratios suggest that although learners were generally successful at assigning the definite article correctly, a considerable number of them tended to opt for the 'zero article' and left 'the' out. Below are two contexts that exemplify the article choice errors observed in this NP environment:

(75) Marcus: Can you and your friend Rick come over this week-end?

Jim: I'll come over, but Rick isn't here. He went to ***a house of his uncle George***… I have no idea where that is. But Rick was very excited about going!

(76) Carrie: Did your funny uncle Reuben visit you for Thanksgiving?

Older sister: No, he and his wife went to visit her family instead. They

went to **Ø capital of North Dakota** – I can't remember what its name is. It's probably a very cold place!

In [-definite, +specific] contexts, which made up the third context type, the target article 'a/an' was used at a rate of 81%, (243 out of 300 uses). Substitution of 'the' for 'a/an' was the second most frequent pattern (24 out of 300 times; 8.0%) followed by 'other' responses (22 out of 300 times; 7.4%). As illustrated, the 'zero article' was supplied 11 out of 300 times, having the lowest ratio; 3.6%. It is apparent that in this context type learners tended to substitute articles rather than omit them. Still, the rate of substitution was not significant. In this category, two contexts where article misuse was most frequent were:

(77) *In an airport, in a crowd of people*

Man: Excuse me, do you work here?

Security guard: Yes. Can I help you?

Man: Yes, please. I am trying to find *the* red-haired girl; I think that she flew in on Flight 239.

(78) *Grandfather comes for a visit*

Grandfather: Where is my little granddaughter Beth? Is she home?

Father: No… She is not going to be back till late. She is having dinner with *the* **girl from class** – her name is Angie, and Beth really likes her.

In the fourth context type, representing [-definite,-specific] NPs, the target article was 'a/an', and it was supplied at a ratio of 81.7% (245 out of 300 times), which is a quite close ratio to that of the preceding context. Overuse of 'the' and the 'zero article' occurred at almost the same rates; 5.7% (17 out of 300 times) and 5.3% (16 out of 300 times), respectively. Words other than articles were supplied 22 out of 300 uses, which amounted to 7.3%. Although substitution and omission were observed in this environment, 'a/an' was by far the most frequently occurring article. This finding suggests that learners were in general successful at using the indefinite article in this context type. The following two items instantiate the article use errors observed in this context:

(79)   *After school*

Father: Do you have any homework?

Child: Yes, I need to write a book report.

Father: So what will you read?

Child: Hmm… I don't know yet. But I like to read about things that move − cars, trains… I know! I would like to read *the* **book about airplanes**! I'll go to the library tomorrow!

(**80**) Rose: Will you come shopping with me this week-end?

Jen: Sure. Where do you want to go?

Rose: Oh, anywhere. I am looking for **Ø warm hat**. It's getting rather cold outside!

Although they were not among the critical contexts, previous-mention and partitive-indefinite contexts yielded noteworthy results as presented in the following table. Evidently, article substitution errors were more dominant in these contexts as opposed to the critical [-definite, +specific] and [+definite, -specific] contexts. Table 6 presents article use rates of learners in these two context types:

Table 6: Rates of Learners' Article Use in Previous-mention Definite and Partitive Indefinite Contexts

| Context | Target article | **Articles supplied by learners** | | | |
		The	A/An	Zero Article	Other
Previous-mention definite	The	**180/300** **60.0%**	69/300 23.0%	34/300 11.3%	17/300 5.7%
Partitive indefinite	A/an	59/300 19.7%	**219/300** **73.0%**	7/300 2.3%	15/300 5.0%

In the previous-mention definite category, the target article was 'the'. In this context, 'the' was supplied at a rate of 60.0 % (180 out of 300 times), which is a drastically lower rate compared to the preceding definite contexts. Substitution of 'a/an' for 'the' was at a rate of 23.0% (69 out of 300 times) and that is the greatest substitution rate observed so far. The 'zero article' and 'other' words emerged at a rate of 11.33% (34 out of 300 uses) and 5.7% (17 out of 300 uses), respectively. Compared to previous contexts, it is clear that the number of substitution is substantial in this context type. In addition, correct article use is rather low. The following are two previous-mention definite contexts where substitution and omission errors were observed:

(81) Vicky: Where were you yesterday? I tried to call you, but you weren't home.

Rachel: I went to a bookstore yesterday.

Vicky: Oh, what did you get?

Rachel: I got lots of things – several magazines, two red pens, and an interesting new book. After I came home, I read ***the*** book.

(82) Robin: How is your little sister Clara doing? Does she still like animals?

Julie: Oh yes! In fact, yesterday, she went to an animal shelter. She saw a very cute kitten and a little puppy there. She played with them all day long. And she gave some milk to ***Ø*** kitten.

In the partitive indefinite context, which aimed at eliciting 'a/an', the target article was employed at a ratio of 73.0% (219 out of 300 times). 'The' overuse emerged at a rate of 19.7% (59 out of 300 uses). On the other hand, article omission was very low compared to other contexts. It only occurred at a ratio of 2.3% (7 out of 300). Words other than articles were used at a rate of 5.0% (15 out of 300 uses). As is clear, the substitution rate was noteworthy in this context, as well. At the same time, substitution surpassed omission and also the use of other words in this category. The following context exemplifies the substitution errors found in partitive indefinite contexts:

(83) Gabrielle: My son Ralph didn't have anything to read last week-end. So, he went to the library.

Charles: Did he find something to read?

Gabrielle: Oh yes – there were so many wonderful things to read in the library: books, magazines, newspapers! I told Ralph to get just one thing. So finally, Ralph chose ***the*** magazine.

As the rates of overall article use suggest, contexts in which the learners were most successful at supplying the target article were the indefinite ones. The highest ratio of correct article use emerged in [-definite, -specific] contexts, at a rate of 81.7% (245 out of 300 contexts) closely followed by [-definite, +specific] contexts, which had a ratio of 81.0% (243 out of 300 contexts). Omission rates were most frequently observed in [+definite, -specific], previous-mention definite and

[+definite, +specific] contexts at rates of 14.0% (42/300); 11.3% (34/300) and 10.3% (31/300), respectively. These observations suggest that learners are more prone to omit articles in definite than in indefinite contexts. As for article misuse, substitution rates were considerably higher in previous-mention definite (69/300; 23.0%) and partitive indefinite contexts (59/300; 19.7%) than in [-definite, +specific] (24/300; 8.0%) and [+definite, -specific] (15/300; 5.0%) contexts.

5.1.1. Statistical analyses

In this section, a closer look will be taken at participants' article use in six of the contexts reported above, and the scores of the two proficiency groups will be compared to determine whether they differ from each other.

5.1.1.1. Context 1: [+definite, +specific]

The following table shows article use accuracy of elementary and intermediate level learners in definite/specific contexts.

Table 7: Rates of Article Use in [+definite, +specific] Contexts by Proficiency Level

Context	Target article	Proficiency level	Articles supplied by learners			
			The	A/an	Zero article	Other
[+definite,+specific]	The	Elementary	89/150 59.3%	12/150 8.0%	28/150 18.7%	21/150 14.0%
		Intermediate	126/150 84.0%	4/150 2.7%	3/150 2.0%	17/150 11.3%

As presented in Table 7, in [+definite, +specific] contexts, the elementary level group supplied the target article 'the' at a rate of 59.3% (89 out of 150 times) while the intermediate level group had a percentage of 84.0% (126 out of 150 times). These ratios suggest that, in this context, intermediate level participants proved to be better than their elementary level counterparts in supplying the target article. An independent samples t-test was run to determine whether the difference between the rates of these two proficiency groups was significant. Overall, the elementary level group displayed article use errors at a mean rate of 2.44 (SD: 1.73), and intermediate

level learners exhibited errors at a mean ratio of 0.96 (SD: 1.06) in this context type. The results of the t-test showed that there was a significant difference between the two groups in terms of article use errors, $t(39.737)=3.641$, $p<0.05$ (see Appendix 5). The elementary level group also exhibited a higher substitution rate of 'a' (8.0%; 12 out of 150 times) than the intermediate level participants (2.7%; 4 out of 150 times). Nevertheless, neither rate was substantial enough to be considered significant. The 'zero article' suppliance rates were 18.7% (28 out of 150 contexts) and 2.0% (3 out of 150 contexts) for elementary and intermediate level groups, respectively. This indicates that elementary level learners omit the definite article far more frequently than their intermediate level counterparts. Finally, the rate of 'other' words used for articles was 14.0% (21 out of 150 times) for elementary level participants and 11.3% (17 out of 150 times) for intermediate level group. The overall rates in this context show that both proficiency groups could supply 'the' correctly with [+definite, +specific] NPs. However, the rate of overall correct article usage increased in line with proficiency as shown by the scores of the two proficiency levels.

5.1.1.2. Context 2: [+definite, -specific]

Table 8 illustrates correct article use rates of elementary and intermediate level groups in definite/non-specific contexts.

Table 8: Rates of Article Use in [+definite, -specific] Contexts by Proficiency Level

Context	Target article	Proficiency level	Articles supplied by learners			
			The	**A/an**	**Zero article**	**Other**
[+definite,-specific]	The	**Elementary**	**94/150** **62.7%**	13/150 8.7%	36/150 24.0%	7/150 4.7%
		Intermediate	**137/150** **91.3%**	2/150 1.3%	6/150 4.0%	5/150 3.3%

In [+definite, -specific] contexts, which is one of the critical context types, the target article was provided at a rate of 62.7% (94 out of 150 times) by the elementary level group. Intermediate level learners, on the other hand, supplied 'the' at a ratio of 91.3% (137 out of 150) times, which was a quite high percentage. Contrary to expectations, substitution of 'a' for 'the' was rather low in both groups.

In the elementary level group the substitution rate was 8.7% (13 out of 150 times), and in the intermediate level group that rate remained at 1.3% (only 2 out of 150 uses). As for article omission, the elementary level group supplied the 'zero article' at a rate of 24.0% (36 out of 150 uses). The intermediate level learners had a lower article omission rate 4.0% (6 out of 150 times) as was the case with substitution. The rate of 'other' words supplied was 4.7% (7 out of 150 uses) for the elementary level learners and 3.3% (5 out of 150 uses) for the intermediate level learners. As can be seen in the table, the rate of correct article usage differed in the two groups in this context type. Elementary level participants were found to have a mean error rate of 2.24 (SD: 1.87) while the intermediate learners had a mean error rate of 0.52 (SD: 0.91). According to an independent samples t-test there was a very significant difference between the scores of the two groups; $t(34.867)=4.116$, $p<0.05$. The results indicate that intermediate level learners made fewer article use errors than the elementary level learners in this context (see Appendix 6). In addition, contrary to expectations, neither group exhibited a significant fluctuation between 'the' and 'a/an'.

5.1.1.3. Context 3: [-definite, +specific]

The performance of elementary and intermediate level learners in indefinite/specific contexts is presented below.

Table 9: Rates of Article Use in [-definite, +specific] Contexts by Proficiency Level

Context	Target article	Proficiency level	The	A/an	Zero article	Other
				Articles supplied by learners		
[-definite,+specific]	A/an	**Elementary**	11/150 7.3%	**113/150 75.3%**	11/150 7.3%	15/150 10.0%
		Intermediate	13/150 8.7%	**130/150 86.7%**	0/150 0.0%	7/150 4.7%

In the [-definite, +specific] context, another critical context type, the target article was 'a/an', and as shown in Table 9, overall it was supplied at a high rate by both proficiency groups. In this NP environment, elementary level participants provided 'a/an' at a ratio of 75.3% (113 out of 150 uses). Intermediate level learners

had a higher percentage of correct article usage than the elementary group (86.7%; 130 out of 150 uses). Elementary level learners made article use errors at a mean rate of 1.48 (SD: 1.32) while the intermediate level learners displayed a mean error rate of 0.80 (SD: 0.91). According to an independent samples t-test, there was a significant difference between elementary and intermediate level groups in terms of 'a/an' usage errors in this context $t(48)=2.111$, $p<0.05$ (see Appendix 7). Again, this indicates that the intermediate level learners made fewer article use errors than their elementary level counterparts in this context type. The substitution rates of both groups were low and similar. Elementary level learners misused 'the' at a rate of 7.3% (11 out of 150 uses). Intermediate level learners' substitution rate was 8.7% (13 out of 150 uses). As for article omission, the use of the 'zero article' was not observed at all in the intermediate group (0/150; 0.0%) whereas it emerged at a rate of 7.3% (11 out of 150 times) in the elementary group. 'Other' words were supplied 15 out of 150 times (10.0%) by the elementary level learners, and 7 out of 150 times (4.7%) by the intermediate level participants. As in the previous context, no significant fluctuation was observed in this context because substitution was observed at a low rate across both proficiency groups.

5.1.1.4. Context 4: [-definite, -specific]

Table 10 shows article choice of the elementary and intermediate level learners in indefinite/non-specific contexts.

Table 10: Rates of Article Use in [-definite, -specific] Contexts by Proficiency Level

Context	Target article	Proficiency level	Articles supplied by learners			
			The	**A/an**	**Zero article**	**Other**
[-definite,-specific]	A/an	**Elementary**	12/150 8.0%	**108/150 72.0%**	14/150 9.3%	16/150 10.7%
		Intermediate	5/150 3.3%	**137/150 91.3%**	2/150 1.3%	6/150 4.0%

The [-definite, -specific] context targeted the use of 'a/an', as well. Correct suppliance of 'a/an' was high, particularly in the case of intermediate learners.

Intermediate level participants provided 'a/an' at a percentage of 91.3 (137 out of 150 contexts) and displayed a mean error rate of 0.52 (SD: 0.71). Elementary level group's ratio of correct 'a/an' usage was lower; 72.0% (108 out of 150 uses), and accordingly their mean rate of error was higher 1.68 (SD: 1.24). An independent samples t-test was applied to compare the scores of the two groups. The result of showed that, in this context there was a very significant difference between the two groups in terms of 'a/an' use errors $t(38.177)=4.031$, $p<0.05$ (see Appendix 8). As was the trend in the preceding contexts, intermediate level learners were found to make article use errors at a smaller rate than elementary learners. Rates of substitution and omission were close to each other in the elementary group. They misused 'the' at a rate of 8.0% (12 out of 150 uses), and omitted the target article 'a/an' at a rate of 9.3% (14 out of 150 uses). Intermediate level participants had smaller rates of substitution and omission; 3.3% (5 out of 150 uses) and 1.3% (2 out of 150 uses), respectively. The number of 'other' words supplied by the elementary and intermediate level groups was 16 out of 150 contexts (10.7%), and 6 out 150 contexts (4.0%), respectively. As in the previous contexts, intermediate level participants made fewer article use errors, and consequently, were more successful than their elementary level counterparts in providing the correct article in this context.

5.1.1.5. Context 5: previous-mention definite

The following table reveals article use rates of both proficiency groups in previous-mention definite contexts.

Table 11: Rates of Article Use in Previous-mention Definite Contexts by Proficiency Level

Context	Target article	Proficiency level	Articles supplied by learners			
			The	A/an	Zero article	Other
Previous-mention definite	The	Elementary	65/150 43.3%	52/150 34.7%	22/150 14.7%	11/150 7.3%
		Intermediate	115/150 76.7%	17/150 11.3%	12/150 8.0%	6/150 4.0%

In this context, which required the use of the definite 'the', there seemed to be a marked difference in the use of the target article between the elementary and intermediate level participants. While the former group employed 'the' at a rate of 43.3% (65 out of 150 times) the latter used 'the' at a ratio of 76.7% (115 out of 150 uses). Statistical analysis showed that elementary level learners used the target article infelicitously at a rate of 3.40 (SD: 1.82). This rate was found to be 1.40 among the intermediate level group (SD: 1.82). According to the results of an independent samples t-test the two groups differed significantly from each other in terms of error rates in this context t(48)=3.873, p<0.05 (see Appendix 9). This finding suggests that elementary level learners made more article use errors than intermediate level participants in this context type. Another significant difference was found in the substitution rates of the two groups. While the elementary level participants substituted 'a' for 'the' 52 out of 150 times (34.7%), intermediate level group's substitution rate was 11.3% (17 out of 150 times). The rate of substitution errors by the elementary level group was 2.08 (SD: 1.22). The intermediate level learners, on the other hand, displayed substitution errors at a rate of 0.68 (SD: 0.90) in this context type. The results of a t-statistic revealed that there was a very significant difference between the substitution rates of the two groups t(48)=4.612, p<0.05, as well (see Appendix 10). The elementary level group was found to make more 'a/an' overuse and fluctuate between the target article 'the' and 'a/an' to a greater extent than their intermediate level counterparts. The 'zero article' and 'other' words were respectively supplied at a rate of 14.7% (22 out of 150 uses) and 7.3% (11 out of 150 uses) by the elementary level group. Intermediate level learners supplied the 'zero article' 12 out of 150 times (8.0%), and employed 'other' words 6 out of 150 times (4.0%) in this context. Evidently, the elementary level participants substituted articles at a substantial rate in this context type. Intermediate level participants, on the other hand, were more successful at using 'the' felicitously.

5.1.1.6. Context 6: partitive indefinite

Table 12 shows elementary and intermediate level learners' article choice in partitive indefinite contexts.

Table 12: Rates of Article Use in Partitive Indefinite Contexts by Proficiency Level

Context	Target article	Proficiency level	The	A/an	Zero article	Other
			Articles supplied by learners			
Partitive-indefinite	A/an	**Elementary**	34/150 22.7%	**101/150 67.3%**	5/150 3.3%	10/150 6.7%
		Intermediate	25/150 16.7%	**118/150 78.7%**	2/150 1.3%	5/150 3.3%

In the partitive indefinite context type, learners were expected to supply the indefinite article 'a/an'. As the figures in Table 12 suggest, elementary level learners supplied 'a/an' 101 out of 150 times (67.3%). Their intermediate level counterparts used the target article at a higher rate (118 out of 150 times; 78.7%); still, they were less accurate when compared to the other two indefinite contexts. The elementary group exhibited a mean error rate of 1.96 (SD: 1.42), and the intermediate group had a mean error rate of 1.28 (SD: 1.56). An independent samples t-test suggested that the difference between the two groups in supplying 'a/an' was not significant $t(48)=1.603$, $p>0.05$ (see Appendix 11). With regards to substitution, the elementary level learners substituted 'the' for 'a/an' at a rate of 22.7% (34 out of 150 times). When compared to the critical contexts (*i.e.,* [-definite, +specific] and [+definite, -specific]), that was a high ratio. Intermediate level learners' substitution rate was 16.7% (25 out of 150 times). The mean substitution error rate of the elementary level group was 1.36 (SD: 1.35). This rate was found to be 1.00 (SD: 1.41) among the intermediate level learners. According to an independent samples t-test, there was not a significant difference between elementary and intermediate level learners in substitution errors in this context type $t(48)=0.921$, $p>0.05$ (see Appendix 12). That means both groups had similar percentages of 'the' substitution error in this environment, which should not be underrated. Omission rates were low for both groups; 3.3% (5 out of 150 times) for elementary level learners and 1.3% (2 out of 150 times) for intermediate level learners. The elementary group was observed to supply words other than articles more frequently than the intermediate group (6.7%; 10 out of 150 times and 3.3%; 5 out of 150 times, respectively).

Overall, participants from both elementary and intermediate level groups supplied articles in the given contexts successfully. Substitution errors occurred in two unexpected categories (*i.e.,* previous-mention definite and partitive indefinite) more frequently than the critical contexts (*i.e.,* definite/non-specific and indefinite/specific). Furthermore, the rate of article use errors was observed to decrease in parallel with proficiency level, resulting in lower rates of article use errors by intermediate level learners in all of the environments.

5.2. Written Narrative Task

This section will present the findings of the WNT. First of all, article use in singular indefinite and plural-mass indefinite contexts will be reported. Next, findings regarding learners' article choice in definite singular and definite plural/mass contexts will be presented. Nevertheless, the findings of the WNT should be taken as suggestive rather than conclusive due to the small number of contexts generated by learners.

5.2.1. Singular Indefinite Contexts

As stated in the preceding chapter, following Ionin *et al.* (2004b), the data obtained from learners in the WNT was organized and sent to native English coders to specify the unambiguously definite and indefinite contexts. After that, these contexts were further classified into the sub-categories in Table 13 to determine the (possibly) [+specific] and [-specific] contexts. In the case of indefinite singular contexts, all of the wide-scope indefnites were taken to be most likely [+specific] while the narrow-scope indefinites and indefinites in *there-have* constructions were regarded as most likely [-specific].

Following the assumption that due to the lack of an overt article system in Turkish and as a result of a parameter setting process, learners would overuse 'the' in indefinite specific contexts (*i.e.,* wide-scope contexts) while they would not exhibit such a behavior in indefinite nonspecific contexts (*i.e.,* narrow-scope and there-have construction contexts), we intended to compare article use in wide-scope and narrow-scope, as well as in wide-scope and *there-have* contexts. The expected pattern was that learners would overuse 'the' in wide-scope indefinite contexts due to associating 'the' with the feature [+specific]. It was also predicted that they would correctly use

the target 'a/an' in narrow-scope indefinite contexts and *there-have* constructions. Nevertheless, as shown in Table 13, there were few instances of 'the' misuse across both proficiency groups (three in total), and only one of these misuses occurred in wide-scope singular indefinite contexts. In other words, compared to Ionin *et al.* (2004a, 2004b, 2009 etc.), the Turkish EFL learners in the present study did not display any fluctuations in such contexts, and indeed the intermediate level group displayed native-like performance. Table 13 illustrates article use of learners in various indefinite singular contexts:

Table 13: Article Use in Different Types of Indefinite Contexts: Singular Indefinites

Article used by L2-learners	WS	NS	*There*-construction	Object of *have*	Post-copular pos.
Elementary level participants					
The	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**
A	24	10	24	31	10
Null	9	1	6	8	9
Intermediate level participants					
The	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**
A	37	27	23	47	27
Null	2	2	3	1	2

Overall, elementary level learners produced 134 sentences in indefinite singular contexts. The target article was used correctly in 99 of these sentences. 33 sentences included the 'zero article', and only two contexts exemplified 'the' misuse. Intermediate level learners generated 172 indefinite singular sentences in total. 161 out of 172 sentences were target-like. 10 sentences included no articles, and only one 'the' misuse error occurred. These figures clearly converge with those yielded by the WET. In other words, the learners were found to exhibit the same pattern in the two tasks by adhering to DEFINITESS rather than SPECIFICITY in [-definite, +specific] contexts. Below is a detailed description of article use rates by both proficiency groups in each category of the singular indefinite contexts.

5.2.1.1. Indefinite Singular Contexts: Elementary and Intermediate Level Learners

Table 14 displays learners' overall rates of article usage in indefinite singular contexts.

Table 14: Overall Rates of Article Use in Indefinite Singular Contexts

Context type	Target article	Articles supplied by learners		
		the	a/an	Ø
Wide-scope		1/73 (1.3%)	**61/73 (83.5%)**	11/73 (15.0%)
Narrow-scope		0/40 (0%)	**37/40 (92.5%)**	3/40 (7.5%)
There- construction	A/an	0/56 (0%)	**47/56 (84%)**	9/56 (16.0%)
Object of *have*		1/88 (1.1%)	**78/88 (88.6%)**	9/88 (10.2%)
Post-copular position		1/49 (2.0%)	**37/49 (75.5%)**	11/49 (22.4%)

In singular indefinite contexts, the required article was 'a/an'. The total number of articles that emerged in wide-scope contexts was 73. Participants from both proficiency levels used 'a/an' at a rate of 83.5% with wide-scope indefinites. Article omission was 15.0%, and contrary to predictions, article misuse emerged only at a rate of 1.3%. In narrow-scope contexts, a total of 40 sentences were produced. Rate of correct article use was highest (92.5%) in this context type. Article omission emerged at a rate of 7.5%, and as predicted, no misuse was observed. In *there*-construction contexts, 'a/an' was supplied at a ratio of 84%, and in line with the predictions, no misuse occurred, as well. Article omission was observed at a rate of 16.0%. In object of *have* contexts, the rate of target article use was 88.6%. Article omission occurred at a rate of 10.2%, and the article substitution rate was only 1.1%. In post-copular position contexts, correct article use emerged at a lower rate than in other environments (75.5%). However, as in the preceding categories, the rate of article omission was considerably higher than the rate of substitution (22.4% and 2.0%, respectively).

As these figures suggest, in general, learners supplied articles in a target-like manner in singular indefinite contexts. Having depicted the overall picture regarding learners' article use in indefinite singular contexts, in the following section we will go into further details based on each proficiency level and context type.

5.2.1.2. Indefinite Singular Contexts: Elementary Level Learners

The performance of the elementary level group in indefinite singular contexts is presented in Table 15.

Table 15: Rates of Article Use in Indefinite Singular Contexts by Elementary Level Learners

Context type	Target article	Articles supplied by learners		
		the	a/an	Ø
Wide-scope		1/34 (3%)	**24/34 (70.5%)**	9/34 (26.4%)
Narrow-scope		0/11 (0%)	**10/11 (90.9%)**	1/11 (9.09%)
There - construction	A/an	0/30 (0%)	**24/30 (80%)**	6/30 (20%)
Object of *have*		0/39 (0%)	**31/39 (79.4%)**	8/39 (20.5%)
Post-copular position		1/20 (5%)	**10/20 (50%)**	9/20 (45%)

Evidently, the elementary level participants were most successful in narrow-scope context type (90.9%) in singular indefinite contexts. Post-copular position contexts were found to be the most difficult environments for this group. Contrary to expectations, article misuse was not frequent in wide-scope indefinites; substitution emerged only in 1 out of 34 sentences at a ratio of 3%. In general, article omission was more frequent than misuse, and the highest rate of omission was in post-copular position contexts with a remarkably high rate of 45%. Below are some instances of article misuse in indefinite singular contexts by elementary level learners:

(84) *Overuse of 'the'*:

a.   I went to Antalya/Olympus with my friend last year. [*Details about what the speaker did there and whom she met follow*] Later we went to *the* **popular club** at Antalya. (wide-scope)

b.   My father gifted me *a professional photographer machine* one year ago. I was so happy because it was *the* **valuable gift** for me. (post-copular)

In (84a), the learner mentions a club she went to in her last vacation. Though the NP was not previously mentioned, the learner marks it as [+definite]. The referent of the DP is arguably [+specific] since the learner describes it as 'popular', and most probably has a specific club in mind. Thus, it is likely that the SPECIFICITY effect led the learner to erroneously mark the NP as [+definite]. In (84b), on the other hand, the participant is talking about a gift which her father gave her. Although the NP was previously-mentioned, in the subsequent mention the NP has a partitive interpretation, and therefore, it is indefinite. Nevertheless, instead of 'a' the learner opted for 'the'. Since the post-copular construction is not

predicational, it is [+specific]. Thus, the speaker most likely misused *the* in this environment due to the feature [+specific], as well.

5.2.1.3. Indefinite Singular Contexts: Intermediate Level Learners

Intermediate level learners' rates of article use in indefinite singular contexts are shown in Table 16.

Table 16: Rates of Article Use in Indefinite Singular Contexts by Intermediate Level Learners

		Articles supplied by learners		
Context type	**Target article**	**the**	**a/an**	**Ø**
Wide-scope		0/39 (0%)	**37/39 (94.8%)**	2/39 (5.1%)
Narrow-scope		0/29 (0%)	**27/29 (93.1%)**	2/29 (6.8%)
There-construction	A/an	0/26 (0%)	**23/26 (88.4%)**	3/26 (11.5%)
Object of *have*		1/49 (2.0%)	**47/49 (95.9%)**	1/49 (2.0%)
Post-copular position		0/29 (0%)	**27/29 (93.1%)**	2/29 (6.8%)

It is clear from Table 16 that the correct article use rates of intermediate level learners were higher than those of elementary level learners. The highest accuracy rate was in object of *have* indefinites with a rate of 95.9%. As for article overuse, contrary to what was foreseen, no substitution was observed in wide-scope indefinites. Actually, there was only one instance of substitution, and it emerged in an object of *have* context. Compared to the elementary level group, article omission rates were lower in this group. The highest omission rate was in *there*-construction environments with a ratio of 11.5%. Below is the only article misuse error which appeared in the intermediate level group's data in indefinite singular contexts:

(85) *Overuse of 'the'*

    a.   I have **the room which is small and painted with orange**.

In (85a), the learner is describing his room as an answer to Question 3. Although the room talked about was not mentioned previously, and therefore is [-definite], the learner marks it as [+definite]. The referent of the NP appears to be [+specific] on the part of the learner since he singles this room out by giving details about it. Hence, misuse of 'the' in this sentence is most likely to stem from the feature [+specific].

5.2.2. Plural-mass Indefinite Contexts

As Table 17 shows, not many plural-mass contexts were elicited from learners. In general, both elementary and intermediate level learners supplied the required article (Ø) successfully in the contexts they produced. The following table shows learners' overall article choice in plural-mass indefinite contexts:

Table 17: Article Use in Different Types of Indefinite Contexts: Plural/mass Indefinites

Article used by L2-learners	WS	NS	*There*-construction	Object of *have*
Elementary level participants				
The	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
A	0	0	0	0
Null	9	6	5	1
Intermediate level participants				
The	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
A	0	1	0	0
Null	14	8	1	5

The indefinite plural/mass contexts produced by both proficiency levels were very limited in number. Elementary level learners produced a total of only 21 sentences in this context type, all of which included the target article 'Ø'. Nevertheless, similar to Yılmaz (2006) who observed target-like 'zero article' use by beginner level learners in an on-line production task, this may be a result of elementary level learners' general tendency to omit articles -due to their usual failure in supplying articles-, rather than an indicator of successful 'zero article' use. In fact, when compared to the intermediate group, the overall omission rates of the elementary level participants were higher in all contexts, attesting the account of Yılmaz (2006). The intermediate group produced 29 indefinite plural/mass sentences. Unlike elementary level learners, they made one 'a/an' substitution error in narrow-scope contexts. Article use of learners in indefinite plural/mass contexts by both proficiency groups is presented below on a categorical basis:

5.2.2.1. Plural/mass Contexts: Elementary and Intermediate Level Learners

Table 18 shows article choice of both elementary and intermediate level learners in plural/mass indefinite contexts.

Table 18: Overall Rates of Article Use in Plural/mass Indefinite Contexts

| Context type | Target article | Articles supplied by learners | | |
		the	a/an	Ø
Wide-scope		0/23 (0%)	0/23 (0%)	**23/23 (100%)**
Narrow-scope		0/15 (0%)	1/15 (6.6%)	**14/15 (93.3%)**
*There-*construction	Null	0/6 (0%)	0/6 (0%)	**6/6 (100%)**
Object of *have*		0/6 (0%)	0/6 (0%)	**6/6 (100%)**

As stated above, the number of sentences produced in indefinite plural/mass contexts was lower than in singular indefinite ones. The sentences generated by learners suggested that learners could successfully supply the target 'zero article' in plural/mass indefinite contexts. Native-like accuracy rates were observed in wide-scope contexts and there-have constructions. There was a single misuse of 'a/an', and it emerged in narrow-scope contexts. The tables below show the article choice of participants based on proficiency levels.

5.2.2.2. Plural/mass Contexts: Elementary Level Learners

Elementary level learners' article choice in plural/mass contexts is given below.

Table 19: Rates of Article Use in Plural/mass Indefinite Contexts by Elementary Level Learners

| Context type | Target article | Articles supplied by learners | | |
		the	a/an	Ø
Wide-scope		0/9 (0%)	0/9 (0%)	**9/9 (100%)**
Narrow-scope		0/6 (0%)	0/6 (0%)	**6/6 (100%)**
*There-*construction	Null	0/5 (0%)	0/5 (0%)	**5/5 (100%)**
Object of *have*		0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)	**1/1 (100%)**

Elementary level learners generated few sentences in this context. They displayed target-like use of the 'zero article' with no misuse of 'the' or 'a/an' at all.

5.2.2.3. Plural/mass Contexts: Intermediate Level Learners

Table 20 illustrates article use rates of the intermediate level group in plural/mass contexts.

Table 20: Rates of Article Use in Plural/mass Indefinite Contexts by Intermediate Level Learners

Context type	Target article	Articles supplied by learners		
		the	a/an	Ø
Wide-scope		0/14 (0%)	0/14 (0%)	**14/14 (100%)**
Narrow-scope		0/9 (0%)	1/9 (11.1%)	**8/9 (88.8%)**
*There-*construction	Null	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)	**1/1 (100%)**
Object of *have*		0/5 (0%)	0/5 (0%)	**5/5 (100%)**

Intermediate level learners were also very successful in this context. They displayed native-like article use in wide-scope contexts and *there-have* constructions. Nevertheless, unlike elementary level learners they displayed one 'a/an' misuse in narrow-scope contexts. The sentence below exemplifies substitution of 'a/an' for the 'null article':

(86) *Misuse of 'a/an'*

a.　　　After that, since I am a footballer, I'll buy *a new shoes* for football.

In (86a), the learner is talking about what he would do with $1000, therefore the context is narrow-scope. Although the referent of the NP is plural indefinite, the learner considers it as singular and substitutes 'a' for 'null' in this context. Thus, the problem here cannot be tied to semantic universals. Rather, it stems from the learner's failure in distinguishing between singularity and plurality. The problem is also L1-constrained because in Turkish 'a' refers to 'a pair of' when used with the noun 'shoes'. Thus, even though 'shoes' is plural and cannot be preceded by 'a' in English, in Turkish the use of the singular indefinite marker 'a' with that noun is licensed. Consequently, the learner might have made this article use error as a result of transferring the rules of his L1-Turkish to the target L2-English.

5.2.3. Singular Definite Contexts

When compared to indefinite singular contexts, the number of definite singular contexts was also low in general. In definite singular contexts, we aimed to compare 'a/an' overuse in narrow-scope contexts vs. the other definite contexts which correspond to [+definite, -specific] and [+definite, +specific] contexts, respectively. Yet, as there were only three sentences in total in the relevant narrow-scope context, the prediction regarding article misuse in [+definite, -specific]

contexts could not be tested as was the case in Ionin *et al.* (2004b). The following table reveals article use of learners in definite singular contexts:

Table 21: Article Use in Different Types of Definite Contexts: Singular Definites

Article used by L2-learners	anaphoric	entailment	associative use	obligatory uniqueness	narrow scope
Elementary level participants					
The	13	3	12	3	1
A	**1**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**
Null	4	3	9	0	1
Intermediate level participants					
The	14	16	18	2	0
A	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**0**
Null	0	0	2	0	0

The number of the definite singular contexts produced by elementary level learners was 52. 32 among 52 sentences were target-like. Omission was observed in 17 contexts, and article substitution emerged in only 3 sentences. Intermediate level learners generated 53 sentences in total, which was almost identical to the number supplied by the elementary group. Unlike elementary level learners, the intermediate group was more target-like, though. They used 'the' correctly in 50 contexts. They made only one article substitution and only two article omission errors. This pattern regarding the intermediate level learners' definite article use converges with that of the WET. Learners' overall article use rates are given in greater detail below:

5.2.3.1. Definite Singular Contexts: Elementary and Intermediate Level Learners

The following table shows elementary and intermediate level learners' article use in definite singular contexts.

Table 22: Overall Rates of Article Use in Definite Singular Contexts

Context type	Target article	Articles supplied by learners		
		the	a/an	Ø
Anaphoric		**27/32 (84.3%)**	1/32 (3.1%)	4/32 (12.5%)
Entailment		**19/22 (86.3%)**	0/22 (0%)	3/22 (13.6%)
Associative use	The	**30/43 (70.0%)**	2/43 (4.6%)	11/43 (25.5%)
Obligatory uniqueness		**5/5 (100%)**	0/5 (0%)	0/5 (0%)
Narrow-scope		**1/3 (33.3%)**	1/3 (33.3%)	1/3 (33.3%)

In definite singular contexts, the target article was 'the'. In general, learners supplied the target article successfully. In obligatorily unique contexts, which were only five in total, 'the' was used in a target-like manner. There was no substitution or omission error in this context type. In entailment contexts, 'the' suppliance emerged at a rate of 86.3%. Article misuse was non-existent, and omission was observed at a rate of 13.6%. In associative use contexts, the accuracy rate was lower compared to other environments. The target article was accurately supplied at a rate of 70%. There were two instances of 'a/an' overuse with a rate of 4.6%. Article omission, on the other hand, had a fairly higher frequency than misuse; 25.5%. The number of narrow-scope contexts was lowest - only three sentences were generated in this context. These three sentences were distributed as instances of target-like use of 'the', overuse of 'a/an' and as article omission. The tables below illustrate article use rates on the basis of proficiency levels.

5.2.3.2. Definite Singular Contexts: Elementary Level Learners

The performance of elementary level learners in definite singular contexts is illustrated in table 23.

Table 23: Rates of Article Use in Definite Singular Contexts by Elementary Level Learners

Context type	Target article	Articles supplied by learners		
		the	a/an	Ø
Anaphoric		**13/18 (72.2%)**	1/18 (5.5%)	4/18 (22.2%)
Entailment		**3/6 (50%)**	0/6 (0%)	3/6 (50%)
Associative use	The	**12/22 (54.5%)**	1/22 (4.5%)	9/22 (40.9%)
Obligatory uniqueness		**3/3 (100%)**	0/3 (0%)	0/3 (0%)
Narrow-scope		**1/3 (33.3%)**	1/3 (33.3%)	1/3 (33.3%)

The lower rates of accuracy across different definite contexts indicate that elementary level learners have more difficulty with the definite article than the indefinite one as observed in the WET. Their highest accuracy rate was in obligatory uniqueness contexts with a rate of 100%. The target-like behavior of learners in this category may be word-specific rather than an indicator of discourse pragmatic mastery. The DPs in these contexts included nouns like 'world' and 'sun', and as *a rule of thumb* learners are instructed to use these words with the definite article from initial stages of their L2-English instruction and on. Learners were least accurate in the category of narrow-scope definites where they produced few sentences with an accuracy rate of only 33.3%. Elementary level learners' article omission rates in definite contexts in the WNT deserve attention. The highest omission rate was in entailment NP environments with a rate of 50.0%. The rate of article omission in associative use contexts was also very high; 40.9%. These rates of omission may be due to learners' intentionally avoiding the definite article because they do not have an exact parallel of it in their L1, and therefore feel unsure about its felicitous usage. Some of the contexts where elementary level learners misused or omitted the target article are as follows:

(87) *Overuse of 'a/an'*

    a.   Of course, firstly, I say to *a person that gives it to me* "Thanks". (narrow-scope)

    b.   When I first came in Antakya, my family was with me. Firstly everything was OK. **New city**, new people, new house etc. But I felt so sorry when my family went back and I stayed alone in *a new city*. (anaphoric)

In (87a), as an answer to Question 5, the learner speculates about what he would do if someone gave him $1000. The context is narrow-scope since the learner is talking about a hypothetical situation. Thus, the individual being talked about as the referent of the DP is non-specific. At the same time, according to the baseline provided by native-speaker coders, it is definite. Thus, in this context substitution of 'a' for 'the' most likely occurred due to the [-specific] feature. In (87b), on the other hand the learner narrates about the first time she came to Antakya and writes about what it felt like to be alone in another city. Though the referent of the DP in (87b)

was previously mentioned by the learner, she fails to choose the definite article in this context, and misuses 'a' instead.

5.2.3.3. Definite Singular Contexts: Intermediate Level Learners

Table 24 presents intermediate level gorup's article choice in definite singular contexts.

Table 24: Rates of Article Use in Definite Singular Contexts by Intermediate Level Learners

		Articles supplied by learners		
Context type	Target article	the	a/an	Ø
Anaphoric		**14/14 (100%)**	0/14 (0%)	0/14 (0%)
Entailment		**16/16 (100%)**	0/16 (0%)	0/16 (0%)
Associative use	The	**18/21 (85.7%)**	1/21 (4.7%)	2/21 (9.5%)
Obligatory uniqueness		**2/2 (100%)**	0/2 (0%)	0/2 (0%)
Narrow-scope		**0/0 (0%)**	0/0 (0%)	0/0 (0%)

Unlike elementary level learners, intermediate level learners were very successful at using the target article with singular definites. They performed in a target-like manner in anaphoric, entailment and obligatorily unique contexts. They displayed one article misuse and two omissions in associative use context. No other misuse or omission was observed in the contexts. Interestingly, no narrow-scope definite context was produced by the intermediate group. The following sentence exemplifies the misuse errors of the intermediate group in this context type:

(88) *Overuse of 'a'*

a.   It is a triplex villa which is next to **a seaside**. (associative use)

In (88a), the learner talks about his last summer vacation. Although the referent of the DP is definite, he misuses 'a' in this context.

5.2.4. Plural/mass Definites

As was the case with plural/mass singular indefinite NPs, the number of plural/mass definite contexts was very few, as well. Table 25 illustrates plural/mass definite article use across both groups:

Table 25: Article Use in Different Types of Definite Contexts: Plural/mass Definites

Article used by L2-learners	anaphoric	entailment	associative use	obligatory uniqueness	narrow scope
Elementary level participants					
the	**0**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**0**
null	1	1	4	0	1
Intermediate level participants					
the	**0**	**9**	**5**	**0**	**4**
null	1	0	1	0	0

Plural/mass definite contexts targeted the definite article. In total, only 31 definite plural/mass contexts were generated by learners. Obviously, intermediate level learners were more successful than their elementary level counterparts since their article omission rate was not as frequent as in the elementary group.

5.2.4.1. Definite Plural/mass Contexts: Elementary and Intermediate Level Learners

Article choice rates of learners from both groups are presented in the following table:

Table 26: Overall Rates of Article Use in Plural/mass Definite Contexts

Context type	Target article	Article supplied by learners	
		the	**Ø**
Anaphoric		**0/2 (0%)**	2/2 (100%)
Entailment		**11/12 (91.6%)**	1/12 (8.3%)
Associative use	The	**7/12 (58.3%)**	5/12 (41.6%)
Obligatory uniqueness		**0/0 (0%)**	0/0 (0%)
Narrow-scope		**4/5 (80.0%)**	1/5 (20.0%)

As illustrated above, the distribution of articles in this environment revealed a tendency to drop the definite article in anaphoric, associative use and narrow-scope contexts. In anaphoric contexts, only two sentences emerged, and both were instances of article omission. In entailment contexts, which were the most frequently occurring environments, learners displayed the highest rate of accuracy (91.6%). The omission rate (8.3%) in this context type was lower compared to other contexts. In associative use contexts, there was a lower rate of correct article use; 58.3%. Consequently, the rate of article omission was high with a percentage of 41.6%. In

obligatory contexts, the learners did not produce any sentences. In the narrow-scope contexts, the target article was supplied at a rate of 80%. The article omission rate was 20%. Below is a more detailed description of the each proficiency group's article choice in plural/mass definite contexts.

5.2.4.2. Definite plural/mass contexts: Elementary Level Learners

Article choice of the elementary level group in definite plural/mass contexts is presented in Table 27.

Table 27: Rates of Article Use in Plural/mass Definite Contexts by Elementary Level Learners

		Article supplied by learners	
Context type	**Target article**	**the**	**Ø**
Anaphoric		**0/1 (0%)**	1/1 (100%)
Entailment		**2/3 (66.6%)**	1/3 (33.3%)
Associative use	The	**2/6 (33.3%)**	4/6 (66.6%)
Obligatory uniqueness		**0/0 (0%)**	0/0 (0%)
Narrow-scope		**0/1 (0%)**	1/1 (100%)

Table 27 shows that elementary level learners produced only eleven sentences in definite plural/mass contexts. Four out of eleven contexts exemplified correct article use in entailment and associative use contexts. The remaining seven, on the other hand, were instances of 'the' omission. The following sentences exemplify article omission in definite plural/mass contexts by elementary level learners:

(89) *Omission of 'the'*

a. I give **all of Ø money** for not having home children. (narrow-scope)

b. Two weeks ago, I, Özlem, Metin and Kadir were in Harbiye. We arrived there. And we walked down to waterfall. **Ø Waterfalls** were amazing. (anaphoric)

c. When **all of Ø people** are in there, it can be too crowded. (entailment)

The three contexts above require the definite article; nevertheless, learners failed to supply the target article, and this led to article omission.

5.2.4.3. Definite plural/mass contexts: Intermediate Level Learners

Table 28 shows article use of intermediate level learners' in definite plural/mass contexts.

Table 28: Rates of Article Use in Plural/mass Definite Contexts by Intermediate Level Learners

		Article supplied by learners	
Context type	**Target article**	**the**	**Ø**
Anaphoric		**0/1 (0%)**	1/1 (100%)
Entailment		**9/9 (100%)**	0/9 (0%)
Associative use	The	**5/6 (83.3%)**	1/6 (16.6%)
Obligatory uniqueness		**0/0 (0%)**	0/0 (0%)
Narrow-scope		**4/4 (100%)**	0/4 (0%)

The intermediate level learners generated twenty sentences in this context type. Eighteen of these sentences included target-like article use. The remaining two represented article omission in anaphoric and associative use contexts as shown below:

> **(90)** *Omission of 'the'*
> a. *[The learner writes about what did when he first came to Antakya with his famiyl]* […] we travelled around Hatay and experienced different kinds of foods. The people who visit Hatay mentioned us before, but we were fascinated about how **Ø food** was so good. (anaphoric)
> b. It was my sixteenth birthday. I threw a party and invited all of my friends. We had fun telling each other our childhood memories. When I blew out **Ø candles**, my friend clapped me and then they gave me a lot of special gifts. (associative)

Although the NPs in the sentences above met the uniqueness presupposition and were [+definite], intermediate level learners opted for the 'zero article' in these contexts.

5.3. Article Omission Rates

This section will deal with article omission rates in both written elicitation and written narrative tasks. Types and rates of omission across the two tasks with

sample contexts from learners' narratives will be presented. First of all, article omission in the WET will be reported, and next, article omission in the WNT will be presented.

5.3.1. Article Omission in Written Elicitation Task

Ionin *et al.* (2004b) reported that article omission was almost non-existent in their study, thus they explored article omission only in the WNT. In the present study, on the other hand, learners were observed to drop articles in both of the tasks. In this section, article omission rates of learners in indefinite and definite contexts across both WET and WNT will be reported separately. Table 29 displays article omission rates of each proficiency group in indefinite contexts in the WET.

Table 29: Article Omission Rates in WET: Indefinite Singular Contexts

Article omission by elementary and intermediate level learners	
Elementary level	30/150 (20%)
Intermediate level	16/150 (10.6%)

In the WET, the elementary level learners omitted the indefinite article at a rate of 20% (30 out of 150 contexts). At intermediate level, this rate dropped to 10.6% (16 out of 150 contexts). The difference between these rates shows that proficiency level and article omission correlate negatively. In other words, as learners' proficiency level increases, they make fewer article omission errors. The contexts below instantiate learners' omission errors in indefinite singular contexts:

(91) *Target article 'a/an'*

Father: How did little Billy spend the evening yesterday, when I wasn't here?

Mother: He did all his homework! And he read *Ø* **very interesting story**: it's about a small fishing village in Portugal, and the lives of the people who live there. He told me all about it.

(92) *In a "Lost and Found": target article 'a/an'*

Clerk: Can I help you? Are you looking for something you lost?

Customer: Yes… I realize you have a lot of things here, but maybe

you have what I need. You see, I am looking for **Ø green scarf**. My little granddaughter lost it here yesterday, and she is very upset!

(93) *Target article 'a/an'*

Rose: Will you come shopping with me this week-end?
Jen: Sure. Where do you want to go?
Rose: Oh, anywhere. I am looking for **Ø warm hat**. It's getting rather cold outside!

What is common in three of the contexts above is that the NP in each context is adjectivally modified. There is evidence that learners tend to omit articles more frequently if the NP of a definite or indefinite description is modified (see *e.g.,* Atay, 2010; Goad and White, 2004; Pongpairoj, 2007b; and Trenkic, 2007).

Compared to indefinite contexts, learners (particularly those at elementary level), omitted articles to a greater extent in definite NP environments. Following is a table that illustrates article omission rates of learners in definite contexts:

Table 30: Article Omission Rates in WET: Definite Singular Contexts

Article omission by elementary and intermediate level learners	
Elementary level	86/150 (57.3%)
Intermediate level	21/150 (14.0%)

The figures above reveal that the definite article is problematic for the elementary level learners. The elementary group exhibited a great tendency to omit the definite article in the required contexts, and this resulted in article omission in 86 out of 150 contexts; 57.3%. Intermediate level learners dropped the definite article at a lower rate (21 out of 150 contexts; 14%), on the other hand. This finding also supports the common observation that as learners progress in proficiency, they start to use articles more appropriately. Omission of the definite article was very frequent in the following contexts:

(94) *Target article 'the'*

Sarah: Yesterday, I took my granddaughter Becky for a walk in the park.

Claudia: How did she like it?

Sarah: She had a good time. She saw one little girl and two little boys in the park. Claudia is a little shy. But finally, she talked to **Ø little girl**.

(95) *Target article 'the'*

Vicky: Where were you yesterday? I tried to call you, but you weren't home.

Rachel: I went to a bookstore yesterday.

Vicky: Oh, what did you get?

Rachel: I got lots of things – several magazines, two red pens, and an interesting new book. After I came home, I read **Ø book**.

In (94), again we see an adjectivally-modified NP. Pre-modification might have triggered article omission in this context as in the aforementioned ones. In (95), on the other hand, the learner appears to have transferred rules of his/her L1 into the ILG. Since Turkish lacks an overt definite article, an L1-turkish learner may omit the English definite article in required contexts.

5.3.2. Article Omission in the Written Narrative Task

In the WNT, learners produced fewer sentences in definite than in indefinite contexts. The tables below show the omission rates of the learners in both indefinite and definite singular contexts of the production task:

Table 31: Article Omission Rates in WNT: Indefinite Singular Contexts

Article omission by elementary and intermediate level learners	
Elementary level	33/134 (24.6%)
Intermediate level	10/74 (13.5%)

As illustrated, in the WNT elementary level learners produced more indefinite contexts in total than their intermediate level counterparts. Their omission rate was higher, as well. Whereas the intermediate level learners omitted the indefinite article at a rate of 13.5% (10 out of 74 contexts), elementary level learners dropped it at a

ratio of 24.6% (33 out of 134 contexts). In developmental terms, these rates indicate that the performance of learners gets better as their L2 English proficiency increases. The following sentences exemplify contexts where learners failed to supply the target article 'a/an':

(96) *Omission of 'a/an'*

a.   I have **Ø bed, Ø wardrobe**, my computer etc. (object of have)

b.   I have **a room which has a bed and a mirror** which I love very much and **Ø table, Ø chair** which is very comfortable. (object of have)

c.   There is a couch, and **Ø desk and Ø table**. (there construction)

d.   There is **Ø huge bed** and near to my bookcase and on the wall, there a lot of posters. (there construction)

e.   İzmir is **Ø beautiful city**. (postcopular position)

f.   I saw the Makkah and Madinah. It was very important for me because I am **Ø Muslim**. . (postcopular position)

g.   She is **Ø journalist**. . (postcopular position)

h.   I have a bear which is my Christmas gift. It is singing **Ø song**. (wide-scope)

i.   We went to **Ø café** to listen to song. (wide-scope)

As the examples above suggest, learners appeared to omit articles randomly, which led to a variety of omission patterns. Nevertheless, in most cases omissions seemed to be tied to L1 transfer (*e.g.*, 96c-f-g).

Table 32: Article Omission Rates in WNT: Definite Singular Contexts

Article omission by elementary and intermediate level learners	
Elementary level	17/52 (32.6%)
Intermediate level	2/53 (3.7%)

In the preceding sections, it was stated that the number of definite contexts generated by learners in the WNT was lower than the indefinite ones. Contrary to predictions, the rate of definite article omission was higher than indefinite article omission in the elementary group (32.6% vs. 24.6%). In the intermediate group, indefinite article omission was more frequent than in definite contexts. Nevertheless, intermediate level learners omitted fewer articles in total (10 out of 74 times in

indefinite contexts and only 2 out of 53 times in definite contexts) than their elementary level counterparts. The reason why the omission rates were higher in indefinite contexts might be stemming from the fact that indefinite descriptions included NPs in *there-have* constructions which yielded many NPs due to listing. As shown in the examples above, in such constructions learners tended to use the required article (a/an) only with the first (or first few) NPs, and omitted them with subsequent NPs, which may have resulted in frequent article omission. Following are instances of article omission in definite contexts:

(97) *Omission of 'the'*

a.   He told about **Ø campus**, Antakya, **Ø dormitory**. Then I went to **Ø dormitory**. (associative use-anaphoric)

b.   We had **Ø address of our dormitory**, but we didn't know how we can get to there so we asked to someone. (unique by entailment)

c.   In last summer holiday, I went to a camp. When I went to there, I felt to be relax. **Ø Camp** was in İzmir. (anaphoric)

d.   Then I went **Ø seaside** to relief. (associative use)

As the omission instances reported earlier, article omission types in these contexts are also L1-constrained. Learners seemed to have transferred the 'zero article' parameter value from their L1 to their ILG grammar. This in turn, resulted in omission of articles in obligatory contexts.

5.4. Conclusion

All in all, contrary to predictions, elementary level learners omitted the definite article more frequently than the indefinite article in both the WET and in the WNT. Their omission rates in definite contexts were 57.3% in the WET and 32.6% in the WNT. On the other hand, they dropped the indefinite article at rates of 20% and 24.6% in the WET and WNT, respectively. Intermediate level learners omitted articles at a fairly lower rate compared to the elementary group. At the same time, they displayed a rather low omission rate (3.7%) in definite contexts in the WNT. Their highest omission rate was in definite contexts in WET with a ratio of 14%. The intermediate group exhibited similar rates of indefinite article omission in the WET and WNT, at rates of 10.6% and 13.5%, respectively. These figures show that

elementary level learners have more difficulty in supplying the definite article than the indefinite one. Nevertheless, a substantial improvement occurs in the mastery of the definite article (and articles overall) as learners progress in proficiency. This is attested by the intermediate level learners' lower rates of article omission across both tasks.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

6.1. Introduction

In this section, a discussion of the findings of the current study will be presented in relation to the research questions posed in the first chapter. Firstly, the results obtained will be interpreted in light of the studies reviewed. Convergent and divergent results will be highlighted. Next, limitations pertaining to the methodology or procedures that were followed will be reported. Finally, relevant implications will be discussed.

6.2. Discussion

RQ1. Does SPECIFICITY as a semantic universal affect the acquisition of the English articles by L1 Turkish speaking learners of L2 English in an EFL setting?

-How do learners of L2 English with L1 Turkish mark [-definite, +specific] contexts in English?

The first research question was about whether the semantic universal SPECIFICITY would have any effects on the article choice of learners of L2-English with L1-Turkish. Since Turkish is a [-ART] language, based on Ionin *et al.*'s (2004a) ACP and FH, we predicted that L1 Turkish-L2 English learners would fluctuate between the DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY settings in [-definite, +specific] and [+definite, -specific] contexts. Consequently, they would sometimes treat 'the' as a marker of the feature [+definite] and sometimes as a marker of the feature [+specific], which would result in fluctuation in indefinite specific contexts. This prediction was not supported. The results revealed that learners could successfully supply the target article in these types of context. Actually [-definite, +specific] contexts were the ones with the second highest accuracy rate. The overall substitution rate of learners was low and emerged even in unexpected contexts where DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY were in agreement. In order words, the few substitution errors observed did not involve systematicity.

The study yielded unexpected results that deserve attention. Substitution rates were most common in previous-mention definite and partitive-indefinite contexts. The rate of accuracy in previous-mention definite contexts was lowest in both proficiency groups. Nevertheless, speaking of previous-mention definite contexts, it may be plausible to think that the low rate of accuracy stemmed from research tool-bias. In other words, the way in which previous-mention items in the WET were designed may have caused fluctuation in these contexts. This view is supported by the learners' accuracy rates in anaphoric definite singular contexts in the WNT. In anaphoric contexts, which may correspond to the previous-mention definite contexts in the WET, there was only one misuse of 'a' and four omission errors out of 32 sentences. All these errors were observed in the elementary group, and intermediate level learners displayed target-like performance. As for partitive-indefinite contexts, there were not corresponding structures in the WNT to make a comparison. Nevertheless, as stated by Ko *et al.* (2007) the felicitous use of 'the' requires the *presupposition of uniqueness* (*i.e.,* maximality) as well as *common ground*. While the former concerns PARTITIVITY, the latter is about SPECIFICITY. Ko *et al.* (2007) state that learners grasp the pragmatic knowledge regarding PARTITIVITY later than SPECIFICITY. Thus, it may be the case that L1-Turkish L2-English learners in the present study displayed high rates of substitution in partitive-indefinite contexts as they lack the *uniqueness presupposition*.

RQ2. Do L1 Turkish speaking learners of L2 English misuse articles by overextending the SPECIFICITY distinction to definites?

-How do learners of L2 English with L1 Turkish mark [+definite, -specific] contexts in English?

The second question aimed to explore whether learners would overuse 'a/an' in [+definite, -specific] contexts, another specificity-induced pattern. As in the previous context, learners displayed correct use of the target-article with a very low rate of substitution. In other words, learners were not observed to fluctuate between the semantic notions DEFINITESS and SPECIFICITY in this context, either. Contrary to Atay (2010) and Ionin *et al.* (2003, 2004, 2008, 2009), who observed fluctuation in the article choice of non-article L1 learners, some previous research has shown that speakers of article-less L1s can use L2 English articles successfully despite the lack of a corresponding article system in their native language. For

instance, White (2003) reported that an end-state L1 Turkish speaking learner of L2 English could use the English articles successfully despite the lack of the Category Determiners (D) in her L1-Turkish. Similarly, in her study examining the relationship between DEFINITENESS, SPECIFICITY, PARTITIVTY and article choice, Dağdeviren (2010) showed that L1-Turkish EFL learners at low and high-proficiency levels had a good command of the English article system, and they could use the English articles in a target-like manner without being affected by SPECIFICITY or PARTITIVITY. Lardiere (2004a) provided evidence from another article-less L1. The researcher observed that an end-state L1 Mandarin-Hokkien learner of L2 English could accurately use the required article in oral and written production.

Although the article use rates of the elementary group indicated a greater distribution across the three types of articles (*i.e.,* 'a/an', 'the', 'zero article') and other words, intermediate level learners proved successful in all context types. For instance, they were almost target-like in [+definite, -specific] and [-definite, -specific] contexts with an accuracy rate of 91.3%. Despite this high rate of accuracy, learners sometimes failed to supply the target articles in obligatory contexts. The MSIH (Prévost and White, 2000; see chapter 3) may account for this failure. In the case of article acquisition, MSIH predicts that although learners have the necessary knowledge underlying article use, sometimes they fail to use them due to the difficulties they face while mapping the knowledge they have to related surface forms.

The overall percentage of learners' article use in all contexts revealed that the accuracy rates varied depending on the article type. It was observed that learners were more target-like in the use of the indefinite article than the definite article. This observation finds support in the studies of Atay (2010), Dağdeviren (2010), Ekiert (2004) and Önen (2007) who reported that contrary to most prior research (*e.g.*, Huebner, 1983; Master, 1987; Parish, 1987; and Thomas, 1989), 'a/an' emerges earlier than 'the' in the ILG of L2 English learners. In the case of Turkish speaking L2 English learners, this finding may be tied to L1 effects. It might be the case that learners are transferring the parameters of their L1 into their ILG grammar. Turkish lacks an overt marker for DEFINITENESS, and marks it with other devices like case markers, word order or sentence stress. On the other hand, it expresses

INDEFINITENESS with an overt marker- 'bir' (*i.e.,* one). Thus, as Önen (2007) and Atay (2010) suggest, the two languages might have parallel parameters in terms of the realization of INDEFINITENESS, and that may have led to a higher rate of accuracy in indefinite contexts.

RQ3. Given the distinct nature of the tasks in the study, do L1 Turkish speaking learners of L2 English display fluctuating use of 'a' and 'the' in both the written elicitation and written narrative tasks?

- How do learners of L2 English with L1 Turkish mark [-definite, +specific] and [+definite, -specific] contexts in the explicit and the implicit tasks?

The third question tapped into task type (*i.e.,* explicit vs. implicit) effects on article choice of L1-Turkish L2-English learners. Based on Ionin *et al.* (2009), we expected that in the explicit WET learners would display both 'the' and 'a/an' overuse in [-definite, +specific] and [+definite, -specific] contexts due to a combination of SPECIFICITY effects and explicit strategies. In the WNT, on the other hand, they would mainly overuse 'the' in [-definite, +specific] contexts. However, as reported above, there was no remarkable SPECIFICITY effect in the WET, and learners were observed to base their article choice mainly on the DEFINITENESS setting. Similarly, in the WNT, they could supply 'a/an' successfully in [-definite, +specific] contexts with no traces of SPECIFICITY effects. This task did not yield adequate [+definite, -specific] contexts, therefore the prediction regarding 'a/an' overuse could not be tested. With regards to fluctuation, these findings might indicate that learners could adhere to the DEFINITENESS setting in their overall article choice irrespective of task type.

It might be intriguing how learners of L2-English with L1-Turkish in this study achieved such a high success rate in the use of the English articles despite the lack of an article system in their L1. The background of the participants who took part in the study might have affected the results. The participants consisted of a very 'special' group in terms of the L2 English instruction they had received. They were all ELT learners, which means, they had been exposed to long years of 'explicit' English instruction. From the initial stages of L2 English exposure and on, they have been instructed with plenty of focus on the formal aspects of the English language. As known, explicit instruction involves predetermined, planned instruction which

requires deliberate attention to the target form, memorization of rules and controlled practice of the target forms. Thus, all through the years they had received explicit grammar instruction, learners might have gained an insight into the specification of the English article system. In fact, studies (see *e.g.,* Ellis, 1993; DeKeyser, 1995; Robinson, 1996; and Rosa and Leow, 2004) have shown that explicit instruction might have a positive role on L2 development. In addition, during their preparation for the University Entrance Examination and also the Foreign Language Examination (*i.e.,* YDS), which is a requirement for being admitted to an ELT progrmamme, learners had a lot of explicit instruction of the English grammar, and had numerous tests that measured their knowledge on different aspects of the English grammar including articles. Hence, the nature of the WET itself might have affected the results. That is, learners' acquaintance with the test-format and long years of explicit instruction to which learners were exposed might have had an impact on their performance.

Although the WNT yielded seemingly parallel results, we should be cautious while interpreting the results we obtained on this task. Since learners produced a limited number of contexts in the WNT, the results of the WNT cannot go beyond being merely suggestive.

RQ4. Does task type (explicit vs. implicit) affect article omission?

- Do learners of L2 English with L1 Turkish omit articles more frequently in the implicit written narrative task than in the explicit written elicitation task?

The fourth question addressed in the present study was about article omission. Specifically, we attempted to find out whether learners would omit articles frequently in the implicit WNT as reported by Huebner (1983), Ionin *et al.* (2004) and Robertson (2000). In addition, we wanted to explore whether learners would omit the indefinite article more frequently than the definite article since the indefinite article carries the least amount of information. Unlike Ionin *et al.* (2004b) in which learners almost never omitted articles in the WET, the learners in the present study dropped articles in the WET as well as the WNT. Therefore we examined the article omission rates of the learners in both tasks. Overall, the frequency of learners' omission errors was higher than the rate of substitution errors in both the WET and the WNT. This might indicate a possible L1 parameter resetting on the part of

learners because when we examine omission rates closely, we can see that except for intermediate level learners' omission rates in the WNT, omission occurred in definite contexts more frequently than in indefnite NP environments across both tasks. This finding was divergent from that of Avery and Radišić (2007) who found more frequent 'a/an' omission than 'the' omission in the production of L2 English learners with L1 Serbian. In short, the rates of definite article omission were not in line with our prediction that learners would omit 'a/an' more frequently. Higher rates of 'the' omission might derive from the absence of category D in Turkish. As stated previously, Turkish lacks an overt marker equivalent to definite 'the' whereas it has the singular indefinite article 'bir', which is also used as a numeral. In other words, contrary to English, in Turkish there is not an overt lexical item that precedes a NP to render it definite. Instead, in most cases Turkish attaches the accusative case marker to a NP to express DEFINITENESS. This being the case, with regards to definite descriptions, Turkish-speaking L2 English learners may be using the *zero-article* parameter of their L1, which leads to a higher rate of article omission.

Although they are far from being systematic, some of the omission patterns which emerged in this study have parallels with those in previous studies. For instance, in indefinite *there-have* constructions which included several NPs, some learners seemed to use the indefinite article with the first NP, but tended to omit it with subsequent NPs as in "There is *a couch*, and *Ø desk and Ø table*". In his study where similar omission instances emerged, Robertson (2000: 169) accounted for this pattern with a "syntactic principle of *determiner drop*". Under this principle "an NP with definite or indefinite reference need not be overtly marked for [± definiteness] if it is included in the scope of the determiner of a preceding NP."

Another omission type was in NPs pre-modified by an adjective as reported in Atay (2010), Goad and White (2004), Pongpairoj (2007b) and Trenkic (2007). Learners were observed to omit both the definite 'the' and the indefinite 'a/an' in adjectivally pre-modified NPs as illustrated in "[…] But finally, she talked to *Ø little girl* […]." and "İzmir is *Ø beautiful city*." (see also 91, 92, 93 and 96d in Chapter 5).

Some of the omission patterns appeared to stem from L1 parameters. The following context provides an example: "In last summer holiday, I went to a camp.

When I went to there, I felt to be relax. ***Ø Camp*** was in İzmir." In the last sentence, the NP written in bold lacks the definite article. Even though the subject NP was mentioned earlier, and therefore it is anaphoric definite, the learner failed to supply the required article. Article drop in this sentence seems to be related to L1 parameter values. It was stated in Chapter 3 that in Turkish a bare NP in subject position has a definite reading (see item 15 in Chapter 2, Section 2.3). Thus, it may be the case that learners omit articles in subject position due to adhering to their L1 Turkish norms. Similar omission cases were reported in Avery and Radišić (2007) where L1-Serbian learners dropped articles in topic position.

Another type of omission reported in Avery and Radišić (2007) occurred in the present study, as well. The results showed that learners omit 'a/an' with predicative nominals such as "She is ***Ø journalist***." (see also 96f in Chapter 5) as was the case in Avery and Radišić (2007). The researchers indicated that L1-Serbian had a role on this omission pattern. We believe in such omission contexts L1 effect holds for Turkish, as well. Although unstressed 'bir' is used as a marker of INDEFINITENESS, in some cases including predicative nominals it is optional unlike English which mandates the use of 'a/an' in parallel structures. (O ***(bir)*** gazeteci vs. She is ***a*** journalist). Therefore, learners may omit articles in such sentences due to a failure in adjusting to English rules. The last omission pattern observed in this study involved dropping articles in object positions with NPs which have generic reference as in "I have a bear which is my Christmas gift. It is singing ***Ø song***." (see also 96h in Chapter 5). The source of omission in these contexts is most probably the differences in parametric values of Turkish and English, as well. In Turkish, as with nominal predicates, the use of the indefinite article in object position is optional in sentences with verbal predicates. This is particularly the case when the object NP has a generic interpretation. Being unaware of the structural differences between their L1 Turkish and the L2 English, learners –particularly those at the beginning of their article acquisition process- may be forming sentences in accordance with the rules of their native language, and hence they might omit articles in obligatory contexts.

RQ5. Does L2-proficiency level affect article choice of L1-Turkish learners of L2-English?

- Do intermediate level L1-Turkish learners of L2-English overall use the English articles more accurately than their elementary level counterparts?

With regards to the last question pertaining to the relationship between accuracy of article usage and proficiency level, predictions were borne out. In all of the contexts, whether definite or indefinite, elementary level learners lagged behind their intermediate level counterparts. This finding has been well documented in the literature (see *e.g.*, Dağdeviren, 2010; Ekiert, 2004; Humphrey, 2007; Master, 1987; and Sarko, 2009 among others). An increase was observed from elementary towards intermediate level in terms of target-like article choice in all context types. A comparison based on indefinite and definite contexts clearly shows that there is a more remarkable development towards the intermediate level in definite contexts than in indefinite ones. Some studies have shown that speakers of non-article L1 backgrounds display an increased use of 'the' in intermediary stages of L2 English acquisition. Ekiert (2004), for instance, reported a U-shape development in terms of definite article usage. This suggested overuse of 'the' at the intermediate level as was observed in Huebner (1983) and Master (1987). Although the learners in the present study did not exhibit *the*-flooding (as termed by Huebner, 1983 and Master, 1987), they still showed a marked increase in definite article use when compared to elementary level learners. It might be the case that as learners progressed in proficiency and were exposed to increased L2 input, they may have realized that the representation of the feature [+definite] in English differs from that of Turkish. Consequently, they may have started to integrate the definite 'the' in their ILG gradually attaining more accuracy in the use of this form. As for article omission rates, a negative correlation was found between article omission and proficiency level. In other words, as the proficiency level of the learners increased, tendency of article omission decreased. The remarkable increase in the correct use of the definite article and the decrease in omission rates suggest that learners start to gain a better grasp of the use of the English article system as they progress in proficiency.

6.3. Summary

In a nutshell, the results of the present study do not support the FH, thus the prediction that L1 Turkish-L2 English learners would fluctuate between the DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY settings in indefinite/specific and definite/non-

specific contexts was not observed. In contrast, learners, particularly those at the intermediate level, could successfully use the English articles based on the DEFINITENESS setting in these contexts. Substitution of articles was observed in two unexpected contexts: previous-mention definite and partitive indefinite. Regarding the former context, fluctuation occurred only in the WET. Hence, it may be related to the task rather than learners' inability to use the definite article based on the appropriate parameter value. The errors in the latter context, on the other hand, may be related to learners' lack of the *uniqueness* (*i.e.,* maximality) *presupposition* as reported in Ko *et al.* (2007).

Overall, learners were more target-like in assigning the indefinite article, and this is most likely due to the parallelism between the representation of INDEFINITENESS in Turkish and English. As for article omissions, in line with the preceding finding, learners generally omitted the definite article in written elicitation and production tasks. Finally, accuracy of article choice increased in parallel with proficiency level providing support for the last prediction. This finding suggested that with increased input, learners could gain a better mastery in using the English article system.

6.4. Conclusion

The present study aimed to shed light on the role of the semantic universals DEFINITENESS and SPECIFICITY on the article choice of L1-Turkish speaking L2-English learners. Specifically, it examined whether L2-English learners with a non-article L1 background (*i.e.,* Turkish) would fluctuate between two settings of the ACP. In addition, based on prior research that suggests fluctuation occurs in both [-definite, +specific] and [+definite,-specific] contexts in elicitation tasks whereas it occurs mainly in [-definite, +specific] contexts in production tasks, it aimed to explore whether fluctuation patterns would differ across the WET and the WNT. There has been evidence that L2 English learners tend to omit articles more frequently in production than in elicitation tasks. It has also been reported that the indefinite article is omitted more than the definite one due to being less informative. Hence, one of the questions that this study addressed was whether learners would drop more articles in the production task, and whether omission would emerge to a greater extent in indefinite contexts. A final issue investigated was related to the

relationship between correct article usage and proficiency level. The direction of correlation between the two notions was examined. To answer these research questions, article choice of ELT learners at MKU was explored. The sample consisted of learners at two proficiency levels as determined by the OQPT: elementary and intermediate. A WET and a WNT were adopted as data collection instruments. The study focused on article choice of learners in two contexts types: [-definite, +specific] and [+definite,-specific]. Descriptive statistics and results of t-tests showed that learners were successful at assigning the target article based on the DEFINITENESS setting in these two contexts as well as in [+definite, +specific] and [-definite, -specific] contexts. Interestingly, substitution errors were observed at high rates in previous-mention definite and partitive indefinite contexts in the WET. Regarding article misuse in previous-mention definite contexts, there was only one substitution error in the corresponding context (*i.e.,* anaphoric) in the WNT. This suggested a possible research tool bias with respect to the substitution rates observed in this context type in the WET. In other words, the design of the previous-mention definite contexts may have triggered article misuse in this context in the elicitation task. No partitive indefinite context emerged in the natural production task; therefore, it was not possible to compare article use in this context across both tasks. Nevertheless, the errors in this context type might have stemmed from the lack of the uniqueness (*i.e.,* maximality) presupposition of learners, which is an integral part of PARTIVITY. Ko *et al.* (2007) maintained that learners acquire this pragmatic knowledge late this being the case learners at both proficiency levels may have shown sensitivity to PARTITIVITY effects. The overall article use rates across all the contexts suggested that learners were more target-like in using the indefinite article. This finding may be tied to the presence of parallel parameters in the L1 and the L2 of learners. Turkish includes an overt indefinite article as in English, and this may have facilitated the grasp of this form by learners. Although in general learners were more accurate in indefinite contexts, they were observed to use both definite and indefinite articles based on the DEFINITENESS setting despite the lack of an article system in their L1 Turkish. The learners who were chosen as the sample might have led to this observation. In other words, since the participants of the present study consisted of ELT learners, they have had a great deal of explicit grammar instruction for long years. In addition, they have been given plenty of explicit tests like fill-in-the-blanks, multiple-choice or written elicitation. Overt focus on different

aspects of the English grammar and also learners' acquaintance with the test-format used as a data collection instrument (*i.e.,* WET) might have affected the results. As for article omission, contra Ionin *et al.* (2004), learners in the current study displayed considerable rates of omission in WET. Contrary to predictions, elementary level learners displayed the highest omission rates in definite contexts, across both tasks. This behavior most probably derived from the lack of an exact counterpart to the English definite article 'the' in L1 Turkish of the learners. Since learners, particularly those at elementary level could not locate 'the' in their existing L1 parameters they ended up omitting it in most of the obligatory contexts. In developmental terms, a considerable decrease was observed in overall omission rates in the intermediate group. This observation and also the overall high level of article use accuracy by the intermediate group compared to the elementary group suggested that proficiency level has a positive correlation with correct article usage. Thus, confirming the last prediction, learners with a higher proficiency level displayed a better mastery of the English article system in general.

6.5. Limitations

One of the basic limitations of this study was the absence of an advanced level group. Since the study aimed to explore article choice of L1 Turkish L2 English learners in relation to their proficiency levels, a complete picture of the learner's developmental stages could not be drawn. Inclusion of participants from all proficiency levels may better help us to see learners' L2 English article usage development along a continuum. Even when all proficiency levels are included, a one-shot cross-sectional study may not yield as robust findings as a longitudinal study because as Master (1987: 9) states "A true picture of article acquisition should be based on longitudinal studies." Thus, adoption of a cross-sectional methodology (in our case due to time constraints) was also a limitation.

Another limitation was about the WNT. Although this task was included to supplement the WET, it did not yield as many contexts as desired. Therefore, the results obtained remained suggestive rather than conclusive. Furthermore, as stated before, SPECIFICITY is in the mind of the speaker; therefore, it was not possible to precisely determine whether a context was [+specific] or [-specific]. Thus, as in Butler (2002), an interview could have been conducted following the administration

of the WNT, and learners could have provided us with exact explanations as to why they chose certain articles in certain contexts.

6.6. Implications

Based on the limitations, one of the implications of the present study may be about the data collection instruments that can be used in future studies. As stated above, the number of sentences generated in the WNT was very limited. Hence, besides a written production task, it may be fruitful to use an oral production task such as story-telling or interview where learners can be prompted to generate more sentences.

Another important implication concerns the L1-transfer induced article omission patterns that emerged in the study. Learners exhibited a tendency to form sentences in the target language based on the norms of their L1, and this resulted in article omissions in certain contexts. Since this problem is not confined to article acquisition alone, in the very first place learners should be taught that each language is a unique system with its own rules. In the context of article acquisition, they should be taught the differences between the way articles are represented in L1-Turkish and L2-English. Undoubtedly, context plays a key role in using articles correctly, so teachers should go beyond simple rules regarding the use of articles. In addition, they should lean on countability distinctions because this is one of the notions that underlie article choice, and as observed in one of the learners' production, it can lead to article misuse particularly in indefinite singular and plural/mass contexts.

REFERENCES

Abbott, Barbara (2006). "Definite and indefinite". In K. Brown (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 392-399.

Anderson, Janet (1978). "Order of difficulty in adult second language acquisition". In R. William (Ed.). *Second language acquisition research: Issues and implications* London: Academic Press, pp. 91–108.

Atay, Zeynep (2010). *Second language acquisition of the English article system by Turkish learners: The role of semantic notions*. Unpublished master's thesis, METU, Ankara.

Avery, Peter and Radišić, Milica (2007). "Accounting for variablility in the acquisition of English articles". In A. Belikova, L. Meroni & M. Umeda (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 2nd conference on generative approaches to language acquisition North America (GALANA)* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 1-11.

Belikova, Alyona, Hagstrom, Paul, Kupisch, Tanja, Özçelik, Öner and White, Lydia. (2010). "Definiteness in positive and negative existentials in the L2 English of Russian speakers". In J. Costa, A. Castro, M. Lobo, & F. Pratas (Eds.). *Proceedings of GALA 2009* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 28-38.

Bergeron-Matoba, Jun (2007). "Acquisition of the English article system in SLA and the Missing Surface Hypothesis". *University of Queensland Working Papers in Linguistics, 1 (3)*, 1-25. http://www.library.uq.edu.au/ojs/index.php/uqwpl/article/view/9/10. (Accessed on: 08.05.2014)

Berry, Roger (1991) "Re-articulating the Articles". *ELT Journa1*, 45 (3), 252-259.

Bickerton, Derek (1981). *Roots of Language.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: Karoma Press.

Bolinger, Dwight (1977). *Meaning and Form.* London: Longman

Brown, Roger (1973). *A First Language: The Early Stages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bussmann, Hadumod, Trauth, Gregory, Kazzazi, Kerstin and Bussmann, Hadumod. *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne and Larsen-Freeman, Diane (1999). *The Grammar Book: An ESL Teacher's Course (2nd ed).* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Chafe, Wallace L. (1976). "Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view". In C. N. Li (Ed.). *Subject and topic* New York: Academic Press, pp. 25-55.

Chan, Wing-man (2005). "Acquisition of the English article system by Hong Kong students". *The Chinese University of Hong Kong.* http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/lin/new/doc/ma_papers/malin/Chan%20Wing%20Man_2004-05.pdf (Accessed on: 08.05.2014)

Chesterman, Andrew (1991). *On definiteness: A study with special reference to English and Finnish.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chierchia, Gennaro (1998). "Reference to Kinds across Languages". *Natural Language Semantics*, 6, 339-405.

Christophersen, Paul (1939). *The Articles. A study of Their Theory and Use in English.* Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard.

Dağdeviren, Gülin (2010). *Acquisition of the English article system by speakers of Turkish in the EFL setting*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.

DeKeyser, Robert (1995). "Learning L2 Grammar Rules". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 17, 379-410.

DeKeyser, Robert M. (2005). "What Makes Learning Second-Language Grammar Difficult? A Review of Issues". *Language Learning*, 55 (1), 1-25.

Dikilitaş, Kenan and Altay, Meryem (2011). "Acquisition Sequence of Four Categories of Non-generic Use of the English Definite Article *the* by Turkish Speakers". *Novitas- ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 5 (2), 183-198.

Du Bois, John W. (1980). "Beyond definiteness: the trace of identity in discourse". In W. L. Chafe (Ed.). *The pear stories; cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production* Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 203–274.

Ekiert, Monika (2004). "Acquisition of the English article system by speakers of Polish in ESL and EFL settings". *TESOL and Applied Linguistics, Working Paper, 4 (1)*, 1-23. http://journals.tc-library.org/index.php/tesol/article/viewFile/42/49 (Accessed on: 08.05.2014)

Ekiert, Monika (2007). "The acquisition of grammatical marking of indefiniteness with the indefinite article *a* in L2 English". *Teachers College, Colombia University Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics, 7 (1)*, 1-43. http://journal.tc-library.org/index.php/tesol/article/viewFile/265/224 (Accessed on: 08.05.2014)

Ellis, Nick (1993). Rules and instances in foreign language learning: Interactions of implicit and explicit knowledge. European Journal of Cognitive Psychology, 5(3), 289–319.

Enç, Mürvet (1991). "The Semantics of Specificity". *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 1-25.

Epstein, Samuel David, Flynn, Suzanne and Martohardjono, Gita (1996). "Second Language Acquisition: Theoretical and Experimental Issues in Contemporary Research". *Behavioral and Brain Sciences,* 19, 677-758.

Epstein, Samuel David, Flynn, Suzanne and Martohardjono, Gita (1998). "The strong continuity hypothesis in adult L2 acquisition of functional categories". In S. Flynn, G. Martohardjono & W. O'Neil (Eds.). *The generative study of second language acquisition* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 61-77.

Epstein, Richard (2002). "The Definite Article, Accessibility, and the Construction of Discourse Referents". *Cognitive Linguistics*, 12 (4), 333–378.

Eubank, Lynn (1993/1994). "On the Transfer of Parametric Values in L2 Development". *Language Acquisition*, 3, 183-208.

Eubank, Lynn, Bischof, Janine, Huffstutler, April, Leek, Patricia and West, Clint (1997). "Tom Eats Slowly Cooked Eggs: Thematic-verb Raising in L2 Knowledge". *Language Acquisition*, 6, 171-199.

Finer, Daniel and Broselow, Ellen (1986). "Second language acquisition of reflexive-binding". In *Proceedings of NELS 16*, 154-168. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Graduate Linguistics Student Association.

Flynn, Suzanne (1987). *A Parameter-setting Model of L2 Acquisition*. Reidel.

Flynn, Suzanne and Martohardjono, Gita (1994). "Mapping from the initial state to the final state: The separation of universal principles and language specific properties". In B. Lust, J. Whitman & M. Suner (Eds.). *Syntactic theory and first language acquisition: Crosslinguistic perspectives* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 319-335.

Flynn, Suzanne (1996). "A parameter-setting approach to second language acquisition". In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.). *Handbook of second language acquisition* San Diego: Academic Press, pp. 121-158.

Fodor, Janet Dean and Sag, Ivan A. (1982). "Referential and Quantificational Indefinites*". *Linguistics and Philosophy,* 5, 355–398.

Fuli, Lotu Titi (2007). *Definiteness vs. Specificity: An investigation into the terms used to describe articles in Gagana Samoa*. Master's thesis, the University of Auckland.

Garcia Mayo, Maria del Pilar (2009). "Article choice in L2 English by Spanish speakers: Evidence for full transfer". In M. d. P. Garcia Mayo & R. Hawkins (Eds.). *Second language acquisition of articles: Empirical findings*

and theoretical implications Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing, pp. 13-36.

Goad, Heather and White, Lydia (2004). "Ultimate attainment of L2 inflections: Effects of L1 prosodic structure". In S. Foster-Cohen, M. Ota, M.A. Sharwood Smith & A. Sorace (Eds.) *EUROSLA Yearbook 4* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 119-145.

Goad, Heather and White, Lydia (2008). "Prosodic Structure and the Representation of L2 Functional Morphology: A Nativist Approach". *Lingua*, 118, 577-594.

Goto Butler, Yuko (2002). "Second Language Learners' Theories on the Use of English Articles: An Analysis of the Metalinguistic Knowledge Used by Japanese Students in Acquiring the English Article System". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 23 (3), 451-480.

Göksel, Aslı and Kerslake, Celia (2005). *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Görgülü, Emrah (2009). "On Definiteness and Specificity in Turkish". In R. Shibagaki & R. Vermeulen (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 5ᵗʰ workshop on Altaic formal linguistics (WAFL5)* MIT Working Papers in Linguistics (MWPL) 58, pp. 115-129.

Guella, Hakima, Déprez, Viviane and Sleeman, Petra (2008). "Article choice parameters in L2". In R. Slabakova *et al* (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 9th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference (GASLA 2007)* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 57-69.

Hawkins, John A. (1978). *Definiteness and Indefiniteness: A Study in Reference and Grammaticality Prediction.* London: Croom Helm.

Hawkins, Roger (2001). *Second Language Syntax: A Generative Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Hawkins, Roger, Al-Eid, Saleh, Almahboob, Ibrahim, Athanasopoulos, Panos, Rangsiya, Chaengchenkit, Hu, James, Rezai, Mohammad, Jaensch, Carol,

Jeon, Yunju, Jiang, Amy, Leung, Yan-kit Ingrid, Matsunaga, Keiko, Ortega, Martha, Sarko, Ghisseh, Snape, Neal and Velasco-Zárate, Kalinka (2005). "Non-target-like article use in L2 English – implications for current UG-based theories of SLA". Ms, University of Essex (oral presentation given by Roger Hawkins).

Hawkins, Roger, Al-Eid, Saleh, Almahboob, Ibrahim, Athanasopoulos, Panos, Chaengchenkit, Rangsiya, Hu, James, Rezai, Mohammad, Jaensch, Carol, Jeon, Yunju, Jiang, Amy, Leung, Yan-kit Ingrid, Matsunaga, Keiko, Ortega, Martha, Sarko, Ghisseh, Snape, Neal and Velasco-Zárate, Kalinka (2006). "Accounting for English article interpretation by L2 speakers". In S. Foster-Cohen, M. Medved Krajnovic & J. Mihaljević Djigunović (Eds.). *EUROSLA Yearbook 6*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 7-25.

Haznedar, Belma and Schwartz, Bonnie Dale (1997). "Are there optional infinitives in child L2 acquisition?" In E. Hughes, M. Hughes & A. Greenhill (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 257-268.

Heim, Irene (1982). *The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Higgins, Roger. 1979. *The pseudo-cleft construction in English*. New York: Garland Publications.

Huebner, Thom (1983). *A Longitudinal Analysis of the Acquisition of English*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Karoma Press.

Huebner, Thom (1985). "System and Variability in Interlanguage Syntax". *Language Learning*, 35, 141-63.

Humphrey, Simon (2007). "Acquisition of the English Article System: Some Preliminary Findings". *Journal of School of Foreign Languages, Nagoya University of Foreign Studies,* 32, 301-325.

Ionin, Tania (2003). *Article semantics in second language acquisition*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Ionin, Tania, Ko, Heejeong and Wexler, Ken (2003). "Specificity as a grammatical notion: Evidence from L2-English article use". In G. Garding & M. Tsujimura (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 22nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 245-258.

Ionin, Tania and Wexler, Ken (2003). "The certain uses of *the* in L2-English". In J. M. Liceras, H. Zobl & H. Goodluck (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 6th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference (GASLA 2002)* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 150-160.

Ionin, Tania, Ko, Heejeong and Wexler, Ken (2004a*). "*Article Semantics in L2-Acquisition: The Role of Specificity". *Language Acquisition*, 12 (1), 3-69.

Ionin, Tania, Ko, Heejeong and Wexler, Ken (2004b). "The role of semantic features in the acquisition of English articles by Russian and Korean speakers". In J. M. Liceras, H. Zobl and H. Goodluck (Eds.). To appear in *The role of formal features in second language acquisition* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 226-268.

Ionin, Tania (2006). "*This* is Definitely Specific: Specificity and Definiteness in Article Systems". *Natural Language Semantics*, 14, 175-234.

Ionin, Tania, Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa and Bautista-Maldonado, Salvador (2008). "Sources of Linguistic Knowledge in the Second Language Acquisition of English Articles". *Lingua*, 118, 554-576.

Ionin, Tania, Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa and Philippov, Vadim (2009). "Acquisition of Article Semantics by Child and Adult L2-English Learners". *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 12 (3), 337-361.

Jarvis, Scott (2002). "Topic Continuity in L2 English Article Use". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 387-418.

Kadmon, Nirit (1990). "Uniqueness". *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 13, 273–324.

Kaku, Keiko (2006). "Second Language Learners' Use of English Articles: A Case study of Native Speakers of Japanese". *Ottawa Papers in Linguistics*, 34, 63-74.

Kamp, Hans (1981). "A theory of truth and semantic representation". In J. Groenendijk, T. Jansen & M. Stockhof (Eds.). *Formal methods in the study of language* Amsterdam: Mathematisch Centrum Tracts, pp. 277-322.

Karmiloff-Smith, Annette (1979). *A Functional Approach to Child Language.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kim, Lucy Kyoungsook and Lakshmanan, Usha (2009). "The processing role of the Article Choice Parameter: Evidence from L2 learners of English". In M. d. P. Garcia Mayo & R. Hawkins (Eds.). *Second language acquisition of articles: Empirical findings and theoretical implications* Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing, pp. 87-113.

Ko, Heejeong, Ionin, Tania and Wexler, Ken (2004). "Adult L2-learners lack *the* maximality presupposition, too!". http://ling.snu.ac.kr/ko/publications/Papers/KoIoninWexler_GALANA2004 _web.pdf. (Accessed on: 17.09.2014)

Ko, Heejeong, Perovic, Alexandra, Ionin, Tania and Wexler, Ken (2008). "Semantic universals and variation in L2 article choice". In R. Slabakova, J. Rothman, P. Kempchinsky & E. Gavruseva (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 9th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 118-129.

Ko, Heejeong, Ionin, Tania and Wexler, Ken (2009). "L2 acquisition of English articles by Korean speakers". http://ling.snu.ac.kr/ko/publications/Papers/CUP final_KoIoninWexler-web.pdf (Accessed on: 17.09.2014)

Kornfilt, Jaklin (1997). *Turkish*. London: Routledge.

Kuno, Susumu (1973). *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Lardiere, Donna (1998). "Case and Tense in the 'Fossilized' Steady State". *Second Language Research*, 14, 1-7.

Lardiere, Donna (2004a) "On morphological competence". In L. Dekydtspotter, R. A. Sprouse, & A. Liljestrand (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 7th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference (GASLA 2004)* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla, 2005, pp. 178-192.

Lardiere, Donna (2004b). "Knowledge of definiteness despite variable article omission". In A. Brugos, L. Micciulla & C. E. Smith (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 28th Boston University Conference on Language Development* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 328–339.

Leung, Yan-kit Ingrid (2001). "The initial state of L3A: Full Transfer and Failed Features?". In X. Bonch-Bruevich, W. Crawford, J. Hellerman, C. Higgins & H. Nguyen (Eds.). *The past, present and future of second language research: Selected proceedings of the 2000 Second Language Research Forum* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 55-75.

Lewis, Michael (1993). *The Lexical Approach: The State of the ELT and A Way Forward.* Language Teaching Publications, Hove, England.

Liu, Dilin and Gleason, Johanna L. (2002). "Acquisition of the Article *the* by Nonnative Speakers of English". *SSLA*, 24, 1-26.

Lu, Fen-Chuan (2001). "The Acquisition of English Articles by Chinese Learners". *Second Language Studies*, 20 (1), 43-78.

Lyons, Christopher (1999). *Definiteness.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Maclaran, Rose (1982). *The semantics and pragmatics of the English demonstratives*. Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.

Maratsos, Michael (1974). "Preschool Children's Use of Definite and Indefinite Articles". *Child Development*, 45, 446–455.

Maratsos. Michael P. (1976). *The Use of Definite and Indefinite Reference in Young Children*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Master, Peter (1987). *A cross-linguistic interlanguage analysis of the acquisition of the English article system.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Master, Peter (1988a). "Teaching the English Article System, Parts I and II". *Forum Anthology*, 4, 208-221.

Master, Peter (1988b). "Acquiring the English article system: a cross-linguistic interlanguage analysis." *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Chicago*. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED298768.pdf. (Accessed on: 08.05.2014)

Master, Peter (1990). "Teaching the English Articles as a Binary System". *TESOL Quarterly*, 24 (3), 461-478.

Master, Peter (1994). "The effects of systematic instruction on learning the English article system. In T. Odlin (Ed.). *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 229-252.

Master, Peter (1997). "The English Article System: Acquisition, Function, and Pedagogy". *System*, 25, 215-232.

Master, Peter (2002). "Information Structure and English Article Pedagogy". *System*, 30, 331-348.

Master, Peter. (2003a). Acquisition of the Zero and Null Articles in English. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 14(1). https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2kb4p9r0 (Accessed on: 08.05.2014)

Master, Peter (2003b). "Pedagogical frameworks for learning the English article system". *On-line Newsletter Articles*. http://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/pmaster/PedFrames.pdf (Accessed on: 17.09.2014)

McEldowney, Patricia L. (1977). "A Teaching Grammar of the English Article System". *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 95-112.

Milsark, Gary (1977). "Toward an Explanation of Certain Peculiarities of the Existential Construction in English". *Linguistic Analysis*, 3, 1-29.

Morales, Alexandra (2011). "The role of the L1 in the acquisition of English articles by Spanish-speaking children". In J. Herschensohn & D. Tanner (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 11th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference (GASLA 2011)* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 83-89.

Mosel, Ulrike and Hovdhaugen, Even (1992). *Samoan Reference Grammar*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Odlin, Terence (1989). *Language transfer*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Önen, Serap (2007). *EFL students' use of English articles at different proficiency levels: A comparison of context and task type*. Unpublished master's thesis, Bilkent University, Ankara.

Özge, Umut (2011). "Turkish indefinites and accusative marking". In A. Simpson (Ed.) *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 62: Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL7)* Cambridge, MA. MIT Press, pp. 253-267.

Parrish, Betsy (1987). "A New Look at Methodologies in the Study of Article Acquisition for Learners of ESL". *Language Learning*, 37 (3), 361-383.

Peters, Olexandra (2007). *The role of specificity in the acquisition of the English determiner system by speakers of Russian*. Unpublished B.A. Thesis, University of Oldenburg.

Pica, Teresa (1983). "Adult Acquisition of English as a Second Language under Different Conditions of Exposure". *Language Learning*, 33 (4), 465-497.

Pienemann, Manfred (1998). *Language processing and second language development: Processability Theory*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Platt, John (1977). "The 'Creoloid' As a Special Type of Interlanguage". *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 2, 22-38.

Poesio, Massimo and Renata Vieira. 1998. A corpus-based investigation of definite description use. *Computational Linguistics*, 24, 183-216.

Pongpairoj, Nattama (2007a). "Are L2 English article choices UG-regulated?". In R. Arscott, K. Barden, A. Krishna, S. Shah & M. Zellers (Eds.). *The proceedings for the fifth Cambridge postgraduate conference in linguistics (CamLing 2007)* Cambridge: Cambridge University, pp. 213–220.

Pongpairoj, Nattama (2007b)." Asymmetric patterns of English article omissions in L2A". In C. Gabrielatos, R. Slessor & J. W. Unger (Eds.). *Papers from the Lancaster University postgraduate conference in linguistics and language teaching (LAEL PG) Volume 1* Lancaster: Lancaster University, pp. 103–119.

Prévost, Philippe and White, Lydia (2000). "Missing Surface Inflection or Impairment in Second Language Acquisition? Evidence from Tense and Agreement". *Second Language Research*, 16, 103-133.

Robertson, Daniel and Sorace, Antonella (1999). "Losing the V2 constraint". In E. Klein & G. Martohardjono (Eds.). *The development of second language grammars: A generative approach* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 317-361.

Roberston, Daniel (2000). "Variability of the Use of the English Article System by Chinese Learners of English". *Second Language Research*, 16 (2), 135-172.

Robinson, Peter (1996). "Learning Simple and Complex Second Language Rules under Implicit, Incidental, Rule-search and Instructed Condition". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 18(1), 27-68.

Rosa, Elena and Leow, Ron (2004). "Awareness, Different Learning Conditions, and L2 Development". *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 25(2), 269-292.

Russell, Bertrand (1905). "On Denoting". *Mind*, 14, 479-93.

Sarko, Ghisseh (2009). "L2 English article production by Arabic and French speakers". In M. d. P. Garcia Mayo & R. Hawkins (Eds.). *Second language*

acquisition of articles: Empirical findings and theoretical implications Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing, pp. 37-66.

Schafer, Robin J. and de Villiers, Jill (2000). "Imagining articles: What *a* and *the* can tell us about the emergence of DP". In C. Howell, S. A. Fish & T. Keith-Lucas (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 609-620.

Schaeffer, Jeannette and Matthewson, Lisa (2005). "Grammar and Pragmatics in the Acquisition of Article Systems*". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 23 (1), 53-101.

Schönenberger, Manuela (2009). "Article use and article omission by native speakers of Russian in L2 and L3 English". ms., University of Hamburg.

Schwartz, Bonnie Dale and Sprouse, Rex A. (1994). "Word order and nominative case in non-native language acquisition: A longitudinal study of (L1 Turkish) German interlanguage". In T. Hoekstra & B. D. Schwartz (Eds.). *Language acquisition studies in generative grammar: Papers in honor of Kenneth Wexler from the 1991 GLOW workshops* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 317-368.

Schwartz, Bonnie Dale and Sprouse, Rex A. (1996). "L2 Cognitive States and the Full Transfer/Full Access Model". *Second Language Research,* 12, 40-72.

Schwartz, Bonnie Dale (2003). "Why child L2 acquisition?". In J. van Kampen & S. Baauw (Eds.). *Proceedings of GALA 2003, 1.* Utrecht University, LOT Occasional Series, pp. 47–66.

Siu, Suk-fun (2010). *What errors do Hong Kong secondary school students make in English article system?* Unpublished master's thesis, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, China.

Snape, Neal. (2005). "The Use of Articles in L2 English by Japanese and Spanish Learners". *Essex Graduate Student Papers in Language & Linguistics*, 7, 1-23.

Snape, Neal (2006). *The acquisition of the English determiner phrase by Japanese and Spanish learners of English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Essex.

Sorace, Antonella (2000). "Syntactic Optionality in Non-native Grammars". *Second Language Research*, 16, 93-102.

Takahashi, Toshiaki (1997). "Japanese Learners' Acquisition and use of the English Article System". *Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 8, 98-110.

Tarone, Elaine and Parrish, Betsy (1988). "Task-related Variation in Interlanguage: The Case of Articles". *Language Learning*, 38, 21-43.

Thomas, Margaret (1989). "The Acquisition of English Articles by First and Second Language Learners". *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 10, 335-355.

Treichler, Michael, Hamann, Cornelia, Schönenberger, Manuela, Voeykova, Maria and Lauts, Natalia (2009). "Article use in L3 English with German L2 by native speakers of Russian and in L2 English of Russian speakers". In M. Bowles, T. Ionin, S. Montrul, & A. Trembley (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 10th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference [GASLA 2009]* Somerville MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 9-16.

Trenkic, Danijela (2007). "Variability in L2 Article Production: Beyond the Representational Deficit vs. Processing Constraints Debate". *Second Language Research*, 23, 289-328.

Trenkic, Danijela (2008). "The Representation of English Articles in Second Language Grammars: Determiners or Adjectives?" *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 11, 1-18.

Tryzna, Marta (2009). "Questioning the validity of the Article Choice Parameter and the Fluctuation Hypothesis: Evidence from L2 English article use by L1 Polish and L1 Mandarin Chinese speakers". In M. d. P. Garcia Mayo & R. Hawkins (Eds.). *Second language acquisition of articles: Empirical findings and theoretical implications* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 67-86.

Tura, Sabahat (1973). *A study on the articles in English and their counterparts in Turkish*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

UCLES. (2001). Quick Placement Test. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VanPatten, Bill and Cadierno, Teresa (1993) "Explicit Instruction and Input Processing". *SSLA*, 15 (2), 225-243.

Warden, David A. (1976). "The Influence of Context on Children's Use of Identifying Expressions and References". *British Journal of Psychology* 67, 101-112.

Wexler, Ken (2003). "Maximal trouble". In E. Gibson & N. Pearlmutter (Eds.). *Paper presented at the CUNY Human Sentence Processing Conference. MIT. [In press as "Maximal trouble: cues don't explain learning"*. The Processing and Acquisition of Reference, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press].

White, Lydia (1990/91). "The Verb-movement Parameter in Second Language Acquisition". *Language Acquisition*, 1, 337-360.

White, Lydia (2003). "Fossilization in Steady State L2 Grammars: Implications of Persistent Problems with Inflectional Morphology". *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 6, 128-141.

White, Lydia (2008). "Different? Yes. Fundamentally? No. Definiteness effects in the L2 English of Mandarin speakers". In R. Slabakova, J. Rothman, P. Kempchinsky & E. Gavruseva (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 9th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference (GASLA 2007)* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 251-261.

White, Benjamin (2009). "Accounting for L2-English Learners' Article Choices". *MSU Working Papers in SLS*, 1 (1), 14-37.

White, Lydia, Belikova, Alyona, Hagstrom, Paul, Kupisch, Tanja and Özçelik, Öner (2009). "Restrictions on definiteness in L2 English". In J. Chandlee, M. Franchini, S. Lord & G. M. Rheiner (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 622- 633.

White, Lydia, Belikova, Alyona, Hagstrom, Paul, Kupisch, Tanja and Özçelik, Öner (2010). "There aren't many difficulties with definiteness: Negative existentials in the L2 English of Turkish and Russian Speakers." In M. Pirvulescu, M. C. Cuervo, A. T. Pérez-Leroux, J. Steele & N. Strik (Eds.). *Selected Proceedings of the 4th Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition North America (GALANA 2010)* Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 266-276.

Whitman, Randal L. (1974). "Teaching the Article in English". *TESOL Quarterly*, 8, 253- 262.

Yamada, Jun and Matsuura, Nobukazu (1982). "The Use of the English Article among Japanese Students". *RELC Journal*, 13 (1), 50-63.

Yılmaz, Gülsen (2006). *L2 Acquisition of the English article system by Turkish learners*. Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul.

Young, Richard (1996). "Form-function relations in articles in English interlanguage". In R. Bayley & D. R. Preston (Eds.). *Second language acquisition and linguistic variation* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 135-175.

Zdorenko, Tatiana and Paradis, Johanne (2008). "The Acquisition of Articles in Child Second Language English: Fluctuation, Transfer or Both?" *Second Language Research*, 24 (2), 227-250.

Zdorenko, Tatiana and Paradis, Johanne (2011). "Articles in Child L2 English: When L1 and L2 Acquisition Meet at the Interface." *First Language*, 32, 38-62.

Zehler, Annette M. and Brewer, William F. (1980). "Acquisition of the article system in English". http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED186907.pdf (Accessed on: 17.09.2014)

Vainikka, Anne and Young-Scholten, Martha (1996). "Gradual Development of L2 Phrase Structure". *Second Language Research*, 12, 7-39.

APPENDICES

Appendix-1: Demographic information of the participants

Participant code	OQPT score (Max. 60 points)	Age	Sex	Grade	Prep class at uni.	Length of exposure to English	Stay abroad	Length of stay abroad	Another L2
E*_1	23	22	F	2	Yes	12 years	Yes-Saudi Arabia	15 years	Yes-Arabic
E_2	24	20	F	1	Yes	10 years	No	-	No
E_3	24	21	F	2	Yes	11 years	No	-	No
E_4	25	23	F	2	Yes	11 years	No	-	No
E_5	25	25	F	2	No	14 years	No	-	No
E _6	26	20	F	2	No	10 years	No	-	No
E _7	26	23	M	2	Yes	11 years	No	-	Yes-Arabic
E _8	27	20	M	2	No	8 years	No	-	No
E _9	27	20	F	2	No	10 years	No	-	No
E _10	28	20	F	2	No	10 years	No	-	No
E _11	28	24	F	2	No	14 years	No	-	No
E _12	28	23	F	2	No	13 years	No	-	No
E _13	28	23	F	2	Yes	11 years	No	-	Yes-German
E _14	28	20	F	1	Yes	10 years	No	-	Yes-German
E _15	29	21	M	2	Yes	13 years	Yes-TRCN	3 days	No
E _16	29	23	F	2	Yes	13 years	No	-	Yes-German
E _17	29	21	M	1	Yes	9 years	Yes-Saudi Arabia	20 years	No
E _18	29	24	F	4	Yes	13 years	No	-	Yes-French
E _19	29	22	F	2	Yes	12 years	Yes-TRCN	15 days	No
E _20	29	22	F	2	Yes	12 years	No	-	No
E _21	29	20	M	2	No	8 years	No	-	No
E _22	29	20	F	2	Yes	12 years	No	-	Yes-Arabic
E _23	29	22	F	4	Yes	11 years	No	-	No
E _24	29	20	F	2	No	10 years	No	-	No
E _25	29	21	F	2	Yes	11 years	No	-	Yes-Arabic

*E stands for "Elementary"

Participant code	OQPT score (Max. 60 points)	Age	Sex	Grade	Prep class at uni.	Length of exposure to English	Stay abroad	Length of stay abroad	Another L2
I*_1	40	23	F	4	No	15 years	No	-	Yes-French
I_2	40	24	F	4	No	14 years	No	-	Yes-French
I _3	40	21	M	2	Yes	9 years	No	-	Yes-German
I _4	40	22	F	2	Yes	12 years	No	-	No
I _5	41	20	F	2	No	8 years	No	-	No
I _6	41	24	M	4	No	14 years	No	-	Yes-French
I _7	41	20	F	1	Yes	10 years	No	-	No
I _8	41	22	F	4	No	12 years	No	-	Yes-French
I _9	41	27	M	4	No	14 years	No	-	Yes-French
I _10	42	29	F	2	No	19 years	No	-	Yes-German
I _11	42	25	F	4	Yes	15 years	Yes-Spain	15 months	Yes-Spanish
I _12	42	24	F	4	No	11 years	No	-	Yes-French
I _13	43	26	F	4	No	16 years	Yes-Greece	3 months	No
I _14	43	23	F	4	Yes	13 years	No	-	Yes-French
I _15	43	26	F	2	No	10 years	No	-	Yes-German
I _16	43	22	F	4	No	12 years	Yes-Qatar	2 months	Yes-German
I _17	44	22	F	4	No	12 years	No	-	Yes-French
I _18	44	23	M	4	No	13 years	No	-	No
I _19	45	24	F	4	Yes	14 years	No	-	Yes-German
I _20	45	25	F	4	Yes	15 years	Yes-Spain	12 months	Yes-Spanish
I _21	46	22	F	4	No	13 years	No	-	Yes-French
I _22	46	21	M	2	No	5 years	No	-	Yes-French
I _23	46	24	M	2	No	17 years	Yes-TRCN	24 months	No
I _24	47	19	F	1	No	9 years	No	-	Yes-German
I _25	47	23	M	2	Yes	17 years	Yes-England and Germany	8 months-3 months	Yes-German

*I stands for "Intermediate"

Appendix-2: Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
,861	,855	36

Appendix-3: Written Elicitation Task

Full name: **Date:**

Grade:

INSTRUCTIONS

This test consists of 60 short English dialogues. One of the sentences in each dialogue contains a blank (_____). Your task is to fill in the blank with the word that you feel is appropriate for the context. Examples of appropriate words are *a, the, she, he, not, to, her, my, from,* etc. You may also put a dash (-) in the blank, to indicate that no word is needed. You may sometimes feel that there is more than one possible answer; in that case, please choose the answer that sounds best to you in the given context.

There is a time limit of forty-five (45) minutes for this test. Please complete the items in the order given. Please do not go back to your earlier answers and don't change them. Please read each dialogue carefully, and then fill in each blank with the answer that you feel is appropriate for that item; please do not spend too much time on any given item.

PRACTICE

1) Alex: Your neighbor Robert is very nice. What does he do?

   Charles: Robert is _____ musician. He plays in our town orchestra.

2) Sam: Where is Julie?

   Andy: I don't know. But _____was here a minute ago!

3) *In a grocery store*

   Clerk: May I help you?

   Customer: Yes. I'd like to buy some _____ potatoes.

1. *At the bus stop*

   Mike: Hello, this is my first time seeing you here. When did you start taking the city bus?

   Chris: I started taking the bus when I started school _____ last week.

2. Jason: How is your cousin doing?

   Rachel: She is doing great. In fact, she is going _____ a trip to Brazil in the summer.

3. Mother: What are you reading in the newspaper?

   Daughter: I'm reading a poem about baby lions – I really like it. I would like to write a letter to _____ author of that poem – unfortunately, I have no idea who it is… The poem isn't signed!

4. *In a school*

   Child: It's my birthday next week!

   Teacher: That's great. Are you going to have a party?

   Child: Yes! A big party! I am hoping to get _____ new dog! I love animals!

5. *At the supermarket*

   Salesperson: Hello! What can I help you with today?

   Customer: I am looking for tomatoes. I want to make spaghetti sauce _____ dinner.

6. Barbara: Did Betsy get anything at the bookstore yesterday?

   Rick: Yes – she bought a novel and a magazine. She read _____ magazine first.

7. *At the bus station*

   Mildred: Where is the bus? It was supposed to come five minutes ago!

   Station Attendant: I'm sorry. The schedule has changed. The bus will _____ come today.

8. *In an airport, in a crowd of people*

Man: Excuse me, do you work here?

Security guard: Yes. Can I help you?

Man: Yes, please. I am trying to find _____ red-haired girl; I think that she flew in on Flight 239.

9. Brother: Did you get anything for our mother's birthday?

Sister: Well, it's a long story. I went to a jewelry store, but I didn't have a lot of money. There were so many beautiful things in that jewelry store: bracelets, earrings, necklaces – and so many of them! And I liked everything! But I had money for only one thing! So finally, I bought _____ bracelet.

10. *Buying groceries*

Salesclerk: Welcome to our store. May I help you?

Customer: Where is the dairy section? I would like to buy my daughter some cheese. _____ is hungry.

11. Mom: Did you eat breakfast this morning, dear?

Daughter: Yes, mother. I ate cereal and milk before I went _____ to school.

12. Carrie: Did your funny uncle Reuben visit you for Thanksgiving?

Older sister: No, he and his wife went to visit her family instead. They went to _____ capital of North Dakota – I can't remember what its name is. It's probably a very cold place!

13. Maria: Mother, have you seen my blue scarf? I would like to wear it to school today.

Mother: No, I haven't dear. Ask your sister. Maybe she knows where it _____.

14. Marcus: Can you and your friend Rick come over this week-end?

Jim: I'll come over, but Rick isn't here. He went to _____ house of his uncle George… I have no idea where that is. But Rick was very excited about going!

15. *Grandfather comes for a visit*

    Grandfather: Where is my little granddaughter Beth? Is she home?

    Father: No… She is not going to be back till late. She is having dinner with _____ girl from class – her name is Angie, and Beth really likes her.

16. Jules: Sarah, have you seen my car keys? I think I've lost them again.

    Sarah: Again? That's too bad, Jules. No, I have _____ seen them. Check your room, instead.

17. *At the cafeteria*

    Miriam: Thank you for bringing me lunch today. This sandwich is very delicious!

    Hannah: Yes, it is. My mother made it. She bought the ingredients _____ the whole foods store.

18. *Mother comes home*

    Mother: How did Peter spend the day at his grandmother's?

    Father: He had a good time. He did his homework for tomorrow. Then he went outside and played with _____ little girl – I don't know who it was. Then he came back inside; and then I came and took him home.

19. *At a bookstore*

    Chris: Well, I've bought everything that I wanted. Are you ready to go?

    Mike: Almost. Can you please wait a few minutes? I want to talk to _____ owner of this bookstore – she is a very nice lady, and I always say hi to her.

20. Jeremy: My head is hurting. I need to take a rest.

    Harold: You're right. You _____ working too hard. You deserve a break.

21. Gabrielle: My son Ralph didn't have anything to read last week-end. So, he went to the library.

    Charles: Did he find something to read?

    Gabrielle: Oh yes – there were so many wonderful things to read in the library: books, magazines, newspapers! I told Ralph to get just one thing. So finally, Ralph chose _____ magazine.

22. Leon: I think I need to relax for a little bit. My life has been so busy!

    Patrick: Really?

    Leon: Yeah, I've been so busy that I forgot _____ own birthday!

23. Louise: Where's your mother?

    Julie: She is meeting _____ principal of my brother's elementary school. He is a very nice man. He is talking to my mother about my brother's grades.

24. Maryanne: What did you do yesterday?

    Richard: I visited my friend Kelly. Kelly and I went to a pet store – we like to play with animals! We saw two cats and one dog at the pet store. I took _____ dog for a walk around the block!

25. Jessie: I baby-sat yesterday for the first time ever.

    Lesley: How was it?

    Jessie: Fine. I baby-sat a little boy named Niles. I played a monopoly game with him. Then I did my homework, and Niles read _____ short story – I don't know what it was about. And then I put him to bed.

26. Cynthia: Jill, does Amy like meatloaf?

    Jill: No, I don't think so.

    Cynthia: Really? How come?

    Jill: She does _____like to eat meat.

27. Mother: What did you and Kenny do yesterday, when I wasn't here?

    Father: Well, we went shopping. Kenny needed something to write with.

We went to a store that had lots of pencils, pens, and markers. I told Kenny he could buy just one thing. So he bought _____ pen.

28. *Father comes home*

Father: Thank you for taking care of Karen. How did you spend the day?

Baby-sitter: Well, we went to a park. Karen played in the sandbox for a while. And then she met _____ beautiful friendly dog – he was very well-behaved, and Karen played with him for almost an hour.

29. Tamara: Hi, Genie. How is your brother George doing?

Genie: Great! Last week-end, he went to visit his friend Ben. He stayed at _____ house of Ben's parents – it's a very beautiful house near a lake!

30. Vicky: Where were you yesterday? I tried to call you, but you weren't home.

Rachel: I went to a bookstore yesterday.

Vicky: Oh, what did you get?

Rachel: I got lots of things – several magazines, two red pens, and an interesting new book. After I came home, I read _____ book.

31. *First day of school*

Girl: Hi there! My name is Kathy. What's your name?

Boy: Hello, I'm Eric. It's a pleasure to meet _____ you.

32. *At a pre-school*

Teacher: Hello, everyone! Good Morning! Today, we'll be reading a story.

Student: Great! I love to read! Are _____ reading a story about pirates?

33. Sarah: Yesterday, I took my granddaughter Becky for a walk in the park.

Claudia: How did she like it?

Sarah: She had a good time. She saw one little girl and two little boys in the park. She is a little shy. But finally, she talked to _____ little girl.

34. *During recess*

Mickey: I went to the zoo with my parents and sisters.

Lesley: How exciting!

Mickey: Yes! I _____ fun!

35. *At a toy store*

Sales clerk: May I help you?

Client: Yes! I am very angry. I bought a toy for my child at this store, but it's broken! I want to talk to _____ owner of this store – I don't care who that is! I am going to complain!

36. *At the library*

Lita: How many books did you borrow from the bookstore?

Patrick: I borrowed nine. I'll have to return them all next _____ Thursday.

37. *Phone conversation*

Grandma: Hi, Billie! This is your grandma.

Billy: Hi, grandma. How are you?

Grandma: I'm fine, but I miss you and your brother Jim. I haven't seen you for almost a year! Is Jim home?

Billy: No, he's still at school. He is tutoring _____ little boy – I don't remember who it is. Jim will be home by seven.

38. Marian: Guess what! I just started working on the school newspaper. I take photographs!

Jim: So what photographs have you taken so far?

Marian: Well, I went to a park. At first I took photographs of flowers and trees. But I wanted to practice on people, too! There were lots of people in the park – adults and children. I had just one picture left in my camera. So I photographed _____ child.

39. *Phone conversation*

Aunt: Hi, Jessie. This is your aunt Trudy from New York. I know it's your birthday next week. So tell me, what would you like for your birthday?

Jessie: Um… I'd like some money, please.

Aunt: Money?! But you are only eight years old! What do you need money for?

Jessie: For my stamp collection. I'd like to buy _____ beautiful stamp – I just saw it at the stamp store. It's really rare, and I really want to have it!

40. Anita: Oliver, please hand me the cookbook from the kitchen cabinet. I am planning on cooking dinner tonight.

Oliver: I'm sorry dear. I'm afraid the book isn't here. I think Chris still _____ it.

41. Dominique: I heard that your sister went on vacation. Where did she go?

Raquel: Latin America. She spent two weeks in _____ capital of Mexico: Mexico City. It's a beautiful city, and she really enjoyed her trip.

42. *After school*

Father: Do you have any homework?

Child: Yes, I need to write a book report.

Father: So what will you read?

Child: Hmm… I don't know yet. But I like to read about things that move – cars, trains… I know! I would like to read _____ book about airplanes! I'll go to the library tomorrow!

43. *At the end of a running race*

Laura: Are you ready to leave?

Betsy: No, not yet. First, I need to talk to _____ winner of this race – he is my good friend, and I want to congratulate him!

44. Father: How did little Billy spend the evening yesterday, when I wasn't here?

Mother: He did all his homework! And he read _____ very interesting story: it's about a small fishing village in Portugal, and the lives of the people who live there. He told me all about it.

45. Lee: Where have you been? I've been looking all over for you.

Jenny: I went to the record store, and I bought some CDs.

Lee: Really? My friend and I _____ planning to go there later today.

Jenny: What a coincidence!

46. *After a girls' soccer game at school*

Child: Excuse me! Can you please let me in?

Coach: What do you need?

Child: I am a reporter for my school newspaper! I need to talk to
_____ winner of this game – I don't know who she is, so can you please
help me?

47. *Phone conversation*

Mother: What did you have for dinner last night?

Son: Well, I had just two things in my refrigerator – a pot of soup and a
cheese sandwich. I didn't want to cook anything else. So I ate _____
cheese sandwich.

48. *At an ice cream parlor*

Younger Sister: What ice cream flavor would you like?

Older Sister: Chocolate ice cream would be nice.

Younger Sister: I don't like chocolate very much. I prefer ____ vanilla.

49. Ruby: It's already 4 p.m. Why isn't your little brother home from
school?

Angela: He just called and told me that he got in trouble! He is talking to
_____ principal of his school! I don't know who that is. I hope my brother
comes home soon.

50. Eric: I really liked that book you gave me for my birthday. It was very
interesting!

Laura: Thanks! I like it, too. I would like to meet _____ author of that
book some day – I saw an interview with her on TV, and I really liked her!

51. Sophie: How did you spend your week-end at your cottage?

Elise: Well, the weather was terrible. I couldn't go outside! And inside, I
had absolutely nothing to do! So, finally, I went to a video store. It was big –
there were lots of videos, DVDs, and games! I had money for just one thing.
So I rented _____ video.

52. Rose: Will you come shopping with me this week-end?

    Jen: Sure. Where do you want to go?

    Rose: Oh, anywhere. I am looking for _____ warm hat. It's getting

    rather cold outside!

53. Kevin: Your sister's name is Katherine, right?

    Larry: No, you've got it all wrong.

    Kevin: I'm sorry. Is her name Cameron?

    Larry: Wrong again! That is _____ her name! It's Candice!

54. Son: I can't believe how hot it is this evening!

    Father: Here, have some water. It should help you cool down.

    Son: Thank you. I will turn on the fan to keep the room from

    _____getting too warm.

55. *Phone conversation*

    Angela: Hello! May I speak to Alicia, please?

    Feliz: Oh, I'm sorry. She's not in right now. She went _____a store

    at the mall.

56. *In a "Lost and Found"*

    Clerk: Can I help you? Are you looking for something you lost?

    Customer: Yes… I realize you have a lot of things here, but maybe you have

    what I need. You see, I am looking for _____ green scarf. My little

    granddaughter lost it here yesterday, and she is very upset!

57. *In the classroom*

    Noah: Would you like to play soccer with me at the park after school?

    Oliver: Yes, I would love to! Can William play, too? _____ is very good

    at this game.

58. Robin: How is your little sister Clara doing? Does she still like animals?

    Julie: Oh yes! In fact, yesterday, she went to an animal shelter. She saw a

    very cute kitten and a little puppy there. She played with them all day long.

    And she gave some milk to _____ kitten.

59. *At a police station*

Susie: Can you please tell me where the library is? I am new here in the city, and I am lost.

Police officer: Of course I can help! The library _____ on the corner of Maple Street and 4th Avenue.

60. Rudolph: My niece Janet likes animals a lot. Last week, she decided to get a pet, so she went to a pet shop.

Lisa: Did she find any pets that she liked?

Rudolph: Yes – she saw so many beautiful animals there – puppies, kittens, birds! Janet's parents told her to get just one animal. So, Janet bought _____ kitten.

Appendix-4: Coding Procedure of the WNT

INSTRUCTIONS

Dear coders,

You are looking at narratives produced by L2-English learners with all the articles removed except for those in formulaic expressions. You are expected to fill in the blanks with the *definite (the), indefinite (a/an)* and *null articles (--)*. The purpose of this coding procedure is to find out the *unambiguously* definite and indefinite contexts and determine whether learners have used articles felicitously in the narratives that they produced. Please follow the instructions below:

1. Read the narratives carefully and insert in each blank the article that you consider most appropriate: *the, a/an*, or -- (if no article is required).

2. <u>Use one of these three options whenever possible</u>. If none of these choices sound right, you can insert other words such as possessives, numerals, demonstratives, or *some*.

3. Pay attention to the plurality of the noun. If it is apparent that the L2-learner was clearly intending to use a plural form but put in a singular form (as in *I read one of the book*), treat the entire noun phrase as a plural.

4. Ignore grammatical errors in the narratives as much as you can and <u>focus on the meaning that the L2-learner is trying to convey</u>, since the meaning of the context determines what article would be most appropriate. For instance, in the case of some participants, there are errors like copula omission (e.g. Elementary-01). Try to ignore such errors and do not insert the appropriate copula in the blanks. Rather, try to insert the most appropriate article in the blank, in accordance with the aforementioned aim of this coding procedure. Again, in the first narrative of this particular participant a plural demonstrative adjective (*i.e.,* <u>These</u> box _____ very old, ancient box) was mistakenly used instead of a singular demonstrative adjective (*i.e.,* this). From the preceding sentence in the narrative under discussion, it is clear that there is a singular referent, thus the singular demonstrative adjective should have been used. Pay attention to such errors in such cases since they may influence your article choice.

5. If you could not understand a given context (because of grammatical errors on the part of L2-English speakers), and did not know what article would be appropriate, insert a question mark (?) in the blank.

6. Do not pay attention to capitalization. If a blank is inserted sentence-initial as in "_____ *People of Izmir are very kind and friendly.*" focus on the meaning rather than form and insert an article if necessary.

7. Please work individually so that I can have an unbiased baseline.

Notes:

1. In total, 50 participants took part in the study. Based on a proficiency test, 25 of these participants were grouped as elementary level learners, and the remaining 25 were grouped as intermediate level learners.

2. The participants were administered a Written Narrative Task with the 5 questions below. All the participants provided written answers to these questions in the given order:

1. Write about some valuable object that you own or owned in the past: either (1) write about something that you received as a gift, and tell about how you received it; or (2) write about something valuable that you lost, and tell about how you lost it.

2. (*For those who come from other cities*) Write about the day when you first arrived in Antakya. Describe your experiences of that day – what you did, where you went, to whom you talked, etc./ (*For those who are from Antakya*) Have you ever been abroad or to another city in Turkey? Describe your experiences of that time – what you did, where you went, whom you met, etc.

3. Describe your room – write about what objects you have in your room, and describe them.

4. Write about what you did on one of your recent vacations (for example; semester holiday, week-end or summer holiday). Write about where you went and what you did etc.

5. Imagine that you get 1000 dollars as a gift, and you have to spend it right away (you can't put it in the bank). Write about how you would spend this money.

3. Obvious spelling mistakes or some crucial incorrect word choices have been corrected by me as in *canapé (NB: "sofa")*. In this example, the learner has chosen the word "canapé" due to negative L1 transfer. The presumably intended word has been written in quotation marks ("sofa") following the initial letters of my name and surname (NB). Since you would probably have difficulty in understanding the contexts due to such mistakes, I corrected this and similar mistakes.

4. Below are the definitions of unfamiliar Turkish words that have emerged in the narratives:

Döner: a fast-food dish comprising grilled meat and salad served in pita bread with chili sauce (source: http://www.thefreedictionary.com/doner+kebab)

Künefe: a kind of dessert with an Arabic origin, made of cheese and served hot. (source: http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/künefe)

Poğaça: Poğaca is a generic name for puffy pastries that are filled with cheese or any other stuff such as potatoes, meat, olives, salami and so on. (source: http://turkishfood4u.blogspot.com/2013/05/pogaca.html)

Kumpir: a baked potato with various fillings. In its basic form, it is made with potatoes that are wrapped with foil and baked in special ovens. (source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baked_potato)

Sanal bebek: virtual baby

If you have any questions or need further information, please do not hesitate to contact me via nesebuyukasik@gmail.com.

Written Narrative Task- Data set 1 (Elementary level participants)

E-01

1. My grandmother gave me _____ little green stripe box. These box _____ very old, ancient box; _____ box very valuable for her. Also she gave me my birthday party. These was _____ very valuable and great gift for me. I liked it very much. And I kept it on my cabinet.

2. When I came in _____ Saudi Arabia to Hatay (Antakya), first of all I came and arrived _____ Samandağ beach and _____Titus tunnel of ancient and amazing for me. I liked _____ ancient grave stone, _____ amazing sea of Samandağ, _____ green trees and _____ colorful flowers.

3. My room big and relax part of _____ home. When enter _____ room, you can see _____ big cabinet, and my cosmetic tools on _____ table. _____ Perfumes, _____ jewel, _____ make-up and _____ big mirrors opposite of _____ door. Then you can see near _____ table my big and comfortable bed. I like sleeping and rest on my bed. And usually my pillow colorful with _____ flowers.

4. When my sister going to Antalya because of _____ Olympic game of swim, I am going to with her to Antalya. She is very good swimming. We get _____ very good time in _____ Antalya. We always swimming, going to dancing in _____ club. Then we return back to _____ hotel.

5. Firstly, I spend this money _____ cancer child in _____ hospital. Because I don't want this child living and spend his/her time in _____ hospital or in _____ bed. I think they need playing, running and laughing all the time. So, I spend and give them to this money also I am going to fun because of these situation.

E-02

1. I lost my ring last month and I was very sad because _____ ring was given by my friend. And finally I found it.

2. I came to Antakya last week. I came to _____ University. And then we walked around Antakya with my family but firstly I didn't like here, and then I liked Antakya.

3. I have _____ room. I have _____bed, _____ wardrobe, my computer etc. I like my room and I miss my room. My favorite activity is read _____ book in my room.

4. I went to Adana in _____ semester holiday and I visited my relatives. I went to Osmaniye. I walked around _____ Mediterranean Sea.

5. Firstly, I buy _____ computer and Internet and I buy _____books and I go to _____ holiday.

E-03

1. My father gifted me _____ professional photographer machine one year ago. I was so happy because it was _____ valuable gift for me. My father gived it me while he was taking _____ my photo. And then he said: "This machine is yours. Anymore (NB: "Now"), you can easily take _____ new photos. Then I said my thanks to him.

2. When I came in Antakya, firstly I met _____ man who was my father's friend. He was _____ police. And he knowed all Antakya, and he helped me while I spending time in Antakya. He and his wife call me their home. And I went to their house for his good helping.

3. There are firstly my bed, _____ wardrobe, _____mirror. My cosmetics are on _____ table. My lesson books are on my working table. There are _____ wall papers on my room wall. My objects' colors are black and white.

4. I went to Istanbul last two weeks ago in _____ semester holiday. I live in Istanbul and my family is in Istanbul. I spent time with my friends who my couldn't seen for two years and of course with my family. I missed them.

5. If I haved 1000 dollars, I would once make _____ investment for my future. Then, I would use this money for my school, my family and my special dealings.

E-04

1. My valuable object is my clock, but it was lost in the past. In the past, I receive _____ gift from my friend. It is _____ bag very beautiful but it lost in _____class.

2. When I came in Antakya, I feel very sad because I don't like at first but after I like Antakya very much. Firstly, I go to my university and go to eat _____ Döner.

3. There is _____ huge bed and near to my bookcase and on _____wall, there a lot of posters. On _____ floor, _____ red carpet and on front of _____ bookcase, _____ huge wardrobe and a lot of cosmetic productions.

4. My recent vacation was very beautiful because I travel a lot of cities. Firstly, Istanbul. I go to Istanbul. It is very big and very crowded, then I go to Mersin, Ankara with my close friends. We go to _____ concert and swim.

5. I donate all _____dollars for _____ poor childs surely.

E-05

1. This pen which I use now. I received it as _____ gift from my student. It is very valuable for me. It brings _____ chance. Especially, when I'm in _____exam.

2. I went to Ankara four years ago for _____university education. It seems to me _____very big city. At first, I went to _____dormitory and I don't like it. It called "Kız Kulesi", because it has 30th floors. I stayed in it only one day.

3. Oh, my sweet home. There is _____ big poster on _____wall. Amy Lee's poster… I have two bed. _____ One is for me and _____ other is for my friends. I have _____ very huge film archives.

4. I had _____ operation last semester holiday. I stayed two weeks in _____ hospital. It was very boring. I slept almost 18 hours. I liked only it.

5. I couldn't even imagine that. I think, I would buy _____ clothes with half of it. And _____ other half, hmmm, I would buy _____ clothes again. I am _____ shopaholic. ☹

E-06

1. I lost my ring ☺ It was my valuable thing but I lost it thank to my sister. I was sad, I don't have any ring now…

2. I am from Antakya. In _____ summer, I went to Istanbul for travelling. Far away my family, it is hard and boring.

3. I have _____ small room. I share it with my sister. We have got two bed, _____ table and _____ chairs.

4. I went to Antalya last summer with my family. We are 6 people and we enjoyed too much. Swimming, dancing and travelling in _____ Waterfalls. We stayed in _____ hotels.

5. Firstly, I help _____ poor children and mothers. After give some money my family, especially my sister and brothers. Then, I spend it for my satisfaction and education. I want to travelling on _____ world.

E-07

1. In the past, I purchase _____ Atari when _____ child. I play every day. But one day, when I get up in _____ bed, I got lost my object. Because my friend crushed it. I was got sorry.

2. Yes, I went to Batman. I love its city. I went to my brother. Because he is working there. I didn't do much thing. Because my brother was busy. But after a time, we will go to Diyarbakır. We spent _____ time in Sur. We travel everywhere.

3. My room are complex ☺ Because when I collect things _____ everywhere are split. My room include _____ bed, _____ books, _____ chair etc.

4. I didn't make anything. Because I didn't go anywhere. I sit in Arsuz.

5. I purchase _____ PC. Because now my dream have _____ PC. My PC broke and my work didn't finish because of it. Normally, it aren't be dream but I have to buy for my own.

E-08

1. In the past, I had _____ bicycle. My elder sister gave it to me as _____ gift. Then, I lost it. Then I found it back. Then, I gave it to my cousin as _____ gift.

2. I have never been _____ abroad. When I first came to Antakya, I got on _____ taxi. Then, I came to _____ dormitory that is _____ nearest _____ school. Then I went to school. I met a lot of students that are teaching (NB: "studying") at this school. And I am still here.

3. There is _____ cupboard in my room. I have _____ clothes and books there. There is _____ bed. There is _____ table and _____ chair. There is _____ laptop on _____ table. _____ laptop has black color.

4. I went to Istanbul on my recent vacation. I visited Eminönü. I visited my mother and my elder brother. _____ voyage was very long.

5. If I have 1000 dollars, I would be so happy. I would buy _____ new mobile phone. Of course, firstly, I say to _____ person that gives it to me "Thanks".

E-09

1. When I took _____ gift, I feel very happy. I hide always hide _____ gift. When I losed that gift, I feel very sad.

2. When I arrived in Antakya, I feel very odd. I was afraid of in this city. After I have been in that city in a week, I accustom to.

3. There are _____ wardrobe, _____ bed in my room. I like very much my room. There are many visual objects in my room.

4. When I was week-end, I study lesson, I am rest. I read _____ book. I walk in _____ streets.

5. I want to buy _____ car and _____ house. I want to help _____ poor people. I want to spend for my future.

E-10

1. I took _____ gift at my last birthday. I came from Adana to Hatay. My friends did _____ surprise party. I took _____ offering (dating) and _____ watch, _____ flower. These are my valuable for me.

2. Firstly, I have been to Antakya, I came with my high school friend. We went to eat something and walked around. We disliked here. We ate _____ Döner and it was so expensive. ☺

3. My room is so colorful. _____ walls are pink. There are _____ toys everywhere. There is _____ computer and _____ books. There are two beds. My sister and I stay together.

4. My recent vacation was horrible. We were _____ semester holiday and there weren't any of my friends. I sat my home every day. I finished my vacation early. I came back to Hatay.

5. If I get 1000 dollars, I did shop, I walked around. But I'm sure, I haven't got get 1000 dollars anytime. So, I don't want to think what I do.

E-11

1. I had _____ watch until I lost it. It is _____ gift from my _____ old friend. It was like _____ our flat. It symbolized my name, too. When I was lost it, I don't forget for days. I could buy like it, but it couldn't give _____ same emotions.

2. It is not _____ good experience for me because of coming Eskişehir. I contrasted _____ two city each other. Finally, I was hungry I didn't find

_____restaurant. However, people who is living there are very kindly. I bought _____ poğaça _____seller. He told something about _____ city.

3. My room is _____ small. I live with my seven friends. There is eight comfortable beds. There is _____ table and three chairs. When all of _____people are in there, it can be too crowded. It can be so sounds.

4. I went to Şanlıurfa in which my brother lives there. I don't have so many chance for travelling everywhere in there, beside I like there. Generally I passed time my brother and his wife because I missed them. They tried to like me Urfa and tried to enjoy with them in a short time.

5. Firstly I'll spend half of them for family, my little brothers' desires. I'll buy _____ huge house for my mother and buy _____ good car for my elder brother. After that I want to go to America for travelling. If I hadn't this money, I could go with _____ work-travel business.

E-12

1. Firstly, I had _____ silver ring two years ago. And I lost it and I didn't find it then. It was my sister's gift for my birthday. It was not on my finger, it was in my bag. So it must be fall when I was open _____ bag to take money from _____ wallet. It was in _____ wallet. And I didn't dicript (NB: "notice") how it fall and lost.

2. I went to another city, to Antalya. I visit wherever I want to see. It was very good for me to see _____ sightseeing place and to meet with _____ people whom I don't know. And to talk with them with English.

3. I have _____ room which has _____ bed and _____ mirror which I love very much and _____ table, _____ chair which is very comfortable. And there is _____ bookcase and I have very book some of them lesson books and _____ others novels etc.

4. On _____ summer holiday, I eventually was on my home. But sometimes I went to visit my friends and my cousins whom are in Iskenderun and I had _____very fun time with them. That was _____ very good holiday. And also I read _____ books, too.

5. I would get _____ gold. I would spend it for everythings. Only if it is essential I would spend for that thing which is essential and from _____ others I would take _____ gold.

E-13

1. I have _____ ring. My friend gave it my birthday. It was _____ silver. I have got it only 3 years. After, I have lost it. And I'm very sad. I think I have lost it when brush _____ dishes.

2. When I first arrived in Antakya, I was very sad. I first saw _____ bus station. I have fear.

3. I have _____ very big room. I have _____ table, _____ chair. My bed's color is green. I don't want to write anymore. I bored. Please.

4. Unfortunately, I didn't go my home this semester. But I can tell _____ last holiday. I work _____ job. I earn _____ money.

5. If I have 1000 dollars, I would paid equally my friend. Really, I would make it.

E-14

1. My valuable object is my boyfriend giving _____notebook. There were a lot of poem for me. _____ notebook is more important for me. _____notebook is _____ most valuable thing. If it is lost, I blame my mother for lost. Because my mother like cleaning and she look it as _____ bad thing/or _____ waste.

2. When I first arrived in Antakya, I was alone. I went to my father's friend. He told about _____campus, Antakya, _____ dormitory. Then I went to _____ dormitory. _____ dormitory was terrible, so I changed my dormitory. Then I went to school and took _____ exam.

3. My room is small, but it is sweet. There are two mirror. There is _____bed, and there are some toys on _____ bed. My wardrobe is brown. My carpet is beige. And I have _____ laptop, and I have _____ studying table.

4. In _____ semester holiday, I went to Ankara, because I live in Ankara. Then I went to Aksaray. Because my hometown is Aksaray. One day, I met my friends. _____ holiday was boring.

5. I buy a lot of clothes. I travel to Konya, İstanbul, Kayseri, Kütahya. Then I go to _____ holiday. Then I can put _____box. Because 1000 dollars isn't enough for everything.

E-15

1. I have _____ small car. It is _____ police car and blue. It was given me by _____ girl 2 years ago. She is very important for me, so _____ car is important, too.

2. I'm from Batman but I studied _____ high school at Van. When my friend and I arrived Van, we were young and didn't know anywhere. We had _____ address of our dormitory, but we didn't know how we can get to there so we asked to someone.

3. My room is wide. When you enter my room, you see two canapé (NB: "sofa"), _____ table, one bookness (NB: "bookcase") and my computer. _____ bookness is on the corner and _____ computer is generally in front of my canapé.

4. In my last semester holiday, I didn't my town but I went to Gaziantep. I went to _____ Gaziantep Zoo. There are many kinds of _____ animal. Then we visited _____ Planetoryum, it is _____ science house and really there are _____ very interesting objects there.

5. At first, I buy _____ car whose brand is Peugeot 407. Because it is my favourite car. And then maybe I buy _____ good computer. _____ car is _____ joke because it is too few. Actually, I can go abroad on _____ summer holiday. So I can improve my speech.

E-16

1. My best friend give me _____ necklace. It is very important for me. Because I forgot it in _____ sea. I was very sad and I don't forget it. Then, my friend asks it me. And I don't understand what tell about _____ necklace. And I don't tell about forgetting it in _____ sea. Then, I am lying her. But I was sad after. I forget it but it is very important for me and it always on my neck.

2. I think Antakya is _____ very mysterious city. Because they have many interesting things. There are many different religions. Every people live as happy and responsible. All of them is very tolerate. I go around Antakya. I go _____ interesting places and I eat _____ Antakya food. I look it very effective. Because Antakya's feeling saving my all body and all mind. Everybody who is speaking is very warmful and _____smiling face. I don't foreign this city. It is warm as my hometown.

3. My room is very beautiful and clear. Because my mother wants to make clear. My room is little but it is progress. Its inside there are many accessories for me. Especially there are _____ enjoyable things. There are three beds for me and my brother and sister. There are _____ computer, _____ mirror and two

wardrobe. I have many make-up on _____ mirror. There are many pillows and they are colorful.

4. I don't forget my next holiday. It was very enjoyable. Because my cousins come to Mersin and we are very fun. We swim, go around and a lot of shopping. Especially, we swim a lot Susanoğlu in Mersin. We are going to stay _____ hotel. We are very happy because we make with together. We swim in the mornings, in the afternoon, in night … ☺ I don't forget next holiday. Everything is very unfaithful. ☺

5. If I have 1000 dollars, I use _____ good job. Because I give little money for _____ children. Especially children who haven't _____ home need to be helped. I give all of _____ money for not having home children. Because they need it very much. Their happy is very important. I think everything must be for them. Because they want to like to life.

E-17

1. I lost my zippo lighter. It was very valuable for me because my girlfriend bought at my birthday. I don't know how lost _____ my zippo lighter.

2. I was born in Saudi Arabia. I have live 20 years. I didn't meet some. I saw _____ Makkah and Madinah. It was very important for me because I am _____ Muslim.

3. There is _____ big bed in my room. The is only one window. It is small. There are two pictures on _____ wall. There is_____ table for study. There are two wardrobe in my room.

4. I went to Izmir and travelled to Izmir. İzmir is _____beautiful city. _____ People of Izmir are very kind and friendly. I saw _____ Saat Kulesi and _____ historical places.

5. Maybe I rent _____ car. I travelled to some good places with this. I buy _____ what I need for my life. If I have 1000 dollars now, I spend it for eat because I'm very hungry now.

E-18

1. I had _____ watch. It was my birthday present. But I losted it. And I became very sad. So, I felt sad now when it came to my mind.

2. I came to Antakya. I stayed in my aunt. I felt sad. I visited _____ University. And I thought about my next days.

3. I have _____ bed. There is _____small table and _____ blue chair. I have _____ bookcase. There are my coursebooks. There is _____ curtain also.

4. I went to Harbiye at this weekend. I walked around with my friends. We drank _____ beer and we chatted. We ate something before coming back.

5. I would lend some of it to my friend. I bought some necessary items which I delayed because of _____ poorness ☺ I would go to my home to see my mother. I would pay my bank credit also.

E-19

1. I received _____ gift from my boy friend last year. He gave _____T-shirt. My T-shirt is very sweet. Its color is blue and on my T-shirt is _____ picture. This picture is _____ small cat. When I saw my T-shirt, I liked it. So I kissed my boyfriend for this gift. I always wear this T-shirt because I like it and this gift is very most important for me.

2. I went to Antalya/Olympus with my friend last year. Firstly, when I arrived Olympus, I liked at Olympus's house. Because these house is done by _____ wood and this house has _____ room. I stayed two girls this house. I met with them at _____ bus. They are sisters. Later we went to _____ popular club at Antalya. It's name is Robin Hood.

3. My room is _____blue color. It is _____ small room. But I like it. Because this room is important for me. My bed is near _____ wall. My table is _____ small. On my table has _____ books, _____ jewellery.

4. Last summer, I went to Çevlik with my family. We stay in Gözde Pansiyon. Later days, my cousin came to us. And we went to _____ sea. We played volleyball beach.

5. Firstly I help _____ poor persons. I give some gift or some money. Secondly I take to me _____ jewellery, _____clothes… Thirdly I go to abroad. And I travel in _____ world.

E-20

1. My own object is _____ clock that my mother gave me before she dead. This object is _____ only valuable thing in my life. Because I remember my mother when I look at it. But also I feel so bad when I look at it, I don't know why this situation is. Maybe I miss my mother, maybe I want to my mother come back.

2. When I first arrived in Antakya, I felt so bad. I thought that this place didn't suit for me and I decided to leave my school. But I didn't. Because I loved Antakya. And in my first day, I always cried. My tears didn't stop, never. Then I liked Antakya by day by day. I have never been abroad and another city.

3. My room is so sweet. I love really it. I have got _____ table, _____ chair and _____big bed. Its wall is yellow, and there is _____ clock on _____ wall. I have _____ table in my room and there are many books in my table. My carpet is red. And there are many pictures on _____ wall.

4. In _____ last summer holiday, I went to _____ camp. When I went to there, I felt to be relax. _____ camp was in İzmir. And this camp was exciting.

5. If I get 1000 dollars, I pay my school's money. I go to abroad to develop myself and I go to many foreign country to develop my English level. And then I buy _____ big home for my sisters. I make _____ career using this money.

E-21

1. I have _____ notebook from my girl as _____ gift. It's very precious, special for me cause I like to write and I write what I think in that notebook. And it's different from other notebooks because it is _____ gift from _____ very special person.

2. I was in Marmaris last summer. I didn't like there but I don't know exactly why, I don't like there. _____ city is beautiful, colorful and live. I went there to work and maybe because of _____ work I couldn't live my life in there, I could not feel as _____ person in _____ holiday. That's why I didn't effected from there.

3. I have _____ guitar cause I like _____ music. I have _____ notebook cause I have to write. But its _____ special notebook. I have _____ ball, whenever I feel bad, I play with it in my room. And I have so many pills cause I am sick and its make me crazy all the time.

4. I have _____ beautiful town with so many trees. I like to spend my holidays there cause that town is gather my family. All of _____ people that I live is together in that town. That is my little heaven.

5. I will take _____ motorcycle and I will not take anything with me and I will go to _____ holiday. Whenever I need _____ money, I will work and then I will keep going and will see all of _____world.

E-22

1. My books are _____ best important and valuable objects. I think that they are _____ best friends with features of _____ loyalty, peace, silence and etc. I think that it is _____ best way to improve _____emotional intelligence or _____ brain. _____ best sharing becomes with _____ books. When you touch it and start to fluent with _____ pages, you are going to be happy.

2. Yes, I have been in Mersin. I went there for _____ short holiday. It was excited and fascinated. I did whatever you can think. I met a lot of tourists who came from Germany.

3. Generally my room fulls with _____ books another from _____ classic objects like _____ bed, _____ clock and _____same things. So, it is wide. I like it and to pass my time there.

4. I mentioned about my one of _____ vacation in Mersin. I don't remember anywhere another from Mersin and Gaziantep. In Gaziantep, I went to near to my cousin. Her school was there. I didn't do so much thing another from go to shopping or her university so it was _____ winter day and I went only for 2 days.

5. I spend it for who needs it. Or maybe I can bury it and all of _____ money which is on _____ universe because of _____ capital system. So, even if I reach at them to who needs it, there are millions of people who needs it. So, I don't want to imagine something about it.

E-23

1. Three years ago, my darling had bought me _____ necklace which our names are written on. I really liked them and I was happy for receiving it. But I had some problems with my homemate so I left home and my necklace left there. I never returned to that house so I lost my necklace.

2. When I first came in Antakya, my family was with me. Firstly everything was OK. _____new city, _____ new people, _____ new house etc. But I felt so sorry when my family went back and I stayed alone in _____ new city.

3. In my room, there is _____ bed, _____ wardrobe, _____ armchair, _____chair, _____ table. There are lots of books. My shoes is in it. There is _____ clock on my table. I also have jewels and perfumes. I think _____most valuable objects in my room are _____ photographs on _____ wall.

4. Last semester I went to Istanbul. It was _____ first time I had been in there. So I was excited. I stayed my friend's house for a week. I spent _____ very good times with her. I saw _____ new places.

5. If I had 1000 dollars, firstly I'd buy _____ car, _____ house for my family, and I then, I would use it for my school. I also would help all students who want to be in _____ good statue.

E-24

1. I took _____ mobile phone from "one". It was _____summer. I was angry with myself. Because I wasn't going out, I didn't want it. One day in June I was bored. And I broke my mobile phone. He heard that and when he couldn't reach me, he sent me _____ new mobile phone. So, it was valuable for me.

2. I was at 5 years old. My father was going to Antalya because of his work. I cried to him for taking me with him. When I went there, I was surprised because I would another city. My father took me _____ different places in Antalya. I met _____ Scottish girl. She was speaking English, but I was speaking Turkish. We were understanding each other with _____ sign language etc.

3. In my room, I have _____ bed covered gold color. Opposite my bed, there is _____ wardrobe. It has my clothes in it. At the right, there is _____ table with my books. Under my table, there are my shoes. And there is _____ fridge at the right of my bed. That's all.

4. Two weeks ago, I, Özlem, Metin and Kadir were in Harbiye. We arrived there. And we walked down to _____ waterfall. _____Waterfalls were amazing. Then we ate _____ Kebap in Mozaik Café. However (NB: "Besides"), we took _____ photographs. When we completed our vacation, we came to _____city centre. We ate _____ Künefe and _____ hot corn. After these, we came home. But we were coming, we were wet from raining.

5. If I had 1000 dollars, I would spent this for _____ orphanage children, their education. Because they need to look after them.

E-25

1. I had _____ sanal bebek. I love it because it is _____very interesting game for me. When I was _____ child, one day I lost it in _____ crowded (NB: "crowd) and I have never found it, so I sad so much.

2. I came here with my family, so I feel myself relax. We wandered around and ate _____ Künefe. I don't like _____ Künefe by the way. Then we come to _____ school for registered. Hatay is _____ very different culture from my own country, so I feel myself alien. But now I used to live here.

3. My sweety room has _____ casual objects. For example, _____ bed, _____ chair, _____ carpet etc. I have _____ bear which is my Christmas gift. It is singing _____ song. I have some gifts from my boyfriend in there.

4. I went to Muğla. _____ weather is so good in there, so I wandered with my friends. We went to _____ café to listen to song. Then I went _____ seaside to relief.

5. Firstly, I bought _____ car and then spent this money with _____ friends. I spent it in _____ AVM. I wander everywhere.

Written Narrative Task- Data set 2 (Intermediate level participants)

I-01

1. About three years ago, when I heard that I entered to _____ University, my grandmother was sitting next to me. She became happy also when she heard this news. After two or three day, she came to us with her gift. It was _____ watch.

2. I have gone to _____ Mersin University with my friends who were studying in _____ different schools. We went to _____ Mersin together. It was _____ good trip for me because I saw many different things and it was _____ big pleasure to see these things with them. It lasted one day. As I turned to _____ Antakya late, I didn't go to _____ home and I stayed in my friend.

3. My room is big and it has a lot of things. But I don't like many of them. In my room, there are two bed because I share it with my little sister. There is also_____wardrobe and _____ bookshelves. And there are also somethings belong to my mother.

4. When I was in _____ summer holiday, I planned to go to _____ G.Antep. I went there for only a day. I arrived there at night. When I woke up, I went to out. I met some friends of my sister and we spent time together.

5. I want to this money only for me. I would like to buy _____ big house far away from here and buy a lot of books. I would like to spend all my time in this house alone and read these books, watch _____ films or etc. But I use these money only my happiness.

I-02

1. I received _____ clock as _____ gift in my birthday. My best friend gave me. _____ other friends and her prepared _____ surprise birthday party.

2. When I first arrived in Antakya, I didn't know where _____ banks were, how I would go to _____ school. _____ friends living in Antakya helped me.

3. I stayed in _____ dormitory. I liked my room. There are eight beds, cupboards, _____ table, three chairs and _____ hang in _____ room.

4. One of my recent vacations is _____ semester holiday. I went to _____ home. I saw my family and had a rest. My holiday was not very good because my mother was ill.

5. If I got 1000 dollars as _____ gift, I would go to _____ abroad. I would go to Italy. I would see _____ different places, would taste _____ different meals and would visit _____ historical places.

I-03

1. My first gift was _____ earphone from my girlfriend. It wasn't my birthday or another special day for us. She had asked politely to accept her gift. How can I refuse? Secondly, I've lost _____ bracelet of Fenerbahçe two years ago. It was _____ most valuable object that I've ever had.

2. I've been in Denizli 6 years ago for a month. I have gone Pamukkale to work or gain money as _____ waiter. I was serving _____ tourists _____ delicious meals and having _____ conversations with them. Even if I've gone to Pamukkale, I've never visited _____ Travertines. _____ first person I've met in there was Cihan.

3. I have _____ small table lamp in my desk. I have _____ computer which is crucial for me. There is _____ huge wardrobe in my room. It replaces almost half of it. _____ Fenerbahçe Posters, _____ uniforms, _____ bracelet are another things that I have on my wall. _____ Little blue slippers stands in _____ middle of _____ room.

4. I've gone to Istanbul a year ago. That was awesome to see such _____ antique civilization city. I have visited _____ Topkapı Palace, Miniaturk, Pierre Lotti. Having some fresh air near _____ Bosporus was amazing. Since we ate so many hamburgers in Burger King, we were stuck in the middle of Eminönü. Finally, we have visited Sultan Ahmet.

5. I would spend it for _____ wearing and _____ technologic devices. First, I'm going to buy _____ new smart-phone. Because I haven't got one. After that, since I am _____ footballer, I'll buy _____ new shoes for football. _____ Uniforms of Fenerbahçe are _____ best thing to spend _____ rest.

I-04

1. I received _____ gift from my best friend, Gözde, two years ago. It is _____ toy ship. It is _____ most precious gift for me. Because I like _____ fishing very much. However, I haven't _____ boat for fishing at deep. For this reason, I can catch _____ little fish. _____ most big fish that

I had caught was 25 centimeters. I insist my father on taking _____ boat but he always postpone it. I lost hope to take my father _____ boat. So, Gözde's gift is very valuable for me.

2. I went to Istanbul where my aunt lives in at the age of twenty. She took me _____ very wonderful places. Later, we went to my cousin home and I saw her baby. After we left my cousin home, my aunt prepared _____ very wonderful dinner for me. _____next day, we toured _____ Istanbul Bosporus with _____ ship. We ate two big ice-creams there. At the third day, I turned back to my hometown.

3. My room consists of two beds, _____ bookcase, two cupboards, two carpets, _____ mirror. In the right side of _____ room, there is my twin's bed, and in _____ left side, there is my bed. On _____ my bed, there is _____ toy bear. There are many books, encyclopedias, dictionaries on my bookcase. _____ cupboard which is on the right is brown and Balca and I use it for our pyjamas, t-shirts, perfumes, etc. _____ cupboard which is on the left is yellow. It includes _____ trousers, jeans, shirts, pullovers.

4. I went to Arsuz in which we have _____ house for _____ summer holiday. Almost in all of _____ days, I awoke at nine and had _____ breakfast with my mother, twin and brother. After _____ breakfast, I swam with my family. But sometimes, instead of swimming, I went to fish. After I had took a shower, we had _____ lunch. Later, I read some English words and wrote them on _____ notebook. Afterwards, I slept for one hour. After sleeping, I went to play basketball and swam again. After having _____ dinner, I walked with my friends and twin, and we sit on _____beach. I went _____ home about at one o'clock.

5. I would spend it for taking _____ boat. It is my imaginary since I was five years old. Or, maybe I would spend it for my aunt's debt. Or, maybe I would spend it for our kitchen in Arsuz. My mother wants to have it restored, but since we are three siblings and my father has _____ great expenses, he doesn't have it restored.

I-05

1. I lost my pen which my teacher gave it to me. I am very reckless about these things. I always lose something. I forget them everywhere. Because I have _____ weak memory, I hardly remember where I put them. Anyway, I lost my

pen. Then after 6 months I found it in _____ book. It is very precious to me. Because I love my teacher so much. So, I love _____ pen, too. And it is _____ very useful pen.

2. I haven't gone anywhere but Antakya. I wish I could. But I have nothing to say about this. I was born in Antakya. I grew up in Antakya. And I am still studying in Antakya.

3. I have _____ big room. I love my room. There is _____TV at the corner of _____ room. There is _____ wardrobe. There are two tables, one for eating, one for studying. I have _____ bed and two chairs. There is _____ printer under _____table. My laptop is travelling all around _____room. I don't have much stuff in my room but I love _____ space.

4. During _____ semester holiday, I went to home. But I came early because I failed three lessons, and I had to come to _____ make-up exams.

5. I would go to Italy. I've watched _____ film recently. _____ film was shot in Italy's streets, villages. And I'm in love with them. So, I would spend 1000 dollars to get _____ passport, _____ plane ticket, _____ camera.

I-06

1. I received _____ book as _____ gift. It is from my close mate. He gave me in my birthday. It is _____ very interesting book.

2. When I first arrived in Antakya, it was very strange. Someone came and spoke to me in Arabic. I was very surprise. I thought where I was come.

3. It is neither big nor small. There is _____ couch, and _____ desk and _____ table. Also there are _____ flowers. There is also _____ little library.

4. Last weekend, I went to Gaziantep. I visited _____ historical places of it. I ate _____ famous food of Gaziantep. But it is very crowded.

5. If I got 1000 dollars as _____ gift, I spent it buying _____ gifts to my classmates because it is a long time I am thinking but I haven't done yet because I don't have enough money.

I-07

1. _____ things I lost last year is _____ notebook. I was sorry because I was always writing my daily problems and memories in it. But now I am not sorry

because I bought _____ new notebook and I continues to write my memories again.

2. Actually I am from Antakya but I was born in Istanbul, and so I came here from there. I had been familiar with Antakya before. I recognized _____ new people, _____ new friends so it is _____ best experience for me to come and live here alone.

3. I have _____ small but cute room. I have _____ bed, its size is normal but in my opinion it is small if I compare myself with my bed. I have _____ big table where I study my lesson. I have _____ big, red and white carpet.

4. I went Istanbul to see my family last semester. I love there so I was happy to go there. I read four novels and generally I met with my friends and mostly I walked around with my family. I had _____ good time there.

5. Firstly, I would invest it for example; I would buy _____ big house and _____ red car. I would give some money to my father to arrange his works. I would share _____ money with my family. I would buy _____ clothes which suit me. I definitely would travel around _____ world.

I-08

1. I have _____ ring which is vital for me. My husband bought it for me. It was _____ best one of all _____ others. I was sleeping and I woke up suddenly because someone was touching to my finger. It was my husband. He was trying to wear _____ ring. It was _____ best gift and _____ best method to present it.

2. I was in Mersin with some friends for _____ holiday. One of my friends showed me something and talked about it in Arabic. When _____ vendor heard us, he asked whether we are French or not. He said that he also knew a little French. We just smiled. It was _____ enjoyable memory.

3. I have _____ big bed, _____ big wardrobe and _____ mirror. Also there are _____ mirrors on _____ face of _____ wardrobe. _____ all objects are white and black. I have _____ white carpets also.

4. My last semester holiday was enjoyable. I didn't stay at home. Every day I went out. Some nights we went out with my husband to drink something and have fun.

5. I would buy _____ gold jewelry and hide it. So, I can spend it whenever I want or need.

I-09

1. In _____ summer holiday, I was working in _____ yacht tour. I am _____ animator and organizer of that tour. My friend from Germany, Alara (aged of 33) bought me _____ trouser as _____ gift. My yellow trouser is from her. That day we were all together amused.

2. As a matter of fact, I am from Reyhanlı. So, Antakya is not _____ strange county for me. I am get used to it. I like. But all the same when I came here, I was excited. Because it is _____ big county and full of many activities.

3. I am staying in _____ dormitory. I have _____ bed, _____ private bookcase, _____ clothes-case. My room is not so big, but sweet. It is composed of two students; me and Hasan.

4. In _____ semester, I had a rest and studied KPSS. I met with my friends. I had missed my home and family.

5. I would put it to _____ bet ☺

I-10

1. I received two fishes and _____ fanus (NB: "fish tank") as _____ gift. They are still alive and I loved them so much. Although I received them from _____ person who I hated him, I love and care of them. Looking after _____ pet is _____ relaxing hobby. They are _____ best gift which I have taken ever.

2. I came to Antakya with my mother. We arrived at 22.00, so I didn't realize _____ city. In the morning, we woke up and went to _____ Serinyol. I didn't love _____ road and _____ bus. I hated there until _____ autumn came and _____ rain would start. I loved _____ rain and _____ wind.

3. Firstly, I had two fish in _____ aquarium. My orange bed is my resting place. I have _____ make-up table. It's orange, too. I think it is enough because there isn't anything in my room ☺

4. I was in Malatya at _____ semester. It was very boring and I could bear only ten days. I missed Antakya and my little house. But there were _____ snow in Malatya and playing with it was so funny. That's all.

5. I would spend all of _____ money in _____ one day. I have _____ credit cards and they are full of debt. I would pay them. Then I would go to KOTON and buy _____ jacket which I like so much. _____ Money is beautiful ☺

I-11

1. In my first year of studying in _____ University, I met my ex-boyfriend. Then, I liked _____ metal, hard-rock music as he did. He gave me _____ necklace which was silver as _____ present. _____ necklace was _____ symbol of _____ rock band named HIM.

2. In our second year in _____ University, I and my classmate Arzu went to Spain as _____ Erasmus students. We met _____ nice people there both from Spain and from _____ other countries. We saved money to go _____ other European countries. We visited Venice, Rome, Paris, Budapest, Krakow, Porto etc.

3. My new room is pretty smaller than my ex, but I like this one. It is calmer and lovelier. I have _____ single bed in one side of _____ bedroom, in front of it I have _____cupboard where my clothes are. I have _____ studying desk in front of _____ window. Sometimes while I'm studying, I'm sipping my cup of tea and watching _____ rain.

4. Last summer I was in Spain, in _____ city called Murcia. I was having _____ fantastic holiday while I was doing my school practice. In _____ week, from 9 a.m. till 2 p.m. I was working with _____ children and having _____ nice and funny times with them. _____ rest of my time was on _____ beach.

5. I have _____ dream for a long time. If I got 1000 dollars, in fact I don't know if it is enough, but I guess I would go Cuba to stay there and observe _____life, economy and politic for a month or two. Of course I would take my boyfriend with me, too: Because it is our common dream.

I-12

1. When I was _____ child, I had a lot of buckles. One day, I took away them to _____ school. But I lost all of them. I was too much sorry. Because I had had them hardy and I used to love them much.

2. When I first came to _____Antakya, I was so excited. I was going to attend _____university. Firstly I went to _____ dormitory. I met with Naime. She helped me for everything. But at _____ first night, I was not able to sleep ☹

3. I stay in _____ dormitory. There are eight beds and eight wardrobes. I stay with seven girls. I had one table and three chairs in my room. I had my books.

4. I went to my town for _____ semester holiday. I visited my relatives. I went to my neighbors for having some fun. My grandmother came to my house. It was good because I had seen nearly all my family members.

5. I would travel all over _____ world with my family. I would go to China and meet with _____ people who look like me. I would not work. But I would make _____ big café named "Funny World".

I-13

1. My aunt gave me a pair of earrings as _____ gift. I lost them at _____ hotel in Denizli. It symbolized _____ chance for me. Therefore it made me sad. Then I wanted to buy _____ same ones, but I couldn't.

2. I have been in Ankara. I visited my sister. She is _____ nurse in _____hospital at Gazi University. She took me there. I met a lot of people who are ill.

3. _____ most I like is my bed because it is very comfortable.

_____ table ⟶ I sit on it for only studying lesson.

_____bookcase ⟶ I have lots of novels, magazines, school-books.

_____wardrobe ⟶ There are my clothes in it.

_____ little radio⟶ I like listening to music very much.

4. I went to Greece 2 years ago. I saw lots of different places. I went to _____ Islands of Greece. They was very fascinating. I want to see there once more.

5. It makes me very happy. Now, I need this money. I must buy some books for KPSS and YDS. I would spend some of it for it. I would give _____ rest of it to my sisters. Thank you! ☺

I-14

1. I had _____ music box. It was given me in my birthday. My friends gave it to me at my birthday. I lost my silver earrings last month. It was very valuable for me because my brother gave them to me.

2. I arrived in Antakya four years ago. I came with my father. I went to Diyarbakır also last year.

3. I stayed in _____ dormitory, so I don't have my own room. I stayed in that room with my seven friends. There are eight beds and wardrobes, and there is also _____ table.

4. I was in my country at _____ semester. I spent time with my family. I went shopping with my friends.

5. First of all, I bought one hundred chocolate. Then I went to shopping to buy _____ shoes, _____ skirts, _____ bags and etc.

I-15

1. In my last birthday, I was in İstanbul, I went there alone, so I was hanging all alone in my birthday. One of my close friends made _____ surprise and she happened to come Istanbul! It was such _____ great moment that I saw her. She prepared _____ gift for me, it was _____ photograph album which include our photos that we took together. Both sides of our photos there were some notes, poems and words of songs. It was _____ unforgettable day of my life.

2. I have been in Antalya 5 years ago. I went there with my friend. It was _____ strange feeling to be in _____ city where nobody knows you or where you don't know anybody but it was also _____ freshing and pleasant feeling. Both _____ anxiety and _____ pleasure covered me those days. I went many historical sites including Aspendos, Perge etc. It was _____ great experience to watch _____ Fire of Anatolia in _____ antique theatre of Aspendos!

3. I share my room with my sister. So, I share all I have with my sister except for my books. I designed _____ small bookcase which is all belong to me. It is all mine. I store all my books here and I am pretty sensitive for it. I much care my books and don't let anybody take any book without my permission. It is _____ only thing that I own in my room.

4. I went Istanbul last summer. I visited _____ Topkapı Palace, Hagia Sophia, Blue Mosque. I hanged in Ortaköy with my friend and ate _____ Kumpir and _____Waffle which were famous there. They were both delicious. I also visited Cihangir, Arnavutköy, _____ famous café of Pierre Lotti, _____ huge aquarium and I also made shopping in _____ popular malls of Istanbul such as Cevahir, Marmara Forum etc.

5. I would travel to _____ east of Turkey, such as Diyarbakır, Ş. Urfa, Mardin, Bitlis, Batman etc. I would bring two of my close friends Derya and Pelin and I would travel all _____ East with them. We are all interested in _____ mysteries of _____ East. It would such _____ great for us.

I-16

1. I really loved my new telephone which my fiancé gave me as _____ gift. It has many programmes. I can take _____ qualified pictures thanks to its camera. What I like most about it is _____ navigation programme, it's 3D version, so you feel _____ real navigation when you search somewhere.

2. I have been to Mersin. It was _____ summer holiday. I went to Erdemli with my fiancé and my cousins. We stayed in _____ hotel which had _____ swimming pool near _____ seashore. What I really loved was our night walkings along _____ seaside. We spent a week there.

3. We share _____ same room with my brother. There are two beds, _____ computer, _____ bookcase, two big wardrobes in it. _____ computer is on _____ bookcase. I have _____ bear on my bed. I really love it. It is _____ white bear.

4. In _____ last semester holiday, I went to Qatar. My fiancé is working there. He is working with his family in their own restaurant as _____ manager. They invited me and I went to there readily. We enjoyed _____ holiday together. We do some shopping, we went to _____ seaside, we discovered many places to travel. It was wonderful.

5. Without thinking, I would take my fiancé to _____ holiday to _____ far place. We could do whatever we want. We could relax together without thinking anyone from our families. We could have more fun!

I-17

1. My aunt bought and gave me as _____ gift _____ teddy bear in _____ trip to Şanlı Urfa when I was 8. I saw and liked it so much. I begged my grandmother to buy it for me, but she insisted on not buying. When I started to cry, my unique aunt could not endure my crying and bought it for me. I still keep it.

2. I went to Denizli to participate in _____ graduation ceremony of my sister. _____ day that I arrived, I attended _____ ceremony and met her friends. _____ second day, we went out for _____ worthseeing places of Denizli.

We wandered till _____ midnight. In _____ last day of my trip, we went to _____ picnic and took lots of photos. It was _____ wonderful trip for me.

3. I share my room with my sister. There are two beds and wardrobes. _____ novels which are special for us and _____ books for KPSS cover most of _____ book shelves. Apart from that, we have some gifts such as _____ teddy bears, _____ photos and _____ computer and _____ radio.

4. I went to Adana for visiting my aunt and cousins as _____ summer holiday. My cousin has _____ little son. I dealt with and took after (NB: "looked after") him. We played _____ various games and enjoyed. We came together and went to _____ picnic. We spent _____ good time altogether. In addition to these, I helped my little cousins with their lessons and tried to teach English.

5. Firstly, I meet all _____ needs and willings of my family to thank for their contributions to my life and education. I help my brother to get _____ regular and constant job to live comfortably. I contribute to my sister's wedding ceremony's spends and tries to make it better. And lastly, I make lots of schools built, especially for _____ foreign language teaching.

I-18

1. _____ best gift I have ever received is _____ love (true love). When I was even not looking for it, she found me. She is _____ best thing ever happened to me. She is 30 years old. But we don't care about it. Because _____ most precious thing is _____ love, when you falling love you don't care about anything just _____ happiness. _____ Age, sex, social status, religious… doesn't matter. She is _____ journalist. Above all happiness is _____ holiest thing, it is hard to find someone to love. Even if we are from _____ different countries, we love each other more than enough. I prefer a minute with her than _____ rest of my life. For me _____ best gift is love.

2. I went to Istanbul. It was _____ great experience for me. I spend my time with my uncles coz they are _____ tourist guide so I went every important place of Istanbul. When I wander alone, I mostly prefer to spend my time in İstiklal Street coz I've _____ opportunity to meet with _____ people from _____ different countries. _____ best thing is to talk with them about _____ life, culture… etc. I love _____ sharing ideas and listening people experiences coz

_____ 1st step of improving speaking is listening. The more you listen, the more you fluent.

3. It's my private place and totally about my private life but I will do a favor and tell you. For everybody, their room is like _____ heaven because you are all alone in it and you can do whatever you want. So, I decorated it according to my interest. I don't like a lot of stuff around _____ my room so I don't decorate a lot with unnecessary stuff. I've two wardrobe, one double-bed, one table, _____ basket also a lot of games, posters, photos. _____ best thing about my room is loneliness, to think about everything.

4. My last vacation was great. I just swam all day long and went to _____ dance clubs. I like dancing coz of this I spent most of _____ nights there. I met with a lot of people. I went there with my family but my family members like me, they like dancing, swimming, shopping… so it is easy for me to do these things with them, too. But what I loved _____ most about my vacation is that to stay all _____ night under _____ moon light and stars on _____ beach with _____ beer ☺

5. What I hate about life is _____ money. What _____ mankind is invented is totally destroy our lifes. If I found 1000 dollars, I don't use it for myself, I give it to _____ charity companies like TEMA, but probably I give it for _____ family need of money for education of their children. It seems insane but in my world _____ money's not important you can't buy _____ happiness with _____ money, _____ happiness is free; hugging, loving, to be with family, to see _____ happiness of _____ child etc. I don't touch even _____ penny of it and I give it. _____ Life is so short to be happy to make somebody happy so who cares about _____ penny or money ☺

I-19

1. My boyfriend gave me _____ beautiful necklace in 2008. I was studying at Pamukkale University at that time. He came to Denizli. We went to Çamlık. He asked me to close my eyes. I closed my eyes. He put _____ necklace in my hand. I just opened my eyes and thanked him.

2. Last summer, my family and I went to Adıyaman. We had _____ good time there. We climbed _____ Mountain Nemrut early in the morning. _____ sun was wonderful. However, it was very cold.

3. There are two beds, _____ computer, _____ mirror. I have lots of books. I have _____ wardrobe. It is light not dark. My sister and I have _____ good time there. It is very special not only for me but also for my sister.

4. I went to Kozan last summer. In fact, I love _____ small city, Kozan, very much. I grew up there. After five years, I climbed _____ Kozan Castle and visited _____ Yaver's Mansion. Besides I met with my school friends. We talked about our school days.

5. Firstly, I would buy _____ mobile phone for my sister. For, she wants to have _____ mobile phone for months. Then, I would buy _____ gifts for my boyfriend and parents. (I like making _____ people happy). Maybe my boyfriend and I would go on _____ holiday. It would be very nice.

I-20

1. I had a lot of gifts for my birthday. One of them is very important for me. It is _____ scarf that my brother present to me. I always use it _____ cold weathers.

2. When I first came to Antakya, I was 18. It was _____ terrible experience for me. Because it was _____ first time that I left from my family. _____ first day, I went _____ dormitory. I met some people there. After then I got used to live in Antakya.

3. I have _____ big room. I have _____ shelf and _____ table in my room. There is _____ computer and lots of books on _____ table. My room has _____ big window. I have _____ wardrobe, _____ carpet, _____ table light.

4. In my summer holiday, I went to Mersin. Mersin is _____ lovely city. I went to _____ sea. I walked around _____ city. I made some shopping. I ate _____ fish and I went to my cousin's house. We spent time all _____ day together with her.

5. At first, I buy _____ beautiful house with _____ garden. I buy _____ car. I give _____ poor people _____ rest of _____ money. _____ homeless, hungry people need it.

I-21

1. My mother had given me _____ earrings as _____ gift when I was young. I had really liked them. I was afraid even to have them in my ears all the time, because that was my first earrings and I didn't want to lose them. One day, I wore them for _____special day and when I returned to home I couldn't find one of them. I was really upset that day.

2. I have gone to Antep when I was in _____ high school. We have visited _____ museum, _____ zoo, and _____big open shop. It was tiring but we spent _____ good time with our teachers. We took a lot of photos and ate Döner there. But their food is not delicious as our. We still mention about that trip while we meet with each other.

3. I have _____ bookshelf in my room. _____ first shelf contains _____ novels and stories, and _____ others are _____ exercises books and magazines. I have _____ little table and _____ vase of flowers on it. They are genuine and I smell their beautiful scent every time I enter _____ room. _____ table is in front of _____ window and I really enjoy watching out while I am studying.

4. I climbed _____ mountain a few weekends ago. My cousins, brothers and my sister joined that activity. I had good times with them. We had _____ nice picnic on _____ way. We drank tea and ate toasts. That was one of my best memories.

5. I will buy _____ ticket to London and I have _____ good holiday. I will go sightseeing and try to see all _____ beautiful places there. _____ time I will spend there can arouse my belief in myself. Going to another place and meeting with _____ new people must be amazing! That can be _____ misery thought but I believe that I deserve it.

I-22

1. It was my sixteenth birthday. I threw _____ party and invited all of my friends. We had fun telling each other our childhood memories. When I blew out _____ candles, my friend clapped me and then they gave me a lot of special gifts. One of them I liked so much was _____ English grammar book. It was from my best friend. I have been keeping it since then.

2. Yes, I have been to another city in Turkey. I went to Antalya for working and practicing my English. Firstly, I suffered from being accustomed to Antalya. It is bigger than Hatay and also more crowded. Luckily, I went there with my friend who is familiar with it. He helped me whenever I was in _____ trouble.

3. I have _____ room which is small and painted with orange. Although it is very small, it is abound with _____ objects. In my room there are three sofas, _____ television, _____ fridge, numerous books and _____ bed.

4. In my semester holiday, I attended _____ French course. I enrolled in _____ novice football team. I spent a lot of days working out and playing _____ match. I went playing table tennis with my close friends. That's all.

5. If I got 1000 dollars as _____ gift, it would be nice ☺ At first, I plan on what to do with this money. Later, I start spending it in agreement with my plan. I take _____ risk and set up _____ work. I involve my friends in it. We make money as well as working together.

I-23

1. Well… Probably _____ most meaningful gift I've got so far is my guitar. It was four years from now and it was _____ winter night. After practicing with my sister's guitar, I really wanted my own and after a while, I've got really good and covered _____ really nice song that my parents really love. They've got really impressed after couple of days I've received my first, personal elec. guitar.

2. I believe it was _____ end of August 2010. My parents decided to come with me since they couldn't do it before at Cyprus. After _____ terribly long car drive (14 hours), we finally arrived to Hatay. _____ First day we were exhausted from _____ drive, so we directly went to _____ Hotel but after that day, we travelled around _____ Hatay and experienced _____ different kinds of foods. _____ People who visit Hatay mentioned us before, but we were fascinated about how _____ food was so good.

3. Well… Obviously _____ bed that pretty comfortable. I've got _____ desk which I mostly use for my computer. There is _____ TV next to my desk, but I almost never turn it on. I've got _____ modem to maintain _____ good connection for _____ online games and such. Other than that I have _____ dresser (NB: "wardrobe") in my room that I don't really like cause it doesn't have much shelves.

4. I went to my beach house as I do every summer. It is _____ triplex villa which is next to _____ seaside. We had quite good time with my friends. I've even tried _____ scuba-diving for _____ first time.

5. I would spend all of it for _____ new guitar. My old one is _____ Korea made, 4 years old guitar. I need _____ new one but this time I am gonna buy _____ Japan made one because they are better quality and they last much longer. My old one is red so this time I am planning to buy _____ sunburst or _____ black one.

I-24

1. I want to write about _____ T-shirt that my sister gave me in my 15th birthday. It was pink and there was some pictures on it. I was very happy when she gave me it. One day, I went to İstanbul. While I was leaving there, I forgot it there. I realized it when I came back to Hatay.

2. Last year I went to İstanbul with my four friends and my English teacher. There we visited İstanbul Aydın University in the first place. Apart from _____ University, we visit Taksim, İstiklal Caddesi, İstanbul Boğazı and Ayasofya Mosque. We stayed there four days in _____ Mina Hotel. There I met with my teacher's cousin.

3. In my room, there is _____ bookcase behind _____ door. At the opposite of _____ bookcase, there is my bed and next to it, there is _____ armchair. There is _____ drawer at _____ other side of _____ door and there is _____ mirror on it. Next to _____ drawer there is _____ cupboard.

4. In my semester holiday I went to Adıyaman with my sister and stayed there for one week and in my second week I returned to Hatay and in my house I play with _____ computer, listen _____ music and read _____ books. I met with my friends and sometimes I went to my uncle and my grandmother house to stay there.

5. In the first place, I buy _____ big house that has _____ big garden. Then I buy _____ beautiful car. After that, I some countries. I make some shopping and with _____ money left I make _____ investment.

I-25

1. I had _____ model RC plane, that I was given _____ gift when I was six. It was like my best friend at that time, I loved it. I almost always played it whenever I got upset or furious. And somehow that miraculous RC plane has always helped me to chill out, until _____ day I crashed it into _____ wall of _____ building. I tried to get it fixed but _____ mechanics failed to do so. Rest in peace my friend, _____ RC plane.

2. When I first got here, I felt like I was rehearsing for _____ hell. _____ cities I had lived until that moment were rather located in _____ northern parts of Turkey, so they were way colder than Antakya. Of course this was not _____ first time that I was in _____ hot environment but nonetheless, _____ most vivid thing I remember is _____ heat. After that, _____ sharp smell of _____ river which goes through _____ city almost made me black out as well. That smell combined with _____ humid weather, made _____ toxic combination.

3. My room is full of _____ junk to be honest. _____ Electronic stuff are all over _____ place. Even though most of them are not even functional anymore, I still enjoy disassembling and messing with them. _____ most significant object is my deceased RC plane. It's _____ rather oldish, red spitfire model plane. It is about 1 meter long and 80 cms wide. And its weight should be around 6-8 kgs if my memory serves.

4. On my most recent holiday, I went to Eskişehir, where many of my friends currently live in. I felt like visiting them and spending some time with them. I thought _____ little change would be good. After that I went to Ankara by _____ train. I have _____ chronological heart disease and I have to get it checked every once in a while. I thought since I'm already close to Ankara, I might as well go there and get that over with.

5. I would definitely get _____ motorcycle. I have always loved these things since I was _____ child. With 1000 bucks, I could get myself _____ nice one I believe. I mean, _____ cars are still my favorite vehicles but I don't think I can get one with this amount of money. It's cool though, I also love _____ motorcycles.

The coding procedure has finished. Thank you all for your contributions.

Neşe BÜYÜKAŞIK

Appendix-5: Independent samples t-test results in [+definite, +specific] contexts

	proficiency level	number	mean	t	SD	SD mean error	p-value
[+definite,+specific]	elementary	25	2.44	3.641	1.734	0.347	.001*
	intermediate	25	0.96	3.641	1.060	0.212	

*p<0.05

Appendix-6: Independent samples t-test results in [+definite, -specific] contexts

	proficiency level	number	mean	t	SD	SD mean error	p-value
[+definite, -specific]	elementary	25	2,24	4.116	1.877	0.375	.000*
	intermediate	25	0.52	4.116	0.918	0.184	

*p<0.05

Appendix-7: Independent samples t-test results in [-definite, +specific] contexts

	proficiency level	number	mean	t	SD	SD mean error	p-value
[-definite,+specific]	elementary	25	1.48	2.111	1.327	0.265	.041
	intermediate	25	0.80	2.111	0.913	0.183	

*p<0.05

Appendix-8: Independent samples t-test results in [-definite, -specific] contexts

	proficiency level	number	mean	t	SD	SD mean error	p-value
[-definite, -specific]	elementary	25	1.68	4.031	1.249	0.250	.000*
	intermediate	25	0.52	4.031	0.714	0.143	

*p<0.05

Appendix-9: Independent samples t-test results in previous-mention definite contexts

	proficiency level	number	mean	t	SD	SD mean error	p-value
previous-mention definite	elementary	25	3.40	3.873	1.826	0.365	.000*
	intermediate	25	1.40	3.873	1.826	0.365	

*p<0.05

Appendix-10: Independent samples t-test results in previous-mention definite contexts: Rates of substitution errors

	proficiency level	number	mean	t	SD	SD mean error	p-value
previous-mention definite	elementary	25	2.08	4.612	1.222	0.244	.000*
	intermediate	25	0.68	4.612	0.900	0.180	

*p<0.05

Appendix-11: Independent samples t-test results in partitive indefinite contexts

	proficiency level	number	mean	t	SD	SD mean error	p-value
partitive indefinite	elementary	25	1,96	1.603	1.428	0.286	.116
	intermediate	25	1,28	1.603	1.568	0.314	

Appendix-12: Independent samples t-test results in partitive indefinite contexts: Rates of substitution errors

	proficiency level	number	mean	t	SD	SD mean error	p-value
partitive indefinite	elementary	25	1,36	0.921	1.350	0.270	.362
	intermediate	25	1,00	0.921	1.414	0.283	