Iraqi EFL Learners' Realization of Morphological, Syntactic, and Semantic Causative/Inchoative Verbs and their Alternation

Asrar Jabir Edan   Suzanne Saad Mohammed Ali
Al-Tulaitela Secondary School for Girls   **University of Kufa/ College of**
Education

The Abstract

Many studies have been achieved upon Iraqi EFL learners' understanding and using English grammar, yet none of them focused on their realization of causative/ inchoative verbs and their alternation. The present study sheds the light upon this aspect attempting to test their recognition and their production of the above phenomena with respect to morphology, syntax and semantics. Actually, Iraqi EFL learners have difficulties in distinguishing them morphologically in a sense that they are expected to lack awareness in derive such verbs. Also, they misunderstand the syntactic and semantic changes when deriving such verbs. In fact, the approach of testing these terms of language is valuable because it helps us to recognize which one is more likely to be understood and which one is not. To achieve the aims and the expectations, the researchers has adopted a number of measures among which is to construct a test of two levels , i.e., recognition and production. Conclusion shows that subjects' performance at recognition task is better than that at the production one.
Key words: Iraqi Learners of English as a Foreign Language, causative verbs, inchoative verbs, causative –inchoative alternation, morphology, syntax , semantics, test, analysis.

:

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

.

:

.   ,   .

1. Introduction

The English language is rich with a variety of verb groups, among which are causative and inchoative verbs. The former denote some action and an entity that brings this action about or represents the reason for this action to take place which are frequently compared with inchoative forms of a verb which, in turn, denote that an

action took place without an entity causing it or without mentioning the entity that might have caused it, (See Frankowska, 2012: 8). In other words inchoative verbs refer to a change of state, occurring to the subject. This subject is not an agent but a theme or the entity that undergoes something:

(1) a. *The ice* melts/ breaks.

Such verbs often allow another causative form in which the theme appears as the object

b. *They melted/ broke the ice.*   (Koopman *et al*., n.d.:107)

There is a strong relation between inchoative and causative verbs. This gives arise to a kind of alternation between the transitive and intransitive uses of the same lexical verb, without any morpho-phonological change. This is called causative alternation or causative-inchoative alternation. Actually not all English verbs undergo this alternation which might lead students to face difficulties in realizing and producing it. Since inchoative verbs are derived in two ways, Iraqi EFL learners are not aware enough of determining which affix to be added to the particular adjective to derive an inchoative verb.They also face difficulties in differentiating inchoative verbs ending in –en and verbs originally ending with –en like *listen* . Consequently, they are unable to analyze such constructions. And their difficulties goes on in understanding what is meant by using such constructions.

This research aims to shed light more closely on the morphological, syntactic, and semantic nature of these kinds of verbs and the possible alternation between them. Therefore , they study hypothesised that Iraqi EFL learners are expected to face problems not only in understanding the nature and usage of these verbs but also in recognizing and producing the alternative relation between them. To achieve the aims of the study , the following procedures will be adapted: a-Surveying the literature about causative and inchoative verbs and their alternations and finding out the relation between them;   b- Applying a test to the fourth year students of the Department of English, College of Education in the University of Kufa, and analyzing the results of the test.

2. Causative Verbs

Causative verbs, such as *allow, cause, force, have, keep, hold, let, require, motivate, get, make, convince, hire, assist, encourage, permit, employ, enable,* and *help* express an action which is caused to happen. In other words, they indicate that some person or thing helps to bring about a new state of affairs. They can be similar in meaning to passive verbs:

(2) a**.** My hair *was cut***.** (Passive)

   b**.** I *had my hair cut***.** (Causative)   (Nordquist, 2011:1)

2.1 Definitions

Hurford and Heasly (1983: 20) express that causative form "denotes an action which causes something to happen". For instance, the transitive verb *open* is the causative from the corresponding to *open* which is intransitive. Then, if *John opens* the door, he causes it to open. :

(3) Fiona *rolled* her pencil across the table.

(4) We'll *freeze* these strawberries for Christmas   (ibid.)

Causative verb means cause to be X. For example the verb *boil* in (5) is causative since Ellen caused the water to boil:

(5) Ellen *boiled* the water   (Mc Carthy, 2002:142)

He adds that when causative verbs used transitively, the object, noun phrase, is usually indicating the thing or the person that is the goal of the action of the verb:

(6) a. Jill *laid* the book on the table.

    b. The book *lay* on the table.   (ibid)

2.2 Morphological Properties of the Causative Verbs

      Hurford and Heasley (1983: 211) mention that English causatives need zero derivation for producing causative forms as in (6) above. Also, causatives are frequently formed by adding the suffix –en to the non-causative root:

(7) *John **reddens** his hands*. (Hurford et al., 2007: 233) .

      Some transitive verbs can be derived from their corresponding intransitive forms:

Intransitive	**Transitive**
Lie (past lay)	Lay (past laid)
Rise (past rose)	Raise (past raised)
Fall (past fell)	Fell (past felled)
Sit (past sat)	Set (past set)

      Those transitive verbs are all causative in that they mean "cause to X" where X stands for the meaning of the corresponding intransitive, (See McCarthy, 2002:54).

It is worth mentioning that causative- in causative verb-pairs are common in English. They nearly all involve conversion as in:

(8) a. *Jill **boiled** the water.*

    b. *The water **boiled.***   (Ibid.)

2.3 Syntactic Properties of Causative Verbs

      Quirk et al. (1972:83) mention that causative requires an animate subject:

(9) a. *He **pulled** his belt right.*

    b. *He **pushed** the window open.*

Such sentences have causative meaning:

(**10) a**. *He caused his belt to be right.*

    b. *He caused the window to be open.*   (ibid: 224)

In the above sentences, the subject is the person who causes an event. That is the actor in the action. Such actor can be specified by the subject of the clause or the agent in the passive construction:

(11) a. ***Some children** stared the fire.*   (caused it to start)

    b. *It was started **by some children.***

Start here is a causative verb and *some children* is the actor.

                              (Leech and Svartvik, 1975: 76)

      They (ibid) add saying that many adjectives and intransitive verbs in English have a corresponding causative transitive causative verbs (See 3.3)

(12) a. *The dam **blew up**.*

    b. *The terrorist **blew up** the dam.*

(13) a. *The tree has **fallen**.*

    b. *Someone has **felled** the tree.*

                             (ibid)

When the actor is not mentioned, the instrument or means takes the position of the subject which represents the role of the causer of the action:

 (14) a. *They killed him **with a bullet.***

   b. ***A bullet** killed him.*

Moreover, the subject can be presented by an agent-by-phrase when the sentence is passivized as in:

   c. *He was killed **by a bullet**.*   (The agent is instrument)

   d. *He was killed **by them.*** *   (The agent is the actor)

                                                                (ibid)

It is worth mentioning that the verbs *(make*, *have*, *get*) gives the causative meaning. *Have* is *causative* or *experiential* in a sense that it has the meaning of cause. It is often used when speaking about various services and it often has three forms; the first followed by an object and a base form of the verb (15.a), the second followed by an object and -*ing* form of the verb (15.b), and the third followed by an object and past participle (15.c):

(15) a. *They **had** John arrive early.*

     b. *He **had us laughing** all through the meal.*

     c. *She **had the car washed** at the weekend.*

   Get is often used instead of **have** and has the same forms:

(16) *I **got** my computer fixed - I **had** my computer fixed.*

   Make differs from most other causative verbs, and from most other verbs that take ***to*** complement clauses, in that it omits the ***to*** in active clauses, although ***to*** must be included in the passive. Compare:

(17) a. *The nurse **made me swallow** it.*

     b. *I **was made to swallow** it (by the nurse).*

                                                      (Nordquist, 2011:1)

In a few cases, ***make*** can be followed by *myself, yourself, etc*. and a past participle (18.a), in addition the change or effect can be noticed when *make* followed by a noun or adjective (18.b and c):

(18) a. *She **had to shout to make herself heard.***

     b. *She **made everybody welcome**.*

     c. *The rain **made the grass wet.***

                                                          (Swan, 2005:335)

   Causative verbs are often used with negative experiences. In these situations it is more common to use **have**:

(19) *I **had** my wallet stolen**.***

2.3 Semantic Properties of Causative Verbs

   The causative form of a verb is one kind of constructions that allow expressing causation. As Shibatani (1976 cited in Frankowska, 2012:11) suggests, the best way to explain a causative construction is to define a *causative situation*, expressed by the causative construction. The causative situation suggests there are two events, related to each other: the causing event and the caused event. The relation between them is *resultative* that is the causing event brings about the caused event and the caused event - the result of the causing event - would not have taken place without the causing event occurring first as in:

(20*) a. Kate told / want John to leave.*

b. *Kate opened the door.*

The above sentences explain the causative and non- causative. Example (20.a) consists of two events, but one cannot actually say that the latter event would or would not take place if the first one did. The event of John's leaving in (20.a) does not depend on the subject's, who is Kate, action of telling John to leave. So the sentence is not causative because the relation between the two events of telling or wanting is not causing John to leave. Thus, the relation between them is not resultative because John might have left weather Kate wanted or told him to do so or not. On the other hand, in the second sentence ,(20.b.), the subject's action does influence the other event. This event would not have taken place if the subject had not done something before it took place. For this sentences (20.b.) presents the causative construction that expresses the resultative relation between the caused and the causing event.

It is transitive, so it has the internal argument, which is THEME or PATIENT, and the external argument, which is AGENT-CAUSER. But this could not be over generalized to all transitive verbs are causative simply because not all transitive verbs are causatives.

(21) *I kicked (at) the ice and nothing happened to it.*

Example (21) presents an ordinary transitive verb which does not contain the relation that mentioned above. The event of *kicking (at)* the ice, even successful with actual touching the ice with one's foot, does not make the ice change in any way, inside or outside ice is still ice. But if we say:

(22) *I melted the ice.*

The event of melting the ice influences it, thus something happens to it. That means its physical state had been changed. Then if we say:

(23) **I melted the ice and nothing happened to it.*

The first event of melting is the causing event, subsequently; the caused event is the event of ice turning into water. The result of this causative event should be confirming this relation. Here it denies the caused event. Thus, the result following from the causing event of melting is the event of nothing happening to the ice, which is illogical and contradicts the earlier causing event. This, in turn, explains why the sentence is unacceptable, (ibid:12-13).

As explained before, causative form denotes an action which causes something to happen. The cause in such causative verbs includes either (a) direct or manipulative causation or (b) indirect or influential causation. Then, if **Jones** breaks a pot by striking it with a hammer, he directly causes the pot to break, and we can say:

(24) a. *Jones broke the pot.*

Break in this sentence is a causative verb, containing the direct causation predicate CAUSE. But if Jones bumps into Stimson who is carrying the pot, making Stimson drop the pot on the floor and break it, then Jones indirectly causes the pot to break. In this case Jones caused the pot to get broken, so it can be said:

b. *Jones caused Stimson to break the pot.*

But we can't say *Jones broke the pot*. In short, (24.a) shows the predicate cause expresses direct causation, and the event [DO(x)] which is the first argument of CAUSE is a directly causative action. (Kearns, 2000**:**232)

According to the thematic roles, Jones in (24. b) is the agent and that Stimson is the theme. Then Jones, the agent, is the first argument of the sentence cause a change of state theme of the argument which comes to be in a state of breaking the pot. That is the causation made indirectly. The schema clarifies the state as follows:

(24-a) agent =x: Do [x,…] ,   while
(24-b) change of state theme=y   Become [state (y)]

For this Kearns (ibid:233)suggests two types of causative verbs:

1- Agentive causative in which [Do (x) cause[...] as in the example (24.a)

 and in this type the causation could be direct or indirect.

2- Non-agentive causative as in :

(25) *The storm broke the vasses.*   [cause (x, [become[state (y)]]. (ibid)

3. Inchoative Verbs

Inchoative verbs are those that indicate a change of state or specify the beginning of an action or a process (Hasselgard, 1999:5). They are: freeze, dry, melt, wilt, harden, soften, rust, solidify, purify, ripen, fade, sweeten, darken, lighten, blacken, yellow, bake, toast, burn, chill ... ect.

3.1 Definitions

Inchoative (inceptive, ingressive) is a distinctive aspectual form expressing the beginning of a state or activity (Trask, 1993:137).

Hurford et al. (2007: 232) add that an inchoative form denotes the beginning or coming into existence, of some state. That is the adjective **dark** denotes a state and **darkens** in (26) which is an intransitive verb represents the corresponding inchoative form, since it denotes the beginning of a state of darkness:

(26) *The sky darkened.*

Similarly, Hasselgard (1999:5) expresses inchoatives as verbs indicting a change of a state. They specify the beginning of an action or a process:

 (27) *The page yellowed.*

 (28) *The clothes dried.*

The above inchoative verbs denote a change in a state from not yellow to yellow and a wet to dry, (See also, Brinton , 2000: 277)

According to Levin (1993: 9), inchoative verbs are verbs of becoming since they describe a change of state:

 (29) *The window broke*   (ibid)

3.2 Morphological Properties of Inchoative Verbs

Morphologically, inchoative verbs are considered derivational words since they are produced by existing derived words from every appropriate source words, (Hurford et al., 2007: 235). They are formed by using word formation process which is derivation. There are two types of suffixes which are added to adjectives to form inchoative verbs.

 Those suffixes are: -en suffix as in (30) and (31) and zero suffix as in (32) and (33):

(30) *The clay hardened.*

(31) *The landscape flattened.*

(32) *My hair dried in the sun.*

(33) *The sky cleared.* (ibid : 232)

Though derivation is very productive process, inchoatives are hardly produced. Productivity here is not culprit, since causative – inchoative –en suffix occurs in a small number of words, (Stmberger, 2007: 18), and it is worth saying that the process of deriving inchoative and causative verbs from adjectives is arbitrary managed because adjectives may or may not be given the inchoative – causative –en suffix. That is one can say harden, deafen but not colden or braven, (Stump, 2007: 3).

Mc Carthy (2007: 1) assures that the English suffix –en that forms verbs from adjectives as in **blacken, dampen, redden, loosen, stiffen**, ...ect. is restricted to bases ending in obstruents. The non existence of verbs as *****coolen** , *****greyen**, **puren**, ...ect. are good evidence for this. Such restriction does not reflect any general phonological characteristics of English, because it does not apply to the adjective- forming suffix-en as in woollen, or swollen.

Kearns (2000: 233) agrees in that inchoative verbs are represented by the past and past participle of some verbs as in:

(34) *The pot broke*. (become broke)

(35) *The door open*. (become open)   (ibid)

3.3 Syntactic Properties of Inchoative Verbs

Examining inchoative verbs syntactically, one can conclude that they are intransitive verbs and the corresponding transitive verbs are causatives:

(36) a. *The door opened.*

    b. *John opened the door.*

    c. *The key opened the door.*

In the above example (36.a) the *door* is an affected subject that is followed by intransitive verb while in (36 b. and c.) the subject is agent and instrument and the verb is a transitive one which followed by an affected object, (Greenbaum and Quirk, 1990:172)

3.4 Semantic Properties of Inchoative Verbs

Botne (1983: 149) looks at inchoative verbs as "a set of verbs serves to express a change of condition or location of the subject; many of them characterize the change , or transition, from one state to another". In his study, he claims that inchoative verbs can be analyzed as a series of temporal phases. He focuses on their behaviour as linguistic representation of the real- world event, and the temporal relationships among these events. (ibid: 150). The temporal phases of those events are represented by onset, nucleus, and coda as in:

  [--------------------- / ----------------------- / --------------------------]

   Onset   nucleus   coda   event

The onset phase can be described as "the time period immediately preceding, and differing in character from the initial phase of the nucleus". Nucleus represents the preparatory stage for the unclear activity of the event. Coda phase stands for the time segment during which the character of the event fifers from that of the immediately following the nucleus of the event and which bring that event to a definite end (ibid: 152):

(37) *The butter **melted**.*

Onset is represented by the primary reference point in the time of speaking which is different from the nucleus referring to the second reference point which the

starting point of the change the event from not melted to become melted. When the event of being melted completed, this aspect can be referred to as coda.

Inchoative verb is a class of verbs that is classified according to the thematic roles theory . Kearns (2000; 232-3) classifies verbs as: inchoative verbs, agentive verbs, agentive-causative, non-agentive causative and stative verbs. Inchoative verbs can be interpreted as predicates of accomplishments with both a durative processes and an end-state as in:

(38) *The lake froze.*

a.   [freeze (the lake)] Cause [become [frozen (the lake)]].

Or they can be interpreted as predicates on events idealized to a simple transition for this case they are achievements. For example, in (38) above, separating from the freezing process, it is an achievement. Thus, the lake froze means

Become [frozen (the lake)].

(Kearns, 2000:235)

To clarify more, the predicate become identifies both the change –of- state theme role and inchoative verbs which take change-of – state themes (ibid.).

4. Causative-inchoative Alternation

The causative form of a verb is frequently compared with an inchoative form of a verb which, in turn, denotes that an action took place without an entity causing it or without mentioning the entity that might have caused it (Shibatani 1976; Haspelmath 1993 cited in Frankowska; 2012 :8).

It is worth mentioning that this alternation is widely observed in English and it is considered as one of the most frequent verbal alternations in the languages of the world because there is a strong relation between those verbs. This relation is explained in the following examples:

(39) a. *Barry broke the glass into a thousand pieces.*

   b. *The glass broke into a thousand pieces.*

This alternation is also exemplified by (Cabrera, 2010: 160-1). The transitive form in (39-a) encodes a causative situation since it focuses on the causer *Barry* and a change of the state of the glass, while the intransitive (or inchoative) form in (39- b) focuses on the result. When examining these two sentences, we find that not only they differ syntactically: the verb of the first sentence is transitive, while in the second, it is intransitive, but also, the meaning of these two sentences differs (semantically) because the first sentence has a causative verb (since it has an agent *Barry* causing the action to happen), while the second sentence has an inchoative verb (since it doesn't have an agent) (Aronoff and Rees-Miller, 2006:232).

4.1 Morphological Properties of Causative –Inchoative Alternation

The causative is a transitive that indicates some person or a thing helps to make something happen, whereas the inchoative is intransitive, refers to a change of state. This gives arise to a kind of alternation between the transitive and intransitive uses of the same lexical verb, without any morpho-phonological change. Haspelmath (1993 cited in Ellison 2005:160) describes the three logical morphological manners in which causative and inchoative alternant. Two of these are 'directed' alternations involving the application of a morphological marker, that is an affix, an auxiliary, or a stem modifier, to derive one alternant from the basic correlate. It happens when:

1- The marker is applied to a basic inchoative verb, the derivation is labelled 'causative'.

2- The morphological marker applied to a basic causative verb to derive the inchoative in this case it us defined as an 'anti-causative' alternation

3- The form is basic to the derivation of the other. That is, no marker can be extracted from one alternant to yield the other. This third type of relation is called "non-directed" alternation.

4.2 Syntactic Properties of Causative – Inchoative Alternation

If the original verb is intransitive, then the causative construction will be transitive e.g; to fall → to make somebody fall. And when it is transitive, the causative construction will be ditransitive , e.g; to eat → to make somebody eats something or to feed something to somebody. (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/causative).

Montrul (2000 cited in Whong-Barr (2005: 1) express that the alternation under study refers to the set of (unaccusative) verbs which can appear in two forms:

1- Transitive form with an agent and theme which is noun phrase as an object of the causative verb.

2- An intransitive form of verb that is called inchoative which requires no object simply because the theme or that is the noun phrase became in subject position.

Then, the English syntax, the alternation is characterized by (a) a change in word order and (b) the absence of the agent noun phrase in the inchoative form:

(40) a. *The road becomes narrower.*

b. *They narrowed the road.*   (Greenbaum and Quirk, 1990:172)

In the above example the causative is a transitive verb while the in the second sentence the inchoative verb is intransitive.

Levin and Hovav (1995) mention that causative-inchoative alternation refers to an argument structure alternation exhibited by a group of externally caused change of state verbs. These verbs can be used both in transitive constructions which represent the causation or facilitation of a change of state by an agent as illustrated in (41. a) below and in intransitive constructions which indicate an autonomous change of state with an unspecified causer as illustrated in (41.b). Causative forms are said to be dyadic (they can have two arguments or slots for two arguments) and inchoative forms are monadic (they can have only one argument). The causative form expresses an event, in which there is causer of an action, action, and cause. The object undergoing the action is caused by causer. The inchoative forms , on the other hand, express an event in which action and causee are relevant, but causer is absent and not implied by any morphology or semantics of the verb form (Ibid.):

(41) a. *John broke the window*. (Causative)

b. *The window broke.* (Inchoative)

As a matter of fact, language has a group of distinguished predicates known as *thematic relations* that characterize the participants of eventualities. The kinds of participants that are relevant here are *agent* (an animate which instigates or causes something expressed by the preposition *by* which frequently corresponds to a subject of a transitive verb) (42. a), *instrument* (a tool or object manipulated by an agent) (42. b), *natural forces* (a physical force that is neither an instrument nor an agent) (42-c) ,and *theme* (the initial part of any structure when considered from an informational point of view:

(42) a. *This picture is painted by Degas. ~ Degas painted that picture.*
   b. *The wind opened the door*
   c. *The computer has solved the problem.* (Greenbaum and Quirk, 1990;199-210)

Thematic relations are two-place relations between eventualities and ordinary objects. One object can stand in a particular thematic relation to a given eventuality; hence any eventuality can have at most one agent. Themes may participate in either events or states, whereas agents, instruments, and natural forces may only participate in events. It is also possible for an object to be both the agent and the theme of an event as *Rebecca* in the following sentence:

(43) *Rebecca jumped into the water.* (Piñón, 2011:6).

The verbs that allow alternation are *unaccusatives*—those intransitive verbs that have only a "theme" (that is, the subject has something happen to it, rather than being an "agent" and causing something). The alternation can be thought of as a process of adding an agent to an unaccusative:*Tom broke the vase,* for instance, is more or less, *Tom caused the vase to break.*

However, the absence of the agent at the syntactic level of the intransitive inchoative alternant is proved by the empirical fact that the above mentioned sentence cannot license a *by* phrase of a purpose clause (Roeper, 1987:267).

(44) a. **The vase broke **by Tom.***
   b. **The vase broke to awaken a sleeping child.*

4.3 Semantic Properties of Causative – Inchoative Alternation

Semantically, a causative - inchoative verb: a pair of verbs which express the same basic situation (generally a state of change) and differ only in that the causative verb meaning includes an agent participant who causes the situation, whereas the inchoative verb meaning excludes a causing agent and presents the situation as occurring spontaneously.

This type of alternation is called "anti-causative" (Haspelmath 1993 cited in Frankowska, 2012: 16), clarifies that the term used to describe such an alternation. It indicates that the verb is causativised first and then, when the event is being expressed without AGENT — the participant of the causing event — it becomes anti-causativised.

Verbs of change of state demonstrated by the verb *break* above in (1) are representative English verbs, the majority of which participate in the causative/inchoative alternation. Others include, according to Levin (1993:20), roll verbs, motion around axis verbs, bend verbs, zero-related to adjectives verbs, change of colour verbs, *-ify, -ize,* and *-ate* verbs, and amuse-type psych-verbs, whereas verbs that do not alternate are: verbs of change of possession (give verbs, contribute verbs, verbs of future having), verbs of cutting, verbs of contact by impact, touch verbs, destroy verbs, verbs of killing, verbs of appearance and disappearance.

Yamaguchi (1989:3) mentions that verbs that alternate are eligible as the change of state verbs do not necessarily need the *direct intervention of the agent* in order to convey actions denoted as English verbs are well-known for their ability to accept a non-animate causer such as natural forces in a subject position, as in:

(45) *The earthquake broke the vase.*

The grammaticality in (45) points to the fact that the verb is not purely genitive in its semantic representation. The natural forces producing motions by themselves cannot

be counted as agentive because it does not involve intention, one of the defining characteristics of agency (Ibid). However, verbs that do require an animate intentional and volitional agent in their basic meaning are said to be non alternating ones such as *build, murder, remove*:

(46) a. *A local architect built the new library.*

  b. **The windstorm built a sand dune.*

  c. **The new library built.*

(Levin and Havav, 1995: 102)

Verbs such as *build* above involve causal relations between two events. They resemble those of alternating verbs such as *break* but they essentially differ from the latter in their entailment of the semantic specification that the denoted event must come about accompanied by the direct intervention of the agent (Ibid.). Some verbs don't allow the causative construction (47.a and b),whereas others don't freely allow the inchoative construction (47.c and d). Such differences come from the differences in argument structure realization:

 (47) a. *The rabbit disappeared.* (Causative)

  b.**The magician disappeared the rabbit*. (No causative alternation)

  c. *John cut the string*.(Causative)

  d. **The string cut*. (No inchoative alternation)   (ibid)

5. The Test

To find out the difficulties that EFL college students might face in recognizing and using causative and inchoative verbs, as well as those that might face in using causative-inchoative alternation, a test has been constructed and administrated to a sample of sixty subjects of the fourth academic year (2012-2013) of the Department of English at the College of Education, University of Kufa. Those subjects have been chosen as the subject under study has been taught to them during their academic year.

The test consists of four questions with five items each. The first ones are meant to measure the subjects' performance of the recognition level; whereas the second ones are allocated to measure their performance of the production level (See Appendix 1). The members of the jury agreed that the test items are appropriate to measure the aims designed for, except for some minor recommendations and modifications, which have been taken into consideration.

The jury members are arranged alphabetically and according to the scientific degrees:

Prof. Riyadh Tariq Kadhim Al-Ameedi (Ph.D). College of Education University of Babylon.

Asst. Prof. Abbas Hasen Jassim (Ph.D).College of Education, University of Kufa.

Asst. Prof. Razzaq Naif . College of Education University of Babylon.

The subject under study was clearly explained to the subjects and sufficient examples on each question of the test were given before administrating it. The following section reveals the results of the test:

5.1 The Results of the Test

The first two questions, as stated earlier, are meant to measure the subjects' performance on the recognition level. In the first question, the subjects are asked to

decide whether the underlined verbs are causative or inchoative, thus measuring their ability to recognize them and their morphological differences. The results obtained after analyzing the subjects' performance on it show that their performance is good as (65%) of the responses are correct against (35%) incorrect. Table (1) display the results more clearly:

Table (1):Subjects' Performance : Question One

No. of item	No. Of Correct Answers	Percentage	No. Of Incorrect Answers	Percentage
1	52	86.7%	8	13.3%
2	47	78.3%	13	21.7%
3	17	28.3%	43	71.7%
4	37	61.7%	23	38.3%
5	42	70%	18	30%
Total	195	65%	105	35%

Table (2), on the other hand, shows the subjects' performance on question two:

Table (2):Subjects' Performance : Question Two

No. of item	No. Of Correct Answers	Percentage	No. of Incorrect Answers	Percentage
1	21	35%	39	65%
2	19	31.7%	41	68.3%
3	51	85%	9	15%
4	43	71.7%	17	28.3%
5	32	53.3%	28	46.7%
Total	166	55.33%	134	44.67%

Table (2) reveals that the subjects' performance on question two, which aims at finding out their awareness of syntactically or semantically accepted sentences with respect to the subject under study, is somehow less than that of question one as (55.33%) of the responses are correct against (44.67%) incorrect.

The lowest percentage of the correct responses goes to item 2 (31.7%) which is semantically wrong; whereas the highest percentage of the correct responses goes to item 3 (85%) which is syntactically wrong.

Table (3) below sums up the subjects' performance at the recognition level:

Table (3):Subjects' Performance at the Recognition Level

No. of Question	No. of Correct Answers	Percentage	No. Of Incorrect Answers	Percentage
1	195	65%	105	35%
2	166	55.33%	134	44.67%
Total	361	60.17%	239	39.83%

The results presented in Table (3) show that the number and rate of the correct responses at the recognition level are (361, 60.17%).

Question Three and Four, however, are allocated to measure the subjects' performance at the production level. The third question is designed to figure out their ability to realize and produce correct causative-inchoative alternation. The results of this question, shown in Table (4) reveal that the subjects face difficulties in this area as the percentage of the correct responses is so low (18.42%) as compared with the correct ones (88.58%):

Table (4):Subjects' Performance : Question Three

No. of item	No. of Correct Answers	Percentage	No. of Incorrect Answers	Percentage
1	16	62.7%	44	73.3%
2	1	1.7%	59	98.3%
3	6	10%	54	90%
4	1	1.7%	59	98.3%
5	10	16.7%	50	83.3%
Total	34	18.42%	266	88.58%

In question four, however, the subjects are required to fill the blanks with the appropriate, active or passive, form of the verbs. The aim is to see if they can use causative and inchoative verbs appropriately. It was predicted that if they were aware of the intransitive/inchoative usage of the verbs, they would fill in the blanks with the active forms of the verbs and if they were not, they would prefer to fill in the blanks with passive forms derived from the transitive/causative counterparts.

The results show that most of the subjects failed to produce correct active and passive forms of the verbs given as the percentage of the correct answers is (10.34%), whereas that of the correct ones is (89.6%):

Table (5):Subjects' Performance : Question Four

No. of item	No. Of Correct Answers	Percentage	No. of Incorrect Answers	Percentage
1	4	6.7	56	93.3
2	0	0	60	100
3	6	10	54	90
4	3	5	57	95
5	18	30	42	70
Total	31	10.34	269	89.6

As Table (5) shows, no subject was able to produce the correct form of the verb *make* in item 2 and the highest percentage of the correct responses is for item 5, which is not good as well (30%).

Table (6) bellow sums up the subjects' performance on the production level:

Table (6):Subjects' Performance at the Production Level

No. of Question	No. of Correct Answers	Percentage	No. Of Incorrect Answers	Percentage
3	34%	18.42	266	88.58%
4	31%	10.34	269	89.6%
Total	65%	10.83	535	89.17%

The results presented in Table (6) show that the number and rate of the correct responses at the recognition level are (65, 10.83%).

The subjects' performance at the whole test can be summarized in the following table:

Table (7):Subjects' Performance at the Whole Test

Level	No. Of Correct Answers	Percentage	No. Of Incorrect Answers	Percentage
Recognition	361	60.17%	239	39.83%
Production	65	10.83%	535	89.17%
Total	426	35.5%	774	64.5%

Table (7) reveals that the subjects' performance on the recognition level is better than their performance on the production one as the number and rate of the correct responses on the recognition level are (361, 60.17%), whereas the number and rate of the correct responses on the production level are (65, 10.83%). Nevertheless, their performance on the whole test is not good as the percentage of the correct responses is only (35.5%).

In addition, the scale of the subjects' scores presented in Table (8) enhances the outcomes mentioned above. The highest score got by the subjects is (60) out of (100). Only one subject was able to get this score; whereas the largest number of the

subjects (24) achieved (30-39) which again shows the subjects' low performance in the subject under study:

Table (8):**The Scale According to the Subjects' Scores**

No.	The scale	Number of students	Percentage
1	0 ⟶ 9	0	0%
2	10 ⟶ 19	3	5 %
3	20 ⟶ 29	9	15 %
4	30 ⟶ 39	24	40 %
5	40 ⟶ 49	19	31.7%
6	50 ⟶ 59	4	6.7%
7	60 ⟶ 69	1	1.7%
8	70 ⟶ 79	0	0%
9	80 ⟶ 89	0	0%
10	90 ⟶ 100	0	0%
Total		60	100%

6. Conclusions

Though causative and inchoative verbs form part of the verb classes, little attention has been paid to these verbs as compared with other verb types. This urged the researchers to devote this research to shed more light on them and investigative the Iraqi EFL students' ability to recognize and use them correctly.

Generally, causative verbs need zero derivation (though some formed by adding the suffix –en to the non-causative root), whereas the inchoative verbs are considered derivational words. Syntactically, the causative verbs are said to be transitive, whereas the inchoative verbs are intransitive. Semantically, they express the same basic situation (generally a state of change) and differ only in that the causative verb meaning includes an agent participant who causes the situation, whereas the inchoative verb meaning excludes a causing agent and presents the situation as occurring spontaneously.

The results of the test administrated to a sample of Iraqi EFL college students reveal that, though they studied those verbs in the academic year, their performance at the test is not good as the percentage of their correct responses is (35.5%). Their performance at the recognition level, however is better than that at the production level as the percentage of the recognition level is (60.17%), whereas that of the production one is (10.83%) which means that the subjects face serious problems in the subject under study and, thus more efforts and attention are needed to be paid it.

References:

Ackerley,K.2012."Introductory".Internet,www.maldura.unipd.it/dllags/.../1_**introductory**.pdf.

Aronoff, M. and Rees-Miller, J. (2006). *The Handbook of Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Biber, D. ; S. Conrad ; and G. Leech. 2002. *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.

Botne, Robert, D. (1983). On the Notion

Brinton, L. J. (2000). *The Structure of Modern English: A linguistic introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Cabrera, M. (2010) *Selected Proceedings of the 12th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*. Somerville:Cascadilla Press.

Ellison , Gregory Campbell (2005). *Establishing the Derivation of the English Inchoative Alternation: The Null Reflexive Morpheme* in Generative Grammar in Geneva 1:159-194, 2005

Frankowska, Magda Rościńska. (2012). *On the Derivation of Causative and Inchoative Verb Forms in Polish In Comparison with English and Other Languages*. *Wrocław:* University of Wrocław Press.

Greenbaum, S. and R. Quirk. (1990). *A Student's Grammar of the English Language:* England: Longman.

Hasselgård, H. (1999). *Glossary of Grammatical Terms Used in English Grammar: Theory and Use*. Internet. folk.uio.no/hhasselg/ Terms.html.

Hurford, J. R., and Heasley B.(1983). *Semantics: a Coursebook*. 1st ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hurford, J. R., Heasley B., and Smith M. B. (2007) *Semantics: a Coursebook*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kearns, K. (2000). *Semantics*. Ed, Roberts N. B. and Spencer, A. Hampshire: Macmillan Distribution Ltd.

Koopman, Hilda; Sportiche, Dominique; and Stabler, Edward (n.d.) *An Introduction to Syntactic Analysis and Theory. N.p.*

Leech , Geoffrey and Svartvik, Jan. (1975). *A Communicative Grammar of English.* London: Longman Ltd.

Levin, B. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternation: A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Levin, B. and M. R. Hovav, M. (1995). *Unaccusativity at the Syntax Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

McCarthy, Andrew Carstairs. (2002). *An Introduction to English Morphology: Words and Their Structure*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

------------------ (2007) "Phonological Constraints on Morphological Rules7" in in The Handbook of Morphology; Edited by: Andrew Spencer And Arnold M. Zwicky. Sayfa 2 / 4:

Nordquist, R. 2011 " Causative Verb". Internet. http://grammar.about.com/od/tz/g/causative verbterm.htm

Piñón, C, (2011). "A Finer Look at the Causative-Inchoative Alternation". Internet. www. pinon.sdf-eu.org/covers/flcia.htm.

Quirk , Randolph; Greenbaum, Sidney; Leech, Geoffrey ; and Svartvik, Jan. (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. England: Longman Group Ltd

Roeper, T. (1987). *Implicit Arguments and the Head-Complement Relation*. Linguistic Inquiry 18, 267-310.

Stemberger, Joseph paul. (28.12.2007). *Morphology in Language Production with Special Reference to Connectionism22*. in Sayfa: blackwellreference.com.

Stump, Gregory T (28.12.2007). *Inflection* in The Handbook of Morphology: Blackwell Reference Online

Swan, R. (2005). *Practical English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trask, R. L., (1993). *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. New York: Routledge.

Whong-Barr, Melinda (2005). "*Transfer of Argument Structure and Morphology*" in Proceedings of the 7th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference (GASLA 2004) ,edited by Laurent Dekydtspotter, Rex A. Sprouse, and Audrey Liljestrand: Cascadilla Press

Will, W. 2011. "Mostly Causative". Internet. http://random-idea-english.blogspot.com/2011/02/mostly-causatives-look-at-have-get-make.html

Yamaguchi, T. (1998). "Lexical Semantic Analysis of Causative/Inchoative Alternation in Japanese: A preliminary investigation of subclasses of verbs". Internet.
http://www.essex.ac.uk/linguistics/publications/egspll/volume_2/pdf/Yamaguchi.pdf

Appendix I
The Test

Q1. *Say whether the underlined verbs are causative or inchoative:*
1. Joe obtained a book.
2. They have forbidden cycling in this area.
3. I had my hair cut.
4. The landscape flattened.
5. God let there be light.

Q2 . According to their grammatical or semantic meaning, write if the following sentences are acceptable or not:*
1. I don't speak good French, but I can make myself understood.
2. The magician disappeared the rabbit.
3. The vase was broke to awaken the sleeping child.
4. *The glass* shattered.
5. Fatigue caused him to sleep.

Q3. *Write the corresponding inchoative-verb sentences from the following Causative-verb one:*
1. The children rolled the ball down the hill.
2. The sunlight has ripened the apples.
3. The breeze cooled the water.
4. They have melted the ice.
5. Tom opened the gates at nine.

Q4. *Fill the blanks in the following sentences with the appropriate, active or passive, form of the verbs*:
1. The clothes -------. (dry)
2. We ------- tidy up after the picnic.(make)
3. My daughter ------- ill. (fall)
4. The sky -------. (darken)
5. The children ------- to do the work, (help)