

On Monolingual Dictionaries and Child Language Development

Lendzemo Constantine Yuka

*Department of Linguistics and African Languages
University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria.*

&

H. Oby Okolocha

*Department of English and Literature
University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria*

Abstract:

Amfani (2008) ignites a very interesting child language development debate. He argues that "... colonial interference in the natural affairs of Africans has been the major factor responsible for the type of communication disorder he refers to as 'lexical starvation' experienced by the modern African child with respect to the acquisition of the mother tongue lexicon". He argues that the dearth of monolingual dictionaries for African languages play a prominent role in promoting and sustaining this type of communication disorder. He advocates for the development of monolingual dictionaries to stem "... the chaotic nature of language acquisition by the modern African child." In this paper we set out to discuss a few of Amfani's exciting claims about the lexicon, the dictionary, second language acquisition, child language acquisition and child language development. We argue that the lexicon of any language is open and expands as the physical and emotional experience of its speakers develop; that no (normal) human being can possibly internalize the 'complete' lexicon of his language; that the lexicon is as dynamic as is the language, capable of employing lexical and syntactic computations to express the knowledge of the competent language speaker; that lexical dearth is the onset of language dearth generally triggered by relevance depreciation; that dictionaries (bilingual or monolingual) are more a means of language documentation and preservation than an enhancement tool of language acquisition.

Key Words: lexicon, monolingual dictionaries, language acquisition, child language development, language preservation

Introduction

Chomsky (1980: 34) completely flaws the stimulus argument that children learn language by experience. The Chomskyan ambit that at birth children possess innate characteristics that predispose them to acquire language can be traced back to Cartesian cognitivism and Platonic philosophy. The structure of the vocal tract, the existence of a large catalogue of language universals (Comrie 1981, Greenberg 1978, Shopen 1985 and others) which are not language specific but simply a reflection of general human experience, the ability to understand the hierarchical nature of syntax and others are among the characteristics that make it possible for children to learn any language they are exposed to. It will not be off the mark to hypothesize that pre-linguistic children most likely possess an internal representation of the world such that language learning becomes simpler. Howell and Becker (2000, 2001) argue that what a child needs to do when learning a language is to reduce the learning process to attaching linguistic labels for things.

The attributes of these things are determined by the child's linguistic experience and his/her environment. A close monitoring of child language acquisition (Gillette et al, 1999) will reveal that children seem to rely more on semantics than syntax when speaking which is why the most observable verbs are learnt before the less observable initial nouns. The child's early vocabulary is dominated by nouns. At this stage, learning is skewed towards imageability or concreteness. The acquisition of verbs is influenced and distinguished by the nouns involved in the act. By the time the child begins to understand argument structure, his/her language learning abilities have moved beyond lexical acquisition to the level of syntax. Knowledge of argument structure requires not only an understanding of categorial features but the subcategorial features of each lexical item. Subcategorial information of words which is part of the lexicon is not always reflected with the dictionary entries of such words and this is the thin line that separates the dictionary from the lexicon.

A dictionary is generally understood to be a reference book containing words alphabetically arranged with information about their categorial features, meaning(s), pronunciation, etymologies, functions etc. While

a monolingual dictionary draws its lexical list from a single language, a bilingual dictionary reflects the semantic equivalents of its lexical entries in two different languages. Unfortunately (as part of practical description) a few analysts freely interchange reference to the dictionary and the lexicon as if they were synonymous. As a theoretical concept, the lexicon must be distinguished from the dictionary. A mental lexicon cannot be wholly equated to a dictionary. The lexicon is a linguist's account of individual words or similar lexical units for a given language. It is interpreted as an unstructured list of lexical items (Chomsky, 1995, 2000, 2001, 2005).

The lexicon houses some of the smallest lexical resources available for computation towards the derivation of lexical items. Jackendoff (2002) makes the important point that lexical items are not words. While some lexical items are smaller than words, others are larger than words. A strict distinction can be made between lexical resources (units) and lexical items. Lexical items are completely formed words (fully inflected for case, agreement, tense etc.) derived through the combination of lexical tokens. Lexical units refer to affixes that are both inflectional and derivational. The lexicon organizes the vocabulary of a language following certain principles. It contains a generative mechanism for deriving both complex and simple words according to the lexical derivation rules. The mechanism of combinatorial rules is dependent on the idiosyncrasies of the computational module of the language in question.

The radical changes that have been witnessed in the development of generative grammar (the Standard Theory, the Revised Standard Theory, The Revised Extended Standard Theory, the Government-Binding Theory, the Minimalist Program and beyond) have been driven principally by the quest for simplicity and the ultimate logical question of language acquisition. Amfani's (2008: 220) assertion that "... monolingual dictionaries play a prominent role in child language development..." and that monolingual dictionaries "...enhance perfect acquisition of the complete lexicon..." should undoubtedly attract the attention of many followers of developments and interpretations within child language acquisition and generative grammar. In the following section of this paper, we set out to examine the role of the lexicon in child language acquisition.

Child Language Acquisition and the Lexicon

Amfani (2008:220) identifies the “...inadequate mastery or acquisition of the complete lexicon...” as a communication disorder that needs to be addressed if we hope to break some of the communication barriers that stretch from childhood to adulthood. To adequately appreciate Amfani’s perspective, it may be necessary to attempt answers to the following questions: When does human language acquisition start? How do children acquire language? Put more generally, how does any abstract language learner acquire language? Howell and Becker (2000) suggest that a model of language acquisition in children provides the foundation necessary for an assessment of more mature language processing.

Howell and Becker (2000, 2001), Gillette et al (1999) report that children are conceptually equipped to understand the concepts that underlie the words adults associate to them. Chomsky (1972) refers to this knowledge as the Language Acquisition Device (LAD). Association of concepts to words is dependent on concreteness and imageability. Less concrete nouns and less imageable verbs are learnt by their association with more concrete nouns as well as more imageable verbs. Gillette et al, (1999) state that the number and syntactic position of nouns in the child’s speech stream reliably cues which verbal concept the unknown word could be. At this stage, the lexical structure of utterances begins to assist the child in his/her vocabulary development. The child has now reached a level in language acquisition where he/she no longer requires explicit extralinguistic context to decipher lexical associations. Once the child attains school age, new words begin to be added with lexical constraints. Grammar acquisition begins to be a consideration when the multi-word stage sets in (Bates and Goodman, 1999).

Previous work (Smith, 1999) suggests that lexical development preceded grammatical development, a developmental ordering with strong theoretical implications. The general conception has been that grammar learning is inherently more complex and does not succeed until the most primal of lexical attractors have been firmly set. More recent research (Howell and Becker, 1999, Jackendoff, (2000a) state that the acquisition of grammar and lexical learning begin at the same

time though, grammar learning does not effectively take place until the lexical representation is solidified. Since there are lexical items larger than words, it will not be far fetched to identify the requirement of grammatical knowledge in lexical derivation. Jackendoff, (2000b) states that the grammatical computation of some lexical items is dependent on the subcategorical properties of the verbal stem. For instance the ‘-ing’ (being a lexical unit) would *select* an appropriate [V] (eat, for example), to *merge* with to create ‘eating’. The word formation process takes place in much the same way as the computational selection of an appropriate complement for a transitive verb. This shows the lack of evidence for the dissociation of lexical and grammatical processes along with very tight developmental links between the two. Bates and Goodman (1999) reveal that the lexical status of a 20-months-old child (children’s vocabulary burst period) is the single best predictor of their grammatical status at 28 months old (the grammatical burst period); it will not be absolutely correct to approach lexical and grammar development as if they are separate modules since a single process is employed in the acquisition of both.

Following Chomsky’s (1972), *Innateness Hypothesis*⁴⁴ we assert that since every normal human child is born with language processing capabilities that belong to him/her as part of his/her biological endowment, the pre-linguistic experience of every normal child incorporates the properties of Universal Grammar⁴⁵ (UG) which can be parameterized to accommodate the peculiarities of any language to which the child is exposed. What this means is that language acquisition does not begin at the time the child utters his/her first word. It begins (to answer the question at the onset of section 2 of this paper) when his/her LAD is activated for imageability and conceptual perception. Lexical acquisition and the development of grammar from hence becomes a process of label learning because the child ascribes

⁴⁴ The claim that some aspects of linguistic competence are genetically specified rather than learnt through experience.

⁴⁵ UG specifies the allowable mental representation and operations that all languages are confined to use. The theory of universal grammar is tied to the theory of mental mechanisms which children employ in the process of language acquisition; their hypothesis about language is couched in structures sanctioned by UG (Pinker, 2000).

lexical tags only to things seen or mentally conceived or physically experienced. As the child's vocabulary grows, so does his/her acquisition of lexical units. The computational rules gradually begin to influence the distinction between well-formed and ill-formed derivations. The child's mental lexicon will continue to expand as his/her experience within the speech community develops. It therefore may not be totally correct to say that; "The source of the complete lexicon should be the innate ability of the fluent native speaker" (Amfani, 2008:220) since the LAD is basically like a blank slate adapted to accommodate the grammar of any language the child is exposed to. Rather the 'source' in question should be the immediate speech community of the child from which the child gradually acquires a robust lexicon as he/she continues to learn new things through his/her interactions with the immediate family and other speakers of the language.

It should be interesting to determine exactly what role a monolingual dictionary (or a bilingual dictionary) plays either in language acquisition process briefly chronicled above or in the continuous retention of the lexicon and the grammar internalized by the child. Since Amfani, (2008) introduces the interference of colonial languages, it may also be necessary to ascertain the ability of the child to retain the knowledge of his first language (L_1) in the face of the domineering influence of a foreign language (L_2) within his speech community. These and other issues are addressed in the following section of our paper.

Dictionaries, Language Acquisition and Language Development

Literature on child language acquisition (Cain and Pietroske, 2002, Howell and Becker, 2002, Jackendoff, 2002b, Sunderman and Kroll, 2006, Bates and Goodman, 1999 and other works) reveals that normal children utter their first words between 8-12 months, vocabulary burst is attained between 18 and 20 months, by 28 months, they experience a grammar bust and by school age they begin reading and acquiring new words with the aid of lexical constraints. Amfani (2008:221) states that "Lexical starvation manifests in adulthood as the inability of the modern African adult to adequately express himself in his mother tongue." There is absolutely no doubt that several forms of

communication disorders can be responsible for an adult's failure to adequately verbalize his/her thoughts, but the connection of lexical starvation to the non-existence of some monolingual dictionary is rather remote. This is because even before school age, such a normal child would have experienced the lexical burst stage and at 28 months, the grammar burst stage would have set in. The mental lexicon of such a child will expectedly continue to expand as he/she matures and learns more about his/her world.

As long as the language in his speech community (his L_1) is the language in use it will depend on the functional relevance of the language to ensure the expansion of the child's expressive capabilities as his competence is challenged daily by personal experiences. The existence or non-existence of some dictionary has totally nothing to contribute to the performance capabilities of such a child or adult speakers within such a speech community. By extension, Amfani's claim above insinuates that the existence of a monolingual dictionary for a language that is experiencing lexical depletion may contribute a fundamental resurgence in lexical expansion and reverse the depreciation of eloquence leading to an enhancement of the native speakers' ability to "... adequately express himself in his mother tongue ...".

The failure of a language speaker "...to adequately express himself in his mother tongue..." cannot simply be blamed on lexical starvation. The possession of a robust lexicon is just one of the components required to communicate the feelings, aspirations and experiences of a speaker. The mastery of combinatorial and syntactic rules in sentence derivation, the ability to match utterances to appropriate sociolinguistic contexts is equally part of the competence required for fluent speech delivery. The numerous factors that can inhibit the balance between a language speaker's competence and his performance are well documented in the literature (De Saussure, 1916, Chomsky, 1965 and others) and do not merit a repeat here.

In section 1 of this paper we made a clear distinction between the lexicon and the dictionary. We equally reiterated Jackendoff's (2002b) observation that some lexical items are not words (/t/ -[past], /-nEs/ [a property], /ADJ-]). We added that lexical elements larger than words

equally exist as the following set phrases in English reveal ‘right to vote’, ‘easy does it’ ‘tax and spend’ etc. Idioms like ‘spill the milk’, ‘it rained cats and dogs’, ‘a stitch in time saves nine’, etc are fixed distinctive expressions stored in the lexicon with a complete morphosyntactic information that is analyzable only as a whole without necessarily alluding to the semantic import of the individual lexical items that make up the whole. The lexicon must permit both storage and free combination of items which Clahsen (1995) refers to as the ‘dual mechanism’. The mental lexicon is heterogeneous since it allows computations that cannot be understood from a semantic analysis of the combined meanings of individual words. While the dictionary thus draw its lexical list from a given language, it is deficient in its reflection of lexical content smaller than or larger than words which is part of the competence of the mental lexicon of the native speaker. It may therefore not be totally correct to equate the lexicon to the dictionary or to assume that “...speakers are less eloquent and descriptively poor in languages where monolingual dictionaries are absent...” (Amfani, 2008: 225).

The Lexicon and the dictionary are not in “the chicken and the egg” precedence dilemma because the dictionary is an approximation of the contents of the computational resources available to the native speaker of a given language. It will be wrong to presuppose that the native speakers’ ability to express his thoughts may be dependent on the existence of some dictionary (be it bilingual or monolingual). Languages are sustained principally when its speakers employ the language as their tool of communication and ensure that the language is continuously being passed onto their children. Language use ensures the expansion (as its speakers encounter new experiences) and the maintenance of the lexicon. Persistent language use equally ‘lubricates’ the competence and the performance values of its speakers. The existence of a monolingual dictionary for a language that is gradually falling out of favour with its readers adds nothing to the gradual depletion of the mental lexicon of its speakers. A language whose Native speakers doubt its functional value will not be encouraged to speak it even if such a language can boast of a monolingual dictionary. Their mental lexicon will gradually fall out of use and deplete and children of such speech communities are likely to end up with an “incomplete lexicon” which Amfani has referred to as

“lexical Starvation”. Though Amfani (2008) does not explicitly state what role the dictionary plays in child language acquisition, there is absolutely no doubt that lexicography is one of the very valuable methods of language documentation and preservation.

The scramble for Africa ushered in colonization. Each colonial master was keen to impose her language and culture onto the people within the territory under her jurisdiction. These European languages automatically became the languages of governance, education, commerce and official communication. In most African states today, the official language of communication is hardly any of the numerous indigenous languages; rather it is the colonizer’s language. Amfani states that:

... colonial languages were mainly English, French and Portuguese. The African child was forced to acquire the lexicons of his mother tongue and that of the colonial language all within the critical period earmarked for the acquisition of the lexicon. The effect of this dual acquisition was that most often acquisition was lopsided with children acquiring more of the colonial language. It is necessary to point out here that the acquired lexicon of the colonial language is usually easily sustained due to the availability of the monolingual dictionaries available in these languages. The acquired lexicon of the mother tongue is easily lost or poorly retained due to the non-availability of similar monolingual dictionaries to sustain it. (Amfani, 2008: 224)

The salient issues in the above extract take the discussion a little beyond the role of monolingual dictionaries in language development to the debate on how bilinguals process the lexicons of two different languages in which they possess competence. Psychologists and linguists have been interested in determining whether bilinguals organize their lexicon in co-ordinate structure or in compound structure, whether the lexicon of L₂ is dependent on the structure of L₁ (Weinreich, 1953, Kroll and De Groot, 1997, 2003, Kroll, et al, 2002, Kroll and Sunderman, 2003 and others). Results of various

experiments from these studies indicate that in fluent bilinguals, lexical forms are activated in both languages; the activation is bidirectional in that L₂ can affect L₁ and vice-versa. Kroll et al (2002), report that once an L₂ is activated through a simple naming task, the L₂ triggers the activation of closely related items in L₁. This activation increases with proficiency. L₁ and L₂ forms are stored according to similarity of form, not meaning, especially for beginning bilinguals. Kroll and her colleagues have equally suggested in the *Lexical Mediation Model*, that L₂ concepts are initially accessed via L₁ but as L₂ proficiency increases, L₂ forms to L₂ meanings are established not necessarily having to pass through L₁.

Second language acquisition generally refers to learning a language after having acquired the first language. Children experience little difficulty in acquiring more than one language. When people become immersed in the cultures of communities that speak the language they wish to learn, learning the second language becomes more successful. What the research reports briefly reviewed above suggest is that the acquisition of the L₂ lexicon does not in any way adversely affect the (already entrenched) lexicon of the L₁ as Amfani will have us believe. At the beginning of L₂ lexical acquisition, the activation relationship between the lexicons of L₁ and L₂ in a budding bilingual is at best complementary.

Majority of African children encounter colonial languages in school. At school age, most normal children have already passed the lexical burst stage and are within the grammar burst stage of their L₁ acquisition. The concurrent lexical acquisition of the L₁ and L₂ lexicon that Amfani alludes to is not a common experience for most African children. The colonial languages begin to dominate indigenous African languages because the society within which the child learner grows impacts upon him/her that the relevance value scale between the two languages is skewed in favour of the colonial language. He recognizes that he requires the colonial language to have access to education, jobs, commerce, international intelligibility etc. The colonial language turns out to be the communication tool for wider communication and his mother tongue is reserved for communication within family circles and ethnic group meetings. Since language is sustained through use, the lexicon of L₁ lacks consistent reactivation

and gradually begins to deplete leading to lexical starvation that result in the inability of adult native speakers to adequately express themselves.

Colonization brought together a multitude of ethnic nationalities under one central administration. The linguistic diversity of most African countries manifest itself as a huge hindrance to the choice of a national language accepted and adopted across the many linguistic groups. The neutral colonial language bereft of any ethnic affiliations has been the easy choice for many countries. The preference for foreign languages as languages of governance, education, commerce and official communication have impacted very negatively on our indigenous languages whose promotion is being linked to the disruption of governments' national integration policies. Such neglect is driving these languages out of use and endangering their continuous survival as tools of communication in the near future. The signs of the eventual language extinction are visible in the absence of language use, which ignites depletion that results in lexical starvation that Amfani, (2008) is concerned about. We have already established that the existence of monolingual dictionaries do not affect lexical acquisition. If the existence of monolingual dictionaries cannot equally turn around the relevance value of indigenous languages in Africa and beyond, monolingual dictionaries may be in no position to halt lexical starvation.

Yuka and Okolocha (2010) have argued for a more functional approach to the development of indigenous African languages. It is their opinion that post-colonial freethinking African intellectuals have provoked the emergence of ethno-linguistic nationalism that is now ubiquitous in Africa. The idealistic and nationalistic approaches to language policy issues in Africa have resulted in the persistence of the language problems in most postcolonial African states. Their paper proposes alternative strategies that are motivated by the functional relevance of language to the speaker's pursuits of his/her 21st Century goals. Their argument is that any language development strategy in the 21st Century that is motivated by the socio-economic needs of its speakers is likely more easily sustainable than an altruistic, nationalistic and idealistic driven strategy. They state that a knowledge-based economy is more relevant in the 21st century than

economies dependent on natural resources (especially if such resources are neither locally processed nor indigenously packaged).

Goods and services from knowledge-based economies stand a better competitive chance in the global market. They maintain that those in need of such goods and services cannot afford to ignore the languages with which such goods are packaged. Economies that export raw materials have the finished products back in their shores packaged in the language(s) of the industrialized countries. The productive recognition is to the people who present the finished product to the market and not those who produced the raw material. Raw material based economies abdicate their opportunity to promote their languages through the packaging of finished products to industrialized economies. Individuals and communities learn a new language only when such a language is functional as a relevant communication tool in quest of their non-language based pursuits. Africa must break through the instrumentality of language that has become a barrier to creative thinking. A link of the current socio-economic values of our society to language policy design is capable of arresting lexical depletion because language use and not monolingual dictionaries hold the key to the solution of language extinction that is ravaging indigenous African languages like an avalanche.

Concluding Remarks

This paper set out to contribute to the debate ignited in Amfani (2008) with his claims about the lexicon, monolingual dictionaries, child language acquisition and child language development. We have established that the connection between 'lexical starvation' and the non-existence of monolingual dictionaries is remote. Dictionary types have no significant effect on the language learners' vocabulary recall or retention; even more, all information that a monolingual dictionary claims to include can equally be offered by a bilingual dictionary. Bilingual or monolingual dictionaries principally function as a store of information about grammar, usages, lexical status, synonym discrimination, application of derivative affixes and the distinction between spoken and written language forms not generally treated in textbooks. This means that dictionaries assume a certain level of language competence from its users. It is debatable whether

Amfani's modern African Child who is being subjected to "chaotic... language acquisition" because of the dearth of monolingual dictionaries for African languages can be said to have the mastery to effectively use the dictionaries being advocated for. Once languages begin to slide into functional irrelevance to its speakers, lexical starvation sets in.

Lexical starvation leads to lexical depletion, which is the onset of language death. Few people will be motivated to seek the lexical status or usage of a word form a language that is not functionally relevant from a dictionary (even if such a dictionary is monolingual). A more appropriate solution to chaotic language acquisition, lexical starvation, lack of eloquence and poor descriptive abilities of the modern African child that Amfani (2008) has identified (to us) appears to lie with language use, the sustenance of the functional relevance in the pursuit of the non-linguistic goals of its speakers rather than in the existence of monolingual dictionaries for African languages which we have acknowledged are a very effective method of language documentation and preservation.

References

- Amfani, Ahmed. 2008. "Dictionaries and Child Language Development." In Shirely-Ifode and Rotimi Badejo. eds. *Readings on Child Language and Communication Disorders in Nigeria*. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.
- Bates, Elizabeth and Goodman, Judith. 1999. "On the Emergence of Grammar from the Lexicon." In B. Mac Whinney. ed. *The Emergence of Language*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cain, Stephen and Pietroski, Paul. 2002. "Why Language Acquisition is a Snap." *The Linguistic Review*, vol. 19: 163 – 184.
- Chapman, Siobhan and Routledge, Christopher. eds. 2009. *Key Ideas in Linguistics and the Philosophy of Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1972. *Studies on Semantic in Generative Grammar*. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____. 1980. *Rules and Representations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. London: MIT Press.
- _____. 2000. "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework." In Roger Martin, Devid Michales and Juan Uriagereka. eds. *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalism in Honour of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- _____. 2001. "Derivation by Phase." In M. Kenstowicz. ed. *Ken Hale: A life in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- _____. 2004. "Beyond Explanatory Adequacy." In Ariana Belletti. ed. *Structures And Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structure 3*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2005. "Three factors in Language Design." *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, no. 1: 1 – 22
- Clahsen, Herald. 1995. "German Plurals in Adults Second Language Development: Evidence for a Dual Mechanism Model Inflection." In L. Eubank, M. Sharwood-Smith and L. Selinker. eds. *The English Language Teaching and Learning*. Dubai: Dubai Men's College, United Arabs Emirates.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1981. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- De Saussure, Ferdinand. 1916. *Cours de Linguistique*. Paris: Payot
- Gillette, Jane. Gleitman, Henry Gleitman, Lila Gileitman Lederer, Anne. 1999. "Human Simulations of Vocabulary Learning." *Cognition*, vol. 73: 135 – 176.
- Greenberg, Joseph. 1978. *Universals of Human Language*, Volume 4: Syntax. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Howell, Steve and Becker Susan. 2001. "Modelling Language Acquisition: Grammar from the Lexicon?" *Proceedings of the Cognitive Science Society*, 2001.
- _____ and Becker Susan. 2002. "Modelling Language Acquisition: Lexical Grounding through Perceptual Features." *Proceedings of the Cognitive Science Society*, 2002.

- Jackendoff, Ray. 2002. "What's in the Lexicon?" In S. Nootboom, F. Weermans and F. Kittay. eds. *Storage and Computation in the Language Faculty*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- _____. 2002. *Foundations of Language*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Juffs, Allan. 2000 "Second Language Acquisition of the Lexicon." In Ritchie, W. and Bhatia, Y. eds. *The New Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Kroll, Judith and De Groot, Annette. eds. 1997. *Tutorials in Bilingualism: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- _____. and Sunderman, Gretchen. 2003. "Cognitive Processes in L₂ Learners and Bilinguals." In M. Long and C. Doughty. eds. *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. New Malden: Blackwell.
- _____. Micheal Dunn and Dufour, Peter. 2002. "The development of Lexical Fluency in a Second Language." *Second Language Research*, vol. 18: 137 – 171.
- Pinker, Steven. 2000. "Language Acquisition." In Gleitman Lila, Liberman Mark and Osherson David. eds. *An Invitation to Cognitive Science*. 2nd Ed., vol. 1: Language. Cambridge, MA MIT Press.
- Shopen, Timothy. ed. 1985. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Volume II: Complex Constructions*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Smith, Lavonia. 1999. "Children's Noun Learning: How General learning Processes make Specialized learning Mechanisms." In Mac Whinney, B. ed. 1999. *The Emergence of Language*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Smith, Neil. 1999. *Chomsky: Ideas and Ideals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sunderman, Gretchen and Kroll, Judith. 2006. "First Language Activation during Second Language Lexical Processing: An Investigation of Lexical Form, from Meaning and Grammatical Class." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28: 387 – 422.

- Thompson, Geoff. 1987. "Using Bilingual Dictionaries." *ELT Journal* 41, no. 4: 282 – 86.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953/1974. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. Mouton: The Hague.
- Yuka, Constantine and Okolocha, Oby. 2010. "Rethinking our Strategies Towards the Development of African Languages." In Conference Proceedings of the 2010 Annual Conference of the Literary Society of Nigeria (LSN) in Honour of Prof R. N. Egudu, University of Benin, Benin City.