

The Nature of Accessibility to Universal Grammar by EFL Learners

Melika Hadavi

Tabaran Higher Education Institute, Iran

Maryam Ghashang

Tabaran Higher Education Institute, Iran

Abstract—As it is mentioned by Chomsky, languages are ruled by a set of universal grammars which are accessible before the age of puberty. In this paper, an attempt is made to find out various theories regarding universal principles underlying the language used by L2 learners. In this case, there is not much information at hand about the universal constraints used by L2 learners. To this goal, a review of the literature regarding universal grammar (UG) application is utilized to investigate the accessibility to UG in L2 learners. There are four views toward L2 UG accessibility; 1. The Full Transfer Full Access Hypothesis; 2. The Minimal Trees Hypothesis; 3. The Valueless Features Hypothesis; and 4. Full Access (without Transfer). The flow writing backers that there are basic slips shared by numerous EFL learners which make scientists consider whether UG standards are pertinent to a dialect after the pubescence. In like manner, there are a few requirements discernible in the creation of grown-up EFL learners which may be taken as proof for the operation of Universal Grammar. Then again, it is not clear how EFL learners have admittance to general classifications which is the subject of thought in this paper.

Index Terms—accessibility, universal grammar, EFL, syntax

I. INTRODUCTION

As it is mentioned in the literature of second language, UG is built based on learnability theory. The definition is that the minor and abstract knowledge obtained by native speakers cannot be explained by the input they get from the environment. As it is related to L2 acquisition, learners are engaging in a similar issue like L1 speakers. Moreover, L2 learners are encountered with a logical problem of language acquisition, in that some abstract, complex and minor features of structure that are underdetermined by the L2 input (Schwartz & Sprouse 2000; White 1985). If it comes out that the L2 learner learns subtle properties that could not have been received from the input, this is strongly a harbinger of the principles of UG constrain L2 performance, just like the situation in L1 acquisition. This is true even in the case that the linguistic competence of L2 learners varies from the linguistic performance of native speakers. In other words, there is no need for L2 learners to achieve the same knowledge as L1 speakers in order to show a poverty-of-the-stimulus issue in L2 acquisition; it is enough to reveal that L2 learners obtain complex and subtle features of language that could not have been received from the L2 environment.

However, L2 learners previously have a tool of using language that is the grammar of the L1. Therefore, it is to say that there is no underdetermination issue: if L2 learners reveal the unconscious knowledge, it is the issue that they are using the L1 structure, rather than on UG principles, as it is mentioned by Bley-Vroman (1990) and Schachter (1990).

Therefore, the strongest issue for the consideration of principles of UG in interlanguage phenomenon can be aroused if learners show knowledge of linguistic elements which is neither learned from L2 environment nor received from the structure of the mother tongue. In other words, the underdetermination problem is not only seen with considering the L2 input but also with consideration to the L1 grammar. Moreover, a learner must also be capable of omitting the possibility of learning with focusing on explicit or deductive instruction or by means of overall learning principles. Considering such reasons, L2 researchers aim to investigate situations in which a poverty of the L2 stimulus happens, where the available L2 structure together with prior grammatical knowledge cannot justify for acquisition unless one hypothesize that interlanguage grammars are limited by UG constrains (Schwartz and Sprouse 2000; White 1989).

To put it in a nutshell, to show convincingly that interlanguage grammars are limited by principles of UG, the following issues should be considered:

i. The input or structure being studied must be underdetermined by the L2 input. That is, it should not be an element that could be learned by the context of the L2 input, involving statistical inference focusing on frequency of occurrence, considering analogy, or on the basis of instruction in the L2 situation.

ii. The input should work differently in the L1 structure and the L2 system. That is, it should be underdetermined by the L1 structure too. So, transfer of surface features can be wiped out as a description of any structure that L2 learners receive.

II. HYPOTHESIS OF ACCESSIBILITY TO UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR IN L2

A. *The Full Transfer Full Access Hypothesis*

First of all, an analysis of the Full Transfer Full Access Hypothesis related to Schwartz and Sprouse is done (1996), according to them the initial state in L2 learning is a specific grammar. Encountered with accounting for L2 input, students adopt the grammar that they previously acquired, the fixed-state grammar of the mother tongue. In contrary to other researchers who discuss about less than complete involvement of the L1, Schwartz and Sprouse introduce *full transfer* which is defined as the whole L1 grammar shape the initial level. Moreover, it is assumed that changes to the initial grammar can happen; put it in other words, the learner is not limited with representations according to the L1 fixed state. At the point when the L1 linguistic use is not ready to suit components of the L2 information, the learner has admittance to UG includes not existed in the L1, including new parameter settings, utilitarian classes or highlight values, with a specific end goal to lead an examination more legitimate to the L2 data, however this may turn out not to be similar to investigation as that is valid in the local speaker punctuation. The target interlanguage grammars are UG-limited, therefore, the term *full access*. Full transfer is Schwartz and Sprouse's argument about the initial level; full access is their argument about subsequent grammar rebuilding during the process of development.

Two types of evidence are to support the arguments of Full Transfer Full Access: (i) the first one is related to L1 features in the interlanguage grammar; (ii) and the second evidence of restructuring away from the L1 grammar. A research study by Haznedar (2001) corroborates Full Transfer Full Access, giving evidence of an L1-based initial level, as well as subsequent variation to the interlanguage grammar. Haznedar studies spontaneous production data accumulated from a Turkish-speaking child, named Erdem, and who was acquiring English. Erdem was initially studied at the age of 4, after living three months in England. As it is related to the first two months, he had lived almost completely in a Turkish-speaking context at home; hereafter, he passed a month in an English school. Moreover, the data that Haznedar reveals are connected to the initial level.

More recent studies of experimental research advocating Full Transfer Full Access are mentioned by Yuan (1998) and Slabakova (2000). Regarding both of these researches, learners of dissimilar L1s reveal distinctly various behaviour with regard to the linguistic features under study, suggesting various representations, by inference for the sake of various initial states.

To put it in a nutshell, the Full Transfer Full Access Hypothesis provides claims about the initial level, about grammars through development and about the fixed state:

a. The first state in L2 acquisition is the L1 fixed state grammar in its complete form. One needs to contemplate about this as in some way a copy of the L1 grammar, a copy which can be changed without influencing the original state. Although Full Transfer Full Access assumes that the L2 student recreates the interlanguage grammar, the L1 grammar does not get modified in reaction to L2 input (Sorace, 2000).

b. The L2 learner is not restricted to L1-based features. If the L1-based examination does not work for some reason, recreating of the grammar will happen; to put it in other words, L2 input will cause grammar alteration. L2 developmental processes are UG-restricted, with interlanguage grammars are placed within the range restricted by UG.

c. and the Final outcome is that – convergence on a grammar like to that of a native speaker is not supported, because features of the L1 grammar or following interlanguage grammars may cause to analyses of the input that alter from those of native speakers.

B. *The Minimal Trees Hypothesis*

In this part, we study another aspect on the interlanguage initial level, which is the Minimal Trees Hypothesis of Vainikka and Young-Scholten (1994), which also mentioned that the initial state is a grammar, with early features based on the L1. However, in contrary to Full Transfer Full Access, just part of the L1 grammar is regarded as making the initial state. Under this circumstances, the initial grammar is argued to suffer functional categories altogether, therefore, L1 functional categories will not be show, nor will functional levels from any other source.

One of the attributes of each instructive framework which can have an incredible impact on learners' formative procedure is instructing strategy. Showing system grasps environment and instructive environment. The interactional way of educating with random components takes represent the multifaceted nature of the idea of instructing. The nature of learning is identified with both showing technique and the destinations of the educational program. Through talking, a few inquiries were asked from the members. The reason for the study rotated around three viewpoints: pathology, perceiving criteria, and exhibiting first class example of educating in dialect classes. In pathology part, variables, for example, nature of instructing, instructive sources, instructors' skill, estimation, and overseeing learners were gone to and talked about. As per learners and educators' perspective, overseeing learners, nature of instructing, instructive yield, ability, identity, and instructive approaches were the principle perceiving criteria of first class educating separately. At last, the hidden components of world class example of educating are examined in which an accentuation is put on exploration based instruction, critical thinking capacity, supporting skilled learners and numerous comparable variables. The discoveries of this study can be valuable for educators and in addition the instructive developers to enhance the nature of dialect instructing in Iran.

Vainikka and Young-Scholten argued that grammars in the first stage of development are various from later grammars, lacking certain feature which subsequently happen. This argument is proposed in the context of the Weak

Continuity Hypothesis regarding L1 acquisition (Vainikka 1993). According to this hypothesis, when functional levels are available in the UG features, initial grammars suffer the full complement of functional categories, including lexical categories and their projections, and probably one non-specified functional projection (Clahsen, 1990).

This study planned to make sense of the interrelationship between power, force, and ethical quality with a top to bottom concentrate on the cooperation among these three components in molding the miniaturized scale level of classroom association. Educating is a technique which is indistinguishable from good activity. Buzzeli and Johnston (2001) advocated that “teachers are moral agents, and education as a whole, and thus classroom interaction in particular, is fundamentally and inevitably moral in nature” (p. 876). This article closes with supporting the thought that instructors utilize their power to direct power relations and moral issues. It ought to be stressed that there are constantly exactly pressure in the middle of ethical quality and force which considers the characteristics of EFL connection.

It is this issue of early grammars that Vainikka and Young-Scholten consider in the context of L2 acquisition. As it is mentioned by these researchers, the initial level in L2 acquisition includes a grammar partly dependent on the L1: the lexical categories of the mother tongue are placed in the initial interlanguage grammar, including with associated L1 features such as headedness. Functional levels, however, do not exist. Although functional levels are not determined in the initial grammar, the full UG features of functional categories are available.

L2 learners sometimes gather functional levels to the interlanguage grammar, on the assumption of L2 input, and are finally able to conduct the associated projections. The argument is that functional levels are added in the ‘bottom up’, in discrete levels, so that there is to be an IP stage before CP as it is mentioned. In other words, the introduction of CP in the grammar show IP: one can put IP without considering CP but not CP without IP. Therefore, although the emergence of functional levels is argued to be triggered by input, there must probably be some kind of built-in sequence that reveals this order. After all, it seems to be no reason in effect why a learner should not take into account features in the L2 input which would motivate a CP before features which would trigger IP.

As it is related to the Minimal Trees account, the initial states of learners of various L1s will differ, focusing on the headedness features of lexical categories in the L1s in every question. Vainikka and Young-Scholten (1996) mentioned that that headedness of all lexical categories will be reassigned to the value proper for the L2 before the development of any functional levels. Development of functional categories, in another view, in no matter depends on features of the L1 grammar; in other words, there is assumed to be no transfer in this part, no stage or grammar in which features of the mother-tongue functional levels are found, a prediction which differs from Full Transfer Full Access. Instead, the L2 learner learns L2 functional levels, with L2 properties. Therefore, L1 and L2 acquisition of any particular language are usually assumed to be similar with respect to functional categories and projections. Vainikka and Young-Scholten (1996) argue about one difference, relating to what features of the input develop the emergence of functional levels, such as bound morphology in L1 acquisition against free morphemes in L2 features.

C. *The Valueless Features Hypothesis*

We turn now to a third view about the interlanguage initial level, which is the Valueless Features Hypothesis of Eubank (1996). Similar to Full Transfer Full Access and Minimal Trees, the Valueless Features Hypothesis argues that the initial level is a grammar. Eubank mentions for ‘weak’ transfer, discussing that the L1 grammar largely – but not completely – predicts the interlanguage initial state. Similar to Full Transfer Full Access and dissimilar Minimal Trees, the Valueless Features Hypothesis mentioned that L1 lexical and functional levels are present in the earliest interlanguage grammar. However, it is to say that although L1 functional categories are accessible, their characteristic values are claimed not to be present. That is, there is no transfer. Instead of having either strong or weak transfer, features are valueless or predictable in the initial level.

It is to say that feature strength has influence for word order. In a language like English, finite verbs stay within the VP constraint. In such languages like French, there is strong transfer, there are no constraints. In the other words, finite lexical categories either must rise at some level or may not rise. As it is related to the Valueless Features Hypothesis, feature values such as mentioned are neither weak nor strong.

According to Eubank, this theory has the following features and consequences: when features are not included for strength, finite verbs can change between raising and not raising. In the other words, if the L2 learner is learning a language with strong features like some languages as French, both the word orders are predicted in early stages, the grammatical, in which the finite verb has raised out of the VP, and the ungrammatical, in which the verb is not raised. The results are identical for a L2 with weak characteristics, like that of English. That is to say, both of the word orders are revealed to happen because, in the absence of a categorization of feature strength, the verb can happen to raise or not, as the case may be similar in some points.

D. *Full Access (without Transfer)*

The last view to discuss is to be considered as the Full Access Hypothesis proposed by Flynn and Martohardjono (1996) and Epstein et al. (1996). As it is mentioned by Epstein et al. (1996, p 750), the Full Access Hypothesis is not, generally speaking a hypothesis about the first state. However, although not proposed like a concrete initial-state hypothesis, in fact it has explicit implications for the quality of the initial state. Moreover, this hypothesis implies, like the Initial Hypothesis of Syntax, that UG should constitute the initial state in L2 acquisition.

What is revealed by the Full Access Hypothesis? Epstein et al. discuss that the interlanguage grammar is UG-restricted at all stages; grammars support to the principles of UG and learners are restricted to the hypothesis space permitted by UG. In the other words, UG stays accessible in non-primary acquisition process. So far, the issues are identical to those proposed by advocates of Full Transfer Full Access; in the other words, the *full access* of Full Transfer Full Access is the *full access* mentioned by Epstein et al. Moreover, this assumption is revealed by Vainikka and Young-Scholten, who discuss that all of UG is accessible in L2 acquisition, although some features are appeared after others. The Valueless Features Hypothesis is also basically intended as a full access assumption, interlanguage grammars being restricted by UG, with inertness of features only a temporary feature.

What makes Epstein et al.'s Full Access Hypothesis dissimilar to the positions regarded so far? In contrary to the first three initial-state assumptions Epstein et al. (1996, p 751) basically reject the possibility that the L1 grammar shapes the initial state. For this reason, it is sometimes referred to their position as Full Access without any Transfer. Irrespective of this rejection, they do determine the presence of L1 impact on interlanguage grammars. But if these impacts are not for the sake of L1-based initial manifestation, then it is not easy to understand just what the learners have in mind.

If the initial level is not the L1 grammar, what is it then? The rationale of Epstein et al.'s discussion necessitates that it is not a grammar that matter but rather UG. In the other words, the initial level in L2 acquisition is the like as the initial level in L1. In effect, however, Epstein et al. (1996, p 751) rejected this possibility too, stating that the initial state in L2 is not like that, so basically not UG itself. It is hard to figure out what the initial state could possibly be, if it is neither at least basically the L1 grammar nor UG. I will continue to interpret their hypothesis as proposing that UG must be the initial state, though they fail to figure out that this is the logical outcome of their position.

To know how it is that Epstein et al.'s position points out UG as the initial state, attention that they generally argue in line with the Strong Continuity or Full Competence Hypothesis as the correct reason of functional categories in L2 grammars and in the opposite of the Minimal Trees Hypothesis of Vainikka and Young-Scholten. As it is mentioned by the Strong Continuity Hypothesis, all functional levels are developed in L1 grammars from the beginning. In contrary, as mentioned earlier, the Minimal Trees Hypothesis argues that initially no functional categories are in work and that they develop gradually. Since the Minimal Trees Hypothesis is an argument about the nature of the interlanguage primary state, Epstein et al.'s discussion necessarily consider an alternative initial-state assumption, in particular the idea that the primary interlanguage grammar will include a full complement of functional categories. And, because they reject the probability that the L1 grammar shapes the initial state, the origin of functional levels in the early interlanguage grammar can only be related to UG itself.

Therefore, whether they figure it out or not, the clear application of Epstein et al.'s Full Access Hypothesis is that UG is the primary level in L2 as well as in L1. The Full Access Hypothesis reveals the L1 grammar unlike the interlanguage grammars, in the other words, Full Access without Transfer.

The main outcome of this assumption is that interlanguage grammars of learners of various L1s will be alike, because of the impact of UG, with no influence originated from the L1, because the L1 does not shape the initial state. In fact, Epstein et al. do not reject the probability of L1-impact and differences between learners of various L1s, as earlier mentioned, it is not at all obvious how the L1 is defined into their scheme. As to the final state accessible in L2 acquisition, this should in fact be a manifestation, similar to that of native speakers of the L2 (Flynn 1996, p 150).

III. CONCLUSION

As it is placed by Chomsky, dialects are administered by a situated of widespread sentence structures which are available before the adolescence. In this paper, an endeavor was made to figure out diverse speculations in regards to widespread standards fundamental the dialect utilized by L2 learners. For this situation, there is very little data close by about the all-inclusive imperatives utilized by L2 learners. To this end, White's (2003) model of widespread syntax (UG) application is used to examine the availability to UG in L2 learners. There are three perspectives toward UG openness; No Access, Partial Access, and Full Access. The ebb and flow writing supported that there are basic mistakes shared by numerous EFL learners which make analysts consider whether UG standards are material to a dialect after the adolescence. In like manner, there are a few imperatives detectable in the creation of grown-up EFL learners which may be taken as proof for the operation of Universal Grammar. In any case, it was not clear how EFL learners have admittance to general classifications which is the theme of thought in this paper. The implication of this study is that this investigation helps teachers find out the organizational patterns of learners language by determining the universal features of L2 interlanguage. UG constraints mentioned that L2 system is governed by the same principles which govern the structure of L1.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bley-Vroman, R. (1990). The logical problem of foreign language learning. *Linguistic Analysis* 20: 3–49.
- [2] Clahsen, H. (1990). The comparative study of first and second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12: 135–53.
- [3] Epstein, S., S. Flynn & G. Martohardjono. (1996). Second language acquisition: theoretical and experimental issues in contemporary research. *Brain and Behavioral Sciences* 19: 677–758.

- [4] Eubank, L. (1996). Negation in early German-English interlanguage: more valueless features in the L2 initial state. *Second Language Research* 12: 73–106.
- [5] Flynn, S. & G. Martohardjono. (1994). Mapping from the initial state to the final state: the separation of universal principles and language-specific principles. In B. Lust, M. Suñer and J. Whitman (eds.), *Syntactic theory and first language acquisition: cross-linguistic perspectives*. Vol. 1: *Heads, projections and learnability* (pp. 319–35). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [6] Flynn, S. (1996). A parameter-setting approach to second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie and T. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition* (pp. 121–58). San Diego: Academic Press.
- [7] Haznedar, B. (2001). The acquisition of the IP system in child L2 English. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 23: 1–39.
- [8] Schachter, J. (1990). On the issue of completeness in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research* 6: 93–124.
- [9] Schwartz, B. D. & R. Sprouse. (1996). L2 cognitive states and the full transfer/full access model. *Second Language Research* 12: 40–72.
- [10] Schwartz, B. D. & R. Sprouse. (2000). When syntactic theories evolve: consequences for L2 acquisition research. In J. Archibald (ed.), *Second language acquisition and linguistic theory* (pp. 156–86). Oxford: Blackwell.
- [11] Slabakova, R. (2000). L1 transfer revisited: the L2 acquisition of telicity marking in English by Spanish and Bulgarian native speakers. *Linguistics* 38: 739–70.
- [12] Sorace, A. (2000). Differential effects of attrition in the L1 syntax of near-native L2 speakers. In C. Howell, S. Fish and T. Keith-Lucas (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* (pp. 719–25). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- [13] Vainikka, A. (1993). Case in the development of English syntax. *Language Acquisition* 3: 257–325.
- [14] Vainikka, A. & M. Young-Scholten. (1994). Direct access to X⁰-theory: evidence from Korean and Turkish adults learning German. In T. Hoekstra and B. D. Schwartz (eds.), *Language acquisition studies in generative grammar* (pp. 265–316). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [15] Vainikka, A. & M. Young-Scholten. (1996). The early stages of adult L2 syntax: additional evidence from Romance speakers. *Second Language Research* 12: 140–76.
- [16] White, L. (1985). Is there a logical problem of second language acquisition? *TESL Canada* 2: 29–41.
- [17] White, L. (1989). *Universal grammar and second language acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [18] Yuan, B. (1998). Interpretation of binding and orientation of the Chinese reflexive *ziji* by English and Japanese speakers. *Second Language Research* 14: 324–40.

Melika Hadavi is an MA student at Tabaran Higher Education Institute.

Maryam Ghashang is an MA student at Tabaran Higher Education Institute.