Toward Theory-Driven Language Pedagogy

Suzanne Flynn
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

Gita Martohardjono
*Queens College/CUNY*

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, theory-driven second language (L2) acquisition research and L2 pedagogy have become increasingly dichotomized. This is unfortunate, because it is clear that a systematic examination of how developments in each of these areas interact constitutes a critical step in building a comprehensive account of L2 learning.

Our purpose in this chapter is to build upon and extend previous discussion of these issues (e.g., Flynn, 1991a, 1991b, in press; Gair, 1992; White, 1990). More specifically, we will attempt to begin to identify and explore specific areas of current linguistic theory and the associated acquisition research that we believe have consequences for language pedagogy.

1.1. Background

As is well known, recognition of the fact that theory, research and practice are intimately related is not new. For example, as noted by Gair (1992, p. 1), during World War II, the military as well as many civilians needed to be “trained effectively and in the shortest time possible in the use of a wide variety of languages, many of them exotic.” To do this, the government sought the help of the American Council of Learned Societies, which in turn contacted the Linguistic Society of America (LSA). As a result, many neo-Bloomfieldian linguists became involved in writing texts and developing materials to teach the
various languages that they were commissioned to deal with. Even Bloomfield himself worked on a text for spoken Dutch, as well as one on Russian.

The approach to language and language learning assumed in this work became more formalized in the articulation of Contrastive Analysis (CA), first by Fries (1945) and later by Lado (1957). Within this context, language learning in general consisted of the learning of a fixed set of habits over time. L2 learning involved the added component of transfer in that it was argued that the L2 learner attempted to transfer the linguistic habits from the first language (L1) to the L2. Where the L1 and the L2 matched, positive transfer took place, and where they did not, negative transfer ensued. Although this is an oversimplified account of CA, what is important is that linguistic theory, namely structuralism, as well as a theory of learning, namely behaviorism, were productively paired in an attempt to understand L2 learning in order to develop sound pedagogical materials and practices.

The demise of behaviorism as an explanatory account of the language learning process and the movement away from structuralism within linguistic theory did not immediately sound the death knell for the relationship between theory, research, and practice. With the advent of transformational grammar, the 1960s also witnessed many attempts to link linguistic theory to language learning and use.

Continued investigation along these lines resulted in the development of Creative Construction (CC) (Dulay & Burt, 1974). This work built directly upon proposals made within a generative account of language and made one of the first attempts to link L2 acquisition with L1 acquisition in a very direct way. Specifically, CC claimed that L1 acquisition and L2 acquisition were essentially the same processes in that they were both guided by the same set of innate language principles for language. Development of this work also resulted in an important linkage of theory and language practices in the work of Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982). Although we have suggested elsewhere (Flynn, 1985) that some of the conclusions drawn were premature in the context of the existing data, the work nonetheless represented an important attempt to relate theory and practice.

Disillusionment, skepticism, and disregard of any possible relevant interactions among theory, research, and practice began to emerge when it was discovered that the proposals made within early models of generative theory did not have the psychological reality initially envisioned (see extended discussion in Flynn, 1993).1 For example, working within a transformational model of generative linguistics, many researchers hypothesized that the comprehension, and perhaps even acquisition, of sentences was affected by the number of grammatical rules or transformations employed in a sentence's derivation. This was essentially the Derivational Theory of Complexity (DTC) (see discussion in Fodor, Bever, &

---

1Much of the discussion in this section of the chapter can also be found in Flynn, 1993.
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Garrett, 1974). After much psycholinguistic research, it has been shown that structures involve language acquisition. It is also easier to acquire or process than to learn. The finding proved devastating to many of the assumptions regarding linguistic theory and a psycholinguistic approach to language learning.

At the same time that psychologists were working on a transformational grammar were numerous Leonidov, 1974, who has shown that language evolves and change quite rapidly; her ideas have often proved quite frustrating for linguists. She has also shown that language is not fixed and makes connections across the world. Many language pedagogues and researchers have been frustrated by the failure of linguistic theory to account for language. There are also many linguists and researchers who have been frustrated by the failure of linguistic theory to account for language.

2. Universal Grammar

These earlier failures were principally because of the complex nature of language, which is not only natural that we should once acquire a language but that we should also be able to use language effectively. The development in the theory of UG, as shown by Chomsky, has been a major contribution to the field of language learning and language pedagogy. As Cook (1991; Flynn, 1992) suggests, UG is a new volume; Rutherford (1987; Sharwood, 1987; Sharwood, 1987).

As is well known, UG consists of a series of parameters that is commonly referred to as linguistic and is associated with the lexicon and syntax. UG is a theory of language and language researches have shown that language is a universal one, which is language specific. This is given as a part of our biological endowment, which we have to be learned; that which is language specific will be taught in a particular manner. As it is a very complicated one because it is a language specific, we need to establish what is the acquisition of the language-specific parameters. For example, the processes underlying specific rules might differ significantly from language to language, and if the parameters were of a specific kind, they could not support the language-specific rules. To illustrate several ways in which the parameters might be involved, then presumably the teacher can introduce these parameters to the student.
outline several programs of research and highlight their implications for language pedagogy. Specifically, we will consider results from experimental L2 acquisition studies that focused on: (a) Parameter-setting, (b) Lexical feature assignment, and (c) Functional Categories.

2.1. Different Parameter Values

Research has suggested that one area in which learning is involved concerns parameter setting. Results of several studies (e.g. Flynn, 1983, 1987; Flynn & Espinal, 1985; Flynn & Lust, 1990; Thomas, 1991) indicate that where parametric values of the L1 and the L2 match, language acquisition is enhanced in comparison to the case in which the parametric values of the L1 and the L2 do not match. One explanation advanced for this pattern of results is that in the matched case, learners do not need to assign a new value to the parameter; thus, no new learning is needed with respect to the value of the parameter, although learning may take place with respect to the instantiation of a particular parameter in terms of language-specific structures.

What is important for our present purposes, however, is that where the L1 and the L2 differ in parametric values, the new value must be learned in some sense and it therefore becomes relevant for language teaching. These results have emerged most saliently in studies of the acquisition of head-initial languages by speakers of head-final L1: head direction in this case is defined in terms of the direction of the head of the complement phrase (CP), C0, and the direction that learners correlate with it. A left-headed C0 correlates with right branching; a right-headed C0 correlates with left branching. "In this formulation, embeddings of sentence (CP) adjuncts are under either NP or S heads. These include relative clauses in complex NPs and adverbial subordinate clauses in complex sentences" (Flynn & Martohardjono, 1994, p. 322). (See also Flynn, 1987, in press; Lust, 1994.)

The results of these studies indicate that speakers of Spanish, a head-initial language, have significantly less difficulty with complex sentence structures in English that instantiate head initiality than do their Japanese counterparts, whose L1 is head final, learning English as a second language. The speakers were tested in an elicited imitation task on sentence structures such as those exemplified in 1. The sentences varied with respect to the preposing and postposing of the subordinate clause in relation to the main clause. Preposed structures correspond to head-final structures, and postposed clauses to head-initial structures.

(1) Preposed and postposed subordinate adverbial clauses
   a. Preposed: When the actor finished the book, the woman called the professor.
   b. Postposed: The worker called the owner when the engineer finished the plans.

The results are shown in Figure 4.1.

Moreover, an examination of the data for the Japanese speakers, especially at the lowest levels of ESL competence, indicated that there were points where the structures tested were not acquired by these speakers at the low level of the subordinate sentence structure. However, these speakers were able to exhibit the right-branching structure of the subordinate clause in sentences at the Japanese speakers were gradually in accord with its properties as a structure.

The results outlined in this section show the role of parameters in L2 acquisition studies: parameter setting might work in L2 acquisition and important way aspect of parameter setting. It is important to bear in mind, however, that there are several other logically possible structures for the L2 acquisition process by native speakers.

2.2. Canonical Government Dis位

Results of a related second study, that must be learned, viz. lexical feature assignment, and examining the head direction for a
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The results are shown in Figure 4.1.

Moreover, an examination of the nature of the errors made by the Japanese speakers, especially at the lowest level of English as a second language (ESL) competence, indicated that the principal locus of error for these speakers is at points where the structures tested manifest rightward directionality. For example, Japanese speakers at the low level often were able to repeat only the main clause of the subordinate sentence structures administered. This finding suggests that these speakers were unable to embed; in other words, they had difficulty with the right-branching structure of English. However, in going from the low to mid levels of ESL competence, there is a significant decrease in the number of one-clause repetitions made across the sentence types tested. This suggests that the Japanese speakers were gradually developing control of embedding in English in accord with its properties as a right-branching language.

The results outlined in this section are interesting because they isolate the role of parameters in L2 acquisition and at the same time specify how parameter setting might work in L2 acquisition. They also isolate in a profoundly interesting and important way one aspect of language that has to be learned during acquisition. It is important to bear in mind that this is not an obvious empirical result; there are several other logically possible learning sequences that are also plausible for the L2 acquisition process but do not occur.

2.2. Canonical Government Direction

Results of a related second study indicate another important area of language that must be learned, viz. lexical-head direction. That is, in addition to determining the head direction for a target-language grammar on the basis of a con-
figuration of the CP, L2 learners must also establish the head direction for lexical categories such as the verb phrase (VP), noun phrase (NP), prepositional phrase (PP), etc. In an elicited imitation study that investigated the acquisition of restrictive relative clauses for Spanish, Japanese, and Chinese speakers learning English as an L2, results indicated, not surprisingly, that the Spanish speakers outperformed the Japanese and Chinese speakers, mainly because of the comp head-direction parameter setting shared by Spanish and English, as indicated by the studies discussed earlier. What was surprising, however, was that the Japanese speakers, and not the Chinese speakers, performed very poorly on sentences that involved a gap in object position in the relative clause (2a) in comparison to their performance on sentence structures that involved a gap in subject position in the relative clause (2a). More precisely, as shown in Fig. 4.2, in the subjects’ elicited imitations of sentences such as 2a and 2b, the Japanese speakers performed significantly better on relative clause structures in which the relative clause gap was a subject, not an object. In fact, Japanese speakers, in their elicited imitations of sentences such as 2b, would convert the object gap to a subject gap, as illustrated in 3.

(2) Relative clause sentence structures

- **Subject Gap**: The student [who Ø called the gentleman] answered the policeman.
- **Object Gap**: The diplomat questioned the gentleman [who the student called Ø].

(3) Conversion of an Object Gap to a Subject Gap

- **Stimulus**: The diplomat questioned the gentleman whom the student called.
- **Response**: The diplomat questioned the gentleman who called the student.

The explanation proposed for these results related to the UG claim that relative clauses contain an empty category, namely a variable that must be interpreted in relation to the head noun phrase. The argument is that there are certain linguistic requirements on the occurrence of null categories of that type, viz. canonical government. English and Chinese are head-initial in VPs and are thus standardly assumed to have proper government of objects (and also canonical government, as in Kayne, 1983) to the right, allowing empty categories in that position that are not properly licensed under more general conditions concerning the occurrence of these gaps in certain positions. These requirements cannot be met in Japanese for a structural position to the right of a verb, as English requires for the object position. However, this is not the case for Chinese, which does allow such elements in the object position; this fact follows from the head-initial structure of the VP in Chinese. Thus, what the Japanese speaker must learn is the permissibility of a null element in a specific position in accord with a parameter setting of English even though elements of that type occur in
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Japanese relative clauses as well (Miyamoto, 1994; Flynn, & Brown, 1994). Thus, relative clauses, in this case, are not the Chinese speakers, must learn.

2.3. The Need to Relearn Subcategorization Constraints

A third important research contribution to studies investigating the acquisition of English was that in the acquisition of the structural constraints on L1 knowledge in acquiring these structures, they provided them with the right amount of input by their L1 knowledge about the relative clause structures exemplified in English (Cooper, Olshtain, Tucker, & Wexler, 1991). The study showed that (i) L2 learners prefer infinitive structures that are marked or nonexistent, and (ii) L2 learners prefer infinitive structures that are marked or nonexistent.

(4) Study on control structures

- **Infinitives**:
  - John promised Henry to come.
  - John reminded Henry of his homework.

- **Finites**:
  - John promised Henry to come.
  - John reminded Henry about his homework.

More specifically, results of two studies (Kaplan, 1970; Waterbury, 1979; d’Anglejan & Roux, 1989) showed that L2 learners performed significantly better on object gaps.
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Japanese relative clauses as well, because the two languages match on the occurrence of such elements in subject position (see Flynn & Brown, 1989; Gair, Flynn, & Brown, 1994). Thus, results indicate that the Japanese speakers, and not the Chinese speakers, must learn this about English.

2.3. The Need to Relearn Subcategorization Features

A third important research contribution concerns subcategorization. Results of studies investigating the acquisition of “control” by L2 learners of English indicate that in the acquisition of the structures in 4, L2 learners did not transfer their L1 knowledge in acquiring these structures, even when the L1 would have provided them with the right answer. That is, (i) L2 learners do not transfer their L1 knowledge about the referent for the null element (PRO) in the infinitive structures exemplified in 4a even when L1 provides the correct referent (Cooper, Olshtain, Tucker, & Waterbury, 1979; d’Anglejan & Tucker, 1975); and (ii) L2 learners prefer infinitives to tensed that clauses even when such structures are marked or nonexistent in L1 (Flynn, Foley, & Lardiere, 1991).

(4) Study on control structures

a. Infinitives:
   i. John promised Henry Ø (PRO) to go to the store. (Subject Control)
   ii. John reminded Henry Ø (PRO) to go to the store. (Object Control)

b. Finites:
   i. John promised Henry that he will go to the store. (John, Henry, other)
   ii. John reminded Henry that he will go to the store. (John, Henry, other)

More specifically, results of two earlier studies (Cooper, Olshtain, Tucker, & Waterbury, 1979; d’Anglejan & Tucker, 1975) indicate that L2 learners performed significantly better on object control structures (4aii) than on subject
control structures (4ai). That is, L2 learners were able correctly to identify the referent for PRO in the object-control sentences more often than for the subject-control sentences. Importantly, no evidence was found that the L2 learners tested attempted to translate or to map the L1 language structures onto those of the target language even when the L1 would have provided the correct interpretations for the subject-control verbs. Like L1 learners of English (see review in Cohen-Sherman, 1983, and Sherman & Lust, 1993), the L2 learners interpreted promise as an object-control verb even when the first language would have given them the correct answer for an interpretation task.

In a more recent study, Flynn, Foley, and Lardiere (1991) found that regardless of the grammatical status of infinitives and tensed "that" clauses in the L1, L2 learners significantly prefer infinitives (as in 4a) over the finite clauses (as in 4b) in their productions in early stages of acquisition. This preference was found regardless of the status of infinitives and finite clauses in the L1. In fact, in the L1s of the speakers tested, Chinese, Japanese, and Spanish, only Spanish unequivocally instantiates infinitive structures. Nevertheless, all three groups performed better in elicited imitations of infinitive structures even when the infinitives and the finite clauses were equated in number of words and syllables. In fact, when speakers were given the structures in 4b to produce, they converted these structures to the corresponding infinitive structures exemplified in 4a.

These results are important because they suggest that transfer from the L1 is not operating in the acquisition of subcategorization features of L2 lexical items; learners must learn anew the lexicon along with its relevant features and subcategorization properties. Furthermore, learners must establish anew in the L2 the mechanisms controlling structural derivations. Both of these areas of "learning" are important for our discovery of what we can assume about the knowledge base of the L2 learner and what needs to be learned.

2.4. Wh-Movement

Research in the acquisition of syntactic Wh-movement has further helped identify areas of grammar which must be learned. Here again, it appears that parameter setting adds to the complexity of the acquisition task.

(5) EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES ON WH-MOVEMENT (Li, 1993; Martohardjono, 1992; Martohardjono & Gair, 1993; Uziel, 1991; White, 1992)

a. Cross-linguistic variation: +/- overt Wh-movement

   English: + Wh-fronting  What do you like__?
   Chinese: – Wh-fronting  Ni shihuan sheme?
                          You like what?

b. Structures involved:

   Relative Clauses:  The woman who drove the car saw the light.
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   Adjunct Clauses:

   Wh-Island Clauses:

   Noun Complements:

The studies cited in 5 all converge as Subjacency and the Empty Category learners, even if these constraints are L1 as suggested in the results in 6.7. The sentence types tested in all of two categories: Strong and Weak those that produce strong movement linguistically 'invariant' UG principles (examples are relative clauses and that typically produce weak movement of either parameterized UG knowledge examples are certain types of Wh-island.

The particular parameter involves that the most deeply embedded Inflected in English-type languages. In addition (seen in 5b) requires language some nouns, like fact, select a phrase. In short, from an acquisition perspective complex learning task than the in clauses and adjunct clauses.

(6) RESULTS FROM WH-MOVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Relative Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>S1: 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O2: 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>S: 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O: 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>S: 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O: 95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, however, the degree of affected by these constraints are major steps involved in the acquisition of from the majority of the Wh-movement more difficulty with structures involving knowledge, as can be seen e.g. in 7.
Adjunct Clauses: The man ordered the soup after the waiter came.
Wh-Island Clauses: Sue knows where Pat hid the candy.
Noun Complements: John believed the rumor that his neighbor stole a car.

The studies cited in 5 all converge in showing that universal constraints such as Subjacency and the Empty Category Principle (ECP) are accessible to L2 learners, even if these constraints are not instantiated in the same way in the L1 as suggested in the results in 6. To illustrate, from an acquisition perspective, the sentence types tested in all of these studies can broadly be said to fall into two categories: Strong and Weak movement structures. Strong structures are those that produce strong movement violations because they instantiate cross-linguistically 'invariant' UG principles, e.g. nodes that are barriers in every language (examples are relative clauses and adjunct clauses); weak structures are those that typically produce weak movement violations because they are instantiations of either parameterized UG knowledge or language-particular knowledge (examples are certain types of Wh-islands and noun complements).

The particular parameter involved in Wh-islands and noun complements is that the most deeply embedded Inflection Phrase (IP) constitutes an extra barrier in English-type languages. In addition, the acquisition of Noun Phrase Complements (seen in 5b) requires language-particular knowledge of subcategorization: some nouns, like *fact*, select a phrasal complement; others, like *rumor*, do not. In short, from an acquisition perspective, these sentence types present a more complex learning task than the instantiation of sentences involving relative clauses and adjunct clauses.

(6) RESULTS FROM WH-MOVEMENT (Martohardjono, 1992, 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relative Clause</th>
<th>Adjuncts</th>
<th>Wh-Islands</th>
<th>Complements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, however, the degree of success in which various sentence types affected by these constraints are mastered seems to be modulated by the different steps involved in the acquisition of these structures. Not surprisingly, results from the majority of the Wh-movement studies show that learners seem to have more difficulty with structures involving parameterized and language-particular knowledge, as can be seen e.g. in 7 (taken from Martohardjono, 1993).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Wh-islands</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, 1988</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Juffs, 1993</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li, 1993</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5. Functional Categories

In our most recent experimental study on the acquisition of functional categories (Epstein, Flynn, & Martohardjono, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1994; see also Eubank, in press; Schwartz, 1993; Schwartz & Sprouse, 1991; Vainikka & Young-Scholten, 1992, 1993), we seem to have isolated two other sources of complexity for both children and adult L2 learners of English: namely, type of derivation and number of boundaries involved in a derivation. In this study we included a variety of sentence types manifesting lexical material (either morphemes or words) in the Inflection Phrase (IP) and the Complementizer Phrase (CP). The sentences we tested for IP contained tense morphemes, modals, progressives, and negation. The sentences we tested for CP were topicalization, RCs, and Wh-questions.

(8) Functional category study with child and adult L2 learners of English

Examples of stimulus sentences:

IP

a. Present tense:
   The nervous professor inspects the broken television.

b. Past tense:
   The nervous doctor wanted a new lawyer in the office.

c. Modal
   The little girl can see a tiny flower in the picture.

d. Progressive
   The clever student is inspecting the expensive basket.

e. Negation
   i. The elderly grandfather is not picking the blue flower.
   ii. The happy janitor does not want the new television.

CP

f. Topicalization
   i. Breakfast, the wealthy businessman prepares in the kitchen.
   ii. The pencil, the talented architect says is expensive.
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   g. Relative Clauses
      The lawyer slices the

   h. Wh-questions
      i. Which young girl en
      ii. Which secret message
Violations in Johnson (1988), White &

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>79%</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...in the acquisition of functional categories... (3a, 1993b, 1993c, 1994; see also Eubank, 1991; Vainikka & Young-Scholten, 1993), two other sources of complexity for both adults and child L2 learners of English.

...such as Wh-questions.

...the broken television.

...a new lawyer in the office.

...a tiny flower in the picture.

...expecting the expensive basket.

...is not picking the blue flower.

...not want the new television.

...the businessman prepares in the kitchen.

...the architect says is expensive.
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g. Relative Clauses

The lawyer slices the vegetables which the father eats.

h. Wh-questions

i. Which young girl erases the tiny picture in the notebook?

ii. Which secret message does the young girl find in the basket?

Using an elicited imitation task we found that adult learners whose native language was Japanese had a higher error rate on the structures involving CP (sentences f–h) than on those involving IP (sentences a–e). What is the difference between these two types of structures, that is, between IP and CP structures? Can the result be predicted by current linguistic theory? Although movement is involved in the instantiation of both IP and CP structures, the particular type of movement differs for the two: Movement to SpecCP involves long-distance maximal movement; movement to 

...between these two types of structures, that is, between IP and CP structures? Can the result be predicted by current linguistic theory? Although movement is involved in the instantiation of both IP and CP structures, the particular type of movement differs for the two: Movement to SpecCP involves long-distance maximal movement; movement to ...

...Japanese adults and children.
those areas of grammar where the acquisition task is rendered more complex and which might therefore benefit from additional pedagogical support: we have isolated several such areas in language learning, namely when parameter setting needs to take place, when language-specific lexical learning has to occur (by this we do not mean learning the words in the L2, but much more complex tasks, such as lexical feature assignment) and subcategorization, and when structures are generated by increased derivational complexity.

3. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The original goal of UG-based L2 acquisition research was to compare L2 acquisition to L1 acquisition and to learn whether there is any grammatical knowledge underlying L2 acquisition which does not need to be learned by L2 learners because it is made available to them by the language faculty. Today most of the research strengthens this hypothesis. The findings we have discussed also demonstrate that the UG research paradigm has proven fruitful in identifying those areas of language learning which do present additional levels of complexity for the L2 learner. This implies that such areas constitute precisely the areas of grammar that are most likely to benefit from additional pedagogical support.

We have described three specific areas of grammar that are candidates for such support: grammatical structures affected by differential parameter settings in the L1 and the L2, structures involving lexical items that require language-specific feature assignment, lexical subcategorization, and structures that are generated by increased derivational complexity. As UG-based research continues to be done, additional areas of difficulty in L2 grammar learning will undoubtedly be identified. Furthermore, new research strategies will have to be devised to determine the specific nature of the pedagogical support that is needed to affect the learning of these areas of grammar. Some obvious questions arise: Will explicit instruction in the grammatical structures themselves be sufficient as a strategy? If surface transfer from the L1 does not really occur, precisely how does L1 knowledge interact with L2 acquisition? How can L1 knowledge be used to enhance L2 acquisition? Much of the research in L2 pedagogy has tried to answer these types of questions; however, our suggestion in this chapter is that theory-driven research, and in particular UG-based research paradigms, can and should guide us in building efficient language-teaching methodologies.

CONCLUSIONS

We have argued that UG-based SLA research has afforded us a clearer and more precise picture of what needs to be learned than we had previously. These findings can and should be developed into a principled language pedagogy. Having iso-
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lated these areas, we now need to go on to the next step, in order to determine whether the UG describes the language faculty, and whether this will facilitate language learning.
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The acquisition task is rendered more complex by additional pedagogical support: we have seen how learning, namely when parameter setting specific lexical learning has to occur (by is in the L2, but much more complex and subcategorization, and when structural complexity.

The focus of research was to compare L2 acquisition research has afforded us a clearer and more pedagogical support that is needed to affect grammar learning will undoubtedly virtually strategies will have to be devised to affect L2 pedagogy has tried to answer the question in this chapter is that theory-based research paradigms, can and should be taught.

research has afforded us a clearer and more pedagogical support. These findings have been central to the development of a principled language pedagogy. Having iso-

lated these areas, we now need to experiment with different pedagogical practices in order to determine whether those areas are amenable to enhanced focus and whether this will facilitate language learning.
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