An Analysis of L2 Learners' Use of Noun Modification in Written Japanese

Yuka Kanehira
The Australian National University
foryuka@hotmail.com

1. Introduction

This paper will explore issues of Japanese language acquisition and in particular will focus on how second language (L2) learners use noun modification in written Japanese. Second language acquisition (SLA) studies to date reveal that the topic of how L2 learners use noun modification is viewed as a relatively minor aspect of Japanese language acquisition. The aim of this study is to examine how each level of L2 learners uses Japanese noun modification in compositions and mini tests, and also to establish an effective method for teaching noun modification in written Japanese. This present study will also demonstrate that the frequency and accuracy of use of four forms of noun modification assists the learners to develop confidence and fluency in written Japanese.

Many forms and functions of noun modification in the Japanese language have been described (e.g. Alfonso, 1966; Kitahara, 1973; Teramura, 1975-78; 1991; 1993; Shibatani, 1978; Masuoka & Takubo, 1989; Makino & Hatasa, 1989; Miyazi, *et al*., 1991, Tsunoda, 1991; Backhouse, 1993; Masuoka, 1994; Hojo, 1998; Sano, 1998; Saito 2002). However, this paper will explore four main forms of noun modification usage: *i*-adjective + noun, *na*-adjective + noun, noun + (*no*) + noun, and relative clause, as well as discuss effective ways to teach learners the correct use of each form. Japanese second language acquisition (SLA) research has in the past tended to focus on a learner's ability to use relative clauses (e.g. Bertkau, 1975; Kubota, 1997; Saito, 2002). This focus is due to the different grammatical constructions of noun modification in Japanese (e.g. Makino, 1969; Kuno, 1974; Inoue, 1976; Kitagawa, 1982; Kuroda, 1992; Matsumoto, 1993; 1994; 1997; Tsujimura, 1996; Nomura, 2002). This situation has led to a neglect of broader SLA studies of noun modification and the extent to which L2 learners transfer the grammar construction of their first language (L1) to their second language (L2).

2. Grammatical characteristics

1) Demonstrative + noun
   あの　　コアラ
   ano　　*koara*
   that　　koala
   'that koala'

2) *I*-adjective + noun
   古い　家
   furui　*ie*
   old　　house
   'an old house'

3) *Na*-adjective + noun
   きれいな　　ゴキブリ
   kireina　　gokiburi
   beautiful　　cockroach
   'a beautiful cockroach'

4) Noun + (*no*) + noun
1.
   日本　　　　の　　　学生
   nihon　　　no　　　gakusei
   Japan　　　POSS　students
   'students from Japan'

2.
   夏期　　　　休暇
   kaki　　　　kyuka
   summer　　　holiday
   'summer holiday'

5) Relative clauses
   あした　　　　見る　　映画　　は　　　面白い　　　と聞きました
   asita　　　　miru　　eiga　　wa　　　omosiroi　　to kikimasita.
   tomorrow　　watch　movie　TOP　interesting　I have heard that
   'I have heard that the movie I am to see tomorrow is interesting.'

Japanese noun modification is typologically composed of five main forms: (1) demonstrative + noun,[1] (2) *i*- adjective + noun, (3) *na*-adjective + noun, (4) noun + (*no*) + noun,[2] and (5) relative clauses[3] investigated by Yasuda (1972: 51-76), Alfonso (1966: 73, 84), Inoue (1976: 187), Tsujimura (1996: 131, 134-135, 263-264), Masuoka & Takubo (1989: 140-45), Miyazi, et al (1991: 2-7), Backhouse (1993: 113-118, 130, 139-140), Hojo (1998: 20-41), and Saito (2002: 45-49).

3. Method

a. Participants:　Eighty-six learners at three different levels participated in this study. One group studied Japanese as a second language (L2) at high school and the other groups at two universities in Canberra, Australia. The 86 learners had participated in at least one of four tasks: compositions, and three sequential mini tests. Seventy-five out of the 86 learners were native English speakers. Forty-four out of the 86 learners had been to Japan at least once. Japanese language competence was determined by two criteria: (1) current curriculum, or entrance prerequisite at the three institutions, and (2) the L2 learners' frequency of the use of noun modification in their compositions (see Table 2). Firstly, one group of L2 learners (ages: 10-15) at secondary level was designated as beginners because their curriculum included only basic Japanese grammar. The two groups at university

---

[1] As in (1), (2), and (3), the head noun is modified by the demonstrative, *i*-adjective, or *na*-adjective. For example, the head noun *koara* 'koala' is modified by the demonstrative *ano* 'that' given (1) above.

[2] Typological characteristics of the noun + (*no*) + noun are subdivided into three main types: (1) noun + *no* + noun, (2) noun + noun, and (3) noun + *no* (pronoun). The role of the particle *no* is to combine the head noun and the modifier in the noun + (*no*) + noun. There are also other different functions of the particle *no*, such as appositive, pronoun, and final particle (e.g. Alfonso, 1996; 73, 83, Backhouse, 1993; 139-140, Tomita, 1991; 73-76, and Tsujimura, 1996; 134-135).

[3] Japanese relative clauses can be seen in three main contexts: (1) The modifier always precedes the head noun in the relative clauses, (2) The Japanese relative clause does not take any relative pronoun (e.g., 'that' and 'which'), and (3) There is no inserting comma in Japanese relative clauses in writing (e.g. Yasuda, 1972; Inoue, 1976; Tsujimura, 1996; Matsumoto, 1997; Saito, 2002).

studied more complex.[4] Secondly, one of the other two groups of L2 learners (ages: 16-25) was designated as intermediate level because their entrance prerequisite at university required learners to have passed at least the first year of beginner level, or its equivalent.[5] Thirdly, the last group of L2 learners (ages: 16-30) was designated as advanced level because they had studied Japanese for at least two years at a university or its equivalent. Note that there was no control class in this study to focus on L2 learners' use of noun modification in compositions or in mini tests. Table 1 below summarises the total number of participants in the compositions and the three mini tests.

Table 1. The total number of three levels of learners in four tasks

The total number of participants	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced	Total
Task 1: Compositions	33	13	15	61
Task 2: The first mini test	39	39	8	86
Task 3: The second mini test	15	0	0	15
Task 4: The third mini test	18	0	0	18

. Sixty-one learners at the three levels (33 beginners, 13 intermediate learners, and 15 advanced learners) participated in writing compositions.
. Eighty-six learners at the three levels (39 beginners, 39 intermediate learners, and 8 advanced learners) responded to noun modification in the first mini test. We should note that 61 out of the 86 overall who wrote compositions answered the questionnaire (see Appendix 1), and did at least one mini test.
. The 15 beginners in the second mini test were included in the 39 in the first mini test, and the 18 in the third mini test.

b. Materials and procedures: L2 learners at the three levels completed compositions and three mini tests that were used in this study. Data collection for each level was carried out in the following order: intermediate learners, advanced learners, and beginners. The beginners and the advanced learners answered the questionnaire (see Appendix 1) and the first mini test at the same time before writing compositions. However, the intermediate learners were asked to write the compositions before the questionnaire and the first mini test. Three teachers of each level asked their learners to write a composition, and also to answer the questionnaire and the first mini test. Note that the second and the third mini tests did not cover relative clauses in the beginners' response because the learners had not been taught the grammar for relative clauses. However, the beginner group was asked to form three questions using relative clauses only in the first mini test to compare with the use of relative clauses by intermediate and advanced learners.

Sixty-one learners at the three different levels were asked to write a composition to find the most common form of noun modification used in their writing. The 61 learners were given a different topic (e.g. your favourite country or your most interesting event) for their compositions. It is noteworthy that during this period, each teacher at the three different institutions did not give any instruction on noun modification to the learners at any level prior to writing. No instruction was given because the purpose of this analysis was to

---

[4] The L2 learners at the beginner level had not been taught *na*-adjective + noun, noun + (*no*) + noun, and relative clauses until the first mini test. However, their teacher instructed the *na*-adjective + noun and noun + (*no*) + noun as new structures before the second mini test.
[5] The L2 learners at the intermediate and the advanced levels had studied Japanese at least one year in a university or equivalent and had already learnt how to use the four forms of noun modification.

clarify the nature of the learners' spontaneous use of noun modification in their compositions. The use of noun modification in the learners' compositions was divided into the four forms of noun modification.[6] This analysis shows the total number of noun modification used and its percentage frequency in the compositions task.

The first mini test was administrated to 86 learners at the three levels of learning to ascertain the accuracy of the use of noun modification as shown in 6) below.

6) すし　　　　は　　　私　　　の　　（　　　）　　料理　　　です。
    susi　　*wa*　　*watasi*　*no*　　　　　　*ryoori*　*desu*
    'sushi is my favourite food'

    [Plain form: 'favourite']
    (Note: The answer for the question given above is the plain form of *na*-adjective *sukina* 'favourite'.)

All learners were asked to fill in the missing word in a bracket in 12 sentences given in the first mini test (see Appendix 2). The learners answered all of the questions in the first mini test in approximately 20 minutes. The responses were separated into correct or incorrect and were also presented as a percentage accuracy in the use of the four forms of noun modification on the first mini test task.

The second mini test was obtained from the 15 beginners to assess accuracy in the use of three forms of noun modification: *i*-adjective + noun, *na*-adjective + noun, and noun + (*no*) + noun.

7)   Tom Cruise is a famous actor.   _____

As shown in 7) above, the 15 beginners were asked to translate ten sentences from English into Japanese including those using the three forms of noun modification in the second mini test (see Appendix 3). The beginners answered all of the questions in the test in approximately 20 minutes.

The aims of the second and third mini tests were: (1) to identify the development of the beginners' correct use of noun modification over the three mini tests, and (2) to examine the effect of the audiolingual method used before the second mini test, and the Test and Feedback (TF) model used before the third mini test.

8)   The process of the Test and Feedback (TF) model

    1)   First test
    2)   Analysis of the learners' incorrect use of each form in the first test
    3)   Negative Feedback
    -    A visual and kinesthetic learning style using jigsaw words that allowed all the beginners to build up each constituent in noun modification.
    -    Those L2 learners who could not conceptualize constructions with noun modification were thereby able to visualize the steps needed to join each constituent (e.g. *i*-adjective stem + suffix + noun).
    4)   Return to step 1)

In 8) above, the TF model consisted of four stages. First, the most common error form of noun modification was identified in the response to the first test. At the second stage, the teacher reviewed the grammar for error correction in intensive lessons using a jigsaw words exercise focusing on those errors found. Each jigsaw word card showed the meaning

---

[6] All the learners' total use of noun modification in their compositions included incorrect uses.

of a constituent (e.g. particle, noun etc.) of noun modification (e.g. Kellerman, 1978; Inagaki & Long, 1998; 1999). The beginners were next asked to build up several sentences with given noun modifications. The teacher immediately gave the learners negative feedback regarding the ungrammatical parts of each sentence, although such constructions were grammatical in their L1. Finally, all the beginners conceptualised the build-up of each constituent of noun modification. At the final stage, the teacher provided the second test to the beginners to ascertain their improvement in the use of noun modification.

   (9)   キャンベラは　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　ばしょ　です。
            Canberra is a **quiet** place.　　（しずか）

In 9) above, 18 beginners were asked to answer 20 questions in the third mini test (see Appendix 4). The beginners answered by filling in the missing word which was shown in brackets in each question. The test took approximately 20 minutes to complete.

To statistically take account of the improvement in beginners' correct use of noun modification over the second and third mini tests. McCulloch and Searle's (2001) Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) were fitted to the data. This is because the answer by a student to an individual question is a binary response, correct or incorrect. It was assumed that the probability that a question was answered correctly would vary randomly from student to student within a test. These models assume that p_{ij}, the probability that the i th question is answered correctly by the j th student, is

$$\log[p_{ij}/(1-p_{ij})] = \mu + \alpha_i + \varepsilon_j$$

where ε_j is a random variable with zero mean characteristic of the j th student, α_i is a quantity reflecting the intrinsic difficulty of the i th question, and u is an average of overall correct response to questions by subjects. If we take the differences between questions as fixed, on average over all students

$$\log[p_i/(1-p_i)] = \mu + \alpha_i .$$

The quantity on the right hand side of this equation is known as the linear predictor. In a more complex form of this model it is assumed that

$$\log[p_{ij}/(1-p_{ij})] = \mu + \beta_t + \alpha_i + \varepsilon_j ,$$

where β_t is a fixed quantity depending on the question type, and α_i is a random variable corresponding to the limited question. In other words, for a particular question type, questions vary randomly in their intrinsic difficulty. Wald tests were used to test the significance of differences between questions and between question types.

4. Results

4.1 Proficiency

Table2.　Three levels of learners' use of the four forms in compositions

Item (the number of participants)	Beginner (33)	Intermediate (13)	Advanced (15)	Total (61)
Average use of noun modification per learner	3.3	13.5	18.3	11.7
I- adjective + noun	6 (5.5%)	21 (11.9%)	22 (8%)	49 (8.7%)
Na adjective + noun	21 (19%)	19 (10.8%)	46 (16.7%)	86 (15.3%)
Noun + (*no*) + noun	83 (75.5%)	117 (66.5%)	183 (66.6%)	383 (68.3%)
Relative clauses	0 (0%)	19 (10.8%)	24 (8.7%)	43 (7.7%)
Total numbers of use of noun modification (per 100)	110 (100%)	176 (100%)	275 (100%)	561 (100%)

(Note: percentages show each level of the learners' use of each form in their compositions per item, including all their errors in using noun modification, to indicate the overall numbers of their use.)

Table 2 above shows the distribution of frequency of the use of the four forms of noun modification by sixty-one learners at three different levels in their compositions. Firstly, as expected, the results indicated that the advanced learners used noun modification in their compositions more frequently than the beginners and the intermediate learners. The beginners used noun modification on the average 3.3 times in their compositions, compared with 18.3 times by the advanced learners. Secondly, nearly 70% of all the levels of learners used noun + (*no*) + noun as their most common form amongst the four forms.

4.2 Accuracy

Table 3.　Three levels of learners' correct use of the four forms in the first mini test

Item (The number of participants)	Beginner (39)	Intermediate (39)	Advanced (8)
I-adjective + noun	89.7%	89.8%	88.3%
Na-adjective + noun	29.9%	80.8%	79.0%
Noun + (*no*) + noun	28.2%	82.0%	81.3%
Relative clauses	16.3%	71.6%	84.3%
Total (per 100)	41.0%	81.1%	83.2%

(Note: percentages show the three levels of the learners' correct responses for the four forms in the mini test, per item)

<Hierarchy order of the three levels of learners' use of the four forms in the mini test>

I-adjective …………	beginner	=	intermediate	>	advanced
Na-adjective ………	beginner	<	intermediate	>	advanced
Noun+ (*no*) + noun .	beginner	<	intermediate	>	advanced
Relative clauses……	beginner	<	intermediate	<	advanced

- *a* = *b* means that *a* and *b* use a form at the same accuracy
- *a* > *b* means that *a* used a form more accurately than *b*
- *a* < *b* means that *b* used a form more accurately than *a*

Table 3 and the hierarchy above summarises the three levels of the learners' total correct responses to questions on the four forms of noun modification in the first mini test. Surprisingly, the intermediate learners' (82.0%) correct use of noun + (*no*) + noun was slightly superior to that of the advanced learners (81.3%). In contrast, as expected, the advanced learners overall used relative clauses at a rate of 84.3% correct in the first mini test, compared to 71.6% correct for the intermediate learners.

Table 4.   Beginners' correct use of the three forms in the three mini tests

Form of noun modification (The number of participants)	The first mini test (39)	The second mini test (15)	The third mini test (18)
I-adjective + noun	89.7%	56.7%	98.3%
Na-adjective + noun	29.9%	48.0%	87.8 %
Noun + (*no*) + noun	28.2%	60.0%	94.4%
Total correct number (per100)	49.3%	54.9%	93.5%

The results over three mini tests showed a marked development in the correct use of noun modification by beginners. Table 4 above shows the estimated average percentage of correct responses from an analysis from all three mini tests by beginners. Overall average number of correct responses for noun modification by the beginners in the third mini test (93.5%) was much higher than in the first mini test (49.3%) and the second mini test (54.9%).

Table 5.   Estimated average percentage of correct responses from an analysis of data from all three mini tests (linear predictor in brackets)

Item	The first mini test	The second mini test	The third mini test
Number of students	39	15	18
Percentage correct response	45.0	50.0	96.9
Mean (lp)	-0.20	0.00	3.44

(Note: The average standard error of the difference of two linear predictors is 0.74)

Table 6.   Estimated average percentage of correct responses for the three forms in the second and third mini tests (linear predictor in brackets)

Item	*I*-adjective + noun	*Na*-adjective + noun	Noun + (*no*) + noun
Percentage correct response	90.9	77.8	86.0
Mean (lp)	2.30	1.26	1.82

(Note: The average standard error of differences of linear predictors is 0.62)

The results provided statistically significant evidence of improvement in the beginner group over the three mini tests. According to the score of Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs), notably the score of the third mini test was significantly higher (p < 0.001) than the first and second mini tests. In particular, the score of the third mini test (linear predictor (lp = 3.44) was significantly (p < 0.001) higher than in the first (lp = -0.20) and the second mini tests (lp = 0.00), as shown in Table 5. In other words, the results of the third mini test showed statistical significance of the effectiveness of the TF model used before the third mini test. However, there was no statistically significant difference between the first and second mini tests (p > 0.05). It is noted that there was no statistically significant difference not only between subject types over all the mini tests, but also question types (p > 0.05), as shown in Table 6. In addition, it should be noted that the first mini test covered a response for relative clauses by beginners, to contrast with intermediate and advanced learners. If we omit the responses to these questions we can combine all three tests into a single analysis.

5. Discussion

The results highlighted distinct characteristics by all levels of L2 learners in the use of each form of the noun modification in terms of proficiency, accuracy, and the Test and Feedback (TF) model. However, the results over three mini tests highlighted three main aspects of: (1) the L2 learners' avoidance of the use of noun modification in the compositions, (2) the effect of the audiolingual method used before the second mini test, and (3) the effect of the TF model used before the third mini test.

5.1 L2 learners' avoidance in the use of noun modification in their compositions

The different frequency of use of each form of noun modification by L2 learners in their compositions might be related to an avoidance of their use (cf. Kleinmann, 1977; Brown 1980; Ellis, 1994). The beginners notably seemed to avoid using *i*-adjective + noun (only 5.5% overall) in their composition (see Table 2). However, the beginners used the *i*-adjective + noun at a rate of 89.7% correct in the first mini test (see Table 3). Another example of the learners' avoidance of the use of noun modification can be seen in the use of relative clauses in their compositions by advanced learners. The advanced learners used relative clauses 84.3% correct in the first mini test, while they used only 8.7% correctly in their overall noun modifications in compositions.

Regarding the avoidance of use of relative clauses by L2 learners, for example, Brown (1980: 178) states that the major element of avoiding use of L2 by L2 learners would seem to be related to, for example, the syntactic or the lexical elements of the L2, including the semantics. Ellis (1994: 104) mentions that an avoidance tendency takes place when L2 learners notice the differences between L1 and L2. Ellis (1994: 305) also claims that L2 learners factors of avoidance are not easy to identify because of three main elements involved.[7] This present study did not identify any of these factors of avoidance by L2 learners in the use of noun modification in compositions. Therefore, for future research, the

---

[7] Avoidance (1) occurs when learners know or anticipate that there is a problem and have at least some, sketchy idea of what the target form is like…Avoidance (2) arises when learners know what the target is but find it too difficult to use in the particular circumstances (for example, in the context of free-flowing conversation). Avoidance (3) is evident when learners know what to say and how to say it but are unwilling to actually say it because it will result in them flouting their own norms of behaviour (Ellis 1994: 305).

evidence of all the levels infrequent uses of noun modification in composition would support the examination of such avoidance factors, through conducting interviews.

However, were beginners and intermediate learners in my study more likely to avoid using L2 structures that are not present in their L1? Liao and Fukuya (2002: 89) examined the extent of two levels of native Chinese speakers' avoidance of using English phrasal verbs. Liao and Fukuya showed that the intermediate learners' frequently use of English phrasal verbs (Phrasal verbs 45% and one word verbs 43% of overall) was lower than that of the advanced learners (75% and 21% of overall). Liao and Fukuya (2002: 89) concluded that avoidance of fewer uses of English phrasal verbs by the intermediate learners were because of the influence of grammatical differences between L1 and L2. However, my results from use of relative clauses in their compositions by intermediate and advanced learners were not consistent with Liao and Fukuya's results above. That is, the intermediate learners used the relative clause (10.8% overall) proportionally more frequently in their compositions than did the advanced learners (8.7% overall), as shown in Table 2. Note that the grammatical characteristics of the Japanese relative clauses are very different from those of English. Hence, I assume that the grammatical differences between Japanese and English relative clauses are not directly related to the intermediate learners' avoidance of the form in their compositions.

5.2 The audiolingual method used before the second mini test

The results of the second mini test reveal two ambiguities regarding the beginners' poor use of *i*-adjective + noun, and the extent of the effectiveness of the TF model used before the third mini test. The rate of the beginners' correct use of the *i*-adjective + noun (56.7%) in the second mini test was substantially lower, compared with that of the first mini test (89.7%). There were four reasons for the beginners' failure of use *i*-adjective + noun correctly in the second mini test. Firstly, the beginners had not used the form in their class for a while because new grammar was given to them during that time. The second reason was that the audiolingual method used before the second mini test did not allow for good two-way communication between the teacher and the beginners. For example, the teacher mostly made the beginners speak and write sentences with noun modification. The third reason was that most of the beginners had not improved in using noun modification because of a tendency to fossilization (cf. Selinker, 1972; White, 1985; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Ellis 1994).[8] Therefore, during the time of the second mini test the beginners in my study might have continued using their L1 grammar when writing *i*-adjective + noun. The final reason might have been that the beginners' incorrect use of the *i*-adjective + noun in the second mini test seemed to show a tendency towards overgeneralisation (e.g. Selinker, 1972: 217; Ellis, 1994: 657-658).

5.3 The Test and Feedback (TF) model used before the third mini test

As for the effectiveness of the TF model used before the third mini test, was the model really an effective method for the beginners to improve their use of the three forms of noun

---

[8] Fossilizable linguistic phenomena are linguistic items, rules and subsystems which speakers of a particular NL [native language] will tend to keep in their IL [interlanguage] relative to a particular TL [target language], no matter what the age of the learner or amount of explanation and instruction he receives in the TL (Selinker 1972: 215).

modification? My study concentrated more on negative feedback than positive feedback after poor results by beginners in the second mini test (e.g. Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1993; Lin & Hedgcock, 1996; Inagaki & Long, 1998; 1999; Oliver, 1995; 2000; Izumi, 2000; Slabokova, 2002). Oliver (2000: 120) has pointed out that "[p]ositive evidence is the input or models that language learners receive about the target language…negative evidence provides information to learners about what is not possible in the target language". That is, most of the beginners were able to distinguish some ungrammatical constructions of Japanese noun modification even though they were grammatical in English.

However, the extent of the effectiveness of the TF model for the beginners' acquisition of the three forms is not certain. This present study lacked not only a sizable number of demonstrations with the TF model, but also long-term research on its effectiveness. Besides, the beginners could have improved their use of noun modification if other teaching methods had been used (e.g. the silent way, the grammar–translation method (cf. Larsen-Freeman, 2000)) in the third mini test without using the TF model. Furthermore, this study failed to compare other models with the TF model with different subjects, such as native Japanese speakers, through a great number of tests. However, as mentioned above, in spite of the short-term research on the TF model with beginners, the TF model provided a potential method for L2 learners to develop the correct use of noun modification in the L2.

6. Conclusions

This paper has highlighted the range of the three levels of L2 learners' use of noun modification in a composition and in three mini tests. In the context of insufficient previous studies of noun modification in SLA, this study of each level of learners' common and different uses of the four forms demonstrated their proficiency, and accuracy. The results suggested that proficiency characteristics in the use of noun modification at each level of learning were different. Each level of learners used the four forms at distinctly frequencies and accuracies. In addition, the results of the third mini test showed 18 beginners had a 93.5% success rate in using the three forms of noun modification after a demonstration of the TF model. Therefore, the characteristics of the three levels of the L2 learners' use of noun modification demonstrated in this paper should help teachers when encountering difficulty in improving or instructing learners in the correct use of each form.

References

Alfonso, A. 1966: *Japanese Language Patterns: A Structural Approach vol. 1* Sophia University L.L Center for Applied Linguistics Tokyo.
Backhouse, A.E. 1993: *The Japanese Language: An Introduction.* Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. and Hartford, B.S. 1993: Learning the rules of academic talk: A longitudinal study of pragmatic change. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15, 279-304.
Bertkau, J.A.S. 1975: Comprehension and production of English relative clauses in adult second language acquisition and child first language acquisition. *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese vol. X* (2) and (3), 231-2.

Brown, H.D. 1980: 'Error analysis-the study of learners' interlanguage' *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliff N. J: Prentice Hall, 162-88.

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

Hojo, J. 1998: *Nihongo kyooiku ni okeru meisiku: Rentai syuusyoku* [Noun phrases and relative clauses in Japanese education]. *Kooza Nihongo Kyooiku*, 20-43.

Inagaki, S. and Long, M.H. 1998: The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *Modern Language Journal* 82, 357-71.

Inagaki, S. and Long, M.H. 1999: 'Implicit Negative Feedback': *The Acquisition of Japanese as a Second Language* in K Kanno (eds.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 9-30.

Inoue, K. 1976: *Henkei bunpoo to nihongo* [Transformational Grammar and Japanese]. Tokyo: Taishukan.

Izumi, S. 2000: Implicit negative feedback in adult NS-NNS conversation: Its availability, utility, and the discourse structures of the information gap task. *Applied Language Learning* 11, 289-321.

Kellerman, E. 1978: Giving learners a break: Native language intuitions as a source of predictions about transferability. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 15, 59-92.

Kitagawa, C. 1982: Topic constructions in Japanese. *Lingua* 57, 157-214.

Kitahara, Y. 1973: *Syuusyoku seibun no syurui* [Categorisation of modifying aspects of noun modification]. *Kokugogaku* 103, 18-34.

Kleinmann, H. 1977: Avoidance behaviour in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 27, 93-107.

Kubota, A. 1997: '*Nihongo no kankeisetu no syuutoku ni tuite-sakubun siryoo to ankeeto tyoosa o toosite*' [Acquisition of relative clauses-through compositions and questionnaires]. *Nihongo Kyooiku Gakkai Syunki Taikai Yokoosyuu*. 196-201.

Kuno, S. 1974: The position of relative clauses and conjunctions. *Linguistic Inquiry* V, 117-36.

Kuroda, S.Y. 1992: *Japanese syntax and semantics: Collected papers*. Dordrecht: Klumer Academic Publishers.

Larsen-Freeman, D. and Long, M.H. 1991: *An Introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, D. 2000: *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Liao, Y.D. and Fukuya, Y. 2002: Avoidance of phrasal verbs: The case of Chinese learners of English. *Second Language Studies 20,* 71-106.

Lin, Y.H. and Hedgcock, J. 1996: Negative feedback incorporation among high-proficiency and low-proficiency Chinese-speaking learners of Spanish. *Language Learning* 46 *vol*. 4, 567-611.

Makino, S. 1969: *Some aspects of Japanese nominalizations*. Tokyo: Tokai University Press.

Makino, S. and Hatasa, Y. 1989: *Kakudai bunsetu nanatu no kata to rensyuu mondai* [Practice exercise for seven types of extended phrases] Dokkai: *Kakudai bunsetu no ninti* [Reading: Recognition of extended phrases]. Tokyo: Arakawa, 13-39.

Masuoka, T. and Takubo, Y. 1989: '*Meisi no syuusyoku to heiretu*' [Noun modification and parataxis]: *Kiso nihongo bunpoo* [Basic Japanese Grammar]. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers, 140-5.

Masuoka, T. 1994: '*Meisi syuusyoku setu no setuzoku keisiki: Naiyoo setu o tyuusin ni. Nihongo no meisi syuusyoku hyoogen*' [Japanese noun modifying clause: Focusing on context phrases] in Y Takubo (ed.) *Rentaisyuusyoku.* Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers, 5-27.

Matsumoto, Y. 1993: *Nihongo meisi-ku koozoo no goyooron-teki koosatu* [Pragmatics of Japanese Noun Phrases]. *Nihongogaku* 12, 101-14.

Matsumoto, Y. 1994: *Imi kara mita rentai syuusyoku no iroiro* [Noun modification from the semantic perspective]. *Gengo* 9, 124-7.

Matsumoto, Y. 1997: Syntactic and descriptive approach to noun modification. noun-modifying constructions in Japanese: *A frame-semantic approach* s*tudies in Language Companion Series* 35. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

McCulloch, E.C. and Searle, R.S. 2001: *Generalized, Linear, and Mixed Models.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Miyazi, *et al*. 1991: '*Rentai syuusyoku*' [Noun modification] : *Syuusyoku* [Modification]: 2-7.

Nomura, M. 2002: 'The internally-headed relative clause construction in Japanese': A cognitive grammar approach. *Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* 36 vol. 1, 99-100.

Oliver, R. 1995: Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 17, 459-81.

Oliver, R. 2000: 'Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pairwork' *Language Learning* 50: 119-51.

Saito, H. 2002: '*Rentai syuushyoku no syuutoku ni kansuru kenkyuu no dookoo*' [Second language acquisition research on Japanese noun modifying clauses] *The States of the Art in Second Language Acquisition and Instruction Research: A Guidepost to Japanese Language Education for the New Century* Bonjin Publishers Tokyo: 45-69.

Sano, Y. 1998: '*Teido fukusi no meisi syuusyoku ni tuite*' [Adverbs of degree for noun modification] *Nihongogaku Ronsetu Siryoo* 35: 24-9.

Selinker, L. 1972: ' Interlanguage' *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10: 209-31.

Shibatani, M. 1978: *Nihongo no Bunseki* [An Analysis of the Japanese Language], Tokyo: Taishukan.

Slabakova, R. 2002: The compounding parameter in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24, 507-40.

Teramura, H. 1975-78: '*Rentai-syuusyoku no sintakusu to imi'* [Syntax and semantics of noun modification]: Nos 1-4 *Nihongo nihonbunka* [The Japanese Language and Culture]. Osaka Gaikokugo Daigaku Osaka.

Teramura, H. 1991: '*Nihongo no sintakusu to imi*' [Syntax and Semantics in Japanese]. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers, 230-6.

Teramura, H. 1993: '*Meisi syuusyokubu no hikaku'* [Comparison of parts of noun modification]: *Teramura Hideo Ronbunsyuu* Ⅱ —*Gengogaku nihongo kyooiku Hen*—[Linguistics and Japanese education]. Kurosio Publishers: Tokyo.139-84.

Tomita, T. 1991: *No* [the Particle No]. *Bunpoo no kiso tisiki to sono osiekata* [Basic Knowledge for Grammar and its Teaching Methods]. Tokyo: Bonjin Publishers, 73-6.

Tsujimura, N. 1996: *An Introduction to Japanese Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher.

Tunoda, T. 1991: '*Nihongo no meisi + no + meisi*' [Noun + *no* + noun in Japanese] *Sekai no gengo to nihongo* [Languages in the World and Japanese] Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers, 144-6.

White, L. 1985: The "Pro-drop" parameter in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 35, 47-62.

Yasuda, T. 1972: Tentative contrastive study of noun phrase structures in Japanese and English. *Syu-Ryu* 33, 51-76.

Appendix 1 Questionnaire [9]

Please circle the one which you think is the closest.

1. Sex: 1) Male   2) Female

2. Age group: 1) 0-15   2) 16-20   3) 21-25   4) 26- 30   5) more than 30

3. What is your native language?

4. Have you been to Japan? If yes, when were you there, for how long, and for what purpose?
    1) Yes   2) No   _____

5. What is your main purpose in learning Japanese?

6. What is the most difficult point for you in writing Japanese?

Appendix 2 The first mini test [10]

Please fill in a suitable form, using the following each plain form, or key words.

1. ハワイは（   ）島_{しま}です。
    Hawaii is a <u>small</u> island.
            [Plain form: 小_{ちい}さい "small"]
2. すしは私の（   ）料理_{りょうり}です。
     Sushi is my <u>favourite</u> food.
            [Plain form: 好_すき "favourite"]
3. 毎日歩_{まいにちある}くことは（   ）運動_{うんどう}です。
    Waking everyday is a <u>good</u> exercise.
            [Plain form: いい "good"]
4. マイケルさんとわたしは（   ）クラスで勉強_{べんきょう}しています。
    Micheal and I are studying in the <u>same</u> class.
            [Plain form: 同_{おな}じ "same"]
5. きのう（   ）人は親切_{しんせつ}でした。
    The person who I <u>met</u> yesterday was kind.
            [Plain form: あう "meet"]
6. 私_{わたし}の両親_{りょうしん}は（   ）ところに住_すんでいます。
    My parents live in a <u>quiet</u> place.
            [Plain form: しずか "quiet"]

---

[9] Three levels of L2 learners were asked to answer six questions overall on a questionnaire.

[10] Three levels of L2 learners were asked to respond eleven questions overall in the first mini test, as shown in below. Beginners were asked questions for relative clauses in this test even though they had not been taught the grammar to compare with those of intermediate and advanced learners.

7. あした 私 たちが（　　　　　　　　）映画はおもしろいそうです。
    Tomorrow, I heard that the movie which we <u>are going to watch in interesting</u>.
        [Plain form: みる "watch"]
8. その(　　　　　　　　　　　　　) は 私 に親切でした。
    The <u>home stay family</u> was kind to me.

        [Key words: ホームステイ "home stay"、家族 "family"]
9. 東京は（　　　　　　　　　） がいます。
    There are <u>many people</u> in Tokyo.
        [Key words: たくさん "many", ひと "people"]
10. （　　　　　　　　　　　　　） は１億2千万人以上です。
    <u>The population of Japan</u> is more than 120 million.
        [Key words : 人口 "population"、日本 "Japan"]
11. （　　　　　　　　　　　　　　） はどこですか。
    Where is <u>the place、where Sato-san lives</u>?
        [Key words: ところ "place", 住む "to live "]
12. （　　　　　　　　　　　　　　） は人気があります。
    <u>The book which Suzuki wrote</u> is popular.
        [Key words: 本 "book", 書く " to write"]

Appendix 3   The second mini test [11]

Translate the following sentences in Japanese:

1. This is an expensive watch.
2. Canberra is a beautiful place.
3. This is an awful (tasting) coffee.
4. I live at Barton in Canberra.
5. Yamada sensei is a kind person.
6. These are cheap books.
7. Yuka is a quiet person.
8. That is a boring film.
9. Tom Cruise is a famous actor.
10. Clive is a serious person.

Appendix 4   The third mini test [12]

Fill in the blanks with the correct form of the adjective:

1. これは ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ 本です。
   This is a boring book.（つまらない）
2. あれは ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ ジャッケトです。
   That is a yellow jacket.   （きいろい）
3. キャンベラは ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿ ばしょです。
   Canberra is a quiet place.   （しずか）

---

[11] Fifteen beginners were asked to respond to ten questions overall for noun modification in the second mini test, as shown in below. However, relative clauses were not covered because this test focused on only beginners, who had not been taught the grammar.
[12] Eighteen beginners were asked to respond to twenty questions overall for noun modification in the third mini test, as shown in below. However, relative clauses were not covered in the test because this test focused on only beginners, who had not been taught the grammar.

   4. 日本語は　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　言葉です。
       Japanese is a difficult language.　（むずかしい）
   5. これは＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　家です。
       This is a beautiful house.　（きれい）
   6. あの人は　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　先生です。
       That person is a famous teacher.（ゆうめな）
   7. これは　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　すしです。
       This is delicious sushi.　（おいしい）

Fill in the blanks by <u>joining</u> the two adjectives correctly:

   8. あれは　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　いぬです。
       That is a small, noisy dog.（ちいさい・うるさい）
   9. それは　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　きです。
       That's a beautiful, tall tree.（きれい・たかい）
  10. トムくん　は　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　目があります。
       Tom has big, blue eyes.　（おおきい・あおい）
  11. これは　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　へやです。
       This is a clean and spacious room.（きれい・ひろい）
  12. キャンベラ　は　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　ばしょです。
       Canberra is a beautiful and quiet place.（きれい・しずか）
  13. これは　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　映画　です。
       This is a long and boring movie.（ながい・つまらない）
  14. これは　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　コーヒーです。
       This is hot and delicious coffee.（あつい・おいしい）
  15. あのレストランは　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　ピザがあります。
       That restaurant has delicious, cheap pizzas.（おいしい・やすい）

Fill in the blanks correctly:

  16. それは　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　です。
       That is Tom's hat.（トム・ぼうし）
  17. 昨日　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　を飲みました。
       Yesterday I drank African coffee.（アフリカ・コーヒー）
  18. あれは＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　です。
       That is an Australian kangaroo.（オートラリア・カンガルー）
  19. 私は＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　にすんでいます。
       I live at Canberra in Australia.（キャンベラ・　オーストラリア）
  20. あれは　＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿　です。
       That is my car.（私・車）