A Study on Restrictive Relative Clauses with Particular Reference to Data Triangulatation in ELT Research

Dr. Aynur BAYSAL
Anadolu University
School of Foreign Languages

Abstract: *Research in language learning is an area not only affecting researchers but also the teachers who make use of research findings or conduct research themselves. This paper focuses on the issue of reliability and validity of data collection instruments and the effect they have on the final results of a study. It briefly outlines three research designs which aim at answering the same research questions via different structure elicitation instruments targeted towards the same structure, relative clauses. The instruments include; a translation task, a sentence combining task, and a grammaticality judgement test. It demonstrates the drawbacks and misleading factors involved in using only one instrument, even though these instruments have proven valid and reliable in the literature in other studies. Finally, it suggests data triangulation for more reliable results.*

Key Words: *research, reliability, validity, data triangulation, restrictive relative clauses.*

Öz: *Dil öğretimi alanındaki çalışmalar yalnızca araştırmacıları değil, aynı zamanda bu araştırma sonuçlarından yararlanan veya kendileri de araştırma yapan dil öğretmenlerini yakından ilgilendirmekte ve etkilemektedir. Bu çalışmada, araştırma yapma, veri toplama ve verilerin yorumlanması açısından çok önemli olan ölçme aracının geçerlik ve güvenirliği üzerinde durulmuş ve özellikle veri toplama araçları incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, aynı yapıyı hedef alan üç farklı veri toplama aracıyla (Cümle bazında çeviri, Cümle Birleştirme ve Dilbilgisel Doğruluk Saptama Testi) nasıl farklı sonuçlara ulaşıldığını ortaya koyarak, tek tip veri toplama aracı kullanmanın bilimsel çalışma açısından sınırlılıklarını tespit etmektir.*

Anahtar Kelimeler: *araştırma, güvenirlik, geçerlik, veri toplama, ilgi-tümleci.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Research into Second Language Learning/Foreign Language Learning gains importance as the number of people who are learning English increases worldwide. English, on its way to becoming the 'world language', is now being taught as a second or foreign language all over the world. This fact has given rise to many studies involving English language learners in terms of factors such as achievement, aptitude, motivation, and attitude (Brown, 1988). English language teachers, who both teach the language and conduct studies, are particularly involved in such research.

1.1. The Role of the Language Teacher

Johnson (1992) highlights the role of the language teacher in research.

"As long as you teach or work in second language programs, you will be reading and evaluating research and accepting or rejecting statements that researchers make about L2 (second language) learning and teaching. Whether or not you conduct research yourself, as a professional, you will continue to seek information that will contribute to improving learning and teaching in second language, foreign language and bilingual education programs" (p.3).

So, language teachers, apart from teaching, may carry out two other research related roles; a) read and evaluate research, and/or b) conduct research themselves. For both to be accomplished effectively, teachers need to form the basic concepts related to research so that they can draw correct conclusions from studies and conduct reliable studies themselves.

1.2 Basic Concepts in Research

Data collection and the interpretation of the collected data are two important steps in research. The way the data is collected (the procedure of data collection) and the instruments involved in this procedure can more or less define the validity and reliability of a study. These key concepts of data collection validity, reliability and data triangulation will be briefly outlined here, as they play a crucial role in research.

Validity: Validity is simply defined as the degree to which one has measured what one really wanted to measure (Johnson, 1992; Nunan, 1992). Thus the validity of a test or data collection instrument shows the degree to which it measures or elicits the target structure.

Reliability: The reliability of a test refers to the stability and consistency of the results obtained from the test (Brown, 1988). A measure that was adequate for one group of students in one situation may be inadequate in another situation. Regardless of the evidence reported (in other studies), the researchers should have knowledge of the adequacy of the measures for themselves (Johnson, 1992).

Data Triangulation: *Triangulation of data or multiple ways of finding out* refers to the use of "a variety of techniques in combination...so that information obtained in different ways and from different sources can be compared" (Johnson, 1992, p. 146). This gives researchers the chance to triangulate and gather information that pertains to the same research question and subject sample. Different methods or techniques enable the researcher to integrate as many different views as possible related to the same phenomenon (Bailey & Nunan, 1996). In this way, the validity and reliability of the data being collected is strengthened (Hilleson, 1996; Block, 1996).

1.3 Aim of the Study

Having highlighted the basic concepts of "validity", "reliability" and "data triangulation", the next step is how to integrate these characteristics into research evaluation and research design. As previously stated, data collection procedures and the instruments being used play an important role in attaining validity and reliability. This study touches upon this issue by demonstrating how different data collection instruments, which have been designed to elicit the same target structure, can produce different results; and thus, different final interpretations of the same kind of subject group. The aim here is to demonstrate that one type of data collection instrument may not be sufficient to ensure the reliability and validity of the study at hand. The target grammatical structure to be studied is the Restrictive Relative Clause in English. By considering data collection instruments individually, the study will show whether there is a difference in the order of relative clause acquisition as reflected by three different data collection instruments; namely the Grammaticality Judgement Test, the Sentence Combining Task, and the Translation Task. In addition, it will also focus on the extent to which these exhibited orders confirm the literature on Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy, first introduced by Keenan and Comrie in 1977.

2. METHODOLOGY

In order to demonstrate how different data collection instruments may lead to different results and interpretations, the same students have been administered three instruments eliciting the acquisition order of relative clauses. Keeping the subjects, the setting and the target structure equal, the instruments have been separately analyzed and discussed. The research question guiding the designed studies is the same: "What is the order of Relative Clause acquisition for Turkish upper-intermediate learners of English?"

2.1. Target Structure

Restrictive Relative Clauses

Sadighi (1994) defines the notion of restrictive relative clauses by highlighting that the structure of relative clauses in a language is affected from the word-order of that language at the sentence level. English is an SVO language; i.e. it starts the sentence with

the subject , followed by the verb and then the object. He says that, "the restrictive relative clause stands to the right of the head NP *(noun phrase)* called post-nominal relative clauses. An RC *(relative clause)* variable marker is substituted for the relativized NP in all positions, except for the direct object position which is optionally deleted on the surface" (p. 143). In English restrictive relative clauses, it is possible to relativize the NP in six positions: Subject, Direct Object, Indirect Object, Oblique, Genitive and Object of Comparison. Relativizing one particular noun phrase refers to the role of the NP in question within the relative clause, not the main clause (McLaughlin, 1987).

Below are the examples for the relative clause types investigated in this study. The table lists the relative clauses together with the noun phrase functions within a hierarchy, which is known as the "Noun phrase accessibility hierarchy" by Keenan and Comrie (1977).

The Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy (NPAH)

Table 1.The Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy.

Subject	(S)	The man who knows the woman
<Direct Object	(DO)	The man that the woman knows
<Indirect Object	(IO)	The man that the woman gave a pencil to
<Oblique	(OBL)	The desk that the woman put the pencil on
<Genitive	(GEN)	The man whose pencil the woman took
<Obj.of Comparison	(OC)	The man that the woman is taller than

(here < means *less marked/complex* than)

The Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy (NPAH) is of special interest in the literature on Relative Clause acquisition and it has been subject to contradicting results. The basic claim underlying this hierarchy is that there is a certain route in the formation of relative clauses, which goes from complex to easier forms. It is implied that this suggested order is also effective in determining the acquisition order for relative clauses. In other words, learners' interlanguage follows this hierarchical order while developing their system of the target language. This order is claimed to be irrespective of the native language background of the students (Gass, 1979). However, different studies have highlighted varying orders according to the data they have gathered from subjects.

For example, Hyltenstam (1983) found a high correlation between the NPAH and the order his subjects exhibited. The data collection only involved oral picture identification task, so the task was oral-production based. Similar results were found by Aarts and Schills (1995) who conducted a study on relative clause formation by gathering data via a sentence-combining task. The students were asked to combine two sentences into one by using a relative clause. Sadighi (1994) investigated the same target structure from the

comprehension point of view. He collected his data by asking the students to comprehend relative clauses at sentence level. The results supported the hierarchy suggested by Keenan and Comrie (1977).

On the other hand, partly supporting evidence for the NPAH and its operation in language learning is given by Eckman, Bell & Nelson (cited in Ellis, 1994) and Jones (cited in Ellis, 1994). The elicitation task was limited to sentence-combining only and the results suggested that, in general, the NPAH is followed by students. However, the genitive construction deviated from the hierarchy in that it exhibited a lower range of errors than expected. Similarly, Hamilton's study (1995) involved a sentence-combining task. He concluded that, again, it is the genitive construction that resulted in less errors, and thus was easier to learn than suggested.

It is important to note here that the object of comparison has not been considered in most of the studies cited, as it has been graded by most native speakers as ungrammatical, even though it is linguistically possible. Baysal (1999), before collecting data on restrictive relative clauses from the actual subject sample, piloted the instruments on Turkish ELT teachers and native speakers and found that they both graded the relativization of the object of comparison as ungrammatical. This construction is not included in the syllabus of the English course which the subjects under study take. As a result, the object of comparison has been excluded in this study.

2.2. Subjects and Setting

The study was conducted at Anadolu University, Faculty of Education, English Preparatory Programme. All the students were first given the Michigan Placement Test, and according to the scores, 40 upper-intermediate students were chosen as the sample group. With this group of students, the different sample research designs (each containing a different data collection instrument eliciting relative clauses) were tried out. (The data of Grammaticality Judgement, Sentence Combining and Translation were from Baysal, 1999). As the aim is to highlight the importance of data triangulation, different tasks directed towards different aspects of language learning have been chosen. The Translation Task and the Sentence Combining Task have been chosen to elicit data on students' production or performance, whereas the Grammaticality Judgement Test has been chosen to get an insight into student competence; what they think is true, without producing any sentences themselves.

Research Design #1

In research design #1, the data collection instrument was a Translation Task (see Appendix-A) which had 20 Turkish sentences containing relative clauses. This task was chosen because it requires students to comprehend a Turkish sentence containing a relative clause, and then to produce an English sentence containing the relative clause. So it is productive on the side of the learners, even though it is controlled in terms of the meaning to be expressed.

There were four sentences for each relative clause type. The random distribution of the items, with respect to the function of the relative pronoun in the relative clause, is indicated in Table 2.

Table 2: Item Distribution of Translation Task.

	SU	DO	IO	OBL	GEN
Items:	1,4,15,18	7,9,10,14	2,8,13,17	5,6,12,19	3,11,16,20

The data was collected in a class hour. However, while completing the task, the students were not put under time restriction because the aim was not to evaluate student accuracy under time-pressure/anxiety. The focus did not involve lexical competence either, so the questions regarding vocabulary were provided by the researcher. An example from the task is given below.

For example: Bu yaz emekliye ayrılacak olan arkadaşım İzmir'e taşınacak.

Expected answer: My friend who is going to retire this summer will move to İzmir.

However, answers like the following were considered wrong.

*My friend whose/whom/which is going to retire this summer he will move to İzmir.

My friend who will move to İzmir is going to retire this summer. (grammatical but relative clause is not defining the expected NP)

([*] = ungrammatical, [/] = or)

Research Design #2

In research design #2, the data collection instrument was a sentence combining task (see Appendix-B). In this task, the students were given 20 pairs of sentences and were then asked to combine these into sentences containing relative clauses. There were four sentences for each relative clause type under study.

This task was chosen because it required skills other than the ones in translation ability even though it was productive in nature.

The operations involved in this task are outlined below:

1. The students did not have any Turkish reference to the meaning to be constructed with a relative clause.
2. The students were expected to identify the co-referential noun/pronoun in order to be able to form an accurate sentence in English.
3. They were expected to insert one sentence into the other without violating structure rules or changing the meaning of the sentences.

The distribution of the items, with respect to the relative clause types they represent, is demonstrated in Table 3.

Table 3: Item Distribution of Sentence-Combining Task.

	SU	DO	IO	OBL	GEN
Items:	1,8,12,17	6,10,14,18	2,5,11,13	4,9,16,19	3,7,15,20

Once again, there was no time restriction for completion of the task. An example from the task is demonstrated below:

I always visit the child. – I told my life story to the child

Expected answer: I always visit the child to whom I told my life story.

Answers like the ones below have been graded as wrong.

*I always visit the child whose/which I told my life story.

*I always visit the child to whose/which/who I told my life story.

*I always visit the child to whom I told him my life story.

([*] = ungrammatical, [/] = or)

Research Design #3

In research design #3, the data collection instrument was a grammaticality judgement test (see Appendix C). A grammaticality judgement test can be defined as "the conformity of a sentence, or part of a sentence, to the rules defined by a particular grammar of the language; also called well-formedness" (Crystal, 1992, p.36). It is a test that accesses the students' intuition about what they think is grammatically acceptable in the target language (Sorace, 1985), thus it is not production-based. It is rather directed towards understanding student competence with the target structure. The task items for the grammaticality judgement test were adapted from Arts (1995) and Hamilton (1995).

There were four sentences for each of the relative clause types; two grammatically correct and two incorrect. The random distribution of the items is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Item Distribution of Grammaticality Judgement Test.

	SU	DO	IO	OBL	GEN
Items:	3,7,11,19	4,12,14,18	5,6,15,20	1,8,13,16	2,9,10,17

Again, there was no time restriction for completion of the task as time-pressure was not a variable here. Examples of correct and incorrect sentences are given below:

I cooked Italian food which actually tasted Indian

*The girl who she had disappeared suddenly could not be found.

*Jane discussed with the woman whom child had stolen her bag.

([*] = ungrammatical)

2.3. Scoring

In studies related to acquisition order, it is usually assumed that the number of errors plays an important role in determining what is acquired prior or later. Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) have suggested that, in acquisition order studies, 80% of correct responses are enough for a structure to be labeled as learned. As a result, in this study, for all research designs, the analysis is based on the number of errors (given a score of 1). All correct responses were counted as (0).

In the three different designs and data collection instruments, there were four items for each of the RC types. As shown in Figure 1, every type was elicited by a total of 12 items, and a total of 4 items when considered separately.

Task	S	DO	IO	OBL	GEN
Gr.Judgement	4	4	4	4	4
Sen.Comb.	4	4	4	4	4
Translation	4	4	4	4	4
TOTAL	12	12	12	12	12

Figure 1. Item Numbers According to Tasks

3. DATA ANALYSIS

Research Design #1

In the first research design, 40 upper-intermediate level students were asked to carry out the translation task, which served as the data basis for the study. Table 5 shows the results in terms of error rates and frequencies.

Table 5. Results of the Translation Task.

TASK	S		DO		IO		OBL		GEN	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
TR	8	5,00	13	8,12	114	71,25	116	72,50	60	37,50

(f = frequency of errors done by the students)

The results, according to the first design, show that students made 8 errors with subject relativization, followed by 13 errors in direct object, 60 errors with genitive, 114 errors

with indirect object and 116 errors with oblique relativization. When only the translation task is taken into account, it might be claimed that the subjects follow an acquisition order as shown below:

Subject < Direct Object < Genitive < Indirect Object < Oblique

This result implies that the defined subject sample reflects an order which deviated from the NPAH in that the genitive construction reflects fewer errors than expected, and thus, is placed third in the hierarchy.

Research Design #2

In the second research design, 40 upper-intermediate level students were asked to carry out the sentence-combining task, combining 20 pairs of sentences into sentences containing relative clauses. Table 6 shows the results in terms of error rates and frequencies.

Table 6. Results of the Sentence Combining Task.

TASK	S		DO		IO		OBL		GEN	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
SC	14	8,75	45	28,13	93	58,12	94	58,75	8	5,00

(f = frequency of errors done by the students)

In this task, students have made 8 errors with genitive relativization, followed by 14 errors in subject, 45 in direct object, 93 in indirect object , and 94 errors with oblique relativization. These results suggest an order as shown below:

Genitive < Subject < Direct Object < Indirect Object < Oblique

The order exhibited by the results of the sentence combining task suggest a different order than that suggested by the translation task. Again, there is deviation from the NPAH, in that the genitive construction has moved from the highly marked (most complex) end to the unmarked (least complex) end of the continuum.

Research Design #3

In the third research design, 40 upper-intermediate level students were asked to indicate their intuition about the correctness of the 20 given sentences. This task did not involve any production on the side of learners but just the indication of 'correct' or 'wrong'. Table 7 shows the results in terms of error rates and frequencies.

Table 7. Results of the Grammaticality Judgement Test.

TASK	S		DO		IO		OBL		GEN	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
GJ	12	7,50	28	17,50	50	31,25	52	32,50	15	9,38

(f = frequency of errors done by the students)

As indicated in Table 7, the error rates increased; starting with 12 errors in subject relativization, followed by 15 errors in genitive, 28 in direct object, 50 in indirect object, and 52 in oblique relativization. The final order reflecting these results is given below:

Subject < Genitive < Direct Object < Indirect Object < Oblique

The acquisition order (as far as errors are concerned) seems to be different from those suggested by both the translation and the sentence combining task results. The genitive construction is again the one that has changed the order. Furthermore, this order does not confirm the order of the NPAH or the results of the previous data collection instruments.

4. DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

In ELT research, as in any other field of research, gathering data and making generalizations are both inevitable and difficult. Difficulties arise in that the researcher has to account for many variables that might interfere with the research data, and consequently any results that may be obtained. Control over the reliability and validity of the data being elicited is one of the factors that might have a direct influence on the answer to the research question posed. In order to lessen or eliminate unreliability, a research technique called 'Triangulation of Data' has been suggested by many authorities within this field (Bailey & Nunan, 1996; Johnson, 1992).

The basic idea underlying the need for triangulation is that one elicitation task, technique or method is not always adequate to give a satisfactory answer to the research question posed or hypothesis to be tested.

The need for such a triangulation is clear from the findings in this study where three different research designs aim to answer the same research question. However, each of them brought about a different order for the acquisition of relative clauses. This section will examine the same data, by triangulating the results of three instruments, and look at the interrelationship of the suggested acquisition orders for each of them. Table 8 shows the results of the three different tasks, the total error rates and frequencies.

Table 8. Total Error Frequencies.

TASK	S		DO		IO		OBL		GEN	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
TR	8	5,00	13	8,12	114	71,25	116	72,50	60	37,50
SC	14	8,75	45	28,13	93	58,12	94	58,75	8	5,00
GJ	12	7,50	28	17,50	50	31,25	52	32,50	15	9,38
TOTAL	34	7,08	86	17,91	257	53,54	262	54,58	83	17,29

(f = frequency of errors made by the students)

The different elicitation tasks had also resulted in different acquisition orders. Taking error rates into account, and assuming the fewer errors students make, the higher is the rate of acquisition, the following orders can be outlined:

Translation Task:

subject < direct object < ***genitive*** < indirect object < oblique

5% < 8.12% < 37.5% < 71.25% < 72.5%

Sentence Combining Task:

genitive < subject < direct object < indirect object < oblique

5% < 8.75% < 28.13% < 58.12% < 58.75%

Grammaticality Judgement Test:

subject < ***genitive*** < direct object < indirect object < oblique

7.5% < 9.38% < 17.5% < 31.25% < 32.5%

TOTAL:

subject < genitive < direct object < indirect object < oblique

7.08% < 17.29% < 17.91% < 53.54% < 54.58%

(Total error rates have been calculated by taking the average error frequencies exhibited in each of the tasks.)

It seems that, when all the error rates of the three different data elicitation tasks are integrated, an order as indicated above results. However, the implication of these figures, i.e. that the students in this setting follow an acquisition order like the one indicated as 'total' and claiming that they do not follow the NPAH while learning relative clauses, could be misleading. It is quite obvious from the conflicting orders of the different research designs that there is actually a common order in all of them. The deviation is always on the side of the genitive construction because, without the genitive construction, the hierarchies actually reflect the suggested NPAH in the literature:

Subject < direct object < indirect object < oblique

So it would be necessary to center the discussion more on the place of the genitive construction, instead of claiming that the elicitation tasks have reflected three different results. However, such a focus would not have come out if different elicitation tasks (triangulation) had not been administered and analyzed.

Another discussion involves why those tasks have reflected different orders only in terms of the genitive construction, and not the others. It is interesting to note that without the genitive, the orders are the same. So further studies are needed to verify the claims that genitive, too (like the relativization of object of comparison) should be excluded from the hierarchy on relative clauses as it actually reflects an order of its own. (For further explanations on Genitive, see Hamilton, 1995). The results of this study support this claim to the extent that language learning with the current subject sample is concerned. However, it certainly lacks linguistic explanation for the varying complexity level of the genitive in each task.

REFERENCES

Aarts, F. & Shills, E. (1995). *"Relative Clauses, the Accessibility Hierarchy and the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis"*. IRAL, 33, 1, 47-63.

Bailey, K.M. & Nunan, D. (1996). *Voices from the Language Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baysal, A. (1999). *"The NPAH in the Acquisition of English Restrictive Relative Clauses by Turkish Learners of English"*. (unpublished dissertation), Eskişehir: Anadolu University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Block, D. (1996). *"A window on the classroom: classroom events viewed from different angles"*. In Bailey, K.M. and Nunan, D. (eds.) Voices from the Language Classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, W.B. (1988). *Understanding Research in Second Language Learning. Cambridge:* Cambridge University Press

Crystal, D. (1992). *Introducing Linguistics. Harmondsworth:* Penguin Books.

Dulay, H., Burt, M. & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two. Oxford:* Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gass, S. (1979). *"Language Transfer and Universal Grammatical Relations"*. Language Learning, 29, 327-344.

Hamilton, R. L. (1995). *"The Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy in SLA: Determining the Basis for its Developmental Effects"*. In Eckman F. R. et al (eds.) Second Language Theory and Pedagogy. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Hilleson, M. (1996). *"'I want to talk with them, but I don't want them to hear': an introspective study of second language anxiety in an English-medium school"*. In Bailey, K.M. and Nunan, D. (eds.) Voices from the Language Classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyltensatm, K. (1983). *"Markedness, Language Universals, Language Typology, and Second Language Acquisition"*. In Pfaff, C. (ed) First and Second Language Acquisition Process. Cambridge: A Division of Harper & Rav Publishers, Inc.

Johnson, D.M. (1992). *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning.* New York: Longman.

Keenan, E. & Comrie, B. (1977). *"Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar"*. Linguistic Inquiry, 8, 63-99.

McLaughlin, B. (1987). *Theories in Second Language Learning.* New York: New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall, Inc.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Sadighi, F. (1994). *"The Acquisition of English Restrictive Relative Clauses by Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Adult Native Speakers"*. IRAL, 32,2, 141-154.

Sorace, A. (1985). *"Metalinguistic Knowledge and Language Use in Acquisition-poor Environments"*. Applied Linguistics, 6, 239-254.

APPENDIX A

Translation Task

Name/Surname:

Class:

Please translate the following sentences into English by using a relative clause.

(Use who, which, that, whose, and whom)

1. Bu yaz emekliye ayrılacak olan arkadaşım Izmir'e taşınacak.

2. Kitabı verdiğim kızı dün gördüm.

3. Saçını kestiğim müşteri parasını vermeyi unuttu.

4. Aniden ağlamaya başlayan kız sandalyeye oturdu.

5. O, hakkında kitap yazılan ünlü bşr politikacıdır.

6. İçine cüzdanımı koyduğum çanta masanın üstünde.

7. Onun satın aldığı arabayı gördüm.

8. Doktor, yanlış ilaç verdiği hastasını ziyaret etti.

9. Bana verdiği kitabı kaybettim.

10. Tarif ettiği evi bulamadım.

11. Raporunu görmek istediğin öğrenci okulda yoktu.

12. Ahmet'in doğumgününü kutladığımız lokanta çok pahalıydı.

13. Ödevimi verdiğim öğretmen okuldan atıldı.

14. Geçen hafta kaybettiğim cüzdanı buldum.

15. Sınavlardan geçemeyen öğrenci çok üzgündü.

16. Arabası çalınan adam polisi çağırdı.

17. Fotoğrafımı verdiğim sekreter para da istedi.

18. Kullanılacak olan arabanın tamire ihtiyacı var.

19. Meyveleri kestiğim bıçağı kaybettim.

20. Kızını terk ettiğim kadını otobüste gördüm.

APPENDIX B

Sentence Combining Task

Name/Surname:

Class:

Please combine the following pair of sentences with a relative clause. Use who, which, that, whose, and whom.

1. a. The man was fired by his boss.
1. b. He had forgotten to pay the salaries.

1. _____

2. a. I always visit the child.
2. b. I told my life story to the child.

2. _____

3. a. The man was taken to hospital.
3. b. His wife was killed in the accident.

3. _____

4. a. I found the bag.
4. b. I had hidden her present in the bag.

4. _____

5. a. I know the woman.
5. b. He offered the money to the woman.

5. _____

6. a. The idea was excellent.
6. b. My father suggested it.

6. _____

7. a. I spoke to the manager.
7. b. His hotel is at the seaside in Florida.

7. _____

8. a. I have a list of words.

8. b. They are not in the dictionary

8. _____

9. a. We noticed the train.

9. b. I lost my bag on the train.

9. _____

10. a. He wants to see the student.

10. b. He interviewed them yesterday.

10. _____

11. a. Everyone respects the headmaster.

11.b. I gave a present to the headmaster.

11. _____

12. a. John's colleague has left quite early.

12. b. He was present at the meeting.

12. _____

13. a. We watched the students.

13. b. The teacher handed the paper to the students.

13. _____

14. a. The film was directed by David Lean.

14.b. Mary had seen it in Venice.

14. _____

15. a. The woman was very upset.

15. b. Her child had been drawned in the river.

15. _____

16. a. I sold the sofa.

16. b. The boy used to put the cat under the sofa.

16. _____

17. a. Sue used an English idiom.

17. b. It did not mean the correct thing.

17. _____

18. a. I was teaching two Spanish students.

18. b. Jane had met them in Madrid.

18. _____

19. a. The students wanted the paper.

19. b. The teacher put a grade on the paper.

19. _____

20. a. I used to have a strange friend.

20. b. My friend's father was believed to be a spy.

20. _____

APPENDIX C

Grammaticality Judgement Test

Name/Surname:

Class:

Indicate whether the following sentences are grammatical or ungrammatical. If you think the sentence is grammatical, put a tick ( ); if you think the sentence is ungrammatical, put a cross (X) in the blanks provided. Please do not make any corrections.

1. _____ I found the taxi in whose I forgot my purse.
2. _____ The woman whose dress was torn got very upset.
3. _____ I cooked Italian food which actually tasted Indian.
4. _____ The boss called the secretary who he employed last week.
5. _____ Mary likes the children to whom she gives presents every week.
6. _____ I love my girlfriend to whom I bought all the flowers in the city.
7. _____ The girl who she had disappeared suddenly could not be found.
8. _____ This is the diary in which I keep my memories.
9. _____ Jane discussed with the woman whom child had stolen her bag.
10. _____ One of my roommates whose father is a famous lawyer he will be a lawyer, too.
11. _____ Our neighbour's son who had broken our window did not apologize.
12. _____ The book which I am reading now was written by Stephen King.
13. _____ That is the wall over which the athletes are going to jump tomorrow.
14. _____ I broke the vase which Mary had bought me as a present.
15. _____ I saw the bank manager to who I gave my cheque.
16. _____ The little boy wanted the chair which I was keeping my books under it.
17. _____ The journalist whose interview I watched yesterday has a programme on tv.
18. _____ The homework which our teacher had assigned it was rather difficult.
19. _____ I bought a wonderful car which it is right at the corner.
20. _____ I saw the man to whom the woman gave her ticket to.