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This study investigates effects of form-focused instructions on the learning of English verb complementation, especially ‘verb+NP+to infinitive’ construction, by Korean EFL learners. The seven target verbs were chosen from monotransitive and ditransitive constructions. 150 college students were randomly divided into two experimental groups, which received negative feedback plus explicit rule presentation (NF) and input enhancement plus meaning-oriented rule search (IE) respectively, and one control group. A pretest and a posttest were conducted to measure learners’ receptive and productive knowledge of the target structure through a grammaticality judgment task (GJT) and a picture description task (PDT). The results of the posttest revealed that experimental groups outperformed the control group in both tasks. In the grammaticality judgment task, the NF group showed better learning in rejecting incorrect structures as well as accepting target structures when compared to the IE group. The NF group also outperformed in reducing error tokens in the picture description task. The findings indicate that two types of form-focused instructions implemented in the study have advantages in facilitating learning of the target structure. (174)

I. INTRODUCTION

Several research findings in second language learning have demonstrated that comprehensible input is necessary but not sufficient for learners to master the target forms. Thus, many studies have investigated effective methods to help learners succeed in acquiring/learning of the target forms by paying special attention to the structures (Dekeyser, 1995; Doughty, 1991; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Ellis, 1993; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993).

The English verb complementation, the target structure of the present study, has been
extensively discussed in the field of linguistic theory (Celce-Murcia & Larsen Freeman, 1999; Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985: Huddleston, 1971; Pinker, 1984). Although the difficulties EFL learners have in learning English verb complementation system is widely recognized, little has been done to bridge the gap between theory and pedagogy. Furthermore, English verb complementation has been relatively ignored in Korean EFL classroom settings and instead substituted by discrete vocabulary learning. Even when it is presented in class, nonsystematic lists of verbs that happened to be similar in surface structures are given together at best. Subsequently, learners are left alone to generalize the target structure by figuring out scattered input. Since L2 acquisition is different from that of L1 especially in EFL context, factors such as L1 influence, the quality of input, and the provision of explicit instruction interact with each other and make each contribution in the process of L2 acquisition and learning (Doughty, 2003). As Lightbown and White (1987) point out, linguistic theory or theoretical explanation is necessary but not sufficient elements of a theory in SLA.

In this respect, the present study aims to investigate the effective methods for presenting the intricacies of English verb complementation to Korean EFL learners. A pilot study was conducted in advance in order to identify the error types on the target structure, verb+NP+to infinitive construction, frequently induced by the learners. Two instructional treatments were cogitated on the basis of the results of the pilot study; negative feedback plus explicit rule presentation and input enhancement plus meaning oriented rule search. The two types of form-focused instructions were adopted mainly considering the feasibility into Korean EFL classroom settings where reading skills are mostly emphasized.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Previous Studies on Negative Feedback

The question whether or not negative feedback has a positive effect on L2 acquisition has been a major concern in the field of second/foreign language acquisition. White (1991) empirically shows that negative feedback plays a positive role in learning of English adverb placement. In her study, experimental groups that had been instructed on the target form through explicit instruction and negative evidence succeeded in realizing that verbs cannot be raised to the position of INFL in English. On the contrary, learners in the control group who were instructed only on the question formation failed to change their performance transferred from their L1. Caroll and Swain (1993) compared the effects of four types of negative feedback; explicit hypothesis rejection, explicit utterance rejection,
modeling/implicit negative feedback and indirect metalinguistic feedback. They focused on the acquisition of the English dative alternation by adult Spanish ESL learners. The results of their experiment showed that all the groups receiving negative feedbacks outperformed the control group both on the learning of abstract linguistic generalizations and narrowing of the application of those rules. In a similar fashion, Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) compared the effectiveness of implicit and explicit corrective feedback. Two experimental groups received either recasts or metalinguistic explanation in response to any utterance that contained an error in the target structure of past tense –ed. The results revealed that the experimental group receiving explicit corrective feedback excelled those who received implicit corrective feedback in both an oral imitation test and a grammaticality judgment test. The results indicated that metalinguistic explanation benefited implicit as well as explicit knowledge. Schwartz and Gubala-Ryzak (1992), however, questioned the effect of negative evidence reviewing White (1991). They argued that negative feedback plays little role in parameter-resetting, unlearning the verb movement. According to their assertion, the learners in White’s study learned a superficial pattern-matching instead of an underlying abstract linguistic rule. Izumi and Lakshmanan (1998) gave counterargument by insisting that knowledge in long-term effects is not necessarily related to linguistic competence. They investigated the role of negative evidence with regard to the acquisition of English passive by Japanese EFL learners and reported a positive role of negative feedback at the beginning of the instructional sessions. The result of a delayed post-test, however, revealed that the effect of negative feedback continues in only some of the participants. Izumi and Lakshmanan (1998) attributed this asymmetry to the inappropriate analysis of the target structure by participants.

With the support of previous studies, the present study employs negative feedback as one type of form-focused instruction. According to Long and Robinson (1998), grammatical rules are categorized as one of the subtype of negative evidence which means that presenting grammatical rules always entails providing negative feedback. Accordingly, negative feedback is used with one session of explicit rule presentation in the present study.

2. The Role of Input Enhancement in SLA

The relationship between input enhancement and the learning of the target structure has been widely investigated by many SLA researchers (Doughty, 1991; Lightbown & Spada, 1990, 1994; Trahey & White, 1993). They have revealed that perceptual saliency obtained from typological enhancement on the linguistic features help learners pay attention to the target forms more explicitly than input flooding. Doughty (1991) investigated the effects of implicit and explicit form-focused instruction in the acquisition of English relative
The two experimental groups consisted of a meaning-oriented group (MOG) and the rule-oriented group (ROG). Subjects in the implicit MOG received lexical and semantic rephrasing of the relative clauses that were visually salient by highlighting and capitalizing while those in ROG received additional rule explanation. The results showed that two experimental groups excelled the control group in the acquisition of the target structure. Furthermore, MOG outperformed both ROG and the control group in transfer comprehension task. This shows that input enhancement help learners enable better comprehension of the content.

Even though it is apparent that perceptual saliency through input enhancement has efficacy on attracting learners attention to the target form, the findings of several research employing input enhancement technique revealed that learners presented with explicit instruction outperformed those in input enhancement group (Alanen, 1995; Dekeyser, 1995; Robinson, 1996). This is in the same vein with other researchers’ opinion that the visual enhancement alone is not sufficient for interlanguage development. They argued that other supplementary instructional treatment should be added. For example, White (1998) suggested using of more explicit information and Izumi (2002) recommended output activities for further processing and subsequent learning. In addition, Jourdenais (1998) articulated that the implicit nature of the typological enhancement was more likely to be beneficial to the learners who already had some initial awareness of the forms and their use. This was also supported by Williams and Evans (1998). Their prior concern was on the question of which forms to choose for focus on form activities. Two experimental treatments were tested; an implicit input flood containing target forms and the input flood plus brief and contextualized explicit instruction on rules for formation and use. The results showed that while the instructional group gained more than the implicit group in simple rules, the two groups were not significantly different in complex rules. This emphasizes that implicit and explicit form-focused instructions are related to both the nature of the forms and the learners’ developmental readiness.

Taking these previous studies into consideration, it can be inferred that input enhancement alone does not have a positive effect on the learning of new rules or unlearning of the incorrect forms when compared with other explicit instructional treatments. Thus in the present study, input enhancement was employed with three sessions of meaning oriented rule search exercises considering the feasibility of meaning based form instruction into Korean EFL classroom settings.

3. The Learnability Problem of English Verb Complementation.

English verb complementation has been explored by many researchers for decades (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999; Huddleston, 1971; Pinker, 1984; Quirk et al.,
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1985). Their classifications as well as the terminology, however, are slightly different from each other according to whether their criteria stand on syntactic or semantic features of matrix verbs. Furthermore, since a large number of English verbs allow more than one type of complementation in nature, it is quite difficult especially for L2 learners to describe every possible complementation type in one clear picture.

Regarding the acquisition and learning of English verb complementation, not many experimental studies were conducted so far (Douglas, 1987; Ioup, 1983; Marina, 2005; Martohardjono & Flynn, 1995). Ioup (1983) investigated the difficulties in learning complex sentence types by examining Arabic speakers’ production of both tensed and tenseless embedded clauses in English and revealed that the learners had more difficulties with infinitival clauses than with tensed clauses. The result indicates that there is some predictable degree of difficulty for different types of complex sentences. Subjects in Marina (2005)’s study also had more difficulty in acquiring infinitival clauses with adjective predicates and noun predicates than tensed clauses. Young-Hee Hong (2000) attempted to predict acquisition order of English verb complementation types by investigating Korean EFL learners’ comprehension and production data. The results showed that ‘object-qui verbs’ were the most difficult among five types of English verbs classified by Pinker (1984). The overgeneralization errors of using redundant Korean dative postposition ‘e-ke’ were also frequently noticed with these verbs. Although a direct comparison is not possible because the target verbs and structures in each study are different, the results of the previous studies suggest that EFL learners have overall difficulties with learning infinitival clauses. Accordingly, the present study mainly focuses on the learning of ‘verb+NP+to infinitive’ construction following Quirk et al.’s (1985) classification. As is shown in Table 1, verbs of the three different complementation types share the same surface structure, ‘verb+NP+to infinitive. However they are demarcated by their distinct syntactic and semantic behaviors. According to Quirk et al. (1985), monotransitive verbs take the whole ‘NP+to infinitive’ construction as an object. Thus, the NP preceding the infinitive cannot function as the subject of the corresponding passive clause. On the other hand, ditransitive verbs differ in that they takes the NP following the matrix verb as an indirect object and ‘to infinitive’ as a direct object. Since the complex transitive verbs are the most productive in alternating with finite that-clauses, they were excluded from the target verbs of the present study.
TABLE 1
Classification of English Verb Complementation by Quirk et al. (1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Complementation Types</th>
<th>[NP, V NP\textsubscript{2} to V NP\textsubscript{3}]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONOTRANSITIVE</td>
<td>I want Jack to clean the house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLEX TRANSITIVE</td>
<td>I expect Jack to clean the house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITRANSITIVE</td>
<td>I allowed Jack to clean the house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I persuaded Jack to clean the house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Research Questions

The present study aims to examine the effectiveness of form-focused instruction on the learning of English verb complementation by Korean EFL learners. Two kinds of instructional treatments were cogitated considering the levels of explicitness; negative feedback plus explicit rule presentation (NF) and input enhancement plus meaning-oriented rule search (IE). The effectiveness of both instructions was measured by two distinct test methods; a grammaticality judgment task (GJT) and a picture description task (PDT). The study was motivated by the following two research questions:

1. Do form-focused instructions have effect on the learning of English verb complementation by Korean EFL learners?

2. What is the relative contribution of two different instructional treatments (NF and IE) in the development of the target structure?

III. THE STUDY

1. Participants

The participants in this study were 150 college students, all freshmen attending a university in Korea. Every participant was enrolled in General English Program which is offered to freshmen by the school in forms of a compulsory course. None of the participants had any experience of living in an English speaking country. Instead, as is typical of the Korean EFL context, they had been learning English as a foreign language for 6 years (from grade 7 to 12) through the regular English curriculum of 4 to 5 hour per week classroom instruction. Since outliers whose English test score of Korean SAT was too high or too low were excluded in advance, the subjects might be possibly considered as intermediate in terms of their English proficiency. They were distributed to six classes
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according to their majors and three instructors taught every two classes. As is shown in Table 2, each of three instructors taught two different groups in order to minimize the effect of instructor variable. Among the subjects, those who did not complete any of the two tasks properly in the pretest and the posttest, as well as those who did not attend every 8 instructional sessions were excluded from the final analysis. Thus, data from 143 subjects in the grammaticality judgment task and 119 subjects in the picture description task were examined in the final analysis.

### Table 2

The Organization of the Participants in the Present Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>GJT (N=143)</th>
<th>PDT (N=119)</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Instructor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NF)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Instructor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Instructor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IE)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Instructor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Instructor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cont)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Instructor 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted to the students who were not participated in the present study. They were asked to judge the grammaticality of sentences with target structure and to translate Korean sentences into English. The results of the pilot study revealed some learnability problems; Korean EFL learners are apt to accept ungrammatical *that*-clause complement with monotransitive verbs, *want* and *would like*. They also judged ungrammatical construction of ‘verb+preposition+NP+to infinitive’ as well as grammatical construction of ‘verb+NP+to infinitive’ as correct with ditransitive verbs. Similar errors were also found in the translation task as shown in (1).

\[I\text{ would like that you show me how to use this machine.}\]
\[I\text{ would like that you show me how to use this machine.}\]

(1) *I want that my father retires soon so that he can relax.
*I would like that you show me how to use this machine.
*John advised Mary to exercise everyday.
*Mrs. White persuaded to Jack buy an expensive car.
*Tom suggested Jane to search the internet.

### 3. Target Structure

The target structure of the present study is ‘verb+NP+to infinitive’ construction. Following Quirk et al.’s (1985) classification, seven target verbs were selected from
monotransitive and ditransitive verbs on the basis of the error analysis data from the pilot study; want, would like, advise, persuade, tell, warn and suggest. Unlike other six verbs, suggest is exceptional in that the target form is tensed that-clause rather than ‘verb+NP+to infinitive’ construction. It was yet chosen as one of the target verbs in this study because it does cause learnability problems; learners tend to identify the syntactic behavior of suggest with that of type 2 verbs. All the seven verbs are presented in the core vocabulary list of high school English course offered by Korean Ministry of Education.

4. Testing Materials

Two different types of tasks were conducted in the pretest and the posttest in order to measure the participants’ receptive and productive knowledge on the target structure. In the grammaticality judgment task (GJT), participants were asked to judge the grammaticality of 10 sentences. Among them, 3 were distracters (Appendix C). The test items were formulated on the basis of the results from the pilot study as follows; For type 1 verb (want, would like), sentences with finite that-clause complements were presented. In case of type 2 verbs, however, sentences with three verbs (tell, warn, suggest) contained ungrammatical constructions while other two verbs (advise, persuade) were used with licit construction in order to keep participants from copying their answers. Before the task materials were implemented, scores obtained from the students who were not participated in the present study were compared. The t-test result shows that there was no significant difference among the mean scores of two GJTs. This guarantees that the pretest and the posttest of grammaticality judgment task are the same in terms of the degree of difficulty.

The picture description task (PDT), consisting of seven pictures, was administered to measure the participants’ productive knowledge of target forms (Appendix D). Every picture describes an event containing two main characters and one target verb. After subjects watched a picture on the screen, they were told to write down one sentence including the two main characters using a given target verb. Time pressure was imposed to keep subjects from elaborating answers; they had 15 seconds to view each picture, and another 15 seconds to complete their responses. Test items were modified for the posttest in order to ensure that the observed improvement in participants’ production on the posttest was not due to the effect of practice or memorization.

5. Instructional treatments

Two different types of form-focused instructions were implemented in this study; negative feedback plus one session of explicit rule presentation (NF) and input enhancement plus three sessions of meaning-oriented rule search (IE).
In the NF group, the instructional treatment sessions consist of error correction exercises and one session of explicit rule presentation. In the first session, the students were given a handout containing example sentences of the target structure. The sentences were mainly extracted from reading passages of the textbook in order to let subjects be familiar with target structure. The instructor then gave an explicit rule explanation especially focusing on the syntactic features. After that, subjects were asked to solve the error correction exercise without consulting example sentences (Appendix A). The ungrammatical sentences used in exercise were made up on the basis of the output data from the pilot study. In order to attract subjects’ attention to syntactic structure rather than to meaning, sentences from reading passages were excluded. Throughout the study, the subjects worked on four sets of error correction exercises with the same format. The instructor provided correct answers in the next class hour.

As for the IE group, the instructional treatment sessions were designed to induce subjects’ attention to the target forms while not hindering their pursuit of meaning comprehension. Five sets of true/false comprehension check-up questions, containing target structure, were developed on the basis of the reading passages dealt with during class hours (Appendix B). The target structures in test items were highlighted in bold letters. Different fonts and colors were used in order to help subjects differentiate between the two verb types regarding their syntactic and semantic features. For 5 sessions, subjects were asked to solve true/false comprehension check-up questions and discuss their answers in groups. The instructor then provided correct answers by presenting highlighted test sentences on the screen and implicitly attracted the subjects’ attention to the target structures by means of repeating sentences while delivering explanations, and guiding subjects to think about the semantic features of two verb types which different fonts and colors indicated. In the 6th session, subjects were given a worksheet where sentences from true/false questions were explicitly categorized according to the verb types. The subjects were encouraged to cogitate over semantic features each verb type share and discuss their opinion in groups. At the end, the instructor synthesized subjects’ opinion and elucidated semantic feature of two different verb types. For the last two sessions, another exercise was conducted to train subjects to discern target structures on the basis of semantic features. Subjects were required to group four to five hodgepodge sentences in light of their semantic features (Appendix B). Non target structures were included in the test items but excluded in final analysis. At the end, the instructor provided correct answers by presenting highlighted sentences on the screen.
6. Procedure

The participants of the three groups were pretested one week prior to the study. After 8 instruction sessions they were again posttested with modified versions of task materials; a grammaticality judgment task (GJT) and a written picture description task (PDT). Two experimental groups received a total of eight 25 minute form-focused instruction over 4 weeks. The instructional treatment was conducted as part of 50 minute Reading and Writing English class which met twice a week. The control group, however, did not receive any treatment regarding the target verbs and this demonstrates typical Korean EFL classroom situation. Although some of the target structures were used in the reading passage of the textbook, no attention was given on the form by the instructor.

The comparison with the control group which is not exposed to any form of treatments on the target structure is required to ascertain whether mere exposure to the reading passages is sufficient to enable learners to improve their receptive and productive knowledge on the target structure.

IV. RESULTS

Data from two different types of tasks were analyzed respectively considering their distinctiveness to measure subjects’ receptive and productive knowledge on the target structure. A one-way ANOVA with alpha set at .05 revealed that the three groups in the pretest were not statistically different from one another in terms of their ability in the grammaticality judgment task and the picture description task; F (2, 140)= .074, p= .929 and F (2, 116)= 2.535, p= .084, respectively. Therefore, any assessable changes gained in the posttest could be attributed not to any preexisting differences across the groups but to the effects of the different instructional treatments that three groups went through.

1. Grammaticality Judgment Task

The means and standard deviations of the grammatical judgment task (GJT) in three groups are shown in Table 3. The maximum score was 10. On the whole, it is apparent that subjects in both instructional groups gained their scores from the pretest to the posttest. However, as is shown in Figure 1, subjects in control group dropped behind in the posttest even though their pretest score was the highest.
TABLE 3

Descriptive Statistics for the GJT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NF (N=47)</th>
<th></th>
<th>IE (N=50)</th>
<th></th>
<th>CON (N=46)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* maximum score=10

FIGURE 1

The Pretest and the Posttest Scores of the GJT in Three Groups

For the referential statistics, a one-way ANOVA was applied to the posttest scores. The result shown in Table 4 indicates that the subjects’ performance of GJT in posttest was affected significantly by two instructional treatment, F (2, 140)= 38.727, p= .000. A post-hoc comparison was also run to identify where the actual difference comes from. The results revealed that three groups were significantly different from one another.

TABLE 4

One-way ANOVA Summary on the Posttest of the GJT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>250.340</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>125.170</td>
<td>38.727</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>452.381</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>3.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>702.721</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to explore the effects of instructional treatments more in depth, the percentage of the correct answer was calculated for each target verb. Figure 2 shows how subjects in three groups performed on type 1 verbs in both pretest and posttest of grammaticality judgment tasks. Since the test items were designed to measure if subjects were able to judge the ungrammaticality of given sentences, the higher the percentage, the better the subjects rejected ungrammatical structure.
As for the type 2 verbs, test items were divided into two parts in order to keep subjects from copying their own answers; while grammatical sentences were given for advise and persuade, ungrammatical sentences were tested for tell, warn, and suggest. As is explained before, the form of ungrammatical sentences were chosen from the data of the pilot study; verb+preposition+NP+to infinitive. For the grammatical sentences, the higher the percentage, the better the subjects accepted correct target structure. For ungrammatical sentences, however, higher percentage reflects that subjects were successful in rejecting incorrect form of target structure. In every verb, the instructional groups outperformed the control group (Figure 3). No matter how big or small the difference in scores would be, two instructional groups showed improvement in the posttest. On the contrary, the subjects in control group showed little difference at best in advise and persuade. The percentage even plummeted with sentences of tell, warn, and suggest.
FIGURE 3

The Percentage of the Correct Answer: Type 2 Verbs

advise (to)

persuade (to)

tell (*to)

warn (*to)

suggest (*to)
2. Picture Description Task

The means and standard deviations of the picture description task (PDT) in three groups are shown in Table 5. The maximum score was 10. In case of appropriate use of the target structure, it was scored 1. For the sentences with incorrect use of the target structure, it was scored 0. Other grammatical features such as verb tense and agreement were not counted in the scores. The results showed that subjects in both instructional groups gained their scores from the pretest to the posttest. However, as is shown in Figure 4, subjects in the control group dropped behind in the posttest even though their pretest score was the highest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
<th>Descriptive Statistics for the PDT*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NF (N=44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* maximum score = 10

For the referential statistics, a one-way ANOVA applied to the posttest scores. The result shown in Table 6 indicates that the subjects’ performance of PDT in posttest was affected significantly by two instructional treatment, F (2, 116) = 26.741, p = .000. A post-hoc comparison was also run to identify where the actual difference comes from. The results revealed that three groups were significantly different from one another.
TABLE 6

One-way ANOVA Summary on the Posttest of the PDT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>275.930</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>137.965</td>
<td>26.741</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>598.471</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5.159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>874.402</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The production data from the pretest and posttest of the PDT were classified into three categories: ‘verb+NP+to infinitive’, ‘verb+finite that-clause’ and ‘verb+preposition+NP+to nifinitive’ constructions. Table 7 shows the PDT result of type 1 verbs; want and would like. The two instructional groups outperformed the control group. They succeeded in not only using more target structure, but also reducing error tokens in the posttest. The NF group excelled the IE group in using more target structures. The control group, on the contrary, showed little difference between pretest and posttest in respect to using target structure even though their performance in the pretest was the best.

TABLE 7

PDT Result for Type 1 Verbs: want, would like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NF (N=44)</th>
<th>IE (N=39)</th>
<th>CON (N=36)</th>
<th>NF (N=44)</th>
<th>IE (N=39)</th>
<th>CON (N=36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>PRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb+NP+to infinitive</td>
<td>15 36 16 26 18 15 6 34 6 23 8 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that-clause</td>
<td>5 1 8 4 3 6 11 1 12 5 5 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb+preposition+to infinitive</td>
<td>10 3 5 2 7 7 4 1 4 3 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PDT results for type 2 verbs are demonstrated in Table 8 and Table 9. For five target verbs, two instructional groups did better than the control group both in using more target structures and reducing error tokens in the posttest. The NF group excelled the IE group especially in using more target structure. The control group, however, gained little in the posttest and also failed to reduce the error tokens even though their mean score in the pretest was the highest.
TABLE 8
PDT Result for Type 2 Verbs: advise, persuade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Advise</th>
<th>persuade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=44)</td>
<td>(N=39)</td>
<td>(N=36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>PRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb+NP +to infinitive</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that-clause</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb+preposition +to infinitive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9
PDT Result for Type 2 Verbs: tell, warn, suggest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tell</th>
<th>Warn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=44)</td>
<td>(N=39)</td>
<td>(N=36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
<td>PRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb+NP +to infinitive</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that-clause</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb+preposition +to infinitive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suggest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb+NP +to infinitive</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that-clause</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb+preposition +to infinitive</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. DISCUSSION

The research questions of the present study were formulated in order to investigate the effects of form-focused instructions on the learning of English verb complementation by Korean EFL learners. According to the results, the two instructional treatments, negative feedback plus explicit rule presentation and input enhancement plus meaning-oriented rule search, showed clear benefits in facilitating learning of the target structure in terms of
learners’ receptive and productive knowledge. In the grammaticality judgment task, both experimental groups succeeded in not only accepting more target structures but also rejecting incorrect sentences. The gained scores between experimental groups and the control group demonstrated statistically significant differences.

Similar outcomes were obtained from the picture description task which was designed to measure the participants’ productive knowledge on the target structure. Both experimental groups showed great improvement in using more target structure and reducing error tokens that were frequently found in the pretest. This suggests that two types of form-focused instructions that are implemented in the present study have clear advantage in facilitating learners’ productive knowledge of the target structure. It seems to be the case that participants in two experimental groups benefited greatly from the instructional treatments.

The control group, on the other hand, failed to show any improvement in both tasks even though their pretest mean scores were the highest. The learning setting of the control group in the present study is somehow suggestive of typical Korean EFL classroom. Although no attention was given to the target structure by the instructor, reading passages of the textbook contained several examples of target structure and other important grammatical features. This means that learners may have opportunities to experience quite many examples of target structure but still the amount of input is insufficient for learners to improve their receptive and productive knowledge. Concerning the fact that those seven target verbs of the present study are all included in the core vocabulary list of high school English course offered by Korean Ministry of Education and Technology, it can be assumed that the learners had chances to learn the target structures before. Therefore, if no attention is driven to the grammatical structure through certain forms of implicit or explicit instructional treatments, it is quite impossible for learners to develop their knowledge about the target structure by themselves.

The second research question of the present study concerns the relative contribution of two different instructional treatments. The post-hoc comparison on the posttests were conducted and found that the difference between the NF group and the IE group was statistically significant in both tasks. In the grammaticality judgment task, as is shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3, the IE group was less successful than the NF group especially in rejecting incorrect sentences. If the ungrammatical sentences are taken as affording a better measure of explicit knowledge, as suggested by R. Ellis (2004), and demonstrated in R. Ellis (2005), this might explain that the subjects in the NF group benefited a lot in improving their explicit knowledge on the target structure. In addition, the relative weak effects found in the IE group reflect the fact that a total of eight sessions of instructional treatments might not have been sufficient to enable learners to unlearn the incorrect structures. The post-hoc comparison of the picture description task also revealed
statistically significant difference between the two experimental groups. The NF group excelled the IE group in both using more target structures and reducing error tokens. This suggests that productive knowledge can also be developed through explicit instructional treatments. Concerning the remaining errors in the production data, it is plausible to raise the possibility that L1 interference still hinders learners from learning the target structure; since dative postposition ‘e-ke’ in Korean which is equivalent with English preposition to is productive in Korean verbs corresponding to type 2 English verbs, learners may still transfer the L1 argument structure when producing sentences with target verbs. Certainly this topic deserves further investigation.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study has confirmed the positive effects of form-focused instructions on the learning of English verb complementation by Korean EFL learners. Two types of form-focused instructions were implemented in this study; negative feedback with one session of explicit rule presentation and input enhancement with three sessions of meaning-oriented rule search exercise. The findings revealed that the experimental groups showed better learning when compared to the control group in terms of both receptive and productive knowledge of the target structure. The differences between two experimental groups were also statistically significant in both tasks. Concerning the learners’ receptive knowledge, which was measured by the grammaticality judgment task, the NF group showed better results in both accepting correct sentences and rejecting incorrect ones. Concerning the learners’ productive knowledge, which was measured by the picture description task, the NF group did better in reducing incorrect error tokens than the IE group. In order to provide more satisfactory explanations for the results of the present study, further research is needed to examine what factors hinder learners from unlearning incorrect forms in certain verbs. For this to be done, studies with longer period of instructions and more elaborated instructional treatments are required.
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**APPENDIX A**

**Negative Feedback plus Explicit Rule Explanation Instructional Material**

Read the following sentences carefully and decide whether each sentence is grammatically correct. (given in Korean)

1. Quacks usually persuade to people buy their products at a very high price.
2. The author of "A Miracle Cure?" warned to people don't believe quacks' "money-back guarantees".
3. Mr. Wilson would like that Tom should help his mother.
4. Doctor Smith advised to me taking a rest.
5. We really want that my father retires soon, so he can relax and enjoy life.
6. Jack has been sick for 2 weeks. We suggested him to see a doctor at once.
7. Professor Wilson told to his students hand in their assignment by next Monday.

**APPENDIX B**

**Input Enhancement plus Meaning-oriented Rule Search Instructional Material**

1) An example of true/false comprehension check-up questions on the reading passages

Check T( rue) or F(alse) of the following sentences, then refer to the text. (given in Korean)

**Unit 6: Tourists in a Fragile Land**

1. Tour companies **persuade** tourists **not to** leave trash on beaches in Antarctica. ( )
2. The author **suggests that** Antarctica **should** belong to a certain country. ( )
3. The author **wants** Antarctica **to** be closed to everyone including tourists. ( )
4. The author **warns** tourists **to** take special care when taking pictures of baby penguins. ( )
5. Some scientists **would like tourists** **to** visit Antarctica because they feel lonely working in such a remote location. ( )
6. The author **advises** tour companies **to** reduce the number of tourists who visit Antarctica. ( )
7. Some leading environmental organizations **told** tour companies **to** take care of the environment of Antarctica. ( )

2) An example of sentence grouping exercise
Discuss the meaning differences of the verbs in bold italics, then classify these sentences. (given in Korean)
1. I would like you to show me how to use this machine.
2. I suggested that he (should) go to the exhibition.
3. Doctor Smith warned Tom not to drink anymore.
4. The children jumped behind the wall.
5. Do you want me to come with you?
6. Doctor Anderson told Daniel to give up eating sweet candies.
7. The salesman persuaded Jim to buy an expensive car.
8. Andrew has gained almost 10 pounds. Doctor Smith advised Andrew to exercise everyday.

APPENDIX C
Grammaticality Judgment Task (pre-test)
1. Jack has been sick for 2 weeks. We suggested him to see a doctor at once. ( )
2. At the end of the class, the professor told to his students hand in their assignment by next Monday. ( )
3. My lawyer advised me not to say anything to the police. ( )
4. We really want that my father retires soon, so he can relax and enjoy life. ( )
5. A: Would you like that I go with you? B: Oh, thank you so much! ( )
6. Jim said the switch was dangerous. He warned to me not to touch it. ( )
7. Jack said he was busy but I persuaded him to come to our party. ( )

APPENDIX D
Pictures used in PDT
1) An example of PDT in type 1 verbs
2) An example of PDT in type 2 verbs

Applicable levels: tertiary education
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