English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. ***15***, No. 2 Summer 2009

Adjective Ordering: Contrastive Analysis and Interlanguage

Woo-hyun Jung
(Yeungnam University)

Jung, Woo-hyun. (2008). Adjective ordering: Contrastive analysis and interlanguage. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *15*(2), 121-150.

This paper deals with contrastive analysis and interlanguage with respect to adjective ordering. It aimed to investigate how similar and different the orders of descriptive adjectives are in English and Korean, and how Korean EFL learners perceive the sequences of English descriptive adjectives. Data were collected from native English speakers and native Korean speakers and Korean EFL learners. The contrastive analysis showed that the order of English adjectives was size, opinion, condition, age, color, shape, material, and origin, whereas the Korean order was condition, age, opinion, color, size, shape, material, and origin. The relative order of the interlanguage was shown to be age, size, opinion, shape, condition, color, origin, and material, with the exceptions of the order of condition preceding age and that of size being the same position as condition. The interlanguage data manifested different aspects of ordering when compared with English and Korean: Some adjective combinations were similar to both English and Korean; Some were different from English or Korean; Some were different from both English and Korean. These ordering patterns are discussed in terms of such principles as the nouniness principle, the subjectivity/objectivity principle, the iconic principle, etc. On the basis of these results, some helpful suggestions are made.

[adjective ordering/contrastive analysis/interlanguage]

I. INTRODUCTION

Word order has long been an important issue in the research of English and Korean (Greenberg, 1966; Kim, 2004; Kim & Dammers, 2008; Oh, 2006; Wulff, 2003). English is an SVO language, while Korean is an SOV language. The difference in this basic word order leads to assume that there may be some differences in the order of adjectives when more than one adjective is juxtaposed. Much attention has been paid to English adjective ordering (Byrd, 1992; Frank, 1972; Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985), but little

research is available on Korean adjective ordering. Though Oh (2006) presented an analysis of adjective ordering in Korean and Japanese, her study focused on the order of an adjective in relation to a noun rather than that of two or more adjectives. Lesser attention still has been drawn to L2 learners' patterns of adjective ordering.

This study deals with contrastive analysis and interlanguage[1] with respect to adjective ordering. The purpose of the study is two-fold: a) to analyze how similar and different the orders of descriptive adjectives are in English and Korean; b) to investigate how Korean EFL learners perceive the order of English descriptive adjectives. This study focuses on descriptive adjectives, excluding other premodifiers like possessives, numerals, demonstratives, etc. This study also limited its scope to unbroken strings with no conjunction between adjectives. It is important to note that adjective orders in this study are not based on prescriptive rules but on those emerging from the responses of native speakers on the one hand and EFL learners on the other.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For several decades, a number of studies have been carried out on the order of adjectives in English. The ordering patterns drawn from some major studies are listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Previous Studies on Adjective Ordering

Researchers	Adjective ordering
Frank (1972)	general description (derivational endings) + physical state (size, shape, age, color) + proper adjectives (nationality)
Bailey (1975)	evaluation + measurement + coloration + material
Praninskas (1975)	Opinion + size + shape + condition + age + color + origin
Clark & Clark (1977)	Opinion + size + age + shape + color + original + material
Crystal (1982)	size + age + color + nationality + material
Quirk et al. (1985)	precentral (emphasizers, amplifiers) + central (nonderived + deverbal + denominal) + postcentral (participles, color) + prehead (nationality)
Sproat & Shih (1991)	quality + size + shape + color + provenance
Byrd (1992)	quality + size + age + temperature + shape + color + origin

[1] Interlanguage refers to the separateness of a second language learner's system, a system that has structurally intermediate status between the native and target languages (Brown, 2000).

As shown above, there are different views on adjective ordering among researchers. These ordering patterns are not comparable mainly because different semantic categories of adjectives were employed in different studies.

Attempts have been made to investigate factors which determine the preference in adjective order in English. One of them was the notion of generality. Frank (1972) stated that adjective order is determined by generality of adjectives: Adjectives with more general application precede those that are more specific. In other words, adjectives that can be used with the greatest number of nouns always come first. The problem here is that it is not easy to determine which adjective describes a greater or more limited number of items than another adjective. Frank (1972) further argued that sometimes the length of the descriptive adjective determines the order, usually a shorter adjective preceding a longer one. Though this is intuitively appealing, no empirical results are available for this argument (Wulff, 2003).

Another determinant of adjective ordering was so-called the nouniness principle (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan, 1999; Posner, 1986), which held that most noun-like modifiers tend to occur closer to the head noun than less noun-like ones. For instance, adjectives of color are placed relatively near to the head noun since they are more easily used as objects. In addition, the variable of comparison-dependency influences the relative order of adjectives (Posner, 1986). That is, adjectives which are less dependent on comparison are placed nearer to the head noun than those which are more dependent. For example, adjective *square* is less dependent on comparison than adjective *tall*, in that what is square is easily identifiable without comparison, whereas who is tall requires comparison of the heights of the persons in question (Wulff, 2003).

Some linguists (Richards, 1977) approached adjective ordering in terms of affective loading: Positively assigned adjectives precede negatively assigned adjectives, as in the preference of *a bright dirty room* over *a dirty bright room*. This principle was substantiated by Wulff's (2003) corpus analysis, which showed that positively loaded adjectives marginally significantly more often precede negatively loaded adjectives than vice versa. However, this principle does not seem to do justice to all different semantic categories of adjectives, only providing a general tendency in affection-related types of adjectives.

Probably the most widely held principle was a subjectivity/objectivity polarity (Quirk et al., 1985). According to this principle, modifiers relating to properties which are inherent in the head of the noun phrase, visually observable, and objectively recognizable or assessable, will tend to be placed nearer to the head and be preceded by modifiers concerned with what is relatively a matter of opinion, imposed on the head by the observer, not visually observed and only subjectively assessable (Quirk et al., 1985).

The ordering of adjectives has also been claimed to be influenced by the general frequency of the adjective (Bock, 1982; Wulff, 2003). That is, more frequent adjectives

precede less frequent ones, or common items occur before rare ones (Quirk et al., 1985). Ney (1983) went one step further to claim that if two adjectives are equally frequent, the difference in familiarity of the two adjectives would determine the ordering. In connection with this claim, Wulff (2003) provided some examples of preferred orderings, together with their corpus frequency: *strong* (15,898) *brown* (3,908) bags; *big* (24,684) *cold* (6,438) lakes.

Recently, Yoo (2004) analyzed the orders of English adjectives in a cognitive perspective and demonstrated that they may be effectively explained by the principle of iconicity, which consists of three sub-principles: a) sequential order principle which claims that the sequential order of events described is mirrored in the speech chain.; b) proximity principle, which says that conceptual distance tends to match with linguistic distance; c) quantity principle, which holds that formal complexity corresponds to conceptual complexity. These iconic principles, according to Yoo (2004), cover the previously discussed principles such as length variable and subjectivity/objectivity polarity. For instance, the principle that the more subjective adjectives come farther from the head noun and the more objective adjectives stand closer to it reflects the iconic proximity, which indicates that conceptual distance tends to match with linguistic distance. In this respect, the principles or variables influencing the adjective order are not mutually exclusive but rather interact with each other in one way or another.

II. METHOD

1. Participants

The participants consisted of a total of 324. They were divided into two groups: for native English speaker data; for both Korean and interlanguage data. The native English speaker data were collected from 148 native English speakers (57 males; 91 females). Most were students in two universities, one in Indiana, the other in California, while some were American instructors teaching English in Korea. Their majors were various, ranging from English to engineering.

The remaining 176 were Korean students who provided both the Korean data and the interlanguage data (16 males; 160 females). They were English majors in a university or nursing majors who were taking an English course at a college. Most of them were lower-level students in terms of educational level (85 freshmen, 79 sophomores, 11 juniors, and 4 seniors). They had been studying English since middle school. Relatively speaking, they had a significant amount of grammar knowledge. Only six of them had been to English speaking countries to study English.

2. Instrument

Data were collected based on a questionnaire survey. There were two versions of the questionnaire (see Appendix): One was an English version for the collection of the English native speaker data and the interlanguage data; The other was a Korean version for the collection of the Korean data. The two versions were equivalent in content.

The questionnaire consisted of 28 questions, each having a pair of different combinations of two adjectives belonging to different semantic categories. The combinations of two adjectives followed the claim that sequences of more than three adjectives seldom occur in speech or writing and that two-adjective sequences are the most typical ones (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999; Wulff, 2003). Since this study focused on descriptive adjectives, the questionnaire included a total of eight semantic categories: opinion, size, shape, condition, age, color, material, and origin. This was based on Praninskas's (1975) categorization with some modification, since his categories involved descriptive adjectives.

It is important to note that in the Korean version, genitive marker *uy*, corresponding to English's, was optional in some items, for instance, items 7 and 13. In other words, some people use the marker, while others do not, in such cases. Thus, the genitive marker, if optional, was placed in parenthesis so that the participants can use or drop it, depending on their own actual use.

3. Procedure and Data Analysis

The American participants were given only the English version of the questionnaire, whereas the Korean participants were given two kinds of questionnaires: one for the Korean data; the other for the interlanguage data. The participants, both American and Korean, were asked to choose the more natural and appropriate order of two options. They were given enough time so that they could be free to fill out the questionnaire.

Data were analyzed according to different combinations of adjectives. If there was no consensus on adjective ordering even among native speakers in the two languages, the analysis was based on a more dominant order - the option chosen by a more proportion of native speakers.

III. RESULTS

It seems reasonable to provide a contrastive analysis of adjective order in English and Korean first and the learners' ordering patterns next.

1. Contrastive Analysis

1) Similarities

There were many combinations of adjectives which revealed similarities between English and Korean. One of them is the category of origin when it is juxtaposed with the other categories, as shown in the following.

(1) opinion + origin
a. This is a convenient Japanese computer. (148; 100%)
b. This is a Japanese convenient computer. (0; 0%)
(1') a. ikes-un phyenlihan ilce(uy) khemphyuthe-ida.
this-TOP[2] convenient Japanese(GEN) computer-be (176; 100%)
b. ikes-un ilce(uy) phyenlihan khemphyuthe-ida. (0; 0%)

(2) size + origin
a. This is a small American radio. (148; 100%)
b. This is an American small radio. (0; 0%)
(2') a. ikes-un cakun mice(uy) ladio-ida.
this-TOP samll American radio-be (152; 86.4%)
b. ikes-un mice(uy) cakun ladio-ida. (24; 13.6%)

(3) shape + origin
a. This is a round Japanese vase. (133; 89.8%)
b. This is a Japanese round vase. (15; 10.1%)
(3') a. ikes-un tungkun ilce(uy) kkospyeng-ida.
this-TOP round Japanese vase (132; 75%)
b. ikes-un ilce(uy) tungkun kkospyeng-ida. (44; 25%)

(4) condition + origin
a. This is broken Japanese mirror. (139; 93.9%)
b. This is Japanese broken mirror. (9; 6.1%)
(4') a. ikes-un kkaycin ilce(uy) kewul-ida.
this-TOP broken Japanese mirror-be (176; 100%)
b. ikes-un ilce(uy) kkaycin kewul-ida. (0; 0%)

[2] Abbreviations used in this paper: TOP = Topic Marker; GEN = Genitive Marker

(5) age + origin
a. This is a new American computer. (148; 100%)
b. This is an American new computer. (0; 0%)
(5') a. ikes-un say mice(uy) khemphyuthe-ida.
this-TOP new American computer-be (158; 89.8%)
b. ikes-un mice(uy) say khemphyuthe-ida. (18; 10.2%)

(6) color + origin
a. This is a red Japanese car. (148; 100%)
b. This is a Japanese red car. (0; 0%)
(6') a. ikes-un ppalkan ilce(uy) cha-ida.
this-TOP red Japanese car-be (159; 90.3%)
b. ikes-un ilce(uy) ppalkan cha-ida. (17; 9.7%)

(7) material + origin
a. This is a plastic American toy. (148; 100%)
b. This is an American plastic toy. (0; 0%)
(7') a. ikes-un phulasthik(uy) mice(uy) cangnankam-ida.
this-TOP plastic American toy-be (123; 69.9%)
b. ikes-un mice(uy) phulasthik(uy) cangnankam-ida. (53; 30.1%)

In both English and Korean, the category of origin follows the other categories such as opinion in (1) and (1'), size in (2) and (2'), shape in (3) and (3'), condition in (4) and (4'), age in (5) and (5'), color in (6) and (6'), and material in (7) and (7'). Unlike the Korean data, many combined sets manifested no variation among the native English speakers: opinion + origin; size + opinion; age + origin; color + origin; material + origin. However, only one combined set (condition + origin) revealed a consensus among the Korean speakers. The combined set which revealed the greatest variation above was the juxtaposition of material and origin in Korean: All of the native English speakers agreed on the order of material preceding origin, whereas the Korean speakers showed a disagreement, 70 percent favoring the order of material preceding origin but about 30 percent favoring the reverse order. This variation among the native Korean speakers may be in part due to the fact that in Korean the category of material and that of origin are used as if they were compound nouns with few attributes of adjectives. As Quirk et al. (1985) pointed out, they are the least adjectival and most nominal premodifiers. According to the nouniness principle, these denominal adjectives are placed nearest to the head noun. These orders are also in keeping with Frank's (1972) point that the order of modifiers just before the head noun is usually fixed - the noun adjuncts come closest to the head noun, then

come proper adjectives including nationality. Since the most noun-like adjectives are more objective than central adjectives, the orders regarding origin adjectives are in line with the subjectivity/objectivity principle. The principle that the subjective item is farthest from the head noun and the objective item, closest to the head ultimately reflects the iconic proximity that conceptual distance tends to match with linguistic distance.

The next category closer to the head noun in both English and Korean is material. This is placed after all categories except the category of origin, as shown in the following examples.

(8) opinion + material
a. This is a luxurious brick house. (148; 100%)
b. This is a brick luxurious house. (0; 0%)
(8') a. ikes-un sachisulewun pyektol(uy) cip-ida.
this-TOP luxurious brick house-be (176; 100%)
b. ikes-un pyektol(uy) sachisulewun cip-ida. (0; 0%)

(9) size + material
a. This is a big gold watch. (148; 100%)
b. This is a gold big watch. (0; 0%)
(9') a. ikes-un khun kum(uy) sikye-ida.
this-TOP big gold watch (176; 100%)
b. ikes-un khum(uy) kun sikye-ida. (0; 0%)

(10) shape + material
a. This is an oblong wooden box. (82; 55.4%)
b. This is a wooden oblong box. (66; 44.6%)
(10') a. ikes-un ciksakakhyeng(uy) namwu(uy) sangca-ida.
this-TOP oblong wooden box (176; 100%)
b. ikes-un namwu(uy) ciksakakhyeng(uy) sangca-ida. (0; 0%)

(11) condition + material
a. This is a bent metal spring. (148; 100%)
b. This is a metal bent spring. (0; 0%)
(11') a. ikes-un whuyecin kumsok(uy) yongswuchel-ida.
this-TOP bent metal spring-be (176; 100%)
b. ikes-un kumsok(uy) whuyecin yongswuchel-ida. (0; 0%)

(12) age + material

a. This is an old iron hanger. (148; 100%)

b. This is an iron old hanger. (0; 0%)

(12') a. ikes-un olaytoyn soy(uy) oskeli-ida.
this-TOP old iron hanger-be (176; 100%)

b. ikes-un soy(uy) olaytoyn oskeli-ida. (0; 0%)

(13) color + material

a. This is a black plastic watch. (106; 71.6%)

b. This is a plastic black watch. (42; 28.4%)

(13') a. ikes-un kkaman phulasthik(uy) sikye-ida.
this-TOP black plastic watch (176; 100%)

b. ikes-un phulasthik(uy) kkaman sikye-ida. (0; 0%)

All of the Korean speakers reached a consensus on the order of material following opinion, size, shape, condition, age, or color. However, the English speakers revealed variations on the order of shape and material and that of color and material. Nevertheless, the overall tendency was that the category of material follows other categories such as opinion, size, shape, condition, age, or color in both languages. As in the category of origin, the ordering regarding material can be accounted for in terms of the subjectivity/objectivity principle, the nouniness principle, and the iconic proximity, in that an item, which is objectively recognizable and represents attributes of nouns, is placed nearer to the head noun than an item which is not. These orders, together with the ordering regarding origin, can also be accounted for in terms of the principle of comparison-dependency. For instance, in example (8), *brick* is less dependent on comparison than *luxurious*: *more luxurious* vs. **more brick*.[3] Material adjectives are hardly used with a comparative structure, and the same is true for origin adjectives.

These principles also seem to be applicable to the category of color when it is juxtaposed with opinion, age or shape in both languages.

(14) opinion + color

a. This is a beautiful white dress. (148; 100%)

b. This is a white beautiful house. (0; 0%)

(14') a. ikes-un alumtawun whuyn tulesu-ida.
this-TOP beautiful white dress-be (167; 94.8%)

b. ikes-un whuyn alumtawun tulesu-ida. (9; 5.1%)

[3] The asterisk indicates that this pattern is not acceptable.

(15) age + color
a. These are old red shirts. (148; 100%)
b. These are red old shirts. (0; 0%)
(15') a. ikes-un nalkun ppalkan shyechu-ida.
this-TOP old red shirts-be (167; 94.9%)
b. ikes-un ppalkan nalkun shyechu-ida. (9; 5.1%)

(16) color + shape
a. This is an oblong red box. (64; 43.2%)
b. This is a red oblong box. (85; 57.4%)
(16') a. ikes-un ciksakakhyeng(uy) ppalkan sangca-ida.
this-TOP oblong red box-be (71; 40.3%)
b. ikes-un ppalkan ciksakakhyeng(uy) sangca-ida. (105; 59.7%)

If a color adjective is juxtaposed with a central adjective, the former tends to follow the latter. Thus, color follows opinion or age, but it precedes shape. In (14) and (14'), whether the dress is beautiful or not can be subjective since people can have different opinions about that. However, whether the dress is white or not can be objectively recognized. This is why color tends to be placed nearer to the head. Similarly, in (15) and (15'), whether the shirts are red or not is more objectively assessable than whether the shirts are old or not.

However, it is not easy to determine the differences in the degree of objectivity between color and shape in examples (16) and (16'). The ordering of these two categories revealed marked variations in both languages probably because both are objectively assessable. This cannot be adequately accounted for in terms of the subjectivity/objectivity principle. Indeed, this flexible order is also observed in the previous studies on English adjective orders. For example, Quirk et al. (1985) classified color and shape in the same zone, that is, postcentral zone and so did Yoo (2004) in his study on English adjective ordering pattern reflecting iconicity. Moreover, color and shape are of noun-like attributes. These characteristics make no clear-cut differences between shape and color. This ordering seems to be more clearly explained in terms of the principle of comparison-dependency since *red* can be used with the comparative, as in *redder*, but *rectangular* cannot. The color adjective, which is more dependent on comparison, is placed farther from the head noun than the shape adjective, which is less dependent.

Let us turn to the category of condition when it is juxtaposed with that of age, color, or shape.

(17) condition + age
a. This is a torn new cloth. (97; 65.5%)
b. This is a new torn cloth. (51; 34.5%)

(17‘) a. ikes-un ccicecin say os-ida.
this-TOP torn new cloth-be (167; 94.9%)
b. ikes-un say ccicecin os-ida. (9; 5.1%)

(18) condition + color
a. This is a torn blue umbrella. (126; 85.1%)
b. This is a blue torn umbrella. (22; 14.9%)
(18’) a. ikes-un ccicecin phalan wusan-ida.
this-TOP torn blue umbrella-be (176; 100%)
b. ikes-un phalan ccicecin wusan-ida. (0; 0%)

(19) condition + shape
a. This is a square chipped rod. (26; 17.6%)
b. This is a chipped square rod. (122; 82.4%)
(19’) a. ikes-un cengsakakhyeng(uy) ccokaycin namwuthomak-ida.
this-TOP square chipped rod-be (43; 24.4%)
b. ikes-un ccokaycin cengsakakhyeng(uy) namwuthomak-ida. (133; 75.6%)

The fact that condition precedes age or color is not congruent with Quirk et al.’s (1985) point that postcentral adjectives such as participles follow central adjectives. This in turn indicates that these orders do not reflect the idea of the iconic principle that human intuition tends to place what is simple (i.e., central adjectives) before what is complex (i.e., participial adjectives). Examples (19) and (19’) revealed variations in the order between condition and shape, probably because it is not easy to determine the differences in the degree of objectivity between shape and condition, both of which are relatively easily identifiable and assessable.

These orders may be determined by originality or uniqueness, i.e., which property is more original and unique. In (17a,b) and their corresponding Korean versions, the cloth was originally new but it was torn later. Likewise, in (18a,b) and their corresponding Korean versions, the umbrella which is blue was torn later. The principle of originality also seems applicable to the last example, the combination between condition and shape, since the rod which is square was chipped later. The adjectives *new*, *blue*, and *square* are preceding properties, whereas *torn* or *chipped* occur later. This shows that, in both English and Korean, items which have more original properties are positioned nearer to the noun than items with no originality.

It is worth observing that in English there are great variations between *a torn new cloth* in (17a) and the reverse order, *a new torn cloth* in (17b). This suggests that even native English speakers had different perceptions about the ordering. Some participants who

supported the order of *new torn cloth*, noted that it can be interpreted as newly torn cloth where *new* modifies the adjective, *torn*, rather than the noun, *cloth*. This example shows that the two sequences have different interpretations. As Quirk et al. (1985) stated, the writers and speakers seem to naturally arrange pre-modification semantically, i.e., according to their communicative intentions.

Let us consider the case where shape is juxtaposed with opinion, size or age.

(20) opinion + shape
a. This is a nice round table. (148; 100%)
b. This is a round nice table. (0; 0%)
(20') a. ikes-un mescin twunkun theipul-ida.
this-TOP nice round table-be (150; 85.2%)
b. ikes-un twunkun mescin theipul-ida. (26; 14.8%)

(21) size + shape
a. This is a small triangular ruler. (148; 100%)
b. This is a triangular small ruler. (0; 0%)
(21') a. ikes-un cakun samkakhyeng(uy) ca-ida.
this-TOP small triangular ruler-be (97; 55.1%)
b. ikes-un samkakhyeng(uy) cakun ca-ida. (79; 44.9%)

(22) age + shape
a. This is a round new gymnasium. (0; 0%)
b. This is a new round gymnasium. (148; 100%)
(22') a. ikes-un twungkun saylowun cheywukkwan-ida.
this-TOP round new gymnasium-be (25; 14.2%)
b. ikes-un saylowun twungkun cheywukkwan-ida. (151; 85.8%)

In both languages, shape is more proximate to the head noun than opinion, size or age is. Adjectives of shape apparently are more objective and of more attributes of nouns than adjectives of opinion, size or age on which people can have more different viewpoints. In this respect, the above examples are adequately accounted for by the principle that the more objective or real the adjective quality is, the closer to the head noun the adjective is placed. This is also in line with the iconic proximity, which suggests that related items or items having similar attributes are placed side by side. Unlike other examples, Korean example (21') exhibits considerable variations, whereas its corresponding English item exhibits no variations. This clearly shows that the order between size and shape in Korean is much looser than in English.

2) Differences

A striking difference in adjective ordering between English and Korean is observed in the category of size when it is juxtaposed with opinion, condition, age, or color.

(23) opinion + size
a. This is a comfortable big chair. (0; 0%)
b. This is a big comfortable chair. (148; 100%)
(23') a. ikes-un anukhan khun uyca-ida.
this-TOP comfortable big chair-be (158; 89.8%)
b. ikes-un khun anukhan uyca-ida. (18; 10.2%)

(24) size + condition
a. These are short worn-out trousers. (89; 60.1%)
b. These are worn-out short trousers. (59; 39.8%)
(24') a. ikes-un ccalpun talhappacin paci-ida.
this-TOP short worn –out trouser-be (13; 7.4%)
b. ikes-un talhappacin ccalpun paci-ida. (163; 92.6%)

(25) size + age
a. This is a tall old building. (111; 75%)
b. This is an old tall building. (37; 25%)
(25') a. ikes-un nophun olaytoyn pilting-ida.
this-TOP tall old building-be (10; 5.7%)
b. ikes-un olaytoyn nophun pilting-ida. (166; 94.3%)

(26) size + color
a. This is long black hair. (148; 100%)
b. This is black long hair. (0; 0%)
(26') a. ikes-un kin kemun meli(khalak)-ida.
this-TOP long black hair-be (72; 40.9%)
b. ikes-un kemun kin meli(khalak)-ida. (104; 59%)

These examples clearly show that size is followed by opinion, condition, age, or color in English, whereas it is preceded by each of them in Korean. Unlike Korean, English combinations between size and opinion and between size and color revealed no variations: The order of size preceding opinion and that of size preceding color are perceived by English speakers to be the only options. English example (23) does not seem to conform to

the subjectivity/objectivity principle, whereas its corresponding Korean ordering does, in that size precedes opinion in English, despite the fact that opinion is the most subjective category (Quirk et al., 1985). English example (24) seems to conform to the claim that central adjectives precede participial adjectives, but this is not true for its corresponding Korean ordering. According to Yoo (2004), the preference in the order among size, age, shape, or color represents great variations in English. This claim is only partially true in that the combination between size and color in English example (24) showed variations, while the combination between size and color in English example (26) manifested no variations. The last example can be accounted for in terms of the notion of generality: Descriptive adjectives with more general application precede those that are more specific. The concept 'long' or 'short' is relative, not absolute: Something can be either long or short, compared with some other things. However, not all things can be black: Things which can be black are limited. In this sense, 'long' is general, whereas 'black' is more specific. Thus, this English example goes from general to specific. In contrast, the Korean ordering goes from specific to general. In addition, the above English examples, except example (25), are accounted for in terms of the length principle, which holds that short words precede long ones. The exactly opposite is true for their corresponding Korean orders.

The length variable, however, does not seem to adequately explain the sharp contrast between opinion and condition and between opinion and age.

(27) opinion + condition

a. This is an expensive broken cup. (104; 70.2%)

b. This is a broken expensive cup. (44; 29.7%)

(27') a. ikes-un pissan kkaycin khep-ida.
this-TOP expensive broken cup-be (0; 0%)

b. ikes-un kkaycin pissan khep-ida.. (176; 100%)

(28) opinion + age

a. This is a magnificent old house. (141; 95.2%)

b. This is an old magnificent house. (7; 4.7%)

(28') a. ikes-un wungcanghan olaytoyn cip-ida.
this-TOP magnificent old house-be (18; 10.2%)

b. ikes-un olaytoyn wungcanghan cip-ida. (158; 89.7%)

Opinion precedes condition or age in English, whereas the opposite is true for Korean in which opinion follows condition or age. The long words precede short ones in English, while the length is identical in the corresponding Korean words. Another principle,

comparison-dependency, also does not adequately account for examples (28) and (28'), because *magnificent* and *old* are dependent on comparison. Viewed in terms of the objectivity/subjectivity polarity, condition or age which is more objectively recognizable is placed nearer to the head than opinion in English, whereas it is placed farther from the head than opinion in Korean. This shows that this principle has explanatory power for the English examples, but it does not, for the Korean examples. The reason for the preference of condition preceding opinion in Korean is that the reverse order may cause a different meaning: *pissan kkaycin khep* 'an expensive broken cup' implies 'A broken cup is expensive.' rather than 'a cup which is expensive and which is broken'. As for English example (28a), some native English speakers indicated that *old house* may be somewhat idiomatic, so that *magnificent* does not intervene between *old* and *house*. However, such idiomatic nature is absent in Korean.

2. Interlanguage

1) Similarities between the Interlanguage and L1/L2

One major similarity among English, Korean, and the interlanguage lies in the juxtaposition of origin with opinion, size, shape, condition, age, or color. Consider the following examples.

(29) opinion + origin
a. This is a convenient Japanese computer. (132; 75%)
b. This is a Japanese convenient computer. (44; 25%)

(30) size + origin
a. This is a small American radio. (122; 69.3%)
b. This is an American small radio. (54; 30.7%)

(31) shape + origin
a. This is a round Japanese vase. (108; 61.4%)
b. This is a Japanese round vase. (68; 38.6%)

(32) condition + origin
a. This is broken Japanese mirror. (135; 76.7%)
b. This is Japanese broken mirror. (41; 23.3%)

(33) age + origin

a. This is a new American computer. (130; 73.9%)

b. This is an American new computer. (46; 26.1%)

(34) color + origin

a. This is a red Japanese car. (111; 63.1%)

b. This is a Japanese red car. (65; 36.9%)

Like English and Korean, the interlanguage shows that origin follows opinion, as in (29), size, as in (30), shape, as in (31), condition, as in (32), age, as in (33) or color, as in (34), though there are more variations in each pair in the interlanguage than in English and Korean. This confirms the claim that origin adjectives with noun-like attributes are placed nearest to the head noun. It also lends support to the subjectivity/objectivity principle that the more objective the quality expressed by the adjective, the closer to the noun it is placed. This in turn reflects the iconic proximity, which indicates that conceptual distance tends to match with linguistic distance.

Another item showing similarities among English, Korean and the interlanguage is material when it is juxtaposed with opinion, size, shape, condition, age, or color, as shown in the following:

(35) opinion + material

a. This is a luxurious brick house. (149; 84.7%)

b. This is a brick luxurious house. (27; 15.3%)

(36) size + material

a. This is a big gold watch. (142; 80.7%)

b. This is a gold big watch. (34; 13.6%)

(37) shape + material

a. This is an oblong wooden box. (123; 69.9%)

b. This is a wooden oblong box. (53; 30.1%)

(38) condition + material

a. This is a bent metal spring. (124; 70.5%)

b. This is a metal bent spring. (52; 29.5%)

(39) age + material

a. This is an old iron hanger. (155; 88%)

b. This is an iron old hanger. (21; 11.9%)

(40) color + material

a. This is a black plastic watch. (137; 77.8%)

b. This is a plastic black watch. (39; 22.2%)

Material follows opinion, as in (35), size, in (36), shape, in (37), condition, in (38), age, in (39) or color, in (40). This is a repeated pattern of the English and Korean ordering discussed in the previous section. This repeated pattern is not surprising, since the target language pattern is analogous to the native language pattern and that there is no interference from the native language in the use of the target language. The learners seem to follow the principle that the item which is more objective and of more noun-like attributes is in a linguistically close position to the head noun than the item with less so.

The combination of color with opinion or age in the learners' language revealed a repeated pattern of the English and Korean ordering.

(41) opinion + color

a. This is a beautiful white dress. (151; 85.8%)

b. This is a white beautiful dress. (25; 14.2%)

(42) age + color

a. These are old red shirts. (147; 83.5%)

b. These are red old shirts. (29; 16.5%)

As in the native English speaker data and the Korean data, the order of color following opinion or age was preferred by the L2 learners to the reverse order. The learners seem to recognize that color is more objectively assessable than opinion or age, and that an objective item is placed in the closer position to the head noun than a subjective item.

Another category which revealed a similarity among English, Korean, and the interlanguage data is the combination of condition with age or color.

(43) condition + age

a. This is a torn new cloth. (92; 52.3%)

b. This is a new torn cloth. (84; 47.7%)

(44) condition + color

a. This is a torn blue umbrella. (102; 58%)

b. This is a blue torn umbrella. (74; 42%)

The learners preferred the order of condition preceding age or color, though there was a big variation. These ordering patterns are not congruent with Yoo's (2004) point that typical adjectives precede participial adjectives. In both examples, *torn* is not a typical adjective, but a participial adjective since it is derived from a verb. In other words, it is an adjective having the attributes of verbs. However, example (44) is in accordance with the principle that a noun-like adjective is positioned closer to the head noun than a typical adjective, since adjectives of color can be used not only as an adjective but also as a noun.

The last category showing a similarity was the juxtaposition of shape with opinion, size, or age.

(45) opinion + shape
a. This is a nice round table. (148; 84.1%)
b. This is a round nice table. (28; 15.9%)

(46) size + shape
a. This is a small triangular ruler. (151; 85.7%)
b. This is a triangular small ruler. (25; 14.2%)

(47) age + shape
a. This is a round new gymnasium. (41; 23.2%)
b. This is a new round gymnasium. (135; 76.7%)

The order of shape following opinion, size or age was predominant, with no significant variations. Most learners seem to order adjectives according to the principle that an objective item comes closer to the head noun than a subjective item. Whether an item is triangular or round is more objectively identifiable than whether it is small or big or whether new or old.

2) Differences between the Interlanguage and L1/L2

A close examination of adjective sequences between English and the interlanguage and between Korean and the interlanguage shows that ordering differences occur in several aspects. First, there are combined sets in which the interlanguage is of the same order as English but different from Korean: size and opinion; opinion and condition; size and color; shape and condition. Consider the following results.[4]

[4] If the results had been considered according to the learners' proficiency, there might have been some differences between the beginning learners and advanced learners. The present study, however, did not consider the learners' proficiency, but focused on the learners' general tendency.

(48) size + opinion

a. This is a comfortable big chair. (77; 43.8%)

b. This is a big comfortable chair. (99; 56.2%)

(49) opinion + condition

a. This is an expensive broken cup. (114; 64.8%)

b. This is a broken expensive cup. (62; 35.2%)

(50) size + color

a. This is long black hair. (118; 67.0%)

b. This is black long hair. (58; 32.9%)

(51) shape + condition

a. This is a square chipped rod. (91; 51.7%)

b. This is a chipped square rod. (85; 48.2%)

Like the native English speaker data, the interlanguage data revealed the orders of size preceding opinion, opinion preceding condition, size preceding color, or shape preceding condition. The reverse orders were true for the Korean data, as shown earlier. This suggests that these interlanguage combinations reflect actual patterns of native English speakers without the interference of the native language, Korean. There were relatively significant variations in each set. Examples (49) and (50) seem to be in line with the principle that objective uses are located more towards the right in the vicinity of the head noun, whereas more subjective uses occur in more leftward positions. For example, it is relatively easier to identify the color of an object than to determine the length of an object, as in example (50).

The combined sets in which the interlanguage is different from English but same as Korean include the juxtaposition of age and opinion on the one hand and that of age and size on the other.

(52) age + opinion

a. This is a magnificent old house. (80; 45.4%)

b. This is an old magnificent house. (96; 54.5%)

(53) age + size

a. This is a tall old building. (70; 39.8%)

b. This is an old tall building. (106; 60.2%)

Many of the learners favored the order of age preceding opinion or size. over the reverse order. These two examples show relatively significant variations in each pair, particularly in the combination of age and opinion: opinion preceding age (45.4%) vs. age preceding opinion (54.5%). This shows that the Korean L2 learners seem to find it difficult to determine which is more subjective, age or opinion, despite the fact that opinion adjectives are arguably the most subjective (Quirk et al., 1985). In example (52), many learners do not seem to recognize that *an old house* is a type of idiomatic expression in English. In these examples, the learners' general preferences are identical to the Korean native speakers' preferences. This opens some possibility of the influence from the native language. In other words, a native-language pattern may be incorrectly transferred or incorrectly associated with an item to be learned (Brown, 2000).

Interestingly, some combined sets in the interlanguage data had different ordering from both the English data and the Korean data: the combination of shape and color and that of origin and material.

(54) shape + color

a. This is an oblong red box. (91; 51.7%)

b. This is a red oblong box. (85; 48.2%)

(55) origin + material

a. This is a plastic American toy. (75; 42.6%)

b. This is an American plastic toy. (101; 57.3%)

Example (54) manifested great variations between (a) and (b), which indicates that the difference between the two is marginal. This suggests that the ordering of shape and color is flexible in the interlanguage data. The two examples above are by no means predictable since they reflect neither the native language pattern nor the target language pattern. This entails that the learners have different perceptions from native English and Korean speakers in the sequences between shape and color and between origin and material. This flexibility may be due in part to the fact that there are similar degrees of objectivity between shape and color on the one hand and between material and origin on the other. The learners failed to capture the degrees of objectivity/subjectivity in the same way as native speakers did.

Lastly, there was a case in which exactly the same number of the learners favored each option of the sequences.

(56) size + condition

a. These are short worn-out trousers. (88; 50%)

b. These are worn-out short trousers. (88; 50%)

Half of them favored the order of size preceding condition, while the other half preferred the reverse order. This suggests that the juxtaposition of size and condition is not subject to strict order. In other words, the learners seem to think that size is often interchangeable with condition in its position. This ordering pattern is in contrast with the native English speakers' preferred order of size preceding condition and with the Korean speakers' preference of the reverse order.

IV. SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

The previous section discussed adjective orders in English, Korean and in the interlanguage. Since it is not possible to use or juxtapose all categories of adjectives in the prenominal position, it is not easy to draw a perfect generalization about adjective sequences. At the expense of some exceptions, the analysis provides the following approximate orders.

FIGURE 1
Adjective Order: English, Korean, and Interlanguage

a. English order

size	opinion	condition	age	color	Shape	material	origin

b. Korean order

condition	age	opinion	color	size	Shape	material	origin

c. Interlanguage order

age	size	Opinion	shape	condition	Color	origin	material

(Deviation: Condition precedes age.
Size is the same position as condition.)

The English order drawn from the present study is in keeping with some of the previous studies (Bailey, 1975), but not with others (Praninskas, 1975). A noticeable difference between the previous studies and the present study lies in the juxtaposition of opinion and size: Opinion precedes size in many previous studies (Praninskas, 1975; Clark & Clark, 1977; Sproat & Shih, 1991; Byrd, 1992), but the other way around in the present study. This difference confirms Yoo's (2004) point that adjective orders are not fixed, but relatively flexible, depending on the context of the situation and the speaker's perspective

about the context. This discrepancy strongly suggests that descriptive grammar, which is based on how language is actually used, can differ from prescriptive rules and that even native speakers can have different perceptions on adjective ordering.

A comparison between English and Korean manifested similarities and differences. One of the most obvious similarities is that the category of origin stands closest to the head noun and material is the next category closer to the head noun. The position of shape is relatively similar in both languages. The next category closer to the head noun is color, though there is an exception in Korean where color is farther away from the head noun than size.

Some major differences between English and Korean lie in the position of opinion and that of size. There were sharp contrasts: English revealed the order of size preceding opinion, opinion preceding condition, opinion preceding age, size preceding condition, size preceding age, size preceding color, but Korean showed the reverse orders in each of these pairs. Another striking difference was that size is positioned farthest away from the head noun in English, whereas it is very near to the noun in Korean. The item positioned farthest from the head noun in Korean was condition.

Overall, the English ordering seems to lend support to such principles as the nouniness principle, the subjectivity/objectivity principle, and the iconic principle. As pointed out earlier, origin, material, shape and color have noun-like attributes in one way or another and are relatively objectively recognizable and assessable, whereas size, opinion, and age are subjective. In addition, opinion is more subjective than condition or age, and size is more subjective than condition or color. However, these principles do not adequately account for some ordering patterns in English. On the other hand, these principles were shown to be less systematically applicable to the Korean adjective ordering. For instance, condition precedes opinion, though the former is less subjective than the latter. For another example, color precedes size, though the former is less subjective than the latter. These orders taken together suggest that none of the principles proposed is completely satisfactory to account for adjective ordering. As Wulff (2003) argued, adjective ordering is determined by a variety of variables. Moreover, the fact that even the native speakers revealed different preferences in many ordering patterns appears to, in a sense, support Ney's (1983) position that almost any order of adjectives seems to be possible, depending on the intended meaning of the speaker or the situation in which the speaker frames an utterance.

The results have also shown that the Korean adjective ordering is looser than the English ordering since more variations were observed in the Korean data, while perfect (100%) agreement was shown on many combinations of adjectives in English.

These similarities and differences in the adjective sequences in the two languages were then compared with the interlanguage data. The learners' overall order of English

adjectives was shown not to exactly correspond to the learners' native language order and even the target language pattern. This revealed that, unlike in English and Korean, in the interlanguage material is in the closest proximity to the head noun and age is at the greatest distance from it. This suggests that the direct evidence of native language interference was not observed in the L2 learners' overall ordering of adjectives. The interlanguage data manifested different aspects of ordering when compared with the native and target languages, as shown in the following:

FIGURE 2
Different Aspects of Adjective Ordering in Interlangauge

- Many adjective combinations were similar to both English and Korean.
- Some were similar to English but different from Korean.
- Some were similar to Korean but different from English.
- Some were different from both English and Korean.

Of particular interest were the ordering patterns which were not traceable to either the native language or the target language. This case does not corroborate the widely held claim that native language interference is the most noticeable source of error among second language learners (Brown, 2000). This also suggests that not all items are transferable from the native language to the target language and that there are many errors which attribute to factors other than interlingual transfer. The learners manifested inconsistency in the juxtaposition of adjectives, moving back and forth between the native and target languages. This is probably due in part to similar degrees of objectivity between shape and color and between material and origin.

It has been shown that prescriptive rules are not necessarily analogous to descriptive grammar on adjective ordering. This finding raises an important question: Which adjective order should be a norm for the Korean EFL learners? Most native English speakers do not order adjectives based on the rules but they arrange them subconsciously. Hence, their language behaviors do not always correspond to prescriptive rules. Viewed in this way, the Korean EFL teachers, while they focus on prescriptive rules, should also pay due attention to descriptive grammar mainly because the native speakers' actual patterns are as important as rule-governed usages and because it is important that they should be appropriately reflected in the learners' language patterns (Yang, 2005). This implies that they should teach not only grammatical rules but also native English speakers' actual use of adjective ordering. This suggestion is in line with Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman's (1999) suggestion that the learners should be aware of the major traditional rules and also aware of those instances where current usage seems to clearly deviate from the traditional

prescription. In teaching prescriptive and descriptive grammar, it is important to consider learners' proficiency level. At the beginning stage, prescriptive rules can be the norm, but at the higher levels, it is important to raise learner awareness of differences between prescriptive rules and native speakers' actual use of adjective ordering. Without well-balanced instructions on prescriptive and descriptive grammar, L2 learners may be confused with different patterns of adjective ordering.

The teachers should also provide students with an opportunity to discuss the similarities and differences between English and Korean adjective ordering which were drawn from the present study. It may be also useful to discuss the juxtaposition of adjectives which naturally occurs in L2 written discourse contexts.

There is a caveat to test-givers. In Korean EFL classrooms, teachers often give questions concerning adjective ordering in mid-term or final exams. In such cases, it is important that questions concerning adjective ordering revealing notable variations among native speakers should be abandoned, mainly because such questions may pose a controversy among and confusion to the EFL learners and because they are not desirable in the exams which measure accuracy. Judging from the results of the study, the items which may be in controversy include orderings between shape and condition, between shape and color, and between shape and material.

This study is subject to some limitations. One major limitation was that this study did not consider such a variable as proficiency, which might affect the order of adjectives. This was largely because the main purpose of this study was to show the learners' general tendency.of adjective ordering. In the future study, it is worthwhile to investigate adjective ordering, according to learners' proficiency.

This study builds up the areas of contrastive analysis and interlanguage, providing some insights into how similar and different the sequences of adjectives are in English and Korean on the one hand and in the two languages and the learners' language on the other. It also provides an opportunity to consider the role of descriptive grammar in second language acquisition.

REFERENCES

Bailey, K. M. (1975). *The ordering of attributive adjectives in English: A preliminary study*. Unpublished paper, UCLA.

Biber, D., Johansson, G., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Longman: Longman.

Bock, J. K. (1982). Toward a cognitive psychology of syntax: Information processing contributions to sentence formation. *Psychological Review, 89*, 1-47.

Brown, D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). NY: Pearson Education.

Byrd, P. (1992). *Applied English grammar*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teachers' course* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Newbury House Publisher.

Clark, H., & Clark, V. (1977). *Psychology and language*. NY: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.

Crystal, D. (1982). *Linguistics*. NY: Penguin Books.

Frank. M. (1972). *Modern English: A practical reference guide.* NY: Prentice-Hall.

Greenberg, J. (1966). Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Universals of language* (pp. 73-113). Cambridge, MA.: The MIT Press.

Kim, B.-J. (2004). A study on effective ways of teaching English grammar. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 9*(2), 109-132.

Kim, H.-S., & Dammers, K. (2008). Korean students' perception of English word order. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 14*(2), 67-86.

Ney, J. W. (1983). Optionality and choice in the selection of order of adjectives in English. *General Linguistics, 23,* 94-128.

Oh, H. J. (2006). A study on the word order of adjectival modifiers in Japanese and Korean. *Japanese Language & Literature, 29,* 111-130.

Posner, R. (1986). Iconicity in syntax: The natural order of attributes. In P. Bouissac, M. Herzfeld & R. Posner (Eds.), *Iconicity: Essays on the nature of culture* (pp. 305-337). Tubingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.

Praninskas, J. (1975). *Rapid review of English grammar* (2d ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall.

Richards, M. M. (1977). Ordering preferences for congruent and incongruent English adjectives in attributive and predicative contexts. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 16,* 489-503.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Sproat, R., & Shih, C. (1991). The cross-linguistic distribution of adjective ordering restrictions. In C. Georgopoulos & R. Ishiharas (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary approaches to language: Essays in honor of S.-Y. Kuroda* (pp. 565-593). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Wulff, S. (2003). A multifactorial corpus analysis of adjective order in English. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 8*(2), 245-282.

Yang, E.-M. (2005). A study on routine formulas and downgraders of request act in high school English textbooks. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *11*(2), 111-134.

Yoo, C. (2004). Iconicity in the order of English adjectives. *Discourse and Cognition*, *11*(2), 83-107.

APPENDIX A

An English Version of the Questionnaire
for English Native Speakers and Korean EFL Learners

This is a questionnaire for adjective ordering when more than one adjective is juxtaposed. Choose the more natural and appropriate order of adjectives in each question.

(1) a. This is a comfortable big chair. ( )
b. This is a big comfortable chair. ( )
(2) a. This is a nice round table. ( )
b. This is a round nice table. ( )
(3) a. This is an expensive broken cup. ( )
b. This is a broken expensive cup. ( )
(4) a. This is a magnificent old house. ( )
b. This is an old magnificent house. ( )
(5) a. This is a beautiful white dress. ( )
b. This is a white beautiful dress. ( )
(6) a. This is a luxurious brick house. ( )
b. This is a brick luxurious house. ( )
(7) a. This is a convenient Japanese computer. ( )
b. This is a Japanese convenient computer. ( )
(8) a. This is a small triangular ruler. ( )
b. This is a triangular small ruler. ( )
(9) a. These are short worn-out trousers. ( )
b. These are worn-out short trousers. ( )
(10) a. This is a tall old building. ( )
b, This is an old tall building. ( )
(11) a. This is long black hair. ( )
b. This is black long hair. ( )
(12) a. This is a big gold watch. ( )
b. This is a gold big watch. ( )

(13) a. This is a small American radio. ( )
b. This is an American small radio. ( )
(14) a. This is a square chipped rod. ( )
b. This is a chipped square rod. ( )
(15) a. This is a round new gymnasium. ( )
b. This is a new round gymnasium. ( )
(16) a. This is an oblong red box. ( )
b. This is a red oblong box. ( )
(17) a. This is an oblong wooden box. ( )
b. This is a wooden oblong box. ( )
(18) a. This is a round Japanese vase. ( )
b. This is a Japanese round vase. ( )
(19) a. This is a torn new cloth. ( )
b. This is a new torn cloth. ( )
(20) a. This is a torn blue umbrella. ( )
b. This is a blue torn umbrella. ( )
(21) a. This is a bent metal spring. ( )
b. This is a metal bent spring. ( )
(22) a. This is broken Japanese mirror. ( )
b. This is Japanese broken mirror. ( )
(23) a. These are old red shirts. ( )
b. These are red old shirts. ( )
(24) a. This is an old iron hanger. ( )
b. This is an iron old hanger. ( )
(25) a. This is a new American computer. ( )
b. This is an American new computer. ( )
(26) a. This is a black plastic watch. ( )
b. This is a plastic black watch. ( )
(27) a. This is a red Japanese car. ( )
b. This is a Japanese red car. ( )
(28) a. This is a plastic American toy. ( )
b. This is an American plastic toy. ( )

APPENDIX B

A Korean Version of the Questionnaire for Korean Native Speakers

이 설문지는 한 개 이상의 형용사가 사용될 때 형용사 어순을 묻는 설문지입니다. 아래 각 항목에서 더 자연스럽고 적절한 형용사 어순을 선택하세요.

(1) a. 이것은 아늑한 큰 의자이다. ( )
b. 이것은 큰 아늑한 의자이다. ( )
(2) a. 이것은 멋진 둥근 테이블이다. ( )
b. 이것은 둥근 멋진 테이블이다. ( )
(3) a. 이것은 비싼 깨진 컵이다. ( )
b. 이것은 깨진 비싼 컵이다. ( )
(4) a. 이것은 웅장한 오래된 집이다. ( )
b. 이것은 오래된 웅장한 집이다. ( )
(5) a. 이것은 아름다운 흰 드레스이다. ( )
b. 이것은 흰 아름다운 드레스이다. ( )
(6) a. 이것은 사치스러운 벽돌(의) 집이다. ( )
b. 이것은 벽돌(의) 사치스러운 집이다. ( )
(7) a. 이것은 편리한 일제(의) 컴퓨터이다. ( )
b. 이것은 일제(의) 편리한 컴퓨터이다. ( )
(8) a. 이것은 작은 삼각형(의) 자이다. ( )
b. 이것은 삼각형(의) 작은 자이다. ( )
(9) a. 이것은 짧은 닳아빠진 바지이다. ( )
b. 이것은 닳아빠진 짧은 바지이다. ( )
(10) a. 이것은 높은 오래된 빌딩이다. ( )
b. 이것은 오래된 높은 빌딩이다. ( )
(11) a. 이것은 긴 검은 머리(카락)이다. ( )
b.이것은 검은 긴 머리(카락)이다. ( )
(12) a. 이것은 큰 금(의) 시계이다. ( )
b. 이것은 금(의) 큰 시계이다. ( )
(13) a. 이것은 작은 미제(의) 라디오이다. ( )
b. 이것은 미제(의) 작은 라디오이다. ( )
(14) a. 이것은 정사각형(의) 쪼개진 나무토막이다. ( )
b. 이것은 쪼개진 정사각형(의) 나무토막이다. ( )
(15) a. 이것은 둥근 새로운 체육관이다. ( )
b. 이것은 새로운 둥근 체육관이다. ( )
(16) a. 이것은 직사각형(의) 빨간 상자이다. ( )
b. 이것은 빨간 직사각형(의) 상자이다. ( )

(17) a. 이것은 직사각형(의) 나무(의) 상자이다. ( )
b. 이것은 나무(의) 직사각형(의) 상자이다. ( )
(18) a. 이것은 둥근 일제(의) 꽃병이다. ( )
b.이것은 일제(의) 둥근 꽃병이다. ( )
(19) a. 이것은 찢어진 새 옷이다. ( )
b. 이것은 새 찢어진 옷이다. ( )
(20) a. 이것은 찢어진 파란 우산이다. ( )
b. 이것은 파란 찢어진 우산이다. ( )
(21) a. 이것은 휘어진 금속(의) 용수철이다. ( )
b. 이것은 금속(의) 휘어진 용수철이다. ( )
(22) a. 이것은 깨진 일제(의) 거울이다. ( )
b. 이것은 일제(의) 깨진 거울이다. ( )
(23) a. 이것은 낡은 빨간 셔츠이다. ( )
b. 이것은 빨간 낡은 셔츠이다. ( )
(24) a. 이것은 오래된 쇠(의) 옷걸이이다. ( )
b. 이것은 쇠(의) 오래된 옷걸이이다. ( )
(25) a. 이것은 새 미제(의) 컴퓨터이다. ( )
b. 이것은 미제(의) 새 컴퓨터이다. ( )
(26) a. 이것은 까만 플라스틱(의) 시계이다. ( )
b. 이것은 플라스틱(의) 까만 시계이다. ( )
(27) a. 이것은 빨간 일제(의) 차이다. ( )
b. 이것은 일제(의) 빨간 차이다. ( )
(28) a. 이것은 플라스틱(의) 미제(의) 장난감이다. ( )
b. 이것은 미제(의) 플라스틱(의) 장난감이다. ( )

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: University

Woo-hyun Jung
Dept. of English Language & Literature
Yeungnam University
214-1, Dae-dong, Gyeongsan-si
Gyeongsangbuk-do, Korea
Tel: (053) 810-2132
Fax: (053) 810-4607
Email: woohjung@ynu.ac.kr

Received in April, 2009
Reviewed in May, 2009
Revised version received in June, 2009