

Studies on adverb placement by L2 learners

Having such flexibility in their positions varying across languages, it is not surprising that extensive research (e.g.; Hernandez, 2006; Lightbown & Spada, 2000; Liu & Rhee, 2017) has been carried out among which the quest of L2 learners' behaviors of adverb use has got a great deal of attention.

Among this various research focusing on L2 adverb placement, Hernandez (2006) conducted a study with 20 graduate students and 12 experienced English teachers at the School of Modern Languages at the University of Costa Rica. She investigated whether the participants could determine the errors in adverb placement in faulty sentences and whether they were able to correct them sufficiently. In order to achieve this purpose, four native speakers evaluated the participants' sentences. The results yielded that most of the students were unable to identify the misplaced adverbs in the sentences. Furthermore, regarding the adverb positioning between the main verb and its direct object, a great number of students as well as some experienced English language teachers made mistakes, which reflects that these participants do not master this rule. In addition, she pointed out that the participants had difficulty in mastering the right use of adverbs when placing an adverb between a transitive verb and its object.

Liu and Rhee (2017) carried out a corpus-based study and examined the Korean and Chinese EFL learners' academic writings and their preferences for English adverb placement. For the comparison, the researchers made use of two corpora: Yonsei English Learner Corpus (YELC), with a number of 2999 instances of adverbs, and Chinese Learner English Corpus (CLEC), with a number of 3824 instances as well as Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays (LOCNESS) as the reference corpus, with 2364 instances. The results showed that native speakers of English tended to use the adverbs in sentence-initial position. Likewise, Korean learners preferred to place the adverbs at the initial position whereas their counterparts, Chinese learners, used adverbs in post-verbal position more frequently. They also stated that the more the target group of learners proficient are, the more they sound native-like. The researcher emphasized that the difference between these two non-native groups may be due to the word order of their mother tongue. They also concluded that there could be a direct L1 influence on the students' preferences of English adverb placement.

Lightbown and Spada (2000) also conducted research with French speakers aged 11-12, which was a follow-up research study that they had carried out before. They examined the effect of explicit L1 rules on their L2 performance on question formation and adverbs. To do that, the participants were asked to judge whether statements were grammatically acceptable or not. They were also expected to explain the rationale behind their judgments. The results of the follow-up study conformed to their previous study in the sense that students' performance on the use of adverbs displayed a vivid influence of L1 transfer.

One final study was carried out by Wu (2016) who examined the differences of the use regarding amplifier collocations. She investigated the data coming from three different corpora: a Chinese learner corpus, the *Spoken and Written English Corpus of Chinese Learners* (SWECCL 1.0 and 2.0), and two Native Speaker English corpora, the *British Academic Written English* (BAWE) corpus and the *Michigan Corpus of Upper-level Student Papers* (MICUSP). Her main aim was to analyze the different uses of adverb-verb/verb-adverb collocations. She found out that Chinese learners preferred Adv-V-O sequence more often compared to native speakers, implying the influence of L1 transfer.

The present study

Drawing on the existing research, as language teachers, it can be said that there is still a need to analyze the adverb placement by different learners from different language backgrounds, which might help to improve the instruction and language classes. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to find out a) whether the accuracy of adverb placement by the students varied with respect to the types of tasks that the participants carried out, b) whether the accuracy of adverb positioning varied with respect to the proficiency levels, and c) whether problematic structures in adverb placement differ regarding language proficiency. For this study, nine different adverbs were specified. The categories of the adverbs were manner, frequency and time. Table 1 displays the categories and the adverbs used in the study. As these adverbs were the most frequently used ones both in their course book (Speak Out series) and in their supplementary packs, these adverbs were chosen on purpose. Bearing these in mind, the following research questions were posed:

1. Is there any difference across proficiency levels in terms of adverb placement in the GJ task?
2. Is there any difference across proficiency levels in terms of adverb placement in the productive task?
3. What items are the most problematic in terms of adverb placement?
 - a. What items are the most problematic in terms of adverb placement at the elementary level?
 - b. What items are the most problematic in terms of adverb placement at the pre-intermediate level?
 - c. What items are the most problematic in terms of adverb placement at the intermediate level?

Methodology

Participants and Context

A group of 214 Turkish EFL learners volunteered to participate in the study. The 71 of the participants were elementary, 71 were pre-intermediate and 72 were intermediate level learners, all of whom were at tertiary level and studying at Anadolu University School of Foreign Languages (AUSFL) at the time of data collection (See Table 2). The reason for choosing elementary, pre-intermediate and intermediate level students was that the lower level students, particularly the beginner level learners, did not have enough competence and knowledge on the accurate placement of adverbs as they were not instructed on the adverb positions specifically. Therefore, it seems useless to explore the accuracy by these lower level language learners. The level of the participants was determined at the very beginning of the 2017-2018 Fall term with a proficiency test based on the Global Scale of English (GSE). GSE is a scale from 10 to 90, which pinpoints the four skills: speaking, listening, reading and writing as well as grammar and vocabulary, and can be regarded as an extension of Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). Elementary level refers to C, pre-intermediate level refers to B level on this scale, whereas intermediate level refers to A level at AUSFL context.

Instruments and Data Collection

In order to analyze the accuracy rate of adverb placement by the participants, two types of instruments were utilized. The first one was a production task, which includes a verb and an adverb with a colored picture prompt. The participants were

expected to generate their own sentences by using the words and the pictures given. The reason behind giving a verb and an adverb is to avoid the sentences without the target structure, in our case the adverbs. The pictures were also given to help them form a sentence with the words given (See Appendix A for the original task). The allocated time for the first task was twenty minutes. There were nine different adverbs including manner, frequency, and time adverbs, and all of the types of adverbs include three different adverbs (See Table 1). The second data tool, implemented right after the first task, was a grammaticality judgment test (GJT), in which the participants read sentences and chose whether they were syntactically accurate or not. Then the students were given another twenty minutes to do this task. If they thought a sentence was inaccurate, they were expected to write their reason below those sentences (See Appendix B for the original task). GJT consisted of 18 sentences including manner, time and frequency adverbs, and almost all test items were adapted from the book *Grammar in Use*, published by *Oxford University Press*. The same adverbs in the production task were used, but each adverb was given in two different sentences, one of which was accurate and the other included a misplaced adverb in the sentence.

Procedure and Data Analysis

The data gathered from the production task and the GJT were collected within the 13th week of the 2017-2018 Spring term. The participants were given twenty minutes to complete each task. All of the students took the tasks in their own classes under their class teachers' supervision. The papers were grouped according to the level of the participants. The production task was administered first and immediately followed by the GJT. Each paper was assigned a number, and the same numbers were given to the same students' GJT. In short, each number of the two tasks represented the same participant. The GJT answers were analyzed with the help of an answer key, which was prepared beforehand (See Appendix C). The number of correct choices of each student from each group was calculated. Finally, the data were first entered into Microsoft Excel to determine the averages of students and then Statistics Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to be able to obtain the frequencies of the correct uses and the accuracy across proficiency levels.

For the written production task, first of all, the writings of each student were analyzed in terms of the right adverb placement. In order to obtain better results, two experienced colleagues, working at the same institution followed the same procedure and examined all of the papers one by one. In order to set the standard among these two instructors, first of all, a norming session was organized, which took approximately one hour. The instructors and the researchers came together and looked into five different production tasks from each group. We analyzed the sentences in terms of accuracy by using color-codes. The instructors crosschecked their answers to see whether there was any mismatch. Later, each instructor analyzed each student's paper in two days and came together to check the final results for each student's paper. If there was any mismatch, the researchers negotiated and came up with a common consensus. While analyzing the data, first of all, the researchers examined whether the required adverbs in each paper were used accurately or not, and then the number of the accurate and the inaccurate uses of the adverbs were counted. The sentences lacking the given adverbs were counted as inaccurate. As a final step, the data gathered were entered into SPSS.

Results

This study investigated the placement of English adverbs by elementary, pre-intermediate and intermediate level Turkish EFL students through two instruments: a grammaticality judgment test (GJT) and a written production task.

The first research question seeks an answer for the accuracy rates of participants at different proficiency levels with regard to the GJT. One-way ANOVA was employed so as to identify the accuracy rates of the participants across varying proficiency levels (See Table 3 below). The students' accurate answers were calculated as the dependent variable whereas the proficiency level was determined as the affecting factor. The significance value was appointed as .05. The table below represents the results between the three groups. As can be seen in Table 3, it is obvious that there is no significant effect of proficiency on adverb placement at the $p < .05$ level for the three conditions [$F(2, 211) = 2.193, p = .114$].

For multiple comparisons, Tukey HSD was run (See Table 4). The results yielded a similar outcome. The significance rates of the intermediate group with the pre-intermediate and elementary levels were .73 and .09, respectively. The pre-intermediate and elementary groups had a ratio of .38. That is, although the results displayed a non-significant outcome, it can be said that the intermediate and elementary groups had the most significant difference in terms of accuracy.

As for the second research question, which inquired whether there was any difference across proficiency levels in terms of adverb placement in the productive task, one-way ANOVA was run once again. The accurate answers were specified as the dependent variable, and the proficiency level was assigned as the independent variable. The significance value was appointed as .05 again. Table 5 represents the results among the three groups. It is clear that there was no significant effect of proficiency on adverb placement at the $p < .05$ level for the three conditions [$F(2, 211) = 2.271, p = .106$].

Regarding the differences between groups, Tukey HSD was carried (See Table 6). The results displayed that the intermediate level had a significance value of .125 in comparison with the pre-intermediate group, and .207 with the elementary level. The difference between pre-intermediate and elementary level groups was .964 (See Table 6 below). The results displayed a non-significant difference among groups; however, it can be seen that, with regard to accuracy, the difference between the intermediate and the elementary groups in GJT was greater compared to the results gathered from the production task.

The final research question seeks the participants' use of the most problematic adverbs in terms of their positions in the sentences at different proficiency levels. In order to identify the troublesome adverb positioning, the average scores of participants in GJT were calculated and then entered into Microsoft Excel. In GJT each adverb was used twice, yet in one sentence the adverb was placed accurately, and in another, it was misplaced deliberately. In the following figures, the blue columns represent the item given accurately in the sentence, and the red columns show the misplaced adverbs. The label on each column reflects the students' right judgments. For example, in Figure 1, the correct sentence for *always* was identified by 60 students; namely, 12 students could not detect the accurate use of *always*. Parallel to this, for the detection of inaccurate use of *always*, 70 students were able to indicate that the sentence was troublesome, while the remaining two could not. Later the accurate scores in production task were analyzed separately. The figures below show the results per level.

Figure 1 below shows the GJT scores done by intermediate level students. The results yielded that the correct judgment of the inaccurate adverb placement overweighs the accurate ones when each adverb is analyzed closely. For example, except two students, all students were able to identify the problematic uses of *always* and *never*. Also, the majority of the students could determine the inaccuracy in the placement of *badly*. That is, it is obvious that the intermediate

level participants were able to identify ungrammatical adverb positioning than the grammatical uses of the adverbs, particularly *always*, *badly*, *never*, *quickly* and *last night*. Besides, these students had the most difficulty in the use of *quickly* and *last night*, respectively. Only 33 students were able to pinpoint the accurate use of *quickly*, and 38 were able to specify the ungrammatical placement. As for *last night*, although 60 students were able to diagnose the ungrammatical sentence, 40 students could identify the grammatical one (See Figure 1).

However, when their production scores were examined, all of the students used *never* and *quickly* accurately. Almost all students used *always*, *usually* and *recently* grammatically as well. However, the adverb *late* stood out as the most problematic adverb in terms of sentence positioning when they produced their own sentences (See Figure 2).

As for the pre-intermediate level, similar to the intermediate group, students were more successful at detecting the inaccurate uses of adverb placement than the accurate ones. Specifically, the pre-intermediate group noticed the inaccurate uses in the adverbs of *usually*, *never*, *quickly*, *badly*, *late* and *last night* when compared to their grammatical uses (See Figure 3). The same number of students identified both the grammatical and ungrammatical uses of *always*. The figure also represents that this group had the biggest difficulty in noting the grammatical uses of *badly* and *last night*. To be more specific, only 24 students could identify the accurate sentence involving *badly*, and 27 with *last night*.

Though the results of the receptive task show that pre-intermediate level students were not able to identify the accurate uses of adverbs *badly* and *last night*, in production task, 59 students were able to use the adverb *badly* and 56 used the adverb *last night* accurately, as is displayed in Figure 4. Nonetheless, the toughest item seems to be *late* in the production task, with an accuracy rate of 38. In addition, the vast majority was able to produce grammatical sentences by using the adverbs *always*, *usually*, *never*, *quickly*, *well* and *recently* (See Figure 4).

The results of the elementary group (See Figure 5) displayed a similar portrait in the use of adverbs in accurate and inaccurate sentences. The inaccurate uses were identified better than the accurate uses. To be more explicit, the ungrammatical versions of the adverbs *usually*, *never*, *badly*, *late*, *recently* and *last night* were noticed better than their grammatical uses. The highest score was seen in the detection of the misplaced adverb *usually*. Following this, the same number of students was able to determine both the grammatical and ungrammatical uses of *quickly*, with a number of 66 right judgments. However, the biggest problem in their judgments was in the case of *recently*, *usually* and *last night*, which were placed accurately in the sentences. Particularly, only 33 students determined the right use of *recently*, which is followed by *usually* with a number of 34 students, and *last night* with a number of 39 students.

Considering the production task of the elementary level (See Figure 6), it is apparent that almost all students were able to use the adverbs *always*, *usually*, *never*, *quickly*, *well*, *last night* and *recently* (from the most to the least accurate uses) in the correct position in their sentences. 57 students were able to use the adverb *badly* in a grammatical way. Yet, similar to the pre-intermediate group's production results, the most problematic item was the adverb *late*, with an accuracy rate of 35.

Discussions

This section aims at possible interpretations of the above results and the possible relationships between these results and second language acquisition. Thus, the

discussion will be done regarding the adverb types used in this study.

Manner Adverbs. When the GJTs of the students were analyzed, it can be said that for adverbs *well* and *badly* the students followed the same pattern. Namely, intermediate level students scored higher than pre-intermediate and elementary level students, respectively in their judgment of both accurate and inaccurate sentences. However, it should be noted that accurate sentence judgment of *badly* does not follow the previously mentioned pattern. On the contrary, *quickly* displayed a reverse pattern, in which judgments of both accurate and inaccurate sentences score the lowest in pre-intermediate level. That's why the production tasks of the learners were also examined. From the trajectory of proficiency, the analysis of the production task may support the place of Full Access/Full Transfer Hypothesis (White, 1991) in second language learning because our data suggest that when the proficiency level of the students increases, the number of inaccurate sentences decreases in an inverse proportion.

Time Adverbs. The analysis of time adverbs shows a similar alignment in the sense that while some of the adverbs display the effect of proficiency, the others do not. To be more specific, the adverb *recently* demonstrates that higher-level learners had more correct judgments for both accurate and inaccurate sentences. This pattern is also observed in the judgment of inaccurate sentences in *last night* and in the judgment of accurate sentences of *late*. However, it is not possible to detect the same figure for the judgment of accurate sentences in *last night* and inaccurate sentences of *late*. With regard to the production task scores of students, it is highly possible to associate the students' scores with Full Access/Full Transfer Hypothesis (White, 1991) as the higher the proficiency level, the more correct answers the students had.

Frequency Adverbs. Unlike manner and time adverbs, discussing the place of Full Access/Full Transfer Hypothesis (White, 1991) for frequency adverbs may be problematic since only the inaccurate sentences of *always*, accurate sentences of *usually* and inaccurate sentences of *never* show an increasing order across levels. However, neither the remaining GJT items nor the production part shows such a proficiency-based order. That is, it cannot be said that elementary level learners did worse than the others because there were fluctuations among the judgments of GJT. In addition, in the production task, all the groups displayed an almost equal number of correct sentences, most of whom produced grammatically correct sentences using frequency adverbs. The majority of learners successfully used these adverbs in either preverbal or postverbal positions depending on the verb and/or auxiliary verb in the sentence. The reason for this high accuracy may be the amount of exposure they had during the academic year. To be more specific, all levels used three books starting from elementary level to intermediate level, with an exception of elementary level, in which learners at this level studied only the first six units of the final course book. Even in this case, all three levels practiced the frequency adverbs recursively throughout the academic year.

Furthermore, in line with Hernandez's (2006) study, students had problems with the positioning of adverbs between the main verb and its direct object (DO). Supporting her point that the students in this study also may not master the relevant rule of adverb placement. It may also be discussed that at the earlier stages of L2 learning, the L1 transfer can be more observable as in the case of manner adverbs in this study. As Erguvanlı (1984, p. 141) states the typical position of manner adverbs in Turkish is just before the verb; however, this situation may change whether the verb is transitive and intransitive. In the case of intransitive verbs, the case markings may affect the position of adverb, and it can come between the verb and the DO. Thus, especially in the grammaticality

judgment of *quickly*, the analysis may show the effect of L1 in their judgments since the adverb comes between the verb and its DO, which is not possible in English but possible in Turkish.

As for the time adverbs, the most problematic use observed was related to *late*. The learners had difficulty in differentiating between adjective and adverb uses of *late* as most students used *late* with copula *be*; which may be again an effect of L1 because, in their study Çelik, Taşdemir and Ünlü (2017) show that Turkish textbooks use time adverbs in sentences in which only copula *be* is used. Therefore, as the learners were exposed to this kind of use in their L1, they may have transferred this use to their L2 production. The next point related to time adverbs' position is about *last night*. Erguvanlı (1984, p. 150) mentions that in Turkish the position of time adverbs can be varied, which implies that time adverbs can precede an adverb of place. However, in English, time adverbs hold the sentence-final position. Yet, the analysis shows that the elementary level learners participated in the study placed *last night* before the adverbs of place which is ungrammatical in English; and this may demonstrate that as the learners are at the earlier stages of language acquisition, they may take their L1 as basis in their L2 production more compared to higher proficiency level learners. Another point regarding *last night* is that this study shows similarities with the results of the data analyzed in Liu and Rhee (2017), who found out that Chinese learners used adverbs in post-verbal position more frequently, while native speakers preferred sentence-initial positions. In our study, a great number of learners judged sentence-initial position of *last night* ungrammatical and sentence-final as grammatical. This reflects their inclination towards sentence-final position.

As hitherto addressed, all in all, L1 can be one of the sources of problematic structures in adverb placement Turkish EFL students in our study. This result is in line with the findings of Lightbown and Spada (2000) and Wu (2016) who argue the prominent effect of L1 on French and Chinese L2 learners of English, respectively.

Implications

The above findings have important implications for foreign language teachers. The analysis of the data has shown that Turkish L2 learners of English demonstrate development differences both in their grammaticality judgment and production tasks, and this may be related to Full Access/Full Transfer Hypothesis as at the beginning of the acquisition, the learners have resort to their L1 more because it forms the basis for them until they have full access to UG. However, as they improve in their L2, their access to UG becomes more prominent leaving less place to L1 transfer.

From a pedagogical perspective, it may be suggested that observing the trace of L1 in lower level learners is natural, and keeping this in mind, language teachers may predict the possible errors that their learners will show, and the courses may be designed accordingly. Moreover, if the common problematic parts or L1 transfer points are analyzed as in the case of *late* in this study; the student may be provided with relevant negative evidence for the better understanding of the target structure.

The final point that needs to be mentioned is related to the limitations of the study. First of all, this study did not administer any placement test, and the participants' proficiency levels were decided based on their levels assigned by their school. Therefore, some of the students may not be in their actual proficiency levels. The next point is related to the tasks. The analysis in this study is just based on the sentences and adverbs used, so the results may show a different pattern if more sample sentences were tested or produced by the participants.

Conclusion

In this study, students at three different proficiency levels were tested on their grammaticality judgments and productions related to adverb placement in English. The results of the study have displayed that the development among Turkish L2 learners of English varies regarding their answers to both tasks, which are grammaticality judgment task and production task. The reason for this difference may be akin to Full Access/Full Transfer Hypothesis because of the fact that at the initial stages of the language acquisition, the learners take advantage of their mother tongue more. This is because L1 provides a basis in the course of language acquisition prior to full access to UG. Nonetheless, inasmuch as they become more capable in their L2, their access to UG comes to the forefront and pushes the L1 transfer aside.

Tables

Table 1

Adverbs Used in the Study

Adverbs of Manner	badly	quickly	well
Adverbs of Time	late	recently	last night
Adverbs of Frequency	always	usually	never

Table 2

Participants

	Total
Elementary	71
Pre-intermediate	71
Intermediate	72

Table 3

Grammaticality Judgment Task

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	19.492	2	9.746	2.193	.114
Within Groups	937.723	211	4.444		
Total	957.215	213			

Table 4

Comparisons of GTJ across Proficiency Levels


(I) Level	(J) Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Intermediate	Pre-Intermediate	.265	.353	.733	-.57	1.10
	Elementary	.730	.353	.099	-.10	1.56
Pre-Intermediate	Intermediate	-.265	.353	.733	-1.10	.57
	Elementary	.465	.354	.389	-.37	1.30
Elementary	Intermediate	-.730	.353	.099	-1.56	.10
	Pre-Intermediate	-.465	.354	.389	-1.30	.37

Table 5
Production Task

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4,388	2	2,194	2,271	,106
Within Groups	203,822	211	,966		
Total	208,210	213			

Table 6
Comparisons of Production Task across Proficiency Levels

(I) Level	(J) Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Intermediate	Pre-Intermediate	.322	.164	.125	-.07	.71
	Elementary	.280	.164	.207	-.11	.67
Pre-Intermediate	Intermediate	-.322	.164	.125	-.71	.07
	Elementary	-.042	.165	.964	-.43	.35
Elementary	Intermediate	-.280	.164	.207	-.67	.11
	Pre-Intermediate	.042	.165	.964	-.35	.43

Figures*Figure 1. Intermediate level participants' GJT scores (n=72)*




Figure 2. Intermediate level participants' production scores (n=72)




Figure 3. Pre-intermediate level participants' GJT scores (n=71)




Figure 4. Pre-intermediate level participants' production scores (n=71)




Figure 5. Elementary level participants' GJT scores (n=71)




Figure 6. Elementary level participants' production scores (n=71)

References

- Alexiadou, A. (1997). *Adverb placement: A case study in antisymmetric syntax* (Vol. 18). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Remarks on nominalizations. In R. Jacobs & P. Rosenbaum (eds), *Readings in Transformational Grammar*. Waltham, Mass: Ginn and Company, 184-221.
- Çelik, T., Tasdemir, O., & Ünlü, D. (2017). Verbs associated with the time focused adverbs in Turkish course books. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(7), 24-29.
- Delfitto, D. (2006). Adverb classes and adverb placement. *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, 83-120.
- Erguvanli, E. E., & Taylan, E. E. (1984). *The function of word order in Turkish grammar* (Vol. 106). Univ of California Press.
- Hernández, M. S. (2006). The Position of Adverbs in English: Trying to solve a major problem most Language Learners usually face. *Revista de Filología y Lingüística de la Universidad de Costa Rica*, 32(1), 271-285.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2000). Do they know what they're doing? L2 learners' awareness of L1 influence. *Language Awareness*, 9(4), 198-217.
- Liu, Y., & Rhee, S. C. (2017). On English Adverb Placements by Korean and Chinese EFL Learners. *언어학 연구*, (45), 357-374.
- Suñer, M. (1994). V-movement and the licensing of argumental wh-phrases in Spanish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12(2): 335-372.
- Westergaard, M. (2003). Unlearning V2: Transfer, markedness, and the importance of input cues in the acquisition of word order in English by Norwegian children. *EUROSLA yearbook*, 3(1), 77-101.
- White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Interlanguage studies bulletin (Utrecht)*, 7(2), 133-161.
- Wilson, S., & Saygın, A. P. (2001). Adverbs and functional heads in Turkish: Linear order and scope. In *Proceedings of WECOL 2001: Western Conference on Linguistics, Seattle, WA*.
- Wu, J. (2016). A Corpus-Based Contrastive Study of Adverb+ Verb Collocations in Chinese Learner English and Native Speaker English.
- Zagona, K. (1990). Mente adverbs, compound interpretation and the projection principle. *Probus* 2(1), 1-30.

APPENDICES

A. Production Task

 <p>go / always</p>	 <p>dance / last night</p>
 <p>listen / usually</p>	 <p>make / well</p>
 <p>eat / never</p>	 <p>hurt / badly</p>
 <p>do shopping / quickly</p>	 <p>steal / recently</p>
 <p>go / late</p>	

B. Grammaticality Judgment Test

Name: _____ Level: _____ Group: _____

<i>Sentence</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Not Acceptable</i>
1. John always stays there when he is in London. Reason: _____	A	NA
2. Our team lost the game because we badly played. Reason: _____	A	NA
3. She usually takes sugar in her coffee. Reason: _____	A	NA
4. Little Jane drinks never hot coffee. Reason: _____	A	NA
5. She quickly got ready to go to school. Reason: _____	A	NA
6. My grandmother loves music. She plays the piano very well. Reason: _____	A	NA
7. Did you go late to bed last night? Reason: _____	A	NA
8. I have met a lot of people recently. Reason: _____	A	NA
9. I never remember her sister's name. Reason: _____	A	NA
10. Last night the police stopped me on my way home. Reason: _____	A	NA
11. I ate quickly my breakfast and went out. Reason: _____	A	NA
12. George speaks very well German. Reason: _____	A	NA
13. She fell and hurt herself badly. Reason: _____	A	NA
14. Paula and I last night played tennis and he was better than me. Reason: _____	A	NA
15. Tom goes always to work by car. Reason: _____	A	NA
16. The new student comes to class late. Reason: _____	A	NA
17. I have usually a shower when I get up. Reason: _____	A	NA
18. I recently have seen Ann. Reason: _____	A	NA

C. Grammaticality Judgment Test - Key

Name: _____ Level: _____ Group: _____

<i>Sentence</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Not Acceptable</i>
1. John always stays there when he is in London. Reason: _____	A	NA
2. Our team lost the game because we badly played. Reason: _____	A	NA
3. She usually takes sugar in her coffee. Reason: _____	A	NA
4. Little Jane drinks never hot coffee. Reason: _____	A	NA
5. She quickly got ready to go to school. Reason: _____	A	NA
6. My grandmother loves music. She plays the piano very well. Reason: _____	A	NA
7. Did you go late to bed last night? Reason: _____	A	NA
8. I have met a lot of people recently. Reason: _____	A	NA
9. I never remember her sister's name. Reason: _____	A	NA
10. Last night the police stopped me on my way home. Reason: _____	A	NA
11. I ate quickly my breakfast and went out. Reason: _____	A	NA
12. George speaks very well German. Reason: _____	A	NA

13. She fell and hurt herself badly. Reason: _____	A	NA
14. Paula and I last night played tennis and he was better than me. Reason: _____	A	NA
15. Tom goes always to work by car. Reason: _____	A	NA
16. The new student comes to class late. Reason: _____	A	NA
17. I have usually a shower when I get up. Reason: _____	A	NA
18. I recently have seen Ann. Reason: _____	A	NA