

**MORPHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT IN
THE INTERLANGUAGE OF
ENGLISH LEARNERS OF XHOSA**

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

of

RHODES UNIVERSITY

by

CAROL BONNIN HOBSON

December 1999

The financial assistance of the Joint Research Committee of Rhodes University is gratefully
acknowledged.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the development of morphology in the interlanguage of English learners of Xhosa. A quasi-longitudinal research design is used to trace development in the oral interlanguage of six learners of Xhosa for a period of eight months. The elicitation tasks employed range from fairly unstructured conversation tasks to highly structured sentence-manipulation tasks. The learners have varying levels of competence at the beginning of the study and they are exposed to input mainly in formal contexts of learning.

One of the aims of the study is to investigate whether the features of interlanguage identified in other studies appear in the learner language in this study. Most other studies discussed in the literature have investigated the features of the interlanguage produced by learners of analytic and inflectional languages. However, this study analyses the interlanguage of learners of an agglutinative language.

Studies of other languages have concluded that learners do not use inflectional or agreement morphology at early stages of development and this conclusion is tested for learners of an agglutinative language in this study. Since agreement and inflectional morphology play a central role in conveying meaning in Xhosa, it is found that learners use morphology from the beginning of the learning process. Although forms may be used incorrectly and the functions of forms may be restricted, morphemes appear in the interlanguage of learners of this study earlier than other studies predict.

One of the characteristics of early interlanguage and an early form of learner language called the Basic Variety (Klein & Perdue 1997) is the lack of morphology, but this feature proves to be inadequate as a measure of early development in the interlanguage of learners of a language such as Xhosa. This study concludes, therefore, that the presence of morphology in the interlanguage of learners of Xhosa cannot be an indicator of advanced language development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	i
LIST OF APPENDICES	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background to the study	1
1.2 Aims	3
1.3 Outline of the thesis	3
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.0 Introduction	5
2.1 Contrastive Analysis	6
2.1.1 Main tenets of contrastive analysis	6
2.1.2 Problems with contrastive analysis	6
2.1.3 The relevance of contrastive analysis	8
2.1.4 Conclusion	9
2.2 Error Analysis	9
2.2.1 Characteristics of error analysis studies	9
2.2.2 Criticisms of error analysis	10
2.2.3 Errors vs. Mistakes	12
2.2.4 Conclusion	13
2.3 Morpheme Studies	13
2.3.1 Background	13
2.3.2 Criticisms of morpheme studies	14
2.3.3 Conclusion	15
2.4 Natural Routes	16
2.4.1 Background	16
2.4.2 Role of L1	18
2.4.3 Influence of elicitation tasks	18
2.4.4 Influence of input	19
2.4.5 Conclusion	20
2.5 Interlanguage	21
2.5.1 Introduction	21
2.5.2 Key concepts in interlanguage	21
2.5.3 Composition of the IL system	24
2.5.3.1 Universal elements	25
2.5.3.2 Formulaic elements	25
2.5.3.3 Conclusion	26
2.5.4 Features of interlanguage	26
2.5.5 Interlanguage development	28
2.5.5.1 General development	28
2.5.5.2 Simplification	29

2.5.5.3	Development of the interlanguage system	29
2.5.5.3.1	Strategies for development	31
2.5.5.3.2	Morphological development	34
2.5.5.3.3	Utterance development	37
2.5.6	Conclusion	38
2.6	Basic Variety	38
2.6.1	Theoretical background	39
2.6.2	Characteristics of the Basic Variety	40
2.6.3	Elements of the Basic Variety	42
2.6.3.1	Lexical items	42
2.6.3.2	Morphology	43
2.6.3.3	Functions expressed in the Basic Variety	43
2.6.3.4	Utterance structure	43
2.6.3.4.1	Phrasal constraints	44
2.6.3.4.2	Semantic constraints	44
2.6.3.4.3	Pragmatic constraints	45
2.6.4	Development of learner language	45
2.6.4.1	Pronoun development	46
2.6.4.2	Reasons for development	46
2.6.5	Conclusion	47
2.7	Formal vs. naturalistic acquisition	47
2.7.1	Limitations of the studies	50
2.7.2	Reasons for better performance	52
2.8	Conclusion	53
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY		55
3.0	Introduction	55
3.1	Methodological approach	56
3.1.1	Longitudinal and cross-sectional studies	56
3.1.2	Case study approach	58
3.1.3	Qualitative methods	59
3.2	Data collection procedures	60
3.2.1	Selection criteria for the sample	60
3.2.1.1	Background of participants	61
3.2.2	Learning context	66
3.2.3	Data collection	67
3.2.3.1	Interviewer	68
3.2.3.2	Data capture methods	69
3.2.3.3	Data types	69
3.2.3.3.1	Interview content	70
3.2.3.3.2	Elicitation tasks	71
3.3	Analysis procedures	76
3.3.1	General principles of IL analysis	77
3.3.2	Analysis of IL as a system	78
3.3.3	Units of analysis	78
3.3.4	Characteristics of formulaic speech	79
3.3.5	Form-focussed analysis	79
3.3.5.1	Error analysis procedures	80
3.3.5.2	Problems with error analysis procedures	81

3.3.6	Functional analysis	83
3.3.6.1	Function-to-form analysis	83
3.3.6.2	Form-to-function analysis	84
3.3.6.3	Functions investigated in my study	85
3.4	Limitations of the study	85
3.4.1	System <i>qua</i> system	86
3.4.2	Competence/performance	86
3.4.3	Determining the norm	87
3.4.4	Classifying an error	88
3.4.5	Different levels of competence	89
3.4.6	Generalisability based on subjects and tasks	90
3.4.7	Elicitation procedures	90
3.4.8	Appropriate linguistic frameworks for SLA studies	91
3.4.9	Interviewer interference	92
3.4.10	Time frames for data collection	92
3.4.11	Amount of data	92
3.5	Conclusion	93
CHAPTER 4:	FORMS AND FUNCTIONS IN THE DATA	94
4.0	Introduction	94
4.1	Size of the data set	94
4.2	Observations on the interlanguage of each learner	96
4.2.1	Strategies for communicating	99
4.2.2	Relationships between elements of the utterance	105
4.3	Functions evident in the data set	107
4.3.1	Referential function	108
4.3.2	Spatial reference	109
4.3.3	Temporal reference	111
4.4	Morphemes evident in the data set	114
4.4.1	Noun prefixes	114
4.4.1.1	Patterns of noun prefix use	116
4.4.1.1.1	Unmarked and marked classes	117
4.4.1.1.2	Class 2 for class 2a	117
4.4.1.1.3	Animacy cues	117
4.4.1.1.4	Opposite of animacy	117
4.4.1.1.5	Singular and plural substitution	118
4.4.1.1.6	Class 2 and 6 interchangeability	118
4.4.1.1.7	<i>E-/i-</i> confusion	118
4.4.1.1.8	Xhosa concords on English words	118
4.4.1.2	Patterns of noun prefix omission	119
4.4.1.2.1	No Xhosa prefixes on English words	119
4.4.1.2.2	English in utterances	120
4.4.1.2.3	Other forms added	120
4.4.1.2.4	Initial vowels	120
4.4.1.2.5	Beginnings of utterances	120
4.4.1.2.6	Correct omission on vocatives	120
4.4.1.3	Conclusion	120

4.4.2	Subject concords	121
4.4.2.1	Patterns of use of the subject concord	122
4.4.2.1.1	Pronoun confusion	122
4.4.2.1.2	Animacy	123
4.4.2.1.3	Opposite of animacy	123
4.4.2.1.4	Class 2 and 6 confusion	124
4.4.2.1.5	Hidden forms	124
4.4.2.1.6	Singular and plural confusion	124
4.4.2.1.7	Plural forms interchanged	125
4.4.2.1.8	Two referents with a singular subject concord	125
4.4.2.1.9	Subject concords on vowel-commencing verbs	125
4.4.2.1.10	Existential forms	125
4.4.2.2	Patterns of subject concord omission in the data	126
4.4.2.2.1	Vocabulary retrieval problems	126
4.4.2.2.2	Intervening morphemes	127
4.4.2.2.3	After <i>xa</i>	127
4.4.2.2.4	After pronouns	127
4.4.2.2.5	No <i>ndi-</i> form	127
4.4.2.2.6	Repetition	127
4.4.2.2.7	Thembi supplies the verb	128
4.4.2.3	Infinitive forms	128
4.4.2.4	Conclusion	129
4.4.3	The verbal formative <i>-ya-</i>	129
4.4.4	Negative subject concords	131
4.4.4.1	Patterns of use of the negative subject concord	133
4.4.4.1.1	Singular/plural substitution	133
4.4.4.1.2	Hidden forms	133
4.4.4.1.3	Animacy cues	133
4.4.4.1.4	Class 6 problems	134
4.4.4.1.5	Past negatives	134
4.4.4.2	Negatives of nouns	134
4.4.4.3	Use of the negative terminative <i>i-</i>	135
4.4.4.4	Conclusion	136
4.4.5	Verbal extensions	136
4.4.6	Auxiliaries	136
4.4.7	Participials	137
4.4.8	Copulatives	137
4.4.8.1	Usage patterns for the copulative	138
4.4.8.1.1	Non-copulative forms in copulative position	139
4.4.8.1.2	Hidden forms	139
4.4.8.1.3	Opposite of animacy cues	139
4.4.8.2	Copulative omission patterns in the data	139
4.4.8.2.1	Omissions with demonstratives	140
4.4.8.2.2	Leave to the context	140
4.4.8.2.3	Verbal functions	140
4.4.8.3	Conclusion	140

4.4.9	Locatives	140
4.4.9.1	Omission patterns in the locative	143
4.4.9.1.1	Omissions on English words	144
4.4.9.1.2	No “is” form	144
4.4.9.1.3	Omit prepositional forms	144
4.4.9.2	Conclusion	144
4.4.10	Demonstratives	145
4.4.10.1	Patterns of use of the demonstrative	146
4.4.10.1.1	Class 2 and 6 confusion	146
4.4.10.1.2	Overgeneralised forms	146
4.4.10.1.3	Animacy cues	147
4.4.10.1.4	Plural forms are used interchangeably	147
4.4.10.1.5	Proximity distinctions not made	147
4.4.10.1.6	Correct usage	147
4.4.10.2	Conclusion	148
4.4.11	Possessive	148
4.4.11.1	Patterns of possessive concord use	150
4.4.11.1.1	Animacy cues	150
4.4.11.1.2	Class 2 and 6 confusion	151
4.4.11.1.3	Singular/plural interchangeability	151
4.4.11.1.4	Marked classes	151
4.4.11.1.5	Hidden forms	152
4.4.11.1.6	Class 1 overgeneralisation	152
4.4.11.1.7	Overuse of <i>ka-</i>	152
4.4.11.1.8	Generalised <i>e-</i> form	152
4.4.11.2	Patterns of omission	153
4.4.11.3	Conclusion	153
4.4.12	Qualificatives	153
4.4.12.1	Patterns of use of the qualificative	155
4.4.12.2	Omission patterns of the qualificative in the data	156
4.4.12.2.1	On numerals	156
4.4.12.2.2	Stems with <i>lu-</i>	156
4.4.12.2.3	Lack of coalescence	156
4.4.12.3	Conclusion	157
4.4.13	Qualificative <i>a-</i> morpheme	157
4.4.13.1	Patterns of use of the qualificative <i>a-</i> morpheme	158
4.4.13.2	Omission patterns of the qualificative <i>a-</i> morpheme	158
4.4.13.2.1	Processing constraints	158
4.4.13.2.2	No subordinate clause marking	158
4.4.13.2.3	Stems beginning with <i>lu-</i>	158
4.4.13.3	Verbal relatives	159
4.4.13.4	Conclusion	159
4.4.14	<i>Na-/nga-</i> : “with”	159
4.4.15	<i>Na-</i> : Associative copulative	161
4.4.15.1	Patterns of use of the associative concord	161
4.4.15.1.1	Lack of correct negative forms	161
4.4.15.1.2	Formal form	161
4.4.15.1.3	Lack of coalescence	162
4.4.15.2	Conclusion	162

4.4.16	<i>Na-</i> : Additive conjunctions	162
4.4.16.1	Patterns of additive conjunction use	163
4.4.16.1.1	Not on lists	163
4.4.16.1.2	Discourse markers	163
4.4.16.1.3	On infinitives	163
4.4.16.1.4	On verbs	163
4.4.16.2	Conclusion	164
4.4.17	Object concords	164
4.4.18	<i>Njenga-</i>	166
4.5	Conclusion	166
CHAPTER 5:	ACQUISITION PATTERNS IN THE INTERLANGUAGE	
	OF LEARNERS OF XHOSA	168
5.0	Introduction	168
5.1	Principles and patterns in morpheme use and omission	168
5.1.1	Singular forms for plural forms and <i>vice versa</i>	168
5.1.2	Mix forms	170
5.1.3	Animacy cues	170
5.1.4	Opposite of animacy	171
5.1.5	Marked and unmarked	171
5.1.6	Beginnings of words	172
5.1.7	Overgeneralised forms	173
5.1.8	Redundancy	174
5.1.9	Restricted functions of morphemes	174
5.1.10	Distance from the noun	174
5.1.11	Processing problems	175
5.1.12	Discreteness of forms	175
5.1.13	Influence of English	176
5.1.14	Structure of words	176
5.1.15	Phonological constraints	176
5.1.16	Multiples functions for one form	177
5.1.17	Rule application	177
5.1.18	Conclusion	177
5.2	Levels of development	178
5.2.1	Givón's pragmatic-syntactic continuum	178
5.2.1.1	Conjunction use	179
5.2.1.2	Noun:verb ratio	180
5.2.1.3	Verb complexity	180
5.2.1.4	Use of grammatical morphology	181
5.2.1.4.1	Morpheme suppliance	181
5.2.1.4.2	Target-like use	182
5.2.1.4.3	Ninety-percent suppliance	183
5.2.1.4.4	Number of different morphemes in the data	183
5.2.1.4.5	Range of morphemes used to realise the referential, spatial and temporal functions	184
5.2.1.5	Reliability of rankings	185

5.2.2	Corder's characteristics of simplified systems	185
5.2.2.1	Fixed word order	186
5.2.2.2	Simple personal pronoun system	186
5.2.2.3	Few grammatical function words or grammatical categories	188
5.2.2.4	Absence of article system	188
5.2.2.5	Some deictic words	188
5.2.2.6	Syntactic relations shown by word order	188
5.2.2.7	Conclusion	189
5.3	Sequences of morphological development	189
5.3.1	Order of teaching	191
5.4	General sequences of development for morphemes	193
5.4.1	Order of appearance	194
5.4.2	Morpheme suppliance	196
5.4.3	Comparison with English sequences of development	197
5.5	Explanation of the sequence of development in my study	198
5.5.1	Morphemes as foundations in utterances	198
5.5.2	Links to thematic roles	199
5.5.3	Agreement functions vs. Semantic functions	199
5.5.4	Invariant forms	200
5.5.5	Intraphrasal forms	200
5.5.6	Extension of the basic utterance	200
5.5.7	Lexical equivalence to English	200
5.5.8	Embedded forms	201
5.5.9	Free vs. Bound forms	201
5.6	Avoidance patterns in the data	201
5.7	Performance on different tasks	202
5.8	Conclusion	206
 CHAPTER 6: COMPARISONS WITH THE BASIC VARIETY AND CONCLUSION		
		207
6.0	Introduction	207
6.1	Comparisons with the ESF study	207
6.1.1	Why might there be points of similarity?	207
6.1.2	Why might there be differences between the BV and the learner language in my study?	208
6.1.3	Comparison of Basic Variety forms and forms in the IL of learners in my study	209
6.1.3.1	Linguistic elements in the BV and my study	209
6.1.3.2	Phrasal constraints	211
6.1.3.3	Levels of development	212
6.1.4	Conclusion	213
6.2	Suggestions for further research	214
6.3	Conclusion	215
 REFERENCES		217
 APPENDICES		243

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
TABLE 2.1 FEATURES OF THE PRAGMATIC AND SYNTACTIC MODE	27
TABLE 3.1 INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	70
TABLE 4.1 NUMBER OF UTTERANCES AND MORPHEMES IN THE DATA	95
TABLE 4.2 CONJUNCTIONS USED BY THE LEARNERS	107
TABLE 4.3 FORMS USED TO REALISE THE REFERENTIAL FUNCTION	109
TABLE 4.4 FORMS USED TO REALISE SPATIAL REFERENCE	110
TABLE 4.5 ADVERBS USED BY THE LEARNERS	111
TABLE 4.6 FORMS USED TO CONVEY THE TEMPORAL FUNCTION	112
TABLE 4.7 SUMMARY OF NOUN PREFIX DATA	115
TABLE 4.8 PATTERNS OF NOUN PREFIX USE	116
TABLE 4.9 PATTERNS OF NOUN PREFIX OMISSION	119
TABLE 4.10 SUMMARY OF SUBJECT CONCORD DATA	122
TABLE 4.11 PATTERNS OF SUBJECT CONCORD USE	122
TABLE 4.12 SUBJECT CONCORD OMISSIONS IN THE DATA	126
TABLE 4.13 SUMMARY OF THE USE OF <i>-YA-</i>	130
TABLE 4.14 SUMMARY OF NEGATIVE SUBJECT CONCORD USE	132
TABLE 4.15 PATTERNS OF USE OF THE NEGATIVE SUBJECT CONCORD	133
TABLE 4.16 SUMMARY OF LACK OF NEGATIVE TERMINATIVE <i>-I</i> FOR NEGATIVE VERBS	135
TABLE 4.17 SUMMARY OF COPULATIVE DATA	138
TABLE 4.18 COPULATIVE OMISSION PATTERNS IN THE DATA	139
TABLE 4.19 SUMMARY OF LOCATIVE MORPHEMES	141
TABLE 4.20 OMISSION PATTERNS IN THE LOCATIVE	144
TABLE 4.21 SUMMARY OF DEMONSTRATIVE DATA	145
TABLE 4.22 PATTERNS OF USE OF THE DEMONSTRATIVE	146
TABLE 4.23 SUMMARY OF POSSESSIVE CONCORD DATA	149
TABLE 4.24 PATTERNS OF POSSESSIVE CONCORD USE	150
TABLE 4.25 SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIVE CONCORD DATA	154
TABLE 4.26 OMISSION PATTERNS OF THE QUALIFICATIVE IN THE DATA	156
TABLE 4.27 SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIVE <i>A-</i> CONCORD	157
TABLE 4.28 SUMMARY OF <i>NA-/NGA-</i>	160
TABLE 4.29 SUMMARY OF THE ASSOCIATIVE COPULATIVE	161
TABLE 4.30 SUMMARY OF USE OF THE ADDITIVE CONJUNCTION	162
TABLE 4.31 PATTERNS OF ADDITIVE CONJUNCTION USE	163
TABLE 4.32 SUMMARY OF THE USE OF OBJECT CONCORDS	164

TABLE 5.1	CONJUNCTION USE IN THE DATA	179
TABLE 5.2	RANGE OF FORMS ADDED TO THE VERB	181
TABLE 5.3	NUMBER OF MORPHEMES USED TO REALISE EACH FUNCTION	184
TABLE 5.4	COMPARISON OF ORDER OF TEACHING, APPEARANCE AND ACCURACY FOR ANN	192
TABLE 5.5	SUPLIANCE OF TOP FIFTEEN MORPHEMES	197
TABLE 5.6	COMPARISON OF ENGLISH AND XHOSA SEQUENCES OF DEVELOPMENT	198
TABLE 6.1	COMPARISON OF LINGUISTIC ELEMENTS IN THE BV AND MY STUDY	210

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page	
APPENDIX A	BIOGRAPHICAL/ATTITUDINAL QUESTIONNAIRE	243
APPENDIX B	A SHORT SUMMARY OF THE BACKGROUND OF THE PARTICIPANTS	244
APPENDIX C	INTERVIEW MATERIAL	246
APPENDIX D	NUMBER OF UTTERANCES IN THE DATA	255
APPENDIX E	COUNTING MORPHEMES	256
APPENDIX F	XHOSA STRUCTURE	257
APPENDIX G1	INCORRECT NOUN PREFIXES	261
APPENDIX G2	NOUN PREFIX OMISSIONS	262
APPENDIX G3	INCORRECT SUBJECT CONCORDS	263
APPENDIX G4	SUBJECT CONCORD OMISSIONS	264
APPENDIX G5	SUPERFLUOUS USE OF -YA-	265
APPENDIX G6	INCORRECT NEGATIVE SUBJECT CONCORDS	266
APPENDIX G7	LACK OF /-ENDING ON NEGATIVES	267
APPENDIX G8	INCORRECT COPULATIVE	268
APPENDIX G9	COPULATIVE OMISSIONS	269
APPENDIX G10	LOCATIVE OMISSIONS	270
APPENDIX G11	INCORRECT LOCATIVES	271
APPENDIX G12	ONLY INITIAL PART OF LOCATIVE	272
APPENDIX G13	ONLY FINAL PART OF LOCATIVE	273
APPENDIX G14	INCORRECT DEMONSTRATIVES	274
APPENDIX G15	INCORRECT POSSESSIVE CONCORDS	275
APPENDIX G16	POSSESSIVE CONCORD OMISSION	276
APPENDIX G17	INCORRECT QUALIFICATIVE CONCORDS	277
APPENDIX G18	QUALIFICATIVE CONCORD OMISSIONS	278
APPENDIX G19	INCORRECT QUALIFICATIVE A- CONCORDS	279
APPENDIX G20	QUALIFICATIVE A- CONCORD OMISSIONS	280

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADJ	Adjective
BV	Basic Variety
C	Conversation
CA	Contrastive Analysis
CCH	Creative Construction Hypothesis
Cop	Copulative
Det	Determiner
EA	Error Analysis
ESF	European Science Foundation
FL	Foreign Language
II	Interlingual Identification
IL	Interlanguage
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
MT	Mother Tongue
NC	Noun Class
NIVES	Non-native Institutionalised Varieties of English
NL	Native Language
NP	Noun Phrase
NS	Native Speaker
O	Object
PD	Picture Description
PP	Prepositional Phrase
S	Subject
SB	Sentence building
SL	Source Language
SLA	Second- Language Acquisition
SVO	Subject Verb Object
T	Translation
TL	Target Language
UG	Universal Grammar
V	Verb
VP	Verb Phrase

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the following people for their contributions and support:

- C The six participants who committed themselves to a longitudinal study and without whom this study could not have been conducted;
- C Thembi, whose unfailing sense of humour and excellent interviewing skills ensured that the participants completed the interviews;
- C Dr John Claughton, Ms Ntosh Mazwi and Ms Bulelwa Nosilela of the African Languages Department at Rhodes University, who were willing to give me access to their classes and learners;
- C Ms Bulelwa Nosilela who proofread the Xhosa parts of this study;
- C My supervisor, Professor Vivian de Klerk, who is an excellent role model in all spheres of academic life. Her comments on drafts and encouragement during the study were invaluable;
- C My supervisor, Professor Gary Barkhuizen, who taught me much of what I know about research. His careful reading of my work improved it substantially, and his early words of encouragement kept me motivated;
- C My colleagues, who carried extra burdens while I completed the study;
- C My family, whose contributions to my education and my life empowered me to contemplate doing this study;
- C Kevin Chadd, who lived through the highs and lows of this project with me, and had to learn about interlanguage to survive.

This thesis is dedicated to my grandfather, Donald Bonnin Hobson.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

L2 [second-language] acquisition research is concerned with investigating the processes and stages that learners undergo in acquiring L2s and subsequent languages. (Nunan 1996:349)

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

The term *interlanguage*, which refers to the language produced by learners acquiring an additional language, was coined by Selinker (1972), although studies of the interlanguage phenomenon predate the term by several years (Corder 1967). A variety of studies has supported the hypotheses that interlanguage is systematic, permeable to influence from the first language and follows a natural sequence of development (Adjémian 1976; Dulay & Burt 1974a; Lalleman 1996).

However, the majority of studies investigating the development of interlanguage (IL) has focussed on speakers of a variety of different languages learning Indo-European (and usually Germanic and Italic) languages. Most studies are of learners of English (see Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, for an overview), although there are also studies of learners of other languages such as Dutch, French, Spanish and German (e.g. Carroll 1999; Extra & van Hout 1996; Lalleman 1983; Lightbown 1980; Jordens 1988; Meisel et al. 1981). These studies provide insights into acquisition patterns in a variety of areas including word order, the development of questions, the use of inflectional morphemes and utterance structure. The patterns of acquisition found in these studies seem to be fairly universal amongst learners of these languages, but it should be noted that the languages are all fairly similar in terms of language typology.

The Germanic and Italic languages are mainly analytical, inflectional or a mixture of the two (Crystal 1997), and inflectional morphemes therefore have varying degrees of salience in these languages. Although many studies have focussed on the acquisition of inflectional morphemes in English, there are relatively few of these morphemes in English, compared with many other languages. As a result, a different perspective on second-language acquisition (SLA) can be obtained by looking at languages with typologies which differ from those of Indo-European languages.

Slobin (1992:9) found in studies of L1 acquisition that typological factors were important: “It seems that we attend to typological factors when encountering languages that have unfamiliar characteristics, such as Eskimo polysynthesis, Bantu prefix concord, and Semitic morphophonemic patterns”. Unfortunately, studies of languages with these typologies are rare and, in particular, the process of learning African languages is rarely documented (a study by Musau, 1995, is a notable exception).

The theoretical foundation of this study falls into the scope of interlanguage (IL) studies which have developed from contrastive analysis studies, error analysis studies and the morpheme studies. Also discussed is the more recent writing on the Basic Variety, an early learner variety which emerged from a cross-linguistic study of the IL of early learners of a range of different languages who were learning in naturalistic settings (Perdue 1993a, b).

One of the main findings of many SLA studies is that the interlanguages of early learners have many common characteristics (Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991). Typically, grammatical morphology is omitted and there is a reliance on the context, rather than morphology, to perform many of the functions needed by the learners in their communication.

However, inflectional morphemes play a much bigger role in agglutinative languages than they do in Germanic and Italic languages because much of the meaning and many of the grammatical relationships are conveyed by the use of morphemes. Demuth (1992:269) concludes then that it is possible “that children learning morphologically rich languages produce more morphology earlier than their more analytic language counterparts”. There are therefore two possibilities for the acquisition of grammatical morphology:

- C first-language learners of morphologically rich languages learn morphemes early, as Demuth (1992) proposes; or
- C grammatical morphology is universally lacking at early stages of L2 learning (as many studies have shown).

A study of L2 learners of an agglutinative language can shed light on which of the two views is correct for L2 acquisition of an agglutinative language. My study therefore investigates the language development of English learners of Xhosa, a Niger-Congo agglutinative language.

My study traces morphological development and some functional development in the IL of six

English-speaking learners of Xhosa, who have varying levels of Xhosa competence. The learners were interviewed seven times over a period of eight months using a range of elicitation tasks, ranging from fairly unstructured, spontaneous conversations to highly structured utterance-manipulation tasks.

The study takes both a formal and a functional approach to the data analysis. This dual approach mitigates some of the negative evaluation of errors which is associated with error analysis and the formal approach, and it provides an interesting perspective on the range of morphemes used to realise particular functions in the data. In addition, the functional approach sheds light on what the learners actually need to do with their IL at early stages of development.

1.2 AIMS

The central aims of the study are:

- a) To provide a qualitative description and analysis of the morphological development in the interlanguage of selected English mother-tongue speakers learning Xhosa;
- b) To determine the sequence of acquisition of morphemes across learners and to compare this sequence to common sequences of acquisition found in other studies;
- c) To explain why learners tend to display preference patterns in terms of which morphemes they omit and which morphemes they use;
- d) To determine whether the lack of grammatical morphology is a feature of the IL of learners of an agglutinative language;
- e) To determine the extent to which the acquisition patterns in this study conform to the patterns of the Basic Variety.

1.3 OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

Chapter 2 discusses the theoretical foundation of my study. It includes an historical perspective on the development of IL studies, including a discussion of contrastive analysis, error analysis and the morpheme studies. In addition, there is a focus on the findings of a variety of IL studies with regard to the features of IL. This is followed by a discussion of the Basic Variety, a more recent development in IL studies. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the influence of formal instruction on IL.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodology used in the study and provides motivations for the use of formal and functional approaches to the analysis of the data. The limitations of the methodology are discussed in this chapter.

Chapter 4 presents some of the results of the study. The chapter is divided to reflect the functional and formal analysis approaches to the data. In the section on how functions are realised in the data, the range of morphemes (and other means) used to convey each function is presented. In the section on the formal characteristics of the data, the range of morphemes found in the IL of the learners is presented. For each of the morphemes, a table of results indicating correct usage, incorrect choices and omissions of morphemes is included. In addition, there are examples of different usage and omission patterns where common patterns are found across learners.

Chapter 5 discusses common patterns of use and omission across different morphemes, and links these patterns to those found in other studies. The level of development of learners in my study is analysed, and problems with applying available methods of measuring the level of development to learners of an agglutinative language are mentioned. Finally, a classification of early- and later-acquired morphemes is made and a tentative sequence of development of morphemes is suggested.

In the final chapter, the findings of my study are compared with those of the European Science Foundation study (Klein & Perdue 1997; Perdue 1993a, b) in order to find similarities and differences in selected areas between the interlanguage produced in my study and the Basic Variety. Finally, suggestions for further research are made.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 INTRODUCTION

My study investigates the characteristics of the interlanguage (IL) of English learners of Xhosa and compares these characteristics to those found in studies of other ILs. The preliminary questions which need to be considered in a survey of the relevant literature are therefore:

- C what are the characteristics of other ILs;
- C which theoretical and methodological perspectives influenced these studies; and
- C why do the ILs in these studies look the way they do?

My study is influenced primarily by the theoretical traditions of IL and the more recent findings pertaining to the Basic Variety (BV) (Perdue 1993a, b). However, even the most recent developments in SLA theory and data analysis cannot ignore the roots of the discipline entirely, and since this study uses several of the basic ideas and data analysis techniques of earlier paradigms, a range of relevant areas will be reviewed. This chapter therefore traces the history of studies of IL, beginning with contrastive analysis (CA), moving on to error analysis (EA) and the morpheme studies from which the notion of IL developed, to the findings of BV studies.

Selinker (1992:4) states that IL has its roots in CA and EA and that the three areas of CA/EA/IL are inextricably linked. This view is also expressed by Corder (1981) in his discussion of EA as a basic learner strategy and a starting point for the study of transfer in ILs. Each of these approaches developed as a result of changing views of the status of the language produced by learners, changing perceptions of the forces driving development and the need for methodological innovation in the study of this form of language. In the absence of a theoretical framework which adequately describes and explains all second-language acquisition (SLA) data, it is also probably best to take an eclectic approach (Tarone 1994). Furthermore, any study also needs to consider a variety of SLA phenomena including variability, systematicity, transfer, staged development and incompleteness (Towell & Hawkins 1994). Each of the four approaches (CA, EA, IL, BV) discussed below accounts for each of these areas with varying degrees of success.

2.1 CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

2.1.1 Main tenets of contrastive analysis

The study of SLA as we know it today is rooted in early CA, which became the dominant approach during the 1950s and 1960s. According to Lado (1957), the purpose of CA is to carefully describe the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) in order to develop effective pedagogical materials. The basic assumption of CA is that learning a second language (L2) entails transferring the linguistic forms and meanings of the first language (L1) to the L2 by learning a set of habits. Contrastive analysts predicted that some languages would be easier to learn than others, because where languages differed greatly in structure, the learner would be required to automatise a more complex set of habits. This automatization would take longer than if languages were structurally more similar.

Three main theoretical claims result from CA:

- ⊆ the learner expects to find equivalence between the SL and TL;
- ⊆ learning the TL requires the learner to learn something which is different from the SL; and
- ⊆ the learner finds it difficult to learn the new language when structures and patterns in the two languages differ (Selinker 1992).

Studies taking a CA perspective therefore focussed primarily on transfer phenomena and especially negative transfer, which occurred when languages differed in structure. As a result of these structural differences, learning a language was not a simple matter of transferring a form directly from L1 to L2. The primary focus of CA studies was therefore on difference and types of difference (Long & Sato 1984).

Detailed analyses of similarities and differences were carried out by comparing languages in terms of mainly phonology and syntax and, to a lesser extent, semantics (Fries 1945; James 1980; Lado 1957; Weinreich cited in Selinker 1989). Many later studies of transfer take a contrastive approach, although a detailed CA is not always carried out.

2.1.2 Problems with contrastive analysis

Unfortunately, CA in its original formulation proved to be seriously flawed when applied to data from learners across the world in different language-learning situations. Most seriously, the strong predictions of difficulty and ease of learning which are intuitively appealing were not

always borne out by studies of learner language (see Lalleman 1996 for an overview; Wardhaugh 1970). In particular, some researchers found that when there was a great degree of difference between languages, learners seemed to be able to produce the form correctly (i.e. there was no negative transfer), whereas if there was a small degree of difference learners seemed to find it more difficult to produce the correct form (Kellerman 1979; Odlin 1989; Towell & Hawkins 1994; Whitman & Jackson 1972; Wode 1978). As a result, some areas of error were not predicted by CA (Hyltenstam 1977). Furthermore, students tended to avoid difficult areas to reduce the possibility of making errors, and thus the full range of possible errors was not available for study in this approach (Schachter 1974).

From an explanatory point of view, another limitation of CA studies lies in the extreme role of transfer posited by early theorists like Lado (1957). Early theorists believed that language transfer was the main process in SLA. However, later studies show that many errors are not simply traceable to the L1 (Dulay & Burt 1973; Felix 1980; George 1972; Richards 1985). In addition, some errors may be a result of performance problems (Zobl 1984) and errors are subject to variability (Zobl 1982, 1984). Several theorists concluded that although there is some role for transfer, learners choose in an active and principled way whether or not to transfer and what to transfer (Gass 1979, 1984a; Kellerman 1979; Selinker 1992). Contrastive analysis does not account for this active role of the learner, because it is primarily interested in the languages as linguistic systems and products rather than in learners using complex psycholinguistic processes (Long & Sato 1984; van Els et al. 1984). As a result of the failure of the “strong” version of CA, Wardhaugh (1970) suggested a “weak” version of CA which proposed that the findings of CA could be used to explain transfer *after the fact*. This version had limited explanatory value, although it was later incorporated as part of EA (James 1998).

From a theoretical perspective, there are profound problems with comparing languages at a superficial or surface level if one views them as independent systems (see section 3.4.1 for a more detailed discussion). For example, it is highly controversial whether one can meaningfully compare English and German, because one is comparing the elements of one system with the elements of another system and trying to find similarities and differences across independent systems. The value of the elements may not be the same in each system and these elements may therefore be incomparable. Furthermore, Lattey (cited in Selinker 1992) points out that even

though structures across languages have the same name, they may not in fact be the same (e.g. clitics in French and clitics in Xhosa) and the size of the structure to be compared may also be problematic. For example, should one study questions, as Langacker did (cited in Selinker 1992), or should one look only at “primary questions”, as Armagost did (cited in Selinker 1992)? A further problem encountered when comparing learner language cross-linguistically is that a learner and a language may use a variety of strategies and structures to express a particular concept or function (Comrie 1984), making direct comparison difficult.

2.1.3 The relevance of contrastive analysis

Despite the problems mentioned above, CA can be a useful approach to SLA. For example, there **are** patterns across languages and one would be missing a great deal of regularity if one failed to compare languages and elements of those languages at all. One of the solutions to the problem of comparing surface features is to posit regularities at the deep level or abstract level (Jake 1998). These regularities may take the form of common grammatical units which occur universally in learner languages. These units have been termed interlingual identifications (IIs), but they have not yet been identified since “... no unit of linguistic theory, as these units are currently conceived, could fit [the criterion] of a unit identified interlingually across three linguistic systems (NL [native language], TL and IL) ...” (Selinker 1972:225). Selinker (1972:227-228) describes these IIs as

... a new type of psycholinguistic unit, available to an individual whenever he [*sic*] attempts to produce sentences in a second language. This interlingual unit stretches, we hypothesize, across three linguistic systems: NL, IL, and TL, and becomes available to the idealized second-language learner who will not achieve native-speaker competence in the TL, whenever he attempts to produce a TL norm. These units become available to the learner only after he has switched his psychic set or state from the native-speaker domain to the new domain of interlingual identifications. I would like to postulate further that these relevant units of interlingual identifications do not come from anywhere; they are latent in the brain in a latent psychological structure, available to the individual whenever he wishes to attempt to produce the norm of any TL.

Selinker (1992) and James (1994) feel that these IIs are still relevant, because although a comprehensive linguistic theory of IIs has not yet been developed and these units are as yet undiscovered and undescribed, numerous studies have upheld this view of a learner contrastively “setting up interlingual identifications” (Selinker 1992:210).

The problem lies in trying to overcome the mind-set of analysts who have been trained in the use of current linguistic terminology and units and requiring them to study the phenomenon in an entirely different way with a set of as yet unavailable analytical tools. This area of research promises to be fruitful if analysts can commit themselves to studying learner languages cross-linguistically as independent systems, so that regularities can be noted. It is only once regularities across learner languages are observed that the role of transfer and cross-linguistic influence could be determined more accurately.

2.1.4 Conclusion

In conclusion, transfer may be one aspect of SLA, but it does not explain it fully. An adequate explanation of the process of development in SLA is therefore not provided by CA (Towell & Hawkins 1994), although Zobl (1984:79) says CA “was not an acquisition theory; or, alternatively, it lacked one”. Contrastive analysis was largely abandoned during the 1970s, but it is perpetuated in a modified form in transfer analysis (James 1990). Transfer analysis is concerned mainly with processes such as cross-linguistic influence (Giacobbe 1992; Kellerman 1986; Kellerman & Sharwood Smith 1986) and language transfer (Gass & Selinker 1992; Odlin 1989). This newer version of CA is not the same as the original because “you are comparing IL with MT [mother tongue] and not MT with TL” (James 1998:5). My study will take a transfer analysis perspective at times, although English and Xhosa are structurally very different and one would expect less transfer than in more closely related languages such as Romance languages.

2.2 ERROR ANALYSIS

2.2.1 Characteristics of error analysis studies

During the 1970s, error analysis (EA) emerged as the next major development in the study of SLA, and although the studies sometimes attempted to explain how second languages are learnt, EA remained primarily a methodological approach rather than a theory of SLA. The central focus in EA is on the L2 learner rather than on the system, as in CA (van Els et al. 1984), although the “systematicity in development and the common processes posited to explain development” (Long & Sato 1984:256) became central features of EA. As the pendulum swung away from CA, theorists claimed that errors could be explained in terms of the target language (TL) only, with no reference whatsoever to the source language (SL), i.e. there was no transfer. In reality, this proved to be too extreme a view once data were carefully analysed.

The EA studies focussed mainly on the performance of learners of a few languages who had learned in formal contexts and were studied in experimental conditions. These studies had two primary aims. The first aim was to provide explanations for errors, which were attributed to learner-internal cognitive processes and learner-external causes. Learner-internal errors include:

- C overgeneralisations (Schumann 1978);
- C developmental patterns which remain the same regardless of the L1 of the learner (Dulay & Burt 1973, 1974a, 1974b; Huang & Hatch 1978; Richards 1985);
- C ignorance of rule restrictions (Richards 1985);
- C incomplete application of rules (Richards 1985); and
- C learning strategies (Selinker 1972).

Learner-external errors related to problems with the input received by the learner, especially in the case of formal instruction (Faerch et al. 1984) and included errors such as transfer of training (Felix 1981; Selinker 1972; Stenson 1974). As a result of finding learner-external causes of errors, the second, later aim of EA was to relate the social context of learning to the errors produced (Faerch et al. 1984; Seliger & Long 1983). These studies looked closely at the input available to the learner and studied the errors in relation to the input received.

2.2.2 Criticisms of error analysis

Error analysis has been strongly criticised, both from a theoretical and a methodological point of view. Firstly, in an EA the norm is the TL and any deviation from the target is viewed as an error. However, determining a norm is problematic because it depends on a variety of factors including the linguistic context, “the medium (spoken or written language), the social context (formal or informal), and the relation between speaker and hearer (symmetrical or asymmetrical)” (van Els et al. 1984:47). Deviation from the norm is viewed negatively, which means that these studies do not acknowledge the creative processes learners use in building the new language. They therefore ignore a large part of the developmental process.

From a methodological point of view, many limitations are discussed in the literature. Firstly, EA measures production (which may be fairly restricted), rather than perception (which may be less restricted) (Alexander 1979). Secondly, EA studies focus on only a small part of the production data (i.e. the errors) rather than all the learner language produced (Alexander 1979; Corder 1975; Schachter & Celce-Murcia 1977). This means that some “errors” would not appear to be errors because they seem to be well-formed, although they may be misformed from a pragmatic point

of view (Zydatiss cited in Alexander 1979). Furthermore, learners may avoid some of the TL constructions because they do not know how to produce them or because certain structures are perceived as difficult and more likely to induce error (Alexander 1979; Kleinmann 1977; Schachter 1974). The group that does produce these constructions, albeit with errors, is not directly comparable to the group which avoids the constructions and therefore makes fewer errors overall.

Another methodological problem is that the task used to elicit data may have an effect on the errors produced so that different types and numbers of errors may be produced in different tasks. Schachter & Celce-Murcia (1977) claim that errors were also often classified very subjectively and that analysts did not always know enough about the languages they were studying to notice subtle but important differences. Analysts did not always correctly identify L1 influence on the learner language since different L1s may influence the source of the error. For example, what is probably a transfer error for a speaker of one language may be a simplification error for a speaker of another language. Related to this point is the way in which errors are classified and quantified. Some studies ascribe errors to one source when there could have been more than one source and other studies ascribe errors to several sources when there was only one source. As Long & Sato (1984:257) note:

Explanations were often impressionistic and vague. Two or more sources of error were often plausible, yet analysts sometimes opted for just one. This is a criticism taken up by Burt, Dulay and Krashen (1982), who see the root of the problem as researchers' attempts to describe *and* classify errors simultaneously. Burt et al. argue for a two-stage analysis. First, errors should be described, e.g. by reference to linguistic domain (word order, morphology, lexis, etc.) or 'surface strategy' (omission, addition, misinformation or misordering). Only then should causes, such as overgeneralization or interference, be attributed.

Another quantification problem occurs when an error is found over a larger linguistic domain than a word (Schachter & Celce-Murcia 1977). In some cases, one error may create additional errors in a text and it may be difficult to decide how to quantify these error forms. Quantification is also problematic since some studies count error types (the occurrence of an error is noted once) and some count tokens (every example of the error is counted; e.g. Lennon 1991). Making comparisons across studies is therefore unreliable and comparing error frequencies or generalising the results is not a simple matter (Nickel 1989; Schachter & Celce-Murcia 1977).

2.2.3 Errors vs. Mistakes

At the level of analysis, deciding whether a deviation is an error or a mistake is another problem. Corder (1967, 1971, 1981) contends that mistakes should not be included in the quantification or analysis of errors and this is the approach taken by most analysts. Johnson (1988) believes that mistakes can be corrected by the learner, but in practice determining whether a learner cannot correct his/her own deviant utterances is very problematic (James 1998). Errors occur when the learner does not know the rule and needs to be taught it or when the learner needs to be shown that the wrong knowledge or partial knowledge has been applied to the particular situation (Shaughnessy 1977). In a different view, Edge (1989) rejects this error-mistake classification and calls all deviations from the norm *mistakes*. These mistakes include:

- C *slips*, which are a result of “processing problems or carelessness” (Edge 1989:11);
- C *errors*, which are comprehensible but which the learner is unable to correct, although the form has been taught; and
- C *attempts*, which are fairly incomprehensible and uncorrectable by the learner.

Snow (cited in James 1998) argues for two steps in error development. The first step is the presence of errors which the learner does not recognise as errors, and the second step is the presence of errors that the learner recognises as errors but which he/she cannot correct. The mistake, where the learner is able to correct a wrong form, may be a third step. In other words, mistakes are a performance problem rather than a competence problem (Corder 1967), rather like the lapses made by L1 speakers (Johnson 1988). This performance-competence distinction is maintained by most theorists in distinguishing errors from mistakes.

Another way of determining whether a deviant form should be classified as an error or a mistake is to decide on the gravity of the error. In order to do this, James (1994:191) believes that criteria for error gravity need to be established (e.g. “are lexical errors more serious than grammatical?”), as well as who will judge the gravity (e.g. L1 teachers/L2 teachers/non-teachers). An additional criterion is that errors have a lack of speaker intention, otherwise they may be classified as deviances (James 1998). The classification of an utterance as deviant is further confused by the distinction between unacceptability and ungrammaticality; e.g. a grammatical utterance may be unacceptable because of non-linguistic factors (de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981). Acceptability is judged by use in a particular context, while grammaticality can be judged by a native speaker of the language and a grammatical utterance is necessarily acceptable as well

(Lyons 1968).

2.2.4 Conclusion

Despite the above criticisms and methodological difficulties, there is evidence of a more positive approach to EA in some recent writing. According to James (1998), there are two reasons for the continued use of EA when investigating SLA data. Firstly, the empirical design is simple, with a clear indication of an error if a particular norm is chosen. Secondly, teachers play this normative role and encourage their students to achieve these target norms. This negative view of error may be held by many teachers, but many SLA theorists tend to regard errors in a much more positive way because they regard them as signs of creative hypothesis construction and testing.

In conclusion, James (1998) feels that those doing IL studies and those engaged in EA analyses have different goals, the former concerned with developing a theory of acquisition and the latter with pedagogic goals. However, like Cook (1993), he feels that EA is an effective way of dealing with data in the absence of a suitable analytical framework in IL studies and it is for this reason that an EA is carried out on the data in my study. An EA alone does not provide a sufficient description or explanation of learner language, but it has a significant contribution to make as part of an analysis of this type of language because it can offer insights into the sequence of acquisition, the patterns of acquisition and the types of structures which learners find difficult.

2.3 MORPHEME STUDIES

2.3.1 Background

At the same time as studies in EA and L1 acquisition were flourishing, a series of studies was conducted to see whether L2 development patterns conformed to those of L1 acquisition. The morpheme studies, as they became known, were different from contrastive analysis (CA) and early error analysis (EA), since researchers viewed learner language and “errors” positively. They sought to discover the developmental patterns in learner language and to account for the learner’s active participation in the construction of his/her communicative system. This focus on the learner was congruent with Selinker’s (1972) views of IL which had been published at about the same time.

More recently, morpheme studies have been linked to performance analysis (Long & Sato 1984)

because of their focus on performance rather than competence during data collection. They have also been linked to creative construction, which Sharwood Smith (1994:49) says takes a “target-oriented and incremental” approach. Second-language input provides “the database for L2 acquisition” and studies focus on the similarities between L1 and L2 development. Examples of morpheme studies include Bailey et al. (1974), Dulay & Burt (1973, 1974a, 1974b), Fathman (1978), Krashen et al. (1976), Larsen-Freeman (1975), Lightbown (1983) and Pica (1983).

The main findings of these studies include:

- C the discovery of natural sequences of morphological development;
- C a significant congruence between L1 and L2 development; and
- C the description of developmental errors.

The focus of the studies is on developmental errors and, as a result, there is a minimal role ascribed to input, the L1 and transfer (except as a performance phenomenon when the learner is under stress to perform what is not known according to Sharwood Smith, 1994). Again, this is an extreme position which needs modification in the light of later studies.

2.3.2 Criticisms of morpheme studies

There have been many criticisms of the morpheme studies, mostly based on methodological weaknesses, but the findings have been reinforced repeatedly in other studies and it cannot be disputed that they stimulated vast amounts of research on the learning of different languages. With regard to criticisms of the studies, Lightbown (1984) feels that the results have been overinterpreted because later studies have shown that input and the L1 also have a significant influence on IL (e.g. White 1977). She also mentions methodological problems such as the difficulty of replication because of the wide range of variables in any study or population group, the failure to investigate the input that learners receive and its influence on IL development, the small range of tasks making up the data, and the need for piloting and testing data-collection instruments to ensure baseline data from speakers of the L1 and the L2. Early criticisms related to the elicitation instrument (Bilingual Syntax Measure), because it was thought that the common developmental sequences found were an artifact of the data-collection methods. However, later studies refuted this criticism when researchers found the same orders using different instruments (Long & Sato 1984).

Long & Sato (1984) discuss further limitations of the morpheme studies:

- C morpheme use in obligatory contexts is the criterion used to show acquisition, but this is not the same as mastery of the morpheme, because it ignores contexts where the morpheme is used inappropriately;
- C accurate use of a morpheme does not imply that the learner knows the function of the morpheme;
- C early development of morphemes in terms of sequence of appearance is not measured; rather the sequence of accurate use is measured;
- C a functional perspective on morpheme use is not taken, and thus no variation in development is noted if the morpheme has a variety of functions (see also Sato 1990);
- C avoidance of morphemes is not considered (see also Schachter 1974);
- C only a small part of the language is studied, i.e. a few morphemes;
- C the order is based on English so that it is not possible to generalise or even compare it to other languages.

The studies are also usually cross-sectional rather than longitudinal (Andersen 1991), and thus ordering of morphemes cannot be said to be absolute in the way that the morpheme studies said they were¹. Finally, individual variation in performance is not adequately reported because data are grouped (Andersen 1977, 1978; Rosansky 1976).

Fathman (1978) reported that the structures which were analysed were based on studies of L1 development. As a result, structures which were unique to SLA may have been missed. Errors with ambiguous sources may not have been accounted for in the data which may provide an explanation for the low rate of L1 errors which was reported (White 1977). In short:

The morpheme order approach is useful for describing the overall sequence of target-like use of distinct structural items as an accuracy measure (Larsen-Freeman 1978), but I think it is not suited to capture various developmental regularities. Notice that the criticism reviewed above did not question the morpheme order approach as a useful notion to describe language acquisition. In Wode et al. 1978 we argue that the notion itself is inadequate as a tool to provide insights into how language is learned, because by focusing on target-like performance morpheme order studies necessarily miss all those developments leading up to, and preceding, the final states of achievements. This includes missing several types of data well known to occur in many different types of language acquisition, including some quite prevalent in many different structural areas of L2 acquisition. (Wode 1981:64)

2.3.3 Conclusion

Andersen (1991) says that morpheme studies lost their relevance and were abandoned partly

¹ Nevertheless, Kessler & Idar (1979) found that a longitudinal study of naturalistic acquisition of English by a Vietnamese adult and child followed the sequences of the morpheme studies.

because of their inability to explain the process of how learners learnt an L2. They could be part of a theoretical explanation of SLA, but they would never account for SLA adequately (Hatch 1979). On the other hand, they proved invaluable in starting the trend towards studying learner language as systematic and showing active participation on the part of the learner in system-building. In addition, notions such as natural sequences of development and developmental errors are still widely accepted today and these two concepts will be addressed in my study.

2.4 NATURAL ROUTES

One of the most important findings of the morpheme studies was the existence of natural routes of development in SLA. These routes usually refer to particular languages, but there are also cross-linguistic generalisations which can be made, especially for the acquisition of Indo-European languages; e.g. external negation is the first step in the acquisition of negation. However, further research is needed to identify natural routes of development in languages which are not part of the Indo-European family. It might be possible, for example, to find functional commonalities rather than formal ones across languages.

2.4.1 Background

A fairly limited number of languages and morphemes have been investigated in search of sequences of development. English as the L2 has been the main focus of most studies and there has been little comparative work on other ILs, especially on ILs of non-Indo European languages. The acquisition orders of negation (e.g. Hyltenstam 1977; Wode 1981), word order and interrogatives (e.g. Carroll 1990; Huang cited in Sato 1990; Ravem cited in Towell & Hawkins 1994; Wagner-Gough 1975) have been studied extensively in English, German, and to a lesser extent, Dutch. The native languages of the learners have tended to be Spanish, Italian, Chinese, Turkish and Arabic (see Lalleman 1996 for an overview). So, although one can now investigate and probably assume that there are natural sequences of acquisition in all languages, it is not clear which morphemes (or functions) are likely to appear earlier and which later, if one were to compare the development of different learner languages.

The earliest mention of natural routes of development is found in Corder (1967) who proposed a *built-in syllabus* for learners. The morpheme studies explored and developed this point so that Krashen (1981, 1982) included the *natural order hypothesis* in his model of SLA. Lalleman

(1996:20) concludes that:

(i) it is generally agreed upon that there are set orders of acquisition whereby certain structures can be learned only after others have been acquired. The acquisition order of a number of (unrelated) morphological features and (related) syntactic features has been shown to be universal to a large extent (Krashen 1981, Dulay et al. 1982). Most researchers, therefore, conclude that the available material has been sufficiently analyzed to consider the 'universal route of acquisition' proven.

The sense in which the word 'universal' is used here is ambiguous. Studies which have shown a universal route of acquisition which is independent of L1 background or learning situation for learners of *a particular language*, support the claim of a universal acquisition for *a language*. However, if the word 'universal' is used in the sense of a universal order of acquisition for *all* languages, regardless of L1 background or the L2 to be learned, then this claim has definitely not yet been proven. It is likely that there could be a universal sequence of development in a functional sense, but the specific morphemes and syntactic patterns of different languages are unlikely to be acquired in exactly the same order.

Most studies have focussed on the acquisition of forms and not of functions since they have looked at particular languages rather than compared sequences cross-linguistically. In addition, the languages which have been studied tend to belong to the Indo-European family and these results cannot necessarily be generalised to languages with different typologies, such as the agglutinative African languages (unless, perhaps, one considers a functional rather than a formal view). For example, one could investigate whether the English acquisition sequence *-ing*, plural *-s*, copula, auxiliary, article, irregular past, regular past, third-person singular agreement, possessive (Krashen cited in Zobl 1995) holds true from a functional view, i.e. do learners typically need to do the same kind of things with their new language and therefore need forms which express the same kinds of functions? I would argue that this might be a more logical and fruitful approach and it might provide explanations for typical early forms, especially if one could assume that human beings are relatively similar in terms of how they process and use language across the world (Felix 1984).

Several studies support a common developmental route for the learning of English by speakers of different L1s. These include Ravem's (cited in Towell & Hawkins 1994) study of a Norwegian child, Cazden et al.'s (1975) study of Spanish speakers, Hakuta's (1974, 1976) study of a

Japanese child, Wode's (1981) study of German children, and Lightbown et al.'s (cited in Allwright 1984) study of French children and adolescents. All of these studies found similar orders which were also similar to other early morpheme studies.

2.4.2 Role of L1

In support of common routes of development, several studies conclude that the influence of the L1 is seen mainly in the rate of development rather than the sequence of development. Firstly, the typological proximity of the L1 to the L2 may affect the rate of acquisition. For example, Zobl (1984) points out that a Swedish learner of English can make use of parsing routines similar to those of Swedish, whereas a Turkish learner of English cannot do this as easily because of the agglutinative structure of Turkish. Zobl (1984:95) concludes that the "degree of initial success with which familiar parsing routines can be applied to the L2 may have a determining influence on how far down on the scale of language differentiation the complexification process begins". Kellerman (1984) feels, however, that the influence of the L1 can work both ways because if the developmental pattern is found in the L1 of the learner, the learner may either move more quickly through that stage or may in fact fossilise at that stage (see also studies by Ravem cited in Towell & Hawkins 1994; Schumann 1978; Wode 1978; Zobl cited in Odlin 1989).

When comparing the results of numerous studies of natural routes, it becomes apparent that there is some controversy about whether there is a set order of acquisition since not all results show exactly the same route of development. For example, a number of studies show the effect of the L1 on acquisition orders (Hakuta 1976; Larsen-Freeman 1975; Mace-Matluck 1979; Schachter 1974). Schumann (1979) and Zobl (1980) argue strongly for substantial L1 influences on development. Odlin (1989) shows that this view is supported by comparative studies of the development of negation, where Spanish learners used *no* as the negative particle while Japanese speakers used *no* and *not*. The choice of particles can be related to the negative formation rules in the L1s of these learners (Stauble 1984). From a different perspective, Kellerman (cited in Kellerman 1984) concludes that L1 influence can be seen clearly if one takes avoidance strategies into account.

2.4.3 Influence of elicitation tasks

It also appears that different types of data yield slightly different results. Although natural

sequences have been observed in spontaneous speech, the order has been shown to be disrupted if more formal language production is studied; e.g. translation, grammar exercises, written forms (Ellis 1987b; Fuller cited in Allwright 1984; Krashen et al. 1976). Ghrib's (1987) study of a Tunisian learner of English attributes differences in the sequence of development to the mixture of spontaneous and elicited data on which her study was based. For example, she finds the regular past tense appears before the irregular in elicited speech but *vice versa* in spontaneous speech.

2.4.4 Influence of input

The type of input which the learners receive also seems to make a difference to the sequence of development. Larsen-Freeman (1991:320) concludes that "a recurring finding was the correlation between the frequency of certain forms in the input and their appearance in learners' ILs". In addition, Sajavaara (cited in Allwright 1984) found differences in sequences of acquisition for Finnish students who only had exposure to formal input. Lightbown (1984:246) feels that disturbed orders in instruction-only contexts are a result of exposure to a "limited and distorted version of [TL] - so distorted that it may be said to constitute a different 'target-language'". Eubank (cited in Zobl 1995) and Weinert (1987) also found disturbed orders with distorted input and explicit instruction as the input. Wode (1981:305) argues that learners in natural situations follow a strict sequence of development, but that learners in instructed environments have developmental orders "characterised by rather loose chronological ordering" (although error types are the same).

Lightbown (1983) shows that accuracy on the plural was worse than on the auxiliary for French learners in Canada. This finding led her to conclude that although the natural order was not confirmed it was also not disconfirmed, and that it might be better not to posit too strict an order. Allwright (1984:213) agrees with this conclusion and feels that although ordering may not be invariant, it is feasible to posit a "reliable and stable ... sequence". Even more tentatively, Andersen (1978) prefers to use implicational hierarchies and says that there is no absolute route but that one can discuss tendencies, i.e. some morphemes appear earlier and some appear later. This is not a particularly helpful observation, as it is rather general.

Nevertheless, several writers show that formal instruction has no effect on natural orders, regardless of whether learners are in naturalistic or formal situations and regardless of the L1 of

the learners (Bailey et al. 1974; Ellis 1984, 1989; Felix 1981; Krashen et al. 1977; Lalleman 1996; Meisel et al. 1981; Perkins & Larsen-Freeman 1975; Pienemann 1984; Towell & Hawkins 1994). To explain this, Felix (1981:110) argues that instructed learners follow the same route as naturalistic learners because when the formal environment demands that they produce the structure, they have to rely on the same natural processes of development and “natural acquisition principles” that naturalistic learners use. Krashen (1985) accounts for similarities between the language of learners in formal and naturalistic situations with his non-interface position. In this view, formal instruction has no influence on the acquisition of a language because formal learning and unconscious acquisition are entirely unrelated and the two knowledge representations never interact. What the learner produces is therefore a result of acquisition rather than formal instruction. Providing a further two possible explanations, Allwright (1984) suggests that the natural syllabus may override what is available in the classroom, or possibly classroom discourse is not particularly different from the input received in the natural environment.

2.4.5 Conclusion

Providing an explanation for the natural order which has been found has proved problematic. Doughty (1991:436) studied the acquisition of relative clause types after formal instruction and concluded that natural sequences are a result of a “universal ordering of difficulty, although exactly what constitutes difficulty has not yet been clearly established”. She relates difficulty to psycholinguistic processing and concludes that markedness also affects acquisition once the learner is ready to acquire a particular structure. Zobl (1995) concludes that a mixture of functional categories and Universal Grammar (UG) provides an explanation for natural orders.

Despite the limitations discussed above, the discovery of natural routes of acquisition was important for a number of reasons. Firstly, it substantiated the idea that acquisition was regular and reinforced the notion of systematicity in learner language. Secondly, its value lay in the contribution it could make to teaching, since language-learning materials could be graded and presented according to the sequence of development. Thirdly, it showed that formal instruction probably had less effect on acquisition than previously believed, which meant that studies of learners in formal and informal learning conditions could be compared.

2.5 INTERLANGUAGE

2.5.1 Introduction

The term *interlanguage* (IL), which refers to the language produced by learners acquiring an additional language, was coined by Selinker (1972), although studies of the IL phenomenon and the notion that learner language should be studied as an autonomous system predate the term by several years (e.g. Corder 1967). Some writers (e.g. Lalleman 1996) classify IL as part of the Creative Construction Hypothesis (CCH) paradigm which has the central tenet that the learner is an active participant in the learning process and produces a system which is not too different from other natural languages (Long & Sato 1984). On the other hand, Sharwood Smith (1994) argues against IL falling under the CCH because he says this branch of research was not concerned with interim grammars but rather with finding common patterns of development.

2.5.2 Key concepts in interlanguage

The original formulations in Selinker's (1972) seminal paper include:

- ⊆ that the learner moves through a series of intermediate stages from the L1 to the L2;
- ⊆ that the learner's aim is to move from the linguistic system of the IL to the L2 system;
- ⊆ that the output of the learner is not describable in terms of the linguistic units of the L1 and/or the L2; and
- ⊆ that 95% of learners never actually achieve the L2 system.

An IL is an independent, structured linguistic system which includes both errors and non-errors (*cf.* EA which looked only at errors) produced by a learner trying to produce a target language (TL). An IL is idiosyncratic to a learner, but as discussed above in section 2.4, there is a fairly common range of IL structures and patterns used by learners with the same L1 and different L1s. Corder's (1971) use of an alternative term for IL, *idiosyncratic dialect*, emphasizes that individual learners do not share the same ILs, although research showing commonalities across learners may make it feasible to talk of "mini-dialects" for a group of learners in the same class (James 1998; Sharwood Smith 1994). Input, which is fairly similar across formal contexts because of common classroom discourse patterns, may also lead to similarities in IL (Allwright 1984), and so common development may result from similar environmental factors (Snow & Ferguson cited in Felix 1984).

Nemser (1971) uses the term *approximative system* for IL to show that the learner moves closer and closer towards the TL as he/she processes more and more of the TL system and Corder's

(1967) use of *transitional competence* has a similar focus on movement from L1 to L2. The notion of movement *from L1 to L2* is controversial and Corder (cited in van Els et al. 1984:69) says that movement should not be seen as movement from one language to another but “as a movement through a series of increasingly complex stages”. Both the terms *approximative system* and *transitional competence* have been rejected by some because of their connotations of comparison between IL and TL, although Nemser’s discussion includes the point that IL is distinct from the L1 and the L2 (as Selinker and others argue).

A further point of difference is that Nemser (1971:116) defined the learner-language system as a “deviant” form of the TL, which is not a view which Selinker holds. Selinker (1972) strongly rejects the notion that IL should be compared to the TL and insists that IL is a system in its own right. Nevertheless, he maintains the view that there is movement towards a target and James (1998:17) also suggests that “as long as FL [foreign language] learners are prepared to see and call themselves learners, the assumption that they wish to conform is surely a reasonable one to make”. He believes that learners themselves are comparing their language to the TL so that some form of comparison is necessary (see also Jake 1998 for a similar view). This is a view not strongly supported by IL theorists, but one practised widely in the analysis of data, even when functional approaches are used.

Regarding IL as a system proved to be a good theoretical concept, but actually analysing the data in this fashion has proved highly problematic. James (1994) says that the first step in an analysis is to describe the IL. However, later it is also necessary to compare systems (L1, L2, IL) in order to reach the desired level of explanation. Perdue and his colleagues (1993a) took a step in the right direction when they analysed the data from their cross-linguistic study of learner language as a system in its own right (see section 2.6.1). However, they too admit to using descriptive categories based on other established languages and they were also unable to avoid completely the “trap” of comparisons between the IL and the TL (Klein & Perdue 1997). In defence, they say that if one is to regard learner language as a natural language (conforming to UG rules with internal consistency), which many do (e.g. Adjémian 1976; Pinker 1984), then one cannot expect to find a whole new set of categories which apply only to learner languages (see also Pienemann 1992). Granted, one may find that learners do not use the categories in a predictable way (e.g. they may have different functional purposes when they use the categories and they may have split

the categories in a non-target-like and non-source-like way), but the basic categories are still available when they learn the language. It is the unique function-form match which the researcher should be interested in rather than attempting to discover entirely new categories for these languages. James (1998:94) makes pertinent points when he asks:

So is it ever justifiable to describe learners' errors in terms appropriate to, or even derived from, the TL? It would be if the two codes were closely related, or 'cognate', if they were two dialects of the same language for example. Now Corder (1971) called the learner's version of the TL their 'idiosyncratic dialect'. This must imply that the learner's and the NSs' [native speakers] codes are dialects of the same language, the first 'idiosyncratic' and incomplete, the NSs', by contrast, a complete and a social rather than an idiosyncratic, private one. Being co-dialects of the same language, they should be describable in terms of the same grammar.

A strong TL comparison approach seems to suppose that all learners can and will eventually become indistinguishable from L1 speakers, a notion which Selinker & Lamendella (1978) and Scovel (1988) reject. Nevertheless, Selinker (1992) notes that some learners can manage to appear to be native-like in some conditions and situations and often control their performance by avoiding certain constructions and types of talk. The lack of complete development of the TL is described as *fossilisation*. Parts of the system appear to be impermeable to outside influence and new hypotheses. A number of reasons have been cited for this phenomenon and they include:

- C the notion that the learner learns as much as is necessary to communicate (Klein & Perdue 1997);
- C phonological fossilisation interferes with morphological development (Sato 1990);
- C non-target-like forms are automatised (Hulstijn 1989);
- C there are problems with parameter-setting in a UG view (Hale cited in Nakuma 1998);
- C the L1 interferes in the form of negative transfer (Selinker 1992; Selinker & Lakshamanan 1992); and/or
- C motivation levels are not high enough (Nakuma 1998).

Adjémian (1976) contributed to the concept of IL by emphasizing its permeability to influence from the L1. Adjémian is comparing L1 and L2 development here and shows that L2 development may show signs of L1 features which the development of L1 logically cannot show because the L1 learner does not have another language to draw on. Permeability to influence from the L1 may be problematic with regard to the notion of systematicity, as it seems to be acceptable to compare the L1 and the IL, but not the IL and the L2. One point in favour here may be that the learner knows the L1 and therefore incorporates it into the system, whereas he/she does not know the L2 so that it cannot be incorporated properly into the system. However, it

might also be possible to say that the IL is influenced by the L2. This leaves two possibilities with regard to the structure of the IL. Either, there are two sources of influence (L1 and L2) and a separate system called the IL; or there are two sources of influence (L1 and L2) which combine to make up the new system. Selinker (1992) seems to argue for the former approach although he does not place much emphasis on the influence of the L1, regarding it as only one of several learner strategies for learning the new language. A further option which he explores is to search for a system of interlingual identifications (IIs) which form a system of comparison at a subconscious level (see section 2.1.3). This would give the L1 and the L2 similar low levels of influence in the formation of the IL. If there was a universal system of IIs, one could then say that the L1 and the L2 have very little influence. However, if the system of IIs is between the L1 and the TL then one returns to the contrastive problem of comparing two languages, albeit at the deep level, and both languages have a major role to play in the formation of the IL. Unfortunately (as discussed in section 2.1.3), an adequate theory of IIs does not exist and the preceding questions cannot yet be answered.

2.5.3 Composition of the IL system

Bialystok & Sharwood Smith (1985) point out that there are two ways of viewing IL. On the one hand, it can be seen as the product of a set of highly structured hypotheses making up the underlying competence. The product is revealed in performance. This product can be studied as a diachronic series of systems which develop as second-language acquisition (SLA) progresses, or as a language system at a particular point in time (Cooreman & Kilborn 1991). On the other hand, IL can be seen as the system of underlying competence which needs to be investigated in terms of the psychological processes at work. It seems then that both the product and the system need to be investigated.

There are different views of the “composition of the IL system” (Bialystok & Sharwood Smith 1985:102-103). Some, like Selinker, see it as a “single system composed of rules which have been developed via different processes”, while others, like Adjémian (1976), see the system as composed of “a combination of separate knowledge sources” consisting of the L1 and an L2-based system. Robert (1989:219-220) views a language as being composed of two aspects: a “computational system”, which is the set of rules for structuring syntax, phonology and semantics, and a “conceptual system” which relates to thematic relations. Whereas fully-fledged

languages make use of both systems to a great extent, it is claimed that IL users rely on the conceptual system more than on the computational system. The conceptual system is more universal whereas the computational system would be language-specific.

Bialystok & Sharwood Smith (1985) argue instead for a knowledge component (underlying linguistic system) and a control component (retrieval procedures) in the description of IL (see also Cook cited in Towell 1987). The control component is the set of retrieval procedures used to access the underlying linguistic system. Either or both of these components need to be considered in the analysis of IL data and may be different from or similar to those of the native speaker (see also Towell 1987). Their definition of IL is therefore:

... the systematic language performance (in production and recognition of utterances) by second-language learners who have not achieved sufficient levels of analysis of linguistic knowledge or control of processing to be identified completely with native speakers. (Bialystok & Sharwood Smith 1985:116)

Second-language acquisition development in this view requires increased knowledge and/or better control.

2.5.3.1 Universal elements

The IL may also consist of a universal component. Despite extensive writing in the area (e.g. Cook 1996; DeKydspotter et al. 1998; Felix 1995; Flynn 1991; Gass 1984b, 1995; Gregg 1989; Kanno 1998; Kaplan 1998; Lardiere 1998; Schachter 1992; Schwartz & Sprouse 1994; Sharwood Smith 1994; White 1992, 1998), theorists cannot agree if IL is a natural language which is UG-based. It is possible, if interlingual identifications (IIs) are not based on UG (which might be the case if UG is unavailable to older learners), that the new system is entirely separate from the native language (NL) and the TL. On the other hand, another argument is that the system is partially separate, has to be based on the NL and the TL to some extent because of transfer, is linked via IIs and should be investigable in a UG framework (e.g. White cited in Selinker 1992). A further possibility is that IL develops from UG with a “learning mechanism which incorporates a theory of markedness” (Zobl 1992:176).

2.5.3.2 Formulaic elements

Formulaic utterances are a major component of the IL system. They serve a vitally important

communicative function and may be unanalysed chunks of language at early stages (Altman 1997; Klein 1986). For example, Altman (1997) points out that inflected verbs may be produced as unanalyzed wholes but this does not mean that the learner can use the rules productively to form other inflected verbs. Apart from their communicative function, Fillmore (cited in Myles et al. 1998) suggests that formulaic expressions may also be useful data on which language learning is based because they can be used as frames for further development. Similarly, Myles et al. (1998, 1999) who studied the development of pronominal systems, conclude that formulaic expressions aid communication in the early stages and that they are used as the basis of hypothesis testing. Hakuta's (1974) discussion of formulaic expressions shows that learners perceive formulaic expressions as units, both syntactically and semantically.

2.5.3.3 Conclusion

Towell & Hawkins (1994) discuss the different origins of the elements of IL and conclude that some of them have UG origins, some have transfer origins, some are formulaic, and some are a result of learned linguistic knowledge. It appears then that there is a knowledge system which may consist of hypotheses about the TL, universal elements such as a conceptual system relating to thematic relations, and formulaic utterances. In addition, there is a control system which consists of procedures to access the knowledge system. The product of the knowledge and control systems will be discussed in the next section.

2.5.4 Features of interlanguage

There have been a variety of attempts at describing IL features and comparisons have been made between IL, child language and pidgins, because some features appear to be similar (Andersen 1983). Kachru (cited in Williams 1989) found that many features of non-native institutionalized varieties of English (NIVES) can be found in learner language and suggests that they have their roots in individual SLA. Theorists comparing IL to "reduced" forms of language like child language and pidgins see it as "a variety of language which is both formally and communicatively reduced when compared to languages used as native languages by adults" (Faerch et al. 1984:271). However, equating IL with other non-native forms of language has met with criticism because some (e.g. Bickerton 1983; Myhill 1991) believe that the social contexts in which each occur are incomparable, although Adamson (1989) suggests that a common bioprogram guides development in these different contexts. Mitchell & Myles (1998) also conclude that pidgins and

ILs do not share all their syntactic features and that pidgin systems are more stable than most ILs. Nevertheless, Givón (1979) provides a framework which describes the features of different forms of language, in which he distinguishes a pragmatic mode of communication which occurs in “reduced” languages and a syntactic mode of communication which occurs in fully-developed languages. Table 2.1 presents some of the features of the two modes.

Table 2.1 Features of the pragmatic and syntactic mode

Pragmatic mode	Syntactic mode
1. Topic-comment structure	1. Subject-predicate structure
2. Loose coordination	2. Tight coordination
3. Slow rate of delivery	3. Fast rate of delivery
4. Small chunks under one intonation contour	4. Large chunks under one intonation contour
5. Lower noun/verb ratio in discourse	5. Higher noun/verb ratio
6. More simple verbs	6. More complex verbs
7. No use of grammatical morphology	7. Extensive use of grammatical morphology

(Adapted from Givón 1979:98)

Sato (1988) reports that only the lack of grammatical IL morphology has been studied extensively and that the evidence of a low noun/verb ratio is not conclusive, although Perdue’s (1993a,b) study supports both lack of morphology and low noun/verb ratios. Pienemann (1992) believes that ILs have a common lexicon, part of the rule system of the TL and a set of idiosyncratic rules. However, these aspects have not been fully explored and a full set of lexical items and rules is not available. A more detailed account of the features of IL (or “simple codes”) is supplied by Corder (1977:2):

... a simple or virtually non-existent morphological system, a more-or-less fixed word order, a simple personal pronoun system, a small number of grammatical function words and grammatical categories, little or no use of the copula, absence of an article system (less often the absence of deictic words). The semantic functions of these and other systematic systems such as tense and aspect are typically performed, when at all, by lexical means, e.g. adverbs, or some “imperial form”. The basic syntactic relations are expressed by word order.

The IL does not therefore consist of the same phonological, morphological and syntactic categories of the target language (TL) or the source language (SL), but it is still unclear to what degree the system is a simplified version of fully-fledged languages and to what degree it is based

on universal categories.

2.5.5 Interlanguage development

2.5.5.1 General development

The initial hypothesis (starting point) of learner language is controversial in SLA theory. Contrastive analysts believed that the L1 is the starting point with successive restructuring until the learner's language approximates the TL (Fries 1945, Lado 1957). Development occurs when the basic system is elaborated by incorporating the rules of the TL. Corder (cited in Gass 1984a) believes that this is the correct position for phonology, but Zobl (1984:85) criticises this perspective because he feels that "(i)n restructuring distinctions are lost and subsequently elaborated along different lines ... unmarking or despecification of the L1 grammar would have to take place for any movement to occur in the direction of the target". He also refutes the idea that the L1 in its full form is the starting point of IL because of empirical data showing that certain structures that one would expect to be transferred because of their equivalent positions in the L2 are in fact not transferred.

Zobl (1984) joins others (e.g. Sharwood Smith & Rutherford cited in Selinker 1992) in believing that the initial hypothesis is an independent system (core grammar, IL base) which resides in the learner, especially for syntax (Corder cited in Gass 1984a). This core grammar might be made up of universal rules of human language (Selinker 1984, 1992) and, according to Corder (cited in Gass 1984a), it is based on the system used when the L1 developed. This may be akin to the notion of Universal Grammar (UG), although Corder does not commit himself on this point. His 1977 paper suggests that semantic aspects such as agency, animacy and spatial location may be sufficient to analyse IL data. He says that the common features found in the ILs of learners with diverse L1 backgrounds may be due to a return to the basic system, rather than a need to use the L1 to any great extent. The pull towards the basic code is therefore stronger than any L1 influences. However, Selinker (1992:33-34) feels that a combination of approaches is the correct one:

My hypothesis is that the NL is part of where the L2 learner has to be on day one of exposure to input from the TL, because of the pervasive reality of language transfer and, therefore, interlingual identifications. But it cannot be the entire starting point because of the reality of early fossilization of non-L1-like structures.

2.5.5.2 Simplification

Simple systems and simplification processes are controversial issues in IL writing. The core system is a simple system (but not a simplified version of the NL or the TL because the learner does not know the TL, according to Valdman, 1977). This simple system is elaborated as the learner learns more about the TL, with the possibility that development is arrested at some point, resulting in fossilization. Explaining the simplification which has taken place in simple codes, Corder (1977) discusses two views of simplification. The first is that IL appears simple because it is compared to a native language (NL), which means that ILs are described in terms of the complexities of these fully-fledged languages. This is the view taken by Silva-Corvalán (1991:330) when she says linguistic simplification includes “reduction of the inventory of linguistic forms, semantic range, or language functions, and the elimination of alternative structures at certain levels”. She also sees it as generalisation or overgeneralisation (see also Preston cited in Silva-Corvalán 1991), which involves expanding the use of one form at the expense of another form, resulting in a loss of variety in the forms used. In SLA, forms are not being lost, but the overgeneralisation of a form is the starting point with progressive acquisition of further forms in a process which is the mirror-image of language loss. Simplification in ILs may therefore be the result of universal simplification processes, which removes the link to a specific native language.

The second way of looking at simplification, which Corder (1977) also examines, is that NLs are complex forms of simple codes and that there are language-specific complexification strategies or rules (see also Klein & Perdue 1997 for a similar conclusion). According to Baker (1979), from a learnability perspective, the idea of a simple code which is elaborated is a better one.

2.5.5.3 Development of the interlanguage system

When discussing further development of the IL system, it is essential to remember that internal systematicity is a central principle of IL. Ellis (1985a) points out that IL is systematic from both horizontal (synchronic) and vertical (diachronic) perspectives. Although it does not necessarily detract from the systematic nature of IL, it is also necessary to posit a degree of variability (Dickerson 1975; Huebner 1979). However, Sharwood Smith (1994) sees systematicity and variability as incompatible, and he argues that absolute systematicity and independence of the system has to be an idealisation because of the dynamic quality of the learner’s IL.

Development may be viewed in two ways: either as leaps from stage to stage, or as the gradual spread of a rule to different areas and contexts of the IL. Both views lead to a role for variability which, although it may be random at times, is more often contextually derived, with influence from the L1 (permeability) and internal development having an effect on the choices made. The task may also have an effect on variability (Tarone 1982, 1983, 1989). Any analysis of IL therefore requires an account of situational, contextual and linguistic factors as well as their interaction, as these factors may influence the product of the system (Sato 1988, 1990).

The focus on L1 and developmental errors is a combination of a contrastive analysis (CA) approach, cognitive processes (Gass 1979; Kellerman 1977, 1979; Sharwood Smith 1979), and developmental processes (Andersen 1983). Learning happens gradually as the process involves learning forms, meanings and functions (Larsen-Freeman 1991) while rules change over time (Ellis 1987a, b, c; Selinker & Douglas 1985). Rules need to cover all aspects of language from the phonological to the discursal levels (Klein 1991), and these rules must allow for interaction, since each level of language is not learnt in an isolated fashion. Form-meaning relationships need to be developed since

... there are also forms whose relationship with meaning is difficult to access in the L2. These forms carry little semantic weight or have little perceptual salience, or the form-meaning relationship may be difficult to grasp. ... Learners also need data as they construct or set their interlanguage. They need to know how their interlanguage differs from the L2. It might be said that they need to know what is ungrammatical, but since interlanguage is systematic and, therefore, grammatical in its own way, one might simply say that learners need to know what in their interlanguage is inconsistent with the L2. Finally, learners need to have data on the potential of their interlanguage for expressing relationships of form and meaning as well as the extent to which they can modify and restructure their interlanguage toward L2 morphosyntax. (Pica 1998:11)

As new knowledge is gained and integrated into the underlying system, the functions of other items in the system are narrowed or broadened and elements of the system are restructured or rejected. Interlanguage does not develop in a linear fashion but is recursive and continually restructured (Corder 1992). Carroll (1984) finds in her study of English learners of German that IL data shows periods of focus where there is a disproportionate number of one type of structure which has been newly acquired at the expense of other forms which may have been used earlier. The notion of staged development from IL1 to ILn might not be a feasible one, as restructuring may not necessarily move the learner forward but may in fact move him/her further away from

the TL if an incorrect hypothesis is made. Alternatively, it may create confusion, so that the learner temporarily reverts to an earlier stage (backsliding). In addition, the degree of variation apparent in an IL at any one time may preclude the notion of discretely staged development. Corder (1992) prefers to use this model for phonological development, but he does not see this as necessarily feasible in the case of other subsystems of language, partly because of the lack of clarity about the starting point of IL. As a result, it is not always possible to predict that learners will progress in exactly the same way and improve their competence in a particular element of the system. For example, Clahsen (1995), discussing the development of German plurals, found that although some learners increased their accuracy over time, some learners stayed at about the same rate of accuracy even though other elements of their grammar did develop. Over the two-year period, none of the learners he investigated reached 100% accuracy.

Fillmore (cited in Johnson 1992) sees L2 development as comprising three stages:

- C gesturing without verbal communication;
- C communication which does not focus on correctness of form; and
- C a concern for form.

Cazden (1968) offers a different classification into four periods in L1 acquisition:

- C no inflection is apparent;
- C formulaic utterances are produced (there are no errors but little communication beyond the set of known utterances);
- C much communication with many errors and overgeneralizations;
- C 90% correct use of a form.

These L1 acquisition stages seem to be true of L2 development as well (Klein 1986). With regard to the grammaticalisation of utterances, Skiba & Dittmar (1992) conclude that the first stage is where learners put words next to each other but they are not explicitly related. The second stage occurs when syntax starts to develop and relations between words are shown more explicitly. The third stage is where the IL and TL start to converge, and syntactic and morphological relations are fairly target-like. Bardovi-Harlig & Bofman (1989) conclude that advanced learners are better at syntax than at morphology because they focus on what is communicatively important rather than on what is less important (and often redundant) to communication.

2.5.5.3.1 Strategies for development

The learner makes use of a number of strategies for accessing and analysing input data and

producing output. Wolf Quintero (cited in Towell & Hawkins 1994:49) provides a number of strategies for analysing and producing language:

- * *conservatism*: ‘the initial hypothesis will be the most conservative possible ... even if a learner notices complexity in the input data’ ...
- * *continuity*: ‘a preference for items that combine to be adjacent’ (p. 44)
- * *uniqueness*: an ‘initial preference for one-to-one correspondences between forms and their meaning’ (p. 45)
- * *cumulative development*: ‘development must proceed in stages and ... each stage will contain the previous stage plus something more’ (p. 45)
- * *generalisation*: ‘avoid exceptions’ (p. 45)
- * *pre-emption*: ‘when a structure is generalised to related lexical items without direct evidence from the input, the hypothesis will be noted as tentative ... If there is never confirming evidence, the hypothesis will be lost’ (p. 46)

Apart from these strategies, Hatch (1978) feels that development is a result of interaction so that forms and functions come to be matched over time and the basis for development is discourse. Pfaff (1987:100) notes that “(d)iscourse functions develop before grammatical functions ...” (see also Huebner 1983; Jordens cited in Cooreman & Kilborn 1991).

Fillmore (cited in Myles et al. 1999) and Nattinger & DeCarrico (1992) take a different view, suggesting rather that formulaic utterances form the basis of grammatical development. Formulaic utterances contain complex grammatical structures which are available to the learner for analysis. Ellis (1996) agrees with this view and, in addition, he concludes that memorizing formulaic or non-formulaic sequences of language forms a major part of language learning. These sequences move from short-term memory to long-term memory, where they are analysed implicitly for regularities (Ellis & Schmidt 1997). In contrast, Krashen & Scarcella (1978) maintain a non-interface position between learned knowledge and acquired knowledge. Zobl (1979) rejects this view based on evidence from creative construction strategies. Wode (1981) also rejects Fillmore’s (cited in Wode 1981) position because it does not explain how elements which do not occur linearly are acquired (e.g. phonological and semantic features, discourse structure rules). Furthermore, there are developmental errors in the speech of a learner which cannot be attributed to any formulaic expressions, the role of the L1 is not explained and formulaic utterances may be altered at later stages to conform to the developmental level at that time.

Schachter (1992) points out that many theorists have accepted the view that language learning involves a process of hypothesis-making and hypothesis-testing, although it is not clear in what

way learners use negative and positive evidence or seek disconfirmation for their hypotheses. Fodor & Crain (cited in Zobl 1992) feel that the conservativeness of the learning process is a result of hypothesis-testing which relies on the input and unmarked versions of a grammar. Less conservative development only occurs once marked versions of a structure are noticed in the input. Beck et al. (1995) and Schwartz (1993) argue that positive evidence is the main factor in L2 grammar development. Although they do not rule out a role for negative evidence in SLA, they do not believe that it plays a role as evidence in constructing L2 grammar systems. Schachter (1992) says that hypotheses are formulated on the basis of experience with the language and input and that the formulation-testing-acceptance/rejection process is cyclical and continuous, with the learner focussing at different times on different hypotheses.

Common to both versions of the cognitive approach is the idea that L2 learners initially decode, analyse, store and produce - i.e. process - material from the new language in ways which are determined by general cognitive factors like the 'perceptual saliency' of the material, the 'continuity' of elements in that material, the basic 'conservatism' of learners in not extending hypotheses to domains not warranted by the input. This approach considers that people perceive events in terms of 'actors', 'actions' and 'persons or things acted upon', and that these are more 'salient' than the place where the event took place, or the time it took place, or the manner in which it took place. By extension it is considered that L2 learners will attend to and acquire new ways of expressing 'actors', 'actions' and 'people or things acted upon' before they will attend to and acquire adverbials dealing with the place, time and manner of the event. (Towell & Hawkins 1994:46)

Tarone (1988) and Ellis (1992) believe that noticing is the crucial aspect for inclusion of a new structure in the grammar. Ellis (1992) sees development spreading according to tasks or contexts. However, Towell & Hawkins (1994) feel that this view implies a random entry point by the learner rather than an entry point which can be related to the L1. They cite as evidence studies of learners of English and French which show that these learners differ systematically in where they place the object pronoun, with French learners easily learning to place the pronoun postverbally in English, but English learners going through a stage of placing the French pronoun postverbally rather than preverbally (the same sequence is found for English learners of Spanish according to Andersen, 1991).

This section has discussed the general features of IL development which seem to result from a series of cycles of hypothesis-making and hypothesis-testing, possibly limited by a universal set of constraints on what kind of hypotheses can be made. The performance displayed by the learner

is subject to variability according to task and level of development. As this section has focussed mainly on the general features of development, the next section moves on to a discussion of morphological development in IL, an area which is particularly relevant to my study.

2.5.5.3.2 Morphological development

Lack of morphology seems to be one of the main characteristics of IL and Schumann (1982:338) explains the logical problem of explaining lack of morphology in the following way:

Absence of morphology is the aspect of simplification that is most problematic because, as many researchers have pointed out, simplification implies having something and then eliminating it. If learners do not supply morphology it is probably because they do not know it, not because they choose not to use it. But I regard lack of morphology as simplification because learners do not process it in the input, and therefore, it is not available in their output. Thus absence of morphology results from a processing constraint which leads to product level utterances which are morphologically simple in comparison to well formed TL speech.

Bybee (1985, 1991) discusses the acquisition of morphology based on a variety of different languages in terms of order and process. Although many studies focus on L1 acquisition, VanPatten (1984) found that L1 and L2 morphological acquisition is almost identical. Suzman's (1982, 1999) studies of the acquisition of Zulu also confirm similarities between L1 and L2 acquisition. Bybee (1991:80) presents a hierarchy of morphemes which are ordered from most semantically relevant to least semantically relevant in the verb (aspect, tense, mood, number, person), a hierarchy upheld by several studies (e.g. Antinucci & Miller 1976 for L1 acquisition; Kumpf 1984; Nixon cited in Andersen 1991; Paradis et al. 1998 for L2 acquisition).

The following acquisition patterns are also found:

- C case-marking is learnt before less semantically motivated morphemes such as gender (Pfaff 1987);
- C basic forms are selected on the basis of markedness or semantic simplicity and/or frequency of use (Bybee 1991);
- C more relevant functors are placed closer to the lexical item so that semantically important morphemes are more likely to be added to the base than morphemes which do not have such important semantic functions (Slobin 1985);
- C "free forms are acquired before bound forms" (Wode 1981:306); and
- C verbal morphology develops before substantive morphology (Connors 1988).

Wode (1981) generalises from data on the acquisition of the plural and says that the rule for an inflection proceeds in the following way: it will first be used with stems that take the inflection

in the target language, while other stems will not be inflected. The rule will then spread within the appropriate class of stems. Newly acquired items may continue to be left uninflected, even if they belong to the set in question. Next there will be generalizations to include some of the remaining stem classes in non-target-like ways. At first, only one inflected form is used in all contexts. The second stage occurs when the learner learns more than one form of the inflection, but words are produced as lexical items with no awareness that there are two parts to the lexical item. Only later is a productive rule used which is when the use of correctly formed irregular items falls away as all forms are regularised. The final stage is correct use of irregular and regular forms, but this stage may not be reached by many learners.

With regard to pronominal development, Felix (1981) records the confusion of pronouns in the early stages of learning (see also Fillmore and Wode, both cited in Felix 1981). He finds a preference for the use of the proper noun rather than the pronoun during spontaneous conversation (see also Broeder 1991). Myles et al.'s (1999) study of French pronoun development shows development of the third-person pronoun based on formulaic chunks which included the first-person pronoun. Initially, the chunk is used inappropriately and the use of *je* (I) is overextended. This is followed by overextension of the chunk which includes *je* (I) with the addition of a lexical NP. The third stage is where the pronoun is omitted and replaced by a NP, and the final stage is where the third-person pronoun is used correctly.

Agreement is a morpheme which may have little semantic impact on utterances and these forms are learnt late. Learners of Brazilian Portuguese initially use the third-person agreement morpheme (Simoes & Stoel-Gammon cited in Bybee 1991), although this is a later form for learners of English. A further stage occurs when first-person agreement is added to an inflected form, so that double morphological marking occurs for learners of Brazilian Portuguese and Polish (Simoes & Stoel-Gammon and Smoczynska, both cited in Bybee 1991). In a discussion of the use of the third-person agreement marker in English L2, Makoni (1996) notes that redundancy does not necessarily stop the learner from using the marker as some have argued before. Rather, the presence of a pronoun requiring the agreement marker triggers the use of the marker more often than zero anaphor does (see also Young 1988, 1991 for similar findings).

Carroll's (1999) study of absolute beginner learners of the French gender system found that

learners learnt natural gender most easily and that a variety of other factors influenced the learning of non-natural gender marking. Phonological cues are not particularly useful for learning gender but semantic patterning which enables the learner to map conceptual categories to morphosyntactic categories aids learning. These learners all made generalisations about gender patterning which were not related to their L1 or to the TL at times.

Krashen (1981) and Seliger (1979) argue that where there is simple one-to-one mapping of form to function, the morpheme will be easy to learn, but where there are a variety of forms for a function or a variety of functions for a form, learners will find these morphemes more difficult to acquire. African languages of the Bantu family make extensive use of morphology, since they have an agglutinative structure and the range of forms and functions is usually wider than the range found in the morphology of Indo-European languages. In fact, Slobin (1982a, b) concludes that L1 learners of agglutinative languages may learn inflections earlier than learners of non-fusional languages because of the important role played by inflections in these languages.

In order for L2 learners to cope with the multiplicity of morphological forms and functions in Swahili (an African language of the Bantu family), Musau (1995) identifies the use of three types of strategies (see also Faerch & Kasper 1983). These include:

- C functional reduction which is shown by “topic avoidance”, “message abandonment” or “meaning replacement”;
- C formal reduction where a simple system is utilised to avoid errors; and
- C compensatory strategies involving “code-switching, interlingual transfer, or overgeneralization (Musau 1995:298).

He found that learners of Swahili overgeneralised a few concords (classes 9 and 10) to all classes of nouns, possibly because they may be the most productive (Bokamba 1977) and neutral (Besha cited in Musau 1995). This pattern has also been seen in learners whose L1 has a similar class system, learners who do not have a similar class system and in L1 learners of other Bantu languages (Tsonope cited in Musau 1995). Musau (1995) explains the pattern by relating it to Andersen’s (1984) One-to-One Principle. In the IL of learners of Swahili, one form (e.g. class 9 or 10) is used to achieve one function (e.g. agreement) with singular/plural distinctions being made by the use of classes 9 or 10 respectively. Musau (1995) notes a similar pattern in the acquisition of adjectival concords.

Morphological development is usually found to be a fairly late development in the acquisition of Indo-European languages, but a question remains about the acquisition of morphology in an agglutinative African language. Although there may be similar sequences of development from a functional point of view, formal aspects of development may differ because of the wider range of morpheme forms which tend to be needed to perform particular semantic functions.

2.5.5.3.3 Utterance development

The Kiel project (Felix 1978; Wode 1976, 1979, 1981) studied the acquisition of German and English longitudinally. The study focussed on the development of negation, interrogation, inflections, phonology, and intonation. The results of the study show that the “variable(s) that determine(s) the linguistic structure of the learner’s utterances are the formal properties of linguistic devices, i.e. word order, free *vs.* bound form, segmental *vs.* suprasegmental marking, embedding, etc.” (Wode 1981:45).

In a pilot study of Perdue’s (1993a, b) study, Klein (1986:82) lists a similar set of utterance organisation principles which he found in learners of German (*cf.* Givón 1979; Robert 1989):

- (A) Put ‘given information’ before ‘new information’...
- (B) Put what is *spoken about* before what is to be *said about it* ...
- (C) Keep elements linked in terms of meaning close together ...
- (D) Place elements of predominantly functional value consistently before (or consistently behind) the corresponding elements of predominantly lexical value ...
- (E) Place orientational elements (place, time, modality, etc.) at the beginning of an utterance ...
- (F) Mention events in their factual temporal order ...
- (G) Indicate sentence modality (interrogative, declarative, requesting) by intonation...
- (H) Mark rhematic information by intonation ...

Dittmar (1981) found that early IL relies on the use of adverbials to encode temporality rather than morphemes indicating tense. Meisel (cited in Sato 1990:85) found extensive reliance on discourse strategies like “interlocutor scaffolding, implicit reference, order of mention, and contrast of two or more events” (see also Schumann 1987).

Klein (1986) argues that the pragmatic principles are not linked to a particular language and that the early learner variety is not influenced by the L1, because the basic categories and inflections have not yet been established. Word classes cannot always be determined by semantic means or

by transfer from the L1. The word class system develops as the learner becomes familiar with the “distributional regularities and the morphological criteria which characterize the given word class” (Klein 1986:90).

It seems, then, that utterance development in ILs begins at a pragmatic level and utterances only grammaticalize at a later stage (if at all) for some learners, who fossilize at the pragmatic organisation level.

2.5.6 Conclusion

Selinker’s notion of IL is a valuable one which has had an enormous impact on the way in which SLA theorists conceive of learner language. For example, interlanguage is no longer widely viewed amongst most theorists as a poor approximation of the TL, but a system in its own right which is regular and rule-governed. It is therefore equal to other languages, although there are notable differences between ILs and fully-fledged languages. Firstly, it is a system which can change quite rapidly and it may have a higher degree of variability at any one time or over time. Secondly, it is idiosyncratic to the learner to some extent, although there seem to be common developmental routes across learners from the same and different language backgrounds. Thirdly, some learners fossilise before they have a fully functional system which could be used in as wide a range of contexts as their L1s.

2.6 BASIC VARIETY

The Basic Variety (BV) is the next major development which is partially based on the approaches discussed thus far. The notion of a BV emerged from a study conducted under the auspices of the European Science Foundation (ESF) study under the guidance of Perdue (1993a, b). A pilot study was conducted in the early 1980s and the study itself took place from 1984-1987. The BV is an hypothesized learner-language variety which is independent of the L1 and L2. It is characterised by a range of syntactic and organisational principles. Klein & Perdue (1997) argue that internal organisation and transitions are systematic and that BV systems are error-free and not poor imitations of other languages. Other languages are merely stable systems of language acquisition where learners stop learning because the learner’s variety and the input are identical.

2.6.1 Theoretical background

The theoretical background is similar to IL, although more rigorous methodological measures have been implemented. Perdue (1993a) distinguishes the BV from IL on two fronts. Firstly, he claims that even though they set out to do so, IL studies did not look at learner language as a truly independent system with no reference to the target language (TL), mainly because of methodological problems. Klein (1998) contends that IL studies are different from BV studies because IL theorists view learner languages as in-between systems which are imperfect versions of the TL. In contrast, he claims that the BV perspective truly looks at the system as independent and studies the system of each learner in its own right. Of course, the system relies on the lexical items of the TL (and the source language [SL] in some instances), but Klein & Perdue (1993) hesitate to ascribe too much transfer effect to the SL, as they focus on the independence of the learner system. There is also a move away from using only a syntactic analysis based on the grammatical categories of fully-fledged languages towards an analysis which relies on organisational principles which are more likely to be universal.

The study is remarkable in a number of respects (Perdue 1993b). Firstly, it is extensive in scope, comparing the language development of five different TLs (Dutch, German, English, French and Swedish) by forty adult learners who came from a variety of language backgrounds (Turkish, Punjabi, Italian, Arabic, Spanish and Finnish). Learners with different SLs who were learning the same TLs were compared so that L1 influence could be assessed. The project ran for thirty months and longitudinal studies of this length are very rare, mainly because of their expense in terms of both time and money, and the attrition of subjects. In addition, the study was of learners in natural environments and finding adult immigrants willing to participate in such a study is difficult. The findings of this study are valuable because of its cross-linguistic perspective and its attempt to establish a theoretical framework which describes the early ILs of learners. A stronger focus on the independence of the learner's language system, the analytical framework and a willingness to generalise it to some other naturalistic learning contexts distinguishes this study from many other IL studies.

Perdue (1993b) hesitates to generalise his findings because the learners were learning in natural environments. Earlier research on acquisition in both formal and informal environments, however, seems to indicate that the learner language of most learners is fairly similar (see section 2.7).

Perdue's (1993a) subjects did not all rely completely on naturalistic acquisition as a few had had some form of formal tuition, although this seemed to have had little effect on the building of their grammars. In particular, tuition appeared to have negligible long-term effects, which makes the decision to generalise the findings only to naturalistic learners problematic to some extent. Nevertheless, Perdue's hesitation may be justified since Myles et al. (1999) found that although early learners in instructed contexts show BV characteristics at early stages, they also focus on memorising formulaic utterances which have been explicitly taught and these chunks form the basis upon which development proceeds. They find that development seems to result from "tension between complex but communicatively rich chunks on the one hand and simple but communicatively inadequate structures on the other hand" (Myles et al. 1999:77). Perdue (1993b) makes no allowance for these formulaic chunks and, in fact, they are specifically ignored in the analysis of the data in the ESF study.

From an analytical point of view, the ESF study is more advanced than many other studies. The analysts tried as far as possible to regard each learner's language as a system without reference to the categories of the SL and TL, although this was not always possible. At times, these categories were useful, but there was also a lack of syntactic categories which were directly comparable to the SL or TL. This finding forced them to choose an analysis based on organisational principles in order to find patterns. Linked to this is the use of a more functional than formal perspective in the analysis. This functional analysis is more difficult for the analyst (but usually more informative) than a formal one, because it has to take a wide range of factors into account; e.g. pragmatic factors and extralinguistic factors rather than just linguistic factors.

2.6.2 Characteristics of the Basic Variety²

Klein & Perdue (1993, 1997) conclude that the BV has three broad characteristics:

- C it is largely independent of the L1 and the L2 because it does not share the structural characteristics of either language but is structured by a small set of universal organizational principles;
- C about a third of learners fossilized at this point although they increased their lexicon and became more fluent in the BV;
- C it is very similar to pidgins (Holm 1990), foreigner talk (Roche cited in Klein & Perdue

²Klein & Perdue (1997) believe that the BV is an I-language (an instantiation of UG), because it satisfies the constraints on an I-language according to Minimalist Theory and because it is communicatively efficient. Criticisms of these views are presented by Bierwisch (1997), Comrie (1997), and Meisel (1997).

1997) and agrammatical speech (Kolk & Heeschen 1992).

The notion of a universal core language has been posited by a number of researchers including Corder (cited in Gass 1984a) with his idea of *simple codes*, Schumann (1978), Klein & Dittmar (1979), Givón (1979) and Bickerton's (1990) *protolanguage*.

Klein & Perdue (1997) believe that there is a universal process at work in BV construction because of observation of similar developmental patterns across learners of a variety of languages who themselves speak different languages. They believe that linguistic and organizing principles are universal and therefore belong to the human language faculty.

Schwartz (1997:393) rejects the notion that the BV is not at all related to the L1 and instead proposes that the L1 grammar is transferred and "it is the first 'way station' for TL input data, *imposing* analyses on them and thus potentially deriving analyses quite distinct from those of the TL native speaker". She argues for a role for the L1 based on evidence that Punjabi and Turkish learners of English and German used an SOV word order (which is congruent with their L1 structure) in their early BV, whereas Moroccan Arabic learners (whose L1 has an SVO order) used SVO order. Vainikka & Young-Scholten (1996) report that Turkish and Korean learners of German produced utterance-final verbs, which serves as evidence of the possible influence of transfer. Furthermore, speakers of Italian and Spanish produce verb-initial utterances based on their own languages, and change these to verb-final ones at an early stage of syntactic development (Vainikka & Young-Scholten 1996). Broeder et al. (1993a, b) and Schenning & van Hout (1994) show that the SL has a role to play when alternatives are available in the TL, in which case the alternative most like the SL form tends to be used. Schwartz (1997) concludes then that the interaction between L1 structure, TL input and UG needs to be analysed to find the internal coherence in the system. She argues, in fact, that the BV as a universal form does not exist and that the L1 plays a far more significant role than Klein & Perdue (1997) allow.

The TL also has some influence on the BV, since the system is related to the TL system to some extent, because it uses TL vocabulary and the learner aims to learn the TL system. However, the BV cannot be described fully in terms of the TL because of the idiosyncratic ways in which learners build up their new system. Rather than the learner using the grammatical categories of

the TL, Perdue (1991:420) explains that the TL is used at a discourse level in the following way:

... the principles governing what information needs to be expressed by words, and what information can be left implicit for the listener to infer, emerge particularly clearly in these systems. Put another way, adult learners assume that the inferencing capacity they have to bring to bear when analyzing TL input ... is available to the TL listener who attempts to understand their speech.

2.6.3 Elements of the Basic Variety

The findings of the ESF study relate to the lexicon, morphological structure and utterance organisation.

2.6.3.1 Lexical items

Klein & Perdue (1993, 1997) and Dietrich (1989a, b) catalogue the structures available to an early learner of a language and say that the learner language will contain proper names, noun-like words and verb-like words, although it is often difficult to decide whether something is a noun or a verb in early speech (Coupier cited in Perdue 1991). An additional motivation for using the term “verb-like” is that these words lack the argument structure which they would have in the TL (Jordens 1997). Additional lexical items include adverbial-like words (usually temporal and spatial denotations), a few numerals, a few personal pronouns (but no anaphoric pronoun forms for inanimate objects), a word for negation, a few determiners which are demonstratives rather than definite and indefinite articles (Carroll & Dietrich 1985) and a few more complex rote or formulaic constructions. There is no copula, nor are there prepositions (except a few with lexical meaning, usually denoting spatial and temporal relations).

Lexical items are based on the L2, although a few L1 items may be used, and there are more open-class items than closed-class items (Klein & Perdue 1997). Lexical items tend to occur in an invariant form which is usually the stem, infinitive or nominative form or an inflected form borrowed directly from the TL. Word formation tends to be via noun-noun compounding rather than derivational processes (Broeder et al. 1993b), with the SL playing a greater role here when there are multiple or ambiguous TL word-formation processes. Single lexical items are preferred to compound ones (Klein & Perdue 1993). Irregular forms are acquired before regular forms. This is congruent with other findings which indicate a period of correct use of irregular forms before the productive application of regular forms (e.g. Bybee 1991; Cazden 1968; Fillmore cited in Seliger & Shohamy 1989; Klein 1986).

2.6.3.2 Morphology

With regard to morphology, the BV is characterised by a lack of morphological inflections with “purely grammatical function” (Klein & Perdue 1997:332). The lack of inflection means that there is no finite morphology marking tense and aspect, no agreement in number, case or gender and no agreement by morphology (Carroll & Dietrich 1985). In contrast, however, in another large study (Pavia Project) of learners of Italian in mainly naturalistic contexts, Giacalone Ramat (1992:302) found that morphological sensitivity (“the ability to analyze words in the input into their morphological components and to distinguish on a principled basis among variant forms of a grammatical category ...”) developed quite early. Bardovi-Harlig & Bofman (1989) agree with Giacalone Ramat (1992), suggesting that lack of morphological development may be related to particular TLs. They suggest that learners of Turkish, which has a very regular morphological structure, may show more accurate and less variable acquisition patterns, although this has not been investigated.

2.6.3.3 Functions expressed in the Basic Variety

Form-function relations between words are shown by means of pragmatic, semantic and phrase-structure constraints and BV users are able to perform a variety of functions relating to temporality (duration, habituality, iterativity), spatial relations (location, change of location) and types of situation (states, dynamic events) (Jordens 1997:291). In his discussion of the development of temporality, Klein (1993:102) points out that “there is no way to mark temporality by grammatical means” in the BV because of the lack of verbs and copulas. Time reference is marked by the use of temporal adverbials, use of the time reference used by the interviewer or by the context of the utterance (Klein & Perdue 1997). Using the time of the utterance as time reference is particularly prevalent because of the use of film-retelling discourse as data (Perdue 1990). Klein et al. (1993) found that contrary to other studies (e.g. Bickerton 1982; Weist 1986), tense marking precedes aspect marking, with aspectual forms such as early use of *-ing* not having clear aspectual functions.

2.6.3.4 Utterance structure

At the level of utterance structure, there is an interaction of phrasal, semantic and pragmatic constraints (Klein & Perdue 1993).

2.6.3.4.1 Phrasal constraints

Phrasal constraints relate to the form and order of the elements and Klein & Perdue (1997:314) say that phrasal constraints in the BV are mainly of the following kind:

- A. NP1-V-(NP2(NP2))
- B. NP1-Cop-{NP2
ADJ
PP}
- C. V-NP2

NP1 may be a proper name/optional determiner plus noun/pronoun/zero. NP2 may be a proper name or optional determiner plus noun. The verbs are usually in the base form, although there may be a *V-ing* form in English, infinitives (German, French) or an inflected form (Swedish), with the SL having an effect on the form of the verb which is more prevalent (Klein & Perdue 1997).

Klein & Perdue (1993:27) state that “(t)he placement of adverbials and negation mainly depends on topic-focus structure and semantic scope”. They note that adverbial items are usually directly in front of or behind the item over which they have scope, or at the point between topic and focus elements (especially in the case of negative particles) (Giacomi et al. and Dimroth & Klein, both cited in Klein & Perdue 1997). This observation fits the placing of early negation particles found in other studies with external negation of *no* and placement of the negative particle directly before the item to be negated (e.g. Wode 1981).

The basic word order is Agent-Verb-Patient and Klein & Perdue (1997) claim that this is a universal pattern for all learners in untutored learning situations. Comrie (1997) and Schwartz (1997), however, question the validity of this claim as the TLs all had this basic word order and it may therefore be a function of the TL input, especially since Punjabi and Turkish learners initially use verb-final forms as their own languages do.

2.6.3.4.2 Semantic constraints

Semantic constraints relate to argument structure and case roles. At a semantic level, the controller of the action is in the first position when verbs appear, although this may be modified by the use of prepositions. Deciding on the “subject/object” function requires an investigation of the semantic controller in the utterance, with the general rule being that “NP-referent with highest control comes first” (Klein & Perdue 1997:316). If there are controllers of source and target

states, as in the arguments of the word *give*, the “controller of the source state outweighs controller of target state” (Klein & Perdue 1997:315).

2.6.3.4.3 Pragmatic constraints

Pragmatic constraints relate to textual structure (Jordens 1997). They include a strong topic-focus structure (*cf.* Givón 1979, 1984, 1985) and patterns of reference introduction and maintenance (given-new patterns) (Klein & Perdue 1997). Perdue (1991) notes, however, that early speech is characterised by scaffolding by the questioner, so that the focus-last sequence could be an artifact of the elicitation task.

2.6.4 Development of learner language

Unlike Corder (1977), who saw the simple code as the initial state, Perdue (1996) discusses a pre-basic variety which indicates that the BV is not the initial state of L2 acquisition. Perdue (1996) says that the pre-basic variety is noun-based and based on semantic-pragmatic relations. Non-finite verbs and NP-internal structure only emerge later in the BV. Klein et al. (1993) discuss a pre-basic variety characterised by its lexical nature without clear distinctions between word classes (although there is a predominance of noun-like words), no functional inflections, and few complex constructions which are characterised by linking via pragmatic principles and context dependency. Jordens (1997) says that verbs do not structure the utterances in terms of arguments and case role assignment, although words cluster around this verb-like element. Organisation using lexical principles and grammatical principles only appears later (Perdue & Klein 1993).

Development proceeds from the “nominal via infinite to finite utterance organisation” (Klein & Perdue 1993:25). The nominal stage of development is the pre-basic variety discussed above. The next stage involves the appearance of non-finite verbs which can assign arguments such as agent and benefactor but which still lack verbal morphology. Verbal morphology needs to be acquired to move to the third stage of target-like production of finite verbs. This stage is beyond the BV and the IL looks very much like the L2. A further stage of use of subordinators can also be seen in some learners (Perdue 1990). Development from stage to stage is “slow and gradual” (Klein & Perdue 1993:25) with variable performance and backsliding at each stage. They conclude then that:

... the acquisition of finiteness is not merely a question of adding some morphological

features, in this case verb inflexion, to the learner's repertoire. *It marks the transition from a type of utterance organisation which is dominated by semantic and pragmatic constraints, to a type of utterance organisation in which phrasal constraints (i.e. syntactic constraints in the narrower sense of the word) gain equal weight.* (Klein & Perdue 1993:29)

2.6.4.1 Pronoun development

Pronoun development is variable but generally follows the pattern of "(i) singular ... before plural; (ii) nominative ... before oblique; (iii) pronouns referring to animates ... before those referring to inanimates and (iv) definitely referring NPs ... before overt pronouns" (Perdue 1991:417; see also Broeder 1991 and Perdue 1990:994). However, Perdue (1990) cautions that the task design (use of film-retelling) precludes display of development of first- and second-person pronouns.

2.6.4.2 Reasons for development

The main explanation of development is that it occurs when constraints come into conflict (Perdue 1990). As new components are added to the system, changes occur in that system because of changing interactions of the principles. For example, if a syntactic element is added, then the weight of some of the other organisational principles may decrease. This shifting of the weight of principles may result in patterns more characteristic of the TL. For example, the number of noun-like elements decreases over time as verb-like elements are added. An increase in utterance complexity is also noticed, with an increase in articles, prepositions, conjunctions and pronouns only after the BV stage (Broeder et al. 1993a; Klein & Perdue 1993, 1997). Development also occurs to improve communicative efficiency (Perdue & Klein 1992). This development, however, may only occur in the lexicon rather than the utterance organisation after an initial period of development. Development beyond the BV is more strongly influenced by the TL because more specific aspects of the TL need to be acquired at this point, since the system is complexified away from the simple basic system (Perdue & Klein 1992). Carroll & Becker (1993:146) point out that development is limited by processing capacity, especially in a conversational situation and because the learner is "building up a workable system of communication by using it actively". Perdue & Klein (1993) conclude that the L1 can influence the rate of acquisition and ultimate achievement, but the sequence of development is not affected by the L1 (as found by other researchers, see section 2.7).

Other reasons for development have been discussed in the literature and Klein et al. (1993)

conclude that length of stay in the TL community is not a causal variable for development. Rather, it is the intensity of input that determines development. Development towards the finite verb form is characterised by:

- C acquisition of morphology as the distinction between non-finite and finite is acquired (*cf.* Jordens 1988);
- C more complex ways of expressing temporality;
- C the development of case oppositions; and
- C subject-predicate marking (Perdue & Klein 1993).

Parameter setting and triggering after exposure to input are also possible explanations for development, although Jordens (1997) does not find this a convincing argument because of the stability of the BV system. He offers the case of structural ambiguity as an additional driving force behind development and feels that the acquisition of categories of fully-fledged languages such as subject, object, noun, etc. are necessary to resolve structural ambiguity and develop structural dependency and recursivity relationships (which are features of fully-fledged languages).

2.6.5 Conclusion

The BV clearly fits the findings of many IL studies, but it adds considerably to our knowledge of the organisational principles at work in learner language. The cross-linguistic perspective of the study is illuminating and the common patterns found across learner languages supports many previous studies. However, Perdue (1993a) repeatedly refuses to generalise the findings of the ESF project to learners in formal situations, and I would argue that there are similarities which should be considered. For this reason, an overview of the findings regarding the influence of formal learning on ILs is considered in the next section.

2.7 FORMAL VS. NATURALISTIC ACQUISITION

Studies of development in classroom and naturalistic situations seem to point to the conclusion that the route of development stays the same regardless of the learning situation but that the rate of acquisition is faster and the ultimate attainment higher in classroom situations (Ellis 1985b; Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991; Long 1983). Some structures such as third-person agreement *-s* and plural *-s* in English also seem to be produced more accurately by learners with instruction. Ellis & Roberts (1987) say this may point to earlier acquisition. On the other hand, there seem to be difficult structures, many of which seem impervious to formal instruction (Larsen-Freeman

1998). These include items such as the French gender system (Clark 1985; Harley cited in Schachter 1998; Karmiloff-Smith 1979), adverbial placement (White 1991; Trahey & White 1993) and English object pronouns (Yuan 1997).

The structures mentioned above may be complex and Robinson (1997b) found that learners not explicitly taught *complex* rules performed better than those who had been given explicit instruction. Schmidt (1990) and DeKeyser (1995) report similar results. Learners explicitly taught *simple* rules perform better than those who are not given explicit instruction (Robinson 1997a, b).

Sharwood Smith (1994:117) distinguishes studies which ask whether formal instruction can disturb the natural order (e.g. Pienemann 1984) from those which ask “whether classroom instruction displays the characteristics encountered in natural situations” (e.g. Felix & Hahn 1985). The latter studies can help to explain why similar routes are found if instruction and natural discourse display the same characteristics, while the former type have less of a comparative focus.

There have been studies of learning in four different types of learning settings:

- C naturalistic settings (e.g. Clahsen 1987; Felix 1978; Huang cited in Felix 1981; Meisel 1987; Perdue 1993b; Trèvisè 1987; Veronique 1987; von Stutterheim & Klein 1987);
- C mixed settings (e.g. Butterworth cited in Felix 1981; Pienemann 1987; Schumann 1975);
- C formal instruction only in the classroom (e.g. Ellis 1989; Felix 1981; Myles et al. 1999; Weinert 1987); and
- C formal instruction only in experimental conditions with artificial languages (e.g. de Graaff 1997; DeKeyser 1995; Ellis & Schmidt 1997; Yang & Givon 1997).

Felix (1981) notes that there is a crucial difference in the input in the different situations because naturalistic learners tend to have exposure to a wide range of structures from the beginning, whereas classroom learners tend to have a restricted number of structures in their input. They are also more likely to be presented with isolated models containing the structures they should be acquiring, so they may be more aware of the actual model that they should be attempting to produce, even though the requirements for accurate production may be too numerous at early stages. Some structures seem to be more amenable to teacher intervention and Felix (1981) mentions that lexical negations like *no* and *don't* could be more easily corrected than structures

which extend over longer chunks of language or may be more abstract, e.g. word order. He concludes that there is nothing in the productions of instructed learners which would not also be found in the language of learners in naturalistic situations. However, Doughty (1991) cautions that Felix's (1981) conclusions are based on noting similarities between the ILs of instructed and naturalistic learners, rather than focussing on any advantages that instruction might have.

The question which many studies strive to answer is whether there is transfer from learnt knowledge to the underlying system. Krashen (1981, 1982) argues a non-interface position (learnt knowledge does not transfer), while others like McLaughlin (1990) and O'Malley & Chamot (1990) argue a strong interface position (learnt knowledge transfers). Others take a middle road and argue that instruction and input enhancement can assist in noticing, so that implicit acquisition is facilitated (Ellis 1993; Long 1991; Tomlin & Villa 1994). De Graaff (1997:251) concludes that

(a)lthough some evidence for the facilitative effect of explicit instruction on L2 acquisition has been found, little is known yet concerning the question of under which specific learning circumstances and for exactly which aspects of grammar explicit knowledge can be most facilitative for L2 acquisition. In Hulstijn and de Graaff (1994), we argued that the following variables could possibly influence the effect of explicit instruction: the target structure's linguistic domain (in the core or in the periphery of Universal Grammar), its complexity ..., its degree of semantic redundancy, its reliability (the ratio of regular to irregular cases), its scope (number of phenomena covered), the frequency with which it is manifested in the input, the competition between rule-based learning and item-based learning ..., task modality (reception *vs.* production), type of instruction or input enhancement, and individual learner characteristics.

Ellis & Roberts (1987) discuss a number of reasons for the more rapid development of classroom learners. Firstly, if the input is tailored so that learners are developmentally ready to learn a structure, it may ensure that the learners acquire the structure more rapidly than if they were left to discover the rule for themselves. A second reason may be the consciousness-raising function of instruction, so that learners may become aware of patterns in grammatical structure which would have gone unnoticed otherwise. A third reason may be that the formality of the language used in the classroom may ensure that the learner is exposed to structures which are rare in everyday speech but more frequent in formal speech and in writing. The learner has more exposure to these constructions and may therefore acquire them more easily than if there was only occasional exposure to them in natural situations.

With regard to the long-term effects of formal instruction, Pienemann's (1984) study seems to suggest that there are no long-term benefits to teaching structures that learners are not ready to process. Pienemann (1984) concludes that there are some structures which depend on the developmental readiness of the learner and there are some structures which can be learnt at any time. In addition, there can be backsliding after instruction to a previous state in which the earlier form is produced rather than the taught form. Towell & Hawkins (1994) show that any immediate effects of classroom instruction may wear off and leave few long-term effects. Generalisability of learnt skills may be problematic (DeKeyser 1997; DeKeyser & Sokalski 1996) and discrete exercises where the rules are applied to sentences and translations may well be correctly completed. However, generalizations outside the classroom to situations which do not require exact repetition of forms learnt in the class are not nearly as successful.

2.7.1 Limitations of the studies

Doughty (1991) argues for a cautious interpretation of the results of many studies on the effect of formal instruction. She feels that many studies do not take into account (or make clear) different amounts of natural and classroom exposure. They are therefore inappropriate predictors of the effect of classroom instruction on the IL of learners. She further discusses the need to specify the nature of instruction received by the learners, although comparisons of different forms of instruction have not shown conclusive differences (Long 1983, 1988). Another criticism is that it has been difficult to measure proficiency, which has tended to be measured in a global way and, as a result, it is impossible to conclude whether the influence has been from formal instruction or not. Long (1988) concludes that, although instruction seems to improve rates of learning and levels of ultimate attainment, future studies need to be careful about subject selection and the selection of structures so that studies are comparable.

Furthermore, Long (cited in Doughty 1991:460) notes that there is a difference between a *focus on form* and a *focus on forms*, "where the former refers to instruction that, in some meaningful way, draws learners' attention to TL structure in context and the latter refers only to the presentation of isolated linguistic structures". Faster rates of acquisition have been noted where there is a *focus on form* as opposed to *no focus on form*.

Jordens (1996) believes that proving the influence of formal instruction on IL development is not

an easy matter and that even within the classroom, different tasks may have different effects on IL development. He distinguishes three different types of classroom activity: “(a) activities which focus on the processing of input, (b) activities which focus on what is called ‘consciousness-raising’ and (c) activities which focus on the productive use of taught formal knowledge” (Jordens 1996:426). The first activity does not require the learner to produce any particular structures in the input, but the input has been carefully selected to expose learners to input which is ahead of their current competence and they are expected to find meaning in the input. The idea is based on Krashen (1982) who believes that focus on meaning will accelerate development. Other studies employing this activity include Ellis (1989), Pienemann (1984, 1989) and Macky (cited in Pica 1998). Using input which has been structured to present structures according to an accessibility hierarchy has also proved effective (Doughty 1991; Eckman et al. 1988). Doughty’s (1991) study focussed on the acquisition of relativization, for which markedness hierarchies have been clearly worked out. She found that “[i]nstruction incorporating unmarked data generalizes only to unmarked contexts, whereas instruction incorporating marked data potentially generalizes not only to that marked context but to other contexts as well” (Doughty 1991:464), although she cannot provide an explanation for this finding.

The second activity, consciousness-raising (also called *input enhancement*), involves making the learner aware of particular structures in the input. This is particularly useful for structures which are not crucial to meaning and might therefore not be noticed otherwise. Examples of studies employing input enhancement include Lightbown (cited in Pica 1998), Lightbown & Spada (cited in Pica 1998), Rutherford (1987), Rutherford & Sharwood Smith (1985) and Sharwood Smith (1991, 1993). Although the structures will not be acquired until the learner is developmentally ready to acquire them, the learner has been “primed” (Ellis 1990:169).

The third activity involves explicit teaching of a grammatical structure or the provision of information about that structure. Development occurs when learners “apply ... generalizations first as formal operations and subsequently in more communicative settings” (Jordens 1996:426). This last activity is probably the most often practised activity in formal settings, but there is a great deal of controversy about its usefulness to students. Robinson (1996a, b) reports that studies have had mixed results with regard to the use of formal instruction and they usually conclude that the learner needs to be developmentally ready to acquire the item before instruction

shows any effect (see also Ellis 1989; Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991; Pienemann 1984, 1989, 1992).

A further method of instruction discussed by Pica (1998) is what she calls *garden path interaction* where learners are presented with the general rule and led to believe that the general rule can be applied to all instances. They then regularise forms which should be irregular. The benefit is that when learners are then taught irregular forms they remember them more correctly than those taught regular rules and irregularities at the same time (Tomasello & Herron 1988, 1989).

2.7.2 Reasons for better performance

Formal instruction may hasten development because of the nature of classroom discourse. Classroom discourse contains a lot of feedback which provides learners with explicit feedback about hypotheses they have made (Allwright 1984). Learners do not therefore have to wait for negative evidence in the input when testing hypotheses. However, formal instruction does have an impact on the development of spontaneous speech because teachers take up about two-thirds of classroom talk time (Allwright 1984). This means that the learners have few practice opportunities which are further depleted by the number of learners in a classroom all competing for opportunities to talk.

Ellis (1987b, c) uses Tarone's (1982) model of careful and casual styles to explain the better performance of instructed learners by saying that classroom learners are better able to perform tasks involving the careful style, as this is the type of learning which is required from them most often. Tarone (1982) argues that development moves from careful to casual styles and Ellis (1987b, c) concludes that instructed learners are at an advantage even in the casual style if they are able to exploit their knowledge of other styles to produce this style. They are particularly advantaged when they are able to practise this transfer in unplanned discourse in the classroom. Pedagogical and social norms also affect development more strongly in the formal context. These norms influence the ILs of classroom learners, making their ILs more permeable to change and positively influencing development.

Schauble et al. (cited in McGroarty 1998) say that naturalistic situations allow learners to choose

their goals in a setting, whereas formal settings limit the choices of learners (*cf.* Spolsky 1989). A good learner seeks out exposure to the language and interaction at the level that he/she is comfortable with (Naiman et al. 1978; Stevick 1989) and formal teaching may be helpful to some but have no effect for others (McGroarty 1998). Other studies (e.g. Lightbown & Spada 1990; White 1991; White et al. 1991) have shown that formal instruction in immersion situations may improve comprehension rather than production. However, there may still be a high level of linguistic inaccuracy in complex clause structures, tense, aspect and sociolinguistic rules, even after long periods of immersion.

Klein & Perdue (1997) claim that the Basic Variety (BV) is only generalisable to naturalistic situations of acquisition and that the BV system has not been found for learners in classrooms. They argue that in the classroom natural principles of acquisition as well as the effect of particular teaching methods are at work. The learner's system is thus influenced by an outside force which has considerable influence of the structure of this system. In particular, learners are expected to learn structures such as inflectional morphology, so it would be expected that they would also produce these forms. However, they also note that learners performing outside the classroom do not always transfer what they have learnt to their production in naturalistic situations. If transfer occurs, then the BV would not be highly relevant to this study, but if it does not usually happen, then the BV may be found in learners with formal learning backgrounds performing outside of formal contexts.

2.8 CONCLUSION

This chapter has outlined the history of the second-language acquisition (SLA) field as it relates to IL. As noted throughout the chapter, there are aspects of earlier research which need to be taken into account and since there is no coherent SLA theory, it seems that an eclectic approach provides a richer picture of IL development. A wide range of aspects needs to be taken into account and no single theoretical or methodological perspective seems to provide an entirely adequate explanation of all areas.

The choice of the BV as a background theory to my study needs to be justified. Firstly, numerous studies show that formal instruction has less effect on IL than teachers would hope and that developmental sequences remain the same regardless of the formal input. As a result, I would

argue that the BV must have some significance for my study, even if it shows where the BV and the IL represented in my study are not related. Secondly, although some learners in this study may have moved beyond the BV, some of the learners are at early stages of learning and their ILs are therefore more likely to display characteristics of the BV. In addition, there is never 100% correct suppliance of any morpheme in the data, which may indicate that learners backslide to previous levels (in this case the BV level). Finally, the European Science Foundation (ESF) study is an extension of IL studies, so it is necessary to discuss it so that a richer picture of early development can be formed.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.0 INTRODUCTION

The broad, primary aim of my study is to investigate the development of morphemes in the Xhosa IL of English speakers. Related to this broad aim are the more specific aims of exploring:

- C which morphemes are used;
- C which functions are realised;
- C how the functions are realised;
- C what sequence of development of morphemes is evident;
- C why this sequence is found in the data; and
- C how the findings of my study relate to current theory and other studies.

This chapter explores the methodological approach of the study. Firstly, it outlines the rationale for the choice of a longitudinal, qualitative approach. Then it proceeds with a detailed exposition of the sample, and data collection and analysis procedures. Finally, the limitations of the methodological procedures are highlighted.

My study borrows aspects of methodology from a range of studies, since it takes both a formal and a functional approach to the data analysis. In this way, a more comprehensive picture of the language data and development in the IL can be formed. The formal approach provides an indication of overall development and trends in the data, while a functional approach assesses the development of a limited number of functions in greater depth. Furthermore, functional approaches provide for a multilevel analysis of data so that syntactic and pragmatic variables can also be shown to contribute to interlanguage (IL) features. This multilevel analysis therefore allows a wider range of explanations of the developmental patterns which are evident in the data.

Long & Sato (1984:279) point out four areas which are generally problematic in SLA methodology: “focus on (1) product rather than process, (2) form rather than function, (3) single rather than multiple levels of linguistic analysis, and (4) IL in isolation rather than in its linguistic and conversational context”. My study tries to overcome some of these problems in a variety of ways.

With regard to the first area (focus on product rather than on process), both the product and the process can be investigated because of the longitudinal nature of the study. The second area (focus on form rather than function), is addressed since both form and function are considered in my study. Following Pfaff (1987), I do not believe that the two can be separated in many cases. With regard to the third area (single rather than multiple levels of analysis), the morphological, syntactic and discoursal levels are considered to some extent in the explanation of data, although the focus of the study is on the morphological level. The fourth area (taking context into account), is addressed in my study, since the context of the IL production is taken into account during analysis and the use of a qualitative paradigm allows for a focus on contextual factors.

3.1 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

My study takes a quasi-longitudinal, case study approach to data collection. The analysis of the data is primarily qualitative. Reasons for the choice of this methodology are discussed in detail below.

3.1.1 Longitudinal and cross-sectional studies

Studies of SLA have usually taken one of three approaches to data collection. One approach is cross-sectional, where data are collected from subjects on a single occasion. This approach is economical and efficient since a large number of subjects can be studied at one time and development of a particular form or function can be measured fairly easily. If subjects have different levels of competence, inferences can be drawn about developmental sequences by taking samples of speech or writing from learners of different levels and sequencing the different developmental patterns which are found. The most well-known studies taking a cross-sectional approach are the morpheme studies (e.g. Dulay & Burt 1973, 1974a, 1974b; Fathman 1978; Krashen et al. 1976; Pica 1983), although other studies also use this approach (e.g. de Graaff 1997; Extra cited in van Els et al. 1984; Klein & Dittmar 1979; Yang & Givon 1997).

A second approach is a longitudinal study where one or more subjects are followed over time and data are collected by sampling at fairly regular intervals (e.g. Carroll 1984; Giacalone Ramat 1992; Myles et al. 1999; Perdue 1993a; Skiba & Dittmar 1992). The longitudinal study can last for anything from a few months to a few years (e.g. Ghrib's 1987 study of a Turkish speaker for about 6 months;

Huebner's 1983 study of a Hmong speaker for 12 months; Schumann's 1978 study of a Spanish speaker for 9 months).

The longitudinal study has a number of advantages over the cross-sectional study. Regular appraisal of the learner's development allows for closer documentation of the individual's progress and a richer picture of developmental sequences and/or lack of development can be painted. This approach also allows the analyst to focus on a wide or narrow range of forms and functions, depending on the purpose of the study and the stage of development of the learner. Regular monitoring of a learner's grammar can then also be linked to the input that the learner receives in order to assess whether it has any impact on the grammar (Corder 1971, 1981; Selinker 1992).

Despite the benefit of being more methodologically sound than cross-sectional studies (Odlin 1989), longitudinal studies are difficult to carry out for a number of reasons. These reasons include:

- ⊆ high costs;
- ⊆ constraints on the number of subjects it is possible to study;
- ⊆ time constraints; and
- ⊆ attrition of subjects over the period of the study.

Analysis is also more difficult because there is a range of variables which need to be accounted for. Furthermore, it is not always possible to develop an effective analysis framework to account for all of the data, which may include formulaic utterances, idiosyncratic rules and constraints, as well as TL forms.

A third approach to data collection is to combine a cross-sectional and longitudinal approach if more than one subject is studied and the learners are at different levels of development. The *Zweitsprachenerwerb Italienischer und Spanischer Arbeiter* (ZISA) project (Meisel et al. 1981), the Pavia Project (Giacalone Ramat 1992) and the European Science Foundation (ESF) study (Perdue 1993a) all used this *pseudo-longitudinal* or *quasi-longitudinal* approach. In these studies, "data from the least advanced learners is hypothesized to represent data collected first, and data from the most advanced learners [represents] the data collected last in a longitudinal study" (Faerch et al. 1984:297). This approach combines the advantages of both longitudinal and cross-sectional approaches.

However, Young (1991) criticises pseudo-longitudinal studies, because he says that they assume that IL changes only over the single dimension of time.

My study uses a pseudo-longitudinal approach since six subjects with different competence levels are interviewed at regular intervals over a period of eight months. This combined approach enables the investigation of both individual development and developmental sequences, since subjects have different levels of competence. The use of this approach was a result of the availability of subjects, as well as the expectation that significant staged development might not occur over the relatively short period of the study.

3.1.2 Case study approach

My study has the goals and design of a case study since

the purpose of a case study is to describe the case in its context. Guided by a research question, a researcher studies the case and those aspects of the environment that pertain to that case and that shed light on the research question. (Johnson 1992:76)

A more in-depth approach is possible with a case study than was possible, for example, with the morpheme studies. There is also a high degree of flexibility with regard to data collection methods and a variety of data may be collected (Johnson 1992; Seliger & Shohamy 1989). Selinker (1992) and Eckman (1994) state a preference for case studies where individual learners are studied so that the variation and progress of the individual is not lost in data from a large group, which is usually the case in large-scale quantitative studies. In addition, it is not always possible to test a particular hypothesis when there is a complex task like language learning under investigation.

Despite these advantages, there may be validity problems with case studies. For example, the researcher may struggle to maintain objectivity (van Els et al. 1984), although better validity can be achieved by triangulation. A further limitation of this kind of study is that the learner's language development may be influenced by frequent interviewing or contact with the interviewer (van Els et al. 1984).

Furthermore, case studies with a single learner or a small group of learners may not be good

predictors of the linguistic behaviour of a larger group of learners (Selinker 1992). In order to counteract this prediction problem, Johnson (1992) says that it is possible to look at a variety of studies and extract general principles which can then be compared with the case study findings. Huebner (1991) notes, however, that generalisability across studies is difficult because of the range of elicitation methods employed, all of which have an effect on the type of data produced. Like Johnson (1992), Huebner (1991:13) prefers to see case studies as a useful “means of generating hypotheses which can then be tested through quantitative studies”. Studies using a case study approach include Hakuta’s (1976) study of a Japanese child learning English, Schumann’s (1978) study of a Spanish speaker learning English, and Wong-Fillmore’s (cited in Johnson 1992) study of five children learning English.

3.1.3 Qualitative methods

My study takes a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach to the analysis of the data, although descriptive statistics are used where quantification is illuminating. One of the main advantages of qualitative methods is that they enable the researcher to look at areas in syntax, semantics and pragmatics where binary choices are not always available for quantitative analysis (Selinker 1992; Tarone et al. 1976). Qualitative studies may also prove better when studying the *process* of second-language acquisition (SLA) rather than the *product* (Rutherford 1984). Quantitative studies usually require a fairly sophisticated level of statistical analysis which requires a very careful manipulation of the variables involved in language production. Variable manipulation is not always possible (or desirable), especially in a longitudinal study (Young 1991). Nevertheless, quantitative studies are not superfluous, and Selinker (1992) argues that quantification might form part of an analysis.

Nevertheless, there are a number of limitations associated with qualitative analysis. Tarone (1987) says the most significant limitation is the lack of generalizability which is possible when results are based on qualitative studies. She warns that data can easily be overinterpreted and to avoid this, contextual factors need to be taken into account, especially when data sets are limited. Similarly, Roberts & Simonot (1987:135) point out that a number of contexts need to be taken into account during analysis, including the “context created as the interaction unfolds ... contexts of previous similar interactions ... and the wider social context ...”.

3.2 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

3.2.1 Selection criteria for the sample

A number of factors need to be taken into account when selecting a sample. For example, Extra & van Hout (1996) note that age, instruction and previous formal education seem to have an effect on SLA and that these factors should be acknowledged when selecting a sample and analysing the data.

For this reason, a shortlist of students was compiled from a list of students registered for Non-Mother Tongue (NMT)¹ Xhosa I, II and III at Rhodes University in 1998. Selection criteria for shortlisting were that:

- c students were first-language English speakers;
- c they had not studied any languages besides Afrikaans and Xhosa at school or university; and
- c they were between eighteen and twenty-one years old.

I wished to restrict the study to English speakers so that it might be possible to generalise about transfer or lack of transfer by keeping the L1 common. As all South African schoolchildren are required to study an L2, it was impossible to select a sample which had not learnt any other language besides Xhosa. This would have been preferable so that interference from an additional language could be ruled out. Nevertheless, all of the participants had learnt Afrikaans as an L2 at school and this allows for some measure of generalisability in the results.

The restriction on the age of the participants was included to promote homogeneity with regard to the possible effects of a range of socio-cultural and cognitive factors. Learners who are much older than the class average may have different motivations, life experiences and attitudes from their younger classmates, and these factors may have an impact on their learning of the L2. Although age itself does not seem to be a major factor in developmental sequences of language learning, it is still preferable to keep the sample as homogenous as possible.

¹The second-language Xhosa course at Rhodes is known as Xhosa Non-Mother Tongue (NMT) and is restricted to students whose first language is not Xhosa, although speakers of other African languages may do the course. From 1998, students who had done Xhosa as a grade 12 subject were not allowed to enter the first-year course since the course content was similar to the content of the school syllabus. However, this restriction was new and two of the participants in my study had done the first-year course despite a grade 12 pass in Xhosa.

These students were then given a letter outlining my study and they were asked to indicate whether they were willing to participate for the full data-collection period. They were not offered any remuneration for their participation, which was entirely voluntary, although encouraged by lecturers in the Department of African Languages. Six students (three at 1st year level, two at 2nd year level, and one at 3rd year level) agreed to participate in my study.

3.2.1.1 Background of Participants

Using a semi-structured questionnaire, I interviewed each of the participants in English about the following aspects, at the end of the year in which data were collected using a semi-structured questionnaire (see Appendix A for the questionnaire):

- Ⓒ motivation for learning Xhosa;
- Ⓒ previous experiences of learning Xhosa;
- Ⓒ practice opportunities utilised; and
- Ⓒ attitudes towards the context of learning.

The participants are introduced below².

Ann

Ann, aged 19 at the beginning of the study, started Xhosa I(NMT) as a complete beginner. She hoped to be able to speak some Xhosa by the end of the year and she believed that she would be competent enough to hold a conversation at the end of the course. She decided to take Xhosa because she intends to do community development work in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa where the majority of people speak Xhosa. She felt that although she had had high expectations of being fluent by the end of the year when she started the course, she had not practised enough and was not confident enough to hold a conversation. The only interaction she had with Xhosa speakers outside the classroom was when she greeted staff in her residence.

She spent about two hours a week working on Xhosa homework outside the class. She said that her speaking ability was “not good” but that she could read and understand “a bit” by the end of the

² Appendix B provides a short summary of the background of the participants for later reference.

course. When she was trying to understand a message, she focussed on the roots of words so that she could understand the basic message, rather than the grammatical categories, which she felt were mainly superfluous to meaning. She had enjoyed the classes and would encourage others to take the course.

During the interviews, Ann was very hesitant about speaking Xhosa and resorted to using English very often. She cited her lack of vocabulary as a major stumbling block to her ability to speak and understand. She obtained 61% for the course at the end of the year.

Ben

Ben, aged 19 at the beginning of the study, was registered for the Xhosa I(NMT) course. He had first learnt Xhosa as a young child, but he had lost most of his speaking ability after moving away from a Xhosa area at the age of five. He then learnt “basic” Xhosa in grades six and seven and more grammar-focussed Xhosa from grades eight to ten. He claimed that his comprehension skills were still good as a result of his early contact with the language, and this is borne out in his interviews where he rarely required questions to be repeated.

He was studying Xhosa because he thought it was an interesting language, it was an advantage to know Xhosa and it was advantageous to know three languages. His goal was to learn to speak Xhosa, but he very seldom spoke to people outside the classroom and he spent about two hours on Xhosa homework outside the class every week. He felt that his comprehension skills were “very good”, and his speaking, reading and writing was “fine”. He did not think that it was very important to produce error-free speech in case other speakers thought he was trying to sound “posh”. His attitude towards Xhosa was positive because he felt that classes were fun and he obtained good marks for the subject (final mark of 85%). He would encourage others to study Xhosa and he was thinking about doing the second-year course (although he did not do this).

Ben was fairly fluent during the interviews and code-switched when he did not know a Xhosa word. He restricted himself to answering the questions in most cases and did not elaborate on utterances unless specifically asked to do so.

Claire

Claire grew up on a farm in the Eastern Cape and had been exposed to Xhosa from an early age, although she said she had lost much of her speaking ability when she went to school. Nevertheless, she is a fairly fluent and very uninhibited Xhosa speaker in terms of speed and lack of hesitation, but has a fairly limited range of topics and vocabulary at her disposal. Her speech also included slang, which was not evident in the speech of other participants. She had never read or written Xhosa before she started the Xhosa I(NMT) course and her motivation for taking the course was to learn to read and write the language, and to regain some of the ability which she had lost. She also thought she might like to be a teacher and she felt that Xhosa would be very advantageous in a teaching situation.

She said that she spoke Xhosa “all the time” to staff on campus and people in her residence and enjoyed speaking the language. She found conversation classes extremely easy, but had many difficulties with learning to write Xhosa and using “correct” grammatical constructions. She felt that when she was speaking she was totally unaware of grammatical categories and did not know which forms she was using when she constructed sentences. She did not mind if other speakers corrected her spoken language and she felt that the amount of practice she had had during the year she had studied Xhosa had improved her language structure and vocabulary. She was the only participant who could hear and produce Xhosa tonology and could apply tones to new vocabulary if she heard the vocabulary from Xhosa speakers. She classified her written work as “poor” because she based it on her spoken language. She spent about half an hour a week outside the classroom practising grammar and writing skills. Her final mark for the 1st year course was 60%.

Claire was very fluent in the interviews and always tried to say as much as possible. She frequently commented on her lack of grammatical knowledge, but usually did not code-switch when she was searching for an appropriate Xhosa word.

Karen

Karen, aged 19 at the beginning of the study, had studied Xhosa formally at school for seven years. This formal instruction included two years of “basic” Xhosa with little focus on grammar in primary school, and five years of Xhosa with a grammatical focus at secondary school. She decided to take

the university Xhosa I(NMT) and II(NMT) courses because she thought that it would be useful to learn more Xhosa for communication and employment purposes, because she enjoyed the challenge of learning the grammar of a new language, and because she had some background in it and felt that this would make it an easy option as a university subject.

She enjoyed grammar and comprehension tests the most, but did not enjoy conversation classes. She never engaged in conversation with Xhosa speakers outside the classroom and said that although she knew this would be a good way to practise the language, she felt that she did not know enough relevant vocabulary to hold general conversations and felt self-conscious about her lack of fluency. She wanted to learn to speak better Xhosa, but her lack of self-confidence and the fact that she was not usually forced to speak Xhosa meant that she did not make use of opportunities to interact with Xhosa speakers. She preferred to write down an utterance to check her grammar rather than produce it spontaneously. She felt that her comprehension skills were “fair” and that she could work out the meaning of written texts fairly easily. She said her written errors were usually a result of direct translation from English and she specifically mentioned that she found it difficult to produce correct complex sentences and object concords.

She said that she spent very little time working on her Xhosa outside the classroom and would usually do only the required homework for the week - “it gets pushed to one side”. She felt that she was not particularly motivated, especially since her skills in reading and writing were not very useful outside the classroom and she should rather be practising speaking skills. Nevertheless, she intended to proceed to third-year Xhosa. Her final mark for the course was 84%.

Karen was a very hesitant and slow speaker in the interviews, although she tried to produce far more complex utterances than any of the other participants. Her range of morphemes is also the widest and she tended to use morphemes more correctly when compared to other participants.

Pat

Pat, aged 19 at the beginning of the study, was registered for the Xhosa II(NMT) course for the second time, having failed it the year before. She had not studied Xhosa formally at school, but had

learnt to speak it before school on the farm on which she lived. However, when she went to boarding school at the age of 6 she did not speak Xhosa except during the holidays, and she said she had lost much of the speaking ability she had developed before school. She was studying Xhosa because her cousins said they had enjoyed the course at Rhodes and she felt it would be good to “have another language”. She spent about an hour a week outside class time doing assigned work and spoke Xhosa to Xhosa speakers in shops and to Xhosa staff at a bar where she worked. She said that she could usually work out what her interlocutors were saying, but that many people spoke very fast.

She felt that her speaking ability allowed her to “help out” when there were communication problems, but that she would not be able to interpret a conversation. She also commented on the colloquial nature of the language used in these situations, where she could code-switch when she did not know a word, whereas the classroom required formal language. She said that outside the classroom she was not inhibited about speaking Xhosa, but that in the classroom she was continually checking her grammar, which made her a less fluent speaker in this context. She enjoyed conversation classes where students were required to talk spontaneously. She said that she had good metalinguistic knowledge and could always explain grammar rules in tests, but that she could not apply this knowledge to the language which she produced, and thus her utterances were not usually correct. Because there were usually many errors in her written work, she did not try to correct all of them but might try to focus on a single error type to improve for the next time she wrote. She felt that vocabulary was important for conversational skills and that grammar only became important when writing. Her final mark for the course was 54%.

Pat was reasonably fluent in the interviews and seemed fairly self-confident when speaking. She code-switched occasionally when conveying her message.

Sarah

Sarah, aged 20 at the beginning of the study, had studied Xhosa at school for ten years, and had decided to register for Xhosa 3 because she felt that the workload was light. In addition, she enjoyed studying Xhosa, she felt that Xhosa was relevant, and it would be useful for her future primary-school teaching career. However, she felt that she had not really progressed much in her competence or

knowledge since grade 12, because there was very little pressure on students to improve and much of the work was a repetition of school work - “I feel that all the Xhosa I know I learnt up to Matric and that I’ve been sort of revising but less and less as the years go on and I’ve actually regressed I’d say”.

She did only the assigned homework outside the class and never initiated conversations with Xhosa speakers outside the classroom. She enjoyed literature classes because she felt that they helped her to improve her reading and translation skills and she found them challenging. She did not feel that she could speak Xhosa fluently, partly as a result of a lack of confidence to practise and partly because there was too little pressure to improve speaking skills. She was worried about making errors and felt that there was too much emphasis on correct grammar in the course, which impeded progress in speaking ability. She felt that her understanding was “fine” and that she was better at writing because there was time to think about grammatical constructions. She could sometimes hear different tones but could not produce them - “the last thing I’m thinking of is tone [when I am speaking]”. She obtained 64% for Xhosa 3 at the end of 1998.

Sarah was a fairly hesitant speaker, although she generally knew the vocabulary reasonably well. She did not attempt to use a very wide range of morphemes when compared to Karen, although she had had more years of formal exposure to Xhosa than the other participants.

3.2.2. Learning Context

The bi-weekly first-year grammar classes were observed throughout the data collection period, so that appropriate vocabulary and grammatical constructions could be selected for the interviews. These classes also gave me insight into the teaching methods used in these classes and the problems experienced by the students.

First-year students attend two grammar classes and one class which focusses on cultural and phonetic aspects of Xhosa per week. In addition, they are assigned to small groups which meet once a week for a conversation class with a Xhosa speaker who teaches at a local school. These conversation classes tend to be fairly structured and vocabulary, sentence structures and sentences are written on

the board. Dialogues may be written out and practised in these classes and there is usually little room for spontaneous conversation, especially if the students are beginners.

At 2nd and 3rd year level, students have 5 and 6 classes per week respectively. These classes focus on grammar, conversation skills, literature and phonology. These classes are much smaller than the first-year class (four 2nd and two 3rd year students in 1998). More spontaneous conversation is encouraged than in 1st year, although students are usually provided with written vocabulary lists for the topic under discussion. It should be noted that these courses are primarily academic courses which focus on the structures of Xhosa, and that communicative ability is of secondary importance.

3.2.3 Data collection

One of the most problematic features of most SLA research is that it seeks to investigate the competence of the learner when researchers have access only to the performance of the learner. Although some data collection procedures, such as grammaticality judgements, are claimed to access competence reliably (Felix 1984; Sorace 1996), the claims are far from proven. As a result, Lalleman (1996:13) concludes that

(a)analyses based on intuitions do not seem to be more reliable than analyses based on spontaneous speech data, and the best way to arrive at the right conclusions is to take different types of language material of many types of learners into account

My study follows Lalleman's approach by including data from a range of different sources and activities (see section 3.2.3.3.2 for further discussion).

The data in my study does not come from naturalistic interactional contexts, but at the same time it is not as highly controlled as in an experimental setting. A typical feature of the experimental setting is that only a single or a few aspects of the IL are studied (Bialystok 1990), whereas my study aims to describe a range of elements in the data. In addition, the more controlled the experiment, the more difficult it is to know whether the reflection of competence is genuine or whether it is an artifact of the research situation. On the other hand, the more naturalistic the situation, the harder it is to control for a myriad of influential factors in the SLA process. A further consideration in rejecting data

collection in entirely naturalistic interactional contexts in my study was that the participants rarely (and never in some cases) conversed in the target language (TL) in natural situations which meant that obtaining such data would have been virtually impossible. For this reason, each participant in my study attended seven structured interviews which consisted of a variety of elicitation tasks over a period of eight months.

3.2.3.1 Interviewer

The interviewer (Thembi) was chosen because she is a L1 Xhosa student and her English competence is good. Five of the six interviewees were female, and since I felt that it would be desirable to match the sex of the interviewer and interviewee as far as possible, a female interviewer was chosen. She was also close in age to all the participants, and although she did not know any of the interviewees at the beginning of the year, she established a relatively relaxed relationship during interviews with all of them over the course of the year. I was not present at the interviews as I wanted the data to be as spontaneous as possible, and I felt that my presence would be intrusive for both the interviewer and the interviewee. However, I was entirely responsible for the formulation of elicitation exercises.

Thembi was approached to conduct the interviews at the beginning of the year in which the data were collected and a pilot interview was conducted so that guidelines for interview conduct could be clarified. We met to discuss the interview material before the beginning of the week in which interviews were conducted. She was instructed to attempt to present the material in as uniform a way as possible across all the interviews. Generally, she succeeded in this aim and conversations were usually started in the same way with the same questions used to elicit data from interviewees. Nevertheless, Thembi was given the freedom to adjust the vocabulary and structures she used according to the competence levels of the participants, which helped to further interaction and ensure more natural conversation. She was encouraged to prompt the interviewees to try and discover meanings by repeating utterances and/or using alternative vocabulary and only to translate into English for them as a last resort. As the year progressed, she increasingly participated in the conversations as a conversational partner rather than as an interviewer, so that the artificial situation of a series of questions directed at the interviewee could be avoided to some extent.

3.2.3.2 Data capture methods

The interviews for my study were tape-recorded. Phonetic transcriptions of spoken data were not made since the phonetic level of IL was not the focus of the study. Instead, there was a fairly simple transposition of speech into writing, with repetition and false starts marked. Thembi checked all transcriptions after I had transcribed the interviews, to ensure greater reliability.

Tape-recording may be problematic for a number of reasons including hesitance on the part of the subject, lack of clarity of the recording and the lack of extralinguistic cues available to the analyst (Johnson 1992; Seliger & Shohamy 1989). However, recordings usually allow for a fuller set of data than note-taking and since the interviews were conducted by someone other than the researcher, tape-recording was regarded as the most feasible way of capturing data³.

3.2.3.3 Data types

The primary data comes from the interviews conducted over an eight-month period. Each of the participants attended seven interviews from March to October and interviews lasted between 35 and 50 minutes each. Five different sets of interviews were used so that two of the interviews were repeated. In this way, morphological development demonstrated in the same tasks over time could be assessed more accurately. Table 3.1 sets out the interview schedule.

³Video-recording was considered, but the presence of a video camera was deemed too intrusive in a context where subjects were participating in what was, for them, a fairly infrequent conversational encounter in the TL.

Table 3.1 Interview schedule

Interview number	Time elapsed since last interview	Additional comments
1	0	First interview held 3 weeks after start of course
2	5 weeks	Interview held after one-week vacation
3	4 weeks	
4	10 weeks	Mid-year examinations and vacation between interviews 3 and 4
5	4 weeks	Repeat of the 2 nd interview
6	4 weeks	One-week vacation included between interviews 5 and 6
7	4 weeks	Repeat of 3 rd interview

3.2.3.3.1 Interview Content

The interviews consisted of eight different tasks, with task types repeated in the same order in each interview. Each interview consisted of two conversations, one joint-storybuilding or role-playing task, one picture-description task, one translation from Xhosa to English and *vice-versa*, one dictation task, sentence-building tasks, sentence-manipulation tasks (e.g. change the sentence from positive to negative), and a grammaticality-judgement task (interview material is included in Appendix C). Interview material was the same for all subjects in order to exploit the benefits of the quasi-longitudinal approach.

Seliger & Shohamy (1989:183) say that elicitation tasks should focus on getting data “where attention is on the meaning of the utterances rather than on grammatical forms, and where the task constrains speakers to produce the language which the researcher is interested in obtaining”. For some of the tasks, this was achieved, although some tasks seemed to elicit greater focus on form than meaning (e.g. translation).

Interview content was selected to match the goals of the elicitation tasks, which were:

- C to generate spontaneous language data (conversation, story-building, role-playing, sentence-building tasks);

- C to test underlying competence (grammaticality judgement, dictation);
- C to elicit examples of particular morphemes which would be obligatory in the context (sentence manipulation, translation);
- C to investigate development of morphology over time; and
- C to investigate variation across tasks.

As different tasks have been shown to influence the IL produced (Selinker 1992; Tarone 1982, 1983, 1987), the tasks were repeated and the interview structure was kept as uniform as possible so that assessments of morphological development could be more reliable for each task. Different tasks may affect both fluency and accuracy (Ellis 1987b, c), since carefully controlled production may be more accurate and less fluent, whereas more spontaneous production may be more fluent but less accurate.

A range of tasks can also limit the problems associated with the kind of data which learners present. Corder (1981) and Extra & van Hout (1996) note that learners may only demonstrate a small part of their repertoire which relates to what they feel most confident about in spontaneous conversation. By artificially “forcing” learners to use certain morphemes in certain contexts (e.g. in the sentence-manipulation task), it may be possible to investigate the underlying system more thoroughly.

3.2.3.3.2 Elicitation tasks

My study uses elicitation task-types commonly used in a variety of other studies. It relies to some extent on the principles (rather than the elicitation tasks) used by the European Science Foundation (ESF) study, which used “free conversation, pre-structured play acting, commenting on or retelling video fragments of films (in particular silent movies), and small-scale experiments” (Extra & van Hout 1996:95). Experiments in the ESF study included translation, picture-naming and verb completion and a few, less structured activities which had highly structured topics (e.g. giving directions). Extra & van Hout (1996:97) note that the variety of exercises and the repetition of interviews “offered ... both variation and structure”. It was felt that if results were to be compared with the ESF study, there would need to be some points of similarity, although a range of other tasks was also included to facilitate comparison with other studies.

Spontaneous conversation

Spontaneous conversation in natural conversation contexts is said to be the ideal IL to study, as it is the “purest” manifestation of competence, primarily because there is minimal monitoring (Faerch et al. 1984; Towell & Hawkins 1994). Studies using spontaneous speech as data include Extra & van Hout (1996), Giacalone Ramat (1992), Tarone (1983), and Wode (1981). Sharwood Smith (1994) argues that spontaneous speech better represents the underlying system than writing because there is less monitoring, and it therefore allows more access to “automatized and implicit IL knowledge” (Faerch et al. 1984:300). However, the availability of spontaneous conversation data is usually limited by ethical problems. With my group of participants, it is also usually limited by their lack of engagement in spontaneous Xhosa conversation. The interview format is therefore employed to stimulate spontaneous speech in my study.

Bell (1984) claims that topic and topic familiarity are important variables to take into account when studying IL utterances, and for this reason, two conversations with different topics were initiated in each interview (see also Selinker & Douglas 1985; Veronique 1987). The primary criterion for topic selection was the availability of vocabulary items which might be known to the participants. Vocabulary and topics were selected by noting the vocabulary items which were introduced in the first-year class⁴.

Story-building and role-playing

The conversation tasks tended to be rather one-sided and unnatural, especially in the early interviews, because the interviewer usually asked questions and the interviewee answered these questions without much elaboration. Faerch et al. (1984) mention role-playing as an effective elicitation method because it requires more equal input from both participants. In the story-building task, the interviewer and the interviewee together created a story on a given topic, each providing two to three items of information per turn. In these tasks, the interviewee would be forced to abandon some of the formulaic utterances which were prevalent in some of the conversations and jointly construct a

⁴It was assumed that 2nd and 3rd year students would be familiar with vocabulary introduced in the first year.

dialogue which was perhaps less predictable because of the greater contributions of the interviewer.

Picture Description

Picture-description tasks have been used widely in IL elicitation, mainly because it is believed that the learner is inclined to focus more strongly on the pictorial elements and less strongly on the form of the language that is produced (e.g. Bialystok & Frohlich 1980; Ghrif 1987; Giacalone Ramat 1992; Sánchez & José Giménez 1998; van Els et al.1984; Váradi 1980; Yang & Givon 1997). As far as possible, care was taken to use pictures relating to vocabulary which would be familiar to participants in my study.

Translations

Studies using translations include Hölscher & Möhle (1987), Swain et al. (1974), and Yang & Givon (1997), but the use of translation as an elicitation task is controversial in SLA theory. On the one hand, some believe that translations adequately measure comprehension, lexicon, grammar and transfer from L1 to L2 (Seliger & Shohamy 1989). On the other hand, others feel that translation does not actually measure L2 proficiency because it is a highly specialised skill which can improve with practice. Students become used to focussing on accuracy without much recourse to the L1 (transfer) when doing translation exercises (Sharwood Smith 1994). Nickel (1989) also found that there were not necessarily more L1 transfer errors in translation than in other activities, despite a belief that learners would focus on the surface form when translating. Dittmar (1981), who used an oral translation task, confirmed the findings of other studies that learners did not produce IL morphology. This finding confirms the view that translation tasks may not elicit a different form of competence from other tasks.

The English-to-Xhosa translations in my study required oral translations of written stimuli. The sentences for translation deliberately included grammatical constructions which students had been taught in the formal situation and vocabulary which should have been familiar to them. Translation tasks have the dual function of investigating the learner's ability to recognise the functions of morphemes in the L2, and the ability to use the morphemes in the grammatical context. In these tasks, the difference between knowledge of function and form is particularly evident.

The translation task requiring translation from Xhosa to English in my study used a read-aloud technique. The Xhosa passage was read aloud by participants and then translated into English. The use of a read-aloud technique can illuminate competence as learners may read what they believe should be there, rather than what is in fact there (Faerch et al. 1984; Schmidt cited in Young 1991; Seliger & Shohamy 1989). This task did not work particularly well in my study because interviewees read too slowly and often with too little comprehension to enable an adequate assessment of their competence. For this reason, the reading data is not included in the analysis. The translations into English served to illuminate comprehension of the meaning and function of morphemes, and for learners with low levels of competence it showed where morphemes were still unknown. At times, “wild” guessing in an attempt to match expected utterances with the context interfered with the reliability of the data.

Dictation

Language-testing research (Oller 1979) has shown that dictation tests may allow the analyst access to competence (see also Long & Sato 1984). When writing down a dictated text, the learner is inclined to write down what he/she thinks should be there, rather than what has actually been said. Dictation-test results in my study were used as comparisons with the results of oral tasks. One of the problems with this task in my study was that participants had varying degrees of familiarity with the vocabulary used. More familiar vocabulary was usually accompanied by more accurate use of morphemes, whereas unfamiliar items were accompanied by poor use of morphology. Nevertheless, the results of the dictation tests usually support the findings from the oral data from subjects.

Sentence building

Sentence-building tasks require students to construct sentences for each word from a list of words given to them. This task requires the production of full sentences with the appropriate morphemes. Students can choose vocabulary with which they are familiar, but the danger is always that they will choose to reproduce formulaic utterances which do not shed light on their morphological development.

Sentence manipulation

Sentence-manipulation (or stimulus modification, James 1998) tasks focus the attention of the interviewees on particular grammatical morphemes (Long & Sato 1984). Studies by Ghrib (1987) and van Els et al. (1984) use this elicitation method. The task requires them to produce these morphemes in given sentences or to make lists of words into sentences using a particular morpheme (e.g. negatives).

In my study, the sentences which needed to be manipulated were either available orally from the interviewer or in written form. Oral forms required the student to remember the given sentence while performing the task, while the written forms were usually easier as they required only the manipulation of one or two components of the sentence.

Grammaticality judgement

The purpose of the grammaticality-judgement test is to test metalinguistic awareness, which is said to test competence (Seliger & Shohamy 1989; Sorace 1996), although this claim is controversial. Examples of studies using grammaticality judgement include Duffield et al. (1998); Tarone (cited in Towell & Hawkins 1994), and Trahey & White (1993). Grammaticality-judgement tests have been conducted in a variety of ways and different types of test include:

- Ⓒ oral production of test sentences or elicited imitation (Munnich et al. 1994);
- Ⓒ a selection of sentences which can be graded for acceptability (Chaudron 1983; Sorace 1996);
- Ⓒ a selection of sentences of which the grammatically incorrect or correct sentence has to be indicated (Sorace cited in Lalleman 1996); and
- Ⓒ a selection of sentences containing errors which must be corrected (Seliger & Shohamy 1989).

Some of these tests require the correction of the sentences, while some require reasons to be given, verbally or in written form, for why the sentence is unacceptable. The grammaticality test used in my study required the student to correct errors in written sentences. A few distractor sentences which contain no errors were used to test hypercorrection (Sajjadi & Tahriran 1992) and therefore ensure greater reliability in the findings.

A grammaticality judgement which merely asks the learner to decide whether the sentence is correct

or incorrect is subject to problems because the more proficient the learner is, the easier it is to decide on a grammatical sentence. However, an increase in proficiency does not necessarily correlate with an ability to decide on grammaticality of a sentence, since the learner may conclude that it is ungrammatical because he/she lacks experience of the sentence structure (Lalleman 1996). Requiring interviewees to *correct* ungrammatical forms in my study avoided some of these problems.

Grammaticality-judgement tests as indicators of competence have numerous detractors. Munnich et al. (1994) feel that the grammaticality-judgement test does not elicit actual linguistic behaviour in the L2, but rather metalinguistic judgements about beliefs about the system (see also Gass 1994). In this case, there may be a mismatch between the underlying linguistic system and the system of knowledge about the underlying system. Birdsong (1989) concludes that grammaticality judgements are too metalinguistic, explicit and unreliable. Furthermore, the link between competence and performance may not be direct (Ellis 1994), since data may be affected by performance constraints. In this case, processing rather than grammaticality may be the problem (Schachter 1989). Similarly, Paradis et al. (1998:238) argue that “metalinguistic and explicit knowledge might interfere with the on-line processing desired in the procedure”.

Written Work

The mode of discourse (oral or written) may have an influence on the language produced (Tarone 1987). For this reason, a sample of the exercises, essays and dictation tests written during the course of the year by each student was collected so that spoken and written data could be compared. A problem with the use of these exercises and essays for comparative purposes is that students have access to charts of concords, dictionaries and other references when completing these assignments, and they are probably not good indicators of actual competence with regard to function, and particularly to form. Nevertheless, written work has value in terms of showing whether students know and can manipulate linguistic rules and morphemes (possibly with the support of materials).

3.3 ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Data was analysed from two different perspectives in my study. Firstly, a form-focussed approach was employed using error analysis (EA), so that general trends with regard to morpheme use in the

data could be assessed. Secondly, a function-focussed approach was used to look at some of the functions which the learners were able to perform in their IL. This latter approach enables a multilevel analysis and it can be used successfully where the range of forms is limited. Morphemes used in the TL may not be available to the learner, but the function may be carried out with the aid of other strategies and so a functional approach provides a more comprehensive account of development. It was hoped that the use of these two analysis procedures might throw light on patterns in the development of morphemes, idiosyncratic usage of morphemes, as well as the ways in which communication was achieved.

3.3.1 General principles of IL analysis

Analysis of IL needs to be carried out very carefully and in a cyclical fashion so that patterns can be identified and genres (or tasks) can be compared (Johnson 1992). Difficulties may be encountered because of the transitional nature of the system, the presence of idiosyncratic rules and the importance of taking the L1 into account (Jagtman & Bongaerts 1994).

Corder (1981) advises that every utterance should be seen as idiosyncratic until it can be shown that it is not. In fact, Selinker (1992) cautions that an analyst should not accept the first plausible interpretation, but should continually look for alternative explanations. Furthermore, Corder (1981) suggests that the analysis should be based on inferring the intended meaning of the learner before conclusions can be reached about the presence or absence of error. In support of this view, Douglas & Selinker (1994:121) say that “primary interlanguage data are always ambiguous; at a minimum, one needs to gain access to interlanguage intention” and that the learner’s perspective needs to remain at the forefront of any analysis. Perdue (1993a:13) cautions that

the nearer a learner’s production appears to be to the TL, the more tempting it becomes to imagine a ‘corresponding’ TL version and use the analytic categories relevant to the latter version to analyse the former. The ‘closeness fallacy’ ... is insidious and ubiquitous, and leads inevitably to false dichotomies such as ‘error/non-error’.

Taking the above cautions into account, it is evident that a consideration of the context is a vitally important aspect of the analysis (see also Selinker 1984). The discourse level is particularly important here, and Long & Sato (1984) provide an example of an analysis of the use of the past tense where

looking at morphological indications of past tense is inadequate because the past time reference may be established early in the discourse by non-morphological means. Isolated sentences may not therefore provide the full picture.

Furthermore, personal characteristics of the learners need to be taken into account during analyses. For example, a greater willingness to take risks may result in a greater amount of speech containing more errors, whereas another learner may not make many errors but speak slowly, hesitantly and produce only small amounts of speech (Klein 1986). This factor was clearly evident in the data of my study.

3.3.2 Analysis of IL as a system

The systematicity of IL has been widely documented (see section 2.5.2), but in a quasi-longitudinal study, systematicity may be difficult to determine. Adjémian (1976) and Selinker & Douglas (1985) argue against the notion of a single system, and they prefer to posit a variety of different distinct and coexistent systems which change over time and according to context (see also Faerch et al. 1984). Transition is also systematic, so there is both horizontal (or synchronic) and vertical (or diachronic) systematicity (Klein 1986; Perdue 1993a). A different view is that there are degrees of systematicity (Labov cited in Young 1988) which need to be discovered for different areas of the data. In addition, it should not be forgotten that it is the system apparent in performance, rather than competence, which is actually analysed (Young 1988).

3.3.3 Units of analysis

Choosing a unit of analysis is problematic in IL studies. Crookes (1990:185) discusses a variety of possibilities. The first option is the *turn*, defined as “one or more streams of speech bounded by speech of another, usually an interlocutor”. A second possibility is the *utterance*, which is defined by Crookes & Rulon (cited in Crookes 1990:187) as

- ... a stream of speech with at least one of the following characteristics:
- (1) under one intonation contour ...
 - (2) bounded by pauses, and
 - (3) constituting a single semantic unit.

For the purposes of my study, the turn was often too large a unit of analysis, especially in some tasks such as translation and picture description where the learner might provide information using a range of unrelated sentences. Rather, the utterance was the preferred unit and the second and third criteria mentioned by Crookes & Rulon above were particularly useful in determining an utterance in my study. Furthermore, utterance length may be a better indicator of development than turn length which depends much more heavily on the task and topic, since very short turns may be all that are required in a conversation, for example.

3.3.4 Characteristics of formulaic speech

The IL of the participants contained varying amounts of formulaic speech, but identifying formulaic utterances was not always an easy task. Examples of forms which are likely to be formulaic in the early interlanguage of learners of English include: “How are you?”, “What is your name?” Bahns et al. (1986) argue that identification is mainly intuitive, but there are other characteristics which can be used to identify these speech forms.

Myles et al. (1999:50) believe that “overextension of these utterances in use (whether syntactically, semantically, or pragmatically)” is one way to identify a formulaic utterance. The utterance is usually used invariantly and fluently in particular contexts and it may be more complex or longer than other forms which appear in the learner’s language (see also Weinert 1995). The learner may not be able to substitute other forms into formulaic utterances and they are therefore used inappropriately. Myles et al. (1999) find instances in their data where the pronoun reference needs to be changed from first to third person if the utterance is to be correct, but the learner can only produce the formulaic utterance which contains the first person. A further indication of a formulaic utterance is that the language is usually “well formed” and “grammatically advanced compared to the rest of the learner’s language” when a formulaic utterance is used (Myles et al. 1999:52). The primary function of formulaic utterances seems to be to enable communication, but they may also be used to deduce the patterns of the language (Pawley & Syder 1983; Wong-Fillmore cited in Myles et al. 1999).

3.3.5 Form-focussed analysis

The form-focussed analysis employed in this study takes the form of an EA. The approach has several

benefits, which include:

- Ⓒ being useful for discovering regularities at the morphological level;
- Ⓒ usefully showing which level of development has been reached; e.g. pragmatic, syntactic, finite, non-finite, etc.;
- Ⓒ allowing one to take a comparative approach by comparing which morphemes are used by learners and L1 speakers; and
- Ⓒ being able to determine sequences of development.

An overall picture of development can be gained by calculating the ratio of errors to the number of words in the text (Faerch et al. 1984). However, Ellis (1989:306) strongly criticises a form-only approach to determining acquisition orders because functions of morphemes are ignored, and “accuracy and acquisition orders cannot be equated”. He goes on to argue that “there seems to be no theoretical basis for comparing the acquisition of one feature (e.g. articles) with another (e.g. auxiliary, be) which comes from a totally separate sub-system of the grammar of the language” (Ellis 1989:306).

3.3.5.1 Error analysis procedures

The first stage of the EA consisted of what James (1998:19) calls the “broad trawl”. This initial analysis enables the researcher “to gain a first impression of the learner’s capacities and limitations, to identify the areas of TL competence where they are most susceptible to error” (James 1998:19). Part of the study consists of a description of the errors and James (1998) lists three reasons for describing data:

- Ⓒ the need for labels so that intuitions can be compared with those of other people;
- Ⓒ the need to count errors; and
- Ⓒ the need to create categories of errors which can be compared intralingually and cross-linguistically.

The focus of the EA is on morphological development, and Young (1991) feels that the use of inflectional morphemes can be quantified fairly easily by categorising them in any of the following ways:

- Ⓒ free or bound;
- Ⓒ easy or hard;
- Ⓒ one-to-one or one-to-many form-to-function relationships;
- Ⓒ likely to transfer or not;

- ⊆ NP or VP morphemes; and
- ⊆ single morpheme versus several allomorphs.

Gregg (1989) argues that one needs a well-defined set of categories before valid categorisation can take place. In my study, data were categorised according to TL morpheme categories. Further analysis occurred at the utterance level so that regularities of morpheme pairing could be noted. It was also necessary to include multiple utterances in the analysis, since some morphemes were used or omitted over a larger discourse unit. Correct use of the TL morpheme was noted as well as deviant usage. Following van Els et al. (1984), usage is divided into three categories:

- ⊆ no morpheme supplied;
- ⊆ misformed morpheme supplied; and
- ⊆ correct morpheme supplied.

There were also a few examples of inappropriate suppliance of morphemes, but this category did not occur often enough to warrant setting up a separate category in most cases. The norm used when deciding the status of a form was a written TL norm, as this was the variety most frequently encountered by most of the participants.

The second stage of an error analysis is where one counts the number of obligatory contexts and then calculates suppliance of the morpheme according to van Els et al.'s (1984) categories noted above. Problems with this approach include instances where the learner avoids the structure. This is especially problematic when comparing learners where one learner uses the form and another learner avoids the form (Tarone 1987).

Error analysis as an analysis procedure has a number of shortcomings (see section 2.2.2), but it is nevertheless a useful starting point for a description of the data (James 1998). In my study, results of the EA are tabulated according to task and interview sequence so that developmental trends can be investigated according to the two dimensions of task and time.

3.3.5.2 Problems with error analysis procedures

The use of TL labels on IL data is problematic, as Pienemann (1992) points out, especially if it is

assumed that IL is a system in its own right. However, no studies have completely reinvented terminology which will effectively account for IL data, because IL categories have not been determined. Broeder et al. (1993a, b), who worked with the corpus from the European Science Foundation (ESF) study, count the number of words in the data and assign a word class category and place of occurrence to each word. However, this approach is problematic in the sense that identification of a word may be problematic (especially in spoken data), and placing it in a category may be even more controversial (Broeder et al. 1993a). Nevertheless, for the purposes of analysis, some level of categorisation needs to take place and I have assumed that there is some regularity in distributional categories and that learners have some notion of a Xhosa word, although it may not be the same as in the TL.

A further problem in an EA is deciding on what counts as an ‘obligatory context’ of use for a morpheme. Tarone (1987:42) suggests that “an ‘obligatory context’ for any language form is a linguistic context in which NSs of the TL would be obliged to supply that language form in order to produce a grammatically correct utterance”. Superficially, this seems to be a fairly easy task, but it is also necessary to look more broadly at the context so that alternative forms can be assessed. In my study, the EA was performed twice: once by myself and once by a Xhosa mother-tongue speaker. The analysis took place independently and results were discussed so that reasons for any discrepancies between the analyses could be noted.

Another difficulty lies in trying to decide when a learner has acquired a morpheme. The 90% correct use in obligatory context criterion has been widely used, but it is not entirely satisfactory. Pienemann (1992:89) advises setting up additional acquisition criteria to measure developmental stages:

Consider the following example: a quantitative analysis reveals that a plural marker (e.g., English ‘-s’) is used 67% of times in plural contexts in a given sample. The researcher might ... decide that any frequency in the occurrence of a morpheme alone does not tell whether it is being used productively. S/he may therefore decide to study lexical and morphological variation in the use of this morpheme. In other words, s/he may wish to investigate how many different lexical items the plural marker occurs with, to what extent the same lexical items vary morphologically, and how many lexical items do not occur with a plural marker in a plural context.

A final aspect to bear in mind is that generalisation of results across tasks can be problematic. In my study, tables which mix results from different tasks and tables which separate results from different tasks are provided.

3.3.6 Functional analysis

As a focus on errors in a classic EA paradigm is based mainly on form, a functional approach is also useful. The functional approach allows one to investigate influences at levels beyond the morphological level, which can give insight into the choices made at the morphological level. The use of a restricted repertoire of forms to perform a wide range of functions is also more noticeable in a functional analysis of the data. Many studies have focussed on order of acquisition, but this may not be a true picture of the underlying processes of acquisition. A more useful and explanatorily adequate analysis would take functional uses into account as well so that systematicity could be observed (Rutherford 1984).

In order to overcome some of the shortcomings of a form-only analysis where many interesting results and patterns of development are hidden, there are two possible functional analysis types: form-function and function-form. Form-function analysis is defined by Long & Sato (1984:265) as “a comprehensive analysis of the functional distribution of a particular form in a learner’s IL”. On the other hand, function-form analysis “begins with a functional domain, such as the expression of temporality, and documents the evolution of grammatical encoding of that functional domain” (Long & Sato 1984:265). Bailey (1989:295) believes that both form and function need to be studied since “nothing in language learning is purely form related or purely meaning related” and at different times each may assume greater priority in the learning process. A form-function approach requires multiple-level analyses, a focus on process rather than product, and a focus on context rather than individual utterances (Extra & van Hout 1996).

3.3.6.1 Function-to-form analysis

One kind of function-to-form analysis starts at the genre (or task) level and then seeks to discover the forms used in the genre (or task). This is motivated by a belief that the discourse functions determine the linguistic forms which are used (Kumpf 1984). The analyst can then start to look at

how, for example, tense, aspect, modality and reference are realised in the discourse *across* utterances at first. A further stage of development is when the functions are gradually found *within* utterances as the language grammaticises (see Sato cited in Long and Sato, 1984, for an example of this approach).

Sato (1990) investigates the development from parataxis (or the pragmatic level) to syntacticisation in a function-to-form analysis of past tense development in two Vietnamese children learning English. She found extensive use of parataxis but little development in syntacticisation, although more lexical past verbs were encoded as the children's IL developed. Although she expected linear development, this did not happen (as Meisel et al. 1981 predicted). Development is slowed down by the availability of discourse-pragmatic means of indicating past time reference, and phonological constraints play a role in slowing down morphological development for the two learners in Sato's study.

3.3.6.2 Form-to-function analysis

In my study, one would expect Andersen's (1984) One-to-One Principle to be relevant, especially since Musau (1995) demonstrates that this principle operates for learners of Swahili who reduce morphological irregularities to single forms (see section 2.5.5.3.2). At early stages of development, the learner prefers to use a single form for each function rather than multiple forms for a single function. A form-to-function approach is thus relevant in my study.

Examples of function-to-form and form-to-function studies include Wagner-Gough (cited in Sato 1990) who studied the acquisition of *-ing* and found non-target-like and variable functional usage of the morpheme. Huebner's (1983) study of a Hmong speaker's English L2 development takes a functional approach. Other studies include Schumann's (1978) study of a Spanish speaker learning English, and Dittmar's (1984) reanalysis of Spanish adults learning German. Karmiloff-Smith (1979) looks at the acquisition of articles by French speakers and Pfaff (1987) investigates the determiner and reference systems of Turkish learners of German using this approach. The ESF study (Perdue 1993a) also takes a functional approach.

Mitchell & Myles (1998) conclude that functionalist approaches have promoted systematic analysis

of a range of functions which have helped to describe IL and that their focus on the discourse and pragmatic levels has been particularly illuminating. However, they tend to focus on early language development and more studies are needed which investigate development of later and more complex areas.

3.3.6.3 Functions investigated in my study

Three functional areas were investigated in my study. These were temporal reference, spatial reference and pronominal reference.

Other studies (e.g. Bhardwaj et al. 1988; Dietrich et al. 1995; Meisel 1987; Trévisé 1987) have found that temporality is encoded:

- ⊆ pragmatically;
- ⊆ at the word level by the use of adverbial elements;
- ⊆ by tense morphemes, to some extent in later development.

Spatial relationships are encoded non-verbally with the use of gestures as well as by the use of adverbial elements (Carroll & Becker 1993; Klein & Perdue 1993; Perdue 1990). Reference can range from repetition of the NP to pragmatic means to pronominal forms (Broeder 1991; Kumpf cited in Long & Sato 1984; Perdue & Klein 1993; Pfaff cited in Rutherford 1984).

These functions were chosen because they had been studied before and the findings of my study could therefore be compared to the findings of other studies. In addition, they seem to be primary functions which need to be performed in the elicitation tasks. Since there are a variety of means of expressing the functions, it is also possible to trace the development of these functions across tasks and over time.

3.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations of my study include several which are theoretically problematic in many other studies in the IL field.

3.4.1 System *qua* system

One of the problems with IL analysis most frequently raised in the literature is the notion that IL needs to be studied as an independent system, rather than a partially correct form of the TL. As Selinker (1992:43) says:

Units of linguistic structure have linguistic ‘value’ only in terms of the place of these units within a linguistic system and the constraints of such units within that system, while at the same time individuals in a language contact situation clearly violate, on a regular basis, such constraints.

Bley-Vroman (1983:6) describes the tendency to describe IL in terms of the TL system as the “comparative fallacy”. Even IL studies have not managed to steer clear of the comparative fallacy, although initially this was a seminal difference distinguishing them from other studies (Rutherford 1984). Analysing IL without reference to the TL is very difficult because it requires one to ignore completely the response that one has when one sees an “error” in terms of the TL. Particularly in the case of my study, where the learners seem to be exposed to a formal classroom norm and seem to experiment very little outside the confines of the classroom, it is tempting to say that much of their output is based on memorization and that very little in the way of independent hypothesis-making and hypothesis-testing is taking place. Yet, there is evidence to suggest that this is occurring and it is necessary to describe the system in its own terms.

3.4.2 Competence/performance

Discovering the competence of a learner using performance as the data is a problem with studies in the IL paradigm. The reliance on performance data is a result of the impossibility of identifying and studying competence. Performance may be variable while competence may not necessarily be variable, and performance may not reflect what is in the underlying system (Swan 1987). However, there are different views on the homogeneity of competence, and Tarone (1987) feels that there are a variety of competences or capabilities rather than the single homogenous one which Chomsky posits. Furthermore, although the competence/performance distinction is widely accepted, Seliger & Shohamy (1989) question whether the distinction needs to be made for L2 acquisition or whether it holds only for L1s.

3.4.3 Determining the norm

As mentioned above, during analysis it would be ideal to view the IL produced by the learner as a system which could not be compared with forms in the TL. Furthermore, one would seek an “IL grammar” made up of its own units rather than using units from the source language (SL) or target language (TL) during the analysis process. Unfortunately, no adequate grammar of learner language exists and work on interlingual identifications is still insufficiently developed. Consequently, most of the analysis of IL relies on using grammatical categories which are more closely associated with fully-fledged languages and the IL is implicitly or explicitly compared to the SL and the TL to some extent (Faerch et al. 1984).

The problem with this approach is that a TL norm has to be provided. Languages always have a range of styles and registers which may affect lexical and syntactic choices (Marshall 1989; Valdman 1989). The learner needs to be able to control a range of language used appropriately in context to achieve the goal of native-like competence (Bialystok 1998; Brown 1998), since what is acceptable in one context of language use may not be acceptable in another context.

The reference form is usually an idealised form of the L2 or the L1 unless baseline data from L1 speakers is used (Selinker 1992). Norms generally used in IL studies tend to be assumed rather than actual (Gass & Selinker 1992), and they tend to be based on written corpora (Alexander 1979). However, using a TL norm may not be as problematic as some theorists claim since the learner may well be comparing his/her forms with those of the TL. In fact, Jake (1998:341) posits the “target-language principle” which says that “to the extent possible, construct the IL from TL lexical structure”. A further relevant point is that these reference points for the learner may not be actual TL norms but may be perceived TL norms against which the learner compares his/her current system (Selinker 1992).

Judging norms is further complicated by the fact that native speakers may make errors although they can usually correct themselves (Faerch et al. 1984:382). In addition, there may be some dispute with regard to what the norm is, especially when using grammaticality judgements (Singh et al. 1982). However, James (1994) says that native speakers are reliable informants.

One argument (Cook 1991) is that learners should not be judged by TL standards as they do not speak this variety of the language, but that they should rather be judged according to their own standards. James (1998) argues strongly against this view because he feels that there needs to be an external rather than an internal norm with which to judge, otherwise no judgement can take place. In order to resolve this conflict, Klein (1998) and Larsen-Freeman (1998) agree that learner data should be analysed both from the perspective of a TL norm so that it can be understood why learners fail to reach the norm and from a systematic perspective, where the data is analysed in its own right. The use of a form-focussed approach and a functional approach in my study allows this dual analysis.

In my study, the choice of norm is further complicated by the relatively large differences between the form of language used in the classroom and the forms of language produced in the wider community of speakers (Gough 1995). The language of the classroom is formal, conservative and relatively “unsullied” by the language of the wider community from the point of view of the purist. It is the language of writing reflected in textbooks and older texts, but does not reflect everyday spoken Xhosa in many ways. The urban spoken language tends to be influenced extensively by other languages, although the influence is mainly in the realm of vocabulary. Nevertheless, the spoken variety is much less formal and there are certain constructions which are necessary in the written form which are not used in the spoken form.

For four of the learners who participated in the study (Ann, Ben, Karen, Sarah), I believe that it is acceptable to use the formal language of the classroom as the norm since they have very little input from speakers of Xhosa. Pat has received input from both Xhosa speakers and the classroom, and deciding on a norm for her language is more difficult, although her exposure is primarily to the written norms. Claire’s primary input has been from mother-tongue speakers of the language in a rural area and her exposure to the formal norms of the classroom is limited. However, rural varieties tend to be closer to the written norms than urban varieties so, although not ideal, it is possible to apply the written norm to her speech.

3.4.4 Classifying an error

Deciding on what is an error and what is a mistake can be difficult, despite the various definitions of

the two given in the literature (see section 2.2.3). Also, there is the “knock-on” effect of an error in the remainder of the utterance; e.g. if the noun class of the Xhosa noun is supplied incorrectly in the subject, it will influence the form of the subject concord of the verb which must agree with it. The problem is then to decide whether this constitutes two errors or one. In my study, I take the view that this constitutes a single error since, although the noun class is incorrect, the form of the subject concord is correct for the verb because it agrees with the noun class of the noun with which it is co-referenced.

Using the categories of the TL is also problematic because one cannot be sure that the learner understands the functions and forms of the categories. Avoidance may have occurred, or the learner may overuse a single form rather than a range of forms which might be more like TL usage. In addition, the use of a correct form does not always indicate understanding of the system since the form may have been produced correctly as a result of an automated, frequently heard form (or even a lucky guess in some cases).

3.4.5 Different levels of competence

The different levels of competence of the learners in my study is both a disadvantage and an advantage. The main disadvantage is that it does not allow precise comparisons to be made because learners control the elements of the language to very different degrees. For example, 15 different morphemes appear in the spoken IL of Ann, while Karen uses 21 different morphemes. Karen’s much more automated performance of some of the “basic” morphemes makes it difficult to compare her IL with that of Ann.

On the other hand, different levels of competence can be viewed as an advantage, because it allows one to develop a sense of the developmental routes of learners over a period of time. At this stage, when the development of morphology in learners of Xhosa has not been studied extensively, it is probably more useful to gain a broader view of the variety of morphemes they are able to manipulate, rather than considering too closely the details of the stages they go through to acquire these morphemes.

3.4.6 Generalisability based on subjects and tasks

A widely documented limitation of case studies relates to the generalisability of the findings. The sample in my study is small and more heterogeneous than is desirable for conclusive findings in the research area. However, it should be remembered that generalisability in any SLA study is problematic because of the vast variety of personal, social, psychological and contextual factors which play a role in the input, processing and output of the learner. Although no two learners are ever exactly alike, certain generalisations seem to be feasible because they appear so often in the IL of learners across the world who learn and speak different languages. Further research would be necessary for more conclusive statements regarding common features of the language produced by learners of Xhosa, but much of what is presented here is probably valid for the broader population of English learners of Xhosa, and it may be valid for the broader population of speakers of non-agglutinative languages who are learning an agglutinative language.

3.4.7 Elicitation procedures

Elicitation procedures are always problematic in SLA studies, because ideally researchers would like to obtain data which are produced spontaneously in settings where the speaker is not aware of being recorded and is genuinely trying to communicate for a real purpose. In my study (and many others), it is not possible to obtain spontaneous data because the learners hardly ever (or even never) have “real” conversations with “real” people for “real” communicative purposes. Class, race and power differences in South Africa play a further role in reducing the amount of “real” contact between English and Xhosa speakers. Indeed, even if there is contact, the English speaker can usually rely on the Xhosa speaker to have at least some rudimentary command of English so that if their Xhosa fails, they are usually able to resort to English instead.

Therefore, many learners of Xhosa have limited conversational practice in simulated environments in the classroom. Teachers and peers who know their L1 provide extraordinary support for these conversations by supplying vocabulary before-hand or even writing up sentence structures and vocabulary on the blackboard. There is little real communicative purpose and little urgency to produce a message which is fully coherent.

The second problem with access to spontaneous data relates to ethical considerations. As all parties involved in the conversation would need to be aware of the recording of data, spontaneity may be reduced. It would also involve recruiting “real” people in actual situations or contexts with the hope that the learner would approach these people in order to interact with them. The learners in my study are not in the same situation as those of the ESF study (Perdue 1993a) who were immigrants who had to use the language of the host country in order to survive and go about their daily business.

Therefore, a variety of elicitation tasks had to be used with varying degrees of spontaneity in terms of spoken data produced. These tasks had to be structured to accommodate learners of different levels (Hulstijn 1989), which means that some learners would have been able to produce fairly fluent data because they had practised the forms more often. On the other hand, some learners would have struggled to produce the data because of their lack of familiarity with the forms and vocabulary required by the tasks. The elicitation tasks may well have focussed on particularly easy or particularly difficult areas and one always has to be aware that they may not adequately reflect the learner’s ability in the language. However, the nature of the learning situation and the types of learners studied required the use of elicitation tasks.

3.4.8 Appropriate linguistic frameworks for SLA studies

Adequate theoretical frameworks for the study of SLA have not been sufficiently developed to account for all types of learner language. The problem lies in the lack of constructs to analyse the data, as the grammatical categories of the TL are not always appropriate for the analysis of IL. It is controversial whether analyses using the current approaches (i.e. comparing the IL and the TL; studying IL as a system in its own right but using the categories of other languages; using a form-function approach) are adequate. Analysts may well be missing important features of the IL and grammatical development by imposing these fairly rigid categories on this type of language. On the other hand, if IL is viewed as a species of language which is completely different from the TL and which cannot be analysed with the available categories, then one risks not finding many similarities with other fully-fledged languages. If general human language processing is taking place, then one might expect that the IL is similar to the TL and finding a completely new linguistic framework for studying it is unnecessary.

3.4.9 Interviewer interference

Ideally, the interviewer should not have used English at all during the interviews and should even perhaps not have been able to speak English. However, the confidence and competence of the students was such that I believe conversation with no resort to English might have caused students to abandon the study.

Directions were therefore usually given in English and there are examples of clarification using English in the data, although the majority of the interviews were in Xhosa. Occasionally there was translation of a vocabulary item and the interviewee might ask for clarification in English. Some resorted to English when they did not know the word in Xhosa. Ironically, this is probably a better representation of the spontaneous conversation of these learners than if they had been allowed to hear and speak only Xhosa, because so many of their interlocutors in the “real” world would be able to give them this kind of help during the conversation. It would also have created an even more artificial interview situation if everyone had pretended not to know any English.

3.4.10 Time frames for data collection

It would have been better to have exactly the same intervals between interviews, but the structure of the university year prevented this and there is a ten-week break between interviews three and four. A total of eight months of data is perhaps too short to find meaningful development, but the quasi-longitudinal nature of the study plays a role in alleviating this problem to some extent. If it were possible to predict which learners would continue learning for a period of a few years, it would be better to obtain further samples of speech from these learners. This would prevent some of the disparities between the subjects found in my study and enhance the predictive value of the study. However, only a very small number of students at Rhodes (typically 4-6 out of about 30) go on to the second year of study and only half of these students usually go on to the third year.

3.4.11 Amount of data

Although there are enough utterances for a reasonable study in a qualitative paradigm, there are not enough examples of individual morphemes to test for statistical relevance in a quantitative analysis. Trends can be analysed, but it is not possible to increase reliability with statistical calculations.

3.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter has shown that there is a wide range of possible data collection and analytical approaches to the study of SLA. The primary aim of IL studies is to gather data about the competence system underlying the performance by learners, but elicitation methods are not always successful in this goal. Different tasks elicit different forms and show the variability in performance of an IL system.

The use of multiple analysis procedures in my study aims to mitigate some of the problems associated with form-only or function-only approaches. In this way, a more comprehensive picture of Xhosa IL development has been made possible. Although the results may not be widely generalisable, the benefits of a detailed case-study are apparent.

In the next chapter, the forms and functions represented in the data are presented and discussed.

CHAPTER 4

FORMS AND FUNCTIONS IN THE DATA

4.0 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the data from the study, focussing both on the functions learners are able to represent in their utterances and the morphemes which they can and cannot produce. The primary focus is on data from conversations, picture descriptions, translation and sentence-building exercises, since these were the best sources of spontaneous data. Data from grammaticality-judgement exercises, dictation tests, written class work and tests are presented to support the analysis in chapter 5, but limitations of data from these elicitation tasks make direct comparison with the oral tasks problematic (see section 3.2.3.3.2). Summaries of the suppliance, omission or incorrect forms of morphemes are included in this chapter. In addition, detailed results of performance on each of the four elicitation tasks for each learner for some morphemes are included in Appendices G1-20, so that task variability can be shown.

The first section of this chapter presents information about the size of the data set. The second section discusses how the functions are expressed in the data and the third section looks at the formal characteristics of the morphemes represented in the data. Where common patterns are evident, results from individuals are discussed together, but individual patterns are also presented. This enables the retention of the case study approach and ensures that the significance of data relating to one individual is not lost by aggregating results (Eckman 1994; Selinker 1992).

4.1 SIZE OF THE DATA SET

Table 4.1 sets out the total number of utterances and morphemes produced in each task by each participant¹. Utterances were counted according to the criteria listed in section 3.3.3, but I found that there were difficulties with this approach, since the boundaries of an utterance in spoken data are often ambiguous. For this reason, I felt that it would be informative to count the number of morphemes in the data. Besides indicating the scope of the data, this total also shows the complexity of the learning task faced by these learners.

¹ Appendix D provides the number of utterances produced in each task for each interview.

When counting morphemes, I took the approach of counting each prefix and stem (e.g. *incwadi* = *i* + *ncwadi*) or each prefix, root and suffix where the suffix is changeable (e.g. *bahamba* = *ba* + *hamb-* + *a*) (but see Posthumus, 1994, for a different approach). Morphological divisions followed the patterns set out by Gough et al. (1989). An example of the counting method is included in Appendix E.

Table 4.1 Number of utterances and morphemes in the data

Name	Number of utterances	Number of morphemes
Ann		
Conversation	111	641
Picture description	90	458
Translation	44	317
Sentence building	102	749
Ben		
Conversation	131	1419
Picture description	69	1207
Translation	41	317
Sentence building	97	768
Claire		
Conversation	152	3680
Picture description	94	1634
Translation	50	393
Sentence building	105	873
Pat		
Conversation	146	2503
Picture description	79	1027
Translation	47	405
Sentence building	103	874
Karen		
Conversation	112	2392
Picture description	57	906
Translation	48	389
Sentence building	100	825
Sarah		
Conversation	122	2302
Picture description	77	1220
Translation	48	431
Sentence building	97	926
Total	2122	26 656

4.2 OBSERVATIONS ON THE INTERLANGUAGE OF EACH LEARNER

I have included general observations on the interlanguage of each participant to serve as a more detailed picture of each learner than that provided in section 3.2.1.1., where attitudes and learning experiences were considered.

Ann

Ann started as a complete beginner in the first-year Xhosa class. Her early interlanguage in the first interview is characterised by formulaic speech and single verbs and nouns. She progresses fairly slowly during the year and has difficulty remembering vocabulary. This means that she tends to produce very little during the conversations, but is able to produce utterances when the words are available to her. Progress is particularly noticeable in her dictation tests, where the texts begin to resemble Xhosa texts towards the end, although she has not mastered any morpheme fully and she employs a fairly limited range of morphemes. As Ghrib (1987:46) found in her study, many morphemes do not appear in free conversation and need to be elicited.

The most obvious feature of Ann's speech is that she uses concordial forms when she can retrieve the necessary vocabulary. When she has retrieval problems, concords are omitted or incorrect concords are selected. This is probably due to the high processing loads when vocabulary is not available. Although many of the concordial forms are correct, she also uses more formulaic utterances than other participants, so that her system may appear more correct and complex than it is. Nevertheless, formulaic utterances do not account for the only correct uses of several morphemes, especially at later stages, and it is evident that Ann has formulated a concordial system by the end of the data-collection period.

Ann's performance is fairly variable since the production of correct forms seems to depend largely on her ability to retrieve the appropriate vocabulary. Task variation can be seen when comparing conversation, translation and sentence building. Forms tend to be most variable and incorrect in spontaneous conversation, where she cannot rely on formulaic utterances, and in translation, where she is forced to retrieve the words and grammatical forms with which she is presented. She is most fluent and correct in the sentence-building tasks, where she has the most control over the content which she produces. This may mean, however, that she usually produces forms which are automatised, formulaic or practised on a previous occasion, rather than new forms where she

applies rules to produce the utterances.

Ben

Ben is a 1st year student who has had some previous exposure to Xhosa as a young child and as a scholar. Ben's speech is fairly fluent and he employs a range of morphemes, although they are not always correct. Most of his speech does not appear to be formulaic, although quite a lot of it seems to be automatised, because he produces forms relatively quickly and repeats forms across the interviews. He uses English when he does not know the relevant vocabulary, but he quite often adds a Xhosa morpheme to the English word.

There is some variability in his use of morphemes, often based on the task. Picture descriptions seem to cause the most problems while sentence manipulation from written data and building his own sentences are the most fluent and accurate. He performs variably on translation tasks. Throughout the interviews, he prefers to use a basic utterance structure: SVO (Locative). This is particularly noticeable in the picture-description task, probably because he is concentrating on the vocabulary retrieval in these tasks. He does not seem to develop much over the course of the interviews, although his repertoire of morphemes expands to some extent. The number of omissions and correct forms remains fairly stable across the data-collection period.

Claire

Claire had had extensive exposure to natural input but was learning Xhosa formally for the first time in the year in which data were collected. Claire seems to know the functions of a wide range of morphemes, although the forms she uses are not always correct. She produces long utterances and a range of morphemes are used from the first interview. She uses a number of lexical items fairly idiosyncratically, which may be a result of mishearing the oral input which she has received. Shortened or abbreviated forms may also be a consequence of mishearing during extensive interaction with L1 speakers. She rarely resorts to English and uses Xhosa discourse markers, interjections and ideophones in her speech. Repetitions and clarifications from Thembi are usually requested in Xhosa. She usually understands what is said and can communicate fairly effectively, although mid-utterance changes in tense, for example, may be confusing to the hearer.

To some extent it seems that Claire's Xhosa has fossilised and she does not show much

development over the course of the interviews. Perhaps communicative fluency is achieved in her view and her system is impervious to change, as Selinker (1992) suggests. She has a fairly uniform performance over different tasks (unlike some of the others who seem to have tasks where they find it easier to produce correct forms) and she seems to make the same kinds of errors across tasks. This may be a result of fossilisation or because she is not using formulaic forms as the other participants may be doing. Nevertheless, picture descriptions contain the most errors and the shortest utterances, and translation sometimes has more errors, perhaps because the necessary forms have not been automatised. When automatised forms are relied on in general conversation, there may be problems with producing new meanings. Claire may experience problems with the task of translation (Sharwood Smith 1994 suggests that it is a practised skill), or a lack of conscious knowledge of translation forms or how some areas are translated. There seems to be less evidence in translation tasks of direct translation from English and she may “think in Xhosa”.

Pat

Pat is a 2nd year student with some exposure to natural input and two years of input in the formal learning context at the beginning of the study. She uses a fairly wide range of morphemes and does not resort to English very often. Her speech is characterised by a few idiosyncratic forms and overuse of a few morphemes. Otherwise, she has variable degrees of correctness in her use of concords, although she usually uses the concords rather than leaving them out. There is development in the use of some concords but generally forms are fairly regular and fossilised. She generally uses an SVO (Locative) utterance structure, but also expands on these elements with modifiers. Picture descriptions cause the most problems. She uses fewer and simpler utterances, mainly with verbs and nouns, rather than expanded by the use of modifiers. Translation is often direct and translation exercises usually have many errors. Some English words are used when Xhosa is not known, but Pat can hold a conversation and answer questions accurately. English discourse markers such as “but”, “as well as” and “and” are used to link elements of the utterances. Pat self-corrects some forms, which may indicate an underlying systematicity with performance difficulties.

Karen

Karen is a 2nd year student with eight years of exposure to Xhosa in a formal learning context at the beginning of the study. She gives the impression of a fairly sophisticated level of development

because of the wide range of morphemes which she uses. However, she makes many errors, mainly as a result of using direct translation as her primary strategy for communication. At the idiomatic and morphemic level, her utterances may thus sound fairly strange to the L1 listener. Her performance on translation tasks is excellent, with most errors occurring in the conversation and picture-description tasks. Where she has control over the content in the sentence-building tasks there are few errors and she performs well on sentence-manipulation tasks. A lack of vocabulary or unknown vocabulary seems to cause the most errors in concord usage. Complex stories in the conversation contain many errors and words containing click sounds also seem to introduce problems. She self-corrects many of her own errors.

Sarah

Sarah, a 3rd year student, has had 12 years of exposure to Xhosa in a formal learning context at the beginning of the study. Her use of morphemes is usually correct in terms of the function of the morphemes, but incorrect forms are sometimes chosen, even in fairly simple utterances. Nevertheless, the range of morphemes which Sarah uses is fairly wide. She goes beyond using only basic utterances and she uses some advanced structures such as auxiliary forms. Much of her speech shows direct translation from English in terms of word order, and the morphemes which she uses and omits. Her translation skills are markedly better than those of Ann, Ben, Claire and Pat and this may be a result of practice in the formal context. Picture descriptions cause problems for the selection of correct morphemes, but she does not usually try to convey particularly complex messages, so there are not too many difficulties in conveying her meanings. She uses English when she is unsure of the vocabulary and many of her errors are self-corrected. Words which contain click sounds seem to cause problems and the links between words are problematic when she is unsure of the vocabulary.

4.2.1 Strategies for communicating

This section on communication strategies is concerned with establishing how the learners manage to initiate and sustain communication, and how they use the cues available in the context to converse. Communication can be achieved by means of non-linguistic elements such as gestures and drawings, transfer from the L1, code-switching and the use of formulaic utterances (Bialystok 1990; Wong-Fillmore cited in Wode 1981; Ghrib 1987; Rampton cited in Bialystok 1998). For several learners, code-switching and the overgeneralisation of known vocabulary items are

important resources. For Claire, there is the option of using Xhosa discourse forms which she has acquired from extensive interaction with native speakers.

Ann's use of formulae help (or enable) her to communicate and may form the basis of further development (as Wong-Fillmore cited in Myles et al., 1998, suggests). For example, when a subject concord has been established in a formula it may be used in a new form, whereas it may have been omitted otherwise. Ann's lack of understanding of the elements of the formulae is evident from the way she mixes formulae, mixes parts of formulae in answers and the lack of pronominal reference changes during a conversation.

The following example illustrates how Ann retains the question word (*phi* "where") in an answer:

- T: *Usisi wakho uhlala phi?*
 'Where does your sister live?'
 A: *Usisi uhlala *phi² eThekwini³ (A1C)⁴*
 Sister lives where in Durban
Usisi uhlala eThekwini.
 'Sister lives in Durban.'

The next example shows how she tries to use formulae in contexts where they are inappropriate:

- T: *Ibinjani iholide yakho? (A2C)*
 'How was your holiday?'
 A: *Could I say *ndiphilile?*

²The asterisk is used on each word which contains an error. Where it is possible, the word which contains the error under discussion has been put in bold, since an utterance may have several asterisked words. English and Afrikaans words used in Xhosa utterances are underlined.

³The examples follow the following format:

- T: Interviewer's utterance
 A/B/C/P/K/S: Initial of the learner replying to Thembi's utterance
 Line 1: Xhosa utterance as produced by the subject
 Line 2: Direct English translation
 Line 3: Correct Xhosa form
 Line 4: Correct English form

⁴ This code has three parts:

- 1: who produced the utterance: A = Ann, B = Ben, C = Claire, P = Pat, K = Karen, S = Sarah, T = Thembi
 2: the number of the interview
 3: the task, C = conversation, T = translation, P = picture description, S = sentence building and sentence manipulation

Could I say I was well?

In the first interview, Ann's strategy for answering questions seems to be to answer by taking the first element of a question and adding *ndi-* (I) to it. For example, she does not appear to understand the first element of the following utterance:

- T:* *Ngeziphi izifundo ozenzayo?*
 'Which subjects do you do?'
- A:* **Ndingeziphi* ... *isiXhosa* **Politics* ... (A1C)
 'I which Xhosa Politics'
 Ndenza ... *isiXhosa nePolitics* ...
 'I do ... Xhosa and Politics ...'

Ann can form questions by adding question words to an utterance, although her knowledge of question words is restricted and she forgets the necessary vocabulary over the course of the interviews.

At the discourse level, Ann focusses mainly on producing (sometimes uninflected) words and leaves the interpretation of the utterances to the hearer. She uses code-switching and relies heavily on the context to create meaning in her messages. There are also some examples of relying on Thembi's utterances. She seems to be able to recognise the stems of words which appear in Thembi's utterances and uses these to build her own utterances. For example, in interview 2, she tries to include an adjective based on Thembi's input:

- A:* *What is "big"?* (A2C)
- T:* *If you want to say "big ears" you say ... like umlomo omkhulu big mouth omkhulu*
- A:* *so I'd say like amehlo *umkhulu*
 So I'd say like eyes are big
 Amehlo amakhulu
 'Eyes that are big'

Her communication is hampered by a lack of vocabulary so that utterance and discourse levels suffer because she has to concentrate on vocabulary retrieval. Ann seems to be most comfortable with forming sentences containing human referents or referents from class 1, so she usually chooses one of these forms to enhance success in communication. In addition, she prefers the "I" (*ndi-*) pronoun when building sentences or making general conversation.

Ben often communicates by building on Thembi's utterances or copying the forms of her utterances. He code-switches, although this is usually at the word level rather than at the phrase or utterance level like Ann. He relies heavily on a basic subject-verb-object-locative pattern in most of his utterances and he has sufficient vocabulary to communicate most of his messages. Ben uses occasional word order transfer and some direct translation from English. An example is the direct translation of "have no hair" as *ananwele* (negative formative+have+stem for hair).

Ben usually seems to know what is going on in the interviews and he can usually answer questions. He sometimes tries to clarify understanding by translating Thembi's Xhosa forms into English before answering, but this may be a think-aloud process. The following is a typical turn by Ben:

- T:* *Uhambe nabani?* (B2C)
You walked with whom?
- B:* **Ndihamba *nemoto *wam yam ja nomninawa wam siye eMonti for *iholide*
I walk with car my my ja with younger brother my we went to East London for holiday
Ndiye ngemoto yam nomninawa wam. Siye eMonti ngeholidi.
'I went with my car and/with my brother. We went to East London during the holidays.'

Claire communicates mainly in Xhosa and, although there are English words in her utterances, they normally have Xhosa morphemes attached to them. She uses Xhosa discourse markers in many places and includes forms such as interjectives (e.g. *yhu* "whew") to convey emotion. She also seems to rely on direct translation to some extent, although she also has some idiomatic forms. An example of direct translation from Claire is *into ukutya* (thing to eat) instead of adding the possessive form, *into yokutya* (thing of to eat). Context sometimes plays a major role in supporting meanings because some of her speech is quite confused and changes direction in a single utterance. The following exchange exemplifies Claire's utterances:

- T:* *Ndixelele ngeklasi yakho nabafundi* (C1C)
'Tell me about your class and the students.'
- C:* *Abafundi OK *andyazi yima *ayafunda nam kodwa mna ndiya *nxa ndiyathetha kakuhle*
Students OK I don't know stop they study with me but me I go when I talk well
*abanye abathethi *odwa ngoku *ndilibe *iXhosa yam yile nto ndiyafunda isiXhosa *odwa*
some don't talk but now I forgot Xhosa my it is this thing I study Xhosa
*siyafunda into *zam ndiyazi *ndiyafunda *ndiyathanda kodwa umfundi eklasini u *andiyazi*

we study a thing my I know I study I like but student in class (hesitancy) I don't know

Abanye abathethi kodwa ngoku ndilibele isiXhosa sam yile nto ndisifunda isiXhosa. Abafundi, andibazi. Bayafunda nam kodwa mna ndithetha kakuhle. Sifunda izinto endizaziyo. Ndiyafunda. Ndiyasithanda kodwa abafundi eklasini andibazi.

'Some don't talk. But now I have forgotten my Xhosa and that is why I am studying Xhosa. The students, I don't know them. They study with me but I speak well. We study things that I know. I study. I like (it) but the students in the class, I don't know them.'

Pat overgeneralises a few forms and uses a few basic utterance patterns wherever she can, e.g. pronoun+*thanda uku*+stem (pronoun+like to+stem). She uses some English, but generally manages to communicate fairly successfully using the context to convey meaning when she lacks suitable forms. Overgeneralisation of forms also allows her to convey functions when forms are not available to her. A typical turn of Pat's would be:

*Abantu *abavuya ukuphuma *ibedroom *kaloku *iyabanda kakhulu abantu *basela ikofu no *bayaphunga ikofu *zishushu (P3C)*

People are not happy to leave bedroom now cold very people drink coffee no drink coffee is hot

Abantu abavuyi ukuphuma kwigumbi lokulala kuba kuyabanda kakhulu. Abantu baphunga ikofu eshushu.

'People are not happy to leave the bedroom because it is very cold. They drink coffee which is hot.'

When producing questions, Pat substitutes *nini* (when) for *ngubani* (who), with the word *ixesha* (time) suggesting overgeneralisation of the prototypical temporal question word, which is *nini* (when). There is also an example of *yintoni ixesha* (what is the time?) which is a literal translation.

Karen communicates with some Xhosa discourse forms, a bit of code-switching and lots of direct translation. Some of her code-switching has Xhosa concords added, e.g. *ngechangi* "with change". She overextends known words and she tends to tail off when she is unsure, rather than completing the message. Karen's direct translation causes clumsy forms, sociolinguistically problematic forms and incorrect idiomatic forms in all the interviews. Word order problems result from direct translation. A typical example of a turn in her conversations is:

*... ngenye imini *kwakuboinja *ecinci ihlala efameni igama *enja *uSpotty uthanda uku ... one day there was dog that is small it lives on a farm name of dog Spotty he likes to ukuya ne *nefama *ukuya *ukuze *ingela *ngena e e es es *esendle (K5C)*

to go with with farmer to go so that ? enter (hesitancy) the veld

... ngenye imini kwakukhoinja encinci. Ihlala efameni. Igama lenja nguSpotty. Uthanda

ukuya nofama endle.

‘... one day there was a small dog. It lives on a farm. The name of the dog is Spotty. He likes to go with the farmer into the veld.’

Like Karen, Sarah communicates with some Xhosa discourse forms, code-switching and lots of direct translation. Direct translation in Sarah’s utterances seems to be very common in all the interviews, and this causes problems for tense selection, morphology which is added or omitted, word order and vocabulary selection. Some code-switching has Xhosa concords added. She also seems to rely on identifying the roots of oral forms with which she is presented. An interesting example of her reliance on root identification is the following:

T: *Zingaphi iimoto emfanekisweni?* (S7P)
‘How many cars in the picture?’

S: *How many?*

T: *(inaudible)*

S: *But phi means where*

T: *Zingaphi*

‘How many’

S: *OK sorry *zineemoto ezintandathu*

They have cars that are six

Uneemoto ezinthandathu

‘It has six cars.’

Examination of overgeneralised vocabulary forms shows that some of the overextended forms are displayed by several learners, while some are unique to individuals. Overextended forms are either in the same semantic field or display phonetic similarities. Examples of overextended forms include:

hamba (go) for *ya* (go to or towards) (Ann, Ben, Claire, Pat)

bona (see) for *bukela* (watch) (Ann)

jonga (look) for *bukela* (watch) (Ben, Claire)

jonga (look) for *bona* (see) (Claire)

jonga (look) and *bona* (see) for *bonakala* (appear or seem) (Sarah)

bukela (watch) for *bona* (see) (Pat, *vice versa* for Karen)

phunga (drink something hot) for *sela* (drink something cold) (Ben, *vice versa* for Pat)

sika (cut) for *cheba* (cut/shave off hair) (Claire, Pat, Sarah)

thetha (talk) for *ncokola* (chat) (Pat)

xelela (tell) for *ncokola* (chat) (Sarah)

vela (come from) for *hlala* (live) (Sarah)

ukutya for “food” and “eat” (Ann)

Overextension of these forms enables communication of similar meanings when vocabulary is limited.

Although they rely on the context to a large extent, these learners are able to communicate their messages at most times. They use a number of strategies to enable communication and these include selecting vocabulary and forms with which they are familiar.

4.2.2 Relationship between elements of the utterance⁵

The relationship between words can be indicated by the word order or by agreement morphemes (Felix 1981; Jordens cited in Cooreman & Kilborn 1991; Klein 1986; Meisel et al. 1981). The simplest way to show the relationship between the elements of an utterance is to place them next to each other and hope that the hearer can infer the intended meaning from the context. A more advanced and target-like way is to use Xhosa morphemes since these show the relationship between co-referenced elements of an utterance. However, the ordering of elements is variable. In some contexts, the unmarked form is SVO, while in narratives, Gough (1992) finds that VS is the unmarked form, e.g.

(concord)VS
bayabhala abantu
 they write people

The subject concord acts as a co-reference with the subject which appears after the verb. Another way of signalling relationships between elements of an utterance is to use conjunctions.

Ann relies on the context and juxtaposition of elements which should be next to each other to convey her meaning when she is unable to produce the required morphemes. The context is an important clue to the meaning which she attempts to convey in many cases, especially since she does not always link her utterances carefully to the previous utterances by means of morphemes. The SVO word order which Ann uses is English-based, but this is not necessarily problematic, since ordering of basic utterances is usually the same in Xhosa and English. There is a fledgling concordial system which attempts to link elements, although the forms of the co-referencing concords are not always correct.

Ben's use of a greater variety of forms than Ann means that he can supply the links between forms rather than relying as heavily as Ann does on juxtaposition of elements. However, where he does

⁵ A brief introduction to the structure of Xhosa is provided in Appendix F.

not know the form of a morpheme, he also uses juxtaposition and English words, e.g.:

**Funa *ya eDulcies what's tonight? (B2C)*
 Want go to Dulcies what's tonight?
Ufuna ukuya eDulcies ngokuhlwa?
 'Do you want to go to Dulcies in the evening?'

Claire usually uses morphemes to link elements in the sentence and makes extensive use of conjunctions in her utterances. Some of these conjunctions act as discourse markers to show hesitation and give her time to think of vocabulary, but some show the relationship between elements of the utterance. An extract from a conversation in interview 7 shows how she creates links between parts of utterances by using morphemes, an English discourse marker and Xhosa conjunctions:

T: Zinjani iimini zasehlotyeni (C7C)
 'What are the days of summer like?'
*C: Zimnandi zinde zishushu and *ndiyathanda kakhulu ngoba ndiyathanda *qubha*
 They are nice they are long they are hot and I like very much because I like swim
*ndiyathanda *ilwandle *ishushu kamnandi ndiyaqubha kaninzi *nxa *ishushu*

...

I like sea it is hot nice I swim lots when it hot
Zimnandi zinde zishushu. Ndiyazithanda kakhulu ngoba ndiyathanda ukuqubha.
Ndiyathanda ulwandle. Kushushu kamnandi (ndiyathanda ulwandle xa
kushushu kamnandi). Ndiyaqubha kaninzi xa kushushu.
 'They are nice, they are long, they are hot. I like them very much because I like
 to swim. I like the sea. It (indefinite) is nice and hot (or I like the sea when it is
 very hot). I swim a lot when it is hot.'

Pat, Karen and Sarah rely on direct translation and morphemes to indicate relationships between parts of their utterances. In the following example, direct translation means that the passive is not included in *uvuya ngexabiso* (he is happy with the price), so the passive followed by the copulative does not appear, e.g.:

*Utata ubuza unovenkile ixabiso *yenja utata *uvuya *ngexabiso ngoku ke *uyathenga*
 (K2C)
 Father asks shopkeeper price of dog father happy with price now he buys
Utata ubuza unovenkile ixabiso lenja. Utata uvuyiswa (passive) lixabiso ngoku ke
uyayithenga.
 'Father asks the shopkeeper the price of the dog. Father is happy with the price and now
 he buys it (the dog).'

The conjunctions which appear in the data from all learners are included in Table 4.2 to show the types of relationships which can be encoded by these learners.

Table 4.2 Conjunctions used by the learners

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
<i>kodwa</i> (but)	%	%	%	%	%	%
<i>xa</i> (when, if)	x	%	%	%	%	%
<i>kanjalo</i> (also/likewise)	x	x	x	x	%	x
<i>okanye</i> (or)	x	%	%	x	%	%
<i>ukuze</i> (that/in order that)	x	x	%	x	%	x
<i>kuba</i> (because)	x	%	%	x	%	%
<i>ke</i> (but/well)	x	x	x	x	%	x
<i>ukuba</i> (if)	x	x	%	x	%	%
<i>ngokuba</i> (because)	x	x	%	x	%	%
<i>mhlawumbi</i> (perhaps)	x	x	x	x	%	x
<i>ngoba</i> (because)	x	%	%	x	x	x
<i>ngaphandle kwa-</i> (except for)	x	x	x	x	x	%
<i>noko</i> (although)	x	x	%	x	x	x

The extensive use of conjunctions and morphemes shows that learners have moved beyond the stage of mere juxtaposition of elements in most of the interlanguage. This earlier stage reappears when they are struggling to retrieve vocabulary, but usually the more complex stage of using conjunctions and morphemes is evident. Although morphemes and conjunctions are not always used correctly, their functions are still usually conveyed and they enhance the meanings intended in the messages.

4.3 FUNCTIONS EVIDENT IN THE DATA SET

I have chosen to start the discussion of the data by looking at what the learners in this study **can** accomplish with the language they produce, since this approach is more congruent with the aims of interlanguage (IL) studies. If one starts from an error analysis perspective, one is continually tempted to focus on the *deficiencies* in the IL rather than the *proficiency* which the learner exhibits. The first focus is therefore on the functions evident in the data as well as on *how*

particular functions are achieved in the IL. For these learners, many functions are realised by the use of morphemes, so an error analysis which analyses the morpheme level is necessary, and this is the second focus of the chapter.

As mentioned in section 3.3.6.3, the functions investigated in my study include the referential function, spatial reference, and temporal reference. Each of these areas will be discussed in more detail below. Discussion of the language produced by the participants has been arranged firstly in order of year of study (1st, 2nd, 3rd), and secondly in order of amount of exposure to Xhosa (e.g. Ann, Ben and Claire are all 1st year students but Claire has the most exposure to Xhosa so her language is discussed third).

4.3.1 Referential function

Perdue (1990, 1991) claims that development of the referential function proceeds from full noun phrases to pronominal forms (see section 2.6.4.1). These patterns are found here, but the wide range of pronominal forms in Xhosa means that learning the pronominal system is a complex task. For example, there are several forms of “it” depending on agreement with different noun classes in the linguistic context. The referential function may be realised by noun phrases, subject concords, object concords, absolute pronouns (e.g. *yena* “he/she”), demonstrative pronouns (e.g. *lo* “this one”), quantitative pronouns (e.g. *bonke* “they all”) and copulatives (e.g. *ngu-* “it is”).

None of the learners use demonstratives and quantitative pronouns with a pronominal function since these morphemes only appear with nouns when they use them. Copulatives are always used with an impersonal function (“it is”). Table 4.3 indicates the range of forms used to perform the referential function by all learners⁶.

⁶ A tick indicates use of the form and a cross indicates that the form does not appear in the data.

Table 4.3 Forms used to realise the referential function

	Full range of subject concord pronominal forms	Full NPs instead of pronominal forms	Absolute pronouns	Object concords	Possessive pronominal stems
Ann	x	%	%	x	x
Ben	%	%	x	x	x
Claire	%	%	%	%	%
Pat	%	%	%	%	%
Karen	%	%	%	%	%
Sarah	%	%	%	%	x

The following patterns are observed in the data:

- C Ann uses subject concord pronominal forms but only some of these are used correctly. She uses the “I” (*ndi-*) form correctly but other pronouns (*ni-* “you-plural”, *si-* “we”, *ba-* “they”) are used interchangeably.
- C All learners have problems supplying the correct subject concords denoting “it” because the choice of forms is wide.
- C Object concords are not used as much as they would be by L1 speakers.
- C Possessive pronominal forms are always used with prepositional *na-* (with) forms; e.g. *nabo* (with them), *naye* (with him/her).

These learners have a range of referential devices available to them and most of these devices take the form of morphemes rather than pragmatic devices. Although forms are not always correct, it is necessary to note that the Xhosa pronominal system is complex because the class system used with nouns demands a range of different agreement forms.

4.3.2 Spatial reference

In Xhosa, spatial reference can be made by means of gestures, adverbs or adverbial clauses, demonstrative forms with nouns, or by means of locatives which indicate location and prepositional relationships. All the interviewees make use of these elements at some point during

the interviews⁷. Spatial reference is required in different tasks across all the interviews and this results in a variety of forms to express this function. Table 4.4 indicates the range of forms used by these learners to realise spatial reference.

Table 4.4 Forms used to realise spatial reference

	Locative	Position 1 demonstrative	Position 2 demonstrative	Adverbs	Adverb for a demonstrative
Ann	%	%	all incorrect	%	x
Ben	%	%	x	%	%
Claire	%	%	x	%	%
Pat	%	%	x	%	%
Karen	%	%	%	%	x
Sarah	%	%	%	%	x

The following patterns are found in the data:

- C Ben prefers the prototypical locative morpheme (add *e-* to the beginning of the word).

This strategy is applied in the following example:

**Ehlobo *thanda ukudlala elangeni* (B7C)

In summer like to play in the sun

Ehlotyeni ndithanda ukudlala elangeni.

‘In summer I like to play in the sun.’

- C First position demonstratives (this/these) are produced by the learners, but second position demonstratives (that/those) are not always produced or are substituted by forms such as *phaya* and *khona* (which mean “there”). The use of these adverbs is probably less cognitively demanding since their form remains constant.
- C Pat adds an unnecessary locative (*e-*) to an adverbial (*phandle*) which shows the primacy of the locative as a means of indicating location in her system:

*Ebusika *uyabanda kakhulu sinay sinayo ikhephu kusasa *uyabanda kakhulu kakhulu*

In the winter it cold very (hesitancy) we have it snow early it cold very very

**akufuna *ukuye e *ephandle* (P7C)

you don’t want to went to outside

Ebusika kuyabanda kakhulu. Sinekhephu kusasa. Kuyabanda kakhulu kakhulu Akafuni ukuya phandle.

⁷ Gestures cannot be accurately recorded because of the data-collection methods, but they are implied in the data, especially in the picture-description tasks.

‘In winter it is very cold. We have snow early. It is very very cold. One does not want to go outside.’

The locative morpheme and adverbial forms seem to be the most usual means of indicating spatial reference for these learners. A limited range of demonstratives is also employed by all learners.

Table 4.5 indicates the range of adverbs employed by the learners.

Table 4.5 Adverbs used by the learners

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
<i>phantsi</i> (below/down)	%	%	%	%	%	x
<i>phandle</i> (outside)	%	%	%	x	%	%
<i>phambili</i> (in front)	%	%	x	x	x	x
<i>phezulu</i> (above)	%	%	%	x	%	%
<i>apha</i> (here)	x	x	%	%	%	%
<i>phakathi</i> (inside)	x	x	%	%	x	x
<i>ngasekohlo</i> (left)	x	x	x	x	%	x
<i>ngasekunene</i> (right)	x	x	x	x	%	x
<i>kufuphi</i> (close to)	x	x	x	x	%	x
<i>apho</i> (there)	x	x	x	x	%	%

4.3.3 Temporal reference

Temporal reference can be achieved by pragmatic or syntactic means. Leaving the hearer to infer time reference from the context, using adverbial forms and conjunctions are examples of pragmatic means, while the use of morphemes indicating tense is an example of syntactic means. Both of these methods of temporal reference occur in the data, with noticeable differences which depend on the proficiency of the interviewee.

Gough et al. (1989:104) say that the present tense is used in Xhosa to show that an “action, process or state takes place, is taking place, or exists in the present.” There are two forms of the future tense: the near future “indicates that something will take place in the relatively near future” (Gough et al. 1989:112), and the remote future “indicates that an action will take place in the remote future” (Gough et al. 1989:113). The learners in this study use only the near future tense form. Gough et al. (1989:114) say that the simple past tense (perfect tense) “indicates a completed action” (e.g. I have read the book) and that the remote past tense is used to show “that an action

took place in the relatively remote past” (Gough et al. 1989:118). The near past continuous tense is used to show “that an action was continuous in the past” (Gough et al. 1989:20). Table 4.6 indicates the forms used to convey the temporal function in the data.

Table 4.6 Forms used to convey the temporal function

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
Present tense	%	%	%	%	%	%
Adverbs	%	%	%	%	%	%
Near past continuous	x	%	%	%	%	%
Remote past	x	%	%	%	%	%
Future	x	%	%	%	%	%
Simple past (perfect)	x	%	x	%	%	%
<i>xa</i> (when)	x	%	%	%	%	%

The tense used most frequently is the present tense, and the past and future forms are left to the context in many cases. For example, Ben leaves the near past continuous form to context when it is introduced by Thembi, although he uses a past tense form in the utterance, e.g.:

T: Ibinjani iholide yakho yePasika? (B2C)

‘How was your Easter holiday?’

*B: *Imnandi ja *ndiye eMonti ...*

It nice ja I went to East London ...

Ibimnandi bendiye eMonti

‘It was nice I went to East London.’

Tenses are often mixed in a single utterance and much of the time reference is left to the context because the morphemes do not always make sense in the context. A typical extract from a conversation by Claire in interview 4 shows the mixing of tense forms:

**Nake *andikwaz’ *k’qubha kakuhle *lee nto bendihlala ekhaya yonke imini efama ? I don’t know it to swim well this thing I was staying at home every day on the farm *odwa ifama yethu *ndiyahamba ngeenyawo elwandle *emnandi ka ka inyani *imnandi eziny’ *imin umama *am *wandithath’ eMonti *bemnandi (C4C)*

other days mother my took me to East London it was being nice

Andikwazi ukuqubha kakuhle. Bendihlala ekhaya efama yonke imini. Bendihamba elwandle. Bekumnandi, nyani, bekumnandi. Ngezinye iimini umama wam ubendisa eMonti bekumnandi.

‘I don’t know how to swim well. I stayed at home on the farm every day. I walked in the

sea which was nice, really, it was nice. Some days my mother took me to East London and that was nice.’

Negative forms of the past tense are not produced, and present tense forms are substituted, e.g.:

- T:* *Utata lo ukhwele imoto* (S3P)
‘This man drove a car.’
- S:* **Awukhweli what did you say i imoto imoto *ikhwela ukhwela ibhayisekile*
he does not ride what did you say car car it rides he rides bicycle
Akakhwelanga imoto, ukhwela ibhayisekile.
He was not driving a car, he was riding a bicycle.

The forms of the future tense seem to be problematic for all learners who use the form. The basic form of the future tense patterns is: subject concord + *za/ya* + *ku-* + verb stem.

Ben usually uses *kwazu-* + verb stem, *sizo-* + verb stem (which is a correct contracted form of the future) and a half future form *za-* with no *ku-* component to indicate the future tense. Claire also uses this latter form. She also uses an *uzo ku-* future form and half future forms (which may be a result of omission of *ku-*, or the contracted form with no coalescence). Pat and Sarah use these half future forms as well, e.g.:

- *Ndizagoduka ...* (P5C)
I will go home
Ndiza kugoduka.
‘I will go home.’

Pat also uses *uyakwazi* (you know it) as a future form. Sarah uses the infinitive (*uku-*) for the future form, which may mean that she focusses on the *ku-* part of the future form. Karen’s future tense sometimes consists of a double *ku-* form (*kuku-*) form in interviews 3 and 6, e.g.:

- (Thembi) **uza kuthanda uku ukuya eSpur *kukuyitya ikofu?* (K3C)
(Thembi) you will like to to go to Spur going to it eat coffee
Thembi uyathanda ukuya eSpur ukuya kuphunga ikofu?
‘Thembi, would you like to go to the Spur to go and drink coffee?’

A common error in the use of the near continuous tense is the substitution of *ibe-* for *ibi-*, e.g.:

- *Ibemnandi* (referring to *iholide*) (B6C)
It was nice (referring to a holiday)
Ibimnandi.
‘It was nice.’

Despite these problems with the use of the different tense forms which all need to agree with the

noun with which they are co-referenced, these learners are attempting to use morphemes to convey their meanings. In many cases, the context is the least cognitively demanding means of indicating a non-present form, but they attempt to use different morpheme forms. Confusing meanings may emerge from these forms and the hearer is obliged to use the context to discover meaning at times.

4.4. MORPHEMES EVIDENT IN THE DATA SET⁸

Development from the pragmatic mode to the syntactic mode is shown partly in the acquisition of morphemes to perform functions previously realised by means of reliance on the context, adverbial elements and gestures (Givón 1979). This development can be seen mainly in Ann because her speech is closest to the pragmatic mode at the beginning of the data-collection period. Other participants seem to have a fairly high level of syntactization, but they also display examples of development in this direction, if one views the pragmatic and syntactic modes as extremes on a continuum. Although by using morphemes the learners can be placed closer to the syntactic extreme, improved correct performance and greater use of the morphemes means that there is further movement along the continuum.

Learning the morphemes of Xhosa is a fairly complex task, since Learning a morpheme entails learning two things:

- C the function of the morpheme; and
- C the form of that morpheme, depending on the class of the noun with which it agrees.

Throughout the data, it is evident that although the function of the morpheme is learned early, the multiple forms which the morpheme can take cause difficulties for the learner. For most morphemes, a small number of agreement forms are learnt first and the forms of less commonly used classes usually appear later.

4.4.1 Noun prefixes

The noun prefix is attached to all nouns and indicates the class membership of the noun. It is therefore an important part of the noun, which is used to determine the concordial forms of other

⁸ Appendix F provides a brief explanation of Xhosa structure.

morphemes in the utterance.

Table 4.7 shows that in the overwhelming majority of cases (average 89.8%), the correct noun prefix is included. To a lesser extent, the incorrect noun prefix is included (average 5.4%), and only in a relatively small number of cases (average 4.8%) is the noun prefix omitted. Ann, Karen and Sarah reach a 90% correct suppliance level⁹ while Ben is very close to this level. Claire and Pat have the poorest levels of correct suppliance. They have both learnt some of their Xhosa from natural input and this may have influenced their levels of correct use. On the other hand, they may be less concerned with correctness and more concerned with producing speech, a conclusion perhaps supported by the fact that they use more nouns than other participants. Claire's high number of omissions may be a result of her exposure to natural input which may mean that her noun prefix system has developed more slowly and that forms without prefixes may have been automatised. Although Sarah has a high level of correct suppliance, omission levels are higher than incorrect suppliance levels, which is an unexpected result given her level of exposure to formal input where this morpheme is strongly emphasized.

Table 4.7 Summary of noun prefix data¹⁰

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Omissions	Total
Ann	320 (90.9%)	20 (5.7%)	12 (3.4%)	352 (100%)
Ben	412 (89.0%)	26 (5.6%)	25 (5.4%)	463 (100%)
Claire	529 (85.3%)	34 (5.5%)	57 (9.2%)	620 (100%)
Pat	474 (87.9%)	49 (9.1%)	16 (3%)	539 (100%)
Karen	456 (94.2%)	18 (3.7%)	10 (2.1%)	484 (100%)
Sarah	467 (93%)	14 (2.8%)	21 (4.2%)	502 (100%)
Total	2658 (89.8%)	161 (5.4%)	141 (4.8%)	2960 (100%)

Ann's high level of noun prefix suppliance is perhaps surprising in the light of her early level of

⁹I agree with Gass & Selinker (1994) that 100% suppliance should be a better measure of suppliance since a form should be used correctly in both form and function if it is target-like, but a 90% suppliance level is widely used to measure use/development of interlanguage in the literature.

¹⁰ A full table of results for each task is included in Appendices G1 and G2.

development, and it is necessary to look at which nouns she uses, to find a possible explanation for this phenomenon. Closer analysis of her nouns reveals that she uses 116 different nouns (including names and plurals) in all seven interviews. The range of nouns is therefore fairly restricted and this may mean that the forms are themselves formulaic to some extent. This may reduce the processing load during production. On the other hand, Ann seems to realise from an early stage of acquisition that the noun prefix is detachable, although this early realisation might be a benefit from formal instruction. She detaches concords from stems when Thembi supplies vocabulary and she sometimes detaches the concord and repeats only the stem, e.g.:

- A:* UThembi ufunda - what's English? (A1C)
Thembi she studies - what's English?
T: IsiNgesi
English
A: *Ngesi
English

In the next section, a number of common patterns of use of the noun prefix by different participants in the data will be discussed.

4.4.1.1 Patterns of noun prefix use

Table 4.8 is a summary of the patterns of noun prefix use indicating which subjects use particular patterns. Examples of each type of noun prefix use are presented below.

Table 4.8 Patterns of noun prefix use

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
Unmarked/marked classes	%	%	%	%	%	%
Class 2 for class 2a	x	%	x	%	x	x
Animacy	%	%	%	%	%	%
Opposite of animacy	%	x	%	x	x	x
Singular/plural forms	x	x	%	%	%	x
Class 2/6 interchangeability	x	x	%	%	%	x
<i>e-/i-</i> confusion	%	%	x	%	%	%
noun prefixes on English words	(%) ¹¹	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)

¹¹ A bracketed tick indicates variable use.

4.4.1.1.1 Unmarked and marked classes

For all participants, there seem to be unmarked classes (e.g. classes 1, 2, 9 and 10) and marked classes (e.g. 3, 11 and 15). The unmarked classes tend to contain more lexical items than the marked classes, so generalisation of the former may be fairly productive. From a semantic point of view, the unmarked classes seem to be slightly more regular than the unmarked ones as well. For example, most human referents fall into classes 1 and 2. Most borrowed words and the words for many everyday items are found in classes 9 and 10. All students regularise some words from the marked classes, giving them prefixes from common classes, e.g.:

ibisi for *ubisi* (milk) (Claire)
ilwandle for *ulwandle* (sea) (Claire)
ikutya for *ukutya* (food) (Claire and Pat)
icango for *ucango* (door) (Pat)
inqwazi for *umqwazi* (hat) (Pat)
imtshayelo for *umtshayelo* (broom) (Pat)
ifanekiso for *umfanekiso* (picture) (Ann)
imfanekisi for *imifanekiso* (pictures) (Sarah)
iculo for *imiculo* (songs) (Sarah)

4.4.1.1.2 Class 2 for class 2a

Related to the substitution of unmarked for marked forms are the examples from Ben's and Pat's speech, where they use *ba* (class 2) for *oo* (class 2a). The former is the usual plural for human referents, while the latter appears only on a few nouns, e.g.:

**Ababhuti bam bafunda eKingswood* (B6C)
 Brothers my they study at Kingswood
Oobhuti bam bafunda eKingswood.
 'My brothers study at Kingswood.'

4.4.1.1.3 Animacy cues

Semantic animacy cues may encourage learners to presume that most animate referents fall into classes 1 and 2. As a result, some animate referents with class 9 noun prefixes are given class 1 noun prefixes by all learners, e.g.:

**Untombazana mhle* (C6T)
 Girl is pretty
Intombazana intle.
 'The girl is pretty.'

4.4.1.1.4 Opposite of animacy

On the other hand, use of animacy cues seems to be a tendency rather than a rule. Correct forms are produced and, more importantly, the opposite substitution also occurs. For example, there are class 9 substitutions for class 1 forms which denote animate referents, e.g.:

**Uyathanda *ititshalakazi *elesiNgesi ngoba uyakunceda (C1C)*
 He/she likes teacher of English because she helps him/her.
Uthanda utitshalakazi wesiNgesi ngoba uyakunceda.
 'He/she likes the English teacher because she helps him/her.'

4.4.1.1.5 Singular and plural substitution

Singular forms of the noun are used where the context demands the plural. In some cases other concords in the utterance indicate plurality, so learners may be avoiding redundancy. Generally, the singular form occurs on the noun, with plural concords following on other morphemes, but the opposite also occurs to a lesser extent. The context may indicate plurality, so that using the singular form is cognitively less demanding, e.g.:

*Ndinayo *utitshala abathathu (P1C)*
 I have teacher that are three
Ndinootitshala abathathu.
 'I have three teachers.'

4.4.1.1.6 Class 2 and 6 interchangeability

Class 2 and 6 forms are interchanged in some places, possibly because of phonetic similarity and the fact that both forms denote plurality, e.g.:

*uSpotty *uya *unamahlobo abaninzi efameni (K5C)*
 Spotty he goes he has friends that are many on the farm
uSpotty unabahlobo abaninzi efameni.
 'Spotty has many friends on the farm.'

4.4.1.1.7 E-/i- confusion

The data suggests that there may be an *e-* class for some learners, as several nouns begin with this form, although they are not locatives in the context. This may be a result of the phonetic similarity of *i-* and *e-*, or there may be some confusion with the locative, e.g.:

*Utitshalakazi unxiba *elokhwe (A6S)*
 Teacher wears dress
Utitshalakazi unxiba ilokhwe.
 'The teacher wears a dress.'

4.4.1.1.8 Xhosa concords on English words

Noun prefixes are used on some English words when learners code-switch. This shows that they

are trying to produce mainly Xhosa forms and that they can adapt English forms to look more like Xhosa forms so that they are more acceptable in Xhosa, e.g.:

*Batya isoup *inyama *uchocolate ja *ichocolate* (S3C)
 They eat soup meat chocolate ja chocolate
Batya isoup nenyama nechocolate
 ‘They eat soup, meat and chocolate.’

The above section has looked at different uses of the noun prefix and the next section moves on to discuss some of the common patterns in the omission of noun prefixes which are found in the data.

4.4.1.2 Patterns of noun prefix omission

Table 4.9 indicates the patterns of noun prefix omission for each learner. Examples of the omissions are presented below.

Table 4.9 Patterns of noun prefix omission

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
No Xhosa prefixes on English words	%	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
English in utterances	x	%	x	%	x	x
Prefix missing when other forms added	x	x	%	x	x	x
Initial vowels omitted	x	%	x	%	%	x
At beginning of utterances	x	%	x	x	%	x
Correct omission on vocative	x	%	x	(%)	%	%

In addition to the instances displayed above, all learners also drop noun prefixes when they are struggling to retrieve vocabulary, and when processing loads are high.

4.4.1.2.1 No Xhosa prefixes on English words

Although there are many examples of adding Xhosa noun prefixes to English words, there are also a number of examples where this does not occur, e.g.:

*Ndiyafuna *udlala *aerobics* (P4C)
 I want play aerobics
Ndifuna ukudlala i-aerobics.
 ‘I want to do aerobics.’

4.4.1.2.2 English in utterances

Where English occurs in the utterance, it seems to interfere with the suppliance of morphemes; perhaps students are shifting between two different language systems, e.g.:

*It will be *titshalakazi *unika umfundi ipensile* (P5S)
 It will be teacher she gives student pencil
Utitshalakazi unikela umfundi ipensile.
 'The teacher gives the student a pencil.'

4.4.1.2.3 Other forms added

Parts of noun prefixes may disappear when other forms are added to them, as is evident from Claire's use of *ngeXhosa* for *ngesiXhosa*.

4.4.1.2.4 Initial vowels

There is a tendency to omit initial vowels of noun prefixes, e.g.:

*Ndibona *bantwana* (B4P)
 I see children
Ndibona abantwana.
 'I see children.'

4.4.1.2.5 Beginnings of utterances

Noun prefixes on nouns which occur at the beginning of utterances are sometimes omitted, e.g.:

**Sisi wam *iminyaka *ishumi *nesithandathu ...* (K6C)
 Sister my years ten with six
Usisi wam uneminyaka elishumi nantandathu.
 'My sister is 16.'

4.4.1.2.6 Correct omission on vocatives

Most learners correctly omit the noun prefix on nouns in the vocative voice, e.g.:

*Mama *uThembi lo ...* (B2C)
 Mother Thembi this
Mama nguThembi lo ...
 'Mother, this is Thembi ...'

4.4.1.3 Conclusion

The noun prefix has the highest levels of correct suppliance, making it one of the earliest acquired prefixes in the data if one uses the 90% suppliance criterion of acquisition. There are two possible reasons for this high level of suppliance:

- C it is an integral part of the noun and the prefix is not learnt entirely separately from the stem;

- C the noun prefix forms the basic unit for agreement in the remainder of the utterance and it is therefore very important that it be learnt correctly.

4.4.2 Subject concords

The subject is co-referenced with the verb by means of a subject concord which derives its form from the class of the subject noun. The subject concord has a linking function (mainly a grammatical function) and a pronominal function (mainly a semantic function) within the sentence so that the subject is clearly the referent performing the action denoted by the verb. It can also have a pronominal function when the subject noun is omitted after its initial mention in an utterance.

Table 4.10 provides a summary of the subject concord use and omission in the data. Only Sarah reaches the 90% correct suppliance level (Karen only just falls short). Incorrect forms are more prevalent (15.4% average) than omissions (4.7% average) for all participants, which shows an awareness that these forms should be included in their utterances. Karen and Sarah have substantially lower percentages of incorrect uses (7.8% and 8.2% respectively) than the other four learners, which may indicate that this morpheme is corrected at later stages of development and benefits from formal instruction to some extent. Omissions are three to four times higher for Ann (8.1%), Ben (9.4%) and Claire (6.5%) than for the other learners. There are four possible explanations for this:

- C they may be at an earlier level of development than the other three learners;
- C they may be less careful about supplying the morpheme;
- C they may have higher processing loads for vocabulary retrieval, which leaves less processing energy for concord retrieval;
- C the morpheme has more of a linking function, which is a grammatical function, than a pronominal function for them, since they do not usually use it without its co-referenced noun. If their focus is on meaning rather than grammatical correctness, they may omit the morpheme more frequently.

Table 4.10 Summary of subject concord data¹²

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Omissions	Total
Ann	161 (72.5%)	43 (19.4%)	18 (8.1%)	222 (100%)
Ben	318 (75.4%)	64 (15.2%)	40 (9.4%)	422 (100%)
Claire	506 (70.2%)	168 (23.3%)	47 (6.5%)	721 (100%)
Pat	417 (79.6%)	94 (17.9%)	13 (2.5%)	524 (100%)
Karen	502 (89.5%)	44 (7.8%)	15 (2.7%)	561 (100%)
Sarah	464 (90.6%)	42 (8.2%)	6 (1.2%)	512 (100%)
Total	2368 (79.9%)	455 (15.4%)	139 (4.7%)	2962 (100%)

4.4.2.1 Patterns of use of the subject concord

Table 4.11 indicates patterns of use of the subject concord. Examples of these patterns are discussed below.

Table 4.11 Patterns of subject concord use

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
Pronoun confusion	%	x	x	x	x	x
Animacy	%	%	%	%	%	%
Opposite of animacy	x	x	%	%	%	%
Class 2 and 6 confusion	x	%	%	%	%	%
Hidden concords	x	%	%	x	%	%
Singular/plural confusion	%	x	%	%	%	%
Plural interchangeability	x	x	%	%	%	x
Two referents, singular concord	%	%	x	x	x	x
Vowel-commencing verbs	x	%	x	x	%	%
Existential <i>ku-</i> problems	%	%	%	%	x	x

4.4.2.1.1 Pronoun confusion

For Ann, the use of pronominal subject concord forms (e.g. *ndi* “I”, *u* “he/she”) and agreement forms differs. Pronominal forms are usually included, whereas agreement forms are sometimes

¹²A full table of results for all tasks is included in Appendices G3 and G4.

omitted. The preferred subject concord is *u-* (class 1) and she overuses this form, e.g.:

**Uhlala phandle egadini (A5C)*
 He/she/you sit outside in the garden
Sihlala phandle egadini.
 ‘We sit outside in the garden.’

Ann is also confused about the forms of the “we” (*si-*) and “they” (*ba-*) pronouns, e.g.:

**Nihamba eDulcies (A7C)*
 You-plural walk to Dulcies
Siya eDulcies.
 ‘We go to Dulcies.’

4.4.2.1.2 Animacy

As they did for noun prefixes, all learners substitute class 1 or class 2 forms for other class concords when the referents are animate. Class 1 forms are often substituted for class 9 forms, since many animal names fall into class 9. If direct translation is occurring here, they are probably translating the pronoun as “he/she” rather than “it” for animals and using “he/she” for human referents which fall into class 9, e.g.:

*Ikati *uyajonga *nempuku (P2P)*
 Cat he/she looks with mouse
Ikati ijonga impuku.
 ‘The cat looks at the mouse.’

*Indoda *ubulisa umfazi and *ujongisa ihashe (B2P)*
 Man he greets woman and he makes look horse
Indoda ibulisa umfazi. Ijonga ihashe.
 ‘The man greets the woman. He looks at the horse.’

4.4.2.1.3 Opposite of animacy

On the other hand, the opposite pattern also occurs where class 9 forms are substituted for class 1 forms (in the same kind of substitution as the noun prefix), e.g.:

*Ubhuti *yam uyafunda isiXhosa eSt Andrews *iyathetha kakuhle (C6C)*
 Brother my he studies Xhosa at St Andrews it talks well
Ubhuti wam ufunda isiXhosa eSt Andrews. Uyathetha kakuhle.
 ‘My brother studies Xhosa at St Andrews. He speaks well.’

It should be noted, however, that these verbs usually occur relatively far away from the original referent. Higher levels of processing power are required to find the correct form, since the co-referent is far away and this may interfere with correct morpheme selection.

4.4.2.1.4 Class 2 and 6 confusion

Class 2 and 6 concords are used interchangeably, as they are for noun prefixes, e.g.:

*Abafazi *ayathanda *upheka* (C2S)

Women they like cook

Abafazi bayathanda ukupheka.

‘The women like to cook.’

*Amakwenkwe *baleqainja* (K4P)

Boys they chase dog

Amakwenkwe aleqinja.

‘The boys chase the dog.’

Nouns from class 6 generally seem to cause problems when agreement morphemes need to be selected. This may be a result of the marked status of class 6, since fewer lexical items fall into it compared to some other classes. A further problem may be the multifunctionality of the *a-* morpheme, which is used in the noun prefix of class 6 nouns, to form the negative and qualificative, as well as being the concordial form for class 6 nouns in the possessive.

4.4.2.1.5 Hidden forms

The hidden concords of classes 5 and 11 cause difficulties for learners. They usually choose the subject concord of classes 9 and 1 respectively for these classes, probably because the surface forms of the nouns indicate these choices, e.g.:

*Ihashe *iyatyaingca *ityaingca* (C5T)

Horse it eats grass it eats grass

Ihashe lityaingca.

‘The horse eats grass.’

4.4.2.1.6 Singular and plural confusion

Some learners do not always provide singular subject concords with singular nouns, but instead often use plural concords with singular nouns. This may indicate a lack of redundancy or that they only decide on the plural form once they have embarked on the utterance, e.g.:

... *intombi bazi *banxibailokhwe* ... (P1P)

... girl (hesitancy) they wear dress ...

... *intombi inxibailokhwe* ...

‘... the girl wears a dress ...’

The opposite also occurs where a plural noun is used with a singular subject concord, e.g.:

*Abahlobo *ufunda eRhodes* (A1C)

Friends he/she studies at Rhodes
Abahlobo bafunda eRhodes
 'Friends study at Rhodes.'

4.4.2.1.7 Plural forms interchanged

Plural forms are used interchangeably to some extent without regard for agreement, e.g.:

T: *Imini zasebusika?* (C7C)
 'The days of winter?'
 C: *The days in winter zifutshane zona *amanye *ayabanda*
 The days in winter they are short them some are cold
Zimfutshane zona ezinye ziyabanda.
 'They are short, some are cold.'

4.4.2.1.8 Two referents with a singular subject concord

Two referents are used with a singular subject concord in the data. The singular form of the subject concord therefore agrees with only one of the referents (usually the second one), e.g.:

**Numzana nenkosikazi *uthatha *uthetha* (A5P)
 Mister and Miss (hesitancy) he/she talks
Umnumzana nenkosikazi bayathetha.
 'The man and woman are talking.'

4.4.2.1.9 Subject concords on vowel-commencing verbs

Adding subject concords onto vowel-commencing verbs, usually requires extra forms or coalescence of sounds, e.g.:

T: *Uzokwenza ntoni apha eRhodes?* (B1C)
 'What will you do at Rhodes?'
 B: **Zoyenza iBA HMS*
 Will do BA HMS
Ndenza iBA HMS.
 'I am doing a BA HMS.'

4.4.2.1.10 Existential forms

The *ku-* existential form seems to be a form acquired later. Although all learners use it, it is formulaic in several instances, especially when the vocabulary refers to the weather. This vocabulary is used to introduce the use of the existential form in the formal context, but its function is not fully grasped by all learners, e.g.:

**Ngeendlebe *kuyagodola* (A3S)
 With ears it is cold
Iindlebe ziyagodola.

‘The ears are cold.’

4.4.2.2 Patterns of subject concord omission in the data

There are several common omission patterns in the data. Subject concords are omitted by all learners when the processing load seems to be higher, probably because they are struggling to retrieve vocabulary. Where the focus is on the message rather than the concords, forms may be omitted. Picture-description tasks seem to be particularly problematic in terms of requiring high levels of processing power. Basic sentences with common words are usually correct, either because vocabulary retrieval is easy, which leaves processing power for concordial agreement or because the forms are automatised (or a combination of these areas). Table 4.12 indicates which of the learners displays particular omission patterns in the data.

Table 4.12 Subject concord omissions in the data

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
Retrieval problems	%	%	%	%	%	%
Intervening morphemes	x	%	x	x	%	x
After <i>xa</i> (if, when)	x	x	%	%	x	x
After pronouns	x	x	%	x	x	x
No <i>ndi-</i> (I)	x	%	%	x	x	x
Repetition	x	%	x	x	x	%
Thembi supplies form	%	x	x	%	x	%

4.4.2.2.1 Vocabulary retrieval problems

Vocabulary retrieval problems cause difficulties with the suppliance of subject concords, since processing loads are higher than when vocabulary is familiar. In the following example, Karen is telling a fairly complex story in her utterance and she is struggling to retrieve the necessary vocabulary, e.g.:

*I don't know OK xa uSpotty *ukuya *uzingela emini *hamba *ayithandi ukulala ...*
(K5C)

I don't know OK when Spotty to go hunts/chases in the afternoon walk it does not like to sleep

uSpotty uya kuzingela. Emini uyahamba. Akathandi ukulala ...

‘Spotty goes to hunt. In the afternoon he walks. He does not like to sleep ...’

4.4.2.2.2 Intervening morphemes

Intervening morphemes may cause omissions of the subject concord, perhaps because the subject concord is too far away from its co-referent, e.g.:

*Bhuti uThembi lo *funda eRhodes* (B2C)
 Brother Thembi this studies at Rhodes
Bhuti, nguThembi lo. Ufunda eRhodes.
 ‘Brother, this is Thembi. She studies at Rhodes.’

4.4.2.2.3 After *xa*

The subject concord is often missing after *xa* (if/when). It may seem implicit in the subordinate clause since the subject concord is mentioned in the main clause, e.g.:

**Ayatya *nayasela icooldrink *nxa *hamba* (C2P)
 They eat and drink cooldrink when walk
Bayatya basela nesiselo xa behamba.
 ‘They eat as well as drink cooldrink when they are walking.’

4.4.2.2.4 After pronouns

Another similar lack of subject concords occurs after the use of a pronominal form. Here the subject concord would be repetitive and therefore possibly redundant in the eyes of the learner, e.g.:

*Umakhulu wam *naye *hlale eMont’* (C6C)
 Grandmother my and she lived in East London
Umakhulu wam yena uhlala eMonti.
 ‘My grandmother lives in East London.’

4.4.2.2.5 No *ndi-* form

When pictures are described, the *ndi-* (“I”) form is sometimes omitted, probably because it is implicit in the context or mentioned earlier, e.g.:

**Umfanekiso *bona ingca and abantwana *bancinci* (B1P)
 Picture see grass and children are small
Emfanekisweni ndibona ingca nabantwana abancinci.
 ‘In the picture I see grass and small children.’

4.4.2.2.6 Repetition

A second verb in the utterance may also lack the subject concord, which would be a repetition of an earlier use on another verb and may therefore be regarded as redundant, e.g.:

*Sibhala *ephepha and *sebenza ebhodini* (B1C)
 We write on paper and work on the board

Sibhala ephepheni sisebenze ebhodini.

'We write on the paper and work on the board.'

4.4.2.2.7 Thembi supplies the verb

Another omission occurs when Thembi has used the subject concord and only the stem is used by the learner in the next utterance. Again, the subject concord is probably implicit because of its previous use, e.g.:

- I: *Ukhwela ntoni apha?* (P5P)
 'What does he/she ride here?'
 R: **Khwela *umtshalo pha*
 Ride broom there
Ukhwela umtshayelo pha.
 'He/she rides a broom there.'

4.4.2.3 Infinitive forms

A separate area which needs discussion is the use and omission of the infinitive form (*uku-*), since this morpheme seems to appear later in the interlanguage of the learners than many subject concord morphemes.

Ann's first infinitive appears in interview 3, but it seems to be formulaic. In all other cases where infinitives are required, two verbs are merely juxtaposed. Other learners also use this strategy, e.g.:

- uThembi uthanda *lala* (A1C)
 Thembi likes sleep
uThembi uthanda ukulala.
 'Thembi likes to sleep.'

Ben, Claire and Karen use part forms of the infinitive with the initial vowel missing, e.g.:

- Bafuna *kusela icooldrink* (B4T)
 They want to drink cooldrink
Bafuna ukusela isiselo.
 'They want to drink cooldrink.'

Some learners use the verb with a subject concord rather than an infinitive, e.g.:

- uThembi *uyathanda *utya inyama* (P1C)
 Thembi likes eat meat
uThembi uthanda ukutya inyama.
 'Thembi likes to eat meat.'

4.4.2.4 Conclusion

The subject concord has a fairly high level of suppliance, although the forms used are not always correct. In the formal context, this is a form introduced in the first two weeks of the course, which may play a role in its use in the interlanguage of learners in the formal context. Its dual linking and pronominal function may also entrench its use to a greater extent than if it had only a grammatical linking function. The infinitive form appears later than the subject concord form, perhaps because it is an extension of the basic SVO utterance form. On the other hand, it is often necessary if the learner is translating directly from English, so it appears fairly frequently in the interviews.

4.4.3 The verbal formative *-ya-*

In Xhosa, the verbal formative *-ya-* is used after the subject concord of the verb in the indicative present tense when the verb is positive and intransitive. The other primary use of the morpheme is between the subject concord and the object concord to separate the two concords. A further use is between the subject concord and verb root with any adverb, infinitive, adverbial clause, or object concord + (object) + adverb if the verb is *emphasized* (translated from du Plessis 1978:115). Generally, this morpheme therefore has a primarily grammatical function, although it can also be used for emphasis.

The *-ya-* morpheme seems to be quite salient for these learners and all learners use it appropriately and superfluously. Table 4.13 is a summary of the use of *-ya-* in the data for all learners. “Correct use” indicates use on an indicative, present tense, intransitive verb. “Overuse” indicates use on transitive, present tense verbs and use on non-present tense forms. “Omissions” are instances where the *-ya-* form is not used on intransitive, present tense, indicative verb forms. It does not seem that the target system of *-ya-* use is operating for Claire and Pat because of their overuse of the morpheme on many of their present tense, transitive verbs in the indicative. The low number of forms for other learners indicates that they usually use transitive verbs (Ann and Ben) or use verbs which are not in the present tense (Karen and Sarah). The overuse of the form is also prevalent for these four learners, although lower numbers of verbs make the percentages a less reliable measure than those for Pat and Claire.

Table 4.13 Summary of the use of *-ya-*¹³

Name	Correct	Overuse	Omissions	Total
Ann	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	0	15 (100%)
Ben	11 (37.9%)	18 (62.1%)	0	29 (100%)
Claire	45 (15.2%)	228 (77.7%)	24 (8.1%)	297 (100%)
Pat	28 (13.6%)	178 (86.4%)	0	206 (100%)
Karen	11 (50%)	10 (45.5%)	1 (4.5%)	22 (100%)
Sarah	4 (44.5%)	3 (33.3%)	2 (22.2%)	9 (100%)
Total	111 (19.2%)	440 (76.1%)	27 (4.7%)	578 (100%)

In Ann's utterances, this morpheme is usually correctly omitted, which means that her preferred utterance structure is SVO. Only 12 of her verbs are used intransitively in the positive, indicative present tense. Ann's use of this form is the best of all the learners, and this is mainly because she produces very few intransitive verbs, she produces fewer verbs than other learners, and she rarely needs to use the form. This does not mean, however, that she understands when the use of this morpheme is obligatory. Her low level of overuse may actually be inadvertent because she does not produce forms which require this morpheme.

Ben overuses *-ya-* in contexts where the verb is not intransitive. However, he self-corrects his use of the morpheme in some cases and this may indicate knowledge of the system. On the other hand, some of his correct forms are copies from Thembi, so it is unclear whether he has formulated a rule for use, although the lack of omissions may indicate a fairly systematic use. His primary sentence pattern is SVO, so few of his verb forms are intransitive, which lowers the potential for omissions.

Claire and Pat overuse *-ya-* on most transitive verbs in the present tense. The emphatic function of the morpheme does not seem to be understood because it is overused to such a great extent. Although most of their utterances contain transitive verbs, they include *-ya-* on the verb. It seems therefore that their default present tense verb form is: subject concord + *-ya-* + verb stem, e.g.:

*Abazali *bayathenga inyama kodwa abantwana bathenga iilekese.* (P2T)

¹³ A full table of results for overuse of *-ya-* for all tasks is included in Appendix G5.

Parents buy meat but children buy sweets.
Abazali bathenga inyama kodwa abantwana bathenga iilekese.
 'The parents buy meat but the children buy sweets.'

Karen and Sarah have low numbers of verbs which would require the *-ya-*, partly because of the use of mainly SVO patterns in their utterances and partly because of the use of a variety of non-present tense forms where the *-ya-* form is not needed.

The *-ya-* morpheme may be phonologically salient and its constant form may help to entrench its use. In particular, this form may be phonologically salient when input is provided in the oral mode. This may be one explanation for overuse of this form by Claire and Pat, who receive more oral input from L1 Xhosa speakers than other learners.

Another possible explanation for overuse is that the use of *-ya-* gives the student more time to retrieve the appropriate verb. The subject concord can be retrieved from the preceding noun with which the verb is co-referenced, and *-ya-* can be included as a constant, but retrieval time for the variable verb is needed. There was often a pause between the production of the subject concord + *-ya-* and the verb which followed and this may be evidence to support this hypothesis. Also, when the verb was easily retrievable, this *-ya-* was sometimes left out, e.g. in the sentence-manipulation tasks. On the other hand, few students removed or added the *-ya-* where necessary in the grammaticality-judgement tests. This may show that there is little conscious knowledge of the rules of use of this morpheme.

4.4.4 Negative subject concords

Xhosa uses a negative subject concord made up of the negative formative *a-* and the subject concord (or negative formative *a-* + *-ka-* for class 3) on the beginning of the verb in the present tense to indicate negation. In addition, the final vowel of the verb stem changes to *-i* in the present tense. The learner is thus required to supply the correct negative subject concord agreement morpheme and to remember to change the final vowel of the verb stem. Table 4.14 is a summary of the use of negative subject concord agreement morphemes in the data. Only Karen reaches 90% correct suppliance, and Ann's forms are correct only 13.7% of the time. Claire's uses of the negative are substantially higher than those of the other learners, which indicates that she uses these forms in normal conversation more often than the other learners, who produce roughly the

same number of negative forms. Since the negative is specifically elicited in some of the tasks, all learners are forced to use the form, but it is clear that it is not used spontaneously to any great extent¹⁴.

The negative subject concord appears as a creative form for the first time in Ann's second interview and in Ben's third interview (he uses the formulaic *andiyazi* form in interview 1). For all learners, forming negatives from oral data produces more errors than in the sentence-manipulation task where the input is written.

Table 4.14 Summary of negative subject concord use

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Ann	7 (13.7%)	44 (86.3%)	51 (100%)
Ben	37 (69.8%)	16 (30.2%)	53 (100%)
Claire	117 (83%)	24 (17%)	141 (100%)
Pat	30 (53.6%)	26 (46.4%)	56 (100%)
Karen	54 (91.5%)	5 (8.5%)	59 (100%)
Sarah	54 (76.1%)	17 (23.9%)	71 (100%)
Total	299 (69.4%)	132 (30.6%)	431 (100%)

Ann's first use of the negative is to add only the negative formative *a-*. Otherwise, *aku-* is the default negative subject concord for her (a form used 37 out of 51 times). This form may be derived from *aka-* which is the class 1 negative subject concord or it may be an overgeneralisation of the "you are not" *aku-* form, which she may have encountered frequently in the classroom input. Other forms which she uses are *asi-* for class 9, 10, 11, and 12 nouns, *azi-*, and *andi-*.

Examples of her negatives include:

*Abantwana *akutyi *inyama* (A4S)

Children you don't eat meat

Abantwana abatyi nyama.

'Children don't eat meat.'

Ben uses a wider variety of forms than Ann, including *aka-* (for classes 1, 2, 6 and 9), *aba-* (for

¹⁴ This can also be seen in Appendix G6 which indicates the incorrect use of the negative for each task.

classes 1 and 2), *aya-* (for class 6), and *ayi-* (for classes 1 and 9) in interview 3. By interview 6, he has added *ali-* (for class 5) to his repertoire and all his negative concord forms are correct in this interview.

4.4.4.1 Patterns of use of the negative subject concord

The patterns of concord use for negative subject concords coincide with the patterns of use for positive subject concords in the data. Table 4.15 indicates the patterns of negative subject concord use in the data.

Table 4.15 Patterns of use of the negative subject concord

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
Singular/plural substitution	x	%	x	%	%	x
Hidden concords	x	%	x	%	x	%
Animacy	x	%	x	%	x	%
Class 6 problems	%	%	%	x	%	%
Past negatives not produced	x	x	%	%	%	%

4.4.4.1.1 Singular/plural substitution

Plural nouns pattern with singular concords and *vice versa* in the data, e.g.:

*Umfazi *abanxiba *ilokhwe ... (P3P)*

Woman does not wear dress

Umfazi akanxibi lokhwe.

‘The woman does not wear a dress.’

4.4.4.1.2 Hidden forms

Class 9 concords are substituted for class 5 concords, e.g.:

*Ihashe *ayitya ingca *akatyi ayitya ingca (P6S)*

Horse it does not eat grass he/she does not eat it does not eat grass

Ihashe alityi ngca.

‘The horse does not eat grass.’

4.4.4.1.3 Animacy cues

Animacy cues override the choice of class 9 and 10 concords for animate referents and class 1 and 2 forms are substituted, e.g.:

*Le kati *akafuni ukutya (B3T)*

This cat he/she does not want food
Le kati ayifuni kutya.
 ‘This cat does not want food.’

4.4.4.1.4 Class 6 problems

Class 6 nouns may cause problems because the subject concord form and the negative form are the same: *a-*. This multifunctionality may cause difficulties for learners following the principle that there should be only one function for a single form (Andersen 1984). Ann uses only the negative formative for class 6 nouns and other learners also experience problems with this form, e.g.:

*Amahash *ayatyi inyama* (B3S)
 Horses don’t eat meat
Amahashe akatyi nyama.
 ‘Horses don’t eat meat.’

4.4.4.1.5 Past negatives

Although the negative subject concord is used correctly in the present tense, past tense negatives which are indicated by Thembi’s past tense forms in the previous utterance are not produced, e.g.:

T: *Oomama baphethe iidasta.* (P3P)
 ‘Mothers carried dusters.’
P: *Oomama baya *abaphethi iidasta *abaphetha *umtshayelo*
 Mothers (hesitancy) don’t carry dusters that they carry broom
Oomama abaphethanga iidasta, baphethe imitshayelo.
 ‘Mothers didn’t carry dusters, they carried brooms.’

4.4.4.2 Negatives of nouns

Ben and Karen generalise the negative of the verb form to the negative of the noun form. When the noun referent is not known, Ben uses *ayi-* and *aka-* although there is no referent available, e.g.:

*Hayi *ayibhayisekile or *akabhayisekile iteksi* (B3P)
 No it is not a bicycle or it is not a bicycle taxi
Hayi, asiyobhayisekile, yiteksi.
 ‘No, it is not a bicycle, it is a taxi.’

Claire realises the negative of the noun as *hayi + noun stem* in interview 3, but as *hayi + akho + noun stem* in interview 6, e.g.:

**Hayo *bhayisekile *iteksi* (C3P)
 No bicycle taxi
Hayi, asiyobhayisekile, yiteksi.
 ‘No, it is not a bicycle, it is a taxi.’

Pat uses a variety of negative forms on the noun, including a negative subject concord, an invariant *asingo* + *noun stem* form and an invariant *asikho* + *noun stem* form in one interview, e.g.:

**Asivenkile* (P4P)
it is not a shop
Asiyovenkile.
'It is not a shop.'

*Hayi *asingokati leinja* (P4P)
No it is not a cat this dog
Hayi, asiyokati le, yinja.
'No, it is not a cat, it is a dog.'

*Hayi *asikho umabonakude *inomatoto* (P4P)
No it is not here television it radio
Hayi, asingomabonakude, ngunomathotholo.
'No, it is not a television, it is a radio.'

4.4.4.3 Use of the negative terminative *i-*

As mentioned earlier, a second indicator of the negative form is the change of the final vowel to *i-* in the present tense. An indication of the lack of final negative indicators in the data is given in Table 4.16. The *i-*negative ending seems to be fairly salient for all learners except Pat. Its constant form may help it to be used even though it is a verb-final form and is redundant to some extent.

Table 4.16 Summary of lack of negative terminative *-i* for negative verbs¹⁵

Name	Number
Ann	6 (11.8%)
Ben	4 (7.5%)
Claire	8 (5.7%)
Pat	26 (46.4%)
Karen	2 (3.4%)
Sarah	0
Total	46 (10.7%)

¹⁵ A full table of results indicating lack of the terminative *i-* is included in Appendix G7.

An example of Pat's failure to produce the *i*-ending on negatives follows:

**Eli kati *akafuna ukutya* (P3T)
 This cat he/she does not want food
Le kati ayifuni kutya.
 'This cat does not want food.'

4.4.4.4 Conclusion

The basic form of the negative would seem to be a fairly easy form to acquire once learners know the subject concord of the positive form, but this does not seem to be the case for these learners whose performance is much worse on the negative subject concord than their performance on the positive subject concord. It seems that they may not have realised that the rule requires the addition of the negative formative to the subject concord (with a different form for class 1). Instead, they seem to regard the task as learning a new set of morphemes relatively unrelated to other morphemes which they have encountered before.

4.4.5 Verbal Extensions

There are several different verbal extensions in Xhosa, including the passive, reciprocal, applied, causative, stative, reduplicative and intensive (Gough et al. 1989). These extensions are added to the end of the verb and some show relationships between nouns or extend the meaning of the verb.

The only forms which are used creatively by these learners are the applied extension (Claire, Pat, Karen and Sarah) and the reciprocal extensions (by Claire, Karen and Sarah). Judging from the restricted number of words on which other extensions appear, it seems that other verbal extensions are seen as part of the stem form. For example, *-thenga* (buy) and *-thengisa* (sell) are two different vocabulary items rather than a single form *-thenga* (buy) with the causative extension added. This conclusion is supported by Demuth (1992) who says that many lexical items are not analysed as verb stems and extensions during early stages of L1 seSotho acquisition. In addition, for these students, the verbal extensions are only taught in the second year.

4.4.6 Auxiliaries

Seven auxiliary forms appear in the data. Claire uses the "just" form *anduka* and *zange* (never). Sarah uses *mana* (always) and *funeka* (must). Karen uses *ma-* (must) and *sa* (still). She struggles

with *dla + ngoku* (usually) in interview 2, but produces the correct form in interview 4. Auxiliary forms add meaning to utterances, but they move beyond the basic utterance structure and this may explain why they are used only by more advanced learners and appear fairly infrequently.

4.4.7 Participials

Claire, Pat, Karen and Sarah fluctuate in their use of the ordinary participial in the dependent clause after the conjunction *xa* (“when”). This mood is not used elsewhere with other constructions, although L1 speakers have a range of uses for this morpheme. An example of the omission of the participial follows:

*Amadoda *abancokola xa *baya uku fix lungisa *ilungisa *ihlangu* (P7P)
 Men they don’t talk when they go to fix fix it fix shoe
Amadoda akancokoli xa eya ukulungisa izihlangu.
 ‘The men don’t talk when they are fixing shoes.’

Claire has learned this from exposure to Xhosa, since this form is not taught in the first-year course, while Pat, Karen and Sarah would have had formal instruction on some of the uses of the participial.

4.4.8 Copulatives

Jokweni (1997:110-111) says that “(a) copulative is generally defined in terms of its structural function, namely, to link the subject and the complement. ... The copulative is said to be an umbrella term which comprises the subject, the copula and the complement” The copulative in Xhosa is the equivalent of the English “this is”. The copulative morpheme is attached to the noun and the form of the copulative morpheme is dependent on the class of the noun. Although the learners use the copulative as a “this is” form, it is not always clear that they have grasped the verbal function of the morpheme, and they seem to use it with a deictic function in most cases.

Table 4.17 is a summary of the use of copulatives in the data. As the copulative is often omitted in answer to a question (and this is not strictly unacceptable), such occurrences have not been counted as omissions when they occur in conversation, e.g.:

Question: What is this? Answer: (It is) a dog.

The set of figures for omissions therefore refers to omissions in utterances where the form is necessary for an acceptable utterance or required in translation tasks.

The copulative occurs in the data of all the learners, although Ann uses it formulaically until the third interview and Ben only starts using it in the second interview. Copulatives are used by the beginner learners directly after they learn them, but their use atrophies later. None of the learners reach 90% correct suppliance levels, which means that none of them have acquired the morpheme if the 90% correct usage criterion is applied.

Table 4.17 Summary of copulative data¹⁶

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Omissions	Total
Ann	20 (58.9%)	1 (2.9%)	13 (38.2%)	34 (100%)
Ben	12 (50%)	0	12 (50%)	24 (100%)
Claire	46 (79.4%)	6 (10.3%)	6 (10.3%)	58 (100%)
Pat	19 (44.2%)	2 (4.7%)	22 (51.1%)	43 (100%)
Karen	48 (87.3%)	3 (5.5%)	4 (7.2%)	55 (100%)
Sarah	27 (69.3%)	2 (5.1%)	10 (25.6%)	39 (100%)
Total	172 (68%)	14 (5.5%)	67 (26.5%)	253 (100%)

Ann uses the copulative in interview 3, but use seems to be mainly formulaic and it only occurs with class 1 nouns, e.g.:

- T:* *Ngubani igama lakhe?* (A3C)
 ‘What are their names?’
A: *NgJulie noThoko*
 ‘It is Julie and Thoko.’

Later in the same interview she does not use the copulative which may show that she is unsure of the use of this morpheme, e.g.:

- *Ngumhlobo *umhlobo *uJulie *uThoko *Kelly* (A3C)
 It is friend friend Julie Thoko Kelly
Abahlobo nguJulie noThoko noKelly.
 ‘Friends are Julie, Thoko and Kelly.’

4.4.8.1 Usage patterns for the copulative

A few patterns of copulative usage are evident in the data and these patterns will be discussed below.

¹⁶ A full table of results is included in Appendices G8 and G9.

4.4.8.1.1 Non-copulative forms in copulative position

Although forms of the copulative are used, selection of the correct morpheme is not always appropriate. For example, Claire uses *ku* and *ngo* for *ngu*, e.g.:

*Tata *ku (Thembi) lo kutata wam lo igama lesiXhosa ngoVuyisile (C2C)*
 Father this is Thembi this this is father my this name of Xhosa is Vuyisile
Tata nguThembi lo. Ngutata wam lo. Igama lakhe lesiXhosa nguVuyisile.
 ‘Father this is Thembi. This is my father. His Xhosa name is Vuyisile.’

4.4.8.1.2 Hidden forms

Using the same strategy which was used for subject concord selection, that of relying on the surface forms of the noun, Sarah uses a class 9 form for a class 5 copulative, e.g.:

... *intombi *yixhego I mean yiwitch (S2P)*
 ... girl is old man I mean she is a witch
 ... *intombi ligqwirha*
 ‘... the girl is a witch’

4.4.8.1.3 Opposite of animacy cues

Claire uses the opposite of animacy cues (also found in subject concord selection) to produce the following example where the class 1 copulative *ngu-* is substituted by a class 9 form *yi-* in *-titshalakazi* (teacher), e.g.:

*Umama *am uyafund *fundisi iMusic esikolweni *uyititshalakazi (C2C)*
 Mother my she teaches Music at school she is a teacher
Umama wam uyafundisa iMusic esikolweni ungutitshalakazi.
 ‘My mother teaches Music at school. She is a teacher.’

4.4.8.2 Copulative omission patterns in the data

Table 4.18 indicates the omission patterns in the data and indicates which of the learners use these patterns. Examples are discussed below.

Table 4.18 Copulative omission patterns in the data

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
With demonstratives	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Context	%	%	%	%	%	%
Verbal function not realised	%	%	%	%	%	%

4.4.8.2.1 Omissions with demonstratives

Copulatives which should co-occur with demonstratives are left out, e.g.:

(Thembi) **utata lo *umama lo *usisi lo* (A2C)
 (Thembi) father this mother this sister this
Thembi ngutata lo, ngumama lo, ngusisi lo.
 ‘Thembi this is father, this is mother, this is sister.’

4.4.8.2.2 Leave to the context

Using pragmatic means to indicate the copulative, some forms are left to the context, e.g.:

*Into *andithando *ires *iduty* (P3C)
 Thing I don’t like res duty
Into endingayithandiyo ehoste le yiduty.
 ‘The thing I don’t like in residence is duty.’

4.4.8.2.3 Verbal functions

As mentioned above, the verbal function of the copulative form is not realised, which means that several utterances remain verbless, e.g.:

*Usisi *umdala *ines i the other sisi *utitshalakazi* (A6C)
 Sister is old nurse the other sister teacher
Usisi omdala yinesi, omnye usisi ngutitshalakazi.
 ‘The older sister is a nurse, the other sister is a teacher.’

4.4.8.3 Conclusion

The copulative appears to be a later-acquired morpheme, although it appears in formulae which are taught during the early stages of the formal course in Xhosa. It is also interesting to note that the copulative is the Xhosa form of the verb “to be”, a verb which is often exceptional and usually difficult to acquire in other languages.

4.4.9 Locatives

The locative form in Xhosa has two important functions. Firstly, it is used to indicate the location of an object, as its name suggests, and, secondly, it fulfills the role of many forms which would be prepositions in English. For example, “in the town” is realised as *edolophini*, which is *idolophu* (town) with locative morphemes added to it. The locative appears in all the interviews, although it is only taught in the second semester to the first-year students, so Ann may use it formulaically at the beginning.

With regard to the functions of the locative, in interview 7 it becomes apparent that Ann does not fully grasp the prepositional function of locatives when she says in interview 7: “I don’t know what is write *bhala* I don’t know how to say on paper”.

Table 4.19 is a summary of the five suppliance patterns of the locative in the data. Only Karen reaches 90% correct suppliance. The range of possible permutations may inhibit correct use of this form by other learners.

Table 4.19 Summary of locative morphemes¹⁷

Name	Correct	Omissions	Incorrect	Initial only	Final only	Total
Ann	53 (73.6%)	8 (11.1%)	3 (4.2%)	3 (4.2%)	5 (6.9%)	72 (100%)
Ben	119 (78.3%)	6 (3.9%)	5 (3.3%)	20 (13.2%)	2 (1.3%)	152 (100%)
Claire	153 (79.7%)	13 (6.8%)	7 (3.6%)	13 (6.8%)	6 (3.1%)	192 (100%)
Pat	87 (66.9%)	24 (18.5%)	5 (3.8%)	13 (10%)	1 (0.8%)	130 (100%)
Karen	176 (95.2%)	4 (2.2%)	1 (0.5%)	3 (1.6%)	1 (0.5%)	185 (100%)
Sarah	164 (87.3%)	7 (3.7%)	9 (4.8%)	7 (3.7%)	1 (0.5%)	188 (100%)
Total	752 (81.8%)	62 (6.8%)	30 (3.3%)	59 (6.4%)	16 (1.7%)	919 (100%)

There are four patterns of use of the locative morpheme in the data:

- 1) no locative - only the basic form of the noun is supplied with no locative morphemes. Context is relied on to convey meaning or the use of the noun indicating a place is deemed sufficient to convey location, e.g.:

*Abafundi bafunda *iklasi* (A4S)

Students study/read class

Abafundi bafunda eklasini.

‘The students study/read in class.’

- 2) prefixed locative - usually the most common locative prefix (*e-*) is added to the noun, while the remainder of the noun retains its basic shape. When only the initial form is used when both are required, it may be related to the general principle that learners pay more attention to the beginnings of words (Slobin 1985). Also, since the prototypical use of the

¹⁷ A full table of results is included in Appendices G10 - G13.

locative is to prefix *e-*, students may regard this as the most productive means of indicating location. For five of the six students, using only the initial form where both are required is more common than only suffixing a locative form.

Another possibility which occurs in utterances of the more advanced learners is the prefixing of *ku-*, *kwa-* or *nga-* to the noun. Ben uses locatives from the first interview, but *nga-* as a locative is infrequent at early stages, e.g.:

**Cawa on Sunday yes *Cawa siye *church* (B2C)
 Sunday on Sunday yes Sunday we went church
NgeCawa siye ecaweni.
 ‘On Sunday, we went to church.’

The default form of the locative is *e-*, with or without a form of *-ini* on the end. This is especially common where *nga-* and *ku-* are needed, e.g.:

... *ndiyafuna *uye *egqirha *amazinyo* (P5C)
 ... I want to went to doctor teeth
 ... *ndifuna ukuya kugqirha wamazinyo.*
 ‘... I want to go to the dentist.’

All the learners use *ku-*, *nga-* and *e-* locative forms interchangeably, e.g.:

**Akafuna *lendihamba *kuSpur *kukuhlwa ufuna join me?* (C7C)
 Don’t he/she want? I walk to Spur to evening you want to join me?
Akufuni ukuya eSpur ngokuhlwa?
 ‘Don’t you want to go to the Spur tonight?’

Ann uses the locative from the first interview, although it appears to be formulaic or retrievable from the previous utterance by Thembi, e.g.:

Ndivela eJameson House (A1C)
 ‘I come from Jameson House.’

The formula *ndivela e-* ... (I come from ...) is one of the first conversational formulae taught in the first-year class and the above example is probably based on this form.

- 3) suffixed locative - in this case, the initial vowel retains its basic shape, but a form of *-ini* is suffixed onto the noun. The shape of the *-ini* suffix is dependent on the final vowel of the noun and this shape is not always correctly formed in the utterances, perhaps because the patterns have not yet been established or coalescence rules are not understood. It is

also possible that the student realises halfway through the word that a locative function is needed and adds it to the end of the word.

... **indleleni ndibona ilori* ... (B6P)
 ... in the road I see a lorry ...
 ... *endleleni ndibona ilori* ...
 '... in the road, I see a lorry ...'

- 4) prefixed and suffixed locative - this is usually the correct form of the locative. Some of the occurrences may be related to formulaic use. For example, the form *edolophini* (in town) occurs in Ann's first interview and this is also a formula used in early classes. Another example where the prefix and suffix forms are correctly added to the stem is:

... *ngoku ndidlala esikolweni*. (P4C)
 '... now I play at school.'

In interview 3, Ann seems to be constructing the locative by herself. In the following example from a translation exercise, she is unsure of the necessary vocabulary but constructs a locative form from the noun which Thembi supplies, e.g.:

A: *I'm not sure what some is either abantu akuhl no ja *akuhlali *indlela*
I'm not sure that's houses no I don't know (A3T)
 I'm not sure what some is either people (hesitancy) you don't live road
 I'm not sure that's houses no I don't know

T: *It's close*

A: *No I don't know*

T: *Izindlu*
 Houses

A: *Sorry *ezindlini*
 Sorry in houses
Ezindlwini
 'In houses'

4.4.9.1 Omission patterns in the locative

Table 4.20 indicates omission patterns of the locative in the data of individuals. Examples are discussed below.

Table 4.20 Omission patterns in the locative

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
Omit on English words	%	%	%	%	%	%
No “is” form	%	%	x	%	x	(%)
Preposition omitted	%	%	x	x	x	x

4.4.9.1.1 Omissions on English words

Locatives are not always supplied on English forms, e.g.:

*Khona abantu abane *Jeep ... (B5C)*

There are people that are four Jeep

Kukho abantu abane kwiJeep.

‘There are four people in the Jeep.’

4.4.9.1.2 No “is” form

The use of the “is” form on the locative is variable and this may be because, as with the copulative, the verb “is” remains problematic for learners, e.g.:

Sithetha isiXhosa xa siseklasini (S5T)

‘We talk Xhosa when we are in the class.’

I: Intombi iphi apha? (S2P)

‘Where is the girl here?’

*R: Intombi *ekitshini*

Girl in kitchen

Intombi isekitshini.

‘The girl is in the kitchen.’

4.4.9.1.3 Omit prepositional forms

Other omissions occur where some locative forms require an adverbial followed by a prepositional form and the preposition is omitted. For example, the *kwa-* preposition is not used after *emva* (after) and *phezulu* (above).

4.4.9.2 Conclusion

The locative is not taught until fairly late in the first-year course and it is interesting that this form is needed from the beginning, even by Ann. This is probably because of the need to use the location thematic role.

4.4.10 Demonstratives

The Xhosa demonstrative is used to mean “this” in the same way that English uses a demonstrative adjective (e.g. this dog) and a demonstrative pronoun (e.g. this). It is also used with the copulative for the translation equivalent of “this is an X this”. There are three different positions for the Xhosa demonstrative, depending on proximity of the object to the conversationalists, corresponding roughly to “this”, “that” and “that over there”. The form of the demonstrative agrees with the noun with which it is co-referenced.

It is not possible to calculate the omission of the demonstrative in ordinary conversation as it is not an obligatory form. Baseline data from first-language speakers is also not an accurate measure as there are not usually obligatory contexts for the use of this part of speech. In addition, Xhosa allows one to refer to a noun by using the subject concord on the verb, so use of the demonstrative as a pronoun is not as frequent as it would be in English which does not have this additional referential device. The omissions can therefore only be calculated for translation exercises which explicitly require the use of a demonstrative. Table 4.21 is a summary of demonstrative use in the data. Only Karen reaches the 90% correct obligatory suppliance criterion. The number of incorrect forms is higher than usual because the translation task requires demonstratives denoting distance from the speaker, forms which few of the learners can produce correctly, although they usually know the demonstratives denoting proximity to the speaker.

Table 4.21 Summary of demonstrative data¹⁸

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Omissions	Total
Ann	13 (54.2%)	5 (20.8%)	6 (25%)	24 (100%)
Ben	38 (66.7%)	17 (29.8%)	2 (3.5%)	57 (100%)
Claire	56 (64.4%)	27 (31%)	4 (4.6%)	87 (100%)
Pat	33 (60%)	18 (32.7%)	4 (7.3%)	55 (100%)
Karen	39 (90.7%)	3 (7%)	1 (2.3%)	43 (100%)
Sarah	24 (77.4%)	4 (12.9%)	3 (9.7%)	31 (100%)
Total	203 (68.4%)	74 (24.9%)	20 (6.7%)	297 (100%)

¹⁸ A full table of results is included in Appendix G14.

In interview 3, Ann is required to translate demonstrative forms soon after she has been taught these forms. However, in interview 7 she claims to have forgotten all demonstrative forms in the translation task which repeats the task in interview 3. She attempts distinctions in proximity in interview 3, e.g.:

**Aboya bantu *aboya *babantu *hlala ... (A3T)*

Those people those people live ...

Abo/abaya bantu bahlala...

‘Those people live ...’

4.4.10.1 Patterns of use of the demonstrative

Table 4.22 indicates the patterns of use of the demonstrative, while examples are discussed below.

Table 4.22 Patterns of use of the demonstrative

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
Class 2 and 6 confusion	x	x	%	x	x	%
Overgeneralised forms	%	%	%	%	x	x
Animacy cues	x	x	x	%	x	x
Interchangeable plural forms	x	x	x	%	%	x
Distinction in proximity	(%)	x	x	x	%	%

4.4.10.1.1 Class 2 and 6 confusion

Class 2 and 6 concords continue to be used interchangeably when producing the demonstrative, e.g.:

**La bantu *ayahlala ... (C3T)*

These people they live ...

Aba bantu bayahlala ...

‘These people live ...’

4.4.10.1.2 Overgeneralised forms

Pat uses a class 5 form for a number of classes throughout the interviews, a strategy which is less cognitively demanding than retrieving the correct demonstrative form for each noun, e.g.:

**Eli bantwana abanayo *incwadi (P3T)*

This children do not have book

Aba bantwana abanancwadi.

‘These children do not have books.’

Incorrect choices seem to follow some of the same patterns as noun prefixes and subject concords. For example, class 9 demonstrative concords are overgeneralised, e.g.:

*Ndiyafunda eRhodes *le nyaka* (C1T)
I study at Rhodes this year
Ndifunda eRhodes kulo nyaka.
'I study at Rhodes this year.'

4.4.10.1.3 Animacy cues

Class 9 animate nouns are supplied with a class 1 animate concord, e.g.:

*Ikati *lo* (P5P)
Cat this
Ikati le
'This cat'

4.4.10.1.4 Plural forms are used interchangeably

As for the subject concord, there is interchangeability of *ama/izi/aba* (class 6/10/2) plural forms, e.g.:

*Amehlo *ezi* (P5P)
Eyes these
Amehlo la
'These eyes'

4.4.10.1.5 Proximity distinctions not made

No distinctions are made between "this/that/these/those" demonstratives in interviews 3 and 7 where these forms are tested in the translation task. Adverbials like *apho* (there) and *phaya* (there) may be used instead of demonstrative forms denoting distance from the speaker in interview 7:

*Abantwana apho *abanayo ezi ncwadi phaya* (P7T)
Children there they don't have these books there
Abo bantwana abanazo ezo ncwadi.
'Those children don't have those books.'

4.4.10.1.6 Correct usage

With regard to correct usage, Karen is the only interviewee to use demonstratives consistently in answers to questions of the *yintoni le* (what is this) type, e.g.:

T: *Yintoni le?* (K2P)
'What is this?'
K: *Yingca le.*
'This is grass.'

The initial vowel of the noun following the demonstrative is usually correctly omitted by all learners.

4.4.10.2 Conclusion

The demonstrative is elicited to some extent in the interviews because translation tasks demand that these forms be used in interviews 3 and 7. The use of the morpheme may thus be fairly restricted in general conversation for these learners. Only one learner can produce the morpheme correctly over 90% of the time and this morpheme may be a later-acquired one, possibly because it is an extra form which adds meaning to basic utterances. Other adverbs can also be used to convey the same meanings and they may be preferred because of their constant form.

4.4.11 Possessive concord

The possessive concord is used to indicate a possessive function and it is prefixed to a noun or to a pronominal stem. The form of the possessive concord depends on the class of the noun which is the possessee; e.g. to say “my book”, one looks at the class membership of “book” (*incwadi*), which is from class 9 and attaches the class 9 possessive concord *ya-* to *-m*, which is the pronominal stem for the first person, singular pronoun.

Table 4.23 indicates the use of the possessive concord in the data. All interviewees except Ann use this morpheme from the first interview, with Ann using it formulaically in interviews 1 and 4 and only using it independently from interview 5. The range of correct suppliance is 50% to 78.4% which shows that none of the learners has mastered all the forms of the morpheme, although omission rates are fairly low (except for Pat).

Table 4.23 Summary of possessive concord data¹⁹

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Omissions	Total
Ann	10 (55.6%)	8 (44.4%)	0	18 (100%)
Ben	46 (78%)	11 (18.6%)	2 (3.4%)	59 (100%)
Claire	72 (58.6%)	48 (39%)	3 (2.4%)	123 (100%)
Pat	47 (50%)	27 (28.7%)	20 (21.3%)	94 (100%)
Karen	92 (77.3%)	22 (18.5%)	5 (4.2%)	119 (100%)
Sarah	62 (78.4%)	16 (20.3%)	1 (1.3%)	79 (100%)
Total	329 (66.9%)	132 (26.8%)	31 (6.3%)	492 (100%)

Ann's first independent possessive forms are usually incorrect. There are several correct formulaic forms, and they are generalised to new contexts. In the following example, she uses *lakho* (your) for *lakhe* (her) and this form is probably copied from the formulaic form *ngubani igama lakho* (what is your name):

*Igama *lakho nguLinda ngusisi wam igama *lakho *uNitha (A5C)*
 Name your is Linda is sister my name your Nitha
Igama lakhe nguLinda. Ngusisi wam. Igama lakhe nguNitha.
 'Her name is Linda. It is my sister. Her name is Nitha.'

The next example also uses *lakho* (your), but this time it is for *lehashe* (of the horse):

*Igama *lakho ihashe *Black Beauty (A5C)*
 Name your horse Black Beauty
Igama lehashe nguBlack Beauty.
 'The name of the horse is Black Beauty.'

In another example in interview 5, she tries to form the possessive on a noun by using *ne-* instead of *e-*:

**Igamehlo *nehashe *ezinkulu (A5C)*
 Eyes and horse that are big
Amehlo ehashe makhulu.
 'The eyes of the horse are big.'

In the fourth example, she overuses the "my" pronominal stem to indicate the possessive function because she is unable to use the possessive on the noun.

¹⁹ Full tables of results are included in Appendices G15 and G16.

- A: My boyfriend's family (A5C)
 T: *Usapho*
 Family
 A: *Usapho *lwam*
 Family my
Usapho lomhlobo wam.
 'My friend's family.'

This overuse of the “my” form appears elsewhere in the data and may be an overgeneralised way to show the possessive function when a range of forms is not available.

4.4.11.1 Patterns of possessive concord use

Table 4.24 indicates common patterns of use of the possessive concord across learners. Examples are discussed below.

Table 4.24 Patterns of possessive concord use

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
Animacy cues	x	%	%	x	%	%
Class 2 and 6 confusion	x	x	%	%	x	x
Singular/plural interchangeability	x	%	%	%	%	%
Marked classes	%	%	%	x	x	%
Hidden forms	x	x	%	x	%	%
Class 1 overgeneralisation	x	x	%	x	x	x
Overuse of <i>ka-</i>	x	x	x	%	x	%
Generalised <i>e-</i>	x	x	x	%	x	x

4.4.11.1.1 Animacy cues

Forms which may pattern with “he/she” are used with animate referents. This may indicate the prevalence of animacy as a cue to selecting forms, as found for other morphemes, e.g. *-khe* (his/her) for animate forms. A typical example is the following:

- Inja igama *lakhe nguMissy* (C5C)
 Dog name of him/her is Missy
Inja, igama layo nguMissy.
 'Dog, its name is Missy.'

4.4.11.1.2 Class 2 and 6 confusion

Throughout the interviews, Claire and Pat produce *am* (class 6) with *utata* (father) and *umama* (mother), e.g.:

*Utata *am uyasebenza eMonti (C6C)*
 Father my works in East London
Utata wam usebenza eMonti.
 ‘My father works in East London.’

This may be a routinised form since it is only used with these two words.

Similarly, *am* (class 6) may be used instead of *bam* (class 2) for *utata nomama* (father and mother). This may be a class 2 and 6 confusion or a result of not marking plurality since the *am* (class 6) form is used with each of these referents when they occur individually, e.g.:

*Umama notata *am *ayahamba eBhayi namhlanje (C3C)*
 Mother and father my walk to Port Elizabeth today
Umama notata bam baya eBhayi namhlanje.
 ‘My mother and father go to Port Elizabeth today.’

4.4.11.1.3 Singular/plural interchangeability

Not all possessive concords agree in terms of singular or plural forms, which may indicate a more general principle of not marking morphemes redundantly, a pattern found with other morphemes as well, e.g.:

*Ndiyathanda ukuthetha nabahlobo *wam (P1C)*
 I like to talk with friends my
Ndiyathanda ukuthetha nabahlobo bam.
 ‘I like to talk to my friends.’

4.4.11.1.4 Marked classes

There are problems with supplying the possessive concords of marked classes, e.g.:

**Ndiyathanda ukutya *wakhe (C5C)*
 I like food of her/him
Ndithanda ukutya kwakhe.
 ‘I like his/her food.’

The choice in the example above seems to be based on the initial vowel rather than the whole noun prefix of class 15.

4.4.11.1.5 Hidden forms

There are errors with nouns from class 5 where part of the noun prefix is hidden. Class 9 forms are used instead of class 5 possessive concords, a choice based on the visible part of the noun prefix. Again, this is a pattern found in the selection of other concords. A typical example is:

*Igama lam *yesiXhosa *Sindiswa* (C2C)
 Name my of Xhosa Sindiswa
Igama lam lesiXhosa nguSindiswa.
 'My Xhosa name is Sindiswa.'

4.4.11.1.6 Class 1 overgeneralisation

The class 1 concord is overgeneralised to a class 1(a) noun with a possessive concord consisting of a vowel, e.g.:

... *umhlobo *wamama *am* ... (C5C)
 ... friend of mother my ...
 ... *umhlobo kamama wam* ...
 '... my mother's friend ...'

Few other concords make distinctions between class 1 and class 1(a) and it appears that Claire is using this general feature in the above example.

4.4.11.1.7 Overuse of *ka-*

On the other hand, Pat overgeneralises the *ka-* form to a class 1(a) noun with a possessive concord which consists of a consonant and vowel. It appears that she has not fully grasped the rule for the use of *ka-* here, e.g.:

*Abazali *kaThembi bayasebenza* (P1C)
 Parents of Thembi work
Abazali bakaThembi bayasebenza.
 'Thembi's parents work.'

A similar lack of understanding of the rule is evident in the overuse of the *ka-* possessive with nouns which do not fall into class 1(a), e.g.:

... *xa ibirthday *kaumntu* ... (P4C)
 ... when birthday of person ...
 ... *xa umhla wokuzalwa womntu* ...
 '... when a person's birthday ...'

4.4.11.1.8 Generalised *e-* form

A generalised *e-* possessive form is used in several examples (rather than the correct possessive

concord), e.g.:

*Umqhubi *emoto *akancoka (P7S)*
 Driver of car does not chat
Umqhubi wemoto akancokoli.
 'The driver of the car does not chat.'

4.4.11.2 Patterns of omission

There are a few similar omission patterns across learners in the data. Firstly, the pragmatic means of indicating possession is to place nouns next to each other and hope that the hearer derives the meaning from the context, e.g.:

*Ndiza kuthatha imoto *umama wam (C3C)*
 I will take car mother my
Ndiza kuthatha imoto kamama wam.
 'I will take my mother's car.'

For Pat and Sarah, possessives are often missing from infinitive forms, probably as a result of direct translation from English, e.g.:

*... izinto *ukupheka (P4C)*
 things to cook
... izinto zokupheka
 '... things to cook'

Transfer from English also causes the omission of some possessive markers, e.g.:

**Ikrisimesi iholide ide kakhulu (P5C)*
 Christmas holiday long very
Iholide yeKrisimesi inde kakhulu.
 'The Christmas holiday is very long.'

4.4.11.3 Conclusion

Although possessive forms appear in the data and possession seems to be a function necessary in the interlanguage of these learners, they are not always able to select the correct form of the morpheme.

4.4.12 Qualificatives

Two classes of words in Xhosa perform the equivalent of the English adjectival function, i.e. adjectives and relatives. The adjective class is fairly restricted and includes the words for the numbers one to six, *-bi* (ugly), *-dala* (old), *-de* (long, tall), *-fuphi* (close), *-futshane* (short), *-hle*

(beautiful), *-khulu* (big), *-ncinane* (small), *-ncinci* (small), *-ninzi* (many), *-ngaphi* (how many), and *-tsha* (new). All other qualificatives are in the relative class. Adjectival and relative concords are fairly similar, but learners have to learn two sets of morphemes to be sure that the correct morpheme is used. However, I have chosen to present the data of both morphemes together in Table 4.25 since their function is the same. I have not included in this table examples where the qualificative formative *a-* has been added or should be added, since these examples are discussed in section 4.4.13.

All learners use the adjective and relative concords, although Ann only starts using them in the third interview. These forms are additional to the basic utterance and they modify elements of the basic utterance. This may mean that learners regard them as less necessary for conveying the basic message and so they may be learnt later. They are also presented towards the end of the second semester in the first-year class. Four learners have correct suppliance of under 50% for these morphemes, as indicated in Table 4.25.

Table 4.25 Summary of qualificative concord data²⁰

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Omissions	Total
Ann	4 (30.8%)	7 (53.8%)	2 (15.4%)	13 (100%)
Ben	12 (40%)	13 (43.3%)	5 (16.7%)	30 (100%)
Claire	46 (75.4%)	10 (16.4%)	5 (8.2%)	61 (100%)
Pat	11 (42.3%)	14 (53.9%)	1 (3.8%)	26 (100%)
Karen	9 (69.2%)	4 (30.8%)	0	13 (100%)
Gill	12 (48%)	10 (40%)	3 (12%)	25 (100%)
Total	94 (56%)	58 (34.5%)	16 (9.5%)	168 (100%)

Ann's earliest qualificative forms appear in interview 3. Some of the examples in this interview show that she merely places the root of the qualificative after the word it modifies, relying on pragmatic means to convey her message, e.g.:

**Mpahla *shushu *shushu* (A3C)
 Clothes hot hot
Impahla eshushu

²⁰ Full tables of results are included in Appendices G17 and G18.

‘Clothes that are hot’

Also in this interview, there are examples where she adds *ku-* onto the qualificative, e.g.:

Kushushu ikofu iti (A3C)
It is hot coffee tea
Zishushu ikofu neti.
‘The coffee and tea are hot.’

She encountered the existential form *ku-* on *-shushu* (hot) in the weather vocabulary which she had learned just before this interview and this may have resulted in transfer of these forms. Another example which may be transfer of *ku-* or a correct form using knowledge of the qualificative concord system is the following:

*Ukutya *kumbi* (A3C)
Food is bad
Ukutya kubi.
‘Food is bad’

If the example above is an example of transfer of *ku-*, then Ann’s early development of the qualificative concord is to place the qualificative next to the noun which it modifies or to use the *ku-* form on the qualificative. Differentiation of forms may occur at a later stage.

4.4.12.1 Patterns of use of the qualificative

There are a number of common patterns of use of the qualificative in the interviews. Firstly, a productive strategy which indicates the relevant function but is not too cognitively demanding is to use only one or two forms of a morpheme. Ann uses only the *omnye* (“one” for class 1) form and it is probably formulaic. Sarah’s default form is *enye* (class 9) with a few examples of *omnye* (class 1). Pat replaces *enye* (class 9) with *omnye* (class 1) in some places. e.g.:

... **indoda *abubini *bayancokola *omnye *uyatshaya* ... (P7P)
... man that are two they chat one he smokes
... *amadoda amabini ayancokola. Enye iyatshaya* ...
‘... two men are talking. One is smoking ...’

Claire, Karen and Sarah again interchange class 2 and 6 concords, e.g.:

*Abantu *ayasebenza *isitalatu *amanye *ayathengisa *ikutya abanye ikafe abanye impahla* (C4P)
People work street some sell food others coffee others clothes
Abantu bayasebenza esitalatweni. Abanye bayathengisa ukutya, abanye ikofu abanye impahla.

‘People work in the street. Some sell food, some coffee, some clothes.’

4.4.12.2 Omission patterns of the qualificative in the data

Table 4.26 indicates the omission patterns in the data. Examples are presented below.

Table 4.26 Omission patterns of the qualificative in the data

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
On numerals	x	%	x	%	x	%
Stems with <i>lu-</i>	x	%	%	x	x	x
No coalescence	%	%	x	x	x	x

4.4.12.2.1 On numerals

Qualificatives are not always used on numerals, perhaps because they redundantly show plurality, e.g.:

- T:* *Zingaphi iklasi onazo evekini?* (B1C)
‘How many classes do you have per week?’
- B:* *I think *hlanu*
I think five
Ndicinga zintlanu.
‘I think five.’

4.4.12.2.2 Stems with *lu-*

Qualificative forms are not always added to stems which begin with *lu-*. This is the subject concord for class 11 and learners may think that words beginning with *lu-* already have concords so they do not need to add another one, e.g.:

- Umthi *luhlaza* (B6T)
Tree green
Umthi uluhlaza.
‘The tree is green.’

4.4.12.2.3 Lack of coalescence

The *-hle* adjective form, which requires coalescence when an adjective concord with a nasal is added, is not always coalesced, e.g.:

- Intombazana *ihle* (B6T)
Girl is pretty
Intombazana intle.
‘The girl is pretty.’

4.4.12.3 Conclusion

As noted above, correct suppliance of the qualificative morpheme is relatively poor and this may be a result of:

- C the range of forms which need to be learnt;
- C the less urgent need to learn forms which relate to optional elements of the utterance;
- C the fact that these forms fulfill mainly an agreement function rather than a semantic function, since the semantic function is carried by the stem of the qualificative.

4.4.13 Qualificative *a-* morpheme

The qualificative *a-* morpheme is added to the verb or to the qualificative (as discussed above). In effect, a subordinate clause is created with this morpheme, so one would expect that forms would be omitted or incorrect since the utterance structure moves beyond the basic form. Instead, a comparison of tables 4.25 and 4.27 shows that for four of the six learners, the qualificative *a-* is used correctly more often than the qualificative morpheme by itself. However, the level of omission of the qualificative *a-* morpheme is higher for five of the six learners and this is probably a better reflection of their abilities to use the morpheme. Pat has the lowest correct suppliance of all, although she creates the most opportunities for use by using complex utterances but leaving out the form. The qualificative *a-* form is used more often than the adjective and relative concords by themselves and this embedded form is probably necessary because the learners translate directly from English in many cases. Table 4.27 is a summary of the use of the qualificative *a-* concord in the data.

Table 4.27 Summary of qualificative *a-* concord²¹

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Omissions	Total
Ann	11 (45.8%)	5 (20.9%)	8 (33.3%)	24 (100%)
Ben	34 (47.9%)	12 (16.9%)	25 (35.2%)	71 (100%)
Claire	49 (60.5%)	15 (18.5%)	17 (21%)	81 (100%)
Pat	20 (30.8%)	16 (24.6%)	29 (44.6%)	65 (100%)
Karen	69 (75%)	13 (14.1%)	10 (10.9%)	92 (100%)
Sarah	70 (76%)	11 (12%)	11 (12%)	92 (100%)
Total	253 (59.6%)	72 (16.9%)	100 (23.5%)	425 (100%)

²¹ Full tables of results are included in Appendices G19 and G20.

4.4.13.1 Patterns of use of the qualificative *a-* morpheme

Many of the errors made when selecting qualificative *a-* forms are the same as those made when choosing other qualificative forms, since the qualificative *a-* form is added to the qualificative morpheme and coalesced where necessary, e.g.:

Isikolo sihle (qualificative concord)

'The school is beautiful.'

Isikolo esihle (qualificative *a-* + qualificative concord + coalescence of forms)

'The school which is beautiful'

Pat overuses the *e-* form on several qualificatives, e.g.:

*Kwi-exam time abantu*eninzi abantu bayafuna kufu bafuna ukufunda ...* (P3C)

At exam time people that are many people want (hesitancy) they want to learn ...

Ngexesha lemviwo abantu abaninzi bafuna ukufunda ...

'At exam time many people want to study ...'

4.4.13.2 Omission patterns of the qualificative *a-* morpheme

There are several omission patterns for individuals in the data and these patterns will be discussed below.

4.4.13.2.1 Processing constraints

Ben omits the qualificative *a-* when he produces longer utterances which may cause processing problems, e.g.:

**Omnye ine what's a roof dak ... *phahla *omnye *nephahla *ebomvu ne *necango*

One has what's a roof roof ... roof one has roof that is red and and door

**ubomvu nefestile *eblaw *udonga *lumphophe ...* (B6P)

red and window that is blue wall is white

Enye inophahla olubomvu nocango olubomvu nefestile eluhlaza nodonga olumphophe

...

'One has a red roof and a red door and a blue window and a white wall ...'

4.4.13.2.2 No subordinate clause marking

Sarah combines three sentences with no relative clause markers, e.g.:

*Ndinenja *ihlala ekhaya *yam *imhlophe* (S2S)

I have dog it stays at home my it is white

Ndinenja emhlophe ehlala ekhayeni lam.

I have a dog that is white that stays at my home.

4.4.13.2.3 Stems beginning with *lu-*

Sarah uses no qualificative *a-* forms on colour terms which start with *lu-*, e.g.:

*Utitshala unxiba ibhulukwe ende eblauw nehempe *lubhelu* (S1P)

Teacher wears pants that are long that are blue and shirt yellow

Utitshala unxiba ibhulukwe ende eluhlaza nehempe elubhelu.

‘The teacher wears long blue pants and a yellow shirt.’

Omissions usually relate to a failure to understand that the qualificative *a-* is used to indicate an embedded clause.

4.4.13.3 Verbal relatives

Because the qualificative *a-* can also be added to verbs, it is necessary to examine the use of the *-yo* morpheme in the data. Gough et al. (1989:265) say that “(t)he relative suffix *-yo* is added to the verbal relative when there is no adjunct, object or any other extension ...”.

Pat, Claire, Sarah and Karen usually use the *-yo* form, although there are omissions by all of them, e.g.:

T: Ngowuphi umdlalo owuthandayo? (P4C)

‘Which sport do you like?’

*P: Ndiya izidlalo *ndiyathanda ...*

I go sports I like

Izidlalo endizithandayo ...

‘The sports that I like ...’

Sarah also uses existential forms for the qualificative *a-* + *-yo* form in interview 7, e.g.:

*... sinxiba impahle *kupholile* (S7C)

... we wear clothes it is cool

... sinxiba impahla epholileyo

‘... we wear cool clothes’

4.4.13.4 Conclusion

An utterance containing an embedded clause is more complex than the basic utterance and these learners show that they do not always indicate the presence of an embedded clause by means of the correct morpheme. It should also be noted that when analysing spoken utterances it is not always clear whether an utterance is meant to be embedded or whether the speaker is starting a new utterance which uses only the basic qualificative form. Levels of omission may therefore not be accurately reflected in Table 4.27.

4.4.14 *Na-/nga-*: “with”

Sections 4.4.14, 4.4.15 and 4.4.16 discuss three different morphemes which take the same form, i.e. *na-*, but which have different functions and names.

The first morpheme is used to denote “with”. The morpheme has two forms: *nga-* when used with human referents and locatives and *na-* with all other referents. A summary of the use of both forms of the morpheme is included in Table 4.28. Average *use* (correct + incorrect uses) of the morpheme reaches the 90% suppliance level, but the uses are not always correct, so it cannot be said that any of the learners have acquired the morpheme fully.

Table 4.28 Summary of *na-/nga-*

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Omissions	Total
Ann	14 (82.4%)	0	3 (17.6%)	17 (100%)
Ben	34 (58.6%)	20 (34.5%)	4 (6.9%)	58 (100%)
Claire	82 (83.7%)	13 (13.3%)	3 (3%)	98 (100%)
Pat	39 (81.3%)	6 (12.5%)	3 (6.2%)	48 (100%)
Karen	64 (88.9%)	5 (6.9%)	3 (4.2%)	72 (100%)
Sarah	53 (68.8%)	9 (11.7%)	15 (19.5%)	77 (100%)
Total	286 (77.3%)	53 (14.3%)	31 (8.4%)	370 (100%)

Ben, Claire, and Sarah usually distinguish the *nga-* “with” and the *na-* “with” forms, although there are some errors, e.g.:

*Ndihlala *nebhola phandle* (B2S)
 I live(play) with ball outside
Ndidlala ngebhola phandle.
 ‘I play with the ball outside.’

The omission of *nga-* is particularly prevalent on forms which denote temporality, since this form is not a direct translation from English, e.g.:

**Ndiyaqubha kakuhle *izinye imini* (C5C)
 I swim nicely one day
Ndiqubhe kakuhle ngezinye imini
 ‘One day I swam nicely.’

When *na-* and *nga-* are used purely to mean “with” as they would be used in English, these forms are usually correct. However, the problematic usage is when *nga-* is added to a form which

denotes temporality. The “with” function is not particularly obvious to the English-speaking person here, since the translation of these forms into English does not require the use of “with”. Transfer may therefore be a source of errors in this case.

4.4.15 *Na-*: Associative Copulative

The morpheme *na-* can be used to indicate “have” when it is attached to the noun or pronoun. Table 4.29 summarises the use and omission of the morpheme and indicates that omission levels are fairly low, although except for Karen, correct usage does not reach the 90% correct suppliance.

Table 4.29 Summary of the associative copulative

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Omissions	Total
Ann	1 (25%)	0	3 (75%)	4 (100%)
Ben	16 (55.2%)	10 (34.5%)	3 (10.3%)	29 (100%)
Claire	16 (84.2%)	2 (10.5%)	1 (5.3%)	19 (100%)
Pat	36 (87.8%)	4 (9.8%)	1 (2.4%)	41 (100%)
Karen	20 (95.2%)	1 (4.8%)	0	21 (100%)
Sarah	29 (85.3%)	5 (14.7%)	0	34 (100%)
Total	118 (79.7%)	22 (14.9%)	8 (5.4%)	148 (100%)

4.4.15.1 Patterns of use of the associative concord

4.4.15.1.1 Lack of correct negative forms

One of the main sources of incorrect forms of “have” is that the correct negative forms are not always produced, e.g.:

*Aba bantu *abanencwadi *neencwadi (S3T)*
 These people they don't have book have books
Aba bantu abanancwadi.
 ‘These people don't have books.’

4.4.15.1.2 Formal form

Pat uses only a very formal associative form: pronoun + *na-* + *-yo* + noun. Although this form is not incorrect, it is regarded as very formal in the context of everyday conversation. Pat uses a form which is invariant regardless of the need for agreement of the pronoun with the noun which

follows it, e.g.:

*Ndinayo izinto *izininzi to do* (P4C)

I have things many to do

Ndineezinto ezininzi zokwenza.

‘I have many things to do.’

4.4.15.1.3 Lack of coalescence

Coalescence of the initial vowel of the prefix and the associative copulative causes problems, although the morpheme is used, e.g.:

... *uThabo *unemakhulu* (B1C)

... Thabo he has grandmother

... *uThabo unomakhulu.*

‘... Thabo has a grandmother.’

4.4.15.2 Conclusion

Incorrect coalescence of positive forms and the lack of non-coalescence of negative forms seem to be the two major areas affecting the use of correct forms of the associative copulative. The function of this morpheme is therefore used in most cases, although the forms of the morpheme remain problematic for most learners.

4.4.16 *Na-*: Additive conjunction

The final use of the *na-* form is as an additive conjunction. Other conjunctions which take the form of individual words are discussed in section 4.2.2. The additive conjunction is used or required fairly widely in the data and since it is a morpheme which is attached to stems, I have chosen to discuss it separately from the other conjunctions.

Table 4.30 Summary of use of the additive conjunction

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Omit	Total
Ann	0	0	9 (100%)	9 (100%)
Ben	24 (39.3%)	28 (45.9%)	9 (14.8%)	61 (100%)
Claire	7 (43.8%)	0	9 (56.2%)	16 (100%)
Pat	29 (47.5%)	2 (3.3%)	30 (49.2%)	61 (100%)
Karen	33 (64.7%)	5 (9.8%)	13 (25.5%)	51 (100%)
Sarah	38 (70.4%)	0	16 (29.6%)	54 (100%)

Total	131 (52%)	35 (13.9%)	86 (34.1%)	252 (100%)
-------	-----------	------------	------------	------------

4.4.16.1 Patterns of additive conjunction use

Table 4.31 indicates the patterns of use of the additive conjunction for different learners. Examples are discussed below.

Table 4.31 Patterns of additive conjunction use

	Ann	Ben	Claire	Pat	Karen	Sarah
Not on lists	%	%	%	%	%	%
Discourse marker	x	%	%	x	x	x
On infinitives	x	x	x	x	(%)	x
On verbs	x	x	%	%	x	x

4.4.16.1.1 Not on lists

The additive conjunction is not always used, especially in lists of English and Xhosa words, e.g.:

*Ndibona amaqanda necephe nebhotolo nepleyiti *bowl *ikeki *iscale *iswekile ... (S5P)*
 I see eggs and spoon and butter and plate bowl cake scale sugar
Ndibona amaqanda necephe nebhotolo nepleyiti nebowl nekeyiki nescale neswekile.
 'I see eggs, spoon, butter, plate, bowl, cake, scale and sugar.'

4.4.16.1.2 Discourse markers

The English word "and" may be used as a discourse marker in utterances, e.g.:

... *ngoobhuti bam aba *Jonathan *and uWalter (B5C)*
 ... these are brothers my these Jonathan and Walter
 ... *ngoobhuti bam aba nguJonathan noWalter*
 '... these are my brothers Jonathan and Walter.'

4.4.16.1.3 On infinitives

The *na + uku* (additive conjunction + infinitive) form to indicate "and" on an infinitive is used variably, e.g.:

*Ndithanda ukukhwela *intaba *kuya elwandle (S3C)*
 I like to climb the mountain to go to the sea
Ndithanda ukukhwela entabeni nokuya elwandle.
 'I like to climb the mountain and go to the sea.'

4.4.16.1.4 On verbs

The additive conjunction is used incorrectly on verbs, e.g.:

... *watshata *nabuya izolo (V2C)*

... she married and returned yesterday
 ... *watshata sibuye izolo*.
 ‘... she married and we returned yesterday.’

4.4.16.2 Conclusion

There are many omissions of the additive conjunction in the data. English patterns may affect the use of the morpheme since English does not require the use of “and” between each noun in a list.

4.4.17 Object concords

One function of the object concord in Xhosa is to show definiteness, as Xhosa does not have an article system which is equivalent to English. A second function is a pronominal function operating both cataphorically and anaphorically. The object concord is attached to the verb preceding the object or to a verb which refers back to an object in a different utterance. The shape of the object concord is dependent on the class of the object noun to which it refers.

The omission of the object concord is difficult to calculate, as its use is not obligatory and it is difficult to detect from the context when definiteness is necessary and when it is not. Baseline data for the conversations is not an adequate measure of obligatory use, because the conversations differ from person to person. Table 4.32 provides a summary of object concord use in the data. The object concord is not used by Ann, and Ben uses one incorrect form. The levels of use of the morpheme by other learners are very low and it is clear that this is one of the later-acquired morphemes.

Table 4.32 Summary of the use of object concords

Name	Correct	Incorrect	Omissions	Total
Ann	0	0	0	0
Ben	0	1 (33.3%)	2 (66.7%)	3 (100%)
Claire	14 (37.8%)	4 (10.8%)	19 (51.4%)	37 (100%)
Pat	5 (62.5%)	0	3 (37.5%)	8 (100%)
Karen	9 (60%)	4 (26.7%)	2 (13.3%)	15 (100%)
Sarah	3 (50%)	2 (33.3%)	1 (17.7%)	6 (100%)
Total	31 (45%)	11 (15.9%)	27 (39.1%)	69 (100%)

For Claire, only the pronominal function of the object concord is realised and this is variable. Pronominal forms are not always used to refer to previous utterances and the referent is left to the context or repeated, e.g.:

... *zinde zishushu and *ndiyathanda kakhulu* (C7C)
 ... they long they hot and I like very much
 ... *zinde zishushu ndiyazithanda kakhulu.*
 ‘... they (days) are long and hot and I like them very much.’

Pat does not use object concords forms in interviews 1 to 4, even when these forms are expressly required in a sentence-manipulation exercise. An example of a turn requiring object concords is the following:

*Ndiyathanda ukufunda iincwadi *thetha nabahlobo nabahlobo bam exercise amthambo*
 I like to read books talk with friends with friends my exercise exercise
 **ndiyathanda* (P2C)
 I like
Ndiyathanda ukufunda iincwadi nokuthetha nabahlobo bam. Umthambo ndiyawuthanda.
 ‘I like to read books and to talk to my friends. Exercise, I like it.’

Sarah does not use object concords in interviews 1 and 2. There are no definite object concord markers in 1, 3 and 5, although object concord pronominal forms are used. The object concord appears in the sentence manipulation in 2 and 5 but without a *-ya-* between the subject and object concord, e.g.:

*Utitshalakazi *usinika *usinika ipensile ekhabhatini* (S5S)
 Teacher she us give she us give pencil from the cupboard
Utitshalakazi uyasinika ipensile evela ekhabhatini.
 ‘The teacher gives us a pencil from the cupboard.’

Karen’s object concord pronominal forms are omitted in interviews 1, 2 and 5, although there is one example of an object concord pronominal when she builds her own sentence in interview 1, e.g.:

*Xa ndifuna uku *kudlala nenja yam ndiyayibiza *ngegama *lakho* (K1S)
 When I want to to play with dog my I it call with name of you
Xa ndifuna ukudlala nenja yam, ndiyayibiza ngegama layo.
 ‘When I want to play with my dog, I call it by name.’

Karen also uses the object concord form correctly in the sentence-manipulation exercise where this form is required.

These learners seem to regard the object concord as optional since it has a pronominal function

rather than a full semantic function. In addition, its function of showing definiteness is not understood by these learners. The article system of a language is often learnt later and this may be one of the reasons why this morpheme is not used by these learners. In addition, English uses a separate word to show this function, whereas Xhosa uses a morpheme in the middle of the word (a non-salient position for language learners, according to Slobin 1985).

4.4.18 *Njenga-*

The Xhosa form *njenga-* translates as “like” and is attached to the noun or verb. Only Karen and Sarah use this morpheme correctly, e.g.:

*Bathanda uku ukutya ukutya okushushu njengesoup soup *njani *njani.* (K3C)
 They like to to eat food that is hot like soup soup etcetera etcetera.
Bathanda ukutya ukutya okushushu njengesoup njalo njalo.
 ‘They like to eat hot food like soup etcetera etcetera.’

Pat and Ben omit this morpheme, e.g.:

*Ndiyathanda ukudlala *amathambo isport ihoki* (P2S)
 I like to play sport sport hockey
Ndithanda ukudlala umdlalo njengehoki.
 ‘I like to play sport like hockey.’

Pat uses an uncoalesced form in a later interview, e.g.:

*Ndithanda ukutya *ikutya *kushushu *njenge isop* (P7C)
 I like to eat food hot like soup
Ndithanda ukutya ukutya okushushu njengesoup.
 ‘I like to eat hot food like soup.’

This morpheme occurs rarely in the data, but it is not needed in many cases since the sentence can be changed to avoid the form.

4.5 CONCLUSION

This chapter has presented the data of my study from a functional and formal perspective. Throughout the chapter, it is evident that these learners are able to perform a range of functions with their interlanguage. Although the forms they use are not always correct in the linguistic context and the hearer carries a heavy burden of trying to work out what is meant, they manage to convey a range of meanings. It is clear, however, that these learners have moved beyond only using pragmatic means to convey their meanings and they can manipulate a wide range of morphemes.

In the next chapter, common patterns of acquisition across morphemes and learners are investigated. In addition, the development of morphemes for individuals is discussed and a possible sequence of development is proposed.

CHAPTER 5

ACQUISITION PATTERNS IN THE INTERLANGUAGE OF LEARNERS OF XHOSA

5.0 INTRODUCTION

The functions and morphemes represented in the data were presented in chapter 4 and it is clear that there are numerous common patterns of morpheme realisation. This chapter will analyse common acquisition patterns and suggest possible explanations for them. Further areas of discussion include individual developmental sequences of particular morphemes, discussion of the developmental sequence of morphemes in the data, and an overview of the learners' performance on different tasks.

5.1 PRINCIPLES AND PATTERNS IN MORPHEME USE AND OMISSION

The results discussed in chapter 4 show that there are common patterns of morpheme use and common principles of morpheme choice across a range of morphemes which have an agreement component. Since the form of all agreement morphemes relates to the class of the co-referenced noun, it might be expected that similar principles would be applied when making choices across these morphemes and wherever possible, parallels are drawn between my study and the findings of other studies. A number of patterns of suppliance and non-suppliance of morphemes are discussed below. It is important to note that some examples may have several explanations, since different cognitive principles may interact.

5.1.1 Singular forms for plural forms and *vice versa*

In several places (e.g. noun prefixes, subject concords, negative subject concords, possessives), singularity/plurality may be marked only on some stems in the utterance. For example, a noun with a singular noun prefix may be co-referenced with a plural subject concord and *vice versa*. There are two possible explanations for this pattern. Firstly, the context often clarifies whether singular or plural forms are necessary, so the learner may deem it unnecessary to mark number distinctions more than once in the utterance. Secondly, the pattern may be a result of a strategy to avoid redundancy, so that plurality is marked only once in the utterance.

In a study of first-language acquisition¹ of siSwati² noun classes, Kunene (1986) found that children (aged 2-3) produced a bare noun stem first. However, they used agreement forms which marked number on the possessive and the demonstrative forms which followed bare noun stems. This means that these children acquire agreement forms before they acquire the noun prefix. This finding is not true for the L2 learners in my study, since they acquire the noun prefix before other agreement forms. However, an interesting hypothesis is that L2 learners are behaving similarly by marking singular/plural forms only after the noun rather than on the noun prefix. This may mean that number distinctions are acquired later, although learners realise that morphemes should be supplied on co-referenced stems before number distinctions can be made (as for the child).

A further possibility for number acquisition is that plural noun forms are derived from singular noun forms. However, this would mean that if singular forms are learnt as wholes, one could expect plural forms to be added to the singular forms, e.g. **abaumntwana* (class 2 *ba-* plus class 1 *u-*). This pattern is not apparent in the data³. Instead, there appears to be a productive rule applied to noun stems. Further evidence of rule application is discussed in section 5.1.2.

Nevertheless, it is not possible to rule out the possibility that nouns and noun prefixes are learnt as wholes and automatised (rather than being the result of a process of rule application), although the memorisation of hundreds of singular and plural noun forms is cognitively wasteful. Nevertheless, Kunene (1986:37) says that learning forms as wholes may be the way L1 acquisition proceeds:

One possible explanation as to why Cimcim learned plural prefixes with some nouns and singular prefixes with others has to do with the frequency of the noun. If the noun more commonly occurs with its plural prefix, then the child might learn the plural prefix of that noun before learning its singular prefix. [and *vice versa*]

¹First- and second-language acquisition is comparable in many ways and similarities have been found in several studies (e.g. Dulay & Burt 1974a, b; Felix 1978; Mace-Matluck 1979; Suzman 1982, 1999; Wode 1978).

² Because of the lack of studies of second-language acquisition of African languages, several first-language acquisition studies are referred to in this chapter. Examples from studies of siSwati, isiZulu and seSotho are included here. These languages share many of the typological characteristics of Xhosa and I have made generalisations where they can reasonably be applied to Xhosa because of typological similarities.

³ Kunene (1986) also finds that this pattern is not upheld in L1 data.

This may be a strategy employed by L2 learners, especially at early stages of acquisition when the extent of the noun class system is not yet fully understood.

5.1.2 Mix forms

When several forms have a common attribute, these forms may be used interchangeably. For example, forms which denote plurality (classes 2, 6, 10) are used interchangeably for noun prefixes, subject concords and demonstratives. Since learners would not have heard incorrect forms in the input, this suggests creative application of forms to stems (rather than learning a stem as a whole, as discussed above in 5.1.1). It also suggests that semantics rather than phonology may form the basis of morpheme choice to some extent because, although many agreement forms are phonological copies of the noun prefix, the learners do not seem to always use this cue. This finding is in contrast to the findings for L1 acquisition of seSotho since Demuth (1992:630) concludes that:

There is no evidence from the Sesotho data, nor from the other studies mentioned, that children learning Bantu languages rely on semantics to help them into the noun class and agreement system. Rather, there is support for the fact that they rely on phonological information. In Demuth (1988b), I propose that this holds up crosslinguistically. Access to the semantics of the system becomes available only at later stages of development, whereas early overgeneralizations are normally of a phonological nature. We know little about how and when Sesotho-speaking children do acquire access to the semantics of the noun class system, such as productively deriving human nouns from non-human nouns.

The cognitive differences between young L1 learners and L2 adult learners may explain this difference, since semantic choices also seem to play a role in the choices discussed in the next section.

5.1.3 Animacy cues

In the data, agreement forms of class 9 and 10 animate noun forms are replaced by class 1 and 2 agreement forms respectively for noun prefixes, subject concords, negative subject concords, demonstratives, and possessives. These substitutions seem to be based on semantic distinctions, and semantic distinctions have been found to play a role in the acquisition of a range of different morphemes (Bybee 1991; Carroll 1999; Young 1991). From a semantic perspective, many human referents fall into classes 1 and 2, while many non-human referents fall into classes 9 and 10. In addition, the pronoun for “he/she” is *u-* and the pronoun for “they” is *ba-*, and the learner may be using the pronoun “he/she/they” rather than “it” if they are translating from English. The

“he/she/they” pronominal forms are the same as the subject concord forms for classes 1 and 2 respectively (although there are tonal differences in pronunciation of pronominal forms and subject concords which these learners do not realise in their production). Together, these two factors seem to encourage the selection of class 1 and 2 concords for animate referents which normally fall into classes 9 and 10. This explanation supports Perdue’s (1991) findings that the forms for personal pronouns appear before forms for reference to “it”.

Kunene (cited in Demuth 1992:599) found similar overgeneralisations for human referents which are found in nonhuman classes for children aged 4;6-5;9:

Once the lexical noun and corresponding subject marker were initially used, children’s sentences would undergo pro-drop and they would switch to class 1/2(the human class) subject markers. Once these older children deleted the head noun, semantics - at least for the human class - may have begun to play a role.

Similarly, Suzman (1999:143) found that

(w)hen first year university students learning Zulu as a second language were asked to compose sentences using ‘human’ nouns in classes other than NC1 [Noun Class 1] or 1a ... they often used agreeing prefixes from NC1 Students have obviously used meaning rather than the form as the basis of agreement.

The difference between these findings and the findings of my study is that the learners in my study focussed on *animacy* rather than *humanness*. So, they extended these substitutions to animals as well as humans in classes 9 and 10.

5.1.4 Opposite of animacy

However, the principle operating in 5.1.3 is not applied consistently, since the opposite substitution also occurs. Animate referents which fall into classes 1 and 2 are sometimes given agreement forms from classes 9 and 10 on noun prefixes, subject concords, negative subject concords and copulatives. A possible explanation for this principle is that class 9 and 10 forms are overgeneralised because they have the highest number of lexical items. Frequency of class 9 and 10 forms in the input may encourage selection of these forms (as Musau 1995 predicts).

5.1.5 Marked and unmarked

As mentioned in section 4.4.1.1.1, there seem to be marked and unmarked classes for these learners when choosing noun prefixes, subject concords, negative subject concords,

demonstratives, possessives, qualificatives and qualificative *a-* morphemes. Classes 1, 2, 9 and 10 seem to be unmarked and learners sometimes substitute forms from one of these classes for forms from other classes. These classes may be deemed unmarked because:

- C they contain the most lexical items;
- C most borrowed lexical items are found in these classes;
- C they have agreement morphemes which match noun prefixes phonologically; and
- C they pattern fairly regularly across morphemes.

Other classes may have few lexical items, hidden concord forms (e.g. class 5 has a hidden *li-* form in its prefix and class 11 has a hidden *lu-* form in its prefix), and unpredictable forms (e.g. class 3 singular to class 4 plural changes).

A more pragmatic reason for overuse of classes 1 and 2 may be that they appear first in the chart of morpheme inflections and these forms may be the first forms learnt and therefore the forms which receive the most attention (although this does not explain the use of these forms by Claire who has had less exposure to formal input).

Musau (1995) found that learners of Swahili overgeneralise class 9 and 10 forms and he links this to Andersen's (1984) One-to-One Principle where one form is used to show one function. This strategy reduces the cognitive processing load, because learners use only a few of the available forms.

5.1.6 Beginnings of words

In a few morphemes (e.g. locatives and verbal relatives), morphemes may be formed by a prefix and a suffix. A comparison of the suppliance of prefixes only and suffixes only (when prefixes and suffixes are required) shows that prefixes are supplied more often than suffixes (*cf.* Richards 1985). In the case of the locative, the use of only the initial forms is strengthened by the prototypicality of adding only the *e-* form to the stem when forming the locative.

Another example of omitting parts of a morpheme occurs when a prepositional form has two parts. The second part is attached to the noun which follows the first part, and the second part may be omitted by these learners (e.g. *phambi kwa-* "before" has omissions of the *kwa-* preposition).

Double marking of a single function is redundant and this may strengthen the tendency not to supply both morphemes when one form conveys the intended meaning.

However, there is an exception to this tendency. The negative terminative *-i* morpheme is usually produced, but this is probably because it is constant in the present tense, while the initial morpheme is variable according to the noun class with which it agrees.

5.1.7 Overgeneralised forms

Overgeneralisation can take two forms. Firstly, a single form is overgeneralised to convey one function in a variety of agreement contexts. Secondly, a morpheme category can be overgeneralised to new contexts. Overgeneralizations are found in a number of studies (e.g. Dittmar 1981, 1984; Schumann 1978; Tomasello & Herron 1988).

Examples of the first form of overgeneralisation include overuse of:

- C *aku-* as a negative subject concord;
- C class 1 copulatives;
- C first-position demonstratives;
- C qualificatives which add only *ku-*;
- C agreement forms from classes 1, 2, 9 and 10;
- C the *e-* form of the qualificative *a-*.

Findings by Suzman (1982 for L1 acquisition of Zulu; 1999 for L2 acquisition of Zulu), show that the Zulu equivalents of Xhosa classes 1 and 9 are learned early by L1 learners and classes 1, 5 and 9 are learnt early by adult learners. The learning of class 5 at an early stage is a finding not upheld in my data and it is a surprising finding, because the hidden form of class 5 (*i/li*) makes choosing the correct agreement form more difficult. Reasons for overgeneralisation of classes 1 and 9 have been discussed in section 5.1.5.

The second type of overgeneralisation occurs when learners overgeneralise verbal negative morphemes to the noun negative (see section 4.4.4.2) and use the additive conjunction on the verb (see section 4.4.16.1.4). These overgeneralisations may indicate either a lack of understanding of restrictions on where forms can occur, or a lack of knowledge of the morphemes needed in the context. In order to communicate, the learners overgeneralise what they already know, based on a common function.

5.1.8 Redundancy

Several studies have confirmed that there is a tendency to avoid redundancy when learning an L1 and L2 (Bybee 1991; Schumann 1987; Slobin 1985), although Young (1991) found that his learners marked plurality redundantly. Redundancy is probably avoided to reduce the cognitive processing load. A lack of redundancy is found in several places in my study, e.g.:

- C the use of singular noun prefixes with plural concordial forms (and *vice versa*);
- C subject concord omissions when the form is implicit or repeated;
- C the lack of demonstratives with copulatives;
- C using only one of the locative morphemes;
- C leaving forms to the context; and
- C the omission of the qualificative form on numerals.

5.1.9 Restricted functions of morphemes

Although a wide range of morphemes appears in the data, the target-language range of functions of the morphemes is not always exploited. Many morphemes are used with a single function or perhaps two functions and less prototypical functions are not used by the learners. Instead learners focus on a particular function (sometimes based on transfer from English) and use the morpheme in a restricted range of contexts. Wolf-Quintero (cited in Towell and Hawkins 1994) describes this as the principle of conservatism, since learners are reluctant (or unable) to employ the full range of functions of a morpheme initially. For example, object concords are only used with a pronominal function rather than as definiteness markers as well, and locatives are not always understood to have prepositional functions. The functions of the Xhosa copulative listed by (Jokweni 1997) are not exploited since these learners use the copulative mainly as the copula would be used in English.

Another example of restricted function of morphemes is the case where learners have difficulties with the non-present-tense forms of some morphemes (e.g. subject concords, negative subject concords and demonstratives). They learn the present-tense form in the first year of instruction, although for second- and third-year students and those with exposure to natural input, the most frequent tenses they are exposed to are probably not present tense forms.

5.1.10 Distance from the noun

Agreement morphemes are co-referenced with the noun and if they occur relatively far away from the noun they are more likely to be incorrect than those right next to the noun. This is probably

a result of processing constraints. The learner continually has to refer back to the noun in the utterance to produce the correct agreement form at a later point in the utterance. Subject concords are particularly prone to this strategy since they are forms which can occur far away from the noun. Many of the other agreement forms occur within the noun phrase (e.g. possessives, qualificatives), but they also follow this pattern if there is a question or comment from Thembi between the noun produced by the learner and the agreement form produced after Thembi's turn. This pattern links to Wolf-Quintero's (cited in Towell & Hawkins 1994) principle of continuity, which says that adjacent forms are more likely to be combined.

5.1.11 Processing problems

McLaughlin (cited in Gass & Selinker 1994:154) says that "(p)rocessing energy is limited and must be distributed economically, if communication is to be efficient." Vocabulary retrieval seems to require high levels of processing energy and morphemes such as subject concords and qualificative *a-* morphemes are omitted or used incorrectly if there are difficulties with vocabulary retrieval. Processing constraints are particularly obvious for Ann, because she has many problems retrieving vocabulary.

Adding additional forms to the noun (e.g. *na-/nga-* "with") may interfere with suppliance of the noun prefix, because this increases the processing load, especially when there is a need for vowel coalescence. Furthermore, initial vowels may be left off noun prefixes, especially at the beginning of utterances. It is possible that processing loads may be fairly high at the beginning of utterances where the learner is shifting from English to Xhosa and thinking about the message to be produced. All participants seem to struggle with adding agreement morphemes to words containing clicks, perhaps because of the extra processing power needed to produce these non-English sounds.

5.1.12 Discreteness of forms

To some extent it is possible that words are viewed as fairly separate entities by these learners and that preceding or subsequent words do not affect words. Examples of forms in my study which do not show an awareness of relationships between morphemes and other words in the utterance include the lack of:

C initial vowel dropping on a noun which follows a negative;

- C the subjunctive on successive verbs in the present tense; and
 C object concords.

The one place where initial vowels are dropped on the following noun is with the demonstrative. This may be a result of the phonological incompatibility of successive vowels of the demonstrative and the initial vowel of the noun (e.g. *lo (u)mntu*).

5.1.13 Influence of English

When English is used in an utterance, it seems to interfere with the use of morphemes on noun prefixes and locatives. At a cognitive level, the learner is moving between two different underlying systems which may interfere with each other.

Transfer from English is evident on a range of morphemes (e.g. additive conjunctions, omission of possessives, lack of prepositional forms, no *nga-* “with” forms on locatives). Positive transfer may occur for word order, but generally little is directly transferable because of the difference in typology of English and Xhosa. Transfer tends to be more noticeable at the discourse level, where there may be over- or underuse of emphasis, disturbed topic-focus patterns and overuse of noun phrases where pronouns are more appropriate.

5.1.14 Structure of words

Verb roots which begin with vowels seem to be marked forms which are irregular when concordial elements are attached to them. Usually an extra form needs to be added to link the vowel of the concord to the initial vowel of the verb. Monosyllabic verbs are also marked in terms of the way in which concords are added, since they may also include extra forms. These difficulties conform to Wolf-Quintero’s (cited in Towell & Hawkins 1994) principle of generalisation which says that learners avoid exceptions.

5.1.15 Phonological constraints

The confusion of class 2 (*ba-*) and class 6 (*a-*) forms (on noun prefixes, subject concords, negative subject concords, demonstratives and qualificatives) may be the result of phonological constraints. The *a-* vowel is common to both classes in the agreement forms, which may influence selection of the appropriate morphemes. A second example is the substitution of *e-* and *i-* on noun prefixes, which may also be a result of phonological perception problems.

5.1.16 Multiple functions for one form

Multiple functions for one form seem to cause problems as Andersen's One-to-One Principle (1984) suggests they might. The learner's preference is usually for one form per function. The form which seems to cause the most problems for these learners is the morpheme *a-*. This form is used as the class 6 subject concord, qualificative *a-*, negative formative, and possessive of class 6. The learners in my study also use it as a default subject negative form on its own possibly because it is the negative formative. When choosing forms for class 6, the multifunctionality causes problems and learners seem to hesitate to supply agreement forms which only consist of *a-*.

The *ku-* form is also multifunctional. Visser (1989:155) lists a range of forms which use *ku-*, including the infinitive, the class 15 noun, and agreement forms with class 15. The confusion of forms such as *ukutya* (to eat/food) may stem from the multifunctionality of the *uku-* form at the beginning of this word.

Wolf-Quintero's (cited in Towell & Hawkins 1994) principle of uniqueness is relevant here, since learners prefer one form to have one meaning. Young (1991) also notes that a pattern of one form to one function which is easy to learn is preferred.

5.1.17 Rule application

Rule application appears before automatisisation (after a period of formulaic use which is automatised). This principle is shown in coalescence, where learners do not always produce a correctly coalesced form. The errors made for locatives and noun prefixes also show a preference for rule application rather than automatisisation (although the incorrect form may have been automatised).

5.1.18 Conclusion

In the above section, several common patterns of morpheme use and explanations for these patterns have been discussed. It is evident that most of the above principles have been found in other studies of interlanguage, which shows that they are probably general language-learning principles, regardless of the typology of the languages involved. In the next section, the levels of development of the learners in my study will be investigated.

5.2 LEVELS OF DEVELOPMENT

Levels of development have been very broadly defined in the literature because of the wide range of factors which needs to be taken into account when assessing development in interlanguage (IL). A particular problem in measuring development in an agglutinative language is that most words have more than one morpheme, which means that presenting noun:verb ratios or utterance length measured in number of words in the data is problematic. Even in L1 development, where the standard measure of development is the Mean Length of Utterance (MLU), there is criticism of this measure for agglutinative languages (Demuth 1992). However, I have applied some of the measures of development suggested by Givón (1979) and Corder (1977) to the data and I will show where these measures fail. It should be noted that none of these measures of development can give an accurate picture on its own and that the interaction of the measures should be considered for a more reliable assessment.

It should also be noted that different tasks influence the level of language produced. So, in some tasks, learners' interlanguage appears to be more developed, while high task demands result in backsliding to earlier forms in other tasks⁴. Givón's (1979) and Corder's (1977a) characteristics of early IL will be investigated below.

5.2.1 Givón's pragmatic-syntactic continuum

The first level of development which I will discuss is that of Givón (1979). He says that learners progress from pragmatic to syntactic levels of development and, for my data, it is necessary to see this model as a continuum. The pragmatic mode is characterised by *inter alia*:

- C loose coordination;
- C lower noun:verb ratios;
- C simple verbs; and
- C no use of grammatical morphology.

For many of the measurements, the level of development is a ranking of each of the six learners against each other, since there are no other available standards against which these results could be accurately measured. However, ranking these learners shows how they might be placed on Givón's (1979) continuum in relation to each other.

⁴ Appendices G1 to G20 provide an impression of the suppliance and non-suppliance of individual morphemes for each task in the data.

5.2.1.1 Conjunction use

The first area of investigation is the use of conjunctions in the data. Table 5.1 indicates that coordinating conjunctions are not the only conjunctions in the data, as Givón (1979) suggests they should be at early levels of development.

Table 5.1 Conjunction use in the data

Name	Number of coordinate conjunctions	Number of subordinate conjunctions	Conjunction total	Number of different conjunctions used
Ann	3	16	19	2
Ben	6	55	61	7
Claire	47	145	192	11
Pat	36	45	81	4
Karen	63	141	204	13
Sarah	72	121	193	9

None of these learners employ only loose coordination to join elements of utterances. In fact, use of subordinate conjunctions is higher than use of coordinate conjunctions for all learners. This means that all learners have moved beyond the pragmatic level of development in their conjunction use. Using the total use of conjunctions as a measure of the level of development, the learners⁵ are ranked from lowest to highest in the following way:

Ann, Ben, Pat, Claire, Sarah, Karen

Another way to look at conjunction use is to look at the number of different conjunctions employed. This may give a better indication of conjunction use, since a large repertoire of forms can show an ability to produce more sophisticated meaning relations between parts of the utterance. Using this measure of development, the following ranking (lowest to highest) is found:

Ann, Pat, Ben, Sarah, Claire, Karen

The problem with measuring development by looking at the number and range of conjunctions in this data is that learners are producing oral data for the measurement. Using conjunctions is to

⁵A reminder of the background of each learner is included in Appendix B.

some extent optional, since suprasegmental features can be used to separate utterances which might be joined by conjunctions in writing. Also, speech is usually less complex with regard to the use of conjunctions, other than fairly simple additive conjunctions like “and”, “but”, etc. This is because of the processing constraints involved in the use of conjunctions which express more complex meaning relations. Task constraints may also influence the number of conjunctions used because, where more processing energy is needed (e.g. in picture descriptions where there are vocabulary retrieval difficulties), simple utterances may be preferred.

5.2.1.2 Noun:verb ratio

The noun:verb ratio indicates the number of subjects and objects per verb. Early development is characterised by a low noun:verb ratio (often 1:1), although very early stages have many nouns and very few verbs. The noun:verb ratio is fairly problematic when measuring an agglutinative language, since, although many morphemes are added to noun or verb stems, the result is not a noun or a verb in terms of form or function. Forms like the copulative are added to the verb to form a verb-noun complex and selecting the forms to count is therefore problematic. Nevertheless, a rough guide to the noun:verb ratio may be obtained by comparing the number of noun stems to the number of verb stems. The following ratios are evident:

Ann	1.4:1
Ben, Pat	1.3:1
Karen, Sarah	1.1:1
Claire	0.9:1

In an agglutinative language, the ratio of stems with morphemes to stems without morphemes might be a more accurate measure of development, since the use of uninflected stems indicates a lower level of development (although there are a few forms which may be correctly omitted, e.g. the subject concord on an imperative). Results of this measurement are presented in the discussion of the use of grammatical morphology in 5.2.1.4.1.

5.2.1.3 Verb complexity

Verb complexity is another measure used by Givón (1979) to measure level of development. Bardovi-Harlig (1994), Schumann (1987) and van Els et al. (1984) also mention that verbal morphology indicates higher levels of development. They look at the auxiliary and modal forms which are used with the verb to measure development. In Xhosa, the auxiliary forms do not have the function of indicating tense as English forms do. For this reason, it is necessary to extend the

category of forms counted to include tense markers. Auxiliaries and verbal extensions are counted because both of these categories are additions to the verb stem. The range of forms (number of different types of morphemes) used by the learners is shown in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2 Range of forms added to the verb

Name	Non-present tense markers	Auxiliary forms	Verbal extensions	Total
Ann	0	0	0	0
Ben	4	0	0	4
Claire	3	2	2	7
Pat	4	0	1	5
Karen	4	3	2	9
Sarah	4	2	2	8

The table indicates that a fairly small range of forms which increase the complexity of the verb phrase is used by these learners. Ranking of learners from lowest range of forms to highest range of forms is as follows:

Ann, Ben, Pat, Claire, Sarah, Karen

The use of tense markers is over 90% for all learners, so verbal morphology is used (although not always correctly or extended beyond the present tense). These learners therefore have a highly syntacticised interlanguage (IL) in Givón's (1979) terms.

5.2.1.4 Use of grammatical morphology

According to Sato (1988), the use of grammatical morphology is one of the most widely researched features of L2 levels of development. Givón (1979) claims that the absence of morphology is a reliable indicator of early language development and different formulae have been used to measure the use of grammatical morphology.

5.2.1.4.1 Morpheme suppliance

Firstly, there is a measure of suppliance of morphemes. This shows whether morphemes are absent in the IL. Pica (cited in Gass & Selinker 1994:45) says that a reliable measure of suppliance should give 2 points to the suppliance of a correct form and 1 point for suppliance of an incorrect

form, as well as an indication of the total number of obligatory contexts. Her formula is the following:

$$\frac{(\text{number of correct suppliance} \times 2) + (\text{number of misformations})}{\text{total obligatory contexts} \times 2}$$

Using this formula across 15 morphemes discussed in chapter 4, the following ranking is obtained for the six learners (the percentage of morphemes supplied is indicated in brackets):

Pat (74%), Claire (77%), Ann and Ben (82%), Sarah (90%), Karen (91%)

It is clear from these figures that these learners do not lack morphology. Even Ann, who has only learnt Xhosa for a short period of time, does not omit a very large number of morphemes. There are several possible explanations for this:

- C this formula may not be an accurate measurement of development for learners of agglutinative languages because of the predominance of morphemes which carry meaning;
- C these learners are not early learners;
- C all these learners have been influenced by the formal context so morpheme use may be higher than for learners in natural contexts. The formal context may help learners to realise that the use of morphemes is vital for Xhosa and they may therefore pay more attention to them (Schmidt 1990; Tomlin & Villa 1994). Measuring morpheme use may not therefore be an accurate way to measure the development of these learners;
- C most morphemes in Xhosa do not have only grammatical functions, but also have semantic functions. Omitting morphemes therefore reduces the meaning which can be conveyed.

5.2.1.4.2 Target-like use

Another similar measure of morpheme use relates to target-like use of morphemes in the data (Pica cited in Gass & Selinker 1994:45). In this formula, the number of forms which are supplied in non-obligatory contexts is included in the calculation. This number is included because learners may use forms where they are not required, which indicates non-target-like use of the morpheme. A weakness of measuring only target-like use is that learners may be using a morpheme to perform a function, but this is not reflected in the calculation (Long & Sato 1984). The formula is as follows:

$$\frac{\text{number of correct supplings in obligatory contexts}}{\text{number of obligatory contexts} + \text{number of supplings in non-obligatory contexts}}$$

The following ranking is found for the learners (the percentage of correct suppliance is provided in brackets):

Pat (61%), Claire (64%), Ben (73%), Ann (74%), Sarah and Karen (86%)

Comparing the figures for morpheme suppliance and target-like use, it is clear that use of morphemes is always higher than target-like use of morphemes. The difference between the two figures is higher for less proficient learners (8%-13%) and lower for more proficient learners (4%-5%). Although learners are using forms of the morphemes to convey a range of functions, they are not always able to provide the correct form of the morpheme.

5.2.1.4.3 Ninety-percent suppliance

Related to the previous measurement, an indication of the number of different morphemes which reach 90% suppliance for each learner reveals the following ranking:

Pat (none)
 Ann (noun prefix)
 Ben (*i*-ending on negatives)
 Claire (*i*-ending on negatives)
 Sarah (noun prefix, subject concord, *i*-ending on negatives)
 Karen (noun prefix, subject concord, *i*-ending on negatives, locatives, demonstratives, associative copulative)

This is a low number of morphemes which can be said to be used in nearly target-like ways, which shows that these learners do not have target-like competence in many morphemes, although they may use them to convey the functions they need in their interlanguages.

5.2.1.4.4 Number of different morphemes in the data

A different way of looking at levels of development with regard to grammatical morphology is to look at the range of morphemes used by each learner. The range of morphemes is obtained by counting the number of different morpheme types (rather than forms of each morpheme) which appear in the data. It should be noted, however, that some morphemes may not be used productively to any great extent. The tenses which are indicated are non-present tenses, since the present tense is used by all learners. Using this ranking, the following pattern emerges:

Ann (15 different types of morphemes)
 Ben (17 different types of morphemes and 4 different tenses)
 Pat (19 different types of morphemes and 4 different tenses)
 Claire (20 different types of morphemes and 3 different tenses)
 Karen (21 different types of morphemes and 4 different tenses)
 Sarah (21 different types of morphemes and 4 different tenses)

The problem with this approach is that learners may know other morphemes but choose to avoid the use of these morphemes in speech (this is supported in the discussion of the morphemes used in written work in section 5.7). Furthermore, they may have alternate ways of producing the morpheme, e.g. using the adverb, *phaya* (there), instead of the demonstrative. Avoidance of morphemes may not mean that they *cannot* produce them, but that they *choose* not to produce these forms. These learners are certainly using only a subset of the full set of morphemes available to the L1 user, so even though 21 different types of morphemes may seem impressive, there are many forms which they do not use and conjugations which they do not employ (e.g. auxiliaries, past tense forms, negatives). It should also be noted that the study is based on a small sample of speech which may not elicit the full range of forms and functions these learners know.

5.2.1.4.5 Range of morphemes used to realise the referential, spatial and temporal functions
The number of different morphemes used to realise the functions investigated in the data also supplies a useful measure of development. Table 5.3 indicates the number of different morphemes used to realise the functions discussed in chapter 4.

Table 5.3 Number of morphemes used to realise each function

Name	Referential function	Spatial function	Temporal function
Ann	4	4	2
Ben	3	3	7
Claire	5	3	6
Pat	6	3	7
Karen	6	4	7
Sarah	6	4	7

This measurement ranks learners against each other, since these forms are only subsets of the number of morphemes available to Xhosa speakers who wish to realise the same functions. The rankings for each of the functions follows, from lowest to highest (the number of morphemes is shown in brackets):

Referential function: Ben (3)
Ann (4)

	Claire (5)
	Pat, Karen, Sarah (6)
Spatial function:	Ben, Claire, Pat (3)
	Ann, Karen, Sarah (4)
Temporal function:	Ann (2)
	Claire (6)
	Ben, Pat, Karen, Sarah (7)

More advanced learners usually use a wider range of morphemes to express particular functions. Overuse of a few forms is characteristic of early IL, since learners use a small range to accomplish as much as possible in terms of communication.

5.2.1.5 Reliability of rankings

The rankings which result from these measures seem to be fairly consistent. Karen is consistently the most advanced learner according to the ranking. Sarah is second to her on all but one measure (range of conjunctions). The lowest ranking is occupied by Ann in 5 instances, by Pat in 3 instances and by Ben in 3 instances. Where range of forms is ranked, Pat is usually higher than Ann and Ben, but where accuracy is measured, she usually scores below them. Pat and Claire occupy the two lowest rankings for morpheme suppliance and target-like use and this may be a result of their high levels of naturalistic input. The formal context which the other four learners have experienced may have played a role in their use of morphemes, although the range of forms they use may develop slowly over a long period of time.

5.2.2 Corder's characteristics of simplified systems

Corder's (1977) list of characteristics of simplified systems includes characteristics which are not mentioned by Givón (1979). According to Corder (1977), the learner's simplified system is characterised by *inter alia*:

- C a simple or virtually non-existent morphological system;
- C more-or-less fixed word order;
- C a simple personal pronoun system;
- C a small number of grammatical function words and grammatical categories;
- C the absence of an article system;
- C some deictic words; and
- C syntactic relations expressed by word order.

The presence of a morphological system has been discussed in section 5.2.1.4.1. It should also be noted that Corder (1997) notes that semantic functions are usually realised by lexical means rather than morphemes in the learner's interlanguage. However, this cannot be entirely true of learners of agglutinative languages because of the greater reliance on morphology to mark semantic functions in these languages.

5.2.2.1 Fixed word order

The word order used by these learners is usually SVO, but this is the word order of both English and Xhosa, and so positive transfer should occur. Nevertheless, word order in Xhosa can deviate from the SVO order for emphasis in discourse. Gough (1992) says that Xhosa is a SV(O) language, but VS also occurs because the subject concord attached to the verb links cataphorically to the subject. This VS structure is used for foregrounding events and is normal for oral narratives where events are important. These learners do not use this VS structure, and prefer to use the SVO pattern, probably because of transfer from English and lack of knowledge of the discourse effects of the choice of VS patterning.

5.2.2.2 Simple personal pronoun system

A simple personal pronoun system can be looked at in two ways. Firstly, there can be a small subset of forms from a larger set of forms of a particular morpheme type. Secondly, only a small range of morphemes employed as pronominals in the target language (TL) may be produced in the IL.

If one considers the personal pronoun system to consist of morphemes for "I/we/he/she/you-sg/you-pl/they", then only Ann is unable to produce all of these forms correctly. She is able to produce singular forms of these pronouns, but confuses plural forms in some places. None of the learners produce the "it" form correctly all the time in the data, and this is probably because of the complexity of the system, which has a range of different agreement forms.

The learners also only produce some of the range of pronominal forms available in the TL. Of the five types of pronouns (absolute, demonstrative, quantitative, emphatic absolute and possessive pronominal stem) discussed by Gough et al. (1989) and du Plessis (1978), the learners produce the absolute pronoun and the possessive pronominal stem. The demonstrative (this/that/that over

there) and the quantitative (all) are not used as pronominal forms, but occur only with the noun. The only exception is the use of the quantitative stem *-odwa* (only), which occurs a few times in an inflected form, *ndedwa* (by myself). The emphatic absolute pronoun is not used at all by these learners, probably because its function is peripheral to their needs. The possessive pronominal stem is usually *-m* (I), and there are problems with other forms of this morpheme (e.g. *-khe* ‘he/she’).

Several studies of pronouns show that they can be confused at early stages (Felix 1981), and that proper nouns are preferred to pronouns. Myles et al. (1999) found that pronouns occur first in formulaic chunks, then they are realised as full NPs and then the pronoun is used correctly. Perdue (1991) found that singular forms appear before plural forms (which seems to be true for Ann), pronouns for animates before inanimates (which can be extrapolated as use of classes 1 and 2 before other classes, which is true only to some extent), and definitely referring NPs before overt pronouns. This last point is realised in several ways in the data, with the use of full object NPs instead of object concords⁶, and full subject noun phrases instead of subject concords. Furthermore, where pronominal forms could appear on their own (e.g. demonstratives), these forms usually occur with the noun.

The use of the NP instead of a pronoun can be explained in two ways. Firstly, the learners use fairly short utterances and the utterances are not always linked together by means of pronominal forms. Each utterance is seen as a new message and the NP is therefore repeated. A second explanation may be that they are avoiding the pronoun, preferring to use the NP which may be easier to retrieve or require less processing power because agreement forms do not have to be accessed.

From a discourse point of view, it is important to note that pronouns are probably not used by these learners as often as L1 users use them, because they use the NP where the pronoun is used by L1 speakers. Baseline data is not available to test this hypothesis, but Gough (1992) says that the VS order where the subject concord is added to the verb is a normal foregrounding move for narratives. The first element of a sentence/utterance is most prominent and emphasized and

⁶ Suzman (1982, 1999) notes similar late acquisition of object concords for L1 and L2 Zulu acquisition.

overuse of the NP by these learners may create non-target-like discourse effects.

Suzman (1982:54) found that Zulu “children first use concord markers as pronominal elements which arise in discourse or in non-linguistic context” and this is also true of this data, where pronominal subject concord forms are used before agreement forms, and object concords are used with pronominal functions before they acquire definiteness functions.

5.2.2.3 Few grammatical function words or grammatical categories

These learners use between 15 and 21 different morphemes, but many of these morphemes have semantic rather than purely grammatical functions. There are very few morphemes which have only a grammatical function in Xhosa, because much of the meaning is carried by morphemes. The only purely grammatical morpheme used by these learners is *-ya-*.

5.2.2.4 Absence of article system

The article system is shown primarily by the use of object concords in Xhosa, since the use of these forms denotes definiteness. Since object concords are used very rarely in the IL of these learners, there is no fully-fledged article system.

Suzman (1982) found in her study of L1 Zulu acquisition that subject-verb agreement occurs before object-verb agreement because object-verb agreement is optional and indicates definiteness. Subject-verb agreement is obligatory and word initial, while object-verb agreement is less salient because of phonetic structure. Objects are realised as full noun phrases in her study, as they are in my study.

5.2.2.5 Some deictic words

There are some deictic words in the IL of the learners in my study because demonstratives and adverbs are used to indicate spatial relationships. The functions of demonstratives for these learners seem to differ from those of L1 speakers. Gough (1992) says that demonstratives function in discourse as definiteness markers and thematic prominence markers rather than spatial deixis indicators for L1 speakers. However, the spatial deixis function is the primary function of demonstratives in my data.

5.2.2.6 Syntactic relations shown by word order

In Xhosa, many syntactic relations are shown by the use of morphemes and these morphemes are usually employed, as shown by the calculations in 5.2.1.4. The common SVO order of English and Xhosa also helps to encode correct syntactic relations, although the subject is not replaced by the subject concord as in TL use (Gough 1992).

5.2.2.7 Conclusion

In conclusion, it appears that the IL of these learners does not conform to all the characteristics of simplified systems mentioned above, which may mean that:

- C they are not early learners; and/or
- C this is not a good set of criteria for measuring development of learners of agglutinative languages.

5.3 SEQUENCES OF MORPHOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

A number of studies have shown that there are fairly common sequences of development for morphemes as a whole. Cazden (1968) lists four periods of development for L1 development which seem to be generalisable to L2 development:

- C no inflection;
- C formulaic;
- C communication with many errors and overgeneralisation;
- C 90% correct use of a form.

Within the development of individual morphemes, this pattern is evident, although it cannot be said to hold true for the IL as a whole because it consists of morphemes at different levels of development. Only a few morphemes reach the 90% correct suppliance level, as indicated in section 5.2.1.4.3. Ann uses formulaic forms before forms with no inflection at early stages of development to some extent, and other studies support her sequence (e.g. Myles et al. 1998; 1999).

A second sequence, specifically for L2 development, is presented by Skiba & Dittmar (1992):

- C words are put next to each other but they are not related;
- C syntax starts to develop;
- C IL and TL converge and syntax and morphology is fairly target-like.

These levels of development are fairly broad and all three levels are found if one looks at

individual morphemes. Looked at from a broader perspective, the IL of learners has examples of all three levels, because morphemes are at different levels of development.

Suzman's (1999) study of L1 Zulu acquisition found that the early sequence of development is:

- Stage 1: singular forms of class 1a, 5 and 9, the subject marker, possessive, demonstratives and pronouns in the first stage (2 years);
- Stage 2: other singular classes 1 and 7, the object concord, relative and adjective and the plural forms of noun classes (2, 6, 8, 10). This second stage is at about 2;6 years;
- Stage 3: complex sentences with pronominals, negative morphemes, verbal extensions including questions, some passives, relative clauses, cleft constructions and expletive/impersonal constructions.

To some extent, the learners in my study follow this pattern. They learn class 1, 2, 9 and 10 forms first (although the lack of number marking is not apparent for them, possibly due to advanced cognitive skills). The possessive and the demonstrative forms are later forms for these learners. Many of the forms from stage 3 are learnt later or appear only in the speech of more advanced learners, as they do for Suzman's subjects.

The sequence of development in Ann's IL is the following:

- 1) Use a formula wherever possible in the context;
- 2) Use a form correctly if it has been recently taught and omit it if not recently taught;
- 3) Use the root form only;
- 4) Learn one form and apply it to several contexts (usually class 1 or 9);
- 5) Use the correct and incorrect forms variably, depending on the retrievability of the vocabulary and the correct morphemes.

Ann's sequence conforms roughly to the three sequences mentioned above, but the influence of the formal learning context needs to be taken into account, as in level 2. Level 2 also supports the findings of the influence of formal instruction which show that if the learner is not ready to acquire the morpheme, it may appear in the interlanguage (IL) immediately after it has been taught but will not remain in the IL (Pienemann 1984; Towell & Hawkins 1994). Levels 3 to 5 concur with Wode's (1981) study of German learners of English.

Ben's sequence of development clearly shows the use of class 1 forms first with extension to a few other classes (e.g. *omnye* (one), negatives and some subject concords). The agreement morphemes seem to develop from agreement in phrases, to agreement in utterances, to agreement

across turns.

For the referential function, Claire develops from using mainly noun phrases to subject concords to pronominal forms to object concords, a sequence also found by Suzman (1999) for L1 learners of Zulu.

Generally, it seems that these learners follow the morphological development patterns found in other studies, which probably means that general language-learning principles apply in this study.

5.3.1 Order of teaching

Although research (discussed in section 2.7) has established that formal teaching probably has very little influence on the construction of the IL system, it is nevertheless necessary to indicate the order in which morphemes were presented to learners in the first year. It is assumed that second- and third-year learners have received formal instruction in all the morphemes presented to first-year learners, as well as additional instruction on other elements of the grammatical system. This does not necessarily imply, however, that these forms have been incorporated into their interlanguages. In particular, it is noticeable that although forms appear briefly in the learners' interlanguages soon after they have been taught, their use may atrophy over time (e.g. demonstratives appear in interview 3 and they are forgotten by interview 7 for Ann). At later stages, the production probably relies on an internalised system rather than the formally taught system, although the acquisition of the internalised system may be hastened by the demands of the formal situation. The positive influence of formal instruction on the rate of acquisition is seen in Karen and Sarah whose performance on many morphemes is better than Claire's, even though Claire has been learning Xhosa for a longer period of time and probably has had more exposure to it than any of the other learners.

In Table 5.4, the order of teaching, the order of appearance of morphemes and the order of accuracy of morphemes are contrasted for Ann. She seems to be the learner most likely to be influenced by the formal context since she has no input from naturalistic contexts. "Order of teaching" refers to when the forms are first taught, although some forms are revised and/or retaught after the first teaching. "Order of accuracy" refers to the average accuracy of use of a morpheme over the course of the interviews (although this obscures development).

Table 5.4 Comparison of order of teaching, appearance and accuracy for Ann

Order of teaching (date in brackets)	Order of appearance in interviews (date in brackets)	Semantic/ grammatical morpheme	Order of accuracy
noun prefix (23/2)	interview 1 (16/3)	mainly grammatical, partly semantic	1
subject concord (9/3)	interview 1 (16/3)	semantic and grammatical	5
- <i>ya-</i> (9/3)	interview 1 (16/3)	grammatical	3
<i>na-/nga-</i> (with) (16/3)	interview 3 (18/5)	semantic	2
copulative (23/3)	interview 3 (18/5)	semantic and grammatical	6
demonstrative, 1 st position (23/3)	interview 2 (20/4)	semantic and grammatical	8
negatives (13/4)	interview 2 (20/4)	semantic and grammatical	12
demonstrative, 2 nd position (4/5)	interview 3 (18/5)	semantic and grammatical	never correct
demonstrative, 3 rd position (11/5)	never	semantic and grammatical	not used
<i>na-</i> (have) (12/5)	interview 7 (19/10)	semantic	11
qualificative (12/5)	interview 3 (18/5)	semantic and grammatical	10
qualificative <i>a-</i> (12/5)	interview 4 (27/7)	semantic and grammatical	9
possessive (3/8)	interview 5 (24/8)	semantic and grammatical	7
absolute pronouns (24/8)	interview 4 (27/7)	semantic and grammatical	used only 3 times, so ranking is not reliable
locatives (5/10)	interview 3 (prototypical forms) (18/5)	semantic	4
future tense (19/10)	never	semantic	not used

From the above data, it is not possible to say that morphemes which fulfill semantic functions are always learned before morphemes which fulfill grammatical functions. Firstly, many morphemes with semantic functions have grammatical functions as well. Secondly, the only morpheme with a purely grammatical morpheme which appears in the data, *-ya-*, occurs before several semantic morphemes. On the other hand, the learners may not produce some of the other possible grammatical morphemes and this would mean that these forms *are* acquired later than semantic forms. For example, some of the functions of the subjunctive and the participial are primarily grammatical, and these forms are rarely realised in the data, and only appear in the ILs of more advanced learners.

It is clear from Table 5.4 that the order of teaching does not necessarily correlate with the order of appearance⁷ or the order of accuracy, since locatives appear in the data long before they are formally taught.

5.4 GENERAL SEQUENCES OF DEVELOPMENT FOR MORPHEMES

As found in the morpheme studies (see Wode 1981 for an overview), it is not possible to work out an *exact* sequence of development of morphemes found in this study. Instead, it is only possible to indicate which morphemes appear earlier and which appear later (*cf.* Andersen 1978). This could be interpreted as a weakness since it does not tell us enough about the sequences of development. However, I feel that even fairly tentative indications of a sequence of development can be useful. Firstly, the sequence tells us about the functions necessary to communicate at early levels of development. Secondly, it tells us which forms learners feel they need to pay attention to when they are learning to speak the new language. Thirdly, comparisons can be made between the interlanguages of different languages by looking at the functions performed by the morphemes, and generalisations can be made from this type of comparison. Fourthly, it can serve as a guide as to whether morphemes should be taught earlier or later, so that the natural acquisition sequence can be maximally utilised.

Finding a sequence of development across learners is difficult because there is a difference between a sequence based on order of appearance and one based on accuracy. A further

⁷ The forms recently taught are included in the elicitation tasks so the order of appearance may not be a reliable indicator of natural development.

problematic feature is avoidance, where learners are able to use a form in their class work and tests, but it never appears in the oral IL of the interviews. These morphemes cannot be captured in the sequence of development which I present because it is based on the oral IL. Another possible problem is that some forms occur or occur more frequently in the oral data because they are required in the elicitation tasks. Nevertheless, an analysis of the use of forms shows that all forms appear in all tasks at some point in the interviews, although frequency and number of errors may differ⁸. It is also important to note that some studies (Ellis 1987b; Krashen et al. 1976) claim that orders are disrupted for formal elicitation tasks.

5.4.1 Order of appearance

Using a measure of order of appearance (based mainly on Ann's forms at early stages since other learners have already acquired most of the forms), the following sequence is found:

Early acquisition (appear in 1 st interview for Ann):	noun prefix subject concord -ya-
Later acquisition (appear in 2 nd /3 rd interview for Ann):	locatives in the prototypical form <i>na-/nga-</i> (with) qualificative demonstrative negative subject concord adverb copulative
Even later acquisition (only from 4 th interview for Ann):	conjunction qualificative <i>a-</i> absolute pronoun possessive associative copulative (have)
Latest acquisition (never in some learners):	non-prototypical locative additive conjunction object concord participial extensions on verbs <i>njenga-</i> (like)

⁸ It should be noted that several morphemes occur too infrequently (below 50 occurrences) for analysis to determine reliable ordering.

In order to support the findings on development, comparisons of the interviews which were repeated (interviews 2 and 5, and 3 and 7) can show that some forms appear later in the IL in equivalent contexts. It is clear from a comparison of interviews for Ann that there is development in her IL, mainly in terms of the range of morphemes which is available to express particular meanings. The morphemes which do not appear in 2, but which are used in 5, include copulatives and possessives. Demonstratives and locatives are found in both interviews, as is a preference for the forms *ndi-* (I) and *u-* (you/he/she). There are also similar errors in both interviews, e.g.:

*Ihashe *ukutya ingca* (A2T)

*Ihashe *ukutya ingca* (A5T)

Horse to eat/food grass

Ihashe litya ingca.

‘The horse eats grass.’

This example shows continued difficulty with the multifunctional *ku-* form, which can be a class 15 agreement form or an infinitive.

An example which shows a wider range of morphemes in an equivalent utterance follows:

*Amehlo *umkhulu* (A2C)

Eyes are big

Amehlo amakhulu

‘Eyes that are big’

**Igamehlo *nehashe *ezinkulu* (A5C)

Eyes and horse that are big

Amehlo ehashe amakhulu

‘Eyes of the horse that are big’

In the first example, Ann uses a qualificative agreement form to indicate the qualificative and the utterance contains no qualificative *a-*. In interview 5, although the forms are incorrect, she has added a possessive and the qualificative *a-* form.

Another example shows how Ann’s vocabulary increases over the course of the interviews:

inyama (A2T)

meat

*Abazali *basenga inyama kodwa abantwana *basenga* (A5T)

Parents they milk meat but children milk

Abazali bathenga inyama kodwa abantwana bathenga (iilekese).

‘Parents buy meat but children buy (sweets).’

This example shows development from what is usually a word or two (nouns and verbs) to utterances which use the locative and some qualificatives. The utterance length therefore increases.

Ben's development can be measured in terms of:

- C complexification (wider range of morphemes used in an utterance, e.g. demonstratives, *na-/nga-* (with), infinitive added);
- C increased accuracy when using the morphemes (e.g. demonstratives, possessives, coalescence); and
- C an increase in the number of times morphemes are used (e.g. copulatives, future tense).

Claire, Pat, Karen and Sarah do not show the same types of development. Their use of forms seems to be fairly fossilised in terms of complexification, accuracy and number of times morphemes are used.

5.4.2 Morpheme suppliance

Using measures of suppliance and accurate suppliance, Table 5.5 shows the values and rankings of the top fifteen morphemes across the learners. The "average suppliance" value shows how often each morpheme is used (correctly and incorrectly) in the data. The "average for accurate use" value shows how often the morpheme is supplied correctly in the data. Rankings are given for each of these values as an indication of which forms are used and acquired first. It should be noted that these are average values and that there is some deviation from these sequences for individual learners.

Table 5.5 Suppliance of top fifteen morphemes

Morpheme	Suppliance average	Ranking	Average for accurate use ⁹	Ranking
Noun prefix	92.5%	1	89%	1
<i>i</i> -ending on negative	89.3%	2	89.3%	2
Subject concord	87.6%	3	79.9%	4
Locative	87.5%	4	81.4%	3
Associative copulative	87.2%	5	79.2%	5
Negative subject concord	84.7%	6	69.4%	7
<i>na-/nga-</i> (with)	84.5%	7	77.3%	6
Possessive	80.2%	8	66.7%	10
Demonstrative	80.1%	9	68.4%	8
Qualificative	73.2%	10	55.3%	12
Copulative	70.8%	11	68%	9
Qualificative <i>a-</i>	68%	12	59.5%	11
Additive conjunction	58.9%	13	52%	13
<i>-ya-</i>	57.3%	14	19.2%	15
Object concord	52.9%	15	44.9%	14

Suppliance sequences and order of appearance sequences are slightly different, but this may be partly because of the influence of Ann's data on the order of appearance list (see 5.4.1).

5.4.3 Comparison with English sequences of development

Comparison with English is highly problematic, because in Xhosa many morphemes mark functions which are encoded lexically in English. Comparing Xhosa morphemes, with their strongly semantic functions, and English morphemes, which do not always have such a strong semantic function, is not particularly productive. Indeed, even the functions of forms in the two

⁹ Some of these values are slightly different from those in the tables in chapter 4, because of the inclusion of unnecessary use which is not always indicated in the tables in chapter 4.

sequences do not appear to match. A comparison with the English sequence of development is made in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6 Comparison of English and Xhosa sequences of development

English morpheme in order of appearance ¹⁰	Function of English morpheme	Comment on Xhosa form and order of acquisition
<i>-ing</i>	marks aspect	Xhosa aspect is marked by forms of the subject concord, but aspectual marking is not an early form in my data.
plural <i>-s</i>	marks number	Number marking occurs on the noun prefix in Xhosa and these morphemes occur early, as they do for English.
copula	form of the verb	The copulative is acquired late in my data.
auxiliary	marks temporality, tentativeness (may/might/could), ability (can/could), intention (shall/should)	These functions are not marked by auxiliaries until fairly late in my data, and some non-temporal functions are not marked at all for some learners.
article	marks definiteness or indefiniteness	The equivalent form, the object concord, is one of the latest acquired forms for learners in my study.
irregular past	marks temporality	Past forms are learnt relatively late, as they seem to be in the English sequence.
regular past	marks temporality	same as above
third-person singular agreement	purely grammatical function	There is no equivalent morpheme in Xhosa.
possessive	marks possession	This form is marked fairly early for learners in my study.

5.5 EXPLANATION OF THE SEQUENCE OF DEVELOPMENT IN MY STUDY

Several explanations of the sequence of development seem plausible, although a range of explanations is needed to account for all occurrences and several may be applicable to some morphemes.

¹⁰ This is the English order of acquisition reported by Krashen (cited in Zobl 1995).

5.5.1 Morphemes as foundations in utterances

The noun prefix seems to be the first form learnt, probably because of the central role it plays in the selection of morphemes in the remainder of the utterance. The importance of this morpheme as the foundation for further morphological choices may be the reason for its high level of suppliance.

Practice seems to mean that forms can become automatized and retrieved more quickly (Robinson 1997a, b). Some morphemes (e.g. noun prefixes) occur very often and may therefore be memorised fairly quickly. Verbal forms are also foundations of utterances and the most simple associated morphology may therefore appear early.

5.5.2 Links to thematic roles

Robert's (1989) view of the interlanguage (IL) system is that it consists of a computational system and a conceptual system (discussed in section 2.5.3). Thematic relations are important in the conceptual system. To some extent, this may be true of the IL produced by these learners, since functional constraints seem to be important determiners of the use of morphemes.

Radford (1988:373) mentions eight thematic roles: theme/patient, agent/actor, experiencer, benefactive, instrumental, locative, goal and source. An analysis of the thematic roles in my data shows that the use of the agent, patient/theme and locative functions (the location, goal and source functions are realised by the locative morpheme) is predominant. Since these three thematic roles are primary, the required morphemes appear early. The benefactive and instrumental functions occur occasionally, with the latter usually shown by *nga-/na-* (with) or left to the context. The benefactive function is usually shown by the verb which has two arguments (direct object and indirect object) or an applicative extension *-ela*, which only appears in the utterances of more advanced learners. The experiencer role is not apparent in the data, perhaps because of the elicitation tasks which have been used.

5.5.3 Agreement functions vs. Semantic functions

Most morphemes do not have only an agreement function, but encode semantic information and perform core discourse functions as well. It is therefore necessary to use morphemes to convey semantic and discourse functions even if the forms are incorrect.

If selection of a morpheme is based more on grammar than on semantics, the form may not be used. For example, the verbal relative *-yo* has both a grammatical and a semantic function, but the semantic function can also be encoded at the beginning of the stem, so the *-yo* form is not always produced. The form *-ya-* has a grammatical function, and although it appears early, it is not produced accurately by some learners.

5.5.4 Invariant forms

Some invariant forms (e.g. *i*-ending on negatives) seem to be among the earliest forms learnt. The invariant forms seem to be cognitively easier to acquire and may therefore appear fairly early, perhaps especially so for these learners who have to learn so many agreement forms. Furthermore, formal instruction may be successful if rules are *simple* and consistent (de Graaff 1997; DeKeyser 1995; Robinson 1997a, b).

5.5.5 Intraphrasal forms

Suzman (1999:139), in a discussion of L1 Zulu acquisition, notes that “(a)s a general observation, agreement markers with primarily pronominal function overgeneralize while agreement markers within the noun phrase are accurate.” Here she is referring to morphemes such as the qualificative. However, this is clearly not true of my data, since qualificative forms are acquired fairly late and agreement forms are not always correct.

5.5.6 Extension of the basic utterance

Forms which extend the core message are acquired later in my data. The learners’ focus may be on basic nouns, verbs and location forms at the beginning, because these forms are important for the message which they convey. Once learners have some measure of control over these forms, they may be willing to expand their utterances with qualificatives, demonstratives, etc.

5.5.7 Lexical equivalence to English

The locative encodes forms which would be prepositions and adverbs in English and the associative copulative encodes the English lexical form “have”. In order to translate successfully from English, these forms need to be learned early and it might explain their early appearance in the sequence of development.

5.5.8 Embedded forms

Forms which expand the utterance to a complex or compound structure are learned later (Wode 1981). The qualificative *a-* and the additive conjunction fall into this category, and these forms appear late in the sequence of development.

5.5.9 Free vs. Bound forms

The forms discussed in the sequence of development of morpheme suppliance (section 5.4.2) are bound forms, but some forms like adverbs appear in the middle stages of the order of appearance sequence (section 5.4.1). These forms are free lexical forms and this may explain their relatively early development (Wode 1981).

5.6 AVOIDANCE PATTERNS IN THE DATA

Avoidance of morphemes is an important strategy to take into account in IL analysis (Kleinmann 1977; Schachter 1974). Gass & Selinker (1994:26) say that “one cannot interpret data only on the basis of what is present, because we do not know if absence of forms means lack of knowledge of forms.” Avoidance takes three forms in the data of my study:

- C omissions of forms, with reliance on context for interpretation;
- C substitution of other forms for a morpheme; and
- C restructuring of utterances to avoid the production of a difficult morpheme.

Examples of these patterns include:

- C avoidance of demonstratives which show distance from the speaker and replacement by adverbs (*phaya*, *apho* “there”);
- C avoidance of non-present tense forms. In these cases, learners rely on the context to indicate the necessary tense of the utterance;
- C overuse of some subject concord pronominal forms instead of other subject concord forms in the sentence-building task;
- C avoiding forms like *njenga-* (like), participials and conjunctions by producing different utterances rather than joining parts of utterances to form more complex forms;
- C avoiding object concords and the definiteness which their use would imply and leaving interpretation of definiteness to the context;
- C avoiding pronominal forms by repeating the noun phrase;
- C overusing one form to express particular functions; e.g. overuse of adverbs rather than tense indicators and locatives;
- C choosing to produce only simple utterances using forms that the learner feels he/she can control; and
- C overgeneralising one agreement form.

Avoidance seems to result from an attempt to decrease processing loads by choosing lexical items

or single forms rather than agreement forms, reliance on the context to infer meaning, and a lack of knowledge of forms.

5.7 PERFORMANCE ON DIFFERENT TASKS

A comparison of the performance of these students on different spoken and written tasks is necessary to provide a more complete picture of their development and capabilities.

As mentioned in section 3.2.3.3.2, the use of class work as an indicator of development is problematic because students may have access to charts which contain the correct forms of morphemes. Incorrect forms may therefore occur less frequently if the learner has grasped the function of the morpheme and knows where it should be used. A further limitation is that some class tasks call for performance on a particular, specified morpheme so that their use may not be a good indicator of knowledge of the function of the morpheme. DeKeyser (1997) also notes that although learners may be able to produce forms in the classroom situation where the task is narrowly defined and the permutations are limited, they may not be able to apply the forms to other contexts.

Nevertheless, there is evidence in the test and examination scripts that learners can produce a wider range of forms than they produce in the oral data. This may point to avoidance in some contexts or to the ability to produce forms in only one context. The level of learned metalinguistic knowledge which can be applied in the test situation should also not be discounted.

In the oral interviews, exercises which give the learner the greatest level of control over the content and subject matter seem to be supplied most fluently and correctly (e.g. building sentences from words). They are not listening to the interviewer, struggling to comprehend the message and trying to find vocabulary which meets the demands of Thembi's questions all at once. Instead, they control the topic and they can select more routinised, familiar patterns.

Ann

In the first few interviews, most spoken utterances are about two to three words long and when they are longer than this, problems appear in choosing and including the correct concordial element. Ann's written work is generally better than her oral data. Her tests show problems with

class 4, 5, 6, and 9 subject concords, negative concords (although these forms are more often correct than in the oral data), and qualificative concords. She only uses the existential with weather terms, which is similar to her oral data. Nevertheless, some forms are better in tests than in oral data, and she uses *ka-* possessive forms and correct copulatives in tests. The positive effect of learning for a test may explain the observation, but test effects are usually temporary and have little effect on the IL system. Some forms therefore appear correctly in the written work or in tests where they are incorrect in the oral data.

Ann's lack of vocabulary interferes with her performance on the dictation tests, although her dictation texts begin to resemble Xhosa texts by the end of the interview period. In the grammaticality judgements, she notices coalescence problems and some agreement problems (although they are usually wrongly corrected until interview 7).

Ben

Ben's range of morphemes is slightly wider in his written work (e.g. he uses absolute pronouns and demonstratives in all three positions), but many of the errors are similar to those in his spoken language. In the written work, negative forms are correct, the *hamba/ya* (go/go towards) confusion remains, marked classes have more errors and non-prototypical locatives are sometimes incorrect. The qualificative *a-* also shows errors. Coalescence is better in the written work, possibly because of the time available to consider the correct form.

Ben's dictation tests resemble Xhosa texts from the first interview, although several forms are omitted. Familiarity with the vocabulary of the tests seems to influence correctness of morpheme forms, which may indicate that extra processing energy is needed to produce morphemes. Agreement forms and coalescence are usually appropriately corrected in the grammaticality-judgement tasks.

Claire

Claire's written work reproduces many of the same errors which she makes in her spoken data, but the range of morphemes she uses is smaller (probably because she is not usually required to produce spontaneous writing on a scale larger than the sentence). Although her written work appears to be slightly better than her spoken data in terms of frequency of errors, the types of

errors remain the same (e.g. overuse of *-ya-*, lack of agreement). She appears to have more qualificative *a-* problems in her writing than in her oral data, which may mean that many of the forms she uses in oral data are automatized. Other problematic morphemes are absolute pronouns, possessives, and the associative copulative. Her written and spoken performances seem to be quite similar, except that there is a much wider range of morphemes in her spoken data.

Claire seems to find the dictation tests difficult and often produces stems without agreement morphemes. Her spoken ability appears to be superior to performance on this task. One reason for this finding may be that she is unfamiliar with written forms of Xhosa and may not know how to encode forms with which she is familiar. In the grammaticality-judgement task, coalescence is usually corrected and her performance on correcting incorrect agreement forms improves over the course of the interview period.

Pat

Pat's range of morphemes in her written class work is wider than the range of forms she uses in oral data. She adds to her written repertoire passives, some object concord pronominal forms, more conjunctions, a few subjunctive forms and negative forms of a range of tenses. However, she fails all her tests because she makes many similar errors to the ones in the oral data. As in her oral data, she makes many concord errors, she overuses *-ya-*, and she uses the subject concord + *nayo* form for the associative copulative. Her test forms and her oral forms are therefore fairly similar, while some written essay work appears to be better than her oral data (probably because of the resources available to find agreement forms).

For Pat, the first two dictations are fairly poor with many forms left off. Subject concords cause problems and there are interchangeable forms for classes 2 and 6, as in the oral data. The present tense indicative form is preferred and clicks cause perception problems. From interview 3, dictations are better, perhaps because the vocabulary is more familiar. Where interviews are repeated, the dictation is markedly better in the repeat interview. In the grammaticality judgements, Pat wrongly corrects many agreement forms, but coalescence problems are usually corrected. What is interesting is that in repeated interviews, Pat makes almost exactly the same corrections, which may point to stability in her underlying IL system.

Karen

In the interviews, Karen uses correct forms when she has a high level of control over the content (e.g. sentence-building tasks) and translation is particularly good. Grammaticality judgements are usually excellent and the dictation tests are nearly perfect towards the end of the data-collection period. The vocabulary is presumably very familiar for these tasks and the morphemes do not seem to cause many problems. For the grammaticality-judgement tasks, the extra time available to consider forms and the written nature of the input may help her to make correct judgements.

The written work which Karen presents in class and in examinations shows a higher level of development than the forms she produces in the oral interviews. She uses a wider range of morphemes and these are usually used correctly. Some of the errors which she makes in the oral data hardly ever appear in her written work (e.g. incorrect agreement forms for subject concords, possessives, etc.). She also uses a range of auxiliary morphemes, passives, past and future tense forms, and negative forms more often than these appear in the oral data (although these may be a result of the tasks set for the class and may not reflect natural use of the forms). She makes errors with some tenses, and object concords are not always used where necessary. The time available to her seems to influence her performance, as found in several studies of the effect of planning time on fluency, accuracy and complexity (Crookes 1989; Foster & Skehan 1996; Ortega 1999).

Sarah

Sarah uses a slightly wider range of morphemes in her written class work and examinations than in her oral data, adding the use of the potential mood and a wider range of conjunctions. However, her written abilities seem to be quite close to her spoken abilities and she makes the same kind of errors in both contexts. It is probably fair to say that her spoken IL is quite close to her written IL and that the interviews are a fair reflection of her Xhosa ability. Many of the written errors she makes are similar to those in her spoken data (e.g. incorrect choices of agreement forms, using the terminative *-e* form on verbs in the remote past tense, and using the same tenses as she uses in the oral data).

Sarah struggles with dictation tests when vocabulary is unfamiliar, but tests with fairly basic vocabulary show a knowledge of the agreement system and correct use of most morphemes. Most

incorrect agreement forms are appropriately corrected in the grammaticality-judgement tests, although grammatical forms like the subjunctive are not supplied where necessary.

5.8 CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed common patterns of morpheme choice which are evident in the data and has compared these patterns to those found in other studies. Many of the patterns and principles are common to my study and other studies of L1 and L2 acquisition. This may point to common language-learning principles which operate when learning a range of different languages. However, it is also evident that there are acquisition patterns which can be attributed to the complexities of the agglutinative structure and that these patterns are not found in typologically different languages. These patterns create difficulties for comparison with other studies and, in particular, the methods used to measure levels of L2 development.

In the concluding chapter, the findings of my study are compared to the findings relating to the Basic Variety.

CHAPTER 6

COMPARISONS WITH THE BASIC VARIETY AND CONCLUSION

6.0 INTRODUCTION

In this final chapter, comparisons are made in selected areas between the findings of the European Science Foundation (ESF) study (Klein & Perdue 1993, 1997; Perdue 1993b) and the findings of my study. Suggestions for further research are also discussed in this chapter.

6.1 COMPARISONS WITH THE ESF STUDY

Since one of the main findings of the ESF study is the existence of a learner variety called the Basic Variety (BV), this comparison will focus on the BV and whether selected characteristics of the BV are evident in my data. Since my study has focussed mainly on the forms which appear in the interlanguage (IL) of learners of Xhosa and the morphological development evident in the data, the aspects of the BV which relate to these two areas will be the focus of this section.

6.1.1 Why might there be points of similarity?

Before comparing the findings, it is necessary to ask why there might be similarities between the findings of the two studies. The main reason is that, on the basis of the literature reviewed in chapter 2 and the common learning principles found in my data and other studies, it seems reasonable to hypothesise that there might be similarities between the BV and the learner language produced in my study.

The second point is that the ESF study is a cross-linguistic study which found points of similarity between the ILs produced by learners of a range of languages. On the basis of these similarities, it might be expected that there would be points of comparison with the IL found in my study.

A third point is that formal instruction seems to have a limited effect on the IL (see section 2.7) and, as a result, the BV and the IL of the learners of my study may be comparable. Klein & Perdue (1997) hesitate to generalise the BV beyond naturalistic contexts of learning, although they also say that the BV *is* observed outside the classroom for learners who learn L2s in formal contexts.

Finally, the learners in my study are fairly early learners if one looks at the amount of input they have received. Learners who have had only formal input have spent roughly 100 - 130 hours in formal classes per year¹. If one compared the learners in the ESF study (who are immersed in the language in an immigrant situation) with the learners of my study, one would probably find that the ESF learners are exposed to more of the target language and use it much more than the learners in my study.

6.1.2 Why might there be differences between the BV and the learner language in my study? Klein & Perdue (1997) may be correct in their hesitancy to generalise the BV beyond naturalistic contexts of learning, especially if learners have been exposed *only* to formal input, where the focus is on morphology. Most learners in my study have had very little exposure to Xhosa in naturalistic contexts and much of their input is written. Written input allows more time to focus on morphology, since one can move beyond looking only for the meaning of stems to find the main message (as learners in my study say they do when listening to oral input). Studies discussed in section 2.7 also point to the earlier acquisition of forms when learners are exposed to input in formal contexts, which means that learners may move beyond the BV fairly quickly. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the learners do not use a BV at any stage in their development, although they may use it for only a short period of time.

The typological differences between the languages learned in the ESF study and the language learnt in my study may lead to differences in findings (see also Giacalone Ramat, 1992, who found that learners of Italian learnt morphology fairly early because of the importance of morphology in that language). The agglutinative structure of Xhosa may override some of the constraints on learning morphology found in languages where morphology does not play such an essential semantic role. In Xhosa, the learner cannot ignore morphology because it is too semantically important. Indeed, many morphemes in Xhosa are the equivalent of lexical items in isolating or analytic languages. In order to produce equivalent messages, one would need to learn the morphology.

¹ However, it should be noted that most of the class time is spent talking in English because explanations are provided almost exclusively in English. Learners may also spend some time doing homework and learning for tests and examinations, but, as mentioned in 3.2.1.1, not a lot of time is devoted to Xhosa outside the classroom by most learners in my study.

Another reason why the ESF study and my study may not be comparable is that the learners' language in my study may be too far developed; i.e. they may not be at sufficiently early levels of development. Development can be related to amount of exposure, but, as noted above, the amount of input to which they have been exposed is fairly low and some of the input has been sporadic or occurred a long time ago. Development can also be measured according to the type of language produced (e.g. use or omission of morphology, subordination, etc.). In this regard, learners in my study may have moved beyond the BV because of the input from formal contexts to which they have been exposed.

A final reason why the two studies may not be comparable is that many of the forms produced in my study may be routinised forms which include both stems and morphemes (e.g. noun stems may be routinised as noun prefix + noun stem). In the mind of the learner, some of the morphology may not in fact be additional morphology, but may be integrally related to the stem so that the two are indistinguishable. The overgeneralisation of some forms may also support this point.

There are, therefore, reasons for expecting similarities and reasons for expecting differences between the findings of the two studies. In the next section, a comparison between the BV and the IL of learners in my study is made.

6.1.3 Comparison of Basic Variety forms and forms in the IL of learners in my study

6.1.3.1 Linguistic elements in the BV and my study

Table 6.1 is a comparison of the linguistic elements found in the BV (Carroll & Dietrich 1985; Klein & Perdue 1997; Perdue 1993b) and those found in my study.

Table 6.1 Comparison of linguistic elements in the BV and my study

Linguistic form	In the BV?	In my study?	Comment
Proper names, noun-like words, verb-like words	o	o	
Adverbial-like words (temporal and spatial)	o	o	
Numerals	o	o	
Personal pronouns	o	o	
Anaphoric pronouns for inanimate objects	x	o	the form for “it” is problematic, but it is supplied
Word for negation	o	(o)	some use of <i>hayi</i> (no), but usually by means of negative morphemes
Determiners which are demonstratives rather than articles	o	o	demonstratives have spatial reference function, object concord system not fully developed
Formulaic utterances	o	o	
Copula	x	(o)	copulative morpheme is used, but function is not always known
Prepositions	x	o	some free forms, mainly realised by the common locative morpheme
Invariant morphological forms	o	(o)	some invariant forms, most have a restricted range rather than invariant form
Morphemes with purely grammatical functions	x	(o)	only one (- <i>ya-</i>)
Finite morphology marking tense and aspect	x	(o)	tense is marked, but aspect is not usually marked
Agreement in number	x	o	
Agreement in gender	x	o	central to the Xhosa class system and it appears early ²
Agreement by morphology	x	o	central to the Xhosa agglutinative structure and it appears early

²The masculine, feminine, (neuter) gender system of many Indo-European languages is replaced by the class system in Xhosa.

A comparison of the linguistic elements in the BV and the IL of the learners in my study shows that they appear to have developed beyond the BV. Their IL contains the elements of the BV, but it also contains elements which show that it is probably more advanced than the Basic Variety level (e.g. in terms of morphology, anaphoric pronouns for inanimate objects, prepositions, copula). Some morphemes, such as tense, are supplied variably or realised by a restricted range of forms by the learners in my study. Nevertheless, morphology is used in their IL.

Should one conclude then that the learners in my study have moved beyond the BV level? One argument in favour of this conclusion is that they produce forms which Klein & Perdue (1997) say show that learners have moved beyond Basic Variety level of development (e.g. morphology, prepositions). However, a closer analysis of these forms shows that their presence can be closely linked to the language typology of Xhosa, where morphology is the usual means of indicating negation, many prepositions, tense, anaphoric pronouns for inanimate objects, copula forms, agreement, number and gender. In fact, the present tense, anaphoric pronouns for inanimate objects, agreement, number and gender can all be indicated by the use of one type of morpheme: the subject concord. This means that as soon as learners are able to manipulate the subject concord, they are able to perform this wide range of functions. I would therefore hesitate to claim that the presence of morphology indicating these forms means that learners have moved beyond the Basic Variety level. Instead, I would argue that because morphology is so important in Xhosa, learners would need to produce a far wider range of forms in order to be said to be approaching target-like usage (as Klein & Perdue, 1997, claim learners are doing when they move beyond the BV). It might, in fact, be more useful to posit a slightly different type of BV for agglutinative languages.

6.1.3.2 Phrasal constraints

Klein & Perdue (1997) find that the usual word order is Agent-Verb-Patient in the ESF study. They also mention that this relates to the SVO pattern of fully-fledged languages, but they hesitate to give elements of the BV status as subject, verb or object. This is because subjects and objects may be noun-like forms rather than nouns, and verbs may not be finite forms. Furthermore, they find that subjects and objects are not the primary means of organising the BV. Instead, it is organised by means of semantic principles with elements in topic and focus position.

In the IL of the learners in my study, the SVO pattern is used and the Agent-Verb-Patient pattern is also common. Nevertheless, other thematic roles are also assigned and, in particular, the location role appears early. The nouns which occupy subject and object positions may also be expanded by the use of descriptive elements such as qualificatives. English and Xhosa both have the SVO structure, so positive transfer can occur.

According to Bierwisch (1997), the basic phrasal pattern found in the BV is:

(NP)-V-(XP-(XP)) where X = Noun, Adjective or Preposition, depending on the subcategorization of V.

Adverbial forms may also occur before or after the basic pattern.

This pattern is found in the IL of learners of my study, but they also expand this pattern because some of them use conjunctions and subordinating forms. Subordination is not found in the BV (Perdue 1993b) and, as a result, it appears that the learners in my study are indeed more advanced than the BV level (although their subordination patterns do not reach target-like levels of use).

6.1.3.3 Levels of development

Klein & Perdue's (1993:25) levels of development are "from nominal to infinite to finite utterance organisation". At the nominal level, learners produce mainly noun-like forms and there is no functional morphology, case role assignment or argument structure. At the infinite level, verb-like forms appear but there is no "distinction between the finite and non-finite component of the verb" (Klein & Perdue 1993:25). The finite level includes verbs which make the finite/infinite distinction.

If one looks only at the markers of finiteness in Xhosa, one has to conclude that the learners in my study are at the finite level of development (although there is some backsliding when they omit these forms). From the "summary of subject concord data" (Table 4.10 in section 4.4.2), it is clear that omission of the subject concord (and therefore finiteness markers) is relatively rare and all six learners reach the 90% suppliance criterion for this morpheme. In fact, this is one of the earliest acquired morphemes, rather than a late form as the BV predicts.

Furthermore, because of the range of morphology which appears in Xhosa, I find the use of a measure which looks mainly at verbal morphology problematic. As indicated in section 6.1.3.1,

one set of verbal morphology would suffice to move the learner beyond the infinite level if only verbal morphology were taken into account in the measurement. Instead of this narrow view, I believe that one needs to consider morphology which occurs on noun stems, qualificative stems, etc. Without this morphology, the learner is not approaching target-like use in agglutinative languages, as the finite level of development suggests in non-agglutinative languages.

Based on the findings of my study, I would suggest that the following levels of development might prove useful when measuring development of Xhosa interlanguage:

Stage 1: use of nouns, verbs and locatives;

Stage 2: expansion of the noun phrase and verb phrase to include qualificatives, demonstratives, possessives, etc.;

Stage 3: complexification of verbal morphology to increase the range of tenses, aspect, and verbal extensions, as well as the development of subordination;

Stage 4: expansion of the functions of the forms which appear in earlier stages, and development of target-like discourse norms relating to use of morphology.

I suggest that morphology appears from stage 1, although its use may be variable. The number and types of different morphemes which appear in the IL is important when measuring development in a language which relies extensively on morphology to encode meaning. Increases in the use of morphology go hand-in-hand with the development of the range of functions which can be expressed in the IL. Increasingly target-like use of morphemes can be measured by an increase in accuracy and an increase in the target-like functions of morphemes, as shown in stage 4.

6.1.4 Conclusion

It appears from the above points that the findings of the two studies are different in several ways. The learners of my study use the forms found in the BV, but they also use forms which do not appear in the BV. However, concluding that this means that learners in my study have moved beyond the BV is problematic. Instead, it appears that the BV may not be an adequate description of the level of development of early learners of Xhosa. The use of morphemes appears to be too widespread in Xhosa for one to rely mainly on a measure of use of verbal morphology to indicate that learners are approaching target-like use. Furthermore, the effect of the formal context on the

IL of the learners of my study is unclear. Exposure to the formal context probably hastened the acquisition of morphology and it may have meant that these learners proceeded very quickly through the early stages of development.

6.2 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

As a result of the conclusions reached above, there are a number of areas which need further research in the field of acquisition of forms in languages which are typologically different from inflectional and analytic languages.

Firstly, more studies of the second-language acquisition of morphological forms in other African languages are needed in order to compare findings with those of my study. The order of acquisition may be strongly related to the order of teaching in my study, although studies of the influence of formal input suggest that order of teaching may have little influence on acquisition. Although the order of acquisition in my study corresponds roughly to the order of acquisition in L1 acquisition studies of other typologically similar languages, the differences in cognitive development of learners make comparisons problematic.

There is also a need for studies of learners who are exposed only to naturalistic input from the very beginning. Although my study found that the BV could not be applied successfully to the IL produced by learners in my study, it may be more easily applied to learners in naturalistic situations (as Klein & Perdue, 1997, suggest). This kind of study would also indicate the effect of formal instruction on morphological development.

Further studies in the area of L2 acquisition of Xhosa (and other typologically related languages) would shed more light on appropriate measures of levels of development. The number and/or types of different morphemes which need to be learned in order to claim that a learner has reached particular milestones needs to be determined by examining the ILs of many more learners.

Further research into the teaching of Xhosa as a second language needs to be conducted. For example, the effect of using a syllabus based on the order of appearance of morphemes in the IL in this study could be tested. It appears, for example, that the locative should be taught quite early as learners seem to need to perform the location function early. In addition, there seems to be a

need to introduce a more communicative way of teaching so that learners practise oral skills and actually use their interlanguage to perform useful communicative functions (see also Duvené de Wit & Ntuli 1994).

6.4 CONCLUSION

This study investigated morphological development in the IL of English learners of an agglutinative language. In addition, it considered some of the commonly investigated functions which appear in the interlanguage of these learners. It showed that the learners are able to express temporality, spatial and pronominal reference. They can use morphemes (and other means) to convey the functions necessary to communicate the messages required of them in the interviews.

One of the aims of the study was to compare the findings of my study with the findings of other IL studies and, in particular, the findings of the European Science Foundation study. Comparisons have shown that there are both similarities and differences in the findings of my study compared with these other studies. Firstly, there were many similarities in terms of learning principles which the learners use to make sense of the input and produce language in the interview situation.

Similarities were also found between the findings of L1 acquisition studies of African languages and my study with regard to learning principles and some parts of the sequence of development of morphemes. It proved impossible to compare the sequences of development found in English and Xhosa, primarily because of the differences in the way in which forms are realised in the two languages.

The most marked differences between the findings of my study and other studies appeared to be the extensive use of morphology by the learners in my study. This is not predicted by other studies of IL which conclude that morphology is acquired late and only after extensive exposure to the target languages. Typological differences therefore appear to be very important when drawing conclusions about which forms will appear in the early IL of learners (as Slobin, 1992, also concludes for L1 acquisition). The measures of development which are used to assess learners of Indo-European languages therefore appear to be inadequate measures of the level of development of learners of an agglutinative language such as Xhosa.

In conclusion, it appears that similar language-learning and production principles are employed by learners of typologically different languages. However, there are differences in *which* forms appear early in the ILs of learners of non-analytic and non-inflectional languages. Where morphemes are important, as in an agglutinative language, learners of these languages pay attention to the need for morphology and learn it early.

REFERENCES

- Adamson, H. D. (1989). Does the bioprogram affect second language acquisition? In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation (pp. 33-47). New York: Plenum Press.
- Adjémian, C. (1976). On the nature of interlanguage systems. Language Learning, 26(2), 297-320.
- Alexander, R. (1979). Elements of a theory of second language learning. Frankfurt: Verlag Peter Long.
- Allwright, R. L. (1984). The analysis of discourse in interlanguage studies: The pedagogical evidence. In A. Davies, C. Cripser, & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), Interlanguage (pp. 204-219). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Altman, R. (1997). Oral production of vocabulary. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), Second language vocabulary acquisition (pp. 67-97). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andersen, R. W. (1977). The impoverished state of cross-sectional morpheme acquisition/accuracy methodology. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 14, 49-82.
- Andersen, R. W. (1978). An implicational model for second language research. Language Learning, 28(2), 221-282.
- Andersen, R. W. (1983). Pidginization and creolization as language acquisition. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Andersen, R. W. (1984). The One to One Principle of interlanguage construction. Language Learning, 34(4), 77-95.
- Andersen, R. W. (1991). Developmental sequences: The emergence of aspect marking in second language acquisition. In T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories (pp. 305-324). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Antinucci, F., & Miller, R. (1976). How children talk about what happened. Journal of Child Language, 3(2), 167-189.
- Bahns, J., Burmeister, H., & Vogel, T. (1986). The pragmatics of formulas in L2 learner speech: Use and development. Journal of Pragmatics, 10, 693-723.
- Bailey, K., Madden, C., & Krashen, S. (1974). Is there a "natural sequence" in adult second language learning? Language Learning, 24(2), 235-243.

- Bailey, N. (1989). Discourse conditioned tense variation: Teacher implications. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation (pp. 279-295). New York: Plenum Press.
- Baker, C. (1979). Syntactic theory and the projection problem. Linguistic Inquiry, 10(4), 533-581.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1994). Anecdote or evidence? Evaluating support for the hypotheses concerning the development of tense and aspect. In E. E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), Research methodology in second-language acquisition (pp. 41-60). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Bofman, T. (1989). Attainment of syntactic and morphological accuracy by advanced language learners. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11(1), 17-34.
- Beck, M., Schwartz, B. D., & Eubank, L. (1995). Data, evidence and rules. In L. Eubank, L. Selinker, & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), The current state of interlanguage: Studies in honor of William E Rutherford (pp. 177-195). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. Language in Society, 13(2), 145-204.
- Bhardwaj, M., Dietrich, R., & Noyau, C. (1988). Temporality. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation.
- Bialystok, E. (1990). Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second language use. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Bialystok, E. (1998). Coming of age in applied linguistics. Language Learning, 48(4), 497-518.
- Bialystok, E., & Frohlich, M. (1980). Oral communication strategies for lexical difficulties. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, 5(1), 3-30.
- Bialystok, E., & Sharwood Smith, M. (1985). Interlanguage is not a state of mind: An evaluation of the construct for second language acquisition. Applied Linguistics, 6(2), 101-116.
- Bickerton, D. (1982). The roots of language. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Bickerton, D. (1983). Comments on Valdman's 'Creolization and second language acquisition'. In R. Andersen (Ed.), Pidginization and creolization as language acquisition (pp. 235-240). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Bickerton, D. (1990). Language and species. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bierwisch, M. (1997). Universal Grammar and the Basic Variety. Second Language Research, 13(4), 348-366.

- Birdsong, D. (1989). Metalinguistic performance and interlinguistic competence. New York: Springer.
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1983). The comparative fallacy in interlanguage studies: The case of systematicity. Language Learning, 33(1), 1-17.
- Bokamba, E. G. (1977). The impact of multilingualism on language structures: The case of central Africa. Anthropological Linguistics, 19(5), 181-202.
- Broeder, P. (1991). Talking about people: A multiple case study on adult language acquisition. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Broeder, P., Extra, G., & van Hout, R. (1993a). Richness and variety in the developing lexicon. In C. Perdue (Ed.), Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives: Vol. 1. Field methods (pp. 145-163). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Broeder, P., Extra, G., van Hout, R., & Voionomaa, K. (1993b). Word formation processes in talking about entities. In C. Perdue (Ed.), Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives: Vol. 2. The results (pp. 41-72). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H. D. (1998). Some further perspectives on the development of applied linguistics: A response to Bialystok. Language Learning, 48(4), 519-526.
- Bybee, J. (1985). Morphology. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Bybee, J. L. (1991). Natural morphology: The organization of paradigms and language acquisition. In T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories (pp. 67-91). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Carroll, M. (1984). Cyclical learning processes in second language production. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Carroll, M. (1990). Word order in instructions in learner languages of English and German. Linguistics, 28(5), 1011-1037.
- Carroll, M., & Becker, A. (1993). Reference to space in learner varieties. In C. Perdue (Ed.), Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives: Vol. 2. The results (pp. 119-149). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carroll, M., & Dietrich, R. (1985). Observations on object reference in learner languages. Linguistische Berichte, 98, 301-337.
- Carroll, S. E. (1999). Input and SLA: Adults' sensitivity to different sorts of cues to French gender. Language Learning, 49(1), 37-92.

- Cazden, C. (1968). The acquisition of noun and verb inflections. Child Development, 39(2), 433-448.
- Cazden, C., Cancino, E., Rosansky, E., & Schumann, J. (1975). Second language acquisition in children, adolescents and adults. Final report. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- Chaudron, C. (1983). Research on metalinguistic judgments: A review of theory, methods, and results. Language Learning, 33(3), 343-377.
- Clahsen, H. (1987). Connecting theories of language processing and (second) language acquisition. In C. Pfaff (Ed.), First and second language acquisition processes (pp. 103-116). Cambridge: Newbury House.
- Clahsen, H. (1995). German plurals in adult second language development: Evidence for a dual-mechanism model of inflection. In L. Eubank, L. Selinker, & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), The current state of interlanguage: Studies in honor of William E Rutherford (pp. 123-137). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Clark, E. (1985). The acquisition of Romance with special reference to French. In D. Slobin (Ed.), The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition Vol. 1. (pp. 687-782). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Comrie, B. (1984). Why linguists need language acquirers. In W. Rutherford (Ed.), Language universals and second language acquisition (pp. 11-29). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Comrie, B. (1997). On the origin of the Basic Variety. Second Language Research, 13(4), 367-373.
- Connors, K. (1988). Morphological markedness in second language acquisition. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 26(2), 101-113.
- Cook, V. J. (1991). Second language learning and language teaching. London: Edward Arnold.
- Cook, V. J. (1993). Linguistics and second language acquisition. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Cook, V. J. (1996). Universal Grammar in second language acquisition. In P. Jordens & J. Lalleman (Eds.), Investigating second language acquisition (pp. 167-185). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cooreman, A., & Kilborn, K. (1991). Functionalist Linguistics: Discourse structure and language processing in second language acquisition. In T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories (pp. 195-224). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5(4), 161-170.

- Corder, S. P. (1971). Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 9(2), 147-160.
- Corder, S. P. (1975). Error analysis, interlanguage and second language acquisition. Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts, 8, 201-218.
- Corder, S. P. (1977). 'Simple codes' and the source of the second language learner's initial heuristic hypothesis. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 1(1), 1-10.
- Corder, S. P. (1981). Error analysis and interlanguage. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Corder, S. P. (1992). A role for the mother tongue. In S. M. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), Language transfer in language learning (rev. ed.), (pp. 18-31). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Crookes, G. (1989). Planning and interlanguage variation. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11(4), 367-383.
- Crookes, G. (1990). The utterance, and other basic units for second language discourse analysis. Applied Linguistics, 11(2), 183-199.
- Crystal, D. (1997). The Cambridge encyclopedia of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Beaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). Introduction to text linguistics. London: Longman.
- De Graaff, R. (1997). The Esperanto experiment: Effects of explicit instruction on second language acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(2), 249-276.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (1995). Learning L2 grammar rules: An experiment with a miniature linguistic system. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17(3), 379-410.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (1997). Beyond explicit rule learning: Automatizing second language morphosyntax. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(2), 195-221.
- DeKeyser, R., & Sokalski, K. (1996). The differential role of comprehension and production practice. Language Learning, 46(4), 613-641.
- Dekydspotter, L., Sprouse, R. A., & Thyne, R. (1998). Evidence for full UG access in L2 acquisition from the interpretive interface: Quantification at a distance in English-French interlanguage. In A. Greenhill, M. Hughes, H. Littlefield, & H. Walsh (Eds.), Proceedings of the 22nd annual Boston University Conference on language development Vol. 1 (pp. 141-152). Somerville: Cascadilla Press.

- Demuth, K. (1992). The acquisition of seSotho. In D. I. Slobin (Ed.), The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition Vol. 3 (pp. 557-638). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dickerson, L. J. (1975). The learner's interlanguage as a system of variable rules. TESOL Quarterly, 9(4), 401-407.
- Dietrich, R. (1989a). Nouns and verbs in the learner's lexicon. In H. Dechert (Ed.), Current trends in European second language acquisition research (pp. 13-22). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dietrich, R. (1989b). Communicating with few words. An empirical account of the second language speaker's lexicon. In R. Dietrich & C. Graumann (Eds.), Language processing in social context (pp. 233-276). Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Dietrich, R., Klein, W., & Noyau, C. (1995). The acquisition of temporality in a second language. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dittmar, N. (1981). On the verbal organization of L2 tense marking in an elicited translation task by Spanish immigrants in Germany. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 3(2), 136-164.
- Dittmar, N. (1984). Semantic features of pidginised learners of German. In R. Andersen (Ed.), Second languages: A cross-linguistic perspective (pp. 243-270). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Doughty, C. (1991). Second language instruction does make a difference: Evidence from an empirical study of SL relativization. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13(4), 431-469.
- Douglas, D., & Selinker, L. (1994). Research methodology in context-based second-language research. In E. E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), Research methodology in second-language acquisition (pp. 119-131). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Duffield, N., Montrul, S., Bruhn de Garavito, J., & White, L. (1998). Determining L2 knowledge of Spanish clitics on-line and off-line. In A. Greenhill, M. Hughes, H. Littlefield, & H. Walsh (Eds.), Proceedings of the 22nd annual Boston University Conference on language development Vol. 1 (pp. 177-188). Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- Dulay, H. C., & Burt, M. K. (1973). Should we teach children syntax? Language Learning, 23(2), 245-257.
- Dulay, H. C., & Burt, M. K. (1974a). Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. Language Learning, 24(1), 37-53.
- Dulay, H. C., & Burt, M. K. (1974b). A new perspective on the creative construction process in child second language acquisition. Language Learning, 24(2), 253-278.

- Du Plessis, J. A. (1978). isiXhosa 4. Goodwood: Oudiovista.
- Duyvené de Wit, H. E., & Ntuli, R. M. (1994). Die bevordering van natuurlike diskoers en kommunikatiewe kompetensie in die Afrikatale. South African Journal of African Languages, 14(1), 1-14.
- Eckman, F. R. (1994). The competence-performance issue in second-language acquisition theory: A debate. In E. E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), Research methodology in second-language acquisition (pp. 3-15). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eckman, F. R., Bell, L., & Nelson, D. (1988). On the generalization of relative clause instruction in the acquisition of English as a second language. Applied Linguistics, 9(1), 1-20.
- Edge, J. (1989). Mistakes and corrections. London: Longman.
- Ellis, N. C. (1996). Sequencing in SLA: Phonological memory, chunking, and points of order. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18(1), 91-126.
- Ellis, N. C., & Schmidt, R. (1997). Morphology and longer distance dependencies: Laboratory research illuminating the A in SLA. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(2), 145-171.
- Ellis, R. (1984). Classroom second language development. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Ellis, R. (1985a). Sources of variability in interlanguage. Applied Linguistics, 6(2), 118-131.
- Ellis, R. (1985b). Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (Ed.). (1987a). Second language acquisition in context. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Ellis, R. (1987b). Contextual variability in second language acquisition and the relevancy of language teaching. In R. Ellis (Ed.), Second language acquisition in context (pp. 179-194). London: Prentice-Hall.
- Ellis, R. (1987c). Variability in interlanguage systems. In R. Ellis (Ed.), Second language acquisition in context (pp. 67-71). London: Prentice-Hall.
- Ellis, R. (1989). Are classroom and naturalistic acquisition the same? A study of the acquisition of German word order rules. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11(3), 305-328.
- Ellis, R. (1990). Instructed second language acquisition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom: A study of two language learners' requests. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 14(1), 1-23.

- Ellis, R. (1993). The structural syllabus and second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, *27*(1), 91-113.
- Ellis, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., & Roberts, C. (1987). Two approaches for investigating second language acquisition in context. In R. Ellis (Ed.), Second language acquisition in context (pp. 3-29). London: Prentice-Hall.
- Extra, G., & van Hout, R. (1996). Second language acquisition by adult immigrants: A multiple case study of Turkish and Moroccan learners of Dutch. In P. Jordens & J. Lalleman (Eds.), Investigating second language acquisition (pp. 87-113). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), Strategies in interlanguage communication (pp. 21-57). London: Longman.
- Faerch, C., Haastруп, K., & Phillipson, R. (1984). Learner language and language learning. London: Multilingual Matters.
- Fathman, A. (1978). ESL and EFL learning: Similar or dissimilar? In C. Blatchford & J. Schachter (Eds.), On TESOL '78: Policies, programs and practices (pp. 213-223). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Felix, S. (1978). Some differences between first and second language acquisition. In N. Waterson & C. Snow (Eds.), The development of communication (pp. 469-479). New York: Wiley.
- Felix, S. W. (1980). Second language development. Trends and issues. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Felix, S. W. (1981). The effect of formal instruction on second language acquisition. Language Learning, *31*(1), 87-112.
- Felix, S. W. (1984). Maturation aspects of Universal Grammar. In A. Davies, C. Criper, & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), Interlanguage (pp. 133-161). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Felix, S. W. (1995). Universal Grammar in L2 acquisition: Some thoughts on Schachter's Incompleteness Hypothesis. In L. Eubank, L. Selinker, & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), The current state of interlanguage: Studies in honor of William E Rutherford (pp. 139-151). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Felix, S., & Hahn, A. (1985). Natural process in classroom second-language learning. Applied Linguistics, *6*(3), 223-238.

- Flynn, S. (1991). Government-Binding: Parameter-setting in second language acquisition. In T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories (pp. 143-167). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task-type on second language performance. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18(3), 299-323.
- Fries, C. C. (1945). Teaching and learning English as a foreign language. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Gass, S. M. (1979). Language transfer and universal grammatical relations. Language Learning, 29(2), 327-344.
- Gass, S. M. (1984a). A review of interlanguage syntax: Language transfer and language universals. Language Learning, 34(2), 115-131.
- Gass, S. M. (1984b). The empirical basis for the Universal Hypothesis in interlanguage studies. In A. Davies, C. Criper, & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), Interlanguage (pp. 3-24). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gass, S. M. (1994). The reliability of second-language grammaticality judgments. In E. E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), Research methodology in second-language acquisition (pp. 303-322). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gass, S. M. (1995). Universals, SLA, and language pedagogy: 1984 revisited. In L. Eubank, L. Selinker, & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), The current state of interlanguage: Studies in honor of William E Rutherford (pp. 31-42). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (Eds.). (1992). Language transfer in language learning (rev. ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (1994). Second language acquisition: An introductory course. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- George, H. (1972). Common errors in language learning. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Ghrib, E. M. (1987). A longitudinal study of a Tunisian adolescent's learning of English morphemes in a classroom context. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 25(1), 41-54.
- Giacalone Ramat, A. (1992). Grammaticalization processes in the area of temporal and modal relations. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 14(3), 297-322.
- Giacobbe, J. (1992). A cognitive view of the role of L1 in the L2 acquisition process. Second Language Research, 8(3), 232-250.

- Givón, T. (1979). On understanding grammar. New York: Academic Press.
- Givón, T. (1984). Universals of discourse structure and second language acquisition. In W. Rutherford (Ed.), Typological universals and second language acquisition (pp. 109-136). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. (1985). Function, structure and language acquisition. In D. Slobin (Ed.), The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition Vol. 1 (pp. 1005-1028). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gough, D., Jones, J., Mfusi, M., Podile, K., Finlayson, R., Louw, J. A., & Satyo, S. C. (1989). Xhosa study guide 3 for XHA100-F, XHB100-K. Pretoria: University of South Africa.
- Gough, D. H. (1992). Demonstratives and word order: Aspects of discourse reference in Xhosa narrative. South African Journal of African Languages, 12(1), 1-4.
- Gough, D. H. (1995). Xhosa beyond the textbook: An analysis of grammatical variation of selected Xhosa constructions. South African Journal of African Languages, 15(4), 156-161.
- Gregg, K. R. (1989). Second language acquisition theory: The case for a generative perspective. In S. M. Gass & J. Schachter (Eds.), Linguistic perspectives on second language acquisition (pp. 15-40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hakuta, K. (1974). A preliminary report on the development of grammatical morphemes in a Japanese girl learning English as a second language. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 3, 18-43.
- Hakuta, K. (1976). A case study of a Japanese child learning English as a second language. Language Learning, 26(2), 321-351.
- Hatch, E. (1978). Acquisition of syntax in a second language. In J. Richards (Ed.), Understanding second and foreign language learning: Issues and approaches (pp. 34-70). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Hatch, E. (1979). Apply with caution. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2(1), 123-143.
- Holm, J. (1990). Features in the noun phrase common to the Atlantic creoles. Linguistics, 28(4), 867-881.
- Hölscher, A., & Möhle, D. (1987). Cognitive plans in translation. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), Introspection in second language research (pp. 113-134). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Huang, J., & Hatch, E. M. (1978). A Chinese child's acquisition of English. In E. M. Hatch (Ed.), Second language acquisition: A book of readings (pp. 118-131). Rowley: Newbury House.

- Huebner, T. (1979). Order of acquisition vs. dynamic paradigm: A comparison of methods in interlanguage research. TESOL Quarterly, 13(1), 21-28.
- Huebner, T. (1983). A longitudinal analysis of the acquisition of English. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Huebner, T. (1991). Second language acquisition: Litmus test for linguistic theory. In T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories (pp. 3-22). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (1989). A cognitive view of interlanguage variability. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation (pp. 17-31). New York: Plenum Press.
- Hyltenstam, K. (1977). Implicational patterns in interlanguage syntax variation. Language Learning, 27(2), 383-411.
- Jagtman, M., & Bongaerts, T. (1994). Report-COMOLA: A computer system for the analysis of interlanguage data. Second Language Research, 10(1), 49-83.
- Jake, J. L. (1998). Constructing interlanguage: Building a composite matrix language. Linguistics, 36(2), 333-382.
- James, C. (1980). Contrastive analysis. Essex: Longman.
- James, C. (1990). Learner language. Language Teaching, 23(4), 205-213.
- James, C. (1994). Don't shoot my dodo: On the resilience of contrastive and error analysis. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 32(3), 179-200.
- James, C. (1998). Error in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis. New York: Longman.
- Johnson, D. M. (1992). Approaches to research in second language learning. New York: Longman.
- Johnson, K. (1988). Mistake correction. English Language Teaching Journal, 42(2), 89-97.
- Jokweni, M. W. (1997). Identifying, descriptive and associative copulatives in Xhosa: Structure and function. South African Journal of African Languages, 17(3), 110-113.
- Jordens, P. (1988). The acquisition of word order in L2 Dutch and German. In P. Jordens & J. Lalleman (Eds.), Language development (pp. 149-180). Dordrecht: Foris.
- Jordens, P. (1996). Input and instruction in second language acquisition. In P. Jordens & J. Lalleman (Eds.), Investigating second language acquisition (pp. 407-449). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Jordens, P. (1997). Introducing the Basic Variety. Second Language Research, 13(4), 289-300.
- Kanno, K. (1998). The stability of UG principles in second-language acquisition: Evidence from Japanese. Linguistics, 36(6), 1125-1146.
- Kaplan, T. I. (1998). General learning strategies and the process of L2 acquisition: A critical overview. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 36(3), 233-246.
- Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1979). A functional approach to child language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kellerman, E. (1977). Towards a characterisation of the strategy of transfer in second language learning. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, 2(1), 58-145.
- Kellerman, E. (1979). Transfer and non-transfer: Where we are now. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2(1), 37-57.
- Kellerman, E. (1984). The empirical evidence for the influence of the L1 in interlanguage. In A. Davies, C. Criper, & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), Interlanguage (pp. 98-122). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kellerman, E. (1986). An eye for an eye: Crosslinguistic constraints on the development of the L2 lexicon. In E. Kellerman & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition (pp. 35-48). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kellerman, E., & Sharwood Smith, M. (Eds.). (1986). Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kessler, C., & Idar, I. (1979). Acquisition of English by a Vietnamese mother and child. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 18, 65-77.
- Klein, W. (1986). Second Language Acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, W. (1991). SLA theory: Prolegomena to a theory of language acquisition and implications for theoretical linguistics. In T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories (pp. 169-194). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Klein, W. (1993). The acquisition of temporality. In C. Perdue (Ed.), Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives: Vol. 2. The results (pp. 73-118). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, W. (1998). The contribution of second language acquisition research. Language Learning, 48(4), 527-550.

- Klein, W., Dietrich, R., & Noyau, C. (1993). The acquisition of temporality. In C. Perdue (Ed.), Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives: Vol. 2: The results (pp. 73-118). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, W., & Dittmar, N. (1979). Developing grammars. Berlin: Springer.
- Klein, W., & Perdue, C. (1993). Utterance Structure. In C. Perdue Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives: Vol. 2. The results (pp. 3-40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, W., & Perdue, C. (1997). The Basic Variety (or: Couldn't natural languages be much simpler?) Second Language Research, 13(4), 301-347.
- Kleinmann, H. (1977). Avoidance behavior in adult second language acquisition. Language Learning, 27(1), 93-108.
- Kolk, H., & Heeschen, C. (1992). Agrammatism, paragrammatism and the management of language. Language and Cognitive Process, 7(2), 89-130.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). Second language acquisition and second language learning. New York: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. New York: Longman.
- Krashen, S. D., Houck, N., Guinchi, P., Bode, S., Birnbaum, R., & Strei, G. (1977). Difficulty order for grammatical morphemes for adult second language performers using free speech. TESOL Quarterly, 11(3), 338-341.
- Krashen, S. D., & Scarcella, R. (1978). On routines and patterns in second language acquisition and performance. Language Learning, 28(2), 283-300.
- Krashen, S. D., Sferlazza, V., Feldman, L., & Fathman, A. (1976). Adult performance on the SLOPE test: More evidence for a natural sequence in adult second language acquisition. Language Learning, 26(1), 145-151.
- Kumpf, L. (1984). Temporal systems and universality in interlanguage: A case study. In F. Eckman, L. Bell, & D. Nelson (Eds.), Universals of second language acquisition (pp. 132-143). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Kunene, E. C. L. (1986). Acquisition of siSwati noun classes. South African Journal of African Languages, 6(1), 34-37.

- Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics across cultures. Applied linguistics for language teachers. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lalleman, J. (1983). The principle of elimination: Establishing word order regularities in the Dutch of foreign workers. Linguistische Berichte, 87, 40-63.
- Lalleman, J. (1996). The state of the art in second language acquisition research. In P. Jordens & J. Lalleman (Eds.), Investigating second language acquisition (pp. 3-69). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lardiere, D. (1998). Dissociating syntax from morphology in a divergent L2 end-state grammar. Second Language Research, 14(4), 359-375.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1975). The acquisition of grammatical morphemes by adult ESL students. TESOL Quarterly, 9(4), 409-430.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1991). Second language acquisition research: Staking out the territory. TESOL Quarterly, 25(2), 315-350.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1998). On the scope of second language acquisition research: "The learner variety" perspective and beyond - a response to Klein. Language Learning, 48(4), 551-556.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). An introduction to second language acquisition research. London: Longman.
- Lennon, P. (1991). Error: Some problems of definition, identification and distinction. Applied Linguistics, 12(2), 180-196.
- Lightbown, P. M. (1980). The acquisition and use of questions by French L2 learners. In S. Felix (Ed.), Second language development: Trends and issues (pp. 151-175). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Lightbown, P. M. (1983). Exploring relationships between developmental and instructional sequences in L2 acquisition. In H. Seliger & M. Long (Eds.), Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition (pp. 217-245). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Lightbown, P. M. (1984). The relationship between theory and method in second language acquisition research. In A. Davies, C. Cramer, & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), Interlanguage (pp. 241-252). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative teaching: Effects on second language learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12(4), 429-448.

- Long, M. H. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? TESOL Quarterly, 17(3), 359-382.
- Long, M. H. (1988). Instructed interlanguage development. In L. Beebe (Ed.), Issues in second language acquisition: Multiple perspectives (pp. 115-142). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Long, M. H. (1991). A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Grimsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. (1984). Methodological issues in interlanguage studies: An interactionist perspective. In A. Davies, C. Cripser, & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), Interlanguage (pp. 253-279). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1968). An introduction to theoretical linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mace-Matluck, B. J. (1979). Order of acquisition: Same or different in first- and second-language learning? Reading Teacher, 32(6), 696-703.
- Makoni, S. B. (1996). Variation in unplanned discourse. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 34(3), 167-181.
- Marshall, H. W. (1989). The colloquial preterit: Language variation and the ESL classroom. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation (pp. 297-315). New York: Plenum Press.
- McGroarty, M. (1998). Cognitive and constructivist challenges for applied linguistics. Language Learning, 48(4), 591-622.
- McLaughlin, B. (1990). Restructuring. Applied Linguistics, 11(2), 114-128.
- Meisel, J. M. (1987). Reference to past events and actions in the development of natural second language acquisition. In C. Pfaff (Ed.), First and second language acquisition processes (pp. 206-224). Cambridge: Newbury House.
- Meisel, J. M. (1997). The L2 Basic Variety as an I-language. Second Language Research, 13(4), 374-385.
- Meisel, J. M., Clahsen, H., & Pienemann, M. (1981). On determining developmental stages in natural second language acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 3(2), 109-135.
- Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (1998). Second language learning theories. London: Arnold.

- Munnich, E., Flynn, S., & Martohardjono, G. (1994). Elicited imitation and grammaticality judgment tasks: What they measure and how they relate to each other. In E. E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), Research methodology in second-language acquisition (pp. 227-243). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Musau, P. M. (1995). Communicative strategies of Swahili learners: The one to one principle. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 33(4), 297-314.
- Myhill, J. (1991). Typological text analysis: Tense and aspect in creoles and second languages. In T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories (pp. 93-121). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Myles, F., Hooper, J., & Mitchell, R. (1998). Rote or rule? Exploring the role of formulaic language in classroom foreign language learning. Language Learning, 48(3), 323-363.
- Myles, F., Mitchell, R., & Hooper, J. (1999). Interrogative chunks in French L2: A basis for creative construction? Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21(1), 49-80.
- Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H., & Todesco, A. (1978). The good language learner. Research in Education Series 7: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Nakuma, C. K. (1998). A new theoretical account of “fossilization”: Implications for L2 attrition research. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 36(3), 247-256.
- Nattinger, J. R., & DeCarrico, J. S. (1992). Lexical phrases and language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nemser, W. (1971). Approximative systems of foreign language learners. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 9(2), 115-123.
- Nickel, G. (1989). Some controversies in present-day error analysis: ‘Contrastive’ vs. ‘non-contrastive’ errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 27(4), 293-305.
- Nunan, D. (1996). Issues in second language acquisition research: Examining substance and procedure. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), Handbook of second language acquisition (pp. 349-374). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Odlin, T. (1989). Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oller, J. W. (1979). Language tests at school: A pragmatic approach. London: Longman.
- O’Malley, J., & Chamot, A. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Ortega, L. (1999). Planning and focus on form in L2 oral performance. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21(1), 109-148.
- Paradis, J., Le Corre, M., & Genesee, F. (1998). The emergence of tense and agreement in child L2 French. Second Language Research, 14(3), 227-256.
- Pawley, A., & Syder, F. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In J. Richards & J. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and communication (pp. 191-266). London: Longman.
- Perdue, C. (1990). Complexification of the simple clause in the narrative discourse of adult language learners. Linguistics, 28(5), 983-1009.
- Perdue, C. (1991). Cross-linguistic comparisons: Organizational principles in learner languages. In T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories (pp. 405-422). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Perdue, C. (Ed.). (1993a). Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives: Vol. 1. Field methods. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perdue, C. (Ed.). (1993b). Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives: Vol. 2. The results. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perdue, C. (1996). Pre-basic varieties: The first stages of second language acquisition. In E. Kellerman, B. Weltens, & T. Bongaerts (Eds.), EUROSLA 6: A selection of papers (pp. 135-149). Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij.
- Perdue, C., & Klein, W. (1992). Why does the production of some learners not grammaticalize? Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 14(3), 259-272.
- Perdue, C., & Klein, W. (1993). Concluding Remarks. In C. Perdue (Ed.), Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives: Vol. 2. The results (pp. 253-272). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perkins, K., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1975). The effects of formal language instruction on the order of morpheme acquisition. Language Learning, 25(2), 237-243.
- Pfaff, C. (1987). Functional approaches to interlanguage. In C. Pfaff (Ed.), First and second language acquisition processes (pp. 81-102). Cambridge: Newbury House.
- Pica, T. (1983). Adult acquisition of English as a second language under different conditions of exposure. Language Learning, 33(4), 465-497.

- Pica, T. (1998). Second language learning through interaction: Multiple perspectives. In V. Regan (Ed.), Contemporary approaches to second language acquisition in social context (pp. 9-31). Dublin: University College Dublin Press.
- Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6(2), 186-214.
- Pienemann, M. (1987). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. In C. Pfaff (Ed.), First and second language processes (pp. 143-168). Cambridge: Newbury House.
- Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypotheses. Applied Linguistics, 10(1), 52-79.
- Pienemann, M. (1992). COALA - a computational system for interlanguage analysis. Second Language Research, 8(1), 59-92.
- Pinker, S. (1984). Language learnability and language development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Posthumus, L. C. (1994). Word-based versus root-based morphology in the African languages. South African Journal of African Languages, 14(1), 28-36.
- Radford, A. (1988). Transformational grammar: A first course. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (1985). The context of language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robert, J-M. (1989). Intralanguage, agrammatism and the conceptual system. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 27(3), 217-221.
- Roberts, C., & Simonot, M. (1987). This is my life: How language acquisition is interactionally accomplished. In R. Ellis (Ed.), Second language acquisition in context (pp. 133-148). London: Prentice-Hall.
- Robinson, P. (1996a). Consciousness, rules and instructed second language acquisition. New York: Peter Lang.
- Robinson, P. (1996b). Learning simple and complex second language rules under implicit, incidental, rule-search, and instructed conditions. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18(1), 27-67.
- Robinson, P. (1997a). Generalizability and automaticity of second language learning under implicit, incidental, enhanced, and instructed conditions. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(2), 223-247.

- Robinson, P. (1997b). Individual differences and the fundamental similarity of implicit and explicit adult second language learning. Language Learning, 47(1), 45-99.
- Rosansky, E. (1976). Methods and morphemes in second language acquisition. Language Learning, 26(2), 409-425.
- Rutherford, W. E. (1984). Description and explanation in interlanguage syntax: State of the art. Language Learning, 34(3), 127-155.
- Rutherford, W. E. (1987). Second language grammar: Learning and teaching. London: Longman.
- Rutherford, W. E., & Sharwood Smith, M. (1985). Consciousness raising and Universal Grammar. Applied Linguistics, 6(3), 274-282.
- Sajjadi, S., & Tahririan, M. H. (1992). Task variability and interlanguage use. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 30(1), 35-44.
- Sánchez, L., & José Giménez, M. (1998). The L2 acquisition of definite determiners from null to overt. In A. Greenhill, M. Hughes, H. Littlefield, & H. Walsh (Eds.), Proceedings of the 22nd annual Boston University Conference on language development Vol. 2 (pp. 640-650). Somerville: Cascadilla.
- Sato, C. J. (1988). Origins of complex syntax in interlanguage development. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 10(3), 371-395.
- Sato, C. J. (1990). The syntax of conversation in interlanguage development. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Satyo, S. (1998). Soft harmonisation and cross-fertilising vocabularies: The case of Nguni languages. In K. Kwaa Prah (Ed.), Between distinction and extinction: The harmonisation and standardisation of African languages. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Schachter, J. (1974). An error in error analysis. Language Learning, 24(2), 205-214.
- Schachter, J. (1989). A new look at an old classic. Second Language Research, 5(1), 30-42.
- Schachter, J. (1992). A new account of language transfer. In S. M. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), Language transfer in language learning (rev. ed.), (pp. 32-46). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schachter, J. (1998). Recent research in language learning studies: promises and problems. Language Learning, 48(4), 557-583.
- Schachter, J., & Celce-Murcia, M. (1977). Some reservations concerning error analysis. TESOL Quarterly, 11(4), 441-451.

- Schenning, S., & van Hout, R. (1994). Dimensional spatial relations in adult language acquisition. In R. Bok-Bennema & C. Cremers (Eds.), Linguistics in the Netherlands (pp. 235-246). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11(2), 129-158.
- Schumann, J. H. (1975). Affective factors and the problem of age in second language acquisition. Language Learning, 25(2), 209-235.
- Schumann, J. H. (1978). The pidginization process: A model for second language acquisition. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Schumann, J. H. (1979). The acquisition of English negation by speakers of Spanish: A review of the literature. In R. Andersen (Ed.), The acquisition and use of Spanish and English as first and second languages (pp. 3-23). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Schumann, J. H. (1982). Simplification, transfer, and relexification as aspects of pidginization and early second language acquisition. Language Learning, 32(2), 337-366.
- Schumann, J. H. (1987). The expression of temporality in basilectal speech. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9(1), 21-41.
- Schwartz, B. D. (1993). On explicit and negative data affecting competence and linguistic behavior. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15(2), 147-163.
- Schwartz, B. D. (1997). On the basis of the Basic Variety. Second Language Research, 13(4), 386-402.
- Schwartz, B. D., & Sprouse, R. (1994). Word order and nominative case in non-native language acquisition: A longitudinal study of (L1 Turkish) German interlanguage. In T. Hoekstra & B. Schwartz (Eds.), Language acquisition studies in generative grammar: Papers in honor of Kenneth Wexler for the GLOW 1991 Workshops (pp. 317-368). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Scovel, T. (1988). A time to speak. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Seliger, H. W. (1979). On the nature and function of language rules in language teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 13(3), 359-369.
- Seliger, H. W., & Long, M. H. (Eds.). (1983). Classroom-oriented research in second language acquisition. Rowley: Newbury House.

- Seliger, H. W., & Shohamy, E. (1989). Second language research methods. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10(3), 209-231.
- Selinker, L. (1984). The current state of IL studies: An attempted critical summary. In A. Davies, C. Cramer, & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), Interlanguage (pp. 332-343). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Selinker, L. (1989). CA/EA/IL: The earliest experimental record. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 27(4), 267-291.
- Selinker, L. (1992). Rediscovering Interlanguage. New York: Longman.
- Selinker, L., & Douglas, D. (1985). Wrestling with 'context' in interlanguage theory. Applied Linguistics, 6(2), 190-204.
- Selinker, L., & Lakshamanan, U. (1992). Language transfer and fossilization: The multiple effects principle. In S. M. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), Language transfer in language learning (rev. ed.), (pp. 197-216). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Selinker, L., & Lamendella, J. (1978). Two perspectives on fossilization in interlanguage learning. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, 3(2), 144-191.
- Sharwood Smith, M. (1979). Strategies, language transfer and the simulation of the second language learner's mental operations. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, 4(1), 66-83.
- Sharwood Smith, M. (1991). Speaking to many minds: On the relevance of different types of language information for the L2 learner. Second Language Research, 7(2), 118-132.
- Sharwood Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15(2), 165-179.
- Sharwood Smith, M. (1994). Second language learning: Theoretical foundations. London: Longman.
- Shaughnessy, M. (1977). Errors and expectations. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, C. (1991). Cross-generational bilingualism: Theoretical implications of language attrition. In T. Huebner & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), Crosscurrents in second language acquisition and linguistic theories (pp. 325-345). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Singh, R., d'Anglejan, A., & Carroll, S. (1982). Elicitation of Inter-English. Language Learning, 32(2), 271-288.

- Skiba, R., & Dittmar, N. (1992). Pragmatic, semantic, and syntactic constraints and grammaticalization. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 14(3), 323-349.
- Slobin, D. (1982a). The cross-linguistic study of language acquisition. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Slobin, D. (1982b). Universal and particular in the acquisition of language. In E. Wanner & L. Gleitman (Eds.), Language acquisition: The state of the art (pp. 128-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Slobin, D. (1985). The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition Vol. 2: The theoretical issues. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Slobin, D. (1992). Introduction. In D. Slobin (Ed.), The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition Vol. 3 (pp. 1-13). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sorace, A. (1996). The use of acceptability judgements in second language acquisition research. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), Handbook of second language acquisition (pp. 375-409). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Spolsky, B. (1989). Conditions for second language learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stauble, A. (1984). A comparison of the Spanish-English and Japanese-English interlanguage continuum. In R. Andersen (Ed.), Second language: A crosslinguistic perspective (pp. 323-353). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Stenson, N. (1974). Induced errors. In J. Schumann & N. Stenson (Eds.), New frontiers in second language learning (pp. 54-70). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Stevick, E. (1989). Success with foreign languages. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Suzman, S. M. (1982). Strategies for acquiring Zulu concord. South African Journal of African Languages, 2(3), 53-67.
- Suzman, S. M. (1999). Learn Zulu the way children do. South African Journal of African Languages, 19(2), 134-147.
- Swain, M., Dumas, G., & Naiman, N. (1974). Alternatives to spontaneous speech: Elicited translation and imitation as indicators of second language competence. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 3, 68-79.
- Swan, M. (1987). Non-systematic variability: A self-inflicted conundrum? In R. Ellis (Ed.), Second language acquisition in context (pp. 59-66). London: Prentice-Hall.

- Tarone, E. E. (1982). Systematicity and attention in interlanguage. Language Learning, 32(1), 69-84.
- Tarone, E. E. (1983). On the variability of interlanguage systems. Applied Linguistics, 4(2), 143-163.
- Tarone, E. E. (1987). Methodologies for studying variability in second language acquisition. In R. Ellis (Ed.), Second language acquisition in context (pp. 35-46). London: Prentice-Hall.
- Tarone, E. E. (1988). Variation in interlanguage. London: Edward Arnold.
- Tarone, E. E. (1989). On chameleons and monitors. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation (pp. 3-15). New York: Plenum Press.
- Tarone, E. E. (1994). A summary: Research approaches in studying second-language acquisition or "if the shoe fits...". In E. E. Tarone, S. M. Gass, & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), Research methodology in second-language acquisition (pp. 323-336). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tarone, E. E., Cohen, A., & Dumas, G. (1976). A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: A framework for communication strategies. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 9, 76-90.
- Tomasello, M., & Herron, C. (1988). Down the garden path: Inducing and correcting overgeneralization errors in the foreign language classroom. Applied Psycholinguistics, 9(3), 237-246.
- Tomasello, M., & Herron, C. (1989). Feedback for language transfer errors: The garden path technique. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11(4), 385-395.
- Tomlin, R., & Villa, V. (1994). Attention in cognitive science and second language acquisition. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16(2), 183-204.
- Towell, R. (1987). Variability and progress in the language development of advanced learners of a foreign language. In R. Ellis (Ed.), Second language acquisition in context (pp. 113-127). London: Prentice-Hall.
- Towell, R., & Hawkins, R. (1994). Approaches to second language acquisition. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Trahey, M., & White, L. (1993). Positive evidence and preemption in the second language classroom. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15(2), 181-203.
- Trévisé, A. (1987). Toward an analysis of the (inter)language activity of referring to time in narrative. In C. Pfaff (Ed.), First and second language acquisition processes (pp. 225-251). Cambridge: Newbury House.

- Vainikka, A., & Young-Scholten, M. (1996). The early stages in adult L2 syntax: Additional evidence from Romance speakers. Second Language Research, 12(2), 140-176.
- Valdman, A. (Ed.). (1977). Pidgin and creole. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Valdman, A. (1989). Classroom foreign language learning and language variation: The notion of pedagogical norms. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation (pp. 261-277). New York: Plenum Press.
- Van Els, T., Bongaerts, T., Extra, G., Van Os, C., & Janssen-van Dielen, A. (1984). Applied linguistics and the learning and teaching of foreign languages (2nd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.
- VanPatten, B. (1984). Processing strategies and morphological acquisition. In F. R. Eckman, L. H. Bell, & D. Nelson (Eds.), Universals of language acquisition (pp. 88-98). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Váradí, T. (1980). Strategies of target language learner communication: Message adjustment. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 18(1), 59-72.
- Veronique, D. (1987). Reference to past events and actions in narratives in a second language: Insights from North African workers' French. In C. Pfaff (Ed.), First and second language acquisition processes (pp. 252-272). Cambridge: Newbury House.
- Visser, M. (1989). The syntax of the infinitive in Xhosa. South African Journal of African Languages, 9(4), 154-184.
- Von Stutterheim, C., & Klein, W. (1987). A concept-oriented approach to second language studies. In C. Pfaff (Ed.), First and second language acquisition processes (pp. 191-205). Cambridge: Newbury House.
- Wagner-Gough, J. (1975). Comparative studies in second language learning. CALERIC/CLL Series on languages and linguistics 26.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1970). The contrastive analysis hypothesis. TESOL Quarterly, 4(2), 123-130.
- Weinert, R. (1987). Processes in classroom second language development: The acquisition of negation in German. In R. Ellis (Ed.), Second language acquisition in context (pp. 83-99). London: Prentice-Hall.
- Weinert, R. (1995). The role of formulaic language in second language acquisition: A review. Applied Linguistics, 16(2), 180-205.

- Weist, R. (1986). Tense and aspect: Temporal systems in child language. In P. Fletcher & M. Garman (Eds.), Language acquisition: Studies in first language development (pp. 356-374). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, L. (1977). Error-analysis and error-correction in adult learners of English as a second language. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 13, 42-58.
- White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. Second Language Research, 7(2), 133-161.
- White, L. (1992). Universal Grammar: Is it just a new name for old problems? In S. M. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), Language transfer in language learning (rev. ed.), (pp. 217-232). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- White, L. (1998). Introduction: The implications of divergent outcomes in L2 acquisition. Second Language Research, 14(4), 321-323.
- White, L., Spada, N., Lightbown, P., & Ranta, L. (1991). Input enhancement and L2 question formation. Applied Linguistics, 12(4), 416-432.
- Whitman, R., & Jackson, K. (1972). The unpredictability of contrastive analysis. Language Learning, 22(1), 29-41.
- Williams, J. (1989). Variation and convergence in nonnative institutionalized Englishes. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation (pp. 117-135). New York: Plenum Press.
- Wode, H. (1976). Developmental sequences in naturalistic L2 acquisition. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 11, 1-13.
- Wode, H. (1978). The L1 vs. L2 acquisition of English interrogation. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 15, 37-57.
- Wode, H. (1979). Operating principles and 'universals' in L1, L2, and FLT. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 17(3), 217-231.
- Wode, H. (1981). Learning a second language: An integrated view of language acquisition. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Yang, L. R., & Givon, T. (1997). Benefits and drawbacks of controlled laboratory studies of second language acquisition: The Keck second language learning project. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(2), 173-193.

- Young, R. (1988). Variation and the interlanguage hypothesis. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 10(3), 281-302.
- Young, R. (1991). Variation in interlanguage morphology. New York: Peter Lang.
- Yuan, B. (1997). Asymmetry of null subjects and null objects in Chinese speakers' L2 English. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(4), 467-497.
- Zobl, H. (1979). Systems of verb classification and cohesion of verb-complement relations as structural conditions on interference in a child's L2 development. Working Papers on Bilingualism, 18, 43-57.
- Zobl, H. (1980). The formal and developmental selectivity of L1 influence on L2 acquisition. Language Learning, 30(1), 43-57.
- Zobl, H. (1982). A direction for contrastive analysis: The comparative study of developmental sequences. TESOL Quarterly, 16(2), 169-183.
- Zobl, H. (1984). Cross-generalizations and the contrastive dimension of the interlanguage hypothesis. In A. Davies, C. Cramer, & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), Interlanguage (pp. 79-97). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Zobl, H. (1992). Prior linguistic knowledge and the conservatism of the learning procedure: Grammaticality judgments of unilingual and multilingual learners. In S. M. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), Language transfer in language learning (rev. ed.), (pp. 176-196). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zobl, H. (1995). Converging evidence for the 'acquisition-learning' distinction. Applied Linguistics, 16(1), 35-56.
- Zotwana, S. Z. (1991). Xhosa in context: From novice to intermediate. Cape Town: Perskor.

APPENDIX A: BIOGRAPHICAL/ATTITUDINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How old are you now?
2. When did you start learning Xhosa?
3. Why did you decide to study Xhosa at university?
4. What would you like to do with your Xhosa?
5. Do you talk to L1 speakers outside the classroom?
If yes - how often do you do this?
6. What kind of Xhosa classroom exercises or activities do you enjoy most?
7. How would you rate yourself on:
 - a) speaking ability
 - b) understanding of spoken language
 - c) reading ability
 - d) writing ability
8. How important do you think it is to pronounce Xhosa correctly?
9. How important do you think it is to produce correct grammar when you are speaking?
10. What do you think a Xhosa course at university should teach you?
11. How many hours a week do you think you spend on Xhosa outside the classroom?
12. Do you intend to do Xhosa next year?
13. Would you encourage other people to learn Xhosa?
14. Do you enjoy learning Xhosa?

APPENDIX B: A SHORT SUMMARY OF THE BACKGROUND OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Ann

Ann was a beginner Xhosa learner at the start of the data-collection period. She was exposed only to input in the formal classroom and never interacted with L1 Xhosa speakers, except to greet them. Her interlanguage is at a very basic level at the beginning, although she uses a range of basic morphemes from the beginning of the interview period.

Ben

Ben had learned some Xhosa in primary school and for the first two years of high school. He was in the first-year class during the data-collection period. He rarely spoke to L1 speakers, although he had had extensive exposure to Xhosa at a young age. His interlanguage is fairly fluent, although the range of forms is limited.

Claire

Claire grew up on a farm where she learnt Xhosa, but she had never learned to read and write the language. She was in the first-year class so that she could learn to read and write Xhosa. She is a fluent speaker who uses a range of forms, although analysis of her interlanguage shows many errors.

Pat

Pat had had some exposure to Xhosa at home on a farm and she was willing to communicate with L1 speakers. She was in the second-year class at the time of the interviews. She made many errors, although she used a wider range of forms than Ann and Ben.

Karen

Karen had studied Xhosa at school and was in the second-year Xhosa class. She produced a wide range of forms which are usually correct, although she spoke fairly slowly and appeared to be self-monitoring to a large extent.

Sarah

Sarah had studied Xhosa at school and was in the third-year Xhosa class. She produced a range of forms, although there were still errors in several basic forms. She felt that her ability to speak had deteriorated over the years.

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW MATERIALInterview 1

1. Have a conversation with X about where he/she comes from, his/her surname, his/her family, his/her friends, why he/she is at Rhodes, when he/she came to Rhodes, etc.
2. Have a conversation with X about what X usually does in his/her Xhosa class.
3. Make up a story about Thembi. Thembi says a few sentences, X says a few sentences. About two or three sentences at a time. Carry on until you have exhausted the subject.
4. Thembi reads a passage to X. X writes down as much as he/she can. Thembi reads once through, then twice more, fairly slowly.

Passage:

Abafundi bahlala ezidesikeni. Idesika ihlala umfundi omnye. Abafundi bangamashumi amabini anesihlanu eklasini yooThembi. Ngoko ke kukho iidesika ezingamashumi amabini anesihlanu. Idesika zineziciko. Abafundi bayazivula bafake iincwadi nezinto zokubhala. Abanye abafundi bayathandana ukubhala iidesika.

(From Zotwana 1991:96)

5. Translate these sentences into Xhosa.

Hello, my name is Thembi.

I am studying at Rhodes this year.

I live in town in a house.

I would like to learn Xhosa to talk to other people.

Open the door.

I am going to PE this weekend.

6. Translate these sentences into English.

Sisitulo sikatitshalakazi. Utitshalakazi usondeza isitulo etafileni ahlale. Abantwana babeka iincwadi etafileni phambi kukatitshala. Utitshalakazi uyazivula, ajonge umsebenzi wabantwana, alungise iziphoso. Usebenzisa usiba olubomvu. Ubanika amanqaku abantwana. Uwabhala encwadini yamanqaku. Ngezinye iimini utitshalakazi ubanika umsebenzi wasekhaya abafundi.

(From Zotwana 1991:97)

7. X describes the picture in as much detail as possible.

8. X builds sentences with the following words:

vula; biza; beka; bona; thanda

Interview 2 (repeated in interview 5)

1. Have a conversation with X about his/her family. Who they are, what they do, how old they are, what they like to do, what they like to eat, etc.
2. Have a conversation with X about what he/she did during the vac.
3. Make up a story about animals (ihashe/ingonyama/inja). Thembi says a few sentences, X says a few sentences. About two or three sentences at a time. Carry on until you have exhausted the subject.
4. Thembi reads a passage to X. X writes down as much as he/she can. Thembi reads once through, then twice more, fairly slowly.

Passage:

Abasebenzi basenga iinkomo ederi. Bavuka ekuseni ngenj'ixukuxa, basenge lide liphume ilanga kuba iimazi zininzi. Abasengi ngezandla, basenga ngoomatshini bokusenga. Olunye ubisi lugalelwa ezikalini lusiwe edolophini ngelori: olunye luyajijwa kwenziwe ibhotolo ngalo: olunye lunikwa abasebenzi. Ixibhiya inikwa izinja neehagu. Efameni kukho iigusha zoboya kunye neeseyibhokhwe. Ziyachetywa qho ngoSeptemba. Uboya buthunyelwa emalikeni yoboya eMonti.

(From Zotwana 1991:128)

5. Translate these sentences into Xhosa.

I have a headache.

Grandfather lives in town.

My brother is studying.

The parents buy meat but the children buy sweets.

They like milk.

We speak Xhosa in class.

The horse eats grass.

6. Translate these sentences into English.

Utitshalakazi ubhala ebhodini. Ubhala ngetshokhwe. Ubhala imibuzo yomsebenzi waseklasini ikanye yovavanyo. Ushwankathela zonke izifundo ebhodini. Sakuphela isifundo utitshalakazi uthatha idasta asule ibhodi. Ngamanye amaxesha abafundi bayayisula ibhodi. UThembi uyathanda ukusula ibhodi. Kodwa akafiki phezulu kuba mfutshane. Ibhodi imnyama.

Abafundi babhala ngeentsiba, nangeependile. Iintsiba zabafundi zisebenzisa i-inki. I-inki isebhotileni ye-inki. Abanye abafundi basebenzisa i-inki emnyama. Utitshalakazi akafuni abafundi basebenzise i-inki emnyama; ufuna basebenzise eblowu.

(From Zotwana 1991:98-99)

7. X describes the picture in as much detail as possible. Elicit data by asking: Yintoni le/Ziintoni ezi and Wenza ntoni?

8. X builds sentences with the following words:
inja; thanda; thetha; abafazi; dlala; tya; vala; ubhuti; hlala; bhala
9. Use the following words to make grammatical Xhosa sentences. You may change the form of the words and add extra elements to form a grammatical sentence.
- a) tya umntwana ukutya
 - b) thanda abafazi thenga idolophu inyama
 - c) utitshalakazi nika si iipensile ikhabhathi
10. Look carefully at the following sentences and correct any errors in them.
- a) Isikolo sikaThembi singena ngo-8.00, kodwa intsimbi zikhala ngo-7.55.
 - b) Abantwana bayaphuma eziklasini baya phandle, baphumla imizuzu elishumi elinisihlanu, sidlala.
 - c) Ihashe ibaleka iplasini.
 - d) Sibhala ngipensile.
 - e) Sivala zifestile nacango.

Interview 3 (repeated in interview 7)

1. Have a conversation with X about the weather and what X likes to do in different kinds of weather. You could also discuss typical weather for different seasons.
2. Role-play a situation where X asks you out for an evening. Talk about where you will meet, what you will do, etc.
3. Make up a story about living in res. Thembi says a few sentences, X says a few sentences. About two or three sentences at a time. Carry on until you have exhausted the subject.
4. Thembi reads a passage to X. X writes down as much as he/she can. Thembi reads once through, then twice more, fairly slowly.

Passage:

Ngoku masingene egumbini lokutyela. Igumbi lokutyela lakuthi lincinci. Kukho itafile nezitulo. Izitulo zithandathu. Phezu kwetafile kukho ilaphu letafile. Kukho isayibhodi. Umama ufaka izitya neeglasi neekomityi esayibhodini. Ezinye izitya zihlala ekhabhathini ekhithshini. Isayibhodi ineedrowa. Ezidroweni umama ufaka amacephe, iimela, iifolokhwe namatispuni. Amanye amatispuni namacephe neemela neefolokhwe zihlala ekhabhathini ekhithshini.

(From Zotwana 1991:60)

5. Translate these sentences into Xhosa.

We drink this water.

They don't like meat.

This cat doesn't want food.

Those people live in the forest.

Some people don't live in houses.

When does that bus arrive?

These children don't have those books.

6. Translate these sentences into English.

Nasi isitovu. Sisitovu sombane. Umama uphekela esitovini. Isitovu sakuthi sinewoma neondi. Iipleyiti zesitovu sakuthi zine. Iipleyiti ezintathu zinkulu. Ipleyiti encinci inye. Esitovini siyapheka, siyafrayisha. Sipheka ukutya; sifrayisha amaqanda okanye inyama. Ngamanye amaxesha umama uyabhaka esitovini, e-ondini. Ubhaka isonka okanye ikeyiki. Mna notata asikwazi ukubhaka, kodwa sifuna ukufunda. Umama uthi uza kusifundisa ukubhaka.

(From Zotwana 1991:54)

7. X describes the picture in as much detail as possible. Elicit negative sentences by asking questions which require negative answers.
8. X builds sentences with the following words:

iincwadi; iindlebe; kushushu; impheleke; amaphepha; ukutya; amahashe; abantwana;

ixesha; kusasa

9. Use the following words to make grammatical NEGATIVE Xhosa sentences. You may change the form of the words and add extra elements to form a grammatical sentence.
- a) bhala umfundi incwadi
 - b) ikati phandle lala
 - c) amahashe inyama tya
10. Change the following sentences into the negative
- a) Umama uya ngetreyini edolophini.
 - b) Ndithanda ukubhala ngepensile.
 - c) Ibhasi ifika ngo-2:00 ekuseni.
11. Look carefully at the following sentences and correct any errors in them.
- a) La mntu uyafunda Monti.
 - b) Lamahashe la abaleka.
 - c) Abantwana akafuni kuya eBhayi.
 - d) Eziinja sitya.
 - e) Oomama aziseli ubisi.

Interview 4

1. Have a conversation with X about what he/she intends to do this term, e.g. work, recreation, sport, etc.
2. Build a story about each other's vacs. X says two or three sentences, Thembi says two or three sentences.
3. Role-play a situation where X wants to buy some items and Thembi is shop assistant e.g. questions on size, price, where to find it, how many, what colour, etc.
4. Thembi reads a passage to X. X writes down as much as he/she can. Thembi reads once through, then twice more, fairly slowly.

Passage:

Namhlanje ndifuna ukunixelesa ngeYunivesiti yaseKapa. Ndifuna ukunixelesa ngeyunivesiti kuba ndiyayithanda. Ndiyithanda kakhulu. Yiyunivesiti enkulu kakhulu. Inabafundi abaninzi. Abafundi apha bavela kwiimbombo zone zomhlaba. Abanye bavela phesheya. Ngamanye amaxesha abadlali bezinye iindawo bayeza apha. Kumnandi kakhulu apha ngempelaveki kodwa mna andidlali kulo nyaka.

(From Zotwana 1991:101)

5. Translate these sentences into Xhosa.

The children play outside.

They want to drink cooldrink.

We don't like meat.

Where is the shop?

This tree is green.

Those men drink coffee, but these women drink tea.

They don't eat bread on weekends.

6. Translate this passage into English:

uMatthew usengxakini kakhulu namhlanje. Ufuna ukufunda isiXhosa kodwa iincwadi zakhe azikho; zisesikolweni. Akakwazi ukuzifumana kuba nguMgqibelo namhlanje. Ootitshala bayayitshixa igeyithi esikolweni. Ngoko ke abafundi abakwazi ukungena esikolweni ngempelaveki. Ngoku uMatthew ufuna ukusebenzisa ifowuni athethe noJohn Patterson, umhlobo wakhe. Ikhaya likaJohn liseMowbray. UMatthew uthetha nomama wakhe. Uthi: "Mama, ndicela ukusebenzisa ifowuni."

(From Zotwana 1991:91)

7. X describes the picture in as much detail as possible. Ask "Yintoni le/Ziintoni ezi" questions and ask some questions that require negative answers when X has run out of things to say about the picture.
8. X builds sentences with the following words:

hlala; bona; iklasi; funda; idolophu; inkwenkwe; igama; namhlanje; khulu; izindlu

9. Formulate questions which would require the following answers:
- Ndihlala eRhini.
 - Sitya izonka.
 - Abafazi bayalala.
 - Izinja zitya ukutya ngo-6.
10. Use the following words to make grammatical NEGATIVE Xhosa sentences. You may change the form of the words and add extra elements to form a grammatical sentence.
- tya abantwana inyama
 - utitshalakazi ibhodi bhala
 - idolophu hamba amakwenkwe
11. Look carefully at the following sentences and correct any errors in them.
- Umalume banabantwana athathu.
 - Oobhuti bafundi iincwadi.
 - Lo abantu bahamba idolophu.
 - Ndisika izonka imela.
 - Iikati silala.

Interview 6

1. Have a conversation with X about what he/she did during the vac.
2. Build a story about each other's families. X says two or three sentences, Thembi says two or three sentences. (Describe who is in the family, what they look like, etc).
3. Role-play a situation where Thembi asks X to go out, but X doesn't want to go out. Discuss where, when, why, etc. Could also try to make a date for another night.
4. Thembi reads a passage to X. X writes down as much as he/she can. Thembi reads once through, then twice more fairly slowly.

Passage:

Utitshala usebenza esikolweni. Ufundisa abantwana. Iiprofesa zifundisa eyunivesithi. Umsebenzi weeprofesa nowetitshala kukufundisa. Abanye abafundi bafuna ukuba ngoosomashishini. Umsebenzi kasomashishini kukuthengisa. Bathengisa izinto ngezinto. Abanye bathengisa iibhasi; abanye bathengisa iimoto, iibhaki, izithuthuthu neelori. Abanye bathengisa iibhayisekile. Abanye baneeteksi.

(From Zotwana 1991:73)

5. Translate these sentences into Xhosa.

The tree is green.

The girl is beautiful.

They live in a big house.

The dogs eat meat, but the horses eat grass.

The ugly dogs play in the brown houses.

The car doesn't stay in the garage.

This is a red bicycle.

6. Translate this passage into English:

Ngamanye amaxesha ndiya elayibri, ndiye kuboleka iincwadi okanye ndifundele khona. Ezinye iincwadi aziphumi elayibri. Ilayibri ivula imini yonke ivala ngo-10 ebusuku phakathi evekini, kodwa ngoMgqibelo ivala ngo-12 emini; ayivuli ngeCawe. Bonke abafundi banamakhadi. Ikhadi lomfundi linefoto yakhe. Abafundi bayafota bafumane amakhadi ekuqaleni konyaka. Elayibri ukhupha ikhadi lakho ukuba ufuna ukuboleka incwadi, uphume nayo. Zininzi iilayibri apha; zinkulu. Zonke zineencwadi ezininzi.

(From Zotwana 1991:114)

7. X describes the picture in as much detail as possible. Ask "Yintoni le/Ziintoni ezi" questions and ask some questions that require negative answers when X has run out of things to say about the picture.
8. X builds sentences with the following words:

ivenkile; thenga; bhala; nini; enza; utitshalakazi; hamba; uMgqibelo; hle; ninzi

9. Formulate questions which would require the following answers:
- a) Ndiya edolophini ngoku.
 - b) Ndifuna isonka.
 - c) Sihamba yonke imihla.
 - d) Abafazi bahlamba iimpahla.
10. Use the following words to make grammatical NEGATIVE Xhosa sentences. You may change the form of the words and add extra elements to form a grammatical sentence.
- a) ihashe tya ingca
 - b) iimpahla abantwana thenga
 - c) umntwana incwadi bhala
11. Look carefully at the following sentences and correct any errors in them.
- a) Lo mntu isebenza.
 - b) Aba mthi luhlaza.
 - c) Abanta akafuni izonka esimhlophe.
 - d) La ihashe atya ingca iluhlaza.
 - e) Ubuso bakaThandi buhle.

APPENDIX D: NUMBER OF UTTERANCES IN THE DATA

Interview number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
Conversation	22	10	20	6	16	17	20	111
Picture description	2	10	17	14	10	19	18	90
Translation	6	6	7	6	7	6	6	44
Sentence building	3	13	14	18	16	22	16	102
Ben								
Conversation	25	18	23	14	13	20	18	131
Picture description	7	18	12	7	7	8	10	69
Translation	6	0	7	7	7	7	7	41
Sentence building	5	13	16	16	13	17	17	97
Claire								
Conversation	29	18	23	21	15	24	22	152
Picture description	12	25	10	11	7	19	10	94
Translation	6	7	7	7	7	9	7	50
Sentence building	5	12	18	20	15	18	17	105
Pat								
Conversation	26	16	20	30	17	19	18	146
Picture description	6	4	16	8	19	14	12	79
Translation	6	7	6	7	7	7	7	47
Sentence building	5	14	16	18	18	16	16	103
Karen								
Conversation	23	18	18	14	12	13	14	112
Picture description	3	13	10	10	6	10	5	57
Translation	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	48
Sentence building	5	13	17	17	13	18	17	100
Sarah								
Conversation	31	16	20	16	11	11	17	122
Picture description	14	12	6	6	16	13	10	77
Translation	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	48
Sentence building	5	13	18	16	13	16	16	97
Interview Total	264	290	335	303	279	337	314	2122

APPENDIX E: COUNTING MORPHEMES

- Utterance: *Utitshalakazi wam nguB nguBulelwa andiyazi ifani yakhe*
 teacher my is Bulelwa I don't know surname her
**olundiyamthanda yhu*
 that I her like whew
 'My teacher is Bulelwa. I don't know her surname. I like her a lot.'
- Morphemes: *u+titshala+kazi* *wa+m*
 noun prefix+stem+noun suffix possessive concord+possessive stem
(nguB) *ngu+Bulelwa*
 (hesitant form not counted) copulative formative+noun stem
a+ndi+y+az+i
 negative formative+negative subject concord+linking consonant+root+terminating
 vowel
i+fani ya+khe
 noun prefix+stem possessive concord+possessive stem
o+lu+ndi+ya+m+thand+a yhu
 qualificative formative+basic prefix+pronoun+verbal formative+object
 concord+root+terminating vowel interjective

= 24 morphemes

APPENDIX F: XHOSA STRUCTURE

The Xhosa class system

Xhosa nouns are each assigned a grammatical gender which manifests itself as a class system. Each noun is a member of a class and the class of the noun is marked by a class prefix (du Plessis 1978).

The form of an agreement morpheme is dependent on the class of the noun with which the morpheme needs to agree¹. Fifteen different noun classes are recognised in Xhosa, although, when agreement is marked, only thirteen different forms of each agreement morpheme are used. Each pair in classes 1 and 1(a), and classes 2 and 2(a) shares the same form of the morpheme when it is brought into agreement with the noun. Effectively this means that the language learner has to learn the function of the morpheme and up to thirteen different forms of the morpheme if it is to be supplied correctly in a particular linguistic context.

Noun prefixes

A noun prefix always appears on a noun stem in Xhosa, although the initial vowel is dropped on vocatives (e.g. *bantwana* “children”), after negatives (e.g. *andifuni bantwana* “I don’t want the children”) and after demonstratives (e.g. *lo tata* “this father”). There are fourteen different noun prefixes in Xhosa, as classes 1 and 3 share a common prefix. The prefix of the noun shows whether the root noun to which it is attached is in the singular or plural form. Nouns that fall into classes with odd numbers indicate the singular form and nouns that fall into the classes with even numbers indicate the plural form (see the table overleaf). The plurals of nouns in class 11 are found in class 10, while classes 14 and 15 have only one form as they are usually mass or abstract nouns and infinitive forms respectively (which do not make singular/plural distinctions). The noun prefix table over the page gives examples of nouns in different classes.

¹It should be noted that a study by Satyo (1998) found that L1 Xhosa speakers do not always produce correct agreement forms. He cites examples of class 11 nouns which appear with class 5 agreement forms, where phonological similarities seem to influence morpheme choice.

Noun prefixes

Class number	Prefix	Example
1	um-	umntwana <i>child</i>
1a	u-	utata <i>father</i>
2	aba-	abantwana <i>children</i>
2a	oo-	ootata <i>fathers</i>
3	um-	umlilo <i>fire</i>
4	imi-	imililo <i>fires</i>
5	ili-	i(li)xesha/ilifu <i>time/cloud</i>
6	ama-	amaxesha/amafu <i>times/clouds</i>
7	isi-	isitya <i>dish</i>
8	izi-	izitya <i>dishes</i>
9	in-/i-	indlu/ibhokwe <i>house/goat</i>
10	izin-/ii-	izindlu/iibhokwe <i>houses/goats</i>
11	ulu-	uluvo/u(lu)cango <i>opinion/door</i>
14	ubu-	ubuso <i>face</i>
15	uku-	ukutya <i>food</i>

Adapted from Zotwana (1991) and du Plessis (1978)

Other morphemes

Many other morphemes agree with the class of the noun with which they are co-referenced.

Examples of morphemes which appear in the data and which take agreement forms are:

- e) subject concords
- f) negative subject concords
- g) participials
- h) demonstratives
- i) copulatives
- j) possessives
- k) qualificatives
- l) object concords

Any learner learning to use the morphemes listed above would need to learn multiple forms of the morphemes, since they would need to know which form to use depending on the noun with which the morpheme needs to be co-referenced.

The following morphemes which appear in the data do not agree with nouns, but usually have single forms which are added to noun or verb stems, with or without coalescence of the vowels:

- a) *ya-*
- b) verbal extensions
- c) auxiliaries
- d) locatives
- e) qualificative *a-*
- f) associative copulative
- g) *nga-/na-* “with” morphemes
- h) additive conjunctions
- i) *njenga-* (“like”)
- j) absolute pronouns
- k) pronominal forms for personal pronouns

For most of these morphemes, the learners need to learn only a single form and the function of the form. They would also need to know the coalescence rules which regulate the sound changes which occur when two vowels appear next to each other. For example, if the qualificative *a-* is to be added to a qualificative form which begins with *i-*, the *a-* and the *i-* are coalesced to form *e-* and the form which is added to the stem is therefore *e-*.

Example sentences

The following would be a typical Xhosa sentence using a variety of morphemes:

Abantwana abaninzi abazifundi iincwadi esikolweni.

Children that are many don't read them the books at school.

‘Many children don't read the books at school.’

In the above example, *abantwana* (children) is a noun with a class 2 noun prefix.

Abaninzi (that are many) consists of a qualificative *a-* morpheme followed by a relative concord, *ba-*. The form *ba-* is derived from the class 2 noun *abantwana* (children), with which the adjective stem *-ninzi* (many) is co-referenced.

The next word, *abazifundi* (they don't read them), is a verb in the negative with an object concord. It begins with a negative formative *a-* which is followed by the subject concord *ba-*. *Ba-* is selected as the subject concord because it is co-referenced with *abantwana* (children), a class 2 noun. The *zi-* form is an object concord which is co-referenced with the object *iincwadi* (books). The object concord in this case denotes definiteness. The verb stem ends in terminative *-i* because verbs in the present tense which are also in the negative always end in *-i*.

The form *esikolweni* (at school) is a locative derived from the noun *isikolo* (school). The initial vowel changes to *e-* and the suffix *-ini* is added to the stem. Coalescence of the final vowel *-o* and the first vowel of the suffix *-i*, results in the change to *we-*.

APPENDIX G1: INCORRECT NOUN PREFIXES

The table indicates the number of times an incorrect noun prefix has been supplied by each of the learners for each of the tasks investigated. The number of times that a noun prefix has been incorrectly supplied for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that a noun prefix has been incorrectly supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of incorrect suppliance as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C ²	1 (5%)	0	3 (25%)	0	1 (7%)	2 (20%)	4 (36%)	11 (14%)
PD	0	1 (4%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (2%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (11%)	0	1 (1%)
SB	0	0	3 (17%)	2 (15%)	1 (5%)	1 (6%)	0	7 (6%)
Ben								
C	1 (3%)	0	1 (6%)	0	1 (5%)	4 (27%)	1 (6%)	8 (6%)
PD	1 (8%)	3 (7%)	1 (7%)	3 (11%)	3 (8%)	2 (25%)	0	13 (7%)
T	1 (20%)	0	1 (11%)	0	0	0	1 (11%)	3 (6%)
SB	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0	1 (8%)	0	2 (2%)
Claire								
C	3 (7%)	5 (7%)	2 (7%)	1 (9%)	3 (6%)	1 (3%)	2 (9%)	17 (6%)
PD	6 (27%)	1 (3%)	0	1 (3%)	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	0	11 (6%)
T	0	0	0	1 (10%)	0	2 (20%)	0	3 (5%)
SB	0	1 (6%)	2 (14%)	0	0	0	0	3 (3%)
Pat								
C	2 (5%)	3 (9%)	0	3 (11%)	5 (11%)	4 (24%)	3 (13%)	20 (9%)
PD	1 (6%)	6 (24%)	1 (4%)	2 (13%)	2 (7%)	2 (11%)	4 (17%)	18 (12%)
T	1 (20%)	0	0	1 (10%)	0	0	0	2 (3%)
SB	1 (25%)	3 (21%)	1 (6%)	1 (7%)	3 (14%)	0	0	9 (9%)
Karen								
C	1 (2%)	7 (10%)	0	1 (7%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	0	12 (6%)
PD	1 (13%)	2 (11%)	0	0	0	1 (6%)	2 (12%)	6 (5%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	1 (4%)	3 (8%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)	0	0	7 (4%)
PD	1 (6%)	2 (5%)	0	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	0	1 (5%)	7 (4%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Int Total	22 (6%)	37 (6%)	17 (5%)	19 (5%)	24 (4%)	24 (6%)	18 (5%)	161 (5%)

²C = Conversation, PD = Picture description, T = Translation, SB = Sentence building and Sentence manipulation

APPENDIX G2: NOUN PREFIX OMISSIONS

The table indicates the number of times a noun prefix has been omitted by each of the learners for each of the tasks investigated. The number of times that a noun prefix has been omitted for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that a noun prefix has been omitted in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of omissions as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	2 (9%)	0	1 (8%)	0	1 (7%)	0	0	4 (5%)
PD	1 (14%)	1 (4%)	2 (17%)	0	3 (16%)	0	0	7 (6%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (11%)	0	1 (2%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben								
C	8 (23%)	1 (4%)	0	0	3 (14%)	3 (20%)	0	15 (11%)
PD	3 (23%)	0	1 (7%)	0	0	2 (7%)	2 (9%)	8 (4%)
T	0	0	0	0	1 (10%)	0	0	1 (2%)
SB	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0	0	1 (1%)
Claire								
C	3 (7%)	8 (11%)	1 (4%)	2 (18%)	5 (9%)	4 (10%)	4 (18%)	27 (10%)
PD	2 (9%)	9 (25%)	0	1 (3%)	4 (11%)	2 (11%)	0	18 (9%)
T	1 (17%)	1 (10%)	0	0	2 (18%)	0	0	4 (6%)
SB	3 (50%)	0	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	2 (13%)	0	0	8 (9%)
Pat								
C	8 (19%)	0	0	1 (4%)	2 (5%)	0	0	11 (5%)
PD	0	0	0	0	2 (7%)	0	1 (4%)	3 (2%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	1 (7%)	0	0	1 (5%)	0	0	2 (2%)
Karen								
C	3 (7%)	3 (4%)	0	0	1 (3%)	1 (5%)	0	8 (4%)
PD	0	0	1 (13%)	0	1 (16%)	0	0	2 (2%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	1 (4%)	0	0	3 (14%)	5 (15%)	2 (8%)	3 (15%)	14 (8%)
PD	0	2 (5%)	1 (11%)	0	4 (11%)	0	0	7 (4%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Int Total	35 (10%)	26 (5%)	8 (2%)	10 (3%)	37 (7%)	15 (4%)	10 (3%)	141 (5%)

APPENDIX G3: INCORRECT SUBJECT CONCORDS

The table below indicates the number of times an incorrect subject concord has been supplied by each of the learners for each of the tasks investigated. The number of times that a subject concord has been incorrectly supplied for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that a subject concord has been incorrectly supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of incorrect suppliance as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	2 (12%)	1 (10%)	1 (6%)	0	3 (60%)	0	2 (11%)	9 (11%)
PD	0	1 (17%)	5 (71%)	1 (50%)	2 (40%)	0	1 (33%)	10 (43%)
T	1 (14%)	1 (25%)	0	3 (50%)	3 (38%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	12 (34%)
SB	0	4 (33%)	3 (30%)	1 (7%)	3 (20%)	0	1 (9%)	12 (15%)
Ben								
C	4 (16%)	1 (3%)	6 (18%)	6 (32%)	7 (28%)	7 (25%)	4 (13%)	35 (18%)
PD	4 (36%)	8 (22%)	0	0	4 (19%)	2 (12%)	1 (8%)	19 (15%)
T	0	0	0	3 (50%)	0	0	0	3 (10%)
SB	0	1 (6%)	1 (11%)	0	4 (25%)	0	1 (17%)	7 (9%)
Claire								
C	11 (14%)	17 (24%)	19 (34%)	6 (21%)	8 (14%)	11 (17%)	21 (36%)	93 (22%)
PD	4 (17%)	6 (16%)	3 (43%)	10 (40%)	5 (13%)	10 (50%)	9 (32%)	47 (26%)
T	3 (38%)	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	1 (20%)	2 (22%)	1 (20%)	0	10 (24%)
SB	0	6 (35%)	3 (23%)	3 (19%)	3 (16%)	1 (7%)	2 (17%)	18 (18%)
Pat								
C	2 (6%)	2 (5%)	16 (33%)	7 (15%)	7 (13%)	8 (31%)	11 (30%)	53 (19%)
PD	2 (33%)	9 (38%)	6 (33%)	0	1 (6%)	3 (33%)	5 (36%)	26 (25%)
T	1 (17%)	1 (13%)	0	1 (20%)	1 (14%)	3 (75%)	0	7 (19%)
SB	0	0	1 (9%)	3 (21%)	2 (11%)	2 (13%)	0	8 (8%)
Karen								
C	3 (7%)	6 (7%)	4 (12%)	0	4 (8%)	1 (3%)	0	18 (6%)
PD	0	7 (39%)	1 (17%)	5 (28%)	4 (20%)	0	3 (20%)	20 (20%)
T	0	2 (29%)	0	0	0	0	0	2 (5%)
SB	0	0	1 (6%)	0	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	0	4 (3%)
Sarah								
C	1 (3%)	0	2 (4%)	0	3 (8%)	6 (14%)	4 (10%)	16 (6%)
PD	0	10 (30%)	0	2 (9%)	2 (8%)	2 (13%)	4 (20%)	20 (15%)
T	1 (11%)	0	0	0	1 (14%)	1 (25%)	0	3 (7%)
SB	0	0	1 (6%)	1 (7%)	0	0	1 (6%)	3 (3%)
Int Total	39 (10%)	85 (15%)	74 (20%)	53 (14%)	71 (14%)	62 (16%)	71 (18%)	455 (15%)

APPENDIX G4: SUBJECT CONCORD OMISSIONS

The table indicates the number of times a subject concord has been omitted by each of the learners for each of the tasks investigated. The number of times that a subject concord has been omitted for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that a subject concord has been omitted in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of omissions as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	4 (24%)	3 (30%)	3 (19%)	0	0	0	1 (6%)	11 (13%)
PD	0	0	0	0	1 (20%)	0	0	1 (4%)
T	0	0	1 (50%)	3 (50%)	0	0	0	4 (11%)
SB	0	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0	1 (9%)	2 (2%)
Ben								
C	3 (12%)	3 (11%)	4 (12%)	1 (5%)	4 (16%)	1 (4%)	2 (7%)	18 (9%)
PD	0	8 (22%)	0	4 (21%)	2 (10%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	18 (14%)
T	0	0	0	1 (17%)	0	0	0	1 (3%)
SB	0	1 (6%)	0	0	2 (13%)	0	0	3 (4%)
Claire								
C	6 (8%)	2 (3%)	0	2 (7%)	6 (10%)	3 (5%)	7 (12%)	26 (6%)
PD	0	2 (5%)	0	0	10 (26%)	1 (5%)	4 (14%)	17 (9%)
T	0	0	0	0	1 (11%)	0	0	1 (2%)
SB	0	1 (6%)	1 (8%)	0	0	1 (7%)	0	3 (3%)
Pat								
C	0	3 (8%)	2 (4%)	0	2 (4%)	0	0	7 (3%)
PD	0	1 (4%)	1 (6%)	0	2 (11%)	0	0	4 (4%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	1 (5%)	0	0	0	0	1 (8%)	2 (2%)
Karen								
C	2 (4%)	6 (7%)	1 (3%)	1 (4%)	1 (2%)	0	0	11 (4%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	1 (6%)	0	0	0	3 (18%)	4 (3%)
Sarah								
C	0	0	2 (4%)	0	1 (3%)	1 (2%)	0	4 (1%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 (10%)	2 (2%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Int Total	15 (4%)	31 (6%)	16 (4%)	12 (3%)	33 (6%)	9 (2%)	23 (6%)	139 (5%)

APPENDIX G5: SUPERFLUOUS USE OF -YA-

The table indicates the number of times that *-ya-* is used when it should not be for each task. The number of times that the *-ya-* form is supplied superfluously is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that *-ya-* is used superfluously in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of overuse as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	2 (100%)	0	0	2 (100%)
SB	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	1 (10%)
Ben								
C	3 (75%)	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	0	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	0	10 (71%)
PD	0	4 (80%)	0	2 (67%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	0	8 (67%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Claire								
C	29 (85%)	20 (87%)	12 (71%)	6 (100%)	14 (93%)	18 (82%)	13 (81%)	112 (84%)
PD	4 (80%)	16 (67%)	4 (100%)	11 (79%)	16 (100%)	1 (50%)	6 (50%)	58 (82%)
T	3 (100%)	4 (80%)	1 (100%)	3 (100%)	5 (83%)	3 (100%)	0	19 (90%)
SB	2 (100%)	8 (89%)	7 (78%)	8 (80%)	7 (100%)	3 (100%)	4 (50%)	39 (89%)
Pat								
C	10 (71%)	11 (100%)	18 (67%)	9 (100%)	19 (100%)	4 (100%)	10 (91%)	81 (85%)
PD	2 (100%)	15 (94%)	3 (50%)	4 (100%)	10 (77%)	3 (100%)	6 (67%)	43 (81%)
T	1 (100%)	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	9 (90%)	3 (75%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	23 (91%)
SB	4 (100%)	7 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (100%)	9 (90%)	2 (100%)	4 (100%)	31 (97%)
Karen								
C	1 (100%)	0	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	0	0	0	5 (71%)
PD	0	0	0	0	1 (50%)	0	0	1 (20%)
T	2 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 (50%)
SB	2 (67%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 (33%)
Sarah								
C	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (50%)
PD	0	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (50%)
T	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Int Total	63 (76%)	94 (81%)	54 (65%)	58 (84%)	89 (88%)	37 (88%)	45 (69%)	440 (79%)

APPENDIX G6: INCORRECT NEGATIVE SUBJECT CONCORDS

The table indicates the occurrence of incorrect negative subject concords in the data. The number of times that the incorrect negative subject concord is supplied for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that the incorrect negative subject concord is supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of incorrect uses as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	0	2 (100%)	0	0	0	2 (50%)
PD	0	0	6 (100%)	6 (100%)	0	4 (100%)	4 (100%)	20 (100%)
T	0	0	3 (100%)	1 (50%)	0	0	3 (75%)	7 (88%)
SB	0	0	4 (100%)	3 (100%)	0	3 (100%)	5 (83%)	15 (79%)
Ben								
C	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	2 (67%)
PD	0	0	6 (60%)	2 (50%)	0	0	2 (50%)	10 (53%)
T	0	0	2 (50%)	0	0	0	1 (50%)	3 (33%)
SB	0	0	1 (14%)	0	0	0	0	1 (5%)
Claire								
C	1 (9%)	2 (22%)	0	2 (18%)	1 (67%)	0	3 (18%)	9 (15%)
PD	0	0	2 (33%)	2 (67%)	0	1 (17%)	2 (40%)	7 (16%)
T	0	0	2 (29%)	1 (10%)	0	0	0	3 (20%)
SB	0	1 (50%)	1 (17%)	1 (33%)	0	1 (33%)	1 (17%)	5 (25%)
Pat								
C	0	0	2 (100%)	0	0	2 (67%)	2 (50%)	6 (50%)
PD	1 (100%)	0	1 (25%)	4 (100%)	0	0	2 (67%)	8 (57%)
T	0	0	1 (33%)	1 (50%)	0	0	1 (100%)	3 (50%)
SB	0	0	4 (50%)	3 (75%)	0	1 (33%)	1 (20%)	9 (45%)
Karen								
C	0	0	0	0	2 (67%)	0	0	2 (22%)
PD	0	0	2 (25%)	0	0	0	1 (100%)	3 (18%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	0	0	0	0	2 (67%)	0	0	2 (9%)
PD	0	1 (100%)	4 (67%)	0	0	2 (33%)	2 (67%)	9 (47%)
T	0	0	1 (33%)	0	0	0	0	1 (11%)
SB	0	0	1 (40%)	0	0	1 (33%)	3 (50%)	5 (24%)
Int Total	3 (11%)	4 (18%)	43 (38%)	28 (33%)	5 (42%)	15 (22%)	34 (32%)	132 (31%)

APPENDIX G7: LACK OF *I*-ENDING ON NEGATIVES

The table indicates when the final *i*-ending is not used for the negative verb. The number of times that no *i*-ending is supplied for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that no *i*-ending is supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of omissions as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (25%)
PD	0	0	2 (33%)	0	0	2 (50%)	0	4 (20%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	1 (13%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	3 (30%)	0	0	0	1 (25%)	4 (21%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Claire								
C	0	0	0	0	0	1 (11%)	4 (24%)	5 (8%)
PD	1 (11%)	1 (33%)	0	0	0	0	1 (14%)	3 (7%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pat								
C	0	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (50%)	0	0	1 (100%)	7 (58%)
PD	0	0	6 (100%)	0	0	0	2 (67%)	8 (57%)
T	0	0	2 (67%)	1 (50%)	0	1 (100%)	2 (67%)	6 (55%)
SB	0	0	2 (50%)	0	0	1 (33%)	2 (40%)	5 (25%)
Karen								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	2 (25%)	0	0	0	0	2 (12%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Int Total	1 (4%)	3 (14%)	19 (17%)	3 (4%)	0	6 (9%)	14 (13%)	46 (11%)

APPENDIX G8: INCORRECT COPULATIVE

The table indicates use of the incorrect form of the copulative. The number of times that the incorrect form of the copulative has been supplied for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that the incorrect form of the copulative is supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of incorrect uses as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	0	0	0	1 (11%)	0	1 (3%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Claire								
C	0	4 (29%)	0	0	1 (11%)	0	0	5 (13%)
PD	1 (25%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (6%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pat								
C	0	0	0	0	0	1 (50%)	0	1 (4%)
PD	0	0	1 (33%)	0	0	0	0	1 (9%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Karen								
C	2 (14%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 (5%)
PD	0	0	0	0	1 (25%)	0	0	1 (7%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	1 (33%)	0	0	1 (50%)	0	0	2 (20%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Int Total	3 (6%)	5 (8%)	1 (6%)	0	3 (5%)	2 (5%)	0	14 (5%)

APPENDIX G9: COPULATIVE OMISSIONS

The table indicates the number of times the copulative is omitted in the data for each task and learner. The number of times that the copulative is omitted for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that the copulative is omitted in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of omissions as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	4 (100%)	1 (33%)	0	4 (36%)	3 (33%)	0	12 (38%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)
Ben								
C	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	0	1 (100%)	0	2 (100%)	0	6 (43%)
PD	0	1 (50%)	2 (67%)	0	0	0	0	3 (60%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (50%)
SB	0	0	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	0	0	0	2 (67%)
Claire								
C	0	2 (14%)	0	0	2 (22%)	1 (14%)	0	5 (13%)
PD	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	1 (6%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pat								
C	3 (43%)	2 (29%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	4 (80%)	1 (50%)	0	14 (54%)
PD	0	1 (100%)	1 (33%)	2 (100%)	0	0	1 (50%)	5 (45%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	0	0	3 (60%)
Karen								
C	0	3 (20%)	0	0	1 (17%)	0	0	4 (10%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	1 (14%)	1 (17%)	0	0	2 (25%)	0	0	4 (15%)
PD	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	2 (67%)	0	3 (30%)
T	2 (100%)	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	3 (100%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Int Total	8 (16%)	16 (25%)	9 (53%)	7 (50%)	15 (25%)	11 (26%)	1 (9%)	67 (26%)

APPENDIX G10: LOCATIVE OMISSIONS

The table indicates the number of times that locatives have been omitted for each task. The total for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that the locative has been omitted in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of omissions as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	3 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	3 (11%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	2 (25%)
T	0	0	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	1 (8%)
SB	0	0	0	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0	0	2 (8%)
Ben								
C	0	2 (13%)	0	1 (20%)	0	0	0	3 (4%)
PD	0	0	0	1 (17%)	1 (20%)	0	0	2 (7%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	1 (14%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (3%)
Claire								
C	2 (7%)	1 (5%)	1 (8%)	0	0	0	0	4 (3%)
PD	0	0	0	2 (20%)	0	2 (20%)	0	4 (11%)
T	2 (33%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 (13%)
SB	0	0	0	2 (33%)	0	1 (33%)	0	3 (12%)
Pat								
C	1 (14%)	1 (14%)	1 (9%)	3 (23%)	0	2 (25%)	2 (20%)	10 (14%)
PD	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	3 (20%)
T	2 (40%)	0	0	0	0	1 (50%)	0	3 (20%)
SB	0	0	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (20%)	2 (67%)	1 (20%)	8 (29%)
Karen								
C	1 (5%)	0	1 (13%)	0	1 (4%)	0	0	3 (3%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (3%)
Sarah								
C	1 (4%)	0	1 (7%)	0	0	2 (15%)	1 (11%)	5 (5%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (25%)	1 (3%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	1 (13%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (2%)
Int Total	12 (8%)	10 (6%)	7 (7%)	12 (11%)	4 (3%)	11 (8%)	6 (5%)	62 (7%)

APPENDIX G11: INCORRECT LOCATIVES

The table indicates the number of times that a locative has been incorrectly supplied for each task. The total number of incorrectly supplied forms is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that the locative has been incorrectly supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of incorrect forms as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	0	0	1 (25%)	0	0	1 (4%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	1 (50%)	2 (17%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	1 (100%)	1 (20%)	0	0	0	2 (7%)
T	1 (17%)	0	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	2 (13%)
SB	0	0	1 (20%)	0	0	0	0	1 (3%)
Claire								
C	2 (7%)	1 (5%)	0	0	1 (4%)	0	0	4 (3%)
PD	0	1 (17%)	0	0	0	1 (6%)	0	2 (6%)
T	1 (17%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (7%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pat								
C	0	0	1 (9%)	0	0	0	1 (10%)	2 (3%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	1 (50%)	0	1 (7%)
T	0	0	1 (50%)	0	0	0	1 (33%)	2 (13%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Karen								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	1 (25%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (8%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	0	0	0	2 (17%)	0	0	1 (11%)	3 (3%)
PD	0	2 (25%)	0	0	1 (20%)	1 (14%)	0	4 (14%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	1 (13%)	1 (13%)	0	0	0	0	2 (5%)
Int Total	5 (3%)	5 (3%)	6 (6%)	3 (3%)	3 (2%)	4 (3%)	4 (3%)	30 (3%)

APPENDIX G12: ONLY INITIAL PART OF LOCATIVE

The table indicates the number of times that only the initial part of the locative has been supplied for each task. The total is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that only the initial part of the locative is supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of only initial suppliance as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	1 (33%)	0	2 (25%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	1 (25%)	0	1 (4%)
Ben								
C	2 (17%)	2 (13%)	0	0	2 (25%)	0	1 (7%)	7 (9%)
PD	0	1 (14%)	0	1 (17%)	1 (20%)	1 (33%)	0	4 (14%)
T	0	0	1 (50%)	0	0	3 (100%)	2 (40%)	6 (38%)
SB	1 (3%)	0	0	2 (33%)	0	0	0	3 (9%)
Claire								
C	1 (3%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (1%)
PD	0	0	1 (100%)	1 (10%)	1 (33%)	3 (30%)	1 (33%)	7 (19%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	0	1 (7%)
SB	0	0	1 (25%)	1 (17%)	1 (25%)	0	1 (20%)	4 (16%)
Pat								
C	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	0	0	0	0	0	3 (4%)
PD	0	0	1 (33%)	0	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0	4 (27%)
T	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	1 (7%)
SB	0	0	0	1 (25%)	1 (20%)	1 (33%)	2 (20%)	5 (18%)
Karen								
C	0	1 (3%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (1%)
PD	0	0	0	1 (17%)	0	0	0	1 (8%)
T	1 (20%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (6%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	1 (4%)	0	0	1 (8%)	0	0	0	2 (2%)
PD	0	1 (14%)	0	0	0	2 (29%)	0	3 (10%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (20%)	2 (5%)
Int Total	9 (6%)	6 (4%)	4 (4%)	8 (7%)	10 (7%)	14 (10%)	8 (7%)	59 (6%)

APPENDIX G13: ONLY FINAL PART OF LOCATIVE

The table indicates the number of times that only the final part of the locative has been incorrectly supplied for each task. The total is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that only the final part of the locative is supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of suppliance of final parts of the locative as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (50%)	1 (13%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	0	1 (8%)
SB	0	0	0	2 (40%)	0	1 (25%)	0	3 (12%)
Ben								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	0	1 (3%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	1 (17%)	0	0	0	1 (3%)
Claire								
C	1 (3%)	1 (5%)	0	0	2 (9%)	1 (6%)	0	5 (4%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (50%)	1 (7%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pat								
C	0	0	0	0	1 (6%)	0	0	1 (1%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Karen								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	1 (6%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	0	1 (25%)	0	0	0	1 (3%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Int Total	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	4 (4%)	3 (2%)	4 (3%)	2 (2%)	16 (2%)

APPENDIX G14: INCORRECT DEMONSTRATIVES

The table indicates the use of incorrect demonstrative concords in the data. The number of times that the demonstrative is incorrectly supplied for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that the demonstrative is incorrectly supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of incorrect forms as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	1 (25%)
T	0	0	4 (100%)	0	0	0	0	4 (100%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben								
C	1 (50%)	1 (13%)	0	0	1 (33%)	1 (50%)	0	4 (21%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	1 (50%)	0	4 (67%)	3 (100%)	0	0	4 (100%)	12 (92%)
SB	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	1 (33%)
Claire								
C	1 (50%)	2 (13%)	1 (20%)	0	0	0	1 (100%)	5 (15%)
PD	1 (50%)	5 (56%)	0	3 (100%)	0	0	5 (42%)	14 (39%)
T	1 (100%)	0	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	0	0	3 (60%)	6 (55%)
SB	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	1 (100%)	2 (100%)
Pat								
C	0	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	3 (100%)	1 (20%)	0	0	6 (46%)
PD	0	0	0	1 (100%)	2 (40%)	0	0	3 (12%)
T	1 (100%)	0	3 (60%)	1 (25%)	0	1 (100%)	2 (50%)	8 (67%)
SB	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	1 (50%)
Karen								
C	0	1 (14%)	0	0	0	1 (50%)	0	2 (15%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	1 (33%)	0	0	0	1 (6%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	2 (67%)
PD	0	0	0	1 (25%)	0	0	0	1 (11%)
T	0	0	0	1 (25%)	0	0	0	1 (8%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Int Total	7 (44%)	11 (20%)	15 (27%)	18 (49%)	4 (11%)	3 (17%)	16 (25%)	74 (26%)

APPENDIX G15: INCORRECT POSSESSIVE CONCORDS

The table presents the number of times that a possessive concord has been incorrectly supplied. The total for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that a possessive concord has been incorrectly supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of incorrect forms as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	0	0	8 (73%)	0	0	8 (62%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben								
C	1 (17%)	1 (9%)	2 (25%)	2 (40%)	1 (13%)	0	0	7 (18%)
PD	2 (50%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 (29%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	2 (50%)	0	0	0	0	2 (18%)
Claire								
C	7 (47%)	15 (45%)	2 (22%)	2 (50%)	7 (35%)	10 (43%)	3 (60%)	46 (42%)
PD	0	1 (33%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (9%)
T	0	1 (33%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (17%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pat								
C	3 (30%)	1 (8%)	0	3 (23%)	4 (22%)	7 (41%)	3 (75%)	21 (28%)
PD	0	0	1 (100%)	0	2 (100%)	0	0	3 (75%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	1 (33%)	0	1 (50%)	0	1 (50%)	0	3 (27%)
Karen								
C	2 (15%)	5 (14%)	0	0	2 (20%)	0	0	9 (11%)
PD	0	4 (67%)	0	1 (33%)	5 (83%)	0	2 (100%)	12 (71%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	1 (33%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (6%)
Sarah								
C	2 (20%)	3 (21%)	1 (50%)	1 (25%)	2 (18%)	0	0	9 (16%)
PD	0	2 (100%)	0	3 (100%)	0	0	0	5 (83%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	1 (25%)	1 (33%)	0	0	0	0	2 (15%)
Int Total	18 (25%)	35 (26%)	9 (26%)	13 (28%)	31 (29%)	18 (25%)	8 (27%)	132 (27%)

APPENDIX G16: POSSESSIVE CONCORD OMISSION

The table indicates the number of times that a possessive concord has been omitted for each task. The total number of omissions is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that a possessive concord has been omitted in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of omissions as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben								
C	0	0	1 (8%)	0	0	0	0	1 (3%)
PD	0	1 (7%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (14%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Claire								
C	0	1 (3%)	1 (11%)	1 (25%)	0	0	0	3 (3%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pat								
C	3 (30%)	2 (17%)	0	4 (33%)	6 (33%)	0	1 (25%)	16 (21%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (25%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	1 (50%)	0	0	2 (67%)	3 (27%)
Karen								
C	0	0	0	1 (50%)	1 (10%)	1 (8%)	0	3 (4%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 (50%)	2 (12%)
Sarah								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (7%)	1 (2%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Int Total	3 (4%)	4 (3%)	2 (6%)	7 (15%)	7 (6%)	2 (3%)	6 (20%)	31 (6%)

APPENDIX G17: INCORRECT QUALIFICATIVE CONCORDS

The table indicates the occurrence of incorrect qualificative concords in the data. The number of times that the qualificative concord is incorrectly supplied for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that the qualificative concord is incorrectly supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of incorrect forms as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	0	1 (33%)	0	1 (50%)	4 (44%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	2 (67%)	0	2 (67%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (100%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben								
C	0	1 (33%)	0	2 (50%)	0	1 (50%)	2 (67%)	6 (29%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	3 (75%)	0	3 (60%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (100%)
SB	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	3 (44%)
Claire								
C	2 (50%)	0	0	0	2 (40%)	0	3 (60%)	7 (30%)
PD	0	0	0	0	2 (40%)	0	0	2 (11%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (25%)
Pat								
C	0	0	0	2 (67%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	0	5 (50%)
PD	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	0	1 (33%)	5 (45%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (100%)
SB	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	3 (75%)
Karen								
C	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	3 (33%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	1 (25%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	0	1 (33%)	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	0	0	4 (42%)
PD	0	1 (33%)	0	0	1 (50%)	0	0	2 (33%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (50%)	0	1 (50%)
SB	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	3 (67%)
Int Total	2 (18%)	6 (44%)	2 (29%)	8 (62%)	12 (55%)	16 (47%)	12 (55%)	58 (35%)

APPENDIX G18: QUALIFICATIVE CONCORD OMISSIONS

The table indicates the number of omissions of the qualificative concord in the data. The number of times that the qualificative concord is omitted for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that the qualificative concord is omitted in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of omissions as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	1 (50%)	0	0	1 (50%)	0	2 (22%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben								
C	1 (100%)	0	1 (25%)	0	1 (33%)	0	0	3 (14%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	1 (25%)	1 (100%)	2 (40%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Claire								
C	0	1 (50%)	0	0	0	1 (50%)	0	2 (13%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	2 (67%)	0	2 (11%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	1 (50%)	0	0	0	1 (14%)
Pat								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	1 (9%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Karen								
C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	0	2 (33%)	0	0	0	0	0	2 (17%)
PD	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	1 (17%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Int Total	1 (9%)	3 (19%)	2 (14%)	1 (8%)	1 (9%)	5 (15%)	3 (15%)	16 (10%)

APPENDIX G19: INCORRECT QUALIFICATIVE *A*- CONCORDS

The table indicates the occurrences of incorrect suppliance of qualificative *a*- concords in the data. The number of times that the qualificative *a*- concord is incorrectly supplied for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that the qualificative *a*- concord is incorrectly supplied in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of incorrect forms as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	0	1 (50%)	2 (20%)
PD	0	0	0	1 (25%)	1 (100%)	0	0	2 (22%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (67%)	0	1 (20%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben								
C	0	1 (20%)	0	0	1 (17%)	0	2 (33%)	4 (14%)
PD	1 (14%)	0	0	1 (25%)	2 (33%)	2 (25%)	1 (20%)	7 (21%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	1 (33%)
Claire								
C	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	2 (29%)	1 (20%)	2 (50%)	0	0	7 (22%)
PD	0	1 (20%)	0	1 (20%)	1 (50%)	1 (33%)	2 (40%)	6 (23%)
T	0	0	0	1 (100%)	1 (33%)	0	0	2 (33%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pat								
C	0	0	2 (40%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (11%)	7 (19%)
PD	0	1 (14%)	3 (50%)	0	0	1 (50%)	2 (45%)	7 (31%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	0	1 (17%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (50%)
Karen								
C	1 (17%)	2 (25%)	2 (22%)	0	0	0	1 (25%)	6 (16%)
PD	1 (20%)	4 (50%)	0	0	0	0	2 (33%)	7 (26%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sarah								
C	2 (33%)	1 (33%)	0	1 (25%)	0	0	1 (25%)	5 (16%)
PD	0	0	0	0	2 (100%)	2 (22%)	0	4 (19%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	0	1 (17%)
SB	0	0	1 (25%)	0	0	0	0	1 (5%)
Int Total	6 (11%)	11 (23%)	10 (15%)	7 (14%)	13 (18%)	11 (15%)	14 (24%)	72 (17%)

APPENDIX G20: QUALIFICATIVE *A*- CONCORD OMISSIONS

The table indicates the omission of the qualificative *a*- concord. The number of times that the qualificative *a*- concord is omitted for each task is presented in the *Task Total* column on the right-hand side of the table, and the number of times that the qualificative *a*- concord is omitted in each interview is presented in the *Int Total* column at the bottom of the table. The percentages refer to the percentage of omissions as a percentage of the total number of obligatory uses in each task or interview.

Int No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Task Total
Ann								
C	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	4 (40%)
PD	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	2 (100%)	0	3 (33%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	0	1 (20%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ben								
C	0	1 (20%)	2 (33%)	0	2 (50%)	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	11 (35%)
PD	2 (29%)	0	0	0	2 (33%)	6 (75%)	1 (20%)	11 (32%)
T	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	2 (100%)	0	3 (100%)
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Claire								
C	2 (40%)	1 (20%)	1 (14%)	0	0	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	6 (19%)
PD	4 (67%)	2 (40%)	1 (17%)	0	1 (50%)	0	3 (60%)	11 (34%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pat								
C	0	3 (100%)	1 (20%)	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	5 (56%)	15 (48%)
PD	3 (100%)	2 (29%)	0	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	2 (40%)	11 (42%)
T	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	1 (33%)	0	2 (33%)
SB	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	1 (50%)
Karen								
C	1 (17%)	3 (38%)	0	1 (20%)	0	1 (17%)	0	6 (14%)
PD	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	0	3 (11%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (5%)
Sarah								
C	0	0	1 (25%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	0	1 (25%)	4 (13%)
PD	1 (17%)	0	0	1 (25%)	0	2 (22%)	1 (33%)	5 (16%)
T	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SB	0	2 (40%)	0	0	0	0	0	2 (9%)
Int Total	16 (31%)	14 (23%)	8 (12%)	8 (16%)	10 (13%)	27 (42%)	17 (24%)	100 (24%)