Teaching adverbs position to Italian students of English as L2: verb movement as a teaching tool

YHARA M. FORMISANO
University of Perugia
y.formisano@gmail.com

This article discusses the results of an experiment in which the theory of verb movement (Pollock, 1989) was used in second language teaching. The hypothesis underlying the experiment is that an explicit explanation of the deep computational mechanisms of a language should be more effective in resetting a parameter than a traditional descriptive explanation. The subjects were 67 Italian learners of English as a second language from four different classes: 2^D and 2^F (Junior High School), 3^A and 3^F (High School). They were first tested to record their knowledge of the position of English adverbs and then they were divided into two groups selected on the basis of their Pretest. One which was given a *descriptive* account of adverbs placement and the other which was given a *linguistic* account of the reason why the two languages differ on adverbs position, namely the verb movement theory. They were tested immediately after the explanation and again after 10 weeks. Results show a greater and longer lasting improvement in the ability to place adverbs correctly in subjects who were exposed to the linguistic account of the differences between the two languages compared with subjects who were given the descriptive explanation. These results support the hypothesis that an explicit explanation of the deep computational mechanisms underlying a language is more effective in teaching the correct placement of adverbs than the descriptive explanations traditionally used in second language teaching.

Introduction

The role of Universal Grammar (UG) differs in first and second language acquisition. While there is a widespread agreement about the role UG has in L1 acquisition, there are several different hypothesis that seek to explain the role of UG in L2. Among these are the Minimal Trees Hypothesis (Vainikka and Young-Scholten 1994), the Weak Transfer Hypothesis (Eubank 1993) and the Full Transfer/ Full Access Hypothesis (Schwartz and Sprouse 1994). According to Vainikka and Young-Scholten, the initial state of L2 acquisition is constituted by

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

the transfer of the lexical category solely from the L1 onto the L2 following the linear order and then, going on with the interlanguage stages, there would be the progressive transfer of the functional categories as well, bottom to top. According to Eubank instead, both functional and lexical categories are transferred onto the L2 though in their weak form, that is the value of the features is not transferred in the initial stage, but only at more advanced stage of the interlanguage. However, the theory most widely accepted and corroborated by experimental data is the Full Transfer/ Full Access (FT/FA) Hypothesis. According to Schwartz and Sprouse, second language acquisition involves an initial *full transfer* of the L1 parametric values onto the L2, followed by a failure-driven readjustment process that is guided and constrained by UG, hence the term *full access*. According to the FT/FA hypothesis one should expect Italian learners of English to move the verb in English as well, resulting in agrammatical linear orders in adverb placement. This is in fact what one finds in Italian learners of English L2 even at high levels of proficiency.
As well as the difficulty of learning a parametric difference for a second language, learners also have to cope with accounts given from traditional descriptive grammars that generally confine themselves to describing how an adverb is placed using a series of rules that describe location not even trying to explain the reason behind the differences between two languages. The following explanations of adverb placement given in some English grammar books illustrate the descriptive approach to teaching the subject of adverbs of frequency to learners of English as L2:

> 1[1]. Gli avverbi di frequenza esprimono con quale frequenza compiamo determinate azioni oppure si verifica qualcosa. In inglese essi sono **always** (sempre), **usually** (di solito) **often** (spesso) **sometimes** (a volte) **seldom/rarely** (raramente), **never** (mai). Gli avverbi di frequenza *precedono* sempre il verbo principale nelle frasi affermative, negative ad interrogative. Con il verbo **to be** essi vengono *posti dopo* il verbo, mentre con il verbo **to have got** *vanno posti tra* **have** e **got**[2].
>
> Es.
> Do you **often** play with your computer?
> I **usually** have lunch at one o'clock.
> Kate is **often** late for school.
> I haven't **always** got my dictionary in my school bag.

[1] P. Kelly, G. Chiodini. English Just like that. Student's book. LANG editions. Junior High School text book.
Italics emphasise that the key point of the account is the location of the adverb rather than focusing on the verb. This type of approach fails to consider that learners do not need to *put adverbs* anywhere, because they are already part of the functional structure of the sentence.
[2] Adverbs of frequency express the frequency with which actions take place or are performed. In English these words are: always, usually, often, sometimes, seldom, rarely, never. Adverbs of frequency always precede the main verb in affirmative, negative and interrogative sentences. With the verb to be they are placed after the verb, while with the verb to have got they are placed between have and got.

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

2[3]. We often use the present simple with adverbs of frequency (always, often, sometimes, usually, hardly ever and never). Adverbs of frequency go before the main verb, but after be.

Es.
He **often** goes out. NOT ~~He goes often out~~
She is **always** late. NOT ~~She is late always~~

3[4]. Some adverbs (for example, **always, also, probably**) go with the verb in the middle of a sentence:

Es.
Tom **always goes** to work by car.
We were feeling very tired and we **were also** hungry.
Your car **has probably been** stolen.

Study these rules for the position of adverbs in the middle of a sentence. (They are only general rules, so there are exceptions.):

i) If the verb is one word (**goes**/**fell**/**cooked** etc.), the adverb goes *before* the verb
Note that these adverbs go before **have to**.
ii) But adverbs go *after* **am/is/are/was/were**
iii) If the verb is two or more words (**can remember/doesn't smoke/has been stolen** etc.) the adverb goes *after the first verb*

The rules given are purely descriptive of location. In the first two examples the rules are relatively simple, relying on the student to remember when to put the adverb *before* and when to put it *after* the verb. The third example uses a more difficult approach requiring learners to count the words that make up a verb. None of these approaches mentions the existence of different kinds of verbs (modal, auxiliary and lexical). It could be argued that this alone might be a more reasonable and less complicated explanation of differences in verb behaviour. Although attempting to make the subject 'adverbs of frequency' easy to learn, these explanations actually make it unnatural to learn.
Hence the hypothesis underlying this research project is that:

[3] C. Oxenden, C. Latham-Koenigh, P. Seligson. New English File. Pre-intermediate student's book. Oxford University Press. This text book is used in the third year of High School and is the text book used by the older subjects (groups 3^A and 3^B) of the experiment.
[4] R. Murphy. English Grammar in Use. A self-study reference and practice book for intermediate students. Cambridge University Press. This is a widely used text book, both in High Schools and Universities.

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

A *linguistic* explanation of the linear differences between English and Italian, which takes into account and renders explicit the deep functioning of languages, is expected to be more effective than a traditional descriptive explanation.

1. The experiment

1.1 Subjects

A total of 67 subjects took part in the experiment; 38 of them were in their second year of Junior High School (2^D and 2^F; mean age 12 years) and 29 were in their third year of High School (3^A and 3^B; mean age 17 years).

The original experiment design intended to use first year Junior High school students who had never been exposed to any kind of explanation of adverb placement in English as the younger group of subjects. However, pupils in their first year of Junior High lack grammar awareness and metalinguistic knowledge with their instruction focusing mostly on lexical items and very basic English grammar. The subject of adverbs of frequency is introduced at the end of the first year, a period in which the experiment could not have taken place within the framework of the school year. The experiment used students at the beginning of their second year who had not revised the topic of adverbs of frequency. These subjects all started learning English as L2 in their first year of elementary school, around 6 years of age and they were not taught any English outside school.

2^D comprised 21 subjects, 18 of whom were native speakers of Italian and 3 of whom were bilingual (Italian-Byelorussian, Italian-Spanish and Italian-Albanian) The Pretest results for this subgroup of 3 did not differ from those of their native Italian-speaking peers, (probably because Italian is their primary language of communication) and hence they could reliably be included in the subject group.

2^F comprised 17 subjects, 14 of whom were native speakers of Italian and 3 of whom were bilingual (two Italian-Albanian and one Italian-English) This sub group delivered similar results in the Pretest to the bilingual sub group within 2^D.

The students in the third year of High School were chosen as the second group because the experiment required older subjects to be more advanced than the younger group but not so proficient in English L2 that they would make very few mistakes in adverb placement. Subjects from the High School group started learning English as L2 between second and third year of elementary school (7-8 years of age) and were not taught English outside school.

3^A comprised 17 subjects, 16 Italian native speakers and 1 bilingual Italian-German whose results did not differ from those of her peers.

3^B comprised 12 subjects all native speakers of Italian.

A control group of ten native English speakers between the ages of 20 and 40 completed all tests.

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

1.2 Experiment phases

The experiment was structured in four phases:

- Pretest
- Explanations
- First Post-test
- Second Post-test

1.2.1 Pretest

In the Pretest phase, subjects were given a test that implicitly tested their knowledge of adverb placement in English. The test comprised six different exercises administered separately to avoid cross referencing. At the beginning of the test there were written questions concerning the linguistic history of each subject in order to gather information about the kind and the amount of their exposure to English as L2. The tests included small word reference lists to allow students greater independence in accomplishing the tasks and the tests were completed anonymously.[5]

The test required subjects to use a total of 17 adverbs in 37 different sentences:

- 8 adverbs of frequency: always, usually, often, rarely, never, frequently, occasionally, seldom
- 3 adverbs of manner: slowly, easily, carefully
- 3 *'focusing'*[6] adverbs: only, even, also
- 1 adverb of quantity: very much
- 1 epistemic adverb: probably
- 1 pronoun that behaves the same as an adverb: both

The six exercises tested subjects' knowledge of adverb placement with different tasks: translation, word ordering, error correction, single word placement in a sentence, answering questions with provided information and creating sentences out of a chart.

Correct ('target') answers were those that identified basic word order (Adv-lexical verb and Aux-Adv); other word orders where prosody or context were involved were not considered correct ('not target'). The responses from the control group of 10 English native speakers provided a default position for 'correctness'.

[5] See appendix 1.
[6] Belletti (1990).

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

Results of the Pretest

Table 1

	TARGET	NON TARGET	OMISSIONS
2^D	34%	57%	9%
2^F	28%	46%	26%
3^A	54%	39%	7%
3^B	55%	51%	4%

1.2.2 Explanations

In the Explanations phase subjects were divided into two groups. One (2^D and 3^A) was given the traditional account of the rules of adverb placement and the other (2^F and 3^B) was given the linguistic explanation of the difference between the two languages. For both the younger and older groups, the classes with the higher percentages of non target answers in the Pretest were chosen for the linguistic group.

Both the descriptive and the linguistic explanation, were presented using a power point presentation to ensure that both groups were exposed to the same experimental conditions.

The descriptive explanation was called 'The difference in adverb placement between Italian and English'. The first slide illustrated that in the same sentence (*Gianni legge spesso il giornale / John often reads the newspaper*) the adverb position differs in English and Italian. The researcher emphasised that in Italian the word order is Subject Verb Adverb (SVA) while in English it is Subject Adverb Verb (SAV). The second slide showed that in Italian with either a lexical or an auxiliary verb the adverb always follows the verb, while in English, as the third slide showed, the order is not the same given that adverbs follow auxiliary verbs and precede lexical verbs:

Gianni legge spesso il giornale
Gianni è sempre contento
John often reads the newspaper
John is always happy

The linguistic explanation was called 'The reason behind the difference in adverb placement between Italian and English'. The first slides were the same as for the non-linguistic account, illustrating the difference between the two languages for the same sentence, and then subjects were introduced to the theory of verb movement[7].

The subjects were told that linguistic research shows that our brain doesn't process and produce sentences word by word or develops sentences in linear order but it is as if it follows an outline, a hierarchical structure where every element of a sentence, such as the subject or the verb, has its place. Elements such as the subject are high in the hierarchy and thus we hear them at the beginning of the sentence; elements such as verbs are lower and so we hear them later in the sentence.

[7] The theory was simplified and neither the split inflection nor the inversion of TP and AgrP was explained, as they were not relevant to the discussion.

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

They were then shown a slide with two structures, an Italian one (with the order SVA) and an English one (with the order SAV). It was pointed out that it is unlikely that an Italian and an English brain are structured in different ways, so the structures have to be the same, and in fact they are, but then something has to happen for the linear orders to be different. They were then shown another difference between the two languages: verb inflection, *rich* in Italian where for the present tense there are six different forms agreeing with the person (leggo, leggi, legge, leggiamo, leggete, leggono) and *poor* in English where there are only two (read, reads). At this point subjects were again shown the two structures, both with the order SAV; a second slide overlaid inflection after the subject. They were told that being *rich* Italian inflection is like a big magnet, able to attract the verb, while English *poor* inflection is a small magnet that does not have enough strength to attract the verb and that is the reason why the two languages differ in the linear order of adverb and verb.
For the younger group there were two additional slides, that repeated the same concept using a metaphor. Using a cartoon of a bee, they were told that the bee (the verb) collects pollen from the flowers (inflection) and then takes it to its hive. In Italian, there are six flowers and so the bee has enough pollen to take back to hive and thus moves itself to a higher position (being the hive on a tree and the flowers on the ground), while in English there are only two flowers, the pollen is not enough and thus the bee doesn't take it to the hive and stays at ground level.
At this point they were shown two sentences, one with a lexical verb and the other with an auxiliary verb, which seemed to contradict what had been said so far. It was pointed out though that the verbs in question were not the same kind of verbs one being auxiliary and the other not. They were shown the structures again and told that in the structure auxiliary verbs have their own position which is higher than the one of non auxiliary verbs. Thus in Italian the verb always precedes the adverb, either because it is already high (auxiliary) or because it moves (lexical), while in English the verb only precedes the adverb when it has a high position, that is when it is an auxiliary verb, given that verbs with a low position (lexical verbs) don't move.

1.2.3 Post-tests

Subjects of both groups were tested immediately after the explanations (First Post-test) and after approximately ten weeks (Second Post-test) during which the subjects were not exposed to any kind of explanation on adverb placement, nor were they given any explicit exercise on the subject. Both for reasons of time and the subjects' willingness, in the first Post-test each subject was randomly given only one exercise out of the six that made up the test, while in the Second Post-test phase each of them was given the entire test, as in the Pretest phase.

2. Results

2.1 Results of the First Post-test

The descriptive explanation seemed to have had no effect at all in the younger group, where non target answers decreased but were replaced by omissions as the chart shows

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

Table 2
2^D

	Target	Non Target	Omissions
Pretest	28	41	5
1° Post-test	28	34	12

Subjects of the younger group that were exposed to the 'linguistic' explanation showed a great improvement, doubling target answers and decreasing omissions and non target answers

Table 3
2^F

	Target	Non Target	Omissions
Pretest	21	34	32
1° Post-test	**40**	24	23

Among the older group, both sets of subjects improved, however the subjects who received the linguistic explanations improved more. Subjects exposed to the descriptive explanation achieved a slightly higher rate of target answers compared to the Pretest results, but still produced a quite high number of **non target** answers (**32**%)

Table 4
3^A

	Target	Non Target	Omissions
Pretest	50	37	3
1° Post-test	59	29	2

On the contrary, subjects who received the linguistic explanation achieved double the number of target answers and produced a much lower percentage of **non target** answers (**13**%)

Table 5
3^B

	Target	Non Target	Omissions
Pretest	35	34	2
1° Post-test	**61**	**9**	1

Results of the first Post-test support the hypothesis of the experiment, showing that the linguistic explanation, which involves the deep computational mechanisms of language, is more effective that the descriptive one, at an immediate level.

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

2.2 Results of the Second Post-test

Results of the second Post-test also support the experiment hypothesis. After ten weeks, the younger group of subjects who had received the descriptive explanation had reverted to the level at which they had begun and in some cases to an even poorer level.

Fig. 1




Table 6

2^D

	Target	Non Target	Omissions
Pretest	28	41	5
1° Post-test	28	34	12
2° Post-test	**25**	**40**	9

By contrast, the younger group of subjects who were exposed to the linguistic explanation, not only improved immediately after it but, more importantly, retained that improvement over time

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

Fig. 2




Table 7

2^F

	Target	Non Target	Omissions
Pretest	21	34	32
1° Post-test	**40**	24	23
2° Post-test	**36**	27	24

Comparison between the younger groups

Table 8

	TARGET		NON TARGET		OMISSIONS	
	Pretest	2°Post-Test	Pretest	2°Post-Test	Pretest	2°Post-Test
2^D	34%	33%	57%	55%	9%	12%
2^F	28%	**39**%	46%	**44**%	26%	**17**%

Results from the older groups showed even more clearly the greater efficiency of the linguistic explanation.
Subjects who received the descriptive explanation showed a slight improvement right after the explanation (First Post-test) but, after ten weeks (Second Post-test) their target answers dropped and non target answers increased. Their general performance though, was still better than their starting point.
This improvement might be due to the fact that the researcher used a different technique from the one found in text books with the descriptive group, explaining that adverb placement varied according to whether they were dealing with lexical verbs or with auxiliary verbs. The older group may have found this insight into the generalisation of adverb behaviours more valuable, hence their improvement.

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

Fig. 3





Table 9

3^A

	Target	Non Target	Omissions
Pretest	50	37	3
1° Post-test	59	29	2
2° Post-test	**51**	**37**	2

The most outstanding results are those obtained by the older group that received the linguistic explanation. While they had already improved in the First Post-test, more importantly, they retained their improvement over time, as the graph and the charts show

Fig. 4



BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

Table 10
3^B

	Target	Non Target	Omissions
Pretest	35	34	2
1° Post-test	**61**	**9**	1
2° Post-test	**60**	**11**	0

Comparison between the older groups
Table 11

	TARGET		NON TARGET		OMISSIONS	
	Pretest	2°Post-Test	Pretest	2°Post-Test	Pretest	2°Post-Test
3^A	54%	60%	39%	36%	7%	4%
3^B	55%	**79**%	51%	**19**%	4%	**2**%

3. Discussion
Results from both the younger and the older groups support the hypothesis of the experiment.
Within the younger group, the traditional explanation seemed to be effective neither immediately nor in the longer term. The group scored 34% of target answers in the Pretest and after ten weeks the percentage was almost the same at 33%.
The linguistic explanation offered to 2^F had a remarkable effect immediately (subjects doubled their target answers, 21 vs. 40). Although this learning was not completely retained after ten weeks, they performed better than 2^D in the longer term. From an initial **28**% of target answers of the Pretest the group achieved **39**% in the Second Post-test.
For the older group, subjects who were given the traditional explanation showed a slight improvement both at the immediate level and in the longer term, increasing from 54% of target answers in the Pretest to 60% in the Second Post-test. The most outstanding results were those of the older subjects who were given the linguistic explanation, who not only improved at the immediate level but, more importantly, retained the improvement; from an initial **55**% of target answers in the Pretest, the percentage increased after ten weeks to **79**% of the Second Post-test.
Despite the fact that both groups who were given the linguistic explanation improved, they still produced some non target answers (44% for the younger group and 19% for the older group).
It is noteworthy though, to discuss the kind of non target answers produced by these subjects given that they seem to suggest that where there is a choice regarding adverb placement in English, native Italian speakers will choose an Italian pattern.

In the younger group, the most common non target sentence produced was *Usually she has a big breakfast* in the translation task (target sentence: *She usually has a big breakfast*). This sentence is not strictly wrong but it was considered non target both because it relies on prosody to be correct and also because none of the controls translated the sentence *Di solito fa una grande colazione* as *Usually she has a big*

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

breakfast. This non target sentence was produced by 14 out of 17 subjects, which increased the percentage of non target answers for this group. Furthermore, usually is the highest adverb in the hierarchy proposed by Cinque (1999)[8], something that renders the respective placement of verb and adverb more difficult.
Another non target sentence commonly produced by these subjects (11 out of 17) was *I eat only fresh fruit* in the single word placement in sentences task (target sentence: *I only eat fresh fruit*). This response was considered non target even if not wrong because none of the controls produced it.
Both these non target sentences greatly increased the percentage of non target answers for this group. In both cases, although they were considered non target, sentenced produced were not agrammatical. Possibly subjects preferred these structures because of their correspondence to their L1.
Another sentence that elicited a high percentage of non target responses (15 out of 17) was: Maths *tests aren't always difficult*. However, given the variety of non target word orders produced (*Maths tests always aren't difficult*, *Maths always tests aren't difficult*, *Always Maths tests aren't difficult*, *Maths tests aren't difficult always*) and the low percentage of non target responses to other sentences with auxiliaries, it is likely that the problem lies with the complexity of the sentence itself rather than the task of placing the adverb into the sentence.
Among the older group, the total of non target responses produced is much lower (19%) than that of the younger group. The highest percentage of non target answers was produced in response to usually (5 out of 12) and only (6 out of 12) just as for the younger group, for which what afore stated holds as well. In the correction task the most commonly (10 out of 12) missed correction was in the sentence *I enjoyed very much the party* which was considered correct (target sentence *I enjoyed the party very much*). The fact that subjects failed to correlate the absence of verb movement with the fact that no linguistic element can go between the verb and its direct object, and so consider correct the aforementioned sentence, supports the hypothesis put forward by White (1990) that in second language acquisition, instruction on a parameter is not enough to generalize the properties correlated with it.
A noteworthy aspect of the results was that neither group overgeneralized the rules they had been given. Even though they had been instructed on the fact that lexical verbs do not move and thus follow the adverb, none of the subjects produced the non target word order *She slowly walks to school* in the translation task, not even in the Pretest. The reason for this probably lies in that *slowly* is a 'low' adverb, so no

[8] In this work Cinque puts forward the idea of a universal hierarchy of adverbs which is part of the functional structure of every language. Adverbs are in the specifier of functional heads and so have a fixed position in the sentence, contrary to what was thought before Cinque when they were considered adjuncts. The hierarchy is as follows:

$Mood_{speech\ act}$ > $Mood_{evaluative}$ > $Mood_{evidential}$ > $Mod_{epistemic}$ > T(Past) > T(future) > $Mood_{irrealis}$ > $Asp_{habitual}$ > T(Anterior) > $Asp_{perfect}$ > $Asp_{retrospective}$ > $Asp_{durative}$ > $Asp_{progressive}$ > $Asp_{prospective}$ / Mod_{root} > Voice > $Asp_{celerative}$ > $Asp_{completive}$ > $Asp_{repetitive}$ > $Asp_{iterative}$

For a complete account of the argument see Cinque (1999). Adverbs and Functional heads. A cross-linguistic perspective. Oxford University Press, New York.

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

matter what kind of explanation subjects were given (linguistic or traditional), it was not able to deactivate the hierarchy in their UG. In addition, during the explanation phase only one adverb (often) was used as an example and subjects were then expected to rely on their UG for all the other adverbs.

4. Conclusion

Although further research is needed, results of this experiment seem to constitute evidence in support of the FT/FA theory. In the Pretest phase all of the subjects (with different percentages) extended verb movement to English, yet their adverbial hierarchy (Cinque, 1999) was perfectly accessible resulting in the absence of non target word orders with the low adverb *slowly*. Furthermore, the findings also support the hypothesis that a *linguistic* explanation of the linear differences between English and Italian, which takes into account and renders explicit the deep functioning of languages, is more effective than a traditional descriptive one, demonstrating the crucial role of linguistics in the field of language teaching.

References

Belletti A. (1990). Generalized verb movement. Torino, Rosenberg and Sellier.

Cinque, G. (1999). Adverbs and functional heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective. Oxford.University Press, New York.

Pollock, J.Y. (1989).Verb movement Universal Grammar and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry, 20: 365-424.*

White L. (1990). The verb movement parameter in second language acquisition. In *Language Acquisition, 1(4): 337-360.*

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

Appendix 1

Cod.

La tua lingua materna:

Se la tua lingua materna <u>non</u> è l'italiano:
- da quanti anni sei in Italia:
- che lingua parli a casa:

La tua età:

Da quanti anni studi inglese?

TEST 1

Dizionarietto:
raramente: rarely
si sveglia: wakes up
fa una grande colazione: has a big breakfast
passeggia: walks
incontra: meets
inizia: starts
cena: has dinner

TRADUCI

La giornata di Jane
Jane si sveglia sempre alle 6.00 perché le piace l'aria fresca del mattino. Di solito fa una grande colazione. Passeggia lentamente nel parco pubblico di fronte casa sua per mezz'ora e lì incontra spesso il suo amico Henry. Inizia a lavorare alle 9.00 e pranza raramente. Non è mai a casa prima delle 7.00. Cena intorno alle 8.00 e non va mai a letto dopo le 10.00.

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

TEST 2

Cod.

Dizionarietto:
frequently: frequentemente
alone: solo

ORDINA LE PAROLE PER FORMARE DELLE FRASI. RISCRIVI LE FRASI

1. car/ frequently/ travel/ we/ by
2. my/ cooked/ yesterday/ for/ I/ friends
3. play/ I/ and/ tennis/ also/ football/ play/ I
4. fruit/ eat/ only/ fresh/ I
5. never/ shopping/ go/ Saturdays/ I/ on
6. at/ alone/ rarely/ am/ house/ my/ I
7. like/cinema/ going/ I/ the/ to

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

TEST 3

Cod.

Dizionarietto:
told: ha detto
you claim: sostieni
rarely: raramente
found: abbiamo trovato
carefully: attentamente

CORREGGI GLI ERRORI, SE CE NE SONO

1. Your mother told me that you go often at the seaside.
2. I cleaned the house and cooked also the dinner.
3. You claim to go often to the pool, but I've seen you rarely there.
4. I have usually a shower when I get up.
5. We found easily the solution to that problem.
6. Steve get frequently angry with her girlfriend.
7. I do some shopping and I went also at the bank yesterday.
8. She always says she will phone me, but she never does.
9. I enjoyed very much the party yesterday.
10. Robert prepared carefully a nice, big picnic for his friends.

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

TEST 4

Cod.

Dizionarietto:
rarely: raramente
frequently: frequentemente
younger: più piccoli
bought: ha comprato
abroad: all'estero

<u>RISCRIVI</u> LE FRASI UTILIZZANDO LE PAROLE TRA PARENTESI

1. I go to bed after midnight. (rarely)
2. Susan does her homework before dinner. (frequently)
3. I have got two brothers. (younger)
4. Maths tests aren't difficult. (always)
5. I visit my grandparents every month. (French)
6. John is late for school. (never)
7. Yesterday my mother bought a table. (round)
8. Jenny has been abroad. (often)

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

TEST 5

Cod.

Dizionarietto:
even: nemmeno
bored: annoiato
both: entrambi
hate each other: si odiano

RISPONDI ALLE DOMANDE USANDO LE PAROLE DATE

1. What does Timothy have for breakfast? (an egg + usually)
2. Does Margaret watch a lot of television? (doesn't have a TV + even)
3. Why did James leave the party? (was bored + probably)
4. Does Sally like your new house? (has been there + never)
5. Why do Robert and George hate each other? (want to marry Alice + both)

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)

TEST 6

Cod.

Dizionarietto:
occasionally: raramente
seldom: quasi mai
early:presto
late:ritardo
ill:malato
a day off: un giorno libero

CREA DELLE FRASI RIGUARDO ANGELA E JOHN USANDO LE PAROLE NELLE RIGHE E GLI AVVERBI IN CIMA

	occasionally	**often**	**seldom**
Angela	arrives at work early	isn't in the office in the afternoon	has taken a day off
John	is late for work	is ill	eats sandwiches for lunch

BDD-A22712 © 2013 Centro Interdipartimentale di Studi Cognitivi sul Linguaggio
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:44:49 UTC)