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This study is a bidirectional work which aims at displaying the issue of age factor in second language acquisition and in the end trying to find out an answer to the question: is acquiring a language in the early ages or getting a language later ages gives more successful results? Consequently, it arises that despite the fact that both age group factors are really influential, language learning in later ages’ group which have higher motivation seems easier. By making a literature review and an experimental study; reaching the intended and aimed answer was tried. For this subject, variety of books, articles and online journals were used as a reference and source.
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Bu çalışma, ikinci dil ediniminde yaş faktörü meselesinin iki yönlü olarak ortaya konmasını amaçlayan ve sonunda da küçük yaşta ikinci dil edinimini yoksa ileri yaşlarda ikinci dil edinimimi daha başarılı sonuçlar vermektedir sorusuna cevap arayan bir uğraşıdır. Sonuç olarak ta günümüz de bu iki ihtimalin her iisinin de çok etkili faktörler olmasına rağmen motivasyonu daha yüksek olan ileri yaş grubunda dil ediniminin kolaylığı ön plana çıkmıştır. Literatür taraması ve deneysel bir çalışma yapılarak istenilen ve hedeflenen cevaba ulaşılmaya çalışılmıştır. Bu konu ile ilgili çok çeşitli kitaplar makaleler ve internet üzerinden yayınlanan online dergiler kaynak olarak kullanılmıştır.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Presentation

This chapter begins with background of the study. Then, it continues with problem part which aims to foreshadow the readers about the things they will find out throughout the study. The purpose of the study comes next to enlighten the researchers about why this work has been done. The last part is devoted to the limitations of the study.

1.2. Background of the Study

The level of cognitive development, socio-economic and cultural background, and the ability to acquire a language, age and motivation of the learner’s can be expressed as the factors affecting second language acquisition. The competency of a learner’s in his or her first language has a direct relationship with his or her age. Schooling and cognitive development are the other factors affecting the second language acquisition. In researches and studies made on second language acquisition, the learners who completed their first language acquisition have been found more successful in second language acquisition. Motivation is another factor affecting second language acquisition. Achieving motivation lets the learner a desire to learn a language. Studies on motivation show that motivated learners are more successful in second language acquisition.

Most children in the world learn to speak two languages. Bilingualism is present in just about every country around the world, in all classes of society, and in all age groups (Grosjean, 1982 and McLaughlin, 1984). In the United States monolingualism traditionally has been the norm. Bilingualism was regarded as a social First- and Second-Language Acquisition in Early Childhood stigma and liability. Language represents culture, and the bilingual person is often a member of a minority group whose way of thinking and whose values are unfamiliar to the majority. Language is something we can identify and try to eradicate without showing our distrust and fear of others. Even strong supporters of bilingual education such as Cummins (1981) do not claim that bilingual education is the most important element in a child’s education. In Cummins view, it is more about good programs and about the status of the language group in their community that will determine success. There are no negative effects for children who are bilingual. Their language development follows the same pattern as that of monolingual children (Goodz, 1994). Children who develop proficiency in using their native language to communicate, to gain information, to solve problems, and to
think can easily learn to use a second language in similar ways. (Pérez & Torres-Guzmán, 1996). Even young children who are learning a second language bring all of the knowledge about language learning they have acquired through developing their first language. For these children, then, second-language acquisition is not a process of discovering what language is, but rather of discovering what this language is. (Tabors, 1997). There is, however, much more variation in how well and how quickly individuals acquire a second language. There is no evidence that there are any biological limits to second-language learning or that children necessarily have an advantage over adults. Even those who begin to learn a second language in childhood may always have difficulty with pronunciation, rules of grammar, and vocabulary, and they may never completely master the forms or uses of the language. There is no simple way to explain why some people are successful at second-language learning and some are not. Social and educational variables, experiential factors, and individual differences in attitude, personality, age, and motivation all affect language learning. Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994 notes that ultimate retention of two languages depends on a large number of factors, such as the prestige of the languages, cultural pressures, motivation, opportunities of use but not on age of acquisition (McLaughlin, 1984). It should not be surprising that bilingual children often have one area of language learning that is not equal between the two languages. It does not happen very often that both languages will be equally balanced. The society that children find themselves in and how important each language is viewed within that society are very important. Children will only continue to use two languages if doing so is perceived to be valuable. As children go through school, they usually lose much of their ability in their native language. Children bring their attitudes toward a second language and those who speak it as well as their attitude toward their first language.

1.3. Problem

Starting from the beginning of the last century our world has been witnessing a boom of communication technologies. As a consequence of these advances human beings need to communicate with each other for a variety of reasons. These causes make the acquiring of a second language a must. At this time a big problem arises. Which one is better? Starting to learn a second language at an early age or at a later age? People start learning a new language other than mother tongue in different ages. I chose a research group in a private language course in Kahramanmaras. Now that, it is a growing industrial city lots of people from different backgrounds want to learn a foreign language. As a result this research gave me remarkable results for understanding age related differences in getting a language.
1.4. Purpose of the Study

At the literature review part I will try to exemplify the studies made on the age factor in second language learning. In the methodology part I will try to tell the results of my own study in a private course in Kahramanmaras. At the conclusion part we will have enough data to have a value judgment about whether to learn younger or at a later age.

_Hypothesis 1:_ The students who started learning English in their secondary school period reach more competency levels than older students.

_Hypothesis 2:_ The students who started learning English after finishing their university education reach more competencies.

1.5. Significance of the Study

The above given aim of the study appears to prove the thesis; the study may have a contribution toward the fact that except from having different reasons for acquiring a new language, pupils reflect various results according to their age when they are exposed to a new language.

1.6. Scope and Limitations

This study is limited by several conditions:

This study is conducted on elementary level students of both junior groups and adult groups of American Cultural Association Language Courses Kahramanmaras Branch. The students were chosen according to their age group. After three months of education their ultimate levels might provide a light on the age factor.

This study covers just elementary level. During the course they took 5 progress tests to measure their achievement.

The other limitation of the study is the number of the students in experimental and control groups. It was because the number of the students in classes which is around eleven. So, in this study the number of the subjects was about twenty-two. Due to small number of subjects involved in the research, the results will be limited to the subjects under study. A larger group of subjects would help to produce results that are more reliable.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

It is commonly thought that younger children get the new languages “naturally” and very easily, but older learners generally have a long, hard struggle to achieve even a moderate fluency. Throughout the years various hypothesis have been put forward to explain these informal observations. Besides, a lot of studies have been done to search “the optimal age to learn a second language”.

A survey of the literature yields a remarkable diversity of explanatory hypothesis for the perceived advantage of children versus older learners. As Larsen-Freeman (1975: 175, quoted in Harley B., 1986) comments that at one time or another second language acquisition researchers have entertained the thought that one, all, none or a combination of the following could be used to explain the purported differential success between child and adult learners of a second language: biological factors, affective factors, motivation, time allotment, cerebral dominance (hemisphericity) and learning conditions.

The findings of empirical studies have been equally diverse. Some results have been interpreted as confirming the view that preadolescent children have a special propensity for second language (L2) acquisition (e.g. Oyama, 1976, quoted in Harley B., 1986), while others appear to show the opposite. Clearly these studies need to be closely examined in a theoretical light to determine what differences in the subjects, settings, or experiments can be hypothesized to account for the apparently contradictory results.

In both first- and second-language acquisition, a stimulating and rich linguistic environment will support language development. How often and how well parents communicate with their children is a strong predictor of how rapidly children expand their language learning. Encouraging children to express their needs, ideas, and feelings whether in one language or two enriches children linguistically and cognitively.

Engaging the children and encouraging them to express themselves interactively while building on their prior knowledge in real-life situations is an effective way to build language experience (McLaughlin, 1984 quoted in Singleton D., 1986). Young children will become bilingual when there is a real need to communicate in two languages and will just as quickly reverts back to monolingualism when there is no longer a need. If children’s interactions outside the home are in only one language, they may quickly switch over to that language and
may only have a receptive understanding of their first language. This process may occur even more rapidly when there is more than one child in the family. Children are not usually equally proficient in both languages. They may use one language with parents and another with their peers or at school. At the same time children are acquiring new vocabulary and understanding of the use of language, it may appear that they are falling behind in language acquisition; however, it is normal for there to be waves of language acquisition. Overall, continued first-language development is related to superior scholastic achievement. When children do not have many opportunities to use language and have not been provided with a rich experiential base, they may not learn to function well in their second language, and at the same time, they may not continue to develop their first language. This phenomenon occurs whether children are monolingual or bilingual with the result that their language level is not appropriate for their age. Language learning is not linear, and formal teaching does not speed up the learning process. Language learning is dynamic. Language must be meaningful and used (Collier, 1995a; Grosjean, 1982; Krashen, 1996; McLaughlin, 1984). Tabor states that young children, then, certainly seem to understand that learning a second language is a cognitively challenging and time-consuming activity. Being exposed to a second language is obviously not enough; wanting to communicate with people who speak that language is crucial if acquisition is to occur. Children who are in a second-language learning situation have to be sufficiently motivated to start learning a new language. (Tabors, 1997, p. 81). There is real concern that if children do not fully acquire their first language, they may have difficulty later in becoming fully literate and academically proficient in the second language (Collier, 1992, 1995a; Collier & Thomas, 1989; Cummins, 1981, 1991; Collier & Thomas, 1995). The interactive relationship between language and cognitive growth is important. Preserving and strengthening the home language supports the continuity of cognitive growth. Cognitive development will not be interrupted when children and parents use the language they know best. Experience and ideas must be familiar and meaningful to the child to be learned. Everything acquired in the first language (academic skills, literacy development, concept formation, subject knowledge, and learning strategies) will transfer to the second language. As children are learning the second language, they are drawing on the background and experience they have available to them from their first language. Collier believes that the skills children develop in their first language form the foundation they must have to be academically successful in their second language. Children who are literate in their first language may experience cognitive difficulties as they acquire a second language. Literacy not only transfers across languages, it facilitates learning to read in another language even
when the language and writing system appear to be very different. Reading in all languages is done in the same way and is acquired in the same way. The common linguistic universals in all languages mean that children who learn to read well in their first language will probably read well in their second language. Reading in the primary language is a powerful way of continuing to develop literacy in that language, and to do so, children must have access to a print-rich environment in the primary language (Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994; Collier, 1995a; Cummins, 1981; Krashen, 1996; McLaughlin, 1984; Pérez & Torres-Guzmán, 1996). When we learn a new language, we are not just learning new vocabulary and grammar; we are also learning new ways of organizing concepts, new ways of thinking, and new ways of learning language. Knowing two languages is much more than simply knowing two ways of speaking (Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994, p. 122). When children learn all new information and skills in English, their first language becomes stagnant and does not keep pace with their new knowledge. This may lead to limited bilingualism, where children never become truly proficient in either their first or second language. Supporting only English also gives children the impression that different languages and cultures are not valued. On cognitive and academic measures, children who have lost their first language (so-called; subtractive bilinguals) do not score as well as children who have maintained or expanded their first language as they acquire the second language (additive bilinguals) (Collier, 1992; Ramsey, 1987; Saville-Troike, 1982). When the first language continues to be supported (and this support is especially important when the first language is not the power language outside the home), introducing a second language between the ages of 5 and 11 will ensure full cognitive growth in the first language, which will support full cognitive growth in the second language (Collier, 1995b). The learner’s social skills and styles are also important to language learning. Children who are naturally social and communicative seek out opportunities to engage others. If these children are given lots of opportunity to interact positively with others who speak the target language, their language learning is promoted. Personality, social competence, motivation, attitudes, learning style, and social style in both learners and speakers influence the way a child learns the second language. With the variety of programs available to children, these elements become variables that are difficult to factor in and whose effect is difficult to predict (Lindfors, 1991; Wong Fillmore, 1991a; Wong Fillmore, 1991b computer).
According to the citations above, there are various aspects of second language acquisition to consider when doing a study. In my paper I want to give some hints to the readers about the critical age factor and educational dimensions of second language acquisition.

2.2. The Critical Period Hypothesis

Critical period is the term used in biology to refer to a limited phase in the development of an organism during which a particular activity or competency must be acquired if it is to be incorporated into the behavior of that organism. De Villiers & De Villiers 1978, quoted in Singleton 1989 says that, For example, shortly after hatching, the young of Mallard ducks will follow the first moving object they see. It is usually the mother duck, but in her absence they might become attached to a bird of another species, a prying human naturalist, or as unlikely a parent as a coloured balloon. This following behaviour only occurs within a certain time period after hatching, after which point the ducklings develop a fear of strange objects and retreat instead of following. Within these time limits is the critical period for the following behaviour.

If language acquisition is stringently constrained by the limits of a critical period, this might give the meaning that the acquisition process can not get under way before the start of this period. Unless it begins before the period ends, it simply will not happen.

When does the critical period start? Singleton (1989) suggests that language can not begin to develop until a certain level of physical maturation and growth has been achieved. Between the ages of two and three years language emerges by an interaction of maturation and self-programmed learning.

When does the critical period end? According to Singleton (1989), the age most frequently presented as the upper limit of the critical period is the early teens, that is to say, the stage at which childhood is ending and adolescence, with the beginning of puberty.

For the rest of my study, I will try to observe the age related evidences in the second language acquisition.
2.3. The Younger - Better Position

Singleton (1989) claims “the position that success in second language learning is inversely related to age coincides”, of course, with popular belief on the question. It is enough to dismiss this belief as unscientific, and to proclaim openly that folk psychology is not a good basis for doing research in second language learning. However, at a period when a whole range of sciences, from physics to pharmacology, are finding substance in what were previously stigmatized as ‘old wives’ tales’, blanket dismissal of the popular view may appear somewhat cavalier.

Moreover, the experience underlying the popular view can not easily be dismissed, and such experience must include evidence of a kind. The following sample from Tomb, 1925, concerning British residents in India as the time of Raj will strike a chord with most people who have had a chance to observe immigrant families in any country. He points out that it is a common experience in the district of Bengal in which the writer resides to hear English children three or four years old who have been born in the country conversing freely at different times with their parents in English, with their ayahs (nurses) in Bengali, with the garden-coolies in Santali, and with the house-servants in Hindustani, while their parents have learnt with the aid of a munshi (teacher) and much laborious effort just sufficient Hindustani to comprehend what the house-servants are saying and to issue simple orders to them connected with domestic affairs. It is even not unusual to see English parents in India unable to understand what their servants are saying to them in Hindustani, and being driven in consequence to bring along an English child of four or five years old, if available, to act as interpreter. Another point to be noted in relation to the popular belief about age effects in second language learning is that it seems to concur with the professional intuitions of many language teachers. Indeed, the annals of language teaching are rich in anecdotal support for this belief. Typical is Kirch’s report (1956 quoted in Singleton 1989) in which without giving any real figures, he claims that a group of grade1 learners of German as a second language he observed that they had a better pronunciation in German compared to grade3, grade6 and college-level learners with whom he compared them.
Another category of evidence is the body of results from various American studies of the effects of programmes of foreign languages in the elementary school (FLES). For example, in 1962 a research was conducted in New Jersey (Vollmer (1962) quoted in Singleton 1989). In this particular scheme, FLES graduates continuing to study the language begun in the elementary grades were assigned in high school to an Enriched Language Pattern (ELP) group at a level essentially a year ahead of their non-FLES peers in the Traditional Language Pattern (TLP) group. Vollmer’s research involved the evaluation of 1530 subjects from the classes of 1957-1961. Its principle finding was that students in the ELP group achieved foreign language grades which were nearly 10% higher than those of the TLP students of similar ability despite the age gap of one year.

The problem with evidence of this kind is the embarrassment of variables. In the study just mentioned it was not only age of initial exposure to the foreign language that differentiated two groups but also length of exposure. The ELP group had been learning the foreign language for six years at elementary level whereas the TLP students had only begun their foreign language in the ninth grade.

In a primary study, Brega & Newell, 1965, compared the level of proficiency in French of a group of 15 students who had entered the elementary French programme at grade 3 and had completed two years of high school French in addition to the FLES programme with that of a group of 17 non-FLES students who had just completed two years of high school French. They found that performance of the FLES group on four Modern Languages Association Foreign Language Tests was crucially better than of the non-FLES group. However, in this case, not only was the length of exposure to French not controlled for, but it also indicated that the average IQ of the FLES group was significantly higher than that of the non-FLES group. In a following comparative study (Brega & Newell 1967, quoted in Singleton 1989) involving 54 subjects randomly selected amongst FLES and non-FLES high school learners of French; IQ was controlled for, as well as the possible effect of different groups having different instructors. Again the FLES group performed significantly better, but again too, clearly, length of exposure to French constituted an additional variable.
Another example mentioned by Yamada et all. (1980). In this study the subjects were 30 Japanese elementary school pupils, all of average scholastic achievement, distributed evenly across three age-groups. Thus, there were 10 first graders aged 7 years, 10 third graders aged 9 years and 10 fifth graders aged 11 years. None of the subjects had had any previous experience of English. The experiment searched these subjects’ success in learning a small selection of English vocabulary items. From a list of 40 mono- and di-syllabic words, the denotatum of each of which was represented in an associated picture, each subject was given four items to learn, together with the corresponding pictures, in two learning sessions separated by a period of twenty-four hours. In individual tests it was found that ‘mean learning scores decrease with age, i.e. the older the age the lower the score’.

Some researchers mentions the experience of immigrants acquiring second languages in a naturalistic manner. A number of studies conducted in recent years show a relation between early age of entry into the host country and successful acquisition of its language. One such study is the experiment carried out by Asher & Garcia (1969) that revealed an interaction between age of entry and length of residence, but which showed age of entry to be the better indicator of successful acquisition of pronunciation. The subjects of this study were 71 Cuban immigrants ranging in age from 7 to 19 years, most of who had been in the USA for about five years. A group of 19 American high School children (native speakers of American English) acted as judges of randomly ordered recordings of the Cubans and of a control group of 30 American-born children saying the same set of English sentences. They were scored for fidelity of pronunciation on a four point scale, the extremes of which were “native speaker” and “definite foreign accent”. Asher & Garcia found out that none of the 71 Cuban subjects was judged to have native pronunciation. However, many of them seemed to speak with near-native pronunciation, and the highest possibility of being judged this way occurred in relation to children who had entered the USA between the ages of 1 and 6 years and had lived there over a period of five and six years. In addition the younger a child ha been when entering the USA, the higher the possibility of a native-like accent. This possibility increased when the child had lived longer in the country.
Another study of immigrants’ English language proficiency is that of Ramsey & Wright (1974), who collected data about age of arrival in Canada and attainment in English. They followed a method to take random selection of 25% of classrooms at the grades 5, 7, and 9 across the City of Toronto and to get background information and test measures from the 5000+ students in those classrooms. The language tests given were a vocabulary test and a language skill test including subtests in auditory perception, intonation, lexical knowledge, knowledge of functions and knowledge of idioms.

For each grade a mean test score was calculated and the scores of the 1,200+ students in the sample who had been born outside Canada were expressed in terms of variation from the grade mean. Since no clear trend emerged from this type of analysis, the results were then conflated across grade levels, thus increasing the size of each ‘age of arrival’ group. On the basis of this second mode of analysis Ramsey & Wright felt able to conclude:

In another study (Ramsey C. & Wright 1974, quoted in Singleton 1989) for students who arrived in Canada at the age of seven or older, there is a clear negative relationship between age on arrival and performance. The relationships are modest, however, reflecting the wide range of performance of these students.

An interestingly different approach which was adopted in Seliger et al.’s (1975) investigation of the English and Hebrew proficiency of immigrants to the United States and Israel respectively. In this case the data on subjects’ second language proficiency were these subjects’ own perceptions rather than assessments of a more ‘objective’ kind. The data were obtained by interviewing 394 adults who had migrated at various ages and from various countries. The questions asked concerned country of birth, age, age of arrival in the host country and distinguishability from native speakers of their second language. An analysis of these interviews revealed that majority 9 respondents who had migrated at or under the age of nine years reported that most speakers of their target language thought they were native-speakers. Most respondents who had migrated at or over the age of 16 years, on the other hand, felt they still had a foreign accent. Of respondents who migrated between the ages of 10 and 15 years the number who reported a foreign accent ‘was nearly identical to the number who reported no accent’.
This is another example from which was taken from Oyama (1976, 1978) on 60 male Italian immigrants to the United States. Her subjects were all drawn from the greater New York area and had entered the United States at ages ranging from 6 to 20 years. There was a corresponding variety in the length of time they had lived in the United States, which ranged from 5 to 18 years. Oyama tested her subjects for degree of approximation to a Native American English accent and for proficiency in English listening comprehension. In the former experiment (1976) subjects were required to read aloud a short paragraph in English and also to recount in English a frightening episode from their personal experience. Master tapes of the speech so elicited were made, with control samples intermingled at irregular intervals. A 45-second extract from each sample was then judged by two American-born graduate students, using a five-point scale ranging from ‘no foreign accent’ to ‘heavy foreign accent’. The analysis of results, which treated age of arrival and length of residence as separate, independent variables revealed ‘an extremely strong Age at Arrival effect... virtually no effect from the Number of Years in the United States factor, and a very small interaction effect’. The nature of the age effect Oyama (1976) summarizes as follows; the youngest arrivals perform in the range set by the controls, whereas those arriving after about age 12 do not, and substantial accents start appearing much earlier.

In the listening comprehension experiment involving the same subjects, 12 short sentences (5—7 words long) were recorded by a Native American female. The recorded sentences were then played to subjects through headphones against a background of masking ‘white noise’ (at a signal-to-noise ratio which, according to indications from pilot tests did not cause problems of intelligibility to native-speakers of English), following an instruction to repeat what had been understood. Again the scores obtained reveal a clear age of arrival effect; those subjects who began learning English before age 11 showed comprehension scores similar to those of native speakers, whereas later arrivals did less well; those who arrived after the age of 16 showed markedly lower comprehension scores than the natives.
In another study, on a very much more restricted scale were Kessler & İdar’s (1979) longitudinal and comparative study of the morphological development in English of a Vietnamese woman refugee and her four-year-old daughter living in Texas. Progress was measured for both subjects between two stages. For the mother Stages 1 and 2 comprised respectively the first and last eight weeks of a six-month period during which she was communicating in English at work. For the child Stage 1 covered the last three weeks of a nine-week stay with an American family, her first real experience of an English-speaking environment, and Stage 2 was situated a year after the beginning of her stay with the above family, i.e. some 10 months after the end of Stage 1. During this time, subsequent to her leaving the American home, she attended an English-speaking kindergarten.

The results of a comparison between mother and child in respect of progress towards acquiring six grammatical morphemes between the two stages are as follows. In the mother’s case none of the six morphemes studied was used more than 17% more accurately in Stage 2 than in Stage 1. In the case of the child, on the other hand, improvements of up to 74% were recorded. Kessler and Idar commented that in comparing the two stages of the mother with those of the young daughter, the lack of change in the mother’s acquisition level as opposed to that of the child is readily evident. Clearly the daughter’s Stage 2 represents a higher level of L2 proficiency than that of the mother at either of her two stages.

Another support for the idea of younger=better position is the study of Patkowski (1980). This is a further immigrant study which appears to offer support for the ‘younger = better’ hypothesis is that of Patkowski (1980). Patkowski’s experimental subjects were 67 highly educated immigrants to the United States from various backgrounds, all of whom had resided in their host country for at least five years. His control subjects were 15 native-born Americans of ‘similar backgrounds. All subjects were interviewed in English and transcripts of five-minute samples of these interviews were then submitted to two trained judges for assessment of syntax on a scale from 0 to 5 (with a possible + value for any level except 5).
Patkowski’s results show a strong negative relation between age of arrival and syntactic rating. In addition, the distribution of ratings for the 33 subjects who had entered the United States before age 15 years differed markedly from that for the 34 subjects who had arrived after that age. In the former case there was a distinct bunching of ratings at the upper end of the scale, with 32 of the 33 subjects scoring at the 4+ to 5 level. In the latter case, on the other hand, there was a strikingly ‘normal’ curve centered on the 3+ level, with only five subjects scoring at the 4+ to 5 level and eight subjects scoring at the 2+ to 3 level.

Other variables whose effects were tested statistically were: number of years spent in the United States, amount of informal exposure to English and amount of formal instruction in English. Of these the only one to exhibit a significant effect was amount of informal exposure, and this was at such a low level of correlation as to ‘explain’ less than 5% of the variance. Moreover, this relationship disappeared when the effect of age of arrival was eliminated.

Two subsidiary experiments were carried out by Patkowski in association with the research described above. Using the same data as for the syntax assessment he replicated Oyama’s (1976) results in respect of phonology. When 30-second extracts from each of the taped interviews were submitted to the above-mentioned judges for phonological assessment on a scale from 0 to 5 a strong negative relationship was found between age of arrival and accent rating with one of the other independent variables showing an important effect. He also gathered further data from his subjects’ means of a written multiple-choice test of syntactic competence. In this case the age effect revealed was not so sharp, but subjects who had entered the United States before age 15 still tended to do better.

In order to straddle the borderline between immigrant studies and studies involving shorter-term second language learners Singleton (1989) gives the study of Tahta et al (1981a, 1981b) as an example. They investigated both an immigrant sample (1981a) and a group with only formal exposure to one of the languages in question and no exposure at all to the other (1981b). Interestingly, their two sets of results are in broad agreement with each other.
The immigrant sample consisted of 54 males and 55 females who, from a variety of countries and at various ages, had migrated to the United Kingdom and had been living there for a minimum of two years. Data were gathered by tape-recording these subjects reading aloud a passage of English prose and responding to questions about their second language learning history. Each tape-recording was then listened to by three independent judges, who assigned a rating for accent of 0 (‘no foreign accent’), 1 (‘detectable but slight accent’) or 2 (‘marked accent’).

The results suggest age of commencement of acquisition of English as the factor of overwhelming importance in phonological proficiency:

If L2 learning had commenced by 6, then L2 is invariably accent-free. If L2 learning commenced after 13, then L2 is invariably accented, usually quite markedly.

From 7 to 9 the chances of an accent-free L2 still seem very healthy, while from 9 to 11 the chances have dropped rather abruptly to about 50%. From 12 to 13 onwards, the chances of an accent-free L2 are minimal amongst our subjects.

The only other variable which made a significant contribution was use of English at home.

Tahta et al.’s other sample consisted of 231 English-speaking children and adolescents ranging from 5 to 15 years and drawn from four state schools in Surrey. These subjects were asked to imitate words and short phrases in French (a language to which most subjects over eight had had some formal exposure) and Armenian (which was unfamiliar to all subjects) and their efforts were rated on a 0—3 scale. In addition, two slightly longer phrases in each language were repeated and subjects’ imitations of the intonation patterns were judged as either correct or incorrect. For subjects aged seven and over, if intonation was not correctly copied in both phrases, the less well imitated one was further repeated up to a maximum of ten times until its intonation pattern was faithfully replicated. Proceedings were conducted by a female native speaker of French and a female native speaker of Armenian, who were also responsible for evaluation, each investigator rating performance in the language which was native to her.
The results of this experiment show a generally negative relationship between age and performance. However, a difference does emerge between pronunciation and intonation. As far as pronunciation is concerned, there is a steady linear decline in mean scores with increasing age. With regard to intonation, on the other hand, there is a marked and rapid drop in performance ratings between 8 and 11 years and then a slight superiority in the performance of 13—15-year-olds over that of 11—12-year-olds. These findings are consistent across the two languages used in the experiment.

2.4. The Older Better Position

Evidence favouring the hypothesis that older second language learners are more successful the younger ones mostly comes from studies of learning as an outcome of formal instruction, that is to say, very short-term experimental research, and studies based on primary school second language teaching projects and second language immersion programmes. However, the results of some immigrant studies also seem to point to an advantage for older learners. While most of the relevant studies involve children as at least one element of comparison, there is a small miscellany of studies focused on adolescents and adults of different ages whose results also indicate that older learners fare better.

Of the short-duration experiments involving children and adults, one of the best known is that of Asher & Price (1967) was that their experimental subjects were 96 pupils from the second, fourth and eighth grades of Blackford School, San Jose State College, and 37 undergraduate students from San Jose State College. None of the subjects had had any prior experience of the experimental target language, Russian. In three short training units subjects listened to taped commands in Russian and watched them being responded to by an adult model. Half of the subjects simply observed while the other half imitated the model’s actions. Each session was followed by a retention test in which each subject was individually required, without benefit of a model, to obey Russian commands heard during training, and also ‘novel’ commands comprising recombinations of elements in the learned commands.
The results’ were that the adults, on average and at every level of linguistic complexity, consistently and dramatically outperformed the children and adolescents. With regard to these latter groups, the 14-year-olds (eighth graders) consistently did significantly better than the eight-year-olds (second graders), and the 10-year-olds (fourth graders) in the action-imitating group did significantly better than their eight-year-old counterparts. Other differences amongst the school-pupils were slight, but were, nevertheless, in a consistently positive relationship with advancing age. Asher & Price acknowledge the possible selectivity effect in relation to the college students, whose mental ability would have been above average. However, citing Pimsleur (1966, quoted in Singleton (1989), they claim that ‘general mental ability is a lightweight factor in second language learning accounting for less than 20% of the variance’.

Another American experiment conducted in the 1960s which seemed to indicate an advantage for older second language learners was that of Politzer & Weiss (1969). The subjects in this case were drawn in roughly equal numbers from the first, third and fifth grades of an elementary school and from the seventh and ninth grades of a junior high school. The schools in question drew their pupils from identical areas and the same socio-economic background. Subjects with any knowledge of French were skipped, as were subjects known to have speech or hearing disability.

The experimental procedure consisted of an auditory discrimination test, a pronunciation test and a recall test. In the first of these (taken by 257 subjects) subjects were asked to indicate whether or not 40 pairs of French words, half of which differed by one vowel, were or were not identical and to perform the same task on eight pairs of English and French words such as sea / si and do / doux. In the pronunciation test (taken by 244 subjects), for each of 14 French words, subjects were shown a picture of the image of the item and then (asked to imitate four identical taped pronunciations of the item. Subjects’ attempts were recorded and subsequently evaluated by two native speaker judges. The recall test was administrated together with the pronunciation test. After pronouncing items 1—4, were shown again the pictures relating to those items in the same order and asked to recall the French name of each item? The same process was repeated with pictures 5—8, 9—12, and 13—14. Subjects’ responses were recorded and at a later stage assessed by the native speaker judges.
The results show a general improvement of scores with increasing age in all three tests. Politzer & Weiss acknowledge that, since almost all subjects above grade three level had had some exposure to Spanish and many of the seventh and ninth graders were receiving regular instruction in that language, there may be some question of a progressive effect for Spanish training. However, they go on to claim that such training could only have directly influenced performance on a small subset of test items, namely those which required the discrimination of French non-diphthongal vowels from their English near-equivalents (8 out of 48 items in the auditory discrimination test) and those which required the pronunciation of French non-diphthongal vowels (4 out of 14 items in the pronunciation test).

Singleton (1989) mentioned about a very different kind of experiment which was taken from Smith & Braine, reported in Macnamara 1966, but their results tended in a similar direction. They attempted to teach subjects of widely differing age a miniature artificial language, and then tested them on their progress. In the tests the adult subjects performed better than the children.

To return to the realm of natural languages, Olsen & Samuels (1973) investigated the relative capacity of American English speakers in three different age-groups to learn to pronounce the sounds of German. The three groups consisted of 20 elementary school pupils (ages 9.5—10.5), 20 junior high school pupils (age 14—15) and 20 college students (ages 18—26). None of the subjects had had any previous foreign language learning experience. Each subject participated in the same programme of ten 15—2 minute taped sessions of German phoneme pronunciation drills. On 8 post-test of pronunciation scored by two judges (a German native speaker and an American graduate student majoring in German) there was a marked age-group effect, with the two older groups - performing significantly better than the elementary age-group. The difference between the two older groups was not significant but, such as it was, it favoured the college group. Intellectual ability was taken into account but was not found to be a significant factor.
We turn now to the above-mentioned studies of the results of various FLES schemes (to use the American terminology), that is to say, investigations of the success or otherwise of introducing second languages into the elementary/primary school curriculum. The study is about one relatively early study, report by Ekstrand in two unpublished documents (Ekstrand 1959, 1964) and subsequently in a more recent article (Ekstrand 1978a), was concerned with the teaching of English in the early grades of Swedish primary schools. In the first phase of this project 1,000 or so pupils ranging in age from 8 to 11 years and drawn from elementary school grades ranging from 1 to 4 were exposed to 18 weeks of English instruction via a strictly audio-visual methodology. The pronunciation of a random sample of 355 of these pupils was then tested by means of a procedure which required them to imitate a number of English words and sentences extracted from the teaching materials. Judgment of the accuracy of their pronunciation was effected by three methods, the first involving the transcription and comparison of entire utterances, the second focusing on individual speech sounds and the third consisting in an impressionistic rating by an experienced radio teacher. All three methods yielded results which improved almost linearly with age. A listening comprehension test was also administered. This required subjects to translate some English sentences taken from the teaching tape. Again the scores achieved by the pupils on this test increased steadily with age. Similar results were obtained by Grinder et al. (1961, quoted in Singleton 1989) who, in a study of the relationship between age and proficiency in Japanese as a second language amongst second, third and fourth graders in Hawaii using the same audio-lingual course, found that the older children consistently outperformed the younger ones.

Bland & Keislar (1966), made another interesting study. This involved six fifth graders and four kindergarteners from a West Los Angeles elementary school and was based on a completely individualized programme of oral French. The programme in question made use of a Beli & Howell Language Master, a machine which could play back utterances recorded on strips of audiotape affixed to cards, which also displayed graphic representations of the utterance meanings. One hundred of these cards were used, one utterance and one drawing being associated with each card. One criterion used in assessing the effectiveness of the programme was the time each learner took to ‘speak correctly’ the sentences used for instruction. Amongst the fifth graders this time ranged from 4.5 to 11 hours, the mean being 6.9 hours, whereas amongst the kindergarteners the range was from 12.5 to 17.5 hours and the mean was 15.1 hours.
An entirely unequivocal study, and one which by all accounts was very influential in America, was that of the long-term effect of FLES instruction in Japanese schools conducted by Oller & Nagato (1974). The 233 subjects for this study were drawn from the 7th, 9th- and 11th grades of a private elementary and secondary school system for girls, and at each grade level included some pupils who had experienced a six-year FLES programme in English and some who had not. Subjects’ proficiency in English was measured by means of a 50-item cloze test, a separate test having been constructed for each grade.

The results of these tests were adjusted for IQ level, and on the basis of the adjusted cores means were computed for the FLES group and the non-FLES group in each grade. What emerged from the three analyses is summed up by Oller & Nagato as follows; the first comparison shows a highly significant difference between FLES and non-FLES students at the seventh grade level. This difference is reduced by the ninth grade though still significant; at the eleventh grade, it is insignificant.

To come now to the work of Burstall and her colleagues (Burstall et al. 1974; summary in Burstall 1975b, quoted in Singleton (1989), this was essentially an evaluation of the so-called ‘pilot scheme’ under which in the 1960s and 1970s foreign language teaching was introduced by the Ministry of Education into selected primary schools in England and Wales. This scheme provided for instruction in French as a foreign language to all pupils from the age of eight years in the participating schools. The evaluation covered the period 1964—1974, focusing longitudinally on three age-groups or ‘cohorts’ of pupils attending participating schools involved being in the region of 17,000.

The part of the research which is relevant in the present context is that which compares the proficiency in French of pupils who had experienced primary school French with of pupils who had not. Various comparisons were made at various stages, and the results are interpreted by Burstall et al. as indicating a progressive diminution of any advantage conferred by early and extra exposure to French. This effect is most apparent from comparisons between the experimental sample and control groups of 11-year-old beginners drawn from the same secondary schools and most frequently from the same French classes as the experimental pupils.
When the experimental and control pupils were compared at the age of 13 the experimental pupils scored significantly higher than the control pupils on the Speaking test and on the Listening test, but the control pupils’ performance on the Reading test and on the Writing test equaled or surpassed that of the experimental pupils. When the experimental and the control pupils were compared at the age of 16, the only test on which the experimental pupils still scored significantly higher than the control pupils was the Listening test. The two groups of pupils did not differ in their performance on the Speaking test, but the control pupils maintained their superiority on the Reading test and on the Writing test.

Given the three-year start of the experimental pupils this looks very much like further evidence of the superiority of the older learner, and more direct evidence still is forthcoming from another comparison in the study that is to say when the experimental pupils were compared at the age of 13 with control pupils who had been learning French for an equivalent amount of time, but who were, on average, two years older than those in the experimental sample, the control pupils’ performance on each of the French tests was consistently superior to that of the experimental pupils.

Here come two more North American immigrant studies which provide further evidence tending in the same direction. The first is Walberg et al.’s (1978) work on the English proficiency of Japanese children and young adults living in the United States. Three hundred and fifty-two such subjects ranging in age-level from kindergarten to twelfth grade were to rate the relative difficulty of English and Japanese in respect of reading, writing, speaking and listening. In addition, the American teachers of an overlapping sample of 360 Japanese pupils from grades 1 to 9 were asked to rate the pupils on a four-point scale (ranging from ‘far behind the average American student in the class’ to ‘better than average’) with respect to reading, writing, vocabulary, and the expression of facts, concepts and feelings. The combined results from these two sets of ratings suggest that rapid gains in second language fluency and competency are made early in the learning process and that learning slows down as the process continues. No evidence emerges of an advantage for younger learners. On the contrary, since the older children were found to reach American peer norms in the same amount of time as the younger children took to reach the lower norms of the American age-peers, it can be inferred that ‘older children learn faster.’

The second and more recent and rather different kind of study is that of Horwitz (1983), which concentrates on adolescents and very young adults. The purpose of this study was to ascertain whether there was any relationship between conceptual level and
competence in a second language. Conceptual level is seen by Horwitz in the perspective of Hunt’s model of conceptual development (Hunt 1971; Hunt et al. 1978), which represents conceptual level as indexing both cognitive complexity and interpersonal maturity and which envisages four stages of development from uncompromising self-centeredness to flexibility and social awareness. Horwitz’s subjects were 6! English-speaking female pupils drawn from four secondary schools situated in a south-western district of the United States. Their age ranged from 14 to 18 years, the mean being 15.9, and all were at approximately the same stage in learning French, having reached roughly the same point in their common textbook. Tests were administered to determine subjects’ conceptual level (Paragraph Completion Method), their foreign language aptitude (Modern Language Aptitude Test), their linguistic competence in French (Pimsleur Writing Test, French Level 1) and their communicative competence in French (three oral tasks: oral precis of a brief written text, discussion of a picture and participation in an interview).

Horwitz summarises her results as conceptual level was found to be related to both communicative and linguistic competence ... as was foreign language aptitude... However, foreign language aptitude was not found to be related to linguistic competence when conceptual level was statistically controlled... Conceptual level, on the other hand was found to be - related to communicative competence when foreign language aptitude was statistically controlled.... Thus, conceptual level appears to be an important individual variable in second language learning.

2.5. A Comparison of Early and Late Immersion Students after 1,000 Hours

It is important to note that scores on one variable are not necessarily comparable with scores on another variable, since different questions provided contexts for more or less lengthy responses and more or less optional or obligatory use of specific verb features. The relevant comparisons for each variable are between the two immersion age groups and with the scores of the same-aged native-speaking reference groups. The scores of these reference groups serve as an indication of how likely native speakers are to use particular forms in response to a specific question or set of questions in the interview. By using such reference groups, it was possible to investigate more variables than those relatively few verb forms which can definitely be considered obligatory in a particular context (e.g. number and person agreement) and which can thus confidently be scored “right” or “wrong” without reference to a native-speaking group.
2.5.1. Deictic Time Distinctions

Verb tense is a major means of expressing deictic time distinctions in French (as in English). The interview provided a number of contexts designed to elicit verb forms denoting present-relevant time as well as past and future time relative to the moment of speaking.

Present relevance:

An experiment is mentioned about a study of Hull & Nie, 1979, quoted in Harley (1986). In this study questions 5, 17, 17a, 18, 29 30 and 30a (see Appendix A) were designed to provide contexts for the expression of present relevant time, and such contexts regularly elicited present tense forms from the native speaking students. A total score for each student consisted of the number of unambiguously present tense forms produced and a percentage score was calculated by dividing the total score by the number of present relevant contexts that were supplied.

A comparison of the total scores of the early and late immersion students shows that, on average, the late immersion group produced significantly more present tense forms than the early immersion group. A similar pattern of results was obtained among the native speakers where the total score of the Quebec secondary students was significantly higher than that of the Quebec elementary students. When the two immersion age groups were compared with their relevant native-speaking reference groups, it was found that the total score of the native speakers in grade 1 was on average significantly higher than that of the early immersion students.

When group differences in percentage scores on the “present” variables were tested, no significant difference was found between the two immersion age groups, nor between the two native French-speaking groups. However, of the native-speaker groups scored significantly higher than the corresponding age group of immersion students.
Expressing past time:

A number of questions in the interview were designed to elicit past tense forms in the context of narratives (Questions 14a, 22, 23, 34, 34a, 34b, and 35). Included in the total score are items in the passé composé the imparfait, and other past tenses. The base used for the percentage score consisted of all past time contexts produced in response to the relevant questions.

The findings for past tense forms indicate that there were no statistically significant differences between the total or percentage scores of the early and late immersion students, or between the two native-speaking groups. The early and late immersion students’ average total scores were; however, considerably lower than those of their relevant native-speaking comparison groups, and both immersion groups produced proportionately much fewer past tense forms than the Quebec students.

The past tense produced most often by the immersion students was the aspectually neutral passé composé (Schogt, 1968, quoted in Harley 1986) (on average 81% of the appropriate past tense forms produced by the early immersion students, and 61.25% of those produced by late immersion students). Where the imparfait was appropriately used, it tended to be reserved for frequently occurring stative verbs (such as ETRE) of inherently durative aspectual character (Lyons, 1977, quoted in Harley 1986). In contrast, the native speakers produced almost as many imparfait as passe composé forms, and the imparfait was not restricted to stative verbs but marked appropriate aspectual distinctions in actions, too.

It appears from these findings that the ability of the early and late immersion students to express past time in the verb is quite comparable, with both groups marking past time in the verb considerably less frequently than their native-speaking counterparts.

Expressing Future Time:

Two contexts (questions 10 and 19) were selected for an analysis of the immersion students’ ability to distinguish future time. A total score was aimed at for each student by summing instances of periphrastic future, simple future, conditional’s, subjunctive, and elliptical infinitive forms indicating future time. The base used for the percentage score was number of future time contexts.

We can summarize the findings with respect to future time as there were no significant differences between the early and late immersion students or between the older and younger native speakers with respect to total or percentage scores, but both immersion groups were marking future time significantly less frequently than the native speaker reference groups.
In that the native speakers, in responding to questions 10 and 19, used more periphrastic future forms (ALLER + infinitive) than any other form, an additional analysis was carried out to compare the groups with respect to total and percentage scores for periphrastic future in the same future time contexts. Similar results were obtained as in the preceding future time analysis. No significant differences were found between immersion groups or between the native-speaker groups.

Summary of Deictic Time Findings:

The above findings indicate that in the relatively context-embedded interview setting, the younger and older immersion students are quite comparable in the extent to which they realize the major semantic distinctions of past, present, and future time in the verb. Such basic time distinctions are closely associated with verbs in many languages. Including the students' L1. English, suggesting that, to the extent that the distinctions are made, positive transfer is operating for both the older and younger L2 learners’.

2.5.2. Aspectual Differences

Two questions in the interview (13 and 39) were designed to elicit reference to incomplete actions in the past. A third question (question 28) was designed to elicit reference to habitual past actions. In such contexts the Quebec students all produced verb forms in the imparfait as well as in the more neutral passe composé which was used to a lesser extent. A total verb "aspect" score for each student was calculated by summing the number of imparfait forms produced in response to the three questions; a percentage score was then arrived at by taking the total score as a proportion of the finite verb forms produced in (the generally brief) responses to these questions.

At the end of the study there are no statistically significant differences between the two immersion groups or between the two native speaker groups on total or percentage scores, but as would be expected from their size, the differences between each immersion group and its native-speaking reference group are highly significant.
When they use a past tense form, it was the *passe composé* that the, older and younger immersion students generally produced in realizing past actions in the context of questions 13, 28 and 39. This finding confirms that noted in the past narrative context where both early and late immersion students, when they were able to distinguish past time in the verb, tended to operate with a single past tense form per verb. It may be noted that the *passe composé* has been observed to be used prior to the *imparfait* by L1 learners of French also (Sabeau-Jouannet, 1977, quoted in Harley 1986), and by other L1 learners of French in a natural setting (Bautier-Castaing, 1977, quoted in Harley 1986).

2.5.3. Hypothetical Modality

Two questions provided suitable contexts for an assessment of the early and late immersion students’ ability to make modal distinctions in the verb when denoting remotely possible hypothetical events (questions 36 and 37). The total score was calculated by summing the number of conditional forms produced by each student; the percentage score represented the total score divided by the number of hypothetical contexts supplied by the student.

The early immersion students produced no conditional forms in response to questions 36 and 37, while the 12 late immersion students produced only two instances between them. In contrast the Quebec grade 1 students supplied an average of 3.16 conditional forms each, and the older Quebec students an average of 5.5 each. There was a statistically significant difference between the total scores of the two Quebec groups but none between their percentage scores which were close to 100%. Both Quebec groups were significantly ahead of the relevant immersion group.

The lower total score of the grade 1 Quebec students may indicate that they have somewhat less facility with the conditional form than the older native speakers, but it could simply indicate that they had fewer ideas than the older students about what they might do with a large sum of money. Several complementary reasons may be hypothesized to account for the equal lack of progress by the two age-groups of immersion students: the synthetic nature of the conditional form, its difference from the analytic English conditional, and its relative infrequency in French. As will be seen in relation to the expression of a polite request the non-use of the conditional form by the immersion students and lesser use by the younger than the older native speakers is not limited to the hypothetical context.
Once again, these findings indicate that the older L2 learners are no further ahead than the younger ones. Interestingly, however, early and late immersion students performed equally well on item 12 of the translation task (Si j’avais une pomme, je la mangerais). Nine early immersion students and ten late immersion students were able to provide an accurate English translation for this sentence. It appears that the semantic clue provided by the initial si in the conditional clause is a factor in their comprehension of both the *imparfait* and conditional verb forms in this context.

2.5.4. Number and Person Distinctions

The interview provided a variety of contexts (a) for referring to the actions of the speaker plus others; (b) for addressing more than one person; (c) for addressing an adult stranger; and (d) for referring to the actions of persons other than the speaker and addressee.

(a) The actions of speaker plus others. Three questions (17, 23 and 26) in the interview were designed to elicit reference to situations involving the speaker plus others. In making such reference, the native speakers used mainly the pronoun *on* and corresponding singular verb forms. They also occasionally used elliptical infinitive forms, but did not use the more formal literary nouns + verb stem + suffix -ons. The lack of use of nouns + -ons is in accord with Grevisse’s (1975, quoted in Harley 1986) observation that this construction has been largely replaced in conversational French by *on* + verb stem.

Two total scores and percentage scores for the expression of “speaker plus others” were calculated to take account of the fact that some older L2 learners also used the more formal nouns + -ons form despite its lack of use by the native speakers. Thus the total score for the initial “first person plural” variable consisted of forms that agreed in number and person with whichever subject pronoun (*on* or *nous*) the student had selected. The percentage base for the “first person plural” variable consisted of the number of contexts produced for expressing the actions, states, etc. of the speaker plus others. This included the use of elliptical infinitive forms. A second total score for “*on* as first person plural” was also calculated to reflect the fact that this was the form used overwhelmingly in the speaker plus others context by the native speakers. This total score consisted simply of forms agreeing in (unmarked) number and person with the subject pronoun *on*. The percentage base for this second variable was the same as that for the initial “first person plural” variable.
As it is inferred from the total scores; the older immersion students produced significantly more instances of verb forms in agreement with *on* and *nous* than did the early immersion students, and the Quebec secondary students similarly produced more verb forms in association with *on* than did the younger native speakers. These statistical differences were not maintained in the percentage scores. One explanation for this finding is that the older students, as in the present context, had more to say in response to questions 17, 23, and 26.

Another possibility is that grade 1 students may have been more inclined to use the first person singular pronoun *je*, in responding to the relevant questions, reflecting a greater age related tendency to egocentricity than the older students. Regardless of the interpretation, it is clear that the late immersion total score lead over the early immersion students is not maintained when *nous* + *-ons* forms are excluded from the tally. A total score advantage in expressing the actions of speaker plus others can thus only be attributed to the late immersion students if we allow the overly formal, non-native-like use in face-to-face conversation of *nous* + *-ons* forms.

2.6. Acquisition of Second Language Syntax

2.6.1. Second Language Syntactic Development Is Similar In Child and Adult Learners

Another issue that we need to be clear about is the effect that starting to acquire a second language in childhood and starting to acquire a second language in later life has on syntactic development. From the available evidence it seems again that the course of syntactic development is essentially the same, no matter what age one begins acquiring a second language. For example, take some of the studies we have already considered. In the acquisition of German word order, the stages of development were the same in learners who started in adulthood (the studies of Clahsen and Muysken 1986; and Ellis 1989, quoted in Hawkins 2001) and in childhood (Pienemann 1989, quoted in Hawkins 2001). In the case of the acquisition of unstressed object clitic pronouns in L2 French, similar stages of development have been found in learners seven to eight years old (Selinker et al. 1975, quoted in Hawkins 2001), adolescents (Adiv 1984, quoted in Hawkins 2001), and adults (Veronique 1986; Schlyter 1986, quoted in Hawkins 2001). In studies of the acquisition of grammatical items like those which are similar patterns of accuracy have been found in children and adults.
On the other hand, there appear to be two areas where young child learners of second languages are importantly different from adolescent and adult learners. Firstly, in initial stages of acquisition they appear to develop more slowly than adolescents and adults (Snow and Hoefnagel-Hohle 1978, quoted in Hawkins 2001). Secondly, in the long run child L2 learners are normally ultimately more successful than older L2 learners; their mental grammars do not 'fossilize' (stop short of becoming nativelike) in the way that older L2 learners' mental grammars tend to (Patkowski 1980; Johnson and Newport 1989; Long 1993, quoted in Hawkins 2001). These factors are, however, independent of the course of development.

2.6.2 Similarities between Children and Adults in the Acquisition of L2 Morphemes

Bailey et al. (1974 quoted in Hawkins) investigated whether a similar pattern would emerge in adult L2 learners. Using the Bilingual Syntax Measure, and the same scoring method as Dulay and Burt (1973 quoted in Hawkins 2001), they tested 73 subjects aged from 17 to 55. Thirty-three of the subjects were L1 Spanish speakers, and 40 spoke a range of typologically different LIs. Some subjects were foreign students attending an ESL programme in preparation for study at American colleges; others were enrolled on a continuing education ESL programme. (Bailey et al. do not indicate the amount of prior exposure their subjects had to English.)

Although there are differences in the accuracy profiles of the Spanish speakers and the non-Spanish speakers, there are also strong similarities. Progressive -ing, the contractible copula (He's hungry) and plural -S emerge again as relatively the most accurate, with possessive's (John's book) and 3rd person singular -s (john eats hot-dogs) least accurate. The performance of the Spanish speakers on the articles (a, the) is more accurate than that of the non-Spanish speakers, while the Spanish speakers' performance on irregular past tense verb forms (ate, took) is relatively less accurate than that of the non-Spanish speakers.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This study aimed at determining whether learning a second language in younger ages or learning a second language at a later age is more effective. Therefore, it examined the difference between two groups of students taught English in a summer course. The student groups were from discrete age groups. First group of pupils were secondary school students and the other group was adults who finished their university education. At secondary vocabulary through meaning-inferred and another group taught vocabulary through meaning-given. In addition, a second purpose was to investigate if meaning-inferred method makes vocabulary teaching more memorable.

Accordingly, this research tested the following two hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: The students who started learning English in their secondary school period reach more competency levels than older students.

Hypothesis 2: The students who started learning English after finishing their university education reach more competencies.

Consequently, this chapter describes the research design, subjects, materials, and the data collection procedure.

3.2. Research Design

In order to test the hypotheses of the study, an experimental and a control group were formed. Each groups consisted of eleven students at elementary level. At the beginning of the course and experiment, a pre-test was administered to both the experimental and the control group in order to determine their level in the target language.
Treatment materials were implemented in 108 hours. The students attended the course three days a week. Every single day was consisting of three classes. Each class was forty minutes long. Throughout the course the pupils studied the book Framework by Richmond publishing. The course book had twelve units and all the units had both receptive and productive skills exercise. The lessons to the younger group were given by Didem Korkmaz and classes of adults were given by me.

During the teaching process, both groups were given the same quizzes, pre-test as a post-test. The analysis of the post-test results was used to verify which hypothesis was accurate. With twenty hours intervals five progress tests administrated. Besides these tests, oral exams were done to monitor their advance in speaking faculty. Finally our pre-test was applied again at the end of the course to determine their competency level. Table 1 displays this research design:

Table 1. Experimental Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Progress tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>- Test</td>
<td>- total 108 hours</td>
<td>- Test</td>
<td>- Question Types;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 30 multiple choice questions</td>
<td>- Each session:</td>
<td>- 30 multiple choice questions</td>
<td>- grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- three lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td>- dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- each lesson 40 minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Group

| - Test | - total 108 hours | - 30 multiple choice questions | - Test | - 30 multiple choice questions | - Question Types; |
|        | - 30 multiple choice questions | - Each session: | - 30 multiple choice questions |
|        | - three lessons | - each lesson 40 minutes |                                | - grammar       |
|        | - each lesson 40 minutes |                                    |                                | - dialogue      |
|        |                          |                                    |                                | completion      |
|        |                          |                                    |                                | - vocabulary     |
|        |                          |                                    |                                | - reading        |

According to this research design, the same multiple choice test as the pre-test and post-test. In addition, progress tests were applied to check their improvements.
3.3. Subjects

This study was carried out with twenty-two students who were attending English course in American Cultural Association Language Schools. When they register to the course they immediately have a placement test. And as a result of that test they are placed in a group. They take 108 hours of education in 12 weeks. Their main course book is Framework by Richmond Publishing.

The researcher conducted the study by the help of Veli Moroglu, the owner and Didem Korkmaz and himself. Didem Korkmaz was the teacher of younger age group (experimental group) and I was the teacher of adult group (control group). Both groups were consist of eleven students. The experimental group had six boys and five girls. The control group had 7 girls and 4 boys.

3.4. Materials

As seen in Table 1 research design, the materials used in this study were a pre-test, post-test, progress tests and oral exams. Since this was a quasi-experimental research study with two groups (experimental group, control group) a pretest was designed in order to assess the competency levels of both groups at the beginning and at the end of the process. The participants took the pretest before and after the course as this study had both a within-subject and a between-subject design.

The multiple choice pretest, which was used as pre-test, post-test throughout the study, involved thirty multiple choice questions covering the target elementary level subjects (see Appendix B).

These subjects were selected from the course book according to their importance in the target level. The book, Framework was by Richmond Publishing. This book was studied in the American Cultural Association Language Courses. It is also worth mentioning that multiple choice test type was deliberately chosen since it is more appropriate to test the recognition aspect of target level.

The material used with the experimental group during the teaching process was a course book. It has twelve units. These units have vocabulary, listening, reading, grammar, writing and speaking parts.

The material used with the control group during the teaching process was same with the experimental group.
3.5. Data Collection Procedure

As we mentioned above, this study aimed to investigate the age related differences in second language acquisition. In order to understand these, two groups of students used in identically same curriculum. Accordingly, an experimental and a control group were formed.

The experiment was carried out at American Cultural Association Language Courses Kahramanmaras Branch. This private institution conducted a summer course in 2007 from June to beginning of September. Prior to the experiment, the course book was determined, pre-test and post test was set (see appendix B), progress tests (see appendix C) were modified.

The pre-test was applied by the researcher to the both groups in regular class hours on the second of July. The duration of the pre-test was forty-five minutes. The subjects were distributed the multiple choice test including the items that would be taught throughout the course. The aim of the pre-test was to determine the subjects’ passive knowledge of the target level subjects. Besides determining their levels, it also helped me to form baselines for the results of the post-test.

As it shown in Table 1, the teaching process was 108 hours total. It was twelve weeks and each week was consisting of nine hours for both the experimental and the control group. Each week was carried out on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. At the beginning of the course which is 25\textsuperscript{th} of June, pre-test was done. Progress tests were applied on the 9\textsuperscript{th} of July, 25\textsuperscript{th} of July, 10\textsuperscript{th} of August, 27\textsuperscript{th} of August, 12\textsuperscript{th} of September. Post-test was applied on the 15\textsuperscript{th} of September.

The post-test was administered one day after the conclusion of the teaching process on the 14\textsuperscript{th} of September. The post-test aimed to verify hypothesis which are given in the purpose of the study part. Finally, the progress tests were given in every twenty hours period during the course. The aim of these tests was to monitor the developments of the subjects. Consequently, it should be told that subjects were not informed about the study during either these tests or the teaching process.
3.5.1. The Experimental Group

As mentioned above, the experimental group had a course of one hundred and eight hours. There were eleven students. They had twelve weeks, and each week had nine hours of lessons on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. In each week the teacher continued to teach the material which was determined before.

On the first day of the first week, the teacher applied the pre-test to validate the subjects’ level in the target language.

Then in the following weeks, progress test were applied on the days mentioned before.

Finally, post-test was applied at the end of the course to monitor their advances after one hundred eight hours.

3.5.2. The Control Group

As I mentioned before, my experimental and control group was identically the same from the aspects of course design and curriculum. The only difference was their age group. The same processes were applied to the control group.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS

4.1. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the age related differences in second language acquisition. Therefore, the study was guided by the following two hypotheses:

_Hypothesis 1:_ The students who started learning English in their secondary school period reach more competency levels than older students.

In other words, if subjects start acquiring a second language in early ages they pose more competency levels. They are more successful learners than adults.

_Hypothesis 2:_ The students who started learning English after finishing their university education reach more competencies.

In other words, if people start learning a second language in later ages they learn it better. They become more successful learners than younger ones.

In order to test these hypotheses, an experimental and a control group were formed. Twenty two students, eleven in the experimental group and eleven in the control group, participated in the study. The students in both the experimental group and control group were taught the target language level with the same curriculum.

A pre-test, an immediate post-test, and progress tests in every twenty hours period were applied. The purpose of the pre-test was to investigate the passive knowledge of the subjects in the target level of the language. After the teaching process, the same pre-test was given as a post-test in order to verify the hypotheses of the study.

This chapter presents the analysis of the scores obtained from the tests mentioned above. It includes the data analysis procedure and the statistical analysis of the results.

4.2. Data Analysis Procedure

The first step in data analysis was calculating the number of the correct answers for the pre-test. Since the pre-test involved thirty questions, each correct answer was given ‘1’ point. Therefore, the maximum score on the researcher-developed pre-test was 30 points. The post-test was also graded in the same way since they included the same questions. Progress tests were graded out of 100 points.
After getting raw scores, the means for both groups on the pre-test, post-test and progress tests were calculated.

Consequently, the statistical analyses of this study were carried out in three stages; pre-test, post-test, and progress tests.

4.3. Results of the Study

4.3.1. Pre-test

Since the study aimed at testing the students’ passive knowledge in the target language, it was necessary to include a multiple choice pre-test to determine whether the experimental and the control groups were equivalent at the beginning of the experiment. A second purpose of the pre-test was to obtain baselines which would be used to compare and evaluate the results of the post-test.

The pre-test, which consisted of a multiple choice test including the target level items, was administered to the both groups on the same day. The raw pre-test scores of the experimental and the control group were used to calculate the means of the groups. Table 2 displays the results of this statistical analysis.

**Table 2. Analysis for Pre-test Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 2, the average scores of the experimental and control group in the 30 question multiple choice test are examined. As you see above their mean is nearly the same. As a result we can easily say that, both groups were equal in terms of their target language knowledge prior to the experiment.
4.3.2. Post-test

The aim of the post-test, which was administered to the same groups after the target language learning and teaching process, was to compare the groups’ improvement in their competency of aimed language. First of all, pre-test and post-test results were compared within both groups. And results are presented as follows:

**Table 3. Comparison of the Pre-test with Post-test Results within the Control Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE CONTROL GROUP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-TEST</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-TEST</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 3, at the end of the teaching process a great improvement can be seen when we look at the mean scores. In other words, the subjects in the control group developed in terms of target language recognition.

**Table 4. Comparison of the Pre-test with Post-test Results within the Experimental Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-TEST</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-TEST</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 4, there was a significant difference within the experimental group as a result of the teaching and learning process. In other words, the experimental group increased their aimed language competency on the post-test as well.

Table 3 and 4 displayed that both groups showed a startling conversion into competency after the process of the course. However, another table was used in order to compare both groups’ improvement on the post-test in order to see the advance clearly. Table 5 shows the results.
Table 5. Comparison of the Experimental and the Control Group for the Post-Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIMENTAL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequently, these results failed to support *Hypothesis 1*: The students who started learning English in their secondary school period reach more competency levels than older students. Therefore, the first hypothesis of the study was not verified. With a slight domination our *second hypothesis* was verified which is the students who started learning English after finishing their university education reach more competencies.

4.3.3. Progress Tests

During the course of the study, five progress tests were applied to check the both groups’ development. These quizzes were done from two weeks to two weeks. Each group was asked exactly the same questions. Each progress test is shown with an abbreviation of “PT”. The statistical results are presented as follows:

Table 6. The Results of the Progress Tests within the Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE CONTROL GROUP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PT1 Mean</th>
<th>PT2 Mean</th>
<th>PT3 Mean</th>
<th>PT4 Mean</th>
<th>PT5 Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS TESTS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68.54</td>
<td>63.54</td>
<td>63.18</td>
<td>58.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 6, the subjects of the control group got enough marks to say that they had been improving themselves in the aimed language.
According to Table 7, there was a slight difference within the experimental group and the control group but the results show that the experimental group also increased their competency in the target language knowledge on the progress test when compared with their pre-test results.

Accordingly, these results failed to reject Hypothesis 1: The students who started learning English in their secondary school period reach more competency levels than older students. Therefore, the second hypothesis of the study was verified that is the students who started learning English after finishing their university education reach more competencies.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

5.1. Introduction

This study compared the age factor in second language acquisition. In this chapter, the findings of the study are summarized and discussed in the light of the research hypotheses presented in chapter I. Besides these, a brief description of the pedagogical implications and suggestions for further studies will be presented. Finally, concluding remarks of the study are presented.

5.2. Discussion

This study aimed at whether young learners or adult learners reach more competencies in acquiring a second language. Therefore, it examined the differences between two groups of students one of which consisted of secondary school students who were young and another group which consisted of adults who finished their university education.

Accordingly, this research tested two following hypothesis;

Hypothesis 1: The students who started learning English in their secondary school period reach more competency levels than older students.

Hypothesis 2: The students who started learning English after finishing their university education reach more competencies.

According to Table 2, an analysis of the participants’ pre-test scores, which was applied to compare the proficiency levels of both groups, revealed no significant difference between the two groups. So, prior to the experiment, both groups were considered equivalent in their level of target language.

Quantitative results in this study indicate that both groups performed better after instruction. However, the control group performed slightly better on the post test and progress tests (see table 5, 6 and 7). If the control group’s means are analyzed, they were superior to younger learners on a small scale. Besides these, in table 3, it can easily be seen that control group students showed a very big improvement at the post test when compared to the pre-test results.
To summarize, the performance of subjects in the control group was a little better than that of the experimental group. Therefore, the findings of the study confirm the two second hypothesis mentioned above.

This result supports the ideas discussed in review of literature in that older learners can also reach high competency levels if they are highly motivated.

5.3. Pedagogical Implications

The findings of the study found out that both learner groups have their own advantages during the acquisition process. It is overt from the findings that young learners learn more randomly and intrinsically. On the other hand adult learners are more motivated and they learn consciously and reach the correct information faster than the other group.

5.4. Suggestions for Further Studies

This study was restricted by a very crucial factor. That was a state school have the chance of younger and adult groups at the same time but their books and curriculum is different. And this time teachers want to catch up with their programme so they did not want to participate such a study. As result I chose a private course in Kahramanmaraş whose name is American Cultural Association Language Programmes. Apart from the limitations mentioned in Chapter 1, there are some suggestions for further researches.

1. This study was conducted in a private course so the discipline of the students was not so strict. If the same study would be done in a government school, the results might be different.
2. The participants were elementary level students. So, a similar study could be done among pre-intermediate, intermediate or higher level students.
3. The target level was Elementary. Thus, the same kind of study could be done in higher level courses.
5.5. Conclusion

As I have mentioned in the previous pages there are two learner groups in my study. In this part I want to emphasize that the second language development in both the young children and the adults is a very fundamental point to be discussed thoroughly. Young children have their own advantages such as their fresh brains, critical age period and adopting the new things as they are. On the other hand, adults have some kind of blessings such as; high motivation, readiness and reaching new information more consciously. In conclusion, it is hoped that this study has highlighted the importance of considering age factor in preparing curriculum for different age groups.
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Appendix A

The Interview

1. Tu as quel âge?
2. C’est quand, ta fête/ton anniversaire?
3. Ouand c’est ta fête qu’est-ce que tu aimes manger le plus?
4. Qu’est-ce que tu sais préparer toi-même (à la cuisine)?
4a. (Si rien) As-tu jamais aide ta mère faire un gâteau
5. Est-ce que tu peux m’expliquer comment Préparer... (Ce que lève a répondu a 4)?
6. Où est-ce que tu habites? Quelle est ton adresse?
7. Est-ce que c’est loin d’ici?
8. Si tu étais en retard pour l’école qu’est-ce que le directeur/professeur ferait? Qu’est-ce qu’il ferait si tu arrivais souvent en retard?
10. Oui, c’est ça. Et qu’est-ce qu’il va faire maintenant, tu penses?
11. Imagine maintenant que tu rencontres ce monsieur dans la rue et que tu veux savoir quelle heure il est. Alors, qu’est-ce que tu lui dis? Tu veux être très poli, n’est-ce pas, parce que tu ne le connais pas. Alors, moi, je fais le monsieur. Qu’est-ce que tu dis au monsieur?
12. D’habitude, qui est-ce qui te réveille le matin?
12a. (Si c’est pas la mère) C’est pas ta mère alors?
13. Qu’est-ce qu’elle faisait, ta mère quand tu es parti pour l’école ce matin?
14. Est-ce que tu as un animal chez toi?
14a. (Si oui) Raconte-moi quelque chose que ton chien/chat/etc. a fait?
15. As-tu des frères ou des sœurs?
16. Est-ce qu’il(s)/elle(s) fait/font partie du programme d’immersion?
16a. (Si oui) En quelle année?
16b. (Si l’un/la une n’a pas de frères ou de sœurs) As-tu des amis qui habitent près de chez toi?
17. Qu’est-ce que vous aiment faire ensemble?
17a. (Si ce n’est pas dans la réponse a 17) A quels jeux jouez-vous?
18. Est-ce que tu peux m’expliquer comment jouer a... 7 (ce que l’élevé a mentionné en répondant a 17)
19. Qu’est-ce que tu feras ce soir après l’école?
19a. Et puis, qu’est-ce que tu feras? ... Et puis? (Jusqu’a ce que l’élève se mette au lit)
20. Pourquoi est-ce qu’on doit se coucher de bonne heure pendant la semaine?
21. Tu regardes la télévision quelquefois? Quel est ton programme favori?
22. Raconte-moi ce qui s’est passé la dernière fois que tu as vu... ? (Le programme mentionne)
23. Avez-vous déjà fait un voyage en famille, tous ensemble?
23a. (Si non) Avez-vous déjà fait une visite quelque part en classe?
24. Qu’est-ce que tu as aimé le mieux de ce que tuas vu?
25. Comment étai (en) t...? (Quelque chose que l’élève mentionne)
26. Et ta famille, avez-vous des projets pour les vacances de Noël/d’été/de Paques qui viennent?
27. Qu’est-ce que tu aimes le mieux, l’été ou l’hiver? Pourquoi?
28. L’hiver/l’été passe, qu’est-ce que tu faisais d’habitude les fins de semaine (le week-end)?
B. 29. J’ai ici une petite scène d’été. Voici un homme avec un appareil photo. Qu’est-ce qui se passe?
29a. Qu’est-ce que tu penses qu’il dit aux enfants?
29b. Pourquoi les enfants sont-ils contents à la fin?
C. 30. Voici une autre scène d’hiver. Qu’est-ce qui arrive ici?
30a. (Si plonger n’a pas utilise ) Qu’est-ce qu’il fait ici (6e dessin)?
30b. Pourquoi est-ce qu’il y a tant de pieds dans le sable?
30c. Qu’est-ce que tous ces gens auraient dû faire avant de sauter?
31a. Pourquoi le Monsieur n’est pas content?
E. 32. Voici un accident de skidoo (moto-neige). Qu’est-ce qui se passe ici?
F. 33. Voici une autre sorte d’accident. Qu’est-ce qui est arrivé
33a. Ou est-ce qu’ils vont l’amener, tu penses?
34. As-tu déjà été a hôpital?
34a. (Si fon) As-tu jamais eu une grande peur?
34b. (Si non) n’As-tu jamais fait un mauvais rêve?
35. Raconte-moi ce qui s’est passe.
36. Qu’est-ce que tu ferais, si tu avais beaucoup d’argent? Si tu gagnais la loterie, par exemple?
37. Et tes parents, qu’est-ce qu’ils feraient, eux?
38. Ou’est-ce que tu aimes le mieux faire à l’école?
39. Qu’est-ce que la classe faisait quand tu es sorti toute à l’heure?
40. Maintenant, imagine que tu es la maîtresse/le professeur et que la classe fait des bêtises. Que est ce qu’tu dis aux élèves ? Voici la classe devant toi. Alors, qu’est-ce que tu nous dis?
APPENDIX B
PRE-TEST / POST TEST

Choose the best answer

1- ---------is this blue bag? It's £5.50.

2- ---------your car? It's in the car park.
a) Which is b) Who's c) When's d) Where's e) What's

3- ---------bag is this? It's mine.

4- There aren't ---------people here today.
a) many b) much c) a lot d) the many e) the much

5- He ---------in an office every morning from eight to twelve.
a) working b) works c) work d) am working e) is work

6- Do you like ---------?
   - Yes, I do.
a) to shop b) to shopping c) shop d) shopping e) to shopped

7- She works ---------Saturday.
a) at b) to c) in d) on e) by

8- How do you get to work? ---------.
a) By car b) In car c) By the car d) On car e) With car

9- Where is Mary? She ---------over there.
a) is stand b) is standing c) stand d) standing e) stands

10- I'm hungry. ---------something to eat, please.
a) I like b) I'd want c) I am would d) I'm like e) I'd like
11- He -------- born in 1963 in Spain.
   a) had  b) is  c) was  d) did  e) were

12- Switzerland is -------- Britain.
   a) as small  b) the smallest  c) more small  d) smaller than  e) smallest

13- Motor racing is -------- sport in the world.
   a) most expensive  b) expensivest  c) more expensive  
      d) as expensive  e) the most expensive

14- He passed his English exam very --------.
   a) easy  b) easier  c) good  d) easily  e) as easy

15- When -------- you go to the USA? Last year.
   a) did  b) was  c) went  d) have  e) were

16- She's never -------- to New York.
   a) gone  b) was  c) been  d) went  e) be

17- Those are very nice --------. Where did you buy them?
   a) shirt  b) dress  c) trousers  d) handbag  e) skirt

18- What does he look like? He's quite tall and he's got short, dark --------.
   a) glasses  b) eyes  c) head  d) hair  e) chin

19- Where can I buy some envelopes? At the --------.
   a) baker's  b) newsagent's  c) library  d) grocer's  e) cafe

20- It's very -------- in here. I can't hear anything.
   a) noisy  b) quiet  c) exciting  d) clean  e) interesting

21- It's a very long day for Jack. He doesn't get home from school -------- six o'clock.
   a) since  b) to  c) towards  d) until  e) on
22- They usually ---------at home but today they ---------lunch in a restaurant.
   a) are eating / have                          c) eat / have
   b) eat / are having                          d) are eating / are having
   e) eats / are having

23- We didn't stay late ---------we were very tired.
   a) but                                   c) that
   b) so                                   d) until
   e) because

24- I think most people ---------English for their jobs in the future.
   a) need                                 c) will need
   b) are needing                          d) will have needed
   e) is going to need

25- Teenagers today like wearing casual clothes so leather shoes aren't ---------trainers.
   a) as fashionable than                  c) as fashionable as
   b) more fashionable                     d) as fashionable
   e) so fashionable

26- A friend of ---------phoned this morning but ---------didn't leave a message.
   a) you / she                             b) you / her
   c) yours / she                          d) yourself / hers
   e) your / she

27- If I have enough money next year, I ---------to the USA.
   a) will go                               b) go
   c) would go                             d) went
   e) did go

28- ---------she likes coffee, she prefers tea.
   a) However                              b) Although
   c) But                                  d) When
   e) In spite of

29- They went to Australia ---------a month ---------summer.
   a) during / the                         c) for / last
   b) for / during                         d) last / during
   e) during / next

30- I haven't heard from Jane for ages. I wonder ---------.
   a) what she like                         b) how is she
   c) how she is                           d) how does she
   e) what does she like
APPENDIX C
PROGRESS TESTS

PROGRESS TEST 1
Answer on a separate sheet of paper. Then check your answers. Follow the examples.

GRAMMAR

-ing form

Write the -ing form of the following verbs.

- go:
- meet
- love
- eat
- dance
- fly
- get
- visit
- make
- stop
- ski

GO, LIKE, LOVE, PREFER

Put the verbs in brackets in the right form.

Would you like something (eat)?
Would you like something to eat?
‘What do you like (do) in your free time?’
 ‘I love (listen) to music.’
She loves (rollerblade) but she loves (mountain bike).
‘What would you like (do) tomorrow?’
 ‘I’d love (play) tennis.’
‘Does he like (go) to restaurants?’
 ‘Yes, he does. But he prefers (eat) at home.’
I (go swim) twice a week but I never (go jog).

PRESENT CONTINUOUS

Make and answer questions about what some people are doing at this moment using prompts.

‘What / you / do?’ = ‘What are you doing?’
I / do / homework = ‘I’m doing my homework.’
‘What / they / do?’
 ‘They / work out / in the gym.’
‘He / take / dog / walk?’
 ‘No / He / do sport.’

‘You / listen / music?’
 ‘No / I / play / computer games.’
‘What / your father / do?’
 ‘He / work.’
‘They / visit / monuments?’
 ‘No / They / read / newspaper.’

VOCABULARY

MOVIES & FILMS

1 Match the words in the columns. More than one answer may be possible. Choose the most common answers.

1 - a
classic
action
independent
film
home
special
late night
love
psychological
cinema
science

b) videos
c) fiction
d) thrillers
e) programme
f) films
g) movies
h) review
i) stories
j) show
k) effects

TELLING THE TIME

2 Write the times in two different ways.

1.15 = one fifteen / a quarter past one

1 1.30
2 2.15
3 7.45
4 6.10
5 9.25
6 7.20
7 8.40
8 10.05
9 12.55
10 11.50
LEAVING A MESSAGE

3 Complete the text with the phrases from the box.

- I’m calling to see what you’d like to do next weekend.
- Bye for now.
- Hello, John. This is Mary.
- Please phone me at 4658696 when you get home.
- And I’d love to go to the country on Sunday afternoon.
- Maybe on Friday or Saturday night?

GOING OUT

4 Put this dialogue in the right order.

Mike: Hi, Anne. How about going to the cinema tomorrow?
Mike: Yes, no problem. See you tomorrow!
Anne: That’s a good idea. What’s on?
Mike: I’d love to watch ‘The Lord of the Rings’.
Anne: I’d prefer to visit the new art gallery and maybe have a drink at the pub.
Anne: I can’t stand science fiction films.
Mike: It’s about a fantastic world from a very famous book. Some creatures want to take control of the world and some want to defend it. The special effects are really great.
Mike: That sounds good too.
Anne: Wonderful! So the art gallery first and then a drink at the pub?
Mike: What movie would you like to watch?
Anne: What’s that about?

ERROR ANALYSIS

Find and correct the mistakes.

1 I love studing studying English.
2 John watch a film at this moment.
3 Tony is getting up at 8 every day.
4 I love meet my friends at the pub.
5 ‘How often do you do sport?’ ‘It’s depend.”
PROGRESS TEST 2
Answer on a separate sheet of paper. Then check your answers. Follow the examples.

GRAMMAR

PRESENT SIMPLE & CONTINUOUS

1 Put the verbs in brackets in the right tense.

What (you do) every day?
What do you do every day?
1 ‘What (he do) next weekend?’
‘(He travel) to Paris.’
2 ‘How often (you see) your friends?’
‘(We go out) every week.’
3 ‘What (you studying) now?’
‘(I prepare) an English exam.’
4 ‘(He watch) TV right now?’
‘No, (he play) computer games.’
5 ‘How (you get) to work tomorrow?’
‘(I catch) a train.’

2 Write the negatives.

I like football.
I don’t like football.
1 He’s leaving at six o’clock tomorrow.
2 We listen to the radio in the morning.
3 I’m writing negatives at the moment.
4 My brother’s having a party next week.
5 I do sport twice a week.

3 Make questions about underlined words.

I like football. = What do you like?

ADVERBS OF FREQUENCY

4 Write sentences using the prompts and the adverbs in brackets.

I / read books (usually)
I usually read books.
1 He / go to school /? (every day)
2 She / travel (three times a year)
3 We / study English (hardly ever)
4 I / give money to charity (once a year)
5 They / visit friends (sometimes)
6 Americans / travel by plane (very often)
7 I / check my e-mail (twice a day)
8 We / do exercise (never)
9 You / have a shower in the morning /? (normally)
10 I / use a computer (during the week)

VOCABULARY

NUMBERS, YEARS & DATES

1 Write the numbers, dates and years.

$1^{st}$ = first
11 2$^{nd}$
12 55%
13 Monday, January 29$^{th}$, 1897
14 89%
15 Saturday, December 23$^{rd}$, 2004
16 78%
17 56
18 12$^{th}$
19 44
20 Tuesday, March 15$^{th}$, 1567

ACTIVITIES

2 Match the words in the columns. More than one answer may be possible. Choose the most common answer.

I - a

play        a) football
leave       b) school / work
start / finish c) home
write       d) breakfast / dinner …
g get        e) it easy
move        f) e-mails
take        g) alarm clock
drive       h) to work
have        i) to another country
arrive      j) (un)dressed
go off      k) the house
MAKING ARRANGEMENTS

3 Complete the dialogue with sentences from the box.

2 Right, OK. Why not? I love your newspaper. I read it every day.
1 No problem. See you then. Bye.
• Hello, is that John Smith?
• Well, mid-evening is normally good for me.
• One other thing. My daughter bought your CD yesterday. Can I have your autograph for her?
• Hello, I’m Mark Johnson from Framework newspaper. I hope I’m not disturbing you.
• Yes, Thursday is fine.
• Sorry, I can’t. I’m having a meeting with my agent.
• Well, John, we’d like to interview you about your new CD.
• Erm, no, sorry. I’m going to the dentist on Tuesday.
• Hello?

John: Hello?
Mark: …
John: Yes, speaking.
Mark: …
John: No, not at all. How can I help you?
Mark: …
John: …
Mark: Great! So what’s a good time for you, John?
John: …
Mark: Right, OK. So, how about Tuesday evening at about 7 o’clock?
John: …
Mark: What about the day after?
John: …
Mark: So, what about Thursday then?
John: …
Mark: …
John: Sure, no problem.
Mark: Great. Thanks a lot. See you Thursday, John.

John: …
Answer on a separate sheet of paper. Then check your answers. Follow the examples.

**GRAMMAR**

**SHOULD / SHOULDN’T**

1. Give ideas for each situation using should or shouldn’t and the words in brackets.

   I’m very tired. (sleep more hours)
   You should sleep more hours.
   • I’d like to learn English. (go to classes)
   • I want to pass my exams. (study more)
   • I’m always late for work. (get up so late)
   • My TV is broken. (buy a new one)
   • I’m very stressed. (relax)

   CAN / CAN’T

2. Complete the table with the phrases in the box about the things you are / aren’t allowed to do in your country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowed</th>
<th>Not Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>smoke in hospitals</td>
<td>drive under the effects of alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vote if you are under 18</td>
<td>drink in the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buy alcohol if you are over 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use your mobile when driving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Make sentences about the phrases from table using can / can’t.

   I can’t use my mobile phone when driving.

**HAVE TO / DON’T HAVE TO**

4. Write about the things you have / don’t have to do.

   I have to go to school /
   work.
   • make your bed
   • do the shopping
   • tidy your room
   • use a computer
   • send e-mails

**SHOULD / SHOULDN’T, CAN / CAN’T, HAVE / DON’T HAVE TO**

5. Complete with the right verb and form.

   You shouldn’t drink and drive.
   1. He … smoke. It’s very bad.
   2. I’d love to go to the party but I … . I have an exam.
   3. She … go to school today. It’s a holiday.
   4. You … always look before you cross the road.
   5. I’m going to bed. I … get up very early tomorrow.

**OBJECT PRONOUNS**

6. Write the right form of the pronouns in italics.

   The prize
   Last Christmas was very special for 1 me. A few months ago, I won the first lottery prize, 2,000,000 euros. Incredible! Christmas was very near so I decided not to tell anybody about its and give all my family a big surprise. First, my parents. I bought 3 their a new house. Then, my brother. I bought 4 his a fantastic car. Finally, my girlfriend. I gave 5 hers a diamond ring and two tickets for a luxury cruise in the Caribbean, just for the two of 6 we. We were all very happy on Christmas Day!

**VOCABULARY**

**SPECIAL OCCASIONS**

- Match the special occasions and the presents. Choose the most common answer.

  *I - a*
  1. your brother’s birthday  a) a CD
  2. your mother’s birthday  b) some flowers
  3. Father’s Day           c) a ring
  4. Mother’s Day           d) a teddy bear
  5. a wedding anniversary  e) money
  6. a baby’s birthday
17 a teenager’s birthday  f) a football
18 a child’s birthday  g) a box of chocolates
19 Valentine’s Day  h) a tie

2 Match the occasions and the reactions from the box.

- To the happy couple!
- Well done!
- You deserve it!
- Good luck!
- Congratulations on your new baby!
- What a lovely flat!

21 moving into a new home
22 a new job
23 becoming a parent
24 winning a competition
25 a wedding
26 taking an important exam

FESTIVALS & CELEBRATIONS

3 Complete with the right form of the verbs in the box.

take place / stop / have fun / last / finish / dress up / celebrate / participate / continue / start

Badajoz Carnival
Badajoz is a city in southwestern Spain, near Portugal. Its carnival \(1\) … in February every year and \(2\) … five days. It \(3\) … on a Friday and \(4\) … on a Tuesday. People always \(5\) … in colourful and spectacular costumes and \(6\) … carnival with lots of noise, music, dancing and singing in the street. Thousands of people \(7\) … in processions and masquerades all over the city. The street party \(8\) … every night and never \(9\) … . Everybody’s welcome! So if you really want to \(10\) … , come and experience the Badajoz carnival. It’s something to remember!
PROGRESS TEST 4
Answer on a separate sheet of paper. Then check your answers. Follow the examples.

GRAMMAR

QUESTION FORMS
1 Make and answer questions from the prompts.
   ‘How many / chips / you / eat?’ ‘I / eat / a lot.’
   ‘How many chips do you eat?’ ‘I eat a lot.’
- ‘What / he / do / yesterday?’
  ‘He / visit / friends.’
- ‘Where / you / go / tomorrow?’
  ‘I / travel / Paris.’
- ‘How / be / she?’
  ‘She / be / fine.’
- ‘Who / you / play / tennis / with / last Sunday?’
  ‘I / not / play / tennis. / I / go / run.’
- ‘Why / they / learn / English / this year?’
  ‘They / want / spend / summer / England.’
- ‘You / like / something / drink?’
  ‘Yes / I / love / have / coke.’
- ‘You / enjoy / reading?’
  ‘No / I / prefer / watch TV.’
- ‘How often / he / do / exercise?’
  ‘He / normally / swim / twice a week.’
- ‘What / be / weather / like / last weekend?’
  ‘It / be / sunny / hot.’
- ‘She / study / now?’
  ‘Yes / she / prepare / exam.’

A LITTLE, A FEW, A LOT (OF)

2 Write about your diet using a little, a few or a lot of and the food in the box.

red meat / fish / olive oil / butter / eggs / chips / rice / hot dogs / bread / chocolate / hamburgers

I eat a few / a lot of hamburgers.

IF & WHEN

3 Give advice about the situations using if and when and words in brackets.

If (not sleep), (do more exercise).
If you don’t sleep, do more exercise.
- When (have a headache), (take an aspirin).
- When (have a sore throat), (not speak).
- (Not go to work) if (feel sick).

FOOD

1 Complete the table with the food from the box.

ice cream / grapes / onions / sugar / oranges / potatoes / tea / cakes / beans / wine / cheese / water / lemon / yoghurt / pulses / juice / tomatoes / beer / apples / lettuce / kiwis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fruit</th>
<th>milk products</th>
<th>vegetables</th>
<th>legumes</th>
<th>sweets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kiwis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>drink</th>
<th>milk products</th>
<th>vegetables</th>
<th>legumes</th>
<th>sweets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIET & HEALTH

2 Match the definitions and the food expressions in the box.

- Something that isn’t good for your body.
- You shouldn’t eat a lot of this if you want to be thin and healthy.
- The opposite of ‘get fat’.
- Substances that artificially keep food fresh.
- When you like sweets very much.
- What beans, eggs and meat give you.
- What and how you normally eat.
- What you need to do to lose weight.
- One of the best diets in the world.
- What fresh fruit and vegetables give you.
- Food you eat immediately after it is produced.
MINOR ILLNESSES
3 Match the illnesses and the remedies.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a headache</td>
<td>a) sleep well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a cough</td>
<td>b) an aspirin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>flu</td>
<td>c) eat very little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a toothache</td>
<td>d) eat oranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a cold</td>
<td>e) a painkiller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a sore throat</td>
<td>f) drink some water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>a stomach ache</td>
<td>g) lie down and relax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>a backache</td>
<td>h) don’t speak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE WEATHER
4 Cross out the incorrect option.

**What’s the weather like?**
- a) good
- b) sunny
- c) delicious

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | winter | a) hot
| 2 | autumn | a) rainy
| 3 | spring | a) warm
| 4 | summer | a) foggy
| 5 | temperature | a) below zero
| 6 | snow | a) skiing

Mediterranean
7 It’s … today
- a) rain
- b) raining
- c) rainy
8 Does it ... a lot in your country?
- a) snow
- b) snowy
- c) snowing

LOOK & LIKE
5 Choose the right option.

I like / look like / look apples.

Q:\n27 ‘John, you don’t look / look like / like well.’
28 ‘Does he really like / look like / look fish?’
29 ‘What was the weather like / look like / look?’
30 ‘She looks like / looks / looks her father.’
31 ‘Look / Look like / Like at the clock and tell me the time, please.’

QUALITY OF LIFE IN TOWNS & CITIES
6 Underline the factors you consider negative for the quality of life in a town or city. There are ten more.

street violence noisy streets
natural beauty public
transport medical facilities a lot of traffic
very extreme climate terrorism pollution
sports / cultural facilities architecture cultural life
high levels of crime social services fast food diet
stressful lifestyle monuments
friendly people poverty
cosmopolitan atmosphere

ERROR ANALYSIS
Find and correct the mistakes.

Where does do you live?
5 How’s the weather like today?
6 I eat a few cereal.
7 He likes fish a lot of.
8 How much sweets do you usually have?
5 It’s usually snowing in winter in Russia
PROGRESS TEST 5
Answer on a separate sheet of paper. Then check your answers. Follow the examples.

GRAMMAR

PRESENT PERFECT & PAST SIMPLE

1 Make and answer questions about experiences using the prompts.

‘You / ever / travel / England?’
‘Yes. I / be / there / twice. I / visit / London / 1978. I / love / it.’
‘Have you ever travelled to England?’
‘Yes, I have. I visited London in 1978. I loved it.’

‘You / ever / see / The Lord of the Rings?’
‘Yes. I / watch / it / friends / cinema / last week / and / have / great time.’

‘You / ever / ride / horse?’
‘Yes. It / be / last summer / but / I / fall off / and / have to / go / hospital.’

‘You / ever / live / France?’
‘Yes. I / spend / three years / there. I / learn / French / and / do / many / interesting things.’

‘You / ever / cook / paella?’
‘Yes. I / make / paella / one day / summer / three years ago / but / nobody / like / it.’

‘You / ever / fail / exam?’
‘Yes. I / not pass / English exam / when / I / be / university / because / I / not like / teacher.’

TENSE REVIEW

2 Put the verbs in brackets in the right tense.

Nelson Mandela
Nelson Rolihlahla Mandela was born in 1910 in South Africa and 1 dedicate his entire life to the struggle for human rights in Africa. He 2 be the leader of the African National Congress and the movement against apartheid that 3 start about 1952. He 4 spend twenty six years in prison, from 1964 to 1990 when Frederik W. de Klerk, President of the South African Republic, 5 liberate him. In 1990 and 1991, Mandela 6 negotiate the abolition of apartheid with de Klerk and then they both 7 win the Nobel Price for peace in 1994. Mandela’s movement 8 succeed in the first multiracial elections in the history of South Africa in 1994. He 9 still work for human rights now and he says he 10 continue the fight against injustice in the world for the rest of his life.

3 Make sentences with the phrases below. Put the verbs in the right tense.

go to school yesterday (John)
John went to school yesterday.

fly to Russia at 9 o’clock tomorrow (he)
have to work with people every day (she)
be sunny and hot next week (it)
speak English at the moment (we)
be born in New York in 1923 (my father)

4 Make questions about the underlined words in Exercise 3.

John went to school yesterday.
Where did John go yesterday?

5 Make negative sentences with the phrases in Exercises 3.

John went to school yesterday.
John didn’t go to school yesterday.

VOCABULARY

READING MATERIALS

1 Match the titles and the reading materials in the box.


‘Cobuild Monolingual Dictionary’
3 ‘How to use English effectively’
4 ‘Framework’
5 ‘Cosmopolitan’
6 ‘The Quixote’
7 ‘The Discovery of America’
8 ‘The Official Guide to London’
9 ‘Spiderman’
10 ‘The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes’
11 ‘The Guardian’
12 ‘The Life of Lady Di’
FEELING NERVOUS

2 Match the words in the columns to make phrases learnt in Unit 12.

I - a
1 holding a) a spider in your hand
2 speaking b) an oral exam
3 taking c) married
4 going d) in a very small space
5 being closed e) in public
6 job f) to the dentist
7 looking down g) from the top of a tall mountain
8 getting h) a football match
9 watching i) a baby
10 having j) somebody to go out with you
11 asking k) interviews

REACTING TO NEWS

3 React to the news by completing the dialogues with phrases from the box. More than one answer may be possible.

6 Wow! Really? That’s great!
6 Oh no! How did it happen?
• What a pity!
14 Yeah, it’s incredible, isn’t it?
15 Again? So what now?
32 That’s terrible!

A: I lost my dog yesterday.
B: That’s terrible!
A: My parents are going to get divorced.
B: …
A: Did you know John and Anne won 10,000 pounds in the lottery?
B: …
A: I’ve passed all my exams.
B: …
A: My brother had an accident yesterday.
B: …
A: Haven't you heard he had another terrible argument with his boss?
B: …

MAYBE, I DON’T KNOW, I SUPPOSE …

4 Complete the table with your opinions about the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you like to live in Spain?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I suppose so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ERROR ANALYSIS

Find and correct the mistakes.

I have been went to the cinema yesterday.
1 Have ever you worked in a pub?
2 I born in Australia in 1989.
3 I am taking a shower every day.
4 Last summer I ve travelled to Egypt.
5 I’m having a lot of money in the future.