

**The Relevance of Teachers' Non-English Oral Proficiency to their Metalinguistic and
Register Awareness of English**

by

Mehmet Bülent Rakab

A Thesis Presented to the
School of Languages and Literatures, University of Cape Town
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Cape Town

June 2021

University of Cape Town

School of Languages and Literatures

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

This thesis was submitted by Mehmet Bülent Rakab under the direction of the chair of the thesis committee listed below. It was submitted to the School of Languages and Literatures, the University of Cape Town and approved in partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Cape Town.

Approved:

Date of Defense

Ian van Rooyen, Ph.D.

Vanessa Everson, Ph.D.

Anne-Marie Hattingh, Ph.D.

Date of Final Approval

Acknowledgements

Producing a PhD thesis is indeed a daunting task, the completion of which would be impossible without the support and guidance of helpful and resourceful people. I owe the completion of this thesis to a number of special people, whose contribution to this thesis has been invaluable.

I would like to thank my supervisors, Dr. Ian van Rooyen, Emeritus Associate Professor Vanessa Everson, and Associate Professor Anne Marie Hattingh whose continuous support and guidance enabled me to complete this PhD thesis. Their expertise and insightful feedback as well as their guidance made my PhD journey a fruitful and worthwhile learning experience.

Special thanks go to Emeritus Associate Professor Vanessa Everson who retired while I was working on my PhD. Although by no means did she have the obligation to supervise my thesis after her retirement, she did not stop providing feedback on my chapters. I am also indebted to my primary supervisor Dr. Ian van Rooyen for supporting me at times when I was in need. The Covid-19 outbreak did not stop him from helping me through Zoom video meetings every Friday. His extensive written feedback on my chapters, in addition, made the drafting process of the chapters so smooth. I am grateful to him.

I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to Alex d'Angelo, UCT's great librarian, whose help and support went beyond the domain of his specialty. His personalized guidance and assistance removed all the stress and anxiety, especially when I was not able to locate the source of a scholarly work.

Last but not least, I would like to thank the participants, my colleagues, who had to spend quite a few hours to complete the tasks in the instrument. Their time and dedication are immensely appreciated.

Dedication

I am dedicating this thesis to those worshippers who lost their lives in the brutal mosque attack in Christchurch in New Zealand on March 15, 2019. May their souls rest in peace and be placed in heaven by the Almighty.

I declare that the above thesis is my own unaided work, in both concept and execution, and that apart from the normal guidance from my supervisor, I have received no assistance.

May 10, 2021

Mehmet Bulent Rakab

Abstract

This doctoral study investigated whether and the extent to which oral proficiency with limited or no literacy skills in a non-English language promoted native English-speaking (NES) and non-native English-speaking (NNES) English language teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness of English. Teachers were classified as Truly Bilingual (TBL) if they possessed literacy skills in the languages they spoke and not TBL (NTBL) if they did not. A comparative analysis of TBL and NTBL as well as native and non-native English-speaking teachers was carried out. Twenty-three English language instructors with different linguistic profiles participated in the research. This qualitative study required participants to provide responses to both open-ended and close-ended questions. The instrument designed for the study comprised tasks that aimed to assess competence in a variety of linguistics skills including Phonology, Syntax, Morphology, Grammar, and Parts of Speech. Teachers' pedagogical skills were additionally assessed through simulated classroom tasks. The findings echoed previous research findings in that TBL teachers displayed more elevated metalinguistic and register awareness than NTBL teachers. The study further confirmed that NNES teachers appeared to possess more elevated metalinguistic and register awareness than did their NES counterparts. Teachers with subject-relevant qualifications displayed substantially more elevated metalinguistic and register awareness than those with no or limited subject-relevant qualifications, which suggests that subject-specific training seemed to play a greater role in contributing to metalinguistic and register awareness than whether the teachers were TBL or whether they were NES or NNES.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	v
Chapter 1	1
Introduction.....	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Definitions of Terms	10
1.3 Rationale and Significance.....	11
1.4 Problem Statement and Research Questions	14
1.5 Domains and Theoretical Frameworks.....	17
1.6 Significance of the Study	18
1.7 Limitations of the Study.....	19
1.8 Organization of the Thesis	22
Literature Review.....	24
2.1 Introduction	24
2.2 Background to Literature Review	28
2.3 Review of Relevant Theories and Hypotheses.....	30
2.3.1 Constructs of Cognition.	31
2.3.1.1 Implicit knowledge.	31
2.3.1.2 Explicit knowledge	33

2.3.1.3	Linguistic content knowledge	36
2.3.1.4	Basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP)	37
2.3.2	Constructs of Learning	48
2.3.2.1	Fossilization	48
2.3.2.2	The noticing hypothesis	52
2.3.2.3	The threshold hypothesis	57
2.3.3	Metacognitive Approaches to Language	57
2.3.3.1	Language awareness	57
2.3.3.2	Metalinguage	58
2.3.3.3	Metalinguistics	58
2.3.3.4	Metalinguistic awareness	58
2.3.3.5	Metalinguistic knowledge	60
2.3.3.6	Metalingual knowledge	61
2.3.3.7	Teachers' metalinguistic awareness (TMA)	61
2.3.4	Structure in second language acquisition	66
2.3.4.1	Focus on form	66
2.3.4.2	<i>Focus on forms</i>	67
2.3.5	Language Proficiency and Literacy	68
2.3.5.1	<i>The bilingual advantage</i>	68

2.3.5.2	Monolingual teachers.....	70
2.3.5.3	<i>Bilingualism vs. biliteracy; multilingualism vs. multiliteracy</i>	71
2.3.6	Teacher Profiles.....	75
2.3.6.1	Native vs. non-native English-speaking teachers.	75
2.3.7	Discourse Analysis.....	80
2.3.7.1	<i>Spoken vs. written and informal vs. formal modes of language</i>	80
2.4	Summary	84
Chapter 3	85
Research Methodology	85
3.1	Introduction	85
3.2	Aim and Objectives	86
3.3	Research Design.....	87
3.3.1	Open-ended vs close-ended questions.....	92
3.3.2	Participants.....	96
3.3.3	Ethics.....	109
3.3.4	The context.....	109
3.3.5	Tasks and data analysis.	109
3.3.6	The instrument.....	112
3.3.6.1	Error correction.....	113
3.3.6.2	Grammar.	118

3.3.6.3 Phonology.....	122
3.3.6.4 Syntax.....	126
3.3.6.5 Morphology.....	128
3.3.6.6 Identification of parts of speech.....	131
3.3.6.7 Procedural grammar.....	133
3.4 Summary.....	139
Chapter 4.....	142
Findings.....	142
4.1 Overview.....	142
4.2 The Structure of Chapter 4.....	143
4.3 Tables.....	144
4.4 Analysis of Responses.....	145
4.4.1 Task 1: Error correction.....	156
4.4.1.1 Main verb vs. auxiliary verb.....	157
4.4.1.2 Gerund following a preposition.....	161
4.4.1.3 Uncountable comparative form.....	164
4.4.1.4 Awareness of spelling: then vs. than.....	167
4.4.1.5 Punctuation: redundancy when main clause begins a sentence.....	169
4.4.1.6 Economic vs. economical.....	171
4.4.1.7 Subject-verb agreement.....	173

4.4.1.8 Hyphenation in compound adjectives.....	174
4.4.1.9 Missing apostrophe s in possessive case.....	175
4.4.1.10 Morphological aspect of spelling mistakes: fullfill.	177
4.4.1.11 Maybe vs. may be.	179
4.4.1.12 Double comparative forms: less healthier.....	181
4.4.1.13 Amount vs. number.....	185
4.4.1.14 Data as a plural noun: Latin and Greek.	187
4.4.1.15 Whose vs. who’s.	190
4.4.1.16 Redundant use of auxiliary: did.	192
4.4.1.17 Who vs. whom.	193
4.4.1.18 Capitalization of content words in a proper noun.	195
4.4.1.19 Object pronoun in subject position.	197
4.4.1.20 Criteria: singular or plural?.....	199
4.4.2 Task 2: Grammar.	201
4.4.2.1 “Yet” with the Simple Past	202
4.4.2.2 Uncountable nouns acting as countable nouns.	204
4.4.2.3 A non-comparative form (different) preceding “than”.	206
4.4.2.4 Transitive vs. intransitive verbs.	210
4.4.2.5 The Subjunctive Mood.....	211
4.4.3 Task 3: Phonology.....	213

4.4.3.1	Voicing in the pronunciation of the plural suffix -s.....	215
4.4.3.2	Voiced and voiceless bilabials.....	216
4.4.3.3	Stressed and unstressed syllables.....	218
4.4.3.4	Final consonant doubled.	219
4.4.3.5	Voiced and voiceless consonants.....	221
4.4.3.6	Discrepancy between spelling and pronunciation.....	222
4.4.3.7	Awareness of phonemes.	223
4.4.4	Task 4: Syntax.	225
4.4.4.1	Misplaced auxiliary verb in a question.	225
4.4.4.2	Two embedded questions in a single question.....	227
4.4.4.3	Mislocated negative particle (not) in an uncontracted “do not” structure.	228
4.4.4.4	Incorrect inversion in sentences starting with a negative frequency adverb (never).	230
4.4.4.5	Misplaced adverb in a do-question.....	233
4.4.4.6	Misplaced adverb in sentences with the main verb “be”.	235
4.4.5	Task 5: Morphology.	237
4.4.5.1	Im-morpheme before adjectives starting with bilabial consonants.....	238
4.4.5.2	Awareness of morphemes.	240
4.4.5.3	Contribution of morphemes to meaning.	241
4.4.5.4	Plural morpheme not functioning as a plural marker.....	242

4.4.5.5 Overgeneralization of the -ly suffix as an adverb.	244
4.4.6 Task 6: Identification of parts speech.	246
4.4.6.1 Likely.	247
4.4.6.2 His.	247
4.4.6.3 Hardly.	248
4.4.6.4 Hard.	248
4.4.6.5 Never.	249
4.4.6.6 Had better.	249
4.4.6.7 There. Item: “	250
4.4.6.8 They, us.	251
4.4.6.9 Yesterday	251
4.4.6.10 Jogging.	251
4.4.6.11 Phrase vs. clause	252
4.4.7 Task 7: Procedural grammar.	254
4.4.7.1 Present participle: verb or gerund. The item description is presented below. ...	255
4.4.7.2 Noun clause as the subject of the sentence.	256
4.4.7.3 Varying functions of apostrophe s (’s).	257
4.4.7.4 Use of past form of a verb to talk about the present.	258
4.4.7.5 Noun clause as the object of the sentence.	260
4.5 Discussion of Findings	263

Chapter 5	282
Conclusion	282
5.1 General Discussion.....	282
5.2 Concluding Remarks	289
References.....	295
Appendix A.....	321
Appendix B.....	477
Table B1	477
Appendix C.....	484

List of Tables

Table 1: Participants' Linguistic Profile	100
Table 2: Teachers' Academic Background.....	101
Table 3: Truly Bilingual Speakers	104
Table 4: Assessment Scale.....	110
Table 5: Assessment of Parts of Speech	133
Table 6: The Average Scores of All the Participants Based on Task Categories.....	146
Table 7: The Average Scores of the Truly Bilingual Participants Based on Task Categories	148
Table 8: The Average Scores of Not Truly Bilingual Participants Based on Task Categories	149
Table 9: The Average Scores of Native-English Speaking Participants Based on Task Categories.....	150
Table 10: The Scores of Non-Native English-Speaking Participants and Their Averages Across the Tasks.....	151
Table 11: Summary of the Participant Categories in Terms of the Total Averages for all the Tasks.....	153
Table 12: The Summary of Average Scores for all the Tasks and all the Teacher Categories ..	154
Table 13: Impact of Years of Experience on Metalinguistic Awareness.....	261
Table 14: Literacy-Related Tasks in Error Correction	266
Table 15: Non-Literacy-Related Tasks in Error Correction	267

Table 16: Averages Obtained by Individual Teacher Categories	270
Table 17: The Summary of Average Scores for all the Tasks and all the Teacher Categories ..	285
Table 18: Participants' Overall Averages for all Categories	285

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Overview

There is a widespread conviction in the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) literature that speaking a second language, that is, being bilingual bestows upon the speakers metacognitive advantages as well as metalinguistic awareness for both the mother tongue (L1) and the second language (L2) (Bialystok, 2009; E. M. Ellis, 2006, 2012; Fiszler, 2008; Jessner, 2008a; Kemp, 2009). Most of the studies on metalinguistic awareness and bilingualism, however, were conducted with children (Fiszler, 2008). Studies concerning adult bilinguals are much rarer; considerably less research exists on the impact of non-English language (languages other than English) learning of Native English-Speaking¹ (NES) teachers on their linguistic literacy in their L1.

It is important to note that the term *non-English proficiency/language*, a term also encountered in other SLA publications (Correa, 2011b), is used throughout this thesis to refer to languages other than English including the mother tongue of Non-native English Speaking (NNES) teachers. In other words, an NNES teacher's L1 is classified as a non-English language in addition to his² knowledge of L2 (which is English in this study) and additional languages

¹ For the purposes of this study, the acronym NES will be used throughout this thesis to refer to the phrase *Native English-Speaking* whereas NNES will be used to refer to the phrase *Non-Native English-Speaking*. The word *teachers* could refer to EFL, ESL teachers (definitions provided in this Chapter), and to literacy arts teachers who teach children whose mother tongue (L1) is English.

² For the purposes of this study, the pronouns *he*, *his*, *him*, and *himself* are gender-neutral and will be used to refer to a human being.

(L3, L4, L5). This implies that if an NNES teacher has elevated metalinguistic and register awareness, this could be attributed to his awareness in an L3, L4, L5 or equally in his L1. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to determine whether a significantly elevated metalinguistic and register awareness of NNES teachers emerges as a consequence of a knowledge of L1, or L3 and additional languages. This implies that an NNES teacher's elevated level of metalinguistic and register awareness could be attributed to his proficiency in L1 as well as in L3 and in additional languages. This thesis does not attempt to evaluate NNES teachers' metalinguistic awareness in their L1. It should be noted that L2, in the case of NNES teachers, strictly refers to English.

Even though the definition of the constructs such as *linguistic literacy*, *metalinguistic awareness*, and *register awareness* are discussed in this chapter and in the next one, it is noteworthy to provide their definitions as they are operationalized in this study.

First and foremost, this study conceptualizes the term *linguistic literacy* (Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002) as an umbrella term that encompasses metalinguistic and register awareness. On the one hand, linguistic literacy normally refers to the linguistic ability or repertoire that enables individuals to configure their language production, which is based on the context and their intended audiences using the relevant and adequate metalinguistic devices. On the other hand, metalinguistic awareness refers to a wide range of formal properties of language that start with the phoneme, the smallest sound unit and includes linguistic structures at the morpheme, word, phrase, clause, and sentence level. In addition, register awareness is operationalized as an individual's awareness of the choice of language variety in line with the formality or informality of the context in a given linguistic discourse. The definitions above point to an overlap between linguistic literacy and register awareness since register awareness is a fundamental component of linguistic literacy.

The SLA literature indicates that proficiency in an L2 promotes metalinguistic awareness for both L1 and L2 (Hawkins, 1999; Jessner, 2008a). Simard and Wong (2004) suggest that metalinguistic reflection in L1 might contribute to the acquisition of an L2. The modal auxiliary *might* in the previous sentence is arguably pointing to a sense of uncertainty about the positive impact of L1 metalinguistic reflection among the researchers. What could account for this perceived uncertainty is that for L1 to act as a metalinguistic base for L2, one needs to be certain that the individual (NES in this case) has to possess a robust background in L1 literacy. However, individuals and English teachers in particular, are doomed to suffer from impoverished metalinguistic awareness in the absence of L1 literacy. In this scenario, a NES teacher's metalinguistic reflection on his L1 is not very likely to take place as an individual cannot be in a position to reflect on a linguistic entity that he does not possess.

Owing to their superior oral proficiency, NES English language teachers constitute a noteworthy category. There is overwhelming consensus in the SLA literature (E.M. Ellis, 2006; 2012; Hawkins, 1999; Simard & Wong, 2004) that learning an L2 promotes metalinguistic awareness in L1, which implies that NES teachers who have acquired proficiency in an L2 and in additional languages are assumed to have an elevated level of metalinguistic awareness in their L1. Should this be true, then it becomes imperative that the source of NES teachers' metalinguistic awareness be identified. Is an L2 learning experience indeed accountable for an elevated level of metalinguistic awareness in L1 as it is usually argued? Differently put, can NES teachers develop an elevated level of metalinguistic awareness *for English* as a result of learning a second language?

The term *proficiency*, ubiquitously used in the SLA literature, is in itself ambiguous and confusing as it is loosely used to refer to the knowledge of a language, which is usually

understood as oral fluency in a language, irrespective of any reference to literacy skills in the language that the individual can speak. In other words, it is not stated explicitly whether L2 proficiency encompasses literacy skills or whether it is limited to oral competence. In this respect, it is critically important to assess whether the hypothesized L1 metalinguistic awareness of NES teachers is a consequence of a consciously structured L2 learning process, which fundamentally encompasses the instruction of literacy skills. What is even more critical is to assess whether it is mere oral proficiency, which is not complemented by substantial instruction in literacy skills, which accounts for metalinguistic awareness in L1.

With reference to the discussion above regarding the vagueness of the construct *proficiency*, Sebolai (2016) asserts that proficiency tends to be equated with academic literacy. In line with the discussion above, Bigelow and Schwarz (2010) offer the following argument with reference to bilingual teachers who teach languages:

Being bilingual, however, does not necessarily mean the teacher understands metalinguistic concepts in both languages or knows how to make concepts clear to the unschooled. Ideally, this teacher would have a complete understanding of the structure of the learners' language and professional development focused on teaching native language literacy. (p. 18)

To seek answers to the question whether NES teachers have an elevated level of metalinguistic awareness for English as a result of having proficiency in a non-English language, a comprehensive instrument has been developed to assess teachers' metalinguistic awareness. The instrument is comprehensive in that it assesses knowledge of all the formal properties of language including grammar, phonology, morphology, syntax, and teachers' pedagogic

competence. The questions which form part of the instrument resemble the queries that learners often have in the classroom. They elicit participant responses which mimic those inherent in an authentic teaching context. Hence, the instrument is aligned with Andrews's (1999) assertion that teachers' metalinguistic awareness should be displayed in actual classroom performance. To this end, items in the instrument are labeled *simulated tasks* as they require the teacher's explanation of a language rule, similar to actual in-class clarification. These tasks appear at the end of the thesis in the *appendices*. More details about the instrument can be found in Chapter 3 which discusses the methodology used to assess NES and NNES teachers' linguistic literacy.

There is an overwhelming consensus in the SLA literature that NES teachers lack metalinguistic and literacy skills compared to their NNES counterparts (Adger, Snow, & Christian, 2002; Block, 2001, 2002; E.M. Ellis, 2004; Hudson & Walmsley, 2005; Moats, 2000, 2014; Moussu & Llorca, 2008; Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002). This could be attributed to inadequate training and to a lack of sound literacy training (Fielding-Barnsley & Purdie, 2005; Moats, 1994). Tarone and Bigelow (2005) account for the discrepancy between NES and NNES teachers by explaining that NES individuals focus on the meaning of written or spoken discourse rather than on linguistic form or structure that is used to convey messages. They argue that explicit and analytical awareness of language emerges only with focused attention to the literacy aspect of language. Similarly, Basetti (2007) argues that the development of metalinguistic awareness in an individual normally develops as a consequence of literacy education.

Literacy is the result of explicit, systematic instruction in a formal educational setting (Young, 2016). Literacy education aims to raise awareness of the fact that language employed in social and in conversational interactions differs dramatically from language in an academic context (Cummins, 2000). According to Cummins, even the lexicon varies based on the

academic vs. non-academic (informal register) distinction. In other words, literacy ordinarily entails an individual's awareness of the mode of language that he needs to use in different contexts and circumstances, which is normally referred to as register (Nordquist, 2019).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) define register as “linguistic features which are typically associated with a configuration of situational features—with particular values of the field, mode and tenor” (p. 22). Tarone and Bigelow (2005) further argue that literacy skills enable an individual to use all the variations, which are referred to as *register*, in his native language.

In line with the preceding discussion, Tarone and Bigelow (2005) claim that an awareness of the linguistic units encoded in the notational system of the written language grows through literacy development, which suggests that metalinguistic awareness and register awareness are the by-products of robust literacy instruction. Nagy and Anderson (1995) are of the view that literacy instruction, especially in elementary and in secondary school education, should involve metalinguistic terms such as *syllable*, *punctuation*, *spelling*, and so forth. In addition, literacy instruction should aim to raise students' awareness of vocabulary, fluency, accuracy, and phoneme-grapheme correspondence, which is referred to as *phonemic awareness*.

As for academic language, it is defined as “the particular forms of language that are appropriate for the school context of academic learning and academic achievement” (Ballantyne & Rivera, 2014, p. 15). Academic language, in contrast to colloquial language, is inherently formal. It is “the specialized language, both oral and written, of academic settings that facilitates communication and thinking about disciplinary content” (Nagy & Townsend, 2012, p. 92). Schleppegrell (2009, p. 1) defines academic language as “a set of linguistic registers that construe multiple and complex meanings at all levels and in all subjects of schooling.”

The main inquiry in this study is whether NES teachers can attain metalinguistic and register awareness of English by virtue of having attained *knowledge* in a non-English language. The term *knowledge* is used intentionally to refer to a teacher's proficiency in a language irrespective of whether he is literate or not.

The construct *proficiency*, as argued above, is rather vague. The SLA literature does not always make a distinction between individuals who are literate and those who are not, when discussing matters with reference to bilingualism. In line with the preceding argument, Young (2016, p. 3) posits:

In our accepted paradigm of formal education in L2 acquisition, literacy skills are a given. When individual differences are considered in SLA research, these differences have focused largely on cognitive and psychological constructs such as *motivation*, *aptitude*, and *working memory*, while simultaneously taking the L1 literacy and educational background of the participants for granted.

The implication of the above is that most teacher training programs focus on topics such as motivation, classroom management, and individual differences, while neglecting the core of what is to be taught, namely literacy skills. In other words, subject-matter knowledge is taken for granted altogether.

As far as English language teaching is concerned, aspirant teachers, owing to their knowledge of English, are considered to be equipped with the required literacy conventions and metalinguistic awareness. Whereas this may not always be the case in practice, which is arguably truer for NES teachers since they are indisputably regarded as being equipped with superior L1 skills. NNES teachers are also expected to have mastered adequate literacy skills; while the

literature (Moussu & Llorca, 2008) indicates that they have elevated metalinguistic awareness, although this does not necessarily imply that all NNES teachers are highly literate with honed metalinguistic skills. They, too, have to undergo thorough literacy training to develop metalinguistic and register awareness in preparation for their professional teaching career.

Moats (1994, 2000, 2014) argues that many teachers are not adequately prepared for the task of teaching language since they have limited metalinguistic awareness. In the context of the United States, for instance, teachers usually take no course in literacy education; if and when they do, it is usually limited to three or maximum six credit hours only. Hudson and Walmsley (2005, p. 26) lament:

Typically, a student entering college in the US may or may not have considerable error in their written work, but will almost certainly not have a metalanguage available to talk about that. Since the emphasis is on behaviour (error avoidance) and not on knowledge, it is difficult to intervene and difficult to know who or what to blame for that situation.

Cullen (1994) emphasizes that both NES and NNES teachers could benefit from taking a course in grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, and culture. This emphasis tends to support the notion that teachers who currently teach English, whether as L1 or L2, are believed to be inadequately prepared, especially in terms of the formal properties of language, which leads us to an interpretation of the construct *linguistic literacy*.

Ravid and Tolchinsky (2002, p. 420) refer to linguistic literacy as “the process of gaining control over a larger and more flexible linguistic repertoire and simultaneously becoming more aware of one's own spoken and written language systems.” The most important property of linguistic literacy is manifested in “individuals’ ability to produce varied linguistic output

attuned to different addressees and contexts and to create linguistic representations that can be manipulated for metalinguistic reflection” (Tarone & Bigelow, 2005, p. 85). Simply put, linguistic literacy is the ability to use language based on the context and formality of a given discourse. Since the ability to produce language that depends on context and formality is inherently challenging, Tarone and Bigelow (2005) indicate that linguistic literacy is acquired late in an individual’s school life because it involves the process of adding the major linguistic modality of writing to the earlier-acquired modality of speech. Linguistic literacy refers to “the ability to use language in different discursive contexts and for varied functions by appropriate deployment of three inter-related facets of language use: genre, register, and stance” (Berman, 2016, p. 183).

This PhD thesis focuses on the second aspect of the abovementioned three facets proposed by Berman (2016), namely *register* in addition to *metalinguistic awareness*. Many of the tasks in the instrument, especially the tasks that involve grammar and syntax, are relevant to the formal/informal and colloquial/academic English dichotomy. Tasks that seemingly deal with a grammar issue, for instance, may well be relevant to register. For instance, the placement of an object pronoun such as *me* in the subject position of a sentence in the sentence, “me and Sally study Biology”, is completely acceptable in colloquial English. However, it will be frowned upon in academic English, according to which the pronoun *me* can be placed only in the object position of a sentence. Teachers who base their teaching on colloquial rather than on academic English, are likely to display a colloquial-oriented behavior in their responses to the tasks, especially if they have undergone communication-oriented teacher training along with a substantially impoverished literacy instruction. The responses that will be elicited from them

will yield, to a great extent, their sensitivity to language patterns that deviate from academic language.

1.2 Definitions of Terms

Although to be discussed in Chapter 2 in greater detail, it is nevertheless useful to briefly clarify certain key terms for the purpose of elucidation.

Native speaker. A person is said to be a native speaker of the first language (L1) that he learned, if he learned it in childhood (Davies, 1996, p. 156). According to a broader definition of “native speaker” and in addition to the bio-developmental definition, a person is classified as a native speaker if he learns L1 first (Cook, 1999, p. 187).

ESL (English as Second Language). An ESL classroom is one in which English is the primary national language. ESL students learn English as a Second Language in a foreign country, where English is the native and predominant language (learning English in the US). ESL classrooms share a target language.

EFL (English as Foreign Language). An EFL classroom is one in which English is not the native language. EFL students learn English as a Foreign Language in their home country (or any other country that is not a native English-speaking nation. For example, learning English in Germany). EFL classrooms share a native language.

Explicit knowledge. Conscious knowledge that is potentially available for verbal report (Roehr, 2004, p. 5). Explicit knowledge of language is defined as the declarative, conscious knowledge of features of the L2 that can be learned and potentially verbalized. It is mainly accessed via controlled processing (Gutiérrez, 2016, p. 42).

Implicit knowledge. Implicit knowledge of the L2 is often defined as the intuitive and procedural knowledge that is normally accessed automatically in fluent performance and that cannot be verbalized (Gutiérrez, 2012, p. 21).

Metalinguage. Language reflexivity that involves the capacity of language to talk about itself (Sinclair, 1991, p. 123).

Metalinguistic knowledge. It is an individual's explicit knowledge about language (Roehr, 2008, p. 70).

Metalinguistic awareness. Conscious knowledge of the formal aspects of the target language such as grammar (Renou, 2001, p. 248).

Linguistic literacy. "A constituent of language knowledge characterized by the availability of multiple linguistic resources and by the ability to consciously access one's own linguistic knowledge and to view language from various perspectives" (Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002, p. 418).

Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). The extent to which an individual has access to and command of the oral and written academic registers of schooling" (Cummins, 2000, p. 67).

Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS). Conversational fluency in a language (Cummins, 2008, p. 71)

1.3 Rationale and Significance

Given that explicit and systematic teaching of literacy instruction is a fundamental component of language teachers' professional development, teachers are expected to have a thorough knowledge of phonemes, graphemes, syllables, morphemes, basic parts of speech, and sentence structure (Moats, 2009). The presence or absence of these literacy subskills determines

the extent to which teachers possess metalinguistic awareness in the language that they teach. In other words, a solid foundation of literacy should be a core requirement for not only ESL and EFL teachers who teach students whose mother tongue is not English, but also, and even more, for teachers who teach students whose mother tongue is English. An example of the latter is secondary school education in countries such as the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, where English is the L1. Fillmore and Snow (2000, p. 21) argue that “production and understanding of academic English is an issue for English language learners and for NES individuals alike.” This is obviously applicable to many NES teachers who have demonstrated a lack of metalinguistic awareness (Andrews, 1999; Block, 2001, 2002; S. Borg, 2003; Hudson & Walmsley, 2005). In a similar vein, Berman (2016) postulates that even highly proficient speaker-writers encounter difficulty in manipulating register variation appropriately to suit different communicative situations, which often constitutes a stumbling block for them (p. 184).

This PhD thesis frequently refers to NES and NNES teachers since these two groups are fundamentally different in terms of linguistic literacy. In this respect, the study compares NES and NNES teachers in terms of the metalinguistic and register awareness that they possess.

NES teachers and NNES teachers have acquired their English language proficiency in a significantly different manner. Consequently, their metalinguistic and explicit knowledge of language (the formal properties of the English language) and their pedagogical content knowledge (the delivery of the subject matter of knowledge) are significantly different. This is aligned with Bley-Vroman’s (1990) Fundamental Difference Hypothesis (FDH), according to which adults learn languages very differently from children. They no longer have access to the domain-specific innate learning mechanisms which are governed by Universal Grammar (UG). Adults are forced to employ alternative learning strategies such as problem-solving, reference to

L1, focal attention allocation, noticing, and memory rehearsal. The Universal Grammar (UG) hypothesis refers to the idea that “human languages, as superficially diverse as they are, share some fundamental similarities and that these are attributable to innate principles, which are unique to language” (Dabrowska, 2015, p. 1). Adults, owing to their rich cognitive repertoire, a consequence of the acquisition of their mother tongue, can successfully use this cognitive facility to enable them to consciously construe the grammatical structure of the L2 input.

The SLA literature (E. M. Ellis, 2006, 2012; Hu, 2011; Jessner, 2008a; Nagy & Anderson, 1995) argues that bilingual NES teachers are likely to have significantly more metalanguage awareness than monolingual NES teachers because they have undergone structured language learning experiences in a non-English language, which is argued to promote metalinguistic awareness. This study focuses on teachers of the *English* language, and to this end, the discussion in this study will involve teachers’ metalinguistic awareness *for English* rather than for a language other than English. It is important to note that in this thesis, structured language learning is conceptualized as *literacy training*, a fundamental component which entails explicit language instruction.

Fiszer (2008) argues that to benefit from the cognitive advantages of bilingualism, individuals need to have at least moderate proficiency and years of exposure. What needs to be questioned here is whether moderate or limited proficiency in a second language could guarantee linguistic literacy. In this regard, Hammarberg (2010) poses the following questions: “Should comprehension be sufficient to count a language as known? What about the type of cultural, metalinguistic, or non-communicative knowledge that may, for example, be the case with Latin?” Whether teachers’ moderate or limited proficiency in a non-English language can guarantee metalinguistic awareness and register awareness for English is an under-researched

area in the domain of SLA, especially for native English-speaking teachers who have learned additional languages. In this respect, NES and NNES teachers with moderate or limited proficiency (Not Truly Bilingual) in a non-English language are distinguished from those with advanced or native proficiency in a non-English language (Truly Bilingual). Truly Bilingual (TBL) teachers are those who have learned their second and additional language(s) as a system and not only as a tool for communication, which implies that they have literacy skills in both, or in all of the languages they speak. On the contrary, teachers whose proficiency is limited to oral skills are referred to as Not Truly Bilingual (NTBL). These labels are congruent with Cummins's (2000, 2007, 2008) CALP and BICS.

In line with the above discussion, this PhD study argues that in order to attain a high level of metalinguistic and register awareness, an individual has to possess a solid literacy background in the language he teaches. If a person has not learned a language in an explicit manner with a focus on literacy skills, then arguably he has less metalinguistic awareness than a person who has learned the same language explicitly. An individual can be proficient in many languages, but he needs to have learned a language explicitly and systematically to have a heightened level of metalinguistic awareness of that language, especially in order to teach it. Learning a language explicitly and systematically refers to instruction that involves literacy instruction as well as a focus on formal properties of language such as grammar, morphology, phonology, and so forth.

1.4 Problem Statement and Research Questions

To summarize, the current study aims to explore the impact of NES teachers' proficiency in a non-English language on their metalinguistic and register awareness of English. More specifically, the study aims to investigate whether mere oral proficiency in a non-English language contributes to teachers' (both NES and NNES) metalinguistic and register awareness of

English. In order to assess NES teachers' linguistic literacy, it is essential that a comparative analysis be made not only between NES and NNES teachers but also between TBL and NTBL (NES) teachers. Such an analysis will enable this study to confirm whether NNES teachers, as suggested by the SLA literature (Moussu & Llorca, 2008), have indeed more elevated metalinguistic and register awareness, compared to their NES counterparts in terms of metalinguistic and register awareness, the latter being largely uninvestigated.

This thesis critically evaluates a prevailing conception in the SLA literature, which tends to argue that being bilingual or multilingual without being linguistically literate is possible. In other words, the question is whether sole oral proficiency devoid of literacy skills qualifies a teacher as being bi- or multilingual.

This study, in this respect, sets out to address the question whether a teacher should be regarded as bi- or multilingual when they lack linguistic literacy.

In line with the aims discussed above, the following research questions guide this study:

1. Whether and to what extent having oral proficiency in a non-English language promotes NES teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness of English?
2. Whether and to what extent having oral proficiency in a non-English language promotes NNES teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness of English?

Seeking answers to the preceding research questions, the study aims to uncover whether there is a difference between TBL and NTBL teachers in terms of their linguistic literacy. In other words, the question whether being merely proficient in a language devoid of literacy skills enables English language teachers to possess elevated metalinguistic and register awareness of English is explored.

As emphasized earlier, the construct *linguistic literacy* is operationalized in this study as an umbrella term that encompasses the two major sub-components: metalinguistic awareness and register awareness.

Distinguishing between discourses is an important skill component for teachers of English. The distinction between informal colloquial English and formal academic discourse presents a challenge not only for people without a background in language teaching, but also for English teachers who are deemed to have an awareness of the two distinct types of discourse. Teachers who have undergone a communication-oriented teacher training, however, may adopt colloquially-oriented teaching behavior, neglecting major components of literacy, thereby causing impoverished literacy skills on the part of their students. The SLA literature (Kolln & Hancock, 2005; Moats, 2000, 2014) suggests that some teachers carry over the features of the colloquial discourse into the academic discourse. This transfer may well take place at a lexical or morphosyntactic level, which has significant implications for teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness. If a teacher thinks that colloquial and academic discourse is interchangeable, then he cannot be said to have metalinguistic/register awareness. In this regard, this study also aims to assess the participants' awareness of the distinction between academic and colloquial registers.

An additional aim of this PhD study is to investigate whether teachers' knowledge of parts of speech contributes to their overall metalinguistic awareness. The SLA literature suggests that metalinguistic awareness entails the knowledge of parts of speech, which refers to grammatical categories and functions (Alderson, Clapham & Steel, 1997). The instrument devised for this PhD study incorporates a section dedicated to the assessment of the participants'

knowledge of parts of speech (see section 3.3.6.6 for the discussion on *identification of parts of speech*).

It is worthwhile to add that the knowledge of parts of speech may not necessarily constitute the sole criterion for effective instruction; teachers should possess pedagogical competence as well. Andrews (2003) argues that teachers need to combine both declarative and procedural aspects of language teaching for effective instruction.

1.5 Domains and Theoretical Frameworks

The main theoretical framework in which this work will be rooted, is that *metalinguistic awareness*, a major component of the construct *linguistic literacy*, is an outcome of a robust literacy training. Another critical component of literacy, namely register awareness, plays along with metalinguistic awareness a substantial role in teachers' acquisition of subject-matter knowledge, which enables teachers to deliver effective language instruction not only at L2 but also at L1 level.

The framework for the proposed research also draws upon the following hypotheses:

- a. The Threshold Hypothesis (Cummins, 1976)
- b. The Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990)
- c. The Fundamental Difference Hypothesis (Bley-Vroman, 1990)
- d. Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (Cummins, 2000)
- e. Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (Cummins, 2000)

It is important to note that the above research questions make frequent reference to oral proficiency since many individuals who speak a language fluently, even at a native proficiency level, have no recourse to literacy skills in the language that they speak (Correa, 2011b).

1.6 Significance of the Study

Practicing ESL/EFL teachers' non-English language learning experience is regarded as a contributing factor to their metalinguistic awareness. This assumption, however, is made irrespective of any consideration of whether the teacher in question has gained this awareness through literacy instruction or otherwise. In other words, the question whether the teacher has gained a bilingual status through studying a second language as a system (CALP) or as a means of engaging in day-to-day communication (BICS) has not usually been distinguished in the SLA literature. The construct *bilingualism* has come to be simply known as proficiency in two languages. The plethora of definitions of the term have a confounding impact on the discussion of bilingualism, which contributes to the vagueness as to what exactly it refers to.

This PhD study questions the assumption that it is possible to have heightened metalinguistic awareness without having studied a language as a system. It is usually the case that no distinction is made regarding the striking differences between language proficiency that is limited to communicative competence and proficiency that encompasses competence in structural and in formal aspects of language, that is, literacy. This research, as mentioned earlier, distinguishes between teachers with oral proficiency only and teachers who have systematically studied a language. Most importantly, the study investigates whether English language teachers' fluent or native proficiency in English with limited or no literacy skills promotes their metalinguistic and register awareness of English.

Whether non-English language learning experience promotes NES and NNES teachers' register awareness, in particular, is a domain which the SLA literature has neglected to a great extent. The emphasis has usually been on metalinguistic awareness rather than on register awareness. This implies that *metalinguistic awareness* has been operationalized as a construct or

an umbrella term that spontaneously encompasses register awareness. This PhD study aims to assess teachers' register awareness by devising an instrument that evaluates teachers' awareness of academic vs. colloquial English. Consequently, the instrument determines the extent to which teachers have linguistic literacy. In this respect, metalinguistic awareness and register awareness are conceptualized as two distinct but interrelated linguistic entities.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

Limitations are an inherent component of scientific inquiry. Similarly, this study has some limitations. A major limitation is that participants displayed their level of metalinguistic awareness in written tasks, rather than in oral tasks. In this regard, the study lacked actual classroom performance. However, the use of written tasks was preferred as it elicited a larger demonstration of base knowledge, which aligns with the assertions of Serrano (2011) and Wolfson (1986). They argue that controlled metalinguistic tasks, compared to naturalistic oral tasks, are likely to generate more data that are more reliable as instances of particular speech patterns may not emerge in spontaneous oral production. To this end, the repercussion of this limitation is minimized. It also needs to be emphasized that accurate oral production was not a component that this PhD study aimed to address.

Moreover, all participants were subjected to the same questions in the written tasks to ensure standardization. Furthermore, the instrument was designed in a manner that enticed teachers to provide explanations to very intricate and challenging questions that would normally emerge in a natural ESL/EFL classroom context. In this respect, the majority of the tasks in the instrument involved simulated tasks that overlapped with many of the classroom activities, which would include the teacher's response to questions posed by the students, exercises, and other classroom tasks that any ESL/EFL teacher would deal with in class on a daily basis. As

evident in the discussion above, this study was conducted with teachers of English, and not with students learning English.

A plethora of research has been conducted on the relationship between bilingualism and metalinguistic awareness, especially with children (Bialystok, 2009). This line of research has usually involved linguistic development in children, especially in terms of phonological awareness, and has had little, if any, relevance to teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness. When teachers' metalinguistic awareness was researched, this was done without much relevance to teachers' proficiency in non-English languages (bi-, tri-, multilingualism) and how this proficiency influences their metalinguistic and register awareness in English. Research involving adult practicing teachers of English is significantly rarer, and what this research precisely does is that it addresses a topic that has rarely (if ever) been undertaken. It investigates whether and the extent to which proficiency in (a) non-English language/languages (especially when and if that proficiency is limited to sole oral competence) promotes a teacher's metalinguistic and register awareness in English. Register awareness in SLA research, in particular, has hardly been addressed, especially in relation to its relevance to teachers' metalinguistic awareness.

This doctoral study will not pinpoint whether it is L1, L3 or any additional languages that contribute to an NNES teacher's elevated metalinguistic and register for English as it is unviable to measure each NNES participant's metalinguistic awareness in his L1, L3 and additional languages.

As for the design and structure of the instrument, it was entirely developed by the researcher himself. That said, some of the items in the instrument showed similarities to metalinguistic test items in other studies (Fielding-Barnsley & Purdie, 2005; Tsang, 2011).

In spite of not involving a real classroom component, the instrument is comprehensive enough to achieve its intended purpose; on average it took each participant approximately three hours to complete the test. Considering that the teachers who participated in the study were full-time instructors at a tertiary level institution and that 23 teachers participated in the study, time constraints made classroom observations impractical. However, qualitative studies inherently involve much fewer than 23 participants. This implies that the sample size was another factor that accounted for the absence of an actual classroom component.

As for the linguistic landscape where the study was conducted, the majority of the instructors were in Saudi Arabia, where Arabic is spoken L1. English is the second language which is studied in schools and universities, which implies that Arabic speakers in Saudi Arabia are usually able to communicate in English. Although Arabic is the official language, English is commonly used in governmental and private sectors. One participant participated from Turkey, suggesting that this study was not limited to a single geographical location.

The study aimed to research whether and the extent to which non-English language proficiency devoid of literacy skills promoted metalinguistic and register awareness in English irrespective of geographical location. It should be noted that geographical location or the linguistic landscape were not the primary parameters under investigation.

Since Foster (1998) posits that participants' classroom performance in research and in experimental settings is arguably an imperfect reflection of their natural classroom performance, the researcher considered that it could prove counterproductive to elicit metalanguage from teachers in a natural classroom context. Therefore, the researcher decided not to integrate classroom observations for data collection in this study. Another justification for not integrating a natural classroom teaching component is that it is less challenging for participants to

demonstrate their metalinguistic knowledge in controlled metalinguistic tasks that require error correction than in spontaneous oral production (Serrano, 2011). A real classroom setting, seemingly natural, may not in reality provide an intact and natural classroom context simply because it is contrived and unnatural by nature.

1.8 Organization of the Thesis

The remaining chapters of this thesis revolve around the research questions posed above. Chapter 2 starts with a description of the theoretical framework which discusses and details major second language acquisition theories and critical concepts such as explicit and implicit language learning. An extensive review of the literature is provided along with the implications and significance for second language learning. The review provides a context in which constructs surrounding the research questions are explored. Chapter 3 includes a description of the methods that were used to address the research questions. It also introduces the participating teachers and their linguistic background. Chapter 4 focuses on the findings and their implications. Lastly, Chapter 5 discusses the significance of the findings in more detail. This chapter also discusses theoretical and practical implications of the data obtained and it evaluates teacher training programs in a critical manner that highlights the importance of integrating linguistics and other formal properties of language into teacher training curricula.

In this chapter, the rationale and the particular aims have been explicitly stated and the research questions have subsequently been identified. This explanation and formulation have initiated the process of seeking answers to the research questions posed in this chapter.

It has further been argued that teachers without a solid background in the formal properties of language and literacy conventions are likely to have reduced metalinguistic and register awareness. Irrespective of the number of languages that an English language teacher

speaks, his metalinguistic and register awareness of English may be impoverished if he did not undergo literacy training in English. This PhD thesis aims to establish the extent to which this is true.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This study centers upon NES and NNES teachers' proficiency in languages other than English, and whether this proficiency translates into linguistic literacy in terms of both metalinguistic and register awareness of English. More particularly, this study investigates whether oral proficiency in an additional language promotes NES teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness. The SLA literature (Jessner, 2008a; Kemp, 2009) suggests that having proficiency in a non-English language contributes to linguistic literacy in both L1 and L2. However, the literature does not explicitly make clear what the state of knowing two or more languages precisely refers to (Bialystok, 2009; Fiszler, 2008; Jessner, 2008a; Kemp, 2009). The construct *bilingualism*, for instance, is loosely used to refer to proficiency in two languages; no consensus exists on this definition. Oral proficiency sometimes suffices to label an individual as bilingual, irrespective of whether the individual has literacy skills. To obviate any confusion regarding the vagueness in definitions, this study regards the participating teachers as being bilingual (or multilingual) only if they are fully literate, suggesting that the teacher should be equipped with both receptive (listening, reading) and productive skills (speaking and writing) in order to be classified as having proficiency in a language.

As the title of this chapter suggests, it will review literature which is relevant to the topic under investigation. In particular, major relevant constructs, hypotheses, and theories that contribute to the argument of how bi- and multilingualism promote English language teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness in English, will be explored.

Chapter 2 subsumes the discussion of constructs that are classified under seven categories, which constitute distinct but coherent components of the inquiry in question. These components are as the following:

- a- Constructs of Cognition
- b- Constructs of Learning
- c- Metacognitive Approaches to Language
- d- Structure in Second Language Acquisition
- e- Language Proficiency and Literacy
- f- Teacher Profiles
- g- Discourse Analysis

The seven categories listed above form a cohesive whole, which encompass the most relevant and coherent topics that inform the discussion of the relationship between bi-/multilingualism and metalinguistic and register awareness. For instance, the section titled “Language Proficiency and Literacy” involves a discussion of “Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills” (BICP) and “Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency” (CALP). BICS has a bearing on how a teacher’s language skills limited to oral proficiency limits his metalinguistic and register awareness while CALP underscores the importance of a robust literacy training, and how it directly and positively contributes to a teacher’s metalinguistic and register awareness. In the section titled *Constructs of Cognition*, the subsection “explicit knowledge”, in addition, emphasizes the importance of how explicit language instruction promotes a teacher’s cognitive development and his knowledge of formal properties of language.

To sum up, the literature review in this thesis reviews the most relevant and inherently interrelated constructs that inform the discussion of bilingualism/multilingualism; in particular, it

aims to elucidate whether oral bilingualism, devoid of linguistic literacy, promotes a teacher's metalinguistic and register awareness.

Literature on bilingualism and metalinguistic awareness has been addressed extensively in this thesis. Bilingualism that is limited to oral proficiency and its impact on a teacher's metalinguistic awareness has been relatively less addressed in the SLA literature. As for whether and how a teacher's register awareness is promoted by bilingualism that is limited to oral proficiency is a domain, to the best of my knowledge, has rarely (if ever) been addressed. Whether a teacher's (be he a native or non-native speaker) proficiency of oral/colloquial language proficiency in English translates to the awareness of a discourse which is more formal and structured such as academic English is the main inquiry in this thesis.

It is also worth emphasizing that due to the absence (or limitedness) of earlier work on the topic, the literature review herein puts a significant focus on relevant constructs such as bilingualism, multilingualism, and metalinguistic awareness. Most importantly, it sets the theoretical background by providing a conceptual framework that encompasses major theories, and hypotheses that are inextricably intertwined with the inquiry in question.

Chapter 2 not only encompasses major theories and hypotheses that pertain to second language learning and teaching, but also provides historical developments for both L1 and L2 teaching, especially in countries where English is used as L1. In this respect, a comprehensive review of the literature is provided, which entails major constructs associated with language learning and teaching such as *explicit language learning*, *implicit language learning/teaching*, and *bilingualism*.

This study resides in the broader context of second language teaching. The notion of metalinguistic awareness is relevant to language teaching and learning approaches, which rely on metalinguistic referencing.

The discussion in Chapter 1 suggested that NES teachers have a significantly impoverished level of metalinguistic awareness compared to their NNES counterparts (Andrews, 1999; S. Borg, 2003; Moussu & Llurda, 2008). This is attributed to NES teachers' having undergone an educational process in their respective countries that neglected a robust literacy instruction in their L1, especially in formal aspects of English (Hudson & Walmsley, 2005). The section titled "Basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP)", in this respect, discusses L1 language curricula in some English-speaking countries such as Australia, New Zealand, England, and the United States (US) since the majority (if not all) of the currently practicing NES teachers were schooled and trained in the educational systems (including primary/elementary, secondary, and university education) of these countries. More specifically, the discussion attempts to shed light on how, and to what extent L1 language instruction in the above-mentioned countries promotes metalinguistic awareness for native English-speaking individuals who intend to teach English and for currently practicing native English-speaking teachers. The NES teachers who have participated in this study constitute the focus of this study since their metalinguistic awareness in their L1 is investigated in relation to the additional languages in which they have proficiency. These NES teachers are then compared to NNES teachers in terms of their metalinguistic and register awareness.

Regarding the absence of robust literacy instruction in countries where English is the native spoken language, this chapter provides a historical background of the English language

curriculum in the respective countries, especially in terms of reference to the formal properties of the English language. It also provides a brief account of the factors that have led to a diminished focus on language in both L1 and L2 teaching (Kolln & Hancock, 2005) and, more specifically, on the structure of English.

In this study, when discussing issues around bilingualism, frequent reference is made specifically to literacy. In particular, this study has adopted Ravid and Tolchinsky's definition of *linguistic literacy* rather than the concept *literacy* only. Ravid and Tolchinsky define *linguistic literacy* as "a constituent of language knowledge characterized by the availability of multiple linguistic resources and by the ability to consciously access one's own linguistic knowledge and to view language from various perspectives" (2002, p. 418). In light of this definition of linguistic literacy, this study questions whether practicing teachers can or should be regarded as being bilingual or multilingual without being linguistically literate in the languages in which they have proficiency. According to the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) literature, it is usually the case that an individual is regarded as bi- and/or multilingual when he has limited linguistic literacy with very advanced oral fluency (Bigelow & Schwarz, 2010; Jones-Diaz, 1999, Ravid, 1993, Tarone, 2009; Tarone & Bigelow, 2005).

2.2 Background to Literature Review

The fundamental premise of this PhD thesis is that proficiency in multiple languages other than English does not necessarily equip an English language teacher with metalinguistic awareness for English. Sebolai (2016, p. 48) posits that "being proficient in reading and writing a language does not necessarily guarantee competence in the language ability required for coping with the demands of higher education study; an ability thus far referred to as academic literacy."

This thesis underscores the crucial role of academic language in forming teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness. In this respect, it is essential that a working definition of academic language be provided. A further and a very crucial consideration in the discussion herein is the relevance of what register refers to and its contribution to our understanding of academic language. The definition provided by Gottlieb and Ernst-Slavit (2013, p. 2) captures a robust conception of both academic language and register: "Academic language or academic English is a register, that is, a variety of a language used for a specific purpose and audience in a particular context." The School of Education in Indiana University of Pennsylvania (n.d.), in addition, offers the following definition for academic language: "Academic language (AL) is the oral and written language used for academic purposes. AL is the 'language of the discipline' used to engage students in learning and includes the means by which students develop and express content understandings."

As for register, it refers to the use of language depending on the particular purpose or context in which the language is used to convey a message. As Figueiredo (2010) puts it, register represents the context of situation. In other words, level of formality is what constitutes the register of language. The choice of register for a linguistic discourse varies based on the addressees of a particular linguistic message.

It needs to be emphasized that this thesis does not intend to place colloquial language in an inferior status compared to academic language or any other different formal register of language. It solely attempts to emphasize the distinctness and significance of the constructs 'metalinguistic and register awareness', which underpin the skeleton of academic language. This thesis simply makes the argument that different modalities in language require a different set of cognitive skills.

Literacy and academic literacy in particular, are a crucial consideration in this study, especially in terms of their relationship with metalinguistic awareness. Bourdieu and Passeron (1990, p. 66) argue that “the ability to cope with academic discourse is nobody’s native language”. This attests to the fact that an individual’s native proficiency in a language does not necessarily render him academically literate.

Biber, Reppen, and Conrad (2002) emphasize that linguistic features of spoken and written registers are fundamentally different. In the same vein, Biber and Gray (2010) posit that academic writing is substantially different from language transactions in conversation in terms of its grammatical characteristics. For instance, Biber, Reppen, and Conrad point out that “appositive noun phrases and relative clauses are typical characteristics of formal writing” (p. 459), which are actually rare in the informal/colloquial register. Similarly, Uccelli et al., (2013, p. 39) remark: “Many academic words, grammatical and discourse structures are so different from more colloquial ways of using language that many adolescents find them obscure and challenging”.

Based on the discussion above, this chapter attempts to shed light on how, and to what extent, L1 language instruction in English promotes metalinguistic and register awareness of NES individuals who intend to teach English and in NES teachers who are currently teaching in the US, in the United Kingdom (UK), and in other countries where English is spoken as L1.

2.3 Review of Relevant Theories and Hypotheses

This PhD study aims to investigate the extent to which language learning experience in a non-English language contributes to teachers’ metalinguistic awareness for English. In this regard, this chapter presents definitions and a discussion of relevant concepts such as

metalinguage, metalinguistics, language awareness, metalinguistic awareness, explicit language instruction, and implicit language instruction. These are key concepts in terms of their contribution to a robust understanding of the construct *metalinguistic awareness*.

2.3.1 Constructs of Cognition.

2.3.1.1 *Implicit knowledge.* Implicit knowledge is defined as “knowledge that cannot be brought into awareness or articulated” (Roehr, 2008, p. 179). Rebuschat (2012, p. 1) defines implicit learning as “the ability to acquire unconscious knowledge without intending to.” In a narrower definition, Han and Ellis (1998, p. 5) refer to implicit knowledge of language simply as “knowledge of language”. The noun phrase *knowledge of language* is used to refer to implicit knowledge, and *knowledge about language* to explicit knowledge.

Implicit learning is the learning process that results primarily in unconscious knowledge; that is, knowledge that is tacit and inaccessible to conscious introspection. Implicit learning generally occurs without the intention to learn and without awareness of what has been learned, that is, learners are often unaware of having acquired knowledge (Rebuschat, 2013, p. 597)

The foregoing definitions suggest that implicit knowledge is unanalyzed; language users are not aware of the knowledge that they have. The term *unanalyzed* is frequently used in the SLA literature to refer to a person’s knowledge of language representations or, more specifically of language structures, without his having declarative knowledge of these structures (Bialystok, 2001). In this regard, implicit language knowledge is the language knowledge that allows an individual to use a language for communicative purposes without his necessarily being aware of the formal properties of the language, which are normally not amenable to mental or conscious

analysis. Implicit learning is also defined as a “generalized, domain-free inductive process that derives information about patterned relationships in the stimulus environment and represents these relationships in an abstract and tacit form” (Winter & Reber, 1994, p. 117).

Implicit knowledge does not normally enable an individual to articulate or consciously act upon a certain grammatical rule; nor does it afford an individual an awareness of particular morphosyntactic features embedded in verbal communication (Bialystok, 1979). Implicit language learning occurs in the course of natural oral communication where formal components of language such as grammar do not receive priority. Implicit teaching avoids direct instruction of grammar. Instead, it exposes students to grammatical structures in a meaningful and comprehensible context so that students can acquire the grammar of the target language in a natural manner (Scott, 1990).

However, different language tasks require the use of different sources of knowledge. For instance, a conversation with a native speaker would force the learner to draw upon implicit knowledge for the purposes of fluency (Bialystok, 1979 p. 82). Similarly, a native speaker’s language competence is usually attributed to implicit knowledge (Vygotsky, 1962). Bialystok (1981) associates unanalyzed representations of language with implicit learning, which excludes any rule learning and describes implicit knowledge as being demonstrable, verbally justifiable, and transferable to other contexts, but not amenable to mental analysis. In sum, implicit knowledge is usually automatic, easily accessible, but it involves no awareness. Although implicit knowledge is not verbalized, it is observable in language behavior that takes place in natural verbal communication.

According to Sanatullova-Allison (2014), two requirements need to be met for the acquisition of implicit knowledge to take place. First, input has to turn into intake, which

requires learners to transfer and store learned language units in either their short-term or long-term memory. This normally happens through cognitive operations such as noticing and comparing. The second requirement is that intake should become part of the learner's interlanguage system, which requires learned language units to become part of long-term memory.

2.3.1.2 ***Explicit knowledge.*** Han and Ellis (1998, p. 5) refer to explicit knowledge as the “knowledge about the L2”. They posit that explicit knowledge consists of analyzed knowledge and metalanguage; they describe *analyzed knowledge* as knowledge about language items and structures. Han and Ellis (1998) contend that individuals who have analyzed knowledge have an awareness of the formal properties of language, which would entail a thorough knowledge of the structures in English, including but not limited to, aspects of grammar, phonology, and morphology. Metalinguistic knowledge is defined as “the presence of conscious knowledge that is available for verbal report” (Roehr, 2004, p. 5). In line with this definition, metalinguistic knowledge also refers to “explicit and verbalizable knowledge about language” (Ammar, Lightbown, & Spada, 2010, p. 130).

Bialystok (2001) explains that explicit rules can be learned through formal study. This suggests that explicit knowledge is learned through the deliberate formal instruction of language units and their relationship with language categories, which would include parts of speech such as nouns, adjectives, and verbs. This is precisely why Ravid and Hora (2009) argue that explicit language instruction is conceived as an integral component of second language learning *only*, but not first language acquisition. Along the same lines, Andrews (1999) argues that explicit knowledge about language must be an essential part of an L2 teacher's metalinguistic awareness.

Han and Ellis (1998) distinguish between implicit and explicit knowledge according to the notions, *accessibility* and *awareness*. They explain that implicit knowledge of a language is easily accessible and is usually held without awareness, whereas explicit knowledge is held consciously and entails analyzed knowledge that a person can explain explicitly because he has an awareness of what he knows. Alderson, Clapham, and Steel (1997) assert that metalanguage is a fundamental component of explicit knowledge, which must include words for grammatical categories and functions.

In a more comprehensive definition, explicit knowledge is regarded as “a learner’s explicit or declarative knowledge about the syntactic, morphological, lexical, pragmatic, and phonological features of the L2” (Roehr, 2006, p. 183). This suggests that metalinguistic knowledge is an individual’s explicit knowledge about categories. Metalinguistic knowledge also involves the knowledge about relationships between parts of speech. For example, if a teacher can identify whether a noun or noun clause can represent the subject or the object of a sentence, this would point to the presence of that individual’s metalinguistic knowledge. Therefore, a teacher’s metalinguistic knowledge equips him with the tools that would enable him to correct, describe, and explain errors (Roehr, 2006). In the same vein, R. Ellis (2004) explains that there is a direct relationship between explicit knowledge and metalanguage; awareness of linguistic labels (metalanguage) facilitates the understanding of linguistic constructs. This suggests that knowledge of metalanguage plays an important role in accounting for the internalization of explicit grammar (R. Ellis, 2004). In turn, this knowledge contributes to an individual’s construction of accurate structures. It is thus possible to argue that direct instruction of grammar has a positive impact on all language skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening). A good example comes from the British context, where Myhill, Jones, Lines, and

Watson (2012) found that explicit grammar teaching had a positive impact on the writing skills of school children.

Hawkins (1999) sees the two constructs, namely *explicit teaching* and *implicit teaching*, as two extremes and posits that implicit teaching dismisses explicit linguistic instruction. Explicit teaching is usually defined as the deliberate attention to grammar structures, either deductively or inductively (Scott, 1990). In a similar definition, LeBlanc and Lally (1998) explain that explicit teaching entails providing a set of rules directly for a particular linguistic structure. In contrast, explicit language learning involves learners' "conscious efforts to negotiate meaning and construct communication" (N. Ellis, 2005, p. 306).

In terms of adult second/foreign language learning, DeKeyser (2000) posits that if high levels of competence are aimed for, then explicit language learning processes are a necessary condition. DeKeyser (2000, p. 520) argues that explicit language teaching strategies should be a fundamental component of a language curriculum:

Foreign language teaching policies that deny explicit focus on form to academically oriented adults who can handle such analytical approach of linguistic structure, should be considered as fundamentally flawed. They deny learners with high analytic ability the use of the only mechanism at their disposal to master certain basic structures in the L2.

In essence, explicit learning is form-oriented which requires conscious attention to formal aspects of language such as grammar, whereas implicit learning is meaning-oriented, indicating that learners would acquire a language through tasks that have very little or no recourse to the structure of the language. It is assumed that learning in this scenario would take place as learners use the language to meet the demands of a given task.

2.3.1.3 ***Linguistic content knowledge.*** Linguistic content knowledge, which is defined as the teacher’s knowledge of language as a system (Thornbury, 1997), constitutes the most fundamental aspect of teacher professionalism. Andrews (2001, p. 76) argues that “Teacher Language Awareness is essentially concerned with subject-matter knowledge and its impact upon teaching”. As for metalinguistic awareness, Andrews (1999) asserts that it essentially involves a teacher’s reflections upon his explicit knowledge about language, and as such, his metalinguistic awareness inevitably entails knowledge about language forms. Explicit knowledge about language is declarative in nature; a teacher’s declarative knowledge refers to his ability to regard language not only as a system, but also to his ability to talk explicitly about the formal properties of language.

Knowledge of subject matter, that is linguistic content, on the teacher’s part, necessarily involves the teacher’s knowledge *of* and *about* the language in question. The preposition *of* in the previous sentence is used to refer to “implicit knowledge”, whereas *about* would denote “explicit knowledge”. Wright and Bolitho (1997) point out that ESL teachers need not only be ‘proficient users’ but also ‘skilled analysts’ of the English language. Teachers' being "proficient users" normally refers to their ability to speak and write in English as a competent user. Teachers' being "skilled analysts" refers to their knowledge of the analytical aspect of English; that is, knowledge of the formal properties of language such as its phonology, grammar, syntax, morphology, lexical properties, and pragmatic features.

Andrews (2003) argues that teachers’ language awareness involves a metacognitive element, which implies that there is an “extra cognitive dimension of reflection upon both knowledge of subject matter and language proficiency” (p. 86). According to the methodological framework proposed for language awareness, an L2 teacher takes on three

critical roles: language analyst, language teacher, and language user (Edge, 1988). The discussion of a teacher's subject matter knowledge necessarily centers on the teacher as language analyst, which implicates his ability to reflect on language as a system. The word *system* here should be understood as formal properties of language, including grammar, sound system (phonology and phonetics), lexical and morphological properties, as well as its pragmatic features. Shulman (1987) indicates that a teacher's language awareness should entail not only linguistic content knowledge, but also pedagogical knowledge, which would imply that a teacher's subject matter knowledge would manifest in the way he delivers his subject matter knowledge. This is in accordance with Andrews's (1997) assertion that a teacher's metalinguistic awareness should involve both declarative and procedural dimensions. Declarative dimensions concern explicit knowledge of language and procedural dimensions refer to methodological pedagogy, which refers to the delivery of subject matter. In second language teaching, any discussion of teachers' metalinguistic awareness usually entails a teacher's firm understanding of the subject matter and its relationship to other areas of knowledge (R. Ellis, 2004; Hogan 1994). Wright (2002, p. 115) puts forward that "a linguistically aware teacher not only understands how language works, but sympathizes with the student's struggle with language and is sensitive to errors and other interlanguage features."

As argued above, a teacher's metalinguistic awareness essentially centers upon a thorough knowledge of the subject matter of language, which entails his having competence in linguistic content. This, to reiterate, should normally require that he regards language as a system, rather than limiting it to a means of communication only.

2.3.1.4 *Basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP).* Ravid and Tolchinsky's (2002) understanding of

literacy seems to overlap with Cummins's Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), which Cummins introduced to emphasize and explicate the timelines and challenges that second language learners encounter as they put forth great effort to reach the same proficiency level as their peers in terms of their knowledge of the academic aspects of English. While BICS refers to conversational fluency in a language, CALP is used to capture students' ability to understand and express themselves not only in the oral, but also in the written mode. CALP is also used to refer to students' knowledge of concepts and ideas and the way in which they express these concepts and ideas in tasks that require an elaborate use of academic English. The acquisition of CALP, in this sense, is substantially different from BICS in that the former refers to the process whereby an individual consciously attends to the formal properties of language, whereas the latter refers to spontaneous language learning by an infant, which involves no teaching or explicit treatment of language (Hudson & Walmsley, 2005)

It should be noted that it is usually with the process of literacy acquisition that an individual can notice the formal properties of the language he uses. In other words, he can shift his attention from the linguistic content to the linguistic form as he acquires more skills in literacy. Hence, Francis (1999) posits that literacy development starts with schooling, unlike the acquisition of oral proficiency in L1. With literacy, individuals begin to develop a conscious understanding of language, which necessarily involves explicit, declarative, and analytical awareness of language. Tarone and Bigelow (2005), for instance, argue that only alphabetically literate L2 learners have the ability to *notice* consciously and analyze oral L2 input in terms of segmental linguistic units. Only when adults become literate must they consciously notice an L2 structure to internalize it.

The Chinese writing system, for instance, does not mark word boundaries, as confirmed and attested to by research on word segmentation tasks. Chinese literate adults do not develop metalinguistic awareness of words in English, which justifies the relationship between writing systems and metalinguistic awareness. This being the case, Basetti (2007) argues that metalinguistic awareness of linguistic units appears to be mainly a consequence of literacy. According to Basetti (2007), Portuguese speaking illiterate adults learning English, for instance, can identify nouns as words, but have difficulties with function words, and identification of function words as words. In addition, segmentation of frequently used phrases proves to be an extremely challenging task for them (Basetti, 2007). Central to the discussion of the relationship between literacy and metalinguistic awareness are cross-orthographic research findings, which indicate that writing systems have a direct impact on the ability to identify and manipulate linguistic units, enabling literate speakers to acquire an awareness of those linguistic units that are represented in their writing system (Basetti, 2005).

Ravid and Tolchinsky (2002) posit that the Noticing Hypothesis comes into play primarily when an individual aims to construct more complex syntactic structures, which characterize the written language. Bigelow and Tarone (2005) argue that this happens in the process of the acquisition of literacy skills in the L2. In other words, while simple syntactic structures may be acquired unconsciously and not require noticing, the acquisition of more complex structures may prove to be extremely challenging to an illiterate person, particularly for the purposes of writing, which requires a heavier cognitive burden and an elevated level of metalinguistic awareness. A good example comes from illiterate Somali adults who live in the US. Despite the fact that they possess fluent oral proficiency skills, this fluency comes at the expense of metalinguistic skills (Bigelow & Tarone, 2005).

The discussion above suggests that complex syntactic structures are not acquired naturally and unconsciously; they require substantial conscious effort on the part of the learner. Since complex syntactic structures impose relatively more cognitive demand on the learner, their learning requires significantly more metalinguistic awareness. The cognitive demand and the associated cognitive processes are an integral component of academic writing (Bigelow & Tarone, 2005; Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002), which is substantially different from speaking as per the cognitive factors discussed above.

An example of a complex structure, the learning of which normally poses a cognitively heavier load and requires intense concentration and substantially elevated metalinguistic awareness, on the part of both the teacher and student, would be the complex nature of the subjunctive mood in English. In order to illustrate this complexity, the next few paragraphs will be devoted to the rules governing the use of the subjunctive mood in English.

Subjunctive forms of verbs are typically found in clauses following a verb that usually expresses a doubt, a wish, a regret, a request, a demand, or a proposal. The most common examples of verbs used in the subjunctive mood are: *ask, demand, insist, move, order, pray, prefer, recommend, regret, request, require, suggest, and wish*. The subjunctive mood is also frequently used in phrasal expressions such as *it is crucial (that), it is desirable (that), it is essential (that), it is imperative (that), it is important (that), it is recommended (that), it is urgent (that), and it is vital (that)*. A teacher who is faced with the task of teaching the subjunctive mood to students may face some challenges, especially in terms of subject-verb agreement.

In its simplest form, the subjunctive may not pose a challenge to the learner as in the case of the following two examples:

1. I recommend that you eat less.

2. I suggest that we exercise more.

The preceding examples do not present any complications in terms of subject-verb agreement as the subject pronoun, *you* is collocated well with *eat* and *we* with *exercise*. The challenge may arise when the verb is used with any of the third person singular subject pronouns: *she, he, it*.

3. I insist that he see a physician.

In 3, we observe that the third person singular pronoun *he* is not followed by the verb with the third person singular pronoun suffix (-s) attached to it:

he see + s = he sees

The subjunctive verb *insist* is not inflected through the addition of the suffix (-s) as per the structure of the subjunctive mood. The rule, more specifically, says that the verb *insist* (as is the case with all the other subjunctive verbs and phrases) is followed only by the infinitive form of the verb, with no suffix added to it.

The structure of the subjunctive mood gets even more complicated when it is used in the passive voice.

4. I insist that he be promoted.

In 4, we notice that to convert the second clause of the sentence into passive, we need to insert the infinitive form of the verb *be*. This is indeed challenging to the students since the use of the infinitive of the verb *be* is not as frequent and straightforward in English when compared to other simpler structures. To make things more complicated for students, the word *be* is frequently used in non-passive structures, as in the following examples: he must *be* sick; he wants to *be* a doctor, and so forth.

5. I insist that he not be promoted.

The negative passive form of the subjunctive mood is, arguably, the most complicated one as seen in sentence 5. Not only does the student face the challenge of converting the clause to the *passive voice*, but also successfully using it in the negative form.

The preceding discussion of the subjunctive mood in English, in brief, sets a good example of as to why and how complex syntactic structures are not straightforward for learners. Not only do they pose a cognitive challenge to them, but the learning thereof requires significantly more metalinguistic awareness, which suggests that they impose a greater cognitive burden and effort on the part of the learner.

Regarding the notion that literacy development and metalinguistic awareness are closely intertwined, multilingual research conducted with multilingual subjects from the Vai tribe from Liberia positively contributes to the discussion. Despite speaking multiple languages, the members of this tribe have underdeveloped metalinguistic abilities as they are not able to take advantage of formal education, which would involve literacy instruction (Scribner & Cole, 1981). Another example comes from the case of Turkish returnees from Germany. In spite of the fact that these bilingual individuals display flawless proficiency in spoken Turkish, they suffer in terms of academic tasks as reported by their teachers (Daller & Grotjahn, 1999). A third example comes from the two languages, Spanish and Náhuatl (a language spoken in central Mexico). It is interesting to note that when it comes to reading and writing skills, a significant correlation was found between the reading and writing skills in Spanish and Náhuatl and metalinguistic awareness in bilingual speakers of these two languages, but not between speaking and metalinguistic awareness (Francis, 1999), which indicates that academic writing is a cognitively demanding component of language proficiency (Bassetti, 2007; Cummins, 2008;). As Cummins (2013) and Lasagabaster (2001) point out, speaking and listening skills carry a

more conversational dimension, whereas reading, writing, and grammar exercises feature an academic dimension. In particular, Cummins (2008) emphasizes that the latter language components (reading, writing, and grammar) are more decontextualized in nature. Hence, it can be argued that the speaking component of language requires less analysis and mental effort, and this could be attributed to the Critical Period Hypothesis, which posits that children acquire implicit knowledge of language naturally without much effort. Explicit or declarative knowledge of language carries a more analytic dimension and therefore requires more cognitive effort. This suggests that academic writing requires conscious efforts to master, whereas speaking is a spontaneously acquired skill, with significantly less cognitive effort attached to it.

To lend further support to the academic/conversational distinction, the linguistic identity of heritage learners of Spanish in the US constitutes a good example. According to the United States Census Bureau (2016), there are 56.6 million people forming the Hispanic population in the US. The Hispanic population, or otherwise called Latinos, speak Spanish as their mother tongue. The children of this Hispanic population present an interesting linguistic profile since they use Spanish in the family and the community at large. This suggests that these children acquire Spanish in a non-school context, pointing to the fact that they acquire Spanish in naturalistic settings. Correa (2011b) reports that compared to their English-speaking peers who learn Spanish as a second language, heritage learners of Spanish perform below standard in reading and writing tasks. They have impoverished metalinguistic skills in Spanish despite the fact that they sound native-like in conversational Spanish.

As far as the Canadian context is concerned, immigrant children tend to acquire conversational fluency in English to a functional level in about two years of initial exposure to the second language, whereas it takes at least five years for these children to reach their native

English-speaking peers in academic aspects of the second language. Cummins (1984) laments that the current educational system, when looking at these children's oral proficiency, assumes that spoken fluency also extends to the other areas of language skills such as reading and writing. This results in the false assessment of students' language and academic skills, leading educators to form misconceptions regarding their actual proficiency level; these children are reported to perform indeed poorly in academic tasks. According to Cummins, while speaking and listening skills are related to a more conversational dimension, reading, and writing skills, as well competence in grammar are more relevant to the academic dimension, as the latter are more decontextualized in nature.

The preceding part of the literature review has provided definitions and discussions of what having proficiency in additional languages entails, especially in terms of what role this multilingual repertoire plays and what contribution it lends to teachers' metalinguistic awareness. This aims to set the background for a thorough discussion on the impact of proficiency in languages other than English on metalinguistic awareness in English, which will in turn, enable us to make relatively solid arguments as to whether and how English speaking-teachers' proficiency in languages other than English translates into their metalinguistic as well as register awareness in English.

As for the explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology, metalinguistic awareness and explicit knowledge of language of NES individuals with a tertiary background of modern language studies are significantly greater than those of NES individuals with a tertiary background of English studies (Andrews, 1999). In terms of daily teaching practices of language teachers in England, significant differences are observed between English and foreign language (FL) teachers. FL teachers are those teachers who teach languages such as French, German, and

Spanish to students whose L1 is English. In general, FL teachers in the UK view knowledge about language (KAL) largely in terms of sentence-based explicit grammar work, which has led S. Borg (2003) to posit that FL teachers are not influenced by those theories of second-language acquisition that downgrade the role of explicit, form-focused instruction in the learning of a second language. In contrast, English teachers, according to S. Borg, adopt a meaning-based, communicative, and therefore a more functional approach to language work, and rarely conduct explicit grammar work as they report that this is of marginal relevance to the development of students' overall linguistic skills (S. Borg, 2003).

The fact that FL teachers in the UK adopt a rather explicit and form-focused instruction in contrast to what English teachers do, could possibly be attributed to how those FL teachers acquired the language. As suggested by Klapper and Rees (2003), explicit language teaching prevails in foreign language teaching in the UK since synthetic syllabus, at least to some extent, is what constitutes the basis of language teaching. Then, it should be no surprise to observe teachers adopting form-oriented language teaching strategies when they have undergone a training that was predominantly form-oriented.

In a case study (Brumfit et al., 1996), a teacher of French was specifically observed and of the 30 teaching episodes, 23 consisted of language work that focused on language as a system. This led Andrews (1999, p. 148) to conclude that “the explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology of NES teachers with a tertiary background of modern language studies is significantly greater than that of NES teachers with a tertiary background of English Studies”.

The literature review regarding the difference between foreign language teachers and English teachers discussed above suggests that foreign language teachers in the UK most possibly regard language as a system because they studied the system of the language they

learned. They must have also attained expertise in the literacy skills of the language in question in an explicit and conscious manner. In contrast, native-speaking English teachers in the UK have not studied English as a system. Hence, they are deemed to be significantly deficient in terms of the overall literacy skills in English because of educational policies that systematically discarded the study of the formal properties of the English language from the language curriculum (Block, 2001, 2002; Kolln & Hancock, 2005; Moats, 2000, 2014). In brief, educational policies in the UK promoted language teaching and learning, based on the premise that students should be exposed to a large amount of language input through extensive reading and oral input. However, Daffern (2016) argues that despite the fact that exposure to print, reading books and being surrounded by meaningful print are requisite conditions for learning to spell, being immersed in the language in and of itself does not guarantee success in literacy skill acquisition. For teachers to teach literacy skills effectively, especially in the domain of academic English, explicit instruction is essential, which requires in-depth knowledge of the English language (Moats, 2014). However, for explicit instruction to happen, a good knowledge of the linguistic processes that underpin the written language is a necessity.

Research conducted by Block (2001, 2002) reveals that English teachers whose native language is English differ significantly from teachers of French, German, and Spanish whose native language is also English. English teachers who have acquired English as their L1 tend to adopt more functional, communicative, and meaning-based instructional strategies, whereas foreign language teachers (despite being native speakers of English) adopt teaching strategies that regard language as a system and make frequent reference to explicit language work in their classes. The teachers who participated in Block's study (2001, 2002) were NNES foreign language teachers on a Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) course in England.

The PGCE is a one-year higher education course in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland which provides training for university graduates in order to allow them to become teachers in the state school system in the aforementioned countries. The PGCE is also widely recognized in Scotland, where it is now called the Professional Graduate Diploma in Education (PGDE), and it is identical in content to the previous PGCE. Similar to the PGCE, the PGDE is widely recognized throughout the rest of the United Kingdom and the rest of the world.

The teachers who participated in Block's study differed significantly from their native English-speaking counterparts in terms of their orientations to language teaching. They all shared an educational tradition where the system demanded that students should learn the linguistic system of their L1 starting from the early stages of their primary school education. The teachers pointed out that in language teaching, it is crucial that an overt, explicit focus on form be an integral part of language teaching and learning (Block, 2001, p. 301). They all thought that language should be regarded as a system and not only as a means of communication, mainly because their language learning background essentially involved systematic and structured language study.

In contrast, Block (2001, 2002) and Hudson and Walmsley (2005) posit that in Britain, the tradition of regarding language as a system, implementing explicit teaching strategies and the explicit teaching of the grammar of the English language have been neglected to a great extent. They posit that grammar has not been compulsory in English primary schools since 1890. The consequence of this is impoverished or diminished knowledge of metalanguage on the part of British school children. Paradoxically, a good knowledge of metalanguage or, more precisely, metalinguistic awareness, is an essential tool for language teaching (Bassetti, 2005, 2007; Block, 2001, 2002; Hudson & Walmsley, 2005). A good example of impoverished knowledge of

metalinguage is observed in students in England, who are taught phrases such as *doing word* rather than *verb* and *describing word* rather than *adjective*.

The teachers in Block's study expressed resistance to the version of Communicative Language Teaching, which prescribed the teaching of grammar in its early stages. One of the teachers said that although she was not an English teacher, as a modern language teacher, she had to do the English teacher's job and was left in a position where she had to impart to students a metalinguage for the purposes of discussing and analyzing grammar and language in general.

2.3.2 Constructs of Learning.

2.3.2.1 Fossilization. Fossilization is defined as non-progression of learning despite continuous exposure to input, adequate motivation to learn, and sufficient opportunity for practice (Han, 2004, p. 213). O'Riordan (1999) argues that exposure to the language in the form of academic input does not simply suffice to make the acquisition process happen and posits that language fossilization is the result of an "extended period of fluency without accuracy" (p. 21).

In their analysis of the proficiency exam called FSI that is administered by the Foreign Service Institute Language Testing Unit of the US government, Higgs and Clifford (1982) argue that FSI, measured on a five-point scale, is the best assessment tool of oral proficiency. Level 1 represents the lowest proficiency and five the highest, which corresponds to the level of a native speaker. In their analysis, Higgs and Clifford identify a student type referred to as terminal 2/2+; a pattern that represents a student with high vocabulary and low grammar. The authors put forward that a typical characteristic of a terminal 2/2+ student is not missing grammatical patterns that could later on be learned, but it is rather his fossilized incorrect grammar patterns. According to Higgs and Clifford (1982), these fossilized grammatical patterns are not

remediable. They claim that learners arrive at terminal 2/2+ level by means of street learning or by means of communication first programs. Zhang (1998) indicates that the reason why a terminal 2/2+ level learner cannot progress any further is because he has already become a sophisticated user of his own pidginized communicative interlanguage. At this level, the learner has internalized his own version of the language and he has constructed a whole new language system, which is at his disposal. According to this profile, the learner has completed learning his interlanguage. Zhang puts forward that in order to learn the new form of the language, the learner has to first stop using his pidginized language, unlearn it, and start learning the language all over again.

There is broad consensus on the fact that meaning-focused methodologies such as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) do not address accuracy; the emphasis in such methodologies is usually on fluency. As R. Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2002) argue, “learners do not typically achieve very high levels of linguistic competence from entirely meaning-centered instruction” (p. 421). Renou (2001) asserts that CLT rejects explicit teaching of L2 grammar and replaces it with language tasks that prioritize meaning and communication over form. Tsui (2007, p. 664) posits that “students could finish a host of activities without knowing how these activities were related to the language system and what was learned.” According to Block (2002), extensive preference and use of pair and group work activities, typical of meaning-oriented methodologies such as CLT and Task-Based Learning, is a preoccupation for making activities similar to real-world activities, which is usually criticized by researchers. For instance, Cullen (1998, p. 181) questions: “Should classrooms only need to replicate communicative behavior outside the classroom in order to become communicative?” Block (2002) similarly argues that CLT avoids any focus on *knowledge about language* and

explicit instruction of grammar. Bruton (2002), in addition, posits that there is little evidence that tasks as core activities resolve the fundamental question of accurate oral production. A major criticism to meaning-oriented methodologies comes from researchers including, but not limited to, Bruton (2002), Skehan and Foster (2001), and Swan (2005) who point out that there is little empirical evidence for suggesting a link between interaction and acquisition.

In line with the above discussion, it can be argued that meaning-focused methodologies are heavily based on a theoretical framework that promotes implicit learning with much emphasis on communicative competence and substantially diminished emphasis on linguistic competence. In this respect, methodologies that promote implicit learning may well produce students who can communicate fluently, but who have developed fossilized language patterns, which is the case with immersion programs in Canada (Swain, 1985). Immersion programs in Canada are inspired by learning theories that model the naturalistic acquisition which all children undergo. Krashen (1981) who pioneered the movement, based his *Natural Approach* model on the premise that abundant comprehensible input triggers second language acquisition. To this end, receptive skills (listening, reading) are emphasized, whereas production is limited to speaking activities such as pair-work and group activities, with very little focus on written language and error correction. This is precisely why Sheen (1994) argues that immersion programs do not produce equal effects on receptive and productive abilities. Furthermore, N. Ellis (2008) argues that immersion programs are inherently *grammar-free* and that students who come from these programs demonstrate significant shortcomings in the accuracy of their language.

Along the same line, Bournot-Trites and Seror (2003) point to the deep discrepancy between the oral production skills of immersion students and their writing skills. The evidence

for this limitation comes from immersion and naturalistic acquisition studies, which reveal that despite years of exposing learners to comprehensible input and to meaningful interaction, certain features of learners' L2 still remain non-target like (Simard & Wong, 2004). For instance, whereas students' oral skills in immersion schools in Canada indeed come close to native-like standards, their writing skills suffer from significant structural errors. Bournot-Trites and Seror lament that the more years these students spend in immersion schools, the wider this discrepancy becomes. They posit that students' errors become so ingrained that repairing them becomes virtually impossible. Students in these programs receive insufficient form-focused instruction coupled with a lack of error correction. It is commonplace that students' errors in such meaning-focused programs are hardly addressed unless there is a breakdown in communication, which is a major factor that accounts for fossilized language patterns. In such orientations to teaching language, it is assumed that "linguistic form emerges on its own as a result of learners engaging in communicative activities" (Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1997, p. 145). As for metalinguistic awareness, especially as far as teacher training is concerned, no recourse to metalanguage has been made since it is believed that grammatical awareness and labels (metalanguage) would be acquired naturally, at some point. One of the teachers in S. Borg's (1998, p. 21) study reports: "We were told never to use grammatical labels and tell students that it would all come together naturally as a result of the communicative activities they did."

To summarize the foregoing discussion, the theoretical rationale for neglecting a focus on language and metalanguage is the assumption that "communicative interaction could drive language acquisition forward and that this kind of interaction can be successfully achieved in the classroom" (Scheffler, 2008, p. 291). Students who come from meaning-oriented programs such as the immersion programs, are very minimally exposed to instruction on language structure

(Correa, 2011a, Sheen, 1994; Simard & Wong, 2004). To this end, they can arguably be viewed as lacking language awareness.

2.3.2.2 *The noticing hypothesis.* The SLA literature suggests that there is a direct relationship between metalinguistic awareness and noticing. According to Schmidt (1990), noticing is a necessary and sufficient precondition for learning and understanding, which includes metalinguistic awareness. In addition, Tarone and Bigelow (2005) argue that conscious attention and noticing are a prerequisite to the full mastery of linguistic literacy in the L2.

Decoding metalinguistic aspects of language proves challenging to students and to teachers alike because they require explicit attention to form, an aspect of language which is usually taken for granted as being transparent. For instance, Bialystok (2001) points out that formal properties of language usually tend to be neglected in second language teaching. “We pay scant attention to grammar when we engage in conversation, barely notice structure when we read text, and often consider formal knowledge of the rules of grammar to be a needless frill.” (pp. 145-146) Along the same lines, Schmidt (1990, p. 131) remarks:

When we read or listen to an utterance in our native language or in a second language in which we are fluent, we become aware of its meaning but are seldom aware of any part of the complex decoding processes that precedes awareness.

It is worthwhile pointing out that in the SLA literature, grammar is usually regarded as the sole formal language skill that needs to be addressed. Other formal elements of language, such as phonological skills (the knowledge of voiced and voiceless sounds) and morphological skills (awareness of free and bound morphemes) receive considerably less attention.

Lightbown et al. (2002, p. 441), emphasize that the ability to decode language, which is defined as “the ability to understand the meaning conveyed by a particular sentence”, is significantly different from code breaking or from discovering the linguistic systems which carry that meaning. This suggests that for acquisition to take place, a high degree of consciousness on the part of the learner is required, which entails learners’ attention to language forms. In turn, this involves a process, which is referred to as noticing. In essence, the Noticing Hypothesis holds that input does not become intake for language learning, unless it is noticed or consciously registered.

Schmidt (2000) argues that if learners are to produce correct forms and use them appropriately, then conscious understanding of the target language system is essential. Schmidt also distinguishes between input and intake. He posits that it is only those structures that learners consciously notice which become input, indicating that input alone does not suffice to make acquisition happen. As Schmidt (2000) puts it, nothing in the target language input becomes intake for language learning other than what learners consciously notice. In addition, Tarone and Bigelow (2005) make the same argument and posit that “illiterate adults retain the ability to unconsciously internalize the L2, in the same way they internalized their L1; once adults become literate, they must consciously notice an L2 structure to internalize it” (p. 87). It is only those language forms that are attended to, which are subsequently learned, and conscious cognitive effort involving the subjective experience of noticing is a necessary and sufficient condition for the input to be converted into intake (N. Ellis, 2008). It needs to be emphasized that the absence of linguistic literacy does not denote intellectual impoverishment; neither does it imply the incapability of rational thought. The construct “linguistic literacy” simply refers to an individual’s possession of both receptive and productive language skills at an academic level.

This thesis has objectively explored the distinction between academic and non-academic language. The study has also unearthed a question on bilingualism which warrants further study, namely, whether sole oral proficiency in a language equips a practicing teacher with metalinguistic and register awareness.

As for the discussion of the term “input”, there is no unified definition of input in the SLA literature (Chi, 2016). Some definitions regard intake as product, some as process, while others regard intake as the combination of product and process. This study has adopted the first of the three categories, which regards intake as a product and which defines it as the “selected part of the input which has been internalized by learners after processing” (Chi, 2016, p. 77). The implication is that mere exposure to input does not suffice to convert input into intake.

Lightbown et al., (2002) indicate that although some aspects of language can be acquired without awareness, there are certain other patterns that cannot be acquired through unfocused input alone. These more complicated language patterns require the learner’s attention through form-focused instruction or through error feedback. A good example of such complicated language patterns is the subjunctive mood in English, which was discussed in some detail (see Section 2.3.1.4) in the discussion and analysis of the differences between Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP).

Numerous researchers (Lightbown et al., 2002, Schmidt, 1990; Swain, 1995) have found that learners fail to notice those aspects of language that are slightly beyond their level and the use of which is fairly limited when the focus is only on meaning rather than on form. Lightbown et al. (2002) indicate that details of language such as articles, prepositions, morphosyntactic markers of verb tense and aspect are usually neglected in meaning-focused classes as if they were completely transparent. This indicates that in meaning-focused methodologies, it is usually

taken for granted that these grammatical structures are acquired automatically without any focused attention. Lightbown et al. (2002) point out that with ample exposure to language input, learners may improve their comprehension and speaking skills, but their ability to use the language accurately may not improve significantly unless there is some pedagogical guidance. Nassaji and Fotos (2004) also emphasize that grammar instruction facilitates the learning of difficult forms such as articles (*a, an, the*). Likewise, Hinkel (2002) puts forward that some English grammar forms such as tenses and passives are difficult to tackle for learners and that explicit grammar instruction is required to learn them accurately. In particular, Tarone and Bigelow (2005) explain that complex sets of syntactic structures that characterize written English present major challenges to students and to teachers who teach these structures.

The preceding discussion lends strong support to the argument, which emphasizes that mere input is insufficient to trigger language learning on its own, suggesting that not all input becomes intake. McLaughlin (1990) argues that it is not possible to learn a second language or anything else through subliminal perception. According to Schmidt, “intake is that part of the input that the learner notices” (Schmidt, 1990, p. 139). In other words, input cannot make its way into the long-term memory unless learners attend to it. McLaughlin (1990) also indicates that there is no evidence that unattended information becomes part of the long-term store, which is usually referred to as memory. To convert input into intake, a student has to notice the form of the language in question. Schmidt (1990, p. 144) argues that “those who notice learn most, and it may be that those who notice most are those who pay attention most”. As for the relationship between accuracy and noticing, Schmidt (1990) also claims that conscious understanding of the target language system is necessary if learners are to produce correct forms and use them appropriately. Schmidt (1990, p. 132) defines noticing as “availability for verbal report”.

According to this definition, there is some overlap between noticing and an individual's explicit knowledge, which in essence is analyzed and declarative. In other words, if an individual is able to report the knowledge that he possesses verbally, this would be an indication of the presence of awareness on the part of the learner. Awareness seems to be Schmidt's primary requirement for learning to take place as he claims that learning without awareness is impossible. As for language instruction, Schmidt (1990) argues that its role is to make formal features of language more salient and manageable. According to Schmidt, instruction also increases the likelihood of noticing.

In addition, Renou (2001) points to the relationship between metalinguistic awareness and implicit and explicit knowledge, analyzed knowledge, and critical reflection in language. She argues that "increasing levels of analyzed knowledge should be an ongoing goal of both learners and teaching methods" (p. 262). The role of metalinguistic tasks is to enhance critical reflection in students and to enable them to make their implicit knowledge explicit. Only when students gain metalinguistic awareness, can they have declarative knowledge, which will allow them to talk about language. Renou (2001) argues that in order for learners to think critically, they would need analyzed or explicit knowledge.

From the preceding discussion on noticing, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Language learning must entail awareness.
2. Awareness facilitates noticing. In other words, awareness triggers the noticing of formal properties of a language.
3. When forms are noticed, input can be converted into intake, which in turn makes its way into the long-term memory.

4. Awareness normally entails availability for report. As explicit knowledge is essentially verbalizable and can be accounted for analytically, it is possible to argue that awareness, and thus noticing involve explicit knowledge.

2.3.2.3 *The threshold hypothesis.* The Threshold Hypothesis (Cummins, 1991) holds that only by reaching a certain proficiency level in the language(s) in question can an individual have a heightened level of metalinguistic awareness, which would be reflected in his sensitivity to formal properties of language. If, for the purposes of this study, we aim to assess teachers' metalinguistic awareness, then as per Cummins's contention, only proficient speakers of languages should qualify as being bilinguals and multilinguals since terms such as *bilingual*, *trilingual*, and *multilingual* have been frequently used to refer to varying states of proficiency (Kemp, 2009).

2.3.3 Metacognitive Approaches to Language.

2.3.3.1 *Language awareness.* "Language Awareness (LA) is a mental attribute which develops through paying motivated attention to language in use, and which enables language learners to gradually gain insights into how languages work" (Bolitho et al. 2003, p. 251). Donmall (1985, p. 7) defines LA as "a person's sensitivity to and conscious awareness of the nature of language and its role in human life". Verity (2003) posits that LA is a sub-field of applied linguistics and that LA moves from the premise that native speaker knowledge needs to be brought to the surface; in other words made explicit, so that learners can access and benefit from this knowledge as a tool or resource. Wright and Bolitho (1997), in addition, posit that "LA enables teachers to develop and refine their knowledge of how English works— the grammatical system, lexical systems, and textual systems" (p.162).

2.3.3.2 *Metalinguage.* A simplistic definition of metalanguage is that it is “the language used to talk about language” (Berry, 2005, p. 17). Metalanguage is also known as “language reflexivity which involves the capacity of language to talk about itself” (Sinclair, 1991, p. 123). Alderson and Steel (1994) indicate that knowledge about language should include knowledge of and ability to use metalanguage appropriately. According to Cajkler and Hislam (2002), language is a code; hence the study and discussion of the code must entail metalanguage. Berry (2005) states that error explanation involves the use of metalanguage. Alderson, Clapham and Steel (1997) put forward that explicit knowledge must include metalanguage and that metalanguage must include words for grammatical categories and functions, and therefore involve parts of speech. Han and Ellis define metalanguage as “the language used to analyze and describe a language” (1998, p. 5). In addition, Bialystok (2001) explains that “metalinguistic concepts are seen as a reflection of linguistic ability” (p. 151). Berry (2014) posits that metalanguage involves much more than the knowledge of technical lexis; metalanguage is a broader linguistic concept, which entails all the language to talk about language, not simply terminology.

2.3.3.3 *Metalinguistics.* Fielding-Barnsley and Purdie (2005, p. 65) define metalinguistics as “an acquired awareness of language structure and function that allows one to reflect on and consciously manipulate the language”. It includes an awareness of phonemes, syllables, rhyme, and morphology. It allows a reader to detect errors and correct them. Dempsey (2013, pp. 24-25) defines metalinguistics as “the conscious management of linguistic abilities”, which enables an individual to monitor and control linguistic skills.

2.3.3.4 *Metalinguistic awareness.* “The speaker’s ability to distance himself from the content of speech in order to pay attention to the structural features of language and to

the properties of language as an object is referred to as metalinguistic awareness” (Reder, Marec-Breton, Gombert & Demont, 2013, p. 687). Gombert (1996, p. 41) defines metalinguistic reflection as the “acts of reflection about the language that are under conscious control including the learner’s intentional planning of his linguistic processing”. Those who can engage in metalinguistic reflection are assumed to have metalinguistic awareness, which is defined as “the ability to focus on linguistic form and to switch focus between form and meaning” (Jessner, 2008b, p. 277). Individuals who are metalinguistically aware are able to categorize words into parts of speech, switch focus between form, function, and meaning, and explain why a word has a particular function (Jessner, 2008b). Renou (2001) defines metalinguistic awareness as the conscious knowledge of the formal elements of the target language. Tunmer and Herriman (1984, p. 12), regard metalinguistic awareness as “the ability to reflect upon and manipulate the structural features of spoken language, treating language itself as an object of thought, as opposed to simply using the language system to comprehend and produce sentences”. Metalinguistic awareness is not only a reflection of linguistic ability, but also of second language competence, which involves the knowledge and manipulation of metalanguage (Bialystok, 2001). To this end, Andrews (1999) argues that metalinguistic awareness necessarily involves a teacher’s reflections upon his explicit knowledge about language.

Conversely, Bigelow & Schwarz (2010) regard metalinguistic awareness as a trained skill, which requires knowledge of specific terms and ways of talking and thinking about language. Metalinguistic awareness enables individuals to shift attention from message content to the formal properties of language used to convey content (Tunmer, Herriman, Nesdale, 1988). It is through this metalinguistic ability that one reflects on and manipulates the structural features of spoken language. Andrews’s definition of metalinguistic awareness (1999) comprises a

procedural dimension, which refers to the pedagogical aspect of teaching, rather than to the knowledge of and about language only. Andrews describes metalinguistic awareness as a process that encompasses teachers' reflections upon their explicit knowledge and emphasizes "the significant interrelationship between the declarative and procedural dimensions of teacher language awareness" (p. 144).

Lasagabaster (2001) argues that the beginning of literacy instruction marks an important milestone in the acquisition of metalinguistic awareness since it is during this process that a sharp shift from linguistic content to linguistic form takes place. The shift from linguistic content to linguistic form roughly corresponds to a shift from implicit knowledge to explicit knowledge (Edwards & Kirkpatrick, 1999). McNeill's (2005) definition of metalinguistic awareness, however, not only incorporates a teacher's "declarative" and "procedural" knowledge of the target language, but also his reflections on language. The use of the term metalinguistic awareness is, therefore, intended to underline the importance of the teacher's reflections upon his declarative knowledge, which is also referred to as explicit knowledge about language (Andrews, 1999).

2.3.3.5 *Metalinguistic knowledge.* Metalinguistic knowledge is defined as the presence of conscious knowledge which is available for verbal report (Roehr, 2004). In line with this definition, metalinguistic knowledge also refers to explicit and verbalizable knowledge about language (Ammar, Lightbown, & Spada, 2010). A similar definition comes from Correa (2011a) who posits that metalinguistic knowledge is verbalizable and that it demonstrates an individual's ability to identify grammar terminology and ungrammatical sentences, as well as his ability to provide grammar rules. Correa points out that verbalizable metalinguistic knowledge and terminology cannot be learned without some form of explicit instruction. In the same vein,

Roehr and Ganem-Gutierrez (2009) contend that the “length of exposure to form-focused language instruction in itself predicts to a considerable extent the quality and quantity of metalinguistic knowledge” (p. 174). However, according to Krashen (1985), metalinguistic knowledge is of some use only when the overriding focus is on accuracy; it therefore serves the function of a monitor, which is activated when the goal is accuracy only. Roehr (2006) explains that metalinguistic knowledge is operationalized as the learner’s ability to correct, describe, and explain errors.

2.3.3.6 *Metalingual knowledge.* Berry (2014) emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between knowledge about language and knowledge about metalanguage. Berry asserts that metalinguistic knowledge refers to knowledge about language and that metalingual knowledge refers to knowledge about metalanguage. Berry (2005) regards awareness of terminology (metalanguage) as metalingual awareness. Similarly, R. Ellis (1994, p. 714) defines metalingual knowledge as the knowledge of the technical terminology needed to describe language. Metalingual competence, another relevant term, is defined as the ability to produce and understand metalanguage (Berry, 2005).

2.3.3.7 *Teachers’ metalinguistic awareness (TMA).* Language awareness of teachers is defined by Thornbury (1997) as teachers’ knowledge of the underlying systems of the language that enables them to teach effectively. This indicates that teachers’ metalinguistic awareness (TMA) refers to teachers’ subject-matter knowledge and its impact upon teaching (Andrews, 1999). In this respect, the use of the term metalinguistic awareness defines the ability of a teacher to reflect upon his explicit knowledge about language. According to Andrews, metalinguistic awareness involves reflective and procedural aspects of teaching, which should necessarily incorporate an L2 teacher’s knowledge-base (language systems). Andrews argues

that the declarative aspect of language, along with explicit knowledge about language, is an indispensable component of TMA. Andrews further argues that the combination of explicit and declarative knowledge about language constitutes the basis of any L2 teacher's metalinguistic awareness, which is metacognitive in nature. This implies that metalinguistic awareness is cognitively demanding and requires extra effort on the part of the teacher in order to be able to reflect upon his subject matter knowledge as well as language proficiency.

Andrews (2003) states that "teacher language awareness is an area of perennial concern to language teacher educators" (p. 88). Andrews argues (2003, p. 82) that "knowledge of subject matter constitutes the core of a teacher's language awareness," which is usually defined as the teacher's knowledge of the language systems. If language teachers lack language awareness, this would indicate that they lack a key element of teacher professionalism, which is usually referred to as subject matter knowledge. As Wright and Bolitho (1997) put it, "a teacher who is ill-informed and unaware of how the language works is not in a particularly good position to deal with learners' inevitable difficulties in mastering the language" (p.162). Along the same line, Andrews (1999) argues that teachers' explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology is an essential part of teachers' metalinguistic awareness, and that teachers who lack such knowledge may place their students at a severe disadvantage (p. 146).

In line with Andrews's assertion (1999) that explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology is an essential part of teachers' metalinguistic awareness, Hu (2011) posits that explicit pedagogical intervention is an indispensable requirement for the development of explicit grammar if teachers are to avoid inadequate competence in grammar and grammatical terminology. To this end, Hu attributes teachers' impoverished underlying metalinguistic ability to a lack of explicit training in reflecting on language.

As for the teachers' use of metalanguage, Tsang (2011) reports that practicing teachers rarely employ metalanguage such as *complement* or *indirect object* in their daily teaching because of training that is heavily communicative-oriented, which has little place, if any, for a formal language component. Similarly, S. Borg (1999) argues that inadequate knowledge of grammar on the teachers' part, coupled with lack of knowledge of metalinguistic terminology, renders teachers reluctant to use such terminology in their teaching. As Shuib (2009) points out, without a sound knowledge about the English language, teachers would not be able to provide adequate feedback on students' work, especially as far as errors are concerned. According to Tsang (2011), teachers' scarce use of metalanguage in class may have originated from what they learned in teacher training courses, the majority of which tend to put a heavy focus on classroom tasks such as pair-work or group-work activities, based on the premise that language learners acquire linguistic structures by seeking situational meaning (Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1997). The assumption that dictates the above premise is that the linguistic form is learned incidentally, and not as a result of focusing directly on linguistic form, or grammatical structures (Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1997).

As for grammar teaching, the inability to talk about language and lack of metalinguistic awareness would extend to teachers' knowledge of grammar. Studies conducted by Andrews (1994), Bloor (1986: 158), Bolitho (1988), Chandler et al. (1988), Williamson and Hardman (1995), and Wray (1993) point to a critical problem among potential and practicing English language teachers in the context of UK universities. Teachers who participated in these studies displayed a significant lack of grammar knowledge. For instance, teachers were mostly unable to identify parts of speech such as adverbs and prepositions. They had even more difficulty with the identification of key functional elements of a sentence such as *subject* and *object*. The results

of the studies cited above convincingly point to the inadequate levels of grammatical knowledge/awareness of these teachers and their lack of declarative knowledge about language, which should constitute the core of teachers' language awareness. Cajkler and Hislam (2002) contend that for teachers to gain language awareness, metalanguage training should be an indispensable component of teacher education. Accordingly, Berry (2009) posits that unless teachers receive some specialized instruction, verbalizable metalinguistic knowledge and terminology cannot possibly be learned.

As for the relevance of grammar to teacher training, the Linguistics Association of New Zealand issued a report, which strongly recommended that those teachers who plan to teach language should necessarily study grammar as an integral part of their English undergraduate program. This implies that teachers who wish to embark on the teaching of English as part of language arts programs, whose content can range from the teaching of literature, reading, writing, presentation skills and listening to the study of spelling, affixation, and language structure, would need a sound knowledge of the grammar of the English language. Gordon (2005) posits that in order for teachers to talk about language in the classroom and analyze texts linguistically, it is imperative that they themselves have a good understanding of language and use the relevant terminology to describe it. Gordon emphasizes that without knowledge of the structure of language, teachers would not be able to contribute to their students' language development, especially in writing and speaking. Neither would they be able to deliver effective language instruction that would respond to their needs.

Educational policies in English-speaking countries have usually resulted in language curricula that have discarded the formal study of language in the name of contextualized and meaningful instruction. Grammar, in particular, usually appears to be a representative

component of formal properties of language. To this end, it is the absence of grammar instruction (in addition to other formal properties of language) which is usually referred to in this literature review and in other parts of this thesis, when discussing literacy problems in English-speaking countries.

The preceding discussion has provided a summary of the consequences of structure-free language programs, which prioritize a language teaching approach that promotes oral communicative competence at the expense of cognitively more demanding skills such as academic writing. Such language programs that model implicit language acquisition have created a generation of students who lacked the ability to distinguish between two fundamental registers of language (Moats, 2000; Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002), namely formal and informal language or, more specifically, spoken and written modes of language. Section 2.3.7.1, in particular, discusses these fundamentally different registers of language, especially in terms of their relevance to linguistic literacy. The discussion elaborates on the consequences of the abandonment of the study of formal properties of language and on how the resultant structure-free language programs have ignored the two very fundamental components of language; register and academic writing. This is then elaborated on in relation to the discussion of teachers' metalinguistic awareness since the literature argues that metalanguage awareness is a fundamental component of linguistic literacy (Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002).

It needs to be emphasized that this study does not attempt to address the factors that make language learning more effective; neither does it aim to explore whether metalinguistic awareness makes English learning faster. Both of the preceding falls outside the scope of this thesis.

2.3.4 Structure in second language acquisition.

2.3.4.1 *Focus on form.* The word *form*, as far as the literature in second language acquisition is concerned (Spada & Lightbown, 2008), refers to the formal or linguistic elements of language that convey meaning. Focus on Form (FonF) is also used to refer to “instruction that overtly draws students’ attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons where the overriding focus is communication” (Long, 1991, pp. 45-56). Davies (2006) posits that the Focus on Form approach was formulated to mediate the dispute between the proponents of form-focused and meaning-focused language instruction. The integration of a focus on form (formal components of language) into second language instruction points to some deviation from the initial form of meaning-oriented methodologies, which in reality never aimed to address form, or accuracy. A form-oriented approach to language emerged as a consequence of extended periods of students’ exposure to content-based programs such as the immersion programs in Canada, which heavily implemented meaning-oriented communicative programs, where the focus of instruction was purely on fluency rather than accuracy. The students coming out of these programs attained fluency in terms of speaking but suffered from inaccuracy, especially as far as writing was concerned (Swain, 1985).

The integration of form into teaching was a consequence of substantial research evidence, which demonstrated that form-focused instruction had a positive impact on second language learning. The evidence attests to the fact that learners do indeed learn the grammatical structures that they are taught (R. Ellis, 2002). Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen, (2002) and Lightbown et al. (2002) emphasize that unless there is some focus on form, formal accuracy is not a feasible result. In addition, Norris and Ortega (2000) posit that form-focused explicit language instruction is not only significantly more effective than implicit language instruction, but that it

also yields more durable learning outcomes. By the same token, Spada and Lightbown (2008) argue that some formal linguistic elements never emerge in learners' interlanguage unless form-focused instruction is implemented. They continue to argue that some non-target forms may fossilize, which indicates that students may not be aware that they use deviant language patterns, both in writing and speaking. Spada and Lightbown (2008) also posit that exclusively meaning-based instruction may lead to enhanced comprehension skills, oral fluency, and self-confidence, resulting in enhanced communicative competence, all of which emerge at the expense of morphosyntactic, pragmatic, and phonological aspects of language.

2.3.4.2 *Focus on forms.* Focus on Forms (FonFs) defines instruction, which involves discrete points of linguistic elements of language, namely grammar, in isolation without a significant emphasis on the communicative aspects of language. That said, Corbeil (2005) points out that recent FonFs approaches make use of communicative activities. This points to a marriage between the FonF instruction and the much-criticized FonFs instruction, the latter being usually blamed for lacking meaning and a focus on oral communication that are typical of CLT. In addition, FonFs instruction receives severe criticisms for being too mechanical and decontextualized. In Focus on Forms, students are viewed as learners of a language and language is viewed as the object of study, as opposed to Focus on Form, where learners are viewed as language users and the language in question is viewed as a tool for communication. Focus on Forms is regarded as an approach that involves skill acquisition and that consists of three stages. The first stage involves declarative knowledge; in the second stage, declarative knowledge becomes proceduralized knowledge, which finally becomes automatized as a result of extensive practice of language patterns (Laufer, 2006).

The preceding part of the literature review has discussed major theories, hypotheses, and constructs relevant to the inquiry on whether and how teachers' English language proficiency in languages other than English translates into their metalinguistic awareness for English. To support the discussion, constructs surrounding proficiency in more than one language are explicated. Therefore, the following section discusses topics relevant to bilingualism and to the cognitive advantages associated with being bilingual.

2.3.5 Language Proficiency and Literacy.

2.3.5.1 *The bilingual advantage.* It is an established fact that growing up with two languages indeed promotes children's intellectual development (Cook, 2016). According to Bialystok (2009), bilingualism as a process, has the capability to influence cognitive functions and structures because evidence from neuroimaging studies supports the claim that frontal regions in an individuals' brain are activated when bilinguals are switching or selecting languages. Along similar lines, Fiszler (2008) points out that bilinguals have an advantage over monolinguals in several extra-linguistic domains. For instance, bilingual children tend to score higher on measures of creativity, divergent thinking, and problem- solving and cognitive control. Fiszler argues that bilingual experience reorganizes implicated cortical areas over years of performance. Fiszler also posits that lifestyle factors such as physical and mental exercise can lead to lasting changes in brain connectivity and morphology. As for speaking two languages on a regular basis, bilingualism, as such, should have a lasting effect on brain function as increased mental exercise impacts brain morphology substantially. Research with children has also shown that bilingual children develop the ability to solve problems that contain conflicting or misleading cues at an earlier age than monolinguals (Bialystok, 2009, p. 5). Balanced bilingual

children, as opposed to monolingual children, also show definite advantages in measures of metalinguistic awareness (Hakuta, Ferdman, & Diaz, 1987).

Indeed, research on bilingualism reveals that even when balanced bilingual children are challenged with language tasks that require unusual awareness of, and attention to linguistic features and detail, they display a remarkable awareness of language. Hakuta (1990) reports that bilinguals outperform monolinguals on tests that measure metalinguistic awareness.

The preceding discussion suggests that bilinguals have analytical as well as declarative knowledge of language which monolinguals tend to lack. Bialystok (2001) attributes the flexibility and creativity that bilingual children display for a variety of tasks to the fact that these children have enhanced metalinguistic awareness. Bialystok defines metalingual awareness as the ability to direct attention to, and reflect on, the systematic and formal features of language.

The discussion on the advantages of bilingualism further indicates that *bilingualism*, as a construct, should not only be limited to the process of acquiring or accumulating linguistic experiences, but that it should also be viewed as an important process that facilitates and accelerates an individual's mental and intellectual growth. This, in turn, equips bilinguals with a language-specific mental base or competence, which can be referred to as metalinguistic awareness. As language awareness, and more specifically metalinguistic awareness, involves the ability to analyze formal properties of language, either in isolation or as a whole, it would not be wrong to argue that proficiency in two or more languages gives an edge to individuals embarking on the teaching of any of the languages that they have in their repertoire. It is worthwhile to point out that some researchers (Moussu & Llorca, 2008) tend to believe that those individuals who teach the language they learned as their second language are advantaged, especially as far as

explicit language teaching and metalinguistic awareness are concerned. E.M. Ellis (2006) adds that L2 and L3 learning is crucial to the successful teaching of L1.

2.3.5.2 Monolingual teachers. SLA researchers usually argue that teachers who speak more than one language have the capability of regarding language as a system more than those who are monolingual speakers. In contrast, monolingual teachers usually have the perception that language is simply a means of communication (S. Borg, 2003; Jessner, 2008b). E. M. Ellis (2006) emphasizes that it is usually assumed that a monolingual teacher can attain an understanding of second language development and language awareness without having learned a second language. She argues that the experience of learning a second language constitutes “a rich source of insights, which might contribute to teachers' beliefs, assumptions, and knowledge” (p. 5), and also regards teacher language learning as an important contributor to professional practice. E. M. Ellis (2004) and Hogan (1994) further argue that an ability to analyze the language is essential. To this end, they urge teachers to have an understanding of bilingualism.

In addition, Cenoz (2003) emphasizes that the positive effect of bilingualism on TLA is linked to metalinguistic awareness, finely honed language learning strategies, and a well-developed communicative ability. As for language awareness, Jessner (2006) asserts that it is an inherent component of multilingual proficiency, which involves crosslinguistic awareness and metalinguistic awareness. Crosslinguistic awareness, according to Jessner (2006), is an individual's tacit and explicit awareness of the similarities and differences in the system of the target language. Similarly, Cummins (1991) posits that the cognitive advantages acquired through multilingualism can be attributed to a heightened level of metalinguistic awareness.

Jessner (2008a) argues that a crosslinguistic pedagogy facilitates second language learning and teaching, which can be viewed as another indication why a prospective language

teacher is urged to be proficient in at least two languages to teach efficiently. This is compatible with E. M. Ellis's (2006) assertion that a foreign language teacher should have proficiency in at least two languages to be able to pass his metalinguistic awareness on to his students. Jessner (2008) further argues that a foreign language teacher is ideally a language learner equipped with language-specific learning strategies. This suggests that teachers need to possess multilingual learning skills and language-specific learning strategies, in addition to a heightened level of metalinguistic awareness, all of which are indispensable components of teachers' metalinguistic awareness without which a teacher cannot survive in the classroom.

2.3.5.3 *Bilingualism vs. biliteracy; multilingualism vs. multiliteracy.* Broadly speaking, bilingualism and multilingualism give a cognitive edge to an individual, be he a teacher or student, in the sense that bilinguals and multilinguals have an elevated level of metalinguistic awareness owing to their ability to communicate in more than one language (Jessner, 2006). There is usually a tendency to take for granted that bilinguals and multilingual individuals are fully literate and that their rich linguistic repertoire grants them an elevated level of metalinguistic awareness thanks to their oral proficiency. Formal properties of language such as grammar, punctuation, and literacy skills are not usually regarded as fundamental components of general language proficiency. This tendency stems from the notion that language is usually regarded as a tool for communication rather than a system (Tsui, 2007). The Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA), for instance, defines English language proficiency as “the ability of students to *use* the English language to make and *communicate* [emphases added] meaning in spoken and written contexts while completing their university studies” (2009, p. 1). AUQA seems to be promoting and prioritizing communication while relegating language structure and formal aspects of language to a relatively redundant status as quoted below:

Such uses may range from a simple task such as discussing work with fellow students, to complex tasks such as writing an academic paper or delivering a speech to a professional audience. This view of proficiency as the ability to organise language to carry out a variety of communication tasks distinguishes the use of ‘English language proficiency’ from a *narrow focus on language as a formal system* [emphasis added] concerned only with correct use of grammar and sentence structure (AUQA, 2009, pp. 1–2).

The aforementioned view of language proficiency that limits language proficiency to communication skills is ubiquitous and is firmly ingrained in the methodological principles of meaning-oriented language teaching methodologies such as Communicative Language Teaching and Task-based Language Teaching. Such a view of language proficiency tends at best to neglect and at worst to discard literacy skills, which according to Ravid & Tolchinsky (2002) are in fact fundamental components of language proficiency and metalinguistic awareness.

The inquiry into what exactly fluency and proficiency refer to in the SLA literature has been a major source of confusion as the two terms have been used rather inconsistently and, most importantly interchangeably, as if they were referring to the same construct (Cummins, 2008; Kormos & Dénes, 2004; Maletina, 2014). This creates terminological and conceptual vagueness, especially in terms of making methodological and pedagogical choices in the domain of teaching second/foreign languages.

Limiting language proficiency to mere oral fluency is problematic. Kormos and Dénes (2004) and Maletina (2014) point out that the term *fluency* is often defined as *spoken language competence* or an *overall oral proficiency*. Chambers (1997) explains that the non-technical use of the term *fluency* is often synonymously used with *overall linguistic proficiency*. Kormos and Dénes (2004), Maletina (2014), and Chambers (1997) emphasize that there is no unified

definition of the term fluency, which is usually equated with *proficiency*. In addition, Stephenson, Johnson, Jorgensen, and Young (2004) posit that attaining language proficiency is not a neat process that can be captured and described by a uniform state. Similarly, Cummins (1980) indicates that what exactly constitutes *proficiency* and how it is assessed is questionable. In this respect, one can argue that it is quite possible to be fluent without being highly proficient as it is also possible to be highly proficient without being fluent (Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002).

The preceding discussion suggests that limiting language proficiency to mere oral fluency is problematic for the purposes of making solid arguments regarding the critical role of literacy in language acquisition. The fundamental premise of this thesis is that oral proficiency in a second language does not automatically lead to biliteracy. In this regard, this PhD study attempts to explore whether and to what extent oral proficiency in a second language leads to biliteracy. In other words, whether proficiency, a construct on the definition of which there is no solid consensus, equips an individual with literacy skills and metalinguistic awareness in the language in question is investigated.

As for the tendency to regard bilinguals and multilingual individuals as literate individuals based on their oral proficiency, a significant number of SLA researchers whose studies are cited below challenge the view that all bilinguals or multilinguals should be regarded as having elevated metalinguistic awareness as well as cross-linguistic awareness. They argue that oral proficiency in a language should not qualify an individual as a truly bilingual or trilingual. These scholars emphasize that bilingualism does not automatically lead to biliteracy, and that neither does bilingualism necessarily equip an individual with the competence of reading and writing in two languages (Bassetti, 2007; Goncz & Kodzopeljc, 1991; Jones-Diaz, 1999). Bassetti (2005) argues that bilingualism *per se* does not make L2 users more aware of

linguistic units than monolinguals. Similarly, Bigelow and Schwarz (2010) postulate that bilingualism does not guarantee metalinguistic awareness in both languages.

In the same vein, Ravid (1993) argues that a person may still be illiterate in spite of having learned how to read and write in his native tongue (p. 35). For Ravid, a person can be regarded as being illiterate if he cannot function at all levels of civilized life in his society or country and if he cannot use language in all its variations. According to Ravid's criteria for literacy, a person whose linguistic knowledge is limited to the conversational dimension can well be regarded as illiterate since he has no ability to access the academic register of the language he speaks. Having said that, complete illiteracy means that a person cannot read or write at all. Of equal relevance is the concept *functional illiteracy*, which means that "an individual may have basic reading, writing, and numerical skills, but that he cannot apply them to accomplish tasks that are necessary to make informed choices and participate fully in everyday life" (World Literacy Foundation, 2005, p. 4). Some statistics from the UK context constitute a good example of functional illiteracy and portray the extent to which the detrimental consequences of functional illiteracy impact the social, economic, and educational structure of the UK, according to the World Literacy Foundation. A UK government report suggests that seven million UK adults were functionally illiterate to the extent that they could not find a plumber in the Yellow Pages (Hudson & Walmsley, 2005, pp. 609-610).

The above discussion, which encompasses the definition and consequences of illiteracy, reveals that speaking a language (be it first, second, or third) does not automatically qualify an individual as being literate in the language(s) he speaks. That oral proficiency does not necessarily translate into linguistic literacy is acknowledged by the majority of SLA researchers

(Basetti, 2005, Goncz & Kodzopeljic, 1991; 2007; Jones-Diaz, 1999; Hudson & Walmsley, 2005; Ravid, 1993; Ravid and Tolchinsky, 2002).

2.3.6 Teacher Profiles.

2.3.6.1 *Native vs. non-native English-speaking teachers.* Bolitho (1988) notes that those prospective native English-speaking language teachers who arrive on initial teacher training courses without even a basic knowledge of the systems of their own language are puzzled to observe that some adult learners who have studied English formally tend to know more about the English grammar than their teachers do. Andrews's (1994) study of teacher trainees supports Bolitho's observation as Andrews comments that 50% of the trainees he studied were perceived to have inadequate grammatical knowledge/awareness. In another study, Bloor (1986) tested the metalinguistic knowledge of 63 students entering modern language or linguistics courses at two British universities. Bloor's results echoed Andrews and Bolitho's results; the participants in the study were unable to identify grammatical categories, and neither were they aware of the metalinguistic aspects of language.

In the context of the UK, Chandler et al. (1988), Williamson and Hardman (1995), and Wray (1993) studied explicit knowledge of prospective native English-speaking teachers who were asked to identify parts of speech. Prospective teachers achieved a success rate of only 30% in identifying adverbs and 23% for pronouns. As for the identification of prepositions, their success rate was less than 10%. Chandler et al. (1988, p. 23) describes the teachers' attitude in his study as one of confident ignorance. This may imply that prospective native English-speaking teachers are either not aware of their deficient knowledge of language or deem it unimportant or irrelevant, especially as far as the formal properties of language are concerned. As for

prospective primary school teachers, Williamson and Hardman (1995) investigated the knowledge about language (explicit knowledge of language) of 99 trainee primary school teachers at the start of a PGCE course. Similar to the findings in other studies, the participants in this study also had difficulty in identifying parts of speech and clauses.

Native-speaking English teachers, in addition, seem to have a lack of pedagogical skills, which are manifested in their teaching. McNeill (2005), for instance, examined the discrepancy between non-native and native English-speaking teachers in terms of their ability to predict with which vocabulary items the students had more difficulty. In a task that required the teachers to predict the words that were unfamiliar to the students among a group of 40 words, local NNEST English teachers (Hong Kong context) were more accurate than their native English counterparts in predicting students' vocabulary difficulties. McNeill concluded that this was because of non-native English-speaking teachers' own English learning experience, referred to as "structured language learning experience".

The SLA literature indicates that linguistic literacy, operationalized in this study in terms of the two fundamental components, metalinguistic awareness and register awareness, is a construct that should not be a core component of ESL/EFL training programs only; it should also be a major skill that all kindergarten and primary/elementary school teachers are equipped with since metalinguistic awareness/linguistic literacy development starts from a very early age (Hudson & Walmsley, 2005; Moats, 2000; Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002). In line with this argument, Reagan (1997) and Adger, Snow, and Christian (2002) suggest that the development of substantial metalinguistic knowledge should be a core requirement for even K-12 (American expression that refers to the mainstream school education from kindergarten to 12th grade)

teacher training, regardless of the subject area. They argue that metalinguistic knowledge will enable mainstream teachers to deal with the intricacies of classrooms where ESL students are present. Hence, Williamson and Hardman (1995) investigated prospective primary school teachers' knowledge about language (explicit knowledge of language). They found that most teachers were incapable of identifying parts of speech and clauses. Kolln and Hancock (2005, p.26) lament:

There is no way of blaming the teacher for not teaching grammar when it has already been proven that teaching grammar is harmful. The fault then lies within the students' failure to somehow soak it up from exposure or from the teacher's non-technical remarks. Or perhaps, because everyone grows at his own pace, that a student is simply on a path that will lead him toward maturity somewhere down the road. Unfortunately, some of those students, unschooled in an understanding of grammar, become English teachers in their own right. Even if they have become writers not prone to error, they do not carry into teaching a deep grounding in knowledge of the language. Editing student writing becomes more a matter of what feels right. They don't have the knowledge base necessary to put the quirks of prescriptive grammar into perspective. They don't see a connection between formal choices and rhetorical effect.

Since such inadequately prepared language teachers lack explicit knowledge of language, one can argue that students taught by these teachers are very likely to lack metalinguistic awareness; they might furthermore lack more cognitively demanding skills such as producing academic essays. Regarding teachers' lack of explicit knowledge of language, Kolln and Hancock (2005) pose the following question: "How can teachers with little if any grammar

education be expected to teach reading and writing, let alone discuss the social implications of language in our lives?" (p. 19).

The discussion above points to a significant lack of knowledge about grammar and metalanguage coupled with an inability to analyze language as a system, especially by potential native English-speaking language teachers. These studies in the context of the UK involved NES teachers who were the products of the British state school system. It is worthwhile to point out that prospective NNES teachers performed significantly better than did NES teachers on tests that assessed teachers' explicit knowledge of the English grammar as well as knowledge of grammatical terminology (metalanguage). Chandler et al (1988) attribute the deficiency in NES teachers' metalinguistic awareness to the fact that the only source of prospective teachers' grammatical knowledge was their own language learning experiences at school, especially in the context of the UK National Curriculum. Likewise, Phillipson (1992) argues that since most NNES teachers had learned their second language as adults, they were better equipped to teach the L2 to other adults than those who had acquired it as their L1 when they were children. In the same vein, Cook (2016, p. 187) notes that "native speakers are not necessarily aware of the properties of their own language and are highly unlikely to be able to talk about its grammar coherently". This is the case not only for teachers who teach non-native speakers of English, but also for teachers who teach English to native English-speaking pupils in the school system of the country, where English is spoken as the native language. Fielding-Barnsley and Purdie (2005), for instance, drawing on the Australian context, indicate that "many teachers are not adequately prepared for the task of teaching young children to read because they understand too little about spoken and written language structure" (p. 66). They suggest that metalanguage instruction be integrated into the undergraduate curricula. Tsang, (2011) further argues that teachers essentially

need a more systematic organization and presentation of the English metalanguage, which can promote their awareness and contribute to the knowledge of how the English language is structured.

NES individuals, by nature, acquire English in childhood in an implicit manner as opposed to adults who learn English explicitly as their learning process requires conscious effort. This is precisely why M. Borg (2005) argues that native speakers are not able to reflect on their knowledge of English since it is stored implicitly. The two processes, native speakers' acquisition of English as their first language and non-native speakers' learning English as their second language, especially after childhood, are quite distinct, both qualitatively and quantitatively. As M. Borg (2005) emphasizes, native speakers do not have direct experience of what students are learning, especially if they are monolinguals and, as such, they cannot possibly appreciate the difficulties that adult second language learners encounter. E. M. Ellis (2006, p.14) states that a teacher who has never learned a second language cannot say, "I have never learned a second language, but I am going to teach you the best way of doing so," as the teacher has not experienced the language learning process himself. Seidlhofer's following quotation best demonstrates a monolingual teacher's lack of ability to establish empathy with his students who experience language learning problems: "native speakers know the destination, but not the terrain that has to be crossed to get there; they themselves have not travelled the same route" (1999, p. 238). In this regard, E. M. Ellis (2006) and Moussu and Llorca (2008) recommend that NES teachers should gain a good knowledge of contrastive linguistics before they start teaching their own language to be able to better respond to their students' needs. This implies that a teacher should be proficient in at least one more language in addition to his L1 as contrastive linguistics usually involves the comparative analysis of two or more languages. Andrews (1999)

argues that in spite of the fact that NES teachers are proficient users of their native language, they may be prone to be deficient in terms of their explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology.

In line with the above discussion, an explicit understanding of language not only plays a critical role in the effectiveness of the work of language teachers, but also forms the basis of an L2 teacher's metalinguistic awareness. This being the case, one can argue that teachers, especially the monolingual ones who lack metalinguistic awareness, are not particularly in a good position to deliver effective language instruction.

2.3.7 Discourse Analysis.

2.3.7.1 *Spoken vs. written and informal vs. formal modes of language.* The focus of this study is whether and to what extent oral proficiency in a non-English language promotes English language teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness. To this end, it is essential that we investigate which language skills, modalities, and genres promote or require metalinguistic and register awareness.

Ravid and Tolchinsky (2002) posit that written text conventions foster metalinguistic thinking in various linguistic domains since written language promotes consciousness of the implicit structure of spoken language. In this scenario, metalinguistic development is related to the acquisition of literacy and knowledge that originates from school-based learning. Rhetorical flexibility, an essential component of literacy, develops along with literacy acquisition, which enables an individual to analyze domains of language for the purpose of creating flexible and manipulable linguistic representations, which in turn promotes metalinguistic reflection.

Adversely, conversational modality, the most common mode of language use, aims to maintain or change a discourse topic according to the message that needs to be conveyed, the

focus of which tends to be on meaning or message rather than on the linguistic form.

Conversational modality involves linguistic transactions that are geared towards satisfying communicative goals. In this respect, Ravid and Tolchinsky (2002) emphasize that in conversational modality “language is used rather analyzed” (p. 430), which suggests that conversational modality is fundamentally distinct from the written text modality in academic English, especially in terms of its aim, as it prioritizes the exchange of messages or meaning, rather at the expense of linguistic accuracy.

Based on the above discussion of the relationship between literacy and metalinguistic awareness, as well as the differences between conversational and writing modalities, the applied linguistics literature suggests that informal and formal modes of language have significantly different characteristics, in terms of register, syntax, and choice of vocabulary. For instance, Moats (2000) argues that spoken language and written language are substantially different and that mastery of each requires unique skills.

It is worth emphasizing that when researchers discuss issues with regard to the comparison of written language and spoken language, they are underlining the important distinction between informal colloquial language and academic language, the latter of which underpins the so-called academic discourse. In other words, written modality refers to academic discourse, while spoken language refers to informal register as reflected in colloquial spoken discourse. It is obvious that some spoken language could well be formal (such as the ones in formal or official conferences). To facilitate and simplify the discussions in this thesis, the term *written language* has been used to refer to rather formal and academic discourse and *spoken language* to informal colloquial daily conversations.

As for the distinction between colloquial language and academic language, Harris (2012) comments that academic English is characterized by complex structures that are literally non-existent in spoken English. Mattingly (1972) further argues that there is not a scrap of evidence for any innate expectation regarding written language. Furthermore, Hawkins (1999) posits that mastering reading and writing is learned and that it is not an innately programmed process. Moats (2000, p. 9) also posits that “learning to read is not a natural process, and that most children must be taught to read through a structured and protracted process”.

To sum up, linguistic literacy requires the possession of a linguistic repertoire that encompasses a wide range of registers and genres, which implies that it is critical that a linguistically literate individual possess knowledge of the two major linguistic modalities: speaking and writing (Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002). Since written text conventions promote metalinguistic thinking in various linguistic domains such as sound/letter correspondence, word, and sentence boundaries, as well as constructions that are grammatically appropriate and coherent, writing is inherently more challenging than conversational modality, especially in terms of the cognitive demands that it imposes on individuals. In this respect, proficiency in writing encompasses the knowledge of linguistic literacy, which in turn requires the use of a high-register, formal, and normative language.

Owing to the relationship between literacy acquisition and metalinguistic awareness discussed above, a short discussion follows on the strategies and processes that are employed in reading and writing, the knowledge of which will normally qualify an individual as being linguistically literate. The discussion also covers how orthographic knowledge relates to speaking in the particular context of literacy.

To exemplify the complex process of writing, it is essential that some writing conventions be discussed in order to further provide insight into the role that literacy plays in the process of writing. To this end, the complex role of the knowledge of orthography has to be brought to the fore.

Whereas written Finnish, for instance, features a “shallow” orthography, written English is regarded as the most inconsistent “deep” orthography in the world. Thus, it displays a stark contrast to that of a shallow orthographic system, an example of which is Finnish. In a “shallow” orthography, the correspondences between graphemes/phonemes (letters and sounds) are almost one-to-one in a very systematic and regular manner. The English writing system, which is a good example of a “deep orthography” displays frequent irregularities, where a phoneme can have multiple spellings, and different spellings can represent the same phoneme or sound. In such orthographies, the relationship is less direct between the grapheme and phoneme, which forces the reader to learn the arbitrary or unusual pronunciations of irregular words (Davis, 2005).

The foregoing discussion suggests that reading and, more specifically, writing require complex cognitive processing and pedagogic effort load for learners. This normally involves the learning of certain rules and conventions, which are at times very regular and systematic.

The distinction between the speaking/listening and reading/writing modalities roughly corresponds to Cummins’s (2000) Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), namely to conversational and academic aspects of language proficiency. Academic language proficiency, defined as “the extent to which an individual has access to and command of the oral and written academic registers of

schooling” (Cummins, 2000, p. 67), requires elevated metalinguistic awareness (Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002), which is therefore very distinct from conversational fluency.

2.4 Summary

This chapter has reviewed major hypotheses and theories surrounding teachers’ metalinguistic awareness and multilingualism. The literature reviewed reveals that individuals who have acquired English in Anglophone countries often display a lack of language awareness, especially in terms of structural and formal aspects of their L1.

In contrast, according to Block (2001, 2002) individuals born in European countries such as France, Germany, and Spain not only acquire their respective L1s in an implicit manner as all children do, but also study formal properties of their L1. The literature also suggests that marked differences are observed between NES teachers and NNES teachers from Europe in terms of their orientations towards language teaching.

This chapter has also signaled that literacy acquisition has a direct impact on metalinguistic awareness as literacy requires explicit attention to the formal properties of language such as spelling, orthography, sentence structure, and so forth. Most importantly, the literature review presented in this chapter attempted to set the appropriate ground for the investigation into whether bilingual/multilingual native English-speaking teachers have an elevated level of metalinguistic and register awareness owing to their proficiency in a language or languages other than in English, which is the focus of this study.

Chapter 3

Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter provided an overview of the literature relevant to teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness. In doing so, theories, hypotheses, and constructs associated with linguistic literacy were examined and dealt with in some detail. This chapter begins by providing a summary of the aim and objectives of the study, followed by a detailed analysis of the research design and the justification for choosing a qualitative research design. Following the discussion on the research design employed in this study, the participants will be introduced. It has to be pointed out that although throughout this thesis the terms *participant* and *teacher* may seem to have been used interchangeably, the term *teacher* is usually used to attribute a pedagogical meaning to the *participant* while *participant* is used with a tendency to treat the individual with a rather research orientation.

Chapter 3 also provides detailed information on the linguistic and academic background of the participants. This is followed by an analysis of the instrument and of the specific tasks that the participants had to complete in the instrument. Relevant tables regarding the linguistic and academic background of the participants are provided, which are followed by an overview of the assessment process of the participants' metalinguistic and register awareness. Tables with more comprehensive data can be found in the Appendices (pages 321-489).

Chapter 3 also involves a detailed explanation of the whole assessment process; it provides detailed information regarding how teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness is assessed. More specifically, it details the role of tables in accounting for how the findings are tabulated.

3.2 Aim and Objectives

As noted in Chapters 1 and 2, the proposed research investigates whether and to what extent proficiency in a non-English language promotes English language teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness. In particular, the impact of Native English-speaking (NES) teachers' learning a second and additional languages on their metalinguistic and register awareness will be investigated. The goal of this inquiry is reflected in the research questions posed in Chapter 1. The study aimed to assess whether and to what extent NES teachers' knowledge of a non-English language learning, which is limited to oral competence, translated into L1 metalinguistic and register awareness.

There is a broad consensus in the SLA literature suggesting that non-native English-speaking teachers have a significantly higher level of metalinguistic awareness in English than their native English-speaking counterparts (Andrews, 1999; S. Borg, 2003; E. M. Ellis, 2006, 2012; Moussu & Llurda, 2008). In this regard, this study explores whether and to what extent by learning a language other than English, native English-speaking teachers can attain the level of metalinguistic and register awareness that non-native English-speaking teachers have. The SLA literature indicates that native English-speaking monolinguals lack the ability to reflect on their L1 because of their impoverished metalinguistic awareness (E. M. Ellis, 2006; Moussu & Llurda, 2008; Jessner, 2006; Simard, 2004). This study investigates to what extent bilingual or multilingual NES and NNES teachers attain metalinguistic and register awareness by acquiring proficiency in a non-English language.

As emphasized in Chapters 1 and 2, the case of seemingly bilingual and multilingual NES teachers' level of linguistic literacy is of more interest as the literature suggests that attaining proficiency in a non-English language promotes teachers' metalinguistic and register

awareness. The word *seemingly* above has been used intentionally since there is a tendency to regard an individual as bilingual or multilingual regardless of whether the individual's proficiency is limited to oral competence.

3.3 Research Design

To explore the complex and intriguing topic of teachers' metalinguistic awareness, this study utilizes a case study approach, allowing an in-depth look at the metalinguistic and register awareness of the participating teachers. Case study methodology explores a phenomenon in context by means of multiple data sources and collection methods, which aim at revealing multiple facets of the phenomenon (Baxter & Jack, 2008). It enables the researcher to answer "how" and "why" type questions, while taking into consideration how a phenomenon is influenced by the context within which it is situated (p. 556). Case studies are used in qualitative research to analyze, describe, compare, evaluate and understand different aspects of a research problem. They can provide the subtle details and processes involved in a phenomenon that experimental studies in quantitative research cannot usually address. It is a useful instrument in qualitative research to analyze, describe, compare, evaluate and understand different aspects of a research problem. It reveals subtle details and processes about the phenomenon that experimental studies in quantitative research cannot usually address. As a method of enquiry case studies enable the researcher to closely examine the data within a specific context (Zainal, 2007). In this respect, it is regarded as a robust research method particularly when a holistic, in-depth investigation is in question.

A major problem found in questionnaire-based quantitative studies is that researchers are not usually able to see the complexity in the metalinguistic behavior of the participants, which is usually masked by group scores in the quantitative research design (M. Borg, 2005). This is not

the case in this study; through its qualitative research design, which consisted of a battery of comprehensive and versatile tasks, it provides the opportunity to see the teachers' metalinguistic behavior manifested in how they reacted to the tasks in the study.

Foster and Ohta (2005), supporting M. Borg, warn against risks associated with quantitative research methodologies. They posit that data obtained and analyzed through statistical analyses run the risk of sacrificing not only the richness of natural data that would be acquired through qualitative research design, but also the subjectivity of the research process, which actually bypasses the invaluable opportunity of observing teacher behavior in a given task. Researchers, in this scenario, are unlikely to see what has really transpired or validate findings when and if interactions are reduced to tables and figures (Foster & Ohta, 2005). To this end, Foster and Ohta also question the validity and reliability of experimental and quasi-experimental research since they point out that studies are rarely replicated in SLA studies. Having said that, qualitative research provides researchers more freedom in terms of the interpretation of data. Therefore, compared to quantitative research design, descriptive work is more valued; researchers' focus is more on the observation of the subjective process of the human experience, and to this end, reductionism is avoided. Intensive analysis of small groups of subjects is implemented, which is geared towards building a robust picture of SLA processes through the accumulation of studies conducted with small sample sizes (Foster & Ohta, 2005).

Researchers have tended to use varying instruments to assess metalinguistic awareness. Rausch, Naumann and Jude (2011) posit that metalinguistic awareness can relate to all levels of language, from phonemes (phonological awareness) to awareness of syntax (word order in a sentence). In this respect, it can be argued that the instrument designed for this PhD study is comprehensive in that it has attempted to assess the teacher's metalinguistic and register

awareness through tasks on structural components of language, which comprise syntax, morphology, phonetics and phonology, pedagogical grammar, and knowledge of parts of speech.

It has to be emphasized that no pilot study was conducted due to the comprehensiveness of the instrument. It took some participants quite a few hours to complete the tasks. The researcher's justification for not conducting a pilot study was guided by the concern that pilot study participants would succumb to instrument fatigue and drop out. It was decided to reserve a healthy participant cohort instead.

The instrument displays resemblances to that of Roehr and Gánem-Gutiérrez (2009) who assessed learners' metalinguistic knowledge in a Grammaticality Judgment Test. The participants in Roehr and Gánem-Gutiérrez's study first corrected written errors, identified grammatical functions, and explained the relevant rule. Likewise, Tsang's study (2011) conducted in the EFL context of Hong Kong is limited to assessing teachers' metalinguistic awareness of grammar only as the author herself points out. Fielding-Barnsley & Purdie's study (2005, p. 6) focused solely on phonological awareness; the questions in their instrument are closed-ended and involve multiple-choice questions as per the examples below:

1- A pronounceable group of letters containing a vowel is:

a- A phoneme b- A grapheme c- A syllable d- A morpheme

2- A diphthong is found in the word:

a- coat b- boy c- battle d- sing e- been

A comparative analysis of the instrument used in this PhD study and those in Fielding-Barnsley & Purdie and Roehr and Gánem's will reveal that the tasks used in this PhD study are more conducive to eliciting a larger amount of data owing to its open-ended nature. In Roehr

and Gánem-Gutiérrez's study (2009), in particular, the participants were required to complete two tasks:

- a- assign a part of speech to the word which was highlighted,
- b- correct and explain the nature of the error which was also highlighted.

In contrast, the customized instrument does not highlight the error, thereby making the tasks more challenging as participants are required to label and assign parts of speech to predetermined lexical items.

The instrument designed for this study differs significantly from those above in that it attempted to capture all the linguistic skills (phonology, morphology, syntax, etc.), and not only grammar and phonology. It also involved a component, which aimed to assess the participants' knowledge of lexical items with Latin and Greek origin.

Notwithstanding that the instrument used in this PhD study does contain a significant content of grammar, it does not limit itself to assessing teachers' metalinguistic awareness through grammar tasks such as Grammaticality Judgment Tests (GJTs) or other assessment tools. It comprises a comprehensive assessment of all formal properties of language (phonology, morphology, syntax), which makes the instrument unique.

The discussion in Chapter 2 pointed out that explicit knowledge is a fundamental component of an individual's metalinguistic awareness. If explicit knowledge plays a key role in forming an individual's metalinguistic awareness, then it becomes essential that explicit knowledge be assessed through tasks that cover all aspects of language (formal properties of language). Hu (2011, p. 65) posits that in SLA research, "explicit knowledge is frequently elicited through tasks that require learners to explain target grammatical features." The researcher indicates that to measure metalinguistic knowledge, error correction and rule

explanation tasks are used. Bialystok (2001) posits that in GJTs, subjects are required to decide whether or not there are grammatical violations. The extent to which subjects can achieve this would be an indication of their level of grammatical analysis and metalinguistic awareness. Sorace (1985) adds that the explanation of the error requires a more advanced level of conscious metalinguistic knowledge rather than simply correcting the error without accounting for it. Berry (2005), in agreement with the researchers above, asserts that GJTs require the explanation of the rule, which involves the use of metalanguage.

Based on the foregoing, it can be concluded that grammaticality tasks should normally involve the following steps:

- a. Identification of the mistake
- b. Correction of the mistake
- c. Explanation of the cause of the mistake and how it can be corrected.

In summary, the discussion above accounts for the procedures followed in responding to the requirements of the tasks in the instrument as well as a brief summary as to how the tasks would assess the formal properties of language.

In this section, the focus of discussion is on the modes and principles of the process of data collection; more specifically, the details of data collection methods are elaborated on. The study has adopted a research approach that involves a mixed-method data collection methodology which consists of open-ended questions and closed-ended questions. The justification for adopting such a multi-component data collection method is in pursuance of triangulation. The applied linguistics literature postulates that for validity and reliability purposes, data should be collected from a variety of sources using different research methodologies (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Zohrabi, 2013). *Triangulation*, which is defined as the

collection of data from multiple sources, is argued to be the most efficient approach to collect data. Mackey and Gass (2005, p. 233) define triangulation as “the use of multiple, independent methods of obtaining data in a single investigation in order to arrive at the same research findings”. Olsen (2004) defines *triangulation* as the “mixing of data or methods so that diverse viewpoints or standpoints cast light upon a topic” (p. 3). In addition, Rahman and Yeasmin (2012) adopt a definition that regards triangulation as a process of “verification that increases validity by incorporating several viewpoints and methods. (p. 156)”

In this regard, since this study has employed a variety of methods to collect data, it can be argued that data collection conforms to the principles and procedures employed in attaining triangulation. As Olsen (2004, p. 6) puts it, methodological pluralism is a research methodology that enables a researcher “to use different techniques to get access to different facets of the same social phenomenon.” Inspired by the principles of *triangulation* research methodology, this study therefore, collected data through: (a) open-ended questions and (b) close-ended questions.

In this respect, it can be argued that the individual sub-methods listed above complement one another in terms of achieving triangulation for the purposes of validity and reliability. In what follows, a discussion of the above data collection methods is provided.

3.3.1 Open-ended vs close-ended questions. While the majority of the tasks in the instrument involved open-ended questions, to assess tasks with precise answers (as in the example “how many speech sounds are there in the word mix?”), closed-ended questions were also integrated into the instrument. It mainly aimed to assess teachers’ metalinguistic and register awareness in relation to the research questions set out Chapter 1, whether and the extent to which having oral proficiency in a non-English language promotes NES and NNES teachers’ metalinguistic and register awareness of English? Teachers’ metalinguistic and register

awareness is assessed through tasks that are intended to motivate teachers to use their explicit or declarative knowledge.

Open-ended questions are used where the question, statement, or the task is not followed by response options for the respondent to choose from as is the case with Likert-scale questionnaires in quantitative research design. Open-ended items are usually followed by some blank space (e. g., dotted lines) for the respondent to complete (Dörnyei, 2003). The items in the questionnaire are open-ended questions in the sense that they do not restrict the participants to limited yes/no answers; neither do they try to elicit a short one-sentence answer. The rationale here is that open-ended questions would yield more qualitative data, especially as far as metalanguage is concerned. Zohrabi (2013) explains that open-ended questions provide the inquirer with qualitative or text information, as opposed to close-ended questions which limit the researcher to obtain merely quantitative and numerical data. Another natural aspect of open-ended questions is that they encourage the participant to pay attention to the content rather than to the language that he is going to use, in which case metalanguage use would emerge as a consequence of a participant's engaging in a relatively challenging metacognitive activity without his necessarily being aware of it. In particular, the instrument attempted to assess teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness in terms of the language subskills listed above.

Open-ended questions have substantial merits in that they permit greater freedom of expression, and with their unique and flexible design, they can provide a far greater richness, and are therefore, compared to close-ended questions, regarded as being more efficient; the data obtained through open-ended questions tend to be more robust and reliable compared to data that have been obtained quantitatively (Zohrabi, 2013). Gillham (2000, p. 5) asserts that "open ended questions can lead to a greater level of discovery." In the same vein, Nunan (1999) argues that

responses to open-ended questions have the potential to accurately reflect what the participants want to say. Furthermore, sometimes open-ended items are essential for the simple reason that we do not know the range of possible answers and therefore cannot provide pre-prepared response categories.

As for the disadvantages of open-ended questions, they are rather time-consuming and require significant time on the part of the participant. Some participants in this Ph.D. study refrained from writing comprehensive responses to the task, predictably because of the lengthiness of the instrument and the time it took them to complete the tasks. As will be seen in Items 13 and 16 in the Error Correction task in Chapter 4, two participants' responses were limited to "wrong word" for identifying and explaining the error in question. It might have been the case that a comprehensive and time-consuming instrument such as this one might have exhausted the participants, thereby forcing them to keep their responses as brief as possible. This is a factor that should be taken into consideration when designing any instrument aiming at assessing metalinguistic awareness. In spite of the instrument's length, reducing the parameters of enquiry was treated with caution as it would compromise the richness of data for the sake of participant fatigue. The comprehensive output of the collected data, however, justifies the lengthiness of the instrument, which makes it unique, especially in terms of the vast skill categories it encompasses. This study took the risk of being lengthy in order to assess teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness through tasks that tapped almost every single linguistic skill.

This study attempted to assess teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness through tasks involving grammar, phonology, morphology, syntax, parts of speech, and procedural grammar, most of which were inspired by either mistakes students make in the local context (the

Saudi EFL context), or by teachers' lack of awareness regarding the difference between spoken colloquial language and written academic language.

It has to be emphasized that this study avoided oral tasks and any observation of natural classroom teaching, simply because teachers are likely to use less metalanguage because of time constraints and the need to make online decisions without having much time to think. As Serrano (2011) puts it, it is more convenient for individuals to demonstrate their metalinguistic knowledge in controlled metalinguistic tasks involving error correction than in spontaneous oral production. Wolfson (1986), in addition, asserts that a great disadvantage associated with collecting naturalistic data is that a particular speech feature may simply fail to display a pattern as it might well be the case that it occurs so rarely and unpredictably that large samples of language patterns may not emerge, which might impede the research process. In light of the preceding discussion, it would be the wrong to label the tasks in the instrument as 'artificial' simply because it did not involve a natural classroom setting.

As for another drawback of open-ended tasks is, as Foster and Ohta (2005) indicate, that the data obtained are also difficult to code in a reliable manner, which requires expertise to read and interpret adequately.

Apart from the data obtained by the seven-page instrument, the following data were obtained from the participants:

- a. Linguistic background (proficiency level in the languages spoken).
- b. Number of years of experience in teaching English.
- c. Academic background (subjects studied at university and degrees/certificates/diplomas held).

To attain reliability and validity, two further research components were added to the study. The first research variable was that candidates were categorized depending on whether they were “truly bi-/multilinguals”. As argued in Chapter 2, this study will not regard the teachers as bilinguals or multilinguals if they have no competence in literacy skills. In other words, a teacher’s proficiency in a language limited to oral competence will not qualify him as being linguistically literate as per Ravid and Tolchinsky’s (2002) definition of linguistic literacy. Therefore, a specialized category was created as to whether the participants were truly bilinguals or multilinguals, which for the purposes of this study was operationalized and defined as individuals who have linguistic competence at either *native* or *fluent* proficiency levels for all productive and receptive language skills, speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

The second research variable was the participants’ academic background. More specifically, an important point of interest was whether the teacher possessed credentials relevant to second language teaching. In other words, teachers who hold subject-specific qualifications in areas such as language teaching, applied linguistics, and linguistics would be regarded as a distinct category from those who hold degrees in areas such as engineering and computer science, which cannot be regarded as subject-specific areas.

These two research variables, namely true bilingualism/multilingualism and academic background, were analyzed in terms of their relevance to the metalinguistic and register awareness of the participants.

3.3.2 Participants. In order to assess native and non-native ESL/EFL teachers’ metalinguistic awareness in English, teachers with a variety of linguistic and academic backgrounds were recruited. Twenty-three practicing teachers participated in this study, of

whom ten were native speakers of English and the remaining 13 were non-native speakers of English.

Case study samples usually involve small number of participants. Yin (2009) went as far as suggesting that single-case study could well serve a qualitative research design under certain circumstances. TESOL International Organization (n.d.) indicates that a case study may involve two to four participants when studying multiple cases. This study initially recruited 24 participants, which is above par with studies of this nature. One participant withdrew, resulting in a participant cohort of 23. The recruitment of more participants aimed to collect a richer data set and to ensure a larger sample of varying linguistic profiles. With these aims in mind, it facilitated the enquiry into whether and the extent to which proficiency in second and additional languages that is limited to sole oral competence promotes teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness of English.

The analysis of participants' language skills revealed that of the 23 participants, 17 were truly bilingual speakers. Of the ten native English-speaking participants, only six were truly bilingual, suggesting that the remaining four did not have advanced or fluent levels of reading and writing proficiency in the language they spoke. Obviously, all the non-native English-speaking teachers were truly bilingual, implying that they had access to both spoken and written modes of at least two languages. It has to be highlighted that based on Ravid and Tolchinsky's (2002) definition of linguistic literacy, none of the teachers were categorized as trilingual.

It should be noted that pseudonym allocations were chosen as the preferred subject-labelling system as opposed to generic labelling. As this PhD study was qualitatively oriented, the justification for using pseudonyms was to facilitate contextual familiarity with participants

and to better assess the relationship between their scores and their linguistic and academic background.

In what follows, a brief discussion of the tables is provided, especially in terms of what variables the data subsumed in those tables refer to. Tables 1 and 2 contain data regarding the linguistic and academic background of the participants, which are arguably the most fundamental variables, since this study investigates the extent to which teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness is impacted by having proficiency in languages other than English. In particular, Table 1 details the linguistic repertoire that the participants possess; more specifically, it lists the number of languages in which they have proficiency. It further assigns proficiency levels (advanced, fluent, intermediate, and basic) to the participants for both speaking and writing skills in the languages in which they are proficient. Table 2 provides information about the academic background of the participants. The degrees that the participants have, the academic field (major) in which they have specialized, whether or not they possess subject-specific qualifications, and how many years of teaching experience they have are presented in Table 2. Table 3 demonstrates which teachers are truly bilingual. The construct *truly bilingual* refers, for the purposes of this study, to individuals who are either fluent or who have native proficiency in two languages for both speaking and writing skills. If an individual is a native speaker of a language but lacks the ability to read and write in that language, he is not regarded as being truly bilingual. In line with Ravid and Tolchinsky's (2002) construct of *linguistic literacy*, a person may be regarded as being linguistically illiterate despite having native or native-like fluency in speaking. As for the assessment of the tasks, Tables 4 and 5 provide a relatively detailed explanation of how participants' responses were evaluated. In addition, Tables 4 and 5 address the assessment procedure in some detail. What follows immediately below are Tables 1 to Tables

3. They were grouped together because they provide essential data on the participants' linguistic and academic profiles as well as their years of teaching experience.

Table 1*Participants' Linguistic Profile*

	Participant	L1 Spoken	L1 Written	L2 Spoken	L2 Written	L3 Spoken	L3 Written	L4 Spoken	L4 Written	L5 Spoken	L5 Written
1	Al	ENGLISH	ENGLISH	URDU N	Urdu int.	PUNJABI N	<u>Punjabi np</u>	Arabic bsc.	Arabic bsc.		
2	Nur	TURKISH	TURKISH	English fl.	English fl.						
3	Faris	ENGLISH	ENGLISH	URDU N	Urdu bsc.	Arabic int.	Arabic int.				
4	Firaz	SINHALA	SINHALA	ENGLISH	ENGLISH N	TAMIL N	Tamil bsc.	Arabic int.	Arabic int.		
5	Hustin	ENGLISH	ENGLISH	Arabic int.	Arabic int.						
6	Osama	ARABIC	ARABIC	English fl.	English fl.	Spanish bsc.	Spanish bsc.				
7	Elia	URDU	Urdu int.	English fl.	English fl.	Hindi fl.	Hindi fl.	Tamil fl.	Tamil int.	Arabic bsc.	Arabic bsc.
8	Indigo	HINDI	HINDI	English fl.	English fl.	Urdu fl.	Urdu fl.	Kannada int.	Kannada int.	French bsc.	French bsc.
9	Jesus	ENGLISH	ENGLISH	Italian int.	Italian int.	Arabic bsc.	Arabic bsc.	Spanish bsc.	Spanish bsc.		
10	Jalil	ARABIC	ARABIC	English fl.	English fl.	Hebrew bsc.	Hebrew bsc.	French bsc.	French bsc.		
11	Kamil	ARABIC	ARABIC	English fl.	English fl.	Hebrew bsc.	<u>Hebrew-np</u>	Spanish bsc.	Spanish bsc.	French bsc.	French bsc.
12	Brow	ENGLISH	ENGLISH	Japanese int.	Japanese bsc.	French bsc.	French bsc.				
13	Light	ENGLISH	ENGLISH	Spanish fl.	Spanish fl.						
14	Bey	ENGLISH	ENGLISH	BOSNIAN N	BOSNIAN N	French int.	French bsc.				
15	Mert	TURKISH	TURKISH	English fl.	English fl.						
16	Salima	BOSNIAN	BOSNIAN	English fl.	English fl.						
17	Sam	ARABIC	ARABIC	English fl.	English fl.	French bsc.	French bsc.				
18	Sierra	ARABIC	ARABIC	English fl.	English fl.						
19	Smyrna	ENGLISH	ENGLISH	URDU N	Urdu basic	Arabic int.	Arabic int.	Spanish int.	Spanish int.		
20	Suzanne	ENGLISH	ENGLISH	German fl.	German fl.	Chinese fl.	Chinese bsc.	French bsc.	French bsc.		
21	Talat	ARABIC	ARABIC	English fl.	English fl.						
22	Vivi	ENGLISH	ENGLISH	German fl.	German fl.	Spanish bsc.	Spanish bsc.	Arabic bsc.	Arabic bsc.		
23	Wali	ARABIC	ARABIC	English fl.	English fl.	German int.	German int.				

The following abbreviations have been used in Table 1 for the purposes of simplification.

1. **N** = native
2. fl. = fluent
3. int. = intermediate
4. *bsc.* = basic
5. np. = no proficiency

Corresponding to the abbreviated words above, bold and italicized uppercase and lowercase letters have been used to classify different proficiency levels. For instance, the italicized lower case letters (*bsc.*) represent the proficiency category ‘basic’.

Table 2

Teachers' Academic Background

No.	Teacher	Degree	Specialization	Certificates	Experience
1	Al	Bachelor's	Computer Science	<i>I to I (20 hours) + CELTA (4 weeks)</i>	6
2	Nur	Bachelor's	<i>Teaching English as a Foreign language</i>	<i>DELTA (1 year)</i>	31
3	Faris	Bachelor's + PGCE Master's	Mathematics Educational management	<i>I to I (20 hours)</i>	9
4	Firaz	Bachelor's MA PhD	Computer Science TESOL <i>Linguistics/Arabic</i> (completed coursework only)		10
5	Hustin	Bachelor's	Engineering		10

No.	Teacher	Degree	Specialization	Certificates	Experience
		PGCE MA PhD	Education TESOL TESOL (ongoing at the time of participation)		
6	Osama	Bachelor's Master's PhD	Dental Technology Instrumentation & Analytical Science TESOL (in progress)	I to I (20 hours)	12
7	Elia	BA MA MPhil	English English English		13
8	Indigo	Bachelor's Master's	Business Management Business Administration	CELTA P.G. Diploma in Marketing Management (1 year) Certificate in Teaching English (1 year)	18
9	Jesus	Bachelor's Master's	History Applied Linguistics	New York State Teaching License in TESOL K-12	16
10	Jalil	Bachelor's Master's	Translation English Language & Literature		10
11	Kamil	Bachelor's	English Language & Literature	Higher Diploma Teaching of English as a Foreign Language	32
12	Brow	Bachelor's Master's	History Education		20
13	Light	Bachelor's Master's	Creative Writing Creative Writing		8
14	Bey	Bachelor's Master's	English Applied linguistics		13

No.	Teacher	Degree	Specialization	Certificates	Experience
15	Mert	Bachelor's Master's	<i>Teaching English as a Foreign Language TESOL</i>	<i>TESL Certificate- TESL Canada</i>	30
16	Salima		No undergraduate qualifications	<i>CELTA</i> Diploma Personal Support Worker	3
17	Sam	Bachelor's Master's PhD	<i>English Translation Literature</i>		22
18	Sierra	Bachelor's Master's	Literature and <i>Linguistics TESOL</i> (ongoing at the time of participation)	Diploma in Education (1 year)	1
19	Smyrna	Bachelor's Master's	Psychology and Economics Special Education	<i>US Teaching License</i> (2 years) <i>TESOL Certificate (100 hours)</i>	15
	Suzanne	Bachelor's Master's +PhD	Psychology <i>Psycholinguistics</i>		1
21	Talat	Bachelor's Master's	<i>Linguistics and English Literature Simultaneous Translation</i>	<i>Higher Studies Diploma in Translation</i>	11
22	Vivi	Bachelor's Master's	<i>Secondary English Education TESOL</i>		34
23	Wali	Bachelor's Pre-Master's	<i>English Language & Literature Applied Linguistics</i> (coursework completed only)	Certificate Teaching Arabic as a Foreign Language (1 month) <i>Certificate Teaching English as a Foreign Language (10 days)</i>	13

The fields written in **bold** and in *italics* represent academic areas/fields relevant to the profession of English Language Teaching.

Table 3*Truly Bilingual Speakers*

No	Participant	L1	L2	L3	L4
1	Nur	Turkish	English		
2	Firaz	Sinhala	English	Tamil (spoken)	
3	Osama	Arabic	English		
4	Elia	English	Hindi	Tamil (spoken)	Urdu (spoken)
5	Indigo	Hindi	English	Urdu (spoken)	
6	Jalil	Arabic	English		
7	Kamil	Arabic	English		
8	Light	English	Spanish		
9	Bey	English	Bosnian		
10	Mert	Turkish	English		
11	Salima	Bosnian	English		
12	Sam	Arabic	English		
13	Sierra	Arabic	English		
14	Suzanne	English	German	Chinese (spoken)	
15	Talat	Arabic	English		
16	Vivi	English	German		
17	Wali	Arabic	English		

L1: Native language

L2: Second language (could refer to native-speaker proficiency)

L3 and L4: Languages which the participant has proficiency in only for speaking, but not writing.

As for the positions that the participants held at the time of participation, the majority were instructors at King Abdulaziz University in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. While one particular participant was an instructor at Üsküdar University in Istanbul, Turkey, another participant was employed at Technical Trainers College in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. In addition, there was one participant who was unemployed at the time of participation; hence he was not affiliated to any

institution. It is also worthwhile to emphasize that geographical location was not one of the parameters, which informed this study.

All teachers participating in this study taught students at varying proficiency levels in English, the majority of whom were at low-intermediate proficiency level. The preparatory year at King Abdulaziz University's English language program mainly caters for students of elementary to low-intermediate levels. Some of the participating teachers taught in the preparatory year, whereas other teachers taught students who had completed the preparatory year and commenced their studies in the Faculty of Engineering. The students who had finished the preparatory year were required to take a course in the Faculty of Engineering called IE 200 Communication Skills. This course consisted of ten-hour class work, of which six hours were devoted to training students in research skills. The remaining four hours were dedicated to the teaching of structural aspects of English, such as grammar and reading comprehension.

It is worthwhile to point out that, for this particular study, no monolingual native English-speaking teachers participated in study and neither did any trilingual teacher, based on the definition of the construct *linguistic literacy*.

A challenge was that the rich linguistic profile of the participants would not enable the researcher to assess the exact proficiency level of the participants or label the participants as bilinguals as there is no consensus in the literature regarding what criteria are to be used for classifying individuals as bilingual speakers.

Franson (2009), for instance, posits that the definitions of the construct *bilingualism* may range from a minimal proficiency in two languages to advanced proficiency. Franson emphasizes that an individual may seem to be functioning and appearing as a native-like speaker of two languages but he might, in fact, be limited to only converse and communicate orally. In a

similar vein, Gass and Selinker (2008) argue that the concept *bilingualism* is defined and interpreted differently in the field of SLA and posit that different interpretations of bilingualism exist in the fields of psychology and education. They define the term *bilingual* as “someone whose language is in a steady state and who has learned and now knows two languages” (p.25). Gass and Selinker’s definition above also suggests that no particular mention of literacy skills is implicated when defining the concept *bilingualism*. In other words, literacy skills do not tend to receive much attention in the discussion of the construct *bilingualism*.

To address the discrepancy discussed above and to distinguish between proficiency limited to only oral competence and one that captures both oral fluency and linguistic literacy, the participants were asked to select the appropriate proficiency level for both speaking and writing skills. This aimed at a relatively more accurate assessment of the participants regarding their Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), which refers to the dimension of language proficiency that is strongly related to literacy skills (Cummins, 1980).

As per Ravid (1993) and Ravid and Tolchinsky’s (2002) definition of linguistic literacy, a person may be labeled as functionally illiterate despite having native or native-like fluency in speaking. A participant’s linguistic profile represented a good example of the above trait. A native speaker of English classified himself as a native speaker of Punjabi for speaking, although he indicated that he had no literacy skills in Punjabi. Such interesting linguistic profiles are analyzed and discussed in further detail in Chapter 4, especially as far as metalinguistic and register awareness is concerned.

The categorization of such individuals in terms of language proficiency is extremely challenging since they can easily be labeled as native speakers when their oral proficiency is taken as a reference. However, in terms of linguistic literacy, they may well be deficient and

have relatively poor or no reading and writing skills. For this particular reason, it is quite a daunting task to assess and categorize individuals' language proficiency level when they have no or very limited reading and writing skills. In line with Ravid and Tolchinsky's (2002) construct of linguistic literacy, such individuals may be labeled as functionally illiterate.

In terms of the classification of proficiency levels, there were four major proficiency categories: *native*, *fluent*, *intermediate*, and *basic*. It has to be reemphasized that for the operationalization of this study, an individual with basic language proficiency was not classified as a language speaker. Only *native* and *fluent* proficiency qualified an individual as being bi-, tri-, or multilingual. Such classification is also in line with Cummins's Threshold Hypothesis (1991), which posits that in order to reap the cognitive advantages of multilingualism, an individual needs to have advanced proficiency in language.

The preceding discussion aims to justify the categorization of the participants' linguistic profile based on their proficiency level, not only for speaking and listening, but also for their literacy skills, which would encompass their reading and writing skills.

The teachers participating in the study presented a very rich linguistic profile in terms of both linguistic and academic backgrounds. Native-English speaking teachers came from the UK, the USA, and Canada. By contrast, non-native English-speaking teachers were also of diverse linguistic and academic backgrounds. Most of the non-native teachers of English were from Urdu, Hindi, and Arabic speaking backgrounds. Two teachers had Turkish as their L1. One of the Turkish-speaking participants was employed in Saudi Arabia and the other was an instructor at a private university in Turkey.

The rich linguistic repertoire of the participants presented an interesting categorization with extremely varying levels of proficiency. For instance, a native English-speaking teacher

reported to have native proficiency in Urdu for speaking, but only basic proficiency in writing. Another participant said that he spoke Tamil fluently, but indicated that his proficiency for writing was limited to intermediate level.

An individual who has an intermediate or even basic proficiency, may well be classified by some as having full language proficiency since there is no clear-cut definition of constructs such as bilingualism and multilingualism. The plethora of definitions, in fact, cause conceptual vagueness, especially in terms of which proficiency levels these constructs exactly refer to. One good example comes from one of the participants who is a native speaker of English. Apart from his native English proficiency for both reading and writing, he has native proficiency in Urdu for speaking, although only basic proficiency for reading and writing. In addition, he has intermediate level proficiency in both Arabic and Spanish for both speaking and writing skills. At first glance, this individual might immediately be labeled as multilingual, especially when his oral proficiency in these languages is taken as the yardstick. However, based on Ravid (1993) and Ravid and Tolchinsky's (2002) definitions of linguistic literacy, this particular individual is fully literate *in English* only and not in other languages. The closest definition of bilingualism which is in line with linguistic literacy as defined above indicates that bilingualism is an individual's access to more than one linguistic code as a means of social communication (E.M. Ellis, 2006; Hamers & Blanc, 2000). The word *code* here should be understood as the structure of a language including all linguistic features or formal properties of that language. Based on the preceding definition of bilingualism, then, one can argue that the above-cited participant has access to the code of one single language, which is English.

The discussion above has provided a detailed description of the participants, especially in terms of their linguistic background. Tables 1 to 3 summarize this discussion; more specifically,

they provide detailed information regarding participants' linguistic and academic background; whether they are truly bilingual teachers; and their total number of years' experience in teaching English.

3.3.3 Ethics. Ethics approval for the study was obtained from the University of Cape Town and from the institutions to which the participants were affiliated at the time of the study. These institutions include: the King Abdulaziz University in Jeddah; the Technical Trainers College in Riyadh; and the Saudi Arabia and Üsküdar University in Istanbul, Turkey.

3.3.4 The context. The student population at King Abdulaziz University consists of native speakers of Arabic with English proficiency levels ranging from basic to upper intermediate. Depending on the nature of the course, the medium of instruction may be in both Arabic and English as most faculty members are proficient speakers of both English and Arabic. Students report that non-native Arabic speaking teachers teach in English only, whereas instructors who are native speakers of Arabic code switch between English and Arabic.

3.3.5 Tasks and data analysis. Regarding the process of designing tasks for such a comprehensive research instrument, utmost attention was paid to aligning the tasks with the aim and objectives of this study. To reiterate, the aim of this doctoral study was to investigate whether oral proficiency, which does not incorporate literacy skills in a non-English language, contributes to metalinguistic and register awareness. In line with this aim, the researcher had to devise an instrument with appropriate tasks that would gauge teachers' metalinguistic awareness, which would incorporate elements that would also assess the participants' register awareness without their being aware of it.

In light of the foregoing, this section aims to discuss the tasks in detail and to explain how teachers' performance was assessed for each task. For instance, the discussion of Task 1

below not only provides detailed information about the nature of the task, but also explains how Task 1 was assessed for each individual teacher. In particular, Table 4 aims to illustrate how teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness was assessed. More specifically, it attempts to assess whether a teacher was able to respond to the criteria each statement demanded. Table 4 also outlines the criteria used as a yardstick against which a subject's performance would be assessed on a 4-point scale. In addition, it provides a description of each assessment category on the scale. By contrast, Table 5 displays the criteria used to assign marks for identifying parts of speech. Table 5 differs from Table 4 in that it consists of a 3-point scale.

It is important to note that despite Table 4's being identified as a 4-point rating scale it deviates from traditional or common 4-point scales in that there is no midpoint. There is therefore no mark allocation of 0.5. Such a design was set up intentionally to prevent awarding points for mediocre performance. In other words, the scale intended to avoid a mid-point, 0.5, to avoid performance judgments that would be colloquially labeled as *so-so performance*. In this scenario, a teacher's metalinguistic awareness is assumed to be absolute; either satisfactory or non-satisfactory.

Table 4

Assessment Scale

Assessment	Explanation of Assessment Categories	Mark
Very satisfactory	Identified the error; used metalanguage adequately; justified his response by providing a pedagogically sound explanation.	1
Satisfactory	Identified the error; used some metalanguage; justified his response with some explanation.	0.75
Unsatisfactory	Identified the error; did not use metalanguage; did not justify his response with any explanation/no explanation provided.	0.25
Very unsatisfactory	Did not identify the error; did not use metalanguage appropriately/ little or unsatisfactory /no explanation provided.	0

It is worthwhile to emphasize that there will be occasional deviations from the assessment scale in Table 4, based on the nature of the task in question. Especially in the Error Correction task, there are certain sentences to which the responses are deemed to be straightforward; these sentences should be regarded as less challenging than the other tasks. Any fluent English speaker, whether he is a teacher of English or not, a native speaker or not, should easily provide the correct responses to these tasks. For instance, the response to the question “Do you have a pen?” would be “Yes, I do” in the affirmative case. A second example required the participants to correct the sentence, “Thank you for invite us to your house.” Similar to the example above, this task was so straightforward and unchallenging that any English speaker with an advanced proficiency would simply say “Thank you for inviting us to your house.” In essence, such tasks aimed to measure the participants’ explicit knowledge rather than merely providing the correct answer. In other words, the participants were expected to explain the factors that led to the error by using metalanguage.

These unchallenging tasks should require slight deviation from the scale in Table 4. A teacher’s correct response to such unchallenging tasks, hence, should not be assigned 0.25 despite the fact that the assessment scale indicates that a minimal mark of 0.25 should be assigned for such tasks. In contrast, there are other tasks to which responses are not as simple and straightforward as those unchallenging ones. These tasks usually aim to receive responses that require a participant’s knowledge of literacy conventions and register. In other words, they aim to assess whether a participant is able to distinguish between informal and formal language, and whether he is able to identify the missing formal language elements in informal language such as a comma or an apostrophe. An example of more challenging tasks that required a participants’ knowledge of literacy skills is Task 9 in Error Correction, which aimed at assessing

whether the participant was able to identify the missing apostrophe (days' time) in the sentence, "I will be there in two days time". For such tasks, the participant should be awarded 0.25 for at least being able to identify the missing apostrophe.

To avoid vagueness as to whether a task is challenging or not; in other words, whether a participant should be awarded 0.25 in the error analysis section, it will be clearly indicated that the participant would not be assigned 0.25 for a correct response. To reiterate, the tasks that are deemed to be simple and unchallenging would not be assigned 0.25, contrary to what the Assessment Scale stipulates.

3.3.6 The instrument. What follows next is the instrument and a detailed discussion of each subsection.

The instrument consists of a seven-component battery of tasks which aims to elicit data on various aspects of the participating teachers' metalinguistic knowledge and register awareness. The constituents of the instrument aimed at obtaining data relating to the following critical areas: structure (error analysis), grammar (involving pedagogical intervention), phonology, syntax, morphology parts of speech, and pedagogical grammar. It has to be emphasized that the participants were not instructed to use any metalanguage to avoid biasing them. The intention was to allow metalanguage to emerge naturally, as they were working on the task. It is also worth mentioning that the participants were not required to provide a proficiency level in their L2 through standardized tests, which would have presented logistical problems. It is also not within the scope of this thesis to evaluate the participants' proficiency in English or any additional languages.

3.3.6.1 Error correction. If you identify any error in any of the following sentences, first write the correct version of the sentence. Then, explain why the error might have been committed and how it can be corrected.

1. Do you have a pen? Yes, I have.
2. Thank you for invite us to your house.
3. Jane has less students than does Susan.
4. I would stay home rather then go out.
5. I did not see him yesterday, because I did not attend the meeting.
6. The western world has been facing a severe economical recession.
7. There's a lot of unemployed people in this city.
8. The three-year old boy played with his toy.
9. I will be there in two days time.
10. Her average performance did not fullfil the expectations of the audience.
11. He maybe in class right now.
12. Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthier.
13. The amount of students in my class is 23.
14. The data obtained from the study is to be published soon.
15. The man who's brother I met yesterday left town.
16. Who did found Apple Company?
17. The man whom got a promotion joined us only last month.
18. King Abdulaziz University hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency.
19. Me and Talal are good friends.
20. The *criteria* that were agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce.

The first task involved an error correction task, which is referred to as Grammaticality Judgment Tests (GJT). GJTs contain sample sentences that violate a particular grammar rule in question. An important aspect of this part of the instrument is that the instructions to the participants about what they were expected to do in a particular task clearly state that there is a possibility that the teacher might perceive the sentence as correct, “If you identify any errors in any of the following sentences, first write the correct version of the sentence, then explain why the error might have been committed and how it can be corrected.” It is, in fact, the case that some grammatical structures, usually informal and ungrammatical in terms of academic English, might be regarded by a teacher as being correct if and when his judgments are not based on the academic register. In a way, Task 1 assessed the participants’ awareness of the difference between the *academic* and *non-academic* registers as well as the differences between formal and informal styles, especially as far as the structural aspects of language are concerned. The next step required the participants to explain “why the error might have been committed and how it could be corrected.” In other words, the participants were required to provide explicit explanations regarding the error.

It has to be noted that there were 20 open-ended questions in Task 1, all of which had issues relating to the structure or register of the sentence. The errors were not only related to grammar; there were problems concerning the following aspects of language as well:

- a. Punctuation errors (such as the possessive apostrophe, missing hyphen in a compound adjective, capitalization).
- b. Spelling errors such as fulfil vs. fullfil.
- c. The use of the wrong word (economical vs. economic).

The Error Correction task also involved teachers' sensitivity to spelling mistakes as well as their reaction to incorrectly used lexical items. To assess teachers' sensitivity to a spelling mistake, for instance, they were asked to correct the mistake in a sentence such as "I would rather go out *then* stay home and watch TV." Teachers were expected to correct the misspelled word *then* to *than*, a common spelling error, especially in e-mail correspondences. An example of a sentence that would require teachers' reaction or sensitivity to an incorrectly used lexical item is "Europe is currently experiencing severe *economical* problems." Teachers would be expected to change *economical* to *economic* and to explain the difference between *economical* and *economic*, both of which are adjectives with different meanings.

As for the variation between colloquial and academic language, some structures may be acceptable in daily spoken (colloquial) English, whereas in written English, where the language has to conform to academic standards, they may simply be labeled as incorrect in terms of its grammaticality and register. For instance, positioning the object pronoun *me* in the subject position of a sentence, *me and John* came yesterday, is very common in spoken English, whereas according to the norms of academic English, this would be regarded as a deviant structure where the academically acceptable form would be *John and I*. In this respect, the tasks required the teachers' attention to the differences between formal and informal registers. Hence, as per the Noticing Hypothesis, whether a teacher can distinguish between the two registers, formal vs. informal and academic vs. colloquial, and whether he can notice that a sentence or a structure violates standard (academic) language, would be one of the determining factors of the presence of a teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness.

The Error Correction Task, in this regard, attempts to assess the participants' sensitivity to structural aspects of language through grammaticality judgments. Since grammaticality

judgments are commonly used in metalinguistic awareness tasks, as is the case with the tasks in this study, the following section will discuss grammaticality judgment tasks in more detail.

Grammaticality judgments refer to intuitive judgments of the well-formedness of utterances in a given language (Serrano, 2011). Mitchell and Myles (2004) indicate that GJTs assess whether participants can identify the error(s) in a given sentence. Likewise, Bialystok (2001) posits that grammaticality judgment tasks are tools for assessing linguistic and metalinguistic competence. Keller (1999) explains that they might further be used to get the subjects to state explicitly what rule was deviant and how they would correct it. In essence, GJTs aim to determine whether or not individuals can evaluate the use of specific grammatical structures by requiring them to detect violations of the rule.

In grammaticality judgments, the purpose of the task is to determine whether or not individuals can reflect on their competence in grammar to detect whether a rule has been broken, which depends to a large extent on whether he knows the grammar rule at some level. To what extent a person knows the rule would presumably vary along a wide range of explicitness or consciousness. In this respect, Friesen and Bialystok (2012) assert that those metalinguistic tasks that require the highest levels of control of processing are the ones which require more noticing and paying focused attention to formal aspects of language, which are usually not salient, not usual, or not expected. Hence, the level of explicitness or analysis required for the response can vary.

Scoring each item is not a simple process since the responses and explanations provided by the subjects will be assessed in a subjective manner, which implies that there will be no uniformity in evaluation. In contrast, in quantitative research design, objective evaluations are carried out where participants are required to choose from a limited number of options provided

as in the case of multiple choice, Likert-scale and yes/no questions/statements. For this particular study, the evaluation is subjective by nature and therefore the assessment of the responses provided by the participants is open to varying interpretations. An important factor is whether participants are capable of using the relevant metalanguage in accounting for the error in question. As each task consists of different items involving different types of errors, the evaluation is going to vary across the items based on the nature of the statement and the error.

In Item 5 of the Error Correction task, for instance, a sentence such as “I did not see him yesterday, because I did not attend the meeting” can be perceived as being correct since there is no obvious grammar mistake in the sentence. Obviously, no punctuation exists in the oral mode of language. Hence, a comma does not contribute much to the meaning of a sentence. For many teachers, literacy conventions are not regarded as a priority for language teaching; communication of meaning is what is emphasized in modern teaching methodologies. However, according to ESL and EFL grammar textbooks, if a sentence starts with an independent clause it should not be followed by a comma (Azar, 2009). If we reverse the clauses and say, “Because I did not attend the meeting, I did not see him yesterday” a comma should be inserted following the clause starting with the subordinating conjunction *because*. To this end, any response that suggests the sentence, “I did not see him yesterday, because I did not attend the meeting” is correct would be marked as incorrect and be awarded zero marks. Conversely, if the participant identifies the sentence, “I did not see him yesterday, because I did not attend the meeting” as incorrect, then he would be given a full mark provided that he explains the mistake using metalanguage.

The descriptors in Table 4 provide the criteria for what a participant was required to do to get a full mark. For instance, a full score represents the assessment unit “Very satisfactory”,

which corresponds to the following descriptor: “Identified the error; used metalanguage adequately; justified his response by providing a pedagogically sound explanation.”

3.3.6.2 Grammar.

1. If a student wanted to know the difference between the two sentences:

I **have not seen** him yet.

I **did not see** him yet.

What would you tell him?

2. Why do native speakers say “**2 coffees**” when “**coffee**” is uncountable?
3. Are both of the following sentences correct grammatically?

My opinion is **different from** yours.

My opinion is **different than** yours.

How would you explain the difference to your students? Please provide your reasons.

4. In the following two sentences, the word “**walk**” has different meanings. How would you explain this to your students? Please provide your reasons.

I **walk** every day.

I **walk** the dog every day.

5. Why does the verb “**hand**” in the following sentence **not** have the 3rd person singular **-s** suffix?

The burglar demanded that the cashier “**hand**” him all the money.

The second task aimed to assess the participant’s pedagogical ability or pedagogical content knowledge through a grammar-oriented activity, which implies that the main aim of this task was to evaluate a teacher’s pedagogical or procedural knowledge in action, that is, in

simulated classroom tasks. In particular, Task 2 aimed to see how a teacher would display his subject-matter knowledge in explaining a particular structural rule (grammar), and the extent to which he would use metalanguage efficiently in his explanations.

Pedagogical ability or pedagogical competence is deemed to be an essential component of a teacher's metalinguistic awareness. Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) is defined as "a special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding" (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). PCK represents "the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction" (Shulman, 1987, p. 8). Andrews (1997) posits that metalinguistic awareness should not be limited to teachers' declarative knowledge; it should also encompass procedural aspects of metalinguistic knowledge, and to this end, the assessment of teachers' metalinguistic awareness that does not incorporate a procedural dimension may not yield reliable results". Similarly, McNeill (2005, p.101-102) defines metalinguistic awareness as "a composite of teachers' beliefs or reflections and their 'declarative' and 'procedural' knowledge of the target language."

Increasing language teachers' explicit knowledge about grammar through teacher education, as suggested above, does not automatically lead to more effective instruction. Teachers also need the pedagogical skills to use this knowledge to enhance learning. In line with the preceding discussion, this study has devoted a substantial component of a pedagogical, or procedural component to the instrument. Tasks 2 and 7, in particular, require the participating teachers to demonstrate their pedagogical skills as to how a particular linguistic feature could be

explained to their students. A good example of this can be found in the Grammar Task in item 3.

Below is the relevant task:

Are both of the following sentences correct grammatically?

- a. *My opinion is different from yours.*
- b. *My opinion is different than yours.*

How would you explain the difference to your students? Please provide your reasons.

A well-versed teacher who is skilled both declaratively and pedagogically could provide the following explanation: Since the word *different* is not a comparative adjective, it should normally *not* be followed by the preposition *than*. The preposition *than* is normally reserved for only comparative adjectives such as *taller*, *bigger*, *greater* which can then be followed by the preposition *than*. That said, however, in informal English, *different than* is used commonly, especially in North America, and from a sociolinguistic perspective it is regarded as an acceptable language structure. A teacher who is equipped with pedagogical or procedural skills should be able to provide a similar explanation to the one given above.

This particular task also contained elements that aimed to assess the participants' sensitivity to the difference between *transitive* and *intransitive* verbs as in the following example:

In the following two sentences, the word “walk” has different meanings. How would you explain this to your students? Please provide your reasons.

- a. *I walk every day.*
- b. *I walk the dog every day.*

A teacher who is not familiar with the distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs may limit his explanation to providing only the meaning of the two different meanings of

walk, and provide the following explanation:” In, *I walk every day*, the verb *walk* refers to an activity that an individual does for himself, whereas in *I walk the dog every day*, the verb *walk* refers to an activity that a person does for a dog, and not himself. Conversely, a metalinguistically more aware teacher would provide the preceding discussion and add that in *I walk every day* the verb *walk* is intransitive since it is not followed by a direct object, whereas in *I walk the dog every day* the verb *walk* is followed by the direct object *the dog*, which qualifies it as a transitive verb.

In the preceding example, the participants are expected to distinguish between transitive and intransitive verbs. To get a full mark for this item, the teacher is expected to mention the words *transitive* and *intransitive*, followed by a short explanation, pedagogically justifying the use of transitive versus intransitive verbs, ideally in another example. If the metalanguage items *transitive* and *intransitive* are implicated in the participant’s explanation, he will be given a full mark, 1, which corresponds to *very satisfactory*. If the teacher limits his explanation only to the simple explanation, “ In, *I walk every day*, the verb *walk* refers to an activity an individual does for himself, whereas in *I walk the dog every day*, the verb *walk* refers to an activity that a person does for a dog, and not himself”, then he will be awarded zero marks. This can be justified because even a person without any training in second language teaching would be able to provide the same explanation. This suggests that any fluent English speaker, be he native or non-native speaker, is expected to know the differences in meaning in the above two sentences. This implies that knowing the differences in meaning in the sentences would and should not automatically entitle a person to be metalinguistically aware.

As for the actual scoring of the subjects’ performance for all the tasks, the evaluation will be based on a 4-point scale ranging from *very satisfactory* to *very unsatisfactory* with the

exception of Task 6a, which will be further explained in the section titled, Task 6.

Guerriero and Deligiannidi (2017) suggest that assessing knowledge of teachers involves understanding how this knowledge functions in the teaching-learning process, and more specifically, how teachers make on-the-spot decisions as a reaction to students' spontaneous demands and questions. They point out that for teachers to be able to make informed pedagogical decisions, they need to have benefited from the experience of specific learning and teaching episodes, along with contextual and situational factors so that they can connect all this information to their specialist knowledge of the teaching-learning process, which will guide subsequent teaching actions.

The foregoing discussion suggests that in order to respond to challenging questions as in the above example of *different from* versus *different than*, teachers will need pedagogical competence as well as declarative knowledge of the subject matter, and unless the teacher possesses the combination of these two, the teacher will not be able to deliver the subject matter knowledge effectively. After all, efficient teaching should not be limited to possessing solely content knowledge but it should also incorporate skills that would enable the teacher to efficiently deliver what he knows. Hence, it can be argued that making sound instant pedagogical decisions hinges on the pedagogical as well as content knowledge held by the teacher.

3.3.6.3 Phonology.

1. The plural suffix of the word **cat** (cats) is pronounced /s/, whereas the plural suffix of the word **dog** (dogs) is pronounced /z/. Please state the reason(s).
2. Arabic speakers of English usually pronounce **p** as **b**. For instance, instead of saying **paid**, they say **baid**. Can you explain why?

3. In the word “**matter**” the stress falls on the first syllable. Can you explain the reason?
4. Why is the **t** in the word *omit* doubled (i.e., *omitted*) when it receives **-ed** whereas the **n** in the word *open* is not (i.e., *opened*)?
5. What is the phonological difference between the two following sound categories?
 - a. /p, f, t, k/
 - b. /b, v, d, g/
6. How many speech sounds are there in the word **mix**?
7. What is a **phoneme**?

In this task, the aim was to assess the teachers’ phonological awareness, which is defined as “one’s degree of sensitivity to the sound structure of oral language” (Anthony & Francis, 2005, p. 255), which also encompasses explicit awareness of the phonological structure of the words in one’s language. Oral language can be divided into smaller components, manipulated, and analyzed. Operations that subject oral language to division, manipulation, and analysis fall in the domain of *phonological awareness*, which is also regarded as a method that attempts to account for the segmentation of oral languages.

To assess teachers’ phonological awareness, the participants were asked a variety of questions, which are listed below.

“Why do adjectives starting with the letter *p*, *b*, or *m* usually receive the “-im” negative prefix? (for instance, impolite and immature)”, which aimed to assess the teachers’ awareness of bilabial sounds in English. Of course, this demands that the teacher be aware of phonological assimilation, according to which the final sound of a prefix becomes more like the first sound of a root, if the articulation of the two sounds is quite close (Okada, 2013). For instance, the *-in*

prefix assimilates to /im/ before bilabials /p/, /b/ and /m/. The same happens to /il/ before alveolar /l/, and to /ir/ before alveolar /r/, and these are reflected in the spellings im-, il- and ir- respectively. The following examples illustrate the above discussion:

/p/, /b/ /p/

in- + possible → impossible,

in- + polite → impolite

in- + balance → imbalance

in- + moral → immoral,

in- + mortal → immortal

in + logical → illogical

in + responsible → irresponsible

Apart from the phonological assimilation rule, Task 3 aimed to assess the teachers' awareness and knowledge of:

- a. Minimal pairs.
- b. Unstressed syllables and their pronunciation as in the example of *matter* /mætəʔ/.
- c. When to double the final consonant as in the example of *omit*.
- d. Voiced vs. voiceless consonants.
- e. Number of speech sounds (phonemes) in a word.
- f. What a phoneme refers to.
- g. The pronunciation of the plural suffix (is -s pronounced as [s] or [z]?)

One important aspect of the questions in the Phonology Task, as well as in other tasks, is that they made reference to the local EFL context. In other words, some of the statements in the

tasks were inspired by mistakes frequently generated by Arabic-speaking learners in the Saudi context.

In Task 3, for instance, the question required the participating teachers' awareness of the particular distinction between the two voiceless and voiced bilabial sounds /p/ and /b/, which was captured through the question:

Arabic speakers of English usually pronounce /p/ as [b]. For instance, instead of saying "paid", they say "baid". Can you explain why?

This question assesses an essential component of a teacher's phonological awareness, especially if he is teaching L1 learners in Arabic. In Arabic, the voiceless /p/ does not exist, and therefore learners resort to the nearest bilabial sound, /b/; they therefore tend to pronounce the word *past* /pæst/ as *bast* [bæst]. Some participants might say the phoneme /p/ does not exist in Arabic, and so the closest sound to /p/ is /b/, and that is why Arabic speakers tend to replace the /p/ sound with /b/. In the preceding example, participants would be required to provide an explanation that would involve metalanguage. For instance, they could say that of the two bilabial phonemes, /p/ and /b/, only the voiced bilabial, /b/, exists in Arabic whereas the bilabial voiceless stop, /p/, is not a sound that exists in the phonological system of Arabic.

SLA studies attest that L2 sounds are perceived through the sieve of L1, especially when certain L2 phonemes are not existent in learners' L1. Their phonological system, in such cases, functions like a sieve that subjects the L2 phoneme to adapting and assimilating to the nearest L1 phoneme (Pallier, Colomé, & Sebastián-Gallés, 2001). In the preceding example, the mention of the words such as *bilabial*, *voiceless*, *voiced* are metalanguage and are expected to be produced by the participants. In this respect, saying that in Arabic, /p/ does not exist, cannot be considered

correct as it involves no metalanguage and therefore the teacher in question will be awarded zero marks.

3.3.6.4 Syntax. If you identify any error(s) in any of the following sentences, first write the correct version of the sentence. Then, explain why the error might have been committed and how it can be corrected.

1. Why you didn't visit him?
2. Do you know where does he live?
3. Do not you like coffee?
4. Never I have seen such a beautiful baby.
5. Do you like me really?
6. I always am ready.

The items in syntax aimed to assess the participants' sensitivity to syntactic errors, similar to those in the Error Correction task. It involved grammaticality judgments, which included the identification of incorrectly structured embedded questions as in the examples "do you know where does he live?" and "why you didn't visit him?". In addition, incorrectly positioned adverbs as in the example "do you like me really?" and incorrectly inverted word order starting with a negative adverb such as *never* as in the example of "never I have seen such a beautiful baby" were also part of this task.

Syntactic awareness refers to the capacity to understand the grammatical structures of language in sentences (Tunmer & Hoover, 1992) as well as the ability to "reflect on the syntactic structure of language and regard it objectively and separately from the meaning conveyed by language" (Blackmore, Pratt & Dewsbury, 1995, p. 405). Bialystok (2001) posits that responses to tasks that require metalinguistic awareness reveal something about the explicitness with which

linguistic knowledge has been represented. She explains that tasks that aim to assess syntactic awareness, in particular, require high levels of analysis for their solution simply because the object of the study is the grammar of the language, which can be regarded as one of the skills that require relatively more cognitive effort on the part of the individual.

Regarding the assessment of the participants' metalinguistic awareness for syntax, the criteria demanded for the grammar items will be applicable for this task as well, and the justification for this would be that, as argued above, the grammar of the language would be the focus or the object of investigation. To solidify this argument, items 5 and 6 will be explicated below, the assessment of which will follow the categorization outlined in Table 4.

Item 5: *Do you like me really?*

As per the syntactic rules of the English language structure, the word *really*, an adverb, should normally be positioned between the subject and the verb. Hence, the word *really* should be placed between the subject, *you*, and the verb, *like*. The correct syntactic order, would then be, “*do you really like me?*” The only exception to this rule is the presence of the verb *to be* in the sentence, which takes us to Item 6:

Item 6: *I always am ready*

In sentences with the main verb *be*, the adverb is placed after the verb *to be*. So, the sentence should read “*I am always ready.*” To qualify for a full mark, the participant is required to use the metalanguage items *verb* and *adverb of frequency*, and explain the normal position of an adverb in a sentence. Explanation limited to saying that the sentence is correct in informal English would not fetch a participant any mark as the word order in the sentence, “*I always am ready*” has been changed for the purposes of emphasis. As this task was a straightforward and

unchallenging one, responses which are limited to the correct formulation of the sentence, (I am always ready) would not fetch a participant any mark.

3.3.6.5 Morphology.

1. **Immature, impossible, impolite** vs. **unable, inefficient, dislike, irrelevant**

Task: Explain when/why **im-** (versus **un-**, **in -**, **dis -**, etc.) should be used before certain adjectives.

2. How many **morphemes** are there in the following words?

- a. *Cats*

- b. *Decaffeinated*

- c. *Happy*

3. The word **able** changes its meaning when the negative prefixes are added to it. Please comment on the word (**able**) before any affixation process and explain how the negative prefixes contribute to the change in meaning.

- a. able

- b. **enable**

- c. **unable**

- d. **disable**

4. I'm very sorry to hear this news.

Task: Please comment on (-s) at the end of the word news.

5. Please comment on (-ly) in the following two words regarding their function.

- a. lovely

- b. slowly

Similar to Item 10 (*her average performance did not fulfil the expectations of the audience*) in the Error Correction task, the participants' morphological awareness was assessed.

More specifically, the participants' sensitivity to the affixes (prefixes and suffixes) in English was tested. A particular task on morphology, which also assessed the teachers' sensitivity to spelling mistakes through morphology was in Item 10, in Task 1. This demanded that participants pay attention to a common spelling mistake. There is a tendency among both native and non-native speakers of English to spell *fulfil* as *fullfil*. This stems from the fact that -ful in the first syllable is incorrectly converted to the free morpheme full, which is an independent lexical item that has a meaning. Below is Item 10 from the Error Correction task:

Her average performance did not fullfil the expectations of the audience.

For the participants to get a full mark for this item, they first need to identify that the word *fulfil* is incorrectly spelled, and ideally explain that the word *fulfil* consists of two syllables, the first one of which is not related to the free morpheme *full*. In terms of the assessment of the responses, the same assessment process will be followed here as in the previous tasks, as well as the criteria and standards set out in Table 4.

This section of the instrument, as does Item 1 in Task 6, attempts to assess the participants' awareness of the distinction between an adverb and an adjective by requiring the participants to distinguish the function of the -ly suffix in the words lovely and slowly.

Item 5 in Task 5 reads:

Please comment on (-ly) in the following two words regarding their function.

- a. lovely
- b. slowly

The -ly suffix normally qualifies a lexical item as an adverb when it is added to an adjective. However, this is not the case with the words *lovely* and *likely*, both of which function as adjectives. Below is Item 1 from Task 5.

It is likely to rain today.

Morphological awareness, similar to many other linguistic constructs, has a multiplicity of definitions which have no consensus in the literature (Apel, 2014). Morphological awareness, in its simplest sense, is defined as awareness of morphemes, which can be defined as morphological units of a language that carry meaning, but cannot be further divided. In a more specialized definition, morphological awareness refers to “conscious awareness of the morphemic structure of words and their ability to reflect on and manipulate that structure” (Carlisle, 1995, p. 194). “Morphological awareness represents the ability to consciously focus on words’ morphological structure, including the relations between base words (one-morpheme words) and their related inflected and derived forms” (Apel et al., 2012, p. 1285).

The study of morphemes involves an awareness of how rules that govern morphemes are manipulated, especially in terms of written orthographic structure of affixes (prefixes and suffixes) and how those affixes are attached to base words or roots (Apel, 2014). The study of the writing system of the English language is regarded as being morphophonemic since it represents information at both the phonological and morphological levels of language (Casalis, Deacon, & Pacton, 2011).

Research indicates that there is a direct relationship between morphological awareness and spelling as Casalis, Deacon, and Pacton posit that English-speaking children’s spelling is influenced by morphological structure. This is because morphophonemic written systems also represent the morphological structure of words and morphemes, which are the minimal units of meaning in language. These units often provide the learner more than one choice of plausible spellings for a single word.

3.3.6.6 Identification of parts of speech. What part of speech does each word in bold represent in the following sentences (e.g., noun)?

1. It is **likely** to rain today.
2. The car is **his**.
3. I **hardly** speak any French.
4. The student studied **hard**.
5. **Never** has he been there.
6. You **had better** do your homework now.
7. The bus stop is **there**.
8. **They** have not seen **us**.
9. We went there **yesterday**.
10. **Jogging** right after a meal is not recommended.
11. What is the difference between a **phrase** and a **clause**?

This is the section of the instrument where teachers were directly exposed to metalanguage. The teachers were provided with a sentence where a lexical item is written in bold text. They were asked to identify what part of speech that particular word belonged to. Particular attention was paid to making this part as challenging as possible. One example was the word *likely*. Owing to the suffix *-ly*, some teachers might tend to take it for granted that the presence of the *-ly* suffix is an indication of an adverb. However, in the sentence, “It is *likely* to rain today”, the word *likely*, just as is the case with the example of *lovely* discussed above, is an adjective, and not an adverb. Another example was in the sentence “The student studied hard.” In this sentence, the word *hard*, which can also function as an adjective depending on the context, does not function as an adjective, but rather as an adverb. It is common to hear students

say, “I studied *hardly*”, which might suggest that instruction has not emphasized the difference between an adjective and an adverb, especially with regard to the *-ly* suffix.

A very obvious shortcoming of meaning-oriented methodologies such as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Task-Based Teaching is that structure is usually relegated to a status which does not merit much attention; activities and games dominate classrooms. For instance, Renou (2001) indicates that CLT rejects the traditional, decontextualized, explicit teaching of L2 grammar and replaces it with language tasks which prioritize meaning in the name of fostering communicative competence, which is believed to promote and support learning most effectively.

Other tasks included identification of a *time adverb* (yesterday), the difference between a *subject* and an *object pronoun*, identification of a *modal verb* (had better), a *gerund* functioning as the subject of a sentence, *there* as an adverb of place, and so forth. The final item in this part of the instrument (Item 11) required the participants to distinguish between a *phrase* and a *clause*. Assessment of 6b followed the same procedure as in all other items displayed in Table 4.

As for the scoring of items one to ten, the participants were required to attach the correct label (part of speech) or metalanguage to the underlined word. In other words, if the participant, for Item 1, could label the word *likely* in the sentence *it is likely to rain today* as an adjective, he would get a full mark (1); otherwise he would get zero. To this end, this part of the instrument, as well as the other parts, involves quantification; in other words, instances of correct or acceptable responses would be counted and be awarded a mark. If a participant’s response was not deemed to be completely satisfactory, he might be given a half a mark for his answer. The following is an example when a participant could be awarded half a mark:

They haven't seen us.

In this example, if a participant labeled both of the underlined words as *pronouns*, then he would be given only half a mark because there is a difference between the two pronouns. The first one, *they*, is in the subject position, and is therefore a subject pronoun, whereas the second one, *us*, is in the object position following the verb *haven't seen*; is therefore an object pronoun. There are, in fact, other pronouns such as possessive and reflexive pronouns. So, the participants were required to specify which kind of pronoun the two pronouns precisely referred to. To this end, identifying both words as pronouns would not qualify the answer as being completely correct. Thus, half a mark (0.5) would be awarded to the participant.

The following table illustrates the marking scheme for this particular task.

Table 5

Assessment of Parts of Speech

Assessment	Satisfactory	Reasonably satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Mark	1	0.5	0

A high score in this section might point to the presence of some metalinguistic awareness. However, pedagogical or procedural explanations complement the score obtained in the identification of parts of speech. There were 10 tasks in this section where the participants were required to identify the relevant part of speech. Following the task of identification of parts of speech, the last item required the participants to explain the difference between a *phrase* and a *clause*, and with this item, this section bore a full score of 11. However, as indicated below, data obtained will not be subjected to statistical analysis in this study.

3.3.6.7 Procedural grammar.

1.

- a. I am **swimming**.

b. **Swimming** is good for you.

How do the two words (**swimming**) in **a** and **b** vary in terms of their grammatical function?

2. **What made the landing difficult** was severe weather conditions.

Please comment on the grammatical function of “**What made the landing difficult**” in the sentence.

3. A student in your class is having trouble with (**'s: apostrophe s**). He thinks that (**'s**) in the following sentence represents **has**. (The sentence is not meaningful.)

Ali's a car.

How would you help this student? Explain to the student when **'s** can represent **has, is**, and when it can refer to a **possessive** form.

4. I wish I **had** a car.

Your students think that the verb **had** in the sentence refers to some action completed in the past. How would you tackle this problem? Provide a thorough explanation for the students.

5. I cannot accept **what you have done**.

Please comment on the grammatical function of “**what you have done**” in the sentence.

The last part of the instrument, Task 7, was essentially a grammar task again; this time, however, the aim was to assess teachers' awareness of pedagogical grammar, which in essence went beyond the identification of speech parts. The task attempted to elicit whether teachers were able to provide pedagogically sound explanations in grammar to facilitate students'

comprehension. For instance, the apostrophe followed by –s in English is challenging not only for students, but for teachers as well. Here is what 's might stand for:

- a. He's here. 's → is
- b. He's been here for an hour. 's → has
- c. John's car is red. 's → possession

If we take the last example, we can have two apostrophes followed by –s.

John's car's red.

A beginner level student is faced with the challenge of distinguishing between the two apostrophes. The first one is possessive (belonging to John) and the second one represents the verb (is). As for the relevant question, teachers were required to respond to the following task:

A student in your class is having trouble with ('s: apostrophe s). He thinks that ('s) in the sentence "Ali's a car" represents has (The sentence is not meaningful!).

Although the sentence 'Ali's car' can be regarded plausible in children's literature, the tasks devised for this PhD study modelled discourse anticipated by the target audience.

For the answer to this challenging task, knowledge and awareness of metalinguistic items may not suffice. The teacher is charged with the task of explaining the subtle details that would facilitate comprehension. Although there is simply no single answer, the following could serve the purpose:

In the sentence, *Ali's a car*, -'s cannot stand for *has* simply because if ['s] stood for *has*, then it would have to be followed by the past participle. Students have been taught that the verb *have/has* can be used in three different forms in terms of tense. They say that Verb 1 (present/infinitive) is *have/has*, Verb 2 (past) is *had*, and Verb 3 corresponds to *past participle*

(again had). The teacher can say that unless *has/have* is followed by a past participle, it cannot represent *has*.

The teacher can write on the board:

- a. 's + V3 → 's = has
- b. 's + noun → 's = possessive case
- c. 's + predicate → 's = is

The last two options (b and c) are rather confusing to students. This time the teacher needs to explain the difference between the two:

- a. 's → 's = is
- b. 's → 's = possessive

The teacher can further elaborate through an example:

- a. John's here. 's → 's = is

The teacher can say: *John's* is not followed by a *noun*. So, (*'s*) here should refer to *is*.

- b. John's father's here.

In this example, *John's* is followed by a *noun* (father), which means that 's represents the possessive case.

The above explanation by the teacher can vary depending on the unplanned and spontaneous questions posed by students. Such explanations on grammar should also be complemented by the teacher's skillful use of modifications in intonation; posing very short and instant questions that would serve as comprehension check questions; establishing eye-contact with students at all times and building rapport with them; using the board appropriately; and making sure that follow-up activities are provided for consolidation.

In Task 7, the participants were asked to identify the noun clause in sentences:

- a. **What you have done** is unacceptable.
- b. I cannot accept **what you have done**.

The noun clauses in both sentences were written in bold text so that the participants could recognize that the whole clause represents a structure, which has a particular label that qualifies it as metalanguage. In other words, in the first sentence *what you have done* is a clause which functions as the subject of the sentence, whereas in the second sentence *what you have done* is a clause that functions as the object of the sentence.

In Task 7, assessment of metalinguistic awareness will follow the same procedure as in Task 2. The assessment of this section will be subjective as is the case with the other parts of the instrument. For instance, in Question 1 the participants are required to identify the different functions of the word *swimming* in the following sentences:

- a. *I am swimming.*
- b. *Swimming is good for you.*

For the first sentence, if the participants could explain that the word *swimming* is a present participle and that it served as the main verb of the sentence, he would be given a full mark. In the second sentence, the participant would also be able to get a full mark if he could state that *swimming* is a gerund and functions as the subject of the sentence. Different explanations could well serve the purpose, and to this end flexibility in marking would be exercised. That said, as indicated above, metalanguage items such as *subject*, *main verb*, and *present participle* had to be used by the participants.

Overall, the researcher's expectation was that all the tasks would generate responses from teachers that would presumably require them to employ metalanguage in their explanation; it

was expected that more metalanguage would be elicited especially in tasks that were relevant to grammar since grammar, a major component of English language teaching, was dealt with by teachers almost on a daily basis. Consequently, based on the answers to the open-ended and close-ended questions in the instrument, as well as on the data provided in tables, the study will be able to answer the research questions in Chapter 1, which will subsequently enable the researcher of this particular study to make recommendations for teacher training, especially as far as metalinguistic and register awareness are concerned.

The greatest challenge in this study was to assess what constitutes metalanguage. Alderson, Clapham and Steel (1997) emphasize that metalanguage must include parts of speech. In this respect, words such as *adjective*, *adverb*, and *pronoun* are considered metalanguage. Phrases such as *transitive verb*, *intransitive verb*, *countable noun*, and *uncountable noun* are also considered items of metalanguage. Other words that can qualify as metalanguage are *prefix*, *suffix*, *subject*, *object*, *singular* and *plural*.

It is important to emphasize that this study will not adopt Berry's (2014) definition of metalanguage. Berry distinguishes between *metalanguage* and *terminology*; he argues that it is actually *terminology* that best represents technical language items or, more specifically, technical lexis. For Berry, a sentence such as "I don't like the way he said that" may well serve as metalanguage as it comments on the language that has been produced. That said, however, the sentence does not quite explain why the person did not like that particular sentence. Did he not like it because there was a problem with its grammar, incorrect use of affixes, pronunciation, intonation, or voice pitch which might have expressed anger, frustration, and criticism? All these questions have no answers as per Berry's definition. Berry posits that the term that properly expresses technical lexis is rather *terminology* and not *metalanguage*. Based on his

argument, Berry (2014) might classify the term *yesterday* as metalanguage rather than an *adverb of time*. This stands in sharp contrast to the definition provided by Alderson, Clapham and Steel (1997) who point out that it is parts of speech that represent metalanguage. This study has adopted Alderson, Clapham and Steel's conception of metalanguage. To this end, only parts of speech and relevant technical lexis or lexical phrases qualify a language item as metalanguage. Yet, the classification and categorization of metalanguage items may require some flexibility; some lexical items used by participants may imply metalanguage and therefore require ad hoc decisions about the identification and categorization of metalanguage items based on the nature of the task.

This study, to reiterate, did not utilize a quantitative research design. The research analysis to follow in Chapter 4, specifically focuses on whether metalanguage items (irrespective of how many) were coherently used, whether they made sense, and whether they were relevant to the correction of the rule in question. In other words, particular attention is paid to whether the teacher was able to explain the rule that precisely captured the error. As such, the teacher was required to identify the mistake, explain how and why the mistake was made, and provide suggestions as to how the mistake would be corrected. What is of particular interest in this process, is whether the teacher was able to consider the contextual factors and clues that led the error to occur in the context of a particular question.

The assumption in this study is that NNES teachers are likely to address accuracy more adequately than NES teachers, owing to their elevated metalinguistic awareness in English.

3.4 Summary

The preceding discussion on the research design adopted for this study provided an overview of how the participating teachers' metalinguistic awareness would be assessed. The

discussion, in particular, attempted to provide a justification for why a qualitatively-oriented research design was utilized. In addition, the tasks were described in terms of their nature and what the participants were expected to do with them. Scoring, the most important component of the assessment of teachers' metalinguistic awareness was elaborated on, which was complemented by tables that described and justified why such a scoring process was implemented.

The discussion particularly emphasized that the research design adopted a subjective process for evaluation since most of the data were obtained through open-ended tasks, resulting in the collection of substantially qualitatively rich data. The data, in such analyses, are always subject to varying judgments and interpretations as opposed to evaluations made in quantitative studies, where participants normally choose an answer among a range of limited options as in Likert-scale statements.

In this section, a detailed description of linguistic profiles of the participants was also provided. How many years of teaching experience the participant had and whether he was linguistically literate was also included in this section. In addition, as a distinct variable, the participants' formal qualifications and, more specifically, their teaching credentials were integrated into the study. Whether a participant had received specialized training relevant to second language teaching was explored with a view to attaining a more valid, more reliable, and most importantly, a more robust profile of the participants' metalinguistic and register awareness.

The next section, Chapter 4, presents a detailed analysis of the findings and an in depth-discussion of whether the participants' metalinguistic awareness is associated with the variables discussed in Chapter 3. In particular, whether a participant's proficiency in a language other

than English contributes to his metalinguistic and register awareness is explored. More specifically, the discussions to follow in Chapter 4 relate to how the findings obtained in this study respond to the research questions set out in Chapter 1.

Chapter 4

Findings

4.1 Overview

The current study aimed to investigate whether and to what extent there was a causal relationship between oral proficiency in non-English languages and linguistic literacy in English. In other words, the question whether linguistic literacy in English was a by-product of having oral proficiency in a non-English language needed to be investigated.

In line with the research questions in Chapter 1 and the aims cited above, this chapter aims to address the following overarching questions.

1. Whether and to what extent does NES teachers' oral proficiency in English and subsequent languages contribute to their linguistic literacy for English?
2. Whether and to what extent does NNES teachers' oral proficiency in a non-English language contribute to their linguistic literacy for English?

The SLA research, to day, has provided conflicting results on the relationship between teaching experience and metalinguistic awareness. Fielding-Barnsley and Purdie's research (2005) found no relationship between knowledge of metalinguistics and years of teaching experience as far as teachers' metalinguistic awareness is concerned. The authors attribute this to teacher training programs that prioritized a whole language approach to language learning and teaching as opposed to teacher training programs before the 1970s that adopted a more code or structure-based approach. The authors posit that older teachers tend to adopt a skills-based approach to teaching while the teachers who received training in the last few decades (especially after the 1980s) favor communicative approaches to language.

As for research conducted with students about the relationship between metalinguistic awareness and years of exposure to language (experience), conflicting findings were also observed. While one study (Roehr & Gánem-Gutiérrez, 2009) found a very strong link between cumulative years of study of other L2s and metalinguistic knowledge, another indicated that there was no relationship between years of foreign language experience (years spent studying foreign languages) and the acquisition of the explicit knowledge of a plural rule (Martin & Ellis, 2012). In a similar vein, Njika (2015) reports that regardless of the years of teaching experience, many teachers lack language awareness. Based on the foregoing discussion, this study has also attempted to investigate the link between years of teaching experience and metalinguistic awareness.

Findings obtained from the participants' responses are displayed in Chapter 4, in the tables as well as in the appendices. These tables show how the respondents reacted to the error correction and rule explanation tasks. It was predicted that responses to these tasks would enable the researcher to assess the participating teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness.

4.2 The Structure of Chapter 4

This chapter displays participant scores in tables and it briefly explains the rationale behind each table design. In addition, a discussion is included on how the respective tables contribute to the analysis and interpretation of participant scores. It needs to be emphasized that since a considerable number of tables represent the findings, the detailed and comprehensive tables can be referred to in the Appendices Section (pages 321-489), whereas those tables that portray a summary of the findings can be found in Chapter 4. These summarized versions of the tables provide essential data that a reader needs to review in a concise but broader manner. Furthermore, the instrument can be found in both Chapters 3 and 4. In this way, the reader can

comfortably refer to any specific item in the instrument without having to flip between the two chapters.

4.3 Tables

The data collected are represented in three major tables that appear in Appendices A, B, and C in the Appendices Section at the end of the thesis. The tables in Appendix A (page 321) present a detailed display of the participants' responses and the scores assigned to their responses. The tables in Appendix B (page 477) summarize the tables in Appendix A; they display the scores of each participant on a particular task for all the task categories. For instance, a participant's scores on all 20 tasks in *Error Correction* are displayed; the same applies to all the other task categories; *Grammar*, *Phonology*, *Syntax*, *Morphology*, *Parts of Speech*, and *Procedural Grammar*. The tables in Appendix B also display the total and average scores on all the task categories. In addition, the tables in Appendix C (pages 484-489) display the scores of all the participant categories. They contain data on the participants' performance averages in individual tasks and their performance averages in all the participant categories. Such a distinction aims to view the scores on individual participant categories from a broader perspective.

As indicated above, the tables in Appendix C (Table C1 through Table C5) are organized according to participant categories. The first table in Appendix C represents *all 23 participants'* performance across all the tasks, whereas the second table displays *Truly Bilingual Teachers'* performance only. The third table displays the data of the participants who are *Not Truly Bilingual*, the fourth of the *Native English-speaking participants*, and the fifth displays findings regarding *Non-Native English-speaking Teachers'* performance across the tasks.

As pointed out above, the tables displayed in this chapter represent a summary of all the tables in Appendices A, B, and C; the scores of individual teachers are not reflected. Instead, averages for individual teacher categories are displayed. The first five categories reflect average scores for each participant category; *All the Participants*, *Truly Bilingual Participants*, *Not Truly Participants*, *Native English-speaking* and *Non-Native English-speaking* participants. These five tables rank the participants based on their average scores depending on which task categories they were most successful in. The sixth table provides a summary of all the tables; it displays the average scores for all the participant categories based on their performance in each task category; *Error Correction*, *Grammar*, *Phonology*, *Syntax*, *Morphology*, *Parts of Speech*, and *Procedural Grammar*, respectively. The seventh and the final table provides a very basic summary; it solely displays the averages of the participant categories. Consequently, it enables the researcher to draw broader conclusions regarding the complete dataset obtained.

To sum up, the tables that provide more comprehensive data regarding the findings are in the Appendices Section, whereas the tables displayed below provide a summary of the tables in Appendices A, B, and C.

The seven tables along with their respective discussions, follow.

4.4 Analysis of Responses

As can be seen in Table C1, the average score for *All the Participants* across all the tasks is 49%. Table C1 ranks all the participants based on their performance across all the task categories. It indicates that the highest average score for *All the Participants* was obtained in the task *Parts of Speech* (66%), whereas the lowest average score was obtained in the *Phonology* task (33%). The findings reveal that the participants were most successful in *Parts of Speech*,

followed by *Syntax*, and *Procedural Grammar*, *Error Correction*, *Morphology*, and *Grammar*, respectively.

Based on the discussion above, Table 6 summarizes the scores in Table C1 by sequencing tasks based on participant performance across the tasks. Table 6 and a brief discussion of what the findings in the table represent, follow.

Table 6

The Average Scores of All the Participants Based on Task Categories

RANK	TASK	AVERAGES (%)
1	Parts of Speech	66
2	Procedural Grammar	51
3	Syntax	49
4	Error Correction	47
5	Morphology	44
6	Grammar	38
7	Phonology	33
	Average for all Tasks	49

A comparative analysis of Tables 6, 7 and 10 reveals that the average score for *All the Participants* was below the average of *Truly Bilingual Participants* and *Non-Native English-speaking Participants*, which implies that the teachers in the participant category, *All the Participants*, obtained a higher average than did *Native English-Speaking* and *Not Truly Bilingual Participants*. As for their performance in the individual task categories, *All the Participants* performed best in *Parts of Speech* and poorest in *Phonology*; a persistent pattern in all the other participant categories. Whereas their averages for *Syntax*, *Error Correction*, and *Morphology* (49%, 47%, and 44% respectively) constituted the middle range, their scores for the two grammar tasks, *Procedural Grammar* and *Grammar* displayed stark differences. The average for *All the Participants* was 51% in *Procedural Grammar*, whereas it stood at only 38%

for *Grammar*, which tends to point to some deficiency in terms of the subject matter knowledge of the English language. While the averages for both categories cannot be deemed to be particularly high, that the participants' low scores in grammar and phonology suggest that their academic background at the undergraduate and graduate level may not have involved substantial training of the formal properties of language. As for the participants' better performance in procedural grammar (51%) compared to their performance in the grammar category (38%), their relatively better performance in procedural grammar needs to be complemented by a robust knowledge of grammar and other formal aspects of language. This in turn would produce more efficient teaching on the part of the teachers. The participants' better performance in procedural grammar portrays a positive picture, which reveals that they display a relatively satisfactory performance delivering the subject matter. This is in line with Andrews's (1997) assertion, according to which teachers performance can be enhanced only if the following two skills complement each other; the way teachers deliver the subject matter (pedagogical knowledge) and their knowledge of explicit (declarative) knowledge.

Table C2 in Appendix C solely displays the scores of *Truly Bilingual Participants* and their averages across the tasks. Table C2 also includes the averages obtained by each participant. Similar to Table C1, Table C2 also details the score of each teacher for a particular task category as well as the percentage to which that score corresponds; however, it does this across all the tasks for *Truly Bilingual Participants* only. Furthermore, it displays the total averages of all the tasks for each teacher, along with the scores and corresponding averages obtained by all the other *Truly Bilingual Teachers*. Table C2 reveals that there were 17 truly bilingual teachers of whom only four teachers were native speakers of English. The remaining 13 teachers were non-native English-speaking teachers.

As shown in Table C2 in Appendix C and in Table 7 below, the average score for the *Truly Bilingual Participants* was not only above the total average for all the participating teachers, but also above all individual task categories. For instance, the total average score for *All the Participating Teachers* was 49%, whereas the total average score for *Truly Bilingual Participants* was 54%. As for an example of an individual task category, the average score for *All the Teachers* for *Parts of Speech* was 66%, whereas the average score for the *Truly Bilingual Participants* for the same category was 72%. This superiority of the *Truly Bilingual Participants* dominates all the other tasks. Table 7 follows.

Table 7

The Average Scores of the Truly Bilingual Participants Based on Task Categories

RANK	TASK	AVERAGES (%)
1	Parts of Speech	72
2	Procedural Grammar	57
3	Syntax	54
4	Morphology	51
5	Error Correction	50
6	Grammar	43
7	Phonology	41
	Average for all Tasks	54

Table 7 sequences the participant score averages based on rank, depending on which task categories they were most successful in. In other words, it displays the averages solely based on all the participants' performance across all the task categories. Table 7 shows that *Truly Bilingual Participants* scored highest in the task *Parts of Speech* and lowest in *Phonology*, which seems to suggest that *Truly Bilingual Participants* followed the same pattern as all the other

remaining teacher categories; teachers performed best in *Parts of Speech* and poorest in *Phonology*.

Table C3 in Appendix C, and Table 8 below, which summarizes Table C3, display the averages obtained by the participants who are *Not Truly Bilingual* (NTBL). Table C3 displays a detailed picture of the findings for NTBL participants. It lists the score of each NTBL teacher on a particular task and it shows to what percentage that score corresponds across all the tasks for all the NTBL teachers. Furthermore, it displays the total averages of all the tasks for each NTBL teacher, along with the scores and corresponding averages obtained by all the NTBL teachers.

Table 8 ranks all the NTBL participants based on their performance across all the task categories. It summarizes Table C3 in that it ranks the tasks according to the teachers' success rate, which is displayed under *Averages* next to the column titled *Task*.

Table 8

The Average Scores of Not Truly Bilingual Participants Based on Task Categories

RANK	TASK	AVERAGES (%)
1	Parts of Speech	48
2	Error Correction	36
3	Procedural Grammar	34
4	Syntax	33
5	Grammar	25
6	Morphology	25
7	Phonology	10
	Average for all Tasks	33

Tables C3 and 8 suggest that the average scores obtained by the *Participants* who are *Not Truly Bilingual* (NTBL) are lower than those of the previous groups examined (*All the Participants* and the *Participants who are Truly Bilingual*). The tables below, which show the

scores and performance averages for *Native* and *Non-Native English-Speaking Participants*, point to similar results and to a similar pattern; the scores obtained by *NTBL* participants are also lower than those obtained by *Native* and *Non-Native English-Speaking Participants*.

Table C4 in Appendix C, which is summarized as Table 9 below, display all the data obtained from NES participants across the tasks. Table C4 provides a detailed picture of the findings for NES teachers; it lists each teacher's score on a particular task and it shows to what percentage that score corresponds across all the tasks for NES teachers only. Table C4 and Table 9 suggest that the averages obtained by *NES Participants* are lower than those of all the other teacher categories, excluding the participants who are *NTBL*.

Table 9

The Average Scores of Native-English Speaking Participants Based on Task Categories

RANK	TASK	AVERAGES (%)
1	Parts of Speech	61
2	Syntax	48
3	Error Correction	46
4	Procedural Grammar	40
5	Morphology	36
6	Grammar	28
7	Phonology	26
	Average for all Tasks	44

Table 9 sequences all the *NES* participants based on their performance across all the task categories. It summarizes Table C4 in that it ranks the tasks according to the teachers' performance, which is displayed under *Averages* next to the column titled *Task*.

Table C5 in Appendix C, summarized in Table 10 below, displays the averages obtained by *NNES* teachers for the task categories. Table C5 takes a detailed look at the performance and

scores obtained by *NNES* teachers; it lists each teacher's score on a particular task and it shows the percentage to which each teacher's score corresponds across all the tasks for *NNES* teachers only.

Table 10

The Scores of Non-Native English-Speaking Participants and Their Averages Across the Tasks

RANK	TASK	AVERAGES (%)
1	Parts of Speech	70
2	Procedural Grammar	59
3	Morphology	50
4	Syntax	50
5	Grammar	45
6	Error Correction	47
7	Phonology	38
Average for all Tasks		52

Based on the findings displayed in Table C5 and in Table 10, *NNES* teachers outperformed all the other categories (*All the Participants*, *NES Participants*, and *NTBL Participants*), excluding the *TBL Participants*. That said, however, the average score obtained by *NNES* participants (52%) was not substantially different from that of *TBL* (54%). The findings suggest that *NNES Participants* performed as successfully as the *TBL Participants* across all the tasks. The reason for the close proximity in score is that the majority of the *TBL* participant cohort consisted of *NNES* teachers. What this suggests is that variable factors not possessed by *NNES* teachers had a negligible effect on the average score in the *TBL* category. The small percentage difference between the *TBL* (54%) and *NNES* (52%) categories, in

addition, reveals that some NES participants (Suzanne, 75%; Vivi, 74%) performed better than the participants in the NNES category did.

The performance of individual teacher categories was discussed and displayed in the tables above in some detail. To some extent, Table 11 performs the same function. This time, however, the average shown for individual teacher categories, is based on their rank depending on which task categories they were more successful in. Teachers' performance in task categories differed; for instance, while *Procedural Grammar* was the second most successful task for the TBL teachers, *Procedural Grammar* was the third most successful task for the NTBL participants.

Table 11

Summary of the Participant Categories in Terms of the Total Averages for all the Tasks

TASK + AVERAGE (%)									
All Participants		Truly Bilingual		Not Truly Bilingual		Native		Non-Native	
Parts of Speech	66	Parts of Speech	72	Parts of Speech	48	Parts of Speech	61	Parts of Speech	70
Procedural Grammar	51	Procedural Grammar	57	Error Correction	36	Syntax	48	Procedural Grammar	59
Syntax	49	Syntax	54	Procedural Grammar	34	Error Correction	46	Morphology	50
Error Correction	47	Morphology	51	Syntax	33	Procedural Grammar	40	Syntax	50
Morphology	44	Error Correction	50	Grammar	25	Morphology	36	Grammar	45
Grammar	38	Grammar	43	Morphology	25	Grammar	28	Error Correction	47
Phonology	33	Phonology	41	Phonology	10	Phonology	26	Phonology	38
Average for all Tasks	49	Average for all Tasks	54	Average for all Tasks	33	Average for all Tasks	44	Average for all Tasks	52

Table 11 above provides the averages for all the participant categories and the averages for individual task categories. In this respect, Table 11 aims to portray a very broad picture of the participants' performances in relation to the participant category that they belong to as well as their overall performance in all the task categories.

Table 12 provides a summary of Table 11 in that it displays only the *averages* for all the teacher categories; however, it does not list individual participant scores or averages for individual task categories. In other words, it provides a summary of the participants' performance without any reference to individual task scores.

Table 12

The Summary of Average Scores for all the Tasks and all the Teacher Categories

AVERAGES FOR TEACHER CATEGORIES (%)				
All Participants	Truly Bilingual	Not Truly Bilingual	Native Speakers	Non-Native Speakers
49	54	33	44	52

The performances of the participating teachers' have been portrayed in Tables 11 and 12; while Table 11 details individual skill categories for all participant categories, Table 12 provides concise information displaying solely total averages for the five participant categories.

The following sections analyze and discuss the details of teachers' performance based on their responses to individual tasks, namely *Error Correction*, *Grammar*, *Phonology*, *Syntax*, *Morphology*, *Parts of Speech*, and *Procedural Grammar*. The first section discusses *Error Correction*. The data obtained are displayed in the tables in Appendix A, where all the teachers' responses to individual tasks are tabulated. The following section presents a description of the items in each task, which is followed by a relatively detailed analysis and discussion of participants' responses.

To do such an analysis, some correct responses to individual tasks are provided. These serve as model answers to the tasks. As the responses provided by some participants were exemplary, their explanation of the problem is cited, which serves as a model response to the problematic sentence.

A pair of tables follow the responses provided by the teachers. The first table displays the averages for *TBL* and *NTBL* teachers, which provide a view of how those two teacher categories compare. The second table compares *TBL Teachers* and *NTBL Teachers* in terms of the number of zeros they were awarded. In other words, the zero percentage of each teacher category (*TBL* and *NTBL*) is shown in a table following the teachers' responses to the respective tasks.

Chapter 3 detailed the definition of a full mark (1) and a zero (0). If a teacher were able to identify the error, use metalanguage adequately, and justify his response by providing a pedagogically sound explanation, he would be awarded a full mark. Whereas a zero was spared for a teacher who was not able to identify the error, use metalanguage appropriately, and who provided little/unsatisfactory or no explanation. Those teachers who were able to identify the error, use some metalanguage, and justify their response with some explanation, would be awarded 0.75. Teachers who were able to identify the error but who did not use metalanguage appropriately and provided little/unsatisfactory or no explanation, were awarded 0.25. As explained in Chapter 3, some deviations from this grading scheme have taken place based on the nature of the task. In certain tasks, no marks were assigned to the participants even if they had formulated the correct answer. This was the case for the tasks which elicited simple responses to the extent that any fluent speaker of English would be able to provide an answer.

The following section encompasses the 20 items that constitute the first part of the instrument, *Error Correction* task, followed by a discussion of the participants' responses to these items. The discussion explores the critical tasks sequentially from *Error Correction* to *Procedural Grammar*. It then discusses the implications of the overall findings and how these relate to the broader academic debate. A description of each item per task, as well as a discussion and analysis of participants' responses to each item, follows.

4.4.1 Task 1: Error correction. If you identify any error in any of the following sentences, first write the correct version of the sentence. Then, explain why the error might have been committed and how it can be corrected.

1. Do you have a pen? Yes, I have.
2. Thank you for invite us to your house.
3. Jane has less students than does Susan.
4. I would stay home rather then go out.
5. I did not see him yesterday, because I did not attend the meeting.
6. The western world has been facing a severe economical recession.
7. There's a lot of unemployed people in this city.
8. The three-year old boy played with his toy.
9. I will be there in two days time.
10. Her average performance did not fullfil the expectations of the audience.
11. He maybe in class right now.
12. Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthier.
13. The amount of students in my class is 23.
14. The data obtained from the study is to be published soon.

15. The man who's brother I met yesterday left town.
16. Who did found Apple Company?
17. The man whom got a promotion joined us only last month.
18. King Abdulaziz University hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency.
19. Me and Talal are good friends.
20. The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce.

4.4.1.1 Main verb vs. auxiliary verb. Item: "Do you have a pen? Yes, I have." As was the case with other tasks, some of the participants' responses function as model responses. It is important to emphasize that a multiplicity of responses could well serve as the correct/adequate response to the problematic sentence. Since the evaluation of qualitative data can be regarded as a rather subjective process, a variety of responses could account for the correct response. In addition, it needs to be emphasized that due to the subjective nature of evaluating teachers' responses, awarding marks to the participants proved to be challenging. It might be the case that different evaluators might award different marks to the teachers' performances, which is true for any other subjective evaluation process. However, this study attempts to minimize this subjectivity, by setting certain criteria to be met by the teachers in their responses. For instance, in the first item of the error correction task, a teacher must use the metalanguage items *auxiliary/helping verb* and *main verb* to be awarded a full mark for the question, *Do you have a pen?* and for the answer, *Yes, I have.* As set out in Chapter 3 in the section 3.3.5 titled *Tasks and data analysis* and earlier in this chapter during the discussion of mark allocation, the short answer to *do you have a pen?* is deemed to be very straightforward and unchallenging.

Consequently, any fluent English speaker, be he native or not, would easily provide the correct answer, *Yes, I do*. In this respect, those participants who provided the correct response were not awarded any marks, to reiterate, as per the discussion regarding the assessment scale in Chapter 3, in the section 3.3.5.

Some teachers correctly emphasized that the problem in this sentence was a lack of awareness regarding the importance of distinguishing between *have* as a *helping/auxiliary verb* and *have* as a *main verb*. These teachers displayed elevated metalinguistic awareness; they met the criteria set by the researcher by providing the metalanguage items *auxiliary/helping verb* and *main verb*, which qualified their responses as being correct.

Here are the relevant responses:

- | | |
|-------|---|
| Firaz | Yes, I do. The short answer to a question incorporates the auxiliary verb, not the main verb. |
| Mert | We use Subject + Auxiliary Verb combination to give short answers to questions. If, however, the main verb is intended to be used in response, then the answer must be in a full sentence, i.e., ‘Yes, I have got a pen.’ |
| Kamil | Do have a pen? Yes, I do. Students are usually confused between have as a helping verb and a main verb. |
| Wali | The error here is because some students are confused about have as being a helping verb and being a main verb. |

Some other teachers believed that the answer, *Yes, I have* was not wrong. What is more, they were unable to account for the error. Here is an example:

Suzanne Yes, I have is not terrible. Yes, I have one is better. The proper short answer to a do-question takes do as its verb. I do not know why. English do structures are just strange. I can only teach them by modelling the forms.

Suzanne inexplicitly explains that the sentence, in its full form, should be followed by the word *one*. This response indicates that Suzanne is aware that in the question, *Do you have a pen?* the word *have* is a *transitive verb*, which should be followed by an object, but she does not provide an explicit explanation that contains some metalanguage. Hence, she is awarded a minimal 0.25.

A similar explanation came from another participant called Light. “The error could be explained by telling the speaker that whenever you have a pronoun followed by have you need to state what it is that you have.” Here, Light is trying to imply that, similar to the explanation provided by Suzanne, the verb *have* is a transitive verb. Therefore, it needs to be followed by an *object*, evident in the question, *What it is that you have?* However, similar to Suzanne’s explanation, he does this inexplicitly.

Suzanne’s and Light’s responses suggest that these participants are trying to explain the error without necessarily citing any metalanguage. It is worthwhile mentioning that both Suzanne and Light are native speakers of English. Suzanne has a PhD in Linguistics and Light holds Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees in Creative Writing.

Some teachers limited their answers to a very brief explanation. They explained that the short answer to a question starting with a *do* requires an answer with the word *do*, for which they were awarded only 0.25. Only those participants who expressed the point that in short answers

an *auxiliary verb* should be used were awarded a full mark, which indicates those participants' metalinguistic awareness; they were able to distinguish between an *auxiliary verb* and a *main verb*.

To further elaborate on the mistake *Yes, I have* rather than *Yes, I do*, it has to be emphasized that the answer, *Yes, I have* can only serve as a response to a question in the *Present Perfect Tense*. For instance, a question such as *Have you seen my watch?* would require the short answers, *Yes, I have* or *No, I haven't*, in which case the word *have* would function as the auxiliary verb.

Two other teachers thought that the answer, *Yes, I have* to a *do-question* was correct. Another teacher used the metalanguage, *ellipsis*, which refers to a short response that replaces the full sentence; this response was awarded 0.75. Two native speakers expressed the fact that they knew how the correct response would be formulated but that they were unable to articulate the rule, as the following two answers suggest. Suzanne wrote, "The proper short answer to a do question takes do as its verb. 'I do not know why.'" Faris offered the following response, " 'Yes, I do.' That's the way we say it. 'Yes, I have' is not a complete answer."

Regarding these two native English-speaking teachers' lack of ability to make explicit statements, Verity (2003) posits that NES teachers need to bring their L1 competence to the surface and make this competence accessible to themselves. This implies that not all NES teachers are able to make their L1 knowledge explicit and as a consequence, they fail to offer explicit explanations about language, especially for the purposes of error correction. A very likely consequence is impoverished pedagogical delivery, which reminds us of Andrews's (1997) assertion that subject matter knowledge, an essential component of teachers' metalinguistic awareness, should be manifested in its delivery, which complements explicit knowledge. In this

scenario, it is the combination of explicit knowledge and pedagogical knowledge that makes teachers deliver effective instruction.

In terms of the success rate of teachers' responses to the error in Item 1, the findings indicate that the performance of TBL teachers (54.4%) was significantly better than that of the NTBL participants (33.3%), as well as the other teacher categories. Only approximately 12% of the TBL participants received zeros as opposed to NTBL participants whose average for zero stood at 50%.

4.4.1.2 Gerund following a preposition. Item: "Thank you for invite us to your house." In this part of the findings, the participants' responses to the statement, *Thank you for invite us to your house* are cited and followed by a discussion. As per the discussion of the assessment scale in Chapter 3 in the section 3.3.5, for this particular task, a participant was not assigned 0.25 for formulating the correct answer as it was deemed to be a very straightforward and unchallenging task. As is the case with Item 1, some of the participants' responses are quoted as a model response to Item 2.

To be awarded a full mark, the participants were required to cite the metalanguage *gerund*. For instance, a participant with the pseudonym, Osama, wrote the correct form of the sentence and added only one word, namely "Gerund", to account for his explanation: "Thank you for inviting us to your house. Gerund." This one-word explanation was regarded as self-explanatory and hence was awarded a full mark.

Some participants used the metalanguage *gerund* along with the word *for*; they were awarded a full mark in this case. Some other participants used the word *preposition* along with *gerund*, for which they were also awarded a full mark. As indicated above, the word *gerund* was the fundamental prerequisite for a full mark rather than the word *preposition* since some teachers

might interpret the word *inviting* as being a *verb*, which has indeed been the case in Item 2.

Below are some exemplary responses for which the respective teachers obtained a full mark.

- | | |
|-------|--|
| Kamil | Thank you for inviting us to your house. Prepositions are followed by nouns, pronouns, or gerunds. |
| Nur | Thank you for inviting us to your house. After a preposition (for) a gerund is used. |
| Firaz | Thank you for inviting us to your house. For is a preposition and takes a noun phrase as its object (usually) when it takes a verb phrase as its object, then the head verb must be in gerund (-ing) form. |

Firaz' response, especially the part where he says, "the head verb must be in gerund (-ing) form" reveals that he has a background in linguistics. The word *head*, in particular, is commonly used by linguists, especially in the domain of syntax. Indeed, Firaz has a background in theoretical linguistics.

An example of a case, where two participants missed being awarded a full mark was that of the participants with the pseudonyms, Hustin and Suzanne. They emphasized that the word *for* had to be followed by *a verb* with an *-ing*. Hustin explained, "Thank-you for inviting us to your house. 'For' requires verb with 'ing'." and Suzanne wrote, "Um a "for complement" requires the *-ing* form." However, they did not use the required metalanguage *gerund* nor did they use *preposition*; their explanations were therefore deducted 0.25.

It is interesting that some teachers believed that the *-ing* in the word *inviting* was part of what we English teachers call, the *Present Continuous Tense*, which is, however, a tense that shows the time of an action being carried out. The *Present Continuous*, as a tense, refers to an

action that is ongoing at the time of speaking. An example of this can be seen in the sentence, *John is writing a letter.*

The sentence above suggests that John is currently in the process of writing a letter, which is observed by the person present in that particular context. The suffix *-ing* in the word *writing* is, in fact, quite distinct from the suffix *-ing* in the word *inviting* since the latter is a *gerund*; it functions as a *noun* and it does not denote an action. The word *writing* above, however, refers to an action because it is preceded by the verb *to be* as is the case in *is writing*. In sum, the word *inviting* functions as a *noun* and not as a *verb*. Below are teachers' responses that exemplify this discussion.

- | | |
|--------|--|
| Indigo | Thank you for inviting us to your house. The answer should be in the present continuous tense. The person is still in the process of leaving and is thanking his host. |
| Al | Thank you for inviting us to your house (invite). Wrong verb used. Error may have been committed because the student hasn't understood the verb form of "to be" and explain present continuous. explain/teach different scenarios. |
| Faris | Inviting- as its (meaning it's) present continuous. |
| Smyrna | Thank you for inviting us to your house. Using present instead of present continuous for an activity. |

The above examples point to the teachers' misconception that the word *inviting* represents the *Present Continuous* tense. The so-called phenomenon *language fossilization*, a commonly used construct to refer to students' persistent production of deviant language forms

despite adequate instruction (Han, 2004), it seems, also extends to practicing English language teachers as is evident in the examples above. It is obvious that those teachers who have the misconception that *inviting* in the sentence, *thank you for inviting us to your house* refers to the *Present Continuous Tense*, have been conditioned to believe that the suffix *-ing* always refers to a tense rather than seeing it as a lexical item that functions as a noun. This suggests that they might have overgeneralized the rule that applies to the *Present Continuous Tense*.

Overgeneralization, as observed in second language learners, involves applying a grammar rule across all members of a grammatical class regardless of the exceptions (Ellis, 2000).

Apparently, fossilization is now observed as a phenomenon in teachers, where some teachers adopt one particular grammar rule and adapt it to similar structures across the board. As is the case in Item 1, TBL participants outperformed the participants who were NTBL in Item 2. The average score for TBL participants was 76.5 % as opposed to NTBL participants whose average score stood at 45.8%. The same superiority on the part of TBL participants also goes for the number of zeros awarded; as opposed to only 11.8% of TBL participants, 50% of the NTBL participants obtained a zero.

As far as the participants' metalinguistic awareness is concerned, TBL participants have, by far, outperformed NTBL participants in the first three items of the *Error Correction* task.

Teachers' responses to Item 3 and an analysis of their responses follow.

4.4.1.3 Uncountable comparative form. Item: "Jane has less students than does Susan."

Teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness encompasses their being aware of the academic versus non-academic and formal versus informal registers. It is usually the case that features of informal spoken English are carried over to academic texts without a language user being aware of it. In this respect, the thesis aims to explore to what extent the participating

teachers are aware of the distinction between the academic and spoken/informal registers of the English language. Sentence 3 was specifically designed to assess this particular distinction. In the informal register, the word *less* is usually used as a default comparative adjective to modify both countable and uncountable nouns in English, whereas in the academic register, it is normally used to modify uncountable nouns only.

As emphasized in Chapter 3 (see section 3.3.5), based on the nature of the task, some deviation in terms of mark allocation for some tasks might be expected. The fact that more than half of the participants obtained a zero in this task motivated the researcher to assign a minimal mark of 0.25 to those participants who provided the correct comparative structure, *fewer* rather than *less* as in *Jane has fewer students than . . .*

Below are some responses that start with a very experienced native speaker, Vivi, whose answer to Item 3 serves as a model response: “Jane has fewer students than does Susan. ‘Less’ is for nouns which are non-count such as milk, sugar, love, gasoline, etc. Fewer is for count nouns such as students.”

In addition to assessing the participants’ sensitivity to countable versus uncountable comparative structures, Item 3 also contains a structure that is indeed rare in spoken English. In the sentence, *Jane has less students than does Susan*, the second part of the sentence, *than does Susan*, reflects a grammatical structure that is referred to as *inversion*. In inverted sentence structure, the auxiliary verb *does* is inverted similar to any other auxiliary verb such as *did*, *do*, *have*, *has*, and so forth. This means that the auxiliary verb is positioned before the subject, which renders a relatively different and infrequent grammatical structure.

The inversion rule can be used to compare two subjects as in the example, *She speaks English better than does her brother*. Voice of America (VOA), which is a governmental

broadcasting institution in the United States of America, quotes (2018): “It sounds strange, but that’s because it’s not something we do in spoken English. Again, inversion is very formal, usually used in written form, and only appropriate in some types of writing.”

The participants’ responses to Item 3 confirmed that a good number of teachers were not aware of the inversion rule as the findings suggest that 12 out of 17 TBL, and four out of six NTBL participants, totaling 16 participants thought that there was an inversion problem in the original sentence.

The above discussion of the sentence, *Jane has less students than does Susan*, points to a phenomenon which is ubiquitous throughout the other relevant tasks that this study encompasses, which is the fact that the participants transfer the linguistic features of colloquial English into domains where language has to conform to rather academic norms. Below are five participants’ responses who did not seem to be aware of the inversion structure in English. Four of the five responses below came from NES participants.

Indigo	There is no requirement to include does here.
Light	I am not sure why they would have added does.
Bey	The noun should be placed before the auxiliary verb.
Hustin	No ‘do’ in this case because the sentence is affirmative (not negative or a question).
Smyrna	Wrong word for comparatives + redundant usage of do.

The inversion rule that places the auxiliary verb before the subject in comparative structures is usually encountered in high stakes exams such as TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), GMAT (Graduate Management Admission Test), and GRE (Graduate

Record Examination). As is evidenced by the participants' responses to Item 3, many native speakers may not even have acquired this particular structure. Arguably, this could be because they were not exposed to the structure in question since it is encountered in rather academic domains. Frequency studies in SLA confirm that the frequency of structures determines the success rate in language acquisition, which depends, at least to some extent, upon how frequently a learner is exposed to language (R. Ellis, 2002). Likewise, Schwartz and Causarano (2007) argue that high-frequency language constructions provide more exemplars compared to low-frequency constructions, facilitating SLA process, suggesting that the more frequently one is exposed to language input, the easier the acquisition process takes place.

Eighteen of 23 participants (both native and non-native) seemed to be unaware of the inversion rule. Based on their answers to Sentence 3, it was evident that of the 17 TBL teachers, 12 were not aware of the inversion rule, as opposed to 6 NTBL teachers who were also unfamiliar with this rule.

It needs to be highlighted that the focus of the study is not to provide a guideline in terms of linguistic content for courses which focus on English for special purposes, but rather to establish the degree to which teachers possess the metalinguistic ability to address student queries on structures which may or may not occur rarely.

Teachers' responses to Sentence 4 and a brief discussion of their responses follow.

4.4.1.4 Awareness of spelling: *then* vs. *than*. Item: "I would stay home rather then go out." Although the sentence, *I would rather stay home than go out* sounds more natural to the ears than *I would stay home rather than go out*, it cannot be classified as an incorrect utterance. The rather less commonly used word order of the sentence *I would stay home rather than go out* attracted a lot of attention; some participants were not able to spot the spelling mistake that the

letter *e* in the incorrectly spelled word *than* should have been replaced by the letter *a* to rectify the mistake; *then* → *than*. For example, Osama wrote, “I would rather stay at home then go out”.

This is the same subject preference statement in the base form. S + Would + rather.”

Model explanations, on the other hand, came from the following three participants:

Light I would stay home rather than go out. The speaker may have made the error because *then* and *than* look and sound similar. I would explain to the speaker that *than* is used for comparisons and contrasts. *Then* is used to order events and actions chronologically.

Suzanne *Then* is a temporal adverb, *than* a comparative . . . something.

Vivi I would stay home rather *than* go out. *Then* is for time. *Than* is for comparisons.

Suzanne’s use of the metalanguage *temporal adverb*, in particular, presents a rather different example of a linguistic profile. The metalanguage *temporal adverb* is a kind of jargon commonly used by linguists rather than practicing EFL/ESL teachers.

As for the allocation of marks, it was sufficient for the participants to state that *than* should have been used instead of *then* to be awarded a full mark. Faris’s limited explanation, “*Than*. *Then* is for something to follow” earned him only 0.25 since he did not use any metalanguage. In addition, his explanation, “*Then* is for something to follow”, can be considered problematic since the verb *follow* does not necessarily invoke a reference to time.

A comparison of the TBL and NTBL participants’ responses to Sentence 4 yielded a different picture of teachers’ metalinguistic awareness. The average score for the TBL participants was 70.6% as opposed to the 66.7% average obtained by the NTBL participants. Notwithstanding the fact that the TBL participants performed minimally better in Sentence 4,

they obtained more zeros than did their NTBL counterparts; the zero percentage was 29.4% for the TBL group as opposed to 16.6%, implying that TBL participants were awarded more zeros.

A higher percentage of zeros for a task points to more zeros obtained by the participants.

What follows below is the participants' responses to the error in Item 5.

4.4.1.5 Punctuation: redundancy when main clause begins a sentence. Item: "I did not see him yesterday, because I did not attend the meeting." Similar to Item 3, Item 5 also attempted to assess the participating teachers' sensitivity to the distinction between the written/spoken and academic/informal registers. Commas, semicolons, apostrophes, capital letters and other punctuation devices are obviously non-existent (not visual, and therefore not paid attention to) in the spoken and informal register. To this end, the task required teachers' attention to the subordinating conjunction *because*, and especially to whether the comma should be placed in a complex sentence that starts with the main clause.

The sentence, "I did not see him yesterday, because I did not attend the meeting," contains two clauses; a *main clause* (also called an *independent clause*) and a *subordinate clause* (also called a *dependent clause*). The rule in English dictates that when a sentence starts with a main clause as in the above sentence, there is no need to insert a comma before the subordinating conjunction *because* whereas if the sentence starts with a subordinate clause, then it is essential that a comma be inserted right before the main clause as in the following example: *Because I did not attend the meeting, I did not see him yesterday.*

The following TBL participant's answer sets a good example of a model response.

Vivi I did not see him yesterday because I did not attend the meeting. A comma is not used here because the subordinating conjunction ‘because’ occurs between 2 clauses. If because is initial, we need a comma.

Because S V, S V.

S V because S V. We don’t pause here when we read this one.

Fifteen out of 23 teachers scored a zero in this particular item; only three participants were able to get a full mark. Of the 15 teachers who got zeros, 10 were TBL and five were NTBL participants. In terms of percentages, almost 59% of the TBL teachers obtained zero as opposed to approximately 83% of the NTBL teachers. As for the general success rate for Item 5, the TBL teachers’ average was 23.5% as opposed to that of the NTBL teachers whose average stood at 4.2%. This particular task witnessed the lowest score average in the entire Error Correction task, which corresponded to a record low of 18%.

The sentence *I did not see him yesterday, because I did not attend the meeting*, entails a literacy-related error, which is by no means encountered in natural, spontaneous, and informal speech. Hence, such rules need to be taught through explicit instruction. Since literacy conventions do not necessarily constitute an essential component of English language teacher training programs, teachers are very likely to leave these courses with limited knowledge of literacy. This suggests that they are usually limited to the knowledge that they have gained in early school years and in secondary school education. Participants’ responses to Item 5 reflect this observation. The fact that the majority of the participants failed to notice an important feature of the academic register, punctuation, and more specifically a comma, merits attention and it has serious implications for teacher training.

A description and discussion of participants’ responses to Item 6 follow.

4.4.1.6 Economic vs. economical. Item: “The western world has been facing a severe economical recession.” In the sentence, *The western world has been facing a severe economical recession*, the participants were required to identify that the word *economical* was used incorrectly and to replace it with the word *economic*. They were also expected to explain that the words *economical* and *economic* were both *adjectives* with different meanings. Some participants did display an awareness; they were able to distinguish between the two lexical items while others simply formulated the correct word, *economic*. They were only awarded 0.25. The two teachers with a linguistics background provided explanations beyond what was expected for this incorrect sentence. Firaz explained, “Economic is a pre-modifying adjective that appears before a noun. Economical is a predicate adjective.” Suzanne wrote, “‘Economical’ double adjectival marking- not necessary.”

Regarding Firaz’ explanation, his astute use of the metalinguistic items *pre-modifying adjective* and *predicate adjective* earned him a full mark despite the fact that the word *economical* can also be used as a *pre-modifying adjective*, depending on the context such as the one in the sentence below:

We need to buy an “economical” car that does not consume too much gas.

As for Suzanne’s response, “double adjectival marking- not necessary”, it is indeed the case that both *economic* and *economical* are derived from *economy*; a noun which functions as the root for both of the adjectives, *economic* and *economical*. In this regard, *double adjectival marking* is an adequate explanation for the mistake.

As is the case with the other tasks, the participants provided a variety of responses, which at times deviated from the correct response. For instance, three teachers believed that the sentence was correct; another teacher said that the word *economic* meant cheap, whereas two

teachers thought that the first letter of the word *western* had to be capitalized. The word *western* is not normally capitalized unless it represents a particular geographical region or when it is part of a proper noun as in the examples of *West Virginia* and *the University of Western Ontario*.

Another participant, Smyrna, thought that the word *economical* was an *adverb*. He also thought that the first letter of *western* needed to be capitalized. He explained, “The Western world has been facing a severe economic recession. Using an adverb instead of an adjective.”

Some other participants thought that the problem could be found in the incorrect tense usage. They provided the following explanations:

- | | |
|--------|---|
| Indigo | The western world is facing severe economical recession <i>is</i> more preferable instead of <i>has been</i> which implies that the crisis in the past is over. |
| Vivi | The western world has been facing a severe economic recession. This is a misunderstanding of the meaning of <i>facing</i> . <i>Facing</i> is a word that does not continue in the past because once it has happened, it doesn't continue (e.g., enter, meet). |

Vivi's explanation that “facing is a word that does not continue in the past” cannot seem to be justified as the Corpus of Contemporary American English offers the following sentence:

At the time she testified, Sheila was facing sentencing on drug charges herself.

The sentence above clearly contradicts Vivi's claim that the verb *face* cannot refer to an action that continues in the past. In addition, two other teachers displayed some lack of confidence as their responses included expressions of doubt such as “It might be correct, but I feel . . .” and “the

western world is facing severe economical recession is more preferable . . . ”. It is worthwhile to emphasize that both teachers who displayed a lack of confidence, did not have a subject-specific teacher training background, which is very likely to have caused doubt. This indicates a relatively diminished metalinguistic awareness coupled with a lack of explicit knowledge.

Participants’ responses to Item 7 and a discussion of these follow.

4.4.1.7 Subject-verb agreement. Item: “There’s a lot of unemployed people in this city.”

Item 7 is one of the items in the *Error Correction* task, where the participants obtained the highest average. This could be because the participants felt less challenged as they only had to identify the *subject-verb agreement*, which required an inclusion of metalanguage terms such as *singular* and *plural*. It could be argued that *subject-verb agreement* is a grammar issue, the use of which is frequent in the daily classroom transactions of a teacher and therefore less challenging.

The sentence, *there’s a lot of unemployed people in this city*, was specifically selected because of its relevance to the academic/informal dichotomy. In informal English, the sentence is commonly used, albeit in its contracted form (there’s) rather than in its uncontracted form (there is). Only one participant thought that the sentence was “OK”, he was possibly using the spoken/informal register as the basis of his response. Another participant, Indigo, gave a satisfactory response but he displayed some doubt by saying “ ‘There are’ is better than ‘there is.’ ” in his response and hence was deducted 0.25. Here is his full response: “There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. ‘There are’ is better than ‘there is’. This is because it is plural.”

Another teacher used the metalanguage *collective* rather than *plural*, for which he was awarded only 0.25. *Collective nouns* such as *family*, *team*, *staff*, etc. can be used for both

singular and plural noun structures as in the examples, *My family lives in London and Liverpool are playing Manchester United today.*

A description and a discussion of the teacher participants' answers to Item 8 follow.

4.4.1.8 Hyphenation in compound adjectives. Item: "The three-year old boy played with his toy." In Item 8, the participants were required to identify the problem in the sentence, *The three-year old boy played with his toy.* The participants were provided with a compound adjective, the last part of which contained no hyphen. They were supposed to identify the missing hyphen, explain why it was missing, and how the compound adjective would be properly structured. We can define a *compound adjective* as the combination of two or more adjectives joined together to modify a single noun.

Of the 23 participants, nine participants thought that the sentence was correct as is. However, two participants thought that the sentence had a tense problem. Here are their responses:

- | | |
|-----|--|
| Nur | The three-year old boy were playing with his toy. Simple past somehow needs time expression. |
| Bey | Wrong tense is used here. Past Continuous should have been used for an action that takes place in the past and occurs over a period of time (was playing). |

An adequate response came from Kamil, a very experienced teacher: The three-year-old boy played with his toy. Compound adjectives should have all parts hyphenated. Here is an appropriate response from Mert, another participant: "The three-year-old boy played with his

toy.’ The general rule which applies here is that hyphens should be used between number + year + old adjective combinations.”

A participant, Firaz, labeled *the three-year-old* as a *noun phrase* when, in fact, it should have been classified as an *adjectival phrase* since the phrase modifies the noun *boy*. Here is his response: “I think it is three-year-old rather than three-year old because it consists of a compound noun made up of 3 words: 3, year, old.” Firaz was awarded 0.75 only since he identified the mistake but he used the wrong metalanguage, namely *compound noun*. The mistake did not encompass the noun *boy* but rather the three-word compound adjective. Hustin, another participant, provided a similar response: “The three-year-old boy... Need hyphens for all three words of this noun phrase that serves to describe the ‘boy’.” Since the response should incorporate the phrase *compound adjective* rather than *noun phrase*, Hustin was also deducted 0.25.

To finalize this section, 15 out of 23 participants obtained a zero score on this task. Of these 15, ten were TBL and five were NTBL teachers. This suggests that almost 59 % of the TBL teachers got a zero as opposed to around 83% of the NTBL teachers; the latter can indeed be considered a high percentage. The overall average for this sentence stood at around 30%, which once again points to a critical lack of metalinguistic awareness, where the participants displayed a lack of knowledge in terms of an important aspect of a literacy convention, namely the hyphenation of compound adjectives.

A discussion and analysis of participants’ responses to Item 9 follow.

4.4.1.9 Missing apostrophe s in possessive case. Item: “I will be there in two days time.” Item 9 was another item where participants were assessed based on their sensitivity to the difference between the formal and informal registers. Whereas in the spoken register of the

English language, the possessive apostrophe is at times inaudible, many English speakers may not be aware of the presence of the apostrophe +s, especially in the structures in the sentence, *I will be there in two days' time*, where the inanimate possession is even rarer than that of animate possessiveness as in the example, *John's car*, in which case the apostrophe +s is, at least, clearly audible.

While a lay person may not be aware of the presence of the apostrophe +s, a teacher of English is expected to be sensitive to it, when considering the teacher training that he underwent, as well as his awareness of the literacy conventions of written English. This particular sentence, to summarize the foregoing, aimed to assess to what extent the practicing teachers were aware of the distinction.

Regarding the findings, eight participants thought that the sentence without an apostrophe was correct. Of these eight participants, six participants were TBL teachers and the remaining two were NTBL teachers. In total, 16 participants received zeros for this item. Here are some examples of the correct answers:

- | | |
|-------|---|
| Osama | I will be there in two days' time. This is called Inanimate Possessives. So, it requires the possessive. |
| Vivi | I will be there in two days' time. Days is plural possessive. |
| Jesus | I will be there in two days' time. Days need an apostrophe after the s to imply possession as days is connected to time and need to be possessive. Otherwise, it is just two nouns one after the other. I would explain the rules of possession and apostrophe +s and then this answer will become clear for the student. |

A teacher was not able to spot the apostrophe problem, but rather provided a rule which actually deviated from the norm. In academic English, it is a convention that contractions are to be avoided since they are a common feature of the spoken register. Here is A1's response to the item.

“I'll be there in two days time (I will). Shortened version is preferable. Short form is better in written English; explain short form.”

It is interesting to note that of the 23 participating teachers, 16 teachers (70%) were awarded zeros. The responses to Item 9, in this regard, point to a lack of awareness on the part of teachers regarding the apostrophe + s in *inanimate possessives*, which is another important feature of academic English. The participants, similar to their performance in other literacy-related tasks, seemed to lack metalinguistic awareness, which fundamentally involves the adequate use of proper punctuation.

A discussion and analysis of participants' responses to Item 10 follow.

4.4.1.10 Morphological aspect of spelling mistakes: *fullfil*. Item: “Her average performance did not fullfil the expectations of the audience.” This item required the participants to identify a minor spelling mistake in the word fullfil. The incorrectly spelled word fullfil was intentionally chosen by the researcher as the words such as *full* and *fill* are normally *free morphemes* that have a meaning of their own.

English as a language features a non-transparent orthographic system and it usually displays inconsistencies, especially in terms of spelling and pronunciation. These inconsistencies point to the fact that the *phoneme-grapheme* correspondence is not straightforward in English.

Regarding the spelling of the word *fulfil(l)*, since the pronunciation of a word in English does not usually correspond to the way in which it is spelled, it was predicted that unless focused

attention was paid, it would be difficult to spot the double *l*, in the incorrectly spelled word *fullfil*. To further elaborate on the correct spelling of the word, both *fulfil* and *fulfill* are regarded as correct spellings in English. Thirteen teachers failed to identify the spelling error while a teacher, Bey, thought that the error in the sentence was tense-related: “Past Perfect should have been used here.”

Some teachers suggested that the two words *fulfill* and *expectations* did not collocate. In other words, the claim was that the two words could not be used together.

- | | |
|--------|---|
| Sam | Meet instead of fullfil. It is a matter of usage here and usually we speak of meeting expectations. |
| Indigo | Her average performance did not meet the expectations of the audience.
Meet should be used instead of fulfill. |
| Kamil | Her average performance did not satisfy the expectations of the audience. |

Sentences from the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), however, do not seem to support the teachers’ comments above. Here are two examples from COCA:

- a. I know my role and I fulfill the expectations of Society exactly.
- b. TQE aims at improving and enhancing the quality school as organization in order to fulfill the expectations of its clients.

Some participants suggested that the adjective *average* was not the appropriate modifier for the noun *performance*. Here are their comments:

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Firaz | Average doesn’t mark as an appropriate adjectival modifier for performance in this sentence. |
| Suzanne | Her substandard performance did not fulfil expectations of the audience.
Average is not the best word choice as in this context it reads as if this |

audience has listened to several of her performances and is judging the average of all of them- odd.

The corpus, however, contradicts both Firaz and Suzanne. Here are sentences from the corpus:

- a. He also told Holmes to better organize his presentation. "It was probably an **average performance**," Vijayaraghavan said.
- b. Noisy four-cylinder versions offer just **average performance**, while those . . . with the V-6 are lively.

In these sentences, *average* is the synonym of *mediocre*. To sum up the above discussion, 14 out of the 23 participants (60.9%) were unable to identify the spelling error.

This particular task aimed to assess whether the participants were able to identify that the word fulfil(1) was a free morpheme on its own or whether it was a combination of two morphemes. The findings point to a lack of morphological sensitivity, namely morphological awareness, which refers to an awareness or knowledge that words can be either free morphemes on their own or be made up of two or more morphemes. Since spelling is a fundamental component of literacy, the low score average (33%) obtained by the participants presents a gloomy picture of the participants, especially in terms of metalinguistic awareness.

A discussion and analysis of participants' responses to Item 11 follow.

4.4.1.11 Maybe vs. may be. Item: "He maybe in class right now." In Item 11, the participants were required to identify the difference between *maybe*, an adverb, and *may be*, a combination of a modal auxiliary verb and a main verb. In the spoken register, it is not easy to assess whether *may* and *be* are written together as one word or separately as two words, especially because the pronunciation of the two lexical items (*maybe* and *may be*) are just the

same, suggesting that they are homonyms. Such apparent minute differences may give rise to confusions where individuals, even trained teachers, may overlook them. The fact that four teachers did not feel that there was an error in Item 11 justifies this. Here are their relevant responses. Teacher participant, Bey, indicated, “Correct”; Salimo wrote, “No mistake”; Wali remarked, “I see that this sentence is correct.”; and Al confirmed, “The sentence is OK.”

Five of the 23 participants felt that the auxiliary verb *might* should replace *may*. In spoken English, *may* and *might* are indeed used interchangeably with little or no difference in meaning. Sometimes, *might* does replace the auxiliary verb *may*, depending on the grammatical context. For instance, when changing a *direct quote* to *reported speech*, the practice is that the tense is changed into past. The following exemplifies this:

Direct Quote: I may be absent tomorrow.

Reported Speech: He said that he might be absent the next day.

The teachers above, however, did not provide any explanation regarding the error. Some of them simply said that “might be” was the correct answer, for which they were minimally awarded. A participant, Indigo, said the following “He may be in class right now. May be instead of maybe” for which he was awarded a 0.25.

To receive a full mark, the participants were required to provide at least one of the following metalanguage items: *adverb*, (modal) *auxiliary verb*, and *main verb*.

The response of teacher participant, Mert, is regarded as a good explanation of the error:

“Correction: ‘He may be in class right now.’ Maybe, written as one word, is an adverb. In the sentence, ‘may’ must be written separately as the modal auxiliary verb, and ‘be’ as the main verb.”

In total, five teachers got a zero on this task. As opposed to 17.6% of the TBL teachers, 33.3% of the NTBL teachers obtained a zero on this task. Compared to the previous task which assessed teachers' morphological awareness regarding the morphemes in the word fulfil(l), this particular task was designed to assess teachers' morphosyntactic awareness. Since the difference between *may be* and *maybe* is by no means audible in spoken English, it was predicted that some teachers would not be able to distinguish the difference between the two structures. Although the teachers obtained a higher score average (almost 53%) in this task than in the previous task, it is difficult to conclude that teachers performed successfully, which suggests that some teachers tend to adopt a colloquial-oriented attitude to academic tasks. This is a risky approach to language teaching which may arguably result in students' acquiring very limited literacy skills. A discussion and analysis of participant responses to Item 12 follow.

4.4.1.12 Double comparative forms: less healthier. Item: "Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthier." This item was specifically designed to assess the participants' sensitivity to another common error among English speakers, prevalent in the informal register. One error is using *double comparatives* as in the example *less healthier* and another one is using an adjective (in the comparative form) to modify a verb as in the example of *eat healthier*. Grammar rules in English indicate that an adverb only can modify a verb rather than an adjective if it is preceded by a verb as in the example of *He ate quickly*. It is common to observe learners producing sentences such as *I speak English good*, where they use an adjective to modify the preceding verb.

Item 12 was the second most challenging item for the participants as 14 participants got zeros; there were only five teachers who were able to get a full mark. This means that only approximately 22% of the participants obtained a full mark. Three participants suggested that

the sentence was correct. The following responses were given a full mark and therefore their responses could be regarded as model responses.

- Sam A teacher should explain that healthy (as an adjective) can't qualify a verb (eat). I'd also explain that the sentence can be set right by adding food at the end. Though it is already used by native speakers, eating healthy is considered not correct because 'healthy' is not an adverb. It should be fine in everyday English. There are books now on 'eating healthy' but from a linguistic point of view, it is not correct. Either add 'healthy food' at the end or use the regular adverb 'healthily'. All the following are ok:
 Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthy food.
 Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthily/healthfully.
 Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat healthier food.
 Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthy. (Americanism. I don't recommend it, but it is widely used)
 Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthier. (NOT CORRECT)
- Mert Correction: 'Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthy food.' The word 'healthier' is an adjective, therefore, cannot be used as an adverb.

The preceding explanations of the above teachers adequately assess the error as they contain appropriate metalanguage such as *adverb* and *adjective*; the teachers in question also emphasize that an adjective cannot modify a verb.

Two other participants, on the other hand, were awarded 0.75. Here are their responses and a brief explanation why 0.25 was deducted. Nur wrote, "Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthily. Word formation problem."

Nur was deducted 0.25 because she did not explain the problem explicitly. The reason why she was awarded 0.75 was because she was able to formulate the sentence correctly and her

explanation, *word formation problem*, suggests that she is aware that a different affixation treatment would be needed for the sentence to be correct; that only an adverb *healthily* could modify the verb *eat*. This would, in turn, require an affixation modification of the word *healthy*, which she successfully does with her correct formulation of the sentence. As suggested in Chapter 3, as per the assessment scale (see Table 4) which is used as a yardstick for awarding adequate marks to the participants, her response was deemed to have satisfied the descriptors in Table 6, the Assessment Scale. Her response was deducted with 0.25 because she did not use metalanguage terminology such as *adjective* and *adverb*.

That only six participants were able to formulate the correct adverb (healthily or healthfully) proved that this particular sentence was indeed challenging for the participants and to this end, those participants who were able to formulate the appropriate adverb were awarded 0.75, even when their explanation was not completely explicit. Only 6 (around 26%) of the 23 participants were able to formulate the correct adverb. Some participants chose to use an adjective to modify the noun *food*, which can be argued to be a slightly less challenging response, although they were still awarded a full mark. Mert's response reads, "Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthy food." The word 'healthier' is an adjective, therefore, cannot be used as an adverb." The other participant, Hustin, whose score was 0.75 was deducted 0.25 despite the fact that he identified the error and that he provided the correct response because he did not explicitly explain the adjective/adverb dichotomy in the sentence. Here is his response: "Less healthily. 'Healthier' is for comparing descriptions. Here we need . . . to compare verbs."

Another participant, Jalil, correctly identified that double comparatives could not be used in English, but he failed to change the adjective into an adverb, (healthy →healthily) or

healthfully, and hence was deducted 0.25. Here is his response: “Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthy. The error is healthier because you cannot have two comparatives for one adjective.” Yet another participant, Firaz, felt that the definite article should be removed from the sentence. He responded: “The is unnecessary because a plural should be bare (sans article) unless the entity encoded in the plural refers to the group in general, then should be a bare plural.” Bey, on the other hand, believed that the problem was with the tense. Here is his response: Present Continuous should have been used here (they are now eating). Clue = now.”

Some other mistakes included the following:

- a. They eat less healthier (by 3 participants)
- b. They eat less healthy (by 2 participants)

The use of double comparatives was the problem in the first example, whereas in the second example, *less healthy* should have been followed by a noun since *healthy* as an adjective should modify a noun only, which in this case was missing. Another teacher thought that the sentence was a run-on sentence.

The participants’ responses to this task reveal an important phenomenon. The teachers in this study tended to carry morphosyntactic features of colloquial English over to Academic English, which suggests the lack of register awareness. This implies there is a tendency among some teachers to base their teaching on colloquial English rather than on Academic English.

This raises an important question that has not been adequately addressed in SLA, at least for the last few decades, which is, “What is the subject matter of ESL and EFL teaching?” The issue is that we, as English language specialists, do not have consensus on what exactly we are to teach. It is precisely this lack of consensus which prompted Spolsky (1968) to title his article,

“What does it mean to know a language?” Following this title, he poses the following critical questions in the content of his article:

- a. How do we know that someone has learned a language?
- b. What does it mean when we say that someone knows a language? (p. 1)

Baker (2001, p. 3), in the same vein, adds: “if a person is asked whether he or she speaks two languages, the question is ambiguous”. Based on the preceding discussion, it is critical that the field of SLA should prescribe realistic goals to determine what exactly constitutes the content of English language teaching. Arguably, classroom management skills and the capability of putting students in pairs and groups to get the students to interact orally do not necessarily render effective teaching. As per the above discussion, Fillmore and Snow (2000, p. 4) argue:

Too few teachers share or know about their students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds, or understand the challenges inherent in learning to speak and read Standard English. Teachers lack this knowledge because most have not had well-designed professional preparation for their current challenges.

This brings the discussion of the sentence in Item 12 to an end. The next section presents the participants’ responses to Item 13, followed by an analysis of their responses.

4.4.1.13 Amount vs. number. Item: “The amount of students in my class is 23.” In Item 13, the participants were required to identify the error in the sentence, *the amount of students in my class is 23*. The task, in particular, aimed to assess the participants’ sensitivity to the difference between *amount* and *number*, the former modifying uncountable and the latter countable nouns.

For this particular task, the participants were minimally awarded a 0.25 if they produced the correct word, *number*. To get a full mark, the participants were required to provide a

thorough grammatical explanation as to in which context the words *amount* and *number* would be used, ideally by using some metalanguage such as *countable* and *uncountable noun*.

The average score for TBL participants was almost 62% as opposed to NTBL teachers' average of approximately 29%, which points to a significant performance difference between TBL and NTBL teachers in favor of TBL teachers. Only one teacher thought that there was no error in the sentence and six teachers were awarded zeros; four TBL teachers received zeros (23.5%) and two NTBL teachers also received zeros (33.3%). Two teachers provided the same incorrect explanation: Sierra wrote, "The amount of students in my class are 23. S-V agreement." and Smyrna also wrote, "The amount of students in my class are 23. Subject verb agreement."

The above responses of the teachers point to some deficiency regarding subject-verb agreement, especially with regard to the nouns *amount* and *number*. In addition, the following explanations were provided by two teachers: Nur wrote, "The number of students in my class is 23. Wrong word." and Elia indicated, "amount —number wrong word." Both Nur and Elia's explanations include the metalanguage *wrong word*, which is commonly used to assess the writing component of IELTS (International English Language Testing System). These explanations are similar to the metalanguage *wrong form*, which actually refers to an error in grammatical form. In other sentences of the error correction task, some teachers have also used such IELTS terminology.

At many universities, especially in the Middle East, it would not be wrong to say that teachers who mark essays commonly use IELTS terminology to correct students' mistakes. The question as to what extent students can make sense of these IELTS error codes needs to be researched in the EFL context of the Middle East. Another participant whose response is quoted

here, explains that *number* is used to modify *people* and *amount* to modify items, which cannot be considered to be correct as *number* is used to refer to countable nouns including *people* and *amount* to uncountable nouns. Osama wrote, “The number of students in my class is 23. Number is more accurate to describe people. Amount is used to describe items.” The participants’ responses to Item 14 and the analysis of these responses follow.

4.4.1.14 Data as a plural noun: Latin and Greek. Item: “The data obtained from the study is to be published soon”. Item 14 aimed to assess the participants’ awareness as to whether the much commonly term used in research publications and academic contexts, namely *data*, was a singular or a plural noun. Derived from Latin, the word *data* is usually used as a singular noun in the informal register. *Data*, a plural noun, the singular of which is *datum*, is a research term which is sometimes even confused by educated people. Similar Latin words that may pose a challenge to teachers are *focus/foci*, *curriculum/curricula*, *thesis/theses*, *basis/bases*, and so forth.

In the sentence, *the data obtained from the study is to be published soon*, the participants were required to identify the subject-verb agreement problem and convert *is* to *are* so that it agrees with the subject *data*, a plural noun.

Based on the definition of linguistic literacy, a fundamental component of this study involved assessing the participants’ register awareness, which should normally manifest in the participants’ ability to distinguish between the academic and colloquial registers. In other words, the inquiry was how proficiency in multiple languages in languages other than English impacted a teacher’s awareness of the distinction between formal and informal registers. In this respect, this particular task was important in terms of assessing the participants’ awareness of not only a grammar issue, subject-verb agreement, but also of the formal/informal register distinction.

The findings reveal that only five out of 23 teachers were aware that data was a plural noun. Eleven participants believed that there was no error in the sentence, which confirms the misconception that *data* is a singular noun. One participant's response to the sentence was indeed to the point. Firaz wrote, "In academic literature data is treated as a plural noun; however, in everyday English, it is often used as a singular noun." It is evident that Firaz' solid background in linguistics enabled him to distinguish between formal and informal registers.

Some participants preferred to change *is* into *will be*:

- | | |
|--------|---|
| Indigo | The data obtained from the study will be published soon. Instead of 'is to be', 'will be' is better. |
| Talat | The data obtained from the study will be published soon. The correct tense is the future simple. The sentence can be corrected by using the auxiliary 'will' and the infinitive 'be'. |
| Vivi | The data obtained from the study will be published soon. |

The strategy of avoiding some complex structures such as those of subject-verb agreement as in the case of some participants' changing the original sentence, "the data obtained from the study *is to be* published soon" to "the data to be published to data *will be* published" is arguably a good way of bypassing complex rules by reducing them to simpler structures. That said, the *to be + past participle* rule is used to attribute future reference to the action in question. An example would be:

The decision is to be made by the committee.

In the sentence above *to be made* implies that the committee is assumed or expected to make the decision. The sentence is grammatically correct and meaningful; there is no need to insert a *will* into the sentence to replace *to be*.

The findings obtained regarding the noun *data* revealed a widespread ignorance on the part of the participating teachers regarding words of Greek and Latin origin in English. This suggests that the teachers' teacher training did not, most probably, involve a component which would introduce them to English words with Latin and Greek origin. This has implications for academic English because Graeco-Latin words constitute 60% of the vocabulary in written English, whereas everyday spoken English predominantly consists of Anglo-Saxon origin (Jessner, 2008a). Furthermore, Jessner emphasizes that every day high-frequency words of the Anglo-Saxon origin in English tend to contain only one or two syllables, whereas 60% of the three-four syllable words in written English are of Graeco-Latin origin. The grammatical components of academic English which consist of words with more affixes as well as nouns, adjectives, prepositions, and nominalizations are typical of academic English. These components are used to achieve greater informational density and abstractness. These are typically formed with words of Latin and Greek origin rather than Germanic words. The implication of this is that Latin and Greek words are usually associated with academic English, which does not seem to constitute a major part of teachers' teacher training programs.

Another compounding factor is that Latin and Greek words can be encountered, at least to some extent, only in advanced English classes. The practical implication of this is that because the majority of our students in our classes are usually at levels between elementary and intermediate, teachers do not always get the opportunity to teach advanced level students. Hence,

it can be argued that Latin and Greek words do not constitute a major part of teachers' daily teaching.

A description and discussion of participants' responses to Item 15 follow.

4.4.1.15 *Whose vs. who's*. Item: "The man who's brother I met yesterday left town."

Item 15 tested the participants' awareness of whether they thought that the contracted form *who's* attributed a possessive meaning to modify the word *brother*. In other words, in the sentence, *the man who's brother I met yesterday left town*, the question was whether *who's* referred to *who is* or whether *who's* attributed a possessive meaning.

The participants' responses to this sentence revealed that none of the teachers believed that *who's* attributed a possessive meaning because of the apostrophe + s ('s). The fact that no teacher thought *who's* was the possessive form of *who*, proved that this particular task was a frequent daily classroom undertaking. Therefore, it was assessed to be unchallenging. To this end, no marks were awarded for the participants who formulated the correct spelling of the word.

A teacher commented that *who's* could also refer to *who has*, which is true when apostrophe + s ('s) is followed by a past participle as in the example, *'s left*, which corresponds to *has left*. For instance, a teacher participant, Kamil, wrote: "The man whose brother I met yesterday left town. Whose=possession=object. Who's is the short form of either 'who is' or 'who has'."

In ESL/EFL grammar textbooks, the word *whose* is labelled as a *possessive determiner*, a *pronoun*, and a *modifying word*. When it is not a pronoun as in the example "whose book is this", it normally functions as an adjective. Hence, the word *whose* is sometimes referred to as a possessive adjective. The use of any of the above metalanguage items would grant the participants marks based on the nature of their explanation.

Based on the foregoing, the word *whose* is definitely not a reflexive pronoun (myself, yourself) as Elia indicated; neither can a simplistic explanation such as *wrong word* account for the mistake *who's*, which again reminds us of the inadequate use of metalanguage that is limited to IELTS terminology. Bey and Smyrna used the metalanguage *homophone* and *homonym* respectively. Both are correct, for which they were awarded 0.75, but since their explanation did not incorporate a more detailed structural explanation, they were both deducted 0.25. Another participant, Talat, deviated from what was really required and provided the following explanation: “The man, a brother I met yesterday, left town. The sentence can be corrected by embedding the defining clause ‘a brother I met yesterday’ with commas.” Talat was awarded a zero since he avoided dealing with *whose*. The beginning part of the sentence “The man, a brother I met yesterday” does not sound correct as the subject of the sentence starts with the definite article *the*, whereas the non-defining relative clause starts with an indefinite article, *a*.

It needs to be emphasized that throughout the Error Correction task and other tasks that required the participants to correct and explain the error, frequent reference was made to IELTS codes, which were actually designed and introduced by the British Council only as a correction tool in the assessment of test-takers’ essays. This implies that IELTS codes were not intended to be used as a pedagogical tool since the metalanguage used in IELTS codes is not very student-friendly; terminology such as *WF* (Wrong Form), *WW* (Wrong Word), *WO* (Word Order) and *SV* (Subject Verb agreement) would make very little sense to students. In addition, there is no consensus in the SLA literature as to what exactly the word *form* refers to and as to whether there is any difference between the words *form* and *structure*, nor is it clear whether these words refer to grammar or to the overall structure of the English language. In this respect, it can be argued that teachers should refrain from using such vague terminology when they address students’

questions. That said, if they are or become IELTS examiners, they should feel free to use IELTS codes since their job requires the predominant use of these codes as an integral part of essay marking.

Some of the responses to Item 15 by the participants have been analyzed above. A description and analysis of participants' responses to Item 16 follow.

4.4.1.16 Redundant use of auxiliary: *did*. Item: "Who did found Apple Company?" In Item 16, the participants were expected to complete more than one task in responding to the question, *Who did found Apple Company?* They were first required to identify that the question was without a subject; in which case the auxiliary verb *did* should be removed. They also needed to identify the difference between the two verbs, *find* and *found*, both of which are infinitives that carry different meanings. Although it was not an essential part of this task, the participants were also expected to delete the word *company* after *Apple*.

As was the case with the other tasks in Error Correction, some teachers insisted on limiting their explanation to very simplistic terms, which echoed IELTS terminology. Here is an example: Nur wrote, "Who founded Apple Company? Grammar, wrong form/ wrong word." Al also offered a similar inadequate response: "Who founded Apple Company (did found) wrong words used to form verb."

The explanation "wrong words used to form verb" does not satisfy what is required for the task. Metalanguage items such as *wrong form* or *wrong word* do not constitute a good explanation since they do not say why the error was committed and how it could be corrected. Jalil's explanation was adequate in that he emphasized the unnecessaryness of the auxiliary verb *did*. However, his additional comment "when a question starts with who, no auxiliary is needed" cannot be justified since when the question has a subject and the object is missing, we can well

say: *Who did you see?*” Here is Jalil’s complete response: “Who founded Apple Company? The error is using the auxiliary *did* before the subject because when a question starts with *who*, no auxiliary is needed.”

The above answer from Jalil earned him 0.75 marks. Below is a decent explanation of what causes the error, especially in terms of the use of the auxiliary verb.

Mert Correction: ‘Who founded the Apple Company?’ When we use ‘*who*’ as the subject of the sentence in an interrogative form, we remove the auxiliary verb from the sentence, by using ‘*who + main verb*’ format.

Secondly, the companies should be preceded by the definite article ‘*the*’.

The above explanation was awarded a full mark. An interesting response came from a participant, Talat, who thought that the auxiliary verb *did* should not be used because the verb *found* was an irregular verb. Here is his complete response: “Who found Apple Company? The auxiliary *did* should not be used because *found* is an irregular verb.”

Talat’s explanation, which suggests that the verb *found* is an irregular verb, indicates that he is referring to the infinitive *to find*, the past and the past participle forms of which are the same word, *found*. Apparently, Talat has misidentified the main verb since the context points to founding or to establishing a new company, rather than locating some item that some people had been looking for.

The preceding discussion has analyzed and discussed some of the responses to Item 16. An analysis and discussion of the participants’ responses to Item 17 follow.

4.4.1.17 *Who vs. whom.* Item: “The man whom got a promotion joined us only last month.” Item 17, which incorporates a relative clause, aims to assess whether the participants were able to identify the incorrect relative pronoun. In the sentence, *the man whom got a*

promotion joined us only last month, the word *whom* should be replaced with *who* since the relative pronoun refers to a subject, and not an object. Quite a few participants provided adequate responses, some are cited below:

- | | |
|-------|--|
| Jalil | The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. The error is “whom” as this relative pronoun is used for the object of the sentence, not for the subject. |
| Kamil | The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. ‘Who’ is a relative pronoun which is used here to talk about a subject. |
| Mert | Correction: “The man who got a promotion joined us only last month.” We use ‘who’ for the subjects, and ‘whom’ for the objects. |
| Susan | The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. Whom is an object form – dative case. Nominative case is required in this frame. |

Susan’s use of the metalanguage *dative case* is indeed to the point; however, it would possibly not make any sense to a student. The metalanguage items *subject* and *object* would arguably function as more student-friendly terminology. Susan was awarded 0.75 for her response.

A novice teacher, Sierra, spelled the relative pronoun *whose* as *whoes*; her explanation was not satisfactory either. Here is what she said: “Who got. Whom, whom, whose [sic] are often used incorrectly as they may seem for language user similar.” Interestingly, another participant, Symrna, did not identify the incorrect relative pronoun *whom* as an error, and focused on a different aspect of the sentence: “Replace only with just. Wrong emphasize.” Faris provided a similar response: “The man whom got a promotion only joined us last month.”

Similar to that of Smyrna, Faris's response involved no mention of the incorrect relative pronoun. This possibly points to the fact that both Smyrna and Faris have the misconception that the relative pronoun *whom* can also refer to a subject as well as to an object. It is important to note that both Smyrna and Faris are native speakers of English; Smyrna was educated in the United States and Faris in England. Their misconception regarding the relative pronoun *whom* suggests that their K-12 and university education did not involve a substantial component of literacy instruction or the structure of the English language. Hence, they were unable to distinguish between *who* and *whom*. The lack of knowledge about the difference between *who* and *whom* also has critical implications for linguistic literacy as the word *whom* is not used very frequently in colloquial English, whereas it is used much more frequently in academic English. For instance, *who did you see?* would be heard more in colloquial English in comparison to *whom did you see?*

An analysis and discussion of participants' responses to Item 18 follow.

4.4.1.18 Capitalization of content words in a proper noun. Item: "King Abdulaziz University hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency." Item 18 aimed to assess the participants' awareness of capitalization in relatively longer (3 or 4-word) proper nouns. In the proper noun *King Abdulaziz University Hospital*, the researcher predicted that some teachers might think that the first letter of the last word in the noun phrase *King Abdulaziz University Hospital*, would not require capitalization. This would be due to the fact that words such as *hospital* and *university*, may not be perceived as proper nouns even if they are attached to another proper noun, or a proper noun string. Given that words such as *hospital* and *university* are common nouns, it might well be the case that when they are not attached to other proper nouns or noun strings, some teachers would not notice the absence of capitalization in these

words. They would transfer the features of common nouns to proper nouns while stripping the features of proper nouns of their original function in a multi-noun context, where every single lexical item in the noun phrase must be capitalized in the word-initial position. In other words, the first letter of each lexical item in the proper noun phrase, including the word *hospital* in this instance, must be capitalized.

Nine of the TBL and three of the NTBL participants, 12 in total, were not able to identify that the first letter of the noun *hospital* in the proper noun *King Abdulaziz University Hospital* should have been capitalized. This implies that slightly more than half of the participants were unable to address the capitalization issue and thus were awarded a zero.

Some participants also overgeneralized the use of a proper noun to the noun phrase “Canadian accreditation agency”, where they capitalized the initial letters of *accreditation agency*. They did not recognize that the noun phrase *Canadian accreditation agency* is preceded by the indefinite article *a* which points to the fact that there may be more than one accreditation agency. This would be correct if the noun phrase were preceded by the definite article *the*, which would attribute the quality of being a proper noun to the institution as in the example of *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. What the participant, Osama, did was that he changed *a* to *the* for some reason. He treated the noun phrase *Canadian accreditation agency* as a proper noun when this change was not required; he was therefore awarded a zero. Here is his response: “King Abdulaziz University hospital is accredited by ‘the Canadian Accreditation Agency’. The Canadian Accreditation Agency is a KNOWN body so it necessitates the use of the definite article *the* rather than the indefinite article *a*.” Another participant, Bey, thought that the tense in the sentence required a change: “Present Perfect should have been used here.”

Item 18 aimed to assess the participants' awareness of the distinction between common and proper nouns, especially in terms of capitalization. Their responses to Item 18 revealed a significant deficiency. The participants had problems as to where and when a noun should be capitalized; they encountered difficulties in the assessment of whether a noun was a common or proper noun. This, once again, points to a critical deficiency of the teachers regarding their lack of metalinguistic awareness and literacy conventions of the English language.

A description and analysis of participants' responses to Item 19 follow.

4.4.1.19 Object pronoun in subject position. Item: "Me and Talal are good friends." Item 19, similar to those discussed in the previous tasks, aimed to assess to what extent the participants could notice the distinction between formal and informal registers. More specifically, it aimed to assess the participants' reaction to the use of an object pronoun in the subject position. The use of an object pronoun in the subject position in colloquial English is indeed common and acceptable as in the example of *me and Talal are good friends*. *Me* in English is an object pronoun, which indicates that it can only be used in the object position in the sentence as far as the grammar rules of English are concerned. That said, sociolinguists can account for such deviations by attributing them to factors such as culture, context, level of formality, and colloquialism, all of which determine to what extent daily spoken language can deviate from the syntactic norms of English. It is perhaps the case in all languages with an alphabet that the colloquial register, at least to some extent, deviates from the academic or formal register. Since this study does not aim to investigate the sociolinguistic factors that bring about such deviations, the analyses made in this particular task and in the other tasks are limited to the investigation of linguistic causes that yield deviations such as the one in this example.

The participants obtained relatively better scores in this task despite the fact that four participants were awarded a zero, three of whom were TBL teachers. Here are some of the responses where the participants obtained a zero. As can be seen in these responses, two participants believed that there were no mistakes in the sentence. Salima indicated, “No mistake” and Al wrote, “The sentence is OK.” Another teacher, Indigo, provided an alternative structural combination which indeed deviated from the acceptable syntactic pattern, namely: “Talal and me are good friends.”

Faris’s following response was awarded 0.25 marks. “Could be Talal and I; both OK.” The fact that Faris, a native-speaker of English, suggests that both structures (*me and Talal*; *Talal and I*) are correct, indicates that Faris is aware that *Talal and I* represents a correct subject structure but he does not explicitly state the difference between the two in terms of register. This could originate from the fact that Faris may not be aware of the formal vs. informal dichotomy regarding the syntactic order of the pronouns in a sentence. Even if he were, he does not make this awareness explicit, which is indeed a prevailing phenomenon with many NES teachers.

The use of the object pronoun in the subject position as the second agent of the subject, especially following a proper noun (Talal) is obviously a deviant syntactic structure. Below are further responses which merit consideration. Bey, a native speaker of English was not able to account for the error. He wrote, “Can’t explain.”

Another participant did provide a rather sociolinguistic explanation, which did not involve any linguistic analysis, especially about the distinction between the subject and object and their position in the sentence, although he did provide the correct form of the sentence; he was therefore awarded 0.25.

Hustin Talal and I are good friends. “Me and Talal’ is absolutely fine to all native speakers in all contexts. The news presenters and even the Queen will say it. However, the grammar books say it is wrong. It is a perfect example of why some grammar has to be taught in schools, because the native speakers themselves don’t use it!

The preceding discussion aimed to gauge the participating teachers’ awareness regarding the distinction between the formal versus informal register in terms of where subject and object pronouns can be positioned in a sentence. A description and discussion of participants’ responses to the last task in Error Correction, Item 20, follow. This item deals with another aspect of subject-verb agreement.

4.4.1.20 Criteria: singular or plural? Item: “The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce.” Item 20 required the participants to recognize that *criteria*, a word derived from Greek, is a plural noun. Only two teachers thought that the sentence, *the criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce* did not involve any errors. Six participants had the misconception that the word *criteria* was a singular noun. Hence, they believed that the verb *were* had to be replaced with *was*. Below are their complete responses:

Sierra The criteria that was agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Subject-verb agreement.

Talat The criteria that was agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. The singular form ‘was’ must be used.

- Wali Incorrect. It should be ‘The criteria that was agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce.’
Students feel that the word criteria is plural.
- Al The criteria that was agreed upon. Wrong form of verb is used. Same as No: 16. Give examples of plural and singular past tense verbs.
- Faris The criteria that was agreed upon
- Symrna The criteria that was agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Subject-verb agreement.

In total, eight participants were awarded zero marks, five of whom were TBL teachers.

One particular participant provided an exemplary response:

- Mert This is similar to the error made with regards to ‘data/datum’. The word “criteria” is plural and “criterion” is singular. Therefore, according to the subject + verb agreement principle, the sentence should be ‘The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting do not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce.’

The remaining participants were aware that the noun *criteria* was the plural form of the noun *criterion*. The results point to the fact that there is a deficiency in some teachers’ knowledge of English words derived from Latin or Greek. A similar deficiency was observed in Item 14 where 18 participants had difficulties in identifying the Latin noun *data* as a plural noun. A more detailed discussion of lexical items with Greek or Latin origin can be found in the discussion of the word *data* in Item 14.

This brings the analyses of the sentences in the *Error Analysis* task to an end. The five tasks that constitute the second part of the instrument, the *Grammar* task, as well as a description and discussion of the teacher participants' responses to these tasks, follow.

4.4.2 Task 2: Grammar.

1. If a student wanted to know the difference between the two sentences:

I *have not seen* him yet.

I *did not see* him yet.

What would you tell him?

2. Why do native speakers say “**2 coffees**” when “**coffee**” is uncountable?
3. Are both of the following sentences correct grammatically?

My opinion is *different from* yours.

My opinion is *different than* yours.

How would you explain the difference to your students? Please provide your reasons.

4. In the following two sentences, the word “**walk**” has different meanings. How would you explain this to your students? Please provide your reasons.

I *walk* every day.

I *walk* the dog every day.

5. Why does the verb “**hand**” in the following sentence **not** have the 3rd person singular **-s** suffix?

The burglar demanded that the cashier “**hand**” him all the money.

The second component of this PhD instrument involved the participants' sensitivity to grammar errors. There were particular tasks in this section where the participants were required to identify some grammatical errors that are, similar to those in the *Error Correction* task, regarded as being correct in the informal register despite the fact that they deviate from standard grammatical norms of academic English. Interestingly, it is also a fact that some deviant and non-standard language structures have come to be recognized as acceptable structures as a result of extended periods of frequent use, which can be accounted for by sociolinguistic factors.

Apart from assessing teachers' sensitivity to the difference between formal and informal registers, especially as far as grammar is concerned, the tasks in this section also aimed to gauge the participants' knowledge of metalanguage such as transitive and intransitive verbs and whether the word *yet* should be used with tenses other than the perfect tenses. Teachers' knowledge of the subjunctive mood was also assessed as the most challenging component of this section titled, *Grammar*.

An analysis and brief discussion of participants' responses to the five items in the *Grammar* task follows.

4.4.2.1 "Yet" with the Simple Past. Item: "If a student wanted to know the difference between the two sentences: I have not seen him yet and I did not see him yet, what would you tell him?"

The Collins English Dictionary offers the following definition for the word *yet*:

You use *yet* in negative statements to indicate that something has not happened *up to the present time*, although it probably will happen.

The above definition indicates that the word *yet* is normally used for actions that have some link to the present time as is the case with the present perfect tense. *I have not seen him yet* is usually

replaced by *I did not see him yet* in the informal register, which is totally acceptable in informal contexts. An individual uttering the sentence *I did not see him yet* would, under normal conditions, not get any negative feedback regarding the inaccuracy or accuracy of his utterance. Therefore, the utterance *I did not see him yet* would pass for accurate language production.

As for assigning marks to the participants, the requirement was that the participants were expected to explain that *yet* is normally used with *the present perfect tense* and not with the *Past Tense*. The Past Tense would normally require a time word, a phrase, a clause, or an adverb indicating when the action was carried out in the past. Based on these criteria, the following responses were awarded a full mark as they satisfied the criteria set for this particular task.

- Nur I would tell him: In the first sentence, there is still a possibility of seeing him, but up to now this hasn't happened. The second one is wrong because of yet. Yet shows that something is related to the present. Thus, the simple past tense is not appropriate.
- Osama I would introduce the concept of present perfect and past simple (finished and unfinished actions) and then try to explain to the student that 'yet' is generally connected with present perfect format and in this case, the correct form to use is the present perfect since we have 'yet' and the negative structure indicating the absence of meeting with the other person.
- Hustin The second sentence should not have 'yet' at the end —simple past refers to a single point in past time.

Kamil was awarded a 0.75 since he did not talk about the use of *yet* in the *Simple Past Tense* structure. He wrote, "I have not seen him yet. Present perfect tense is used with yet." The

following participant, Brow, provided a satisfactory response despite not using any metalanguage and hence was deducted a 0.25. He explained, “We don’t use did with yet; haven’t seen him yet— until now.”

Some participants limited their answers to the explanation of the difference between the two sentences in terms of meaning, rather than providing a linguistic analysis, for which they were awarded a zero. Below are some examples:

- | | |
|--------|--|
| Firaz | A and B are very close in meaning. In A, there is an expectation that I will see him; in B there is no such expectation. |
| Elia | First is a present perfect tense where the emphasis is on the result. An action that started in the past shows its result now and is up till now. Second sentence is a past simple tense that emphasis is on the time of the action. |
| Indigo | I have not seen him implies that recently I have not seen him. I did not see him yet implies that I have been looking for him for a long time and I did not see him. |

It is interesting to note that 17 participants obtained a zero for this task, 13 of whom were TBL, which indicates that 76.5% of the TBL participants and 66.7% of the NTBL participants obtained zeros for this first item in Grammar. Once again, these percentages point to a deficiency in terms of the participants’ awareness of the distinction between formal and informal registers, especially in terms of the grammatical use of *yet*, an adverb.

4.4.2.2 Uncountable nouns acting as countable nouns. Item: “Why do native speakers say ‘2 coffees’ when ‘coffee’ is uncountable?” In Item 2, the participants were required to respond to the question, *Why do native speakers say ‘2 coffees’ when ‘coffee’ is uncountable?”*

This question, similar to most of the other tasks in *Error Correction*, was designed to assess the participants' sensitivity to the formal/informal; academic/non-academic distinction, especially as far as register is concerned. If participants were able to specify explicitly the distinction between formal and informal registers as well as adding a grammatical explanation, they were awarded a full mark. To get a full mark, they were expected to ideally use metalanguage items such as countable and/or uncountable noun along with the word *colloquial* or *informal*.

If they just limited their explanations by writing, “they actually mean two cups of coffees”, they were awarded only 0.25 and if their explanation was irrelevant, they were then awarded zero marks. Here are the participants' responses that explicitly involved the formal/informal distinction. Besides, they also provided a grammatical explanation as to why *cups of coffee* was omitted. Hence, they were awarded a full mark. Suzanne's explanation that “mass nouns can be made to have count noun characteristics”, was indeed adequate, especially as far as the grammar is concerned.

- | | |
|---------|---|
| Jesus | Here the colloquial form of coffee has become a countable noun. In written English, we would say two cups of coffee but to shorten our speech we omit ‘cups of’ and make coffee countable. |
| Suzanne | Most mass nouns (or maybe all) can be made to have count noun characteristics by utilizing them, for instance, with classifiers, or just numbers, for instance: The miller ground 5 different flours from the same wheat. |

A participant, Mert, explained that “2 coffees” were *colloquial*, but did not integrate the metalanguage items, countable or uncountable noun, to his explanation, and hence was awarded 0.75. Here is his explanation: “ ‘Coffees’ refer to ‘cups of coffee’. In *colloquial* language, there is an inclination to drop certain rules and use short-cuts.”

The above sentences suggest that Jesus, Mert, and Suzanne are able to recognize that there is a distinction between colloquial and academic English, which they explicitly state in their explanation. Kamil, on the other hand, provides a similar explanation but he does this inexplicitly: “They assume that the other party will understand it as 2 cups of coffee since language is *a means of communication* regardless of the correct grammar.” Kamil uses the sentence “language is a means of communication” to refer to informal communication and adds that communication can take place without correct grammar. Kamil, however, does not use relevant metalanguage, and thus was deducted 0.25.

4.4.2.3 A non-comparative form (*different*) preceding “*than*”. Item: “Are both of the following sentences correct grammatically?”

- a. *My opinion is different from yours.*
- b. *My opinion is different than yours.*

“How would you explain the difference to your students? Please provide your reasons.”

The third item of the section titled, *Grammar* required the participants to produce an explanation of another relatively confusing structure in English. The word *different* can be followed by the preposition *to*, which is usually used in British English, whereas the preposition *than* is preferred in American English,

As a metalinguistically aware teacher is assumed to have the awareness of the distinction between formal and informal registers, it is assumed that he would know which particular structure is acceptable in informal English and which particular structure would represent the formal register. Hence, his response would qualify for grammatically correct language production.

As for the grammatical nuance between *different from* and *different than*, *different* is simply an adjective rather than a comparative adjective. Since comparative structures such as *taller*, *easier*, and *more difficult* require the preposition *than* to follow them, it is possible to argue that the preposition *than* can only be reserved for comparative adjectives, which leads us to conclude that *different than* is grammatically incorrect since *different* is not a comparative adjective. Many participants confirmed that *different than* was incorrect. Four participants who stated that *different than* was incorrect were not able to provide an explanation as to why *different than* was incorrect.

It needs to be highlighted, though, that sociolinguists would regard the structure *different than* as being correct since it has become an accepted and commonly used structure, especially in North American English. For us, then, to be able to make judgments regarding a structure's grammatical accuracy, it certainly becomes imperative that judgments be made based on the extent to which the structure conforms to the academic register.

An analysis of participants' responses to Item 3 follows. Based on the discussion above, it is obvious that some participants did indeed recognize that *different from* was a deviant structure in terms of its conformity to the formal and academic register. Below is an exemplary response by a participant that can function as a model response:

Mert: Both forms are used interchangeably, however, 'than' essentially indicates comparison whereas 'from' functions as a preposition which indicates separation. Depending on the context or sentence structure, one form can be preferred over the other.

For example: My car is (more) different than yours. Here, there is a sense of comparison, however, since 'more' is implied rather than physically

used, 'from' would be more appropriate, i.e., My car is different from yours. If, however, a phrase or clause follows the prepositions, then one form should be preferred over the other for accuracy.

For example: My car is different than the one you got. (with a phrase, use than) My car is different from what you got. (with a noun clause, use 'from').

Some teachers, on the other hand, thought that they were unable to distinguish between the two structures. Jalil's response offers an example: "I think both are correct. I don't know what the difference is." Jalil's answer, unfortunately, did not grant him any marks. A native speaker of English, Suzanne, displayed some doubtful attitude towards the explanation, which could be regarded as a trait that many native English-speaking teachers have. She was awarded a minimal 0.25.

Suzanne My opinion is different from yours: CORRECT. My opinion is different than yours: NOT CORRECT IN MY DIALECT OF English. I am not sure how I would explain it. I might emphasize the spatial character of from and explain in spatial metaphoric terms: distance from.

When a teacher identified which structure was correct without providing a grammatical explanation, he was awarded a minimal mark, 0.25. Here are two examples:

Osama Both forms are actually correct. However, different than is common in American English, but might sound strange to British ears, and in the UK, different to is a common alternative that is seldom used in the US. I would

advise the students that if in doubt, to stick to (meaning use **to** as a preposition).

Elia My opinion is different from yours. = CORRECT. My opinion is different than yours. = INCORRECT.

One participant displayed elevated metalinguistic awareness as he emphasized the importance of distinguishing between the registers. Here is his response:

Talat Informally, both sentences are correct, although the first sentence is more accepted. The word ‘than’ has only recently started to be used in relation to the age of the English language. Hence some educated native speakers may not favour the second sentence. Formally and strictly, the first sentence is correct but the second is not. Even when ‘than’ is used, usually is used with ‘different’ only when it is followed by a verbal clause rather than a noun. For example, it is OK to say ‘this is different than what you said’, but would be really inaccurate to say ‘this is different than yours’. ‘Than’ is usually used only in the case of comparative adjectives and when it is used with bare adjective, it is a common mistake.

It is important to underscore the importance of a teachers’ emphasis on the distinction between the *formal* and *informal* registers to be awarded a full mark.

This concludes the summary of responses to Item 3 in the *Grammar* task. Item 4 attempts to assess whether the participants were aware of the distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs.

4.4.2.4 Transitive vs. intransitive verbs. Item: “In the following two sentences, the word ‘walk’ has different meanings. How would you explain this to your students? Please provide your reasons.”

a- I walk every day. b- I walk the dog every day.

The distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs in English is intriguing and challenging for learners and at times for teachers. A teacher’s awareness of the functional difference between transitive and intransitive verbs would mark his metalinguistic awareness, at least to some extent. A typical student-generated error, *I said him*, emphasizes the importance of the distinction because *say* is an intransitive verb. The rule in English dictates that only a transitive verb can be followed by an object, whereas intransitive verbs cannot. A challenging factor in English is that some verbs can be used both as transitive and intransitive verbs based on the meaning of the verb. The verb *see* is a good example of this. In the sentence, *I see him*, the word *see* is used as a transitive verb, whereas in the sentence *I see* the verb *see* is intransitive since it is not followed by an object. In the sentence, *I see*, the verb *see* is used to mean *understand*. This is also the case with the verb *walk*. The verb *walk* can be transitive or intransitive depending on the context. In the sentences, *I walk the dog every day*, and *I walk every day*, the verb *walk* has two different meanings.

The participants’ performance in this particular task displayed a similar pattern to the previous tasks; TBL participants outperformed NTBL participants. The participants who were not aware of the transitive-intransitive distinction resorted to explaining the meaning between the two sentences. Here is an example of such an answer:

Al I walk every day is a daily exercise that I myself partake in and complete.
I walk the dog is me making the dog walk by taking him/her out. So the
dog is actually walking outside because of me.

Another participant, Hustin, did provide an adequate answer, albeit without using the metalanguage items transitive and intransitive; he was awarded 0.75 marks. Here is his complete answer: “The first needs a subject only, while the second needs an object.”

Ten participants were awarded a zero for this task, six of whom were TBL participants, who obtained an average of around 65% as opposed to an average of around 29% obtained by NTBL participants.

The following section discusses and analyses participants’ responses to Item 5

4.4.2.5 The Subjunctive Mood. Item: “Why does the verb ‘hand’ in the following sentence not have the 3rd person singular -s suffix?”

The burglar demanded that the cashier “hand” him all the money.

Item 5 in the Grammar task aimed to identify the participants’ awareness of the subjunctive mood in English. The fact that the third singular person (present form) suffix -s is not attached to the verb in the subjunctive structure is another intriguing and challenging aspect of the English grammar.

The participants’ responses indicated that this particular question was one of the most challenging for the participants as the scores they obtained for this task was among the lowest compared to the other questions in the grammar task as well as other tasks. None of the NTBL participants provided the correct answer. They thus obtained an average of zero, while TBL participants’ scores averaged approximately 38%. To be more precise, 15 participants scored a

zero, nine of whom were TBL participants. The low average for this task (28.3%) could be attributed to the fact that the subjunctive form is rarely encountered in both daily conversational and classroom interactions; it is rather encountered in more formal and academic contexts.

Talat's response sets a good model for the answer to the question: "This is because the verb demand is a subjunctive verb. It means the verb after is usually non-finite (without inflection). The same applies to verbs like 'suggest' and 'recommend'." Here is another decent answer:

Nur I'd say some verbs like demand, insist, recommend, suggest, request ... are called subjunctive verbs & don't have past, future forms or plural forms. It only uses the simple form and it stresses the importance & urgency. Subjunctive verbs are kind of noun clauses & usually used with 'that'.

Nur's response was deducted 0.25 marks because her assessment of subjunctive verbs as being similar to noun clauses cannot be justified. Obviously, verbs and clauses are different grammatical categories. The clause that follows the word *that* should also be regarded as a complete sentence since it has a subject, a verb, and an object.

Another relevant answer came from Wali who provided the following explanation: "Because the verb that follows the verb demand should be in the infinitive form with no additions." Wali's response was also deducted 0.25 marks since he did not explicitly mention the word *subjunctive*. He could have, in addition, used the verb *suffix* rather than *addition*.

The preceding discussion aimed to assess the participants' awareness of metalanguage with special reference to grammar tasks. The findings reveal that the subjunctive mood, which is referred to in rather formal contexts, presented challenges to the participants since its use is

infrequent in colloquial English. Similar to how participants responded in many other tasks in this instrument, here too, many tended to provide explanations aligned with frequently used colloquial language rather than academic English.

What follows in the next section concerns participants' responses to a rather challenging aspect of language teaching, namely phonology. The word *challenging* in the preceding sentence has been used intentionally as many teacher training programs either lack a component of instruction on phonology or allocate very limited time to the teaching and learning of sounds and sound units, especially as far as the English language is concerned.

Below are the seven items that constitute the third part of the instrument, namely the Phonology task, followed by the participants' responses to the items.

4.4.3 Task 3: Phonology.

1. The plural suffix of the word *cat* (*cats*) is pronounced [s], whereas the plural suffix of the word *dog* (*dogs*) is pronounced [z]. Please state the reason(s).
2. Arabic speakers of English usually pronounce **p** as **b**. For instance, instead of saying **paid**, they say **baid**. Can you explain why?
3. In the word "**matter**" the stress falls on the first syllable. Can you explain the reason?
4. Why is the **t** in the word *omit* doubled (i.e., *omitted*) when it receives **-ed** whereas the **n** in the word *open* is not (i.e., *opened*)?
5. What is the phonological difference between the two following sound categories?
 - a. /p, f, t, k/
 - b. /b, v, d, g/
6. How many speech sounds are there in the word **mix**?

7. What is a **phoneme**?

The third component of this PhD instrument involves the participants' sensitivity to and knowledge of sounds in English. The tasks in this part of the instrument aimed to assess the extent to which the participants were aware of relatively basic aspects of the English sound system including, but not limited to, the distinction between voiced and voiceless consonants, recognition of the number of phonemes in a word, stress patterns in English, morphophonological variations in spelling, and so forth. It is indeed the case that most teacher training programs contain very limited components of phonology, if any. As Saidi (2017) emphasizes, systematic study of sounds and pronunciation has been, to a great extent, neglected in English language teaching."

Apart from the questions on phonology, a pedagogic element was integrated into the instrument, which aimed to measure how a participant would address a linguistic transaction that frequently takes place in classrooms where students share the same L1, namely Arabic. The question reads:

"Arabic speakers of English usually pronounce /p/ as [b]. For instance, instead of saying 'paid', they say 'baid.' Can you explain why?"

The teacher's response to this question would, at least to some extent, measure both his metalinguistic awareness and his pedagogical competence. In other words, how he would address the aforesaid pronunciation error in the classroom would give us some idea about the teacher's pedagogical expertise in addition to shedding light on his own metalinguistic awareness.

An analysis of the participants' responses to the seven items in phonology and a short discussion of these responses follow.

4.4.3.1 Voicing in the pronunciation of the plural suffix -s. Item: “The plural suffix of the word cat (cats) is pronounced [s], whereas the plural suffix of the word dog (dogs) is pronounced [z]. Please state the reason(s).” The absence of robust phonological training on the part of the teachers who participated in this study was obvious. Of the 23 participants, 14 participants (eight TBL and six NTBL participants) scored zero. This suggests that 100% of the NTBL participants and 47% of the TBL participants scored nil in this first task of Phonology. Of these, six participants provided no answer, one said he was not sure, and another participant provided an irrelevant answer, which will be cited below. Here are some of the responses provided:

- | | |
|---------|---|
| Sam | The /t/ sound and the /s/ sound are both voiceless consonant sounds. That is why it is more comfortable for the speaker to have them together in a consonant sequence. The /g/ and /z/, on the other hand are voiced. |
| Firaz | Prior to an unvoiced sound like [t], the suffix is pronounced [s] while preceding a voiced sound, it is pronounced [z]. |
| Suzanne | /t/ is an unvoiced stop consonant; /g/ is a voiced one. Voicing carries over to the suffix. |
| Talat | This is because /t/ is a voiceless sound so the adjacent sound should also be voiceless but /g/ is a voiced sound and the adjacent sound should also be voiced. |

The preceding responses of the four participants showed that these teachers were fully aware that the [s] and [z] distinction in the pronunciation of the -s suffix was because of voicing. Some other participants were also aware of the voiced/voiceless distinction, but they did not

fully explain the rule and their responses were thus deducted 0.25 marks. The examples follow. Elia wrote, “/s/ is voiceless . . . /z/ is voiced” and Jalil explained, “The /t/ in cat is voiceless whereas the /g/ in dog is voiced.” Indigo, a TBL participant, provided the following response:

“This is because of the chart.”

In answering, “This is because of the chart”, the participant was most likely referring to the phonetic chart, which unfortunately did not grant him any mark.

The responses to Item 1 in the Phonology task shed some light on the participating teachers’ background in phonology. The fact that the average score of all the participants, which was approximately a mere 34%, portrays a very gloomy picture of the participants’ awareness of the voiceless-voiced distinction in phonology.

The remaining tasks in Phonology below will, to some extent, determine whether the teachers’ knowledge of phonology is consistent with their responses to Item 1.

4.4.3.2 Voiced and voiceless bilabials. Item: “Arabic speakers of English usually pronounce /p/ as [b]. For instance, instead of saying paid, they say baid. Can you explain why?”

Item 2 on the Phonology task required participants to account for a very common pronunciation error made by Arabic speaking learners. Since the voiceless bilabial stop /p/ does not exist in Arabic, learners usually resort to the nearest bilabial voiced stop, which is /b/. The responses of the participants point to a critical lack of awareness regarding the linguistic source of this error. To get a full mark on this task, the participants were required to display awareness of voicing (/p/ is voiceless whereas /b/ is voiced) and place of articulation, which is bilabial. Hence, the task aimed to elicit two metalanguage items for this task: *voiced/voiceless* and *bilabial*.

It was interesting to observe that only one participant, Suzanne, a linguist, was able to use these two terms (*voiced* and *bilabial*) to explain the source of the problem. Seventeen participants scored a zero on this task. In fact, the phonology task was the section where the participants obtained the lowest marks. Here are responses of two participants who scored 0.75. They were deducted 0.25 as they did not mention the place of articulation, namely bilabial.

Sam Arabic has no p sound, so Arabic speakers shift to the closest sound they have; which in this case voiced version of the /p/ sound.

Talat Well, not usually, but sometimes. This is particularly the case with Saudi learners. This is because the voiceless variety of the Arabic baa does not exist in Arabic. This is a problematic feature for some Arabic speakers from a contrastive analysis point of view, especially at the early stages of language learning. The same applies to /v/ and /f/.

Another teacher, Symrna, did identify the sounds /p/ and /b/ as bilabial without discussing voicing and was awarded a 0.75 as well. Here is the response: “This is the closest phonological sound to the /p/ in the Arabic language as it is also bilabial.”

As mentioned above, the most comprehensive response came from a participant, Suzanne, who was a linguist. She explained: “There is no unvoiced bilabial stop consonant in Arabic, but they do have a voiced one.”

The responses to Item 2 in Phonology points to a significant deficiency, on the part of the participants, regarding the two important aspects of phonology, voicing and place of articulation.

This confirms the absence of robust phonology instruction in teacher training programs, which requires all the stakeholders to reflect upon. The discussion above brings us to the participants' responses to Item 3 in the Phonology task.

4.4.3.3 Stressed and unstressed syllables. Item: "In the word 'matter' the stress falls on the first syllable. Can you explain the reason?" Item 3 required the participants to respond to a question regarding stress patterns in English. The participants were asked to explain why the stress fell on the first syllable in the word "matter".

TBL participants scored only slightly better in Item 3 as compared to Item 2. NTBL participants, on the other hand, received low scores similar to the ones in Item 2. Of the 17 TBL participants, four participants provided no answer and two indicated that they did not know the answer. In terms of the participants who scored zeros, of the 17 TBL participants, eight participants (47.1%) obtained a zero, whereas the percentage for NTBL participants stood at 83.3%, indicating that most of the participants had not received any training on the stress patterns of the English language. The following three responses contained adequate explanations and were therefore awarded full marks. These responses involved a sound explanation as to the fact that the suffix -er is regarded as not carrying stress because of the *schwa*, which constitutes an unstressed syllable.

Sam Word stress is arbitrary. We can't give rules but we can make some observations.

Usually the -er suffix is treated as a weak syllable.

Jalil Because the word matter has two syllables where the second one /ə/ (schwa) which is weak.

Brow No reason, I don't know why . . . -er -- —unstressed syllable

The following two responses were awarded 0.75 since they did address the question adequately but fell short of mentioning the *schwa* as constituting an unstressed syllable or any alternative explanation to that effect.

- Suzanne Not really. I vaguely remember learning about a language historical pattern in English that has lexical stress tending to shift toward word initial. Is it something to do with that? Or something to do with the flap articulation of the /tt/. flatter, latter, ladder, adder, etc. There is a paradigm.
- Vivi When there is a double consonant, the stress falls on the first syllable (Two syllable word; double the consonant (middle, piddle, little, bigger, chatter).

The responses to Item 3 reveal that the scores obtained by the participants were remarkably low, which points to the need to integrate morphophonological training into teacher training programs.

The next section discusses the participants' responses to Item 4 in Phonology.

4.4.3.4 Final consonant doubled. Item: "Why is the 't' in the word omit doubled (omitted) when it receives -ed whereas the -n in the word open is not (opened)?" Item 4 in the task *Phonology* aimed to assess the morphophonological awareness of the participants. More specifically, it attempted to gauge the participants' sensitivity to the change in stress pattern in two-syllable verbs. It aimed to assess the participants' awareness of the relationship between syllables in English and the stress pattern of syllables.

The data obtained from the participants reveal that the relationship between syllables and the stress pattern in English is not an important aspect of the teachers' everyday teaching transactions. All of the NTBL participants scored a zero as opposed to 13 out of 17 TBL participants (76.5%) who also scored zero. Only three TBL participants obtained full scores, and one teacher scored 0.75. Below are the responses of three participants who obtained a full mark.

Suzanne Not sure. Maybe to block an erroneous long –i pronunciation? But the same would apply to opened. Unless it also has to do with the difference in syllable stress. Stress on the first syllable for open, on the second syllable for omit, like:

órder = ordered refér = referred

Talat This is because the verb 'omit' consists of two syllables and the stress is on the second one, so the consonant after the last vowel should be doubled. However, the verb 'open' has two syllables but the stress is on the first syllable, hence the consonant /n/ is not doubled.

Vivi o / m̄ i t = stress falls on the second syllable; 2 syllable word= double the final consonant. ō / pen = stress falls on the first syllable.

As for the participant who received 0.75, here is his response:

Osama This is to do with stressing of the syllable. We double the final letter when a word has more than one syllable, and when the final syllable is stressed in speech. If the final syllable is not stressed, we do not double the final letter.

Osama's response was deducted 0.25 marks as he made an overgeneralization by saying "we double the final letter when a word has more than one syllable" when words consisting of three or four syllables may actually have the stress on the first, second, or on one of the remaining syllables. It is also a questionable remark to say that the final letter is doubled when the final letter in a word could well be a vowel.

This particular item in Phonology witnessed the lowest average score of 16.3% in the seven items, which points to a pressing need for raising teachers' awareness of the stress pattern in English as well as syllable awareness; especially how syllables form in English and how they contribute to the stress pattern in English. For this to materialize, it is crucial that courses in linguistics be integrated into teacher training programs, which can only come true by recognizing that native language proficiency in English and a university degree in an irrelevant academic discipline would not suffice to turn a fluently English-speaking individual into a teacher. It is obvious that short-term courses such as CELTA (Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) are far from furnishing the competence required for teaching.

The preceding summarizes the participants' responses to Item 4 in the Phonology task. Below are participants' responses to Item 5 and a brief analysis of their responses.

4.4.3.5 Voiced and voiceless consonants. Item: "What is the phonological difference between the two following sound categories?"

a- /p, f, t, k/ b- /b, v, d, g/

Item 5 in the task titled, *Phonology*, aimed to assess the teachers' sensitivity to voicing in English. More specifically, the question attempted to gauge the participants' awareness of the distinction between voiced and voiceless consonants. Compared to the previous two questions, TBL participants performed better in this question as their average success rate for this question

was 54.4% while all NTBL participants scored zero. Seven TBL participants, on the other hand, scored zero, which brought TBL participants' zero-average to approximately 41%. In total, 13 teachers (56.5%) were awarded zero. The following displays some of the answers provided by the teachers.

Sam	a-	/p, f, t, k/	voiceless
	b-	/b, v, d, g/	voiced
Firaz	a-	/p, f, t, k/	UNVOICED
	b-	/b, v, d, g/	VOICED

A participant correctly identified the two groups as voiced and voiceless but thought that all the sounds were plosives, which resulted in his being awarded only 0.25 marks. /f/ and /v/ are, in fact, fricatives rather than plosives.

Elia	a-	/p, f, t, k/	voiceless plosives
	b-	/b, v, d, g/	voiced plosives

Insofar as the teachers' responses to the questions in the Phonology task are concerned, the participants seemed to have a very limited awareness of the knowledge of sounds in English. That seven out of 17 TBL participants scored a zero in Item 5 in the Phonology task confirms this lack of awareness. It seems that a robust background of the English sound system is essential for teachers to teach pronunciation, which requires teacher training programs to incorporate at least some introductory courses in phonetics and in phonology.

The next section analyzes the participants' responses to Item 6 in Phonology.

4.4.3.6 Discrepancy between spelling and pronunciation. Item: "How many speech sounds are there in the word mix?" Item 6 essentially involved participants' awareness of phonemes. There is usually no direct correspondence between the spelling of a word and its

pronunciation in the English language since English is classified as having a deep orthography. The word mix in English is composed of four speech sounds (phonemes) although it is spelt with three letters. The question aimed to assess whether the participants were aware of this distinction in English; the lack thereof may well be perceived as a discrepancy by some whose L1 has a different phoneme/grapheme correspondence. In the word mix, the letter x represents two consecutive phonemes, namely /k/ and /s/, which are pronounced as [ks].

The pattern that persisted in the previous questions in Phonology was also consistent with Item 6; TBL participants scored significantly better than NTBL participants. NTBL participants obtained significantly more zeros than did the TBL participants. Below are some answers from the TBL participants who were awarded a full mark:

Sam	[miks] 4 sounds.
Firaz	[mIks] = 4
Elia	[m I k s] = 4
Wali	There are 4 speech sounds in the word mix.

It is interesting that four participants, three TBL and one NTBL, quoted the number of letters rather than the number of speech sounds. Here is a TBL participant's answer:

Osama	3 (three)
-------	-----------

This brings us to Item 7, which is the final item in the task titled, *Phonology*.

4.4.3.7 Awareness of phonemes. Item: "What is a phoneme?" Item 7 in the Phonology Task aimed at assessing the participants' awareness of the most basic and most important concept in phonology; the smallest sound unit, referred to as the *phoneme*. More specifically, the aim was to assess whether the participants were aware of what a phoneme referred to and whether they could define it.

The responses of the NTBL participants echoed the responses that they provided in the previous phonology; they obtained a very low average while TBL participants scored significantly better. 70.6% percent of the TBL participants provided appropriate answers while only 20.8 % of the NTBL participants were able to formulate correct responses. Only one NTBL participant scored a full mark while one NTBL participant was able to obtain a score of 0.25, for the response reproduced below:

Brow A unit of sound.

Since Brow, a NTBL participant, did not specify that a phoneme was the smallest sound unit, his definition of a phoneme as a sound unit earned him a minimal 0.25. Three NES and NTBL participants did not know what a phoneme was:

Al Not sure

Faris I don't know.

Symrna A cluster of sounds that make up a word ????

Two of the TBL and NNEs participants were also unaware of what a phoneme referred to:

Indigo Pronunciation chart.

Salima No answer

Indigo's answer, pronunciation chart, can be regarded as being irrelevant, which justifies his lack of knowledge of phonology.

The participants' performance on the individual phonology tasks was significantly below average compared to the other task categories. While, for instance, NTBL participants' average was 33% across all the tasks, this average was approximately 10% for Phonology. This vast discrepancy is indeed thought-provoking and needs to be interpreted carefully. The responses to

this task once again reveal a critical lack of awareness regarding basic knowledge of the sound system in English.

The next section displays the findings obtained in the Syntax Task.

4.4.4 Task 4: Syntax. Items: “If you identify any error(s) in any of the following sentences, first write the correct version of the sentence. Then, explain why the error might have been committed and how it can be corrected.”

1. Why you didn't visit him?
2. Do you know where does he live?
3. Do not you like coffee?
4. Never I have seen such a beautiful baby.
5. Do you like me really?
6. I always am ready.

Syntax constituted the fourth task category in the instrument. It essentially included common syntactic errors made by Arabic-speaking as well as students speaking other languages. The frequency of common syntactic errors is largely a function of psychotypology, defined as the distance of the target language to L1 as perceived by students (Kellerman, 1978).

The sentences provided in the instrument mostly involved mistakes regarding the correct position of the auxiliary verbs such as *do* and *does*, the correct position of adverbs in a sentence, and a violation of the inversion rule when an adverb, *never*, is positioned at the beginning of the sentence for the purposes of emphasis.

4.4.4.1 Misplaced auxiliary verb in a question. Item: “Why you didn't visit him?” In the first task of Syntax, the participants were required to provide an explanation for a very common mistake made by students; an incorrectly constructed question, “why you didn't visit him?” The

participants were expected to state that the auxiliary verb *did* should always precede the subject. Since Arabic, unlike English, involves no auxiliary verbs such as *do* and *did*, the use of the word “why” suffices to change a sentence into a question, an error commonly made by Arabic speakers. Hence, it is imperative that a teacher explain the word order in questions, putting emphasis on how the auxiliary verb changes position in questions and in negative sentences.

To receive a full mark, the participants needed to mention the metalanguage items *auxiliary/helping verb* and, ideally, *inversion*. Labeling the problem as *word order problem* was not regarded as a satisfactory explanation of the problem. The answer “L1 interference” was assigned a 0.25 since the participant was able to cite the source of the problem. If the participant just provided the correct word order “Why didn’t you visit him”, he was awarded a zero as this particular question was indeed a very easy, unchallenging, and straightforward task.

A comparative analysis will reveal that scores for Syntax were significantly higher than those of Phonology for all the participants, but more pronounced for NTBL participants (33% as opposed to 10%). An exemplary response came from the following participant:

Suzanne Why didn’t you visit him? Perhaps non-natives assume that the use of the question word obviates the need to invert subject and auxiliary verb. Correcting such an error-it might be helpful to call the non-native’s attention to the “Do you”, “Are you” question form and stress that it holds when a question word is added.

Quite a few other participants did also cite inversion as the source of the problem. No NTBL participant scored a zero on this particular question. Most NTBL participants’ answers were limited to labelling the problem as *L1 interference*.

It is worth noting that it was critical for this particular task that the participants cite the metalanguage *auxiliary/ helping verb* as the correction of this sentence requires the inversion of the auxiliary verb. Firaz' response provides a relevant example: "Why didn't you visit him? In question subject-auxiliary are inverted." In this sentence, Firaz has been awarded a full mark not because he formulated the correct version of the sentence, but rather because he accounted for the mistake by including metalanguage items *auxiliary verb* and *inversion*. A participant, Wali, also explained the mistake adequately but he was deducted 0.25 marks for not using the metalanguage *auxiliary verb*. He, on the other hand, did explain the fact that inversion should take place without using the word *inversion*. Here is his response: "Incorrect because of the word order of the sentence. As a question, the word did should precede the subject."

The participants' responses to Item 2 in the Syntax task follows.

4.4.4.2 Two embedded questions in a single question. Item: "Do you know where does he live?" For the second task in Syntax, there was no significant discrepancy between TBL and NTBL participants. Correcting, *where does he live?* into the noun clause, *where he lives* was the key to the answer. The expectation here was that the participant should explain that English does not allow two embedded questions in a single question, which in fact makes it a run-on sentence/question.

Nur provided an exemplary response: "Word order is problematic here again. This is a noun clause. The second part is not a question any more. It functions as the object of the sentence." Vivi offered another adequate response: "This student has again used incorrect word order. The underlined part is not a question but a noun clause. We do not use any form of do in a noun clause because it is not a question." Here Vivi eloquently uses the metalanguage noun

clause which very successfully accounts for the mistake. Other participants who used the metalanguage *clause* also obtained a full score.

Firaz Do you know where he lives? There is no do-support in subordinate clauses.

Suzanne Do you know where he lives? The non-native is thinking in terms of two sentential questions, each with its own verb rather than one sentence with an embedded relative clause.

A discussion and analysis of the participants' responses to Item 3 in the Syntax task follow.

4.4.4.3 Mislocated negative particle (not) in an uncontracted “do not” structure. Item: “Do not you like coffee?” Item 3 elicited responses where the participants' scores averaged almost half of what they had scored in Item 2. In the question, *Do not you like coffee?*, one misleading factor was that in spoken English *do* and *not* are contracted to yield *don't you* whereas in the more formal version of the sentence, when the contraction is missing, the negative adverb *not* should be placed after the subject *you* and not after the auxiliary verb *do*. Hence, the correct version of the question is either, *Don't you like coffee?* as in the informal context, or *Do you not like coffee?* which would rather be used in formal contexts. As is the case with the other items in Syntax, limiting a response to “word order problem” would not fetch a participant any mark without some additional explanation, which obviously involves the use of metalanguage in order to pinpoint the problem. It should be noted that no marks were awarded to those participants who formulated the correct sentence as this error was deemed to be easy and straightforward for any fluent English speaker.

Here are some participants' exemplary responses:

- Firaz Do you not like coffee? 'Not' should be inserted between the auxiliary and the main verb.
- Osama This is an example of an interrogative-negative question where either the abbreviated form is acceptable, i.e., Don't you like coffee? OR the expanded form with the auxiliary interrogative form is separated by the subject, i.e., Do you not like coffee?
- Mert Correction: 'Don't you like coffee? or Do you not like coffee?' When forming a negative-interrogative question, either use the contraction of the auxiliary verb + not, or auxiliary + subject + not.

As indicated above, the participants scored significantly lower in this sentence. This was more pronounced for NTBL participants. Five out of six participants scored a zero except for one participant who provided a nearly perfect response without using the metalanguage *auxiliary verb* and was therefore awarded a 0.75. Symrna wrote, "Do you not like coffee? Do is followed by subject first." It is worthwhile emphasizing that only two participants mentioned the issue of formality, both of whom were awarded a full mark. Here are their responses:

- Talat The sentence should be 'Do you not like coffee?' The grammatical mistake is that the speaker or writer moved the auxiliary and the negative particle 'not' together when making the inversion and this is not correct. We move both of these only in informal English when they are together any way such as in 'Don't you like coffee?' where there is abbreviation.

However, when they are separate, only the auxiliary is inverted with the subject.

Vivi Negative question problem: ‘Do not you like coffee.’ Possible correct constructions for this question: 1. Do you not like coffee? (Semi-formal: Can be said in a situation where you are surprised that someone does not seem to like coffee. Stress is on ‘not.’ 2. Don’t you like coffee? (Informal: said when you are surprised that a person doesn’t seem to like coffee. For some reason, this expression is only used with a contraction (don’t, doesn’t), ie. We cannot say, ‘do not you like coffee?’ Even for native speakers of English, a negative question like this can be difficult to answer without ambiguity. The best response to a negative question is a complete response. In other words: A: Don’t you like coffee? B: No, I don’t like it. A: Don’t you like coffee? B: Yes, I like it but I’m not in the mood right now.

The above item, seemingly syntactic/grammatical, was in fact more relevant to register in language; the main inquiry was whether the participants were aware that “do you not like coffee?” was a more formal version of “don’t you like coffee?” Similar to many other tasks in the instrument, the participants scored significantly lower than they did in tasks which were not relevant to register.

A discussion and analysis of participants’ responses to Item 4 in the Syntax task follow.

4.4.4.4 Incorrect inversion in sentences starting with a negative frequency adverb (*never*). Item: “Never I have seen such a beautiful baby.” In Item 4, participants were expected

to explain that the frequency adverb *never* is inverted and positioned at the beginning of sentences only for emphasis, in order to get a full mark. The data obtained from Item 4 revealed that many teachers were not aware of the inversion rule, where the frequency adverb is placed at the beginning of the sentence to make the meaning more emphatic. In this regard, those teachers who provided the correct form of the inverted sentence were awarded 0.25 marks for recognizing the inversion structure in English, despite the fact that they had not been able to account for how the inversion impacted the overall structure of the sentence.

It is interesting to note that NTBL participants obtained a higher average than did the TBL participants (37.5% as opposed to 25%). It is also interesting that slightly more than half of the TBL participants (52.9%) obtained a zero as opposed to only 16.7% of the NTBL participants. Here is an exemplary response:

Talal The sentence should be ‘Never have I seen such a beautiful baby’. The rule here says that when a sentence starts with a negative adverbial phrase such as ‘Never, not only, seldom, rarely, etc’, there should be inversion between the subject and the auxiliary.

The following two participants, one of whom is TBL and the other NTBL, also provided near-perfect responses, but they were deducted 0.25 marks for not explaining that when a sentence starts with a negative adverb or an adverbial phrase such as *never, rarely, not only, no sooner . . . than*, and *under no circumstances*, inversion should take place, which is a process that incorporates reversing the regular subject-verb order.

Suzanne Never have I seen such a beautiful baby. A focussing / emphasizing transformation of I have never seen becomes → Never have I seen. The

transformed partial sentence, [never] have I seen could perhaps strike a non-native as being a question form, prompting, [never] I have seen instead.

Jesus Never have I seen such a beautiful baby. This is an emphatic statement and in order to stress and make the sentence very emphatic we reverse the normal order 'I have never seen' to 'Never have I seen'. This is done for emphasis and to make the statement very strong. The student tried to do this but didn't use the correct form.

Suzanne's use of the word *transformation*, rather than *inversion* could be seen as a function of her specialist knowledge of linguistics as the term *transformation* is frequently used in theoretical linguistics.

Interestingly, about one quarter of the participants corrected the sentence to "I have never seen such a beautiful baby" which implies that they were not aware of the inversion rule used for the purposes of emphasis. This is evident in Wali's following response: "Incorrect: I have never seen such a beautiful baby. The position of the word never should be after the helping verb have." Inversion does not frequently take place in informal/daily spoken communication. It is usually encountered in more formal contexts. As Al-Azzawi (2009, p. 3) puts it:

Inversion may perform certain functions of emphasis or delivering a sense of formality in political speech, on the news as well as literature. It may be used by native speakers in daily conversation. So, 'inversion is used to give emphasis or to be rhetorical in more formal situations, in political speech, on the news, and also in literature.'

Similar to the previous task in Syntax, the process of inverting the word order in English is rather used in the formal register and is characteristic of formal/academic English. Similar to the other tasks in the instrument that aimed to assess the participants' awareness of the formal versus informal distinction, the participants did not obtain particularly high scores in this task, which tends to corroborate other findings in this instrument. Item 4 in Syntax, in fact, witnessed the lowest average score for the whole task, Syntax. Participants, in general, did indeed obtain low scores that pertain to register, which in this study was interpreted as the participants' awareness of the distinction between formal and informal language.

A discussion and analysis of participants' responses to Item 5 in the Syntax task follow.

4.4.4.5 Misplaced adverb in a do-question. Item: "Do you like me really?" The question, *Do you like me really?* was designed to assess participants' awareness of the correct position of the adverb in a question. The average score for TBL participants was 64.7% whereas the NTBL participants scored 16.7% on average. The main requirement in this sentence was that the participants were expected to point out that an adverb (really) under normal conditions would be placed between the subject and the verb. If the verb is to be in the sentence, then the adverb would be placed after the verb to be as in the example, *I am usually late*. It is worthwhile emphasizing that providing the correct response, *Do you really like me?* would not get a participant any marks since the question is deemed to be unchallenging. However, Vivi's response is adequate: "Adverb should go between S and Verb = You REALLY like."

To obtain a full score on this sentence, the participants were expected to use the metalanguage items: *adverb*, *subject*, and *main verb*. Another adequate response came from the following participant:

Talat The sentence should be ‘Do you really like me?’ Usually, adverbs of degree come before the main verb and after the auxiliary verb. However, I would not personally rule this sentence out; it is widely used in informal English.

The participant quoted below explained that *really* as an adverb modified the verb *like* but he did not elaborate on where adverbs are positioned in sentences and hence his response was awarded only 0.25 marks.

Light Do you really like me? or Do you like me, really? With the first example, it is a word order error. With the second example a comma is missing. In the first example, really is an adverb modifying ‘like’. In the second example, the comma adds a pause and casts doubt on whether or not the listener likes the speaker.

A similar lack of clarification was observed in Symrna’s response: “Do you like me really? Misplaced modifier as really modifies liking.”

In the following response, on the other hand, Brow uses the metalanguage *verb* and explains that it is an *adverb of manner* that modifies a *verb*. This participant was therefore awarded 0.75 marks for his considerably more comprehensive metalinguistic explanation. Brow wrote: “Do you really like me? Really: adverb of manner = before the verb. The army always is ready.” Brow’s example, however, the army always is ready, cannot be regarded as correct as in sentences where the main verb is *to be*, the adverb is normally preceded by the verb *to be* and followed by the predicate; in this case *ready*, which results in the following word order: “The army is always ready.”

It should be noted, though, that an adverb can sometimes be followed by the verb *to be* for the purpose of attributing emphasis to the sentence, especially in non-academic contexts. It was for this particular nuance that Brow was deducted 0.25 marks.

A discussion and an analysis of participants' responses to Item 6 in the Syntax task follow.

4.4.4.6 Misplaced adverb in sentences with the main verb “be”. Item: “I always am ready.” Item 6 in the Syntax task aimed to assess the participants' awareness of whether the normal position of the adverb in a sentence (the adverb being between the subject and the verb as in Sentence 5) is applicable to sentences in which the main verb is the verb *to be*. To be awarded a full mark, the participants were required to explain the default position of an adverb in sentences that contain all the verbs other than *to be*, as opposed to sentences with the main verb *to be*, complemented by the use of the metalanguage item *adverb*.

TBL participants scored remarkably better than did NTBL participants, a pattern that persisted throughout the other tasks in the instrument. Below are some participants' responses that could be regarded as being exemplary.

Jalil	I am always ready. Verb position of the adverb always. Overgeneralization of the rule: Adverbs precede verbs.
Talat	The sentence should be ‘I am always ready’. While adverbs of frequency usually come before the main verb in the sentence, they usually come after verb ‘to be’.
Vivi	This is a BE verb so the frequency adverb always need to go after the verb.

It is interesting that a TBL participant identified *am* in the sentence, *I am always ready* as a helping verb although *am* as the only verb in the sentence serves as the main verb of the sentence rather than the helping/auxiliary verb. Here is the relevant answer: “Helping verb can’t go after the adverb.”

Osama’s following explanation is correct, to some extent, but adverbs of frequency are preceded *only* by the verb *to be*; with all other verbs, adverbs normally precede the verb. Since Osama’s explanation lacks this detail, his was deducted 0.25 marks resulting in his obtaining 0.75 marks. He wrote, “An affirmative statement with an adverb of frequency is always preceded by the verb to be (in this case, am).”

NTBL participants’ average score was relatively low in Syntax (33%) compared to their most successful task, Parts of Speech, where their average was 48%. This points to a need for the integration of a Syntax component into teacher training, which would contribute to teachers’ awareness of complex clausal structures that go as far as determining where to place punctuation in a sentence and whether certain clauses function as the subject or the object of the sentence. It is imperative that teachers not only know how syntactic processes impact the sentence structure, but that they are also able to deliver to students the outcome of syntactic transformations in the most concise, clear, and most importantly explicit manner. It is important for any teacher to be able to respond to questions starting with the words *why* and *how* rather than saying “this is the way we say it in English; don’t ask!” When a student asks the question “why can’t we say *do you know where does he live?*”, a teacher should be able to provide the rule explicitly and say that English does not allow two embedded questions in one question, which actually makes it a run-on question. As Vivi and Nur emphasized in Item 2, the second part of the sentence has to be converted into a noun clause to avoid two auxiliary *do-questions* stacked together. The fact

that the teachers obtained an average of 49% in Syntax reveals a critical deficiency in terms of their metalinguistic awareness regarding the word order in English and, more particularly, regarding how metalanguage can be used to explain the source of an error to a student.

The next section analyzes the findings obtained from the participants' responses to the task titled, *Morphology*.

4.4.5 Task 5: Morphology.

1. *Immature, impossible, impolite* vs. *unable, inefficient, dislike, irrelevant*

Task: Explain when/why *im-* (versus *un-*, *in -*, *dis -*, etc.) should be used before certain adjectives.

2. How many **morphemes** are there in the following words?

- a. *Cats*

- b. *Decaffeinated*

- c. *Happy*

3. The word **able** changes its meaning when the negative prefixes are added to it.

Please comment on the word (**able**) before any affixation process and explain how the negative prefixes contribute to the change in meaning.

- a. able

- b. **enable**

- c. **unable**

- d. **disable**

4. I'm very sorry to hear this news.

Task: Please comment on (-s) at the end of the word news.

5. Please comment on (-ly) in the following two words regarding their function.

- a. lovely
- b. slowly

A discussion and analysis of participants' responses to Item 1 in the Morphology task follows.

4.4.5.1 *Im-morpheme before adjectives starting with bilabial consonants.* Item:

“Immature, impossible, impolite vs. unable, inefficient, dislike, irrelevant. Task: Explain when/why im- (versus un-, in -, dis -, etc.) should be used before certain adjectives.” Item 1 in Morphology aimed to assess the participants' awareness of a morphophonological rule. It is usually the case that to turn an adjective into a negative, different prefixes are added to the root. Okada (2013) explains that as per the phonological assimilation rule, the prefix in- displays an interesting assimilation behavior as a prefix because it usually assimilates to /im/ before bilabials /p/, /b/ and /m/. Adjectives ending in a suffix such as -ful and -able, however, do not seem to follow the same assimilation pattern as in the lexical items such as *meaningful* and *reasonable*, which is pointed out below by the participant with the pseudonym Talat (his response is further below).

Language teacher training programs, in general, be they at the certificate or degree level, put very little emphasis on the study of sounds in English. This is reflected in the participants' responses to Item 1. TBL participants' average stood at only 25% while none of the NTBL participants appeared to be aware of the morphophonological assimilation rule at play.

Here is the best possible response from a participant with a solid background in linguistics. In his explanation, he uses both the metalanguage items *bilabial* and *assimilation*.

Firaz The prefixes im- and in- usually modify adjectives and are identical in meaning (they flip the meaning of the adjective to give the opposite

meaning). The only difference is that im- appears before the bilabial [p] and is probably due to assimilation of [n] to the [p] following it—The morpheme ir- is just like im- except it appears before an [r]. Un- usually modifies verbs to give a meaning of reversing an action. The morpheme dis- is much less productive than un- but it too modifies verbs to give the meaning of reversing an action as such. The opposite word usually begins with en- (Examples: encourage/discourage, enable/disable, entangle/disentangle.

Wali also provided an adequate response discussing the nasalization process for ease of pronunciation and referred to assimilation, albeit implicitly. His following explanation was awarded a full mark as well: “We use im- instead of in- because in-ends in a nasal sound while im- ends in a nasal-bilabial sound which makes it easy to pronounce the word.”

The following participant’s response earned him only 0.25 marks as he did not provide an explanation of the place of articulation (bilabial); neither did he discuss the phonological assimilation.

Talat The pre-fix ‘im’ is usually used before adjectives starting with ‘p’ and ‘m’ such as in ‘imperfect, improper, impossible, impotent, impractical, immature, immoral, etc). However, with using prefixes and suffixes, there is no fixed rule, and exceptions are many. For instance, we don’t say ‘irreasonable’ but ‘unreasonable’; we don’t say ‘immeaningful’ but ‘meaningless’.

Talat's examples, *irreasonable* and *immeaningful* as deviating from the norm, do not constitute a solid case as both of the above adjectives end in a suffix; *-able* in the case of *irreasonable* and *-ful* in the case of *immeaningful*.

It is interesting to note that 16 out of 23 participants scored a zero on this particular task, which witnessed the lowest average, 18.5%, in the section titled, *Morphology*. This tends to confirm a lack of morphophonological knowledge on the part of these participants, which points to the urgency of the integration of phonological and morphological training into teacher training programs.

The following subsection displays and discusses the participants' responses to Item 2 in Morphology.

4.4.5.2 Awareness of morphemes. Item: "How many morphemes are there in the following words?"

a- Cats b- Decaffeinated c- Happy

Item 2 in Morphology aimed to assess the participants' awareness of morphemes in English. Words can be divided into syllables and morphemes in English. In this part of the Morphology task, the participants were required to provide the number of morphemes in a word.

The fact that this particular task had three options for the participants to choose from, required a different grading scheme; one correct answer would award a participant 0.33 marks and two correct answers 0.66 marks. The success rate for this particular task was 64.5% for TBL participants as opposed to 22.2% for NTBL participants.

The participants provided a variety of answers to the question on the number of morphemes, although the most interesting response came from a TBL participant who thought that the word *happy* had *no* morphemes in it. His responses reveal that this particular participant

believed that morphemes were only suffixes that are added to the base, but not the root or the base word itself. In this scenario, for the word *eats*, his answer would also be a 1= one, similar to his response for *cats* (one morpheme).

Light Cats: 1 b- Decaffeinated: 2 c- Happy: 0

The next Item in Morphology generated the lowest scores across all the tasks. The participants' responses to Item 3, a discussion about the nature of their responses, and the causes of such low scores on the part of the participants is presented below.

4.4.5.3 Contribution of morphemes to meaning. Item: "The word *able* changes its meaning when the negative prefixes are added to it. Please comment on the word (*able*) before any affixation process and explain how the negative prefixes contribute to the change in meaning."

a- *able* b- *enable* c- *unable* d- *disable*

In response to this particular item, most of the participants resorted to explaining the changes in meaning that prefixation caused rather than explaining how affixation brought upon changes in the meaning of the root word. Here is an example:

Salima	a-	<i>able</i>	adjective, describes a noun.
	b-	<i>enable</i>	make it possible
	c-	<i>unable</i>	somebody is not in a position to do something
	d-	<i>disable</i>	something is preventing somebody to do something

The participants were expected, albeit not exclusively, to provide some of the explanation below. The word *able* can function as either a *free* or *bound* morpheme. The negative prefixes such as *un-*, *in-*, and *dis-* are bound morphemes which cannot function as stand-alone lexical items.

For instance, in the sentence, "he is not able to come", the word *able* is a free morpheme since it can function independently and has a meaning, even when it is a stand-alone vocabulary

item. The word *able* can also function as a suffix, in which case it should be regarded as a bound morpheme. As a bound morpheme, it cannot have an independent meaning; it rather changes a particular *noun* or *verb* into an *adjective*. In other words, it has the capacity to convert a *noun* or a *verb* into an *adjective* as in the following sentences.

- a. The chair is so comfortable**able**.
- b. The humidity in this city is hardly tolerable**able**.

As for the prefixation aspect of the changes made, the word *enable*, for instance, is a verb derived from the root *-able*. So, when the prefix *en-* is added to the root, it converts it into a *verb*. Examples of this are: **en**danger, **en**act, **en**courage, etc. As for the word *unable*, the prefix *un-* makes the adjective *able* negative, but it does not take away its adjectival function, which means both *able* and *unable* are adjectives, the latter being a negative one. In the word *disable*, the prefix has two functions. The first one is that it adds negativity to the root, *able* and it changes it into a verb. In a way, *enable* and *disable* share similar attributes; both of them are causative verbs. In *enable*, some agent causes some function to operate and in *disable*, some agent causes some function to stop.

For this particular task in Morphology, all NTBL participants scored a zero and no TBL participant obtained a full mark. TBL participants' average score for this task was a record low of 2.9%. This poor performance could have been caused by two factors. The task was either not clear to the teachers, or their morphological background was so poor that they just resorted to providing the meaning of the words after the affixation process.

The next subsection analyses participants' responses to Item 4 in Morphology.

4.4.5.4 Plural morpheme not functioning as a plural marker. Item: "I'm very sorry to hear this news. Task: Please comment on (-s) at the end of the word news."

In this particular task, the participants were asked to respond to a rather confusing question. The question was confusing because the *-s* at the end of the word *news* is actually not a suffix, but part of the base word. However, since *-s* at the end of the word *news* looks exactly the same as the plural *-s* marker, the question was designed intentionally to assess the participants' attention to the particular detail and to assess whether they were aware that *-s* in the noun *news* was not a plural suffix.

The participants' scores were relatively high on this task. While the TBL participants obtained an average of 75%, the NTBL participants' average stood at approximately 33%. Some adequate responses provided by participants follow.

- Firaz Actually, I don't think it is a suffix at all. Even though it looks like as if the plural suffix "–s" has been attached to the word 'new'. Perhaps historically it was conceived as a plural, meaning 'new things', but synchronically it probably is best analyzed as a single morpheme meaning new information.
- Elia It is a part of the base word.
- Jalil The –s at the end of news is not a plural suffix, it is part of the base.
- Light I do not think this qualifies as a suffix. The word in its basic form contains an "s".
- Talat The suffix '-s' is part of the word here and it is not treated as a plurality marker. Therefore, the word 'news' takes a singular verb and is an uncountable noun. In fact, I don't think the '-s' can be treated as a suffix here as it is part of the word and it is not an inflectional morpheme.

In addition, an NTBL participant, Jesus, provided a response that was as good as those above, if not better: “It is not a plural S but part of the whole morpheme news.” On the other hand, another NTBL participant, Brow, limited his explanation to providing what part of speech each of the two words, *new* and *news* represented: “New: adjective; has to be news. News makes it a noun.” He was awarded 0.25 marks for correctly identifying that *new* was an adjective and *news* was a noun.

The following subsection discusses the participants’ responses to Item 5 in the Morphology task.

4.4.5.5 Overgeneralization of the -ly suffix as an adverb. Item: “Please comment on (-ly) in the following two words regarding their function.”

a- lovely

b- slowly

Item 5 in Morphology aimed to gauge another seemingly confusing topic, which is the addition of the *-ly* suffix to an adjective to make it an adverb. It is usually the case that students, and even some teachers, overgeneralize the rule and they treat all *-ly* ending words as adverbs as in the case of *lovely* and *likely*. Indeed, a TBL teacher overgeneralized the *-ly* rule and identified both *lovely* and *slowly* as adverbs, which again fits one type of language fossilization, namely overgeneralization. Here is his answer:

Elia a- lovely → adverbs b- slowly → adverbs

In general, most of the participants obtained good scores on this task as the average success rate stood at 82.6%. Many participants provided adequate responses to the question. Below are some exemplary answers that enabled the participants to obtain a full mark for this question.

the task that required them to recognize the *-s* at the end of the word *news*. This raises the question whether the *-s* suffix is a more challenging suffix than the *-ly* suffix since the *-s* suffix is used as a plural marker and as the third person singular verb marker for the pronouns *she*, *he*, and *it*. Although this is not the main enquiry of this study, it is a topic which researchers might wish to address in future.

A description, discussion, and analysis of the 11 Items in the Parts of Speech task follow.

4.4.6 Task 6: Identification of parts speech. What part of speech does each word in bold represent in the following sentences (e.g., noun)?

1. It is **likely** to rain today.
2. The car is **his**.
3. I **hardly** speak any French.
4. The student studied **hard**.
5. **Never** has he been there.
6. You **had better** do your homework now.
7. The bus stop is **there**.
8. **They** have not seen **us**.
9. We went there **yesterday**.
10. **Jogging** right after a meal is not recommended.

Additional Item:

11. What is the difference between a **phrase** and a **clause**?

The task titled, *Parts of Speech*, aimed to assess the participants' awareness of how well they were equipped with the knowledge of parts of speech. The lexical items in this task were

provided in a sentence so that it would be more convenient for the participants to identify the part of the speech in the presence of contextual clues. Otherwise, this task could well lead to participant confusion since in English, certain lexical items can represent two and at times three parts of speech. As explained in Chapter 3, Parts of Speech will follow a different marking scheme; 1 for a full mark, 0 for an unsatisfactory answer, and a 0.5 for a reasonably satisfactory answer.

A discussion and analysis of participants' responses to Item 1 follow.

4.4.6.1 Likely. Item: "It is likely to rain today." In the sentence, "it is likely to rain", it was predicted that the word *likely* might give the impression of being an adverb as it ends in the suffix *-ly*, as is the case with the words *slowly* and *easily*. It was indeed the case that 13 out of 23 participants (56.5%) believed that the word *likely* was an adverb. It is possible to label this as *overgeneralization*, a type of language fossilization, where teachers conceptualized *likely* as an adverb.

There is abundance of literature on *fossilization* based on the errors made by students; not much research, if any, has been conducted on the fossilization of errors teachers make. Hence, these findings might open up new avenues for research on the mistakes that teachers make. Arguably, errors that teachers commit have the strong potential to have a negative impact on their instruction.

A discussion and analysis of participants' responses to Item 2 follow.

4.4.6.2 His. Item: "The car is his." In the sentence, *the car is his*, the participants were required to distinguish between a possessive adjective and a possessive pronoun. The word *his* is usually labeled as a possessive adjective because it precedes a noun as in the example, *his book*.

When, however, in a context where the noun can be omitted to avoid repetition, the whole noun phrase can be reduced to a possessive pronoun as in the following example:

This is my book, and that is *his*.

The word *book* following the possessive pronoun *his* is omitted above to avoid wordiness as the word *book* is understood even if it has been omitted. The participants obtained quite high scores for this task; TBL participants scored an average of 76.5% while NTBL participants' average stood at 50%. Those participants whose responses were limited to "pronoun" were awarded only half a mark. Four out of 17 TBL and four out of six NTBL participants labeled *his* as a pronoun, while three participants thought that the word *his* in the sentence, *The car is his*, was an adjective.

A discussion and analysis of the participants' responses to Item 3 follow.

4.4.6.3 Hardly. Item: "I hardly speak any French." In the sentence, *I hardly speak any French*, the participants were expected to label the term *hardly* as an adverb of manner. Those participants who believed that *hardly* was a frequency adverb rather than an adverb of manner were awarded 0.5, whereas all others were awarded a full mark. The success rate for this particular task was the highest compared to all other task categories; 94.1% for TBL participants and 100% for NTBL participants. This particular task was one of the very few tasks where NTBL participants scored better than TBL participants. In addition, no participants scored zero. The high success rate for this task could be attributed to the fact that the *-ly* suffix, in general, represents word endings for adverbs; which is familiar to many practicing teachers. The next subsection presents an analysis of responses to Item 4 in Parts of Speech.

4.4.6.4 Hard. The student studied hard. Item 4 in Parts of Speech, similar to the previous item, aimed to assess participants' awareness of whether they knew that *hard* could function both

as an *adjective* and an *adverb* depending on its position in the sentence. As was the case in previous tasks, some teachers tended to overgeneralize the rule and they treated the word *hard* as an adjective, irrespective of its position. This overgeneralization, again a type of language fossilization, was also the case in this task, albeit to a lesser extent. Three TBL (17.6%) and two NTBL (33.3%), five participants in total (21.7%) believed that the word *hard* in the sentence, “the student studied hard” represented an adjective. It is obvious that the word *hard* in this sentence represents an *adverb* since it modifies the verb *study*. The success rate for this task was approximately 82% for TBL and almost 67% for NTBL participants.

An analysis of the participants’ responses to Item 5 in Parts of Speech follows.

4.4.6.5 Never. Item: “Never has he been there.” Item 5 in this task aimed to assess participants’ awareness of the use of an adverb at the beginning of the sentence. The frequency adverb *never* was inverted and hence was positioned at the beginning of the sentence for emphasis. Although many participants labeled *never* as an *adverb* only rather than a *frequency adverb*, they were still awarded full marks. The participants obtained exceptionally high scores on this task. With the exception of one NTBL participant whose response was limited to “negative” only, every participant was aware that the word *never* was an adverb. The next subsection discusses and analyses participants’ responses to Item 6 in Parts of Speech.

4.4.6.6 Had better. Item: “You had better do your homework now.” Item 6 aimed to assess the participants’ awareness of a relatively less frequently used modal auxiliary verb, namely *had better*, which is close in meaning to *should*, normally used to express rather strong advice. Although the main verb in the sentence, “you had better do your homework now” is *do*, four participants thought that *had better* was a *verb*, whereas three participants believed that it was an *adverb*. Two participants, on the other hand, believed that *had better* was an *adjective*.

Fourteen participants out of 23 scored a zero on this task, pointing to a lack of awareness regarding *had better*.

Compared to the previous tasks in Parts of Speech, participants scored considerably lower in this item, most probably due to the infrequent use of *had better* in their daily teaching transactions. According to the British National Corpus, *had better*, a modal auxiliary verb, occurs only 507 times, whereas *should*, another modal auxiliary verb, which can be regarded as a synonym of *had better*, occurs 107, 822 times. Schwartz and Causarano (2007) posit that high-frequency language constructions, in contrast to low-frequency ones, provide more exemplars for L2 learners to make generalizations which is a likely factor that might have accounted for the low scores for this particular task.

The responses to Item 6, in short, support the research results conducted with students that language structures that are more frequently used are likely to be retained in the long-term memory compared to the low-frequency ones. Teachers, in this research, seem to have followed the same pattern.

A presentation and discussion of participants' responses to Item 7 follow.

4.4.6.7 There. Item: "The bus stop is there." Item 7 in Parts of Speech aimed to assess a frequently used lexical item, *there*, which is normally classified as an *adverb of place* in terms of its grammatical category. Similar to the results obtained in the previous task for *had better*, 13 participants out of 23 scored a zero, pointing to the fact the participants lacked awareness regarding their knowledge of what part of speech the lexical item *there* represented. Other parts of speech such as adjectives, pronouns, and prepositions were included in participants' responses.

A discussion and analysis of participants' responses in Item 8 follow.

4.4.6.8 They, us. Item: “They have not seen us.” Item 8 in Parts of Speech aimed to assess participants’ awareness of English pronouns and more specifically, it gauged whether the participants were aware of the distinction between subject and object pronouns. Those participants who said that both *they* and *us* were pronouns were awarded only half a mark. The success rate was fairly high for this task; 79.4% for TBL and 50% for NTBL participants. The responses of two participants stood out. Here is a linguist, Suzanne’s response:

“Nominative/accusative pronouns.” Another participant, Osama, provided a most sophisticated response: “They = gender-neutral subjective plural pronoun and us = gender-neutral plural objective pronoun.”

A discussion and analysis of participants’ responses to Item 9 follow.

4.4.6.9 Yesterday. Item: “We went there yesterday.” Item 9 in Parts of Speech aimed to assess the participants’ awareness of the word yesterday in the sentence, *We went there yesterday*. Compared to Item 8, the NTBL participants scored lower on this task (33.3%) while TBL participants did relatively well again (76.5%). In total, eight zeros were awarded to the participants, four of which were for TBL and the remaining four were for NTBL participants.

A participant incorrectly labelled yesterday as a noun while another said *yesterday* was a past tense, leading us to think that the participant believed that the word *yesterday* was a verb. Such poor responses are thought-provoking as they present a gloomy picture in terms of teachers’ metalinguistic awareness, which in turn begs the question why and how the teacher training programs that the teachers underwent neglected such basic elements of language.

A discussion and analysis of the participants’ responses to Item 10 follow.

4.4.6.10 Jogging. Item: “Jogging right after a meal is not recommended.” Item 10 aimed to assess participants’ awareness of gerunds functioning as nouns, in this case at the beginning of

the sentence. Since *gerunds* are regarded as nouns, they can function as either the subject or object of the sentence. In the sentence, “jogging right after a meal is not recommended”, the word *jogging*, in the sentence-initial position, is a gerund and it functions as the subject of the sentence.

Overall, the participants obtained high scores; 79.4% for TBL and 66.6% for NTBL participants. Only three participants were awarded a zero, which confirms that both groups did well on this task. Those participants who limited their response to “noun” alone were awarded only 0.5 since they were expected to explain that *jogging* with an *-ing* suffix was a gerund functioning as a noun. Three participants said *jogging* was a verb; they did not recognize that *jogging* was positioned at the beginning of the sentence functioning as the subject of the sentence. A verb at the beginning of a sentence cannot possibly function as the subject of the sentence unless it is in the imperative form as in the example *sit down*, with the difference that in the sentence *sit down* the subject (you) is hidden and is normally implied.

The participants’ responses to Item 11 in Parts of Speech follows. These responses are slightly different from the preceding 10 items as the participants were required to explain the difference between a *clause* and a *phrase*.

4.4.6.11 Phrase vs. clause. Item: “What is the difference between a phrase and a clause?” The last item in the Parts of Speech task aimed to assess the participants’ awareness of the distinction between a clause and a phrase. The simplest explanation of the difference between the two is that a clause is a group of words that contain a *verb* (when I saw him), whereas a phrase is a group of words not containing a *verb* (on the table). TBL participants obtained an average of 58.8% while NTBL participants’ average stood at 33.3% for this task.

Eight participants, half of whom were TBL participants, scored a zero. Below are some exemplary responses to the question:

- Elia Phrase: doesn't contain a subject and a verb
 Clause: contains a subject and a predicate
- Talat Normally, a phrase does not have a verb, but a clause has a verb. Hence a sentence is usually called a clause.

Below is a partially correct response:

- Nur Phrase is a word or a group words which has a meaningful form. e.g.,
 Thanks; an art gallery. Clause is a group of words which has a subject and a verb, but it is not a full sentence; it is a kind of dependent one. e.g.,
 When he saw me.

Nur's judgment that a clause is not a full sentence and that it is a kind of dependent one cannot be justified because a clause can be either *dependent* or *independent*. For this reason, Nur was deducted 0.25 marks. The following participants provided incorrect responses, significantly deviating from the correct answer; they were therefore awarded zeros.

- Mert A phrase consists of a subject and a verb; a clause doesn't.
- Sierra A phrase is a compound noun. A clause is an incomplete sentence.
- Hustin A phrase can contain clauses.

The preceding mistakes point to the teachers' lack of metalinguistic knowledge regarding the most basic elements of a sentence in English.

This brings us to the end of the discussion and analysis of the participants' responses to the items in the section titled, Parts of Speech.

4.4.7 Task 7: Procedural grammar.

The last section of the instrument, namely *Procedural Grammar*, attempted to assess the participants' reaction to simulated real classroom challenges, where the questions were specifically designed to resemble those that would emerge in real-life classroom transactions.

1. How do the two words (**swimming**) in **a** and **b** vary in terms of their grammatical function?

c. I am **swimming**.

d. **Swimming** is good for you.

2. **What made the landing difficult** was severe weather conditions.

Please comment on the grammatical function of “**What made the landing difficult**” in the sentence.

3. A student in your class is having trouble with (**'s: apostrophe s**). He thinks that (**'s**) in the following sentence represents **has**. (The sentence is not meaningful.)

Ali's a car.

How would you help this student? Explain to the student when (**'s**) can represent **has, is**, and when it can refer to a **possessive** form.

4. I wish I **had** a car.

Your students think that the verb **had** in the sentence refers to some action completed in the past. How would you tackle this problem? Provide a thorough explanation to the students.

5. I cannot accept **what you have done**.

Please comment on the grammatical function of “**what you have done**”.

A discussion and analysis of Item 1 in the Procedural Grammar task follow.

4.4.7.1 Present participle: verb or gerund. The item description is presented below.

“a- I am swimming. b- Swimming is good for you. How do the two words (swimming) in a and b vary in terms of their grammatical function?”

The first item in the subsection titled, *Procedural Grammar*, required the participants to distinguish between *swimming* as a noun and *swimming* as the main verb of *am swimming*. The participants were expected to use the metalanguage *gerund* to refer to *swimming* used as a *noun* and *swimming* as *verb*, the latter being used in the present continuous tense.

To obtain a full mark, the participants were required to use the metalanguage *gerund* or another word or phrase that would be equivalent to *gerund*. For instance, the phrase *verbal noun* would satisfy the requirement as the use of *verbal noun* points to a participant’s awareness of the fact that *swimming*, derived from the infinitive *to swim*, in the subject position functions as a noun. In this respect, if a participant said *verbal noun* or *noun* used as a *subject*, he would also obtain a full mark.

This particular task witnessed the highest average obtained in this section as well as across all the other task categories. The fact that only one participant scored zero accounts for the high average obtained in this section. TBL participants obtained an average of 86.8% on this task while NTBL participants obtained a record high average of 95.8%. The only participant that scored a zero provided the following explanation which was devoid of any use of metalanguage. Indigo explained: “A shows an action currently taking place. B shows a general action good for you.” A full explanation came from a linguist. Here is Suzanne’s response: “a- I

am swimming (present continuous form of the verb swim; part of the . . . predicate.) b-
Swimming is good for you. (nominalized form of the verb-sentential subject.)”

Suzanne’s use of the *nominalized form of the verb-sentential subject* once again reflects her background in theoretical linguistics, which was awarded a full mark since this phrase replaces the metalanguage item *gerund*. This phrase may not be a very student-friendly metalanguage that can be used in a real second/foreign language classroom as the term *nominalized* would, most probably, not make sense to a student.

A discussion and analysis of Item 2 in the Procedural Grammar task follow.

4.4.7.2 Noun clause as the subject of the sentence. Item: “What made the landing difficult was severe weather conditions. Please comment on the grammatical function of ‘What made the landing difficult’ in the sentence.”

Item 2 in Procedural Grammar was among those tasks where a significant number of participants, 10 out of 23 (43.5%), obtained a zero. In the sentence, *What made the landing difficult was severe weather conditions*, the participants were required to label what made the landing difficult as a *noun clause*, which functioned as the subject of the sentence. An adequate response came from the following participant, Osama: “This is a complex sentence with a noun clause acting as the subject in the sentence.” NTBL participants obtained the lowest average (16.7%) for this task.

Those participants whose responses were limited to saying *what made the landing difficult* was the subject of the sentence were deducted 0.25 marks; their responses therefore obtained 0.75 marks. For instance, Sam wrote: “What made landing difficult here is used as a subject.” One of the participants thought that the clause “what made the landing difficult” was a

subordinate clause for which he was deducted 0.25 marks. Here is Talat's sentence: In this sentence, the clause in bold (referring to quotation marks) is used as a subordinate clause, and it is the subject for the sentence."

An analysis of the participants' responses to Item 3 in Procedural Grammar follows.

4.4.7.3 Varying functions of apostrophe s ('s). "A student in your class is having trouble with ('s: apostrophe s). He thinks that ('s) in the following sentence represents has. (The sentence is not meaningful.) Ali's a car. How would you help this student? Explain to the student when 's can represent has, is, and when it can refer to a possessive form."

Item 3, in this section, aimed to elicit teachers' explanations on a rather complex grammar rule, namely the apostrophe -s ('s). Apostrophe -s is used in a variety of contexts to refer to possession and to the contraction of *is* or *has* after either a subject pronoun or proper/common noun to refer to different structures that have different meanings. Apostrophe -s is extremely confusing to students and it therefore requires teachers to provide adequate explanations in terms of both structure and meaning. Item 3 witnessed one of the lowest averages for both TBL and NTBL teachers, 42.6% and 12.5% respectively. The participants provided a variety of responses. An adequate explanation came from the following participant:

Talat The apostrophe s usually refers to 'has' when the verb 'has' is used as an auxiliary verb; i.e., a main verb should come after the apostrophe s and that verb should be suffixed with 'ed' if regular or should have the third form of the verb (past participle) if irregular (e.g., He's finished, she's done her homework).

The apostrophe s usually refers to 'is' if it is not followed by a main verb; i.e., the verb 'is' in this case is the main verb itself. In this case, it is

usually followed by either an adjective (as in He's good) or a determiner phrase DP (i.e., a noun phrase that has a determiner as in 'He's a teacher'). The apostrophe s usually refers to the possessive form if it is followed by a noun or a noun phrase but not a determiner phrase DP. There must not be any determiner (e.g., article) after the apostrophe s in this case. For instance, it is incorrect to say 'Steven's a car' but 'Steven's car', as the first sentence 'Steven's a car' would be meaningless as Steven cannot be a car'.

There were also participants whose explanations were rather vague and unclear. Here is an example of Indigo's explanation: "Has refers to a possession of something. Is represents a current fact. A fact in the past can be because of the possessive form."

The preceding response was awarded a zero since it lacked clarity and involved no details regarding the complex nature of the apostrophe -s.

An analysis of the participants' responses to Item 4 in Procedural Grammar follows.

4.4.7.4 Use of past form of a verb to talk about the present. Item: "I wish I had a car.

Your students think that the verb had in the sentence refers to some action completed in the past. How would you tackle this problem? Provide a thorough explanation for the students."

Item 4 in Procedural Grammar aimed to address what is indeed a challenging topic in the grammar of the English language. The primary goal was to see how the teachers would deal with a complex grammar rule in English, namely the use of the past form of a verb to refer to unreal present or future that is hypothetical in nature. This is also the case in Conditional

Clauses Type 2 and in wish-clauses. The English grammar at times, rather confusingly, makes use of the past form of a verb to refer to the present. Below are some examples of these:

- a. I wish I *spoke* French.
- b. If I *spoke* French, I would find a good job.
- c. It is high time we *started* learning French.

The data obtained from the responses revealed that neither the TBL nor the NTBL groups attained particularly high averages; 47.1% and 33.3%, respectively. Here are some adequate responses:

- Nur It is a good idea to teach this just after you have gone through the second conditional, so you could say that just like in the second conditional, verb 2 doesn't refer to the past, rather it shows that the possibility is weak. Here - me having a car is something unlikely to happen as -let's say -I am just a student & cannot afford a car at the moment.
- Firaz The past form of verbs do not always represent completed actions in the past. Just like in if-clauses, they may refer to hypothetical (unreal) scenarios.
- Elia In this sentence 'wish' is used to talk about something you don't have. It is actually a verb that replaces the word 'if' in a second conditional sentence. (if + past simple, would + past participle)

Answers limited to saying a wish in the present were awarded zero marks. Here is an example. Indigo wrote: "A wish is for the present and future tense."

The findings suggest that some teachers also had problems with language pedagogy, which manifested in the inadequacy of the delivery of the subject matter, namely grammar. This points to a compelling need for the integration of a more solid grammar component into teacher training programs.

This brings us to an analysis of the final item in Procedural grammar; the responses and an analysis of their implications can be found below.

4.4.7.5 Noun clause as the object of the sentence. Item: “I cannot accept what you have done. Please comment on the grammatical function of ‘what you have done’ in the sentence.”

The final task in procedural Grammar involved another complex grammar rule, which is normally dealt with in advanced level English classes. In the sentence, *I cannot accept what you have done*, *what you have done* is a noun clause and serves as the object of the verb *accept*. Because of its complex nature, the participants scored low scores on this task, 48.5% for TBL and 12.5% for NTBL participants. It is noteworthy to mention that ten out of 23 students obtained zero marks. The average score for NTBL participants for this task was among the lowest compared to other tasks. Here are some adequate responses to the task.

Nur It is a noun clause and it is the object of the sentence. What can't s/he accept? What you have done. In other words, what you have done is unacceptable.

Mert ‘What you have done’ is a noun clause used in the object position in the sentence.

Those participants who used the metalanguage *phrase* rather than *clause* were deducted marks. Here are some examples. Elia wrote: “Object noun phrase because it answers the question

(what?)”. Kamil defined: “Phrase functions as an object”. Suzanne offered: “Phrasal sentential object”. Another participant, Talat, had the misconception that *what you have done* was a subordinate clause rather than a noun clause and hence was deducted a 0.25. He wrote: “This is a subordinate clause used as the object of the sentence.”

The analysis of the responses to Item 5 in Procedural Grammar brings the discussion on findings to an end. The following section discusses the findings in terms of whether there is a relationship between age and metalinguistic awareness.

Table 13

Impact of Years of Experience on Metalinguistic Awareness

	PARTICIPANT	AVERAGE	EXPERIENCE
	Name	%	years
1	Suzanne	75	0-1
2	Firaz	75	10
3	Vivi	74	34
4	Sam	71	22
5	Talat	70	11
6	Mert	69	30
7	Kamil	64	32
8	Jalil	62	10
9	Jesus	60	16
10	Osama	57	12
11	Nur	57	31
12	Wali	50	13
13	Bey	49	13
14	Hustin	49	10
15	Brow	40	20
16	Elia	40	13
17	Light	40	8
18	Smyrna	29	15
19	Salima	25	3
20	Sierra	19	1

	PARTICIPANT	AVERAGE	EXPERIENCE
	Name	%	years
21	Faris	17	9
22	Indigo	14	18
23	Al	14	6
	AVERAGES	49	14.7

Table 13 above ranks the participants based on their overall averages (ranging from the highest to the lowest). Written in bold are the NES participants.

SLA research has not found a strong link between teaching experience and metalinguistic experience to date. Tsang (2011), for instance, points out that longer years of teaching does not necessarily guarantee a higher level of confidence in the use of metalanguage. In addition, Fielding-Barnsley and Purdie's research (2005) reveals that the knowledge of metalanguage did not vary according to teachers' years of experience. Njika (2015), in a similar vein, indicates that many teachers lack language awareness irrespective of the number of years that they have taught.

Similarly, the findings obtained in this PhD study did not display a consistent pattern regarding the relationship between years of teaching experience and metalinguistic awareness. Table 13 above reveals the findings on the relationship between years of experience and metalinguistic experience. For instance, the holders of the highest average scores, Suzanne and Vivi displayed a very interesting experience-versus-metalinguistic awareness relationship. Whereas Suzanne with only one semester of English language teaching experience had an average score of 75% Vivi, with an experience of 34 years, obtained a 74%. Suzanne's experience, to emphasize, was limited to working as a researcher of linguistics at a university in the United States. It is evident that Suzanne's PhD in Theoretical Linguistics enabled her to get

a high score, which points to the positive impact of linguistics background on metalinguistic awareness. Another discrepancy between years of teaching experience and metalinguistic awareness was evident in the scores of Jesus and Smyrna. Whereas Jesus, with 16 years of teaching experience scored a 60%, Smyrna, with teaching experience of 15 years, obtained an average of 29%. It should be added that Smyrna possessed very limited subject-specific qualifications, which lends support to the positive relationship between subject-specific qualifications and metalinguistic awareness. Another interesting, but less marked discrepancy was found between the two participants, Mert and Nur, who had almost the same number of years' experience, 30 and 31, respectively. Whereas Mert's average stood at 69%, Nur obtained a 57%. Other participants' scores, in general, displayed an inconsistent pattern as well.

The participants who obtained the highest scores, Vivi (74%), Sam (71%), Mert (69%), and Nur (57%) in addition to Suzanne (75%), had one particular trait in common; they all held subject-relevant qualifications. In this respect, the findings reveal that metalinguistic awareness seems to be more dependent on relevant teaching qualifications rather than on teaching experience.

The preceding section in Chapter 4 discussed the findings in detail and analyzed them from two different perspectives; metalinguistic awareness and register awareness. The next section elaborates on and discusses the implications of these findings.

4.5 Discussion of Findings

The preceding section has displayed the findings and discussed the implications in some detail. In this section, the implications of these findings are elaborated on in a significantly broader and more detailed manner.

The guiding research question in this study was whether proficiency, which is limited to oral skills in a non-English language, promoted:

- a. NES teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness of English,
- b. NNES teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness of English.

The study, in particular, was motivated by the question whether proficiency limited to oral skills in a non-English language promoted NES teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness of English. The reason for placing a slightly heavier focus on NES teachers in this study is motivated by the argument that learning a second language promotes their metalinguistic and register awareness (E.M. Ellis, 2006, 2102, Hawkins, 1999). To investigate to what extent this is true, the study required the assessment of NNES teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness so that a comparative analysis could be made between NES and NNES teachers. This subsequently paved the way for an analysis as to whether there was a difference between teachers whose proficiency was limited to oral proficiency in a non-English language and those whose proficiency encompassed literacy skills.

The study has established that language proficiency limited to oral proficiency does not promote linguistic literacy, which manifests in the participants' responses to tasks that were associated with metalinguistic and register awareness. In other words, the participants' lack of metalinguistic and register awareness, broadly speaking, reflected a shortcoming in terms of teachers' linguistic literacy for both NES and NNES teachers. An implication of this, as per Moats (2000, 2014) and Hudson and Walmsley's (2005) assertions is that English language teachers are inadequately prepared for their profession, which in turn suggests that the existing teacher training programs lack a component of robust literacy training. This tends to lend strong

support to the argument that explicit and systematic teaching of literacy instruction is a fundamental component of language teachers' professional development (Moats, 2009).

To reiterate, the focus of this study was to investigate the relationship between proficiency in a non-English language devoid of any literacy skills and metalinguistic and register awareness. Addressing the question "whether linguistic and register awareness of a language other than English enhances one's ability to teach English" warrants further post-study investigation.

The study also uncovered that some teachers were not immune to *language fossilization*, a frequently encountered phenomenon among second language learners. The findings, in addition, pointed to a significant lack of register awareness on the part of both NES and NNES teachers, which suggests that they were unable to distinguish between academic language and informal language.

The findings, in addition, suggest that features of academic English extend not only to the choice of vocabulary, but also to the grammatical structure of any given discourse, suggesting that an apparent grammar issue is, in reality, a critical literacy point. This reveals that teachers need an awareness of the distinction between formal and informal registers, lending strong support to the notion that many of the linguistic properties are inextricably and fundamentally intertwined with literacy and, more specifically, with linguistic literacy. The tasks in Error Correction, Grammar, Syntax, and Procedural Grammar, in particular, aimed to capture the relationship between formal properties of language and awareness of linguistic literacy. Table 14 below portrays the tasks in Error Correction that were associated with register, namely the colloquial-versus-academic dichotomy.

Table 14*Literacy-Related Tasks in Error Correction*

No.	Item no. in instrument	Average Performance	Mistake	Domain	Nature of Mistake
1	3	34%	Jane has less students than	Informal Grammar	Improper Comparative
2	4	70%	I would stay home rather then go	Spelling	Preposition Vs. Adverb
3	5	18%	I did not see him yesterday, because	Punctuation	Subordinate Clause
4	6	37%	The western world	Punctuation	Capitalisation
5	7	87%	There's a lot of unemployed people	Informal Grammar	Contraction of Is S-V Agreement
6	8	30%	Three-year-old	Informal Grammar	Punctuation/Hyphenation
7	9	30%	Two days time	Punctuation	Possessive Apostrophe
8	10	33%	Fullfil	Spelling	-Ful vs Full/Bound vs. Free Morpheme
9	12	33%	Eat less healthier	Informal Grammar	Improper Use Comparative Adjective Replacing Adverb
10	13	53%	The amount of students in my class is	Informal Grammar	Use of Amount with Countable Nouns
11	14	22%	The data is to be published	Academic Vocabulary	S-V Agreement Lexis/Latin
12	15	55%	The man who's brother	Punctuation	Wrong Use of The Apostrophe +S
13	18	43%	King Abdulaziz University hospital Canadian accreditation agency	Punctuation	All Parts of Proper Nouns to Be Capitalized
14	19	60%	Me and Talal	Informal Grammar	Use of Object Pronoun in The Subject Position
15	20	62%	Criteria does not satisfy	Academic Vocabulary	Subject-Verb Agreement; Lexis/Greek
Average		44%			

Table 15*Non-Literacy-Related Tasks in Error Correction*

No.	Item no. in instrument	Average Performance	Mistake	Domain	Nature of Mistake
1	1	49%	Do you have a pen? Yes, I have.	Grammar	Absence of use of helping verbs in short answers
2	2	67%	Thank you for invite us to your house.	Grammar	Gerunds follow prepositions
3	11	52%	He maybe in class right now.	Grammar	Maybe is an adverb. <i>May</i> and <i>be</i> are to be separated.
4	16	43%	Who did found Apple Company?	Grammar	No use of helping verb when question is for the subject.
5	17	57%	The man whom got a promotion	Grammar	Incorrect use of relative pronoun. Whom → who.
Average		54%			

Tables 14 and 15 above cite the part of the sentence that deviates from the structural norm and these tables indicate the general domain (punctuation, spelling). It, in addition, labels the specific nature of the mistake by indicating what aspect of punctuation it belongs to, such as capitalization. Table 14 neatly categorizes individual tasks that are literacy-related, whereas Table 15 displays the tasks in Error Correction, which are not literacy-specific. Fifteen out of 20 tasks in Error Correction were identified to be literacy-related while the remaining, namely Tasks 1, 2, 11, 16, and 17, were related purely to grammar.

It is interesting to note that participants' overall average for tasks that were related to literacy (44%) was substantially lower than the average for tasks that were not related to literacy (54%). This indicates that participants in this study performed more poorly in tasks that required the activation of literacy skills, which in turn required the participants to make heavier use of their cognitive resources.

The error in item 11 in the Error Correction task, *he maybe in class right now* was classified as a grammar rather than a literacy task, which can be justified because *maybe* as one word is an adverb whereas *may be* is the combination of a modal auxiliary verb and a main verb. However, in a sense, it might be regarded as a spelling error since when *may be* is written as *maybe*, it shows the participants' failure in recognizing that *maybe* and *may be* refer to distinct meanings. The researcher's conception was that this was a grammar rather than a spelling error since a spelling error would normally involve the presence of at least one wrong letter, and hence the classification here as a grammar rather than a literacy error.

Broadly speaking, the findings confirmed the hypotheses stated in Chapter 1. The most important finding was that TBL participants outperformed NTBL as well as all other teacher categories. This particular finding reveals that those participants whose language competence

was limited to oral proficiency, in general terms, appeared to have limited metalinguistic and register awareness. Consequently, they did not enjoy the cognitive advantages of linguistic literacy as did TBL participants, which was evident in the averages that they obtained. While NTBL participants obtained an average of only 33%, TBL participants' overall average stood at 54%, which suggests that oral proficiency in a language devoid of literacy skills does not promote linguistic literacy.

The percentages stated above point to a significant discrepancy in the performances of teachers in both groups, lending very strong support to Cummins's (2000) Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). CALP, in essence, refers to the elaborate use of academic English which enables an individual to communicate abstract concepts and ideas, not only for speaking, but also for writing. Those teachers with limited literacy skills in their non-English language also fit Cummins's hypothesis (2000, 2008) of Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS), which represents conversational fluency with limited literacy skills.

The findings lend even stronger support to Cummins's (2001) Threshold Hypothesis which states that for an individual to reap the cognitive advantages of speaking a second or third language, he needs to have reached a certain proficiency level, not only in the oral mode of language, but also in literacy skills. This is aligned with Renou's (2002) findings which suggest that for elevated metalinguistic awareness, individuals must have attained a relatively advanced proficiency level in a language.

Table 16*Averages Obtained by Individual Teacher Categories*

AVERAGES FOR TEACHER CATEGORIES (%)				
All Participants	TBL	NTBL	NES	NNES
49	54	33	44	52

Table 16 above also suggests that there was no significant difference between TBL (54%) and NNES (52%) teachers in terms of their overall performance, indicating that the majority of TBL participants were NNES teachers. NES participants, on the other hand, obtained an average score of (44%), which was even below the average score for the category *All Participants* (49%).

The findings, in addition, reveal that not all TBL participants display an elevated level of metalinguistic awareness. Four of the 17 TBL (also NNES) participants' cases, in particular, are worth exploring. Of these four, Indigo and Elia, both of whom are proficient in more than two languages display an interesting profile in terms of their scores. Elia, whose average was not dramatically low across all the tasks (40%) had advanced proficiency in Hindi (both spoken and written), Urdu (Native-level in speaking and intermediate in writing), and Tamil (fluent in speaking, intermediate in writing) in addition to English. With such a rich linguistic repertoire, one would expect that Elia would attain higher scores in tasks that assessed his metalinguistic awareness. Indigo, another participant with a very rich linguistic repertoire, attained an average of only 14%. He had proficiency in Hindi (native for both speaking and writing), Urdu (fluent for both speaking and writing) and Kannada (intermediate for both speaking and writing) in addition to English; he obtained the lowest score average, which did not seem to reflect his remarkably rich linguistic repertoire.

It would normally be expected that the more languages an individual has in his linguistic repertoire, the higher elevated metalinguistic and register awareness he would have. This,

however, was not the case for these two TBL participants discussed above. The other two TBL and NNES participants who had very different linguistic profiles, on the other hand, Salima and Sierra, also obtained very low scores; 25% and 19% respectively. Salima had native fluency in Bosnian, whereas Sierra's native fluency was in Arabic; these two participants had different linguistic backgrounds compared to Indigo and Elia, the latter pair having proficiency in more languages compared to Salima and Sierra.

As indicated above, TBL participants obtained a higher average than did their NTBL counterparts; the low scores of the four TBL participants discussed above, however, cast doubt on whether being biliterate or multiliterate contributes to an elevated level of metalinguistic and register awareness across the board; for the aforementioned four participants, this was not the case. More importantly, the average scores of TBL participants across all the tasks was only 54%, which arguably should not be conceived of as a significantly high average. This, however, does not change the fact that TBL participants in this study outperformed NTBL participants.

The findings, in addition, reveal that NES teachers, as hypothesized, do not necessarily attain metalinguistic and register awareness by having native-like oral proficiency in a non-English language. In other words, oral proficiency in a non-English language, even at a native proficiency level, does not translate into the metalinguistic awareness of NES teachers.

Another finding was that not all NNES teachers, as suggested above, attain an elevated metalinguistic and register awareness by learning English as a second language as well as a non-English language. This was especially evident in the overall averages of the participants with pseudonyms *Indigo*, *Sierra* and *Salima*. Likewise, not all NES participants in this study lacked metalinguistic awareness. For instance, *Suzanne* and *Vivi* obtained the highest scores; 75% and 74% respectively. Their high scores could be attributed to the fact that both participants possess

subject-specific qualifications. *Suzanne* holds a PhD in Linguistics and *Vivi* holds a bachelor's degree in Secondary English Education and a Master's in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). This points to a critical interdependence between relevant subject-specific qualifications and linguistic literacy.

The same pattern extended to NNES teachers; those teachers who had received subject-specific training tended to score higher than those who had received relatively less subject-specific training. Four of the 13 NNES teachers, in particular, obtained substantially high scores. *Firaz*, for instance, scored as high as *Suzanne*, a NES teacher (75%), while the remaining three, *Sam*, *Talat*, and *Mert* obtained significantly high scores; 71%, 70%, and 69% respectively.

As for the participants who obtained the lowest scores, the majority of these participants did not receive subject-specific training. Of the NES participants, *Faris* obtained an average of 17% while *Al's* average stood at 14%. *Faris* holds a bachelor's degree in Mathematics and a Master's in Educational Management; the only subject-specific training that he received was limited to a 20-hour course, which did not involve a face-to-face component. Likewise, *Al* holds only a bachelor's degree in Computer Science along with the same 20-hour course followed by *Faris*. In addition, he completed a well-reputable course, *Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (CELTA) which consisted of a mere 120-hour class instruction in addition to a six-hour practicum, where student teachers are given the opportunity to teach in an authentic context. Another NES participant, *Smyrna*, who also obtained a relatively low average (29%), had also not received a solid subject-specific training. He holds a Bachelor's in Psychology and Economics and a Master's in Special Education. The only relevant qualification that he received was a 100-hour TESOL certificate course.

The discussion above suggests that not all NNES participants possess elevated metalinguistic and register awareness. Indigo, Salima, and Sierra, in particular, obtained significantly low scores; 14%, 25%, 19%, respectively. Of these participants, Indigo's low score can be justified, at least to some extent, as he had not received a solid subject-specific training. He had instead, a strong background in Business Studies with both bachelor's and master's degrees. His teaching credentials were limited to a one-year Certificate in Teaching English. As for Salima, she held no university degree. Her teaching experience was limited to occasional private tutoring. She later obtained a CELTA certificate.

Sierra, a native Arabic speaker, presents the most interesting profile. At the time of her participation in this study, she was pursuing a master's degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). She holds a bachelor's degree in English Literature and Linguistics, as well as a one-year Diploma in Education. It is difficult to predict why Sierra performed so poorly in this battery of tests that aimed to assess her metalinguistic and register awareness but based on the grammar and spelling mistakes she made; it is evident that her relatively poor English proficiency could be regarded as accounting for her low scores. Below are some examples of her written input with the spelling and grammar mistakes uncorrected.

- a. "Yes, I do. The error is possible to occur as the verb have in the question."
- b. "Thank you for inviting us to your house. I think it is happened because of not knowing what comes as (after) a preposition."
- c. "It might be correct, but I feel if there is a year, it will be more certain about it."
- d. "I will be there 2 times a day. In the sentence, I feel in as a pre might be need if the meaning is different. So, the meaning that wants to be delivered."

- e. “Her average performance does not fulfill the expectations of the audience. I think it is worse as the writer orally talking about something happened. Both did/does could be correct. But for the past there should be an indicator (...ago, yesterday?).”
- f. “The man whose brother I met yesterday left town. “whose not whose.”
- g. “It is past tense sentence. I think sometime user of English think that did is indicator like (ago). But in fact, it is a verb in past form.”
- h. “Talal and I are good friends. I think this form sentence is rarely said by non-native language user, and when it is said it likely to be written incorrectly.”

The sentences above cast doubt on *Sierra's* English language proficiency. *Sierra's* poor performance on the metalinguistic tasks, once again, confirms and lends support to Cummins' Threshold Hypothesis (2001, 2007), according to which individuals should have advanced proficiency in a language to claim metalinguistic awareness. Otherwise, *Sierra's* strong subject-specific qualifications should have normally enabled her to perform relatively well in all the tasks.

One very interesting teacher profile is presented by the participant with the pseudonym *Jesus*. Based on his self-declaration, he was classified as *NES* and *NTBL*. This particular participant, however, obtained scores that made him stand out. His performance across the tasks was 60%, which was better than nine TBL and five NTBL participants. This implies that he performed better than a total number of 14 participants. There were, in fact, six NTBL participants who participated in the study and *Jesus* obtained the highest average in his own category. *Jesus's* relatively good performance could be attributed to two factors, the first one of

which is his qualifications. He holds a master's degree in Applied Linguistics and a New York State Teaching License in TESOL for K-12. The second factor was that it is very likely that he underestimated his language skills, especially for his L2, Italian. His own assessment of his Italian proficiency level was intermediate for both productive and receptive skills, whereas his actual proficiency level could well be advanced without his being aware of it. In an informal conversation, he stated that he had studied Italian at university, and added an important detail; the delivery of Italian was implemented by means of explicit teaching instruction, which in all likelihood, contributed to his relatively elevated metalinguistic awareness. Individual factors could also account for such a discrepancy; there is a consensus in the SLA literature that individual differences play a major role in language acquisition (Kidd, Donnelly & Christiansen, 2017). *Jesus*'s qualifications are very similar to those of *Hustin*, another NES and NTBL participant, who obtained an overall average of only 40% as opposed to *Jesus*'s 60%. With such varying performance outcomes, research should address and interpret such discrepancy in scores very carefully. In the context of this research project, individual differences, as opposed to other factors, appear to account for the discrepancies in scores of *Hustin* and *Jesus*. Otherwise, the findings obtained from the study, displayed a very consistent pattern; language proficiency limited to oral competence did not equip teachers with elevated metalinguistic awareness.

The findings also uncovered an interesting aspect of metalinguistic awareness. There were seven task categories, namely Error Correction, Grammar, Phonology, Syntax, Morphology, Parts of Speech, and Procedural Grammar. The task category in which the participants were most successful was Parts of Speech, where their average score stood at 66%, as opposed to the other tasks where the participants obtained significantly lower scores; Procedural Grammar (51%), Syntax (49%), Error Correction (47%), Morphology (47%),

Grammar (38%), and Phonology (33%). This is an interesting finding as Alderson, Clapham and Steel (1997) emphasize that metalanguage (parts of speech) is the core requirement to qualify an individual as being metalinguistically aware. The findings, however, reveal that the participants' high average in Parts of Speech is not carried over to other areas of language. In other words, awareness of Parts of Speech, on its own, does not necessarily bring about elevated metalinguistic awareness in other language domains such as phonology, morphology, and syntax. This implies that metalinguistic awareness requires knowledge of other formal properties of language, which is beyond the knowledge of Parts of Speech.

The study also identified a link between linguistic literacy and the frequency with which teachers were exposed to rarely-emerging language structures in their daily teaching. A good example of this is the *inversion rule* in English as in the examples, *John scored better than did Fred* and *Never have I seen such a beautiful baby*. The findings revealed that of the 23 participants, 18 were unaware of the inversion structure in English.

A finding worth emphasizing is that no correlation was identified between number of years of teaching experience and metalinguistic awareness. *Suzanne*, for instance, obtained the highest average although she had less than one year's language teaching experience. Her background was limited to working as a researcher in the domain of theoretical linguistics.

The above discussion of the implications of the findings points to the importance of a particular issue in the SLA literature, which is the tendency to extrapolate research results to all members of a specific linguistic category. For instance, NNES teachers are always argued to have elevated metalinguistic awareness in comparison to NES teachers. TBL teachers, in addition, constitute a category which is always regarded as having elevated metalinguistic awareness. The findings suggest that such broad generalizations cannot be applicable across the

board. The findings obtained in this study do not completely conform to the extrapolation for the two linguistic categories above; NNES and TBL: they do only to some extent, which is evident in the performances of five TBL participants whose scores were well below average.

To exemplify the discussion above, the case of two participants who were also discussed above in some detail, merits particular attention. A TBL and NNES teacher, Indigo, whose proficiency in Urdu was classified as native for speaking and fluent for writing, obtained an average of only 14%. As for an example of a NTBL and NES teacher, *Al*, had native oral proficiency in Urdu and Punjabi but rather limited literacy skills in both languages. He displayed neither an elevated level of metalinguistic nor register awareness for English. He, in addition, performed poorly across all the tasks, and just as did Indigo, he obtained an overall average of 14%.

The cases of these two teachers strongly suggest that utmost caution should be practiced in the SLA research to avoid making sweeping generalizations regarding linguistic categories. The findings obtained in this study demonstrated that not all NES teachers display limited metalinguistic awareness; those NES teachers who have subject-specific qualifications, contrary to what is suggested in the literature, display metalinguistic awareness as elevated as those of NNES teachers, if not more. One wonders whether previous research on metalinguistic awareness, which was conducted with NES teachers with results pointing to significantly impoverished metalinguistic awareness, was limited to NES teachers with non-subject-specific qualifications. If so, most of these NES teachers who participated in earlier studies, are likely to have been the products of very short teacher training courses such as the CELTA. The findings, in addition, also suggest that not all NNES teachers possess remarkable levels of metalinguistic awareness.

Chapter 1 suggested that NNES teachers possess a higher level of metalinguistic awareness than do NES teachers, which is usually attributed to the way in which they learned English. NNES teachers, according to the literature (E. M. Ellis, 2006, 2012) undergo a learning process that is referred to as *structured language learning*, which inherently encompasses learning a language explicitly and systematically. This implies that NNES teachers must have learned English in an explicit manner, where English was treated as a system, involving rule learning for all language skills including grammar. The three NNES teachers, Indigo, Salima, and Sierra, who were discussed above obtained the lowest averages despite the fact that they are assumed to have learned English explicitly and systematically. What this suggests is that not all NNES teachers who undergo a structured language learning process attain an elevated level of metalinguistic and register awareness as suggested by the literature. This could be accounted for by a number of reasons including individual differences, an inability or unwillingness to see language as a system, the nature of the language curriculum, which may have promoted the communicative aspect of language rather than viewing it as decontextualized components of a system, and so forth. No matter what factors may have caused these three NNES teachers to obtain the lowest averages, one important conclusion we can draw is that they do not tend to follow the pattern that Ellis envisages, namely that NNES teachers have a more elevated metalinguistic awareness compared to NES teachers as a consequence of experiencing structured language learning in an L2. That said, Ellis conducted her studies with only monolingual NES teachers, which might have accounted for her generalizations regarding the elevated metalinguistic awareness of NNES teachers compared to monolingual NES teachers in the context of Australia.

To summarize the above discussion, the findings obtained from the study suggest the following:

1. NES teachers' oral proficiency in non-English languages, even at the native-proficiency level, does not guarantee metalinguistic awareness in their mother tongue.
2. NNES teachers seem to have a more elevated level of metalinguistic awareness than do NES teachers.
3. Not all NES teachers lack metalinguistic awareness.
4. Not all NNES teachers have elevated metalinguistic awareness
5. Not all TBL teachers have an elevated level of metalinguistic awareness.
6. Individual differences seem to play some role regarding teachers' metalinguistic awareness.
7. There seems to be a strong link between teachers' subject-specific qualifications and linguistic literacy.
8. There is also a strong relationship between teachers' L2 proficiency level and metalinguistic and register awareness suggesting that a higher level of proficiency in a language is a determining factor for a teacher's metalinguistic awareness.
9. A good knowledge of parts of speech does not necessarily translate into elevated metalinguistic awareness.
10. The frequency with which a teacher encounters and teaches a particular language rule seems to have a significant impact on his metalinguistic awareness. The structures that are taught more frequently are observed to be retained more in teachers' long-term memory, which translates into a higher level of metalinguistic

awareness. This seems to be in agreement with studies conducted on the impact of frequency on language acquisition in general (Schwartz & Causarano, 2007).

11. No relationship is established between years of teaching experience and metalinguistic awareness.
12. The two participants with solid linguistic backgrounds seem to have a significantly elevated level of metalinguistic awareness and register awareness compared to those who did not, lending very strong support to the notion that the study of theoretical linguistics may have a positive impact on metalinguistic awareness.
13. Not all NNES teachers who underwent structured language learning experience possess elevated metalinguistic awareness.
14. Explicit and systematic teaching of literacy seems to be essential to promote teachers' linguistic literacy.
15. Language fossilization, a construct that is normally associated with language learners, seems to have an impact on some teachers as well, especially in the form of overgeneralization.
16. Teachers' use of IELTS codes for error correction may not necessarily contribute to student comprehension.
17. Teachers displayed some ignorance regarding English words with Latin and Greek origin. This suggests that teacher training programs should incorporate a component that involves the study of lexical items derived from other languages.

This concludes Chapter 4, which first elaborated on the findings and then discussed their most noteworthy implications. The final chapter completes the study; it further addresses the implications of the findings and offers relevant recommendations.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1 General Discussion

This PhD study had multiple aims. First and foremost, it set out to investigate the extent to which learning an L2 and additional languages would promote NES teachers' linguistic literacy. More specifically, it aimed to investigate to what extent NES teachers' oral proficiency in an L2 and in additional languages, even at a native or fluent level, promoted their linguistic literacy for their L1. As for NNES teachers, the study likewise aimed to assess the extent to which oral proficiency in a non-English language would contribute to their linguistic literacy. The overarching goal of this study, then, was investigating to what extent competence limited to oral proficiency in a non-English language determines NES and NNES teachers' linguistic literacy.

This thesis has challenged the view that bi- and multilingualism automatically equips an individual with metalinguistic awareness regardless of whether the individual has literacy skills in the languages in his repertoire. It went further and investigated English teachers' metalinguistic and register awareness. This study was motivated by the question whether oral proficiency, irrespective of a lack of literacy skills in a non-English language promoted an English teacher's metalinguistic and register awareness. The findings in this particular doctoral study suggested that teachers who were seemingly bi- or multilingual were identified to be linguistically illiterate as per Ravid and Tolchinsky's construct of linguistic literacy.

To reiterate, the construct *linguistic literacy*, frequently used in this chapter and in previous chapters, encompasses two fundamental components, namely metalinguistic awareness and register awareness. There is usually a tendency to use the construct *metalinguistic*

awareness as a generic term to refer to linguistic literacy, the latter of which would incorporate an individual's awareness of the distinction between academic English and colloquial English, referred to as *register awareness* in this thesis.

What motivated this study was the overwhelming consensus in the SLA literature (E. M. Ellis, 2006, 2012; Moussu & Lourda, 2008) that learning a second language raises an individual's metalinguistic awareness for both L1 and L2. The majority of the studies on metalinguistic awareness, however, investigated children rather than adults (Bialystok, 2001; Fiszler, 2008, Ravid & Tolchinsky, 2002). If we classify adults into two groups as *teacher-adults* and *non-teacher adults*, it would not be wrong to argue that SLA research, to date, has predominantly focused on children and non-teacher adults. This implies that research dealing with adult teachers is significantly less than it is for adults and non-teacher adults, especially in terms of whether their acquisition of second, third, and additional languages contributes to their linguistic literacy in English. What is more, the research conducted with practicing teachers of English usually delves into issues such as teachers' beliefs and, more specifically, the impact of learning experiences on individuals' beliefs (Al-Marza, 1996; Bialystok, 2009; S. Borg, 1998, 2003, Gatbonton, 1999; Kinsella, 1995; Pajares, 1992, Smith, 1996). This suggests that there is indeed a paucity of research exploring the impact of a non-English language learning experience on English language teachers' linguistic literacy, which is operationalized as a construct comprising both metalinguistic awareness and register awareness. In addition, research investigating the link between metalinguistic awareness and register awareness is almost non-existent.

Many tasks in the instrument were seemingly related to the structure of the English language, which implies that they aimed to assess the teachers' awareness of the formal

properties of English such as grammar, phonology, and morphology. In essence, however, they were designed also to assess the participants' awareness of the distinction between the academic and non-academic (informal) register. In this regard, it is important to note that this study aimed to capture two fundamental components of linguistic literacy, metalinguistic awareness and register awareness.

The study hypothesized that oral proficiency in a non-English language devoid of literacy skills, would not necessarily translate into linguistic literacy in English for both NES and NNES teachers. It was hypothesized that NES teachers would not be able to possess elevated metalinguistic awareness as well as register awareness in English simply by acquiring oral competence in a non-English language. Neither would NNES teachers' oral proficiency in a non-English language devoid of literacy skills guarantee elevated metalinguistic awareness as well register awareness for English.

In line with the goals stated above, the study distinguished between those teachers whose non-English proficiency was limited to oral proficiency (NTBL) and those teachers whose non-English proficiency encompassed both oral and literacy skills (TBL). It was hypothesized that TBL teachers would have a more elevated level of metalinguistic awareness than would NTBL teachers. The findings justified this hypothesis; TBL teachers obtained significantly higher averages than did their NTBL counterparts across all the tasks. In fact, TBL participants obtained higher averages than did all the other teacher categories.

Despite the fact that there was a pattern regarding the averages obtained by all teacher categories, teachers' performance reflected some, and at times significant, deviation from the pattern. The findings also revealed that not all NES teachers displayed impoverished metalinguistic awareness and neither did all NNES display an elevated level of metalinguistic

awareness. The same inconsistency persisted for both TBL and NTBL participants; not all TBL participants displayed elevated metalinguistic awareness and neither did all NTBL participants display impoverished metalinguistic awareness.

The following tables summarize all the findings in a relatively concise manner. The first table, namely Table 17, which was also displayed earlier in the Findings section of Chapter 4, shows the average scores of all the teacher categories while the second table, namely Table 18, ranks all the participants based on their performance across the tasks. Table 18 also lists the participants' category, i.e., TBL/NTBL and NES/NNES.

Table 17

The Summary of Average Scores for all the Tasks and all the Teacher Categories

AVERAGES FOR TEACHER CATEGORIES (%)				
All Participants	Truly Bilingual	Not Truly Bilingual	Native Speakers	Non-Native Speakers
49	54	33	44	52

Table 18

Participants' Overall Averages for all Categories

PARTICIPANT		AVERAGE	CATEGORY	
Rank	Name	%	NES vs. NNES	TBL vs. NTBL
1	Suzanne	75	NES	TBL
2	Firaz	75	NNES	TBL
3	Vivi	74	NES	TBL
4	Sam	71	NNES	TBL
5	Talat	70	NNES	TBL
6	Mert	69	NNES	TBL
7	Kamil	64	NNES	TBL
8	Jalil	62	NNES	TBL
9	Jesus	60	NES	NTBL
10	Osama	57	NNES	TBL
11	Nur	57	NNES	TBL
12	Wali	50	NNES	TBL
13	Bey	49	NNES	TBL

14	Hustin	49	NES	NTBL
15	Light	40	NES	TBL
16	Brow	40	NES	NTBL
17	Elia	40	NNES	TBL
18	Smyrna	29	NES	NTBL
19	Salima	25	NNES	TBL
20	Sierra	19	NNES	TBL
21	Faris	17	NES	NTBL
22	Al	14	NES	NTBL
23	Indigo	14	NNES	TBL
	AVERAGE	49%	10 NES & 13 NNES	17 TBL & 6 NTBL

The tables above suggest that the average score for all the participants was 49%, which was obtained by two participants, one of whom was TBL and the other NTBL. The number of participants who ranked above the average was 12, 11 of whom were TBL, which tends to justify the hypothesis that to have an elevated level of linguistic literacy, one needs to be literate in the second, third, and additional languages that he speaks. As for the ratio of NES to NNES teachers who scored above the average; nine of the twelve participants were NNES and three were NES teachers. This result corroborates the findings in the literature and in the hypotheses stated in Chapter 1 that NNES have a more elevated level of metalinguistic awareness than NES. However, not all NES teachers who participated in this study lacked metalinguistic awareness. The findings also indicate that NES teachers with subject-specific qualifications can attain the same level of metalinguistic awareness that NNES teachers have.

The picture of the participants who have scored above the average is neat and clear, justifying the hypotheses set out in Chapter 1. In contrast, the participants who scored below the average, display a rather fuzzy and thought-provoking pattern in terms of the implications of what their scores refer to. In total, nine participants scored below the average, five of whom

were NES and the remaining four were NNES. The low scores obtained by these four NNES teachers do not follow the pattern for the teachers ranked above the average, which tended to justify NNES teachers' elevated metalinguistic awareness compared to their NES counterparts. What is more striking was that of the nine teachers who scored below the average, five were TBL, which also casts doubt on the superiority of TBL teachers to NTBL teachers. While the overwhelming majority of the teachers who scored above the average consisted of TBL teachers, more than half of the teachers who scored below the average also comprised TBL teachers. While such a discrepancy on the part of TBL teachers does not change the fact that they obtained the highest average as far as their linguistic category is concerned, the case for TBL participants who scored below the average merits a careful analysis.

Regarding the five TBL participants who scored below the average, three of them did not possess subject-specific qualifications. Another TBL participant held degrees in a rather literature-related domain; creative writing. In the country (the US) where the participant studied, Departments of English offer degree programs in Creative Writing; students studying in these programs take courses in fiction, non-fiction, and poetry, as well as courses in literature, language, literary analysis, publishing, and elective courses in a range of other topics. This suggests that graduates of these programs do not take courses associated with the structural aspects of English such as Phonology, Syntax, and Morphology, which in all likelihood accounts for the particular teacher's relatively low score average. In sum, the teacher discussed above cannot be considered to be holding very relevant subject-specific qualifications, leaving only one TBL participant with subject-specific qualifications who obtained a relatively low average of 40%. His poor performance could be attributed to individual differences. Another likely factor

that might account for his poor performance in metalinguistic tasks might be that not all English programs in universities offer courses relevant to the structure of English such as linguistics.

To summarize the discussion and analysis of the findings, the hypothesis that TBL and NNES teachers have more elevated metalinguistic awareness than do NTBL and NES has been justified by the findings. Overall, TBL and NNES participants obtained higher averages than did NTBL and NES participants; that said, there were cases that deviated from the pattern which indicates that not all NES and NTBL teachers lack impoverished metalinguistic awareness. It is important to note that the high scores in metalinguistic awareness scores were also complemented by the high scores on tasks that required attention to register.

One important observation was that the upper end of the ranking of the participants based on their overall average across the tasks indicated that the participants whose scores were above the average were predominantly TBL (91.7%), while slightly more than half (56%) of those who obtained scores below the average were also TBL participants. It is worthwhile to underscore that all the teachers who scored above the average held subject-specific qualifications while an overwhelming majority of the TBL participants who scored below the average did not hold relevant teaching credentials. One critical implication of this is that relevant subject-specific qualifications seem to be more relevant to metalinguistic awareness than whether a teacher is TBL or NTBL, or whether he is a native or non-native speaker of English. The five TBL teachers whose scores were below the average present a very interesting and challenging linguistic profile indeed, which perhaps in and of itself should not be extrapolated to other TBL teachers globally. That said, the fact that those TBL teachers who scored above the average all held subject-specific qualifications and that those TBL teachers who scored below the average predominantly held non-subject-specific qualifications, cannot be a coincidence, which seems to

point to the critical interdependence of linguistic literacy and subject-specific qualifications; a potentially promising area in which a new line of research can be initiated.

5.2 Concluding Remarks

This PhD study investigated the impact of oral proficiency in a non-English language on NES and NNES teachers' linguistic literacy, which was conceptualized as the combination of two constructs, metalinguistic awareness and register awareness. In particular, the findings indicated that proficiency in non-English languages had a positive impact on teachers' metalinguistic as well as register awareness. However, the teachers' elevated metalinguistic and register awareness was contingent upon their proficiency in non-English languages' not being limited to mere oral proficiency. In other words, only those teachers with literacy skills in the relevant non-English language tended to display elevated metalinguistic and register awareness. The study also found that teachers' subject-specific qualifications had a more prominent role to play in determining the extent to which they had metalinguistic and register awareness. This finding, in particular, presents a promising avenue for subsequent research in this specific domain. Further studies should be conducted to justify the finding as to whether subject-specific qualifications are more relevant to linguistic literacy than whether a teacher is monolingual or multilingual or whether he is NES or NNES. This call for further research is made as the relationship between bilingualism limited to oral proficiency and metalinguistic and register awareness is a domain that has not been addressed before. This study, therefore, is the first of its kind in that it attempts to investigate whether and the extent to which bilingualism limited to oral proficiency promotes metalinguistic and register awareness. In addition, research conventions, as a principle, always advise researchers to recommend further research as one study may never constitute the ultimate reality. Babin et al.' (2020, p. 2) remark, in this respect, sheds light into

the importance of corroboration: “Corroboration of empirical insights is critical to theory development, developing generalizations from empirical findings, verifying the validity and reliability of findings, delimiting the scope of empirical findings, and increasing scientific rigor.”

While the study justified the hypotheses and research findings in SLA that teachers with proficiency in non-English languages had elevated metalinguistic and register awareness provided that their proficiency was not restricted to sole oral proficiency, the average score across the tasks for all the participants (49%) was not particularly high, indicating that the teachers, in general, possessed impoverished subject matter knowledge. In turn, this suggests that the teachers seemed to suffer from a lack of explicit knowledge about language, defined by Thornbury (1997) as teachers’ knowledge of the underlying systems of the language that enables them to teach effectively”, which according to Andrews (1999, p. 144) “must form the basis of any L2 teacher’s metalinguistic awareness.”

In error correction tasks, even when some teachers, NES teachers in particular, were able to identify the error, they were not able to account for the mistake, pointing to a lack of explicit knowledge, sometimes referred to as declarative knowledge. To be able to identify and explain the source of a linguistic error, it could be argued that a fundamental linguistic entity, analyzed knowledge, is a prerequisite, which could be defined as the ability to successfully dissect language into decontextualized linguistic units for the purposes of a thorough and in-depth analysis.

The participants’ relatively poor performance especially in tasks relevant to the structure of language reveals that teacher-training programs may be lacking a critical component; language structure. The findings suggest that those participants with a background in linguistics

have a more elevated level of metalinguistic than those who do not, which implies that more course work on the formal properties of language should be integrated into teacher-training programs. Courses in linguistics such as phonology, morphology, and syntax can be made a fundamental prerequisite of more advanced courses. Further research that compares metalinguistic awareness of teachers with a background in linguistics and those without can be investigated, which seems to present a promising avenue for a new line of research in applied linguistics.

The teachers' relatively low averages could be attributed to the inadequate academic credentials they possessed; those teachers who performed poorly on metalinguistic tasks did not hold relevant subject-specific qualifications. In addition, most of the seemingly bilingual and/or multilingual teachers were either illiterate or had limited literacy skills in the languages they spoke, which did not obviously translate into heightened metalinguistic and register awareness of English, which was the language of focus in this study.

The discussion around teachers, and especially the ones who do not hold subject-specific qualifications, is a hotly debated issue in the SLA literature. That teachers who are not equipped with adequate qualifications and who can still make it into the teaching profession, has been a long-standing orthodoxy and contested issue, which has been attributed to factors such as linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) and the superiority of native speakers of English, who are usually regarded as ideal teacher candidates as far as English teaching is concerned. That any NES or fluent English speaker can enter the profession so easily after a few weeks or even hours of training, can be accounted for in the eyes of many by one particular reason; language is simply reduced to a tool for communication rather than a science, or more specifically, a system. When language is conceived of as merely a tool, then the sole task of teaching is reduced to

enabling learners to communicate in class through tasks such as pair-work, group-work, projects, and so forth simply because native or fluent oral competence in English is regarded as the required subject matter of English language teaching. Training teachers, then, becomes just a matter of acquainting them with topics such as classroom management; individual differences; offering praise for good work; encouraging participation; and using non-verbal communication, all of which in essence, constitute an integral part of each and every single teacher's core job. That said, language cannot and should not be limited to a tool for communication. Here is how Ravid (1993) views language:

Language is a system, a network, not just a random group of elements which have no connection. The elements of language are related to each other in a structured way. The key words are network, system, structure. This, of course, means that the elements of language - or languages - are bound by rules.

Cummins (2008), in agreement with Ravid, explains that language teaching involves discrete language skills that are associated with rule-governed aspects of language such as phonology, grammar, and spelling. In the same vein, Moats (2015) asserts that teachers should be able to identify basic formal properties of language such as phonemes, graphemes, syllables, morphemes, basic parts of speech, sentence structures, and narrative or expository discourse organization.

In contrast, a completely different orientation to language can be seen in the following teacher's view:

It doesn't really matter at first how many mistakes the (students) make, so long as they're communicating. ... Regardless of how broken it is, or how badly grammatically it's

spoken, it doesn't matter; if they can get the basic pronunciation, someone will understand (Mangubhai et al., 2004, p. 13)

Apparently, this particular teacher has adopted a monolingual, sometimes referred to as *Native-Speakerist* approach to language (Holliday, 2006), which reflects the view that language is merely a tool for communication. In such narrow orientations towards language, formal properties of language are usually neglected and a teacher's performance is usually assessed by students' acquiring reasonable oral fluency in a language.

If we want English language teaching to be seen as a profession and to gain the status and respect it deserves as is the case with any other academic discipline, it is imperative that we treat it as a profession, which views language not only as a tool for communication, but also as a system, which would consequently require years of study to produce specialists. Just as it is impossible for a nurse to become a physician after having completed a 120-hour course, it must legally be impossible for a person with a degree in computer science to become an English language practitioner. The so-called domain "English Language Teaching" should stop being viewed as a safe haven for unemployed fluent or native-English speaking individuals to land a job, especially in EFL contexts.

I would like to conclude this study with a quote from a renowned Linguistics professor, Dr. Marianne Celce-Murcia in an interview with her PhD student:

A language teacher who knows about the grammatical system, who knows about the phonological system, and who knows something about how discourse operates—other things being equal—will be a better language teacher than a language teacher who is linguistically naive. I mean, it's the same idea in other fields: How can you teach math if

you don't know math yourself? You've got to know your subject matter. How can you teach the English language if you don't know English as declarative knowledge? There is much more to teaching than that, of course. Language teachers have to find ways to make the declarative knowledge procedural knowledge for their learners (Yoo, 2001, p. 193).

References

- Adger, C. T., Snow, C. E., & Christian, D. (2002). Introduction. In C.T. Adger, C.E. Snow & D. Christian, (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (2nd ed., pp. 1–6). McHenry, IL/Washington, DC: Delta Systems/Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Al-Azzawi, Q. O. (2009). English inversion as used by Iraqi EFL learners. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312023484>
doi: 10.15179/RG.2.1.4705.2099
- Alderson, C., & Steel, D. (1994). Metalinguistic knowledge, language aptitude and language proficiency. In D. Graddol & T. Stephen (Eds.), *Language in a changing Europe* (pp. 92–103). Clevedon: BAAL and Multilingual Matters.
- Alderson, C., Clapham, C., & Steel, D. (1997). Metalinguistic knowledge, language aptitude and language proficiency. *Language Teaching Research*, 1, 93–121.
- Al-marza, G.G. (1996). Student foreign language teachers' knowledge growth. In D. Freeman & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Ammar, A., Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2010). Awareness of L1/L2 differences: does it matter? *Language Awareness*, 19(2), 129–146.
- Andrews, S. (1994). The grammatical knowledge/awareness of native-speaker EFL teachers. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (Eds). *Grammar and the Language Teacher* (pp. 69–89). Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Andrews, S. (1997). Metalinguistic awareness and teacher explanation. *Language Awareness*, 6(2-3), 147–161. doi: 10.1080/09658416.1997.9959924

- Andrews, S. (1999). All these like little name things: A comparative study of language teachers' explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology. *Language Awareness, 8*, 143–159.
- Andrews, S. (2001). The language awareness of the L2 teacher: Its impact upon pedagogical practice. *Language Awareness, 10*(2-3), 75–90.
- Andrews, S. (2003). Teacher language awareness and the professional knowledge base of the L2 teacher. *Language Awareness, 12*(2), 81–95.
- Anthony, J. L., & Francis, D. J. (2005). Development of phonological awareness. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*(5), 255–259. doi: 10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00376.x
- Apel, K. A. (2014). Comprehensive definition of morphological awareness: Implications for assessment. *Topics in Language Disorders, 34*(3), 197–209.
doi: 10.1097/TLD.0000000000000019
- Apel, K., Wilson-Fowler, E. B., Brimo, D., & Perrin, N. A. (2012). Metalinguistic contributions to reading and spelling in second and third grade students. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 25*(6), 1283–1305. doi: 10.1007/s11145-011-9317-8
- Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) (2009). *Good practice principles for English language proficiency for international students in Australian universities*. Report to the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. Canberra.
- Azar, B. S. (2009). *Understanding and using English grammar*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

- Babin, B.J., Ortinau, D.J., Herrmann, J., & López, C. (2020). Science is about corroborating empirical evidence, even in academic business research journals. *Journal of Business Research*.
- Ballantyne, K., & Rivera, C. (2014). *Language proficiency for academic achievement in the international baccalaureate diploma program* (1–161). The George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bassetti, B. (2005). Effects of writing systems on second language awareness: Word awareness in English learners of Chinese as a foreign language. In V. Cook & B. Bassetti (Eds.), *Second Language Writing Systems* (pp. 335–356). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bassetti, B. (2007). Bilingualism, biliteracy and metalinguistic awareness: Word awareness in English and Japanese users of Chinese as a second language. *Birkbeck Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 2, 1–21.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559.
<https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2008.1573>
- Berman R.A. (2016). Linguistic Literacy and Later Language Development. In: J. Perera, M. Aparici, E. Rosado & N. Salas (Eds.), *Written and Spoken Language Development across the Lifespan. Literacy Studies 11* (pp. 181–200). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-21136-7_18
- Berry, R. S. (2005). Making the most of metalanguage. *Language Awareness*, 14(1), 3–20.
- Berry, R. S. (2009). EFL majors' knowledge of metalinguistic terminology: A comparative

- study. *Language Awareness*, 18(2), 113–128.
- Berry, R. S. (2014). Investigating language awareness: The role of terminology. In L. Andrzej & K. Szcześniak (Eds.), *Awareness in action: The role of consciousness in language acquisition* (pp. 21-33). Poland: Springer International Publishing.
doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-00461-7_2
- Bialystok, H. (1979). Explicit and implicit judgments of L2 grammaticality. *Language Learning*, 29(1), 82–103.
- Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 65, 24–35. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1981.tb00949.x
- Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition*. Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511605963
- Bialystok, E. (2009). Bilingualism: The good, the bad, and the indifferent. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 12, 3–11. doi: 10.1017/S1366728908003477
- Biber, D., & Gray, B. (2010). Challenging stereotypes about academic writing: Complexity, elaboration, explicitness. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(1), 2–20. doi: 10.1016/j.jeap.2010.01.001
- Biber, D. E., Reppen, R., & Conrad, S. (2002). Developing linguistic literacy: perspectives from corpus linguistics and multi-dimensional analysis. *Journal of Child Language*, 29(2), 458–462.
- Bigelow, M. & Schwarz, R. L. (2010). *Adult English learners with limited literacy*. Washington DC: National Institute for Literacy. Retrieved from <http://lincs.ed.gov/publications/pdf/ELLpaper2010.pdf>

- Blackmore, A. M., Pratt, C., & Dewsbury, A. (1995). The use of props in a syntactic awareness task. *Journal of Child Language*, 22(2): 405–421. doi: 10.1017/s0305000900009855
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1990). The logical problem of foreign language learning. *Linguistic Analysis*, 20, 3–49.
- Block, D. (2001). Foreign nationals on PGCE in modern languages course: Issues in national identity construction. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 24(3): 291–312.
- Block, D. (2002). Communicative language teaching revisited: Discourses in conflict and foreign national teachers. *Language Learning Journal*, 26, 19–26.
- Bloor, T. (1986). What do language students know about grammar? *British Journal of Language Teaching*, 24, 157-160.
- Bolitho, R., Carter, R., Hughes, R., Ivanič, R., Masuhara, H., & Tomlinson, B. (2003). Ten questions about language awareness. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 251–259.
- Bolitho, R. (1988). Language awareness on teacher training courses. In T. Duff (Ed.), *Explorations in Teacher Training: Problems and Issues* (pp. 72–84). Harlow: Longman
- Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 9–38.
- Borg, S. (1999). Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching. *System*, 27(1), 19–31.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in grammar teaching: a literature review. *Language Awareness*, 12(2), 96–108.
- Borg, M. (2005). A case study of the development in pedagogical thinking of a preservice teacher. *TESL-EJ*, 9(2), 1–30.

- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London and Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Bournot-Trites, M., & Séror, J. (2003). Students' and teachers' perceptions about strategies which promote proficiency in second language writing. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 129–157.
- Bruton, A. (2002). From tasking purposes to purposing tasks. *ELT Journal*, 56(3), 280–288.
- Brumfit, C., Mitchell, R. & Hooper, J. (1996). Grammar, language and classroom practice. In M. Hughes (Ed.) *Teaching and Learning in Changing Times*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cajkler, W., & Hislam, J. (2002). Trainee teachers' grammatical knowledge: The tension between public expectation and individual competence. *Language Awareness*, 11(3), 161–177.
- Carlisle, J. F. (1995). Morphological awareness and early reading achievement. In L. Feldman (Ed.), *Morphological aspects of language processing* (pp. 189–209). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Casalis, S., Deacon, S. H., & Pacton, S. (2011). How specific is the connection between morphological awareness and spelling? A study of French children. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 32(3), 499–511. doi: 10.1017/S014271641100018X
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1997). Direct approaches in L2 instruction: A turning point in communicative language teaching? *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 141–152.
- Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 7(1), 71–88.
- Chambers, F. (1997). What do we mean by fluency? *System*, 25(4) 535–544.

- Chandler, P., Robinson, W. P. & Noyes, P. (1988). The level of linguistic knowledge and awareness among students training to be primary teachers. *Language and Education*, 2(3), 161–73.
- Chi, D. N. (2016). Intake in second language acquisition. *Hawaii Pacific University TESOL Working Paper Series*, 14, 76–89.
- Cook, V. J. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185–209.
- Cook, V. J. (2016). *Second language learning and language teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Corbeil, G. (2005). Effectiveness of focus-on-forms instruction: Different outcomes on constrained and free production tasks? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8, 27–45.
- Correa, M. (2011a). Subjunctive accuracy and metalinguistic knowledge of L2 learners of Spanish.” *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 8(1), 39–56.
- Correa, M. (2011b). Advocating for critical pedagogical approaches to teaching Spanish as a heritage language: Some considerations. *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(2), 308–320.
- Cullen, R. (1994). Incorporating a language improvement component in teacher training programmes. *ELT Journal*, 84(2), 162–172.
- Cullen, R. (1998). Teachers talk and the classroom context. *ELT Journal*, 52(3), 179–187.
- Cummins J. (1976). The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: a synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 9, 1–43.
- Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. *TESOL Quarterly*, 175–187.

- Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1991). Language learning and bilingualism. *Sophia Linguistica*, 29, 1–194.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2007). BICS and CALP: Empirical and Theoretical Status of the Distinction. *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 2(2), 71–83.
- Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In B. Street, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (2nd ed., pp. 71–83). New York: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_36
- Cummins, J. (2013). The role of research on literacy, poverty and diversity in transforming schools: A critical analysis of PISA cross-national findings. In R. A. DeVillar, B. Jiang, & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Transforming education: Global perspectives, experiences and implications* (pp. 17–39). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Collins English dictionary. (1994). Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Dabrowska, E. (2015). What exactly is Universal Grammar, and has anyone seen it? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 852. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00852
- Daffern, T. (2016). What happens when a teacher uses metalanguage to teach spelling? *The Reading Teacher*, 70(4), 423–434.

- Daller, H., & Grotjahn, R. (1999). The language proficiency of Turkish returnees from Germany: An empirical investigation of academic and everyday language proficiency. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 12(2), 156–172.
- Davies, A. (1996). Proficiency or the native speaker: what are we trying to achieve in ELT? In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 145-157). Oxford: OUP
- Davies, M. (2006). Paralinguistic focus on form. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(4), 841-850.
- Davis, C. (2005). *Shallow vs non-shallow orthographies and learning to read workshop*. Report of the OECD-CERI Learning Sciences and Brain Research. Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/54/39/35562310.pdf>.
- DeKeyser, R. (2000). The robustness of critical period effects in second language acquisition. *SSLA*, 22, 499-533.
- Dempsey, M. (2013). *Self-efficacy for metalinguistic control and its relationship to writing quality* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nebraska-Lincoln, NE, United States of America.
- Donmall, G. (1985). *Language awareness*. NCLE Papers and Reports No. 6. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Edge, J. (1988). Applying linguistics in English language teacher training for speakers of other languages. *ELT Journal*, 42(1), 9–13.
- Edwards, H. T., & Kirkpatrick, A. G. (1999). Metalinguistic awareness in children: A developmental progression. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 28(4), 313–329.

- Ellis, E. M. (2004). Language background and professional competencies in teaching ESOL. *English Australia Journal*, 21(2): 55–71.
- Ellis, E. M. (2006). Language learning experience as a contributor to ESOL teacher cognition. *TESOL-EJ*, 10(1), 1–21.
- Ellis, E. M. (2012). Language awareness and its relevance to TESOL. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 7, 1–23.
- Ellis, N. C. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 305-352.
- Ellis, N. (2008). Implicit and explicit knowledge about language. In J. Cenoz & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education, Volume 6: Knowledge about Language* (2nd ed., pp. 119-132). United States of America: Springer.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2000). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Ellis, R. (2002). The Place of Grammar Instruction in the Second/Foreign Language Curriculum. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos. *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms* (pp. 14-34). London: Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (2004). The definition and measurement of explicit knowledge. *Language Learning*, 54, 227-275.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2002). Doing focus on form. *System*, 30, 419 -432.
- Fielding-Barnsley, R. & Purdie, N. (2005) Teacher's attitude to and knowledge of metalinguistics in the process of learning to read. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(1).

- Figueiredo, D. (2010). Context, register and genre: Implications for language education. *Revista Signos* 43, Número Especial Monográfico N° 1, 119-141.
- Fillmore, L.W., & Snow, C. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language*. (Contract No. Ed.-99- CO-0008). U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Fiszer, C. (2008). *The Effect of Bilingualism on Cognition: Evidence from Early and Late Bilinguals*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Paris Descartes University, Paris, France.
- Foster, P. (1998). A classroom perspective on the negotiation of meaning, *Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 1–23.
- Foster, P. & Ohta, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(3), 402–430.
- Francis, N. (1999). Bilingualism, writing and metalinguistic awareness: Oral-literate interactions between first and second languages. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 20, 533–561.
- Franson, C. (2009). Bilingualism and Second Language Acquisition", in *NALDIC*. [Online]. Retrieved from <http://www.naldic.org.uk/ITTSEAL2/teaching/bilingualism.cfm>
- Friesen, D. C., & Bialystok, E. (2012). Metalinguistic ability in bilingual children: The role of executive control. *Rivista di Psicolinguistica Applicata*, 12(3), 47–56.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gatbonton, E. (1999). Investigating experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *The Modern Language Journal* 83, 585–616.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Case Study Research Methods*. London: Continuum.

- Gombert, J. E. (1996). Metalinguistic activities and language acquisition. *Acquisition and interaction in a foreign language*, 8. Retrieved from <http://journals.openedition.org/aile/1224>
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/aile.1224>
- Goncz, L., & Kodzopeljic, J. (1991). Exposure to two languages in the preschool period: Metalinguistic development and the acquisition of reading. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 12, 137–163
- Gordon, E. (2005). Grammar in New Zealand schools: Two case studies. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 4 (3), 48–68.
- Gottlieb, M., & Ernst Slavit, G. (2013). *Academic language in diverse classrooms: Mathematics Series*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Gutiérrez, X. (2012). Implicit knowledge, explicit knowledge, and achievement in second language (L2) Spanish. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(1), 20–41.
Retrieved from <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19945>
- Gutiérrez, X. (2016). Analyzed knowledge, metalanguage, and second language proficiency. *System*, 60, 42–54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.06.003>
- Guerriero, S., & K. Deligiannidi (2017). The teaching profession and its knowledge base. In S. Guerriero (Ed.), *Pedagogical Knowledge and the Changing Nature of the Teaching Profession*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264270695-3-en>.
- Hakuta, K. (1990). Bilingualism and bilingual education: A research perspective. *ERIC: ED321584: Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education*, 1, 1–16. Retrieved from <http://www.ncela.ed.gov/files/rcd/BE017493/Hakuta.pdf>

- Hakuta, K., Ferdman, B.M., & Diaz, R. (1987). Bilingualism and cognitive development: three perspectives. In S. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Advances in applied psycholinguistics: Reading, writing, and language learning, Volume 2* (pp. 284–319). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Group.
- Hamers, J. F., & Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). *Bilinguality and bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hammarberg, B. (2010). The languages of the multilingual: Some conceptual and terminological issues. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 48, 91–104.
- Han, Z. H. (2004). Fossilization: Five central issues. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 212–42.
- Han, Y., & Ellis, R. (1998). Implicit knowledge, explicit knowledge and general language proficiency. *Language Teaching Research*, 2, 1–23.
- Harris, R. (2012). Raising lecturer awareness of issues in academic language for non-native speakers of English in the Irish third level sector. *International Conference on Engaging Pedagogy 2012 (ICEP12)*. Dublin, Ireland: ITB.
- Hawkins, E. W. (1999). Foreign language study and language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 8(3-4), 124–142.
- Higgs, T. V., & Clifford, R. (1982). The push toward communication. In T. V. Higgs (Ed.), *Curriculum, competence, and the foreign language teacher* (pp. 57-136). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). Grammar teaching in writing classes: Tenses and cohesion. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second*

- language classrooms* (pp.181–198). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hogan, S. (1994). *TESOL teacher competencies document*. Sydney: ATESOL NSW.
- Holliday, A. (2006). Key concepts in ELT: Native-speakerism. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), 385–387.
doi:10.1093/elt/ccl030
- Hu, G. (2011). Metalinguistic knowledge, metalanguage, and their relationship in L2 learners. *System*, 39, 63–77.
- Hudson, R. & Walmsley, J. (2005). The English patient: English grammar and teaching in the twentieth century, *Journal of Linguistics*, 41(3) 593–622.
- Indiana University of Pennsylvania (n.d.). Understanding Academic Language in edTPA: Supporting Learning and Language Development. Retrieved April 1, 2022 from https://education.indiana.edu/students/undergraduates/clinical-experiences/_docs/Academic%20Language.pdf.
- Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jessner, U. (2008a). Teaching third languages: Findings, trends and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 41, 15–56.
- Jessner, U. (2008b). A DST model of multilingualism and the role metalinguistic awareness. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(2), 270–283.
- Jones-Diaz, C. (1999). Bilingualism, biliteracy and beyond. In the proceedings of the 3rd annual conference of the Bilingual Children’s Interest Group and the Language Acquisition Research Centre, 1 – 19. Retrieved from https://www.abcd.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Biling_conf.pdf
- Keller, F. (1999). Grammaticality Judgments and Linguistic Methodology. *Journal of Logic*,

- Language and Information*, 8(1), 114–121. doi: 10.1023/A:1008323501411
- Kellerman, E. (1978). Giving learners a break: Native language intuitions as a source of predictions about transferability. *Working papers on Bilingualism*, 15, 59-92.
- Kemp, C. (2009). Defining multilingualism. In L. Aronin & B. Hufeisen (Eds.) *The Exploration of Multilingualism* (pp. 11-27). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/aals.6.02ch2>
- Kinsella, K. (1995). Understanding and empowering diverse learners in ESL classrooms. In J. M. Reid (Ed.), *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom* (pp. 170–194). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Klapper, J. & Rees, J. (2003). *Language Teaching Research* 7(3), 285–314.
- Kolln, M. & Hancock, H. (2005). The Story of English Grammar in United States Schools. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 4(3), 11–31.
- Kormos, J., & Dénes, M. (2004). Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. *System*, 32, 145–164.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2001). The effect of knowledge about the L1 on foreign language skills and grammar. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 4(5), 310–331. doi:10.1080/13670050108667735
- Laufer, B. (2006). Comparing focus on form and focus on forms in second-language vocabulary learning. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63, 149–166.
- LeBlanc, L. B., & Lally, C. G. (1998). A Comparison of Instructor-Mediated Versus

- Student-Mediated Explicit Language Instruction in the Communicative Classroom.
French Review 71, 734–46.
- Lightbown, P. M., Randall H. H., White, J. L., & Horst, M. (2002). Comprehension-based learning: The limits of do it yourself. *Canadian Modern Language Review*. 58(3), 427–464.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R.B. Ginsberg & C. Kramersch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Maletina, O. V. (2014). *Understanding L1-L2 fluency relationship across different languages and different proficiency levels* (Unpublished master's thesis). Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.
- Mangubhai, F., Marland, P., Dashwood, A., & Son, J. B. (2004). Teaching a foreign language: One teacher's practical theory. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(3), 291–311.
- Mattingly, I. G. (1972). Reading, the linguistic process, and linguistic awareness. In J. F. Kavanagh & I. G. Mattingly (Eds.), *Language by ear and by eye: The relationships between speech and reading* (pp. 133-147). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Martin, K. I., & Ellis, N. C. (2012). The roles of phonological short-term memory and working memory in L2 grammar and vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34(3), 379-413. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263112000125>.
- McLaughlin, B. (1990). "Conscious" versus "Unconscious" learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(4), 617–634. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3587111>

- McNeill, A. (2005). Non-native speaker teachers and awareness of lexical difficulty in pedagogical texts. In E. Llurda (Ed.) *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 107-128). New York: Springer Science Business Media.
- Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (2004). *Second language learning theories*. Second edition. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Moats, L.C. (1994). The missing foundation in teacher education: Knowledge of the structure of spoken and written language. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 44, 81–102.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02648156>
- Moats, L. C. (2000). *Whole language lives on: The illusion of "balanced" reading instruction*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Moats L.C. (2009). Still wanted: Teachers with knowledge of language. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 42, 387–391. doi: 10.1177/0022219409338735.
- Moats, L.C. (2014). What teachers don't know and why they aren't learning it: Addressing the need for content and pedagogy in teacher education. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*, 19(2) 75–91.
- Moussu, L., & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language teaching*, 41(3), 315–348.
- Myhill, D., Jones, S. M., Lines, H., & Watson, A. (2012). Re-thinking grammar: the impact of embedded grammar teaching on students' writing and students' metalinguistic understanding. *Research Papers in Education*, 27(2), 139–166.
- Nagy, W. E., & Anderson, R. C. (1995). *Metalinguistic awareness and literacy acquisition in different languages* (Report No. 618). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.

- Nagy, W., & Townsend, D (2012). Words as tools: Learning academic vocabulary as language acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47, 91–108.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/RRQ.011>
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2004). Current developments in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 126–145. doi:10.1017/S0267190504000066.
- Njika, J. A. (2015). Teacher metalinguistic awareness as an essential component of language teaching/learning: case study of ELT in Cameroon. *Syllabus Review* 6(2), 23–52.
- Nordquist, R. (2019). What is register in linguistics? Retrieved 24 June 2020 from <https://www.thoughtco.com/register-language-style-1692038>
- Norris, J. & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 Instruction: A Research Synthesis and Quantitative Meta-analysis, *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417–528.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*: Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Okada, A. (2013). Phonological Features of in-, un- and non-. *IPEDR*, 63(21), 123–128.
DOI: 10.7763
- Olsen, W. (2004). Triangulation in social research: qualitative and quantitative methods can really be mixed. In M. Holborn (Ed.), *Developments in Sociology*. Ormskirk, England: Causeway Press.
- O’Riordan, M. (1999). *Strategic use of pedagogic rules in micro-level editing*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the New York State Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Bronx, NY.
- Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332.

- Pallier, C., Colomé, A., & Sebastián-Gallés, N. (2001). The Influence of Native-Language Phonology on Lexical Access: Exemplar-Based Versus Abstract Lexical Entries. *Psychological Science, 12*(6), 445–449.
- Phillipson, R. H. L. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rahman, K. F., & Yeasmin, S. (2012). Triangulation research method as the tool of social science research. *BUP JOURNAL, 1*(1), 154–163
- Rausch, D. J., Naumann, J., & Jude, N. (2011). Metalinguistic awareness mediates effects of full biliteracy on third-language reading proficiency in Turkish-German bilinguals. *The International Journal of Bilingualism, 16*(4), 402–418.
- Ravid, D., & Hora, A. (2009). From implicit to explicit language knowledge in intervention: Introduction to the Special Issue on intervention and metalanguage. *First Language, 29*(1), 5–14. doi: 10.1177/0142723708097563
- Ravid, D. (1993). Acquisition of Language and Literacy: *Emergent Literacy in Early Childhood Education* (pp. 27–43). UNESCO.
- Ravid, D., & Tolchinsky, L. (2002). Developing linguistic literacy: A comprehensive model. *Journal of Child Language, 29*, 419-448.
- Reder, F., Marec-Breton, N., Gombert, J. E., & Demont, E. (2013). Second-language learners' advantage in metalinguistic awareness: A question of languages' characteristics. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*, 686–702.
- Rebuschat, P. (2012). Implicit learning. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Second Language Acquisition*. London: Routledge.
- Rebuschat, P. (2013). Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge in second language research. *Language Learning, 63*, 595-626.

- Reagan, T. (1997). The case for applied linguistics in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 48*, 185–196.
- Renou, J. (2001). An examination of the relationship between metalinguistic awareness and second-language proficiency of adult learners of French. *Language Awareness, 10*(4), 248–267. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658410108667038>
- Roehr, K. (2004). Exploring the role of explicit knowledge in adult second language learning: Language proficiency, pedagogical grammar and language learning strategies. *Centre for Research in Language Education, 59*, 1–22.
- Roehr, K. (2006). Metalinguistic knowledge in L2 task performance: A verbal protocol analysis. *Language Awareness, 15*(3), 180–198.
- Roehr, K. (2008). Linguistic and metalinguistic categories in second language learning. *Cognitive Linguistics, 19*(1), 67–106.
- Roehr, K., & Gánem-Gutiérrez, G. A. (2009). The status of metalinguistic knowledge in instructed adult L2 learning. *Language Awareness, 18*(2), 165–181.
- Saidi, A. (2017). *The Importance of Phonetics and Phonology in The Teaching of Pronunciation*. Retrieved from <https://www.eflmagazine.com/importance-phonetics-phonology-teaching-pronunciation/>
- Sanatullova-Allison, E. (2014). Memory Retention in Second Language Acquisition and Instruction: Insights from Literature and Research. *The IAFOR Journal of Language Learning, 1*(1), 1–13.
- Scheffler, P. (2008). The natural approach to adult learning and teaching of L2 grammar. *IRAL, 46*(4), 289–313.

- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2009, October). *Language in Academic Subject Areas and Classroom Instruction: What Is Academic Language and How Can We Teach It?* Paper presented at the Workshop on the Role of Language in School Learning: Implications for Closing the Achievement Gap, Hewlett Foundation, Menlo Park, CA.
- Schmidt (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied linguistics*, 11, 129–158.
- Schwartz, M., & Causarano, P. L. (2007). The role of frequency in SLA: An analysis of gerunds and infinitives in ESL written discourse. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, 14, 43–57.
- Scott, V. (1990). Explicit and implicit grammar teaching strategies. *The French Review*, 63, (5), 779–789.
- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The Psychology of Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sebolai, K. (2016). Distinguishing between English proficiency and academic literacy in English. *Language Matters*, 47(1), 45–60.
- Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double standards: Teacher education in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, 18(2), 233–245.
- Serrano, R. (2011). From metalinguistic instruction to metalinguistic knowledge, and from metalinguistic knowledge to performance in error correction and oral production tasks. *Language Awareness*, 20(1), 1–16.
- Sheen, R. (1994). A critical analysis of the advocacy of the task-based syllabus. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 127–151.
- Shuib, M. (2009). Grammatical awareness among primary school English language teachers.

- GEMA Online™ *Journal of Language Studies*, 9(1), 35–46.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). Corpus concordance collocation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simard, D., & Wong, W. (2004). Language awareness and its multiple possibilities for the L2 classroom. *Foreign Language Anals*, 37(1), 96–110.
- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (2001). Cognition and tasks. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp.183–205). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, D. B. (1996). Teacher decision making in adult ESL classroom. In D. Freeman & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 197–216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sorace, A. (1985). Metalinguistic knowledge and language use in acquisition-poor environments. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(3), 239–254. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/6.3.239>
- Spada, N. & Lightbown, P. M. (2008). Form-Focused Instruction: Isolated or Integrated? *TESOL Quarterly* 42(2), 181–207.
- Spolsky, B. (1968). What does it Mean to Know a Language, or How Do You Get Someone to Perform His Competence? *Second Conference on Problems in Foreign Language Testing* (pp. 1–21). University of Southern California: ERIC Clearinghouse.
- Stephenson, A., Johnson, D.F., Jorgensen, M.A., & Young, M.J. (2004). *Assessing English language proficiency: using valid result to optimize instruction*. Paper presented at the 81st Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association (CERA).
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and

- comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235–56). New York: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swan, M. (2005). Legislation by hypothesis: The case of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics* 26(3), 376–401.
- Tarone, E. (2009). Second-language acquisition by low-literate learners: An under-studied population. *Language Teaching*, 43, 75–83.
- Tarone, E., & Bigelow, M. (2005). Impact of literacy on oral language processing: Implications for SLA research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 77–97.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190505000048>
- TESOL International Association. Qualitative Research: Case Study Guidelines (n.d). Retrieved April 27, 2022, from <https://www.tesol.org/read-and-publish/journals/tesol-quarterly/tesol-quarterly-research-guidelines/qualitative-research-case-study-guidelines>
- The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA): 560 million words, 1990-present.
 Available online at <https://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>.
- Thornbury, S. (1997). *About Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsang, W.L. (2011). English metalanguage awareness among primary school teachers in Hong Kong. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 11(1), 1–16.
- Tsui, A.B.M. (2007). Complexities of identity formation: A narrative inquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(4), 657–678.
- Tunmer W. E. & Herriman M. L. (1984). The Development of metalinguistic awareness: A

- conceptual overview. In W.E. Tunmer, C.Pratt & M.L. Herriman (Eds.), *Metalinguistic awareness in children* (pp.12–35). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Tunmer, W. E., Herriman, M. L., & Nesdale, A. R. (1988). Metalinguistic Abilities and Beginning Reading. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23(2), 134–158.
<http://doi.org/10.2307/747799>
- Tunmer, W. E., & Hoover, W. A. (1992). Cognitive and linguistic factors in learning to read. In P. B. Gough, L. C. Ehri & R. Treiman (Eds.), *Reading acquisition* (p. 175–214). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351236904>
- Uccelli, P., Dobbs, C., & Scott, J. (2013). Mastering academic language: Organization and stance in the persuasive writing of high school students. *Written Communication*, 30, 36–62.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2016). *Facts for Features: Hispanic Heritage Month 2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/facts-for-features/2016/cb16-ff16.html>
- Vasconcelos Horta, I., & Alves Martins, M. (2009). Orthographic performances in a Portuguese primary school: A longitudinal study in third and fourth grades. *LI – Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 9(4), 43–61.
- Verity, D.P. (2003). Everyone is a native speaker: Promoting language awareness in classroom. *NUCB JLCC*, 5(2), 133–141.
- Voice of America (2018, August 2). Inversion in Academic Writing, Part 2. Retrieved from <https://learningenglish.voanews.com/a/improve-your-writing-with-inversion-part-2/4509288.html>.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language* (E. Hanfmann & G. Vakar, Eds. and Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published 1934)

- Williamson, J. & F. Hardman (1995). Time for refilling the bath? A study of primary student-teachers' grammatical knowledge. *Language and Education*, 9 (2), 117–34.
- Wray, D. (1993). Student-teachers' knowledge and beliefs about language. In N. Bennett & C. Carre' (eds.), *Learning to Teach*. London: Routledge.
- Winter, B., & Reber, A. S. (1994). Implicit learning and the acquisition of natural languages. In N. C. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 115–146). London, UK: Academic Press.
- World Literacy Foundation (2015). *The Economic & Social Cost of Illiteracy; A snapshot of illiteracy in a global context*. Retrieved from <https://worldliteracyfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/WLF-FINAL-ECONOMIC-REPORT.pds>
- Wolfson, N. (1986). Research Methodology and the Question of Validity. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(4), 689–699. doi:10.2307/3586519
- Wright, T. (2002). Doing language awareness: Issues for language study in language teacher education. H. Trappes-Lomax & G. Ferguson (Eds.), *Language in Language Teacher Education* (pp. 113–130). London: John Benjamin.
- Wright, T. & Bolitho, R. (1997). Towards awareness of English as a professional language. *Language Awareness*, 6(2-3), 162–70.
- Young, S. C. (2016). *Reframing metalinguistic awareness for low-literate L2 learners: Four case studies* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Georgetown University.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Yoo, I. W. (2001). Bridging the Gap between Research and Pedagogy: An Interview with Marianne Celce-Murcia. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 12(2). Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/91g1p6kp>.
- Zainal, Z. (2007). Case study as a research method, *Journal of Jurnal Kemanusiaan*, 12(9), 1-6.
- Zhang, M. X. (1998). The Crucial Role of Formal and Explicit Instruction and Learners' Prior Knowledge - An Example in Learners of Chinese Background. *ERIC*, ED430391, 1-18.
- Zohrabi, M. (2013). Mixed Method Research: Instruments, Validity, Reliability and Reporting Findings. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3, 254-262.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.2.254-262>.

Appendix A

The Instrument

Task 1: Error Correction

If you identify any error in any of the following sentences, first write the correct version of the sentence. Then, explain why the error might have been committed and how it can be corrected.

1. Do you have a pen? Yes, I have.
2. Thank you for invite us to your house.
3. Jane has less students than does Susan.
4. I would stay home rather then go out.
5. I did not see him yesterday, because I did not attend the meeting.
6. The western world has been facing a severe economical recession.
7. There's a lot of unemployed people in this city.
8. The three-year old boy played with his toy.
9. I will be there in two days time.
10. Her average performance did not fullfil the expectations of the audience.
11. He maybe in class right now.
12. Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthier.
13. The amount of students in my class is 23.
14. The data **obtained from the study** is to be published soon.
15. The man **who's** brother I met yesterday left town.
16. Who did found Apple Company?
17. The man whom got a promotion joined us only last month.
18. King Abdulaziz University hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency.
19. Me and Talal are good friends.
20. The *criteria* that were agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce.

4.2. Error Correction

Table A1

Main Verb vs Auxiliary verb

Item 1: Do you have a pen? Yes, I have

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers'

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Yes, I do. Here auxiliary verb should be do.
2	SAM	0.25	The answer is understandable, but a more grammatically correct one would have been: yes, I do . Because you respond to the verb "do you".
3	FIRAZ	1	Yes, I do. The short answer to a question incorporates the auxiliary verb , not the main verb . In cases where no auxiliary verb is present in the question, the verb do is incorporated into the short answer.
4	OSAMA	0.25	Do you have a pen? Yes, I do. In a yes/no question, the answer is always given to the first verb. In this case, do.
5	ELIA	0.25	Yes, I have → Yes, I do. Present Simple question do you takes an answer "yes, I do."
6	INDIGO	0.25	Yes, I do. I feel this answer is slightly more appropriate in this case. This is because the question started with a do; therefore, the answer must have a do in it preferably .
7	JALIL	1	Do you have a pen? Yes, I do. The error is "I have". It happened because the student doesn't know how to answer yes/no question with the right auxiliary verb .
8	KAMIL	1	Do have a pen? Yes, I do. Students are usually confused between have as a helping verb and a main verb.
9	LIGHT	0.25	Do you have a pen? Yes, I have a pen. The error might have been committed by the speaker because they believed that they did not need to repeat information. The error could be explained by telling the speaker that whenever you have a pronoun followed by have you need to state what it is that you have.
10	BEY	0.75	The question is in the Present Simple and the answer should have been in the Present Simple as well rather than Present Perfect (I have).
11	MERT	1	Correction: Do you have a pen? Yes, I do. The correct answer should be "Yes, I do." We use Subject + Auxiliary Verb combination to give short answers to questions. If, however, the main verb is intended to be used in response, then the answer must be in a full sentence , i.e., "Yes, I have got a pen."

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
12	SALIMA	0.25	Yes, I do. Mistake is made in the "I have" part.
13	SIERRA	0	Yes, I do. The error is possible to occur as the verb have in the question.
14	SUZANNE	0.25	"Yes, I have" is not terrible. Yes, I have one is better. <u>The proper short answer to a do question takes do as its verb.</u> I do not know why. English do structures are just strange. I can only teach them by modelling the forms.
15	TALAT	0	OK.
16	VIVI	0.75	Correct Response: Yes, I have a pen. Yes. Yes, I do. Yes, I do have a pen (for emphasis). WHY: Have requires an object. Short answer=Yes, I do.
17	WALI	1	Sentence 1 is incorrect because it should be "Yes, I do." The error here is because some students are confused about have as being a helping verb and being a main verb.
AVERAGE		54.4%	

Teachers Truly bilingual: 2 zeros

Table A1.1

Main Verb vs Auxiliary verb

Responses by NOT Truly Bilingual Teachers'

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	HUSTIN	0.75	Yes, I do. Need " do " for the ellipsis – response to a question which has " do ".
2	AL	0	The sentence is OK.
3	FARIS	0.25	Yes, I do. That's the way we say it. Yes, I have is not a complete answer.
4	BROW	0	Do you have a pen? Yes, I have → Yes, I do. Yes, I have is too informal.
5	JESUS	1	Do you have a pen? Yes, I do. The student is taking the have from the question and bringing it over into the answer. This is similar to when they are taught to use the BE verb in a YES/NO question and bring it over into the answer. Are you a student? Yes, I am. They are incorrectly applying this rule to this question but not realizing that the auxiliary DO should be brought over into the answer to this question.
6	SYMRNA	0	Yes, I do. Wrong Verb Usage
Average		33.3%	

Teachers not Truly bilingual: 3 zeros

TOTAL: 5 zeros

Table A1.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	54.4%
NTBL average	33.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	48.9%

Table A1.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	2	11.8%
NTBL	3	50%
TOTAL	5	21.7%

Sentence 2: Thank you for invite us to your house.

Table A2

Gerund following a Preposition

Responses by Teachers Truly Bilingual

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Thank you for inviting us to your house. After a preposition (for) a gerund is used

2	SAM	0.75	For inviting. For is a preposition . It needs a noun after it.
3	FIRAZ	1	Thank you for inviting us to your house. For is a preposition and takes a noun phrase as its object (usually) when it takes a verb phrase as its object, then the head verb must be in gerund (-ing) form.
4	OSAMA	1	Thank you for inviting us to your house. Gerund .
5	ELIA	0.25	Inviting. Wrong form was used. It is a common error among EFL learners who are unsure of word endings .
6	INDIGO	0	Thank you for inviting us to your house. The answer should be in the present continuous tense . The person is still in the process of leaving and is thanking his host.
7	JALIL	1	Thank you for inviting us to your house. The error is using invite after the preposition for. This might be because the student does not know that after prepositions , a gerund (ing) is needed. This could be explained to the student in a grammar lesson.
8	KAMIL	1	Thank you for inviting us to your house. Prepositions are followed by nouns, pronouns, or gerunds .
9	LIGHT	0.25	Thank you for inviting us to your house. The error may have been committed because not conjugating the verb does not impede one's understanding of the statement . In other words, the speaker only knows the basic form, and this is enough to communicate their idea.
10	BEY	1	The gerund should have been used in this sentence (inviting).
11	MERT	1	The correct answer is, "Thank you for inviting us to your house." Verbs, which follow prepositions , should be used as gerunds , i.e., verb + ing form.
12	SALIMA	0	Thank you for inviting us to your house.
13	SIERRA	0.75	Thank you for inviting us to your house. I think it is happened because of not knowing what comes as (after) a preposition
14	SUZANNE	0.75	Um a "for complement " requires the -ing form.
15	TALAT	1	Thank you for inviting us. A verb is used after a preposition. The correct version can be made by using a gerund after the preposition .
16	VIVI	1	"For" is a preposition. Therefore, the gerund (ing) form is necessary because we need a noun (object of the preposition).
17	WALI	1	It is incorrect because it should be thank you for inviting us to your house. Some students don't know the rule that says prepositions should be followed by a gerund (V+ing).
	AVERAGE	75%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 2 zeros

Table A2.1

Gerund following a Preposition

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.75	Thank-you for inviting us to your house. “ for ” requires verb with “ ing ”.
2	AL	0	Thank you for inviting us to your house (invite). Wrong verb used Error may have been committed because the student hasn’t understood the verb form of “ to be ” and explain present continuous . Explain/teach different scenarios.
3	FARIS	0	Inviting- as its present continuous .
4	BROW	1	Inviting; gerund after for .
5	JESUS	1	Thank you for inviting us to your house. The student is using the basic form of the verb ‘invite’ when they should be using the gerund here. Here the proper form of the verb ‘invite’ should be used which in this case is the gerund ‘inviting’. This is a common collocation coupled with thank you. Thank you for verb + ing. This form could be practised with other expressions. Thank you for visiting me today. Thank you for serving me dinner. Thank you for
6	SYMRNA	0	Thank you for inviting us to your house. Using present instead of present continuous for an activity.
AVERAGE		45.8%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

TOTAL: 5 zeros

Table A2.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	76.5%
NTBL average	45.8%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	67.4%

Table A2.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	2	11.8%
NTBL	3	50%
Total	5	21.7%

Sentence 3: Jane has less students than does Susan.

Table A3

Uncountable Comparative Form

Responses by Teachers Truly Bilingual

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	Jane has less students than Susan does. Word order is a problem. Inversion
2	SAM	1	Less > fewer: fewer is for countable nouns.
3	FIRAZ	1	Jane has fewer students than does Susan. Less is used only with uncountable nouns. Fewer is used with countable nouns.
4	OSAMA	0.75	Jane has fewer students than Susan does. Less is used with uncountable nouns comparative statements while fewer is used with countable ones. In a noun comparative sentence, when less is used as an adjective, the responding part of the comparative statement has the noun + auxiliary verb. Inversion
5	ELIA	0	Does Susan=Susan does. Comparative adjectives form for the use of than has the structure of comparative adjective + than +the noun. Since the sentence has a possessive verb has. The word does should follow the noun and vice versa. Inversion
6	INDIGO	0	Jane has less students than Susan. There is no requirement to include does here. A good comparison has been made in the above sentence. Inversion
7	JALIL	0	Jane has less students than Susan does. The error is writing does before Susan. Inversion
8	KAMIL	1	Jane has fewer students than does Susan. Fewer is used with countable nouns. Less is used with uncountable nouns.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
9	LIGHT	0.75	Jane has fewer students than Susan. The speaker may have made an error because fewer and less are similar and often confused. I am not sure why they would have added does. The error may have been made because fewer and less are similar. I would explain to the student that fewer is used for countable objects while less is used for uncountable objects. Inversion
10	BEY	0.75	In this sentence, the noun should be placed before the auxiliary verb and fewer should have been used instead of less which is used for uncountable nouns. Inversion
11	MERT	0	Correction: "Jane has less students than Susan does", or, "Jane has less students than Susan." This is similar to the short answer rule; we employ the auxiliary verbs in comparisons. Inversion
12	SALIMA	0	Jane has less students than Susan. Inversion
13	SIERRA	0	Jane has less students than Susan. In comparison, there is no need for 2 helping verbs. Inversion
14	SUZANNE	1	Less vs. Fewer= mass vs. Count distinction. Student is a count noun.
15	TALAT	0	Jane has less students than Susan does. The auxiliary does should come after the subject Susan. Inversion
16	VIVI	1	Jane has fewer students than does Susan. "less" is for nouns which are non-count such as milk, sugar, love, gasoline, etc. Fewer is for count nouns such as students.
17	WALI	0	It is incorrect as it should be "Jane has less students than Susan does". Some students don't feel it is ok to have a helping verb like do at the end of the sentence, especially if you have a full-stop at the end of the sentence. That's why they prefer to put does before the last word to make sure it is statement not a question. Inversion
Average		42.6%	

Teachers not Truly bilingual (9 zeros)

Table A3.1

Uncountable Comparative Form

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	HUSTIN	0.25	Jane has fewer students than Susan (has). No "do" in this case because the sentence is affirmative [not negative or a question]. "Fewer" is the more natural word in this context, although "less" is acceptable.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
2	AL	0	Jane has less students than Susan. OR Jane has less students than Susan does. (word: does not necessary). Because students is not sure of the verb to do and subject verb agreement. Explain/teach verb to do and subject verb agreement rules.
3	FARIS	0	Omit does.
4	BROW	0	Should be "Susan does" not "does Susan".
5	JESUS	0	Jane has less students than Susan. The word does is in the wrong position here. In fact, it is not necessary at all and should be omitted. This is superior. If the sentence were to continue then it would come after Susan and not before Susan as it is an auxiliary verb that should follow the noun.
6	SYMRNA	0.25	Jane has fewer students than Susan. Wrong word for comparatives + redundant usage of do.
AVERAGE		8.3%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

TOTAL: 13 zeros

Table A3.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	42.6%
NTBL average	8.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	33.7%

Table A3.3

Zero averages

Number of zeros	Zero average
------------------------	---------------------

TBL	9	52%
NTBL	4	66.6%
Total	13	56.5%

Sentence 4: I would stay home rather than go out.

Table A4

Then vs. than

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Spelling of then is a problem →than
2	SAM	1	Rather than NOT rather then
3	FIRAZ	1	I would stay home rather than go out. Than is correct spelling. Then is incorrect for the comparative marker. Rather is a synonym for prefer to in this sentence. So, it should come directly after would.
4	OSAMA	0	I would rather stay at home then go out. This is the same subject preference statement in the base form. S + Would + rather
5	ELIA	1	then = than . Spelling error.
6	INDIGO	0	I would prefer to stay at home is more appropriate. I would stay home rather then go out.
7	JALIL	1	I would stay home rather than go out. The error is then. It is because then and than are pronounced similarly. The teacher can highlight the difference and give them examples.
8	KAMIL	1	I would stay home rather than go out. Rather goes with than .
9	LIGHT	1	I would stay home rather than go out. The speaker may have made the error because then and than look and sound similar. I would explain to the speaker that than is used for comparisons and contrasts. Then is used to order events and actions chronologically.
10	BEY	0	Can't explain.
11	MERT	1	"I'd rather stay home than go out," as "rather" precedes verbs. In addition, we use " than " in comparisons instead of " then ".
12	SALIMA	0	I would rather stay home then go out.
13	SIERRA	0	I would stay at home rather then go out. It may sound correct but grammatically it is not.
14	SUZANNE	1	Then is a temporal adverb, than a comparativesomething.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
15	TALAT	1	I would stay at home rather than go out. The error can be corrected by changing the e into a in the word then.
16	VIVI	1	I would stay home rather than go out. Then is for time. Than is for comparisons
17	WALI	1	It is incorrect as it should be I would stay home rather than go out . This error happens because some students are confused about the spelling of then. They use then instead of than and vice versa.
AVERAGE		70.6%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 5 zeros

Table A4.1

Then vs. than

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	HUSTIN	1	I would rather stay at home than go out. Need "at" with "home". Putting "rather" before is more natural, although keeping it where is was is acceptable. Must replace "then" with "than".
2	AL	1	I would stay at home rather than go out (Spelling mistake). It could be just a spelling mistake or not understanding the difference between then and than .
3	FARIS	0.25	Than . Then is for something to follow.
4	BROW	0	I would say should stay home.
5	JESUS	1	I would rather stay home than go out. Rather is out of place and should come after the modal would and before the verb stay. Then is also not the proper spelling. We should spell it as 'than' which is used in comparisons. Then has a totally different meaning and the student should have both of these meaning explained to him.
6	SYMRNA	0.75	I would stay home rather than go out. Wrong word/spelling.
AVERAGE		66.7%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 1 zero

TOTAL: 6 zeros

Table A4.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	70.6%
NTBL average	66.7%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	69.6%

Table A4.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	5	29.4%
NTBL	1	16.6%
Total	6	26%

Sentence 5: I did not see him yesterday, because I did not attend the meeting.

Table A5

Redundancy of punctuation when main clause begins a sentence

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	No problem.
2	SAM	0.25	The comma is not needed here.
3	FIRAZ	0	“Did not” sounds rather stilted. I would probably say didn’t in this sentence.
4	OSAMA	0.25	It is unusual to put a comma before “because”.
5	ELIA	0	Formal/informal language. Informal speech takes contractions of the verbs didn’t in place of did not.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
6	INDIGO	0	This is acceptable. We can also use as/since instead of because.
7	JALIL	1	I did not see him yesterday because I did not attend the meeting. The error is using a comma before because. This is because is a subordinating conjunction. The teacher should highlight the difference between the two kinds.
8	KAMIL	0.25	There is no need for a comma since there is a linking verb . Could is better than did with verbs of sense.
9	LIGHT	0	No problem.
10	BEY	0	In this sentence there are two actions taking place in the past and one occurs before the other, so Past Perfect should have been use (because I hadn't attended the meeting.)
11	MERT	0	I can't find anything wrong with this one.
12	SALIMA	0	No mistake.
13	SIERRA	0	Correct.
14	SUZANNE	1	No comma is required before a conjunction.
15	TALAT	0.25	I did not see him yesterday because I did not attend the meeting. The comma must not be used here.
16	VIVI	1	I did not see him yesterday because I did not attend the meeting. A comma is not used here because the subordinating conjunction "because" occurs between 2 clauses. If because is initial, we need a comma. Because S V, S V. S V because S V. We don't pause here when we read this one.
17	WALI	0	I see that this sentence is correct.
	AVERAGE	23.5%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 10 zeros

Table A5.1

Redundancy of punctuation when main clause begins a sentence

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	OK. Although it is more natural to use "I didn't", be it in speech or formal writing.
---	--------	---	---

2	AL	0	The sentence is OK. Shortened version is preferable. Short form is better in written English; explain short form.
3	FARIS	0	I wasn't at – do not repeat did not.
4	BROW	0	OK.
5	JESUS	0	I couldn't find an error here.
6	SYMRNA	0.25	Delete the comma.
	AVERAGE	4.2%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 5 zeros

TOTAL: 15 zeros

Table A5.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	23.5%
NTBL average	4.2%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	18.5%

Table A5.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	10	58.8%
NTBL	5	83.3%
Total	15	65.2%

Sentence 6: The western world has been facing a severe economical recession.

Table A6

Economic vs. economical

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.25	The western world has been facing a severe economic recession. Word formation problem
2	SAM	1	Economical is not the right adjective here. It may be used for economical, car. Etc. Economic = related to economics or to economy; economical= saving, frugal, e.g., an economical car. Mohammad's economical car makes 100 kms per gallon.
3	FIRAZ	1	Economic is a pre-modifying adjective that appears before a noun. Economical is a predicate adjective.
4	OSAMA	0	"Western" is an abstract noun (i.e., capital W).
5	ELIA	0.25	economical = economic. Word endings.
6	INDIGO	0	The western world is facing severe economical recession is more preferable instead of has been which implies that the crisis in the past is over.
7	JALIL	1	The western world has been facing a severe economic recession. The error is using economical instead of economic. This is because the two words look similar and both of them are adjectives derived from the noun economy.
8	KAMIL	0	The western world is facing a severe economical recession. Since/for
9	LIGHT	0.25	The western world has been facing a severe economic recession. The speaker may have made an error due to confusion arising from the forms of economic.
10	BEY	0	Capitalization – Western world
11	MERT	1	Correction: "The western world has been facing a severe economic recession." The adjectives "economic" and "economical" have different meanings; the former relates to things which are about the economy itself, however, "economical" relates to cost or price being affordable. Students of English may confuse such words as "historic" or "historical" in the same way.
12	SALIMA	0	No mistake.
13	SIERRA	0	It might be correct , but I feel if there is a year, it will be more certain about it.
14	SUZANNE	1	"economical" double adjectival marking - not necessary.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
15	TALAT	0.25	The western world has been facing a severe economic recession. The correct word is economic not economical. Economic is the right adjective.
16	VIVI	0.25	The western world has been facing a severe economic recession. This is a misunderstanding of the meaning of facing. Facing is a word that does not continue in the past because once it has happened, it doesn't continue (e.g., enter. Meet)
17	WALI	0	I see that this sentence is correct.
AVERAGE		36.8%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 7 zeros

Table A6.1

Economic vs. economical

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	1	... economic recession. "economical" has a different meaning – it means to be careful with your money [or figuratively, careful with other things, such as the truth, etc.]. "economic" is the correct adjective derived from the noun "economy".
2	AL	0	The sentence is OK.
3	FARIS	0.25	Economic
4	BROW	0	Economic means cheap.
5	JESUS	1	The western world has been facing a severe economic recession. The word economical is the wrong word. It has a meaning that is different from the correct word economic. Both are adjectives but with different meanings. I would explain the meaning of both words to the students so that they can understand how both are used. Economical implies someone who is trying to save money whereas economic is a description to describe that something is related to economics and economies.

6	SYMRNA	0	The Western world has been facing a severe economic recession. Using an adverb instead of an adjective.
AVERAGE		37.5%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

TOTAL: 10 zeros

Table A6.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	36.8%
NTBL average	37.5%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	37%

Table A6.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	7	41.2%
NTBL	3	50%
Total	10	43.5%

Sentence 7: There's a lot of unemployed people in this city.

Table A 7

Subject-verb agreement

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Singular/plural mistake
2	SAM	1	There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. The word is does not agree with the plural noun people; subject-verb agreement
3	FIRAZ	1	Subject verb agreement requires the plural form are rather than the singular is.
4	OSAMA	1	People is a countable (plural form) noun and so it requires "are".
5	ELIA	1	There's = there're. A lot of/lots of are plural forms; hence take 'are'.
6	INDIGO	0.75	There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. There are is better than there is. This is because it is plural.
7	JALIL	1	There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. The error is using is with a plural noun people. This is because language learners are used to seeing the subject before the verb, which is, as they think in this sentence, there.
8	KAMIL	1	There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. A lot of" & "people" here are plural nouns. They should go with the plural form of verb "to be"; which is are.
9	LIGHT	1	There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. The error might have been committed because there's followed by "a" which usually indicated singularity. However, people is plural. I would simply explain to the student that people is plural. Therefore, they need to pluralize the verb to be.
10	BEY	1	The plural should have been used here (There are a lot of unemployed people in this city.)
11	MERT	1	Correction: "There're a lot of unemployed people in this city." While in colloquial English the usage of singular verb "is" for plural nouns are acceptable, grammatically the subject – verb agreement applies, i.e., the singular verb form for the singular objects and plural verb form for plural subjects/objects, etc.
12	SALIMA	0.75	There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. It is plural issue, it is not there is a lot of people, but there are a lot of
13	SIERRA	0.25	There are lots of unemployed people in this city. Misunderstanding of using lots of/a lot of, which are confusing.
14	SUZANNE	1	Subject – verb agreement for number.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
15	TALAT	1	There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. The verb are should be used with the plural noun "people" so that we have the correct subject-verb agreement.
16	VIVI	1	There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. People is plural so we must use a plural verb.
17	WALI	1	This sentence is incorrect. It should be there are a lot of unemployed people in this city. Some students use the word people as a singular word, that's why they use is instead of are.
AVERAGE		92.6%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: No zeros

Table A7.1

Subject-verb agreement

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	1	There are many unemployed people in this city. "are" is needed because the reference is to the plural "people". "a lot" could be left, but "many" is briefer and hence recommended.
2	AL	1	There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. Incorrect word is used (there's). Because not realizing that the plural form should be used. Teach/explain singular/plural forms.
3	FARIS	0.25	There are – people: collective , therefore use are.
4	BROW	0	OK.
5	JESUS	1	There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. The rules for 'There is/There are' are very simple. You use 'There is' with a singular noun and you use 'There are' for plural nouns. Here the students is confused because people doesn't have an s so the student is treating people as a singular noun and hence the reason for using 'there is'. The student needs to be taught that people is a plural noun and the rule 'there are' should apply.
6	SYMRNA	1	There are a lot of unemployed people in this city. Subject-verb agreement
AVERAGE		70.8%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 1 zero only

TOTAL: 1 zero

Table A7.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	92.6%
NTBL average	70.8%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	87%

Table A7.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	0	0%
NTBL	1	16.7%
Total	1	4.3%

Sentence 8: The three-year old boy played with his toy.

Table A8

Hyphenation in compound adjectives

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	The three-year old boy were playing with his toy. Simple past somehow needs time expression.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
2	SAM	1	Three-year-old extra hyphen is needed for the 3-word combination.
3	FIRAZ	0.75	I think it is three-year-old rather than three-year old because it consists of a compound noun made up of 3 words: 3, year, old.
4	OSAMA	0	No clear indication of any errors. However, in general human perceptions, children play with TOYS rather than ONE TOY. However, it could be that this boy had ONE toy only.
5	ELIA	0	No error.
6	INDIGO	0	Acceptable answer.
7	JALIL	0.75	The three-year-old boy played with his toy. The error is with the punctuation of three-year old.
8	KAMIL	1	The three-year-old boy played with his toy. Compound adjectives should have all parts hyphenated.
9	LIGHT	1	The three-year-old boy played with his toy. The speaker may have committed the error because they thought that three-year was separate from old. I would explain to the student that three-year-old must be hyphenated because the words are a description that should remain connected.
10	BEY	0	Wrong tense is used here. Past Continuous should have been used for an action that takes place in the past and occurs over a period of time (was playing).
11	MERT	1	Correction: The three-year-old boy played with his toy.” The general rule which applies here is that hyphens should be used between number + year + old adjective combinations.
12	SALIMA	0	No mistake.
13	SIERRA	0	Three years old. Since in saying the old, it is possible that the learners may apply the rule of plural/singular in it.
14	SUZANNE	0.75	The three-year-old boy played with his toy. Compound adjective needs to be completely linked up with dashes.
15	TALAT	0	The three years old boy played with his toy. Three and year should not be hyphenated and the plural form of the noun year is the correct grammatical entity.
16	VIVI	0	The three year old boy played with his toy (No hyphens because there is a noun) OR The three-year-old played with his toy
17	WALI	0	I see that this sentence is correct.
AVERAGE		36.8%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 10 zeros

Table A8.1

Hyphenation in compound adjectives

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.75	The three-year-old boy... Need hyphens for all three words of this noun phrase that serves to describe the “boy”.
2	AL	0	The sentence is OK.
3	FARIS	0	Could be toy or toys.
4	BROW	0	OK.
5	JESUS	0	I could not find an error in this one.
6	SYMRNA	0	No mistake.
	AVERAGE	12.5%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 5

TOTAL: 15 zeros

Table 8.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	36.8%
NTBL average	12.5%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	30.4%

Table A8.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	10	58.8%
NTBL	5	83.3%

Total	15	65.2%
--------------	-----------	--------------

Sentence 9: I will be there in two days time.

Table A9

Missing apostrophe in possessive case

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	I will be there in two days ' time. Punctuation mistake. Apostrophe is missing.
2	SAM	1	Two days' time; an apostrophe is missing. In the time of two days is what is meant here. So, we need a possessive.
3	FIRAZ	0	No mistake
4	OSAMA	1	I will be there in two days' time. This is called Inanimate Possessives. So, it requires the possessive apostrophe
5	ELIA	0	Time. Time is not necessary.
6	INDIGO	0	Acceptable answer.
7	JALIL	0	It seems Ok.
8	KAMIL	0	OK.
9	LIGHT	0	No problem.
10	BEY	0	In this sentence going to future should have been used instead of will (going to for future plans).
11	MERT	1	Correction: "I will be there in two days' time." An apostrophe should be used as in "day's" or "days'" when number + day/days are used as adjectives.
12	SALIMA	0	No mistake.
13	SIERRA	0	I will be there 2 times a day. In the sentence, I feel in as a pre might be need if the meaning is different. So, the meaning that wants to be delivered.
14	SUZANNE	1	I will be there in two days' time. Possessive form is required. Time is the chunk possessed by 2 days
15	TALAT	0	I will be there after two days. This is my intuition of the correct form the sentence.
16	VIVI	1	I will be there in two days' time. Days is plural possessive.
17	WALI	0	I see that this sentence is correct.
	AVERAGE	35.3%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 11 zeros

Table A9.1**Missing apostrophe in possessive case****Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual**

1	HUSTIN	0	I will be there in two days. Could write “days’ time”, but leaving of the “time” is briefer and hence recommended.
2	AL	0	I’ll be there in two days time (I will). Shortened version is preferable. Short form is better in written English; explain short form.
3	FARIS	0	Omit two days time; replace with a couple of days.
4	BROW	0	OK.
5	JESUS	1	I will be there in two days’ time. Days need an apostrophe after the s to imply possession as days is connected to time and need to be possessive. Otherwise it is just two nouns one after the other. I would explain the rules of possession and ‘s and then this answer will become clear for the student.
6	SYMRNA	0	No mistake.
	AVERAGE	16.7%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 5 zeros

TOTAL: 16 zeros

Table A9.2**Averages****TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages**

TBL average	35.3%
NTBL average	16.7%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	30.4%

Table A9.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	11	64.7%
NTBL	5	83.3%
Total	16	70%

Sentence 10: Her average performance did not fullfil the expectations of the audience.

Table A10

Morphological aspect of spelling mistakes: fullfill

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	No problem.
2	SAM	0	Meet instead of fullfil. It is a matter of usage here and usually we speak of meeting expectations.
3	FIRAZ	0	Average doesn't mark as an appropriate adjectival modifier for performance in this sentence.
4	OSAMA	1	Spelling error (SP). However, If you are referring back to an instance of a speaker or a learner making a mistake on the word fullfil, then I would say that this is a typical linguistic error which language learners make when they try to write (initially) this word since they might combine the two words together full and fill. Also, they might realise that there is a single "L" somewhere but cannot locate the right position.
5	ELIA	1	Fullfil vs. fulfill. Spelling error.
6	INDIGO	0.25	Her average performance did not meet the expectations of the audience. Meet should be used instead of fulfill.
7	JALIL	0	Seems OK.
8	KAMIL	0	Her average performance did not satisfy the expectations of the audience.
9	LIGHT	0	No problem.
10	BEY	0	Past Perfect should have been used here.
11	MERT	1	Correction: "Her average performance did not fulfill the expectations of the audience." There is a spelling error committed in the word "fulfill".

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
12	SALIMA	0	No mistake.
13	SIERRA	0	Her average performance does not fullfil the expectations of the audience. I think it is worke as the writer orally talking about something happened. Both did/does could be correct. But for the past there should be an indicator (...ago, yesterday?)
14	SUZANNE	0.25	Her substandard performance did not fulfil expectations of the audience. Average is not the best word choice as in this context it reads as if this audience has listened to several of her performances and is judging the average of all of them-odd.
15	TALAT	0	O.K.
16	VIVI	1	Her average performances did not fullfil the expectations of the audience. Spelling of fullfill.
17	WALI	0	I see that this sentence is correct.
AVERAGE		26.5%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 11 zeros

Table A10.1

Morphological aspect of spelling mistakes: fullfill

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	1	... did not meet the expectations... "meet" is the word that normally collocates with "expectations". "fullfil" can be used, but if so should be spelled "fulfil".
2	AL	0	The sentence is OK.
3	FARIS	0	No answer.
4	BROW	0	Average is not needed; bad word choice.
5	JESUS	1	Her average performance did not fulfill the expectations of the audience. I can only see the spelling error in the word fullfill. The student has used two Ls in the beginning and one L in the beginning. The correct spelling is the opposite of this.
6	SYMRNA	1	Her average performance did not fulfill the expectations of the audience. Spelling.
AVERAGE		50%	

Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

TOTAL = 14 zeros

Table A10.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	26.5%
NTBL average	50%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	32.6%

Table A10.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	11	64.7%
NTBL	3	50%
Total	14	60.9%

Sentence 11: He maybe in class right now.

Table A11

Maybe vs. may be

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.25	Punctuation / may & be should be written separately.
2	SAM	1	He maybe in class right now. He may be = not maybe. Maybe is the same as probably. He may be means he probably is. It is a subject plus verb sequence. Maybe is an adverb so you can say: Maybe, he'll come tomorrow = perhaps heetc
3	FIRAZ	1	May be not maybe because maybe is an adverb which means perhaps.
4	OSAMA	0.75	He might be in class right now. May and Might are modal verbs. They can normally be interchanged without a significant difference in meaning however Might often implies a smaller chance of something happening (when expressing possibility). Also, might is more commonly used in English
5	ELIA	0.25	may be = might be is a better option.
6	INDIGO	0.25	He may be in class right now. May be instead of maybe.
7	JALIL	0.25	He may be in class right now. The error is writing may be as one word. The student cannot distinguish between may be, which means possibly, and maybe, which means perhaps.
8	KAMIL	1	He may be in class right now. Maybe, he is in class now. After subject, modal verb plus main verb.
9	LIGHT	0.25	He may be in class right now. The speaker may have made the error because may be and maybe sound the same. They may not have seen the words written. I would explain to the student that maybe indicates uncertainty, whereas may be indicates uncertainty too. It is used after the subject. Maybe is used before the subject.
10	BEY	0	Correct.
11	MERT	1	Correction: "He may be in class right now." Maybe, written as one word, is an adverb. In the sentence, "may" must be written separately as the modal auxiliary verb, and "be" as the main verb.
12	SALIMA	0	No mistake.
13	SIERRA	1	may-be / might be. It is 2 words (aux + V) which could be incorrectly written/ or the writer means by using it perhaps.
14	SUZANNE	0.25	He may be in class now. The word maybe would require a different sentence frame; e.g., "maybe he is in class now. It is a one qualifier with scope over the whole phrase.
15	TALAT	1	He may be in class right now. Maybe is an adverb which means possibly and cannot be used instead of the auxiliary may and the verb be to make a grammatical sentence.
16	VIVI	0.75	Maybe means perhaps or possibly. Are you coming? I am not sure, maybe. Correct is: He may be in class now. MAYBE VS. MAY BE.
17	WALI	0	I see that this sentence is correct.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
	AVERAGE	52.9%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

Table A11.1

Maybe vs. may be

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.25	He might be in class right now. More natural to use "might be" or "could be" instead of "maybe".
2	AL	0	The sentence is OK.
3	FARIS	0	Might be
4	BROW	0.75	May be; verb needed.
5	JESUS	1	He may be in in class right now. The proper use here is to the use the modal of possibility may with a correct verb after it. In this case it is may + be. The student has confused this expression with the adverb maybe. I would try to show the student how these two expressions are different.
6	SYMRNA	1	He may be in class right now. Confusion of modal + verb rather than adverb.
	AVERAGE	50%	

Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual: 2 zeros

TOTAL: 5 zeros

Table A11.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	52.9%
NTBL average	50%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	52.2%

Table A11.3**Zero Averages**

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	3	17.6%
NTBL	2	33.3%
Total	5	21.7%

Sentence 12: Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthier.

Table A12**Double comparative forms: less healthier****Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers**

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.75	Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthily. Word formation problem
2	SAM	1	A teacher should explain that healthy (as an adjective) can't qualify a verb (eat). I'd also explain that the sentence can be set right by adding food at the end. Though it is already used by native speakers, eating healthy is considered not correct because "healthy" is not an adverb. It should be fine in everyday English. There are books now on "eating healthy" but from a linguistic point of view, it is not correct. Either add "healthy food" at the end or use the regular adv "healthily". All the following are ok: - Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthy food. - Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthily/healthfully. - Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat healthier food. - Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthy. (Americanism. I don't recommend it but it is widely used)

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
			- Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthier. <i>NOT CORRECT</i>
3	FIRAZ	0	The is unnecessary because a plural should be bare (sans article) unless the entity encoded in the plural refers to the group in general, then should be a bare plural.
4	OSAMA	1	Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthfully. Adverb describing the eating.
5	ELIA	0	I think this is an incomplete run-on sentence.
6	INDIGO	0	Twelve percent of the retirees say <u>that</u> (underlined by the teacher) they now eat less healthier.
7	JALIL	0.75	Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthy. The error is healthier because you cannot have two comparatives for one adjective.
8	KAMIL	0	OK.
9	LIGHT	0	Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthier food. The speaker may have made an error because they thought that food was implied, and therefore they didn't have to mention it. I would explain to the student that when they are comparing two things, we need to know what those things are.
10	BEY	0	Present Continuous should have been used here (they are now eating). Clue – now
11	MERT	1	Correction: "Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthy food." The word "healthier" is an adjective, therefore, cannot be used as an adverb.
12	SALIMA	0	No mistake
13	SIERRA	0	Twelve percent of the retirees say they are eating less healthier now. Present progressive.
14	SUZANNE	1	Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthily. healthier = comparative form. What is required is an adverb modifying the verb eat.
15	TALAT	0	Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthier food. The noun food must be added to make the noun phrase less healthier food.
16	VIVI	0	Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthy .
17	WALI	0	I see that this sentence is correct.
	AVERAGE	32.4%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 11 zeros

Table A12.1

Double comparative forms: less healthier

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.75	... less healthily. "healthier" is for comparing descriptions. Here we need to compare verbs.
2	AL	0	The sentence is OK.
3	FARIS	0	BLANK.
4	BROW	0	Now eat healthier.
5	JESUS	1	Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthily. The student has used the adjective of degree healthier when they should have used the adverb healthily. I would remind the students about the different between an adverb and an adjective and why in this case an adverb should be used.
6	SYMRNA	0.25	Twelve percent of the retirees say they now eat less healthily. Using comparative form with less.
AVERAGE		33.3%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

TOTAL: 14 zeros

Table A12.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	32.4%
NTBL average	33.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	32.6%

Table A12.3

Zero Averages

Number of zeros	Zero average
------------------------	---------------------

TBL	11	64.7%
NTBL	3	50%
Total	14	61%

Sentence 13: The amount of students in my class is 23.

Table A13

Amount vs. number

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.25	The number of students in my class is 23. Wrong word
2	SAM	1	I prefer number of students. We save amount for non-count nouns.
3	FIRAZ	1	Amount is used to refer to the quantity of an uncountable noun, but students are countable.
4	OSAMA	0	The number of students in my class is 23. Number is more accurate to describe people. Amount is used to describe items.
5	ELIA	0.25	amount = number wrong word.
6	INDIGO	0	The number of students in my class is 23. I prefer that amount should be removed and number should be added instead.
7	JALIL	1	The number of students in my class is 23. The error is amount. Amount is used for uncountable nouns while number is for countable nouns.
8	KAMIL	1	The number of students in my class is 23. Students=countable=number, not amount or quantity.
9	LIGHT	1	The number of my students is 23. The speaker may have been confused amount and number here because both are used in descriptions of quantity. I would explain to the student that amount is used for uncountable objects, whereas number is used for countable objects.
10	BEY	1	Amount is used for uncountable nouns, and number for countable nouns.
11	MERT	0	There often is ambiguity in such noun combinations and verbs. Grammatically, the verb should agree with the noun before "of", in which case the sentence is correct. If, however, the verb agrees with the noun which follows "of" then the sentence should be "The amount of students in my class are 23." Another example to this could be "A range of mountains lie/lies across the coast."

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
12	SALIMA	1	The number of students in my class is 23. Number not amount; students are countable.
13	SIERRA	0	The amount of students in my class are 23. S-V agreement.
14	SUZANNE	1	The number of students in my class is 23. amount vs. number = mass noun vs. count distinction. Student is a count noun.
15	TALAT	1	The number of students in my class is 23. The mistake can be corrected by using the noun number which is used with count nouns like students.
16	VIVI	0.75	The number of my students is 23. Amount is used for weight or money. Amount of love, amount of love, amount of the bill. The amount of weight he lost surprised everyone.
17	WALI	0.25	Incorrect sentence as it should be the number of students in my class is 23. Some students don't know the difference between the word amount and number.
AVERAGE		61.8%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

Table A13.1

Amount vs. number

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.25	The number of students.... "amount" is not natural here – for use with numbers.
2	AL	0	The sentence is OK.
3	FARIS	0.25	The total number of students in my class is 23.
4	BROW	0.25	Amount → number.
5	JESUS	1	The number of students in my class is 23. Amount is not used with count nouns. The proper word to be used with count nouns is number. Amount is used for non-count nouns.
6	SMYRNA	0	The amount of students in my class are 23. Subject verb agreement.
AVERAGE		29.2%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 2 zeros

TOTAL: 6 Zeros

Table A13.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	61.8%
NTBL average	29.2%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	53.3%

Table A13.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	4	23.5%
NTBL	2	33.3%
Total	6	26.1%

Sentence 14: The data obtained from the study is to be published soon.

Table A14

Data as a plural noun: Greek vs. Latin

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	No problem
2	SAM	1	Data are = data is plural. Data is the plural of datum.
3	FIRAZ	1	In academic literature data is treated as a plural noun; however, in everyday English, it is often used as a singular noun.
4	OSAMA	0	Correct!

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
5	ELIA	0	No error.
6	INDIGO	0	The data obtained from the study will be published soon. Instead of is to be, will be is better.
7	JALIL	0	Seems OK.
8	KAMIL	0	OK.
9	LIGHT	0	No problem.
10	BEY	0	Correct
11	MERT	1	Correction: "The data obtained from the study are to be published soon," or, "The datum obtained from the study is to be published soon." This is a common mistake committed by the majority of English speakers, natives, and non-natives alike. The common perception of "data" is taken as information. Grammatically, however, "data" is plural; "datum" is singular
12	SALIMA	0	No mistake.
13	SIERRA	0	The data obtained from the study is meant to be published soon. Meaning is clearer by adding the word meant.
14	SUZANNE	1	The data obtained from the study are to be published soon. Data is the plural form of datum. Subject – verb agreement requires plural form of the verb.
15	TALAT	0	The data obtained from the study will be published soon. The correct tense the future simple. The sentence can be corrected by using the auxiliary will and the infinitive be.
16	VIVI	0	The data obtained from the study will be published soon.
17	WALI	1	This sentence is incorrect as it should be the data obtained from the study are to be published soon.
AVERAGE		29.4%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 12 zeros

Table A14.1

Data as a plural noun: Greek vs. Latin

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	OK
2	AL	0	The sentence is OK.
3	FARIS	0	BLANK.
4	BROW	0	OK.
5	JESUS	0	The data obtained from the study will soon be published . To talk about the future we use will +verb or going to be + verb. Neither of these forms are used here. I would explain that this

			construction is not the appropriate way to speak about the future.
6	SYMRNA	0	The data obtained from the study is soon to be published. Misplaced modifier.
	AVERAGE	0%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 6 zeros

TOTAL: 18 Zeros

Table A14.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	29.4%
NTBL average	0%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	21.7%

Table A14.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	12	52.2%
NTBL	6	100%
Total	18	78.3

Sentence 15: The man who's brother I met yesterday left town.

Table A15

Whose vs who's

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.25	The man whose brother I met yesterday left town. Wrong word
2	SAM	1	Whose brother= grammatically correct Whose is followed by a noun. Who is followed by a verb. Whose is used in the possessive case.
3	FIRAZ	1	Who's is a contraction for who is; the relative pronoun is spelt "whose".
4	OSAMA	1	The man whose brother I met yesterday left town. Whose NOT who's (who is). Who's is a contraction of "who is" or, less commonly, "who has." Whose is the possessive of "who"
5	ELIA	0	who's = whose. Wrong use of word and reflexive pronoun.
6	INDIGO	0.25	The man whose brother I met yesterday left town. Remove who's and put whose. Who is brother will become grammatically wrong.
7	JALIL	1	The man whose brother I met yesterday left town. The error is who's as it is a contraction of who + is, whereas the sentence requires the relative pronoun whose.
8	KAMIL	1	The man whose brother I met yesterday left town. Whose=possession=object. Who's" is the short form of either "who is" or "who has"..... So it cannot be used here before the word "brother".... "Is" should be followed by -ing, adjective, or past participle in the passive.... "Has" should be followed by possessive noun or past participle...."Whose" here is a relative pronoun used before a possessed noun in the objective case.....In all sentences, the context is clear... The main idea is "The man left town. I met that man's brother yesterday."....
9	LIGHT	0.75	The man whose brother I met yesterday left town. Here the student may have made an error because apostrophe + s shows possession. I would just explain that whose is the possessive form of the word who.
10	BEY	0.75	In this sentence the person is mixing homophones who's and whose.
11	MERT	0.75	Correction: "The man, whose brother I met yesterday, left town." The word "who's" refers to "who is," therefore, the personal adjective form "whose" should be used instead of "who's". In addition, the non-defining adjective clause "whose brother I met yesterday" should be separated preceded and followed by commas.
12	SALIMA	0	The man, who's brother I met yesterday, left town. Comma slices.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
13	SIERRA	0	The man whoes (whose) brother I met yesterday left town. whoes (whose) not whose.
14	SUZANNE	1	The man whose brother I met yesterday left town. Umm... relative pronoun, possessive form is required. Who's falsely appears to be a possessive.
15	TALAT	0	The man, a brother I met yesterday, left town. The sentence can be corrected by embedding the defining clause "a brother I met yesterday" with commas.
16	VIVI	1	Whose vs. who's. Whose is correct here because it's possessive. We need the relative clause subordination conjunction whose. Who's= who is
17	WALI	0.75	It is an incorrect sentence. It should be the man whose brother I met yesterday left town. Students are confused between whose which is who's, and whose as one word which refers to possessiveness.
AVERAGE		61.8%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

Table A15.1

Whose vs. who's

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	The man whose brother I met yesterday, left town. "who's" means "who is".
2	AL	0	The man whose brother I met yesterday left town (whose). Wrong verb tense used. Possession has not been understood here, (or spelling). Teach/explain possession.
3	FARIS	0	Whose not who's
4	BROW	1	Whose: relative pronoun.
5	JESUS	1	The man whose brother I met yesterday left town. We should use the possessive pronoun whose here and not the who's contraction. Who's is a contraction that means who is. Whose is a possessive pronoun. I would explain this to my student and the proper use of the both.
6	SYMRNA	0.25	The man whose brother I met yesterday left town. Wrong verb (homonym).
AVERAGE		37.5%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

TOTAL: 7 zeros

Table A15.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	61.8%
NTBL average	37.5%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	55.4%

Table A15.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	4	23.53%
NTBL	3	50%
Total	7	30.4%

Sentence 16: Who did found Apple Company?

Table A16

Redundant use of auxiliary: did

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.25	Who founded Apple Company? Gram wrong form/ wrong word

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
2	SAM	0.75	Who founded; verb to found=to establish find – found – found = locate found – founded – founded = establish I'd explain the 2 distinct verbs and highlight the fact that "found" here is the present form of a REGULAR verb and indicate that unless you want to ask about the person who ACTUALLY founded the company or there is doubt as to who actually did that, it is advisable to refrain from unnecessarily asking in the emphatic form and simply ask Who founded Apple Company?
3	FIRAZ	0.75	The usual way of asking this question is “who found Apple”. “Who did found...?” is used only in a contrastive question such as in a question in reply to “Bill Gates did not found Apple!”. Also, we say a company’s name without “company”. IBM, Microsoft, Apple” and not “IBM Company” etc., why? I am not sure. Perhaps because the name of a company cannot act as the modifier to the word “company”.
4	OSAMA	0	Who started Apple Company? Apple is a company, so it is not a “discovery”.
5	ELIA	0.25	did found = founded
6	INDIGO	0.25	Who founded the Apple Company? Instead of who did, who founded should be used.
7	JALIL	0.75	Who founded Apple Company? The error is using the auxiliary did before the subject because when a question starts with who, no auxiliary is needed.
8	KAMIL	0.75	Who founded Apple Company? Who + main verb is who asks about a subject.
9	LIGHT	0.75	The speaker may have made this error because did is used to describe the past. I would explain to the student that did is used for asking questions and giving responses. I would further explain that if you are forming a wh-word question and did follows the wh -word, then the subject must follow did. If the subject is implied, then you don’t need did. Only the past participle for the main verb is needed.
10	BEY	0.25	The word founded, meaning established, should have been used here.
11	MERT	1	Correction: “Who founded the Apple Company?” When we use “who” as the Subject of the sentence in an interrogative form, we remove the auxiliary verb from the sentence, by using “who + main verb” format. Secondly, the companies should be preceded by the definite article “the”.
12	SALIMA	0	Who did find Apple Company? Wrong tense.
13	SIERRA	0	Who did findIt is past tense sentence. I think sometime user of English think that did is indicator like (ago). But in fact, it is a verb in past form.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
14	SUZANNE	0.75	Who founded Apple Computer Company? In this frame, found is not the past tense of find; rather, the verb meaning to start related to foundation.
15	TALAT	0	Who found Apple Company? The auxiliary did should not be used because found is an irregular verb.
16	VIVI	0.25	Who founded Apple Company? Steve Jobs founded Apple. I went to Apple. (object)
17	WALI	0.75	It is an incorrect sentence. It should be who founded Apple company. Some students are confused between verb found and the second form of find and as a first form of found-founded-founded.
AVERAGE		44.1%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

Table A16.1

Redundant use of auxiliary: did

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.75	Who founded the Apple company? "found" here is the present tense of the verb that means to establish or start something like a university or company. It has a regular past tense which just as "ed" added to it. "company" is not a part of the name, so is not capitalized.
2	AL	0.25	Who founded Apple Company (did found) wrong words used to form verb.
3	FARIS	0.25	Founded the Apple Company.
4	BROW	0.25	Who founded.
5	JESUS	1	Who founded Apple? We don't use the auxiliary DID in this question as the form of the question is asking about an active subject. This is the reason we can't use did.
6	SYMRNA	0	Delete did = not needed
AVERAGE		41.7%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 1 zero

TOTAL: 5 Zeros

Table A16.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	44.1%
NTBL average	41.7%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	43.5%

Table A16.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	4	23.5%
NTBL	1	16.7%
Total	5	21.7%

Sentence 17: The man whom got a promotion joined us only last month.

Table A17

Who vs. whom

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	Spelling.
2	SAM	1	The man whom / whom is for object.
3	FIRAZ	0.75	The relative noun "who" is used to qualify a subject.
4	OSAMA	1	The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. Who is a subjective pronoun (i.e., subject to a verb), whereas whom is an objective pronouns (i.e., as an object).

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
5	ELIA	0	whom = who. Wrong use of word and reflexive pronoun.
6	INDIGO	0.25	The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. Instead of whom, who should be used.
7	JALIL	1	The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. The error is whom as this relative pronoun is used for the object of the sentence, not for the subject.
8	KAMIL	1	The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. Who is a relative pronoun which is used here to talk about a subject.
9	LIGHT	0.25	The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. The speaker may have made an error due to the fact that who and whom sound very similar. They are also pronouns and can be used to ask questions. I would explain to the student that when using whom in question it must follow to.
10	BEY	0.25	The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. Unable to explain the error. The man to whom the promotion was given, joined us only last month. (In this, it would be correct to use whom.)
11	MERT	1	Correction: "The man who got a promotion joined us only last month." We use "who" for the subjects, and "whom" for the objects
12	SALIMA	0.25	The man, who got a promotion, joined us last month. Comma slices; wrong pronoun.
13	SIERRA	0	Who got (who, whom, whoes [whose]) are often used incorrectly as they may seem for language user similar.
14	SUZANNE	0.75	The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. Whom is an object form – dative case. Nominative case is required in this frame.
15	TALAT	1	The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. The defining clause who got promotion describes the main noun man. The subject relative pronoun who is the correct one.
16	VIVI	1	We use whom only for objects. The man is the subject. Whom in American English is mostly dying out altogether. To whom it may concern (formal business letter greeting)
17	WALI	0.25	Incorrect. It should be "the man who got a promotion joined us only last month. Some students get confused between whom and who.
AVERAGE		57.4%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

Table A17.1

Who vs. whom

<u>Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual</u>		
1	HUSTIN	1 The man who got a promotion, joined us only last month. “who” is for subjects, while “whom” is for objects.
2	AL	0.25 The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. . (whom wrong word form) Same as no: 15
3	FARIS	0 only joined us last month.
4	BROW	1 Who- wrong relative pronoun; whom comes before SV; replaces object.
5	JESUS	1 The man who got a promotion joined us only last month. Whom is the used when the word it is replacing is an object but we want to use the subject pronoun who instead. I will explain the difference between a subject and object and when to who and whom are appropriate to use.
6	SYMRNA	0 Replace only with just. Wrong emphazier.
AVERAGE		54.2%

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 2 zeros

TOTAL: 5 Zeros

Table A17.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	57.4%
NTBL average	33.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	56.5%

Table A17.3
Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	3	17.6%
NTBL	2	33.3%
Total	5	21.7%

Sentence 18: King Abdulaziz University hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency.

Table A18

Capitalization of content words in a proper noun

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.75	King Abdulaziz University Hospital is accredited by a Canadian Accreditation Agency (Capital letters).
2	SAM	0.75	King Abdulaziz University hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency. KAUH Hospital (capital H)
3	FIRAZ	1	“Hospital” should have an initial capital because it is part of a proper noun.
4	OSAMA	0	King Abdulaziz University hospital is accredited by the Canadian Accreditation Agency. The Canadian Accreditation Agency is a KNOWN body so it necessitates the use of the definite article “the” rather than indefinite article “a”.
5	ELIA	0	Canadian accreditation agency = Canadian Accreditation Agency = proper noun.
6	INDIGO	0	Correctly used.
7	JALIL	0	King Abdulaziz University hospital is accredited by a Canadian Accreditation Agency. The error is not capitalizing Accreditation Agency since these are part of a proper noun, so they should be capitalized.
8	KAMIL	1	King Abdulaziz University Hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency. The whole proper noun should be capitalized.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
9	LIGHT	1	King Abdulaziz University Hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency. The student may have made this error because they did not realize that hospital is a part of the official name and as such it needs to be capitalized and KAUH is the complete proper noun.
10	BEY	0	Present Perfect should have been used here.
11	MERT	0.75	King Abdulaziz University hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency. Correction: "The King Abdulaziz University Hospital has been accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency." The definite article "the" should precede the proper nouns. They must also be capitalized.
12	SALIMA	0	No mistake.
13	SIERRA	0	Correct.
14	SUZANNE	1	King Abdulaziz University Hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency. Hospital is part of the name KAU Hospital, so, a proper noun, so, to be capitalized.
15	TALAT	0	OK.
16	VIVI	1	Hospital. Capitalize names of specific places or institutions.
17	WALI	0	Correct.
	AVERAGE	42.7%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 9 zeros

Table A18.1

Capitalization of content words in a proper noun

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	1	... Hospital... "Hospital" is a part of the name / title and so should be capitalized as well.
2	AL	0	The sentence is OK.
3	FARIS	0	BLANK.
4	BROW	0	OK.
5	JESUS	1	King Abdulaziz University Hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency. Hospital is part of the proper name of the hospital and this is the reason it must also be capitalized. I will explain this rule to the student.
6	SYMRNA	0.75	King Abdulaziz University Hospital is accredited by a Canadian accreditation agency. Capital H (part of the name)

AVERAGE 45.8%

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

TOTAL: 12 Zeros

Table A18.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	42.7%
NTBL average	45.8%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	43.5%

Table A18.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	9	52.9%
NTBL	3	50%
Total	12	52.2%

Sentence 19: Me and Talal are good friends.

Table A19

Object pronoun in subject position

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.75	Talal and I are good friends. Word order & me is informal
2	SAM	1	Acceptable informally. A more acceptable sentence for me is Talal and I because the pronoun I is the subject pronoun.
3	FIRAZ	0.25	"Me and Talal" is more colloquial than "I and Talal".
4	OSAMA	0.25	I and Talal are good friends. Me is wrongly used here since we are intending a "subject" usage. "I" on the other hand is a subject and it is the correct form of self to be used.
5	ELIA	1	Me and Talal = Talal and I. Me is an object pronoun
6	INDIGO	0	Talal and me are good friends.
7	JALIL	1	Talal and I are good friends. The error is me since it is an object pronoun rather than a subject pronoun.
8	KAMIL	1	Talal and I are good friends. "I" is much better to be used in the subject case.
9	LIGHT	0.75	Talal and I are good friends. The student may have heard people say "me and Talal" are in good friends in informal speech. I would explain to the student that you always put another before yourself, when speaking about the two of you, because it is considered polite.
10	BEY	0	Can't explain
11	MERT	1	Another common error often committed. The correct sentence is, "Talal and I are good friends." Grammatically, we use the subject pronoun before the main verbs. Additionally, "I" is used after "and" in such dual subject combinations.
12	SALIMA	0	No mistake.
13	SIERRA	0.25	Talal and I are good friends. I think this form sentence is rarely said by non-native language user, and when it is said it likely to be written incorrectly.
14	SUZANNE	1	Talal and I are good friends. Talal and I together are nominative case, can occupy subject slot. Me is an object form.
15	TALAT	1	Talal and I are good friends. I think it is better to start with the subject Talal instead of the object pronoun me.
16	VIVI	1	Talal and I are good friends. (subject form) I goes last. Me is the object form. Me and Talal is colloquial English that you will hear on the street. It is technically incorrect.
17	WALI	0.25	Incorrect. It should be Talal and I are good friends. It is not OK in English to start with the pronoun "I" when mentioning other people sharing you in the action.
AVERAGE		61.8%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

Table A19.1

Object pronoun in subject position

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.25	Talal and I are good friends. “Me and Talal” is absolutely fine to all native speakers in all contexts. The news presenters and even the Queen will say it. However, the grammar books say it is wrong. It is a perfect example of why some grammar has to be taught in schools, because the native speakers themselves don’t use it!
2	AL	0	The sentence is OK.
3	FARIS	0.25	Could be Talal and I; both OK.
4	BROW	0.75	Spoken. Talal and I.
5	JESUS	1	Talal and I are good friends. Me is an object pronoun and I is a subject pronoun. You shouldn’t use ‘me’ in a subject position as it can only be used as an object of a sentence.
6	SYMRNA	1	Talal and I are good friends. Customary usage + usage of object pronoun instead of subject pronoun.
AVERAGE		54.2%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 1 zero

Total: 4 Zeros

Table A19.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	61.8%
NTBL average	54.2%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	59.8%

Table A19.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	3	17.6%
NTBL	1	16.7%
Total	4	17.4%

Sentence 20: The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce.

Table A20

Criteria: singular or plural

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting do not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Subject /verb agreement
2	SAM	1	The criteria does not= do not. Criteria is plural. Criteria is the plural of criterion.
3	FIRAZ	1	Since "criteria" is a plural noun, the verb "do" is required rather than "does" for subject-verb agreement purposes.
4	OSAMA	0	Correct!
5	ELIA	1	Does not = do not; subject verb agreement. The criteria is a plural noun.
6	INDIGO	0	Correctly used.
7	JALIL	1	The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting do not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Subject-verb agreement error because the verb is far from the subject.
8	KAMIL	1	The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting do not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Criteria = plural = were =do
9	LIGHT	1	The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting do not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Here the speaker may have made an error because they did not know the criteria was plural. I would explain to the student that criteria is plural, and therefore needs a do.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
10	BEY	1	Subject – verb agreement. The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting do not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce.
11	MERT	1	This is similar to the error made with regards to “data/datum”. The word “criteria” is plural and “criterion” is singular. Therefore, according to the subject + verb agreement principle, the sentence should be “The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting do not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce.”
12	SALIMA	1	The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting do not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Criteria were agreed upon; plural use do; not does for plural.
13	SIERRA	0	The criteria that was agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Subject-verb agreement.
14	SUZANNE	1	The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting do not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Criteria is the plural form of criterion. Subject – verb agreement requires the plural form of the verb.
15	TALAT	0	The criteria that was agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. The singular form “was” must be used.
16	VIVI	1	Criteria do Criterion does (subject-verb) agreement problem.
17	WALI	0	Incorrect. It should be “The criteria that was agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Students feel that the word criteria is plural.
AVERAGE		70.6%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 5 zeros

Table A20.1

Criteria: singular or plural

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	1	The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting, do not really....
---	--------	---	--

			The subject is plural so we need “do”.
2	AL	0	The criteria that was agreed upon. Wrong form of verb is used. Same as No: 16. Give examples of plural and singular past tense verbs.
3	FARIS	0 that was agreed upon
4	BROW	0.25	Criterion
5	JESUS	1	The criteria that were agreed upon in the meeting do not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Criteria is a plural noun and should have an appropriate plural verb. Does is a for a singular noun. Do is a for a plural noun. You need to use DO for proper subject/verb agreement.
6	SYMRNA	0	The criteria that was agreed upon in the meeting does not really satisfy the standards set by the Chamber of Commerce. Subject-verb agreement
AVERAGE		37.5%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

TOTAL: 8 Zeros

Table A20.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	70.6%
NTBL average	37.5%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	62%

Table A20.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	5	29.4%
NTBL	3	50%
Total	8	33.3%

Task 2: Grammar

- If a student wanted to know the difference between the two sentences:

I have not seen him yet.

I did not see him yet.

What would you tell him?
- Why do native speakers say “**2 coffees**” when “**coffee**” is uncountable?
- Are both of the following sentences correct grammatically?

My opinion is different from yours.

My opinion is different than yours.

How would you explain the difference to your students? Please provide your reasons.
- In the following two sentences, the word “**walk**” has different meanings. How would you explain this to your students? Please provide your reasons.

I walk every day.

I walk the dog every day.
- Why does the verb “**hand**” in the following sentence **not** have the 3rd person singular -s suffix?

The burglar demanded that the cashier “**hand**” him all the money.

4.3.1 Grammar

Question 1: If a student wanted to know the difference between the two sentences,

- a- I have not seen him yet. b- I did not see him yet. **What would you tell him?**

Table A21

Yet with simple past

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	I would tell him: In the first sentence, there is still a possibility of seeing him, but up to now this hasn't happened. The second one is wrong because of 'yet.' Yet shows that something is related to the present. Thus, the simple past tense is not appropriate.
2	SAM	0.25	I haven't seen him is British English. In British English, this is used to denote an action that started in the past and continued to the present (or to say that the action did not take place up to the moment in the present. I did not see him may not be acceptable to a British speaker, but in American English, it is used interchangeably with the Present Perfect and is acceptable particularly in Spoken English.
3	FIRAZ	0	A and B are very close in meaning. In A, there is an expectation that I will see him; in B there is no such expectation.
4	OSAMA	1	I would introduce the concept of present perfect and past simple (finished and unfinished actions) and then try to explain to the student that "yet" is generally connected with present perfect format and in this case, the correct form to use is the present perfect since we have "yet" and the negative structure indicating the absence of meeting with the other person.
5	ELIA	0	First is a present perfect tense where the emphasis is on the result. An action that started in the past shows it result now and is up till now. Second sentence is a past simple tense that emphasis is on the time of the action.
6	INDIGO	0	I have not seen him implies that recently I have not seen him. I did not see him yet implies that I have been looking for him for a long time and I did not see him.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
7	JALIL	0	If you haven't seen the person, you shouldn't use the past simple form didn't see because the past simple is used when the action is completed while the present perfect have seen is used when the action is not completed.
8	KAMIL	0.75	I have not seen him yet. Present perfect tense is used with yet.
9	LIGHT	0	I would say that in the first sentence there is a greater expectation that the speaker will see this person, or that the speaker has plan to see this person.
10	BEY	0	I have not seen him yet - is Present Perfect tense which is used to express an experience that occurred in the past. Here we are interested in the experience that occurred in the past rather than when it actually occurred. I did not see him yet – is Past Simple which is used for a completed action followed by a time word.
11	MERT	0	The present perfect should be used for actions which began in the past and had continued up to the present.
12	SALIMA	0	The difference between these two sentences, at least how I see them, is that in first sentence it means that I haven't seen him yet until that specific time, but maybe there is still time for him to show up. In the second sentence, we are talking in past simple tense, something that already happened and it's finished.
13	SIERRA	0	The first one would be explained by saying that I have not seen my friend recently, and I may see him. The second one: could be an answer for (did you see him yesterday?)
14	SUZANNE	0	The first is present perfect; the second, simple past. The first incorporated a time span up to the present. The second is entirely past.
15	TALAT	0	I would tell him that the first sentence implies that the action of 'not seeing him' still continues to the present time. This started in the past and is still correct at the time of speaking, hence the use of the present perfect. In the second sentence, however, the action is completed and finished, hence the use of the past simple.
16	VIVI	0	Present perfect includes up to this moment. (INCLUDE DIAGRAM)
17	WALI	0	I haven't seen him yet refers to an action that happened in the past and still has an effect in the present time. This sentence means that he hasn't seen him for a long time maybe and the action continues to the present time. I didn't see him yet refers to an action that is finished and done. It means that he didn't see him in the past, but he may have seen him later.
AVERAGE		17.6%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 13 zeros

Table A21.1

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	1	The second sentence should not have “yet” at the end – simple past refers to a single point in past time
2	AL	0	I would explain that for the first sentence, I am still waiting for the person, and he might come along later. The second sentence would mean that the action is complete and to move on.
3	FARIS	0	I have not seen him yet. From a given point in the past till now I haven’t seen him but I might see him later. I did not see him yet. This is present simple where the questioner wants to know “did you” or “did you not”.
4	BROW	0.75	We don’t use did with yet; haven’t seen him yet → until now.
5	JESUS	0	The first sentence is in the present perfect and the second sentence is in the simple past.
6	SYMRNA	0	The first sentence shows that you expecting (certain) to see him soon (progressive), but haven’t (unfinished action). The second sentence indicates that there is a likelihood of seeing him, but not certain.
AVERAGE		29.2%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 Zeros

TOTAL: 17 zeros

Table A21.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	17.6%
NTBL average	29.2%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	20.7%

Table A21.3**Zero Averages**

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	13	76.5%
NTBL	4	66.7%
Total	17	73.9%

Question 2: Why do native speakers say “2 coffees” when “coffee” is uncountable?

Table A22**Uncountable nouns acting as countable nouns****Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers**

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT’S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.25	They want to say that they want 2 cups of coffee.
2	SAM	0.75	They mean two cups, two mugs, two orders of coffee. Here coffee ceases to be an uncountable noun, and assumes a new meaning. Even dictionaries may be citing this as a countable meaning for the word.
3	FIRAZ	0.75	Because they are referring to cups of coffee not directly to coffee and cups are countable.
4	OSAMA	0.25	This is more of a short form used in place of “Can I have two CUPS of coffee”.
5	ELIA	0.25	It actually means two cups/mugs of coffee where cup is understood and hence not spoken.
6	INDIGO	0	The term I would like a cup of coffee implies that I want only 1 cup. The term that I want two cups of coffee or 2 coffees implies that I want more coffee.
7	JALIL	0.25	When they say 2 coffees, they mean two cups of coffee.
8	KAMIL	0.75	They assume that the other party will understand it as 2 cups of coffee since language is a means of communication regardless of the correct grammar.
9	LIGHT	0.25	Because they are actually thinking of two cups of coffee.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
10	BEY	0.25	They are usually referring to two cups or mugs of coffee but are omitting the word cup or mug.
11	MERT	0.75	"Coffees" refer to "cups of coffee". In colloquial language, there is an inclination to drop certain rules and use short-cuts.
12	SALIMA	0.25	They automatically think about 2 cups of coffees.
13	SIERRA	0.25	If it is 2 cups of coffee, I think this is why they said.
14	SUZANNE	1	Most mass nouns (or maybe all) can be made to have count noun characteristics by utilizing them, for instance, with classifiers, or just numbers, for instance: The miller ground 5 different flours from the same wheat.
15	TALAT	1	This is one of the features of rapidly developing English. 'Coffee' is an uncountable noun, but it is common now to say 'two coffees' or 'three teas', referring to 'two cups of coffee' or 'three cups of tea'. Here the object in which the uncountable item is contained dominates in terms of number agreement.
16	VIVI	0.75	It's faster. It is uncountable in other languages. 2 coffees=2 cups of coffee.
17	WALI	0	Native speakers say 2 coffees in the slang language like saying "she" for a cat and "he" for a dog.
AVERAGE		45.6%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 2 zeros

Table A22.1

Uncountable nouns acting as countable nouns

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.25	Because "cups of" is being omitted, because that is understood by all.
2	AL	0.25	Because they count the cups or mugs in which coffee is dispensed. So, they see two cups of coffee. Hence, coffees being used.
3	FARIS	0	I don't know.
4	BROW	0.25	Because for serving cup is understood.
5	JESUS	1	Here the colloquial form of coffee has become a countable noun. In written English, we would say two cups of coffee

			but to shorten our speech we omit 'cups of' and make coffee countable.
6	SYMRNA	0.25	Because it is understood that 2 coffees refers to 2 cups of coffee.
	AVERAGE	33.3%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 1 Zero

TOTAL: 3 zeros

Table A22.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	45.6%
NTBL average	33.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	42.4%

Table A22.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	2	11.8%
NTBL	1	16.7%
Total	3	13%

Question 3: Are both of the following sentences correct grammatically?

a- My opinion is different from yours.

b- My opinion is different than yours.

How would you explain the difference to your students? Please provide your reasons.

Table A23

A non-comparative form (different) preceding “than”

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.25	My opinion is different from yours. The first one is correct. I would say this is the right preposition needed here. Do not question!
2	SAM	0.75	In formal English, we prefer different from, although in spoken English, I often hear different than. Grammatically, you would need to say more different than if you want to sound more correct.
3	FIRAZ	0.75	From yours sounds better; than yours sounds wrong. Perhaps because than is used to compare two entities that share a characteristic.
4	OSAMA	0.25	Both forms are actually correct. However, different than is common in American English, but might sound strange to British ears, and in the UK, different to is a common alternative that is seldom used in the US. I would advise the students that if in doubt, to stick to.
5	ELIA	0.25	My opinion is different from yours. = CORRECT My opinion is different than yours. = INCORRECT
6	INDIGO	0	In the first case, the speaker disagrees with the opinion suggested. In the second case, the speaker has another idea than the one suggested.
7	JALIL	0	I think both are correct. I don't know what the difference is.
8	KAMIL	1	My opinion is different from yours. This is correct because the adjective different is followed by the preposition from! Different than cannot be used here.
9	LIGHT	0.25	My opinion is different from yours. (Correct) My opinion is different than yours. (Not correct)
10	BEY	0	I am not sure but I think that the second one is correct.
11	MERT	1	Both forms are used interchangeably, however, 'than' essentially indicates comparison whereas 'from' functions as a preposition which indicates separation. Depending on the context or sentence structure, one form can be preferred over the other. For example: My car is (more) different than yours. Here, there is a sense of comparison, however, since 'more' is implied rather than physically used, 'from' would be more appropriate, i.e., My

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
			car is different from yours. If, however, a phrase or clause follows the prepositions, then one form should be preferred over the other for accuracy. For example: My car is different than the one you got. (with a phrase, use than) My car is different from what you got. (with a noun clause, use 'from')
12	SALIMA	1	The first sentence is correct. This is not a comparative sentence, that's why we cannot say than yours.
13	SIERRA	0.25	Native speaker may say both are correct, but I think the first one is grammatically correct. As the opinion is not said, so we cannot use comparative form.
14	SUZANNE	0.25	My opinion is different from yours. CORRECT My opinion is different than yours. NOT CORRECT IN MY DIALECT OF ENGLISH I am not sure how I would explain it. I might emphasize the spatial character of from and explain in spatial metaphoric terms: distance from.
15	TALAT	1	Informally, both sentences are correct, although the first sentence is more accepted. The word 'than' has only recently started to be used in relation to the age of the English language. Hence some educated native speakers may not favour the second sentence. Formally and strictly, the first sentence is correct but the second is not. Even when 'than' is used, usually is used with 'different' only when it is followed by a verbal clause rather than a noun. For example, it is OK to say 'this is different than what you said', but would be really inaccurate to say 'this is different than yours'. 'Than' is usually used only in the case of comparative adjectives and when it is used with bare adjective, it is a common mistake.
16	VIVI	0	My opinion is different from yours. OK in spoken English. My opinion is different than yours. (Correct). Preferred, comparing two things.
17	WALI	1	My opinion is different from yours is grammatically correct while the other sentence is incorrect because of than. Than is used in comparative sentences.
AVERAGE		47.1%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

Table A23.1

A non-comparative form (different) preceding “than”

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	1	Then first is correct, not the second, although it’s better to say “different to yours”. Firstly, this is just the way English is – not all prepositional phrases can be used. Secondly, “than” is used for comparatives like “bigger than”, etc.
2	AL	0	Both sentences are correct grammatically. The difference would be explained about than or from. Than only comparing the two; from could be from many.
3	FARIS	0	Forgot, but will need to check textbook.
4	BROW	0	Both are OK.
5	JESUS	1	No. The first sentence is correct and the second is incorrect. Than is used with comparatives such as ‘My opinion is better than yours’. With different we use from and not than because it is a not a comparative.
6	SYMRNA	0	Yes, correct.
	AVERAGE	33.3%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

TOTAL: 8 zeros

Table A23.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	47.1%
NTBL average	33.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	43.5%

Table A23.3**Zero Averages**

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	4	23.5%
NTBL	4	66.7%
Total	8	34.8%

Question 4: In the following two sentences, the word “walk” has different meanings. How would you explain this to your students? Please provide your reasons.

a- I walk every day.

b- I walk the dog every day.

Table A24**Transitive vs. Intransitive verbs****Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers**

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT’S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	I walk every day. Here the activity is walking. (I would draw a picture. A stick and a man) I walk the dog every day. Here I’d say I take the dog for a walk.
2	SAM	1	I would explain to them the idea of transitive and intransitive verbs and say that walk in the first sentence requires no object, whereas it needs one in the second.
3	FIRAZ	1	In A, walk is an intransitive verb and in B is transitive and means to cause someone/some animal to walk.
4	OSAMA	1	I would explain to them the concept of transitive versus intransitive verbs with examples and Comprehensive Check Questions and worksheets.
5	ELIA	0	In both sentences, it is a verb. The inferred meaning is different. In the first, it is just the action of walking. In the second, it is to take someone out; to go with someone.
6	INDIGO	0	BLANK
7	JALIL	0	In the first sentence, walk refers to the speaker while in the second sentence, it refers to the dog.
8	KAMIL	1	I walk every day. I practice the action of exercising walking every day. Walk as a verb does not need an object since it is

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
			an intransitive verb. In the second sentence, I walk the dog every day, the verb walk here is used as transitive verb followed by an object. I do not walk. I make the dog walk.
9	LIGHT	0	I walk every day. (I am walking alone) I walk the dog every day. (I am taking the dog outside so it gets exercise)
10	BEY	1	In the first sentence the verb is intransitive and the in the second sentence it is transitive because it takes an object.
11	MERT	1	In the first sentence, the verb is intransitive, and in the second one the verb is transitive.
12	SALIMA	0	The meaning is different but also similar. But the second use of walk is a helping word.
13	SIERRA	1	Transitive vs intransitive verb. Walk in the first sentence, refers to the action that is the subject doing, but in the second, the action verb refers to the action that the dog is doing.
14	SUZANNE	1	I walk every day. walk need intransitively- no object I walk the dog every day. walk used transitively-an object.
15	TALAT	1	In the first sentence the verb as intransitive and does not take any object. In the second sentence, the same verb is used as a transitive verb and it takes an object, which is the dog in this case. So, in the first sentence, I do the action of walking, but in the second, I take the dog for a walk.
16	VIVI	1	Walk every day. (intransitive: cannot take an object). I walk the dog every day. (Transitive: do something to something else)
17	WALI	1	I walk every day means I am the subject, the doer of the action and I'm doing it for myself. While the other sentence is refers to another beneficiary of the action which is the dog. In sentence 1, the verb walk is an intransitive verb. While in the second sentence, the verb walk is a transitive verb.
AVERAGE		64.7%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 6 zeros

Table A24.1

Transitive vs. Intransitive verbs

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.75	The first needs a subject only, while the second needs an object. No metalanguage
---	--------	------	---

2	AL	0	I walk every day is a daily exercise that I myself partake in and complete. I walk the dog is me making the dog walk by taking him/her out. So the dog is actually walking outside because of me.
3	FARIS	0	I walk every day. (This refers to me). I walk the dog every day. (This refers to the dog)
4	BROW	1	Walk is “like” I exercise, I eat; walking the dog= doing something to the dog/transitive vs intransitive.
5	JESUS	0	In the first sentence, we mean that we physically walk with our legs every day. The second sentence means that we lead a dog on a leash around so that the dog can walk. This is the difference in meaning here.
6	SYMRNA	0	The first sentence is present tense (transitive verb), while the second sentence is an activity (an intransitive verb).
AVERAGE		29.2%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 Zeros

TOTAL: 10 Zeros

Table A24.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	64.7%
NTBL average	29.2%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	55.4%

Table A24.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	6	35.3%

NTBL	4	66.7%
Total	10	43.5%

Question 5: Why does the verb “hand” in the following sentence not have the 3rd person singular -s suffix?

The burglar demanded that the cashier “hand” him all the money.

Table A25

Subjunctive Mood

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.75	The burglar demanded that the cashier “hand” him all the money. I'd say some verbs like demand, insist, recommend, suggest, request ...are called subjunctive verbs & don't have past, future forms or plural forms. It only uses the simple form and it stresses the importance & urgency. Subjunctive verbs are kind of noun clauses & usually used with 'that'.
2	SAM	1	Because hand in this sentence is in subjunctive.
3	FIRAZ	0	Because in the subordinate “that” clause, the verb is not conjugated but remains in the base form.
4	OSAMA	1	This is a syntactical form of subjunctive example where it used to emphasize urgency or importance. In a subjunctive sentence, the use of the simple form of the verb is used. Thus, the infinitive is inserted in the sentence.
5	ELIA	0	In the phrasal verb hand over or hand him over (separable/inseparable), the second part of the phrase is understood and generally avoided.
6	INDIGO	0	This is because the sentence is in the past, demanded. Therefore, hands which is in present tense will not be used.
7	JALIL	0.25	Because of the verb demanded which requires an infinitive verb.
8	KAMIL	0	Simply because it means should hand.
9	LIGHT	0	Because it is imperative. It is a command.
10	BEY	0	I am not sure.
11	MERT	1	The verb “hand” is used in the subjunctive state, i.e., free from conjugation as in the main verb “demand.”
12	SALIMA	0	Because he would use it as, hand me the money.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
13	SIERRA	0	I am not sure really, the sentence in the past and the clause has no -s.
14	SUZANNE	0	I am not sure. Guesses: it is not the main verb of the sentence. It is embedded in a relative clause. Umm.....
15	TALAT	1	This is because the verb demand is a subjunctive verb. It means the verb after is usually non-finite (without inflection). The same applies to verbs like 'suggest' and 'recommend'.
16	VIVI	0.75	Demanded is one of those special intense verbs which require the subjective in a noun clause. (e.g., suggest, advise, insist, require)
17	WALI	0.75	Because the verb that follows the verb demand should be in the infinitive form with no additions.
AVERAGE		38.2%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 9 zeros

Table A25.1

Subjunctive Mood

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	Because it is reported speech that is given as a direct quote.
2	AL	0	The word hand here is to pass the cash/money. It is understood by English Speaking countries as to pass something over. Hence, the singular suffix -s is not required.
3	FARIS	0	Will need to check textbook.
4	BROW	0	Just an expression; not sure.
5	JESUS	0	The key word is that. That makes it an indirect statement.
6	SYMRNA	0	The command form of the verb is in the first person singular form.
AVERAGE		0%	

Participants not Truly Bilingual: 6 zeros

TOTAL: 15 zeros

Table A25.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	38.2%
NTBL average	0%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	28.3%

Table A25.3

Zero Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	9	52.9%
NTBL	6	100%
Total	15	65.2%

Task 3: Phonology

1. The plural suffix of the word **cat** (cats) is pronounced /s/, whereas the plural suffix of the word **dog** (dogs) is pronounced /z/. Please state the reason(s).
2. Arabic speakers of English usually pronounce **p** as **b**. For instance, instead of saying **paid**, they say **baid**. Can you explain why?
3. In the word “**matter**” the stress falls on the first syllable. Can you explain the reason?
4. Why is the **t** in the word **omit** doubled (i.e., *omitted*) when it receives **-ed** whereas the **-n** in the word **open** is not (i.e., *opened*)?
5. What is the phonological difference between the two following sound categories?
 - a. /p, f, t, k/
 - b. /b, v, d, g/
6. How many speech sounds are there in the word **mix**?
7. What is a **phoneme**?

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

Question 1: The plural suffix of the word cat (cats) is pronounced [s], whereas the plural suffix of the word dog (dogs) is pronounced [z]. Please state the reason(s).

Table A26

Voicing in the pronunciation of the plural suffix -s

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.25	Similar speech sounds go together. e.g., /t /goes well with /s/ or /g/ goes well with /z/
2	SAM	1	The t sound and the s sound are both voiceless consonant sounds. That is why it is more comfortable for the speaker to have them together in a consonant sequence. The g and z, on the other hand are voiced.
3	FIRAZ	1	Prior to an unvoiced sound like [t], the suffix is pronounced [s] while preceding a voiced sound, it is pronounced [z].
4	OSAMA	0	This is an example of a morphophonological alternation in English which is provided by the plural morpheme, written as "-s" or "-es". Its pronunciation alternates between [s], [z], and [ɪz], as in cats, dogs, and horses respectively. A purely phonological analysis would most likely assign to these three endings the phonemic representations /s/, /z/, /ɪz/. On a morphophonological level, however, they may all be considered to be forms of the underlying object //z//, which is a morphophoneme. The different forms it takes are dependent on the segment at the end of the morpheme to which it attaches.
5	ELIA	0.75	/s/ is voiceless /z/ is voiced
6	INDIGO	0	This is because of the chart.
7	JALIL	0.75	The /t/ in cat is voiceless whereas the /g/ in dog is voiced.
8	KAMIL	1	Cat s = s because the s sound occurs after t which is voiceless. Dogs = z because the g is voiced.
9	LIGHT	0	For cat the vowel "a" has a higher pitch. For dog the vowel "o" has a lower pitch
10	BEY	0	Not sure.
11	MERT	0	No answer.
12	SALIMA	0	No answer.
13	SIERRA	0	No answer.
14	SUZANNE	1	/t/ is an unvoiced stop consonant; /g/ is a voiced one. Voicing carries over to the suffix.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
15	TALAT	1	This is because /t/ is a voiceless sound so the adjacent sound should also be voiceless but /g/ is a voiced sound and the adjacent sound should also be voiced.
16	VIVI	1	g = voiced + z = voiced t = unvoiced + s = unvoiced
17	WALI	0	No answer.
AVERAGE		45.6%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 8 zeros

Table A26.1

Voicing in the pronunciation of the plural suffix -s

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	That's the way English is! Even if there is a rule, I've adopted the strategy of using lots of input to assist the students to recognise for themselves the difference cases.
2	AL	0	Because of the o in the middle of the word dog.
3	FARIS	0	No answer.
4	BROW	0	No reason. Case by case. English comes from different; no consistency in pronunciation rules.
5	JESUS	0	It is related to the easiness on the tongue and the location of the tongue in the final consonant. The rule is words ending in a vowel plus certain consonants are pronounced as /s/. The other rule is words ending in a vowel plus certain other consonants are pronounced as /z/.
6	SYMRNA	0	No answer.
AVERAGE		0%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 6 zeros

TOTAL: 14 Zeros

Table A26.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	45.6%
NTBL average	0%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	33.7%

Table A26.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	8	47
NTBL	6	100
Total	14	60.9%

Question 2: Arabic speakers of English usually pronounce /p/ as [b]. For instance, instead of saying *paid*, they say *baid*. Can you explain why?

Table A27

Voiced vs. voiceless bilabials

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	No idea.
2	SAM	0.75	Arabic has no p sound, so Arabic speakers shift to the closest sound they have; which in this case voiced version of the p sound.
3	FIRAZ	0	Because Arabic does not have the phoneme /p/.
4	OSAMA	0	This is due to the fact that the sound /p/ does not exist in Arabic, with the sounds that are usually substituted for them are in borrowed words.
5	ELIA	0	There is no /p/ sound in Arabic.
6	INDIGO	0	This is because there is no p in the Arabic alphabet.
7	JALIL	0.25	Because the p sound with aspiration is not found in the Arabic sound system.

8	KAMIL	0	Simply because there is no sound like p in Arabic. We are not familiar with it.
9	LIGHT	0	Perhaps the p sound does not exist in Arabic, or it may be that the p sound exists but it is used infrequently.
10	BEY	0	There is no p in Arabic. (no plausive sounds in Arabic)
11	MERT	0	The consonant “p” does not exist in Arabic, hence the Arab learners of English substitute “p” with “b”.
12	SALIMA	0	There is no sound p in Arabic language. This is the reason why many Arabic speakers of English struggle to pronounce it.
13	SIERRA	0	In Arabic, there is only one sound that is similar to /b/. So, the sound /p/ is quite hard to consider specifically for beginner user of language.
14	SUZANNE	1	There is no unvoiced bilabial stop consonant in Arabic, but they do have a voiced one.
15	TALAT	0.75	Well, not usually, but sometimes. This is particularly the case with Saudi learners. This is because the voiceless variety of the Arabic Baa does not exist in Arabic. This is a problematic feature for some Arabic speakers from a contrastive analysis point of view, especially at the early stages of language learning. The same applies to /v/ and /f/.
16	VIVI	0	There is not /p/ in Arabic.
17	WALI	0	Arabic speakers of English don’t pronounce the sound p correctly because in the Arabic language they don’t have the two different sounds p and b. They have only one sound for both of them. They can’t even identify the sound when they hear it.
AVERAGE		16.2%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 13 zeros

Table A27.1

Voiced vs. voiceless bilabials

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	Because “p” does not exist in Arabic.
2	AL	0	Because there is no letter/sound “p” in the Arabic language.
3	FARIS	0	Because there is no p sound in Arabic. I will make the students practice. I don’t know the sound p.
4	BROW	0.25	The /p/ and /b/ are not two distinct sounds; like /r/ and /l/ in Japanese.
5	JESUS	0	The sound P doesn’t exist in the Arabic language and Arabic speakers cannot hear any difference between these two sounds. It is

			quite similar to the way English speakers may not be able to hear any difference between the two H sounds of Arabic.
6	SYMRNA	0.75	This is the closest phonological sound to the /p/ in the Arabic language as it is also bilabial.
AVERAGE		17%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

TOTAL: 17 zeros

Table A27.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	16.2%
NTBL average	17%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	16.3%

Table A27.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	13	76.5%
NTBL	4	66.7%
Total	17	73.9%

Question 3: In the word “matter” the stress falls on the first syllable. Can you explain the reason?

Table A 28

Stressed and unstressed syllables

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	Don't know.
2	SAM	1	Word stress is arbitrary. we can't give rules but we can make some observations. Usually the -er suffix is treated as a weak syllable.
3	FIRAZ	0	NO.
4	OSAMA	0.25	Matter" is a noun and about 80% of two syllable words have their stress on the first syllable.
5	ELIA	0.25	Generally, in two-syllabled words the stress is on the first syllable.
6	INDIGO	0	To stress on the right pronunciation.
7	JALIL	1	Because the word matter has two syllables where the second one /ə/ (schwa) which is weak.
8	KAMIL	0.25	Because it can be a noun or verb ... and when double t is followed by a light -er.
9	LIGHT	0	No answer.
10	BEY	0.25	In two syllable words the stress is usually placed on the first syllable.
11	MERT	0	No answer.
12	SALIMA	0	No answer.
13	SIERRA	0	Aspiration sound.
14	SUZANNE	0.75	Not really. I vaguely remember learning about a language historical pattern in English that has lexical stress tending to shift toward word initial. Is it something to do with that? Or something to do with the flap articulation of the /tt/. flatter, latter, ladder, adder, etc. There is a paradigm.
15	TALAT	0.25	Not really no, but what I know is that the stress is on the first syllable in both the verb and the noun here. Usually, in two-syllable nouns, the stress is on the first part.
16	VIVI	0.75	When there is a double consonant, the stress falls on the first syllable. (Two syllable word; double the consonant (middle, piddle, little, bigger, chatter)
17	WALI	0	No answer.
AVERAGE		27.9%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 8 zeros

Table A 28.1

Stressed and unstressed syllables

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	That's the way English is! Even if is there is a rule, I've adopted the strategy of using lots of input to assist the students to recognise for themselves the difference cases. Also in this case, the stress is not really that great. If you over emphasis the first syllable, you will sound strange. Refer to other similar words like "batter", "hatter", etc.
2	AL	0	No answer.
3	FARIS	0	No answer.
4	BROW	1	No reason, I don't know why..... -er --→unstressed syllable
5	JESUS	0	The stress falls on the most important sound and the less important part of the word is less stressed.
6	SYMRNA	0	No answer.
AVERAGE		16.7%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 5 zeros

TOTAL: 13 Zeros

Table A 28.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	27.9%
NTBL average	16.7%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	25%

Table A28.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	8	47.1%
NTBL	5	83.3%
Total	13	56.5%

Question 4: Why is the /t/ in the word **omit** doubled (i.e., omitted) when it receives –ed whereas the /n/ in the word **open** is not (i.e., opened)?

Table A29

Final consonant doubled

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	Don't know
2	SAM	0	This is possibly because the –ed in omitted is pronounced /id/, so the speaker needs to make the /t/ sound clearer: /tid/. in opened, the ed is pronounced /d/.
3	FIRAZ	0	The letters [t] and [d] are doubled before a suffix beginning with a vowel sound?
4	OSAMA	0.75	This is to do with stressing of the syllable. We double the final letter when a word has more than one syllable, and when the final syllable is stressed in speech. If the final syllable is not stressed, we do not double the final letter.
5	ELIA	0	No answer.
6	INDIGO	0	Rules of grammar.
7	JALIL	0	Not sure.
8	KAMIL	0	t in omit is doubled because it is preceded by a short sound vowel i no ai and stressed before a strong –ed, whereas the n is followed by a light sound d=t.
9	LIGHT	0	Because of the difference in the final consonant. There is a vowel in each word followed by a consonant. With this structure, when you add –ed to make the past participle form, you double certain consonants and don't double others.
10	BEY	0	One-syllable words containing one.
11	MERT	0	No answer.
12	SALIMA	0	No answer.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
13	SIERRA	0	Because of the vowel letters.
14	SUZANNE	1	Not sure. Maybe to block an erroneous long -i pronunciation? But the same would apply to opened. Unless it also has to do with the difference in syllable stress. Stress on the first syllable for open, on the second syllable for omit, like: órder = ordered refér = referred
15	TALAT	1	This is because the verb 'omit' consists of two syllables and the stress is on the second one, so the consonant after the last vowel should be doubled. However, the verb 'open' has two syllables but the stress is on the first syllable, hence the consonant /n/ is not doubled.
16	VIVI	1	o / m̄ i t = stress falls on the second syllable; 2 syllable word= double the final consonant. ō / pen = stress falls on the first syllable.
17	WALI	0	No answer.
AVERAGE		22.1%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 13 zeros

Table A29.1

Final consonant doubled

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	These rules I do teach, but I myself have not memorised them. I refer the students to book. Again, this is the way English is! Even if is there is a rule, I've adopted the strategy of using lots of input to assist the students to recognise for themselves the difference cases.
2	AL	0	No answer.
3	FARIS	0	I guess it is an exception to the rule.
4	BROW	0	Changes the way you pronounce the word.
5	JESUS	0	This is a spelling rule and not a pronunciation rule. Certain words ending in a vowel and certain consonants have the last consonant doubled in spelling and other words ending in vowels plus certain other consonants are not doubled.
6	SYMRNA	0	No answer.
AVERAGE		0%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 6

TOTAL: 19 Zeros

Table A29.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	22%
NTBL average	0%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	16.3%

Table A29.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	13	76.5%
NTBL	6	100%
Total	19	82.6%

Question 5: What is the phonological difference between the two following sound categories?

- a- /p, f, t, k/
 b- /b, v, d, g/

Table A30

Voiced and voiceless consonants

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	a- /p, f, t, k/- hard consonants (at least - we call them in Turkish) b- /b, v, d, g/-soft consonants

2	SAM	1	a- /p, f, t, k/ voiceless b- /b, v, d, g/ voiced
3	FIRAZ	1	a- /p, f, t, k/ UNVOICED b- /b, v, d, g/ VOICED
4	OSAMA	1	Technically, if we are to specify the sounds as they relate to voicing then the first group “a” sounds are categorised as “voiceless” and the second group “b” sounds as “voiced”.
5	ELIA	0.25	a- /p, f, t, k/ voiceless plosives b- /b, v, d, g/ voiced plosives
6	INDIGO	0	No answer.
7	JALIL	1	a- /p, f, t, k/ voiceless b- /b, v, d, g/ voiced
8	KAMIL	1	a- /p, f, t, k/ voiceless b- /b, v, d, g/ voiced
9	LIGHT	0	No answer.
10	BEY	1	a. voiced b. unvoiced
11	MERT	0	The range of consonants p,f,t,k are articulated by stronger air friction while b,v,d,g are uttered without friction.
12	SALIMA	0	No answer.
13	SIERRA	0	Place of articulation.
14	SUZANNE	1	a- /p, f, t, k/ unvoiced b- /b, v, d, g/ voiced
15	TALAT	1	The first set is voiceless and the second is voiced.
16	VIVI	1	a- /p, f, t, k/ VOICELESS b- /b, v, d, g/ VOICED
17	WALI	0	No answer.
AVERAGE		54.4%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 7 zeros

Table A30.1

Voiced and voiceless consonants

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	I have not memorised this difference
2	AL	0	a- p, f, t, k/ heavy b- /b, v, d, g/ soft
3	FARIS	0	No answer.
4	BROW	0	Can't remember. Aspirated: blowing out. Vocalization different. Bringing lips together in /b/.
5	JESUS	0	The first group (A) is formed with the lips and the second group (B) is formed with the tongue.

6	SYMRNA	0	No answer.
AVERAGE		0%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 6 zeros

TOTAL: 13 Zeros

Table A30.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	54.4%
NTBL average	0
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	40.2%

Table A30.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	7	41.2%
NTBL	6	100%
Total	13	56.5%

Question 6: How many speech sounds are there in the word mix?

Table A 31

Discrepancy between spelling and pronunciation

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	No idea.
2	SAM	1	/miks/ 4 sounds.
3	FIRAZ	1	[mIks] = 4
4	OSAMA	0	3 (three)
5	ELIA	1	m I k s = 4
6	INDIGO	0	3 (three)
7	JALIL	1	Four
8	KAMIL	1	four
9	LIGHT	0	3 (three)
10	BEY	0	Two.
11	MERT	0	No answer.
12	SALIMA	0	No answer.
13	SIERRA	0	No answer.
14	SUZANNE	1	4 (four)
15	TALAT	1	Four sounds
16	VIVI	1	4 = m i k s
17	WALI	1	There are 4 speech sounds in the word mix.
AVERAGE		52.9%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 8 zeros

Table A 31.1

Discrepancy between spelling and pronunciation

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	3 I think. Not sure.
2	AL	0	Not sure.
3	FARIS	0	2 (two).
4	BROW	0	1 (one)
5	JESUS	1	4 speech sounds
6	SYMRNA	0	No answer.
AVERAGE		16.6%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 5 zeros

TOTAL: 13 Zeros

Table A 31.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	52.9%
NTBL average	16.6%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	43.5

Table A31.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	8	47.1%
NTBL	5	83.3%
Total	13	56.5%

Question 7: What is a phoneme?

Table A32

Awareness of phonemes

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.25	Speech sound.
2	SAM	1	A phoneme is a sound unit or part of a word pronunciation that gives a distinct meaning.
3	FIRAZ	1	It is a sound that is present in the repertoire of sound made contrastively by the speaker of a language.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
4	OSAMA	1	The simplest definition of a phoneme is the smallest speech sound.
5	ELIA	1	Phoneme is the smallest individual sound.
6	INDIGO	0	Pronunciation chart.
7	JALIL	1	The smallest sound unit.
8	KAMIL	1	Smallest contrastive unit in the system of a language.
9	LIGHT	1	The smallest part of a language. The building blocks of language.
10	BEY	0.25	A unit of sound.
11	MERT	1	A phoneme is a unit of sound which is different from other units of sound by its own properties.
12	SALIMA	0	No answer
13	SIERRA	0.25	Single sound.
14	SUZANNE	1	The basic unit of sound system of a language, of the language phonology, as defined by participation in minimal pairs; e.g., cab vs. cap □ /b/ vs. /p/.....where the voiced / unvoiced distinction makes two different morphemes.
15	TALAT	1	It is the smallest distinct sound unit in a particular language. It usually leads to a change in meaning when changed. So, the two words in a minimal pair differ in one phoneme (e.g., /miks/ and /fiks/).
16	VIVI	0.25	a unit of sound
17	WALI	1	Phoneme is the smallest unit of sound in a word.
AVERAGE		70.6%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 2 zeros

Table A32.1

Awareness of phonemes

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	The part of speech that relates with pronunciation, i.e., not writing. I think...
2	AL	0	Not sure
3	FARIS	0	I don't know.
4	BROW	0.25	A unit of sound.
5	JESUS	1	The smallest units of sound in a language.
6	SYMRNA	0	A cluster of sounds that make up a word ????
AVERAGE		20.8%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

TOTAL: 6 zeros

Table A32.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	70.6%
NTBL average	20.8%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	57.6%

Table A32.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	2	11.8%
NTBL	4	66.6%
Total	6	26.1%

Task 4: Syntax

If you identify any error(s) in any of the following sentences, first write the correct version of the sentence. Then, explain why the error might have been committed and how it can be corrected.

1. Why you didn't visit him?

2. Do you know where does he live?
3. Do not you like coffee?
4. Never I have seen such a beautiful baby.
5. Do you like me really?
6. I always am ready.

Sentence 1: Why you didn't visit him?

Table A.33

Misplaced auxiliary verb in a question

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	Why didn't you visit him? There is a word order problem.
2	SAM	0.25	Why didn't you visit him? This is one of the common mistakes of Arabic speakers because the natural order in Arabic for such a question is: Why you didn't visit him limaza anta lam tazor ho A good solution is to reinforce the English question structure and the subject-verb inversion by giving many examples and doing many exercises.
3	FIRAZ	1	Why didn't you visit him? In question subject-auxiliary are inverted.
4	OSAMA	0	Why didn't you visit him? The first version of the sentence is very informal or rather, incomplete and cannot occur independently.
5	ELIA	0.25	Why didn't you visit him? Subject and verb change positions when a statement is converted to a question.
6	INDIGO	0	Why didn't you visit him? Students are not used to the rules of grammar. It should be placed in the proper order.
7	JALIL	1	Why didn't you visit him? The error is switching the auxiliary didn't with the subject you. It is because lack of knowledge of question form.
8	KAMIL	1	Helping verb before subject in interrogative.
9	LIGHT	0.25	This is a simple word order error. In the speaker's language, when forming a question with a negative, the subject may go first. I would inform that student when

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
			forming a question with a negative, the negative must come before the subject. i.e., "why haven't you finished?"
10	BEY	1	An auxiliary verb has to follow a question word.
11	MERT	1	Correction: "Why didn't you visit him?" Use the auxiliary verb at the beginning of the sentence to form the interrogative form.
12	SALIMA	1	Word order: Question word + helping verb + pronoun.
13	SIERRA	0	Why didn't you visit him?
14	SUZANNE	1	Why didn't you visit him? Perhaps non-natives assume that the use of the question word obviates the need to invert subject and auxiliary verb. Correcting such an error-it might be helpful to call the non-non-native's attention to the "Do you", "Are you" question form and stress that it holds when a question word is added.
15	TALAT	1	The sentence should be 'Why didn't you visit him?' The grammatical mistake here is that there is no inversion between the auxiliary and the subject, which is required when forming questions in English starting with a wh-word (unless the speaker is asking about the subject, e.g., what happened? Who died?).
16	VIVI	1	WORD ORDER Student used sentence word order S V Why didn't you visit him? Q Word, aux, subj, V, obj.
17	WALI	0.75	Incorrect because of the word order of the sentence. As a question, the word did should precede the subject.
AVERAGE		61.8%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

Table A33.1

Misplaced auxiliary verb in a question

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.25	Why didn't you visit him? Must reverse the order with the why question
2	AL	0.25	Why didn't you visit him? This maybe a language clash of the student where his subject verb agreement is different to English.
3	FARIS	0.25	Why didn't you visit him? Possible reason is thinking in L1.

4	BROW	0.25	Mostly L1 interference.
5	JESUS	1	Why didn't you visit him? The word order for a question is incorrect here. It should be a Wh-Question + the auxiliary did +not + subject + verb. It doesn't follow this order.
6	SYMRNA	0.25	Why didn't you visit him? In question form, did (question word) precedes the subject.
AVERAGE		37.5%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: No Zeros

TOTAL: 4 zeros

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

Table A.33.2

Averages

TBL average	61.8%
NTBL average	37.5%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	55.4%

Table A33.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	4	23.5%
NTBL	0	0%
Total	4	17.4%

Sentence 2: Do you know where does he live?

Table A34

Two embedded questions in a single question

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Word order is problematic here again. This is a noun clause. The second part is not a question any more. It functions as the object of the sentence. DISCUSS THIS
	SAM	0.75	Here you need to explain to the student the idea of INDIRECT questions and tell him/her that in such cases the sentence regains its natural subject-verb order.
3	FIRAZ	1	Do you know where he lives? There is no do-support in subordinate clauses.
4	OSAMA	0	There are two errors here, the first one is related to the question formation and the other one to the subject-verb agreement (letter 's) is required for present simple affirmative third person form.)
5	ELIA	1	Do you know where he lives? In indirect questions, the auxiliary verb do/does is dropped as it ceases to be the main clause.
6	INDIGO	0	Do you know where he lives? Students normally use where does he live? It should be placed in the right order.
7	JALIL	0	Do you know where he lives? The error is using the auxiliary does in the wrong place.
8	KAMIL	1	A. "Where does he live?" is a direct question. So, it should follow the normal order of the interrogative sentence (question). That is to say, Wh- word + helping verb (here: to do) + subject + main verb + question mark. B. In the indirect/ embedded/ or complex question "Do you know where he lives?", 1. There is an embedded question in this sentence.... 2. The order of the "embedded/ complex/ indirect question" should be changed by going back, more or less, to the regular order of the normal sentence.... 3. We should start with the helping verb + first subject + first main verb + wh-word + second subject + second main verb + question mark.
9	LIGHT	0.75	The speaker may have gotten this wrong because <i>does</i> is used with third person he quite often. I would explain that does is an auxiliary verb. We already have one auxiliary verb in the question "do". We don't need another.
10	BEY	0.75	There is no need for the auxiliary verb here.
11	MERT	1	Correction: "Do you know where he lives?" Where he lives" is a subordinate clause, not a question, which is used in the object position.
12	SALIMA	0.75	Do you know where he lives? No need to use 2 helping verbs in 1 question.
13	SIERRA	0	No answer.
14	SUZANNE	1	Do you know where he lives? The non-native is thinking in terms of 2 sentential questions, each with its own verb rather than one sentence with an embedded relative clause.
15	TALAT	1	The sentence should be 'Do you know where he lives?' The grammatical mistake is that the speaker made an inversion in the second part of the sentence which is supposed to be an affirmative

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
			clause or an indirect question. The first inversion is correct, but the second is incorrect as the clause 'where he lives' is a subordinate clause or indirect question here.
16	VIVI	1	This student has again used incorrect word order. The underlined part is not a question but a noun clause. We do not use any form of do in a noun clause because it is not a question.
17	WALI	0.75	Incorrect. It should be "do you know where he lives?" You can't have two questions in one sentence, do you know and where does he live?
AVERAGE		69.1%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

Table A34.1

Two embedded questions in a single question

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.75	Do you know where he lives? Can't have 2 auxiliary "do"-s.
2	AL	0.25	Do you know where he lives? Again a language clash (grammar). The student hasn't understood the verb correctly.
3	FARIS	0	Do you know where he lives?
4	BROW	1	Embedded question; get rid of do/does/did. Function words.
5	JESUS	0.75	Do you know where he lives? This is a compound YES/NO Question that follows the following order: DO + YOU + KNOW + WH-Question + SUBJECT + VERB. This is the form for this complex question.
6	SYMRNA	0.75	Do you know where he lives? The <i>does</i> is redundant as it is expressed in the Question form "do".
AVERAGE		58.3%	

Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual: 1 Zero

TOTAL: 5 zeros

Table A34.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	69.1%
NTBL average	58.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	66.3%

Table A34.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	4	23.5%
NTBL	1	16.7%
Total	5	21.7%

Sentence 3: Do not you like coffee?

Table A35

Mislocated negative particle (not) in an uncontracted “do not” structure.

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT’S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	Don’t you like coffee? Word order is a problem.
2	SAM	0	This is acceptable.
3	FIRAZ	1	Do you not like coffee? “Not” should be inserted between the auxiliary and the main verb.
4	OSAMA	1	This is an example of an interrogative-negative question where either the abbreviated form is acceptable, i.e., Don’t you like coffee? OR the expanded form with the auxiliary interrogative form is separated by the subject, i.e., Do you not like coffee?
5	ELIA	0	Don’t you like coffee? OR Do you not like coffee?

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
6	INDIGO	0	Don't you like coffee? Confusion on the rules of grammar. It should be placed in the right order.
7	JALIL	0	Do you not like coffee?
8	KAMIL	0.75	Don't you like coffee? or Do you not like coffee? Short form can be at the beginning; long form should be separated. GOOD EXPLANATION WITHOUT METALANGUAGE
9	LIGHT	0	Do you not like coffee? In this case, the speaker may have taken my advice from example 1 and put the negative before the subject in a question. However, the difference between #3 and #1 is that #1 is asking why the listener failed to do something, whereas #3 is an attempt to confirm whether or not a person likes coffee (referring to Question 1: Why you didn't visit him? NO MISTAKE EXPLAINED
10	BEY	1	In the interrogative form subject pronoun has to come after the auxiliary verb Do.
11	MERT	1	Correction: "Don't you like coffee?/or Do you not like coffee?" When forming a negative-interrogative question, either use the contraction of the auxiliary verb + not, or, auxiliary + subject + not.
12	SALIMA	0	Don't you like coffee?
13	SIERRA	0	No Answer.
14	SUZANNE	0	Do you not like coffee? OR Don't you like coffee? = both are fine. That is interesting that "do not" is pretty terrible, while the contraction form is fine! I don't know why this would be the case. (LINGUIST BUT LACKS DECLARATIVE KNOWLEDGE)
15	TALAT	1	The sentence should be 'Do you not like coffee?' The grammatical mistake is that the speaker or writer moved the auxiliary and the negative particle 'not' together when making the inversion and this is not correct. We move both of these only in informal English when they are together any way such as in 'Don't you like coffee?' where there is abbreviation. However, when they are separate, only the auxiliary is inverted with the subject.
16	VIVI	0.75	Negative question problem: "Do not you like coffee." Possible correct constructions for this question: 1. Do you not like coffee? (Semi formal: Can be said in a situation where you are surprised that someone does not seem to like coffee. Stress is on "not.") 2. Don't you like coffee? (Informal: said when you are surprised that a person doesn't seem to like coffee. For some reason, this expression is only used with a contraction (don't, doesn't), ie. We cannot say, "do not you like coffee?" Even for native speakers of English, a negative question like this can be difficult to answer without ambiguity. The best response to a

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
			negative question is a complete response. In other words: A: Don't you like coffee? B: No, I don't like it. A: Don't you like coffee? B: Yes, I like it but I'm not in the mood right now.
17	WALI	0	Incorrect. It's better when you offer something to use the positive form, not the negative one, do you like coffee?
	AVERAGE	38.2 %	

Teachers Truly Bilingual 10 zeros

Table A35.1

Mislocated negative particle (not) in an uncontracted "do not" structure.

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	Word order wrong.
2	AL	0	Do you not like coffee? Forming the sentence is a problem here.
3	FARIS	0	Do you not like coffee?" Or "Don't you like coffee?"
4	BROW	0	Don't you like coffee? Expectation.
5	JESUS	0	Don't you like coffee? or Do you like coffee? Don't you like coffee? is checking for confirmation of what you already know. It is similar to the tag question, 'You like coffee, don't you?'. The form is similar to a tag question.
6	SYMRNA	0.75	Do you not like coffee? Do is followed by subject first.
	AVERAGE	12.5%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 5 Zeros

TOTAL: 15 zeros

Table A35.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	38.2%
NTBL average	12.5%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	31.5%

Table A35.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	10	58.8%
NTBL	5	83.3%
Total	15	65.2%

Sentence 4: Never I have seen such a beautiful baby.

Table A36

Incorrect inversion in sentences starting with a negative frequency adverb “never”.

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT’S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	Word order. Statements in English usually have a subject +verb+ object
2	SAM	0.25	Never have I Explain to the student that when we begin a sentence with never, the word order has to follow the question order.
3	FIRAZ	0.25	Never have I seen such a beautiful baby. This is an archaic form and the word order is the one above.
4	OSAMA	0	I have never seen such a beautiful baby. In a present perfect syntactic structure, the time adverb (in this case, never) is

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
			placed between the auxiliary verb "have" and the main verb "seen".
5	ELIA	0.25	Never have I seen such a beautiful baby.
6	INDIGO	0	I have never seen such a beautiful baby. Trying to show importance. Order should be explained.
7	JALIL	0	Never I have seen such a beautiful baby. Seems OK.
8	KAMIL	0	I have never seen such a beautiful baby. Helping verb + adverb of frequency + main verb
9	LIGHT	0.25	Never have I seen such a beautiful baby. Word order and error again. Perhaps in the speaker's language, the subject would follow a time expression such as never and then be preceded by a helping verb. I would just say that in this instance, it's adverb of frequency followed by helping verb, followed by subject.
10	BEY	0.75	Never have I seen such a beautiful baby. Inversion has to be used here.
11	MERT	0.75	Correction: "Never have I seen such a beautiful baby." Use the inverted structure.
12	SALIMA	0	I have never seen such a beautiful baby. Word order.
13	SIERRA	0	I have never seen such a beautiful baby.
14	SUZANNE	0.75	Never have I seen such a beautiful baby. A focussing / emphasizing transformation of I have never seen becomes → Never have I seen. The transformed partial sentence, [never] have I seen could perhaps strike a non-native as being a question form , prompting, [never] I have seen instead.
15	TALAT	1	The sentence should be 'Never have I seen a beautify baby'. The rule here says that when a sentence starts with a negative adverbial phrase such as 'Never, not only, seldom, rarely, etc', there should be inversion between the subject and the auxiliary.
16	VIVI	0	Generally adverbs of frequency such as often, always, never are placed between the aux verb and main verb or between S never V.
17	WALI	0	Incorrect: I have never seen such a beautiful baby. The position of the word never should be after the helping verb have.
	AVERAGE	25%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual 9 zeros

Table A36.1

Incorrect inversion in sentences starting with a negative frequency adverb “never”.

<u>Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual</u>		
1	HUSTIN	0.25 I have never seen such a beautiful baby. Word order wrong, although could be acceptable in classical literature or theatre.
2	AL	0.25 Never have I seen such a beautiful baby. Again this is a problem regarding forming a sentence using the subject verb agreement. This needs to be explained.
3	FARIS	0.75 I have never seen such a beautiful baby. Never have I seen such a beautiful baby. (I would use this in spoken English for emphasis)
4	BROW	0.25 Never have I seen such a beautiful baby (superlative vs. frequency)
5	JESUS	0.75 Never have I seen such a beautiful baby. This is an emphatic statement and in order to stress and make the sentence very emphatic we reverse the normal order ‘I have never seen’ to ‘Never have I seen’. This is done for emphasis and to make the statement very strong. The student tried to do this but didn’t use the correct form.
6	SYMRNA	0 OK.
AVERAGE		37.5%

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 1 zero

TOTAL: 10 Zeros

Table A36.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	25%
NTBL average	37.5%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	28.3%

Table A36.3**Zero averages**

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	9	52.9%
NTBL	1	16.7%
Total	10	43.5%

Sentence 5: Do you like me really?

Table A37**Misplaced adverb in a do-question****Responses by Truly Bilingual Participants**

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Do you really like me? Word order problem. If a sentence has an adverb, it should come before the main verb.
2	SAM	1	Explain to students that this is the normal place for adverbs (before main verb) unless there is usage need for change.
3	FIRAZ	1	Do you really like me? "Really" modifies the verb "like" so it should precede it.
4	OSAMA	0	Do you like really me? In an interrogative sentence (question), the object pronoun is almost always preceded by either a verb (like, in our case) OR a preposition (She loves sitting next to him). The question was not about the object pronoun.
5	ELIA	0	Do you really like me?
6	INDIGO	0	Do you really like me? Minor order correction. Order should be explained.
7	JALIL	0	Do you really like me? The error is the wrong position of the adverb really. Because normally we use adverb at the end of a sentence.
8	KAMIL	1	Do you really like me? Adverb + main verb / really + like
9	LIGHT	0.25	Do you really like me? or Do you like me, really? With the first example, it is a word order error. With the second example a comma is missing. In the first example, really is an adverb modifying "like". In the second example, the comma adds a pause and casts doubt on whether or not the listener likes the speaker.

10	BEY	1	The adverb has to come before the verb.
11	MERT	1	Correction: "Do you really like me?" The adverb comes between the subject and the main verb.
12	SALIMA	1	Do you really like me? Adverbs go before verbs.
13	SIERRA	0	Do you like me, really? OR Do you really like me?
14	SUZANNE	0.75	Do you really like me is better, or any rate, a higher-frequency form. A learner's native language could have different rules for placements of adverbs in the sentential sequence of constituents. There's an additional issue in the two possible sentences, here, though: a question of the intend scope of the adverb – narrow (modifying only like) or broad (the whole utterance).
15	TALAT	1	The sentence should be 'Do you really like me?' Usually, adverbs of degree come before the main verb and after the auxiliary verb. However, I would not personally rule this sentence out; it is widely used in informal English.
16	VIVI	1	Adverb should go between S and Verb = You REALLY like.
17	WALI	1	Incorrect: It should be do you really like me? The word order is incorrect as the position of the word really should be after the subject pronoun.
AVERAGE		64.7%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 5 zeros

Table A37.1

Misplaced adverb in a do-question

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	Do you really like me? or Do you like me, really? First is more normal.
2	AL	0	Do you really like me? Same as Question 4. Question 4: Never have I seen such a beautiful baby. Again this is a problem regarding forming a sentence using the subject verb agreement. This needs to be explained.
3	FARIS	0	Do you really like me?
4	BROW	0.75	Do you really like me? Really: adverb of manner = before the verb. The army always is ready.

5	JESUS	0	Do you really like me? This is a different meaning from the sentence above. The new sentence means ‘Do you like me a lot?’ An alternative to this could be ‘Really? You like me?’. This form may actually capture the meaning more.
6	SYMRNA	0.25	Do you like me really? Misplaced modifier as really modifies liking.
AVERAGE		16.7%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

TOTAL: 9 zeros

Table A37.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	64.7%
NTBL average	16.7%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	52.2%

Table A37.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	5	29.4%
NTBL	4	66.7%
Total	9	39.1%

Sentence 6 I always am ready.

Table A38

Misplaced adverb in sentences with the main verb “be”

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT’S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	I am always ready. Word order. Adverbs of frequency must come after the verb to ‘be’
2	SAM	0.75	Acceptable in more emphatic terms, though a more natural one would be I am always ready.
3	FIRAZ	0.75	I am always ready. “Always” modifies “ready” so it should precede it.
4	OSAMA	0.75	I am always ready. As a rule of thumb in English grammar, an affirmative statement with an adverb of frequency is always preceded by the verb to be (in this case, am).
5	ELIA	0	I always am ready = INFORMAL USAGE I am always ready.
6	INDIGO	0	I am always ready. Confusion in sentence creation. Order should be explained.
7	JALIL	1	I am always ready. Verb position of the adverb always. Overgeneralization of the rule: Adverbs precede verbs.
8	KAMIL	1	I am always ready. be + frequency adverb
9	LIGHT	1	I am always ready. Word order error. Perhaps in the speaker’s language <u>adverbs of frequency</u> can separate a subject and to be verb. I would explain that in English a subject and to be verb cannot be separated.
10	BEY	1	In this declarative sentence the adverb of frequency has to come after the verb.
11	MERT	1	Correction: “I am always ready.” Adverbs are used after the main verb “be”.
12	SALIMA	0	Helping verb can’t go after the adverb.
13	SIERRA	0	I’m always ready.
14	SUZANNE	0.25	As for 5, I’d guess the learner’s native language has a different rule for ordering constituents. However, in my dialect of English, again the “error” of 6 is OK – as a focus/emphasis construction. 5 & 6→These forms are OK in some contexts.
15	TALAT	1	The sentence should be ‘I am always ready’. While adverbs of frequency usually come before the main verb in the sentence, they usually come after verb ‘to be’.
16	VIVI	1	This is a BE verb so the frequency adverb always needs to go after the verb.

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
17	WALI	0.75	Incorrect: It should be "I am always ready". The word order of the sentence is incorrect. There should be no separation between the pronoun "I" and the verb "am".
AVERAGE		66.2%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

Table A38.1

Misplaced adverb in sentences with the min verb "be"

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.25	I am always ready. "I" and "am" should not be separated.
2	AL	0	I'm always ready. Sentencing formation and using the correct subject verb form is a problem here. This should be explained to the student and taught with examples.
3	FARIS	0	I am always ready.
4	BROW	0.75	I am always ready (adverb modifying ready).
5	JESUS	1	I am always ready. The form here is BE Verb + Always. If it was another verb (not the BE verb) it would be Always + Verb. The student is using the second form which is incorrect.
6	SYMRNA	0.25	I am always ready. Misplaced modifier.
AVERAGE		37.5%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 2 Zeros

TOTAL: 6 zeros

Table A38.2

Misplaced adverb in sentences with the min verb "be"

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	66.2%
--------------------	--------------

NTBL average	37.5%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	58.7%

Table A38.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	4	23.5%
NTBL	2	33.3%
Total	6	26.1%

Task 5: Morphology

1. *Immature, impossible, impolite* vs. *unable, inefficient, dislike, irrelevant*

Task: Explain when/why *im-* (versus *un-*, *in -*, *dis -*, etc.) should be used before certain adjectives.

2. How many **morphemes** are there in the following words?

- a. *Cats*

- b. *Decaffeinated*

- c. *Happy*

3. The word able changes its meaning when the negative prefixes are added to it. Please comment on the word (**able**) before any affixation process, and explain how the negative prefixes contribute to the change in meaning.

- d. able

- e. enable

- f. unable

g. **disable**

4. I'm very sorry to hear this news.

Task: Please comment on (-s) at the end of the word news.

5. Please comment on (-ly) in the following two words regarding their function.

h. lovely

i. slowly

4.6. Morphology

Task 1 *Immature, impossible, impolite* vs. *unable, inefficient, dislike, irrelevant*

Explain when/why *im-* (versus *un-*, *in -*, *dis -*, etc.) should be used before certain adjectives.

Table A39

Im- morpheme before adjectives starting with bilabial consonants

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.75	To make the meaning of certain adjectives negative, we use them. Unfortunately, there is no specific rule. However, we can say that if a word starts with M or P we usually use im – as a prefix. With words starting with 'r' we use ir- / Un- as a prefix is the most common one.
2	SAM	0.25	Actually, I think that in these 3 words (immature, impolite, and impossible) we use one of the prefixes, namely in-, so the original was in+mature, in+polite, in+possible. Then the consonant “m” was introduced instead of “n” for ease of pronunciation.
3	FIRAZ	1	The prefixes im- and in- usually modify adjectives and are identical in meaning (they flip the meaning of the adjective to give the opposite meaning). The only difference is that im- appears before the bilabial [p] and is probably due to assimilation of [n] to the [p] following it – The morpheme ir- is just like im- except it appears before an [r]. Un- usually modifies verbs to give a meaning of reversing an action. The morpheme dis- is much less productive than un- but it to modifies verbs to give the

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
			meaning of reversing an action as such. The opposite word usually begins with en- (Examples: encourage/discourage, enable/disable, entangle/disentangle)
4	OSAMA	0.75	The prefix in- becomes im- before sounds p, b, m. It also becomes ir- before r, as in irrespective and irresponsible, and il- before l, as in the words “illegible” and “illegal” — these are examples of assimilation as well.
5	ELIA	0	No answer.
6	INDIGO	0	Certain words require -im to be the prefix. Any other will make the word grammatically wrong.
7	JALIL	0.25	When the adjective starts with the consonants /p/ or /m/
8	KAMIL	0	No idea.
9	LIGHT	0	No answer.
10	BEY	0	Prefix im- usually comes before adjectives beginning with a plausible phoneme.
11	MERT	0	No answer.
12	SALIMA	0	No answer.
13	SIERRA	0	I think with the letter p (im-) is used.
14	SUZANNE	0	Interesting question. I don't know. My first guess would be that im-, un-, in-, dis-, ir- words come to English from different ancestor languages and carried derivational morphology baggage with them.
15	TALAT	0.25	The pre-fix 'im' is usually used before adjectives starting with 'p' and 'm' such as in 'imperfect, improper, impossible, impotent, impractical, immature, immoral, etc). However, with using prefixes and suffixes, there is no fixed rule, and exceptions are many. For instance, we don't say 'irreasonable' but 'unreasonable'; we don't say 'immeaningful' but 'meaningless'.
16	VIVI	0	Latin vs. Greek ??
17	WALI	1	We use im- instead of in- because in-ends in a nasal sound while im- ends in a nasal-bilabial sound which makes it easy to pronounce the word.
AVERAGE		25%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 10 zeros

Table A39.1

Im- morpheme before adjectives starting with bilabial consonants

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	That's the way English is! Even if there is a rule, I've adopted the strategy of using lots of input to assist the students to recognise for themselves the difference cases.
2	AL	0	Not so sure. But I think it is dependent on the word being vowel/consonant.
3	FARIS	0	No answer.
4	BROW	0	Just negative form from different sources. Differences in morphemes for adjectives. -s is for plural.
5	JESUS	0	Im-creates a complete opposite meaning. The other above morphemes don't have the same opposite meaning.
6	SYMRNA	0	No answer.
	AVERAGE	0%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 6 zeros

TOTAL: 16 Zeros

Table A39.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	25%
NTBL average	0%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	18.5%

Table A39.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	10	58.9%
NTBL	6	100%
Total	16	69.6%

Task 2 How many **morphemes** are there in the following words:

a- *Cats*

b- *Decaffeinated*

c- *Happy*

Table A40

Awareness of morphemes

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE		
1	NUR	0.66	a- Cats 2	b- Decaffeinated 3	c- Happy 1
2	SAM	1	a- cat+s=2	b- de+caffeine+ate+d = 4	c- happy = 1
3	FIRAZ	1	a- Cats- 2	b- Decaffeinated - 4	c- Happy - 1
4	OSAMA	0.66	a- Cats	Two morphemes, cat and 's'	
			b- Decaffeinated	Three morphemes	
			c- Happy	One morpheme	
5	ELIA	0.66	a- Cats cat +s = 2	b- de + caffeine + ate + d = 4	c- happy = 4
6	INDIGO	0	No answer.		
7	JALIL	1	a- Cats 2	b- Decaffeinated 4	c- Happy 1
8	KAMIL	1	a- Cats 2	b- Decaffeinated 4	c- Happy 1
9	LIGHT	0	a- Cats: 1	b- Decaffeinated: 2	c- Happy: 0

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE	
10	BEY	0.66	a- Cats 2 c- Happy 1	b- Decaffeinated 3
11	MERT	0	No answer.	
12	SALIMA	0.33	a- Cats 1 c- Happy 1	b-decaffeinated 3
13	SIERRA	1	a- Cats 2 c- Happy 1	b- Decaffeinated 4
14	SUZANNE	1	a- Cats 2 c- Happy 1	b-Decaffeinated 4
15	TALAT	1	a- Cats (2) c- Happy (1)	b- Decaffeinated (4)
16	VIVI	1	a- Cat s = 2 c- Happy = 1	b- De caffeine ate d = 4
17	WALI	0	a- Cats 1 c- Happy (no	b- Decaffeinated 2 morpheme)
AVERAGE		64.5%		

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

Table A40.1

Awareness of morphemes

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	I can't remember what morphemes are. If I remember correctly, they are the bits added to the basic forms of words, e.g., "s" for plurals, "ed" for past tense, etc. I have never taught it to students.	
2	AL	0	Not sure.	
3	FARIS	0	No answer.	
4	BROW	0.33	a- Cats 1 b- Decaffeinated 2 c- Happy 1	-ed shows it is adjective. (ambiguous)
5	JESUS	1	a- Cats-2 b- Decaffeinated -4 c- Happy-1	
6	SYMRNA	0	a- Cats = 3 b- Decaffeinated = 5 c- Happy = 3	
AVERAGE		22.2%		

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

TOTAL: 8 zeros

Table A40.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	64.5%
NTBL average	22.2%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	53.5%

Table A40.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	4	23.5%
NTBL	4	66.6%
Total	8	34.8%

Task 3 The word able changes its meaning when negative prefixes are added to it. Please comment on the word (**able**) before any affixation process, and explain how the negative prefixes contribute to the change in meaning.

Table A41

Contribution of morphemes to meaning

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0	<p>j. able originated from ability It is an adj. If you are able to do sthg, you can do it.(you have the capacity)</p> <p>k. enable to give sb. / sthg. capacity, power; opportunity etc.</p> <p>l. unable negative form of able e.g., I have been unable to respond your mail.</p> <p>m. Disable He is a disabled child. e.g., His body cannot function as he had a terrible car accident. EXAMPLES ✓</p>
2	SAM	0	<p>n. able: able as an adjective means that someone can or is capable of something or of doing something.</p> <p>o. enable: here the en- prefix means to make. So, the meaning changes to "make able"</p> <p>p. unable: un- makes the meaning not able to</p> <p>q. disable: dis- makes the meaning to (verb) make or to render unable</p>
3	FIRAZ	0.25	<p>able- single morpheme adjective meaning capable</p> <p>enable- causative of able</p> <p>unable- antonym of the adjective able</p> <p>disable- antonym of the causative enable.</p>
4	OSAMA	0	<p>a- able</p> <p>b- enable the prefix -en is used to form verbs that mean to cause to be something</p> <p>c- unable The prefix un- means not, reverse action, deprive of, release from. Does not have the ability to do something.</p> <p>d- disable The prefix dis- also means not and opposite of. For example, disconnect. So in this case, it means not able.This part is really confusing and very unstructured to say the least (is the prefix "en-" a negative prefix?! I remember from my university studies that the most common negative prefixes in English are in-, un-, non-, de-, dis-, a-, anti-, im-, il-, and ir-. So, what is it that is needed here? For example, do I let you know the meaning of able?? Able is as a solo word means can do something (adjective). As a suffix indicates "can be" or "worth being". But I am not entirely sure what exactly is meant for us to do here.</p>
5	ELIA	0	<p>a- able having the power to do something</p> <p>b- enable to give power</p> <p>c- unable opposite of able</p> <p>d- disable make something powerless, unusable</p>
6	INDIGO	0	<p>a- Able: shows a positive sentence</p> <p>b- enable: a positive verb</p> <p>c- unable: a negative meaning</p> <p>d- disable: a negative meaning</p>

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE	
7	JALIL	0	a-	able: An adjective which means has the ability do something.
			b-	enable: A verb and it means to make someone have the ability to do something.
			c-	unable: An adjective and it is the opposite of enable.
			d-	disable: A verb and it is the opposite of enable.
8	KAMIL	0	a-	able adjective means can
			b-	enable verb means make someone able: 2 morphemes
			c-	unable adjective : lack of ability: 2 morphemes
			d-	disable verb: take or remove the ability or power
9	LIGHT	0	a-	able: to have the capacity to something
			b-	enable: To give someone something the help needed to accomplish something.
			c-	unable: not having the capacity to do something
			d-	disable: to take away someone/something's capacity to do something.
10	BEY	0	a-	able able means to be capable of doing something
			b-	enable enable (the prefix en- is positive here and means to empower someone with the ability to do something.
			c-	unable the prefix un- means not (not able to do something)
			d-	disable the prefix dis- means to strip something of something
11	MERT	0	No answer.	
12	SALIMA	0	a-	able adjective, describes a noun.
			b-	enable make it possible
			c-	unable somebody is not in a position to do something
			d-	disable something is preventing somebody to do something
13	SIERRA	0	root of able (can)	
			b-	enable en + able V = similar to can
			c-	unable can not = ppl
			d-	disable can not = used w/thing
14	SUZANNE	0	a-	able having the capability
			b-	enable causing to have capability
			c-	unable lacking the capability
			d-	disable causing to lose capability
15	TALAT	0.25	The word able means 'can do'. The prefix 'en' means an agent contributes to this ability, hence 'enable' means 'make someone or something able to do'. The prefix 'un' means that 'not' here it is added to the word 'able' and keeps the grammatical category, which is adjective, hence 'unable' means 'cannot do'. The prefix	

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
			'dis' means that an agent contributes to the lack of this ability, hence 'disable' means 'make someone or something unable to do'.
16	VIVI	0	a- able = can b- enable = verb give ability to c- unable = adj not able d- disable = verb was able before, not able now
17	WALI	0	a- able: a positive word which means has the power to something b- enable a positive word that means empowering someone to do something. c- unable a negative word which means having no power to do something d- disable a negative word which means not empowering someone not to do something able ≠ unable enable ≠ disable
AVERAGE			2.9%

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 15 zeros

Table A41.1

Contribution of morphemes to meaning

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	HUSTIN	0	a- able can do something b- enable give the ability to something else to do something c- unable cannot do something d- disable remove the ability of something else to do something
2	AL	0	a- able to do something b- enable aiding you to do c- unable stopping you to do d- disable stopping/permanently stopping
3	FARIS	0	a- able: the ability to do something b- enable: To make something able. c- unable: the opposite of able d- disable: BLANK
4	BROW	0	a- Able can do something b- enable give ability c- unable can't do something

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE	
			d-	disable make something unable to function
5	JESUS	0	a-	able-means that you have the ability to do something
			b-	enable-means give someone the ability to do something
			c-	unable-means lack of the ability to do something
			d-	disable-means to lose the ability to do something
6	SYMRNA	0	a-	able the ability to do something
			b-	enable to allow to be able
			c-	unable not able
			d-	disable disallow to be able
AVERAGE		0%		

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 6 zeros

TOTAL: 21 Zeros

Table A41.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	2.9%
NTBL average	0%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	2.2%

Table A41.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	15	88.2%
NTBL	6	100%
Total	21	91.3%

Task 4 I'm very sorry to hear this news.

Task: Please comment on the suffix (-s) at the end of the word news.

Table A42

Plural morpheme not functioning as a plural marker

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	This ' s' is plural in form, but singular in construction. Material reported in a newspaper or TV. No news is good news.
2	SAM	0.75	In teaching grammar, this is one of the tricky suffixes and we always warn our students that it does not make the noun plural. So the news is..., not the news are... You have to stress the fact that the "s" is not for the plural here and that the noun is to be treated as singular. Give examples of other words not ending in "s" and tell them to treat news similarly.
3	FIRAZ	1	Actually, I don't think it is a suffix at all. Even though it looks like as if the plural suffix "-s" has been attached to the word "new". Perhaps historically it was conceived as a plural, meaning "new things", but synchronically it probably is best analyzed as a single morpheme meaning new information.
4	OSAMA	0.75	Although the equivalent expression in many languages would be in the plural, "news" is a singular uncountable noun, which means that not only is it followed by a singular verb, but you also cannot say "a news". The problem with this word is that it is countable in the Arabic language so students may have a problem using it grammatically correct.
5	ELIA	1	It is a part of the base word.
6	INDIGO	0	The word news just shows a piece of information conveyed to the speaker.
7	JALIL	1	The -s at the end of news is not a plural suffix, it is part of the base.
8	KAMIL	0.75	News: s is one original alphabet in the word like means of. It is singular. It is confusing to many learners. The word "news" looks like a plural noun, but in fact it is singular in construction and is dealt with as a singular noun in grammar like "lens, means, thesis,etc.". That is, the -s at the end is an original letter of the alphabet like the -e in "is, send, abstract....". That's why it is very confusing to many people in general and to many learners in particular. Therefore, it takes a singular noun..... The only strange

No	Participant	Mark	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
			or odd thing about the singular noun "news" is that it is uncountable. That's why the article "a" cannot be used before it. We say: We've got good news. We don't say: We've got a good news.
9	LIGHT	1	I do not think this qualifies as a suffix. The word in its basic form contains an "s".
10	BEY	0.75	The -s at the end of new is not a suffix.
11	MERT	0	No answer.
12	SALIMA	0	The -s suffix turns the word new into a new word. Not only does it make it plural, but it also means something different.
13	SIERRA	0.75	The -s is part of the word.
14	SUZANNE	1	In a synchronic analysis, the-s is not a suffix. News as a whole is singular mass noun. Perhaps a diachronic analysis would show that the -s at one time functioned as a plural suffix.
15	TALAT	1	The suffix '-s' is part of the word here and it is not treated as a plurality marker. Therefore, the word 'news' takes a singular verb and is an uncountable noun. In fact, I don't think the '-s' can be treated as a suffix here as it is part of the word and it is not an inflectional morpheme.
16	VIVI	1	News = non count = singular. It is part of the word such as dog. It is not a plural marker. Fetus, Jesus= part of the word not a plural marker.
17	WALI	1	The -s at the end of the word news is not a suffix. It is a part of the word structure.
AVERAGE		75%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

Table A42.1

Plural morpheme not functioning as a plural marker

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	"New" is an adjective, but with "s" it is a noun. It actually represents "new reports" or "new stories"
2	AL	0	The -s dictates the situation (news)
3	FARIS	0	No answer.
4	BROW	0.25	New: adjective; has to be news. News makes it a noun.
5	JESUS	1	It is not a plural S but part of the whole morpheme news.
6	SYMRNA	0.75	News is a noun and not plural.
AVERAGE		33.3%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

TOTAL: 6 zeros

Table A42.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	75%
NTBL average	33.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	64.1%

Table A42.3

Averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	3	17.6%
NTBL	3	50%
Total	6	26.1%

Task 5 Please comment on (-ly) in the following two words regarding their function.

a. lovely

b. slowly

Table A43

Overgeneralization of the *_ly* suffix as an adverbResponses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	a- Here lovely is a an adjective although it seems like an adverb. It is a false friend !. b- Here -ly is a suffix which is added to certain adjectives to make them adverbs.
2	SAM	1	a- lovely: in lovely, the -ly does not make an adverb out of an adjective. b- slowly: in slowly, the suffix does change slow, an adjective, into "slowly", an adverb.
3	FIRAZ	1	"-ly" is usually adverb forming suffix that changes an adjective into an adverb. But of course "love" is not an adjective, nor is "lovely" an adverb, rather it is an adjective. So, it seems to form somewhat of an exception to the rule.
4	OSAMA	1	a- lovely adjective b-slowly adverb A word ending in -ly suffix can be an adverb or an adjective. When used as an adjective, it modifies a noun. Some examples of -ly adjectives are: Lonely, friendly, lovely. When the word ending in -ly describes a verb, then it becomes an adverb.
5	ELIA	0	a- lovely (adverbs) b-slowly
6	INDIGO	0	a- lovely: it adds stress to the word. b- Slowly it adds stress to the word
7	JALIL	1	a- lovely: an adjective as the suffix -ly is added to the noun love. b-slowly: an adverb as the suffix -ly is added to the adjective slow.
8	KAMIL	1	a- lovely: added to a noun: adjective: describes a noun b. slowly: added to a verb: adverb: describes verb (action)
9	LIGHT	1	a- Lovely: Here the -ly turns the word into an adjective. b- Slowly: Here the -ly turns the word into an adverb.
10	BEY	1	a- lovely is an adjective b- slowly - by adding the suffix -ly we change the adjective into an adverb
11	MERT	1	a- Lovely = adjective b- Slowly = adverb
12	SALIMA	0.75	a- lovely adjective: describes a noun b- slowly describes the verb

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE	
13	SIERRA	1	a- lovely: adjective	b- slowly: adverb
14	SUZANNE	1	a- lovely -ly ≠ a suffix in modern usage (synchronic analysis). Perhaps, it once had a function as a suffix. But now, lovely seems to be just an irreducible adjective. b- slowly -ly = an adverbial suffix on the adjective slow, would modify a verb.	
15	TALAT	1	a- Lovely- The 'ly' here is a derivational morpheme making the word 'love', which is a noun or a verb, an adjective. b- Slowly- The 'ly' here is a derivational morpheme making the word 'slow', which is an adjective (and could also be used as a verb), an adverb.	
16	VIVI	1	a- lovely = not an affix just part of the verb b- slowly = adverb how -ly is an affix= suffix "ly" is a common adverbial ending. May have to do with etymology of each word.	
17	WALI	1	a- Lovely = adjective b- Slowly = adverb The normal rule says that adding -ly to the adjective changes it to an adverb. The word love is not an adjective; so, when adding -ly to it, the rule does not apply.	
AVERAGE		86.8%		

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 2 zeros

Table A43.1

Overgeneralization of the _ly suffix as an adverb

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	1	a- lovely: adjective	b- slowly: adverb
2	AL	0.25	a- lovely: helping to describe the beauty slowly: describing the pace	
3	FARIS	1	a-Lovely: adjective.	b- Slowly: adverb.
4	BROW	0	a- Lovely: opinion	b- Slowly fact: adjective
5	JESUS	1	a-love is a verb or noun. By adding ly we have an adjective. b-Slowly-slow is an adjective. By adding ly, we now have an adverb.	
6	SYMRNA	1	a- lovely: adjective	b- slowly: adverb
AVERAGE		70.8%		

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 1 zero

TOTAL: 3 Zeros

Table A43.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	86.8%
NTBL average	70.8%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	82.6%

Table A43.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	2	11.8%
NTBL	1	16.7%
Total	3	13%

Task 6: Identification of Parts Speech

What **part of speech** does each word in bold represent in the following sentences (e.g., noun)?

1. It is **likely** to rain today.
2. The car is **his**.
3. I **hardly** speak any French.
4. The student studied **hard**.
5. **Never** has he been there.

6. You **had better** do your homework now.
7. The bus stop is **there**.
8. **They** have not seen **us**.
9. We went there **yesterday**.
10. **Jogging** right after a meal is not recommended.

Additional Task:

11. What is the difference between a **phrase** and a **clause**?

What part of speech does each word in bold represent in the following sentences (e.g., noun)?

Sentence 1: It is **likely** to rain tomorrow.

Table A44

likely

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	adjective
2	SAM	1	adjective
3	FIRAZ	0	It is an adverbial of likelihood modifying the main verb.
4	OSAMA	0	adverb
5	ELIA	0	adverb
6	INDIGO	1	adjective
7	JALIL	1	adjective
8	KAMIL	0	adverb
9	LIGHT	0	adverb
10	BEY	1	adjective
11	MERT	1	adjective
12	SALIMA	0	adverb
13	SIERRA	0	adverb
14	SUZANNE	1	adjective / predicate adjective (e.g., It is interesting; she is beautiful.)
15	TALAT	1	adjective
16	VIVI	1	adjective
17	WALI	1	adjective
	AVERAGE	58.8%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 7 zeros

Table A44.1

Likely

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	adverb
2	AL	0	adverb
3	FARIS	0	adverb
4	BROW	0	Adverb (not sure)
5	JESUS	0	adverb
6	SYMRNA	0	Adverb of frequency
AVERAGE		0%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 6 zeros

TOTAL: 13 zeros

Table A44.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	58.8%
NTBL average	0%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	43.5%

Table A44.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	7	41.2%
NTBL	6	100%
Total	13	56.5%

Sentence 2: The car is his.

Table A45

His

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES
1	NUR	1	Possessive Pronoun
2	SAM	0.5	Pronoun
3	FIRAZ	1	Predicate Possessive Pronoun
4	OSAMA	1	Possessive Pronoun
5	ELIA	0	Possessive Adjective
6	INDIGO	0.5	Pronoun
7	JALIL	0	Possessive Adjective
8	KAMIL	1	Possessive Pronoun
9	LIGHT	1	Possessive Pronoun
10	BEY	1	Possessive Pronoun
11	MERT	0.5	Pronoun
12	SALIMA	1	Possessive Pronoun
13	SIERRA	0.5	Pronoun
14	SUZANNE	1	Possessive Pronoun
15	TALAT	1	Possessive Pronoun
16	VIVI	1	Possessive Pronoun
17	WALI	1	Possessive Pronoun
	AVERAGE	76.5%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 2 zeros

Table A45.1

His

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES
1	HUSTIN	0.5	pronoun
2	AL	0.5	Pronoun

3	FARIS	0.5	Pronoun
4	BROW	1	Possessive Pronoun
5	JESUS	0	Adjective
6	SYMRNA	0.5	Pronoun
AVERAGE		50%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 1 zero

TOTAL: 3 zeros

Table A45.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	76.5%
NTBL average	50%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	69.6%

Table A45.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	2	11.8%
NTBL	1	16.7%
Total	3	13%

Sentence 3: I hardly speak any French

Table A46

Hardly

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.5	Adverb of frequency
2	SAM	1	adverb
3	FIRAZ	1	adverb
4	OSAMA	1	adverb
5	ELIA	1	adverb
6	INDIGO	1	adverb
7	JALIL	1	adverb
8	KAMIL	0.5	Adverb of frequency
9	LIGHT	1	adverb
10	BEY	1	adverb
11	MERT	1	adverb
12	SALIMA	1	adverb
13	SIERRA	1	adverb
14	SUZANNE	1	adverb
15	TALAT	1	adverb
16	VIVI	1	adverb
17	WALI	1	adverb
	AVERAGE	94.1%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: No zeros

Table A46.1

Hardly

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	HUSTIN	1	adverb
2	AL	1	adverb
3	FARIS	1	adverb
4	BROW	1	Adverb of manner
5	JESUS	1	adverb
6	SYMRNA	1	adverb
	AVERAGE	100%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: No zeros

TOTAL: No zeros

Table A46.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	94.1%
NTBL average	100%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	95.7%

Table A46.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	0	0%
NTBL	0	0%
Total	0	0%

Sentence 4: The student studied **hard**.

Table A47

Hard

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Adverb of manner
2	SAM	1	adverb
3	FIRAZ	1	Adverbial post modifier

4	OSAMA	1	adverb
5	ELIA	1	adverb
6	INDIGO	0	adjective
7	JALIL	1	adverb
8	KAMIL	1	adverb
9	LIGHT	0	adjective
10	BEY	1	adverb
11	MERT	1	adverb
12	SALIMA	1	adverb
13	SIERRA	0	adjective
14	SUZANNE	1	adverb
15	TALAT	1	adverb
16	VIVI	1	adverb
17	WALI	1	adverb
	AVERAGE	82.4%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 3 zeros

Table A47.1

Hard

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	HUSTIN	1	adverb
2	AL	0	adjective
3	FARIS	1	adverb
4	BROW	1	adverb
5	JESUS	1	adverb
6	SYMRNA	0	adjective
	AVERAGE	66.7%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 2 zeros

TOTAL: 5 zeros

Table A47.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	82.4%
NTBL average	66.7%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	78.3%

Table A47.3**Zero averages**

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	3	17.6%
NTBL	2	33.3%
Total	5	21.7%

Sentence 5: Never has he been there.

Table A48**Never****Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers**

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	adverb
2	SAM	1	adverb
3	FIRAZ	1	Negative particle. The negative particle is the word not (or its reduced form, -n't) used to indicate negation, denial, refusal, or prohibition. Also called a negative adverb.
4	OSAMA	1	adverb
5	ELIA	1	adverb
6	INDIGO	1	adverb
7	JALIL	1	adverb
8	KAMIL	1	Frequency adverb
9	LIGHT	1	Adverb of frequency
10	BEY	1	Adverb of frequency
11	MERT	1	adverb
12	SALIMA	1	adverb
13	SIERRA	1	adverb

14	SUZANNE	1	Temporal adverb
15	TALAT	1	adverb
16	VIVI	1	adverb
17	WALI	1	adverb
	AVERAGE	100%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: No zeros

Table A48.1

Never

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	HUSTIN	1	adverb of time
2	AL	0	negative
3	FARIS	1	adverb of frequency
4	BROW	1	frequency adverb
5	JESUS	1	adverb
6	SYMRNA	1	Adverb of frequency
	AVERAGE	83.3%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 1 Zero

TOTAL: 1 zero

Table A48.2

Never

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	100%
NTBL average	83.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	95.7%

Table A48.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	0	0%
NTBL	1	5.9%
Total	1	4.3%

Sentence 6: You had better do your homework now.

Table A49

Had better

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Auxiliary verb
2	SAM	0	verb
3	FIRAZ	1	A modal
4	OSAMA	0	verb
5	ELIA	0	No answer
6	INDIGO	0	adjective
7	JALIL	1	modal
8	KAMIL	0	Should: advice/adverb; desirable action
9	LIGHT	1	Auxiliary verb phrase
10	BEY	1	Modal verb
11	MERT	1	Modal auxiliary for strong advice/warning
12	SALIMA	0	adverb
13	SIERRA	0	compound
14	SUZANNE	1	Phrasal modal verb
15	TALAT	0	verb
16	VIVI	0	verb
17	WALI	0	adjective
	AVERAGE	41.1%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 10 zeros

Table A49.1

Had better

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	HUSTIN	1	modal
2	AL	0	No answer
3	FARIS	0	No answer
4	BROW	1	Modal with a verb
5	JESUS	0	adverb
6	SYMRNA	0	No answer
AVERAGE		33.3%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

TOTAL: 14 zeros

Table A49.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	41.1%
NTBL average	33.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	39.1%

Table A49.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	10	58.8%
NTBL	4	66.7%
Total	14	60.9%

Sentence 7: The bus stop is **there**.

Table A50

There

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Adverb of place
2	SAM	0	pronoun
3	FIRAZ	1	Demonstrative particle
4	OSAMA	1	Adverb (place)
5	ELIA	0	Adjective (not sure)
6	INDIGO	1	adverb
7	JALIL	1	adverb
8	KAMIL	0	Location/place
9	LIGHT	0	noun
10	BEY	0	Demonstrative pronoun
11	MERT	1	adverb
12	SALIMA	0	adjective
13	SIERRA	0	Signal for place
14	SUZANNE	0	Demonstrative pronoun
15	TALAT	1	adverb
16	VIVI	1	Subject complement (be verb) adverb
17	WALI	0	Preposition of place
AVERAGE		47%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 9 zeros

Table A50.1

There

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	HUSTIN	0	Not sure
2	AL	0	No answer
3	FARIS	0	place
4	BROW	1	adverb
5	JESUS	0	pronoun
6	SYMRNA	0	Demonstrative pronoun
AVERAGE		16.7%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

TOTAL: 13 zeros

Table A50.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	47%
NTBL average	16.7%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	39.1%

Table A50.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	9	52.9%
NTBL	4	83.3%
Total	13	56.5%

Sentence 8: They haven't seen us.

Table A51

They, us

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Subject pronoun / object pronoun
2	SAM	0	adverb
3	FIRAZ	1	Subject pronoun / object pronoun

4	OSAMA	1	They = gender-neutral subjective plural pronoun and us gender-neutral plural objective pronoun.
5	ELIA	1	Subject pronoun / object pronoun
6	INDIGO	0.5	pronoun
7	JALIL	1	Subject pronoun / object pronoun
8	KAMIL	1	Subject pronoun / object pronoun
9	LIGHT	0.5	pronouns
10	BEY	0.5	Personal pronoun
11	MERT	1	Subject pronoun / object pronoun
12	SALIMA	0.5	Both are pronouns
13	SIERRA	0.5	Subject + pronoun
14	SUZANNE	1	Nominative/accusative pronouns
15	TALAT	1	Subject pronoun / object pronoun
16	VIVI	1	Subject pronoun / object pronoun
17	WALI	1	Subject pronoun / object pronoun
	AVERAGE	79.4%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 1 zero

Table A51.1

They, us

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.5	Pronoun / object pronoun
2	AL	0.5	pronoun
3	FARIS	0.5	pronouns
4	BROW	0	They: subject / us: indirect object
5	JESUS	0.5	pronouns
6	SYMRNA	1	Subject pronoun / object pronoun
	AVERAGE	50%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 1 zero

TOTAL: 2 zeros

Table A51.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	79.4%
NTBL average	50%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	71.7%

Table A51.3**Zero averages**

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	1	4.3%
NTBL	1	16.7%
Total	2	8.7%

Sentence 9: We went there yesterday.

Table A52**Yesterday****Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers**

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Adverb of time
2	SAM	0	noun
3	FIRAZ	1	Time of adverbial
4	OSAMA	1	Adverb (time)
5	ELIA	1	Adverb of time
6	INDIGO	1	adverb
7	JALIL	1	adverb
8	KAMIL	0	Time expression
9	LIGHT	0	Time expression: noun
10	BEY	1	adverb
11	MERT	1	adverb
12	SALIMA	1	adverb
13	SIERRA	0	Time
14	SUZANNE	1	Temporal adverb
15	TALAT	1	adverb

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
16	VIVI	1	adverb
17	WALI	1	adverb
AVERAGE		76.5%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

Table A52.1

Yesterday

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES
1	HUSTIN	0	time
2	AL	0	Past tense
3	FARIS	1	adverb
4	BROW	0	time
5	JESUS	1	Adverb (when)
6	SYMRNA	0	No answer
AVERAGE		33.3%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

TOTAL: 8 zeros

Table A52.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	76.5%
NTBL average	33.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	65.2%

Table A52.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	4	23.5%
NTBL	4	66.7%
Total	8	34.8%

Sentence 10: Jogging right after a meal is not recommended.

Table A53

Jogging

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	gerund
2	SAM	0.5	noun
3	FIRAZ	1	Verbal noun
4	OSAMA	1	Verb →gerund
5	ELIA	1	Noun- gerund
6	INDIGO	0	verb
7	JALIL	1	gerund
8	KAMIL	1	gerund
9	LIGHT	1	gerund
10	BEY	1	Verbal noun
11	MERT	1	Gerund/noun
12	SALIMA	0	verb
13	SIERRA	0.5	noun
14	SUZANNE	1	Nominal form of verb / gerund
15	TALAT	1	Gerund/noun
16	VIVI	1	Subject/gerund/noun
17	WALI	0.5	noun

NO PARTICIPANT MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
	79.4%

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 2 zeros

Table A53.1

Jogging

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0.5	Noun - subject
2	AL	1	Gerund/verbal noun
3	FARIS	0	verb
4	BROW	1	Gerund as a subject
5	JESUS	1	Noun (gerund)
6	SYMRNA	0.5	noun
		66.6%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 1 zero

TOTAL: 3 zeros

Table A53.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	79.4%
-------------	-------

NTBL average	66.6%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	76.1%

Table A53.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	2	11.8
NTBL	1	16.7
Total	3	13%

Task 11: What is the difference between a **phrase** and a **clause**?

Table A54

Phrase vs Clause

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.75	Phrase is a word or a group words which has a meaningful form. e.g., Thanks ; an art gallery. Clause is a group of words which has a subject & a verb, but it is not a full sentence; it is a kind of dependent one. E.g., When he saw me
2	SAM	1	A clause is a sentence or part of a sentence that has a verb conjugated with a subject. A phrase does not. Clause: Because he was happy, Phrase: Because of his happiness,.....
3	FIRAZ	0.75	A phrase doesn't have an independent subject but a clause has its own subject.
4	OSAMA	1	If there is a subject and a verb with a predicate, it is a clause. If there is a noun but no verb or a verb but no noun and does not have a predicate, it is a phrase.
5	ELIA	1	Phrase : doesn't contain a subject and a verb clause : contains a subject and a predicate

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
6	INDIGO	0.75	A phrase is a collection of words that may have some noun or verb but it does not have a subject. A clause is a collection of words that has a verb and a subject.
7	JALIL	0.25	A phrase is a group of words which do not convey a complete thought. A clause is a group of words which convey a complete thought.
8	KAMIL	0.25	Phrase: A group of words that has only a subject or a predicate, but not the two Clause: a group of related words that has both a subject and a predicate (verb).
9	LIGHT	0	No answer.
10	BEY	1	A phrase is a group of words in a sentence and a clause contains a subject and a verb.
11	MERT	0	A phrase consists of a subject and a verb; a clause doesn't.
12	SALIMA	0	No answer
13	SIERRA	0	A phrase is a compound noun. A clause is an incomplete sentence.
14	SUZANNE	1	A clause would be a verb + its arguments, whereas a phrase is a more general notion. Or, one could limit phrase (a noun + any determiners, modifiers), verb phrase (verb + any complements, modifiers). Beyond NPs and VPs, though, there is a general connotation of phrase, i.e., any short interval of speech.
15	TALAT	1	Normally, a phrase does not have a verb, but a clause has a verb. Hence a sentence is usually called a clause.
16	VIVI	1	1-SV = clause; can be dependent or independent 2- phrase = may have a subject or a verbal but not both; is an incomplete utterance= a sentence (never).
17	WALI	0.25	A phrase is an incomplete sentence. A clause is a complete sentence.
AVERAGE		58.8%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

Table A54.1

Phrase vs Clause

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	A phrase can contain clauses.
2	AL	0	A phrase is a saying or collection of words or statement. A clause is a part of speech dependant on prior or pre statement/sentence

3	FARIS	0	A clause provides further description to the sentence.
4	BROW	1	A clause can be an independent sentence; a phrase cannot.
5	JESUS	1	A clause has a subject and a verb.
6	SYMRNA	0	A phrase is a complete sentence on its own while a clause is part of a sentence.
AVERAGE		33.3%	

Teachers not Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

TOTAL: 8 Zeros

Table A54.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	58.8%
NTBL average	33.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	52.2%

Table A54.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	4	23.5%
NTBL	4	66.7%
Total	8	34.8%

Task 7: Procedural Grammar

1.

- a. I am **swimming**.
- b. **Swimming** is good for you.

How do the two words (**swimming**) in **a** and **b** vary in terms of their grammatical function?

2. **What made the landing difficult** was severe weather conditions.

Please comment on the grammatical function of “**What made the landing difficult**” in the sentence.

3. A student in your class is having trouble with (**'s: apostrophe s**). He thinks that (**'s**) in the following sentence represents **has**. (The sentence is not meaningful.)

Ali's a car.

How would you help this student? Explain to the student when **'s** can represent **has, is**, and when it can refer to a **possessive** form.

4. I wish I **had** a car.

Your students think that the verb **had** in the sentence refers to some action completed in the past. How would you tackle this problem? Provide a thorough explanation for the students.

5. I cannot accept **what you have done**.

Please comment on the grammatical function of “**what you have**”

4.8. Procedural Grammar

Task 1 a- I am swimming b- Swimming is good for you.

How do the two words (swimming) in a and b vary in terms of their grammatical function?

Table A55

Present participle: verb or gerund

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	a- Present Progressive Tense –to talk about an action happening now b- Gerund functioning as a subject of the sentence
2	SAM	1	In a) swimming offers part of the present progressive tense. In b), it is a gerund that serves as a noun like tennis, basketball. etc.
3	FIRAZ	1	a- I am swimming VERB b- Swimming is good for you. SUBJECT OF THE SENTENCE: VERBAL NOUN
4	OSAMA	0.75	The first one is a present continuous (participle) verb and the other one is a gerund type verb.
5	ELIA	1	a- action verb b- gerund
6	INDIGO	0	A shows an action currently taking place. B shows a general action good for you.
7	JALIL	1	a- I am swimming verb b- Swimming is good for you. gerund
8	KAMIL	1	a- I am swimming main verb b- Swimming is good for you. gerund (subject)
9	LIGHT	1	a- I am swimming (verb) b- Swimming is good for you (gerund: functions as a noun.)
10	BEY	0.25	a- I am swimming = gerund b- Swimming is good for you. = verbal noun
11	MERT	1	a- I am swimming = verb action b- Swimming is good for you. Gerund used as subject
12	SALIMA	0.75	a- I am swimming Verb b- Swimming is good for you. Noun
13	SIERRA	1	a- I am swimming Present Progressive b- Swimming is good for you. Noun - gerund
14	SUZANNE	1	a- I am swimming (present continuous form of the verb swim; part of the predicate.) b- Swimming is good for you. (nominalized form of the verb-sentential subject)
15	TALAT	1	In the first sentence, 'swimming' is a main verb used in the present continuous. In the second sentence, 'swimming' is used as a gerund, which is the nominal form of the verb created by adding '-ing'.
16	VIVI	1	a- I am swimming main verb b- Swimming is good for you. Gerund = noun = subject or object
17	WALI	1	In a) swimming is a verb plus –ing which refers to the Present Continuous Tense. While in b) swimming is a noun, gerund.
	AVERAGE	86.8%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 1 zero**Table A55.1****Present participle: verb or gerund.****Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual**

1	HUSTIN	1	a- I am swimming verb b- Swimming is good for you. noun - subject
2	AL	1	a- Is an action verb currently being used. b- Is a verbal noun, which becomes like a noun.
3	FARIS	1	a- I am swimming. verb b- Swimming is good for you. gerund
4	BROW	1	Swimming → continuous; swimming is a gerund as a noun in the second sentence.
5	JESUS	1	Swimming is the present continuous form of the verb in A. Swimming is a gerund and is the subject of the sentence in B. It functions as a noun and not a verb.
6	SYMRNA	0.75	a- I am swimming Present continuous verb b- Swimming is good for you. noun (activity)
AVERAGE		95.8%	

Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual No zeros**TOTAL: 1 zero only****Table A55.2****Averages****TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages**

TBL average	86.8%
NTBL average	95.8%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	89.1%

Table A55.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	1	5.9%
NTBL	0	0%
Total	1	4.3%

Task 2 What made the landing difficult was severe weather conditions.

Please comment on the grammatical function of “What made the landing difficult” in the sentence.

Table A56

Noun clause as the subject of the sentence

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	Noun Clause which functions as the subject.
2	SAM	0.75	What made landing difficult here is used as a subject.
3	FIRAZ	0.75	It is the subject.
4	OSAMA	1	This is a complex sentence with a noun clause acting as the subject in the sentence.
5	ELIA	1	Noun clause (subject)
6	INDIGO	0	This is just stating a past problem. Later on an explanation is given as to the reason for the problem.
7	JALIL	0.75	This is the subject of the sentence.
8	KAMIL	0.75	The whole phrase is a subject. It can be referred to by “it”.
9	LIGHT	0	What made the landing difficult → Predicate (contains the verb) was severe weather conditions. → Contains the subject
10	BEY	0	What made the landing difficult' is the part of the passive. Passive is used here rather than active (The weather conditions made the landing difficult) because the writer wished to place the emphasis on the 'landing' rather than 'weather'.
11	MERT	1	A noun clause used as the subject in the sentence.
12	SALIMA	0	No answer.
13	SIERRA	0	No answer.
14	SUZANNE	0.75	Phrasal sentential subject

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
15	TALAT	0.75	In this sentence, the clause in bold is used as a subordinate clause, and it is the subject for the sentence.
16	VIVI	0.75	Subject
17	WALI	0.75	What made the landing difficult functions as a subject and it could be replaced by the pronoun it.
AVERAGE		58.8%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 5 zeros

Table A56.1

Noun clause as the subject of the sentence

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	“What made” is replacing “The reason for”
2	AL	0.25	Describing the situation that took place using a verbal noun.
3	FARIS	0	No answer.
4	BROW	0.75	What made the landing difficult → subject.
5	JESUS	0	This form is used for emphasis. It highlights this part of the sentence and makes it very strong.
6	SYMRNA	0	No answer.
AVERAGE		16.7%	

Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual: 5 zeros

TOTAL: 10 zeros only

Table A56.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	58.8%
NTBL average	16.7%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	47.8%

Table A56.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	5	29.4%
NTBL	5	83.3%
Total	10	43.5%

Task 3 A student in your class is having trouble with ('s: **apostrophe s**). He thinks that ('s) in the following sentence represents **has**. (The sentence is not meaningful.)

Ali's a car.

How would you help this student? Explain to the student when 's can represent **has**, **is**, and when it can refer to a **possessive** form.

Table A57

Varying functions of apostrophe s ('s).

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	0.75	I 'd say here there must be a verb, so this must be has. If it is so, we cannot use a contraction .It should be 'Ali has a car 'or Ali 's got a car.' I'd also give this as an example: Ali's a good boy. Similarly, here again is is the main verb. It must be the main verb as there is none other than this. As for the possessive - s- ,as in the example, ' Ali's car is big ' we have the verb be that is 'is' & apostrophe s indicates that the car belongs to Ali. Usually apostrophe s is followed by a noun but there are exceptions to the rule as well. e.g., I went to the butcher's. Here there is a hidden' shop' in parenthesis.

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
13	SIERRA	0	Explain by using it in a full sentence where it has S + V
14	SUZANNE	0	Perhaps, for has (have) and is, get the student to think in terms of the uncontracted forms and underscore the meanings – one sensical, the other non-sensical: Ali has a car. Ali is a car. For the possessive form, relate it to the possessive pronoun "his" and underscore that the form with an apostrophe is not in this case a contraction. Al's car It is car.
15	TALAT	1	The apostrophe s usually refers to 'has' when the verb 'has' is used as an auxiliary verb; i.e., a main verb should come after the apostrophe s and that verb should be suffixed with 'ed' if regular or should have the third form of the verb (past participle) if irregular (e.g., He's finished, she's done her homework). The apostrophe s usually refers to 'is' if it is not followed by a main verb; i.e., the verb 'is' in this case is the main verb itself. In this case, it is usually followed by either an adjective (as in He's good) or a determiner phrase DP (i.e., a noun phrase that has a determiner as in 'He's a teacher'). The apostrophe s usually refers to the possessive form if it is followed by a noun or a noun phrase but not a determiner phrase DP. There must not be any determiner (e.g., article) after the apostrophe s in this case. For instance, it is incorrect to say 'Steven's a car' but 'Steven's car', as the first sentence 'Steven's a car' would be meaningless as Steven cannot be a car'.
16	VIVI	0.25	He's been to China He's there now. Ali has a car. Ali's car is blue. In American English, has can only be a contraction with a pronoun, but not with a proper noun.
17	WALI	0.25	a- He's a student. b- He's a nice car. c- I liked his brother's car. In sentence (c), the ('s) refers to the possessive form which most of the time comes between two nouns, (brother + 's + car) while ('s) which refers to is or has can be understood or they depend on the context.
AVERAGE		42.6%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 5 zeros

Table A57.1

Varying functions of apostrophe s ('s).

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	Don't use 's for has. Lots of examples and situations for 's. Best to use the relevant chapter of the books.
2	AL	0	I would tell the student of ownership vs. possessive.
3	FARIS	0	Ali's car. Car belongs to Ali
4	BROW	0.25	"Has" needs a verb; not stand-alone verb. Has fallen/has received
5	JESUS	0.25	You need to explain to the student when 's can be used and when it can't. He has studied English for many years. He's studied English for many years. This is okay. In the above sentence (Ali's a car), it can't be used to mean <i>has</i> and it would imply that Ali is a car which is nonsensical. Understanding when you can use and when you can't is essential for creating appropriate meanings.
6	SYMRNA	0.25	Possessive form is always followed by an object (noun).
	AVERAGE	12.5%	

Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual 3 zeros

Total: 8 zeros

Table A57.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	42.6%
NTBL average	12.5%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	34.8%

Table A57.3**Zero averages**

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	5	29.4%
NTBL	3	50%
Total	8	33.3%

Task 4 I wish I **had** a car.

Your students think that the verb **had** in the sentence refers to some action completed in the past. How would you tackle this problem? Provide a thorough explanation for the students.

Table A58**Use of past form of a verb to talk about the present.****Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers**

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	It is a good idea to teach this just after you have gone through the second conditional, so you could say that just like in the second conditional, verb 2 doesn't refer to the past, rather it shows that the possibility is weak. Here - me having a car is something unlikely to happen as -let's say -I am just a student & cannot afford a car at the moment.
2	SAM	0.25	<p>If the student is an Arabic speaker, a good choice would be to give him/her an example from a similar structure in Arabic:</p> <p>wadedtu lao kana endi I wish if had with me</p> <p>It is always a good idea to explain to the student that in this structure you use the past after "I wish" because you are speaking about something that you want very much, so much that you think of it as if you already had it.</p>

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
3	FIRAZ	1	The past form of verbs do not always represent completed actions in the past. Just like in if-clauses, they may refer to hypothetical (unreal) scenarios.
4	OSAMA	0.25	The phrase "I wish I had "is used to express that I would like to have something that I do not have. I wish I had a car means I would like to have a car but I do not currently have. I don't have a car, but I would like to have it. = I wish I had a car. In the phrase, (I wish I had) 'had' is the past simple form of the verb 'to have' but is used to indicate possession (wishing to possess a car).
5	ELIA	1	In this sentence "wish" is used to talk about something you don't have. It is actually a verb that replaces the word "if" in a second conditional sentence. (if + past simple , would + past participle)
6	INDIGO	0	A wish is for the present and future tense.
7	JALIL	0.25	When we use had after the verb wish, it refers to a hypothetical or imaginary situation.
8	KAMIL	0.25	Expresses regret about something we did do or didn't but we wish we had or hadn't done.
9	LIGHT	0.25	I would explain that had indicates possession in this sentence. We use had not because it has anything to do with the past. Simply, it expresses desire.
10	BEY	0.75	I honestly don't know how I would go about explaining this. I would simply tell the students that we use wish + past tense to express a wish for things to be different in the present. I predict that the students would probably ask why we simply don't say "I wish I have a car" because that would probably make more sense to them. I am not sure how I would explain this. I guess this is one of those situations where you say "this is simply the way it is."
11	MERT	0.25	In the unreal wish clause, if the verb "wish" is in the present tense, the meaning is also present. "Had" is used as the subjunctive, which implies that the wish is unreal/not possible at the moment.
12	SALIMA	0	No answer.
13	SIERRA	0	Explain that in context or conversation.
14	SUZANNE	0	All I can think of is to align this use of the verb to have with other verbs and phrases one can use in English to mean possess. Guessing that these are beginners or low intermediate, I would illustrate/accompany the explanation with enactments. E.g. I have a pen possess own You have a pen possess own

NO PARTICIPANT MARK			PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
			This is my pen. It is mine
			This is your book. It is yours
15	TALAT	1	The verb 'had' here is used in the unreal past; i.e., it is not referring to the past, but rather to the present. This is the case after the verb 'wish', which means that the speaker of writer of the sentence does not have a car at the moment. The same applies, for example, to a sentence like 'If I were you'. 'Were' in this case does not refer to the past but to the present. If the reference is made to the past, then the past perfect has to be used (e.g., I wish I had had a car OR If I had been you,)
16	VIVI	1	wish = conditional, unreal/untrue in the present or future. I would teach all forms of conditional, which includes wish. All forms: 0 1 2 3 2 = If I were you; I wish I had.
17	WALI	0.75	I wish I had a car. The verb had is in the past but it refers to now, present time. We used the verb in the past because the wish is impossible in the present time.
AVERAGE		47.1%	

Teachers Truly Bilingual: 4 zeros

Table A58.1

Use of past form of a verb to talk about the present.

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	Here it means possession. The past tense of "have", i.e., to "own".
2	AL	0	Again it would be about ownership/possessing a vehicle.
3	FARIS	0	By telling them it is a possessive verb.
4	BROW	0.25	Conditional sentence (imaginary, hypothetical)
5	JESUS	1	I would go through the three types of conditional sentences and link them with this sentence which is ultimately a type of conditional sentence-If I had a car

6	SYMRNA	0.75	When there is an unreal situation or conditional, the verb is usually in the past.
AVERAGE		33.3%	

Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual 3 zeros

TOTAL: 7 zeros

Table A58.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	47.1%
NTBL average	33.3%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	43.5%

Table A58.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	4	23.5%
NTBL	3	50%
Total	7	30.4%

Task 5 **I cannot accept what you have done.**

Please comment on the grammatical function of “*what you have done*” in the sentence.

Table A59

Noun clause as the object of the sentence

Responses by Truly Bilingual Teachers

NO	PARTICIPANT	MARK	PARTICIPANT'S RESPONSE
1	NUR	1	It is a noun clause & it is the object of the sentence. What an't s/ he accept? What you have done. In other words, what you have done is unacceptable.
2	SAM	0.75	Here what you have done serves as the object of the sentence.
3	FIRAZ	0.75	It is an object phrase that is the complement of "accept".
4	OSAMA	1	This is similar to no.2 in that it is a complex sentence where the noun clause "what you have done" is serving as the object of the verb accept.
5	ELIA	0.25	Object noun phrase (?) because it answers the question (what?)
6	INDIGO	0	This shows a recent action in the past.
7	JALIL	0.75	What you have done is the direct object of the sentence.
8	KAMIL	0.25	Phrase functions as an object.
9	LIGHT	0	What you have done almost seems to appear to have a secondary subject and verb, though it cannot exist without being attached to "I cannot accept". It indicates that the listener has committed a distasteful act.
10	BEY	0	I really don't know how I would go about explaining that.
11	MERT	1	"What you have done" is a noun clause used in the object position in the sentence.
12	SALIMA	0	No answer.
13	SIERRA	0	I think it sounds OK in this form as it is written in this form.
14	SUZANNE	0.25	Phrasal sentential object.
15	TALAT	0.75	This is a subordinate clause used as the object of the sentence.
16	VIVI	0.75	This is a noun clause.
17	WALI	0.75	What you have done is an object. It can be replaced by the pronoun it.
AVERAGE		48.5%	

Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual: 5 zeros

Table A59.1

Noun clause as the object of the sentence

Responses by Teachers NOT Truly Bilingual

1	HUSTIN	0	“The things that you have done” – the things you did before and still are of relevance to our conversation now.
2	AL	0	The function here is to state about an incident that took place in the past by a second person.
3	FARIS	0	This refers to the result.
4	BROW	0.75	Noun (object).
5	JESUS	0	‘What you have done’ is unnamed and it creates a feeling of emphasis by not naming what the person has done.
6	SYMRNA	0	Prepositional phrase.
AVERAGE		12.5%	

5 zeros

TOTAL: 10 zeros

Table A59.2

Averages

TBL (Truly Bilingual) and NTBL (Not Truly Bilingual) averages

TBL average	48.5%
NTBL average	12.5%
AVERAGE FOR ALL (TBL+NTBL)	39.1%

Table A59.3

Zero averages

	Number of zeros	Zero average
TBL	5	29.4%

NTBL	5	83.3%
Total	10	43.5%

Appendix B

Table B1

Individual Task Scores for Error Correction

Participant	TASK																				Sum	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
1 Suzanne	0.25	0.75	1	1	1	1	1	0.75	1	0.25	0.25	1	1	1	1	0.75	0.75	1	1	1	16.75	84%
2 Vivi	0.75	1	1	1	1	0.25	1	0	1	1	0.75	0	0.75	0	1	0.25	1	1	1	1	14.75	74%
3 Light	0.25	0.25	0.75	1	0	0.25	1	1	0	0	0.25	0	1	0	0.75	0.75	0.25	1	0.75	1	10.25	51%
4 Bey	0.75	1	0.75	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.75	0.25	0.25	0	0	1	6.75	34%
5 Hustin	0.75	0.75	0.25	1	0	1	1	0.75	0	1	0.25	0.75	0.25	0	0	0.75	1	1	0.25	1	11.75	59%
6 Al	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	2.5	13%
7 Faris	0.25	0	0	0.25	0	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0	0	0.25	0	0	0.25	0	1.75	9%
8 Brow	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0.25	0	1	0.25	1	0	0.75	0.25	5.25	26%
9 Jesus	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	16	80%
10 Smyrna	0	0	0.25	0.75	0.25	0	1	0	0	1	1	0.25	0	0	0.25	0	0	0.75	1	0	6.5	33%
11 Firaz	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.75	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0.75	0.75	1	0.25	1	14.5	73%
12 Osama	0.25	1	0.75	0	0.25	0	1	0	1	1	0.75	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0.25	0	9.25	46%
13 Elia	0.25	0.25	0	1	0	0.25	1	0	0	1	0.25	0	0.25	0	0	0.25	0	0	1	1	6.5	33%
14 Indigo	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	0.25	0.25	0.25	0	0	0	2.25	11%
15 Jalil	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0.75	0	0	0.25	0.75	1	0	1	0.75	1	0	1	1	13.5	68%
16 Kamil	1	1	1	1	0.25	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0.75	1	1	1	1	14	70%
17 Nur	1	1	0	1	0	0.25	1	0	1	0	0.25	0.75	0.25	0	0.25	0.25	0	0.75	0.75	1	9.5	48%
18 Mert	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.75	1	1	0.75	1	1	16.5	83%
19 Salima	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.25	0	0	1	3.25	16%
20 Sam	0.25	0.75	1	1	0.25	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0.75	1	0.75	1	1	16.75	84%
21 Sierra	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0.25	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0	2.25	11%
22 Talat	0	1	0	1	0.25	0.25	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	7.5	38%
23 Wali	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	1	0.75	0.75	0.25	0	0.25	0	7.25	36%
AVERAGE	49%	67%	34%	70%	18%	37%	87%	30%	30%	33%	52%	33%	53%	22%	55%	43%	57%	43%	60%	62%	9.4	47%

Table B2**Individual Task Scores for Grammar**

PARTICIPANT	TASK					SUM	AVERAGE
	1	2	3	4	5		
1 Suzanne	0	1	0.25	1	0	2.25	45
2 Vivi	0	0.75	0	1	0.75	2.5	50
3 Light	0	0.25	0.25	0	0	0.5	10
4 Bey	0	0.25	0	1	0	1.25	25
5 Hustin	1	0.25	1	0.75	0	3	60
6 Al	0	0.25	0	0	0	0.25	5
7 Faris	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8 Brow	0.75	0.25	0	1	0	2	40
9 Jesus	0	1	1	0	0	2	40
10 Smyrna	0	0.25	0	0	0	0.25	5
11 Firaz	0	0.75	0.75	1	0	2.5	50
12 Osama	1	0.25	0.25	1	1	3.5	70
13 Elia	0	0.25	0.25	0	0	0.5	10
14 Indigo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15 Jalil	0	0.25	0	0	0.25	0.5	10
16 Kamil	0.75	0.75	1	1	0	3.5	70
17 Nur	1	0.25	0.25	0	0.75	2.25	45
18 Mert	0	0.75	1	1	1	3.75	75
19 Salima	0	0.25	1	0	0	1.25	25
20 Sam	0.25	0.75	0.75	1	1	3.75	75
21 Sierra	0	0.25	0.25	1	0	1.5	30
22 Talat	0	1	1	1	1	4	80
23 Wali	0	0	1	1	0.75	2.75	55
AVERAGE	21%	42%	43%	55%	28%	1.9	38%

Table B3**Individual Task Scores for Phonology**

Participant	TASK							SUM	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
1 Suzanne	1	1	0.75	1	1	1	1	6.75	96%
2 Vivi	1	0	0.75	1	1	1	0.25	5	71%
3 Light	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	14%
4 Bey	0	0	0.25	0	1	0	0.25	1.5	21%
5 Hustin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
6 Al	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
7 Faris	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
8 Brow	0	0.25	1	0	0	0	0.25	1.5	21%
9 Jesus	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	29%
10 Smyrna	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	0	0.75	11%
11 Firaz	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	57%
12 Osama	0	0	0.25	0.75	1	0	1	3	43%
13 Elia	0.75	0	0.25	0	0.25	1	1	3.25	46%
14 Indigo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
15 Jalil	0.75	0.25	1	0	1	1	1	5	71%
16 Kamil	1	0	0.25	0	1	1	1	4.25	61%
17 Nur	0.25	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0.5	7%
18 Mert	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	14%
19 Salima	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
20 Sam	1	0.75	1	0	1	1	1	5.75	82%
21 Sierra	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.25	0.25	4%
22 Talat	1	0.75	0.25	1	1	1	1	6	86%
23 Wali	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	29%
AVERAGE	34%	16%	25%	16%	40%	43%	58%	2.3	33%

Table B4

Task Scores for Syntax

Participant	TASK						SUM	AVERAGE
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
1 Suzanne	1	1	0	0.75	0.75	0.25	3.75	63%
2 Vivi	1	1	0.75	0	1	1	4.75	79%
3 Light	0.25	0.75	0	0.25	0.25	1	2.5	42%
4 Bey	1	0.75	1	0.75	1	1	5.5	92%
5 Hustin	0.25	0.75	0	0.25	0	0.25	1.5	25%
6 Al	0.25	0.25	0	0.25	0	0	0.75	13%
7 Faris	0.25	0	0	0.75	0	0	1	17%
8 Brow	0.25	1	0	0.25	0.75	0.75	3	50%
9 Jesus	1	0.75	0	0.75	0	1	3.5	58%
10 Smyrna	0.25	0.75	0.75	0	0.25	0.25	2.25	38%
11 Firaz	1	1	1	0.25	1	0.75	5	83%
12 Osama	0	0	1	0	0	0.75	1.75	29%
13 Elia	0.25	1	0	0.25	0	0	1.5	25%
14 Indigo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
15 Jalil	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	33%
16 Kamil	1	1	0.75	0	1	1	4.75	79%
17 Nur	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	50%
18 Mert	1	1	1	0.75	1	1	5.75	96%
19 Salima	1	0.75	0	0	1	0	2.75	46%
20 Sam	0.25	0.75	0	0.25	1	0.75	3	50%
21 Sierra	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
22 Talat	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	100%
23 Wali	0.75	0.75	0	0	1	0.75	3.25	54%
Average	55%	66%	32%	28%	52%	59%	2.9	49%

Table B5

Individual Task Scores for Morphology

Participant	TASK					SUM	AVERAGE
	1	2	3	4	5		
1 Suzanne	0	1	0	1	1	3	60%
2 Vivi	0	1	0	1	1	3	60%
3 Light	0	0	0	1	1	2	40%
4 Bey	0	0.66	0	0.75	1	2.41	48%
5 Hustin	0	0	0	0	1	1	20%
6 Al	0	0	0	0	0.25	0.25	5%
7 Faris	0	0	0	0	1	1	20%
8 Brow	0	0.33	0	0.25	0	0.58	12%
9 Jesus	0	1	0	1	1	3	60%
10 Smyrna	0	0	0	0.75	1	1.75	35%
11 Firaz	1	1	0.25	1	1	4.25	85%
12 Osama	0.75	0.66	0	0.75	1	3.16	63%
13 Elia	0	0.66	0	1	0	1.66	33%
14 Indigo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
15 Jalil	0.25	1	0	1	1	3.25	65%
16 Kamil	0	1	0	0.75	1	2.75	55%
17 Nur	0.75	0.66	0	1	1	3.41	68%
18 Mert	0	0	0	0	1	1	20%
19 Salima	0	0.33	0	0	0.75	1.08	22%
20 Sam	0.25	1	0	0.75	1	3	60%
21 Sierra	0	1	0	0.75	1	2.75	55%
22 Talat	0.25	1	0.25	1	1	3.5	70%
23 Wali	1	0	0	1	1	3	60%
AVERAGE	18%	53%	2%	64%	83%	2.2	44%

Table B6

Individual Task Scores for Parts of Speech

Participant	TASK											SUM	Average
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		
1 Suzanne	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	10	91%
2 Vivi	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	10	91%
3 Light	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0.5	0	1	0	5.5	50%
4 Bey	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	9.5	86%
5 Hustin	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	5.5	50%
6 Al	0	0.5	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	1	0	3	27%
7 Faris	0	0.5	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	0	0	5	45%
8 Brow	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	8	73%
9 Jesus	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	1	1	6.5	59%
10 Smyrna	0	0.5	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0.5	0	4	36%
11 Firaz	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.75	9.75	89%
12 Osama	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	9	82%
13 Elia	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	7	64%
14 Indigo	1	0.5	1	0	1	0	1	0.5	1	0	0.75	6.75	61%
15 Jalil	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.25	9.25	84%
16 Kamil	0	1	0.5	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0.25	5.75	52%
17 Nur	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.75	10.25	93%
18 Mert	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	9.5	86%
19 Salima	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	0	0	5.5	50%
20 Sam	1	0.5	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.5	1	6	55%
21 Sierra	0	0.5	1	0	1	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	3.5	32%
22 Talat	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	10	91%
23 Wali	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0.5	0.25	7.75	70%
AVERAGE	43%	70%	96%	78%	96%	39%	39%	72%	65%	76%	52%	7	66%

Table B7

Individual Task Scores for Procedural Grammar

PARTICIPANT	TASK					SUM	Average
	1	2	3	4	5		
1 Suzanne	1	0.75	0	0	0.25	2	40%
2 Vivi	1	0.75	0.25	1	0.75	3.75	75%
3 Light	1	0	0.75	0.25	0	2	40%
4 Bey	0.25	0	1	0.75	0	2	40%
5 Hustin	1	0	0	0	0	1	20%
6 Al	1	0.25	0	0	0	1.25	25%
7 Faris	1	0	0	0	0	1	20%
8 Brow	1	0.75	0.25	0.25	0.75	3	60%
9 Jesus	1	0	0.25	1	0	2.25	45%
10 Smyrna	0.75	0	0.25	0.75	0	1.75	35%
11 Firaz	1	0.75	0.75	1	0.75	4.25	85%
12 Osama	0.75	1	1	0.25	1	4	80%
13 Elia	1	1	0	1	0.25	3.25	65%
14 Indigo	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%
15 Jalil	1	0.75	0.25	0.25	0.75	3	60%
16 Kamil	1	0.75	0.25	0.25	0.25	2.5	50%
17 Nur	1	1	0.75	1	1	4.75	95%
18 Mert	1	1	0.25	0.25	1	3.5	70%
19 Salima	0.75	0	0	0	0	0.75	15%
20 Sam	1	0.75	0.75	0.25	0.75	3.5	70%
21 Sierra	1	0	0	0	0	1	20%
22 Talat	1	0.75	1	1	0.75	4.5	90%
23 Wali	1	0.75	0.25	0.75	0.75	3.5	70%
AVERAGE	90%	54%	46%	58%	58%	2.5	51%

Appendix C

Participants' Responses for Individual Teacher Categories

4.1.3 Abbreviation Codes

PART. = Participant

Error Corr. = Error Correction

Gr. = Grammar

Ph. = Phonology

Mor. = Morphology

Syn. = Syntax

PoS = Parts of Speech

Proc. Gram. = Procedural Grammar

% = Percentage

FM = Full Mark

All = All the participants

TBL = Truly Bilingual

NTBL = Not Truly Bilingual

N = Native English Speaker

NN = Non-Native English Speaker

The names in bold represent native English-speaking Participants.

Table C1*The Scores of all the Participants and their Averages Across the Tasks*

	PART.	Error Corr.	%	Gr.	%	Ph.	%	Syn.	%	Mor.	%	PoS	%	Proc. Gram	%	SUM	AVERAGE
	Full Mar	20		5		7		6		5		11		5		59	%
1	Suzanne	16.75	84%	2.3	46	6.75	96%	3.75	63%	3	60%	10	91%	2	40%	44.55	75
2	Vivi	14.75	74%	2.5	50	5	71%	4.75	79%	3	60%	10	91%	3.75	75%	43.75	74
3	Light	10.25	51%	0.5	10	1	14%	2.5	42%	2	40%	5.5	50%	2	40%	23.75	40
4	Bey	6.75	34%	1.3	26	1.5	21%	5.5	92%	2.41	48%	9.5	86%	2	40%	28.96	49
5	Hustin	11.75	59%	3	60	0	0%	1.5	25%	1	20%	5.5	50%	1	20%	23.75	49
6	Al	2.5	13%	0.3	6	0	0%	0.75	13%	0.25	5%	3	27%	1.25	25%	8.05	14
7	Faris	1.75	9%	0	0	0	0%	1	17%	1	20%	5	45%	1	20%	9.75	17
8	Brow	5.25	26%	2	40	1.5	21%	3	50%	0.58	12%	8	73%	3	60%	23.33	40
9	Jesus	16	80%	2	40	2	29%	3.5	58%	3	60%	6.5	59%	2.25	45%	35.25	60
10	Smyrna	6.5	33%	0.3	6	0.75	11%	2.25	38%	1.75	35%	4	36%	1.75	35%	17.3	29
11	Firaz	14.5	73%	2.5	50	4	57%	5	83%	4.25	85%	9.75	89%	4.25	85%	44.25	75
12	Osama	9.25	46%	3.5	70	3	43%	1.75	29%	3.16	63%	9	82%	4	80%	33.66	57
13	Elia	6.5	33%	0.5	10	3.25	46%	1.5	25%	1.66	33%	7	64%	3.25	65%	23.66	40
14	Indigo	2.25	11%	0	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6.75	61%	0	0%	9	14
15	Jalil	13.5	68%	0.5	10	5	71%	2	33%	3.25	65%	9.25	84%	3	60%	36.5	62
16	Kamil	14	70%	3.5	70	4.25	61%	4.75	79%	2.75	55%	5.75	52%	2.5	50%	37.5	64
17	Nur	9.5	48%	2.3	46	0.5	7%	3	50%	3.41	68%	10.25	93%	4.75	95%	33.71	57
18	Mert	16.5	83%	3.8	76	1	14%	5.75	96%	1	20%	9.5	86%	3.5	70%	41.05	69
19	Salima	3.25	16%	1.3	26	0	0%	2.75	46%	1.08	22%	5.5	50%	0.75	15%	14.63	25
20	Sam	16.75	84%	3.8	76	5.75	82%	3	50%	3	60%	6	55%	3.5	70%	41.8	71
21	Sierra	2.25	11%	1.5	15	0.25	4%	0	0%	2.75	55%	3.5	32%	1	20%	11.25	19
22	Talat	7.5	38%	4	80	6	86%	6	100%	3.5	70%	10	91%	4.5	90%	41.5	70
23	Wali	7.25	36%	2.8	56	2	29%	3.25	54%	3	60%	7.75	70%	3.5	70%	29.55	50
	AVERAGES	9.4	47%	1.9	38	2.3	33%	2.9	49%	2.2	44%	7.3	66%	2.5	51%	28.54	49

Table C2*The Scores of the Truly Bilingual Participants and their Averages Across the Task*

	PART.	Error Corr.	%	Gr.	%	Ph.	%	Syn	%	Mor.	%	PoS	%	Proc. Gra m	%	SUM	Average
	FULL MARK	20		5		7		6		5		11		5		59	%
1	Suzanne	16.75	84%	2.25	45%	6.75	96%	3.7 5	63%	3	60%	10	91%	2	40%	44.55	75%
2	Vivi	14.75	74%	2.5	50%	5	71%	4.7 5	79%	3	60%	10	91%	3.75	75%	43.75	74%
3	Light	10.25	51%	0.5	10%	1	14%	2.5	42%	2	40%	5.5	50%	2	40%	23.75	40%
4	Bey	6.75	34%	1.25	25%	1.5	21%	5.5	92%	2.41	48%	9.5	86%	2	40%	28.96	49%
5	Firaz	14.5	73%	2.5	50%	4	57%	5	83%	4.25	85%	9.75	89%	4.25	85%	44.25	75%
6	Osama	9.25	46%	3.5	70%	3	43%	1.7 5	29%	3.16	63%	9	82%	4	80%	33.66	57%
7	Elia	6.5	33%	0.5	10%	3.25	46%	1.5	25%	1.66	33%	7	64%	3.25	65%	23.66	40%
8	Indigo	2.25	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6.75	61%	0	0%	9	14%
9	Jalil	13.5	68%	0.5	10%	5	71%	2	33%	3.25	65%	9.25	84%	3	60%	36.5	62%
10	Kamil	14	70%	3.5	70%	4.25	61%	4.7 5	79%	2.75	55%	5.75	52%	2.5	50%	37.5	64%
11	Nur	9.5	48%	2.25	45%	0.5	7%	3	50%	3.41	68%	10.25	93%	4.75	95%	33.71	57%
12	Mert	16.5	83%	3.75	75%	1	14%	5.7 5	96%	1	20%	9.5	86%	3.5	70%	41.05	69%
13	Salima	3.25	16%	1.25	25%	0	0%	2.7 5	46%	1.08	22%	5.5	50%	0.75	15%	14.63	25%
14	Sam	16.75	84%	3.75	75%	5.75	82%	3	50%	3	60%	6	55%	3.5	70%	41.8	71%
15	Sierra	2.25	11%	1.5	30%	0.25	4%	0	0%	2.75	55%	3.5	32%	1	20%	11.25	19%
16	Talat	7.5	38%	4	80%	6	86%	6	100 %	3.5	70%	10	91%	4.5	90%	41.5	70%
17	Wali	7.25	36%	2.75	55%	2	29%	3.2 5	54%	3	60%	7.75	70%	3.5	70%	29.55	50%
	AVERAGES	10.1	50%	2.1	43 %	2.9	41%	3.3	54%	2.5	51%	7.9	72%	2.8	57%	31.7	54%

Table C3

*The Scores of the Participants **Not Truly Bilingual** and their Averages Across the Tasks*

PART.	Error Corr.	%	Gr.	%	Ph.	%	Syn.	%	Mor.	%	PoS	%	Proc. Gram	%	SUM	Average
	FM = 20		FM=5		FM = 7		FM = 6		FM = 5		FM =11		FM=5		FM=59	%
1 Hustin	11.75	59%	3	60%	0	0%	1.5	25%	1	20%	5.5	50%	1	20%	23.75	40%
2 Al	2.5	13%	0.3	6%	0	0%	0.75	13%	0.25	5%	3	27%	1.25	25%	8.05	14%
3 Faris	1.75	9%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	1	20%	5	45%	1	20%	9.75	17%
4 Brow	5.25	26%	2	40%	1.5	21%	3	0.5	0.58	12%	8	73%	3	60%	23.33	40%
5 Jesus	16	80%	2	40%	2	29%	3.5	58%	3	60%	6.5	59%	2.25	45%	35.25	60%
6 Smyrna	6.5	33%	0.3	6%	0.75	11%	2.25	38%	1.75	35%	4	36%	1.75	35%	17.3	29%
AVERAGE	7.3	36 %	1.3	25 %	0.7	10 %	2	33 %	1.3	25 %	5.3	48 %	1.7	34 %	19.6	33%

Table C4*The Scores of Native Speaking English Participants and Their Averages Across the Tasks*

PART.	Error Corr.	%	Gr.	%	Ph.	%	Syn.	%	Mor.	%	PoS	%	Proc. Gram	%	SUM	AVERAGE
Full Mark	20		5		7		6		5		11		5		59	
1 Suzanne	16.75	84%	2.3	46	6.75	96%	3.75	63%	3	60%	10	91%	2	40%	44.55	76%
2 Vivi	14.75	74%	2.5	50	5	71%	4.75	79%	3	60%	10	91%	3.75	75%	43.75	74%
3 Light	10.25	51%	0.5	10	1	14%	2.5	42%	2	40%	5.5	50%	2	40%	23.75	40%
4 Bey	6.75	34%	1.3	26	1.5	21%	5.5	92%	2.41	48%	9.5	86%	2	40%	28.96	49%
5 Hustin	11.75	59%	3	60	0	0%	1.5	25%	1	20%	5.5	50%	1	20%	23.75	40%
6 Al	2.5	13%	0.3	6	0	0%	0.75	13%	0.25	5%	3	27%	1.25	25%	8.05	14%
7 Faris	1.75	9%	0	0	0	0%	1	17%	1	20%	5	45%	1	20%	9.75	17%
8 Brow	5.25	26%	2	40	1.5	21%	3	50%	0.58	12%	8	73%	3	60%	23.33	40%
9 Jesus	16	80%	2	40	2	29%	3.5	58%	3	60%	6.5	59%	2.25	45%	35.25	60%
10 Smyrna	6.5	33%	0.3	6	0.75	11%	2.25	38%	1.75	35%	4	36%	1.75	35%	17.3	29%
AVERAGE	9.2	46%	1.4	28%	1.9	26%	2.9	48%	1.8	36%	6.7	61%	2	40%	25.8	44%

Table C5*The Scores of Non-Native Speaking English Participants and Their Averages Across the Tasks*

PART.	Error Corr.	%	Gr.	%	Ph.	%	Syn.	%	Mor.	%	PoS	%	Proc. Gram	%	SUM	AVERAGE	
FULL MARK	20		5		7		6		5		11		5		59	%	
1	Firaz	14.5	73%	2.5	50%	4	57%	5	83%	4.25	85%	9.75	89%	4.25	85%	44.25	75%
2	Osama	9.25	46%	3.5	70%	3	43%	1.75	29%	3.16	63%	9	82%	4	80%	33.66	57%
3	Elia	6.5	33%	0.5	10%	3.25	46%	1.5	25%	1.66	33%	7	64%	3.25	65%	23.66	40%
4	Indigo	2.25	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6.75	61%	0	0%	9	15%
5	Jalil	13.5	68%	0.5	10%	5	71%	2	33%	3.25	65%	9.25	84%	3	60%	36.5	62%
6	Kamil	14	70%	3.5	70%	4.25	61%	4.75	79%	2.75	55%	5.75	52%	2.5	50%	37.5	64%
7	Nur	9.5	48%	2.3	46%	0.5	7%	3	50%	3.41	68%	10.25	93%	4.75	95%	33.71	57%
8	Mert	16.5	83%	3.8	76%	1	14%	5.75	96%	1	20%	9.5	86%	3.5	70%	41.05	70%
9	Salima	3.25	16%	1.3	26%	0	0%	2.75	46%	1.08	22%	5.5	50%	0.75	15%	14.63	25%
10	Sam	16.75	84%	3.8	76%	5.75	82%	3	50%	3	60%	6	55%	3.5	70%	41.8	71%
11	Sierra	2.25	11%	1.5	15%	0.25	4%	0	0%	2.75	55%	3.5	32%	1	20%	11.25	19%
12	Talat	7.5	38%	4	80%	6	86%	6	100%	3.5	70%	10	91%	4.5	90%	41.5	70%
13	Wali	7.25	36%	2.8	56%	2	29%	3.25	54%	3	60%	7.75	70%	3.5	70%	29.55	50%
AVERAGE	9.5	47%	2.3	45%	2.7	38%	3	50%	2.5	50%	7.7	70%	3	59%	30.62	52%	