영어어문교육, 14권 3호 2008년 가을

L2 Acquisition Order of the PD and the DOD Structures in English*

Eun-Joo Moon
(Paichai University)

Moon, Eun-Joo. (2008). L2 acquisition order of the PD and the DOD structures in English. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 14*(3), 221-239.

The goal of this study is to explore the L2 acquisition order of dative structures in English and thereby suggest the order of introduction of prepositional dative (PD) and double object dative (DOD) structures to Korean learners of English. Based on the markedness theory and the previous L1 and L2 studies on the acquisition of dative constructions, a preference task was devised and administered to about 500 Korean students learning English and to some English native speakers. The dative verbs were divided into two types: Type A verbs were alternating (PD or DOD) verbs and Type B verbs were non-alternating (PD-only) verbs. The results showed that Korean students strongly preferred the PD structures for both type of verbs, whereas the native speakers preferred the DOD counterpart. This result may lead to a prediction that development will proceed in order from the PD (unmarked) to the DOD (marked) structure. That is, the PD structure will be acquired earlier than the DOD in L2 acquisition of dative constructions. This acquisition data provides support for both UG-based and typological markedness theory. The study also analyzed the distribution of PD/DOD structures in English text books. The analysis suggests that more dative verbs be introduced earlier and the PD structure be introduced before the DOD.

[acquisition order/prepositional dative/double object dative]

I. INTRODUCTION

There has been much research on dative constructions, but their precise nature and the relative acquisition order of the prepositional dative (PD) and double object dative (DOD) structures are still very controversial. A major question throughout the

* This research was supported by the Paichai University Research Grants in 2008.

transformational literature on dative constructions is whether one type of dative is derived from the other by a transformational process. For example, Fillmore (1965) and Larson (1988) have argued for an account in which the DOD is transformationally derived from the underlying structure of the PD. On the other hand, Aoun and Li (1989) have argued that the PD is derived from the DOD. Other analyses, as in Pesetsky (1995) and Mulder (1992), have assumed no derivational relationship between these two types of dative structures (Snyder & Stromswold, 1997). This is one of the notable issues related to Universal Grammar (UG) that requires further investigation with various types of empirical acquisition data.

This study examines the acquisition order of the PD and the DOD constructions in English by Korean learners of English. It further explores Moon's (2003) study with a broader range of subjects. Based on the roles played by markedness, and the previous L1 and L2 studies on the acquisition of dative constructions, it is predicted that the Korean learners of English would show an ordering relation in which they consistently acquire one type of dative constructions in English before the other.

A preference task, as shown in Appendix 1, was devised and administered to about 500 Korean students learning English and some native speakers of English. In attempt to suggest introduction order of dative constructions, this study also analyzed the distribution of PD/DOD structures in current elementary and middle school English text books as illustrated in Appendix 2.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Numerous researchers in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) have investigated the relationship between UG and developmental processes in the acquisition of L2 grammar. In these studies, by investigating a markedness relationship, researchers have attempted to explain parameter setting in the target structure which might show a developmental sequence in the beginning stage of acquiring the target language (Mazurkewich, 1984; Wexler & Manzini, 1987; Berent, 1990; Lee, 1997). L1 influence in L2 learning as an important determiner of interlanguage (IL) and L2 errors has also been a source of debate in SLA research (H.-S. Kim, 1987). The roles of markedness in the acquisition of English dative verbs are reviewed in the following.

1. Markedness and Universal Grammar (UG)

The availability of UG in dative alternation is accounted for by the markedness relationship based on UG (Mazurkewich, 1984). The notion of markedness has been

discussed mostly as one of the modules of UG (McLaughlin, 1987). With the concept of parameterization, the theory of UG accounts for the differences among languages. Principles of UG involve a set of properties with parameters, and different languages adopt different parameter settings (White, 1989). At the initial state, the parameters remain open, and a child sets the parameters on the basis of positive evidence in his/her L1. The notion of markedness comes into play in the process of setting the parameters. In L2 acquisition, unlike in L1, some parameters become properly set while others do not as is commonly observed in L2 learners' interlanguage. Although this relates back to the controversy regarding partial versus total accessibility of UG, two other factors more closely pertain to this phenomenon. One of them involves further refinement of the markedness notion, and the other involves the issue of cross-linguistic influence in L2 acquisition (C.-K. Kim, 1996). According to White (1987b), as cited in Wolfe-Quintero (1992b), the development in a target language proceeds in a series of stages that are generally ordered in a markedness relationship defined by learnability, UG, or typological criteria, as discussed in the following.

Markedness relationships are generally defined by what is learnable from the input in learnability theory. To prevent overgeneralizations, the learner must initially hypothesize the most minimal grammar possible and will consider a less restrictive possibility only if the input warrants it. This is governed by the 'subset principle' (Wexler and Manzini, 1987) which requires a learner to select the most restrictive possibility within UG that is consistent with the input. That is, according to this proposal, learners start out with the unmarked (narrower) value of a parameter, and they never arrive at the marked (wider) value of a parameter unless positive evidence from the target language warrants it (H.-S. Kim and Moon, 1997).

Sawyer (1995) has summarized the other two types of markedness, UG-based markedness and typological markedness, as follows. Many early L2 studies on the dative alternation attempted to explain the acquisition of the dative alternation (L1 and L2) in terms of the markedness theory based on the concept of core and periphery grammar (Chomsky, 1981). Mazurkewich (1984) argues that the PD, being more prevalent crosslinguistically and nearly exceptionless within English, is part of the core grammar and thus unmarked. The DOD forms, on the other hand, are less common across languages and less productive in English, and therefore peripheral and marked. Mazurkewich predicts that the PD would be acquired first, in accordance with Chomsky's idea that the core grammar should require minimal evidence for acquisition, while peripheral features should require much more evidence. Her acceptability judgment results show that all groups accepted English PD sentences across most verb types, but varied considerably in the DOD sentences and she concludes that a universal theory of markedness is confirmed.

On the other hand, Wolfe-Quintero (1992b) argues that markedness needs to be defined individually for each language. Its interaction with language transfer can be predicted depending on the individual language type. Based on the data from her free and elicited production tasks, along with a reanalysis of data from numerous previous studies, she concludes that markedness needs to be defined individually for each language. For instance, in English the PD is unmarked in relation to the DOD because it is more productive, but in Chinese the relationship is reversed (Kao, 1990). L2 learners can be expected to transfer their L1 schema in the process of L2 learning initially, whether marked or unmarked, but such transfer will not override the fact that they will acquire unmarked L2 structures before marked L2 structures. Consistent with these predictions, Chinese learners of English mastered the PD first, despite its relative markedness in Chinese. English (L1) learners of Chinese acquired the DOD most accurately, again following the L2 rather than L1 markedness order. The data from Japanese learners of English and of Chinese confirms her hypothesis by showing that they acquire the PD first in English but the DOD first in Chinese. These results can be explained within a framework of typological markedness.

Many researchers agree that if a markedness relationship can be demonstrated, it can lead to prediction that development will proceed in stages from the least marked to most marked structural type (e.g., Chudron & Parker, 1990; Eckman, Bell & Nelson, 1988; Meisel, Clahsen & Pienemann, 1981; Wolfe-Quintero, 1992a,b).

2. Previous Studies on the Acquisition of Dative Constructions

In previous L1 studies on the acquisition of datives, it was widely believed that children acquire the PD before they acquire the DOD. The reason for this belief is that a number of studies from the 1970s and early 1980s showed that preschool children had more difficulty comprehending and imitating the DOD than the PD (Fischer, 1971; Cook, 1976; Osgood & Zehler, 1981; Roeper, T., Lapionte, S., Bing, J. & Tavakolian, S., 1981). However in these studies children were typically given datives with full NPs for both direct and indirect objects. And when a dative has full NPs for both objects, the DOD is often more difficult to process. Additional evidence comes from a pilot study by Wilson, R., Pinker, S., Zaenen, A. & Leveaux, D., (1981) that was designed to elicit the PD and the DOD. However, the results of White (1987a) and Gropen, J., Pinker, S., Hollander, M. Goldberg, R. & Wilson, R. (1989) suggest that the DOD may not be acquired later than the PDs. In White's (1987a) study, children between three and five years of age successfully imitated and acted out both types of datives. The relevance of White's results is limited however, since it is often possible for people to imitate sentences that are not in their grammar. Gropen et al. (1989) examined the spontaneous speech

CHILDES transcripts for five children to determine the age of acquisition of dative constructions and conclude that grammatical DOD and PD forms appear around the second year in children's spontaneous speech, with neither construction systematically preceding the other (Snyder & Stromswold, 1997). In Snyder and Stromswold's (1997) study, the DOD was acquired significantly before the PD.

Researchers also have studied the acquisition of English dative constructions by L2 learners with different L1 (Mazurkewich, 1984; Le Compagnon, 1984; Hawkins, 1987; Tanaka, 1987; Wolfe-Quintero, 1992b; Sawyer, 1995; C.-K. Kim, 1996; Lee, 1997) and reported that a large number of L2 learners experienced difficulty in learning English dative verbs.

In researches on the acquisition of English dative constructions by L2 learners, the roles of markedness within the framework of UG and L1 transfer have been examined most extensively. Lee (1997) has investigated L2 acquisition of dative constructions in terms of three approaches: UG, L1 transfer, and learning principles, as illustrated below.

Mazurkewich (1984) tried to show that evidence based on the acquisition of dative structures in English by L2 learners provides support for a theory of UG-based markedness. She examined the acquisition of English dative constructions by speakers of French and Inuktitut (Eskimo) using the intuitive judgment test. The following set of declarative sentences in (1) represents the types of sentences tested. Each type had either to-dative or for-dative forms.

(1) Type 1 Bill bought a present for Mary. (PD)
Type 2 Cathy gave Kevin a book. (DOD)
Type 3 Susan explained the problem to Jane. (PD)
Type 4 *David suggested Ruth the trip. (DOD)
Type 5 Andrew chased Richard upstairs. (distractor)

(Adapted from Mazurkewich 1984, 108-109)

The results showed that both groups judged Type 1 and Type 3 sentences to be grammatical. With Type 2 sentences that contain alternating dative verbs in the DOD construction, the results showed that Inuit subjects performed better than the French subjects and that the alternation has not been fully acquired by them. The results with Type 4 sentences indicate that overgeneralizations about the dative alternation were made not only by the two L2 groups but also by the younger native control group (Kim, 1996). Also, judgments made about stimulus sentences containing for-datives were not as accurate in general as those containing to-datives. Based on the results of this study, Mazurkewich proposed that the emergence of the PD which is argued to be the unmarked one, before the DOD, the marked one, follows from the theory of UG-based

markedness.

Le Compagnon (1984) examined the role of interference in the acquisition of English dative verbs by native speakers of French. She presented two case studies involving the acquisition of English in a natural environment and two grammaticality judgment tests. In French, the full-noun indirect object must be placed in complement position after the direct object as in (2a), and when the indirect object is a pronoun, it is cliticized and directly precedes the verb as in (2b).

(2) a. J'ai donne le livre a Jean.
'I gave the book to John.'
b. Je lui ai donne le livre.
'I gave him the book.'

French learners of English transfer this L1 knowledge and sometimes produced ungrammatical DOD sentences with pronoun indirect objects (c, d, e), and usually used the PD structure with lexical NP indirect objects (f, g), as shown in the following examples in (3).

(3) a. They sent me a package.
b. Somebody asked me a question.
c. *You explained me many things.
d. *He said me that it was difficult.
e. *They didn't propose me that.
f. The eyes show the interior feeling to other people.
g. I cooked a meal for two professors in the department.

From the case studies, she found that the subjects tended to produce the DOD earlier than the PD if the IO was a pronoun and tended to produce the PD earlier if the IO was a full lexical NP. Also, from the grammaticality judgment task, she found that the subjects preferred the PDs for full lexical NPs and the DODs for pronominal indirect objects. She argued that the acquisition of dative alternation relies on the learners' L1.

Hawkins (1987) has provided a more refined view of the acquisition process of English datives by speakers of French. He reexamined Mazurkewich's (1984) study with a broader range of data in two tasks: a GJT with 36 verbs and a sentence construction task with 42 dative verbs (Lee, 1997). The results from his study were generally consistent with those from Mazurkewich (1984, 1985a, b) and Le Compagnon (1984) with reference to the order of acquisition between the two forms of dative construction: the PD structures are acquired before the DOD structure. In addition, the learners in

Hawkins' study showed preference for dative construction with to-PP to the construction with for-PP. The result of his study also showed that learners at different levels of proficiency make overgeneralizations based on different forms: they overgeneralize the to-PP form at the early stage of learning, and the for-PP form at later stages (Kim, 1996). From the results of this study, Hawkins proposed a notion of 'learning complexity' to account for the acquisition process of dative alternation in English (Lee, 1997).

3. The PD/DOD Constructions in English Textbooks

To examine the dative structures in current English textbooks, the study analyzed the distribution of PD/DOD structures in elementary and middle school text books, as illustrated in Appendix 2.

From Korea's National English Curriculum, the dative constructions from the sample sentences that have communicative functions and the forms that are needed for communication were picked out and illustrated.

Although the dative sentences are complex structures with three arguments, the dative verbs are generally used at early stages of a child's language development both in the L1 and L2. Moreover, according to the word list in the National Curriculum, dative verbs such as give, buy, bring, make, sell, send, show, etc. are encouraged to be used by elementary school students. However, their distribution in the textbooks clearly showed that there were hardly any dative sentences in the elementary English text books. This is perhaps due to the fact that this structure is thought to be fairly complicated.

In the middle school textbooks, about 13 dative verbs (e.g., tell, give, make, send, buy, report, teach, introduce, write, show, lend, open, and throw) were used in the dative sentences. However, there was no consistent pattern of PD/DOD distribution for each verb. Furthermore, there was no consistent order regarding the introduction of PD/DOD constructions. Each verb occurred randomly either in the PD or in the DOD structure without one necessarily preceding the other.

III. RESEARCH DESIGN

1. Subjects

The subjects for this preference task were 512 Korean students learning English and ten native English professors. As illustrated below in Table 1, 132 elementary school (ES) students, 148 middle school (MS) students, 124 high school (HS) students, 108 university (U) students, and 10 native speakers of English (NS) participated. Table 2

describes the number of students per grade in detail.

TABLE 1

Number of Subjects per School

	Number	Percent
ES	132	25.3
MS	148	28.4
HS	124	23.8
U	108	20.7
NS	10	1.9
Total	522	100.0

TABLE 2

Number of Subjects per Grade

	Number	Percent
ES 5th	71	13.6
ES 6th	61	11.7
MS 1st	73	14.0
MS 2nd	75	14.4
HS 1st	44	8.4
HS 2nd	43	8.2
HS 3rd	37	7.1
Univ. 1st	17	3.3
Univ. 2nd	22	4.2
Univ. 3rd	25	4.8
Univ. 4th	44	8.4
NS	10	1.9
Total	522	100.0

In Moon's (2003) pilot study, the subjects were from only two classes in the 5th and 6th grade (n=159), and two classes in 1st and 2nd year in middle school (n=140) respectively. The present study has broader range of subjects. In addition to elementary and middle school students, high school students (1st-3rd year), university students (1st-4th year), and some native speakers of English participated.

The schools and subjects were chosen randomly for this study. However, for a more refined research, learners' proficiency level needs to be considered as in E.-H. Lee (2007).

2. Materials and Procedure

To find out which of the two dative constructions in English the Korean students preferred, a preference task was devised as shown in Appendix 1. This task is a revised

version of that in Moon (2003). In the previous study, since elementary school students are introduced to reading the written forms beginning in the 4th grade and on, according to the National Curriculum in Korea, two types of the same test were devised: a reading task for one class and a reading and listening task for the other in each grade. Surprisingly, there was no particular difference in the performances between the classes which used tapes and those which did not. So this time, only the written task was used. The pictures were also removed based on the feedback from the students. Also the order of the options was arranged more arbitrarily, because it was pointed out that students are sensitive to consistent pattern when making choices.

The verbs were divided into two types: Type A verbs were alternating dative verbs such as give, buy, send, make, tell, show, teach, and write; Type B verbs were non-alternating verbs, such as open, cut, shout, and explain. The choice doesn't affect grammaticality in case of type A verbs, whereas it does in case of type B verbs. That is, type B verbs only allow the PD structures in English, while type A verbs allow both the PD and DOD structures.

The subjects were asked to select one of the dative sentences which they felt more familiar with and easier to understand and produce. The task was administered to Korean learners of English at different proficiency (age) levels.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 3 represents the overall frequency of the PD/DOD selection with alternating verbs. The results apparently show that subjects generally preferred the PD constructions for the alternating (PD or DOD) verbs.

TABLE 3

PD/DOD preferences with alternating (type A) verbs

Verb	Preference	N(%)	Verb	Preference	N(%)
Give	PD	352(67.6)	tell	PD	337(64.7)
	DOD	169(32.4)		DOD	184(35.3)
Buy	PD	381(73)	show	PD	348(66.8)
	DOD	141(27)		DOD	173(33.2)
Send	PD	369(70.8)	teach	PD	393(75.6)
	DOD	152(29.2)		DOD	127(24.4)
Make	PD	362(69.3)	write	PD	403(77.2)
	DOD	160(30.7)		DOD	119(22.8)

(The items with no response were excluded from this analysis.)

Although the overall preference rate for the PD has somewhat decreased in this study compared with that in Moon (2003), similar pattern was observed. That is, the learners showed preference for the PD structure to the DOD for every verb with no exception. The slight drop in the preference rate for the PD is probably because higher age groups and native speakers were included in this study.

Table 4 represents the overall frequency of the PD/DOD selection with the PD-only construction. For these non-alternating verbs, the PD construction was even more strongly preferred. For every verb, the percentage of PD selected with Type B verbs was all higher than 70%. It may be inferred that the students are somewhat aware of the fact that these verbs only allow the PD structure.

TABLE 4

PD/DOD preferences with non-alternating (type B) verbs

Verb	Preference	N(%)	Verb	Preference	N(%)
Open	PD	378(72.4)	cut	PD	395(75.8)
	DOD	144(27.6)		DOD	126(24.2)
Shout	PD	372(71.3)	explain	PD	397(76.2)
	DOD	150(28.7)		DOD	124(23.8)

Next, to find out which of the two dative constructions each age group (elementary school/middle school/high school/university students) prefer for each verb, the chi-square analysis was done, which is illustrated in Table 5 and Table 6.

As shown in Table 5 (Type A verbs) and Table 6 (Type B verbs), Korean students show strong preference for the PD for both Type A and Type B verbs. It's interesting to note that, on the other hand, the English native speakers showed strong preference for the DOD for every verb except for the verb 'make'. They said they chose DOD more often because they generally preferred shorter forms unless they needed to emphasize a certain NP. Some native professors also mentioned that the PD/DOD preferences vary according to the types of NPs (full NPs/pronouns) used for the direct and indirect objects. Unlike the native speakers, the percentage of DOD selection for Korean learners of English remained quite low across every age group.

TABLE 5

Percentage of PD/DOD sentences selected with type A verbs by SCHOOL (ES/MS/HS/U/NS)

Verb		School N(%)					Value	df	Sig.
		ES	MS	HS	U	NS			
give	PD	67(50.8)	104(70.7)	106(85.5)	72(66.7)	3(30.0)	42.340(a)	4	.000
	DOD	65(49.2)	43(29.3)	18(14.5)	36(33.3)	7(70.0)			
buy	PD	78(59.1)	108(73)	112(90.3)	80(74.1)	3(30.0)	41.268(a)	4	.000
	DOD	54(40.9)	40(27)	12(9.7)	28(25.9)	7(70.0)			
send	PD	75(56.8)	110(74.3)	101(81.5)	79(73.8)	4(40.0)	25.253(a)	4	.000
	DOD	57(43.2)	38(25.7)	23(18.5)	28(26.2)	6(60.0)			
make	PD	68(51.5)	104(70.3)	109(87.9)	74(68.5)	7(70.0)	39.929(a)	4	.000
	DOD	64(48.5)	44(29.7)	15(12.1)	34(31.5)	3(30.0)			
tell	PD	67(50.8)	98(66.2)	98(79.0)	71(66.4)	3(30.0)	27.931(a)	4	.000
	DOD	65(49.2)	50(33.8)	26(21.0)	36(33.6)	7(70.0)			
show	PD	68(51.5)	98(66.2)	104(83.9)	76(71.0)	2(20.0)	40.959(a)	4	.000
	DOD	64(48.5)	50(33.8)	20(16.1)	31(29.0)	8(80.0)			
teach	PD	96(72.7)	107(72.3)	103(83.1)	85(80.2)	2(20.0)	23.165(a)	4	.000
	DOD	36(27.3)	41(27.7)	21(16.9)	21(19.8)	8(80.0)			
write	PD	84(63.6)	110(74.3)	110(88.7)	96(88.9)	3(30.0)	44.869(a)	4	.000
	DOD	48(36.4)	38(25.7)	14(11.3)	12(11.1)	7(70.0)			

All the verbs except for the verb 'shout' showed significant difference in PD/DOD preference within each group as illustrated in Table 5 and Table 6. In other words, for most verbs the difference in PD/DOD preference rate within each school group was statistically significant. In case of the verb 'give', far more students preferred the PD over the DOD within middle school (70.7%), high school (85.5%), and university group (66.7%), whereas within elementary school group (50.8%), the difference in preference for the PD was less clear. The elementary school students do not seem to have developed clear preference for the PD or the DOD yet.

TABLE 6

Percentage of PD/DOD sentences selected with type B verbs by SCHOOL (ES/MS/HS/U/NS)

Verb		School N(%)					Value	df	Sig.
		ES	MS	HS	U	NS			
open	PD	66(50.0)	104(70.3)	108(87.1)	90(83.3)	10(100)	57.175(a)	4	.000
	DOD	66(50.0)	44(29.7)	16(12.9)	18(16.7)	0(0.0)			
cut	PD	81(61.4)	99(67.3)	112(90.3)	94(87.0)	9(90.0)	43.533(a)	4	.000
	DOD	51(38.6)	48(32.7)	12(9.7)	14(13.0)	1(10.0)			
shout	PD	89(67.4)	97(65.5)	102(82.3)	75(69.4)	9(90.0)	12.526(a)	4	.014
	DOD	43(32.6)	51(34.5)	22(17.7)	33(30.6)	1(10.0)			
explain	PD	95(72.0)	98(66.7)	106(85.5)	88(81.5)	10(100)	19.347(a)	4	.001
	DOD	37(28.0)	49(33.3)	18(14.5)	20(18.5)	0(0.0)			

According to Table 6, as the students advance to higher grade, it seems that they are able to distinguish between alternating and non-alternating verbs much better. For every Type B verb, which allows only PD structure, high school, university and native speakers predominantly chose PD structure. On the other hand, the PD preference rate was less obvious in case of elementary and middle school student.

It is generally agreed that the PD form is the unmarked or typical case. That is, the PD form can occur freely with verbs with a suitable meaning, whereas the distribution of the DOD form is more restricted. For example, if we replace the verb 'give' with 'donate' the result is grammatical in the PD form but not for the DOD. Based on the distributional facts, the PD form is considered as unmarked and the DOD form as marked, and, it is generally accepted that unmarked forms are acquired earlier (Goodluck, 1991). It may be argued that strong preference for the PD form would lead to more productive use of that form and consequently to a wider range of distribution.

In sum, the overall results of the PD/DOD preference task showed that Korean students strongly preferred the PD construction for both alternating and non-alternating verbs, which implies that Korean students felt the PD sentences are easier and more familiar to them. From this result, it may be predicted that Korean learners of English will show an ordering relation in which they consistently acquire one type of dative construction before the other and that more easily. That is, the PD structure would be acquired earlier than the DOD structure in L2 acquisition. This is theoretically supported by the fact that the PD is the unmarked structure in Korean (L1) (Shibatani, 1977; Kang, 1986; O'Grady, 1991; Lee, D., 1997). This suggests that evidence based on the acquisition of dative constructions in English by Korean learners of English provides support for the UG-based markedness theory, in which the unmarked structure, [_ NP PP], which are assumed to be part of core grammar, will be acquired before the marked one, [_ NP NP]. The result of this study may lead to prediction that development will proceed in order from the PD to the DOD.

However, the analysis on the dative sentences presented in current elementary and middle school English textbooks (Appendix 2) showed no consistent ordering relation introducing the PD and DOD constructions. Also, there was no systematic PD/DOD difference in distribution regarding frequency. How frequently the verbs were used in the PD or the DOD construction was arbitrary dependent upon each verb. The analysis suggests that more dative example sentences be included in the elementary school English text books.

V. CONCLUSION

The overall results of PD/DOD preference task revealed that Korean learners of English strongly preferred the PD constructions for both alternating and non-alternating dative verbs in every age group. The results were generally consistent with those from Moon (2003). Korean students felt that the PD sentences were easier and more familiar to them, which may lead to the prediction that they could learn and use the PD constructions more easily and productively. These findings seem to support the position that the PD is the underlying (unmarked) structure, and consequently support the markedness theory, both UG-based and typological: the PD sentences are acquired before the DOD sentences when Korean students learn dative constructions in English.

The analysis of the English textbooks showed that there was no consistent pattern as to the distribution of PD/DOD constructions for each verb, nor was there any order in introducing these two structures.

Thus, the results of the present study seem to suggest that it would be better to present the PD structures before the DOD structures to Korean learners of English. Furthermore, it is suggested that more dative verbs be introduced earlier in the English text books since dative verbs occur very early and frequently in the child language development both in the L1 and L2.

Concerning future research of the ordering relations between PD and DOD constructions, it is suggested that we consider whether the direct or indirect objects are full NPs or pronouns, and examine the discourse function related perspectives on the acquisition of dative structures.

REFERENCES

Aoun, J., & Li, Y. (1989). Scope and constituency. *Linguistic Inquiry, 20,* 141-172.

Berent, G. (1990). *Relative clause learnability: Second language and deaf learner data.* Paper presented at the 24th Annual Convention of TESOL, San Francisco, CA.

Chaudron, C., & Parker, K. (1990). Discourse markedness and structural markedness: The acquisition of English noun phrases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12,* 43-64.

Chomsky, N. (1981). Markedness and core grammar. In A. Belletti & L. Rizzi (Eds.), *Theory of markedness in generative grammar* (pp. 123-146). Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.

Cook, V. (1976). A note on indirect objects. *Journal of Child Language, 3,* 435-437.

Eckman, F. R., Bell, L., & Nelson, D. (1988). On the generalization of relative clause

instruction in the acquisition of English as a second language. *Applied Linguistics, 9* (1), 1-20.

Fillmore, C. (1965). *Indirect object constructions in English and the ordering of transformations*. The Hague: Mouton and Co.

Fisher, S. (1971). *The acquisition of verb-particle and dative constructions.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. MIT. Cambridge, Mass.

Goodluck, H. (1991). *Language acquisition: A linguistic introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Gropen, J., Pinker, S., Hollander, M., Goldberg, R., & Wilson, R. (1989). The learnability and acquisition of the dative alternation in English. *Language, 65,* 203-257.

Hawkins, R. (1987). Markedness and the acquisition of the English dative alternation by L2 speakers. *Second Language Research, 2,* 20-55.

Kang, Young-Se. (1986). *Korean syntax and universal grammar*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Harvard University. Cambridge, Mass.

Kao, R. (1990). *A lexical approach to language acquisition: A study of the acquisition of Chinese dative movement and bei-passives by second language learners.* Manuscript. University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Kim, Choon-Kyong. (1996). *Native and nonnative speakers' syntactic knowledge of English dative verbs assessed in grammaticality judgments and multiple choice tests*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.

Kim, Hee-Sook & Moon, Eun-Joo. (1997). The subset principle in L1 and L2 acquisition: The acquisition of reflexives by Korean learners of English. *Foreign Language Teaching, 3,* 1-25, Korea National University of Education.

Kim, Hee-Sook. (1987). *Typological approach to language universals and language transfer in second language acquisition: Language typology of word order.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Texas at Austin.

Larson, R. (1988). On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry, 19,* 335-391.

Le Compagnon, B. (1984). Interference and overgeneralization in second language learning: The acquisition of English dative verbs by native speakers of French. *Language Learning, 34,* 39-67.

Lee, Dong-Han. (1997). *Acquisition of dative alternation in English by second language learners*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of South Carolina.

Lee, Eun-Hee. (2007). Teaching English articles by learners' proficiency levels. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 13*(4), 109-126.

Mazurkewich, I. (1984). The acquisition of the dative alternation by second language learners and linguistic theory. *Language Learning, 34,* 91-109.

Mazurkewich, I. (1985a). Syntactic markedness and language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7,* 15-36.

Mazurkewich, I. (1985b). Exchange: In reply to Kellerman: A response from Mazurkewich. *Language Learning, 35,* 103-106.

McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories of second-language learning.* New York: Edward Arnold.

Meisel, J., Clahsen, H., & Pienemann, M. (1981). On determining developmental stages in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 3*(2), 109-135.

Moon, Eun-Joo. (2003). *Acquisition of argument structures in L1 and L2 by Korean learners of English: With special reference to dative constructions.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Korea National University of Education.

Mulder, R. (1992). *The aspectual nature of syntactic complementation.* Leiden University, Holland Institute of Generative Linguistics.

O'Grady, W. (1991). *Categories and case: The sentence structure of Korean (Current issues in Linguistic Theory 71).* Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Osgood, C., & Zehler, A. (1981). Acquisition of ditransitive sentences: Prelinguistic determinants of language acquisition. *Journal of Child Language, 8,* 367-384.

Pesetsky, D. (1995). *Zero syntax. Vol. 1, Experiencers and cascades.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Roeper, T., Lapionte, S., Bing, J., & Tavakolian, S. (1981). A lexical approach to language acquisition. In S. Tavakolian (Ed.), *Language acquisition and linguistic theory* (pp. 35-58). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Sawyer, M. (1995). *Learnability, teachability, and argument structure: Adult Japanese learner's acquisition of the English dative alternation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Shibatini, M. (1977). Grammatical relations and surface cases. *Language, 53,* 789-809.

Snyder, W., & Stromswold, K. (1997). The structure and acquisition of English dative constructions. *Linguistic Inquiry, 28,* 281-317.

Tanaka, S. (1987). The selective use of specific exemplars in second language performance: The case of dative alternation. *Language Learning, 37,* 63-88.

Wexler, K., & Manzini, M. (1987). Parameters and learnability on binding theory. In T. Roeper & E. Williams (Eds.), *Parameter setting* (pp. 41-76). Dordrecht: Reidel.

White, L. (1987a). Children's overgeneralizations of the dative alternation. In K. Nelson & A. V. Kleek (Eds.), *Children's Language, Vol. 6* (pp. 261-287). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

White, L. (1987b). Markedness and second language acquisition: The question of transfer. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9,* 261-286.

White, L. (1989). *Universal grammar and second language acquisition.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wilson, R., Pinker, S., Zaenen, A., & Leveaux, D. (1981). *Productivity and the dative alternation.* Paper presented at the 6th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development, Boston, Mass.

Wolfe-Quintero, K. (1992a) Learnability and the acquisition and universal grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 14,* 39-70.

Wolfe-Quintero, K. (1992b). *The representation and acquisition of the lexical studies of native speakers and Japanese and Chinese adult learners of English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Appendix 1

Preference Task

Class: Name:

• 다음 영어 표현 a와b 중에서 어느 것이 더 쉽게 이해되고 익숙하게 느껴지는지 하나를 고르세요. (For Korean learners of English)

• Which sentence would you prefer to use between choice a and b? Please choose one sentence in each pair that you think is used more often and sounds more natural. (For native speakers)

1. a. James gave a book to Ann.
   b. James gave Ann a book.

2. a. James bought Julie some flowers.
   b. James bought some flowers for Julie.

3. a. James sent Mrs. Royse a letter.
   b. James sent a letter to Mrs. Royse.

4. a. James made his brother a snowman.
   b. James made a snowman for his brother.

5. a. James told a funny story to Bill.
   b. James told Bill a funny story.

6. a. James showed Eric a rabbit.
   b. James showed a rabbit to Eric.

7. a. Mrs. Royse taught English to Nami.
   b. Mrs. Royse taught Nami English.

8. a. James wrote a letter to Peter.
   b. James wrote Peter a letter.

9. a. James opened John the door.
   b. James opened the door for John.

10. a. Mom cut Julie the cake.
    b. Mom cut the cake for Julie.

11. a. Tom shouted the news to Ann.
    b. Tom shouted Ann the news.

12. a. Michael explained James this.
    b. Michael explained this to James.

♥ Thank you very much. ♥

Appendix 2

Dative Constructions within National Curriculum for Elementary and Middle School English Textbooks

▶ Dative structures from the sample sentences with communicative functions in Korea's 7th National Curriculum for English

<Activities related to meeting other people>
① Greetings: Please give my regards to your parents.
② Introduction: Let me introduce myself (to you).
③ Introduction: I'd like to introduce my friend to you.
<Persuasion and advice>

④ Request: Would you do me a favor?
⑤ Request: Could you give me a hand?
<Problem solving>
⑥ Cause and effect: Can you tell me the reason why you said so?
⑦ Giving directions: Could you show me the way to Seoul Station?

▶ Dative structures from the sample linguistic forms (grammatical sentences) with communicative functions in Korea's 7th National Curriculum for English

① (4) Mary hasn't told him what to do.
② (6) Could you show me the way to the nearest post office?
③ (6) Would you please pass me the salt?
④ (25) Please tell me what happened.
⑤ (25) Tell me how to make pizza.
⑥ (30) It was John who/that told me the truth.
⑦ (37) He gave me a present.

▶ According to the word list in the National Curriculum, dative verbs such as *give, buy, make, send, show, teach, write, open, cut, tell, push, shout, drive,* and *say* are encouraged to be used by elementary school students. But, hardly any of them was used in dative structures. The verbs were used as follows.

① Let's *make* a snowman.
② I want to *make* a card.
③ Let's *talk* about our show.
④ *Teach* was used as a noun, 'teacher' and *drive* was used as a noun, 'driver'.

▶ The analysis of dative structures in middle school text books:
Dative sentences in 13 different middle school text books were analyzed based on grade (1st year and 2nd year), lesson and frequency of occurrence.

① TELL – In the 1st year, the dative verb was used only in the DOD, and in the 2nd year, the PD sentences appeared but not as many times as in the DOD sentences.
② GIVE – In the 1st year, the DOD occurred before the PD. In the 2nd year, the similar pattern was shown, but there were only a few PD sentences.
③ MAKE – In the 1st year, the verb was used 4 times in the DOD and 8 times in the PD, and there were more PD sentences in the 2nd year text books.
④ SEND – In the 1st year, the verb was used 3 times in the DOD whereas 6 times in the PD, and in the 2nd year, it occurred 10 times in the PD and 14 times in the DOD.

⑤ BUY – The PD/DOD structures occurred with similar frequency in both grades.
⑥ REPORT – This verb occurred in the PD in only one of the text books.
⑦ TEACH – The verb was used in the DOD structure first and more often. It was used in the PD only two times in one of the text books.
⑧ INTRODUCE – This verb was used only in the PD structure.
⑨ WRITE – Both in the 1st and 2nd year, the verb occurred in the PD, and it occurred in the DOD only 2 times in total.
⑩ SHOW – This verb occurred twice in the DOD form at the end of the 2nd year.
⑪ LEND – In the 1st year, the verb occurred only once in the DOD structure, and in the 2nd year, it appeared 3 times in the DOD and once in the PD structure.
⑫ OPEN – The verb was used in the PD structure 2 times.
⑬ THROW – The verb occurred in the PD in the 1st year, and once in the DOD in the 2nd year.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Elementary/ Secondary/College

Eun-Joo Moon
Liberal Arts Education Center
Paichai University
14 Yeonja 1 Gil, Seo-gu, Daejeon, 302-735, Korea
Tel: (042) 520-5930
Fax: (042) 520-5886
Email: ejm1002@pcu.ac.kr

Received in July, 2008
Reviewed in August, 2008
Revised version received in September, 2008