جامعة بابل

أداء الطلبة العراقيين الدارسين للغة الانجليزية لغة أجنبية في استعمال الأدوار الدلالية للفاعل:تحليل الأخطاء

رسالة

تقدمت بها إلى مجلس كلية التربية في جامعة بابل

جزءاً من متطلبات نيل درجة ماجستير تربية في

طرائق تدريس اللغة الانجليزية لغة أجنبية

آصال هاني حمزة الدليمي

بأشراف

م .د. وفاء مخلص فيصل   ا.م.د. عباس ديكان درويش

تموز   جمادي الثانية

٢٠٠٦ م   ١٤٢٧هـ

University of Babylon

The Performance of Iraqi EFL University Students in Using the Semantic Roles of the Subject: An Error Analysis

A Thesis

Submitted to

The Council of the College of Education,

University of Babylon

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Education

in Methods of Teaching English

as a Foreign Language

By

Assal Hani Hamza

Supervised by

Asst. Prof .	Lecturer
Abbas Deygan Darweesh (Ph.D.)	Wafa' Mukhlis Faisal (Ph.D.)
July	Jamadi Al-Thani
٢٠٠٦	١٤٢٧

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

[يُؤْتِي الْحِكْمَةَ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَمَنْ يُؤْتَ الْحِكْمَةَ فَقَدْ أُوتِيَ خَيْرًا كَثِيرًا وَمَا يَذَّكَّرُ إِلَّا أُولُو الْأَلْبَابِ]

صدق الله العظيم

To
My Parents

الخلاصة

أُجريت هذه الدراسة على طلبة الصفوف الرابعة في أقسام اللغة الانكليزية في كليات التربية لجامعتي القادسية و بابل للعام الدراسي ٢٠٠٥–٢٠٠٦ ، و تُعنى بالأدوار الدلالية للفاعل نحوياً و دلالياً كأحد التراكيب الاساسية و الشائعة الاستعمال في اللغة الانكليزية من ناحية و من التراكيب التي يواجه الطلبة صعوبة في تعلمها من ناحية اخرى. تهدف الدراسة إلى التعرف على قدرة طلبة الجامعة العراقيين الدارسين للغة الانكليزية لغة أجنبية على تمييز و استعمال الأدوار الدلالية للفاعل في اللغة الانكليزية

و ايضاً الى تعريف انواع الاخطاء التي تحدث عند طلاب العينة في استخدام الادوار فكانت فرضيات الدراسة كالآتي:

١– لا يميزوا طلبة الجامعة العراقيين الدارسين للغة الانكليزية لغة أجنبية الأدوار الدلالية المختلفة للفاعل.

٢– يميل الطلبة إلى استخدام التعميم في دور العامل.

٣– يتأثر الطلبة بالوظيفة النحوية للفاعل أكثر من تأثرهم بأدواره الدلالية.

و تكونت عينة الدراسة من مائة طالب و طالبة في أقسام اللغة الانكليزية و استخدم الاستبيان كأداة للدراسة إذ قامت الباحثة بتصميم اختبار تشخيصي يتكون من مائة فقرة و قد استخدمت النسبة المئوية كوسيلة إحصائية لتحليل النتائج و توصلت الدراسة إلى:

١– يواجه طلبة الجامعة العراقيون الدارسون للغة الانجليزية لغة أجنبية صعوبات في تمييز و إنتاج الأدوار الدلالية للفاعل حيث كانت النسبة الأعلى لإجاباتهم الخاطئة

(٤٢.٦٪),لكـنهم يواجهـون صـعوبات أكـثر علـى مسـتوى الأداء حيـث إن نسـبة إجابـاتهم الصحيحة(٢٨.٧٪) مقابل (٦٩.٧٪) لإجاباتهم الصحيحة على مستوى التمييز.

٢- هناك ثمانية أنواع لأخطاء الطلبة هي كالآتي :

١- الإخفاق باختيار الدور الدلالي الصحيح للفاعل.

٢- الخلط في الأدوار الدلالية للفاعل خصوصاً في:

أ – وضع الدور العامل بدلاً من الدور المؤثر.

ب- وضع دور الحدث بدلاً من دور ظرف الزمان.

٣- استخدام الدور العامل في أكثر من موضع.

٤- الإخفاق بتمييز الدور الدلالي الصحيح للفاعل.

٥- الإخفاق بإعطاء التصحيح الصحيح.

٦-- الإخفاق في إعطاء تصحيح.

٧- الإخفاق بإعطاء الدور الدلالي الصحيح للفاعل.

٨- الإخفاق بكتابة الفاعل الصحيح.

٣-تعليم الأدوار الدلالية للفاعل يتطلب تقنيات تدريس خاصة للتغلب على الصعوبات بتعلُم اللغة الانجليزية لغة أجنبية.

Acknowledgements

Abstract

The present study is mainly concerned with the semantic roles of the subject as one of the common and essential constructions in the English language on the one hand, and as a problematic area for English foreign language learners on the other hand. It aims at investigating the ability of Iraqi EFL university students in recognizing and producing the semantic roles of the subject, simultaneously, it defines the types of errors which are made by the sample students in using such roles.   Accordingly, it is hypothesized that:

١. Iraqi EFL university students do not distinguish different semantic roles of the subject.

٢. Such learners are confused in using the semantic roles of the subject. In other words, they tend to use agent role in most cases (i.e. overgeneralization).

٣. Students are influenced by the grammatical function of the subject more than its semantic roles.

Relying on the previous hypotheses, a diagnostic test of one hundred items has been designed and applied to a sample of one hundred Iraqi EFL university students at their fourth year, Department of English, College of Education, in two Universities: Al-Qadissiya and Babylon. Therefore, the following points have been concluded:

١. Iraqi EFL university students face difficulties in recognizing and producing the semantic roles of the subject as the highest rate of their

responses is incorrect (٤٢.٦%) but they face more difficulties at the production level as the rate of their correct responses is (٢٨.٧%) against (٦٩.٧%) for their correct responses at the recognition level.

٢. There are eight types of errors which can be summed up as follows:

١- Failure to choose the correct semantic role of the subject.

٢- Confusing between the semantic roles of the subject especially in:

I - Putting Agentive instead of Affected.

II- Putting Eventive instead of Temporal.

٣- Using Agentive in more than one place.

٤- Failure to recognize the correct semantic role of the subject.

٥- Failure to give the right correction.

٦- Giving no correction.

٧- Failure to give the correct semantic role of the subject.

٨- Failure to supply the correct subject.

٣. Learning the semantic roles of the subject requires special teaching techniques to overcome the difficulties in learning English as a foreign language.

Contents

Abbreviations and Nomenclatures

Symbol	Description
Aff	affected
Ag	agentive
Ben	benefactive
Cs	subject complement
Exp	experiencer
GFs	grammatical forms
GMs	grammatical meanings
Instr	instrumental
L١	first language
L٢	second language
Loc	locative
NP(s)	noun phrase(s)
O	object
O$_d$	direct object
O$_i$	indirect object
Pos	positioner
PP(s)	prepositional phrase(s)
Pred	predicate
Rec	recipient
Stim	stimulus
Subj	the subject of the sentence
Temp	temporal
*	ungrammatical
/	there is no answer

List of Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

١.١ *The Problem*

In English, the term **subject** (henceforth, subj.) is used in the analysis of grammatical functions to refer to a major constituent of a sentence or clause structure, traditionally associated with the "doer" of an action, as in

(١) The cat bit the dog.

(Crystal,٢٠٠٣:٤٤١)

Syntactically, the subj. of the sentence does not seem to be very difficult to identify. Concord, position, and other criteria may help in identifying the subj. Thus, the variety of meanings that the subj. assumes in different sentences is highly controversial.

Linguistic analysis has emphasized the complexity involved in specifying the subj. of the sentence distinguishing, for example, the grammatical subj. from the underlying or logical subj. of the sentence. In addition, the subj. of the sentence is not only the doer of the action, i.e., **agentive** but also it can be **affected, benefactive**, **positioner, instrumental, force, recipient, stimulus, zero, temporal, locative, eventive, source**, and **goal.**

(٢) The boy ran down the street.   (**Agentive**)

(Jones,٢٠٠٤:٣)

(٣) Jack fell down(accidentally).   (**Affected**)

(Quirk et al.,١٩٨٥:٧٤٣)

(٤) Mr. John received a warning.   (**Benefactive**)

(Jones,٢٠٠٤:٤)

(٥) Sam has lived in Swiss most of his life.   (**Positioner**)

(ibid)

(٦) The computer has solved the problem.   (**Instrumental**)

(٧) The avalanche destroyed several houses.   (**Force**)

(٨) Mr. Smith has given his son a radio.   (**Recipient**)

(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٦)

(٩) The party pleases me.   (**Stimulus**)

(Jones,٢٠٠٤:٤)

(١٠) It's freezing outside.   (**Zero**)

(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٨)

(١١) Yesterday was a holida**y.**   (**Temporal**)

(ibid:٧٤٧)

(١٢) The car seats four.   (**Locative**)

(Jones,٢٠٠٤:٦)

(١٣) The dispute over inheritance lasted a decade. (**Eventive**)

(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٨)

(١٤) George gave Bob a Telescope.   (**Source**)

(١٥) Mike was given a gift.   (**Goal**)

(Jones,٢٠٠٤:٦)

As such most Iraqi EFL university students may face difficulties in recognizing and producing different semantic roles of the subj. In this respect, the problem that may arise is that the students face difficulty and show weakness in their use of the appropriate semantic roles of the subj. in the appropriate sentences. For example, the students may not distinguish the semantic roles of the subj. in sentence (١٦); which is a positioner, from that in (١٧); which is affected:

(١٦) Your sister is lying on the bed.

(١٧) Your book is lying on the bed.   (Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٧)

Thus, the present study attempts to shed light on the semantic roles of the subj., and the difficulties encountered by EFL university students in pinpointing and producing them. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, no empirical study of the students' understanding and use of the semantic roles of the subject has been carried out yet. Hence, this work is an attempt to fill such a gap.

١.٢ *Aims of the Study*

This study aims at:

١. Identifying Iraqi EFL university students' performance in recognizing and producing different types of the semantic roles of the subj.

٢. Finding out the causes of the students' errors and the types of such errors so that some solutions can be posited to help them overcome

the problems they face in using different semantic roles of the subj. in the sentence.

٣. Introducing some suggestions that help the students deal with such roles.

١.٣ *Hypotheses*

It is hypothesized that:

١. Iraqi EFL university students do not distinguish different semantic roles of the subj.

٢. Such learners are confused in using the semantic roles of the subj. In other words, they tend to use agent role in most cases (i.e. overgeneralization).

٣. Students are influenced by the grammatical function of the subj. more than its semantic roles.

١.٤ *Procedures*

To achieve the aims of this study the following procedures will be adopted:

١. Presenting a description of English semantic roles of the subj. Throughout this description, these roles can be identified and distinguished within the linguistic approach.

٢. Involving a sample of Iraqi EFL university students; fourth year in a test specifically designed to collect data about the difficulties that they encounter in using the semantic roles of the subj. and to assess the extent to which they master and comprehend such roles.

٣. Using statistic methods to rate the students' performance at the recognition and the production levels in using these roles.

٤. Analyzing the results of the test according to the model chosen and the conclusions and pedagogical implications that will be put forward.

١.٥ *Limit*

The present study is limited itself to the evaluation and investigation of the use of the semantic roles of the subj. by Iraqi EFL fourth year students at the College of Education in Al-Qadissyia and Babylon universities during the academic year (٢٠٠٥-٢٠٠٦).

١.٦ *Value*

The findings of this study are hoped to be useful in two aspects:

١. The theoretical aspect will provide information of the semantic roles of the subj. which can be valuable for the researchers.

٢. The practical aspect will have a pedagogical value to teachers in that it can shed light upon the problematic areas concerning the semantic roles

of the subj. which can be helpful to them in their effort to help learners perform well.

١.٧ Definitions of Basic Terms

Performance: It is defined as the actual use of a syntactic system and it is related to psychological factors of actual speech (incompleteness of natural utterances, the restrictedness of memory, etc.) that is not considered as action related to situation. Thus, performance rules are seen exclusively in a psychological dimension.

(Dittmar ,١٩٧٦: ١٦٣ **)**

EFL University Students: They are those who study English as a foreign language as their ''major'' subject in the departments of English in Iraqi Universities.

Semantic Roles: The operational definition which is adopted in the present study is that they are the underlying relationships that participants have with the main verbs in clauses.

Chapter Two

The Syntactic Identification of the Subject

٢.١ Introduction

Alexander (١٩٨٨:٢) states that a sentence "is a combination of words that makes a statement, asks a question, expresses a wish or a command, or is merely an exclamatory". Every sentence consists of two essential sentence elements, the **subject** and the **predicate**. The **subject** tells us who or what the sentence is about, and the **predicate** tells us what that subj. is doing – or sensing – or is. The most basic part of the predicate is the verb. In fact, sometimes the predicate may consist of only a verb, but it still tells us what the subj. is doing.

(١) a. **The child** laughs.

(Kies, ٢٠٠٤:١)

Even though there are only two words in (١.a), it does meet the three requirements of a complete sentence. The sentence is about the child (the subj.); the word laughs (the verb) tells us what the child do (the predicate), and the sentence expresses a complete thought.

 b. **The soft, purring kitten** nestled in the child's lap**.**

(ibid)

In (١.b), **the soft, purring kitten** is the subj. of the sentence because the kitten (the simple subj.) is what the sentence is about. What did the kitten do? It nestled in the child's lap; therefore, these words form the predicate of the sentence. More specifically, the word **nestled** (the verb) indicates the kitten's action.

٢.٢ Definitions of the Subject

The **subj.** of a sentence is defined as the most important element in the clause elements (except for the verb); it is the element that is most often present. (Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٢٤)

(٢) **This new saw** cuts well.

(Tallerman, ١٩٩٨: ٣٩)

Alexander (١٩٨٨:٣) point out that the subj. is "the person, place, or thing that does or controls the action of the verb i.e. the concept that answers the question **who?** o**r** **what? does** or **is** in relation to the verb".

(٣) a. **The man** ran away.

b. **The man who stole the money** ran away.

(Kies, ٢٠٠٤:٣)

Strumpf and Douglas (١٩٩٩: ٢٨٣) agree with other linguists on the definition of the subj. since they define it as "the naming part of the sentence that represents the person or thing that performs the action of the verb or expresses the condition or state of the verb".

(٤) a**. John** did not find us.

(Alexander, ١٩٨٨: ٧٣)

b. **The children** are writing.

(Chalker, ١٩٨٤: ٢٥)

On the same line, Simmons (٢٠٠٥:١) defines the subj. as "the argument that generally refers to the origin of the action or the undergoer of the state

shown by the predicate'' i.e. refers to the doer of the action whether it is animate or inanimate or the undergoer (the target or the result action in passive sentences).

(٥) **The cups** chased the robbers.

(ibid)

٢.٣ *Types of the Subject*

Burton-Roberts (١٩٩٧: ٣١١) states that there are three types of 'Subject', the simple, the compound, and the complex, which are discussed in the following subsections .

٢.٣.١ *The Simple Subject*

It is the <u>who</u> or <u>what</u> that is doing the verb without any adjectives that precede the subject.

(٦) a. **Booth** assassinated Abraham Lincoln.

(Shepherd et al., ١٩٨٤: ٣)

b. The bright copper **coin** sparkled on the sidewalk.

(Lario, ٢٠٠١: ٣)

The simple subj. can be more than one word, or clause.

(٧) **What he had already forgotten about computer repair** could   fill
   whole volumes.

(ibid)

Sometimes a prepositional phrase appears to be either the subj. itself or part of the subj.

(٨) a. **Neither** of these boys wants to try a piece of pina apple pizza.

(Grush, ٢٠٠٣:٢)

b. **My dog**, along with her seven puppies, has chewed all of the stuffing out of my sofa cushions.   (Simmons, ٢٠٠٥: ٣)

٢.٣.٢ *The Compound Subject*

It is a simple subject consisting of more than one noun or pronoun joined by a conjunction and having the same verb.

(٩) a. Team **pennants**, rock **posters** and family **photographs** covered the boy's bedroom walls.

(Kies, ٢٠٠٤:٦)

b. **Her uncle** and **she** walked slowly through the Inuit art gallery.

(ibid)

٢.٣.٣ *The Complex Subject*

It is the <u>who</u> or <u>what</u> that is doing the verb plus all of the modifiers [descriptive words] that go with it, i.e., it is a simple subj. together with its modifiers. (Grush, ٢٠٠٤:٥)

(١٠) a. **The huge, hair, hungry, green Martian** grabbed a student from the back row. (ibid)

b. **The long, bitter winter** took its toll on the soldiers.

(Strumpf and Douglas, ١٩٩٩: ٢٨٩)

The complex subj. is **the long, bitter winter**. **Winter** is the particular thing about which the sentence speaks; the article **the** and the adjectives **long** and **bitter** modify the subj. (ibid: ٢٨٥)

٢.٤ *Forms of the Subject*

As a noun may be the subj. of a verb, any noun equivalent may be the same thus:

(a) A Noun:

(١١) a. **The boy** came home.

(Grush, ٢٠٠٤:٢)

b. **Builders** are at home.

(Peck, ١٩٩٦: ٣)

(b) An Adjective (used as a noun):

(١٢) **The poor** envy the rich.

(c) A Pronoun:

(١٣) **He** is a friend of my father's.

(Swan, ١٩٨٤: ١٩٢)

(d) A Gerund:

(١٤) **Learning a foreign language** is useful.

(Simpson, ١٩٧٩: ١٥٤)

(e) A Clause:

(١٥) **That he had travelled the world** was known by everyone.

(Peck, ١٩٩٦: ٣)

(f) An Infinitive:

(١٦) **To compromise** appears advisable.

(Thomson and Martinet, ١٩٨٦: ٢١٣)

(g) A Phrase:

(١٧) **The larger car** stopped outside our house.

(Peck, ١٩٩٦: ٣)

(h) A Citation :

(١٨) **"I think so"**, is what he said.

(Herndon, ١٩٧٦: ٦٧)

٢.٥ *Meanings of the Subject*

The subj. is the functional unit that can have the widest variety of meanings. It is true that the structural meaning of the 'subject' is 'performer', but the meaning of performer is signalled by many other devices, and there are many 'subjects' which have other meanings than that of performer. The subj. in English sentences may have one of five distinct meanings (Roberts, ١٩٨٠: ١٥٨).

٢.٥.١ *Doer of the Action*

Generally the most common meaning of the subj. is **doer of the action**. The subj. has this general meaning whenever the verb is not a **linking** verb and whenever it is not followed by the auxiliary **be** and the **past-tense** form of the verb. For example:

(١٩) a. **The canaries** twittered.

    b. **Charlie** was peeling a grape.

<div align="right">(ibid: ١٥٩)</div>

Sometimes this meaning is rather vague. Sometimes the verb does not suggest any very obvious kind of action and consequently the subj. is not a very obvious doer. For example:

(٢٠) **The house** needs a coat of paint.

Need does not really suggest much action in the way of <u>speaking</u> or <u>destroying</u> does, and consequently house is not so obviously a doer here.

Roberts (ibid: ١٦٠) mentions that the meaning of some sentences is quite turned around.

(٢١) **The car** rides easily.

The sentence gives an impression that the car performs the action of riding, whereas in fact, people perform the action and not cars.

٢.٥.٢ *That Which is Described*

The second kind meaning of subj. is **that which is described**. For instance:

(٢٢) a. **The man** was foolish.

   b. **Her house** seemed clean.

Here there's no action at all, vague or otherwise. Consequently there is no doer of the action. The subj. is simply the person (or thing) described by the verb cluster that follows. **The man** is described by **was foolish**.

٢.٥.٣ *That Which is Identified*

The third kind of meaning of the subj. is **that which is identified.** The linking verb is usually either **be** or **become**:

(٢٣) a. **That man** is my father.

b. **He** became my uncle when he married my aunt.

(ibid: ١٦١)

Here the subject **That man**, is not a doer and the verb cluster, **is my father**, does not exactly describe the subj. It simply links up the subj. with another noun and in this way identifies the subj.

٢.٥.٤ *Undergoer of the Action*

The fourth meaning of the subj. is **undergoer of the action** which is the target or the result action in passive sentences. For example:

(٢٤) a. **Charlie** was knocked down by Henry.

b. **The requisition** was sent over a week ago.   (ibid: ١٦٢)

In the first example, **Charlie** is the subj. of the passive and there is an action- 'knocking down'. But Charlie is not the doer of the action. Henry is. Charlie is the one who undergoes the action. The verb with the meaning of undergoer of the action is to be a past form.

٢.٥.٥ That "To or For" Which the Action is Performed

The fifth kind of meaning of the subj. is **that "to or for" which the action is performed**. For example:

(٢٥) **Mr. John** was given the complete file on Phonetics.

(ibid: ١٧٧)

In this example, the subject is **Mr. John** and there is an action-"giving complete file on Phonetics"- moreover **Mr. John** is not the doer of the action. So that the subj. is the one where the action is performed to.

٢.٦ Identification of the Subject

Quirk et al. (١٩٨٥: ٧٢٤) mention four types of distinctions for characterizing the subject:

١. Form.
٢. Position.
٣. Syntactic functions other than positional potentialities.
٤. Semantic Criteria.

Quirk et al.'s treatment of position is different from other syntactic functions because of its conspicuousness.

٢.٦.١ *Form*

In the discussion of this category, the subject is either a noun phrase or a nominal clause.

٢.٦.١.١ *Noun Phrase*

The noun phrase can function as subj., object (henceforth, O), and complement of prepositional phrases. It always contains a nominal which may be a pronoun (he, they, you, etc) a proper noun (Tom, Mr. Smith, New Jersey, etc) or a common noun (book, egg, bag, etc) which may occur with or without determiners or modifiers (Grush, ٢٠٠٤:٥).

 For example:

(٢٦) a. **He** is a doctor.

   b. **John** is a doctor.

٢.٦.١.٢ *Finite Noun Phrases*

This type of Noun Phrases (henceforth, NPs) incorporates a finite verb showing tense .It falls into four categories: that-clause, wh-clause, nominal relative clause and alternative yes / no interrogative NP(Leech and Svartvik, ١٩٩٤:٣١١).

٢.٦.١.٢.١ *That – Clause*

The term that-clause refers to those dependent, declarative, NPs beginning with the subordinate **that** (Crystal, ٢٠٠٣: ٣٥٠). That-clause may function as the 'subj.' of a sentence as in the following example:

(٢٧) **That we need more equipment** is obvious.

(Quirk et al, ١٩٧٢: ٧٣١)

The omission of the conjunction **that** from a subj. clause is not allowed because if so, the sentence will be ungrammatical :

(٢٨) * **You do not know Russian** is a pity.

However, the conjunction **that** is frequently omitted when a subj**. that-clause** (with anticipatory it) is extraposed:

(٢٩) **It**'s a pity you do not know Russian .

(ibid)

٢.٦.١.٢.٢ *Subordinate Interrogative Clause*

Wh-interrogative clause may function as the 'subj.' of the sentence:

(٣٠) a. **How the book will sell** depends on its author.

(Quirk et al, ١٩٧٢: ٥٣٧)

b. **Whether he likes the game** is not clear.

(Bruti, ٢٠٠٣: ٩)

٢.٦.١.٢.٣ *Nominal Relative Clauses*

Nominal relative clauses resemble wh-interrogative clauses in that they are also introduced by a wh-element . They can be paraphrased by NPs containing a noun head with a general reference that is mentioned as a relative clause. For instance:

(٣١) **Whoever did that** should admit it frankly. ['The person who did that …']

(Bruti, ٢٠٠٣:٩)

٢.٦.١.٣ *Non – Finite Noun Phrase*

As their name indicates, non-finite noun phrases do not contain finite (or tensed) verbs. They are expressed via the infinitive with to or bare infinitive, or the gerund.

٢.٦.١.٣.١ *To – Infinitive Clauses*

Nominal to-infinitive clauses may function as subj. For instance:

(٣٢) **To be alone** can be very sad.

<div align="right">(Bruti, ٢٠٠٣: ٢٠)</div>

Normally, the presence of a subj. in a to-infinitive clause requires the presence of a preceding **for** (which is perhaps acting here more as a conjunction than as a preposition). When the subj. is a pronoun, it should be in the objective case(Quirk et al, ١٩٨٥: ١٠٦١).

(٣٣) a. **For me to be writing a book on this subject** was an irrational act.

<div align="right">(Wekker and Haegeman, ١٩٨٥: ١٦١)</div>

b. **For me to study hard** is unusual.

<div align="right">(Thomas, ١٩٦٥: ١١٢)</div>

٢.٦.١.٣.٢ *Bare Infinitive Clauses*

The bare infinitive clause may be the subj. or complement or (rarely) subj. in a pseudo-cleft sentence. (Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥: ١٠٦٧) For instance:

(٣٤) **Mow the lawn** was what I did this afternoon.

<div align="right">(ibid)</div>

It may also be the subj. or subj. complement (henceforth, Cs) of a variant of the pseudo- cleft sentence, where a NP of general reference replaces **what**. (ibid)

(٣٥) **Turn off the tap** was all I did.

<div align="right">(ibid)</div>

The absence of the **to** in the to-infinitive clause is obligatory when the infinitive clause is subj. in the pseudo-cleft sentences, but it is optionally present when the clause is Cs. (ibid)

(٣٦) The thing you should do is (to) **show them your diploma**.

<div align="right">(ibid)</div>

٢.٦.١.٣.٣ *Gerundival Clauses*

Nominal-ing clauses are sometimes called 'gerundive' or 'gerundiva clauses'. They are commonly called a 'gerund'.

(٣٧) **Reading French** is easier than speaking.

<div align="right">(Thomson and Martinet, ١٩٨٦: ٢٢٨)</div>

Chalker (١٩٨٤: ١٤٧) and Elsness (٢٠٠٣: ٤) show the difference between the **gerundival** and **infinitival** clauses in that the former tends to refer to entities whose existence and actuality are already established, i.e. 'backward-looking' or general. The latter, on the other hand, tends to refer to potential,

hypothetical situations, which are imagined rather than factual, i.e. 'forward-looking'. For example:

(٣٨) a. **Saying such a thing** was an insult to their intelligence.

b. **To say such a thing** would be an insult to their intelligence.

(Frank, ١٩٧٢: ٣٢٥)

٢.٦.١.٤ *Verbless Clauses*

Quirk et al. (١٩٧٢: ٧٤٣) indicate that a verbless clause is required to account for a kind of subj. that, inspite of being superficially a NP, has some of the structural and semantic characteristics of a clause. The nominal verbless clauses in the example below can, in turn, be paraphrased by nonfinite nominal clauses.

(٣٩) **A friend in need** is **a friend indeed**. [**To be a friend in need** is **to be a friend indeed**]

(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥: ١٠٦٧)

٢.٦.١.٥ *Other Forms*

Other forms that can function as subjs are nominals such as uninflected words like **now**. For example:

(٤٠) **Now** is the best time.

<div align="right">(Gelderen, ٢٠٠٠: ٢)</div>

Adverbs and adverbial prepositional phrases may also function as subjs:

(٤١) a. **Slowly** is exactly how he speaks. ['Speaking slowly is exactly how…']

b. **Out on the lake** will be splendid. ['A trip out on the lake will be splendid']

<div align="right">(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥: ٧٣٦)</div>

Sometimes sentences beginning with **it** could be followed by an infinitive, a gerund or noun clause. It is possible to begin such sentences with an infinitive, a gerund or noun clause, but **it** is generally needed for preparing the subj.

(٤٢) a. **It**'s pleasant to lie in the sun. [To lie in the sun is pleasant]

b. **It**'s pleasant lying in the sun. [Lying in the sun is pleasant]

<div align="right">(Alexander, ١٩٨٨: ٧٨)</div>

The true subj. in the above examples is the infinitive and the gerund. Also, **there** can be used as an expletive filling in before the verb.

(٤٣) a. **There** was a mop in the kitchen.

b. **There** were some dishes in the sink.

(Bing, ١٩٨٩: ٤٤)

Another item that operates rather like existential **there** in some examples is **here**.

(٤٤) **Here** is my house.

(Gelderen, ٢٠٠٠:٥)

٢.٦.٢ *Position*

By position, the subj. occurs before the verb in declarative clauses, and after the operator in yes-no interrogative clauses:

(٤٥) a. **Your father and mother** have arrived.

b. Have **your father and mother** arrived?

(Swan, ١٩٨٤: ١٣٧)

In wh- interrogative clauses, subj.-operator inversion also occurs except where the wh-element is itself the subj. (Simmons, ٢٠٠٥: ٤)

(٤٦) a. What have **you** done today?

(ibid)

b. **What** has slept you so long?

(Grush, ٢٠٠٣:١)

In example (٤٦a) **you** is the subj., but in example (٤٦b) **what** is the subj.

٢.٦.٣ *Syntactic Functions*

a. Omission of Subj.

The subj. in finite clauses is obligatory except in imperative clauses where it is normally omitted but implied .It is conventional to say that the subj. is 'you' since the imperative sentences are always in the second person. (Lario, ٢٠٠١:٧)

(٤٧) a. Look!

(ibid)

b. Wait a minute.

(Chalker, ١٩٨٤: ١٣)

Also, emphatic cases may include the subj.

(٤٨) **Jane** phoned me yesterday. (Not somebody else)

(Swan, ١٩٨٤:٩١)

Subjs are frequently omitted in conversation where it is easy to supply them from the context (Lario, ٢٠٠١:٧). For example:

(٤٩) a. (It) looks like a very big ball.

b. (I) thought it might be a very big ball but it didn't.

(Peck, ١٩٩٦:٢)

In a subordinate clause, a subj. is occasionally omitted:

(٥٠) He opened his eyes then smiled.   (Gelderen, ٢٠٠٠:٤)

6. Concord

There are two types of concord : 'notional' and 'proximity'. Notional concord is the ' agreement of verb with subject according to the idea of number rather than the actual presence of the grammatical marker for that idea'(Quirk et al., ١٩٧٢:١٧٦)

(٥١) **The Government majority in the Lower House** was perilously small.

(Zandvoort, ١٩٦٢:٢٥٩)

'Proximity' refers to ' agreement of the verb with a closely preceding noun phrase in preference to agreement with the head of the noun phrase that functions as subject'.

(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٥٧)

(٥٢) **One in ten** take the drugs.

(ibid)

In finite clauses the subj. determines the ' number ' and the ' person ' of

the verb . For instance:

(٥٣) **He knows** you. [singular number concord]

(Thomson and Martinet, ١٩٨٦:٧٦)

When the Cs is a NP, the subj. determines its number:

(٥٤) a. **Jack** is **my friend**.

b. **Jack and Tom** are **my friends**.

(Simmons, ٢٠٠٥:٦)

The subj. also determines the number, person and gender of the reflexive

pronoun as a direct object (henceforth, O_d), indirect object (henceforth, O_i),

Cs, or prepositional complement. (Quirk et al, ١٩٨٥:٧٢٥)

(٥٥)a. He cannot shave **himself**. (O_d)

(Swan, ١٩٨٤:٢١٦)

b. She bought **herself** fruit. (O_i)

(Leech and Svartvik,١٩٩٤:٣٢٥)

c. My mother is not **herself** today. (Cs)

(Kies,٢٠٠٤:٤)

d. He spoke to **himself**. (prepositional complement)

(Swan,١٩٨٤:٢١٦)

For pronouns which have distinctive case forms, the subj. requires

the subjective form.

(٥٦)a. **I** like her.

b. **She** likes me.

(Lario,٢٠٠١:٧)

In a tag question, the subj. is repeated by a pronoun form.

(٥٧) **Ann** is on holiday , isn't **she** ?

(Murphy,١٩٨٥:١٠٥)

Expletive ' there ' is followed by a singular or plural verb according to the
number of the entity or entities following :

(٥٨)a. **There** is a good movie on Channel ٤ .

b. **There** are several good programmes on TV tonight .

(Bing,١٩٨٩:٨)

 In the case of the introductory 'it' the verb is always singular whether 'it' is
expletive or pronoun regardless of the number of the predicate.

(٥٩) a. **It** is me.

b. **It** is her.

c. **It** is the kids.

<div align="center">(Gelderen, ٢٠٠٠:٦)</div>

In compound subjs joined by **or** or **nor** , the verb agrees with the noun or NP that comes after **or** or **nor** i.e. principle of proximity:

(٦٠) (N)either Maria (n)or her sisters are watching the movie.

<div align="center">(Bing,١٩٨٩:٨)</div>

In the above sentence, the nearest subj. is **her sisters** which are plural and thus the verb is in agreement with it. But in making the sentence interrogative, the verb should be singular because the nearer subj. will be **Maria** which is also singular.

A gerund used as the subj. of a sentence takes a singular verb:

(٦١)**Growing** flowers **is** her hobby.

<div align="center">(Azar, ١٩٨٩:٢١٨)</div>

c. Passivization

A systematic correspondence can be found between active and passive clauses in that either O$_d$ or O$_i$ of an active clause becomes the subj. of a passive clause and the subj. of the active clause is either omitted or made the complement in a by-agent phrase. (Peck, ١٩٩٦:٧)

(٦٢)a. **Kim** gave **Mary the vase**.   (active)

    b. **The vase** was given.   (passive)

   c. **Mary** was given **the vase** .   (passive)

                         (Tallerman,١٩٩٨:٢٢)

٢.٦.٤ *Semantic Criteria*

Semantic criteria include notions such as ''theme'', ''topic'' ,and ''given''. These notions and terms are rather vague and overlap in more than one point.

٢.٦.٤.١ *Theme, Topic, and Given*

There are different terms that have been used to refer to the meanings of the subjs and the other elements of the sentence . For example: 'theme: rheme', 'topic: comment' ,and 'given: new'.

Quirk et al.(١٩٨٥:٧٢٦) declare that the term ''theme'' or (topic) refers to the subj. of the clause , and simultaneously , it could also refer to information regarded by the speaker as 'given'. Brown and Miller (١٩٨٠:٣٥٦) define the theme as the constituent that occurs in initial position in a thematization process :

(٦٣) a. **My neighbour** damaged my garden fence last week.

b. **Last week** , my neighbour damaged my garden fence.

(ibid)

Hornby(١٩٧١:٧٦) states that the topic-comment is "the part of the sentence which constitutes what the speaker is talking about … the rest of the sentence , the comment , provides new information about the topic ".

Chalker(١٩٨٤:١٧) mentions a slightly different distinction that is sometimes made between 'theme' and 'rheme'. According to him, 'Theme' roughly corresponds to topic but 'rheme' includes everything else .Brown and Miller (١٩٨٠:٣٦٠) examine that the topic is the "perspective" from which a sentence is viewed, i.e., what the sentence is about whereas the comment refers to something said about this topic.

(٦٤) The baby hit the cat on the eyes.

(ibid)

In (٦٤) **the baby** is the topic. The predicate tells something about what the baby did. But the following sentence focuses on the cat, and also tells something that happened to it.

(٦٥) The cat was hit on the eyes by the baby.

(ibid)

So, topic and theme are coincided. Li and Thompson (١٩٧٦:٤٨٦) propose that it is possible to find a theme in every sentence but it is not always possible to find a topic. They (ibid:٤٦٦) differentiate between subj. and topic. The subj. is determined by the verb , related to the verb, and often obligatorily controls verb agreement. These properties are not shared by the topic. Thus, the topic is a discourse notion, whereas the subj., to a greater extent, is a sentence internal notion. The subj. can be easily understood in terms of its functions within the sentence structure. The textual organization of a language includes another aspect that is called ''information structure'' which refers to the organization of a text in terms of function such as 'given' and 'new'. (ibid)

Brown and Miller(١٩٨٠:٣٥٩) point out that ''given'' can be understood as the information which has been given in the preceding text. On the other hand, new information is that which is new to the sentence immediately under consideration. 'New' information is spelled out in full because there is no way for the hearer or reader to get access to it. Suppose that the following two examples are part of a letter:

(٦٦)a. I must tell you the news about Mark and Laura.

   b. They have just got divorced.

                                                    (ibid)

Sentence (٦٦a) gives the new information, that there is some **news** about **Mark** and **Laura**. While in (٦٦b) **they** refers to **Mark and Laura**, and **news** is not mentioned but new information is added, i.e. , the news that **Mark and Laura got divorced**. (ibid)

As a result , as long as the concepts of **new** and **given** overlap in more than one point, they are not of such use in identifying the specific semantic roles that hold between subjs and other elements of the sentence.

Chapter Three

The Semantic Identification of the Subject

٣.١ Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to present a description of the semantic roles associated with the subj. It starts with a list of semantic roles. Then a survey of different definitions and treatments of the semantic roles are discussed. After that, a survey of the approaches to the study of semantic roles is presented in a brief presentation choosing Quirk et al's approach as the model of this study.

٣.٢ Lists of Semantic Roles

It is believed that the set of semantic roles in English is derived from highly restricted, finite and universal ones. (Saad, ١٩٨٢:٦٨)

Linguists propose general norms for a list of cases. Fillmore (١٩٧٥:٥) contemplates the general terms for such a list. According to him, the list of cases must be small in number, adequate for the classification of verbs in the language, and universal across languages, whereas Cruse (١٩٧٣: ٨٦) believes that:

> **Nobody working within the various versions of grammars**
>
> **with 'cases' has come up with a principled way of defining**
>
> **the cases, or principled procedures for determining when**
>
> **you are faced with two cases that happen to have something**
>
> **in common as opposed to one case that has two variants.**

So the precise set of semantic roles differs from one author to another. The assignment of these different lists refers to different ways in which case grammarians may choose to divide the continuum of semantic reality. Different labels are given to 'case roles' by different linguists. In Pike's Tagmemics (١٩٧٧) they are called 'case roles'. Miller (١٩٨٩) uses 'semantic roles' while Schlesinger (١٩٨٩) calls them 'semantic relations' or 'role relations'. Throughout this study, the term 'semantic roles of Quirk et al.' will be adopted.

٣.٢.١ *Agentive*

Cook (١٩٧٩:٥٢) defines **Agentive** (henceforth, Ag) as ''the role that accompanies an action verb and has the ability to determine the entity involved in causing the event''. Most linguists such as Brown (١٩٨٤:٢١٤) and Quirk et al. (١٩٨٥:٧٤١) define the **Ag** role concentrating on the idea that **Ag** is the animate being instigating or causing the action denoted by the verb. **Mike** in the following example plays the Ag role:

(١) **Mike** wrote the poem.

(Simmons, ٢٠٠٥:٦)

Whereas, other linguists believe that the **Ag** is "typically" animate which means that inanimate nouns may also be Ag (Fillmore, ١٩٦٨:٢٥; Platt, ١٩٧١:٧٣; Cook, ١٩٧٨:٢٩٩ and Starosta, ١٩٧٨:٤٦٦). **Ag** role may include natural phenomena, mechanical devices, and human institutions. (Platt, ١٩٧١:٢٣; Saad, ١٩٨٢: xiv)

(٢) a. **John** broke the window.

   b. **The dog** ate the model plane.

   c. **The wind** tore up the trees.

(Todd and Hancock, ١٩٨٦:٢٦)

De Bleeker (١٩٧٦:٢٩) believes that the action assigned by **Ag** role should be intentional, while others like Plienes (١٩٧٦) and Starosta (١٩٧٨: ٤٧٨) report that **Ag** is the nonimmediate perceived causer of the action of the verb.

(٣) **John** rolled down the incline.

(Simmons, ٢٠٠٥:٧)

٣.٢.٢ *Affected*

The Affected role (henceforth, Aff), used in Quirk et al. (١٩٨٥:٧٤١), is considered as the object or the objective in Fillmore (١٩٦٨: ٢٥) and Cook (١٩٧٨: ٣٠٠), theme in Jackendoff (١٩٧٢: ٢٩ – ٣١), or patient in Chafe (١٩٧٠: ١٦٣).

Starosta (١٩٧٨:٤٧٢) defines the **Aff** role as "the entity which is viewed as affected by the action of the verb".

(٤) a. **The watch** broken.

(ibid)

b. **The snow** is melting.

(Lobner, ٢٠٠٢:١١٣)

The Aff role may also be "the entity which is viewed as moving or as being located in (abstract or concrete) space".(Starosta, ١٩٧٨:٤٧٢)

(٥) **The pencil** was lying on the table.

(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٣)

In addition, **Aff** is also defined as "the entity which is viewed as existing in a state, or whose state is changing". (Starosta, ١٩٧٨:٤٧٢)

(٦) a. **The dam** blew up.

(Quirk et al., ١٩٧٢:٣٥٢)

b. **The hut** was set alight by vandals.

(Hurford and Heasley, ١٩٨٣:٢٢٣)

The way that Starosta defines **Aff** is similar to that of Fillmore (١٩٧١a: ٣٧٦) in which **Aff** is defined as "the entity that moves or changes or whose

position or existence is in consideration". It is also similar to Fillmore's (١٩٧١b: ٤٢) definition that "the object case is that of the entity which moves or which undergoes change, and I still use it as a wastebasket".

Some linguists define the patient and Aff semantic roles in slightly different ways. For example Longacre (١٩٨٣:١٥٥-٦) (following Chafe (١٩٧٠:٢٨)) defines patient as the entity:

a- predicated with a state or location:

(٧) a. **The door** is opened.

   b. **John** is at home.

(Longacre,١٩٨٣:١٥٥)

b- undergoing a change of state or location:

(٨)   a. **The door** swung open.

   b. **The ball** rolled off the table.

(ibid)

 c- which is possessed, acquired, or exchanged:

(٩)   a. **John** has a new book.

   b. **John** bought a new book.

   c. **John** gave Mary a new book.

(ibid: ١٥٦)

However, Larsen (١٩٨٤:١٩٩-٢٠٣) defines the **Aff** role as:

a- the entity that is affected by an event:

(١٠) a. The dog ate **the meat**.

 b. The tree fell on **the house**.

b- the person or thing that undergoes a process:

(١١) a. **The water** evaporated.

 b. **Mary** became sad.

c- the person who experiences an event:

(١٢) a. **John** smelled the smoke.

 b. **Mary** saw the snake.   (ibid)

٣.٢.٣ *Benefactive*

The benefactive (henceforth, Ben), also labelled as a recipient in Quirk et al. (١٩٨٥: ٧٤٦), is defined as ''the case required by "benefactive" verbs, which specify the one in the state of possession, or the one who undergoes loss or gain in the transfer of an obj.''

(١٣) **The lawyer** received the summons.

(Cook, ١٩٧٩: ٥٦)

As a matter of fact , most linguists including Platt (١٩٧١:٧٤), Aarts (١٩٩٧:٨٨), and Radford (١٩٩٧:٣٢٦) agree that **Ben** is the perceived beneficiary of an action or state (i.e., the animate being or human institution which is perceived as intended to benefit).

(١٤) **John** was given a pay-rise.

(Starosta, ١٩٧٨:٣٥)

Fillmore (١٩٧١b:٢٦١) reveals that the **Ben** occurs only in sentences with **Ag** subjs and when the **Ag** is deliberate or voluntary. For example:

(١٥) a. He bought these flowers for **Jason**.

b. She cooked **Matt** dinner.

(Carnie, ٢٠٠٢:١٦٩)

But this is not true because **The suspect** in the following example is also **Ben** without the presence of an **Ag**:

(١٦) **The suspect** received a caution.

(Radford, ١٩٩٧:١٦٤)

Hutchins (١٩٧٥:٦٢) states that **Ben** not only has a value, that it covers the entities which benefit from an action, but also a negative value when those entities may be the victims of an action:

(١٧) **John** lost his wife.

Anyhow, the following example expresses the positive value when those entities may be the beneficiary of an action:

(١٨) **Alen** was sent a special offer from the Reader's Digest.

<div align="right">(Hurford and Heasley, ١٩٨٣:٢٢٥)</div>

٣.٢.٤ *Positioner*

Positioner (henceforth, Pos) is explained in relation with the verb types it co-occurs with. It occurs with intransitive stance verbs (they are a small important class of verbs which express the situation type, and intermediate between the stative and dynamic categories) such as **sit, stand, lie, live, stay, remain** and with transitive verbs related to stance verbs such as **carry, hold, keep, wear**. In this role (i.e. Pos) the participant is in control, but the situation is not resultative in that no change is indicated in the **Pos** during the period in which the situation lasts.(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٧)

(١٩) **I** have lived in London most of my life.

(٢٠) **Joseph** is lying in bed.

<div align="right">(Thakur, ١٩٩٩:٦٩)</div>

When identifying a **Pos**, (Thakur,ibid) states that a lot of attention must be paid to the following two points:

a- A positioner is a living being. If it is replaced by a nonliving being, its semantic role in a sentence is changed.

(۲۱) a. **His wife** is lying in bed.

    b. **His books** are lying on the table.

In the first sentence, **his wife** functions as a **Pos** but in the second sentence **his books** functions as an **Aff** participant.

b- Whether a living being is functioning as a **Pos** or as an **Ag** depends on the meaning of the verb used in the sentence. The following sentences exemplify this point.

(۲۲) a. **A nurse** was holding the patient's arm during the operation.

    b. **The security guards** held the terrorists against their will.

    c. **The police** cannot hold back this violent crowd.

In (۲۲a) **was holding** means 'keep in grasp'. It is a stance verb as opposed to a verb of action. Therefore, **a nurse** in this sentence has the semantic role of a **Pos**. In (۲۲b) **held** means 'detained' and has been used as a

verb of action. Similarly, **hold back** in (٢٢c) means 'restrain' and it is a verb of action.

Therefore, the subj of (٢٢b) and, similarly, the subj of (٢٢c) have the semantic role of the **Ag** and not of the **Pos**.

٣.٢.٥ *Instrumental*

Linguists such as Falk (١٩٧٨:٢٦٢), Aarts (١٩٩٧:٨٨), and Carnie (٢٠٠٢:١٦٩) define the Instrumental role (henceforth, Instr) as the medium by which the action or event denoted by the predicate is carried out.

(٢٣) a. **The knife** cut the cake.

(Larsen, ١٩٨٤:١٩٩)

b. **The chisel** opened the door.

(Fillmore, ١٩٦٨:٣٣)

Also, the **Instr** role is mentioned as "the entity (generally inanimate) which an Ag uses to perform an action or instigate a process" (Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٣; Crystal, ٢٠٠٣:٢٣٧)

(٢٤) a. **The pistol** killed the robber.

(Thakur, ١٩٩٩:٧٢)

b. **The magazine** hit the bug.

(Yule, ١٩٩٦:١١٧)

Trask (١٩٩٣:١٤٣) says that this role is borne by an NP which expresses the inanimate means by which something is done. For example:

(٢٥) **A note** scribbled the crayon.

(Laresn, ١٩٨٤:٢٠١)

Fillmore (١٩٧١a: ٣٧٦) explains that **Instr** is limited to physical cases i.e. specifies the **Instr** role as "the stimulus or immediate physical cause of an event".

On the other hand, Starosta (١٩٧٨: ٤٨٧) shows that **Instr** is not limited to physical causes only because this will not allow **telling Bill of the accident** to be **Instr** in the following example:

(٢٦) **Telling Bill of the accident** caused **him** to be more careful.

(ibid)

Although the presence of an **Ag** implies the presence of an **Instr**, the presence of an **Instr** does not imply the presence of an **Ag** in the same sentence. For example:

(٢٧) a. **The burglar** broke the window pane with a **hammer**.

　　　Ag　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Instr

(Thakur, ١٩٩٩:٧٢)

b. **A screw-driver** opened the tin.

Instr   (Hurford and Heasley, ١٩٨٣:٢٢١)

٣.٢.٦ *Force*

The Force role, used in Starosta (١٩٧٨:٤٨٨) also called 'External causer' in Quirk et al. (١٩٨٥:٧٤٣) and 'Natural force' in De Bleecker (١٩٧٦:٧٦), is defined as "the inanimate entity that causes the action described by the verb". (Thakur, ١٩٩٩:٦٩)

(٢٨) a. **The tornado** destroyed the houses near the seacoast.

(ibid)

b. **The electric shock** killed him.

(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٣)

Likewise, Fromkin et al. (٢٠٠٣:٩٣٧) define this role as "the natural force that causes a change".

(٢٩) **The wind** damaged the roof.

(ibid)

Nilson (١٩٧٣:١٠٠) proposes that **force** is more like **Ag** than **Instr** for the reason that it represents a primary, rather than secondary cause. **Ag** can be **force**, but **force** can not be **Ag**.

(٣٠) a. **Hurricanes** devastated the region.

Force

b. **Marauding bands** devastated the region.

Ag/Force

(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٥)

Some linguists such as Radford (١٩٩٧:٣٢٦) consider this role as the instigator of some action.

(٣١) **John** killed Harry.

(ibid)

Others such as Larsen (١٩٨٤:٢٠٢) considered it as an event rather than the instigator of the action.

(٣٢) **Peter** tripped John.

(ibid)

٣.٢.٧ *Experiencer*

Many linguists define the experiencer role (henceforth, Exp), which is used by Thakur(١٩٩٩: ٦٨) as "the animate being that undergoes a psychological event of sensation, emotion or cognition". (Postal, ١٩٧١:٢٠٩)

An Exp role is the subj. of copular verb or a transitive verb of perception , cognition or emotion.

(٣٣) a. **John** saw the door and the key.

b. **John** disliked the food.

(Falk, ١٩٧٨:٢٦٣)

c. **John** knows that actor.

d. **John** is very happy.

(Radford, ١٩٩٧:٣٢٦)

John in each of the previous examples looks as if he were an **Ag**. But actually, he is not. **John** is neither the instigator of an action nor the one who did something. But **John** is the one who was mentally arranged in some way, one with respect to whose mental experience, the door and the key seen, the food was disliked, or happy felt. Therefore, John is a Rec. (Chafe, ١٩٧٠:١٤٥)

Dik (١٩٧٨:٤٣) states that "there is no single underlying semantic representation of experiences, and, no specific functions need to be assigned to the experiencer and the experienced". Exp results from the meaning of the pred. and the properties of the term related to the pred. (Chafe, ١٩٧٠:١٤٦) Other terms used for Exp are Recipient.(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥: ٧٤٦)

٣.٢.٨ *Stimulus*

Stimulus (henceforth, Stim) is called so by Blansitt (١٩٧٨:٣١١), also called Instr by Fillmore (١٩٦٨:٣٢), and Neutral by Platt (١٩٧١:٧٨).

Although this role is similar to other roles in some respects, it has not been listed as a separate and distinct role. (Plank, ١٩٧٩:٦٥).This role occurs in obj. and subj. positions. In subj. position it is used as in the following examples:

(٣٤) **The new film** pleases him.

(ibid)

When Stim co-occurs with Exp in emotive experience, it will be in obj. position and it is limited to the verbs of 'pleasure' which is one type of emotive experience. (Saad, ١٩٨٢:٤٧)

(٣٥) a. Lily likes **slow music**.   (auditory sensation)

b. Lily likes **silk shirts**.   (tactile sensation)

c Lily likes **French perfumes**.   (olfactory sensation)

d Lily likes **ice-cream**.   (gustatory sensation)

e. Lily likes **classical art**.   (visual sensation)

(ibid)

٣.٢.٩ *Zero*

Some types of sentences take the "prop" word **it** as its subj. especially when they require no participant. Since it has little or no semantic content, it can occur in sentences signifying atmospheric conditions, time, and distance.

(٣٦) a. **It**'s half past three.   (time)

(Collins Cobuild English Grammar, ۱۹۹۰:۳۰)

b. **It** was Friday the ۱۳th.   (time)

(Thomson and Martinet, ۱۹۸٦:٦٦)

c. **It** was windy.   (atmospheric condition)

(Roberts, ۱۹۸۰:٦٥)

d. **It**'s ۲۰ degrees!   (atmospheric condition)

(Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, ۱۹۹۹:٥٦)

e. **It**'s about ۱۰۰ miles to Boston.   (distance)

(ibid)

f. **It**'s just one more stop to Toronto.   (distance)

(Quirk et al., ۱۹۸٥:۷٤۸)

۳.۲.۱۰ *Locative*

    Locative (henceforth, Loc) marks the place or the setting of the state or
action (Starosta, ۱۹۷۸:٤۹۳; Quirk et al., ۱۹۸٥:۷٤۷):

(۳۷)   a. **Los Angeles** is foggy. ['It is foggy in Los Angeles'.']

(Quirk et al., ۱۹۸٥:۷٤۷)

 b. **Edinburgh** is very cold these days. ['It is very cold in   Edinburgh these
      days '.]

(Thakur,١٩٩٩:٧٧)

Aarts (١٩٩٧:٨٨) states that Loc is "the specification of the place where the action or event denoted by the predicate is the situation".

(٣٨) **Chicago** is windy.

(Winograd, ١٩٨٣:٣١٧)

According to Longacre (١٩٨٣:١٦١) the semantic role of **Loc** is "identified as the special orientation of a state or action". He mentions that this role does not imply motion to, from, or across the location.

(٣٩)   a. The ship sank at **sea**.

  b. **California** grows the best oranges.

(Comrie, ١٩٨٩:٧٨)

California is the **Loc** subj. , while the first example contain **Loc** phrase that indicates the special location of the subj. these **Loc** phrases are characterized in the following examples by the occurrence of the prepositions **in** and **on**.

(٤٠)   a. Tom saw a mosquito **on the wall**.

(Fromkin et al., ٢٠٠٣:١٥)

  b. His sister is very happy **in Bombay**.

(Thakur, ١٩٩٩:٧٣)

٣.٢.١١ *Temporal*

Temporal (henceforth, Temp), also labelled Time (Cook, ١٩٧٩:١٩), gives the time of the state or action. (Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٧)

(٤١) a. **Yesterday** was a holiday. ['It was a holiday yesterday'.]

(ibid)

b. **٩ o'clock** is a good time for such meetings.

(Thakur, ١٩٩٩:٧٤)

Larsen (١٩٨٤:٢٠٠) and Givon (١٩٨٤:١٣٣) term it as "the temporal placement of an event".

(٤٢) **The ٣rd of October** celebrates the day of German reunification.

(Comrie, ١٩٨٩: ٧٩)

٣.٢.١٢ *Eventive*

The Eventive role refers to "man – made events as opposed to external causers which are forces of usually beyond human control".(Thakur, ١٩٩٩:٧١)

(٤٣) a. **The Norman invasion** took place in ١٠٦٦.

(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٧)

b. **The final match** will be held next week.

Quirk et al. (۱۹۸٥:۷٤۷) state that the noun at the head of the noun phrase is commonly adverbial or a result of nominalization.

(٤٤) a. **Their quarrels** have upset me.

(Thakur, ۱۹۹۹:۷۱)

b. **The explosion** caused many casualties.

(Quirk et al., ۱۹۸٥:۷٤۷)

۳.۲.۱۳ *Source and Goal*

Trask (۱۹۹۳:۱۱۹), Aarts (۱۹۹۷:۸۸), and Radford (۱۹۹۷:۳۲٦) report **Source** as the entity from which a living or a non-living entity moves. For instance:

(٤٥) a. **Bob** gave Steve the syntax assignment.

b. She has come from **London**.

(Carnie, ۲۰۰۲:۱٦۹)

Bob is the **Ag** and the **Source** simultaneously. But **London** is just the **Source** of the movement i.e. an adverbial has the role of source . (Thakur, ۱۹۹۹:۷۳)

Goal refers to the entity towards which a living or a non-living entity moves.

(٤٦)   a. **Jim** was given a gift.

b. He goes to **London**.

(Carnie, ٢٠٠٢:١٦٩)

Jim is the **Ag** and the **Goal** simultaneously. But **London** is just the **Goal** of the movement i.e. an adverbial has the role of goal . (Thakur, ١٩٩٩:٧٣)

٣.٢.١٤ *Summary*

To sum up the following table summarizes the most important semantic roles discussed by the different authors mentioned earlier (٣.٢.١-٣.٢.١٣)

Table (١)

Different Lists of Semantic Roles by Different Authors

Fillmore (١٩٦٨)	Fillmore (١٩٧٠)	Cook (١٩٧٧)	Dik (١٩٧٨)	Cook (١٩٧٩)	Quirk et al.(١٩٨٥)	Radford (١٩٨٨)
Agentive	Agent	Agent	Agent	Agent	Agentive	Agent
Instrumental	Instrument	Experiencer	Instrument	Instrument	Instrument	Instrument
Dative	Experiencer	Locative	Goal	Experiencer	Locative	Experiencer
Objective	Object	Benefactive	Location	Goal	Temporal	Goal
Locative	Locative	Object	Beneficiary	Locative	Affected	Locative
Benefactive	Benefactive		Time	Benefactive	Recipient	Benefactive
Time	Time		Source	Time	Positioner	Theme
Factative	Source		Recipient	Source	External causer	Source
	Goal		Positioner		Prop it	
			Force		Eventive	
			Zero Function			

٣.٣ *Universality of Semantic Roles*

Miller (١٩٨٩:١٩٠) states that the semantic roles which underlie linguistic constructions mirror the way human beings universally discern events and situations i.e. these semantic roles are based on the assumption that the meaning of a sentence can be understood in terms of how people and things participate in real-life situations and this is why these semantic roles are known as participant roles. The role types which are referred to in the description of the semantic structure of arguments create a universally valid and reasonably well-specified set of concepts. (Platt, ١٩٧١:٦٣)

Cook (١٩٧٩:١٢١) states that both 'cases' and 'case configurations' are universal. The verb **give**, for example, in any language, means that 'somebody gives something to somebody else', and that the Agent–Objective–Benefactive configuration is implied regardless of the types of language.

٣.٤ *Concepts Related to Semantic Roles*

This section discusses the main ideas and concepts that are important for a study of semantic roles.

٣.٤.١ *Overt and Covert Semantic Roles of the Subject*

Jackendoff (١٩٧٢:٣٦) believes that a theory of case grammar which assigns exactly one semantic role to each NP in deep structure cannot provide all semantic information about the sentence.

Therefore, he proposes what he calls 'primary' and 'secondary' actions or roles. Primary semantic roles are mainly overt roles which can also be partially covert (Cook, ١٩٧٩:٩١). They include Ag, Instr, Force, Loc, Pos, Rec, Stim, Ben, and Zero.

Secondary semantic roles are always covert and appear only in the deep structure. They include only Source and Goal. (ibid)

There are different views in assigning the number of semantic roles to NPs. In case grammar and Government and Binding theory each NP is assumed to have exactly one semantic role and each semantic role is assigned to one NP. (ibid)

(٤٧) **Michael** smashed the glass.

(Thakur, ١٩٩٩:٢٢٢)

Micheal is the instigator of the action, i.e., the Ag of the sentence. Jackendoff (١٩٧٢:٣٤) assigns two semantic roles to certain verbs. For example:

(٤٨) **Harry** rolled down the grass.

(ibid)

Harry could be **Rec** or **Ag**. In the first reading **Harry** may be unaware of the motion. The other reading suggests that he is rolling willingly. In case grammar, such a sentence would be introduced by giving two different representations of **Harry** in the deep structure. (ibid)

Radford mentions that although most preds do assign the semantic roles to their subjs, a small number of preds are accompanied by what is called 'non-

thematic subjs' which refers to subjs that are not assigned any semantic role by their preds. For example:

(٤٩) **The soil** is hardening.

(Thakur, ١٩٩٩:٧٨)

On the same line, Cook (١٩٨٨:١١٥) discusses the same idea, i.e, non-thematic subjs, in connection with certain kinds of subjs. For instance **it**, is assigned no semantic role at all.

(٥٠) **It'**s very hot in here.

(Quirk et al., ١٩٨٥:٧٤٨)

Therefore, subj. NPs may have one semantic role, two semantic roles simultaneously or no semantic role at all depending on the kind of verb, in part, and on the kind of NP that is chosen as the subj of sentence.

(Talmy, ١٩٨٥:٨٤)

٣.٥ *Models to the Study of Semantic Roles of the Subject*

٣.٥.١ *Platt's Model (١٩٧١)*

Platt(١٩٧١)studies Grammatical Meanings (henceforth, GMs) (i.e., semantic roles) within a tagmemic framework. He examines the types of relationships involved by several predicate fillers and displays the variant nature of possibilities of GMs.

He analyzes GMs and their co–occurrence with Grammatical Forms (henceforth, GFs). He proposes a list which consists of eight GMs: Affective, Agentive, Benefactive (inner, outer and far outer), Instrumental, Locative (inner, outer and far outer), Neutral, participative and purposive.

His approach includes certain observations about the GMs of phrase level tagmemes. It comes close to Fillmore's hypothesis about deep structure cases; that cases are implied by each particular verb or adjective. He claims that any predication, whether expressed by a verb, adjective, or noun implies certain deep structure cases or GM relationships of the other co –occurring elements.

٣.٥.٢ *Jackendoff 's Model (١٩٧٢)*

Jachendoff (١٩٧٢:٣٩) believes that semantic roles can be defined in terms of semantic subfunctions. Ag, for example, is the argument of CAUSE that is an individual. Source and Goal are the initial and final state arguments of CHANGE. Location is defined in terms of the semantic function BE that takes an individual (the Theme) and state (the Location). He does not include selectional information in the lexical entries.

٣.٥.٣ *William's Model (١٩٨١)*

William (١٩٨١) argues that lexical entries should consist of a specification of the argument structure of items. They contain unordered list of the semantic roles. Subj is notationally differentiated from obj by being

underlined. According to Williams' analysis, the entry for **give** might be along the following lines:

give: categorical features: [V, _____, N]

argument structure: [<u>Actor</u>,Theme, Goal]

There are obvious similarities between the proposals of Fillmore and William's. Both assume that a set of general lexical redundancy rules determines (at least in the unmarked case) the categorical status of the internal arguments of predicate whether they appear as NPs or PPs headed by **to**, etc. But if the categorical status of the arguments can be predicated from their semantic roles, then this will have essential implications for the overall organization properties of items which are predictable (at least in the unmarked case) from their semantic roles. (Radford,١٩٨٨:٣٨٣)

٣.٥.٤ *Foley and Van Valin's Model (١٩٨٤)*

This approach is called the 'silent movie' approach. Their approach indicates that, in spite of the fact that a given event might be described in various ways; there is one invariant event which includes the same action, state or event and the same semantic roles.

Their approach, according to Miller (١٩٨٩:٩١), unfortunately ignores the fact that events could not be interpreted directly, but through the use of language, and languages have different constructions that encode different images.

(٥١) **The sun** emits radiation.

The sun is the **Ag**, according to Foley and Van Valin (١٩٨٤: ٣٠), the entity which performs the emission of radiation. Simultaneously, **the sun** is also a Source "the place from which the radiation comes''. This information can be interpreted in a semantic analysis:

[SUN CAUSE [RADIATION COMES FROM SUN]]

They propose a set of 'objective' semantic roles like Source, Ag, Instr, Rec, which are specific to particular predicates. Moreover, they propose what is called the 'generalized semantic relation' or 'macro roles' such as 'actor' and 'undergoer' which are different from Fillmore's 'cases' or Gruber's 'Thematic relation'. The actor expresses "the participant which performs effects instigates, or controls the situation denoted by the predicate". (ibid: ٢٩)

The undergoer is "the argument which expresses the participant which does not perform, initiate, or control any situation but rather is affected by it someway''. (ibid)

٣.٥.٥ *Givon's Model* (١٩٨٤)

Givon's (١٩٨٤) model depends on propositional semantics. His approach is developed gradually as a rejection of the tenets of the transformational – generative tradition. Givon chooses certain classes of nouns and verbs and matches them with the semantic roles of the argument in a sentence.

٣.٥.٦ *Quirk et al.'s Model (١٩٨٥)*

Quirk et al. (١٩٨٥) study semantic roles of arguments of sentences in relation with the type of sentence patterns they belong to. They present many roles which can be subj, O_d, and O_i . (See Table (١)).

They construct a table in which the semantic roles of the arguments of a sentence are presented according to sentence patterns. This model includes Ag, Aff, Pos, Instr, Rec, External causer, Loc, Temp, Eventive and Zero semantic roles. In addition, two semantic roles(i.e. Source and Goal) can be added to the model's semantic roles since they are easy to comprehend. This model is more comprehensive than others since it involves most of the semantic roles that have been mentioned by the grammarians and for its wider scope in comparison to other models. It includes the semantic roles which have been studied by sample. Quirk et al.'s model deals with the semantic roles in a systematic way since it first defines them, then it distinguish between these roles by reporting the main points that differ from one to another. It also limits the circumstances in which each semantic role comes with. As such, this model is adopted in this study.

٣.٥.٧ *Radford's Model (١٩٨٨)*

Radford's (١٩٨٨) approach is similar to William's (١٩٨١) approach

using 'theta grid' which includes an unordered list of the theta roles (i.e., semantic roles in this study), instead of 'argument structure'.

٣.٥.٨ *Previous Study of the Semantic Roles of the Subject*

٣.٥.٨.١ *Salman's Study (١٩٩٦)*

Salman's study(which is an M.A. Thesis) deals with the factors that affect the semantic roles of the subj in English. It is hypothesized that the semantic features of the NP used as a subj. are not determinant of the semantic roles of the subj. unless they are coupled with semantico-syntactic features of the verb. In the light of this hypothesis, the study identified and explained the semantic roles of the subj., obj., and those roles which are related to specific verbs. The researcher states that the traditional semantic sub classification of nouns into concrete, abstract, countable, uncountable, etc. was not of much help in specifying the semantic roles of the subj. Similarly, the well-known syntactic and semantic verb categories: transitive, intransitive, stative, dynamic, etc. could not adequately satisfy the study of the semantic roles of the subj. The present study displays only the semantic roles of the subj, defines them in an attempt to clarify each type and distinguish it from the other.

Chapter Four

Data Collection

٤.١ Introduction

This chapter encompasses the goals of the present study. It displays all the procedures which have been followed in gathering the data of the present study. It starts with the objectives of the test, is followed by the selection of the material, test design, test virtues (i.e. validity and reliability), and then it moves to the pilot administration of the test.

Finally, it ends with the final administration of the test and the scoring scheme.

٤.٢ Objectives of the Test

According to Skehan (١٩٩٩:٣٠٣), a test is "a systematic method of eliciting performance which is intended to be the basis for some sort of decision making".

Thus, the present study has used a diagnostic test to investigate the extent to which university students master the semantic roles of the subject. It aims at locating the precise areas of difficulty encountered by Iraqi EFL university students in using the semantic roles of the subj. and simultaneously identifying the causes and types of their errors. The appropriate recommendations can be built upon the results of the test.

The test is planned for both the recognition and production levels. The first and second questions measure the subjects' responses at the recognition level, whereas the third and fourth questions measure their responses at the production level .

٤.٣ *Selection of Material*

Most of the items of the present test have been picked from the grammar books mentioned in Chapter Two as well from a work-book by R.A. Close **A University Grammar of English** (Workbook) (١٩٧٣).	The selected items convey as far as possible the forms of the semantic roles of the subj. and their different types.	Moreover, the items of the test and its questions have been submitted to a jury[1] of eighteen experienced university lecturers whose recommendations have been taken into consideration.

---

[1]. The jury includes the following:

Prof. Abdul Latif Al-Jumaily (Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics), College of Arts / University of Baghdad.

Prof. Kadhim H. Al-Jawadi (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of Arts / University of Baghdad.

Prof. Salih M. Hameed (Ph.D. in Literature), College of Education / University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Abdul Kareem F. Al-Jumaily (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of Education (Ibn-Rushd) / University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Adil Al-Akkam (M.A. in English Language and Linguistics), College of Basic Education / University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Firas A. Marouf (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of Education (Ibn-Rushd) / University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Hameed H. Al-Masuodi (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation), College of Education / University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Lamya'a A. Al-Aani (M.A. in Linguistics), College of Education (Ibn-Rushd) / University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Muayyad M. Saed (Ph.D. in Methodology), College of Education(Ibn-Rushd) / University of Baghdad.

٤.٤ *Test Design*

The test comprises four questions: the first two questions are designed to measure the subjects' responses at the recognition level, except for the second one which tests both the recognition and the production level. Whereas the last two questions are designed to measure the subjects' responses at the production level .The first question includes thirty items intended to measure the subjects' ability to indicate the different roles of the given subjs. The subjects are provided with a list of semantic roles of the subj. and they are asked to write the letters of the suitable roles in the blanks. The second question involves forty items. The subjects are asked to state whether the given roles of the underlined subjs in each item are true or false and correct

Asst. Prof. Munthir M. Al-Dulaimi (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation), Colleges of Languages / University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Ommran M. Mahood (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of Education (Ibn-Rushd) / University of Baghdad.

Asst. Prof. Razzaq N. Mukheef (M.A. in English Language and Linguistics), College of Education / University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Riyadh T. Al-Ameedi (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation), College of Education / University of Babylon.

Lecturer A'sim A. Zba'r (Ph.D. in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language), College of Basic Education / University of Babylon.

Lecturer Dunya Al-Jabaawi (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of Arts / University of Baghdad.

Lecturer Fareed H. Al-Hindawi (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of Education / University of Babylon.

Lecturer Maysa'a K. Hussein (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of Education / University of Al-Qadisiya.

Lecturer Sundus M. Al-Ubaidy (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of Arts / University of Baghdad.

the false one. Going to the third question, it consists of fifteen items in which, the subjects are instructed to identify the semantic roles of the given subjs.

Finally, the fourth question involves fifteen items. It is designed to test the subject's ability in supplying the appropriate subjs showing the semantic roles required in brackets.

٤.٥ Test Virtues

Good tests are characterized by two main virtues: validity and reliability since they are the two most important aspects of precision. These two points are discussed in the following two subsections:

٤.٥.١ Validity of the Test

Validity refers to the agreement between the value of a measurement and its true value.(Harris,١٩٦٩:٦٠). According to him, the validity can be defined as "the extent to which it does what is intended to do". Also, Alderson et al. (١٩٩٥:١٧٠) state that validity is "the appropriateness of a given test or any of its component parts as a measure of what it is supposed to measure".

On the same line, Hughes (١٩٨٩:٢٢) mentions that the greater a test's content validity, the more likely it is to be an accurate measure of what it is supposed to measure. There are four types of validity but the most important two are content and face.

Mehrens and Lehmann (١٩٨٤:٢٨٥) and Weir (١٩٩٠:٢٦) declare that face validity is concerned with the way the test looks to testers, educators, and

observers i.e.; the measurement of the test appears valid to the general public. The jury has determined whether the test is valid or not, giving their instructions and suggestions on each question of the test and in many sides such as the arrangement of the questions, increasing the number of items, or even replacing some sentences by others. The suggestions have been taken into consideration so as to make it a valid one to fulfill the purposes for which it is designed. Content validity, on the other hand, is "based on the extent to which a measurement reflects the specific intended domain of content". (Carmines & Zeller, ١٩٩١: ٢٠).

Harris (١٩٦٩:١٩) points out that a test "is said to have content validity if it is based on a careful analysis of the material which is intended to be assessed and measured".

٤.٥.٢ *Reliability of the Test*

As a matter of fact, reliability is a necessary characteristic of a good test, it is a prerequisite for the measurement of validity. According to Lado (١٩٦١: ٣٣٠) and Madson (١٩٨٣: ١٧٩) test reliability refers to the stability of test scores when administered on two different occasions under the same (not identical) circumstances. In other words, it refers to the degree to which a test is consistent and stable in measuring what it is intended to measure. Most simply put, a test is reliable if it is consistent within itself and across time.

Brown (١٩٩٦: ١٩٢) declares different strategies for estimating the reliability of a test such as test-retest, two equivalent forms, split-half, and Kurder-Richardson strategy which is followed in this study.

This strategy has the following formula:

R = N / N − ١(١ − (m (N − m) / N X^٢))

Where:

R: represents "reliability".

N: represents "the number of the items in the test".

M: represents "the mean of the test scores".

X: represents "the slandered deviation of the test scores".

It has been concluded from the computations of this formula that the reliability coefficient of the present test is (٠.٩٣) which is a highly positive correlation.

٤.٦ *The Subjects of the Study*

The subjects of this study have been selected from the Department of English of the Colleges of Education at Al-Qadisiya and Babylon Universities. The examination includes one hundred subjects. Fifty subjects (١٤ males and ٣٦ females) have been taken from Al-Qadisiya University and fifty (١٦ males and ٣٤ females) have been taken from Babylon University. The first half represents (٧٣ %) of the total student population, while the second half represents (٧٠ %) of the total student population of the fourth academic year (٢٠٠٥ – ٢٠٠٦).

The study deals only with Iraqi university students who have similar EFL background. The non – Iraqi students are excluded from the test. It is preferred to test fourth year students because the topic under investigation is taught in

the same year of study at both universities. The textbook followed is **A University Grammar of English** by Quirk and Greenbaum (١٩٧٣).

٤.٧ *Pilot Administration*

Before achieving the main test in its final version, a pilot test has been carried out on the second of February, ٢٠٠٦ at University of Al-Qadisiya and on the twenty-three of January, ٢٠٠٦ at University of Babylon in order to guess the time required for answering the test, to check whether the subjects have comprehended the given instructions, and to identify the weakness of their general assessment of the content of the test.

It has been observed that the time demanded to the final administration of the test is about one hour. The test has been administered to twenty students who are selected haphazardly from the fourth year of the Colleges of Education at Al- Qadisiya and Babylon Universities.

٤.٧.١ *Item Analysis*

This way can be used to make judgments about the sufficiency of each single item in a test .Davis (١٩٦٨:١٦٢) states that "the item analysis is a means of speculating how much information each single item contributes to the information by the test as a whole".

The analysis schedulized according to two levels item facility (or difficulty) is a statistical index which is indicated by the percentage of students

who get the right answer. The following formula is used to find out the level difficulty for each item in the test:

FV = R / N

The above formula can be illustrated as follows:

FV: represents "item facility value".

R: represents "the number of correct answers".

N: represents "the number of the students taking the test".

After the implementation of the above formula it has been found that item difficulty and easiness range between (٠.٢٠ – ٠.٨٠) (See Table ٢).

Table (٢)

The Facility Value and the Discrimination Power of the Tests Items

No. of Question	No. of Items	FV	D
	١	٠.٣٠	٠.٣٠
	٢	٠.٢٠	٠.٤٠
	٣	٠.٦٠	٠.٢٠
	٤	٠.٤٠	٠.٣٠
	٥	٠.٦٠	٠.٢٠
	٦	٠.٧٠	٠.٧٠
	٧	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	٨	٠.٣٠	٠.٣٠
	٩	٠.٣٠	٠.٣٠
	١٠	٠.٤٠	٠.٣٠
١	١١	٠.٥٠	٠.٦٠
	١٢	٠.٤٠	٠.٤٠
	١٣	٠.٢٠	٠.٤٠
	١٤	٠.٦٠	٠.٢٠
	١٥	٠.٣٠	٠.٣٠
	١٦	٠.٨٠	٠.٧٠
	١٧	٠.٥٠	٠.٦٠
	١٨	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	١٩	٠.٤٠	٠.٤٠
	٢٠	٠.٥٠	٠.٦٠
	٢١	٠.٣٠	٠.٣٠
	٢٢	٠.٦٠	٠.٥٠

No. of Items	FV	D
٢٣	٠.٧٠	٠.٦٠
٢٤	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
٢٥	٠.٥٠	٠.٤٠
٢٦	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
٢٧	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
٢٨	٠.٤٠	٠.٢٠
٢٩	٠.٣٠	٠.٤٠
٣٠	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠

No. of Question	No. of Items	FV	D
	١	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	٢	٠.٢٠	٠.٤٠
	٣	٠.٤٠	٠.٢٠
	٤	٠.٣٠	٠.٤٠
	٥	٠.٦٠	٠.٢٠
	٦	٠.٧٠	٠.٦٠
	٧	٠.٢٠	٠.٤٠
	٨	٠.٨٠	٠.٧٠
	٩	٠.٤٠	٠.٢٠
	١٠	٠.٣٠	٠.٤٠
	١١	٠.٥٠	٠.٦٠
	١٢	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	١٣	٠.٤٠	٠.٢٠
	١٤	٠.٣٠	٠.٤٠
	١٥	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	١٦	٠.٣٠	٠.٤٠
	١٧	٠.٤٠	٠.٤٠
	١٨	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	١٩	٠.٤٠	٠.٢٠
٢	٢٠	٠.٣٠	٠.٤٠
	٢١	٠.٦٠	٠.٦٠
	٢٢	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	٢٣	٠.٥٠	٠.٤٠
	٢٤	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	٢٥	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	٢٦	٠.٤٠	٠.٤٠
	٢٧	٠.٣٠	٠.٤٠
	٢٨	٠.٤٠	٠.٤٠
	٢٩	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	٣٠	٠.٤٠	٠.٢٠
	٣١	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	٣٢	٠.٥٠	٠.٦٠
	٣٣	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	٣٤	٠.٣٠	٠.٣٠
	٣٥	٠.٧٠	٠.٦٠
	٣٦	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	٣٧	٠.٥٠	٠.٣٠
	٣٨	٠.٦٠	٠.٤٠
	٣٩	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠

No. of Question	No. of Items	FV	D
	٤٠	٠.٧٠	٠.٦٠
٣	١	٠.٢٠	٠.٤٠
	٢	٠.٨٠	٠.٦٠
	٣	٠.٣٠	٠.٢٠
	٤	٠.٤٠	٠.٦٠
	٥	٠.٥٠	٠.٢٠
	٦	٠.٢٠	٠.٤٠
	٧	٠.٧٠	٠.٥٠
	٨	٠.٨٠	٠.٦٠
	٩	٠.٣٠	٠.٢٠
	١٠	٠.٤٠	٠.٤٠
	١١	٠.٣٠	٠.٣٠
	١٢	٠.٥٠	٠.٥٠
	١٣	٠.٤٠	٠.٤٠
	١٤	٠.٣٠	٠.٣٠
	١٥	٠.٢٠	٠.٣٠

No. of Question	No. of Items	FV	D
٤	١	٠.٦٠	٠.٥٠
	٢	٠.٧٠	٠.٦٠
	٣	٠.٧٠	٠.٦٠
	٤	٠.٧٠	٠.٦٠
	٥	٠.٢٠	٠.٣٠
	٦	٠.٤٠	٠.٤٠
	٧	٠.٧٠	٠.٧٠
	٨	٠.٦٠	٠.٥٠
	٩	٠.٥٠	٠.٣٠
	١٠	٠.٧٠	٠.٦٠
	١١	٠.٦٠	٠.٤٠
	١٢	٠.٥٠	٠.٣٠
	١٣	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	١٤	٠.٢٠	٠.٢٠
	١٥	٠.٣٠	٠.٣٠

A test is regarded too easy if more than ٩٠ percentages gets it right.

An item is regarded too difficult if fewer than ٣٠ percentages gets it right.

(Madson, ١٩٨٣:١٨١-٢)

Item discrimination power, on the other hand, refers to the degree to which it discriminates between students, with high and low achievements. Such item discrimination has the following formula:

D = Correct U – Correct L / N

The above formula can be illustrated as follows:

D: represents "discrimination index".

U: represents "upper half".

L: represents "lower half".

N: represents "the number of the students taking the test in one group".

After the application of this formula, it has been found that the discrimination power ranges between ($٠.٢٠ - ٠.٧٠$) (See Table ٢).

٤.٨ Final Administration

After making sure that the test has gained the validity and reliability qualifications, the test has been applied to the whole subjects of the study. The main test was achieved on the second of February at University of Al- Qadisiya and on the fifth of March at University of Babylon during the academic year ٢٠٠٥ – ٢٠٠٦.

The test is administered to one hundred subjects .The time allocated for the test has proved to be sixty minutes. After making the required adjustment the instructions and directions for each question are explained with clear examples to the subjects.

The subjects are asked to write their responses on the test papers without supplying their names in order to avoid embarrassment.

٤.٩ Scoring Scheme

The purpose of scoring scheme is to measure the objectivity and the reliability of the test. The test has been scored out of ١٠٠. Each item is marked as either correct or incorrect or half correct if it isn't corrected . One score is assigned to each correct answer for each item and zero if no answer is given and half score if the answer is wrong or isn't corrected . The scoring scheme adopted for the present test can be illustrated in table (٣).

Table (٣)

Distribution of Scores of the Test

No. of Questions	No. of Items	Scores	Percentage
١	٣٠	٣٠	٣٠
٢	٤٠	٤٠	٤٠
٣	١٥	١٥	١٥
٤	١٥	١٥	١٥
Total	١٠٠	١٠٠	١٠٠

Chapter Five

Results Analysis and Discussion

٥.١ Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the analysis of the results of the test. It tackles the troublesome linguistic errors of the subjects in relation to the semantic

roles of the subj. It also presents an idea about the sources of these errors which represent the problematic areas for Iraqi EFL university students.

٥.٢ Result Analysis

This section displays the results in relation to the subjects' performance on each question of the test. It is the corner stone of approving or disapproving the hypotheses i.e. they are either verified or refuted.

٥.٢.١ Subjects' Performance of the First Question

This question is determined to measure the subjects' responses at the recognition level. To see whether they are capable of recognizing and choosing the correct roles of the appointed subjs.

Table (٤)

The Frequency and Rate of Subject's Performance at the Recognition Level in Question (١)

NO. of Items	NO. of Correct Responses	%	NO. of Incorrect Responses	%
١	٢٠	٢٠	٨٠	٨٠
٢	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	٤٠
٣	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	٤٠
٤	٥٠	٥٠	٥٠	٥٠
٥	٩٠	٩٠	١٠	١٠
٦	٧٠	٧٠	٣٠	٣٠
٧	٣٠	٣٠	٧٠	٧٠
٨	٧٠	٧٠	٣٠	٣٠
٩	٧٠	٧٠	٣٠	٣٠
١٠	٩٠	٩٠	١٠	١٠
١١	٥٠	٥٠	٥٠	٥٠
١٢	٥٨	٥٨	٤٢	٤٢
١٣	٢٠	٢٠	٨٠	٨٠
١٤	٤٨	٤٨	٥٢	٥٢
١٥	٥٦	٥٦	٤٤	٤٤
١٦	٥٦	٥٦	٤٤	٤٤
١٧	٨٩	٨٩	١١	١١
١٨	٥٧	٥٧	٤٣	٤٣
١٩	٣٩	٣٩	٦١	٦١
٢٠	٩٠	٩٠	١٠	١٠
٢١	٧٠	٧٠	٣٠	٣٠
٢٢	٦٧	٦٧	٣٣	٣٣
٢٣	٩٣	٩٣	٧	٧
٢٤	٧٤	٧٤	٢٦	٢٦
٢٥	٥٩	٥٩	٤١	٤١
٢٦	٤٠	٤٠	٦٠	٦٠

NO. of Items	NO. of Correct Responses	%	NO. of Incorrect Responses	%
٢٧	٧٦	٧٦	٢٤	٢٤
٢٨	٩٤	٩٤	٦	٦
٢٩	٨٩	٨٩	١١	١١
٣٠	٧٢	٧٢	٢٨	٢٨
Total	١٩٠٧	٦٣.٦	١٠٩٣	٣٦.٤

The obtained results have contributed to give evidence that the subjects' performance at the recognition level is less than the expected result since their incorrect responses are (٢٦.٤,١٠٩٣) whereas their correct responses are (٦٣.٦,١٩٠٧). This leads to the verification of the first hypothesis that reads Iraqi EFL university students do not distinguish different semantic roles of the subject. The following table summarizes the types of the errors made in relation to this question.

Table (٥)

Errors Made in Response to Question (١)

No.	Types of Errors in Q.١	Frequency of Errors in Q.١	%
١	Failure to choose the correct semantic roles of the subj	١٧٣	٥.٨
٢	Confusion between the semantic roles of the subj	٦٠٦	٢٠.٢
٣	Putting Ag instead of Aff	٩٤	٣.١
٤	Putting Even instead of Temp	٧٣	٢.٤
٥	Using Ag in more than one place	٢٦٠	٨.٧
	Total	**١٢٠٦**	**٤٠.٢**

٥.٢.٢   *Subjects' Performance of the Second Question*

The second question is designed to measure the subjects' ability to recognize the true and the false responses, then it recommends to correct the false ones. Their responses are presented in the following table.

Table (٦)

The Frequency and Rate of Subject's Performance at the Recognition Level in Question (٢)

NO. of Items	NO. of Correct Responses	%	NO. of Incorrect Responses	%	NO. of Half Correct Responses	%
١	٧٢	٧٢	٢٨	٢٨	/	/
٢	٣٣	٣٣	٥٥	٥٥	١٢	١٢
٣	٦١	٦١	٣٩	٣٩	/	/
٤	٦٠	٦٠	٢٠	٢٠	٢٠	٢٠
٥	٧٩	٧٩	٢١	٢١	/	/
٦	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	٤٠	/	/
٧	٤٤	٤٤	١٢	١٢	٤٤	٤٤
٨	٨٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠	/	/
٩	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	٤٠	/	/
١٠	٩٢	٩٢	٦	٦	٢	٢
١١	٨٩	٨٩	١١	١١	/	/
١٢	٥٩	٥٩	٢١	٢١	٢٠	٢٠
١٣	٧٩	٧٩	٢١	٢١	/	/
١٤	٩٠	٩٠	١٠	١٠	/	/
١٥	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	٤٠	/	/
١٦	٦٢	٦٢	٣٨	٣٨	/	/
١٧	٥٨	٥٨	٤٢	٤٢	/	/
١٨	٧٥	٧٥	١٥	١٥	١٠	١٠
١٩	٦٨	٦٨	٣٢	٣٢	/	/
NO. of Items	NO. of Correct Responses	%	NO. of Incorrect Responses	%	NO. of Half Correct Responses	%
٢٠	٦٤	٦٤	٣٦	٣٦	/	/
٢١	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	٤٠	/	/
٢٢	٧٠	٧٠	٣٠	٣٠	/	/

٢٣	٧٥	٧٥	٢٥	٢٥	/	/
٢٤	٧٠	٧٠	٣٠	٣٠	/	/
٢٥	٨٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠	/	/
٢٦	٦٧	٦٧	٣٣	٣٣	/	/
٢٧	٧٧	٧٧	٢٣	٢٣	/	/
٢٨	٨٨	٨٨	١٢	١٢	/	/
٢٩	٥٨	٥٨	٢٩	٢٩	١٣	١٣
٣٠	٥٦	٥٦	٤٤	٤٤	/	/
٣١	٥٩	٥٩	١٢	١٢	٢٩	٢٩
٣٢	٥٨	٥٨	٤٢	٤٢	/	/
٣٣	٧٠	٧٠	٥	٥	٢٥	٢٥
٣٤	٣٩	٣٩	٢٥	٢٥	٣٦	٣٦
٣٥	٩٠	٩٠	١٠	١٠	/	/
٣٦	٦٠	٦٠	٢	٢	٣٨	٣٨
٣٧	٧٩	٧٩	٦	٦	١٥	١٥
٣٨	٣٠	٣٠	٧٠	٧٠	/	/
٣٩	٥٠	٥٠	١٦	١٦	٣٤	٣٤
٤٠	٩٤	٩٤	٦	٦	/	/
Total	٢٦٧٥	٦٦.٩	١٠٢٧	٢٥.٧	٢٩٨	٧.٥

The results show that the subjects face difficulty in recognizing the true and false responses simultaneously; they fail to correct the false ones. Their failure in the correction of the false responses may be attributed to the fact that they either recognize that the item is wrong but they are unable to correct it or consider it wrong by guessing. This awkwardness is obvious in the higher number of the incorrect responses which is (٢٥.٧,١٠٢٧). Accordingly this validates the second hypothesis which entails that such learners are confused in using the semantic roles of the subject. In other words, they tend to use agent role in most cases(i.e. overgeneralization). The following table illustrates these types of errors.

Table (٧)

Errors Made in Response to Question (٢)

No.	Types of Errors in Q.٢	Frequency of Errors in Q.٢	%
١	Failure to recognize the correct semantic role	٢٧٠	٦.٨
٢	Failure to give the right correction	٢٦٤	٦.٦
٣	Giving no correction	١٧٥	٤.٤
Total		٧٠٩	١٧.٧

٥.٢.٣ *Subjects' Performance of the Third Question*

The third question of the test is built in a way to measure the subjects' responses at the production level. Also, it is formed to approve or disapprove the third hypothesis that students are influenced by the grammatical function of the subject more than its semantic roles. The following results have been gained.

Table (٨)

The Frequency and Rate of Subject's Performance at the Production Level in Question (٣)

NO. of Items	NO. of Correct Responses	%	NO. of Incorrect Responses	%
١	٢٠	٢٠	٨٠	٨٠
٢	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	٤٠
٣	٢٠	٢٠	٨٠	٨٠
٤	١٥	١٥	٨٥	٨٥
٥	٢١	٢١	٧٩	٧٩
٦	١٥	١٥	٨٥	٨٥
٧	٦٠	٦٠	٤٠	٤٠
٨	٧٠	٧٠	٣٠	٣٠
٩	٢٠	٢٠	٨٠	٨٠
١٠	١٨	١٨	٨٢	٨٢
١١	١٥	١٥	٨٥	٨٥
١٢	٢٠	٢٠	٨٠	٨٠
١٣	١٦	١٦	٨٤	٨٤
١٤	١٢	١٢	٨٨	٨٨
١٥	١٧	١٧	٨٣	٨٣
Total	٣٩٩	٢٦.٦	١١٠١	٧٣.٤

From the results showed in table (٨) , it has been observed that the total number of the correct responses (٢٦.٦,٣٩٩) is lower than the incorrect responses (٧٣.٤,١١٠١). This refers to the subjects' low performance concerning the semantic roles of the subj. As such, the third hypothesis is validated.

Subjects' Performance of the Fourth Question

As far as the fourth question is concerned, it is planned to measure the subjects' ability to supply the suitable roles in the brackets. The results give an explicit idea about the subjects' responses of each item in this question.

Table (٩)

The Frequency and Rate of Subject's Performance at the Production Level in Question (٤)

NO. of Items	NO. of Correct Responses	%	NO. of Incorrect Responses	%
١	٢٠	٢٠	٨٠	٨٠
٢	٨٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠
٣	١٥	١٥	٨٥	٨٥
٤	٧٠	٧٠	٣٠	٣٠
٥	١٠	١٠	٩٠	٩٠
٦	١٥	١٥	٨٥	٨٥
٧	٢٠	٢٠	٨٠	٨٠
٨	٢٥	٢٥	٧٥	٧٥
٩	١٠	١٠	٩٠	٩٠
١٠	٨٠	٨٠	٢٠	٢٠
١١	١٠	١٠	٩٠	٩٠
١٢	٧٠	٧٠	٣٠	٣٠
١٣	١٠	١٠	٩٠	٩٠
١٤	١٧	١٧	٨٣	٨٣
١٥	٩	٩	٩١	٩١
Total	٤٦١	٣٠.٧	١٠٣٩	٦٩.٣

The outcomes manifested in table (٩) confirm that the total number of the incorrect responses (٦٩.٣,١٠٣٩) is higher than the total number of the correct responses (٣٠.٧,٤٦١). This proves that the subjects have failed to add the appropriate roles and this may be ascribable to their incompetence in this aspect. In turn, the high rate of the subjects' incorrect responses concerning questions (٣) and (٤), proves that they face difficulty in using the semantic roles of the subj at the production level and this verifies the first hypothesis .

Another way of enhancing the validity of the first hypothesis is to display the types of the committed errors as it is shown in the following table.

Table (١٠)

Errors Made in Response to Question (٣) and (٤)

Types of Errors	Frequency of Errors in Q.٣	%	Types of Errors	Frequency of Errors in Q.٤	%
Failure to give the correct semantic roles of the subj	٧٦٤	٥٠.٩	Failure to supply the correct subj	٢٣٤	١٥.٦

٥.٢.٥ Subjects' Performance of the Semantic Roles of the Subject in the Whole Test

The results of the subjects' responses in each question of the test at both levels: the recognition and production can be displayed in the following table.

Table (١١)

The Frequency and Rate of Subject's Performance at the Recognition Level in the Whole Test

Level	NO. of Question	NO. of Correct Responses	%	NO. of Incorrect Responses	%	NO. of Half Correct Responses	%
Recognition	Q.١	١٩٠٧	٦٣.٦	١٠٩٣	٣٦.٤	/	/
	Q.٢	٢٦٧٥	٦٦.٩	١٠٢٧	٢٥.٨	٢٩٦	٧.٤
Total		٤٥٨٢	٦٥.٥	٢١٢٠	٣٠.٣	٢٩٨	٧.٥

Table (١٢)

The Frequency and Rate of Subject's Performance at the Production Level in the Whole Test

Level	NO. of Question	NO. of Correct Responses	%	NO. of Incorrect Responses	%
Production	Q.٣	٣٩٩	٢٦.٦	١١٠١	٧٣.٤
	Q.٤	٤٦١	٣٠.٧	١٠٣٩	٦٩.٣
Total		٨٦٠	٢٨.٧	٢١٤٠	٧١.٣

It has been concluded from tables (١١) and (١٢) that the total number of subjects' incorrect responses (٧١.٣,٢١٤٠) at the production level is higher than

that at the recognition level which is (٣٠.٣,٢١٢٠).While the total number of subjects' correct responses (٦٩.٧,٤٨٨٠) at the recognition level (including half correct responses in the second question) is higher than that at the production level which is (٢٨.٧,٨٦٠). Also, there are certain means used to confirm the obtained results such as the mean and the coefficient variation. The mean for the production level (١١.٠٣) is lower than that for the recognition one (١٩.٥) and the coefficient variation for the production level (٧٤.٢) is higher than that for the recognition one (٦٤.٧). This happens because the students' performance at the recognition level is better than their performance at the production one.

٥.٢ *Error analysis*

Error analysis is a type of linguistic analysis that focuses on the errors that the learners make. It involves a comparison between the errors made in the Target Language and that target Language itself. Researchers are interested in errors because they are believed to contain valuable information about the strategies that learners use to acquire a language.

(Taylor, ١٩٧٥: ٧٤; Dulay and Burt, ١٩٧٤:٨٥)

٥.٢.١ *Possible Sources of Errors*

It is seen that "Systematically analyzing errors made by language learners make it possible to determine areas that need reinforcement in teaching". (Corder, ١٩٧٤: ١٢٠).

These errors can be of great help to the learners' in order to specify the points of weaknesses since the making of errors can be regarded as a device the learner uses in order to learn.(George,١٩٧١:٨٨) According to Corder (١٩٧٤: ١٣٢), error analysis has two objectives: one theoretical and another applied. The theoretical objective serves to "elucidate what and how a learner learns when he studies a second language". And the applied objective serves to enable the learner "to learn more efficiently by exploiting our knowledge of his dialect for pedagogical purposes".

٥.٣.١.١ *Interlingual Transfer*

This kind of errors is attributed to the native language (henceforth, L١). Lado (١٩٦٤:٨٦) mentions that this source of error is the result of the native influence of the mother language on the performance of the target language learner (henceforth, L٢). Connor (١٩٩٦:١٣) states that analyses of "interlingual" systems of learners' actual performance suggest that the influence of transfer on acquisition of the L٢ is quite complex. Other aspects considered include knowledge about L٢ itself, since learners use their knowledge of L١ in learning L٢, the learners' communicative strategies, the instructional situation , and the combined effects of these factors.

The interlingual effect is clear through the subjects' errors in their responses at the production level to items (١١) and (١٥) in question (٣):

Item (١١) **The train** stopped.   Aff

    * **The train** stopped.   **Rec**

Item (١٥) **Los Angeles** is foggy.   Loc

* **Los Angeles** is foggy.   **Temp**

It seems from the subjects' responses that they have depended upon translation. Although the subjects know the semantic roles of the subj, in particular items (١١ and ١٥) i.e., Loc and Aff roles the subjects rely upon what they can understand from the given subj ignoring its meaning in relation to the whole sentence. The subjects may translate the above items as follows: القطار توقف ((١١) Item), مدينة لوس انجلوس ضبابية (١٥) Item)).

This also seems to be true of the items (٤) and (١٠) in question (٣) i.e., the subjects focus on the person who did the action of giving only (the syntax assignment) without taking into consideration the person who receives the action :

Item (٤) **Julie** gave Jack the syntax assignment.   Source

  * **Julie** gave Jack the syntax assignment.   **Ag**

Item (١٠) **The winner** was given a prize.   Goal

  *   **The winner** was given a prize.   **Rec**

Likewise, some of the subjects' errors in item (٥) in question (٤) can be attributed to interlingual transfer:

Item (٥) **He** was holding a passenger's arm.   (Locative)

  * <u>New York</u> was holding a passenger's arm.   (Locative)

The total number of errors of this kind is (٧٠, ٢.١٥٪).

٥.٣.١.٢ *Intralingual Transfer*

Intralingual errors are due to the language being learned target language, independent of the native language. Dulay and Burt(١٩٧٤:٩٨)According to Richards (١٩٧٤:٦), they are "items produced by the learner which reflect not the structure of the mother tongue, but generalizations based on partial exposure to the target language". The learner, in this case, tries to "derive the rules behind the data to which he / she has been exposed, and may develop hypotheses that correspond neither to the mother tongue nor to the target language". (Ellis, ١٩٩٥: ٨٩)

As regard sources of errors, there are many that have been reported by different authors:

١. **Overgeneralization**: It is associated with reduction. It covers instances where the learner creates a deviant structure on the basis of his experience of other structures in the target language. It may be the result of the learner reducing his linguistic burden.   (Richards, ١٩٩٢a:١٧٤)

٢. **Ignoring of rule restrictions**: It refers to the applying of the rules to contexts to which they do not apply.

٣. **Incomplete application of rules**: It is the learners' effective communication through using simple rules which does not help the learner to   acquire the complex types of structure.

٤. **Semantic errors such as building false concepts / systems**: the learners of L٢ are seen to adopt wrong hypothesis or build wrong rule about L٢ i.e. faulty comprehension of distinctions in the target language .(Ibid: ١٧٨; George, ١٩٧١: ٩٨)

The subjects' strategy of **overgeneralization**, as mentioned earlier, is one of the factors that can lead to errors' generation. Errors type ٣ and ٥

which are **putting Ag instead of Aff and using Ag in more than one place** in items (١), and (١٦) are seen in question (١). The items below can illustrate this aspect:

Item (١) **The curtains** disappeared.   Aff

   * **The curtains** disappeared.   **Ag**

Item (١٦) **He** is holding a knife.   Loc

   * **He** is holding a knife.   **Ag**

A lot of subjects seem to overgeneralize the rule of putting Ag instead of putting the required semantic roles and in this case they are Aff and Loc.

Item (٢٦) **I** found it strange.   Rec

   * **I** found it strange.   **Ag**

Item (٣٠) **Jessica** gave Paul a digital watch.   Source

   * **Jessica** gave Paul a digital watch.   **Ag**

Errors like those in item (٢٩) below in question (١), however, might be due to overgeneralizing the rule of putting Ag instead of Goal too:

Item (٢٩) **Carol** was given a vase.   Goal

   * **Carol** was given a vase.   **Ag**

Apparently, it seems that errors type in question (٣) which is **failure to give the correct semantic roles of the subj.** may be attributed to **ignorance of rule restrictions**. The following examples in question (٣) give an apparent idea about such type of errors.

Item (١) **The suspect** received a caution   Rec

*	**The suspect** received a caution.	**Aff**

Item (١٠) **The water** evaorated.   Aff

*	**The winner** was given a prize.	**Rec**

Item (١٣) **Tonight** is rainy.   Temp

*	**Tonight** is rainy.	**Eventive**

As it is mentioned before that **ignorance of rule restrictions** refers to the application of rules to contexts to which they do not apply, the subjects' replacement of one semantic role by another may be attributed to their lack of knowledge of the rules that govern their choice of the correct semantic roles of the subj. since their correct choice enables them to produce such roles when it is required.

The effect of **ignorance of rule restrictions** is obvious in error type ١ which is **failure to choose the correct semantic role of the subj.**

in question (١) in items (١٩), (٢٤), and (٢٧) .See the examples below:

Item (١٩) **Your book** is lying on the bed.   Aff

*	**Your book** is lying on the bed.	**Loc**

Item (٢٤) **The final match** will be held next week.   **Eventive**

*	**The final match** will be held next week.	Temp

Item **(٢٧)** **The mother** told her children a story.   Source

*	**The mother** told her children a story.	**Ag**

Apparently, the subjects have recognized the above subjs as Loc in item (١٩), Temp in item (٢٤), and Ag in item (٢٧). They commit such an error which

is unacceptable because of their ignorance of rule restrictions since they expand the rules for more than one role in item (٢٧) they consider **the mother** as Ag whereas the correct role is source. The item (١٩) is considered as Loc while the real role is Aff .Error type ٢ which is **failure to recognize the correct semantic role** in question (٢) in items (١٣) and (٣٦) reads as follows:

Item (١٣) **Sara** was given a flower.   Goal

    * **Sara** was given a flower.   **Rec**

Item (٣٦) **The thief** told them the truth.   Source

    * **The thief** told them the truth.   **Aff**

This happens because learners think that the subj. in the first sentence is analyzed as Rec regardless of the subj meaning in the sentence as a whole, whereas the subj. in the second sentence is as an Aff without paying attention to the meaning of the whole sentence.

    Errors attributed to **incomplete application of rules** are mostly found in errors type ٢ and ٤ which are **confusing between the semantic roles of the subj.** and **putting Eventive instead of Temp** in question (١) as shown in items (٣), (٨), and (١٨) .

Item (٣) **Last night** was worm.   Temp

    * **Last night** was worm.   **Eventive**

Item (١١)**The bus** seats thirty.   Loc

    * **The bus** seats thirty.   **Rec**

Item (١٨) **The revolver** made him afraid.   Instr

*   The revolver made him afraid.   **Aff**

The subjects in item (٣) have depended on the predicate of the sentence in realizing the semantic role while such a dependency can not alone determine the correct semantic role. In items (١١) and (١٨) the subjects are confused in choosing the required subj. Here, they should not only rely on the subj. itself but should also conclude the semantic role from the given predicate (i.e. the verb or the verb and the following noun).

Likewise, some of the errors in items (٣) and (١٢) in question (٣) might be ascribed to the latter factor:

Item (٣)   **This path** is swarming with ants.   Loc

   *   **This path** is swarming with ants.   **Eventive**

Item (١٢) **The frost** has killed the flowers.   Instr

   *   **The frost** has killed the flowers.   **Loc**

A large number of the subjects' errors might be ascribed to **false concepts hypothesized** as shown in error type which is **failure to supply the correct subj.** in question (٤) in items (٩) and (١٥):

Item (٩)   The screw won't turn.   (instrumental)

   *   The wall won't turn.   **(affected)**

Item (١٥) The party have pleased me.   (eventive)

   *   Today have pleased me.   **(Temporal)**

The subjects' erroneous responses to the above items might be due to faulty comprehension of a distinction between the different semantic roles

such as eventive and temporal or instrumental roles. The subjects in items (٥) and (٢٦) below in question (٢) express error type ١ which is **failure to recognize the correct semantic role** and also seem to rely on meaning of the subj. to arrive at the suitable solution .

Item (٥) **Chicago** is windy.   Loc

    *   **Chicago** is windy.   **Temp**

Item (٢٦) **The car** ran over the ball.   Ag

    *   **The car** ran over the ball.   **Aff**

    False concepts hypothesized might also be the reason behind some of the subjects' incorrect responses to item (٥) in question (٣) and item (٤) in question (٤) as they are shown in the following examples:

Item (٥) **The computer** has solved the problem.   Instr

    * **The computer** has solved the problem.   **Eventive**

Item (٤) It was ٢٠٠٤.   (Zero)

    * Today was ٢٠٠٤.   **(Temporal)**

The total number of errors of this kind is (١٠٢٠, ٦٠.٢٦٪).

٥.٣.١.٣   Context of Learning

    The third major source of errors, though it overlaps with both types of transfer, is the "Context". It refers to the influence of the situation of learning, i.e., classroom. In classroom,   students often make errors because of a

misleading explanation from the teacher through a faulty presentation of a structure or a word in a textbook i.e. the success of learning process depends upon adequate teaching throughout the learning period, good classrooms, good syllabus design and material sequencing.(Brown, ١٩٩٤:٨٩)

Buck, Byrnes, and Thompson (١٩٨٩: ٣) define context as "the circumstances or settings in which a person uses language". Any person can only use the language properly under the supervision of a competence teacher who has the ability to explain anything relying on his culture, ideas, and his/her background.

Richards and Sampson (١٩٧٤: ٣١٥) remark that "at the level of classroom's experience, error analysis will continue to provide one means by which the teacher assesses learning and teaching and determines priorities for future effort". The context of learning's influence can be noticed obviously in the first question in item (١٤) as in the following instances:

Item (١٤) **I** prefer fried eggs and butter on toast.

The above error may be attributed to the material presented in the classroom in which there are several factors that have a clear influence upon it, such as, focusing on some roles and not others, inadequate explanation, little or no practice given to the use of these semantic roles, limited time specified for teaching them, unfamiliarity of the subjects with such a topic. As such, attention must be given to all areas equally. The total number of this kind of errors is (٢٢٠, ٧.٩ %).

٥.٣.١.٤ *Communication Strategies*

These are strategies employed by a learner to convey a message to a hearer. The learner may simply use his native language whether he knows that language or not. Sometimes, a word or two are slipped in, hoping that the learner will get the general idea of what is being communicated. Most of the time the learner gets the message. (George, ١٩٧١:١٠٣)

There are many communicative strategies but some of them have been observed in the subjects' responses such as **guessing** which refers to clues that are either language or not language based, including knowledge of a context, world, or text structure. Such clues make the learner guess the meaning in the absence of complete knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, or other target language elements.(Oxford, ١٩٩٠: ١٨ – ٢٠)

The following examples are from question (٢), items (٢ and ٩), and question (٣), item (٤):

Item (٢) <u>The cold </u>affects me badly.   affected

Item (٩) Do <u>you</u> hold a British passport?   recipient

Item (٤) **Julie** gave Jack the syntax assignment.   <u>Goal</u>

Also, error of guessing can be illustrated in the following examples from item (١ and ١٤) in question (٣) and item (١٤) in question (٤):

Item (٦) **She** received a present.   Rec

   *   **She** received a present.   **Aff**

Item (١٤) **Their quarrels** have upset me.   eventive

   *   **Their quarrels** have upset me.   **loc**

Item (١٤) <u>I</u> have lived in London most of my life.   (locative)

   *   <u>Hilla</u> have lived in London most of my life.   (locative)

    Another communication strategy is called avoidance **strategy.** This strategy entails that the subjects understand the message but they are incapable of expressing themselves accordingly. (ibid)

    The deployment of such a strategy results in error type ٣ in question (٢). This type of error produces responses that do not yield any type of correction i.e. **giving no correction.** The total number of such errors is (٩٨١, ٢٩.٦٩ %).

Chapter Six

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Suggestions

٦.١ Introduction

This chapter contains the conclusions of the present study. It consists of three sections. The first section is concerned with the findings of the study. The second is related to the pedagogical implications (i.e. recommendations or advantages to teachers, learners, and textbook writers). Finally, the third one refers to suggestions for future research concerning the semantic roles of the subj.

٦.٢ Conclusions

٦.٢.١ Theoretical Conclusions

١. The subj., as a syntactic unit, is easy to recognize and describe by appealing to the formal criteria: concord that holds between the subj. and other parts of the sentence.

٢. Different verb classes determine the semantic roles of the subj.

٣. It is not sufficient to depend on the semantic features of the subj. for determining the semantic roles of it. This is because the presence of certain adverbs such as **intentionally**, **accidentally**, prepositions such as **in**, **by**, and, expression **'in order that'** which all have some influence on determining the semantic roles of the subj.

٤. All Agentive subjs must be animate but not all animates are Ags. Animation is also a necessary feature for Exp and Ben. It can also accompany Aff, Stim, and Pos.

٦.٢.٢ Practical Conclusions

1. Iraqi EFL university students at the fourth stage fail to use the semantic roles of the subj. on both of the two levels i.e. recognition and production. This is proved by the high rate of errors (٤٢٠٥, ٤٢.٠٥ %) committed by the sample students. This validates the first hypothesis of the study which states that Iraqi EFL university students do not distinguish different semantic roles of the subj.

2. It can be concluded that learning the semantic roles of the subj. requires special teaching techniques to overcome the difficulties in learning English as a foreign language.

3. The analysis concerning the questions (٣) and (٤) state that most of the subjects fail to identify the semantic roles of the subj. This is evident from the rate of their incorrect responses to these questions which is (٧١.٣٪) whereas the rate of the correct ones is (٢٨.٧٪). Such rate confirms the second hypothesis.

4. It has been found from the subjects' performance throughout the whole test that they face difficulties in using the semantic roles of the subj. on both levels, but it appears from their responses that they face more difficulties at the production level than at the recognition one. This is evident from the mean of the subjects' performance at the recognition level which is (١٩.٥) against (١١.٠٣) at the production level.

5. Ten types of errors are made by the subjects in the field of semantic roles.The error types pinpointed by this study can be summed up as follows:

    1. Failure to choose the correct semantic role of the subj.
    2. Confusion between the semantic roles of the subj.
    3. Putting Ag instead of Aff.
    4. Putting Even instead of Temp.

٥. Using Ag in more than one place.

٦. Failure to recognize the correct semantic role of the subj.

٧. Failure to give the right correction.

٨. Giving no correction.

٩. Failure to give the correct semantic role of the subj.

١٠.   Failure to supply the correct subj.

٦. The reasonable causes underlying the subjects' low performance can be attributed to the following factors that are organized hierarchically relying on the rate of the committed errors in the whole test:

 I. Intralingual transfer which forms most of the subjects' errors and it accounts for (٦٠.٣٪) of their total errors. The inadequate understanding of the semantic roles of the subj. contribute towards making the subjects depend on overgeneralization, incomplete application of rules, false concepts hypothesized, and failure to learn conditions for rule application. This inadequacy results from the subjects' dependency on their prior knowledge of the target language rules in their attempt to recognize or produce the semantic roles of the subj.

 II. The communication strategies in using L٢ knowledge are deployed when learners do not have the adequate linguistic means for the concept they wish to express. Such strategies form (٢٧.٦٣) of their total errors.

 III. Interlingual transfer which refers to the subjects' use of their native language's rules instead of using second language's rules in the production of the semantic roles of the subj. This kind of errors forms (٤.٠١) of their total errors.

IV. Context of learning constitutes (٨.٠٦) of the subjects' total errors. The insufficient focus given to the semantic roles of the subj. especially in their textbooks may be the major cause behind the rate of this kind of errors.

٦.٣ Recommendations

٦.٣.١ Pedagogical Implications

١. A clear distinction should be drawn between the different types of the semantic roles of the subj. in order to contribute to compassing information which can be of help for the students' communication in the TL .

٢. Learners should learn the semantic roles of the subj. through developing awareness of variations of such roles' use through the study of grammatical rules, communicative contexts and the application of sentence exercises. English swarms with these roles because they are very important tools in fostering different communicative purposes. Therefore, they should be given due attention and taught through a variety of different texts.

٣. The error types should be given more attention to be avoided in future.

٤. The subjs' semantic roles should be taught in the early years of the EFL teaching program.

٥. Special courses should be designed for teachers to be in contact with the most suitable modern trends and techniques that teaches and explicates the semantic roles of the subjs .

## ٦.٤	*Suggestions for Further Research*

١. A study can be conducted following the same model regarding the semantic roles of other criteria, such as the object(whether direct or indirect).

٢. A stylistic analysis can be handled to investigate the writer's use of the subj. in association with its various semantic roles in his works.

Bibliography

Aarts, B. ١٩٩٧. **English Syntax and Argumentation**. London: Macmillan Press.

Abraham, W. (ed.) ١٩٧٨. **Vallence, Semantic Case and Grammatical Relations**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alderson, J. C.; Claphan, C.; and Wall, D. ١٩٩٥. **Language Construction and Evaluation**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alexander, L. G. ١٩٨٨. **Longman English Grammar**. London: Longman.

Arnold, D.; Alkinson, M.; Durand, J.; Grover, C.; and Sadler, L. (eds.). ١٩٨٩. **Essays on Grammatical Theory and Universal Grammar**. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Azar, B. S. ١٩٨٩. **Understanding and Using English Grammar**. ٣rd ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Batch, E. and Harms, R.(eds.) ١٩٦٨. **Universals in Linguistics Theory**. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bing, J. M. ١٩٨٩. **Grammar Guide: English Grammar in Context**. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Blansitt, E. L. ١٩٧٨. 'Stimulus as a Semantic Role'. In Abraham, W.(ed.), pp. ٣١١-٢٤.

Brown, E. K. and Miller, J. E. ١٩٨٠. **Syntax: A Linguistics Introduction to Sentence Structure.** London: Hutchinson.

Brown, K. ١٩٨٤ . **Linguistics Today** . Suffolk: Fontana Paperback .

Brown, H. D. ١٩٩٤. **Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.**3rd ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents .

Brown, J. D. ١٩٩٦.**Testing in Language Programs .**New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Bruti, S. ٢٠٠٣. "Anno Accademico". Internet .www.unipy.it/wwwling/ dispenses-٠٢٠٣A.doc.

Buck, K.; Byrnes, H. ;& Thompson, I. (Eds.) (١٩٨٩). **The ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview: Tester Training Manual.** Yonkers, New Jersey: ACTFL.

Burton- Roberts, N. ١٩٩٧. **Analysing Sentences: An Introduction to English Syntax.**2nd ed**.** London: Longman.

Carmines, E. G. and Zeller, R. A. ١٩٩١. **Reliability and Validity Assessment.** Newbury : Sage Publications .

Carnie, A. ٢٠٠٢. **Syntax: A Generative Introduction.** New York: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Celce-Murcia, M. and Larsen-Freeman, D. ١٩٩٩. **The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teachers Course.** ٢nd ed. London: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Chafe, W. L. ١٩٧٠. **Meaning and the Structure of Language** .Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

_____ .١٩٧٦.'Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Points of View' I Li, C. (ed.), pp. ٢٥-٥٥.

Chalker, S. ١٩٨٤. **Current English Grammar**. London: Macmillan Press.

Cole, P. and Sadock, M. (ed.) ١٩٧٧. **Syntax and Semantics: Grammatical Relations.** London: Academic Press. Vol. ٨.

Collins Cobuild English Grammar. ١٩٩٠. London: William Collins Sons & Ltd.

Comrie, B. ١٩٨٩. **Language Universals and Linguistics Typology**. ٢nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cook, W. A. ١٩٧٨. **'A Case Grammar Matrix Model (and its Application to a Hemingway Text)'.** In Abraham,W. (ed.), pp. ٢٩٥-٣٠٧.

_____ . ١٩٧٩. **Case Grammar**: **Development of the Matrix Model (**١٩٧٠-١٩٧٨**).** Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Connor, U. ١٩٩٦.**Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-Cultural Aspects of Second-Language Writing**. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Corder, S. P. ١٩٧٤. **Error Analysis** . London: Oxford University Press.

Cruse, D. ١٩٧٣. 'Some Thoughts on Agentivity' **Journal of Linguistics** ٩, ١-٢٣. Quoted in Fillmore,C. (١٩٧٧:٧٠).

Crystal. D. ٢٠٠٣. **A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davies, A. (ed.).١٩٦٨. **Language Testing Symposium: A Psycholinguistic Approach.** London: Oxford University Press.

De Bleecker, D. ١٩٧٦. **Towards a Revised Case Grammar**. Leuven: Compas Kortrijk.

Dik, S. C. ١٩٧٨. **Functional Grammar**. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Dittmar, N. ١٩٧٦. **Sociolinguistics, A Critical Survey of the Theory and Application**. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, Ltd.

Dulay, H. & Burt, M. ١٩٧٤. **You can't learn without goofing**. In: **Error Analysis**. Ed. Richards, J. C. London: Longman.

Ellis, R. ١٩٩٥. **Understanding Second Language Acquisition**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elsness, J. ٢٠٠٣. **ENG١١٠٠ Introduction to English Grammar** Internet. folk.uio.no/elsness/ENG١١٠٠٪٢٠Lecture٪٢٠١١٪Adjectives%adverbs٪٢٠adverbials.doc.

Falk, J. S. ١٩٧٨. **Linguistics and Language: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Implications.** ٢nd ed. New York: John Wiley& Sons, Inc.

Fillmore, C. J. ١٩٦٨. 'The Case for Case'. In Batch, E. and Harms, R. T. (eds.), pp. ١-٨٨.

_____. ١٩٧١a. 'Types of Lexical Information'. In Steinberg, D. and Jakobovits, L. (eds.), pp. ٣٧٠-٣٩٢.

_____. ١٩٧١b. 'Some Problems for Case Grammar'. **Working Papers in Linguistics,** No. ١٠, Department of Linguistics, Ohio State University. Quoted in De Bleecker, D. (١٩٧٦: ٢٨).

_____.١٩٧٥. 'Principles of Case Grammar; the Structure of Language and Meaning'. Tokyo: Sanseido Publishing Company. Quoted in Cook, W. A. (١٩٧٨: ٢٩٨).

_____. ١٩٧٧. **'The Case for Case Reopened'**. In Cole, P. and Sadock, M. (eds.), pp. ٥٩-٨١.

Foley, W. A. and Van Valin, R. D. ١٩٨٤. **Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frank, M. ١٩٧٢. **Modern English: A Practical English Guide.** Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Fromkin, V.; Rodman, R.; and Hyams, N. ٢٠٠٣. **An Introduction to Language.** ٧th ed. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Gelderen, E. V. ٢٠٠٠. **A Grammar of English**. Internet. www.public.asu.edu/~geldern/٣١٤ext/chap٦.htm.

George, H.V. ١٩٧١. **English for Asian learners: Are we on the right road? English Language Teaching**. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Givon, T.١٩٨٤. Syntax: **A Functional-Typological Introduction**. Vol. ١. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Grush, R. ٢٠٠٣. **Guide to Grammar and Writing**. Internet. www.ccc. comment.edu/grammar/Subject.htm.

Harris, D. P. ١٩٦٩. **Testing English as a Second Language**. New York: Me Graw-Hill Book Company.

Herndon, J. H. ١٩٧٦. **A Survey of Modern Grammars**. ٢nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hornby, P. ١٩٧١. 'Surface Structure and the Topic-Comment Distinction: A Developmental Study'. **Child Development** ٤٢. ١٩٧٥- ٨٨. Quoted in Chafe, W.(١٩٧٦: ٤٧)

Hughes, A. ١٩٨٩. **Testing for Language Teachers .** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hurford, J.R. & Heasley, B. ١٩٨٣. **Semantics: A Coursebook**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchins, W. J. ١٩٧٥. **Language of Indexing and Classification.** England: Peter Peregrinus.

Jackendoff, R. S. ١٩٧٢. **Semantics Interpretation in Generative Grammar**. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Jones, T. E. ٢٠٠٤. **The Semantic Roles of the Subject.** Internet. www.splashesfromtheriver.com/---/semantic roles-subject.htm.

Kies, D. ٢٠٠٤. **Modern English Grammar**. Internet. www.papyre.com/hypertext books/engl-١٢٦/complx٢.

Lado, R. ١٩٦١. **Language testing: The Construction and Use of Foreign Language Tests**. New York: McGraw-Hill .

Lado, R. ١٩٦٤. **Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach**. New York: McGraw-Hill .

Lario, J. S. ٢٠٠١. **Grammatica Inglesa.** Internet. www.es/~jsantana/GI ٤-٣ Thematic Relations. pdf.

Larsen, M. ١٩٨٤. **Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to cross- language equivalence**. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. ١٩٩٤ . **A Communicative Grammar of English**. London: Longman.

Li, C. N. ١٩٧٦. **Subject and Topic**. New York: Academic Press.

Li, C. N. and Thompson, S. ١٩٧٦. 'Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language. '. In Li, C. (ed.) , pp. ٤٥٧-٨٩.

Lobner, S. ٢٠٠٢. **Understanding Semantics**. London: Arnold.

Longacre, R. E. ١٩٨٣. **The Grammar of Discourse**. New York: Plenum.

Madson, H. S. ١٩٨٣. **Techniques in Testing**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mehrens, W. and Lehman, I. ١٩٨٤. **Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology**. New York: GBS College Publishing.

Miller, J. ١٩٨٩. 'Participant Roles, Synonymy, and Truth Condition'. In Arnold et al. (eds.), pp. ١٨٧-٢٠٢.

Murphy, R. ١٩٨٥. **English Grammar in Use**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nilson, D. L. F. ١٩٧٣. **The Instrumental Case in English: Syntactic and Semantic Considerations**. Mouton: The Hague. Quoted in De Bleecker, D.(١٩٧٦: ٧٦).

Oxford, R. L. ١٩٩٠. **Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know**. New York: Harper Collins Publishing, Inc.

Peck, F. ١٩٩٦. **Subject and Predicate**. Internet. http:// en.wikipedia. org/wiki/Subject-(grammar).

Pike, R. ١٩٧٧. ' Discourse Analysis and Tagmeme Matrices' . **Oceanic Linguistics**. Vol ٣. ٥-٢٥. Quoted in Blansitt, E. L. (١٩٧٨: ٣١٢) .

Plank, F. (ed.) ١٩٧٩. **Eragativity: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations**. London: Academic Press.

Platt, J. T. ١٩٧١. **Grammatical Form and Grammatical Meaning: A Tagmemic View of Fillmore's Deep Structure Case Concepts.** Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Plienes, J. ١٩٧٦. **Hanlung, Kausaltitat, Intentions Problem der Beschreibung Semantischer Relationen**. Tubingen: Gunter Narr. Quoted in Starosta, S.(١٩٧٨: ٤٦٦).

Postal, P. M. ١٩٧١. 'On the Surface Verb "Remind". Cambridge: The MIT Press .

Quirk, R.; Greenbaum, S.; Leech, G. ; and Svartvik, J. ١٩٧٢. **A Grammar of Contemporary English**. London: Longman.

_____. ١٩٨٥. **A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language**. London: Longman.

Radford, A. ١٩٨٨. **Transformational Grammar**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____.١٩٩٧. **Syntax: A Minimalist Introduction**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, P.١٩٦٨. **Modern Grammar**. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

_____. ١٩٨٠. **Patterns of English**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (ed.) ١٩٧٤. **Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition**. London: Longman.

Richards, J.C. (ed.). ١٩٩٢ . **Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition.** London: Longman.

Richards, J. C. and Sampson, G. P. ١٩٧٤. **The Study of Learner English**. In J. C. Richards (ed.) **Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition**, pp. ١٨.

Saad, G. N. ١٩٨٢. **Transitivity, Causation, and Passivization: A Semantic – Syntactic Study of the Verb in Classical Arabic**. London: Kegan Paul International.

Salman, S. M. ١٩٩٦. **Factors Affecting the Semantic Roles of the Subject in English.** Unpublished M.A. Thesis, College of Languages, University of Baghdad.

Schlesinger, I. ١٩٨٩. 'Instruments as Agents: On the Nature of Semantic Relations' **Journal of Linguistics**. Vol. ٢٥, pp. ١٨٩-٢١٠.

Shephard, J.; Rossner, R.; and Taylor, J. ١٩٨٤. **Ways to Grammar: A Modern English Practice Book.** London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Shopen, T. ١٩٨٥. **Language Typology and Syntactic Description**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simmons, R. L. ٢٠٠٥. **The Subject of a Sentence**. Internet. http://grammar.ccc.comment.edu/grammar/subjects.htm.

Simpson, J. M. Y. ١٩٧٩. **A First Course in Linguistics**. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Skehan, P. ١٩٩٩. **A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Starosta, S. ١٩٧٨. 'The One Per Sent Solution'. In Abraham, W. (ed.), pp. ٤٥٩-٥٦٥.

Steinberg, D. and Jakobovits, L. ١٩٧١. **Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strumpf, M. and Douglas, A. ١٩٩٩. **The Grammar Bible**. Los Angeles: Westwood Blud .

Swan, M. ١٩٨٤. **Basic English Usage**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tallerman, M. ١٩٩٨. **Understanding Syntax**. London: Arnold.

Talmy, L. ١٩٨٥. 'Lexicalization Patterns: Semantic Structure in lexical Forms'. In Shopen, T. (ed.), pp. ٥٧-١٤٩.

Taylor, B. P. ١٩٧٥. The use of overgeneralization and transfer learning strategies. **Language Learning.** ٢٥, pp. ٧٣-١٠٧.

Thakur, D. ١٩٩٩. **Linguistics Simplified Semantics**. Panta: Bharati Bhawan .

Thomas, O. ١٩٦٥. **Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English**. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Thomson, A. J. and Martinet, A. V. ١٩٨٦ . **A Practical English Grammar**. Oxford :Oxford University Press.

Todd, L. & Hancock, I. ١٩٨٦. **International English Usage**. London: Croom Helm Ltd .

Trask, R. ١٩٩٣. **A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics.** London: Routledge .

Weir, C. J. ١٩٩٠. **Communicative Language Testing**. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Printice-all, Inc.

Wekker, H. and Haegeman, L. ١٩٨٥. **A Modern Course in English Syntax.** London: Croom Helm Ltd.

William, E. ١٩٨١. 'Argument Structure and Morphology'. **The Linguistic Review**, pp. ٨١-١١٤. Quoted in Radford, A. (١٩٨٨: ٣٨٣).

Winograd, T. ١٩٨٣. **Language as a Cognitive Process: Syntax.** Massachusetts: Addison – Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Yule, G. ١٩٩٦. **The Study of Language**. ٢ⁿᵈ ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zandvoort, R. W. ١٩٦٢. **A Handbook of English Grammar**. ٢ⁿᵈ ed. London: Longman.

Appendix I

The Test

**Q١/ Below are some types of the semantic roles of the subject .
Indicate the types of the following roles by writing the letters of   the
suitable roles in the blanks:**

a. agentive b. temporal c. locative d. recipient e. affected   f.
         instrumental g. zero h. goal i. source j. eventive

١- **The curtains** disappeared .   ————

٢-**The driver** was given a license .   ————

٣- **Last night** was warm .   ————

٤- **He** is lying on the floor   ————

٥- **He** threw the ball .   ————

٦- **The stone** broke the window .   ———————

٧- **She** has a car .   ———————

٨- **John** sold a book to Henry .   ———————

٩- **Jim** was given a gift .   ———————

١٠- **It's** too windy in London .   ———————

١١- **The bus** seats thirty .   ———————

١٢- **The explosion** caused many casualties .   ———————

١٣- **The flowers** have died .   ———————

١٤- **I** prefer fried eggs and butter on toast.   _____

١٥- **Tomorrow** is a holiday .   _____

١٦- **He** is holding a knife .   ———————

١٧- **They** climbed the mountain . ————

١٨- **The revolver** made him afraid . ————

١٩- **Your book** is lying on the bed . ————

٢٠- **It** is never crowded at the Pontiac Hotel . ————

٢١- **The Norman invasion** took place in ١٠٦٦ . ————

٢٢- **Last Thursday** , Sonja bought her first vibrator . ————

٢٣- **The dog** caught the ball . ————

٢٤- **The final match** will be held next week . ————

٢٥- **The will** benefits us all . ————

٢٦- **I** found it strange . ————

٢٧- **The mother** told her children a story . ————

٢٨- **It's** a long way to Denver . ————

٢٩- **Carol** was given a vase .   ─────

٣٠- **Jessica** gave Paul a digital watch .   ─────

Q٢/ State whether the semantic roles of the underlined subjects are correct (T) or incorrect (F) . Then correct it if it is   incorrect .

١- <u>My glasses</u> have broken .   recipient

٢- <u>The cold</u> affects me badly.   affected

٣- <u>The bell</u> rang loudly .   affected

٤- <u>Who</u> owns this hat ?   agentive

٥- <u>Chicago</u> is windy .   locative

٦- <u>The festival</u> will be held in France.   eventive

٧- <u>He</u> kept himself upright.   goal

٨- <u>Yesterday</u> was cloudy.   temporal

٩- Do <u>you</u> hold a British passport ?   recipient

١٠- <u>It's</u> ٢٠ degrees .   agentive

١١- <u>Tom</u> gave John the grammar book .   source

١٢- <u>The sun</u> (almost) blinded him .   temporal

١٣- <u>Sara</u> was given a flower .   goal

١٤- Is it raining ?   zero

١٥- The rock broke the window .   locative

١٦- They have a beautiful house .   recipient

١٧-The final session will be held tomorrow .   eventive

١٨-Dan was given a cake .   zero

١٩- Your sister is lying on the bed .   locative

٢٠- That picture has moved .   affected

٢١- The wind blew the ball away .   agentive

٢٢- I heard it ring , too .   instrumental

٢٣- George was given a ticket .   goal

٢٤- Someone raised an arm .   source

٢٥- The scissors cut the cloth .   zero

٢٦- The car ran over the ball .   agentive

٢٧- Last Tuesday was windy .   affected

٢٨- It's our wedding anniversary .   instrumental

٢٩- <u>The dam</u> blew up .   goal

٣٠- <u>They</u> are staying at a motel .   locative

٣١- <u>Sam</u> gave Jim a cigarette .   agentive

٣٢- <u>The second world</u> war took place in ١٩٤٥ .   eventive

٣٣-<u>Sally</u> gave Steve a wrong answer .   zero

٣٤- <u>The key</u> opened the door .   temporal

٣٥- <u>It</u> will be my birthday .   zero

٣٦- <u>The thief</u> told them the truth .   affected

٣٧- <u>Sunday</u> was warm .   instrumental

٣٨ – <u>The child</u> was given a chocolate.   goal

٣٩- <u>My broken arm</u> set easily .   source

٤٠- <u>Friday</u> is a holiday .   temporal

Q٣/ Identify the semantic roles of the subjects below :

١- **The suspect** received a caution .   —————

٢- **Brad** hit Andrew .   ————

٣- **This path** is swarming with ants .   ————

٤-**Julie** gave Jack the syntax assignment .   —————

٥- **The computer** has solved the problem .   —————

٦- **She** received a present .   ————

٧- **It's** already midnight .   ————

٨- **He** nodded his head .   ————

٩- **The water** evaporated .   ————

١٠- **The winner** was given a prize .   ————

١١- **The train** stopped .   ————

١٢- **The frost** has killed the flowers .   ————

١٣- **Tonight** is rainy.   ————

١٤-**Their quarrels** have upset me .   ————

١٥- **Los Angeles** is foggy .   ————

Q٤/ Add an appropriate subject showing the semantic role required   in brackets :

١- ——— has felled that tree .   (instrumental)

٢- ——— have dimmed the lights .   (agentive)

٣- ——— lost his watch .   (recipient)

٤- ——— was ٢٠٠٤ .   (zero)

٥- ——— was holding a passenger's arm .   (locative)

٦- ——— was a holiday.   (temporal)

٧- ——— gave Mary a box .   (source)

٨- ——— was given a car .   (goal)

٩- ——— won't turn .   (affected)

١٠- ——— turned traitor .   (affected)

١١- ——— have a wonderful car .   (recipient)

١٢- ——— was sunny yesterday .   (zero)

١٣- ——— shut quickly .   (affected)

١٤- ——— have lived in London most of my life . (locative)

١٥- ——— have pleased me .   (eventive)

Appendix II

Possible Answers

Q١

١-Aff

٢-Goal

٣-Temp

٤-Loc

٥-Ag

٦-Instr

٧-Rec

٨-Source

٩-Goal

١٠-Zero

١١-Loc

١٢-Eventive

١٣-Aff

١٤-Rec

١٥-Temp

١٦-Loc

١٧-Ag

١٨-Instr

١٩-Aff

٢٠-Zero

٢١-Eventive

٢٢-Temp

٢٣-Ag

٢٤-Eventive

٢٥-Instr

٢٦-Rec

٢٧-Source

٢٨-Zero

٢٩-Goal

٣٠-Source

Q٢

١-F Aff

٢-F Ag

٣-T

٤-F Rec

٥-T

٦-T

٧-F Loc

٨-T

٩-T

١٠-F Zero

١١-T

١٢-F Instr

١٣-T

١٤-T

١٥-F Instr

١٦-T

١٧-T

١٨-F Goal

١٩-T

٢٠-T

٢١-T

٢٢-F Rec

٢٣-T

٢٤-F Ag

٢٥-F Instr

٢٦-T

٢٧-F Temp

٢٨-F Zero

٢٩-F Aff

٣٠-T

٣١-F Source

٣٢-T

٣٣-F Source

٣٤-F Instr

٣٥-T

٣٦-F Source

٣٧-F Temp

٣٨-T

٣٩-F Aff

٤٠-T

Q٣

١-Rec

٢-Ag

٣-Loc

٤-Source

٥-Instr

٦- Rec

٧-Zero

٨- Ag

٩- Aff

١٠-Goal

١١- Aff

١٢- Instr

١٣- Temp

١٤-Eventive

١٥-Loc

Q٤

١-My axe

٢-They

٣-He

٤-It

٥-He

٦-Yesterday

٧-He

٨-He

٩-The screw

١٠-He

١١-They

١٢-It

١٣-The gate

١٤- I

١٥-Their marriage