Stop Using *That:* Expressing Definiteness in Korean

Susie Kim and Hyung-Jo Yoon
Second Language Studies, Michigan State University
susiekim@msu.edu

Abstract

Definiteness is visibly expressed by definite articles in English, but some languages such as Korean lack this morphological exponent. However, speakers of such languages still mark definiteness in different ways. In this proposal, we lay out a study that examines the (re)assembly required by L1-English L2-Korean learners where the formal feature of definiteness in the L1 has to be readjusted to indirect expressions in the L2. In particular, we propose to examine how L1-English learners distinctly interpret and produce the feature [definite] that has been coded overtly (demonstrative determiners) and covertly (word order change) in Korean. The participants' use of demonstrative and word order will be examined by using elicited production tasks and forced-choice selection tasks. We predict that the participants will perform more accurately on the demonstratives. We further hope to gain insights into how much detection, mapping, and reassembly of the linguistic feature have progressed through the experiments.

Keywords: definiteness, English-Korean interlanguage, feature reassembly, overt and covert feature encoding

---

In the field of second language acquisition (SLA), a large body of research has investigated the acquisition of formal features (see Bley-Vroman, 2009; White, 2003). This line of research has primarily looked into whether adult second language learners have the capacity to acquire a feature in the second language (L2) whose counterpart does not exist in their first language (L1). One of the recent, central hypotheses on L2 feature acquisition is the Representational Deficit Hypothesis (RDH) (Hawkins and Chan, 1997). According to the RDH, L2 learners cannot acquire formal features (though limited to uninterpretable ones such as agreement markings) that exist in the L2 but not in their L1, because the features were not selected during L1 acquisition. However, feature acquisition might not all be described as a binary concept of success or failure. Lardiere (2008, 2009) claimed that L2 learners are capable of detecting the differences that exist between a certain formal feature in the L1 and L2, and the difficulty of acquiring the feature lies in correctly assembling the formal differences and determining proper environments for such items.

In this proposal, we use the Feature Reassembly approach to look into L2 learners' acquisition of a formal feature, definiteness. We propose to investigate learners whose L1 marks definiteness in its morphology, but whose L2 expresses this feature in other ways: native speakers of English learning Korean. Definiteness is visibly indicated by definite articles in English, but Korean lacks this morphological exponent. However, Korean speakers will still

mark definiteness in several different ways such as using demonstratives and different word orders. This paper lays out a study that examines the (re)assembly required by L2-Korean learners where the formal feature in the L1 has to be readjusted to indirect expressions in the target language.

Background

Feature Reassembly Hypothesis

Many studies (e.g., Montrul & Slabakova, 2003; Slabakova, 2003 *inter alia*) have shown clear evidence for syntax-semantic mismatches in SLA, to suggest that language acquisition involves more complex processes than described by the advocates of the RDH. A syntax-semantics mismatch refers to an interlingual difference in the way some universal meanings (e.g., plurality, tense, definiteness) are expressed (Slabakova, 2008). Thus, L2 learners have to acquire the new ways in which such universal meanings are expressed in the target language (TL).

Based on such evidence, Lardiere (2008, 2009) noted the need to move beyond a general emphasis on the role of a feature's existence in the L1 in explaining feature acquisition in the TL, and proposed the Feature Reassembly approach. This approach allows for a more detailed explanation of complex language systems in relation to features. Lardiere argued that a major source of difficulty in acquiring the L2 involves acquiring features that are expressed in the TL differently from in the L1. According to her model, L2 learners first need to identify similar patterns between the L1 and the TL in terms of the linguistic expression of certain features. Identification of similarities between the two languages leads learners to map the L1 feature set onto the morpholexical item of the TL. After this process of detection and mapping, learners may go through the next step of reassembling features and adjusting the association between the feature set and the TL item on the basis of the language input they have received.

An L1-English speaker's acquisition of the demonstrative determiner *ku* in Korean is an example of this reassembly process. *Ku*, as a demonstrative, expresses definiteness in anaphoric contexts, so English sentences containing definiteness markers (e.g., *the* or *that*) in anaphoric noun phrases can be translated into Korean using *ku*, as in (1) and (2). Based on such evidence indicating that the two English items, *the* and *that*, can be lexicalized into one single expression, *ku*, in Korean, L1-English speakers may initially link the functions of *the* and *that* to those of *ku*.

(1) I read a book yesterday. *The* book was really interesting.
    Ne-ga eujae chek-ul ilgutsseo. *Ku* chek jungmal jaemisseuseo.

(2) Mike bought a new chair. *That* chair was comfortable.
    Mike-ga se euija-lul satta. *Ku* euija peonhaetta.

However, with more experience with the language, the learners may encounter some input against this one-to-one functional mapping and begin to realize that the association between *the/that* with *ku* does not always hold true. For instance, a definite article expressing uniqueness does not correspond to *ku* in Korean, as in (3) and (4). Given this type of input, L1-English learners of Korean can reassemble their direct link between definite article and the feature [definite] into the optional use of *ku*, depending on the specific meaning of definiteness (e.g., *ku*

presented in anaphoric contexts but not when expressing unique existence). We will discuss definiteness more in detail in the next section.

> (3) *The* sun is shining.
>   Taeyang-i bitnanda.

> (4) How is *the* weather?
>   Nalssi eottea?

Cho and Slabakova (2014) argued that somewhat different explanations are needed for semantic features (e.g., [number]) in contrast to the acquisition of syntactic features (e.g., [case]). It is possible that a particular meaning is lexicalized in some languages while not in other languages, regardless of whether the meaning can be expressed and communicated by speakers. Along with the optionality of lexical markedness, there is a limited correspondence between a syntactic form and a semantic feature (e.g., one semantic feature [definite] expressed through several different morpholexical items (*the* or *that*), or even at different levels of overtness (word order or demonstratives in some languages). This lack of consensus in expressing a given meaning creates difficulty in fully acquiring the expression of semantic features. Thus, we can predict that L2 learners will struggle with detecting and reassembling the expression of a semantic function, especially when these acquisition processes involve unequal numbers of morpholexical markers between the L1 and the TL.

Definiteness

Definiteness includes various semantic components, such as uniqueness, familiarity, and existence (Heim, 1991). The majority of studies have looked into the acquisition of this feature (i.e., article use) in English as the L2 by article-less L1 speakers such as Korean, Chinese, Japanese, or Russian (e.g., Ionin, Ko, & Wexler, 2004; Ko, Ionin, & Wexler, 2010; Liu & Gleason, 2002; Robertson, 2000, *inter alia*). The research has commonly shown L2 learners' erroneous use and omission of articles (see García-Mayo & Hawkins, 2009, for an overview). Regarding infelicitous article use, specifically, researchers have observed overuse of the definite article *the* in indefinite contexts that requires *a/an* (e.g., Huebner, 1983; Thomas, 1989). A systematic analysis by Ionin et al. (2004) has further demonstrated that the two prevalent types of L2 learners' article-related errors (i.e., overuse of *the* in indefinite contexts and overuse of *a/an* in definite contexts) can be attributed to the presence or absence of any of the two features in meaning: [specific] and [definite]. For example, in a definite context, L2 learners tended to overuse an indefinite article when [specific] is nonexistent (see Ionin et al., 2004, for a detailed explanation).

While several different explanations have been proposed for article-less L1 learners' selection of English articles (Goad & White, 2008; Ionin et al., 2004; Robertson, 2000), the present study, adopting the Feature Reassembly approach as a framework, attempts to contribute to this line of research by focusing on a semantic feature [definite] and exploring its potential morphosyntactic representation and interpretation in an article-less language, Korean.

Indirect markings of definiteness. In discussing the feature [definite] in English, researchers have explored the use and functions of the definite article *the* and demonstrative determiner *that*, given the semantic similarity they share as markers expressing definiteness (more specifically, uniqueness) (e.g., Kang, 2005; Kim & Lakshmanan, 2009). Here, the use of

the and *that* has been regarded as the *overt* encoding of definiteness that involves lexicalization (Slabakova, 2009). With a more specific categorization, however, the definite article is a *direct* expression of the feature [definite], while the demonstrative determiner is an *indirect* expression of [definite], which has its primary semantic feature other than [definite] (Cho & Slabakova, 2014). According to Cho and Slabakova (2014), these expressions with different primary semantic features lead to somewhat inconsistent mapping, making the full acquisition of the feature more difficult.

For example, in an experimental study with L1-Chinese L2-English learners, Robertson (2000) discovered learners' overuse of demonstratives and underuse of definite articles in contexts where the definite determiner fit better. Based on this finding, Robertson argued that L1 lexical transfer might have played an important role, leading article-less L1 speakers to use demonstratives to express the meaning associated with the definite article. In an attempt to expand the findings of Robertson (2000), Ionin et al. (2012) explored how L1-Korean L2-English learners distinguish between *the* and *that* by employing comprehension and production tasks. Their primary assumption was that, although almost identical in some contexts (sharing the meanings related to uniqueness; Roberts, 2002; Wolter, 2006), definite articles and demonstratives differ in the way of establishing uniqueness. That is, "while definite descriptions denote uniquely in the discourse, demonstrative descriptions denote uniquely relative to the immediately salient context" through explicit demonstration (Ionin et al., 2012, p. 75). For example, in (5), there are two women described in the discourse, so the use of *the woman* is infelicitous (from Wolter, 2006), while in (6) one woman was uniquely identified in the discourse, making it the better option to use *the woman* instead of *that woman* (from Roberts, 2002).

(5) A woman entered from stage left. Another woman entered from stage right. That/this/*the woman was carrying a basket of flowers.

(6) The curtain rose. A woman and a man came onto the stage. Then, the/*that woman started singing and dancing.

The findings of Ionin et al. (2012) showed that L1-Korean learners distinguished between definite articles and demonstratives to some extent, but their capability of this distinction was less accurate than that of the native English speakers'. The researchers have also found that low-level L1-Korean learners regarded definite articles and demonstratives as interchangeable. What we can infer from their findings is that L2 learners may have a great difficulty in acquiring a new target morpholexical item (here, the definite article) that does not exist in the L1 (i.e., learning direction from absence to presence). Then, the question we pose is: What about the acquisition of morpholexical items for [definite] in an article-less language (i.e., opposite learning direction, from presence to absence)? To what extent would L1-English learners experience difficulty in acquiring how [definite] feature is expressed in an article-less language?

Overt encoding of definiteness: Demonstrative determiner in Korean. Korean has three demonstrative determiners: *i* 'this' (a proximal form), *cheo* 'that over there' (a distal form) and *ku* 'that' (a neutral form; close to hearer or known to both speaker and hearer) (Sohn, 1999, p. 210, as cited in Ionin, Baek, Kim, Ko, & Wexler, 2012). Korean demonstratives behave like those of English and all of them can be used in deictic contexts (Chang, 1996; Ionin et al., 2012). Whereas cheo 'that over there' can be used only in deictic contexts, *i* 'this' and *ku* 'that' can be

used in both deictic and anaphoric contexts. In this paper, we focus on the determiner *ku* specifically because it has some of the functions associated with the English definite determiner. While its main characteristic is that of a demonstrative determiner, it can behave like the English definite article *the* in non-anaphoric contexts as can be seen in examples (1) and (2) above.

Both *the* and *that*, when used in anaphoric contexts as in the examples above, are translated as *ku* in Korean. As Kim and Lakshmanan (2009) argue, such input can lead L1-Korean L2-English learners (at least at the initial stage) to equate both *the* and *that* with *ku*. The use of articles has long been posed as a challenge for speakers of article-less languages in learning English (see, among many others, Ionin & Montrul, 2010; Ionin et al., 2012 for L1 Korean; Butler, 2002; Hawkins et al., 2006 for L1 Japanese; Lardiere, 2008; Robertson, 2000; White, 2008 for L1 Chinese). This is not only because their L1 lacks articles but because contexts which are compatible with *ku* in Korean may correspond only with *the*, only with *that*, or with both in English.[1] While such issues related to L2-English articles and (overuse of) English demonstrative *that* have been robustly investigated in the field of SLA, research in the opposite direction is scarce. In this study we explore if L1-English L2-Korean learners exhibit the same phenomenon in the reverse direction: using *ku* in environments where they would use *the*, but *that* doesn't work. (7) is an example of where an assumed 'unique being' (C. Lee, 1994, p. 326), ('the owner') appears with an anaphoric noun phrase ('this store') that has already been talked about as an antecedent. This kind of definiteness is realized as a definite article in English but as a zero definite element in Korean (C. Lee, 1994).

(7) (*ku) jooin-ul molla.
     (*that) owner-ACC don't know
     'I don't know the owner (of this store).'

In this case, L1-English L2-Korean learners whose L1 overtly marks the feature [definite] have to reassemble their L1 morphemes into zero determiner, or modify the noun which is unique with other means such as a relative clause. Definiteness is often expressed through context and discourse, therefore the definiteness should be understood with the noun phrase alone. Another grammatical component that helps speakers and listeners identify the definite entity in Korean is the use of relative clause, which is a pre-modifier of the following head of the noun phrase (C. Lee, 1994). However, we focus on whether L1-English learners transfer their L1 morpheme *the* into *ku*, and therefore stimuli are constructed to avoid the use of relative clause in order to investigate learners' (in)correct use of *ku*.

Covert encoding of definiteness in Korean: Word order. In addition to the overt encoding of [definite] with morpholexical expressions, some languages have covert ways to express this feature that can be achieved without additional morpholexical items (Cho & Slabakova, 2014). One way of covert [definite] marking is to scramble a default word order. The main function of word order in English is to identify grammatical functions in a sentence. With no morphology marking the function of constituents, the order in which constituents appear would determine the meaning of a sentence. In so-called free word order languages such as German, Hindi, Japanese and Korean, constituents can appear in a variety of surface orders without changing the core meaning of the sentence (E. Lee, 2007). However, the canonical order

---

[1] Though 'uniqueness' is an important characteristic which differentiates *the* from *that* in English, we will not discuss it in this paper since English is not the target language here (see Ionin et al., 2012 for more information).

for Korean is SOV and there is a preferred constituent order depending on the information structure, such as topic and focus. Topic and focus deal with given/known and new/unknown information (Chang, 1996). In Korean, topic noun phrases appear in the sentence initial position and therefore can result in the OSV word order if the object of the sentence is the given/known information (Chang, 1996; C. Lee, 1994; Suh, 2005). In other words, word order can encode (in)definiteness in a sentence. Consider the example (8) and (9):

> (8) Abba-ga gong-ul chat-da
>   Dad-NOM ball-ACC kick-PAST
>   'Dad kicked a ball.'

> (9) gong-ul appa-ga chat-da
>   ball-ACC Dad-NOM kick-PAST
>   'Dad kicked the ball.'

The object *gong* 'ball' endows itself a definite interpretation in (9), while in canonical order (i.e., SOV as in (8)) gives the object an indefinite interpretation; hence the English translation 'a ball' in (8) and 'the ball' in (9). In fact, the OSV sentence would sound unnatural if there is no context and would be most natural if it was uttered as a response to a question such as: "Who kicked the ball?"

During the course of acquisition, L1-English speakers who have a fixed word order and mark definiteness overtly with articles would have to realize that different word orders have different informational structures. They have to learn that, in general, the (in)definite interpretation of nominals in Korean is determined through word order and the object will be interpreted as definite in the OSV order.

The Present Study

Cho and Slabakova (2014) predicted that it would be more difficult to acquire the feature [definite] when it is coded covertly compared to when coded overtly, primarily due to the inconsistent input of the former. However, to our knowledge, empirical research on this topic is scarce in the field of SLA. In this study, we examine how L1-English learners distinctly interpret and produce the feature [definite] that has been coded overtly (demonstrative determiners) and covertly (word order change) in Korean. In particular, we approach the acquisition of this feature through Feature Reassembly Hypothesis which will help us map out the (re)assembly required by L2 Korean learners where the [definite] morphological exponent has to be readjusted to the indirect expressions in the target language.

Methodology

Participants

The participants will include four groups: a control group of 30 native speakers of Korean, 60 L1-English L2-Korean learners broken down into low proficiency level (N=20), intermediate level (N=20), and advanced level (N=20). The learners will be recruited from six different university-associated Korean language institutes located in Seoul, South Korea. All the Korean language institutes offer courses for six levels, from 1 to 6, and the levels are generally compatible across different institutions to meet the required elements of the Test of Proficiency in Korean (TOPIK). The low proficiency group will be recruited from level 2 and 3 classes, the

intermediate group from level 4, and the advanced group from level 5 and 6. The L2 learners will be adult learners who have started learning Korean after age 14. Heritage-learners of Korean will be excluded. In addition, we will collect basic demographic information such as age, gender, foreign language learning experiences, length of Korean language study, and length of residence in Korea.

Materials and Procedure

Two different types of task, an elicited production task and a forced-choice selection task will be tested on two encoding types of definiteness (i.e., use of demonstrative and word order), respectively. Each task will consist of 12 items (12 items x 2 task types x 2 encoding types = 48 items) and each item will present a context. Both elicited and forced-choice selection tasks for demonstrative will have six items in which using the demonstrative *ku* would be appropriate (examples (10a) and (11a)), and another six where it should not be used (examples (10b) and (11b)). For word order tasks, six items will present the object of the test sentence as definite (known, examples ((12a) and (13a)) and the other six as indefinite (unknown, examples (12b) and (13b)). The items will be in Korean, though the prompts will feature English translations to prevent possible misunderstanding of the instruction. The order of encoding types will be counterbalanced for the participants, but the elicited production tasks will always be conducted before the forced-choice tasks to prevent the participants from finding out what they are being tested on.

The elicited production task will provide a list of words and ask the participants to choose relevant words and use them to form a full sentence.[2] By doing so, the task will be structured and controlled for the participants to use or not use the target element *ku* and make them focus on selecting the right words and providing appropriate case markers.

(10) Elicited production task for demonstrative

a. Anaphoric, *ku 'that'* should be selected (n = 6)
        Kyle: What are you reading?
        Hanna: *Kafka on the Shore*. Have you read it?
        Kyle: No, but I want to read it.

        Question: What does Kyle think about the book?

        Prompt: Please create a sentence to answer the question. Selecting the relevant words from the box and only use those words. (Do not use any words that are not in the box).

        ┌───┐
        │ 책(book), 재미있다(to be interesting), 쓰다(to write), 카일(Kyle), │
        │ 그(that), 읽고 싶다(to want to read)   │
        └───┘

        Kyle-NOM *ku* book-ACC want to read.
        ('Kyle wants to read that/the book.')

---

[2] The prompt includes unrelated words because if 'that' is not provided, the participants might not use it at all, but if only 'that' is optional, that could give away the target is the use of 'that'.

b. Non-anaphoric, [-definite], *ku 'that'* should be rejected (n = 6)
   June: Can you bring my bag when you come here?
   Mom: Sure, where is it?
   June: It's on the table next to my desk.

   Question: Where is June's bag?

   Prompt: Please create a sentence to answer the question. Selecting the relevant words from the box and only use those words. (Do not use any words that are not in the box).

   > 준의 가방(June's bag), 탁자(table), 그(that), 있다(to be),
   >
   > 교실(classroom), 위(on)

   June's bag-NOM table on be.
   ('June's bag is on the table.')

Having the determiner *ku* before 'book' is preferred in the response to the question, because the book has been stated in the question (10a). On the other hand, *ku* should not be used in (10b) because the table has not been mentioned in the question . However, due to the established familiarity from the provided context, the response in English would select *the* to refer to the table and this may cause the participants to use *ku* when they should not.

(11) Forced-choice selection task for demonstrative

a. Anaphoric, *ku 'that'* should be selected (n = 6)
   Dan: What did you do during the weekend?
   Andy: I like Star Wars so much that I watched all four of them again.

   Dan asked:

   a) 진짜? 그 영화 얼마나 자주 봐?
   ('Really? How often do you watch the/that movie?')

   b) 진짜? 영화 얼마나 자주 봐?
   ('Really? How often do you watch movie?')

b. Non-anaphoric, [-definite], *ku 'that'* should be rejected (n = 6)
   Sunny: What's wrong?
   Noah: My computer doesn't work. I can't see anything.

   Sunny asked:

   a) 음.. 모니터 켰어?
   ('Hmm.. did you turn on monitor?')

   b) 음.. 그 모니터 켰어?
   ('Hmm.. did you turn on the monitor?')

For (11b), it is assumed that there will be a monitor where there is a computer and therefore an English sentence will have *the* even though the *monitor* has never been mentioned in the exchanges leading up to the question. In Korean, an assumed unique being will receive a zero definite unless it has been mentioned before. Therefore, *ku* should not be used with *monitor*.

The elicited production word order task will ask the participants to use all the words provided. Because the known information is likely to be omitted in the response, it is necessary to require the participants to use all the words to examine what word order they use. The words will be scrambled for each item to prevent the participants from being influenced by the order they see.

Following are the tasks for word order. In (12a) and (13a), the questions provide the subjects, Dad and Sam, and therefore they will be known information and [+definite] in the response. On the other hand, the objects are focused and indefinite. Therefore, the given information, subject will come first as realized in SOV word order.

(12) Elicited production task for word order

a. Object as focus, indefinite: Subject in sentence initial position (SOV) (n = 6)
    Ina was very hungry on her way back home and wondered what her husband was preparing for dinner. So she texted her son: What is Dad cooking tonight?

    Prompt: Please use all of the words in the box to create your response.

    The text said:

    ┌───┐
    │ 요리하다(to cook), 아빠(Dad), 불고기(Bulgogi)   │
    └───┘

    Dad-NOM Bulgogi-ACC cook.PRES.PROG
    ('Dad is cooking Bulgogi')

b. Object as [+definite], known: OSV (n = 6)
    Eugene came home and saw a sandwich on the dining table. So he asked his daughter: Who made sandwich?

    Daughter said:

    ┌───┐
    │ 샌드위치(sandwich), 만들다(to make), 엄마(Mom)   │
    └───┘

    Sandwich-ACC Mom-NOM make.PAST
    ('Mom made the sandwich')

(13) Forced-choice task for word order

a. Object as focus, indefinite: SOV word order (n = 6)
    Anne went to buy a sweater for her brother but didn't know which color he liked. So she texted her Mom: What color does Sam like?

a) Sam-NOM green-ACC likes.
('Sam likes green')

b) Green-ACC Sam-NOM likes.
('Sam likes green')

c) All of the above

b. Object as [+definite]: OSV (n = 6)
Joe left an apple on the dining table in the morning but it was gone when he came back home. So he asked his wife: Who ate (the) apple?

a) Lyn-NOM apple-ACC eat.PAST.
('Lyn ate the apple')
b) Apple-ACC Lyn-NOM eat.PAST.
('Lyn ate the apple')
c) All of the above

In context (12b) and (13b), the subjects 'who' are unknown indefinite, and objects are given and definite. Thus, the preferred word order is OSV. If participants select 'All of the above' as the answer, it would indicate that they have not acquired the covert encoding of definiteness through word order.

Statistical analysis

To examine the extent to which L1-English learners have acquired the use of demonstratives and word order, we will compute a two-way ANOVA with participant group (4) and encoding type (2) as two predictor variables, separately for each task (forced choice and elicited production). This analysis will present results related to different levels of the acquisition of indirect definite (demonstratives) and covert definite (word order) descriptions as well as those related to the effect of participant group (nativeness and proficiency) on the degree of acquisition. The two-way ANOVA will be followed by post-hoc analyses to pinpoint the location of significance among participant groups. We will also run a series of paired t-tests with task type as a predictor variable in order to measure the effect of task type on L1-English learners' performance.

As described above, the majority of this line of SLA research has focused on the direct expression and overt encoding of the feature [definite]. Thus, our attempt to answer the present research questions could help further advance our understanding of how English-L1 learners acquire syntactic and lexical representations intended to express definiteness in an article-less language.

<div align="center">

Predicted Results

</div>

We predict that the learners will perform more accurately on the demonstrative determiners, the overtly encoded version of [definite] feature than on the word order, which is covert. As Ionin et al. (2012) discussed, learners may perform differently in an elicited production task and in a comprehension task, and our prediction in the present study is that the participants will perform better in comprehension tasks than production tasks, with an increasing

level of acquisition along their proficiency levels. However, Cho and Slabakova (2014) have not found a linear relationship between the proficiency level and the acquisition of Russian word order with their felicity judgment tasks. We hope to obtain less obscure and more explainable findings with the elicitation and forced-choice tasks.

Further, we expect the results of this study will help understand the developmental patterns of a formal feature in the language learners' minds. From the Feature Reassembly point of view, in particular, we may gain insights into how much detection, mapping, and reassembly of the linguistic feature expressions have progressed.

Further expansion of the research

The current study proposes only one L1 language group; however, it would provide more insight into the Feature Reassembly Hypothesis and the cline of learning difficulty proposed by Cho and Slabakova (2014) if we include different language groups such as Japanese and Chinese as L1s. For instance, Cho and Slabakova state that the acquisition of the functional feature [definite] which is realized through context (e.g., discourse and word order) in the TL will be relatively easier for learners who have an overt morphological exponent of the feature (e.g., English) than for learners whose L1 (such as Japanese or Chinese) do not have the morphological means to encode [definite] (see Cho & Slabakova, 2014, pp. 165-166). Including different L1 groups that represent different types of learning situations (described by Slabakova (2009) and Cho and Slabakova (2014) as the cline of difficulty in functional feature acquisition) and also have different means to express the target feature, would further add depth and breadth in understanding the mapping required and executed by L2 learners.

References

Bley-Vroman, R. (2009). The evolving context of the Fundamental Difference Hypothesis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 31*, 175-198.

Butler, Y. G. (2002). Second language learners' theories on the use of English articles. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *24*, 451-480.

Chang, S-J. (1996). *Korean*. John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Cho, J., & Slabakova, R. (2014). Interpreting definiteness in a second language without articles: The case of L2 Russian. *Second Language Research, 30*, 159-190.

García-Mayo, M. P., & Hawkins, R. (2009). *Second language acquisition of articles: Empirical findings and theoretical implications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goad, H., & White, L. (2008). Prosodic structure and the representation of L2 functional morphology: A nativist approach. *Lingua, 118*, 577–594.

Hawkins, R., & Chan, C. Y. H. (1997). The partial availability of Universal Grammar in second language acquisition: The 'failed functional features hypothesis'. *Second Language Research, 13*, 187-226.

Hawkins, R., Al-Eid, S., Almahboob, I., Athanasopoulos, P., Chaengchenkit, R., Hu, J., Rezai, M., Jaensch, C., Jeon, Y., Jiang A., Leung, Y. I., Matsunaga, K., Ortega, M., Sarko, G.,

Snape, N., & Velasco-Zárate, K. (2006). Accounting for English article interpretation by L2 speakers. *EUROSLA yearbook*, *6*, 7-25.

Heim, I. (1991). Artikel und definitheit [Articles and definiteness]. In A. Stechow & D. Wunderlich (Eds.), *Semantics: An international handbook of contemporary research* (pp. 487-535). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Huebner, T. (1983). *A longitudinal analysis of the acquisition of English*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.

Ionin, T., Baek, S., Kim, E., Ko, H., & Wexler, K. (2012). That's not so different from the: Definite and demonstrative descriptions in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research, 28*, 69-101.

Ionin, T., Ko, H., & Wexler, K. (2004). Article semantics in L2-acquisition: The role of specificity. *Language Acquisition, 12*, 3-69.

Ionin, T., & Montrul, S. (2010). The role of L1-transfer in the interpretation of articles with definite plurals in L2-English. *Language Learning, 60*, 877-925.

Kang, J. (2005). Written narratives as an index of L2 competence in Korean EFL learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 259-279.

Kim, K., & Lakshmanan, U. (2009). The processing role of the article choice parameter: Evidence from L2 learners of English. In M. P. García-Mayo & R. Hawkins (Eds.), *Second language acquisition of articles: Empirical findings and theoretical implications* (pp. 87-113). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ko, H., Ionin, T., & Wexler, K. (2010). The role of presuppositionality in the second language acquisition of English articles. *Linguistic Inquiry, 41*, 213-254.

Lardiere, D. (2008). Feature-assembly in second language acquisition. In J. Liceras, H. Goodluck, & Z. Hobl (Eds.), *The role of formal features in second language acquisition* (pp. 107-140). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lardiere, D. (2009). Some thoughts on the contrastive analysis of features in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research, 25*, 173-227.

Lee, C. (1994). Definite/Specific and Case Marking in Korean. In Y-K. Kim-Renaud (Ed.), *Theoretical issues in Korean linguistics* (pp. 325-341). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lee, E. (2007). A semantic restriction on scrambling in Korean. *LSO Working Papers in Linguistics, 6*, Madison, WI: Department of Linguistics, University of Wisconsin.

Liu, D., & Gleason, J. (2002). Acquisition of the article the by non-native speakers of English: An analysis of four nongeneric uses. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24,* 1-26.

Montrul, S., & Slabakova, R. (2003). Competence similarities between native and near-native speakers: An investigation of the preterit/imperfect contrast in Spanish. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*, 351-398.

Roberts, C. (2002). Demonstratives as definites. In K. van Deemter & R. Kibble (Eds.),
        Information sharing (pp. 89–136). Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Robertson, D. (2000). Variability in the use of the English article system by Chinese learners of
        English. *Second Language Research, 16*, 135-172.

Slabakova, R. (2003). Semantic evidence for functional categories in interlanguage grammars.
        Second Language Research, 19, 42-75.

Slabakova, R. (2008). *Meaning in the second language*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Slabakova, R. (2009). Features or parameters: Which one makes SLA easier, and more
        interesting to study? *Second Language Research, 25*, 313-324.

Suh, E. (2005). The nominal phrase in Korean: The role of D in a 'determiner-less' language.
        Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics, 24, 10-19.

Thomas, M. (1989) The acquisition of English articles by first- and second language learners.
        Applied Psycholinguistics, 10, 335-355.

White, L. (2003). *Second language acquisition and Universal Grammar*. New York: Cambridge
        University Press.

White, L. (2008). Different? Yes. Fundamentally? No. Definiteness effects in the L2 English of
        Mandarin speakers. In R. Slabakova et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th Generative
        Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference (GASLA 2007)* (pp. 251-261).
        Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Wolter, L. (2006). That's that: The semantics and pragmatics of demonstrative noun phrases.
        Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of California at Santa Cruz, CA, USA.