



THAI INTERFERENCE IN THE USE OF ENGLISH ADJECTIVES

BUNDIT SAKONTHAVAT

25487

**AN INDEPENDENT STUDY SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
MAJOR IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
FACULTY OF LIBERAL ARTS
UBON RAJATHANEE UNIVERSITY**

YEAR 2005

COPYRIGHT OF UBON RAJATHANEE UNIVERSITY



INDEPENDENT STUDY APPROVAL
UBON RAJATHANEE UNIVERSITY
MASTER OF ARTS
MAJOR IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
FACULTY OF LIBERAL ARTS

TITLE THAI INTERFERENCE IN THE USE OF ENGLISH ADJECTIVES

NAME MR. BUNDIT SAKONTHAVAT

THIS INDEPENDENT STUDY HAS BEEN ACCEPTED BY

Saisunee Chaimongkol
..... CHAIR
(DR. SAISUNEE CHAIMONGKOL)

Sirintip Boonmee
..... COMMITTEE
(DR. SIRINTIP BOONMEE)

Seri Somchop
..... COMMITTEE
(DR. SERI SOMCHOP)

S. Thaweessit
..... DEAN
(ASST. PROF. DR. SUCHADA THAWEEESIT)

APPROVED BY UBON RAJATHANEE UNIVERSITY

P. Wirojanagud
.....

(PROF. DR. PRAKOB WIROJANAGUD)

THE PRESIDENT OF UBON RAJATHANEE UNIVERSITY

ACADEMIC YEAR 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been completed without Dr. Saisunee Chaimongkol, my advisor, who contributed her time, advice, support and friendship in an important and appreciated way as well as Dr. Sirinthip Seubsunk-Boonmee and Dr. Seri Somchop, my readers.

I would like to thank Miss Kuenkid Wamakan and Mr. Thiti Rasikul for helping me with the statistics and my Mattayomsuksa 3 students at Patumratchawongsa School who were the subjects of the study.

Most of all, I am greatly indebted to family who encouraged me to finish this project.



(Bundit Sakonthavat)

Researcher

บทคัดย่อ

ชื่อเรื่อง : การแทรกแซงของภาษาไทยในการใช้คำคุณศัพท์ภาษาอังกฤษ

โดย : บัณฑิต สกนธวัฒน์

ชื่อปริญญา : ศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต

สาขาวิชา : การสอนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ

ประธานกรรมการที่ปรึกษา : ดร. สายสุณี ชัยมงคล

ศัพท์สำคัญ : การแทรกแซงของภาษาที่หนึ่ง คำคุณศัพท์ภาษาอังกฤษ

งานวิจัยนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อตรวจสอบว่าการใช้คำคุณศัพท์ภาษาอังกฤษของนักเรียนมีการแทรกแซงจากภาษาไทยมากน้อยเพียงใดและในกรณีใด กลุ่มประชากรที่ใช้ในการศึกษานี้ได้จากการสุ่มตัวอย่างจากนักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 3 โรงเรียนปทุมราชวงศา จังหวัดอำนาจเจริญ ประเทศไทย จำนวน 40 คน เครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการวิจัยคือ แบบทดสอบการแปลภาษาไทยเป็นภาษาอังกฤษซึ่งประกอบด้วยคำคุณศัพท์ที่เป็นส่วนประกอบของภาคแสดง และคำคุณศัพท์ที่เป็นส่วนประกอบของนามวลีซึ่งแสดงความหมาย 8 ชนิด ได้แก่ คุณภาพ ปริมาณ ลี รูปร่าง ขนาด อายุ อุณหภูมิและสัญชาติ

จากการศึกษาพบว่า มีการแทรกแซงของภาษาไทยในการใช้คำคุณศัพท์ภาษาอังกฤษที่เป็นส่วนประกอบของภาคแสดง และคำคุณศัพท์ที่เป็นส่วนประกอบของนามวลีคิดเป็นร้อยละ 66.67 และคำคุณศัพท์ที่แสดงความหมาย 7 ชนิดถูกการแทรกแซงจากภาษาไทย

ABSTRACT

TITLE : THAI INTERFERENCE IN THE USE OF ENGLISH ADJECTIVES
BY : BUNDIT SAKONTHAVAT
DEGREE : MASTER OF ARTS
MAJOR : TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
CHAIR : SAISUNEE CHAIMONGKOL, Ph.D.

KEYWORDS : THAI INTERFERENCE / ENGLISH ADJECTIVES

The purpose of the study was to investigate how much and in what cases L₁ interference occurred when Thai students produced English structures containing adjectives. Forty Mattayomsuksa three students at Patumratchawongsa School, Amnat Charoen, Thailand were randomly selected as the subjects of the study. The instrument was a translation task containing predicative and attributive adjectives of eight semantic types-quality, quantity, color, shape, size, age, temperature and nationality.

The results of the study showed that 66.67% of predicative and attributive adjectives were influenced by L₁, and L₁ interference occurred in the use of adjectives of 7 semantic types.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	I
THAI ABSTRACT	II
ENGLISH ABSTRACT	III
CONTENTS	IV
LIST OF TABLE	VI
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Rationale	1
1.2 Purpose of the study	2
1.3 Research question	2
1.4 Significance of the study	2
1.5 Scope of the study	3
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 L ₁ interference	4
2.2 Contrastive analysis	5
2.3 Adjectives	5
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Subjects	9
3.2 Instrument	9
3.3 Research procedures	9
3.4 Data collection and analysis	10
4 RESULTS	11
5 DISCUSSION	
5.1 Discussion	18
5.2 Pedagogical implications	20

CONTENTS (CONTINUE)

	PAGE
6 CONCLUSION	
6.1 Conclusion	21
6.2 Limitations of the study	21
6.3 Recommendations for further study	21
REFERENCES	22
APPENDICES	
A Translation Task	26
B Answer Key	29
C Tabulating Sheet	31
VITAE	34

LIST OF TABLE

TABLE		PAGE
1	Percentages of Different Categories of English Adjective Usage	11
2	Syntactic Use of English Adjectives	12
3	Use of English Adjectives of Different Semantic Types	13
4	Syntactic Use of English Adjectives of all Semantic Types	15

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the rationale, research question, purpose and significance of the study.

1.1 Rationale

English is now the most useful tool for people in the world to gain some new knowledge, and thus broaden their world views because as pointed out by Richards (1994, cited in Khamput 2004 :1), “a great deal of the world’s scientific, commercial, economic and technological knowledge is published and written in English.” Therefore, English clearly plays an important role in the world.

In Thailand, English is the first foreign language that is required in the curriculum of all educational levels, from the primary to the tertiary. However, learning English in Thailand is rarely successful because English is not used in everyday life. As we know that Thai is used by Thai people as the first and official language whereas English is regarded as a foreign language, Thai learners usually make a great number of mistakes when using the English language in both speaking and writing. It can be seen that most mistakes learners make are caused by first language (L_1) interference. Thai learners are used to Thai; consequently, their English is constrained by Thai structures. For example, they may produce such sentences as ‘You will go where?’ instead of ‘Where will you go?’ or ‘Somsak not come because sick.’ instead of ‘Somsak does not come because he is sick.’ In addition, what is frequently observed among Thai students’ mistakes and errors is adjectives used as main verbs or after nouns as in the sentences ‘She beautiful,’ and ‘He is man handsome.’ In such cases, it is apparent that learners transfer their first language to form the target language, resulting in mistakes or errors. This incident is called ‘interference’, which is the first language transfer adversely affecting the learning of another language (Newmark, 1966, Krashen, 1983). This type of interference can cause difficulty in learning various aspects of the second language such as sounds, words and structures (Lado, 1964). In other words, it is generally believed that negative transfer may prevent learners from promptly acquiring the target language.

Grammar is an essential part in learning English (Chomsky, 1966); as a result, analyzing learners' grammatical errors to help them to be aware of the particular problem is beneficial for English learning and teaching. The idea is supported by Corder (1974 : 125) who states that "the study of error is part of the investigation of the process of language learning. It provides us with a picture of the linguistic development of a learner and may give us indications as to the learning process."

From the researcher's experience in teaching Mattayomsuksa 3 students at Patumratchawongsa school, students often make different types of grammatical errors such as omission, subject-omission, wrong word order, incorrect tense usage, etc. One of the most interesting is students' usage of English adjectives. It is obvious that L₁ interference is involved in this case. That is, students sometimes use English adjectives as main verbs; therefore, their adjectives may occur without copula verbs as in 'She pretty,' 'He must rich,' and 'It not big.' Moreover, adjectives are occasionally placed after nouns as in 'a dog big', 'an umbrella pink' instead of before nouns like 'a big dog' and 'a pink umbrella'.

Thus, to help the researcher solve the problem of adjective usage in the most proper way, what is to be investigated in the study is the percentage of adjective mistakes and errors caused by L₁ interference and the cases, both syntactic and semantic, of adjective usage that are influenced by L₁ interference.

1.2 Purpose of the study

The researcher aims to find out how much and in what cases L₁ interference occurs when Thai students use English adjectives.

1.3 Research question

How much and in what cases does L₁ interference occur when Thai students use English adjectives?

1.4 Significance of the study

It is essential for teachers to be aware of the problems concerned so that they can find the most effective and proper ways to solve them. In other words, if the teachers know how much and in what cases students are influenced by L₁ interference when using English adjectives, they

will be able to solve the problems by providing effective teaching materials and techniques, and encouraging students to overcome their mistakes and errors appropriately and efficiently.

1.5 Scope of the study

This study aims to investigate only predicative adjectives and pre-nominal attributive adjectives. The post-nominal attributive adjectives are ignored because Mattayomsuksa 3 students have not learnt about them and there are not many of them in the English language.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will discuss L₁ interference, contrastive analysis between Thai and English adjective usages and some previous studies.

2.1 L₁ interference

L₁ transfer is scarcely avoidable in second language acquisition and learning. Learners transfer both similar and different structures from their first language to the second language. It seems that they tend to think in L₁ and translate it into L₂ which may result in inappropriate or incorrect use of the second language. As mentioned by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982), there are both “positive” and “negative” transfers. The former occurs when L₁ can promote the acquisition of L₂ whereas the latter refers to the case where L₁ impedes acquisition of L₂. According to the Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics by Hugoe (1997 : 182), negative transfer or interference means “the influence that knowledge of one language has on the way one speaks another : e.g. in the speech of bilinguals, or as a case of errors by someone learning a new language.”

It is likely that L₁ interference causes problems in L₂ learning as claimed by George (1985 cited in Utenpattanun 2004 : 15) that “problems in language learning could be attributed to different reasons, one of which is the interference of L₁, a background knowledge of learners, with the learner’s L₂ learning process.” The idea has been supported by Richards (1994), Lightbown and Spada (1996) and O’Neil (1998). The same view is presented by Intratat (2001 : 119) as follows:

Interference certainly causes difficulty in studying a second language as the learners whose native language is less complex would incline to transfer the patterns from their first language to the second language. This transfer will be unsuccessful and will result in errors.

According to various pieces of significant evidence, many errors made by learners in the second language acquisition are caused by L₁. No one can deny the importance of the first

language role in the second language acquisition. Therefore, to analyze grammatical errors through contrastive analysis is essential.

2.2 Contrastive Analysis

In contrastive analysis, the native language and the target language are compared to find similarities and differences. The former are believed to be easy for learners to acquire whereas the latter bring about difficulty in learning. Teachers can thus employ contrastive analysis for the benefit of teaching and learning as it can help the language learners comprehend the nature of the languages and be aware of the differences between the two languages. In addition, it will help enhance learners' language skills as supported by Hawkins (1987 : 150) that "there is a mass of research showing that insight into pattern lies at the root of successful foreign language learning."

It is, therefore, crucial to contrastively analyze Thai and English adjectives to discover their similarities and/or differences.

2.3 Adjectives

An adjective is a part of speech and a type of content word. It is used to modify a noun phrase or a pronoun to make it more specific as it gives additional information to the noun. Semantically, it can denote quality, size, shape, age, temperature, color, quantity and nationality. Syntactically, it can be used attributively or predicatively. A predicative adjective is part of sentence predicate and acts as a subject complement. Some examples are "A horse is good," "The woman is rich," etc. An attributive adjective, on the other hand, is used as a noun modifier in the structure of modification such as "a good horse," and "the rich woman".

2.3.1 English Adjectives

Almost all English adjectives can be used both predicatively and attributively. The predicative adjective comes after a copula verb 'be' or a linking verb such as look, seem, feel. The following are some examples.

(1) The food is good.

(2) This man looks smart.

The attributive adjective is placed before the noun it modifies. The examples are shown below:

(3) The good food

(4) The smart man

2.3.2 Thai Adjectives

Like English adjectives, Thai adjectives can also be used predicatively and attributively. But unlike English adjectives, when Thai adjectives are used predicatively, they come directly after the subjects without copula verbs as shown below.

(5) /ar-haan nii a-roi/ (Thai)

(food this good)

'This food is good.' (English)

(6) /phuu chaay khon nii cha laat/ (Thai)

(man cl¹ this smart)

'This man is smart.' (English)

The adjectives a-roi 'good' in (5) and chaa laat 'smart' in (6) are predicative parts of the sentences. We can see that Thai adjectives can come directly after nouns without verbs.

Again, dissimilar to English attributive adjectives, Thai ones are placed after nouns as shown in (7) and (8).

(7) /ar-haan a-roi/ (Thai)

(food good)

'the good food' (English)

(8) /phuu chaay cha laat khon nii/ (Thai)

(man smart cl. this)

'this smart man' (English)

Such differences in predicative and attributive adjective usages between Thai and English lead to arguments on the existence and status of Thai adjectives. For instance, Hudak, (1990 : 42 cited in Visonyangoon, 2000 : 50) made the claim below:

(Thai) words considered to be adjectives in English (suay 'beautiful', dii 'good', yaaw '-long') may function as nominal attributes, verbal attributes or as predicates. Because these words behave syntactically as verbs without a copula, they are treated as verbs.

¹ cl. is an abbreviated form of 'classifier.'

Similar to Hudak who regarded Thai adjectives as verbs, Savetamalya (1989 : 155 cited in Visonyangoon, 2000 : 50) claimed that Thai adjectives were used as verbs and they were used as reduced relative clauses in attributive cases.

On the contrary, Visonyangoon (2000 : 50) argued that Thai adjectives did exist because they had their unique characteristics; that is, they could be followed by the comparative morpheme *kwaa* and the superlative morpheme *thii – sut* whereas the verb could not as shown in (9) - (12) below.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| (9) /dam suuŋ kwaa khaaw/ | (Thai) |
| (Dam tall er/more Khaaw) | |
| ‘Dam is taller than Khaaw.’ | (English) |
| (10) /dam suuŋ thii-sut/ | (Thai) |
| (Dam tall est/most) | |
| ‘Dam is the tallest.’ | (English) |
| (11) */dam kin kwaa khaaw/ | (Thai) |
| (Dam eat er/more Khaaw) | |
| ‘*Dam eater than Khaaw.’ | (English) |
| (12) */noi pai thii-sut/ | (Thai) |
| (Noi go est/most) | |
| ‘*Noi the goest.’ | (English) |

We can conclude that Thai adjectives and English adjectives are used differently both predicatively and attributively. It thus causes problems in L₂ learning as evidenced in the following previous studies.

2.3.3 Previous studies

There are a number of error analysis studies conducted through investigation of translation work, essays or compositions by Thai students. They all showed that adjective usage was one of the errors found. Thai students normally used an English predicative adjective without a copula verb and an attributive adjective after a noun as in Thai. In other words, Thai students used English adjectives as verbs as found by Pitpatsrisawat (1992), Srinon (1999), Chownahe (2000), Prasithrasint (2000) and Khumput (2004).

However, as far as the researcher knows, English adjective usage has not been investigated in details by any researcher. Therefore, it is interesting to conduct a study whose aim is to find out how much and in what cases Thai interferes with the usage of English adjectives.

In order to explain how the study is conducted, the methodology will be described in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter will discuss the research methodology which includes subjects, instrument, procedures, data collection and analysis.

3.1 Subjects

The subjects of the study were 40 Mathayomsuksa 3 students in the first semester of academic year 2005 at Patumratchawongsa School, Amnatcharoen, Thailand. The 40 students were randomly selected from Mattayomsuksa 3/3 – 3/6 classes taught by the researcher. All were taking E33203, the Supplementary English course. They had studied in the previous classes verb tenses, adjectives, simple and compound sentences. Therefore, it was assumed that they were able to write simple sentences in English and also translated Thai simple sentences into English.

3.2 Instrument

The instrument used in this study was a translation task which consisted of 13 sentences. All were simple sentences and contained easy vocabulary. They included eight predicative and eight attributive adjectives of eight semantic types, i.e. quality, color, shape, size, age, temperature, quantity and nationality. The subjects were required to translate all the Thai sentences into English. (See Appendix A)

3.3 Research procedures

This study was an experimental research study. All of the students in Matthayom 3/3 to Matthayom 3/6 were given the translation task in an English class lasting an hour. They were allowed ten minutes to look through all the sentences and asked for the meaning of unknown vocabulary. After that, they were given 50 minutes to complete the task. After data collection and analysis, interviews were carried out to discover the reason of L₁ interference in some cases.

3.4 Data collection and analysis

The data were obtained from the students' scores on the translation task. The researcher concentrated only on adjective usage, not spelling nor other grammatical aspects. For predicative adjective usage, the focus was on 'copula verb + adjective' and for attributives, the position of an adjective before a noun or 'adjective + noun'. All adjective usages were checked and grouped into the following categories:

- 1) Correct English adjective usage (C)
- 2) Answer affected by L_1 interference (I)
- 3) Answer diverting from the first two (D)

The numbers of the answers in the three groups were calculated and compared to find out the answers to the research questions, using percentage and the SPSS program. (See Appendix C)

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In this chapter, the answers to the research questions, “How much and in what cases does L_1 interference occur when Thai students use English adjectives?” are presented.

After the subjects had completed the translation task, the data were collected and analyzed, using percentage and the SPSS program. The information in Table 1 below shows the percentage of L_1 interference when Thai students used English adjectives.

Table 1 Percentages of Different Categories of English Adjective Usage

Total	Category C (Correct Eng Adj. usage)	Category I (Answers affected by L_1 interference)	Category D (Diverting Answers)
(640)	122	424	94
Percentages (100%)	19.06 %	66.25 %	14.69%
T-value= - 4.855			
P < 0.01			

As seen in the table above, the number of answers in category I (424 or 66.25%), English adjective usage that is affected by L_1 interference, is significantly greater than that in category C (122 or 19.06%), correct English adjective usage, at $P < 0.01$. The former is over three times as large as the latter. The result thus shows that the use of English adjectives by Thai students is influenced by L_1 or Thai.

The answers to the research question concerning the cases where L_1 interference occurs are shown in Tables 2 and 3. The former presents the syntactic use of English adjectives whereas the latter, semantic.

Table 2 Syntactic Use of English Adjectives

Syntactic Use	C	I	D	Total
Predicative	59 (18.43%)	200 (62.50%)	61 (19.07%)	320 (100%)
Attributive	63 (19.69%)	224 (70.00%)	33 (10.31%)	320 (100%)
T-value	0.212	0.712	1.114	
P-value	0.417 (>0.05)	0.239 (>0.05)	0.134 (>0.05)	

According to Table 2, the numbers of adjectives used attributively in both categories C and I are insignificantly greater than those used predicatively at $P > 0.05$. That means students have problems with both predicative and attributive adjectives or L_1 interference equally occurs in both predicative and attributive adjective usage.

In order to explain the use of English adjectives of various semantic types that are affected by L_1 interference, let's look at Table 3 below.

Table 3 Use of English Adjectives of Different Semantic Types

Semantic Types	C	I	D	Total	P-value (C VS I)
Quality	7 (8.75%)	56 (70.00%)	17 (21.25%)	80	<0.01
Quantity	13 (16.25%)	55 (68.75%)	12 (15.00%)	80	<0.01
Size	16 (20.00%)	59 (73.75%)	5 (6.25%)	80	<0.01
Shape	8 (10.00%)	55 (68.75%)	17 (21.25%)	80	<0.01
Color	17 (21.25%)	52 (65.00%)	11 (13.75%)	80	<0.01
Age	17 (21.25%)	51 (63.75%)	12 (15.00%)	80	<0.01
Nationality	36 (45.00%)	35 (43.75%)	9 (11.25%)	80	>0.05
Temperature	9 (11.25%)	61 (76.25%)	10 (12.50%)	80	<0.01

Table 3 shows that the numbers of adjectives of all semantic types in category I, except nationality, are statistically larger than those in category C at $P < 0.01$. It thus means the use of adjectives of all semantic types, except nationality, is affected by L_1 interference. The number of adjectives denoting nationality affected by L_1 interference in category I is 35 or 43.75% and that in category C is 36 or 45.00%. The numbers in both categories are quite similar. This indicates that adjectives denoting nationality are the least affected by L_1 interference.

In order to see whether syntactic-semantic interface comes into play or not, the total and the percentages of adjective usage classified according to syntactic use and semantic types will be presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4 Syntactic Use of English Adjectives of all Semantic Types

Semantic Types	Syntactic Use	C	I	D	Total
Quality	Predicative	3 (7.50%)	33 (82.50%)	4 (10.00%)	40 (100%)
	Attributive	4 (10.00%)	23 (57.50%)	13 (32.50%)	40 (100%)
Quantity	Predicative	0 (0.00%)	29 (72.50%)	11 (27.50%)	40 (100%)
	Attributive	13 (32.50%)	26 (65.00%)	1 (2.50%)	40 (100%)
Size	Predicative	6 (15.00%)	31 (77.50%)	3 (7.50%)	40 (100%)
	Attributive	10 (25.00%)	28 (70.00%)	2 (5.00%)	40 (100%)
Shape	Predicative	4 (10.00%)	24 (60.00%)	12 (30.00%)	40 (100%)
	Attributive	4 (10.00%)	31 (77.50%)	5 (12.50%)	40 (100%)

Table 4 Syntactic Use of English Adjectives of all Semantic Types (Continue)

Semantic Types	Syntactic Use	C	I	D	Total
Color	Predicative	8 (20.00%)	22 (55.00%)	10 (25.00%)	40 (100%)
	Attributive	9 (22.50%)	30 (75.00%)	1 (2.50%)	40 (100%)
Age	Predicative	2 (5.00%)	29 (72.50%)	9 (22.50%)	40 (100%)
	Attributive	15 (37.50%)	22 (55.00%)	3 (7.50%)	40 (100%)
Nationality	Predicative	33 (82.50%)	0 (0.00%)	7 (17.50%)	40 (100%)
	Attributive	3 (7.5%)	35 (87.50%)	2 (5.00%)	40 (100%)
Temperature	Predicative	3 (7.50%)	32 (80.00%)	5 (12.50%)	40 (100%)
	Attributive	6 (15.00%)	29 (72.50%)	5 (12.50%)	40 (100%)

Table 4 shows that both predicative and attributive adjectives of each semantic type, except adjectives denoting nationality, are somewhat equally affected by L₁ interference. However, it appears that there is no case of correct predicative quantity adjective usage, which means all students have problems with such usage. It is also interesting that there is no L₁ interference in the case of predicative nationality adjectives whereas most nationality adjectives used attributively fall into category I (87.50%). It seems students are much better at predicative usage of adjectives denoting nationality than attributive usage.

With the results presented in this chapter, the next will provide discussion on the findings.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the results shown in the previous chapter and pedagogical implications.

5.1 Discussion

The results in Chapter IV indicate that the use of English adjectives by Thai students is influenced by L₁ or Thai because the percentage of adjective usage affected by L₁ interference is significantly higher than that used correctly at P<0.01. In terms of syntactic usage, L₁ affects both predicative and attributive adjective usage to the same degree. That is, Thai students did not put a copular verb before a predicative adjective as shown in (13)-(15).

(13) ‘*Her pencil sharp’

(14) ‘*Computer very small’

(15) ‘*That dog black’

In addition, students placed attributive adjectives after nouns as shown in (16)-(18) below.

(16) ‘*I want to buy car new’

(17) ‘*Coffee hot is in cup white’

(18) ‘*I like woman Japanese’

From the results, it is obvious that the differences between the two languages, Thai and English, cause negative transfer or L₁ interference in L₂ learning. As supported by Lado (1957 cited in Utenpattanun : 2004 : 20), aspects of a foreign language which are different from those of students’ native language are found hard to learn. The result may also be due to the fact that students tend to think in L₁ and try to translate it into L₂. The idea is supported by Tauyjarern (1996) that Thai learners’ L₂ learning is problematic because Thai students use only the first language, which keeps them from acquiring the target language. In other words, Thai learners are used to Thai; consequently, their English is constrained by Thai structures. According to Susan Gass and Selinker (1994 : 299), “learning involves integration of new language with prior

knowledge. Importantly, one needs some sort of anchor on which to ground new knowledge.” It thus means that L₂ learners have L₁ as prior knowledge they use in L₂ learning.

Besides syntactic use, L₁ interference occurs with adjectives of almost all semantic types : quality, quantity, size, shape, color, age and temperature, except nationality. It shows that meaning does not have much effect or influence on adjective usage. However, there is no case of L₁ interference with predicative usage of nationality adjectives. This is probably because students noticed the word /pen/ which is considered a Thai copular verb followed by a noun as illustrated in (19)–(20) (Junduang (1999 : 99).

- (19) /khaw pen khon jiin/ (Thai)
 (he is person Chinese)
 ‘He is a Chinese.’ (English)
- (20) /somkid pen tanaaykwam/ (Thai)
 (Somkid is attorney)
 ‘Somkid is an attorney.’ (English)

It can thus be assumed that /pen/ acts as a cue that helps students to correctly use predicative adjectives denoting nationality in the study. The results above are supported by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) that positive transfer can promote the learners to gain the knowledge of L₂ because of the similarities of the structures of the two languages.

Concerning the case of predicative usage of quantity adjectives which all the students have problem with, it was found from the interviews that the word ‘por’ (enough) was regarded as a verb by the students although this word is a quantitative adjective. Moreover, they were not familiar with this word because they came across the word only once. As a result, none of the students used ‘be’ in front of this adjective.

The study shows that the use of English adjectives by Mattayomsuksa 3 students is problematic because their translations are affected by L₁. Most of their predicative and attributive adjectives are incorrectly used. Apart from L₁ interference, problems in learning English adjectives may result from teaching and learning. Students may not have enough input nor opportunity to use and practice using English adjectives. The finding may suggest that teachers do not teach students how to use English adjectives appropriately and effectively. In teaching and learning, teachers may not sufficiently emphasize the differences between Thai and English

adjectives in order to raise the students' awareness of correct English adjective usage. To solve such problems, pedagogical implications are presented below.

5.2 Pedagogical implications

L_1 transfer is scarcely avoidable in second language acquisition and learning. L_1 negatively affects L_2 learning if the two languages have different structures. In terms of teaching and learning, teachers can help students understand the structures of the target language in various ways. Teachers can employ contrastive analysis for the benefit of teaching and learning by raising students' awareness of the differences between Thai and English. Teachers should warn students about L_1 interference by pointing out the differences between Thai and English through comparison between Thai and English structures to provide students with clear understanding. This method is applicable to various aspects of language.

Moreover, teachers may use translation tasks to teach how to use English adjectives. Translation helps students to be aware of form and meaning at the same time. When students do the translation task, they have to integrate both form and meaning to construct the target language. It may be helpful for students to focus on the language being introduced. In addition, it is beneficial for teachers to monitor students' learning process or language transfer that may arise when they have not yet mastered the language. Thus, teachers can terminate the problem of L_1 interference and reinforce adjective learning and teaching effectively and successfully.

To summarize the whole study, a conclusion will be presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This chapter will provide the conclusion, the limitations of the study and the recommendations for further study.

6.1 Conclusion

The purpose of the study is to investigate how much and in what cases Mattayom 3 students at Patumratchawongsa School, Amnat Charoen are influenced by L₁ interference when using English adjectives. The results of the study show that L₁ or Thai plays a very significant role in the use of English adjectives. That is, the number of adjectives affected by L₁ interference is over three times as great as that of the correct adjective usage. The students are also found to have problems with both predicative and attributive adjectives of all semantic types, except adjectives denoting nationality.

6.2 Limitations of the study

Despite the careful conduct of the study, some limitations still exist. First, the number of subjects is too small to make the study generalizable. Second, the number of items on the translation task is also limited; each semantic type of adjective is represented by only two words. Third, a variety of tasks involving English adjective usage is not included. In addition, category D containing answers different from categories C and I is not discussed in the study.

6.3 Recommendations for further study

Based on the limitations mentioned in the previous section, further study should be conducted with the greater number of students. There should be more items on the translation task in order to make the study generalizable. The study should also employ a variety of tasks involving English adjective usage such as essay writing or picture description. Moreover, the researcher should investigate category D as some interesting points may be found.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Chomsky, Noam. 1966. Topics in the Theory of Generative Grammar. The Hague : Mouton.
- Chownahe, Prayoon. 2000. An Error Analysis of English Compositions Written by Mattayomsuksa Six Students. Master's Thesis. Khon Kaen University.
- Corder, S. Pit. 1974. "The Significance of Learners' Error" in Jack C. Richards. Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition. pp. 120-125.
- Dulay, Heidi, Burt, Marina and Krashen, Stephen. 1982. Language Two. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Hawkins, Eric. 1987. Awareness of Language: Introduction. (Revised Edition) Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Hugoe, Peter. 1997. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Intratrat, Charatdoa. 2001. "Thai Errors in Using English Adjectives," KMUTT Research and Development. Volume 2. pp. 627-646.
- Junduang, Pensri. 1999. Khuu Mue Lhak Pasa Thai Mattayomsuksa Tom Ton. (Thai Usage : Lower secondary) Bangkok : Mac Publisher Company.
- Khamput, Pawitra. 2004. First Language Interference on Second Language Writing of Mattayomsuksa Five Students. An Independent Study Report for the Master's Thesis. Khon Kaen University.
- Krashen, Stephen. 1983. Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. (Second Edition) Oxford : Pergamon Press.
- Lado, Robert. 1964. Language Teaching : A Scientific Approach. New York : McGraw-Hill.
- Lightbown, Patsy and Spada, Nina. 1996. How Languages are Learned. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Newmark, Leonard. 1966. "How Not to Interfere with Language Learning". International Journal of American Linguistics. pp. 77-83.
- O'Neil, Dennis. 1998. Learning Language. [cited 2001 September 30] Available from : http://anthro.palomar.edu/language/language_4.html.

REFERENCES (CONTINUE)

- Pipatsrisawat, Montra. 1992. An Analysis of Errors in English Writing of Prathomsuksa Six Students, Educational Region Eight. Master's Thesis. Chulalongkorn University.
- Prasithratsint, Amara. 2000. "Adjectives as Verbs in Thai," Linguistic Typology. Volume 4 No. 2, pp. 255-276.
- Richards, Jack and Lockhart, Charles. 1994. Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classroom. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Srinon, Udom. 1999. "An Error Analysis of Free Compositions Written by the First Year Students of Mahamakut Buddhist University", Mahavajiralongkornrajwittayalai Campus, Ayutthaya Province. Master's Thesis. Silpakorn University.
- Susan, M. Gass and Selinker, Larry. 1994. Second Language Acquisition : An Introductory Course. New Jercey : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tauyjarern, Pintip. 1996. Psycholinguistics. (Fourth Edition) Bangkok : Thammasart University.
- Utenpattanun, Warisa. 2004. The Influence of Thai on the English Usage of Thai Learners in a Bilingual Program. Master's Thesis. Khon Kaen University.
- Visonyangoon, Saisunee. 2000. Parallelism between Noun Phrases and Clauses in Thai. Ph.D. Dissertation. Michigan State University.
- Yule, George. 1985. The Study of Language. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Translation Task

Instructions : Translate each sentence below into English.

1. ดินสอของเธอแหลม

Predicative adjective (shape)

.....

2. ฉันต้องการซื้อรถใหม่

Attributive adjective (age)

.....

3. น้ำในขวดพอสำหรับฉัน

Predicative adjective (quantity)

.....

4. กาแฟร้อนอยู่ในถ้วยขาว

Attributive adjective (temperature), (color)

.....

5. คนรวยคนนั้นขยัน

Attributive adjective (quality), Predicative
adjective (quality)

.....

6. ฉันชอบผู้หญิงญี่ปุ่น

Attributive adjective (nationality)

.....

7. คอมพิวเตอร์เครื่องนี้เล็กมาก

Predicative adjective (size)

.....

8. เขามีเงินน้อย Attributive adjective (quantity)
.....

9. เบียร์ในแก้วใหญ่นี้เย็น Attributive adjective (size), Predicative adjective
(temperature)
.....

10. สุนัขตัวนั้นดำ Predicative adjective (color)
.....

11. โคนิวยอร์คมีแต่ตึกสูง Attributive adjective (shape)
.....

12. หนังสือของเขาเก่ามาก Predicative adjective (age)
.....

13. พวกเขาเป็นจีน Predicative adjective (nationality)
.....

Appendix B
Answer Key

1. ดินสอของเธอแหลม
Her pencil is sharp.
2. ฉันต้องการซื้อรถใหม่
I want to buy a new car.
3. น้ำในขวดพอสำหรับฉัน
The water in the bottle is enough for me.
4. กาแฟร้อนอยู่ในถ้วยขาว
The hot coffee is in the white cup.
5. คนรวยคนนั้นขยัน
That rich man is diligent.
6. ฉันชอบผู้หญิงญี่ปุ่น
I like a Japanese woman.
7. คอมพิวเตอร์เครื่องนี้เล็กมาก
This computer is very small.
8. เขามีเงินน้อย
He has a little money.
9. เบียร์ในแก้วใหญ่นี้เย็น
The beer in this big glass is cold.
10. สุนัขตัวนั้นดำ
That dog is black.
11. ในนิวยอร์กมีแต่ตึกสูง
There are only high buildings in New York.
12. หนังสือของเขาเก่ามาก
His book is very old.
13. พวกเขาเป็นจีน
They are Chinese.

Appendix C
Tabulating Sheet

Aspects	Predicative adjective								Attributive adjective							
	Items Samples	1 (shape)	3 (quality)	5 (quality)	7 (size)	9 (temperature)	10 (color)	12 (age)	13 (nationality)	2 (age)	4 (temperature)	4 (color)	5 (quality)	6 (nationality)	8 (quantity)	9 (size)
1	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
2	I	I	D	I	I	D	D	C	I	I	I	D	I	I	I	I
3	I	I	D	D	I	D	I	C	I	I	I	D	I	D	C	I
4	I	I	I	I	I	I	D	C	C	I	I	D	I	I	I	D
5	D	D	I	C	I	I	I	C	I	D	I	I	I	I	C	C
6	D	D	C	C	D	D	D	C	C	D	C	D	C	C	D	C
7	C	I	C	C	C	D	C	C	C	I	C	D	C	C	C	D
8	I	I	I	C	C	D	D	C	C	D	C	I	I	C	C	C
9	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
10	C	I	I	C	I	C	I	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	D
11	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
12	C	D	I	C	I	C	I	C	I	D	I	I	D	I	D	I
13	C	I	I	I	C	C	D	C	I	I	I	I	D	I	C	I
14	I	D	I	I	I	I	I	C	D	I	I	D	I	C	I	I
15	I	D	I	I	I	D	D	D	I	I	C	I	I	I	C	I
16	D	D	I	I	I	I	I	C	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
17	I	D	I	I	I	I	I	C	D	I	C	D	I	I	I	I
18	D	I	D	I	I	I	I	C	I	I	I	D	I	I	I	D
19	D	D	D	I	I	D	D	D	I	I	I	D	I	I	I	I
20	D	I	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
21	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	D	I	I	I	I	I	C	C	I
22	I	D	I	I	I	I	I	C	C	I	I	I	D	I	I	I
23	I	I	I	I	D	I	I	C	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I

Aspects	Predicative adjective								Attributive adjective							
	Items Samples	1 (shape)	3 (quantity)	5 (quality)	7 (size)	9 (temperature)	10 (color)	12 (age)	13 (nationality)	2 (age)	4 (temperature)	4 (color)	5 (quality)	6 (nationality)	8 (quantity)	9 (size)
24	D	I	I	D	D	I	I	D	D	D	D	I	I	I	C	I
25	I	D	I	I	I	I	C	D	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
26	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	D	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
27	D	I	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
28	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	C	C	I	I	C	I	C	I	D
29	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	C	I	I	I	D	I	C	I	I
30	I	D	I	I	I	I	I	C	C	C	C	I	I	C	C	I
31	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	C	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
32	D	I	I	I	D	D	D	C	C	C	C	C	I	C	I	I
33	D	I	I	I	D	D	D	C	C	C	C	I	I	C	I	I
34	I	I	I	D	I	D	I	C	C	I	I	D	I	I	I	I
35	D	I	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
36	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	C	I	D	I	C	I	I
37	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
38	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	C	C	I	I	C	I	I	I	I
39	D	I	I	I	I	I	I	C	I	C	I	D	I	C	I	I
40	I	I	C	I	I	C	I	D	C	C	C	C	I	C	C	C
Total	59								63							
Percentages	18.43 %								19.69 %							

VITAE

NAME	Mr. Bundit Sakonthavat
PLACE OF BIRTH	Sakonnakhon, Thailand
INSTITUTE ATTENDED	
1995 -1998	Bachelor Degree of Education Loei Teachers' College
POSITION HELD	
1998 – 2000	Teaching English at Renunakhonwittayanukun Schook, Nakhonphanom Province
2000 – 2003	Teaching English at Tao-Ngoi pattanasuksa School, Sakhonnakhon Province
2003-Present	Teaching English at Patumratchawongsa School, Amnatcharoen Province