Young Korean Learners' Usage of the Verb *give*: Evidence from Their Narratives*

In Lee

(Jeonju National University of Education)

Lee, In. (2016). Young Korean learners' usage of the verb *give*: Evidence from their narratives. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal 24*(1), 21-48. The dative alternation in English caused the learnability paradox and many L1 acquisition researchers have dealt with this topic. The purpose of this study was to find out how young Korean learners of English use the verb *give* and its construction. My arguments are based on the analysis of 11 children's narratives and their L2 data were collected while each language informant was describing the same wordless picture book, *A Circle of Friends* by Carmi (2003). The following are the findings: First, it seems that the amount of input bears little or no relation to the usage of the verb *give* as far as the appropriateness is concerned. Second, 3 informants in the third grade used inappropriate constructions more frequently than appropriate ones (13 versus 7 occurrences). It can be assumed that inappropriate forms like *$*is$ give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$, *$*give$-NP$_{(DO)}$, or *$*give$-NP$_{(IO)}$, were influenced by their L1. Third, 3 children in Grade 4 began to recognize the verb *give* as a ditransitive rather than as a transitive, and a prepositional form of the dative alternation was their preference. We can assume that their ill-formed constructions like *$*is$ *give*-NP$_{(DO)}$ (twice), *NP$_{(DO)}$-*and*-NP$_{(IO)}$-*is-give*, and *NP$_{(DO)}$-*is*-NP$_{(IO)}$-*give* were the results of L1 transfer. Fourth, 2 children in the fifth grade more frequently used the verb *give* followed by two objects than the verb followed by a single object (20 versus 12 occurrences).

Fifth, it seems that 3 informants in Grade 6 realized the verb *give* as a ditransitive. The usage of the verb in 2 informants' narratives was quite appropriate and stabilized, while 1 informant's narratives showed some characteristics of his Interlanguage. Sixth, it seems that Korean child learners regarded an expression like *give me money* or *give to* as a chunk.

1. Introduction

Gorpen, Pinker, Hollander, Goldberg, and Wilson (1989) started their research with a learnability paradox the dative alternation poses: when children hear *give money to him* and *give him money*, they could formulate a rule deriving the double object construction from the prepositional form, but the rule would allow overgeneralization from *donate money to him* to **donate him money*. Gorpen, et al. (1989) dealt with L1 children's dative alternation by analyzing their speech transcripts and proposed "a dative rule that operates on two levels: a broad-range rule defines the possibility of a verb meaning 'cause to move' to be changed into one meaning 'cause to have', and narrow-range rules license such extensions to be made for subclasses of semantically and morphologically similar verbs"(p. 203).

L1 acquisition researchers have regarded the dative alternation in English as an enigma because deriving a double object construction from a prepositional form can lead native English-speaking children to the overgeneralization of the rule. How about Korean learners of English? Do they also derive a double object construction from a prepositional form? Which VP appears earlier in Korean child learners' spontaneous utterances, a double object construction or a prepositional form? Young Korean learners of English cannot be as much sensitive to morphophonological or semantic properties of the verb as native English-speaking children are. Korean child learners' acquisition of the dative alternation might rely on which form of the dative alternation has been heard more frequently. The purpose of this study is to find out how young Korean learners of English use the verb *give*, one of

the prototypical ditransitive verbs.

2. Theoretical Background

According to Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005, pp. 10-11), research paradigms in SLA are classified into three: normative, interpretative, and critical. Research in normative paradigm tests whether there is a relationship between an independent and dependent variable. Researchers in this paradigm believe that conducting research on L2 acquisition is similar to doing a scientific experiment which tries to identify cause and effect. L2 acquisition in interpretive paradigm, however, is seen as a result of the complex interplay of psychological and social factors. Researchers in this paradigm try to describe and understand some aspects of L2 acquisition subjectively. Finally, L2 acquisition in critical paradigm is seen as rooted in the tensions and historically determined social structures. Researchers in this paradigm conduct a case study in an authentic context where L2 learners interact with native speakers.

This research was conducted in interpretive paradigm. As Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) pointed out, learner language serves as the primary data for the study of L2 acquisition. When L2 learners are asked to perform a narrative task, their spontaneous utterances will show the size of their vocabulary and the current levels of their fluency and accuracy.

Theoretical issues of English ditransitive constructions have been dealt with in recent studies; some studies adopted syntactic approaches (Hong, 2003; Shan & Hong, 2009; Y. Lee, 2011, to cite a few), and others semantic or lexical approaches (Tak, 1999; Jun, 2006; J. Lee, 2009). Lee and Kim (2011) dealt with the L2 developmental sequence of English constructions, but their analysis was based on test results taken by secondary and college students. Little research has been conducted on the elementary school students' spontaneous utterances. Thus, the analysis of L2 learners' transcripts is required.

3. Research Design and Procedures

3.1 Language Informants

Twelve children provided their narratives as raw data for this study. They were attending the same school in Jeonju, Korea. During the summer vacation of the 2014 academic year, the researcher sent an official request to their school along with some information about research ethics and a questionnaire about each voluntary informant's background of learning English, and asked them for help in selecting voluntary language informants (For the questionnaire, refer to Appendix 1). The total number of intended informants was 12 in Grades 3 to 6, three students in each grade. Overall, 6 boys and 6 girls, with their parents' consent, volunteered to join the researcher's project, narrating a wordless picture book in English. Table 1 includes who the informants were, what grade they were in, and how often and when their spontaneous utterances were collected. Each informant's name is a pseudonym on condition of anonymity. Everyone except for Min-guk (S5) provided their narratives for the researcher four times.

Table 1. Information about the Informants

Grade	Name	Boy/Girl	Dates of Collecting Data
G3	Sori (S1)	Girl	Sep. 11; Oct. 16; Nov. 13; Dec. 11
	Sarang (S2)	Girl	Sep. 11; Oct. 16; Nov. 13; Dec. 11
	Boram (S3)	Boy	Sep. 15; Oct. 13; Nov. 10; Dec. 10
G4	Daehan (S4)	Boy	Sep. 1; Oct. 6; Nov. 3; Dec. 15
	Min-guk (S5)	Boy	Sep. 4; Sep. 30; Nov. 6
	Narae (S6)	Girl	Sep. 4; Sep. 30; Nov. 12; Dec. 4
G5	Aram (S7)	Girl	Sep. 2; Oct. 7; Nov. 4; Dec. 2
	San (S8)	Boy	Sep. 5; Oct. 10; Nov. 7; Nov. 28
	Song-yi (S9)	Girl	Sep. 2; Oct. 7; Nov. 4; Dec. 2
G6	Dasom (S10)	Girl	Sep. 12; Oct. 17; Nov. 14; Dec. 15
	Garam (S11)	Boy	Sep. 16; Oct. 14; Nov. 11; Dec. 10
	Sol (S12)	Boy	Sep. 3; Oct. 8; Nov. 5; Dec. 9

Each informant's oral production might be influenced by learner differences. Table 2[1]) shows how soon each informant was exposed to English and how long s/he had been exposed to the target language. This information was collected during the first week of September, 2014. According to Table 2, nine students started to learn English in Kindergarten, and two students in the third grade. Only one student began to learn English in the first grade. Seven students were attending a language institute and/or taking a private English lesson. Five students were not taking any private English lessons, but they had some experience of learning English at a language institute or from a tutor. Four out of 12 students were taking private English lessons with S11 having taken them the longest (6 years and 6 months). S11 was followed by S8 (6 years and 4 months), S12 (5 years and 6 months), and S6 (4 years). Six students were studying English at home for more than 3 hours per week, and two students for 2 hours per week. One student was studying English at home for 1½ hours per week. However, three students were not studying English at home.

---

1) The following abbreviations are used: EL for 'English learning'; Kn for 'kindergarten'; G1 for 'Grade 1'; G2 for 'Grade 2'; G3 for 'Grade 3; PLs for 'private English lessons tutored or taken in a language institute'; Y for 'yes'; N for 'No'; ELs for 'English lessons'; T for 'learning from a tutor'; I for 'attending a language institute'; K for 'a Korean teacher'; E for 'a native English-speaking teacher'; K,E for 'a Korean teacher and a native English-speaking teacher'; SE for 'studying English'; h for 'hours'; L,S for 'listening & speaking'; R,W for 'reading & writing'; Voc for 'vocabulary'; and Gr for 'grammar'. Numerical notations are used to represent 'the amount of time in years and months each informant had spent or was spending for her/his study of English'; for example, 'I:0;10' means 'S3 had been attending a language institute for 10 months'. Mathematical signs read as follows: **<1** means 'less than one'; **1≤** means 'one or more than one, but less than 2'; **2≤** means 'two or more than two, but less than three'; and **3≤** means 'three or more than three'. Twelve informants are abbreviated as S1, S2, S3, and so on.

Table 2. The Informants' Study of English at Home

		S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12
Onset of EL	Kn	○	○	○		○	○		○	○	○	○	
	G1												○
	G2												
	G3				○			○					
PLs Now	Y	○		○		○	○		○	○		○	○
	N		○		○			○			○		
Time for ELs	<1			I:0;10 T:0;4	0;6								
	1≤						I:1		1;0		1;2		
	2≤	I:2;0	2;0							I:2;0 T:0;8			
	3≤						I:4;0		I:5;8 T:0;8			I:6;6	I:5;6
From whom	K			○		○		○			○	○	
	E												
	K,E	○	○		○		○		○	○			○
SE at Home per Week	<1				0h	0h							
	1≤						1.5h						
	2≤								2h		2h		
	3≤	10h	3h	4h						9h		6h	4h
Contents of PLs	L,S	○		○		○	○		○	○		○	
	R,W	○				○	○		○	○		○	○
	Voc						○		○	○		○	○
	Gr			○					○			○	○

3.2 Data Collection

Children's narratives were collected for 4 months from September to December, 2014. There was only one exception. Data from Min-guk were collected three times because the researcher's work schedule did not match with Min-guk's. The researcher met each informant after school on pre-arranged dates, and data collection was conducted in a classroom specially designed for English classes. Children's narratives were recorded with a digital voice recorder (Model: SVR-S820) and the recorded files were saved onto the computer. Then the researcher transcribed the audio files and analyzed each transcript.

3.3 Instruments

Two wordless picture books were presented to each informant: *A Circle of Friends* by Carmi (2003) [henceforth abbreviated to PBa] and *Frog on His Own* by Mayer (1973) [henceforth abbreviated to PBb]. However, only three children, Song-yi, Garam and Sol, tried to describe both PBa and PBb in English; thus, children's narratives of PBa were only dealt with in this study. PBa is a good sampling tool for collecting informants' spontaneous utterances because the theme of the book is 'A chain of giving brings about happiness.'

Each informant was allowed to thumb through the pages of PBa before s/he began to narrate the story. While telling the story, the informant had to turn the pages 15 times. Thus, we can say PBa consists of 16 scenes. Five out of 16 scenes could be described in ditransitive constructions: Scene 2, Scene 5, Scene 7, Scene 8, and Scene 10. Twelve informants performed their narrative tasks, but only 11 students' narratives were analyzed in this study because Aram (S7) had difficulty describing PBa in English. She described each scene in Korean or elicited English words only when she was asked to describe the book.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Findings from Each Informant's Performance

1) Sori's Narratives

Sori, a girl in Grade 3, started to learn English in Kindergarten. She had been attending a language institute for 2 years. She was one of the most diligent students; she was studying English at home for ten hours per week at the time of this study. At the institute, she was taught English by both a Korean teacher and a native English-speaking teacher. Her lessons focused on four skills: Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing.

She described Scene 2, Scene 8, and Scene 10, skipping Scene 5 and Scene 7. Table 3 summarizes how Sori used the verb *give* in her narratives. The following abbreviations are used in Table 3: $NP_{(IO)}$ stands for 'a Noun Phrase

functioned as an Indirect Object of the verb' and $NP_{(DO)}$, 'a Noun Phrase functioned as a Direct Object'. She used the verb *give* in Korean as a transitive or ditransitive, as shown in Sampling 1. She used the verb *give* as a ditransitive twice when she described Scene 2, but it is doubtful whether the second NP functioned as an Indirect Object because she used the preposition *for* instead of *to*. In the fourth sampling of Scene 2, however, she used the verb as a transitive. The verb *give* was also used as a transitive in the second sampling of Scene 8, but in the third and fourth sampling sessions the verb *feed* instead of *give* was used as a transitive. According to Levin (1993), the verb *feed* should be used as a ditransitive verb. In the fourth sampling of Scene 10, she used the verb *give* as a transitive. It seems that she recognized the verb *give* as a transitive instead of a ditransitive.

Table 3. Usage of the Verb *give* in Sori's Narratives

	Sc. 2	Sc. 5	Sc. 7	Sc. 8	Sc. 10
Sample 1	in Korean: $NP_{(DO)}$-*give*	skip	skip	in Korean: $NP_{(IO)}$-$NP_{(DO)}$-*give*	in Korean: $NP_{(DO)}$-$NP_{(IO)}$-*give*
Sample 2	**give*-$NP_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP	skip	skip	**give*-$NP_{(IO)}$	code-switching: E to K
Sample 3	**give*-$NP_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP	skip	skip	*feed*-$NP_{(DO)}$	no use of *give*
Sample 4	**give*-$NP_{(DO)}$	skip	skip	*feed*-$NP_{(DO)}$	**give*-$NP_{(DO)}$

2) Sarang's Narratives

Sarang, a girl in Grade 3, began to learn English in Kindergarten. She was neither attending a language institute nor taking private English lessons; however, she had previously had two years of experience in taking private English lessons. She was studying English for 3 hours per week.

Sarang described four scenes: Scene 2, Scene 5, Scene 8, and Scene 10. Scene 2 was most appropriately described. Her description of Scene 2 showed the dative alternation, *give*-$NP_{(IO)}$-$NP_{(DO)}$ and *give*-$NP_{(DO)}$-*to*-$NP_{(IO)}$. Nonetheless, it is questionable why her description of Scene 2 regressed as sampling sessions

continued. When she described the other three scenes, she showed some progress. During the first three sampling sessions each scene was described in Korean, or the code in her description changed from English to Korean. In the fourth sampling session, however, the four scenes were described in English. It seems that Sarang began to recognize the English verb *give* as a ditransitive during the last sampling session, but her usage of the verb was unstable. Table 4 summarizes how Sarang performed her narrative task.

Table 4. Usage of the Verb *give* in Sarang's Narratives

	Sc. 2	Sc. 5	Sc. 7	Sc. 8	Sc. 10
Sample 1	*give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$	in Korean: NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$-*give*	skip	code-switching: E to K NP$_{(IO)}$-*give*	in Korean: NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$-*give*
Sample 2	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$	code-switching: E to K no use of *give*	skip	code-switching: E to K NP$_{(IO)}$-*give*	in Korean: NP$_{(IO)}$-*give*
Sample 3	*give-NP$_{(DO)}$	in Korean: no use of *give*	skip	code-switching: E to K NP$_{(IO)}$-*give*	code-switching: K to E *give*-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$
Sample 4	*give-NP$_{(DO)}$	*give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$	skip	*is give-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$	*give-*to*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$

3) Boram's Narratives

Boram, a boy in Grade 3, began to learn English in Kindergarten. He had been attending a language institute for 10 months and also had taken private English lessons for 4 months. His private English lessons focused on Listening, Speaking and Grammar. He was studying English at home for 4 hours per week.

Boram described four scenes, skipping Scene 7. He used the verb *give* three times when he described Scene 2, but did not use *give* in his description of Scene 5. The verb *give* was used once in his description of Scene 8, and twice in his description of Scene 10. The verb *give* was used as a transitive or as a ditransitive in his narratives. Table 5 summarizes how Boram performed his narrative task.

Table 5. Usage of the Verb *give* in Boram's Narratives

	Sc. 2	Sc. 5	Sc. 7	Sc. 8	Sc. 10
Sample 1	**giving*-NP(DO)	no use of *give*	skip	no use of *give*	no use of *give*
Sample 2	*give*-NP(IO)-NP(DO)	no use of *give*	skip	no use of *give*	**give*-NP(DO)-NP(IO)
Sample 3	**give*-NP(DO)	no use of *give*	skip	**give*-NP(IO)	**give*-NP(IO)
Sample 4	no use of *give*	no use of *give*	skip	no use of *give*	no use of *give*

4) Daehan's Narratives

Daehan, a boy in Grade 4, was first exposed to English when he was in the third grade. He was neither attending a language institute nor taking private English lessons; however, he had previously taken private English lessons for 6 months. It seems that he was indifferent to learning English. According to the questionnaire, he was not studying English at home.

Daehan used the verb *give* as a ditransitive, but the word order of its arguments was inconsistent. He had a tendency to put a copula verb *is* right after an NP especially when the argument was used as the Subject. Refer to the underlined parts of (1).

(1)   the bird, the bird is, another, another bird, for give,
        another bird, the bread give [Scene 8, 9/1/2014]
        the bird give, the bread, some bread, for, for baby bird
        [Scene 8, 10/6/2014]
        the bird is, give the bread, the baby bird [Scene 8, 11/3/2014]
        the father, the father, the father bird mama, mother bird,
        and the bird's baby bird give some bread [Scene 8, 12/15/2014]

When he described Scene 10 during Sampling Session 2, he properly used a prepositional form of the dative alternation, *give*-NP(DO)-*to*-NP(IO). However, the word order of two Objects in other descriptions deviated from an adult's grammar: **give*-NP(IO)-*and*-NP(DO), **give*-NP(DO)-NP(IO), **give*-NP(DO)-*in*-NP(IO), or

give-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$. It seems that his first description of Scene 8 in (1) was influenced by his L1 word order. Table 6 summarizes how Daehan performed his narrative task.

Table 6. Usage of the Verb *give* in Daehan's Narratives

	Sc. 2	Sc. 5	Sc. 7	Sc. 8	Sc. 10
Sample 1	no use of *give*	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$	skip	*NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$-*give*	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$
Sample 2	*give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-*and*-NP$_{(DO)}$	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*in*-NP$_{(IO)}$	skip	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$
Sample 3	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$	no use of *give*	skip	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$	no use of *give*
Sample 4	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$	no use of *give*	skip	*NP$_{(IO)}$-*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$

5) Min-guk's Narratives

Min-guk, a boy in Grade 4, began to learn English in Kindergarten. He had been attending a language institute for 1 year and his lessons focused on four skills. According to the questionnaire, he was not studying English at home at the time of this study.

Min-guk performed his narrative task three times because the researcher's working schedule did not match with Min-guk's schedule. He described all of the five scenes. In the first sampling session, he had some difficulties in describing each scene; thus, the researcher had to help him try to describe each scene in English. When he described Scene 2 in the first sampling session, he used some dialogic narratives like 'Mom, money please!' and 'Okay, here!' His narratives showed a typical characteristic of young Korean learners of English: the Subject NP frequently followed by a copula verb *is*. His spontaneous utterances are shown in (2).

(2)   the boy, is, give me the, bread, and money, mom, 아닌가?
       [Scene 5, 9/4/2014]
       the boy, is, give, my bread, and running, my house
       [Scene 5, 9/30/2014]

the boy is, some bread, give, the boy, the boy, give some bread, and running home [Scene 5, 11/6/2014]
he is, give, bread [Scene 7, 9/30/2014]
bird, bird mom is, give me the bread [Scene 8, 9/4/2014]
he's give me, he's give me, the, seed [Scene 10, 9/4/2014]

The verb *give* was used as a transitive or as a ditransitive. It seems that his usage of the verb *give* became stable in the third sampling session. Especially his description of Scene 8 showed progress in the usage of the verb *give*: from *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ or **give-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$ to *give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$. Table 7 summarizes how Min-guk performed his narrative task. According to the first descriptions of Scene 5 and Scene 10, Min-guk presumably regarded *give me* as a chunk.

Table 7. Usage of the Verb *give* in Min-guk's Narratives

	Sc. 2	Sc. 5	Sc. 7	Sc. 8	Sc. 10
Sample 1	no use of *give* (dialogic narratives)	**is give me-*NP and NP	no use of *give*	*give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$	**is give me-*NP$_{(DO)}$
Sample 2	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$	**is-give-*NP$_{(DO)}$	**is give-*NP$_{(DO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$
Sample 3	*give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$; *give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$

6) Narae's Narratives

Narae, a girl in Grade 4, was first exposed to English in Kindergarten. She had been taking private English lessons at a language institute for 4 years. Her lessons focused on four skills and Vocabulary. She was studying English at home for 1½ hours per week.

Narae described four scenes, skipping Scene 8. She usually put a copula verb *is* right after an NP as shown in **is give*-NP$_{(DO)}$ or **NP$_{(DO)}$-is-NP$_{(IO)}$-give*. Her utterance like 'give me money' seems to be a chunk. She recognized the verb *give* as a transitive or as a ditransitive, but its arguments and their word order deviated from an adult's grammar. Sometimes, she followed her L1 word

order when she used the verb *give*. Table 8 showed how Narae performed her narrative task.

Table 8. Usage of the Verb *give* in Narae's Narratives

	Sc. 2	Sc. 5	Sc. 7	Sc. 8	Sc. 10
Sample 1	*give me money*	*NP(DO)-and-NP(IO)-is give	*NP(IO)-and-give-NP(DO)	skip	*is give-NP(DO); *NP-NP-and-give
Sample 2	*is give-NP(DO)	*NP(IO)-in-give-NP(DO)	*is give-in-NP(DO)	skip	*NP-NP-in-give
Sample 3	*give-NP(DO)	*NP(IO)-give-NP(DO)	*is give-NP(DO)	skip	*NP(DO)-is-NP(IO)-give
Sample 4	*give and-NP(DO)-NP(IO)	*give-NP(DO)	*NP(DO)-is-NP(IO)-give	skip	*give-NP(DO)

7) Aram's Narratives

Aram, a girl in Grade 5, started to learn English when she was in Grade 3. She was neither attending a language institute nor taking private English lessons. She could not describe the book in English sentences. Since her narratives consisted of Korean or English words only, her spontaneous utterances were not analyzed.

8) San's Narratives

San, a boy in Grade 5, was first exposed to English when he was in Kindergarten. He had been attending a language institute for 5 years and 8 months, and also taking private English lessons for 8 months. His English classes focused on four skills, Vocabulary, and Grammar. He was studying at home for 2 hours per week.

San described all of the five scenes. It seems that he started to use the verb *give* as a transitive. In the first three sampling sessions, he used *give to* as a chunk, but in the last sampling session he used the verb appropriately when he described Scene 2, Scene 8, and Scene 10. Table 9 summarizes how San performed his narrative task.

Table 9. Usage of the Verb *give* in San's Narratives

	Sc. 2	Sc. 5	Sc. 7	Sc. 8	Sc. 10
Sample 1	*give-to-NP_{(DO)}	*give* (?)	*give-to-NP_{(IO)}	E-K (mixed)	no use of *give*
Sample 2	*give me money*	*give-NP_{(DO)}	*give-to-NP_{(IO)}	*give-to-NP_{(IO)}	no use of *give*
Sample 3	*give-to-NP_{(DO)}	*give-to-NP_{(IO)}	*give-NP_{(DO)}-NP_{(IO)}	no use of *give*	*give-NP_{(DO)}-to-NP_{(IO)}
Sample 4	*give-NP_{(DO)}-to-NP_{(IO)}	*give-to-NP_{(DO)}	skip	*give-NP_{(DO)}-to-NP_{(IO)}	*give-NP_{(DO)}-to-NP_{(IO)}

9) Song-yi's Narratives

Song-yi, a girl in Grade 5, was first exposed to English when she was a kindergartener. She had been attending a language institute for 2 years, and also taking private English lessons for 8 months. Her private English lessons focused on four skills and Vocabulary. She was studying English at home for 9 hours per week.

Song-yi described all of the five scenes. In her description the verb *give* was used as a transitive or as a ditransitive. When she used the verb as a ditransitive, the preposition *by* or *for* instead of *to* preceded the second NP. She used a double object form of the dative alternation once when she described Scene 5 in the first sampling session. In a prepositional form of the dative alternation, the first NP can be construed as a Direct Object of the verb. However, it is doubtful whether the second NP is construed as an Indirect Object. It seems to her that the thematic role of the second NP is Benefactive rather than Goal because she frequently used the preposition *for*. When she used the verb as a transitive, the single argument of the verb functioned as a Direct Object of the verb or as an Indirect Object. Table 10 shows how Song-yi performed her narrative task.

Table 10. Usage of the Verb *give* in Song-yi's Narratives

	Sc. 2	Sc. 5	Sc. 7	Sc. 8	Sc. 10
Sample 1	no use of *give*	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(IO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*and-give*-NP$_{(IO)}$
Sample 2	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$	no use of *give*	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*by*-NP
Sample 3	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$
Sample 4	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$	**give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$

10) Dasom's Narratives

Dasom, a girl in Grade 6, started to learn English in Kindergarten. She was neither attending a language institute nor taking a private English lesson. However, she had previously taken private English lessons for one year and two months. She was studying English at home for 2 hours per week.

Dasom described all of the five scenes. During the first two sampling sessions she described a scene in Korean or used a different verb instead of the expected verb *give*. When the verb *give* was used, her spontaneous utterances showed the dative alternation, *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ or *give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$, as shown in her description of Scene 2 and Scene 10 in the fourth sampling. Table 11 summarizes how Dasom performed her narrative task.

Table 11. Usage of the Verb *give* in Dasom's Narratives

	Sc. 2	Sc. 5	Sc. 7	Sc. 8	Sc. 10
Sample 1	in Korean; no use of *give*	in Korean; no use of *give*	in Korean; no use of *give*	in Korean; no use of *give*	in Korean; no use of *give*
Sample 2	no use of *give*	no use of *give*	in Korean; no use of *give*	in Korean; no use of *give*	in Korean; no use of *give*
Sample 3	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$	in Korean; no use of *give*	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$
Sample 4	*give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$	no use of *give*	in Korean; no use of *give*	**give*-NP$_{(IO)}$	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$

11) Garam's Narratives

Garam, a boy in Grade 6, was first exposed to English when he was a kindergartener. He had been attending a language institute for 6½ years. His English classes in the institute focused on four skills, Vocabulary, and Grammar. He was studying English at home for 6 hours per week.

Garam described four scenes, skipping Scene 7. He used the verb *give* twice when he described Scene 5 and Scene 8 during the second sampling session, and his spontaneous utterances showed the dative alternation, *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ or *give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$. However, in the description of Scene 2 and Scene 10, he adopted dialogic narratives. His description of Scene 8 during the last two sampling session also included dialogic narratives. Some examples of his dialogic narratives are shown in (3)-(5).

(3)   "okay, but, don't, don't careful" [Scene 2, 9/16/2014]
        "Mom, can I go to the bakery?" "Yes, be, but be careful"
        [Scene 2, 10/14/2014]
        "oh, mom, can I go to, the bakery?" "okay, but, uh, be careful"
        [Scene 2, 11/11/2014]
        "oh, mom, can I go to the bakery?" "okay, but be careful"
        [Scene 2, 12/10/2014]

(4)   uhm, birds eat the bread
        its bird, bring my baby bird [Scene 8, 9/12/2014]
        "oh, it's bread" "we, we must, we must give bread,
        to our baby bird" [Scene 8, 10/14/2014]
        "oh, it's delicious bread"
        the parents bird say, "Here you are! Here you are, baby bird!"
        [Scene 8, 11/11/2014]
        uhm, it's the bread. Here you are, baby bird! [Scene 8,
        12/10/2014]

(5)   "Here you are! Eat seed." [Scene 10, 9/16/2014]
        "Here you are! That's sunflower seed." [Scene 10, 10/14/2014]

"Here is, uh, sunflower seed!" [Scene 10, 11/11/2014]
"Here is the sunflower seed. You must, you, you must,
plant the sunflower seed." [Scene 10, 12/10/2014]

Table 12 summarizes how Garam performed his narrative task.

Table 12. Usage of the Verb *give* in Garam's Narratives

	Sc. 2	Sc. 5	Sc. 7	Sc. 8	Sc. 10
Sample 1	no use of *give* (dialogic narratives)	no use of *give*	skip	no use of *give*	no use of *give* (dialogic narratives)
Sample 2	no use of *give* (dialogic narratives)	*give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$	skip	*give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$	no use of *give* (dialogic narratives))
Sample 3	no use of *give* (dialogic narratives)	no use of *give*	skip	no use of *give* (dialogic narratives)	no use of *give* (dialogic narratives))
Sample 4	no use of *give* (dialogic narratives)	no use of *give*	skip	no use of *give* (dialogic narratives)	no use of *give* (dialogic narratives)))

12) Sol's Narratives

Sol, a boy in Grade 6, was first exposed to English when he was in Grade 1. He had been attending a language institute for 5½ years. His English classes in the institute focused on Reading, Writing, Vocabulary, and Grammar. He was studying English at home for 4 hours per week.

Sol described four scenes, skipping Scene 7. When he described each scene, he used the verb *give* as a ditransitive or as a transitive. He used one of the following structures: **give*-NP$_{(DO)}$; *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$; **give-to*-NP$_{(DO)}$; **give-to*-NP$_{(IO)}$; *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$; **give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*from*-NP$_{(IO)}$; **give-to*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$; **give-to*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$. In a prepositional form of the dative alternation, various prepositions preceded the second NP; not only the preposition *to*, but also the preposition *from* or *for* was used. Table 13 summarizes how Sol performed his narrative task.

Table 13. Usage of the Verb *give* in Sol's Narratives

	Sc. 2	Sc. 5	Sc. 7	Sc. 8	Sc. 10
Sample 1	*give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$	*give-NP$_{(DO)}$-*from*-NP$_{(IO)}$	skip	*give-NP$_{(IO)}$	*give-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$
Sample 2	*give-NP$_{(DO)}$-*from*-NP$_{(IO)}$	no use of *give*	skip	no use of *give*	*give-to-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$
Sample 3	*give-to-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$	*give-to-NP$_{(IO)}$	skip	*give-to-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$	*give-NP$_{(DO)}$
Sample 4	*give-to-NP$_{(DO)}$	*give-to-NP$_{(IO)}$	skip	*give-to-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$	*give-to-NP$_{(DO)}$

4.2 Amount of English Input and Informants' Usage of the Verb *give*

The amount of English input might have an influence on each informant's oral proficiency. The amount of English input each student has received is calculated as follows: duration of taking public English lessons + duration of taking private English lessons + duration of self-study at home. Duration of public English lessons is calculated as follows: the third graders have been exposed to English lessons at school for 6 months; the fourth graders, for 1½ years; the fifth graders, for 2½ years; and the sixth graders, for 3½ years. Table 14 shows the approximation of English input each student has received.

According to Table 14, Garam (S11) has received the most amount of English input; the approximately accumulated duration of his exposure to English was for 10 years plus 6 hours per week. Sol (S12) has received the second most English input; the approximately accumulated duration of his exposure to English was for 9 years plus 4 hours per week. And San (S8) is the third; the approximately accumulated duration of his exposure to English was for 8 years and 10 months plus 2 hours per week. Boram (S3) has received the least amount of English input; the approximately accumulated duration of his exposure to English was for 2 years.

Table 14. Each Informant's Approximation of English Input

	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12
Public ELs	0;6	0;6	0;6	1;6	1;6	1;6	2;6	2;6	2;6	3;6	3;6	3;6
Private ELs	2;0	2;0	1;2	0;6	1;0	4;0	1;0	6;4	2;8	1;2	6;6	5;6
Self-study at Home per Week	10h	3h	4h	0h	0h	1.5h	n.a.	2h	9h	2h	6h	4h
Total	2 ; 6 + 10h	2 ; 6 + 3h	1;8 + 4h	2;0	2;6	5 ; 6 + 1.5h	3;6	8;10 + 2h	5 ; 2 + 9h	4 ; 8 + 2h	10;0 + 6h	9 ; 0 + 4h

Now let's compare the narratives performed by Garam (S11) who received the most amount of English input with the narratives performed by Boram (S3) who received the least amount of English input. Garam described four scenes: Scene 2, Scene 5, Scene 8, and Scene 10. The majority of his spontaneous utterances included dialogic narratives. He used the verb *give* twice when he described Scene 5 and Scene 8 during the Sampling Session 2, and his spontaneous utterances showed the dative alternation, *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ or *give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$.

Boram described the same four scenes that Garam did. In his spontaneous utterances, the verb *give* was used 3 times out of 16 possibilities. He used the verb with a single or two objects. When a single object was used, it could be construed as a Direct Object of the verb or as an Indirect Object. Neither usage was inappropriate, but his usage of a double object form was appropriate. It seems that the amount of input bears little or no relation to the usage of the verb *give*.

4.3 Characteristics of Korean Learners' Narratives in English: Analysis by Grade

How do Korean child learners of English use the English verb *give* and its constructions? Do the informants in the same grade show a certain tendency in the usage of the verb *give*? To answer these questions, 11 informants'

spontaneous utterances were analyzed by grade.

1) Analysis of the Third Graders' Usage

Sori used the verb *give* 5 times out of 20 possibilities, but her usage was ill-formed: **give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP (twice); **give*-NP$_{(DO)}$ (twice); **give*-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once). Sarang used the verb 7 times out of 20 possibilities: *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ (twice); **is give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); *give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once); **give*-NP$_{(DO)}$ (twice); **give*-*to*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once). Boram used the verb 6 times out of 20 possibilities: **give*-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); **giving*-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); **give*-NP$_{(IO)}$ (twice); *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ (twice).

Among three informants, Sarang used the verb *give* most appropriately and her spontaneous utterances showed the dative alternation. All of the third graders used the verb with a single or two objects. As far as the appropriateness of the construction is concerned, there was little difference in frequency of the dative alternation. A double object form was used 4 times, and a prepositional form 3 times.

On the other hand, three students in Grade 3 used the following ill-formed constructions: **give*-NP$_{(DO)}$ (5 times); **giving*-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); **give*-NP$_{(IO)}$ (3 times); **is give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); **give*-*to*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once); **give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP (twice). They used the verb *give* with a single object more frequently than the verb with two objects.

To sum up, young Korean learners of English in Grade 3 used inappropriate constructions more frequently than appropriate ones (13 versus 7 occurrences). It can be assumed that inappropriate forms such as **is give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$, **give*-NP$_{(DO)}$, or **give*-NP$_{(IO)}$, were influenced by their L1. It seems that Korean child learners of English regard the copula verb *is* as a Topic marker (Cf. I. Lee, 2008; I. Lee, 2010; I. Lee, 2011; and I. Lee, 2014). The Korean language has the following characteristics: First, a Subject NP is usually followed by a Topic marker. Second, either a Subject or an Object is omitted whenever it can be retrieved by the context. Third, Korean word order is not fixed; it allows a free arrangement of the arguments. Fourth, Korean verbs corresponding to some English (di)transitive verbs such as *sing*, *feed*, and *make* include the verb *juda* 'to give' as part of a compound verb. Furthermore, an

Indirect Object of these verbs can be construed as Benefactive by Koreans. Refer to the correspondences in (6).

(6) English-Korean correspondences in some verbs
   a. Will you sing us a song?
   a'. (*urireul wihae*) *norae han gok   bulleojullae*
        (us-ACC for) song one classifier sing-**give**-Q

   b. Mom fed her baby a bottle of milk.
   b'. eommaga *agiege   uyu   han byeongeul   meogyeojueotta*
        Mom-NOM baby-DAT milk one classifier eat-CAUSE-**give**-PAST

   c. Mom made her daughter a dress.
   c'. *emmaga   ttalege   deureseu han beol   mandeureojueotta*
        Mom-NOM daughter-DAT dress one classifier make-**give**-PAST

2) Analysis of the Fourth Graders' Usage

Daehan used the verb *give* 12 times out of 20 possibilities: *NP(IO)-NP(DO)-*give* (once); *give-NP(DO) (once); *give-NP(IO)-*and*-NP(DO) (once); *give-NP(DO)-NP(IO) (4 times); *give-NP(DO)-*in*-NP(IO (once); *give-NP(DO)-*for*-NP (twice); *NP(IO)-*give*-NP(DO) (once); and *give*-NP(DO)-*to*-NP(IO) (once). When he described Scene 8 in the first sampling session, he followed the Korean word order. He appropriately used a prepositional form once.

Min-guk used the verb *give* 14 times out of 15 possibilities. When he described Scene 2 in the third sampling session, he used two forms of the dative alternation: *give*-NP(IO)-NP(DO) and *give*-NP(DO)-*to*-NP(IO). The verb *give* was preceded or followed by two objects in 9 occurrences, but it was preceded or followed by a single object in 5 occurrences. The following are the examples: *give*-NP(DO) (3 times); *is give-NP(DO) (twice); *is give me-NP-*and*-NP (once); *is give me-NP(DO) (once); *give-NP(DO)-NP(IO) (once); *give*-NP(IO)-NP(DO) (twice); *give*-NP(DO)-*to*-NP(IO) (4 times).

Narae used the verb *give* 17 times out of 20 possibilities. However, all occurrences except *give me money* were inappropriate and four occurrences

followed the Korean word order. The following are the examples: *give me money* (once); *is-give-NP$_{(DO)}$ (3 times); *give-NP$_{(DO)}$ (3 times); *give-and-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once); *NP$_{(IO)}$-in-give-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); *NP$_{(IO)}$-give-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); *NP$_{(IO)}$-and-give-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); *is-give-in-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); *NP$_{(DO)}$-and-NP$_{(IO)}$-is-give (once); *NP$_{(DO)}$-is-NP$_{(IO)}$-give (twice); *NP-NP-and-give (once); and *NP-NP-in-give (once).

Three informants in Grade 4 used the verb *give* preceded or followed by two objects 2.3 times more than the verb preceded or followed by a single object (30 versus 13 occurrences). They used a prepositional form of the dative alternation 5 times, and a double object construction 3 times. Fourth graders began to recognize the verb *give* as a ditransitive rather than as a transitive, and a prepositional form of the dative alternation was their preference. We can assume that their ill-formed constructions such as *is give-NP$_{(DO)}$(twice), *NP$_{(DO)}$-and-NP$_{(IO)}$-is-give, and *NP$_{(DO)}$-is-NP$_{(IO)}$-give are the results of L1 transfer.

3) Analysis of the Fifth Graders' Usage

San used the verb *give* 14 times out of 20 possibilities. He used the verb as a transitive in 8 descriptions, and the usage of the verb as a ditransitive was found in 6 occurrences. A double object form of the dative alternation was used twice: *give me money,* and *give-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$. On the other hand, a prepositional form of the dative alternation, give-NP$_{(DO)}$-to-NP$_{(IO)}$), was used 4 times. The following include every type of VP composed of the verb *give* and its arguments: *give-to-NP$_{(DO)}$ (twice); *give-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); *give-to-NP$_{(IO)}$ (5 times); *give me money* (once); give-NP$_{(DO)}$-to-NP$_{(IO)}$ (4 times); and *give-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once). The verb *give* used once in his description of Scene 5 during the first sampling session was his incomplete utterance.

Song-yi used the verb *give* 18 times out of 20 possibilities. She used the verb *give* followed by a single object 4 times, while the verb followed by two objects was used in her 14 descriptions. However, all of her usage was inappropriate: *give-NP$_{(DO)}$ (3 times); *give-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once); *give-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$ (twice); *give-NP$_{(DO)}$-for-NP$_{(IO)}$ (10 times); *give-NP$_{(DO)}$-and-give-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once); *give-NP$_{(DO)}$-by-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once). It is doubtful whether she regarded the second NP in *give-NP$_{(DO)}$-for-NP$_{(IO)}$ as an Indirect Object of the verb because she used the preposition *for* instead of *to*.

Narratives performed by 2 fifth graders show that the verb *give* followed by two objects occurred more frequently than the verb followed by a single object (20 versus 12 occurrences). San used the construction more appropriately than Song-yi.

4) Analysis of the Sixth Graders' Usage

Dasom used the verb *give* 7 times out of 20 possibilities. She used appropriate forms 6 times, and an inappropriate form once: *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); *give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$ (5 times); and *give-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once). During the first two sampling sessions, she started to describe each scene in English, but completed her description in Korean. She preferred a prepositional form of the dative alternation to a double object form.

Garam used the verb *give* twice only when he was expected to use the verb 20 times: *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once) and *give*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once). He skipped describing Scene 7 and adopted dialogic narratives in other descriptions.

Sol used the verb *give* 14 times out of 20 possibilities: *give-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); *give-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once); *give-*to*-NP$_{(DO)}$ (twice); *give-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$ (twice); *give-NP$_{(DO)}$-*from*-NP$_{(IO)}$ (twice); *give-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once); *give-*to*-NP$_{(DO)}$-*for*-NP$_{(IO)}$ (twice); *give-*to*-NP$_{(DO)}$-NP$_{(IO)}$ (once); *give-*to*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once); and *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$ (once). Except for *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$, every usage of the verb *give* in Sol's narratives was inappropriate. The verb *give* followed by two objects occurred more frequently than the verb followed by a single object. Presumably he recognized *give to* as a chunk, but the concept of dative might not be acquired yet.

It seems that 3 child learners in Grade 6 realized the verb *give* as a ditransitive. The usage of the verb in Dasom and Garam's narratives was quite appropriate and stabilized, while Sol's narratives showed some characteristics of his Interlanguage.

5. Conclusion and Educational Implication

To find out how young Korean learners use the English verb *give*, 11

children's spontaneous utterances were analyzed. Twelve elementary school students from Grade 3 to Grade 6 were asked to narrate a wordless picture book, *A Circle of Friends* by Carmi (2003) [referred to as PBa]. However, 11 informants' data were dealt with in this study because one student had some difficulty in describing PBa in English sentences. Their data were collected for 4 months from September to December, 2014.

The analysis of their spontaneous utterances led the researcher to the following conclusion:

First, it seems that the amount of input bears little or no relation to the usage of the verb *give* as far as the appropriateness is concerned. According to the questionnaire, Garam received the most amount of English input and Boram received the least amount of input. Garam used the verb *give* twice only when he described Scene 5 and Scene 8 during the Sampling Session 2, and his spontaneous utterances showed the dative alternation: *give*-$NP_{(IO)}$-$NP_{(DO)}$ and *give*-$NP_{(DO)}$-*to*- $NP_{(IO)}$. Garam adopted dialogic narratives when he described other scenes. In Boram's spontaneous utterances, the verb *give* was used 3 times out of 16 possibilities. He used the verb with a single or two objects. His usage of the verb with a single object was inappropriate, but his usage of a double object form was appropriate.

Second, 3 informants in Grade 3 used inappropriate constructions more frequently than appropriate ones (13 versus 7 occurrences). It can be assumed that inappropriate forms such as **is give*-$NP_{(IO)}$-$NP_{(DO)}$, **give*-$NP_{(DO)}$, or **give*-$NP_{(IO)}$, were influenced by their L1. The verb *give* was frequently preceded by a copula verb *is*, or they arranged the verb and its arguments following the Korean word order. We can also assume that their frequent omission of one Object was the result of L1 transfer.

Third, 3 informants in the fourth grade began to recognize the verb *give* as a ditransitive rather than as a transitive, and a prepositional form of the dative alternation was their preference. We can assume that their ill-formed constructions such as **is give*-$NP_{(DO)}$ (twice), **$NP_{(DO)}$-and-$NP_{(IO)}$-is-give*, and **$NP_{(DO)}$-is-$NP_{(IO)}$-give* were the results of L1 transfer.

Fourth, in the fifth graders' narratives performed by two children, the verb *give* followed by two objects occurred more frequently than the verb followed by a single object (20 versus 12 occurrences). San used the construction more

appropriately than Song-yi.

Fifth, it seems that 3 Korean child learners in Grade 6 realized the verb *give* as a ditransitive. The usage of the verb in Dasom and Garam's narratives was quite appropriate and stabilized, while Sol's narratives showed some characteristics of his Interlanguage. He used a double object form of the dative alternation, *give*-NP$_{(IO)}$-NP$_{(DO)}$, only once.

Sixth, it seems that young Korean learners regarded an expression like *give me (money)* or *give to* as a chunk.

Four groups of child learners from Grade 3 to Grade 6 performed the same narrative task, in which each informant was asked to describe the wordless picture book, PBa. Each group's spontaneous utterances were compared synchronically, but we could assume the development in their acquisition of the verb *give*. It was not dealt with whether the construction in question was taught to them systematically. Further study is required to find the relationship between the instruction of the construction and their acquisition.

This study dealt with young Korean learners' usage of the verb *give*. Even though the construction in question was not used, some scenes were properly described; Garam, for example, adopted dialogic narratives to describe Scene 2 and Scene 10. Using wordless picture books in elementary English classes will be beneficial for young learners because those books may arouse the children to think creatively. They can exert their own imagination in their description of the book.

References

Baker, C. L. (1979). Syntactic theory and the projection problem. *Linguistic Inquiry, 10*, 533-581.

Carmi, G. (2003). *A circle of friends.* New York: Star Bright Books.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gorpen, J., Pinker, S., Hollander, M., Goldberg, R., & Wilson, R. (1989). The learnability and acquisition of the dative alternation in English. *Language, 65*(2), 203-257.

Hong, H.-T. (2003). The English ditransitive construction. *The Jungang Journal of English Language & Literature, 45*(4), 201-216.

Jun, J. S. (2006). Lexical derivation of triadic dative verbs in English. *Discourse and Cognition, 13*(3), 189-207.

Lee, I. (2008). Development of English coupla *be* in L2 acquisition. *Studies on English Language & Literature, 34*(1), 299-319.

Lee, I. (2010). On the development of elementary school students' narrative competence in English. *Primary English Education, 16*(3), 7-26.

Lee, I. (2011). Korean elementary school students' development of English grammar: A case study of two children's descriptive narratives. *Primary English Education, 17*(3), 67-90.

Lee, I. (2014). A Korean child learner's acquisition of English grammar: A four-year-long case study. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal, 22*(1), 69-110.

Lee, J. (2009). Transitive of 'give' in English. *New Korean Journal of English Language & Literature, 51*(1), 303-323.

Lee, J.-H., & Kim, H. M. (2011). The L2 developmental sequence of English constructions and underlying factors. *Korean Journal of English Language & Linguistics, 11*(3), 577-600.

Lee, Y. (2011). English and Korean ditransitive constructions. *The Journal of Studies in Language, 26*(4), 901-919.

Levin, B. (1993). *English verb classes and alternations: A preliminary investigation.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Mayer, M. (1973). *Frog on his own.* New York: Dial Books for Young Readers.

Shan, R., & Hong, S. (2009). On ditransitive constructions: A neo-transformational approach. *The Journal of Studies in Language, 25*(3), 575-599.

Tak, K. (1999). Ditransitive construction and focus. *English Language & Literature, 18*(2), 183-198.

Appendix 1. A sheet of questionnaire

설문지

본 설문지는 언어자료 제공자(귀하의 자녀)의 영어 학습 배경을 살펴보기 위해 작성한 것입니다. 답변 내용은 연구 목적으로만 사용할 것이며, 자녀의 이름은 무기명으로 기술될 것입니다. 해당란에 체크(√)하시거나 간단히 기술해 주십시오.

1. 귀하의 자녀가 처음 영어를 배우기 시작한 시기는 언제입니까?
   가. 유치원 ____   나. 초등 1학년 ____
   다. 초등 2학년 ____   라. 초등 3학년 ____

2. 귀하의 자녀는 <u>지금</u> 영어 학원에 다니거나 영어 과외를 받고 있습니까?
   예 ____   아니오 ____

(설문2에 '예' 라고 답하신 분만 답하시오.)
2-1. 영어 학원에 다닌 기간 <u>또는</u> 영어 과외를 받은 기간을 써 주십시오.
   (두 가지 모두 해당되면 모두 기입해 주십시오.)
   영어 학원 수강 기간: ___년 ___개월 <u>또는</u> 영어 과외 수강 기간: ___년 ___개월
2-2. 영어 학원이나 과외 시간에 학습하는 내용은 무엇입니까? 해당 사항이 많은 경우 모두 체크(√)해 주십시오.
   가. 듣기/말하기 ___   나. 읽기/쓰기 ___
   다. 단어 ___   라. 문법 ___
   마. 기타 (구체적으로 써 주세요) _____

(설문2에 '아니오' 라고 답하신 분만 답하시오.)
3. 예전에 학원에 다녔거나 과외를 받은 적이 있습니까?
   예 ___
   학원 수강 기간 또는 과외 받은 기간: ___년 ___개월
   아니오 ___

(학원 수강 경험이 있거나 현재 수강 중인 경우)
4. 선생님은 다음 중 누구입니까? (또는 누구였습니까?)
   한국인 선생님 ___   영어 원어민 선생님 ___
   한국인 선생님과 영어 원어민 선생님 ___

5. 귀 자녀가 가정에서 영어 공부하는 시간(학원 또는 과외 포함): ____ 시간/주

추신: 귀하는 본 연구 결과물을 우편으로 받기 원하십니까?

   예 ___

주소: _____

   아니오 ___

성실한 답변 감사합니다.

In Lee

Department of English Education

50 Seohak-ro, Wansan-gu, Jeonju, Jeonbuk

Tel: 063-281-7192

Email: inlee@jnue.kr