

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation and Interrogative in Sorani Kurdish: A Case Study**

**Nouroddin Yosoufi,**

Assistant Professor in Applied Linguistics, English Language Department, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran.

Email: nyousofi@yahoo.com

**Shokoufeh Vakili Latif,**

PhD Student in TEFL, English Language Department, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran.

Email:vakilishokoufeh@gmail.com

### **Abstract**

Some studies have tackled the issues of describing Sorani Kurdish and its lexical and syntactic features. Little, however, has been done with regard to comparing syntactic development in this dialect of Kurdish language with other languages. Taking the “focused naturalistic” (O` Grady, 2005) approach and through exploring the acquisition of the interrogative and negation in Sorani Kurdish, this case study investigates the agreement of the its syntactic development with other languages including English. Literature review and what came up through observing and video recording of the linguistic productions of a baby son from 6 to 37 months of age indicate that, irrespective of their first languages, children undergo the same developmental processes in learning these syntactic features. The study highlights the

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

role of the innate capability of language acquisition and goes for the generative side of the extreme has been proposed for investigating the first language syntactic development. The study recommends taking these developmental stages into account in teaching and learning processes.

**Key words:** First language acquisition, Interrogative and negation order, Syntactic development.

### **1. Introduction**

Kurdish language, as member of the Indo-European languages, is spoken in Kurdistan, a large geographical area which includes Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Syria. It is one of the two most widely used languages in Iran, which has a regional status (Sheykh Esmaili & Salavati, 2015). In this paper, we focus on the Sorani dialect of Kurdish language, which has a large number of speakers and is used in different aspects of their lives including education, media and administration.

Previous studies have explored Sorani dialect from different perspectives. Sheykh Esmaili and Salavati (2015) compared it with Kurmanji language and elaborated on the differences in their writing systems too. According to their study, these languages are different in terms of phonology, vocabulary selection and frequency of distributing w.r.t. in their highly common words. Some other differences between the two languages are explainable by using generic prepositions in Sorani Kurdish and its general tendency to use prepositions as suffix. Bynon (1979) believes that variation which is found between Kurdish languages and their different dialects can be interpreted as a progression from ergativity to accusativity, based on a

reductionist view that places central Kurdish languages such as Sorani into the category of accusative languages.

A number of other studies have also focused on the syntax of Sorani. Samvelian (2006) presents a lexical description of Sorani syntax based on the Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) framework. The researcher, elaborates on accounts that justify the rich number of propositions and preposition phrases in Sorani and suggests its classification based on the two dimensions of variation namely, normality and argument realization. In his another study, Samvelian (2007) described the behavior of absolute prepositions and their clitic complements in Sorani Kurdish and argued that although clitic complements show the feature of syntactic transparency, they have to be regarded as affixes. Salih (2014) has broadened his scope of investigation and compared the connectives in Kurdish language (including Sorani) with those of English. According to him, Halliday and Hasan`s (1976) classification of conjunctive relations need to be modified to account for English connectives and these modifications can explain Kurdish connectives and conjunctive relations in more accurate way.

Trying to investigate Sorani Kurdish from a different perspective, this study explores its syntax as it is acquired as a first language and compares its developmental stages with other languages. As far as the researchers know the issue has not received much attention yet. Such investigation can support the views that languages are closely related to each other and their learners will experience similar developmental stages.

### **1.1. Theoretical Framework**

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

Literature of the first language development, according to Neokleous (2010), includes a lengthy battle between functional or usage based and generative account, which emerged from formal syntax of Chomsky. Diessel (2013) confirms this point and emphasizes that syntactic development in first language acquisition can be studied using these two main theoretical approaches, which work based on different premises on the grammatical elements` nature and the grammatical systems` structures. Nativist approach draws heavily on Chomsky`s (1972) generative grammar. Usage based approach, however, is highly related to construction grammar (e.g., Tomasello, 2003) and the idea that grammar development is about involving in a dynamic process of relating forms to functions.

The usage based approach assumes that linguistic constructions are acquired through such general mechanisms of learning as analogy and entrenchment. And, they are finally automatized by the language acquirers. This approach rests upon the significance of innate constraints and language experiences in grammatical development and implies that syntactic categories are the results of processing large bodies of linguistic data to which children are exposed (e.g., Bybee, 2010; Tomasello, 2003). Elman et al. (1996) make a distinction between innate linguistic representation and grammatical architectures and argue that the nativist approach highlights the first category, while the latter has to do more with the usage based approach. Based on the nativist side of this extreme, linguistic categories such as noun phrases (NP) or verb phrases (VP) are the building blocks of grammar knowledge or in Radford`s (1996: 43) words, “templates specifies the (universal) structure of phrases and clauses”, while the usage based approach emphasizes diachronic and chronological changes in grammatical development.

Chomsky (1999) argues that syntactic development as a manifestation of one's cognitive development must be differentiated from learning process during which linguistic categories are acquired gradually based on learners' experiences. Syntactic development, according to him, is an instantaneous process which involves linking linguistic elements to universal grammar (UG) categories. Chomsky's (1972) generative grammar implies that syntactic knowledge is innate and the only requirement of acquiring grammatical categories is "the existence of a linguistic trigger in the input" (Meisel, 1994, p.20). It also denotes that the universal part of grammar consists of linguistic constraints and concepts predetermined by the Language Acquisition Device. Syntactic structure analysis, in this approach, is mediated by two central assumptions of modularity and deriving syntactic structures from a collection of universal grammatical categories. Innate grammar, according to Chomsky (1965), includes three main components or modules (syntax, semantics, and phonology), which have their own rules and categories. Based on the just mentioned point, syntactic representations are to be analyzed independently from the meaning they imply.

Generative grammar is based on the assumption that syntactic representations are derived from a universal set of syntactic categories. Generative grammarians, however, are not unanimous in determining these grammatical categories. Yet, they have agreed up on the points that these grammatical categories are firstly, defined independent of particular grammatical configurations and, secondly, are formed from some primitive syntactic structures that make the building blocks of syntactic analysis in all existing languages.

The differences between the two mentioned theories of language acquisition seem to contribute to the old debate of the nurture vs. nature regarding human

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

training in general and first language acquisition in particular. Tomasello (2006) maintains that the usage based theory highlights the significance of context and shared experiences of the interlocutors in communication. The nativist approach, however, rejects the idea that language acquisition is influenced by the environment in which the child grows up. Human brains, based on this view, irrespective of the languages they speak, are wired to learn language and therefore undergo the same developmental stages in acquiring them. This study aims at contributing to the resolution of the dispute and shedding some more light on the nature of first language acquisition. In doing that, it focuses on syntactic development and investigates the developmental sequences of negative and interrogative utterances of a baby son, who is a native speaker of the Sorani dialect of Kurdish language and compares them with the literature on the acquisition of other languages including English as the first language. Some reasons on the favor of focus on the two structures are that they have been among the main areas of focus in English and other languages. They also form the two essential linguistic communication tools of children during their early stages of language learning. Krashen (1981) further believes that they are easy to learn and need some straightforward and clear conditions of learning. Therefore, this study seeks answering the following question: are the negation and interrogative developmental stages in Kurdish language the same as those of other languages including English?

## **2. Review of the related literature**

It was mentioned in the introduction section that although Sorani Kurdish has a large number of speakers in Iran, few if any studies have tackled investigating it. The

shortage of information becomes more noticeable when it comes to covering the focus of this study. Therefore, review of literature is devoted to the studies that have been conducted with regard to English and other languages based on the two mentioned approaches of first language acquisition.

### **2.1. Question Form Acquisition (Interrogatives)**

Radford (1990) takes the generative approach of analyzing the question acquisition and states that, all children need is acquiring some general grammatical operations such as moving the WH-word to the beginning of the sentence and changing the place of subject and auxiliary. Some other researchers, however, take usage based approach and argue that the results of their studies imply that question acquisition is about tying question words and auxiliaries to some syntactic positions (e.g., Klima & Bellugi 1966). Based on the results of some similar studies (e.g., Dabrowska, 2000), early yes/no questions of children include some pre-specified frames such as *May I ----?* or *Can you---*? Their Wh-questions are, in the same way, usually formed from such semantic formulas as *What are these?* As they get older, they break down these holistic phrases and produce more innovative utterances such as *What doing?*

Dabrowska`s (2000) captures the developmental stages a two-year-old baby son named Naomi went through in acquiring questions. According to the researcher, at the age of 11 months, the child overused such questions as *what getting?* And, later on, other questions like *Whats she eating?* also appeared in his speech. It, therefore, seems that question acquisition based on Dabrowska`s (ibid) study is in line with the usage based approach as it provides no evidence in support of the hypothesis that the

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

way children learn questions is through moving the question word and/or inverting the subject and auxiliary. Syntactic errors of children at this stage (such as those referred to below taken from the Santelmann et al.'s (2002) study), however, tend to be interpreted by some researchers as the evidence for the development of inverting subject and auxiliary at the early stages of children's language development.

- (1) Why he can go?
- (2) What can he can do?
- (3) What does he likes?

O'Grady (2005) believes that children's early questions include words among which *Where* and *What* have the highest frequency followed by *How*, *Who* and *Why*. He further argues that early tendency to use *Where* and *What* is explainable by the frequency of the type of *Wh*-questions children frequently hear. Parents usually ask more *What* questions than other types of *Wh*-questions to make children familiar with different things in their environment. According to O'Grady (2005) development of questions is largely influenced by their function and positions in the sentence, so that for example, *who is talking to mat?* is acquired earlier than *Who is mat talking with?* And, this is because of the difference between the place of subject and object *Wh*-question.

Stromswold (1990) explores the frequency and priority of subject and object *Wh*-questions in the speech of a group of teenagers (from twelve to fourteen years old) and after analyzing about 1500 questions produced by them concludes that most of them use the subject *Wh*-questions earlier than the object ones and that is because,



subject Wh-questions are easier to learn and understand. Yoshinaga (1996) uses a simple way to compare the auditability and understandability of the two just mentioned Wh-questions. In an experiment, she presented a group of young children with a stuffed animal (bear) and two pictures the first one of which showed that one covered animal pushed a pig. The researcher then said “please ask your bears about the person is pushing the pig”. The question needed was “Who is pushing the pig?” (a subject *Wh*-question). The second picture, however, depicted a monkey which was pushing someone. This time the children had to ask their bears about the person the monkey was pushing. The intended response was “Who is the monkey pushing?” (a direct object *Wh*-question). The children were able to produce the question related to the first picture correctly but had a lot of difficulty with producing the second type of question. In most of the cases they said “Who is pushing the monkey?” instead of “Who is the monkey pushing?”

## 2.2. Negation

Following the tradition of generative linguistics, Klima and Bellugi (1966), report on the findings of a study on negation in English language based on which there are three main stages of development which are in line with literature on negation. At the first stage, children use *No* or *Not* to convey their negative messages (e.g., *No I like this* and *Me not doing that*). Bloom (1970) argues that *No*, as the children`s first negative element, emerges at the age of 12 months and is used for expressing such functions as rejection or nonexistence. Cattell (2000) believes that children at this stage get confused over using *No* or *Not*. Children`s negative utterances at this stage also lack any light (auxiliary) verb and the negative word is sometimes used at the

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

wrong place (e.g., *Is it no?*). Children prefer *No* to *Not* at this stage, because of the very fact that the latter is harder to be noticed in adults' speech. It is usually buried in the middle of the utterances and changes into *n't*. (e.g., adults often say *she wasn't studying* rather than *she was not studying*.)

What children produce at this stage can be regarded a good way of avoiding repetition in speech (e.g., *No water* is used to express the denial and non-existence of water in response to the input contains a question about that). Harris and Wexler (1996) argue that at this stage *No* and *Not* are used interchangeably. Cattell (2000) considers negation element, at this stage, external to the verbal components and Wode (1977) assigns it some anaphoric references in cases like the following example.

(4) Mother: Do you want tea?

Child: No, water.

The second stage, in literature, is mainly recognized by the usage of *Don't* and *Can't* along with the verbs denote no special tenses. This stage also signals the continuation of using negators of stage one. According to Klima and Bellugi (1996), the two just mentioned negators are used in holistic phrases and complete constructions, since neither *Can* nor *Do* is used alone in children's utterances. Choi (1988), later on, supports this claim and asserts that *Won't* has the same qualities as *Don't* and *Can't*. Negation at stage two is different from that of the first stage in that the negation element is internal to the verbal components. Some examples are *I not drink juice* and *I can't see*. Cattell (2000) maintains that stage three is characterized by children's more command in negation, so that *No* and *Not* are used in in

appropriate contexts and a wider range of negators are used by children (e.g., doesn't, didn't).

Cross-linguistic studies (e.g., McNeill & McNeill, 1968) have shown that children continue with negation development even after the four years of age, as they might not get the negative meaning behind some adjective such as less (Donaldson & Balfour, 1968; Klatzky, Clark, & Macken, 1973). They might also experience increase in frequency of producing negative statements and finally be able to use them spontaneously.

Bloom (1970) identifies the functions children are able to express using their early negative statements. According to the researcher, nonexistence is the first function children learn fully to production. When expressing the nonexistence of water they may point out to an empty glass and say "*No more water*". The second function children acquire is rejection, which is expressed using such statements as "*No come in*" when, for example, they want to stay outside. Denial/truth-function, according to Bloom (1970), emerges at about 19 to 23 months of age and involves making an utterance about the falsehood of something. For example, if they find that a lollipop has been mistakenly recognized as a candy, they might say "*That no candy*". Pea (1980) adds two more functions to the above list and asserts that self-prohibition and unfulfilled expectations are used when children want to engage in a forbidden action and when an expected object is not present respectively. Choi (1988) compares negation process development across three different languages namely; English, French and Korean, and argues that developmental stages children go through can best be presented in an eight category taxonomy which is based on the

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

conformance of forms and functions. According to Choi (ibid) expression of functions is highly related to the developmental status of forms, so that early functions (such as rejection) are expressed using the initial forms children acquire, while the functions are acquired later (such as denial) are expressed using the forms that are acquired recently.

Lieven and Theakston (2007) investigate the development of English negation with the main focus on zero marked verbs (those are negated using a negative element placed at their beginning) from a usage based perspective. The results came up through analyzing the speech of an English child with his caregiver indicated that his negation development underwent the pattern of *No*, *not*, *n't*, which was found to be sensitive to the frequency of negators in the input to which he was exposed. Functional analysis of the input also suggested that development of these functions were strongly influenced by their frequency in input, although there existed signs of creative learning from their early stages of negation development too.

In an attempt to provide evidence on the agreement of negation process with the usage based approach, Langacker, (1987) argues that in making negative statements, English speaking children rely mainly on a combination of their language experiences or day to day input and their existing system of linguistic development. Bates and MacWhinney's (1987) and Tomassello (2000) assert that children use a general set of cognitive learning mechanisms including analogy and structure combining, which includes combining existing structures to make new ones.

### **3. Method**

### **3.1. Participant**

A baby boy named Pouya, born in September, 2004 in Javanroud, Kermanshah, Iran was the case in this study. Pouya`s parents talked to him in Sorani (a Kurdish dialect) and, during the time the study was in progress, they did their best to keep him away from exposure to other languages such as Persian in order to let his Kurdish language develop independently from and unaffected by the knowledge he might get of them.

### **3.2. Data collection procedure**

In line with O'Grady`s (2005) suggested methods of studying children language development, this case study, which aimed at recognizing the stages Pouya went through in acquiring syntactic features of his first language, enjoyed the "focused naturalistic observation" which involves using observation and elicitation techniques for gathering the focused data and recording the child's utterances. Observation, which started from 6 and finished at 37 months of age, covers about 21 months of day to day linguistic development of the case. It was done by clip recording and note taking of the child`s verbal and non-verbal productions and transcribing the recordings into phonetic representations.

### **3.3. Data analysis procedure**

Linguistic productions of Pouya were recorded from 6 to 37 months of age and translated into English followed by transcribing them into phonetics. They were then represented into tables containing five columns namely: Date- Case`s production-

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

Adult pronunciation- English translation and Situation of production (see Appendix). The word “situation” here is used to describe the condition under which the relevant data were produced. Pouya`s (non-verbal) behaviors were reflected as notes which referred to the significant points regarding the data or his behavior or the experiences were used to elicit the linguistic data.

### **3.4. Data analysis and results**

Studying the first language syntactic development requires getting the capability of putting at least two words on the side of children. Rejecting the idea of some linguists on considering the holophrastic utterances as sentences, Cattell (2000) believes that it is just when real two word sentences begin to appear in children`s speech that we can say that grammatical structures have formed. Cattell (2000) also asserts that somewhere around 18 months of age children start producing two word utterances, which at first seem to be two separate words are simply put next to each other. Our analysis rejects this statement as at the age of 10 and 11 months, Pouya produced such meaningful (although a little away from the Kurdish adult pronunciation) utterances as *Æw Tîe?* which equals *What Is That?* While pointing to every object in his environment. Findings of the study, however, support Roger Brown (1976) and his colleagues` findings in relation with the two-word stage utterances on the side of children all over the world. According to them, such utterances in majority of cases express a basic set of meanings (such as agent+ action or action=affected in the utterances “*daddy go*” and “*throw ball*” respectively) and their orders are consistent in different languages. Roger Brown (1976) further asserts that expressing negative meanings at the two-word stage is mainly done using *No* in such utterances as “*No*

cat” to describe the situation in which a cat has left a little girl. Our findings further show that in line with the expected order of syntactic development stages, Pouya started producing multiple word utterances like *Somæyæ Jajkæ Æxom* meaning *Semaya I Eat/Want Gum*, when he was 28 months of age.

Regarding the development of negation, analysis of Pouya's productions shows that from the age of 24 months, single negative elements such as *Niæ* (there is not) and *Lawæ* (no) appeared in his speech. Later on, Pouya had negative sentences like *Næ næ* (No no) and *Næ næaxonækæ næ* (No no I do not cut nails), which seem to be manifestations of the first stage of negation Klima and Bellugi (1966) proposed. Stilwell (1999) writes that based on this model children, at the first stage of negation development, follow a simple way of negation based on which No or not is simply put at the end or beginning of the sentences. Affirmative sentences, at this stage, are short and the main verb “to be” lack any light verb.

At the stage two of negation development, based on the model mentioned above, the negative element gets into the sentences. Examples of the second stage are samples *Naxom, aw æxom* (I don't drink (milk), I drink water) and *Neixeitæ æwe shishækæ æshkene* (You shouldn't put it there, it will break the glass). By the last stage of negation development, children get the capability of producing sentences over four words long to make them more complex, and in most of the cases verbs appear in their required places. Samples *Nachem da Næna æchem Soma* (I don't go grandma) and *Berqækæ maqosh mækæ bero aw bere* ((the light) don't turn it off, go (some) water bring) are among the manifestations of the stage three. They denote Pouya`s capability of producing longer sentences too.

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

As for the development of the questions, our data shows that the first questions Pouya produced were of the WH type questions, such as *Awæ chiyæ?* (What is that?). Pouya then acquired the linguistic competence of expressing requests like sample *Eiseni?* (Do you buy it?) and moved on to the questions which need auxiliary and are supposed to be acquired quite late in English (e.g., *Dai chiman hæs?* (Mummy what do we have?). The negative questions (e.g., *Bochi næt hela biwæsen?* (Why didn't you let them close it?) and *Bochi hælet nægert?* (Why didn't you take it?) emerged when Pouya had passed two and a half years old. The overall development of question making process in Pouya was completed and close to the adult form when he was 37 months of age.

## **4. Discussion and Conclusion**

Noam Chomsky's theory of language acquisition, developed in almost half a century, has inspired many researchers to study developmental order of different languages all over the world. Using the universal grammar part of this very influential theory, which deals with explaining the nature of innate language properties through such notions as parameters and principles, they have sought getting a clearer view on the routes of first language acquisition (Yosoufi, 2009). Trying to fill the current gap with regard to studying the syntactic development of Kurdish language in a more comprehensive way, this case study compares the stages taken by its participant (Pouya) with those are reported to be taken by speakers of other languages. Analysis of more than 21 months of the linguistic production of Pouya through focused naturalistic observation procedure provides support to the claim that the answer to the



question raised at the beginning of the study is yes and that the acquirers of the Kurdish language (here its Sorani dialect), while getting the negation and question utterances, undertake the same developmental stages as those of other languages like English. Findings of this case study confirm developmental stages Stilwell (1999), Cattle (2000), O'Grady (2005) and Brown (2007) state.

This study confirms the principles of the universal grammar account. After getting the single words and some communicative gestures, Pouya was able to produce two word utterances, which lack preposition and functional words. In getting each focused syntactic category, he went into some stages, and, in each stage he got closer to the pronunciation statues of adults. In acquiring the negation system, as mentioned earlier, he first started with 'Næ', and then moved on into such stages as placing it to the beginning of utterances, attaching it to the sentence verb and finally mastering the negation category and using it correctly. The finding confirms Herschensohn (2001) statement based on which children with different first languages initially tend to put the negative element outside of the verb structure and then put it into the related clause.

Findings of this study may be of benefit in error analyses. That is, they may explain the types of linguistic errors of children in acquiring the syntax of their first languages. It can also inspire studies that aim at comparing different languages syntax. Learning stages Pouya went through could be applied in both first and second language teaching and material development. Oller (2005) maintains that foreign language acquisition and second language learning can get a lot from the findings of first language studies.

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

The study recommends further research on the development of Sorani Kurdish as second language in order to confirm or reject present findings. It also encourages investigating other Kurdish dialects such as kurmanji and Bindi. Exploring development of other parts of syntax such as simple and complex sentences can also be rewarding.

### **References**

- Bloom, L. (1970). *Language development: Form and function in emerging grammars*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Brown, H.D. (200<sup>v</sup>). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5<sup>th</sup>Ed.). New York: Longman.
- Brown, R. (1976). In memorial tribute to Eric Lenneberg. *Cognition*, 4,125-53.
- Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, Usage, and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bynon, T. (1979). The ergative construction in Kurdish. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 42:211–224.
- Cattell, R. (2000). *Children's language: Consensus and controversy*. New York: Cassell.
- Choi, S. (1988). The semantic development of negation: a cross-linguistic longitudinal study. *Journal of Child Language*, 15, 517–31.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Chomsky, N. (1972). *Studies on Semantics in Generative Grammar*. The Hague: Princeton.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). On the nature, use, and acquisition of language. In W.C. Ritchie and T.K. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of Child Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 33-54.
- Darbowska, E. (2000). From formula to schema: The acquisition of English questions. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 11, 83-102.
- Diessel, H. (2013). Construction grammar and first language acquisition. In Trousdale, G & Hoffmann, T. (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar* (PP. 1- 19). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Donaldson, M., & Balfour, G. (1968). Less is more: A study of language comprehension in children. *British Journal of Psychology*, 59(4), 461–471.
- Domencio, P, & Kim, P. (1996). *Rethinking Innateness. A connectionist perspective on development*. Cambridge: Bradford Books/MIT Press.
- Harris, T. & Wexler, K. (1996). The Optional-Infinitive stage in child language: Evidence from negation. In H. Clahsen (Eds.), *Generative perspectives on language acquisition*, 1–42. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Herschensohn, J. (2001). Missing inflection in second language French: accidental infinitives and other verbal deficits. *Second Language Research* 17, 3 (2001); pp. 273–305.
- Klatzky, R., Clark, E., & Macken, M. (1973). Asymmetries in the acquisition of polar adjectives: Linguistic or conceptual? *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 16(1), 32–46.

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

- Klima, E. S. & Ursula, B. (1966). Syntactic regularities in the speech of children. In Lyons, J. & Wales, R.J. (eds.), *Psycholinguistic Papers*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.
- Krachen, S. (1981). *Second language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Pergamon Press, Oxford.
- Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lieven, E., & Theakston, A. (2007). What part of no do children not understand? A usage-based account of multiword negation. *Child Language*, 33, 251–282.
- MacWhinney, B. (1987). The competition model. In B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *Mechanisms of language acquisition*, 249–308. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McNeill, D., & McNeill, N. (1968). A question in semantic development: What does a child mean when he says “no”? Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Center for Research on Language and Language Behavior.
- Meisel, J. M. (1994). Parameters in acquisition. In Fletcher, P & McWhinney, B (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Language*. Oxford: Blackwell, 9-35.
- Neokelous, T. (2011). Generative and usage based approaches to L1 acquisition: evidence from Cypriot-Greek. *langUE*, 91-103.
- O’Grady, W. (2005). *How children learn language?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oller, J.W. (2005). Common Ground between Form and Content: The Pragmatic Solution to the Bootstrapping Problem. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, 263-283.

- Salih, R. R. (2014). A comparative study of English and Kurdish connectives in newspaper opinion articles. Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of philosophy. At the university of Leicester.
- Samvelian, P. (2006). A lexicalist account of Sorani Kurdish prepositions'. In S. Müller (ed.) *Proceedings of the HPSG07 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Samvelian, P. (2007). 'What Sorani Kurdish absolute prepositions tell us about cliticization'. In *Texas Linguistic Society IX: The Morphosyntax of Underrepresented Languages*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Santelemon, L., Berk, S., Austin, J., Somashekar, S., & Lust, B. (2002). Continuity and development in the acquisition of inversion in yes/no questions: dissociating movement and inflection. *Journal of Child Language*, 29, 813-840.
- Sheykh Esmaili, K. & Salavati, Sh. (2015). Sorani Kurdish versus Kurmanji Kurdish: An Empirical Comparison. Conference paper. retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270877570>
- Stilwell, P. J. (1999). Child language (2nd ed. Edited by Richard Hudson). London: Routledge.
- Stromswold, K. (1990). Learnability and the acquisition of auxiliaries. Ph.D. dissertation. MIT.
- Pea, R. (1980). The development of negation in early child language. In D. Olson (Eds.), *the social foundations of language and thought* (pp. 156–186). New York, NY: Norton New York.
- Radford, A. (1990). *Syntactic Theory and the Acquisition of English Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

## **An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

- Tomasello, M. (2000). Do young children have adult syntactic competence?  
*Cognition*, 74, 209-253.
- Tomasello, M. (2003). *Constructing a Language. A usage-based approach*.  
Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Tomasello, M. (2006). Acquiring linguistic constructions. In D. Kuhn & R. Siegler  
(Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology*. New York: Wiley.
- Wode, H. (1977). Four early stages in the development of L1 negation. *Journal of  
Child Language*, 4, 87–102.
- Yoshinaga, N. (1996). *Wh-questions: A comparative study of their form and  
acquisition in Japanese*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- Yosoufi, N. (2009). *The Development of Kurdish Syntax: A Case Study in First  
Language Acquisition (FLA)*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Allameh  
Tabatabaie, Tehran, Iran.

**Appendix:**

	n	on	nce	
				inting to every object in
	æ		is	replaced tiee with chiyæ pronunciation of the word
.2	æ			Fasion is more complete
			re	TV he asked me...
	choni?		n how are you?	ed to one of our relative
7				d noise from outside
		kæm?	light?	

**An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

	kæm?	Berqæ	May I	
				sage my leg.
			?	th some water in his ha
				M Pointing to a
				he gas company worke
		a	Allow fat	
		Ch	What :	
	bashi/ choni?		Are you ok?	
				Pouya saw a player w
	Daikæ æv	Daikæ æwæ/	what is that	
				He used interro
			turned?	



	e æwæ cheshtæ?gos		ee that food? Is i	
	?		ors?	
	iyæ?		hat?	
	xoi?		Semaya	
			I	Inappropri
	t sandi?		watch from the stor/did he buy used for:	
	Semāya becho		ool, ok?	
			en?	
	ekei?		you doing?	ther was busy with

**An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

	sh?	bash?	?	
				May
			?	bor. Pouya asked me...
	chyæ dær?		ng? Are you going	
	æ gelya?	kæ gerya?	cry?	
			k	
	næ chi æka?		g? What is this doi	
	læ dukanækæ sænd		brella is delicious	jective 'xoshæ=deli
			me jump?	
			me eat it?	
		Kwa		Where
	Berom dæk		o you let me go ou	A man was

Negation

			o that	he is not willing to do sth or others do 'where is it?' he replies:  ep Pouya in a place and he will not b ' wanted to lift Pouya from his place a ace.
				jump down from a canapé and his him.

	hæ		t nails	me cut your nails. He  s of negative prefixes  you come in?
--	----	--	---------	---

**An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

		hu/gem bu	on't wear ed/ went and disapn	d to dress hi
--	--	-----------	----------------------------------	---------------

	h		),I drink water	ink milk?
--	---	--	-----------------	-----------

				at the beginning use it as a suffix
--	--	--	--	--

		lo		
--	--	----	--	--

	æm	em		egation: I told t dow' he replied ther to be carefu y sentence. fall, it is icy(la
	n ækæm		am watching	ter me.

			r	ewæ.= it is an ap
--	--	--	---	-------------------

	asha ækæm iyæ leiræ       gæ		aby channel dy is here! p!  book) slept	e channel, I v g this channel treet at night.Pou oesn't sleep'  im: Pouya bexæ = Pouya Aras h
--	--	--	--	---

	shækæ æshkene		at it there, it will br  tell it! V channel).	
--	---------------	--	--	--

			s  a Ræna I gons	?=Pouya is
--	--	--	------------------------	------------

**An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

	æchem Sona Ræna æchen		
--	-----------------------	--	--

		w!	mera in his hand and s to take him upstairs f left he said...
--	--	----	---

	kom.....		t water	bexo + come drink w
	vækæ beshkælanæ		water the small!	ss but there was a small ne to pour the water in th
		nækæ		<b>ange</b>

--	--	--	--	--

	mækæ bero		(right) off , go br	'Amin xæftegæ = An lied...
	osh ækæwen		ill become ill!	ld catch cold.

	fæ		is a bag!	elop in his hand that in your ha
	mæ swari		I get in the car.	
	hokækæm be		eat my peas	

	xasi kæ!		lect them yourself	collect his toys f
--	----------	--	--------------------	--------------------

	wæsen?		t them close i	= you didn't close
--	--------	--	----------------	--------------------

**An Investigation of the Acquisition of Negation.....**

	<p>oshækæ</p> <p>n!</p> <p>wa!</p> <p>n begræ natwane</p> <p>n be shæwal nar</p>	<p>You shouldn't come</p> <p>ke me return!</p> <p>go by foot).</p> <p>my hand I can't come</p> <p>my trousers I won't g</p>	<p>oshækæ bezh</p> <p>don't say x...sa</p> <p>word Pouya ha</p> <p>at K.. is its Kur</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>hem bo mali mamoz</p> <p>om temo!</p> <p>ward <b>fodalækæt</b> bo</p>	<p>! I go to uncle Zafar's h</p> <p>! I will return, myself, lat</p> <p>n on the football for me a</p>	
--	--	--	--



