

行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫 成果報告

英文 Tough 結構難學嗎？ Tough 結構文法教學之成效 研究成果報告(精簡版)

計畫類別：個別型
計畫編號：NSC 100-2410-H-034-023-
執行期間：100年08月01日至101年07月31日
執行單位：中國文化大學英國語文學系(所)

計畫主持人：周敏潔

計畫參與人員：大專生-兼任助理人員：官珉鈞
博士班研究生-兼任助理人員：胡開程

公開資訊：本計畫可公開查詢

中華民國 101 年 12 月 24 日

中文摘要：教學實驗於100學年第一學期第四週進行，實驗組(65人)除了有教學講義並有針對 tough 句型的教學；控制組(47人)則只發給有關 tough 句型的講義。文法判讀測驗於第六週進行，翻譯測驗於第十週舉行。文法判讀測驗結果顯示實驗組學生於12個目標句子中對8個句子的判讀優於控制組，然而在其他類似的句型上則表現得較差，顯示本教學實驗的成效有限。翻譯測驗則依據建立的編碼系統分類出15類句型，包括 It-句型、tough 句型、受詞位移主詞句型、不定詞被動化句型等。研究結果顯示實驗組和控制組使用多的是 It-句型，分別占各組產出句子的 50.8%及 46.5%，顯示變形語法教學可能對學習 tough 句型有所助益。兩組學習者在使用 tough 句型的頻率接近，分別占各組產出句子的 20.3%及 21.3%，多使用在主詞為非人稱的句子。Pseudo TM 主要發生在主詞為人稱的句子，顯示學生受中文句型影響的程度，實驗組和控制組使用 Pseudo TM 之頻率亦相當接近，各占 6.3%及 5.9%。控制組較多使用被動化的不定詞，顯示臺灣學生過度使用被動式的情形，亦可能因為教學實驗的成效，實驗組表現較為優良。

中文關鍵詞：特定語法教學、文法判讀測驗、翻譯測驗、編碼系統、It-句型、tough 句型、受詞位移主詞句型、不定詞被動化句型

英文摘要：In the fourth week of the semester, the experimental group was given form-focused instructions and materials on the use of tough-construction, while the control group received only the materials without any instruction. The grammaticality judgment test was given around the sixth week, and the translation task was held around the tenth week. The results of the grammaticality judgment test showed that among 8 out of 12 target constructions, the experimental group outperformed the control group. Nevertheless, the experimental group made poorer judgment on the similar structures, indicating the limitation of instruction on tough construction. A coding system was established to classify the students output (1344 sentences in total) from the translation task. Totally, 15 categories of sentence structures were identified, including 'It-sentence,' 'object-to-subject raising,' 'Pseudo TM,' 'extraposition,' 'passivization of infinitival clause,' etc. Both the experimental

group and the control group employed the largest number of It-sentences, with 50.8% of the experimental group output and 46.5% of the control group production, which may be attributed to the effectiveness of one of the instructional approaches—the transformational approach. With regard to tough constructions, both groups were equivalent (20.1% vs. 21.3%) in producing object-to-subject raising sentences, mostly with sentences beginning with unanimated subjects. Pseudo TM appeared largely with sentences starting with animated subjects, revealing negative transfer from corresponding L1 Chinese structures. With the experimental group generating more pseudo TM than the control group (6.3% vs. 5.9%), the effect of intervening instructions seemed limited. On the other hand, the control group produced relatively more passivized infinitival clauses, demonstrating Chinese learners' tendency to overuse the passive form and some degree of effectiveness of instruction in purging this kind of interlanguage structure.

英文關鍵詞： Form-focused instruction, grammaticality judgment task, translation task, object-to-subject raising, pseudo-TM

行政院國家科學委員會補助專題研究計畫成果報告

英文 Tough 結構難學嗎？ Tough 結構文法教學之成效

Are Tough-Constructions Tough to Learn?
Effectiveness of Form-focused Instruction on English Tough-Construction

計畫類別：個別型計畫 整合型計畫

計畫編號：NSC 100-2410-H-034-023

執行期間：2011 年 08 月 01 日至 2012 年 07 月 31 日

執行機構及系所：中國文化大學英國語文學系

計畫主持人：周敏潔

計畫參與人員：研究助理官珉鈞、胡開程

成果報告類型(依經費核定清單規定繳交)：精簡報告 完整報告

處理方式：除列管計畫及下列情形者外，得立即公開查詢

涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，一年二年後可公開查詢

中 華 民 國 101 年 12 月 24 日

中文摘要

教學實驗於 100 學年第一學期第四週進行，實驗組(65 人)除了有教學講義並有針對 tough 句型的教學；控制組(47 人)則只發給有關 tough 句型的講義。文法判讀測驗於第六週進行，翻譯測驗於第十週舉行。文法判讀測驗結果顯示實驗組學生於 12 個目標句子中對 8 個句子的判讀優於控制組，然而在其他類似的句型上則表現得較差，顯示本教學實驗的成效有限。翻譯測驗則依據建立的編碼系統分類出 15 類句型，包括 It-句型、tough 句型、受詞位移主詞句型、不定詞被動化句型等。研究結果顯示實驗組和控制組使用多的是 It-句型，分別占各組產出句子的 50.8%及 46.5%，顯示變形語法教學可能對學習 tough 句型有所助益。兩組學習者在使用 tough 句型的頻率接近，分別占各組產出句子的 20.3%及 21.3%，多使用在主詞為非人稱的句子。Pseudo TM 主要發生在主詞為人稱的句子，顯示學生受中文句型影響的程度，實驗組和控制組使用 Pseudo TM 之頻率亦相當接近，各占 6.3% 及 5.9%。控制組較多使用被動化的不定詞，顯示臺灣學生過度使用被動式的情形，亦可能因為教學實驗的成效，實驗組表現較為優良。

關鍵詞：特定語法教學、文法判讀測驗、翻譯測驗、編碼系統、It-句型、tough 句型、受詞位移主詞句型、不定詞被動化句型

English Abstract

In the fourth week of the semester, the experimental group was given form-focused instructions and materials on the use of tough-construction, while the control group received only the materials without any instruction. The grammaticality judgment test was given around the sixth week, and the translation task was held around the tenth week. The results of the grammaticality judgment test showed that among 8 out of 12 target constructions, the experimental group outperformed the control group. Nevertheless, the experimental group made poorer judgment on the similar structures, indicating the limitation of instruction on tough construction. A coding system was established to classify the students output (1344 sentences in total) from the translation task. Totally, 15 categories of sentence structures were identified, including "It-sentence," "object-to-subject raising," "Pseudo TM," "extraposition," "passivization of infinitival clause," etc. Both the experimental group and the control group employed the largest number of It-sentences, with 50.8% of the experimental group output and 46.5% of the control group production, which may be attributed to the effectiveness of one of the instructional approaches—the transformational approach. With regard to tough constructions, both groups were equivalent (20.1% vs. 21.3%) in producing object-to-subject raising sentences, mostly with sentences beginning with unanimated subjects. Pseudo TM appeared largely with sentences starting with animated subjects, revealing negative transfer from corresponding L1 Chinese structures. With the experimental group generating more pseudo TM than the control group (6.3% vs. 5.9%), the effect of intervening instructions seemed limited. On the other hand, the control group produced relatively more passivized infinitival clauses, demonstrating Chinese learners' tendency to overuse the passive form and some degree of effectiveness of instruction in purging this kind of interlanguage structure.

Keywords: Form-focused instruction, grammaticality judgment task, translation task, object-to-subject raising, pseudo-TM

Are *Tough*-Constructions Tough to Learn? Effectiveness of Form-focused Instruction on English *Tough*-Constructions

INTRODUCTION

One problematic structure that occurs frequently in the English writing of Chinese EFL learners is “pseudo tough construction” or “pseudo-tough-movement” (CIL Pseudo TM, henceforth) (Yip, 1995, p. 153). Many studies attribute this phenomenon to cross-linguistic influence of the learners’ L1 and the overgeneralization in the L2 acquisition process (Chen, 2001; Yip, 1995). The study attempted to look into this learning difficulty of Taiwanese EFL college learners by first identifying the frequent patterns of CIL Pseudo TM in an English learner corpus, based on which instructional treatment for this problematic L2 structure were proposed. Thus, the primary goal of the study is to investigate how systematic explicit form-focused¹ instructions in the classroom facilitate the acquisition of the target TM structures.

LITERATURE REVIEW

***Tough*-Constructions in English**

As defined by Eckman (1977), raising in English involves moving an NP of a complement clause into the next higher clause, which includes subject-to-object, subject-to-subject, and object-to-subject raising. The NP movement from a subject/object of subordinate clause to the subject/object of a higher clause creates, therefore, a greater distance between syntactic form and semantic meaning, resulting in ambiguity of surface structures (Callies, 2008).

Syntax of *Tough*-Constructions

From the perspective of syntax, the *tough* construction is characterized by an apparent gap in the object position of an embedded infinitival clause, and by the appearance of a syntactic argument in matrix position that is coreferent with this ‘missing’ object. Thus, the *tough* subject appears to bear a thematic relation to the main verb of the embedded infinitival clauses (Hicks, 2003).

Stuurman (1990) indicates that *tough* infinitives are ‘passival,’ referring to their nature of being active in form but passive in meaning. This connotation of passivity may be one of the reasons why English learners of Chinese tend to use the passive form with *tough* infinitives.

Givón (2001) emphasizes the function of foregrounding an important topic of raising — converting an argument of the subordinate clause to a grammatical argument (either subject or object) of the main clause, manifesting the topicalizing pragmatic function of raising.

Pseudo-Tough-Movement in Chinese-English Interlanguage (CIL)

As observed by Yip (1995), Chinese students produced CIL Pseudo-*Tough*-Movement (Pseudo TM) sentences as the following.

- (1) *I am very easy to forget.
- (2) *I am boring to study.

Yip speculated that in (1) the student might intend to express that s/he forgot something very easily. In (2) the student complained that it was boring for him to study rather than it was boring to study him, as illustrated by the superficial structure of the sentence. With other similar CIL patterns, Yip concluded that Chinese learners were consistently misapplying English TM to the subjects, rather than the objects of

¹ Form-focused instruction refers to instruction on a certain sentence structure through explicit explanation on the grammatical rule, followed by the systematic or sequential presentation of examples, which is distinct from *focus on form* (FonF) advocated by Long (1991), Doughty & Williams (1998), and others.

complement clauses.

Yip's (1995) study of different groups of Chinese learners' judgments of *tough*-movement and other related structures demonstrated that both the intermediate and advanced level L2 learners showed much uncertainty in using English TM structure. It also confirmed the hypothesis that Subject Raising was generalized to *tough*-predicates. The study concluded that the interaction of Raising structures in both English and Chinese and cross-linguistic distribution of the structures led to the overgeneralization of Raising to *tough*-predicates in the interlanguage grammar.

Instructions on *Tough* Constructions

A score of form-focused studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of explicit classroom instruction on EFL Chinese learners' learning of English *tough*-constructions. Chiang and Costello's (1983) study of Taiwanese high school students' learning of the sentence "Jack is easy to see" demonstrated that even the more advanced students had difficulty interpreting the sentence through translation correctly. Many of them considered *Jack* the subject of the verb *see*. Chiang and Costello suggested that mere exposure of such problematic structure to the students was not sufficient for the acquisition of the target structure. The teachers should reserve a significant amount of class time to explain and discuss the structure, so that students could practice and fully master it.

Likewise, Chan and Li's (2004) study provided empirical evidence demonstrating that the high-frequency lexico-grammatical anomalies of Hong Kong university students, such as Pseudo TM and others were teachable and correctable, and thus learnable through a rigorous explicit instructions rather than a mild consciousness-raising approach. Chan and Li (2004) adopted a model of remedial instruction to facilitate learners' self-monitoring and editing skills in both L2 guided and spontaneous output. The study showed that significant and consistent improvement in the learners' performance was the result of explicit and focused instructional treatment of errors in the L2 output. It was in essence a non-developmental approach to eradicating or rectifying students' persistent stabilized errors.

The above studies demonstrated that *tough*-constructions are learnable to Chinese EFL learners and that instructional intervention is imperative for the learners to acquire the right usage of this particular type of sentence structure. A mere exposure to the target structure or an accidental correction of mistakes is not likely to make students realize the nature of the *tough*-construction and to generalize that one instance to other *tough* predicates. Systematic explicit form-focused instruction, followed by ample practice with various examples is necessary for the learners to successfully acquire the English *tough*-construction.

PEDAGOGICAL TREATMENT

With the complexity of CIL TM constructions, a combination of various approaches is necessary to help learners to tackle this problem. A pedagogical treatment involving cross-linguistic comparison, and morphosyntactic and transformational changes in CIL TM constructions are recommended.

1. A Cross-linguistic Approach

Many CIL Pseudo TM constructions bear superficial resemblance with Chinese counterparts. A parallel presentation of the CIL structures and the target structures and a demonstration of the differences between them is useful for the learners to realize the possible source of their erroneous TM constructions—a cross-linguistic influence from L1 Chinese. The learners need to be informed that English *tough*-constructions involves moving (raising) the object of the nonfinite verb to the matrix subject position.

2. A Morphosyntactic Approach

Another way to instruct learners to rectify the Pseudo TM construction involves changing the syntax and morphology of the sentence. The Pseudo TM construction is changed into a non-TM construction by replacing the adjectival predicate *easy* with the adverb *easily*. In the non-TM construction, no NP

movement is involved, and an adverb is adopted to modify the verb rather than the subject.

3. A Transformational Approach

The classical transformational approach to TM (Rosenbaum, 1967) demonstrates that TM constructions and non-TM constructions derive from the same single deep structure. At the first phase, extraposition applies, which then results in the insertion of *it* into matrix subject position, and then through Raising, the object of the nonfinite verb is raised to matrix subject position, taking the place of the expletive *it*. The transformational process can inform students of where the TM construction derives from. And a Pseudo TM construction undergoes a different movement.

THE METHOD

The study attempted to validate the effectiveness of the aforementioned three instructional approaches for facilitating Taiwanese EFL college learners' learning of English *tough*- constructions. It was hypothesized that the students that were treated with the systematic explicit classroom instructions outperformed significantly the students that were not given such instructions on *tough* constructions.

The subjects were 4 classes of students at Chinese Culture University. The experimental group received systematic explicit instructions along with the negative evidence on *tough*-construction before the experimental tests, while the control group (N=47) received such formal systematic instruction until the tests were over.

The proficiency test was given within the third week of the semester to measure the proficiency level of the two groups. The mean score of the experimental group (N=65, SD=12.461) of the proficiency test is 47.78, and the mean score of the control group (N=47, SD=11.810) is 49.57, with $p=0.119$, indicating the compatibility of the proficiency level of the subjects of the two groups. After the classroom instructions, the subjects were requested to take the grammaticality judgment test composed of 20 *tough* constructions with the passive sentences used as distracters. Finally, to measure the lasting effect of the explicit classroom instruction on the TM structures, the translation test was conducted the end of the first semester of 2011 school year as a delayed posttest.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the grammaticality judgment test showed that among 8 out of 12 target constructions, the experimental group outperformed the control group. Specifically, the subjects of the experimental group performed significantly better when making judgment on the following sentences: *Many people are difficult to find a job*, *Grammar is boring to learn*, *Miranda is easy to be pleased*, *The solution is not easy to find*. Nevertheless, the experimental group made poorer judgment on the similar structure: *Some ideas are difficult to be expressed in English*, *Jonny is possible to win the prize*, *The broken furniture is easy to be fixed*, indicating the limitation of instruction on *tough*-construction.

Table 1 The Results of the Grammaticality Test

Sentences	Experimental Group			Control Group			Mean Difference
	Judgment	Frequency	Percent	Judgment	Frequency	Percent	
1. I am not convenient to see you tomorrow.	Grammatical	23	35.4	Grammatical	18	38.3	3.3
	Ungrammatical	42	64.6	Ungrammatical	29	61.7	2.9
3. Some ideas are difficult to be expressed in English.	Grammatical	47	87.7	Grammatical	32	76.6	11.1
	Ungrammatical	8	12.3	Ungrammatical	10	21.3	-9
5. Johnny is possible to win the prize.	Grammatical	40	61.5	Grammatical	25	53.2	8.3
	Ungrammatical	24	36.9	Ungrammatical	22	46.8	-9.9
6. Fast food is convenient to eat.	Grammatical	42	64.6	Grammatical	30	63.8	0.8
	Ungrammatical	23	35.3	Ungrammatical	17	36.1	-0.8
7. Some people are impossible to be persuaded.	Grammatical	46	70.8	Grammatical	35	74.5	-3.7
	Ungrammatical	19	29.2	Ungrammatical	12	25.5	3.7
10. Many cartoons are funny to watch.	Grammatical	31	47.7	Grammatical	24	51.1	-3.4
	Ungrammatical	34	52.3	Ungrammatical	23	48.9	3.4
11. Many people are difficult to find a job.	Grammatical	36	55.3	Grammatical	29	61.7	-6.4
	Ungrammatical	26	40	Ungrammatical	18	38.3	1.7
12. The MRT in Taipei is convenient to take.	Grammatical	45	69.3	Grammatical	34	72.3	-3
	Ungrammatical	20	30.8	Ungrammatical	13	27.6	3.2
15. Grammar is boring to learn.	Grammatical	48	73.8	Grammatical	30	63.8	10
	Ungrammatical	17	26.1	Ungrammatical	17	36.1	-10
17. Miranda is easy to be pleased.	Grammatical	40	61.5	Grammatical	33	70.2	-8.7
	Ungrammatical	25	38.5	Ungrammatical	14	29.8	8.7
19. The broken furniture is easy to be fixed.	Grammatical	54	83.1	Grammatical	37	78.7	4.4
	Ungrammatical	11	16.9	Ungrammatical	10	21.3	-4.4
20. The solution is not easy to find.	Grammatical	52	80	Grammatical	33	70.2	9.8
	Ungrammatical	13	20	Ungrammatical	14	19.8	0.2

Table 2 Frequencies and Percentages of Sentence Types in the Translation Task

Types of Sentences	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	frequency	percent	frequency	percent
<i>It</i> -sentence	396	50.8	262	46.5
Object-to-subject raising	157	20.1	120	21.3
Pseudo TM	49	6.3	33	5.9
Correct but no raising	40	5.1	35	6.2
Omit <i>for</i> -phrase	38	4.9	23	4.1
Incorrect use of <i>for</i> -phrase	33	4.2	23	4.1
Extrapolation: Gerund	27	3.5	15	2.7
Wrong or incomprehensive	11	1.4	16	2.8
Incorrect use of <i>It</i> -sentence	9	1.2	10	1.8
Incorrect raising	8	1.0	11	2.0
Passivization of infinitival clause	6	0.8	12	2.1
Passivization of infinitival clause (incorrect form)	1	0.1	4	0.7
Extrapolation: Infinitival	2	0.3	0	0
Wrong gerund	1	0.1	0	0
<i>No answer</i>	2	0.3		
Total	780	100	564	100

A coding system (Appendix C) was established to classify the students output (1344 sentences in total) from the translation task. Totally, 15 categories of sentence structures were identified, including “*It*-sentence,” “object-to-subject raising,” “Pseudo TM,” “extrapolation,” “passivization of infinitival clause,” “*for*-phrase omission” and others. Both the experimental group and control group employed the largest number of *It*-sentences, with 50.8% (396 out of 780) of the experimental group output and 46.5% (262 out of 564) of the control group production, aligning with the relatively high frequency of occurrences of *It*-sentences in the learner corpus. This phenomenon may also be attributed to the effectiveness of one of the instructional approaches applied in the study--the transformational approach. With regard to *tough* constructions, both groups were equivalent in producing object-to-subject raising sentences (20.1% vs. 21.3%), which came mostly from translations of sentences beginning with unanimated subjects such as 這個意思很難表達, 這個問題不容易解決, 這個計畫很容易執行。As to Pseudo TM, they appeared largely with sentences starting with animated subjects like 他有可能出國留學, 我們不方便告訴你他的電話, 我們不可能在兩天內完成這工作, suggesting influence from L1 Chinese, especially in a translation task. With the experimental group generating more Pseudo TM than the control group (6.3% vs. 5.9%), the effect of intervening instructions seemed limited rectifying this type of L2 errors. On the other hand, the control group produced relatively more passivized infinitival clauses,

demonstrating a tendency in Chinese learners to overuse passive form and the effectiveness of instruction in purging this kind of interlanguage structure.

References

- Anderson, D. L. (2005). *The acquisition of tough-movement in English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, England.
- Biber, D., Finegan, E., Conrad, S., Johansson, S., & Leech G. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Bongaerts, D. (1983). The comprehension of three complex English structures by Dutch learners. *Language Learning* 33, 159-182.
- Callies, M. (2008). Easy to understand but difficult to use? Raising constructions and information packaging in the advanced learner variety. In G. Gilquin, M. B. Diez-Bedmar & S. Papp (Eds.), *Linking contrastive and learner corpus research* (pp. 201-226). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Chan, Y. W., & Li, C. S. (2002). Form-focused remedial instruction: an empirical study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 12, 24-53.
- Chiang, J. S., & Costello, J. R. (1983). The acquisition of syntax in first and second language learning. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 21, 19-33.
- Chomsky, C. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, C. (1969). *The acquisition of syntax in children from 5-10*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Eckman, F. (1977). On the explanation of some typological facts about raising. In F. Eckman (Ed.), *Current themes in linguistics: Bilingualism, experimental linguistics, and language typologies* (pp. 195-214). Washington: Hemisphere.
- Givón, T. (2001). *Syntax. An introduction*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Han, Z. (2000). Persistence of the implicit influence of NL: The case of the pseudo-passive. *Applied Linguistics* 21, 78-105.
- Hicks, G. (2003). "So Easy to Look At, So Hard to Define": *Tough* movement in the minimalist framework. Unpublished Master's thesis. University of York.
- Lehmann, W. P. (1978). English: A characteristic SVO language. In W. P. Lehmann (Ed.) *Syntactic typology: Studies in the phenomenology of language* (pp. 169-222). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Li, H. Y.-H. (1990). *Order and constituency in Mandarin Chinese*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mair, C. (1987). Tough-movement in present-day British English: A corpus-based study. *Studia Linguistica* 41(1), 59-71.
- Mair, C. (1990). *Infinitival complement clauses in English. A study of syntax in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenbaum, P. S. (1967). *The grammar of English predicate complement constructions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Shi, D. (1990). Is there object to subject raising in Chinese? *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: Vol. 16*. (pp. 305-314). Berkeley: University of California.
- Stuurman, F. (1990). *Two grammatical models of modern English (the Old and New from A to Z)*. Routledge, London & NY.
- Thompson, S. (1978). Modern English from a typological point of view: Some implications of the function of word order. *Linguistische Berichte* 54, 19-35.
- Yip, V. (1995). *Interlanguage and learnability: From Chinese to English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Appendix

The Coding System for the Translation Task

Definitions	Examples
Object-to-subject raising	The meaning is (too) hard/ difficult to express. The sentence is difficult/hard to understand. The problem is not easy (hard) to solve. The project is easy to conduct.
Incorrect raising	The meaning is not easy to express it. The meaning is hardly to express. This project is easy conduct. The project is very easy to conduct it.
Passivization of infinitival clause	The problem is not easy to be solved. The sentence is hard to be understood. The meaning is hard to be expressed.
Passivization of infinitival clause (incorrect form)	This meaning is hard to be express. This sentence is hard be understand. The problem is not easy to be solve. It isn't an easy problem to solved.
Extraposition: Infinitival	To solve this problem is difficult. To get along with him is fun. To use the computer at school library is convenient.
Extraposition: Gerund	Taking the MRT is convenient for us to go to Danshui. Using computer in the school library is very convenient. Getting along with him is fun. Going abroad to study is possible for him.
Wrong gerund	Forget her is hard to me. Take the MRT to Danshui is son convenient to us. Use computer in the school library is convenient. Finish this job in two days is impossible for us.
<i>It</i> -sentence	It is hard for me to forget her. It is (very) convenient for us to take the MRT to Danshui. It's convenient that we take the MRT to Danshui. It's fun to get along with him. It is easy to conduct the project. It is possible that he goes abroad to study. It's impossible that we finish (the) job in two days.
Incorrect use of <i>It</i> -sentence	Forget her it's hard to me. It really convenient that we take the MRT to the Danshui. Is fun to get along with him. It's fun to get along with he. It is impossible to us that finish this job in two days.
Incorrect use of <i>for</i> -phrase	To me, it's really hard to forget her. It was inconvenient to see him for me last night. It is inconvenient to Danshui for us about taking the MRT. It's impossible to finish the job in two days for us.
Omit <i>for</i> -phrase	It's hard to forget her. It is very convenient to take the MRT to Danshui.

	<p>It is inconvenient to tell you his telephone number.</p> <p>It's impossible to finish job in two days.</p>
Pseudo TM (Tough movement)	<p>I am hard to forget her.</p> <p>I was inconvenient to see/meet him last night.</p> <p>I was quite inconvenient to see him last night.</p> <p>We are convenient to take the MRT to go Danshui.</p> <p>We are inconvenient to tell you his telephone number.</p> <p>We are impossible to finish this job within two days.</p>
Correct but no raising	<p>He may go abroad <u>to study/for studying</u>.</p> <p>Yesterday night I wasn't inconvenient to see him.</p> <p>Yesterday night, I was inconvenient so I didn't go to see him.</p> <p>We can't finish the impossible job in two days.</p>
Wrong or in comprehensive	<p>It is have to express the meaning.</p> <p>I had inconvenient to see he in yesterday night.</p> <p>We take the MRT to Danshui convenient.</p> <p>This sentence is understand hard.</p> <p>He mays go abroad to studying.</p>

國科會補助計畫衍生研發成果推廣資料表

日期:2012/12/24

國科會補助計畫	計畫名稱: 英文Tough結構難學嗎? Tough結構文法教學之成效
	計畫主持人: 周敏潔
	計畫編號: 100-2410-H-034-023- 學門領域: 英語教學研究
無研發成果推廣資料	

100 年度專題研究計畫研究成果彙整表

計畫主持人：周敏潔		計畫編號：100-2410-H-034-023-					
計畫名稱：英文 Tough 結構難學嗎？ Tough 結構文法教學之成效							
成果項目		量化			單位	備註（質化說明：如數個計畫共同成果、成果列為該期刊之封面故事...等）	
		實際已達成數（被接受或已發表）	預期總達成數（含實際已達成數）	本計畫實際貢獻百分比			
國內	論文著作	期刊論文	0	1	50%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	1	50%		
		研討會論文	0	0	0%		
		專書	0	0	0%		
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	0%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	0%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	0%	件	
		權利金	0	0	0%	千元	
	參與計畫人力 （本國籍）	碩士生	0	0	0%	人次	
		博士生	1	1	30%		1
博士後研究員		0	0	0%			
專任助理		0	0	0%			
國外	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	0%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	0%		
		研討會論文	0	0	0%		
		專書	0	0	0%		章/本
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	0%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	0%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	0%	件	
		權利金	0	0	0%	千元	
	參與計畫人力 （外國籍）	碩士生	0	0	0%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	0%		
博士後研究員		0	0	0%			
專任助理		0	0	0%			

<p style="text-align: center;">其他成果</p> <p>(無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">無</p>
---	--------------------------------------

	成果項目	量化	名稱或內容性質簡述
科 教 處 計 畫 加 填 項 目	測驗工具(含質性與量性)	0	
	課程/模組	0	
	電腦及網路系統或工具	0	
	教材	0	
	舉辦之活動/競賽	0	
	研討會/工作坊	0	
	電子報、網站	0	
	計畫成果推廣之參與(閱聽)人數	0	

國科會補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

達成目標

未達成目標（請說明，以 100 字為限）

實驗失敗

因故實驗中斷

其他原因

說明：

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：

論文： 已發表 未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無

專利： 已獲得 申請中 無

技轉： 已技轉 洽談中 無

其他：（以 100 字為限）

本教學實驗按照教學及研究步驟完成，實驗結果顯示實驗組在大部分測驗項目有較佳的表現，顯示針對語法難點的教學活動有助於特定句型及語法難點的學習。

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）（以 500 字為限）

本研究為一教學實驗的研究，根據英語學習者實際使用的語料，歸類分析學習者使用 tough 句型的情形及難點，並據其設計適當的教學活動以協助學生克服學習困難。本研究有兩項重要的價值：（一）透過學習者語料庫中的自然語料與引發式語料交互參照以更了解學生使用 tough 句型的情形。學習者語料庫是提供觀察語言習得過程及現象極佳的資源，對照母語使用者語料庫及不同母語背景的學習者語料庫，將能對第二語言習得的過程及現象有更充分的了解。（二）本研究結果顯示針對特定語法的教學具有相當的成效，然而部分學習結果是語言發展過程中必然的現象或受第一語言的影響，並非全然決定於教學，因此了解學生語言發展各個階段中的特有的現象及學習偏誤發生的原因是未來英語教學研究重要的議題。