

## 摘要

本研究旨在探討華語的結果式動詞複合動詞 (Resultative verb compound, RVC) 之第二語言習得。根據 Li and Thompson (1981) 的分析，華語的 RVC 有兩個組成成分，第一個成分為表動作的動詞，第二個成分則表示該動作的結果。Tai (1984, 2003) 認為華語的 RVC 和英語完成動詞 (Accomplishment verb) 顯現語言類型上的差異，雖然 RVC 在組成成分上和英語完成動詞類似，但他們最大不同在於 RVC 只表達「結果」一種態 (aspect)，不表達過程；但是，英語完成動詞因同時具有「動作」和「結果」態。Tai (2003) 更進一步提出：事件的結果，對以華語為第一語言的人士來說比較重要；反之，對英語母語人士而言，過程是比較重要的。

本研究以華語 RVC 兩個組成成分的語義為依據，將之分為三類，分別是：活動－結果 (Activity-Result) RVC，如讀懂；瞬間動作－結果 (Semelfactive-Result) RVC，如打破；狀態－結果 (State-Result) RVC，如住慣。基於華語 RVC 和英語完成動詞的差異，本研究將探討以英語為母語的第二語言 (L2) 學習者，在學習華語的 RVC 時，是否會受第一語言的影響而產生移轉 (transfer) 現象。同時，也藉此研究測試不同類型的 RVC，其學習難易度是否不相同。我們的研究對象是台師大國語中心以英語為母語的 L2 學習者。依程度不同，我們將受試者分為中、高二級，每級有二十人。我們的研究工具為一包含有兩大題的問卷，第一大題為語法判斷；第二大題為句子詮釋。

研究發現如下：首先，整體實驗結果顯示，L2 學習者在此三類 RVC 的表現並不相同。學習者在 State-Result RVC 表現顯著優於 Semelfactive-Result RVC。就平均數而言，雖然受試者在 Activity-Result RVC 的得分較 Semelfactive-Result

RVC 高，但此差異並未達到統計上的顯著。但是，在第二大題包含差一點兒這個副詞的題型中，我們發現學習者在 State-Result RVC 的表現並非最好。檢測後發現，英語中的狀態動詞 (States) 是不被允許與副詞差一點兒 (almost) 一起出現；顯示出第一語言對 L2 學習者的表現的確有影響。本研究亦發現，受試者能理解 RVC 只表達「結果」一種態 (aspect)，因而將 Activity-Result RVC 和 Semelfactive-Result RVC 視為英語中只具有「結果」態的瞬間動詞 (Achievements)。值得一提的是，學習者將 Activity-Result RVC 視為「典型瞬間動詞」(typical Achievements)，而 Semelfactive-Result RVC 則被視為「引申瞬間動詞」(derived Achievements)。

其次，實驗結果顯示，第一語言和第二語言的相似和差異對受試者分別產生了正面和負面的影響。英語 typical Achievements 的語意特性與 RVC 相同，但是 derived Achievements 和 RVC 並沒有相同處。在語法判斷題中，由於正向轉移 (positive transfer) 的緣故，L2 學習者在 Activity-Result RVC 的表現顯著優於 Semelfactive-Result RVC。這樣的結果也說明了第一和第二語言的不同產生了負向轉移 (negative transfer)，而導致學習者在 Semelfactive-Result RVC 學習不佳。第一語言在第二語言習得中扮演重要的角色亦受到了證實；受試者在判斷句子含有 Activity-Result RVC/Semelfactive-Result RVC 和副詞差一點兒的主要句意的表現優於此一類不含副詞差一點兒的句子。再者，「語言」與「思維」的關係密切；英語母語人士較重視事件的過程，而華語人士卻認為事件結果比較重要。最後，本研究指出，學習者的華語程度越高則其 RVC 習得表現也越好，顯示出第一語言的影響會隨學習者第二語言能力提升而減弱。

## ABSTRACT

The resultative verb compounds (hereafter RVC) in Chinese consist of two verbal elements, with the second element signifying the result of the action/state denoted by the first (Li and Thompson 1981). Smith (1997) hence suggests that RVCs are like English Accomplishments. However, there are some cross-linguistic variations between RVCs and Accomplishments, though the two verbs have the action-result semantic relation between their semantic components. Tai (1984), for example, indicates that the Mandarin RVC encodes only the aspectual meaning of the result; thus, RVCs are instantaneous verbs, whereas English Accomplishments with the aspectual meaning of both the action and result are durative verbs. Tai (2003) also points out that in Mandarin RVCs, the result of an event is ‘overtly’ expressed with the resultative morpheme, while in English Accomplishments, it is ‘covertly’ expressed, or ‘implied’ in the meaning of the verb (Tai 2003). Based on the difference between Mandarin and English in the specification of ‘result’, Tai claims that English speakers would attend less to the result part of the event than Chinese speakers.

Motivated by the cross-linguistic variations between Mandarin RVCs and English Accomplishments, this study explores the L2 acquisition of Mandarin RVCs by English L2 learners to see whether they have full understanding of the semantic properties of RVCs in general and whether their acquisition varies according to the

three RVC types—divided based on the semantic property of the two constituents-- Activity-Result, Semelfactive-Result and State-Result RVCs. Forty native English speakers learning Chinese at the MTC participated in this study, and they were further divided into two groups according to their Chinese proficiency levels, i.e., the intermediate and high groups. The instrument was a survey composed of two tasks--grammaticality judgment (GJ) and sentence interpretation (SI). The overall results showed that the learners' performance differed according to the three RVC types. They did best on the Sta-R RVCs, with the notable exception of test questions containing both a Sta-R RVC and the adverb *chayidianr* 'almost' in the SI task. Among the three RVC types, the Sem-R RVC had the lowest accuracy rate. Though the learners performed better on the Act-R RVC than on the Sem-R RVC, there was no significant difference between the performances. A further examination revealed that the English learners had the knowledge that the result part constitutes the semantic focus of RVCs and treated Act-R and Sem-R RVCs as English typical Achievements and derived Achievements, respectively.

Moreover, the results showed that the learners' L1 played a crucial role in the L2 acquisition of Mandarin RVCs. In the GJ task, it has been observed the compatibility between the meaning of the derived Achievement and the English progressive misled the learners into considering that Sem-R RVCs could appear with the Mandarin

imperfective aspect marker *zhengzai*, which implies that the L1-L2 difference in structure brings about negative transfer. With respect to positive transfer, it was found that the accuracy of judgment for the Act-R RVC was higher than that for the Sem-R RVC, suggesting that the L1 knowledge of (typical) Achievements had great help in acquiring the Act-R RVC. In the SI task, the results showed that as far as the Action-Result RVCs are concerned, the frequency of the result interpretation for questions with the adverb ‘almost’ is higher than that for questions without the adverb, suggesting that the learners relied heavily on English Achievements when making decision on the center predication of sentences with such RVCs. Last but not least, our results showed that English-speaking people attended more to the action part of the event than to the action part.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the many people who made this thesis possible.

I am deeply indebted to my advisor, Professor Jen-i Li, who shared with me a lot of her expertise and research insight. Throughout my thesis-writing period, she provided encouragement, invaluable advice and lots of good ideas. I would have been lost without her.

Special thanks go to my committee members, Professor Chun-yin Doris Chen and Professor Rueih-ling Fahn, for their careful reading of this thesis and their precious comments and insightful suggestions for improvement. I would also like to express my gratitude to Professor Xue-mei Lu for her kind assistance with the statistical analyses of my thesis.

I wish to thank my friends, Shu-jun Guo, Pei-fen Xie, Mei-hui Cai, Meng-jia Shi, You-shan Zhong, Jin-wen Liu, Fan-jing Liu, Xiu-qing Hao, Ming-xuan Hu and Xiao-ting Li for helping me get through the difficult times and for all the emotional support, camaraderie, entertainment and caring they provided.

Last and most importantly, I would like to thank my beloved mom, Zhao-man Zhang, whose unconditional support and loving company enabled me to complete this thesis. To her I dedicate this thesis.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT (CHINESE)</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>ABSTRACT (ENGLISH)</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>x</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>xii</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>xiii</b>
<b>Chapter One: Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Motivation.....	1
1.2 Theoretical Background.....	6
1.2.1 Theory of Language Transfer.....	6
1.2.2 Theory of Linguistic Relativity.....	8
1.3 Purpose of This Study.....	9
1.4 Organization of the Thesis.....	9
<b>Chapter Two: Literature Review</b> .....	<b>11</b>
2.1 Situation Types in Smith (1997).....	12
2.2 General Characterization of Mandarin RVCs.....	16
2.2.1 Components of Mandarin RVCs and RVC Classification.....	18
2.2.2 Grammatical Properties of RVCs.....	24
2.2.2.1 Incompatibility with Durative Linguistic Markers <i>Zhengzai</i> , <i>Kaishi</i> and <i>Tingzhi</i> .....	25
2.2.2.2 The Result Interpretation of the Adverb <i>Chayidianr</i> ‘almost’ in	

RVC Sentences.....	27
2.3 Linguistic Studies of RVCs.....	29
2.3.1 Tai (1984).....	30
2.3.2 He (1992) and Tai (2003).....	33
2.4 Cross-linguistic Comparisons between Mandarin RVCs and English	
Accomplishments, Achievements and States.....	37
2.4.1 Similarities and Differences between Action-Result RVCs and	
English Accomplishments/Achievements.....	38
2.4.2 Similarities and Differences between State-Result RVCs and English	
States.....	41
2.4.3 Predictions of the Learners' Performance.....	42
2.5 Empirical Studies of Mandarin RVCs .....	44
2.6 Summary.....	47
<b>Chapter Three: Methodology.....</b>	<b>50</b>
3.1 Subjects.....	50
3.2 Methodology and Instrument.....	52
3.2.1 Grammaticality Judgment Task.....	53
3.2.2 Sentence Interpretation Task.....	56
3.3 Procedure.....	59
3.3.1 Pilot Study.....	60
3.3.2 Formal Test.....	61
3.4 Summary.....	64
<b>Chapter Four: Results and Discussion.....</b>	<b>65</b>
4.1 Acquisition Difference among the Three RVC Types.....	65
4.2 L1 Influence on the L2 Acquisition of RVCs.....	75
4.3 Interplay between Language and Thought.....	86



4.4 Summary.....	91
<b>Chapter Five: Conclusion.....</b>	<b>93</b>
5.1 Summary of Findings.....	93
5.2 Implications of the Present Study: Linguistics and Pedagogy.....	95
5.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research.....	96
References.....	98
Appendix 1 (Questionnaire).....	103
Appendix 2 (Consent Form).....	109

## LIST OF TABLES

- Table 2-1. Features of the situation types
- Table 2-2. Similarities and differences between action-result RVCs, Accomplishments and Achievements
- Table 2-3. Similarities and differences between state-result RVCs and English States
- Table 3-1. Personal information of the subjects
- Table 3-2. L2 learners' language background
- Table 3-3. Example sentences in the GJ task
- Table 3-4. Example sentences in the SI task
- Table 4-1. Correct responses to the three RVC types in the GJ task
- Table 4-2. The mean scores of correct responses to questions with the durative linguistic labels *zhengzai*, *kaishi* and *tingzhi* in the GJ task
- Table 4-3. Accuracy rates of questions with Activity-Result RVCs
- Table 4-4. Accuracy rates of questions with Semelfactive-Result RVCs
- Table 4-5. The mid group's mean scores on Act-R and Sem-R RVCs
- Table 4-6. The high group's mean scores on Act-R and Sem-R RVCs
- Table 4-7. Frequency of the result interpretation for test items with Act-R, Sem-R and Sta-R RVCs in the SI task

- Table 4-8. Frequency of the result interpretation response for the items containing both the RVC and *chayidianr* ‘almost’ in the SI task
- Table 4-9. Frequency and percentage for Act-R RVCs with and without *chayidianr*
- Table 4-10. Frequency and percentage for Sem-R RVCs with and without *chayidianr*
- Table 4-11. Frequencies of the result interpretation response for Act-R, Sem-R and Sta-R RVCs
- Table 4-12. Frequency and percentage of result interpretation for Act-R RVC
- Table 4-13. Frequency and percentage of result interpretation for Sem-R RVC

## LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 4-1. The learners' performance on test questions with *kaishi*
- Figure 4-2. The learners' performance on test questions with *tingzhi*
- Figure 4-3. The learners' performance on test questions with *zhengzai*

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	analysis of variance
ASP	aspect marker
CL	classifier
GEN	genitive marker
GJ	grammaticality judgment
L1	first language
L2	second language
LE	perfective marker
MTC	Mandarin training center
RVC	resultative verb compound
Act-R RVC	activity-result resultative verb compound
Sem-R RVC	semelfactive-result resultative verb compound
Sta-R RVC	state-result resultative verb compound
SLA	second language acquisition
SI	sentence interpretation