Investigating Performance of the Third- Person Singular –S as a Learnt Property through Orally Repeated Practice Based on Krashen's Monitor Conditions of Time and Form Focuses: The Case of Jordanian Arab Trainees Translating Arabic into English as a Foreign Language

Asim Khresheh

Al-Mazar, Karak, Amman 61610, Jordan

Tel: 962-3-237-0414   E-mail: isam_khresheh@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study aims at investigating if the third- person singular as a learnt property can be released from the monitor conditions of time and form focuses as long as the trainees keep practicing it orally. The study also aims to identify if such property can be developed to the automatic extreme of the continuum when the trainees are aware of the rule. To achieve this, 30 trainees who produced conditions- focused and unfocused singular present verbs were identified in certain instances at the beginning of the program for later observation. Accordingly, tape- recordings of the trainees' oral translations were obtained as they kept practicing and semi- structured interviews were conducted with them along the program. The results showed that the trainees who were checked to say correct forms of the conditions- unfocused singular present verbs were affected more than those who just merely saying the conditions- focused counterparts. The effect was in the form of focusing on the conditions less and less as well as developing their cognitive skills as few trainees followed mentally new mechanisms to say correct forms of the unfocused present verbs. Consequently, it can be said that such trainees reached the automaticity of the knowledge they produced earlier as learnt one.

Keywords: The monitor model, Automatic/ non- automatic knowledge, Acquisition vs. learning, Bilingualism, SLA, The morpheme –s

1. Introduction and Literature Review

In one of the prominent theories in SLA, the Monitor Model, Krashen (1981) claims in his first hypothesis that acquisition and learning are different and they refer to subconscious and conscious study of language, respectively. In acquisition, study of the language occurs as a result of participating in natural or spontaneous communication and the focus or emphasis is on meaning while in learning, study of the language occurs as a result of participating in a formal setting, i.e. classroom, and the focus is on the formal features of the language. Also, learners can use the acquired knowledge automatically. This kind of knowledge contains the L2 internalized rules from which output is produced and edited by 'feel'. But with learnt knowledge, learners can use it only within a controlled process in which they monitor and edit the output created by the acquired knowledge. Unlike acquired knowledge, learnt knowledge is metalingual and it constitutes the formal features of the language.

Moreover, Krashen claims that learnt knowledge cannot be transferred into acquired knowledge. Both are separate and unrelated. Krashen (1982: 83- 84) states that "a very important point that.....needs to be stated is that learning does not `turn into' acquisition. The idea that we first learn a new rule, and eventually, through practice, acquire it, is widespread and may seem to some people to be intuitively obvious... Language acquisition happens in one way, when the acquirer understands input containing a structure that the acquirer is `due' to acquire".

In his second hypothesis, The Monitor, Krashen differentiates the functions of the two concepts. "The learnt knowledge functions to monitor the grammaticality of the product of the acquired knowledge in form of

utterances" (Hanafi, 2009:25). To achieve this, three conditions must exist. Firstly, the learner must know the rule which equips him to monitor what is going to be generated by the acquired knowledge. Secondly, there must be enough time in order to edit and finally the emphasis must be on the form rather than the meaning. Editing or self-correction may take place either before or after an utterance is said. However, the function of the monitor, as Krashen states, is limited in speaking.

The way Krashen separates between learning and acquisition is referred to as the non- interface position. Results of some empirical studies support such position; Seliger (1979) asked certain adult learners to describe some pictures and analyzed their use of **a** and **an** accordingly. After asking the learners to say the rules they use to produce **a** and **an**, data analysis revealed that there was no relationship between the learners' performance and their knowledge of the rules. To this end, Seliger concluded that learning and acquisition are separable.

In contrast, others rese opposed this position as they realized that learning, i.e. explicit knowledge, can be transferred into acquisition, i.e. implicit knowledge (Sharwood-Smith 1981; Gregg 1984; Stevick 1980; Bialystok 1979 & 1981; Dekeyser 1998, 2009; N. Ellis 1993; R. Ellis 1994, 1995; and Hulstijn & de Graaff 1994; McLaughlin 1978; and Rivers). This is referred to as the interface position and it has two forms: the weak and strong forms.

The weak form is introduced to mean that not all explicit knowledge can be converted into an implicit one. R. Ellis (2008), for instance, claimed that the third person singular –s as a developmental feature can become implicit providing that it is learnt in the correct development route whereas other features such as the copula **be** can develop into implicit knowledge at any time. Seliger (1979) further hypothesized that as the learners' performance introduced different representations of the indefinite articles, conscious rule thereof might be exploited as 'acquisition facilitators'. This can be realized through drawing the learners' attention to "critical attributes of the real language concept that must be induced. That is, conscious or pedagogical rules make the inductive hypothesis testing process more efficient" (p. 368). N. Ellis (2005, 2007, 2011), on the other hand, refers to the weak form to imply that both explicit and implicit knowledge cannot be inseparable and they work one towards another. However, the weak form falls anywhere between the two extremes of non- interface and strong interface positions and explicit knowledge can be transferred into an implicit one under certain conditions or constraints (de Vries et al. 2010).

The strong interface position places emphasis on the total transfer of explicit or learned knowledge to implicit or acquired knowledge (Dekeyser, 1993, 2003, 2009). It is often associated with skill building theories of SLA which highlight that "adults begin learning something through largely explicit knowledge and, with subsequent adequate practice and exposure, move into implicit knowledge" (VanPatten & Benati, 2010, p: 33). This view, in fact, is based on the Adaptive Control of Thought Model proposed by Anderson (1983 and 2005). That is, 'declarative knowledge' is used to develop into 'procedural knowledge', i.e. that which reflects the way the explicit knowledge is used. Learners are aware about rules they have as explicit knowledge and thus automatization takes place as a result of proceduralizing them in appropriate situations and continuous practice (Dekeyser, 2007). Paradis (2009, p.99) comments that interaction required to resolve communicative problems contributes

> to increasing metalinguistic knowledge which will serve as a model and a monitor, and thus provide opportunities for using well- formed structures of interest whose increased frequency of use will implicitly (i.e. without awareness and through an altogether different system) lead to the acquisition of the relevant underlying procedures (i.e. set the proper way between connections and lay down the appropriate procedure to generate the required form).

Furthermore, the acquisition vs. learning distinction has been challenged first by Bialystok (1978). She replaced the term acquired with implicit and learned with explicit. Later, Bialystok (1981) changes such distinction to analyzed and unanalyzed knowledge and further adds automatic and non-automatic knowledge. In essence, the idea of 'automaticity' has been discussed by McLaughlin (1978) in his argument against Krashen's distinction between learning and acquisition. McLaughlin proposes another distinction which is "more empirically based and ties into a general theory of human information processing" (p. 318). That is, controlled and automatic knowledge. McLaughlin thinks that "the advantage of this distinction is that it enables one to avoid disputes about "conscious" or "subconscious" experience, since the controlled-automatic distinction is based on behavioral acts, not on inner states of consciousness"(p. 318).

Several empirical studies have been concerned with such a position. Dekeyser (1997), for example, collected data from learners of artificial language. He divided them into three groups and all were exposed to four rules.

While the first group had been practiced to produce two rules and comprehend the other two, the second group had been practiced to produce the two rules which the first group had not produced and comprehend the other two. Whereas the third group had been practiced to equally produce and comprehend the four rules. Data analysis showed that there was little, if not, transferring from production to comprehension and vice versa and this advocated specifity of second language. Dekeyser concluded that declarative knowledge could be converted into an automatic one through proceduralization. Similarly, this end is supported by a study conducted by de Jong (2005) who proposed that the more aural comprehension his Spanish learners had the more speed they had gained in comprehension. But this stands in contrast to errors they made in terms of language production.

Base on this literature, foreign or second language learners are not expected to make mistakes in the system of their acquired knowledge since the edit, as Krashen stresses, is achieved by feel, i.e. no conscious condition is required to edit. Since those learners learn English and use it only in a formal setting, they may strongly have the system of learned knowledge and they may be expected to have faults or mistakes in the formal properties of learnt knowledge because the edit of such knowledge is carried out within a controlled process, so if one condition of the Monitor is not fulfilled, the learners are expected to make mistakes in the formal properties. Krashen (1982: 112) claims that "The use of the conscious grammar is limited. Not everyone monitors. Those who do only monitor some of the time and use the Monitor for only a sub-part of the grammar...the effect of self-correction on accuracy is modest. Second language performers can typically self-correct only a small percentage of their errors, even when deliberately focused on form...and even when we only consider the easiest aspects of grammar".

If practice has a role in learnt knowledge, it should be suggested first that practicing implies training on the learnt property until learners produce the correct form of the property without attending to the monitor conditions and in this case forms of conditions- missed mistakes are expected to be produced correctly at later stages of practicing because learners become more independent of the conditions. The more practice learners get, the more independent they will be on using the conditions. The same applies to the correct forms of conditions-based property; they are expected to be produced later without satisfying the conditions. Since the three conditions **must** all exist to edit the utterance of a learned knowledge, missing one of them while producing correct form of the property violates the Monitor.

If learners who learnt a conscious rule of the target language can transfer it to the unconscious one through practice, this assumes the presupposition that learners are aware what rule they have transferred (R. Ellis 2005, Gass & Selinker 2008, Isemonger 2007). Realizing this may indicate that the first condition of the monitor may exist earlier, i.e. the learner must know the rule and importantly the concept of automatic knowledge that should be emphasized in this study rather than the acquired one. Their conscious rules can be transferred into obviously subconscious ones through practice. Besides, when learners know the rule, the other two conditions, i.e. the focus must be on the form and there must be enough time, are possible to investigate. In other words, it should be ensured that the learners know the rule and identified accordingly if they can produce utterances with or without paying attention to form or/and time as long as they progress in practicing the language. However, in this study, all the participants know the rule investigated, i.e. adding the third- person singular to present verbs. This is studied when they translate oral texts from Arabic into English.

Significantly, detecting the formal property as part of the learned knowledge can be indicated through the mistakes made in the rule while speaking. These mistakes are examined only in terms of **both** conditions being missed. That is, learners are asked within semi- structured interviews what condition(s) they do not fulfill to make sure that the mistakes are performed as a result of violating the two conditions. The same procedure is applied to the correct forms of the property to make sure that they are the result of focusing on the conditions. Such mistakes and correct forms are identified at the very beginning of the program. Observations should be made then to investigate whether they are released from the conditions as learners keep practicing more and more or not, i.e. do they produce the formal property without attending to one or the both conditions of time and form?

In this study, practicing the use of third- person singular present tense may be investigated due to the period the participants spent using it. It lasts for one year and half. They might have used it before but the main criterion here is identifying the participants who are very similar in making conditions- unfocused- singular present verbs in specific instances and conditions- focused- singular present forms in other instances from the very beginning of the program. Another criterion is determining how many times each one was checked by his classmates and the instructor after making conditions- missed mistakes and how many times they produced conditions- focused- singular present verbs from the beginning till the end of the consecutive translations. However, this criterion reflects how much practice the participants were exposed to using the third- person singular in subject- verb

agreements. This was measured based on orally translated texts that the participants did every Thursday. Such texts were all tape- recorded by the instructor for the purpose of keeping their performance in their records. The instances where such mistakes and forms occurred were also identified at the beginning to explore later if these mistakes and forms changed in the same instances.

1.1 The Third- Person Singular –S as a Formal Property

Irrespective of the differences made between acquisition and learning, all researchers have already agreed that the morpheme –s is a formal feature learned either by native speakers of English or EFL learners (e.g. Richards, 1973, Taylor, 1975, Chamot, 1978, Brown, 1973). Besides, mistakes or errors in such a property are observed by omitting the –s while speaking or writing (e.g. Billings, 1999, Schuwerk, 2004, Muftah and Eng, 2011, Wang, 2000 among others).

The third- person singular –s forms one of the most frequent errors in tense use by Arabs learning English as a foreign language (Scott and Tucker, 1974). Therefore, this might make it easy to explore its development, if any, through practice.

Besides, the occurrence of the third- person singular is frequent along the program. The participants are always challenged when translating texts that require frequent use of the simple present, i.e. political conferences, news, and cultural, scientific and social issues as well as reports. Therefore checking of conditions- missed mistakes and producing the conditions- focused- singular present verbs are frequently made. In fact, these participants may be better than others for the purpose of the study.

The third- person singular –s, however, is widely omitted in some instances and employed in others by many Jordanian Arabs translating English as a foreign language. " In an elicitation task such as translation the learner is required to compare the target language with his L1, so it is not surprising that L1 interference is more evident" (R, Ellis, 1985, p. 89). For this reason, such translators may not use the –s as it does not exist in their mother tongue.

2. Statement of the problem

Concerning certain rule of the target language, it is noticeable that some Jordanian Arabs translating English as a foreign or second language omit the –s in certain instances but use it correctly in others. Other speakers have the accuracy to use it correctly in most places whereas others do so in all situations. It is questionable to ask, then, if this linguistic variation is the result of more and less oral practice of the rule.

3. Purpose of the Study

This study aims at investigating the role of practice on the learnt property. Having identified the conditions- unreleased forms and mistakes that are the result of satisfying and dissatisfying the two conditions, it is plausible to follow if they change without depending on the conditions. As leaning stands in contrast to acquisition as Krashen views and the condition of knowing the rule exists earlier, development of learned knowledge, if any, can be revealed towards the extreme of automatic knowledge rather than acquired one. In this study, as the learners are aware earlier of their controlled knowledge, it is presupposed that it has a relationship with its resulted aspect produced later through practice. The relationship between the two kinds of knowledge might not be dealt with as separately as conscious and unconscious knowledge. In this sense, McLaughlin (1978, p.319) argues here "automatic processes are learned following the earlier use of controlled processes". R. Ellis (1985, p.235) adds that "SLA entails going from the controlled to the automatic mode of operation. It is, therefore, not necessary to presuppose two unconnected knowledge types such as the acquired/learnt distinction." The participants' practice is studied at periods of time, i.e. each of which constitutes more practice of the property than previous one.

4. Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it examines an important hypothesis in one of prominent theories in SLA; the Monitor hypothesis is examined in relation to what is differentiated theoretically in the first hypothesis of the Model, the acquisition-learning hypothesis.

Even though the Monitor hypothesis is an integral part of the model, it has been criticized theoretically more than empirically. Morrison and Low (1983), for example, claim that Krashen specifies the role of monitoring on language performance rather than language reception. He also explains editing on grammatical rules rather than pronunciation, vocabularies and discourse. R. Ellis (1985: 265) also argues that "we are able to attend to the form of our utterances without using conscious rules, and without being able to make explicit how modifications in the initial output have been effected. This happens all the time in writing… and it also happens in speech."

Ellis sees that the variability made by learners in language performance as the result of the heterogeneity of the acquired knowledge it-self. Thus, monitoring is merely considered a secondary process in the L2 knowledge the learner has when engaged in planned discourse. It may be created in relation to linguistic and situational context when language is used in unplanned discourse. The learner makes sense of it as he is engaged in unplanned discourse. However, empirical studies are needed to support or refute such theoretical criticisms.

Additionally, there is no consensus regarding what position is followed by L2 learner, i.e. interface, non-interface, and variability positions. It is a controversial issue and few empirical studies, if any, have examined the role of practicing on language forms. This study, however, is significant because it attempts to explore how learned property can or cannot be developed through practice based on investigation of the Monitor conditions of time and form focuses.

In the case of EFL speakers, it is debatable whether –s as one of other grammatical morphemes is learned at certain points of the natural order as the native speakers do or not. Some researchers claim that first language has little effect on the acquisition of morphemes and consequently they are acquired or learned in the same order the native English speaking children follow (e.g. Dulay and Burt, 1973, 1974, Larsen- Freeman, 1976). On the contrary, other empirical studies report that L1 affects the acquisition order of the grammatical morphemes and EFL learners do not follow the similar natural route of native speaker children (e.g. Hakuta, 1974, Fathman, 1975). Nevertheless, few attempts have been made to explore if practice has an effect on the acquisition order of grammatical morphemes.

5. Methodology

In order to obtain real instances of conditions- focused and unfocused forms of third- person singular verbs, the researcher had the task to obtain the tape-recordings of the translated texted each Thursday of the first three weeks. Each Thursday recording was taped for the whole class so the trainees' names were easy to follow and identify particularly when the instructor named each trainee in the recordings to translate certain text. After listening to the texts of each Thursday, the researcher identified the entire third- person singular- missed verbs where the trainees did not add –s to the verbs. Identification of these verbs was determined on the first two Thursdays of the program. In order to get as accurate and truthful answers as possible, the researcher held semi-structured interviews with the trainees identified in the light of their mistakes in –s. In these interviews, the researcher asked two basic questions for each trainee; 1- do you think that time was a barrier to add –s to the verb and why? And do you think that you do not focus on the form of the verb and why? However, the interviews were semi- ones because the researcher could ask a few follow- up questions to elicit more information about the monitor conditions. Accordingly, positions or instances where such forms occurred were specified.

Likewise, the researcher followed the same procedure with the third- person singular- used verbs. That is, he identified the whole positions of such forms in the light of correct verbs. And the questions of the interviews were; 1- do you think that time was helpful and sufficient to produce the correct verb and how? And do you think that you focused on the form of the verb and why?

Crucially, as the trainees should present opposed answers between the two kinds of the singular present verbs, the positions should be different from each other. If one trainee provided conflicting answers between the two kinds in one or the two questions, he was not sure about what he felt or recognized. Thus, only those trainees whose answers of one type of the verb fully contradicted the counterparts of the other type were included as the study sample.

On the third Thursday, the researcher chose other third- person singular- missed and used verbs from the tape-recording. Of course, they were different from the previously identified ones. However, the researcher asked the trainees about them so as to verify if the trainees provided similar answers about the monitor conditions on the one hand and if their answers were relevant to positions identified earlier.

Having followed this method, 30 trainees were selected from a total of 61 as it was verified that their answers about the third- person singular- missed verbs conformed to the violation of the monitor conditions of time and form focuses. And answers about the third- person singular- used ones resulted in satisfaction of the two conditions.

After that, observation of the trainees' performance was determined only through the tape- recordings the researcher obtained week by week. The researcher was interested to observe the trainees' practice of the two types of the verb in the definable instances by each trainee. Once a clear development appeared in these

instances in one Thursday, the researcher held immediate semi- interviews with the instructor's permission. And the trainee(s) were asked the same questions about the monitor conditions to reveal what had been changed.

The 30 participants were all males training to translate Arabic into English in a one year and half- translation program. That program was taught at the Pioneer Private College located in Amman, Jordan. The trainees were aged from 25 to 30 years. They were selected from three classes. All held B.A. degrees in English and Literature from Jordanian universities. Their qualification implied having an efficient and practical grasp of practicing English grammar in relation to translation. The task of consecutive translation requires much attention to appropriate words, accurate use of grammar and high ability to convey messages. Since they were expected to translate as correctly and precisely as possible by the end of the program, their concern was then to reduce their mistakes and redundancy in whatever aspect.

The trainees were expected to perform several different tasks. One of which was consecutive translation or interpretation from Arabic to English. This was chosen as it served the goal of the present study. Each trainee was asked to translate an oral text which was totally different from others' so the trainees did not know in advance what they were going to translate. As the Thursday lectures lasted for two hours and a half, each trainee was asked to interpret from 4 to 7 short Arabic texts each Thursday in each class. Every text should be translated into 2 to 3 sentences and the time allotted for translation after listening to the Arabic texts was similar amongst the trainees, i.e. the trainee was given around 30- 45 seconds to start translating.

It was recommended by the instructor to study the occurrence of the morpheme –s as the trainees were often usually exposed to translating texts that required the use of singular present verbs. Examples of such texts were sport commentaries, political and economical news, as well as cultural and scientific articles.

6. The findings and Discussion

6.1 Identifications of Conditions- Focused and Unfocused- Singular Present Verbs at the Beginning of the First Semester

The translated texts on the first three Thursdays, March 6, 13, and 20, 2010, constituted all the instances or positions where conditions- focused and unfocused singular present verbs were made. Having obtained the tape-recordings, the researcher, after each of the previous Thursdays, conducted semi- structured interviews in which each trainee was asked about the monitor conditions when focused and unfocused forms were performed in such verbs. The focused and unfocused forms which were purely the result of satisfying and dissatisfying the two conditions were only chosen as occurred in certain positions for the purpose of observing the effect of practice on them in the second and third semesters. However, other instances were not mentioned because they were vague in terms of satisfying or dissatisfying the monitor conditions. The trainees provided contradicting views about the conditions and that is why they were not taken into consideration. Therefore, 30 participants were included in the study since they were certain that all their mistakes in the singular present verbs were made because of missing the two conditions and all correct forms of these verbs were the result of satisfying the two conditions. Moreover, other participants contradicted themselves when they felt that some mistakes in these verbs were sometimes the result of satisfying the two conditions or one of them in other times. Thus, such participants were not included in the study.

Furthermore, to really highlight the effect of practice, it should be observed how purely incorrect- learned-features (performed only as a result of dissatisfying the conditions of time and form) and purely correct- learned-features (performed only as a result of satisfying the conditions of time and form) develop through use. This may be attributed to, as mentioned; the two conditions are inseparable in analysis when a real investigation is made about monitoring.

The researcher identified instances where mistakes and correct forms were made in the third- person singular-present verbs. This was achieved by following a certain method whereby- after each Thursday, the researcher immediately held semi- structured interviews with the participants to ask them about their feeling and recognition towards the monitor conditions in these instances. Accordingly, certain instances were specified for later observations and the 30 participants were included in the study.

6.1.1 Conditions- Focused- Singular present Verbs

The instances where correct forms of conditions- focused singular present verbs occurred usually came at the beginning of the texts. All the 30 participants considered that they were performed as a result of satisfying the three conditions. The first instance can be seen in the following translation:

> 1) The trainee: the word Christmas **comes** from the old English "Christes Maesse", which **mean**

The instructor: **means**

The trainee: which **means** Christ's mass. Although Christians believe that Jesus was born in the small town of Bethlehem, we don't know the exact date of birth because stories about Jesus Christ was written down much later.

The participants used the third- person singular correctly in the first sentence. Before translating the above example and while listening to the Arabic counterpart, the trainees might be thinking about correct translation of what he heard first. When asked to translate, the first sentence was ready to be said correctly in terms of grammar and meaning. But while focusing on appropriate words of the relative clause, the trainees might not find enough time to focus on grammatical forms. That is why, in this example, the trainee said **mean**. In consecutive translation, the trainees were required to present the English text as quickly as possible. The trainee, in this example, did not pause to produce the relative clause. If he did, he might add –s to the verb as performed in other instances. Similar to this was when the trainees used –s correctly in the first and second sentences. They did so because they might have time when they paused before producing the second sentence. Example is the following translated text:

2) Trainee 1: Chinese New Year **begins** between January 21 and February 20. [Pause] The celebration **starts** with the second new moon after the beginning of winter (December 21) and **last** until

Trainee 2: **lasts**

The trainee: pardon

The instructor: **lasts** not **last**

Trainee 1: sorry. The celebration **lasts** until the next full moon…

The trainee in this example did not forget to add-s to the verb **starts**. He might have had time to account for the grammaticality of utterances as he paused. As he was involved in conveying the details in the second utterance, he might forget to add –s to the verb **last**. Focusing on the meanings presented after the verb **starts** might not help the trainee to focus on the form of the verb **last**. He might not have had time as he did before.

Conversely, in other examples, either before translating the entire text or pausing, some trainees added –s in two present verbs when they were combined by a conjunction in compound sentences. The following is an example:

3) The trainee: traffic **causes** ground ozone and **makes** children and older people tired. That is why doctors suggest [pause] not to go outdoors when there is many ozone in the air.

The instructor: too much ozone, not many

Having time before translating the text or pausing to judge the grammaticality of following sentence was helpful to add –s to the singular present verbs. This was felt by the trainees when asked about such verbs in comparison with the incorrect ones, i.e. the ones said without –s. That is to say, saying such correct forms of the singular present verbs was the result of satisfying the condition of time and consequently the condition of form.

6.1.2 Conditions- Unfocused- Singular Present Verbs

It can be understood from the above analysis that conditions- unfocused counterparts occurred in other different instances. If the trainees did not pause before sentences following the first one, the morpheme –s was not added to the singular present verb. This was noticed when the verb was preceded immediately either by its subject, i.e. noun, determiner phrase, and gerund, as in the second example, or a relative pronoun in a relative clause as in the first example. It also occurred when it was preceded by a clause containing two phrases or more, i.e. noun phrase and prepositional phrase, as in the following example:

4) The trainee: India **makes** about 1.2 million cars a year and the idea of a cheap car for everyone **make** some experts skeptical

The instructor: **makes** some experts skeptical

The trainee: **makes** some experts skeptical. [Pause] More cars lead to more traffic and more pollution, which also **contribute** to global warming.

The trainee in this example did not add –s to the verb **make** in the second line. The reason might be, as described previously, the trainee was thinking about formulating meaningful words that qualified the Arabic counterparts. In other words, the existence of noun phrase and prepositional phrases together might not provide much time to account for the grammaticality of the verb **make**.

An important point that should be made here is that the trainees, when corrected to say the third- person singular-present verb, they actually realized that they had made mistakes in the present verbs and consequently they said the correct forms. It was evident that the trainees knew the rule. Nonetheless, all the 30 participants, in the semi-structured interviews, answered "yes" to the first question about the monitor conditions, i.e. do you know when to use the third- person singular –s? Moreover, some trainees who corrected others, as in the second example, were themselves corrected to add the morpheme –s when they translated different Arabic texts. It could be that they did not pay attention to the verb forms when engaged to meaningfully translate the texts. But as they were in positions where they just listened to their classmates' translations, they were aware or able to observe the mistakes their classmates made.

In addition, the trainees claimed that the conditions- unfocused verbs were performed because of limited time and thus failure to focus on the form. They justified that they were concerned to translate quickly and were mentally busy to look up for appropriate words which should meet the Arabic words. From their point of view, conveying meanings of messages was more important than focusing on simple grammatical forms. Translation was needed when one party was not acquainted with another's language. It is crucial for translators here to convey meanings of each other's utterances because the interlocutor, i.e. one party, always waits for what is stated by another party.

In fact, what may support the trainees' claim is their inability to add –s to the singular present verb in the second sentence or in the middle of the text even if it occurred for the first time. The following is an example:

> 5) Trainee 1: In India car maker Tata Motors have brought out the cheapest car in the world:
>
> Trainee 2: I think it is preferable to say manufacturer instead of maker.
>
> The instructor: yeah. I think it is more formal. Yes please.
>
> Trainee 1: would you repeat the text, please?
>
> The instructor: okay, listen carefully
>
> (After listening to the Arabic text)
>
> Trainee 1: In India the car manufacturer Tata Motors have brought out the cheapest car in the world: the Nano. It was [pause] it was first introduced in 2008 and it **cost** only 2,500 dollars plus taxes. [Pause] Tata director **sees** the Nano as a "People's Car".

The trainee might be involved to focus only on the form of present perfect tense and the passive voice but not on the third- person singular- tense.

Additionally, the trainees might be convinced about their justification because some of them were able to use the third –person singular- tense even it was preceded by extra information in the first sentence. An example is the following text:

> 6) Trainee1: According to an international committee on climate change, the warmer the weather **gets**, the more rainfall we will have because
>
> The instructor: we are going to have, not we will have. Do you know why?
>
> (The instructor discussed with the trainees when to use *will* and *be going to*.)
>
> The instructor: let me repeat the text and please be ready to translate.
>
> (After listening to the Arabic text)
>
> Trainee1: According to an international committee on climate change, the warmer the weather **gets**, the more it is going to rain simply because warmer air can hold more moisture. But the weather patterns are going to shift….

The trainee in this example was given more time to focus on the formal properties of what he was going to translate. He listened to the text twice. The first one was while listening to translate for the first time and the other while the instructor was discussing the difference between *will* and *be going to*. That is why he produced understandable and grammatical sentences in the whole text. Moreover, there was further evidence which may support that their claim was almost clear in all the trainees' translated texts, namely, they rarely paused to produce the first sentence. They were prepared to say it without hesitation or confusion. That is why they used the third- person singular –s correctly in the first sentence.

6.2 Findings in the Middle of the Second Semester

In the middle of the second semester particularly on August 12, 2010, both conditions- focused and unfocused- singular present verbs were counted for each trainee in all Thursdays starting from March 6 to August 12, 2010 through the tape- recorded texts. How many times they were uttered in the instances constitutes the trainees' practice of the third- person singular –s tense.

It should be noted here that the 30 trainees practiced both types of singular present verbs in the instances mentioned in the previous section but they varied in times of performing them in those instances. (See the first table as an example).

Unfocused- singular present verbs were uttered in sentences which followed the first one either in the middle or at the end of the text or a clause followed it particularly in the middle of the text. At both cases, the trainees did not pause. Such verbs were ungrammatical because they missed the third- person singular –s and the trainees were checked immediately to say the correct forms (see the second table)

It was possible to count the verbs till the very beginning of the second semester; July 4, 2011, but the researcher did so in August 12, 2010 because the first real change of conditions- unfocused verbs appeared on the following Thursday; August 19, 2010. Thus, the researcher counted how many times both kinds of verbs were uttered till the previous Thursday.

Based on the texts, three trainees started to self- correct the present simple of a second sentence by adding –s without pausing; they immediately self- corrected the third- person singular- unfocused- verb after saying it. The subject that preceded the self- corrected verbs appeared in the form of noun or determiner noun. Those trainees were Khalid, Ahmad, and Waleed. I have used the trainees' names here so as to make description of their development easier to follow.

Regarding the first instance in the second table, Khalid and Ahmad were from group 3, i.e. they used the third- person singular- unfocused verb 33- 38 times after singular subjects whereas Waleed was from group 2 who practiced it 21 to 32 times. In addition, all belong to group 3 in the third instance; they used the unfocused- singular present verb 33- 38 times after relative pronouns. It was reasonable and interesting to know then which groups they belonged to in the first table (the conditions- focused- singular present verbs). As far as the first instance was concerned, Ahmad and Waleed were from group 1 who used the third- person singular tense 18- 30 times in the first sentence while Khalid was from group 2 who used it 31 to 46 times. But in the second instance, all belonged to group 1 who paused 10- 25 times to produce correct forms of conditions- focused singular present verb.

On the other hand, although trainees like Jaber, Sinan, and Amer were from group 2 who paused to produce such correct forms 31- 46 times in the second sentence, they were unable to self- correct unfocused ones preceded by the subject. Regarding the second tables, Jaber, Sinan, and Amer were from group 1 in the three instances. That is to say, they had more practice of the conditions- focused verbs than Khalid, Ahmad, and Waleed but the latter had more practice of the conditions- unfocused verbs than Jaber, Sinan, and Amer.

More revealingly, Khalid, Ahmad, and Waleed were more checked than Jaber, Sinan, and Amer as the former produced incorrect forms of the conditions- unfocused verbs. It seemed that this might assist them to self- correct verbs they had left ungrammatical earlier. The following is an example of self- correction:

> 7) (After listening to the text in Arabic)
>
> Trainee 1: Carbon monoxide is a colorless gas that is set free when wood or petrol is not completely burned. [Pause] it is also in products like cigarettes. Because of it, less oxygen **enter** our blood. Less oxygen **enters** our blood.

Nonetheless, self- correcting of the conditions- unfocused- singular present verbs implied the trainees' inability to say the utterances automatically. They still needed to account for the grammaticality of the conditions- unfocused- singular present verbs. But, it goes without saying, that they had more control than earlier. If they started to self- correct, they were better able to focus on the rule or the property at the time they were translating the meaning of the Arabic message.

Based on the semi- structured interviews carried out on August 19, 2010, more illustrations were gained. That is, most trainees claimed that they, either in pausing or while listening to the Arabic text, looked first for appropriate English words which may meet the Arabic counterparts, then, they considered what grammatical constructions should be used to exhibit the English words, i.e. complex and compound sentences, clauses, phrases, etc. At the final stage, they checked the smallest aspects of grammar, i.e. should the verb be past or

present or present perfect, etc? If past, should they use the **–ed** suffix if the verb is regular or others if it is irregular? What auxiliary verb should be used with the participle? Should the morpheme –s be added to the simple present or not and so on?

21 trainees claimed that they missed the final stage when they were about to produce a new clause or a sentence and that is why they did not add –s to the singular present verb. Sufficient time, according to them, did not exist to follow the latter step and consequently there was no focus on the form. The other trainees asserted that the focus on certain grammatical feature was simpler than others. For example, full or auxiliary verbs of the copula **be** were always recognized after a subject was said. In such a case, the trainees found it easy to only focus on two parts, namely, looking for the appropriate English word which meets the subject said in Arabic on the one hand, and what form of **be** should be used after it on the other. Thus, they found it easy to say **was** and **is** after singular appropriate subjects and **were** and **are** after plural ones. But thinking about the appropriate verb which should meet the Arabic one after the subject prevented them from adding the morpheme –s to the verb. Unlike the copula **be**, thinking about a verb equivalent to the Arabic one minimized their focus on the third- person singular tense. One trainee produced the following:

> 8) (After listening to the Arabic text)
>
> Trainee 1: Each human **needs** about 20 litres of water a day for the basics such as washing, cooking and drinking. But there **are** many places around the world, where someone **get** five litres of water.

Commenting on self- correction, when Ahmad, Khalid and Waleed were asked about the monitor conditions, they further argued that they were capable to quickly account for the grammaticality of the third- person singular verbs they had already produced at time they finished thinking about appropriate equivalents which were ready to be said again. In the seventh example, the trainee was involved to convey appropriate equivalents including the verb and that is why he forgot to add –s. On the other hand, while these equivalents were ready to be produced again for the goal of formal self- correction, the trainee did not need to change them or think about them. At the level of the time condition, they might find time more controllable especially they did not pause to grammatically self- correct repeated equivalents so their capability was less limited in comparison with their former performance.

From their point of view, they became familiar with the way different grammatical features are considered. That is, when they listened to sentences in Arabic, they realized the order used to account for their grammaticality in English. For example, when a tense of certain verb should be in the past, they mentally used to look first to see if the verb was regular or not. Secondly, they added –**ed** if it was regular or other suffixes if it was irregular. Nevertheless, other procedures were used to focus on the third- person singular- tense, namely, they mentally used to recognize that the simple present tense should be used to correctly meet the tense used in Arabic, then they; looked at the subject to verify if it was plural or singular. If plural, they immediately used the base form of the verb but if singular, they added –s. This mental mechanism, as they believed, was followed before saying equivalents for the second time containing the incorrect form of the singular present verb. They repeated the equivalents just because they wanted to add –s to the singular present verb, so the equivalents became unthinkable and were only needed to be said with grammatical focus. Khalid, Ahmad, and Waleed claimed that they found time insufficient to focus on the form when equivalents were said for the first time. However, practicing such forms developed their ability to self- correct.

Creating and thus following such mechanisms were, as they believed, the result of keeping on translating and being checked many times.

Moreover, Ahmad, Khalid, and Waleed did not self- correct each unfocused- singular present verb which occurred in the second sentence of the texts. They left them ungrammatical, i.e. without out –s, in some sentences and grammatical in others. Their self- correction appeared incrementally. Ahmad self- corrected 4 unfocused- singular present verbs in 3 different texts. Khalid self- corrected 7 ones in three different texts whereas Waleed corrected two verbs; each occurred in a different text.

More clearly, to explore the average of self- correction done by each one, the researcher did the following:

How many times incorrect forms of the unfocused- singular present verb were self-

corrected when occurred in the second sentence without pausing in each one's translated texts

_____ * 100% = percentage of trainee's self- correction

How many times such verbs were uttered in this instance by each

(The incorrect+ self- corrected forms)

In the case of Khalid who produced the unfocused- singular present verbs 37 times after singular subjects and self- corrected 7 of them, the percentage of his self- correction in this period was 18.9%. Ahmad, on the other hand, was 11.7% while Waleed was 6.6%.

Practicing the third- person singular in the conditions- focused- present verbs did not reflect clear development as the unfocused counterparts. Whether they were less or more practiced, they were produced correctly. Besides, no justification could be made for their development except the trainees' feelings. However, with respect to the first table of the conditions- focused- singular present verbs, 4 trainees who used the third- person singular correctly at the first sentence believed that they started not to pay attention to the third- person singular –s in the first sentence. The three trainees; Jaber, Sinan, and Amer, were from group 3 who practiced the property 47 to 55 times and another one; Ramzi, was from group 2 who practiced the property 31 to 46 times. It is doubtful that they might be correct but still their feelings should be considered with caution because they could not be empirically investigated.

However, the next real change about the unfocused- singular present verbs appeared in the third semester, particularly, January 20, 2011.

6.3 Findings in the Third Semester

After translating Arabic texts on January 13, 2011, the researcher counted the number of conditions- focused-singular present verbs from August 19, 2010 to January 13, 2011 and added them to the previous ones counted till August 12, 2010 so as to reflect the overall practice of such verbs (see the third table).

The similar procedure was followed with the conditions- unfocused verbs; the researcher counted how many times they were uttered form March 6, 2010 till January 13, 2011. Such verbs were said without preparation, i.e. pausing (see the fourth table)

It was noticed this time that two trainees were able to produce correct forms of the unfocused- singular present verbs in the second sentence without pausing. Such verbs were said after singular subjects. Like the self-corrected verbs, the correct forms of the unfocused- singular present verbs did not appear at one time; rather, they were uttered gradually as the trainees kept translating. Khalid used such forms 5 times in 4 translated texts while Ahmad used them 4 times in 3 texts. Moreover, Khalid was only able to use the unfocused verb correctly after relative pronoun two times in two texts.

Looking at which groups they belonged to, the three trainees were from group 2 in the first instance of the Fourth table, i.e. they used incorrect forms of the unfocused- singular present verb 36- 45 times. Besides, Khalid and Waleed were from group 3 in the third instance, they said incorrect forms of the unfocused- singular present verb 50- 54 times whereas Ahmad was from group 2 who said incorrect forms of the same verb 34- 49 times after relative pronouns. Concerning the second instance, all belonged to group 2 who practiced the unfocused-singular present verbs 31- 35 times after clauses.

Their correct use of such verbs did not suggest ignorance of self- correction, rather, they self- corrected unfocused- singular present verbs. Khlaid, for example, self- corrected 6 verbs, Ahmad self- corrected 4 verbs and Waleed 3 verbs. The numbers of self- corrected forms of the unfocused- singular present verbs from the very beginning till January 13, 2011 were 13 verbs for Khalid, 8 for Ahmad and 5 for Waleed. The overall average of self- correction for each was 28.8%, 18.6%, and 11.9%, respectively.

Realizing which groups they belonged to in the Third table, Khalid and Ahmad were from group 1 in the first instance, i.e. they practiced the focused- singular present verbs in the first sentence 32- 45 times whereas Waleed was from group 2 who practiced it 46- 60 times. On the other hand, they were all from group1 in the second instance who practiced the focused- singular verbs after pausing 15- 30 times.

Importantly, trainees such as Jaber and Sinan started this time to self- correct incorrect forms of the unfocused verbs. Similarly to Khalid, Ahmad, and Waleed, the self- correction made by Jaber and Sinan was limited to incorrect forms which occurred after singular subjects in the second sentence. Notably, Jaber and Sinan still kept practicing correct forms of the focused- singular present verb in the first sentence more than the others; they uttered such forms 61- 69 forms. Likewise, regarding the Third table, they were from group 2 who practiced such verbs in the second sentence 30- 37 times after pausing. However, both of them significantly increased their use of incorrect forms of the unfocused- singular present verbs in the second sentence. They belonged to group 2 in the first instance of the Fourth table; they used them 36- 45 times after singular subjects.

In the light of these observations, it may be stated that practicing the conditions- unfocused- singular present verbs in combination with immediate feedback; being checked by classmates or the instructor to say the correct ones, had a stronger effect to develop the monitor than merely saying the focused ones. In the first semester, although Jaber and Sinan were checked 11- 20 times to say correct forms of the unfocused- singular present verbs and produced 26- 40 correct forms of the focused- singular present verbs after pausing, they were unable to self- correct the unfocused ones, unlike Khalid, Ahmad and Waleed. The latter trainees were more checked, i.e. 33- 38 times and produced less correct forms of the focused ones in the both semesters, i.e. 10- 25 times in the first semester and 15- 30 till the second semester. When Jaber and Sinan were more checked till this semester, they started to self- correct the unfocused verbs in spite of their increasing production of correct forms of the focused verb, i.e. 26- 40 times in the first semester and 30- 37 times till the second semester.

Furthermore, in the semi structured interviews conducted on January 16, 2011, both Khalid and Ahmad were asked why they used correct forms of the third- person singular verbs in a position they previously considered conditions- unfocused. Khalid believed that he was more capable to roughly and rapidly think of what should be produced in the second sentence in terms of both grammar and appropriate equivalents. The same time allotted to him while listening to the text in Arabic allowed him now to extend his focus. He argued that he was able to recall certain mechanism, namely, checking merely if the subject was singular or plural because he knew in advance particularly before saying the verb that the tense was simple present. He produced the following translated text:

> 9) (After listening to the text in Arabic)
>
> Ahmad: Noise is often an uncontrollable factor and can emanate from both inside and outside the classroom. Movement of desks and chairs **forms** all contributors to poor understanding.
>
> Trainee 1: I think he should say poor speech understanding
>
> The instructor: you are right. This is to clarify what type of [pause] let me say to clarify what type of understanding you are talking about.

Khalid did not use the word **speech** to explain simply what understanding he was talking about. But it can be easily understood from the context that he meant **speech understanding**. Besides, if he was able to convey the meaning of the equivalents preceding and following the verb **forms**, it is needless to say that he actually placed emphasis on both form and meaning. Thinking about meanings of appropriate equivalents did not prevent him from thinking about another.

Alternatively, Ahmad further claimed that he became more familiar with the mental mechanism of how to immediately add –s or not after realizing the tense of the Arabic verb and whether the subject preceded it was singular or plural. This occurred with him while saying the translated text, not before.

However, both Khalid and Ahmad claimed that time was enough even though they were about to produce the singular present tense in the second sentence without pausing. But they were still focusing on the form. Khalid needed to check if the subject was singular or plural although he could grasp what tense should be used along the entire text. Ahmad, on the other hand, was able to check the property while conveying the equivalents. Unlike self- correction, time was more exploited here, may be because their ability to recall the mechanisms and checking were faster and more managed.

Commenting on the case where Ahmad was not able to add –s to the conditions- unfocused- singular present verb occurred after a relative pronoun, he argued that this task required much more attention than adding –s to a verb preceded by its singular subject. In his opinion, when the singular present verb was said after the subject, it was easier to think if the subject was singular or not to add –s accordingly. But when it was said after the relative pronoun, it was difficult to keep in mind if the subject referred to the relative pronoun was singular or not particularly when the relative clause was said in the second, not the first sentence. It took longer to think of it at time he conveyed meaning of the first sentence while being busy to convey another.

On the other hand, Khalid might be able to retain his grasp of the tense of the verb while he translated the text. In fact, this might also validate why he was able, in the previous case, to add –s to the unfocused- singular present tense while translating. The following is an example:

> 10) (After listening to the text in Arabic)
>
> Khalid: In northern Europe, branches from green trees were brought into the house to show spring would return soon. Decorating the house is an old custom which **comes** from pagan times.

Furthermore, similar to the second semester is the trainees' feelings about the conditions- focused forms, the same trainees, i.e. Jaber, Sinan, Ramzi, and Amer insisted that they did not pay attention to third- person singular form as long as they produced the focused forms.

All in all, the whole trainees' performance reflected systematic variability of the morpheme –s use. This was evident in the instances determined at the beginning, i.e. the trainees were able to use the –s in certain instances but did not in the other different ones. This is referred to as linguistic variability (R. Ellis, 1985). Such kind of variability was also found when Khalid, Ahmad and Waleed started to self- correct in certain instances because of more practice and later used the morpheme –s correctly in the same ones because of much more practice.

In essence, such trainees started gradually to leave one extreme of the position continuum towards the other; they steadily moved from non- interface position towards the interface one. But they did not, of course, reach that type of unconscious or implicit knowledge. Rather, they transferred non- automatic and analyzed knowledge of the –s to automatic but analyzed knowledge. Dekeyser (2003: 321) stresses that "automatized knowledge is not exactly the same as implicit knowledge. While implicit knowledge or implicit memory is defined with reference to lack of consciousness or awareness… absence of awareness is not a requirement for automaticity". At the end of the third semester, Khalid and Ahmad were able to produce –s in their flow of translation in instances whereas they had never used it in the first and second semesters. In either case, they were aware why they used or did not use it but their cognitive skills were enlarged and developed through practice in terms of the form condition till they had been able to perform correct forms of conditions- unfocused verbs as quickly and correctly as the conditions- focused ones. With respect to the time condition, Khalid and Ahmad had realized time as sufficient to recall the aforementioned mechanisms and this contradicted what they had stated earlier in the first semester. Time was insufficient for them to focus on the form of the equivalents.

Practice had an apparent effect on the variation shown by the whole trainees. In this study, more practice of conditions- focused singular present tense did not change their cognitive skill, i.e. the trainees added the morpheme –s just because the monitor conditions were helpful to make them do so. On the contrary, more practice of conditions- unfocused singular present verbs influenced their cognition later so as to add –s.

7. Conclusion

In this study, the monitor conditions were needed in ordered sequence. Time was used in order to think and focus on the meaning and form of equivalents. Thinking of meaning was prior to that of form, i.e. the participants' concern was to focus initially on meaning and then on form. If time was enough from the participants' point of view, they were able to perform the conditions- focused singular present verbs. These occurred at the beginning of the first sentence or after pausing to produce a new sentence. If time was not enough, they produced the conditions- unfocused ones which occurred in the middle or at the end of the text. In this case, the participants did not pause.

If the singular present verb was conditions- focused, the verb was grammatical, i.e. the morpheme –s was added to the verb, so the participant satisfied the monitor conditions. Conversely, if it was conditions- unfocused, the verb was ungrammatical, i.e. it missed the morpheme –s so the participants did not satisfy one of the conditions or the two; time and form. However, knowing focused or unfocused verbs was determined at the very beginning of the program in definite positions through semi- structured interviews.

Repeated oral practice of conditions- focused and unfocused- singular present tense did not guarantee the end achieved by a few trainees. Khalid, Ahmad, and Waleed, in the second semester had the capability to self- correct incorrect forms of conditions- unfocused singular present verbs by adding the morpheme –s. Such participants were the only ones who practiced such property more than the others till the second semester.

Actually, this development proved that practicing the conditions- unfocused singular present verbs in connection with immediate checking was more effective than merely practicing the correct forms of the focused ones. Alternatively, the participants were not checked as long as they focused on the three monitor conditions to generate singular present verbs. This end was supported when other participants such as Jaber, Sinan, and Amer had reached very similar practice to Khalid, Ahmad and Waleed's groups of the conditions- unfocused positions. As a result, Jaber, Sinan, and Amer started to self- correct the singular present verb in the same instances of conditions- unfocused verbs. This occurred with them in the third semester, although they belonged to groups who practiced the conditions- focused singular present tense more than the others. This was noticed with them till the second and third semesters. Nevertheless, their self- correction did not imply obvious ability to add –s in such instances as long as they faced it, rather, they self- corrected those forms in some sentences but not in other similar ones.

Generally speaking, Khalid and Ahmad extended their control in terms of the form condition since they were able to self- correct forms they had never produced earlier in instances of conditions- unfocused present verbs. The time allotted to them as usual was exploited in that they had developed mentally organized mechanisms. Such mechanisms helped them to immediately check the singular present verb and so they produced correct forms in spite of existence of the conditions- unfocused instances on the one hand and the trainees' involvement to convey meaningful equivalents on the other. Apparently, such trainees practiced and self- corrected the singular present tense in the conditions- unfocused positions more than the others in the third semester.

This study did not present a conclusive result if the grammatical property was totally transferred into the acquired one. Rather, the participants extended and developed their ability more and more as they kept practicing the property. The major development was noticed in the form and time conditions. In the second semester, they found time allotted, i.e. while listening to the Arabic text, controllable and thus sufficient as they had followed mentally new mechanisms. In the third semester, they found time more controllable as they had followed other new mechanisms which motivated them to produce correct verbs they only were able to self- correct in the second semester.

In brief, as practice has an effect on the trainees' mental capability, the monitor can be said to fail in supporting the non- interface position. Therefore, no trainees had reached the so called automatic/ unanalyzed pair of knowledge (Bialystok, 2009). Rather, Khalid and Ahmad's knowledge might appear automatic but analyzed.

The other trainees' inability to reach what had been achieved by Khalid and Ahmad may raise a limitation of the study, namely, programs of longer periods may be better on the ground that more can be revealed towards the end of the second extreme. In addition, the unfeasibility of examining the trainees' feelings and cognition about the conditions- focused verbs forms another limitation. Therefore, it is recommended to conduct similar studies about longer programs and courses concerning other Arabic speakers using or learning English as a foreign language as well as other different grammatical features.

References

Anderson, J. (2005). *Cognitive Psychology and its Implications*. New York: Worth Publishers.

Anderson, J. (1983). *The Architecture of Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bialystok, E. (1979). An Analytical View of Second Language Competence: a Model and Some Evidence. *The Modern Language Journal*, LXIII: 257-62.

Bialystok, E. (1979). Explicit and implicit Judgments of L2 Grammatically. *Language Learning*, 30, 81-104. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1979.tb01053.x

Bialystok, E. (2009). How Analysis and Control Lead to Advantages and Disadvantages in Bilingual Processing. In Sanz, C. & Leow R.P (Eds.), *Implicit and Explicit conditions, Processes and Knowledge in SLA and Bilingualism.* (pp. XX). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Bialystok, E. (1981). Some Evidence for the Integrity and Interaction of Two Knowledge Sources. In Anderson (ed.). *New Dimensions in Research on the Acquisition and Use of a Second Language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Bialystok, E. (1981). The Role of Linguistic Knowledge in Second Language Use. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 4, 31-45. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100004265

Billings, M. (1999). *Greedy to Know English: A Case Study*. Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Regina.

Brown, R. (1973). *A first language: The early stages*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chamot, A. (1978). Grammatical Problems in Learning English as a Third Language. In Hatch (ed.) *Second Language Acquisition. A Book of Readings* (pp. 175-189). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

De Jong, N. (2005). Can Second Language Grammar be Learned Through Listening? An Experimental Study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 27, 205-234. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050114

Dekeyser, R. (1997). Beyond Explicit Rule Learning: Automatizing Second Language Morphosyntax. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 19, 195-221.

Dekeyser, R. (1998). Beyond Focus on form. Cognitive Perspectives on Learning and Practicing Second Language Grammar. In c. Doughty and J. William (eds.) *Focus on Form in Classroom SLA* (pp. 42-63). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge university press.

Dekeyser, R. (2009). Cognitive-psychological processes in second language learning. In Long, M & Doughty, C (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Teaching* (pp. 119-138, 2009). Oxford: Blackwell. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/b.9781405154895.2009.00009.x

Dekeyser, R. (2003). Implicit and Explicit in Learning. In Doughty, C., Long, M (eds.) *the handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 313-348). Blackwell publishing: Oxford.

Dekeyser, R. (2007). Situating the Concept of Practice. In DeKeyser, R (ed.), *Practicing in a Second Language: Perspectives from Applied Linguistics and Cognitive Psychology* (pp. 1-18). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dulay, H, & Burt, M. (1973). Should we Teach Children Syntax? *Language learning*, 23(2), 245-258. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1973.tb00659.x

De Vries, B, Cucchiarini, C, Strik, H, & van Hout, R. (2010). Adaptive Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning. In de Wannemaeker, S, Clarebout,G & de Causmaeeker, P (eds.) *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Adaptive Learning: A Look at the Neighbours* (pp. 1-15). First international conference on interdisciplinary research on technology, education and research, Kortrijk, Belgium: Springer- verlage Berlin Heidelberg.

Ellis, N. (2005). At the Interface: Dynamic Interactions of Explicit and Implicit Language Knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 305-352. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S027226310505014X

Ellis, N. (2011). Implicit and Explicit SLA and their Interface. In Sanz, C & Leow, R (Eds.) *Implicit and Explicit Language Learning: Conditions, Processes, and Knowledge in SLA & Bilingualism* (pp. 35-47). Georgetown University Press.

Ellis, N. (1993). Rules and Instances in Foreign Language Learning.: Interaction of Implicit and Explicit Knowledge. *European Journal of Cognitive psychology*, 5, 289-319. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09541449308520120

Ellis, N. (2007). The Weak-Interface, Consciousness, and Form-focused Instruction: Mind the Doors. In Fotos. S & Nassaji, H (Eds.), *Form Focused Instruction and Teacher Education: Studies in Honour of Rod Ellis* (pp. 17-33). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). A Theory of Instructed Second Language Acquisition In Ellis, N (ed.) *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages* (pp. 79-114). London: academic press.

Ellis, R. (1995). Interpretation Tasks for Grammar Teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, 29, 87-106. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587806

Ellis, R. (2005). Measuring Implicit and Explicit Knowledge of a Second Language: A Psychometric Study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 141-172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263105050096

Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Fathman, A. (1975). The Relationship between Age and Second Language Productive Ability. *Language Learning*, 25, 245-266. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1975.tb00244.x

Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (2008). Second *Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. New York: Routledge.

Gregg, K. (1984). Krashen's Monitor and Occam's Razor. *Applied Linguistics,* 5, 79-100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.2.79

Hakuta, K. (1974). A Preliminary Report on the Development of Grammatical Morphemes in a JapaneseGirl Learning English as a Second Language. *Working Papers in Bilingualism*, 3, 18, 38. (Reprinted from E. Hatch (Ed.). *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, 1979).

Hanafi, A. (2009). Transfer of Learning to Acquisition: Communicative Approach Contribution. *Leksika,* Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 23-32. Retrieved August 5, 2011, from http://www.google.com.sa/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=hanafi+2009+transfer+of+learning+to+acquisition&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CBwQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fjurnal.ump.ac.id%2Findex.php%2Fleksika%2Farticle%2Fdownload%2F24%2F23&ei=cyEMT7ydC8mg4gS08_GYBg&usg=AFQjCNHu21VV-h4SVCT6Bx1nkemCTOIl4Q

Hulstijn & de Graaff. (1994). Under What Conditions Does Explicit Knowledge of a Second Language Facilitate the Acquisition of Implicit Knowledge. A Research Proposal. *AILA review*, 11, 97-112.

Isemonger, Ian M. (2007). Operational Definitions of Explicit and Implicit Knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 29, 101-118.

Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1976). An Explanation of theMmorpheme Acquisition Order of Second Language Learners. *Language learning: A journal of applied linguistics*, 26(1), 125-134.

McLaughlin B. (1978). The Monitor Model: Some Methodological Considerations. *Language Learning*, 28(2), 309-332. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1978.tb00137.x

Mufath, M. & Eng, W. (2011). The Acquisition of English be Auxiliary and Thematic Verb Constructions by Adult Arab ESL Learners. *The International Journal of English Linguistics*, Vol. 1. No. 2. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v1n2p9

Paradis, M. (2009). *Declarative and Procedural Determinant of Second Languages*. Philadelphia: john Benjamin publishing co.

Rivers, W. (1980). Foreign Language Acquisition: Where the Real Problem Lies. *Applied Linguistics,* 1(1), 48-59. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.48

Schuwerk, T. (2004). *Morpheme Acquisition in Second Language Learners*. Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Central Florida.

Seligers H. (1979). On the Nature and Function of Language Rules in Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 13, 359-369. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3585883

Sharwood Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness-Raising and the Second Language Learner. *Applied Linguistics,* 2(2), 159–168. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/2.2.159

Stevick, E. (1980) .*Teachings Languages: A Way and Ways*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

VanPatten, Bill & Benati, Alessandro G. (2010). *Key Terms in Second Language Acquisition*. London: Continuum.

Wang, L. (2000). *Acquisition of Grammatical Morphemes: A Case Study of Language.* Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Regina.

Table 1. Conditions- Focused Singular Present Verbs till the Second Semester

Times of production The instance	Group 1 Between 18 to 30	Group 2 Between 31 to 46	Group 3 Between 47 to 55
At the first sentence	19 trainees	4 trainees	4 trainees
Times of production The instance	Between 10- 25	Between 26- 41	_____
After pausing to produce new sentence or relative clause	25 trainees	5 trainees	

Table 2. Conditions- Unfocused Singular Present Verbs till the Second Semester

Times of production The instance	Group 1 Between 11- 20	Group 2 Between 21- 32	Group 3 Between 33- 38
The verb is preceded by its subject, i.e. noun, in the 2nd sentence	23 trainees	3 trainees	4 trainees

The verb is preceded by a clause in the 2nd sentence	30 trainees	_____	_____
The verb is preceded by a relative pronoun.	18 trainees	7 trainees	5 trainees

Table 3. The Conditions- Focused Singular Present Verbs till the Third Semester

Times of production The instance	Group 1 Between 32 to 45	Group 2 Between 46 to 60	Group 3 Between 61 to 69
At the first sentence	20 trainees	6 trainees	4 trainees
Times of production The instance	Between 15- 30	Between 30-37	_____
After pausing to produce new sentence or relative clause	27 trainees	3 trainees	_____

Table 4. Conditions- Unfocused Singular Present Verbs till the Third Semester

Times of production The instance	Group 1 Between 20-35	Group 2 Between 36- 45	Group 3
The verb is preceded by its subject, i.e. noun, in the 2nd sentence	23 trainees	7 trainees	_____
Times of Production The instance	Group 1 Between 16- 30	Group 2 Between 31- 35	_____
The verb is preceded by a clause in the 2nd sentence.	Group 1 26 trainees	Group 2 4 trainees	_____
Times of Production The Instance	Group 1 Between 18- 33	Group 2 Between 34- 49	Group 3 Between 50- 54
The verb is preceded by a relative pronoun in the middle of the text	21 trainees	7 trainees	2 trainees