

Tilburg University

Acquisition of kinship reference

Broeder, Peter; Extra, G.

Published in:
International Journal of Applied Linguistics

DOI:
[10.1111/j.1473-4192.1991.tb00017.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.1991.tb00017.x)

Publication date:
1991

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Broeder, P., & Extra, G. (1991). Acquisition of kinship reference: A study on word-formation processes of adult language learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 209-227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.1991.tb00017.x>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Acquisition of kinship reference: A study on word-formation processes of adult language learners

PETER BROEDER & GUUS EXTRA
Tilburg University

Although there is a substantial cross-linguistic body of evidence on expressive devices for kinship reference in a variety of languages, empirical studies dealing with the use of such devices in processes of (second) language acquisition are rather scarce. This multiple-case study takes the latter perspective, focussing on Turkish and Moroccan learners of Dutch. The data were derived from a longitudinal and cross-linguistic project carried out with adult immigrants in Western Europe, under the auspices of the European Science Foundation. After introducing the study, a typological comparison is presented of expressive devices for kinship reference in the three languages under consideration, characterized by a great distance between each of the two source languages and the target language. After a brief description of the informants and data-base, the study focuses on learner varieties for referring to the dimensions of blood relationship, kinship degree, generation, and gender. The study will offer evidence for both general and source-language-specific principles of language acquisition. Language learners start with the use of an initial and standard-like core wordstock for referring to "close" kinsmen. "Distant" kinsmen are initially referred to by non-standard devices, which are partly derived from source-language conventions. Left-branching principles in Turkish vs. right-branching principles in Moroccan Arabic, in particular, show a clear influence on these learners' innovative devices for kinship reference in Dutch.

Introduction

The expressive devices for kinship reference belong to the most well-defined and extensively studied examples of semantic fields. For a wide variety of languages and cultures, data on kinship reference have been collected, described and compared. As Barnard & Good (1984: 55) pointed out, compon-

entional analysis came into being with the famous analysis of kinship reference by Goodenough (1956). Since then kinship terminology has been an integral part of semantics and has led to new approaches in the study of language use. Miller & Johnson-Laird (1977: 360-73) used kinship terminology to cast light on their semantic theory of the relation between perception and language. Methods of psychological scaling have been applied to kinship terms. Formal representations have been developed for analyzing kinship data, i.e., generative approaches (see Borland 1979 for a review, and more recently Lambek 1986 and Anglin 1986) as well as more connectionist-oriented approaches (e.g., Hinton 1986). In the study of pidgin and creole varieties, expressive devices for kinship reference have also been a major focus of attention. Master, Sokolik & Schumann (1989) studied kinship reference in experimentally created varieties of German pidgin and Farsi pidgin. One of the very few attempts to look at kinship terminology from an evolutionary perspective is a study by Allen (1989).

Despite the long history and the extensive literature on kinship terminology, studies dealing with the acquisition of kinship terms are rather scarce. At first sight this may seem surprising. It is, however, probably the result of two common types of bias in the study of language acquisition. First, English is most commonly dealt with as the target language. As a matter of fact, kinship terminology in English is relatively undifferentiated. Second, most acquisition studies have dealt with child language (see Carter 1984 and Haviland & Clark 1974 for an overview of the most important studies). Child language acquisition is a less revealing area for kinship terminology. Children will acquire the nuclear terms (e.g., 'father', 'mother', 'brother', 'sister') at a relatively early stage. Reference to relatives outside the nuclear family will only be needed at a later stage, at which time such reference usually can be accomplished in a standard-like fashion.

In this paper, we present a cross-linguistic perspective on the acquisition of kinship reference by Turkish and Moroccan adult learners of Dutch. First, a typological comparison is made of the terms for kinship reference in standard Dutch, Moroccan Arabic and Turkish. Next we focus on two Turkish and two Moroccan adults acquiring Dutch as a second language. We examine which lexical and morphological devices these informants use to express which kinship relations. The study is a follow-up of earlier work carried out by Broeder et al. (1988), Broeder, Extra & Van Hout (1989) and Broeder & Extra (1988) which focussed on processes concerning the developing lexicon of adult immigrants acquiring the language of their new environment in Western Europe.

Kinship terminology in Dutch, Moroccan Arabic and Turkish

In the long history of kinship studies, many attempts have been made to classify the kinship terminologies of the world (see Barnard & Good 1984 for an overview). The most important dimensions on which kinship relations can vary are the following:

- generation: i.e., kinsmen of the same generation, ancestors and descendants
- blood relationship: i.e., consanguineal vs. affineal kinsmen
- degree: i.e., first, second and third degree kinsmen
- gender of ego, of relative (alter), or of connecting relative.

Kinship terminologies of languages differ in the distinctions and equations that are made for each of these dimensions. On the basis of a typological comparison of a variety of languages, Greenberg (1966) postulated three general characteristics of kinship terminology: (1) languages tend to keep generations apart—most commonly, there are different terms for parents, grandparents, children, and grandchildren; (2) languages tend to discriminate between blood relatives and a spouse's relatives (e.g., *mother* versus *mother-in-law*); (3) languages tend to discriminate between the gender of at least some relatives (e.g., *mother* versus *father*, or *sister* versus *brother*).

It is not always straightforward to decide what constitutes a basic kinship term, although intuitively native speakers may agree with each other. For example, the forms *mother*, *grandmother* and *mother-in-law* can be characterized as constituting three basic terms, or as constituting one basic kinship term (i.e., *mother*) to which structural modifications have been applied (i.e., the added morphemes *grand* and *in-law*), corresponding with specific dimensions of the kinship system (i.e., "ancestor +1 generation" and "affinity").

Table 1 contains a survey of basic kinship terms in Dutch derived from the conceptual distinctions given above.

Table 1: Basic kinship terms in Dutch

	consanguineal				affineal	
	direct		collateral		male	female
	male	female	male	female		
+3	<i>overgrootvader</i>	<i>overgrootmoeder</i>				
+2	<i>opa</i> <i>grootvader</i>	<i>oma</i> <i>grootmoeder</i>	<i>oudoom</i> <i>grootoom</i>	<i>oudtante</i> <i>groottante</i>		
+1	<i>papa</i> <i>vader</i>	<i>mama</i> <i>moeder</i>	<i>oom</i>	<i>tante</i>	<i>schoonvader</i>	<i>schoonmoeder</i>
0	<i>broer</i>	<i>zus(ter)</i>	<i>neef</i>	<i>nicht</i>	<i>schoonbroer</i> <i>zwager</i>	<i>schoonzus(ter)</i>
-1	<i>zoon</i>	<i>dochter</i>			<i>schoonzoon</i>	<i>schoondochter</i>
-2	<i>kleinzoon</i>	<i>kleindochter</i>	<i>achterneef</i>	<i>achternicht</i>		
-3	<i>achterkleinzoon</i>	<i>achterkleindochter</i>				

The standard Dutch system for kinship terminology has separate lexemes for six nuclear kinship types: *vader* ('father'), *moeder* ('mother'), *broer* ('brother'), *zuster* ('sister'), *zoon* ('son') and *dochter* ('daughter'). In addition, there are four more intimate kinship terms: *papa* ('daddy'), *mama* ('mommy'), *opa* ('grandpa') and *oma* ('grandma'). Kinship types outside the nuclear family are referred to by a transparent system of word-formation devices in which specific classes of morphemes correspond with specific kinship types:

- direct ancestors are referred to by means of *groot* (+2) and *over-groot* (+3)
- direct descendants are referred to by means of *klein* (-2) and *achter-klein* (-3)
- collateral ancestors are referred to by means of *oud* (+2)
- collateral descendants are referred to by means of *achter* (-2)
- affinal relations are expressed by the addition of *schoon* to the nuclear basic terms. However, as well as *schoonbroer*, there is also a separate basic lexeme for brother-in-law, i.e., *zwager*.

With respect to some nuclear kinship types, Dutch has cover-terms in which the gender distinction is neutralized: *ouders* ('parents') and *kind* ('child'). However, Dutch has no such cover-term for reference to siblings. If we now compare Dutch kinship terminology with Moroccan Arabic and Turkish kinship conventions, some interesting observations can be made. Tables 2 and 3 contain a survey of basic kinship terms in Turkish and Moroccan Arabic respectively. Turkish kinship terminology is so complex that no complete account can be given here. For a thorough account of Turkish kinship terms, we refer to Liebe-Harkort (1983).

Table 2: Basic kinship terms in Moroccan Arabic

	consanguineal				affineal	
	direct		collateral		male	female
	male	female	male	female		
+3						
+2	<i>henne</i>					
	<i>jedd</i>	<i>jedda</i>				
+1	<i>mwi</i>	<i>ba</i>	<i>Cam</i>	<i>Camma</i>		
	<i>kwali</i>	<i>kwali</i>	<i>khal</i>	<i>khala</i>		
0	<i>akk</i>	<i>ukht</i>			<i>nsib</i>	<i>nsiba</i>
-1	<i>weld</i>	<i>bent</i>				
-2						
-3						

Table 3: Basic kinship terms in Turkish

	consanguineal				affineal	
	direct		collateral		male	female
	male	female	male	female		
+3	<i>büyükdede</i>	<i>büyüknane</i>				
+2	<i>dede</i> <i>büyükbaba</i>	<i>nane</i> <i>büyükanna</i> <i>anneanne</i> <i>babaanne</i>				
+1	<i>peder</i> <i>baba</i>	<i>valide</i> <i>anne</i>	<i>amca</i> <i>dayı</i>	<i>hala</i> <i>teyze</i>	<i>kayınpeder</i> <i>kayınbaba</i>	<i>kayınvalide</i> <i>kaynana</i>
0	<i>ağabey/abi</i> <i>erkek kardeş</i>	<i>abla</i> <i>kız kardeş</i>			<i>kayın</i> <i>enişte</i>	<i>balıız</i> <i>yenge</i>
-1	<i>oğul</i>	<i>kız</i>	<i>erkek yeğen</i>	<i>kız yeğen</i>	<i>damat</i> <i>güvey</i>	<i>gelin</i>
-2	<i>oğlan/erkek torun</i>	<i>kız torun</i>				
-3						

On the dimension of blood relationship, Dutch and Moroccan Arabic have the most differentiated set of kinship terms for reference to direct kinsmen and the least differentiated one for reference to affineal kinsmen. The reverse can be noted for Turkish. Moroccan Arabic kinship terminology is less specific than Dutch; the kinship terms *nsib* ('father/brother/son-in-law') and *nsiba* ('mother/sister/daughter-in-law') equate +1, 0, and -1 affineal kinship types. Again, Turkish kinship terminology is remarkably differentiated in that, for affineal kinsmen of the same generation, the gender of the ego is relevant. For example, *görümce* ('sister-in-law') refers to 'sister of the husband', *balıız* ('sister-in-law') to 'sister of the wife', *enişte* ('brother-in-law') to 'husband of the sister of the husband', and *bacanak* ('brother-in-law') to 'husband of the sister of the wife'.

On the dimension of kinship degree, the Dutch system is cognatic, i.e., the same terms are used for both paternal and maternal kinsmen. However, a distinction is made both in Turkish and Moroccan Arabic between the uncle/aunt on the father's side and the uncle/aunt on the mother's side; i.e., in Moroccan Arabic, *Camm* and *Camma* versus *khal* and *khala* respectively, and in Turkish, *amca* and *hala* versus *dayı* and *teyze*.

On the dimension of generation, the Moroccan Arabic system of kinship terms is again less specific than Dutch: the oldest ancestors covered by basic kinship terms are generation +2, *jedd* ('grand-father') and *jedda* ('grand-mother'), whereas the youngest descendants covered by basic kinship terms are generation -1, *weld* ('son') and *bent* ('daughter'). The set of basic kinship terms in Turkish is more extended, i.e., from generation +3 to generation -2. For direct ancestors (+2 and +3), a rather transparent word-formation device is operative which affixes the morpheme *büyük*, e.g., *büyükbaba* ('grandfather')

and *büyükdede* ('greatgrandfather'). For direct maternal ancestors, the parents of the mother may be referred to in Turkish by the composite expressions *anneanne* ('mother-mother') and *babaanne* ('father-mother'), while equivalent devices for direct paternal ancestors do not exist; *anna baba* ('mother father') is the Turkish equivalent for the kinship type "parents".

On the dimension of gender, finally, in Moroccan Arabic a systematic word-formation device is operative: female kinship types are referred to most commonly by adding *-a* to the basic term for reference to the corresponding male kinship types. In the Turkish system, gender reference emerges differently. There are three genderless terms: *kardeş*, ('brother/sister') for direct relatives of generation 0, *torun* ('grandchild') for direct relatives of generation -2, and *yeğen* ('nephew/niece') for collateral relatives of generation -1. Gender-specific reference is realized by the juxtaposition of these terms with *erkek* for masculine reference and with *kız* for feminine reference. This procedure results in left-branching, head-final constructions, e.g., *erkek kardeş*, ('brother') and *kız torun* ('girl grandchild').

It can be concluded from this typological comparison of kinship terminology in standard Dutch, Turkish and Moroccan Arabic that the Turkish system is clearly the most differentiated one. Moreover, it is important to bear in mind for all three languages that if more specific kinship types have to be expressed for which no basic terms are available, this can be done by combining basic kinship terms. However, an important difference can be observed between Turkish and Moroccan Arabic in the ordering of the modifier and the head: the modifier occurs second in Moroccan Arabic and first in Turkish. Some examples are given in Table 4:

Table 4: Modifier-head order in Moroccan Arabic and Turkish

Kinship type	Moroccan Arabic	Literal translation	Turkish	Literal translation
cousin	weld l-khal	son the-uncle	dayi oğgul	uncle son
grandson	weld l-bent	son the-daughter	erkek torun	boy grandchild
granddaughter	bent l-weld	daughter the-son	kız torun	girl grandchild
sister-in-law	ukht r-ražel	sister the-man	görümce	sister-in-law

Given these typological similarities and differences between the three languages under consideration, we will now focus on the acquisition of Dutch kinship reference by Moroccan and Turkish adults.

Informants and data-base

The subjects in this study are two Turkish adults (Ergün and Mahmut) and two Moroccan adults (Fatima and Mohamed) who are in the process of acquiring Dutch in everyday interaction. Native speakers of Turkish and Moroccan Arabic belong to the largest ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands. The data were gathered in the context of a cross-national project of the European Science Foundation, based in Strasbourg. The project was carried out from 1982 to 1987 in Great Britain, Germany, the Netherlands, France and Sweden. It focussed on processes of non-tutored second language acquisition by adult immigrants in Western Europe, and it had both a cross-linguistic and longitudinal dimension. The cross-linguistic dimension was expressed in the study of five different target languages (L2) learnt by speakers of six different source languages (L1). The corresponding L1/L2 pairs were combined in the following way:

L2:	Swedish	French	Dutch	German	English	
	^	^	^	^	^	
L1:	Finnish	Spanish	Arabic	Turkish	Italian	Punjabi

With respect to the longitudinal dimension, each month during a two-and-a-half year period, audio/video recordings were made of two core informants for each L1/L2 pair, making a total number of twenty core informants. A detailed description of the aims and design of the project is given in Perdue (1984).

When the Turkish and the Moroccan learners of Dutch started to participate in our study, they had been living in the Netherlands for 8-12 months. Their ages varied from 17 to 24. None of them had a Dutch-speaking spouse nor any children of school age, and they had received little education in their source countries. At the start of the project, their language proficiency in Dutch was very low. During their participation in the project, they learnt Dutch as a second language without substantial formal tuition. Basic sociobiographical characteristics of our informants are given in Table 5.

In order to get as complete a picture as possible of the second language acquisition process of these four informants, all interactional data that have been collected in the ESF-project for the informants were taken into account. With each informant, 27 sessions took place in monthly intervals during the first three years of their stay in the Netherlands. The sessions contained audio- and video-recordings of native/non-native speaker interactions in a variety of language activities such as guided conversations, role-playing, or film-retellings.

The procedure for building a data-base in this particular study can be summarized as follows. First, all word-types used for kinship reference were selected. Next, for all selected word-types, a concordance of the utterances of

Table 5: Basic sociobiographical informant characteristics*

	Ergün	Mahmut	Fatima	Mohamed
Sex	male	male	female	male
Year, Birthplace	1964, Ankara	1962, Temürlü	1956, Kenitra	1961, Casablanca
Residence SC	Ankara	Ankara	Kenitra	Casablanca
Schooling SC	5 years	5 years	2 years	7 years
Employment SC	motor mechanic	motor mechanic	needlewoman	none
Age on arrival TC	17	19	24	19
Session 1 (months after arrival)	11 months	9 months	12 months	8 months
Schooling TC	Educ. center	none	Comm. center	none
Employment TC	fact. worker	fact. worker	kitchenmaid	fact. worker
Marital status	single	married	married	single
Living with	Turkish family	wife	husband	parents
Skill in other lang.	none	none	none	a little French

* SC = Source Country, TC = Target Country.

the non-native informant and the native interlocutor was derived from the transcripts by means of a concordance program (OCP); the concordance list gives all word-tokens used by a particular informant alphabetically, together with their verbal context and frequency of use. Finally, the referential function was established for each word-token. In this way, the list of word-tokens could be reduced to a list of expressive devices which refer to specific kinship types.

Results

Table 6 gives the total number of word-tokens and word-types produced during all sessions (1-27) by each informant, and the total number of selected kinship references focussed upon in this study.

The linguistic devices by which our informants expressed consanguineal (i.e., direct or collateral) and affineal kinship reference are given in Appendices I-III. Table 7 contains a survey of standard (SD) vs. non-standard devices (NSD) used by all informants; direct imitations of native kinship terms are excluded from this table.

Table 6: Total number of words and kinship references

	Total data-base		Kinship reference	
	N word-tokens	N word-types	N tokens	N types
Ergün	64,611	2784	578	37
Mahmut	61,140	2578	480	48
Mohamed	56,437	2528	355	27
Fatima	31,953	1846	332	33
N total	214,141	5902	1745	93

Table 7: Survey of standard (SD) vs. non-standard devices (NSD) for kinship reference

	Mahmut		Ergün		Mohamed		Fatima	
	SD	NSD	SD	NSD	SD	NSD	SD	NSD
Direct kinsmen	411	24	335	18	275	3	254	19
Collateral kinsmen	3	43	73	12	57	14	13	20
Affineal kinsmen	63	24	32	6	-	4	19	3
N total	477	91	440	36	332	21	286	42

Standard devices are most common in the case of reference to consanguineal-direct kinsmen. Apart from the use of words like *tante* ('aunt'), *oom* ('uncle') or *nicht* ('cousin/niece'), most non-standard devices are based on the utilization of an initial core wordstock of consanguineal-direct kinship terms. The structure of these devices used for reference to direct, collateral and affineal kinsmen is summarized in Table 8. In this table, linear and hierarchical constructions are represented. The latter are divided into head-possessive-modifier constructions and modifier-head constructions.

Table 8: Linear (Lin), head-initial (HpM), and head-final (MH) constructions as non-standard devices in learner varieties

	Mahmut			Ergün			Mohamed			Fatima		
	Lin	HpM	MH	Lin	HpM	MH	Lin	HpM	MH	Lin	HpM	MH
Direct kinsmen	23	-	-	15	1	2	3	-	-	-	-	-
Collateral kinsmen	-	-	43	-	-	10	-	13	-	-	14	-
Affineal kinsmen	9	-	20	-	-	5	-	5	-	2	14	2

Two observations can be made. First of all, a mirror-like division emerges between the Turkish and Moroccan learners of Dutch according to different principles in their respective source languages. Whereas Mahmut and Ergün prefer non-standard head-final constructions, such as *vader zus* ('father's sister'), *vader broer zoon* ('father's brother son') and *zuster dochter* ('sister's daughter'), Mohamed and Fatima prefer head-initial constructions such as standard *broer van vader* ('brother of father') or *dochter van tante* ('daughter of aunt'), and non-standard *vrouw mijn oom* ('wife (of) my uncle').

Secondly, it can be noted that the cover-term *ouders* ('parents') is only — and frequently — used by Mohamed. The other informants make use of the linear device *vader (en) moeder* ('father and mother') or *moeder (en) vader* ('mother and father'). The Turkish informants' use of this device would seem to be a literal translation from Turkish, which has no cover-term for referring to parents apart from *anna baba* ('mother father'). The non-availability of the cover-term *ouders* ('parents') can also be deduced from the following sequence taken from session 15 with Ergün (NS = Native Speaker of Dutch):

NS:	Akkerstraat tachtig.	Akkerstraat eighty.
Ergün:	+	+
NS:	Daar woont ze ook bij d'r ouders?	There she lives also with her parents?
Ergün:	Welk?	Which?
NS:	Woont zij ook bij d'r ouders?	Does she also live with her parents?
Ergün:	Ouders?	Parents?
NS:	Ja bij haar vader en moeder wonen meisje?	Yes with her father and mother live girl?
Ergün:	Jawel jawel jawel.	Yes yes yes.

We will now discuss the preferences of our learners for each different dimension in the kinship system.

The dimension of blood relationship

The frequencies of kinship reference are given in Table 9. It can be noted that consanguineal kinsmen are more frequently referred to than affinal kinsmen.

The same observation can be made for the order of the five most frequently mentioned kinship terms, as presented in Table 10.

Table 9: Frequencies of reference to consanguineal vs. affineal kinsmen

	Mahmut	Ergün	Mohamed	Fatima
Consanguineal kinsmen	488	438	350	306
Affineal kinsmen	90	42	5	26

Table 10: Order of most frequently mentioned kinship terms

Mahmut	Ergün	Mohamed	Fatima
broer 103	vader 104	ouders 83	vader 67
moeder 88	broer 85	vader 54	moeder 62
vader 70	zus 62	moeder 42	broer 38
dochter 53	moeder 57	oom 40	zus 36
zus 35	neef 52	broer 37	dochter 28

These five highly frequent kinship terms also show that our informants mostly refer to consanguineal kinsmen. Only two of the terms refer to collateral kinsmen, i.e., *neef* ('nephew/cousin') and *oom* ('uncle'). Affineal kinsmen are most extensively referred to by Mahmut and least extensively by Mohamed. Sociobiographical factors can explain these differences: Mahmut is married and lives near his parents-in-law, whereas Mohamed is single and still lives with his parents.

The Turkish informants, especially Mahmut, refer to affineal kinsmen of the same generation by juxtaposition of basic kinship terms, e.g., *zus man* ('sister man/husband') vs. Turkish *enişte* ('brother-in-law'), *vrouw zus* ('woman sister') vs. *baldız* ('sister-in-law') and *vrouw zus man* ('woman sister man') vs. *bacanak* ('brother-in-law').

The dimension of kinship degree

Table 11 gives the token frequencies of reference to kinsmen of first, second and third degree of distance. For all informants a descending order can be observed: they most commonly refer to first-degree kinsmen and less often to third-degree kinsmen.

In the devices used by Mahmut for referring to his second-degree kinsmen, a developmental pattern emerges. In session 5 Mahmut refers to the son of his uncle with the expression *vader broer zoon* ('father's brother son'), whereas in

Table 11: Token frequencies of reference to kinship degree

	Mahmut	Ergün	Mohamed	Fatima
First degree	367	206	227	199
Second degree	165	205	118	92
Third degree	27	27	4	10

session 26 and session 27 he uses *oom zoon* ('uncle son').

A reverse developmental pattern can be observed for Mahmut's reference to his aunt. Mahmut uses the basic kinship term *tante* ('aunt') already in session 5, whereas the more specific paraphrase *vader zus* ('father sister') is used relatively late, in session 22.

The dimension of generation

Inspection of the appendices shows that kinsmen of the same generation or generation +1/-1 are mentioned frequently, in contrast to generations +2/-2 and +3/-3. The relevant data are summarized in Table 12. Here, the token frequencies of reference to different generations are given.

Table 12: Token frequencies of reference to different generations

Generation	Mahmut	Ergün	Mohamed	Fatima
G+3	-	-	1	-
G+2	12	10	34	-
G+1	291	224	246	167
G0	176	204	56	105
G-1	93	46	15	57
G-2	1	-	-	2
G-3	-	-	-	-

The data in Table 12 also provide clear evidence that the informants refer to ancestors more frequently than to descendants: G+1 is referred to more frequently than G-1, and G+2 more frequently than G-2. G+3/-3 is only represented by a single reference in the case of Mohamed. With respect to generations of the second or third degree of distance (G+2/-2/+3/-3), only consanguineal kinsmen are referred to.

The use of constructions like *grote + N* ('great + N') by one Turkish

informant (Ergün) is interesting. Analytical, decompounded adj + N (or N + adj) combinations are used instead of standard-like reference to ancestors: *grote vader moeder* (instead of *grootouders*), *grote papa/vader* (instead of *grootvader*), and *grote moeder* or *moeder grote* (instead of *grootmoeder*). Ergün's use of *grote* + N would seem to be inspired by source language conventions, as can be deduced from the following sequence in session 5:

NS:	Wat zegt zij nou tegen jouw vader?	What does she say now to your father?
Ergün:	Oh grote papa.	Oh great daddy.
NS:	Ja en hoe/ hoe zeg je dat?	Yes and how/ how do you say that?
Ergün:	*Büyükbaba*	*Great daddy*
NS:	Oja.	Oh yes.

The dimension of gender

Of particular interest is Fatima's non-standard use of *oma*, which literally means 'grandma' in Dutch. However, Fatima uses *oom-a* to refer to 'wife of uncle', i.e., 'aunt'. This seems to be one of the rare examples of code-mixing, i.e., the standard Dutch kinship term *oom* ('uncle') is combined with Moroccan Arabic *-a* (female suffix). Such use of *oma* will obviously lead to misunderstandings, as can be observed in the following sequence taken from session 5 with Fatima, in which she shows family photos to her native interlocutor:

Fatima:	Uh haar zus van mijn moeder.	Eh her sister of my mother.
NS:	Zus van je moeder?	Sister of your mother?
Fatima:	Ja.	Yes.
NS:	Met allemaal kindertjes.	With all little children.
Fatima:	Van deze.	Of these.
NS:	Ja.	Yes.
Fatima:	Amal.	Amal (=proper name of aunt).
NS:	Ja.	Yes.
Fatima:	Van haar dochter/ uh zoon deze van dochter deze uh.	Of her daughter/ eh son these of daughter these eh.
NS:	Ja.	Yes.
Fatima:	Mijn neef.	My cousin.
NS:	Neef ja	Cousin yes.
Fatima:	Ja OOM-A kind van OOM-A.	Yes OOM-A child of OOM-A.
NS:	Kind van?	Child of?
Fatima:	*Mon oncle*	My uncle.
NS:	Ja ja van jouw OOM ja + ja leuk OOM-A als vrouwelijk	Yes yes of your OOM yes + yes nice OOM-A as feminine

van OOM ja + 't kind van je/	of OOM yes + the child of your/
+ jouw neef ja jouw neefje.	+ your cousin yes your little cousin.

Utterances in which Fatima refers to the kinship type 'aunt' with *oma* can be found in four different sessions (8, 11, 13 and 16). The standard kinship term *tante* ('aunt') can be found in sessions 5 and 20. However, with one exception (in session 20) it always is an imitation of the native interlocutor. Broeder (1991) observed a similar occurrence of Fatima's code-mixing. She used the bilingual combination *doctor-a* for reference to a female doctor in Dutch.

Conclusion

On the basis of the analysis presented in this study, the following general principles emerge:

- P1: Consanguineal kinsmen are referred to more frequently than affineal kinsmen.
- P2: In case of consanguineal kinsmen, direct kinsmen are referred to more frequently than collateral kinsmen.
- P3: Close generations are referred to more frequently than distant generations.
- P4: Ancestors are referred to more frequently than descendants.

These principles show that language learners start with the use of an initial stock of basic kinship terms for everyday purposes. Derived from P1 and P2, the following learner-specific principles emerge:

- P5: Consanguineal-direct kinsmen are commonly referred to with standard-like expressive devices.
- P6: Consanguineal-collateral or affineal kinsmen are commonly referred to with non-standard devices, derived from the availability of an initial core wordstock of kinship terms.

Principles 1-6 hold for all language learners in our study, no matter which source language is taken into account. Apart from these general principles, however, various types of source-language influence could be evidenced in the use of non-standard devices for kinship reference. Accordingly, our last principle can be formulated in the following way:

- P7: Non-standard devices for kinship reference are partly inspired by source-language principles.

Source-language principles of second language acquisition emerge in the following cases:

- a mirror-like division of head-final vs. head-initial non-standard devices for Turkish and Moroccan learners of Dutch respectively, with head-final preferences in Turkish vs. head-initial preferences in Moroccan Arabic
- the use of the linear device *vader moeder* ('father mother') for *ouders* ('parents') would seem to be a literal translation from Turkish, which has no cover term for referring to parents
- the degree of specificity by which the Turkish informants refer to affineal kinsmen of the same generation would seem to be derived from the source language, given the fact that Turkish has basic kinship terms for expressing such specific references
- finally, both Ergün's use of analytical, decomposed *grote* + N (e.g., *grote papa* and *grote moeder*) for ancestor reference and Fatima's use of *oom-a* for 'aunt' are indicative of source-language influence, as can be deduced from specific sequences in the flow of native/non-native speaker interactions

The mirror-like preference of Turkish and Moroccan learners of Dutch for head-final vs. head-initial non-standard devices was also evidenced in an earlier study of Broeder & Extra (1988). In that study, which took into account a wider range of reference to entities (both persons and objects) by the same informants, the following preferences were found:

- the Turkish learners of Dutch made more use of both standard-like and innovative head-final devices than the Moroccan learners, e.g., *sigarettenwinkel* ('cigar shop'), *winkelbaas* ('shop owner'), *broodbaas* ('breadboss') instead of standard-like *bakker* ('baker'), *moslimkerk* ('moslim church') instead of standard-like *moskee* ('mosque')
- the Moroccan learners of Dutch made more use of both standard-like and innovative head-initial devices than the Turkish learners, e.g., *winkel van sigaret* ('shop of cigars'), *baas van winkel* ('boss of shop'), *boek van baby* ('book of baby'), *fabriek van boten* ('factory of ships'), instead of standard-like *sigarettenwinkel*, *winkelbaas*, *baby-boek*, and *scheepswerf* ('ship yard') respectively
- only the Turkish learners of Dutch made use of innovative head-final devices based on more than two lexemes, e.g., *allemaal-kleine-kinderfeest* ('all little children party'), *andere-mensen-garage* ('other people garage'), *auto-monteur-werk* ('car mechanic work')

In the present study on kinship reference, head-final devices based on more than two lexemes could only be evidenced in the case of one Turkish informant

(Mahmut), e.g., *vader broer zoon* ('father's brother son') and *tante dochter kind* ('aunt's daughter child'), cf. Appendix II.

In conclusion, both general and source-language-specific principles of kinship reference in adult language acquisition processes could be evidenced in our study. In the latter case, word-order conventions in Turkish and Moroccan Arabic as the source systems have a clear influence on the patterns of our learners' innovative devices for kinship reference in Dutch as the target system. The cross-linguistic analyses carried out by Broeder (1991) on the acquisition of word-formation devices in the learner varieties of the five target languages in the ESF-project (see section 3) underlines the findings of the present study.

Note

This research has been supported by the Foundation for Linguistic Research which is funded by the Dutch National Science Foundation (NWO).

References

- Allen, N. (1989) The evolution of kinship terminologies. *Lingua* 77: 173-86.
- Anglin, W. (1986) A mathematical analysis of a production grammar. *Theoretical Linguistics* 13: 125-38.
- Barnard, A. & Good, A. (1984) *Research practices in the study of kinship*. London: Academic Press.
- Borland, C. (1979) Kinship term grammar: A review. *Anthropos* 74: 326-52.
- Broeder, P. & Extra, G. (1988) Woordvormingsprocédé's bij verwijzing naar objecten in tweede-taalverwervingsprocessen van volwassenen. *Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen* 30: 105-17.
- Broeder, P., Extra, G., van Hout, R., Strömqvist, S. & Voionmaa, K. (1988) *Processes in the developing lexicon*. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation.
- Broeder, P., Extra, G. & van Hout, R. (1989) Processes in the developing lexicon of adult immigrant learners. In Nation, P. & R. Carter (eds.), *Vocabulary acquisition*. Amsterdam: AILA Review 6: 86-109.
- Broeder, P. (1991) *Talking about people: A multiple case study on adult language acquisition*. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Carter, A. (1984) The acquisition of social deixis: children's usages of 'kin' terms in Maharashtra, India. *Journal of Child Language* 11: 179-201.
- Goodenough, W. (1956) Componential analysis and the study of meaning. *Language* 32: 195-216.
- Greenberg, J. (1966) *Language universals*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Haviland, S. & Clark, E. (1974) This man's father is my father's son: A study

- of the acquisition of English kin terms. *Journal of Child Language* 1: 23-48.
- Hinton, G. (1986) *Learning distributed representations of concepts*. Pittsburg: Carnegie-Mellon University, Dept. of Computer Science.
- Lambek, J. (1986) A production grammar for English kinship terminology. *Theoretical Linguistics* 13: 19-36.
- Liebe-Harkort, K. (1983) "Bruder ist nicht agabey - teyze is nicht Tante" Verwandtschaftsbezeichnungen im Türkischen und im Deutschen. *Deutsch Lernen* 1: 42-9.
- Master, P., Sokolik, M. & Schumann, J. (1989) The experimental creation of a pidgin language. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 4: 37-64.
- Miller, G. & Johnson-Laird, P. (1976) *Language and perception*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Perdue, C. (ed.) (1984) *Second language acquisition by adult immigrants*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

APPENDIX I: Consanguineal direct kinship relations

GEN	Standard var.	Learner variety	MAH	ERG	MOH	FAT	English equivalent
+3	overgrootouders	ouders van die opa	-	-	1	-	great-grandparents
+2	grootouders	grote vader moeder	-	1	-	-	great father mother
		opa	6	-	15	-	grandpa
	-	grote papa	-	1	-	-	granddad
		grootvader	-	1	-	-	grandfather
	oma	grote vader	-	1	-	-	grandfather
		oma	6	3	19	-	grandma
	grootmoeder	grootmoeder	-	1	-	-	grandmother
		grote moeder	-	1	-	-	grandmother
		moeder grote	-	1	-	mother grand	
+1	ouders	ouders	-	1	83	-	parents
		vader (en) moeder	23	15	3	19	father (and) mother
	vader	vader	70	104	54	67	father
		pepe	13	1	-	1	daddy
	moeder	moeder	88	57	42	62	mother
mama		19	-	-	1	mommy	
0	broer	broer	103	85	37	38	brother
		zus	35	82	14	36	sister
-1	zoon	zoon	18	13	10	21	son
		dochter	53	5	1	28	daughter
	zus	1	-	-	-	sister	
Ntot			435	353	279	273	

APPENDIX II: Consanguineal collateral kinship relations

GEN	Standard var.	Learner variety	MAH	ERG	MOH	FAT	English equivalent	
+1	oom	oom	-	16	40	-	uncle	
		broer van vader	-	-	1	-	brother of father	
		broer van (mijn) moeder	-	-	2	-	brother of (my) mother	
		broer van moeder of vader	-	-	1	-	brother of mother or father	
		broer van vrouw van mij(n) oom	-	-	3	-	brother of woman of me (my) uncle	
		broer van vrouw van vader	-	-	1	1	brother of woman of father	
		vrouw van oom hij broer	-	-	1	-	woman of uncle he brother	
		vrouw van mij oom en die jongen	-	-	1	-	woman of my uncle and that boy	
		man van mij tante	-	-	1	-	man of my aunt	
		tante	tante	3	5	8	2	aunt
			oma	-	-	-	4	grandma
	vader zus		1	-	-	-	father sister	
	vrouw mijn oom		-	-	1	-	woman my uncle	
	moeder zus(je)		1	2	-	-	mother	
	moeder en zus		-	1	-	-	mother and sister	
	zus(ter) van (mijn) moeder		-	-	2	2	sister of my mother	
	zuster van moeder of vader		-	-	1	-	sister of mother or father	
	tante *ane*		-	2	-	-	aunt mother	
	oom vrouw		-	1	-	-	uncle woman	
	oom+tante		vader en broer en vrouw	-	1	-	-	father and brother and woman
			vader en zus en broer	-	1	-	-	father and sister and brother
			moeder ook zus of broer	-	1	-	mother also sister or brother	
	0/-1	neef	neef(je)	4	52	9	8	cousin/nephew
		nicht	-	-	-	2	cousin/niece	
0	neef	vader broer zoon	4	-	-	-	father brother son	
		oom ('s) zoon	3	1	-	-	uncle's son	
		tante zoon	2	-	-	-	aunt son	
-1	neef	vrouw broer zoon	1	-	-	-	woman brother son	
		broer (eentje) zoon	5	1	-	-	brother one son	
		zuster zoon	1	-	-	-	sister son	
		zus jongen	1	-	-	-	sister boy	
0/-1	nicht	nicht	6	-	-	5	cousin/niece	
0	nicht	tante zus(ter)	2	-	-	-	aunt sister	
		tante dochter kind	1	-	-	-	aunt daughter child	
		moeder zus dochter	1	-	-	-	mother sister daughter	
		vader zus dochter	7	-	-	-	father sister daughter	
		vader dochter zus	1	-	-	-	father daughter sister	
		dochter van (mijn) tante	-	-	-	3	daughter of my aunt	
		meisje van mijn tante	-	-	-	1	girl of my aunt	
		dochter voor mijn broer	-	-	-	1	daughter for my brother	
-1	nicht	broer meisje	1	-	-	-	brother girl	
		broer dochter	6	-	-	-	brother daughter	
		zuster dochter	1	-	-	-	sister daughter	
	neef-nicht	zus kinderen (singular)	-	1	-	-	sister child	
		kinder van mij dochter (=zuster)	-	-	-	1	child of my daughter (=sister)	
		twee kinder van mijn broer	-	-	-	1	two child of my brother	
		kind van oma (oma=tante)	-	-	-	1	child of grandma (grandma=aunt)	
-2	achterneef-nicht	vader zus dochter jongen	1	-	-	-	father sister daughter boy	
		kinder van nicht/neef	-	-	-	2	child of cousin/nephew	
Ntot			53	85	71	33		

APPENDIX III: Affineal kinship relations

GEN	Standard var.	Learner variety	MAH	ERG	MOH	FAT	English equivalent	
+1	schoonouders	schoonvader (en) moeder	4	-	-	-	father-in-law and mother	
		ouders van (die) meisje	-	-	3	-	parents of that girl	
		meisje vader (en) moeder	3	-	-	-	girl father and mother	
		vrouw vader (en) moeder	2	-	-	2	woman father and mother	
	schoonvader	schoonvader	31	6	-	1	father-in-law	
		meisje vader	3	-	-	-	girl father	
		vrouw vader	-	1	-	-	woman father	
	schoonmoeder	schoonmoeder	23	5	-	1	mother-in-law	
		moeder van die meisje	-	-	1	-	mother of that girl	
		moeder van nieuw vriendin	-	-	1	-	mother of new girl-friend	
		vrouw mama	2	-	-	-	woman mommy	
		vrouw oma	5	-	-	-	woman grandma	
	stiefmoeder	mij vader vrouw	-	-	-	1	my father woman	
		vrouw van mij(n) vader	-	-	-	2	woman of me(my) father	
0	schoonbroer	schoonbroer	9	-	-	10	brother-in-law	
		zus(ter) man	1	4	-	-	sister man	
		vrouw zus man	1	-	-	-	woman sister man	
	zwager	zwager	-	4	-	-	brother-in-law	
		schoonzus	-	21	-	7	sister-in-law	
	schoonzus	broer...vrouw	2	-	-	-	brother...woman	
		vrouw zus	1	-	-	-	woman sister	
		zus(je)	-	1	-	1	(little) sister	
	stiefzusje	stiefzusje	-	-	-	1	steph-sister	
		neef	2	-	-	-	father-in-law son	
	vader schoonzoon	vader schoonzoon	1	-	-	-	father son-in-law	
	Ntot			90	42	5	26	