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Malay and related languages such as Indonesian are regarded as having a subject relativization advantage in terms of acquisition (Tjung 2009; Bakar, Razak, and Woan 2016). The present study investigates whether there is a preference for agent or patient relative clauses in production and comprehension in child Malay. Twelve Malaysian Malay-speaking children aged 3;9-8;6 (mean: 6;6) participated in an experiment involving an elicited-production task and a picture-selection task. From the overall responses, the children were found not to have any agent or patient preference in terms of production. However, the children performed better for agent relative clauses in terms of comprehension.

1. INTRODUCTION. The acquisition of Malay relative clauses is relatively understudied. In particular, the Malaysian Malay variety has seen only very preliminary research on this topic with data from very few participants. The present research is exploratory in nature and asks the question of whether child native speakers of Malaysian Malay show a preference for agent relative clauses compared to patient relative clauses.

In the field of child language acquisition, how the relative clause is acquired has remained a popular topic. Part of its popularity is due to the following factors: (1) Children do not completely acquire relative clauses until a relatively late age compared to other structures. (2) Certain types of relative clauses appear to be more easily acquired. While these factors appear to be generalizable cross-linguistically, their application is not universal and absolute, especially since the acquisition of relative clause has been studied in only a small proportion of the world’s languages. Therefore, data from more languages will serve to determine the extent to which these tendencies are true.

This paper is organized as follows. This introductory section first provides background information on relative clauses in general, then explores an overview of the variation in relative-clause acquisition across languages, and finally reviews previous acquisition research in various varieties of Malay. Section 2 discusses the voice system of Malaysian Malay and explains how arguments can be relativized. Section 3 describes the experiment that was carried out, which consists of two parts – an elicited production task and a picture selection task. Section 4 presents the results of the data collection and its analysis. Finally, section 5 offers some preliminary conclusions and future research directions based on the findings.

1.1 RELATIVE CLAUSES (RCS). Relative clauses are a type of filler-gap dependency (Hawkins 1999) exemplified in (1).

\begin{enumerate}
  \item a. the \textbf{musician} [that \_ saw the director] (Subject RC)
  \item b. the \textbf{musician} [that the director saw \_] (Direct object RC)
\end{enumerate}

(Kim 2013)

The fillers (represented by the underlined NPs) correspond to the head noun phrases (NP), while the gaps (represented by ‘\_‘) correspond to the relativized position in the RC. As the filler and gap correspond to the moved element and its trace (Fodor 1989)—for example, the head NP in (1a) is the subject of the verb in the relative clause—there is an association between them which must be resolved to interpret the meaning of the clause (Hawkins 1999). Listeners need to correctly identify the gap and hold the filler in working memory.

---

1 Various Malay dialects are divided roughly along state lines in Malaysia. Most of these dialects are mutually intelligible, although some varieties are relatively more divergent. Malaysian Malay is used here as a general term to refer to Malay spoken in Malaysia and is not meant to refer specifically to the national language, officially known as \textit{Bahasa Malaysia} (Malaysian Language). The national language is based on the dialect spoken in the southern region of Peninsular Malaysia, and is the variety of Malay that is taught in the formal education system. As children do not enroll in primary schools until the calendar year in which they turn 7, the Malay variety they acquire first will be a regional dialect, especially for those children residing in rural areas.
1.2 ACQUISITION OF RELATIVE CLAUSES ACROSS LANGUAGES. Relative to other syntactic structures, relative clauses tend to be acquired late (Clancy, Lee, and Zoh 1986). For example, by the age of 3, English-speaking children have acquired passives well enough to be productive with newly learned verbs, even when prompted by non-passive lead-ins (Brooks and Tomasello 1999) and comprehend reflexives at an above-chance level in truth value-judgment tasks (McKee 1992). On the other hand, English-speaking 4-year-olds have difficulty repeating relative clauses (Diesell and Tomasello 2005). While Hebrew-speaking children as young as 3 are able to produce some relative clauses, they typically only master comprehension of relative clauses two to three years later (Friedmann and Novogrodsky 2004).

Children tend to acquire subject relative clauses (SRC), such as in (2a), earlier than object relative clauses (ORC), such as in (2b). In a comprehension task, Italian 3-year-olds were at ceiling level for SRC, while some of them performed above chance for ORC. Only children 4 years and older performed in an adult-like manner for ORC (Adani 2011). Hebrew-speaking children were able to perform above chance at age 4 when comprehending SRC, while they were able to perform above chance for ORC comprehension only at age 6 (Friedmann and Novogrodsky 2004). The subject advantage was also observed in languages such as English, Korean, and Cantonese (Kim 2013; Lau 2016).

2  a. The boy [who __ kissed Mary].
   b. The boy [(who) Mary kissed __].

   (Diesell and Tomasello 2005)

However, SRC-ORC are not the only dimensions in which children can differ in their acquisition. Even in languages which allow only subject relative clauses, such as Tagalog, children in general appeared to be better at producing agent relative clauses (ARC) than theme relative clauses (TRC), although individually some of the children were better at TRC than ARC (Tanaka 2015).

1.3 ACQUISITION OF RELATIVE CLAUSES IN VARIETIES OF MALAY. Research on Malaysian Malay is limited to a single preliminary production and comprehension study on a group of 6 Malay L1 children aged 4 to 9 (one child for each year) (Bakar, Razak, and Woan 2016). The children at all ages performed equally well for SRC and ORC comprehension, with some errors committed by the 4- and 6-year-olds. However, all the children were worse at producing ORC compared to SRC. In fact, even the older children were below chance. It is important to note that this study used the bare forms of verbs in the test items. Bare forms tend to be more colloquial in nature.

This object relativization disadvantage echoes the claim made for Jakarta Indonesian (Tjung 2006) and Standard Indonesian2 (Tjung 2009). Tjung (2009) suggests that adults and children do not prefer to relativize objects directly as in (3). Instead, they often instead opt first to passivize the object and then relativize it, as in (4). This is because the passive in Indonesian is not more structurally complex than the active. Both verb types are equally marked with active verbs prefixed by meN- and passive verbs prefixed by di-. Tjung (2009) also offers the explanation that agent and patient (the semantic roles of subjects in active and passive sentences) are equally able to encode the meaning of transitive propositions in Indonesian and related languages.

3. [Semua yang SBY lakukan __]: bukti, bukan janji nyata, bukan wacana all REL SBY do proof not promise concrete not discourse
   ‘All that SBY did: proof, not just promise, not just talk’

---

2 While there are differences between Standard Malay of Malaysia and Standard Indonesian, these are mostly phonological and lexical in nature. Both varieties are almost identical in terms of sentential syntax and semantics (Nomoto and Shoho 2007).
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4. [Semua yang __ di-lakukan SBY]: bukti, bukan janji nyata, bukan wacana
   ‘All that was done by SBY: proof, not just promise, not just talk’

   While there is an apparent preference for subject relativization in Malay, it is uncertain whether agent and patient are equally preferred.

2. TRANSITIVE VERBS AND RELATIVIZATION IN MALAY. The voice of morphological transitive verb forms is marked by the prefixes meN- (active) and di- (passive).³

   5. Dia sudah mem-baca buku itu.
      she PERF meN-read book that
      ‘She has read the book.’

      book that PERF di-read (by)-her
      ‘The book has already been read by her.’

   With the meN- prefix, the preverbal nominal is typically the agent or the actor, while when the verb is marked with di-, the preverbal nominal is typically a theme or patient. When the verb is marked with di-, the postverbal nominal may be marked with oleh, though this is not obligatory.

   Relativization is marked by the presence of the relativizer yang with the NP relativized from the subject position. Examples 7—8 show relativization in a meN-marked clause and a di-marked clause, respectively.

      person REL meN-read book that late
      ‘The person who read the book was late.’

   8. [Buku yang __ di-baca (oleh)-nya] hilang.
      Book REL di-read (by)-her missing
      ‘The book that was read by her is missing.’

   It is also possible to have reduced relative clauses without the relativizer. This construction results in clauses which are identical to declarative sentences such as (5) and (6). In complete sentences, these reduced relative clauses will be disambiguated by the presence of the matrix verb. However, when used as stand-alone replies in casual conversation, they are less easily distinguishable from simple sentences. As the focus of this study is not on these reduced forms, they will not be discussed further. We now turn to the experiment in which we tested child production and comprehension of these two different kinds of relative clauses in Malay.

³ It is possible to have morphologically bare verb forms where the voice of such forms is marked by word order. In bare forms the agent precedes auxiliary/negation/adverb in the active, while in the passive no element can intervene between the agent and the verb stem.

   5a. Dia sudah baca buku itu.
       she PERF read book that
       ‘She has read the book.’

   6a. Buku itu sudah dia baca.
       book that PERF she read
       ‘She has already read the book.’
3. **Methodology.** The experimental materials (pictures and lead-in sentences) were adapted and translated from Tanaka 2015. There are two tasks in the experiment: an elicited-production task to investigate the production of relative clauses, and a picture-selection task to test comprehension.

In the production task, children were shown a set of pictures. An assistant, who is a native speaker of Malay, then read a set of lead-in sentences corresponding to those pictures:

**9.** Terdapat dua budak lelaki di sini.  
Present two child man at here  
‘There are two boys here.’

Seorang budak lelaki me-meluk monyet, seorang budak lelaki  
one child man meN-hug monkey one child man  
me-meluk budak perempuan.  
meN-hug child woman  
‘One boy is hugging a monkey, another boy is hugging a girl.’

**10.** Di manakah anak panah?  
At where arrow  
‘Where is the arrow?’
The child was then asked to describe (to the researcher, who was seated in a manner where he could not see the child’s set of pictures) where the arrow is pointing. The structure of the pictures was designed to maximize the chances for the production of a relative clause. Because there are two boys in the pictures, a response of ‘over the boy’ is insufficient to identify where the arrow is. Moreover, because the boy is hugging different characters in each picture, a response of ‘the boy that is hugging’ is also insufficient—an overt object is required. Furthermore, the boys in the two pictures are dressed the same (thus avoiding responses regarding clothing, such as ‘the one wearing a green shirt’), have similar facial features (avoiding responses like ‘the one with big eyes’), and differ along characteristics that are not easy to put into words. Finally, the fact that the researcher is seated in such a way that they cannot see the pictures that the child is looking at, the child cannot simply point at the relevant character and say “this one.” This methodology has been used previously in Tanaka 2015, as well as in many others (e.g., Hsu, Hermon, and Zukowski 2009).

The production task consists of 20 transitive verb items with the following breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reversible</th>
<th>Non-reversible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MeN- (agent subject)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di- (patient subject)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reversible and non-reversible conditions refer to whether the NP described in the lead-ins can semantically be reversed. For example, a sentence such as the boy is pushed by the girl is reversible, since the boy and the girl can be switched and the sentence would still be acceptable. However, as sentence such as the boy pushed the truck is not reversible since the boy and the truck cannot be reversed without producing a semantic anomaly. Thus reversibility was controlled by manipulating the animacy of the direct object. In addition, there were 10 less complex intransitive items which serve as a baseline for comprehension.

In the comprehension portion, the same speaker read lead-in sentences which asked the child to place stickers on the correct picture:

11. Lekat sticker di bawah budak lelaki yang di-dukung oleh budak perempuan.

   ‘Stick the sticker under the boy carried by the girl.’

There were 10 items in the comprehension task, with 5 items each of agent relative clauses (using meN-) and patient relative clauses (using di-).

Twelve Malay L1 children aged 3:9–8:6 (mean: 6:6) were recruited from the northern region of Peninsula Malaysia. All the children did both parts of the experiment, with the production task conducted first. Two children (3:9, 7:4) were excluded from the production task because they did not complete the task, while one child (8:5) was excluded from the comprehension portion for the same reason.
4. RESULTS

4.1 PRODUCTION RESULTS. Only responses which clearly describe the correct character and which contain the relativizer *yang* were coded as correct responses. For example:

12a. Anak panah berada di atas budak lelaki yang me-meluk monyet.
    arrow located at top child man REL meN-hug monkey
    ‘The arrow is above the boy that is hugging the monkey.’

Bare verb forms were coded as correct so long as they also contained the relativizer. However, declarative sentence responses such as 12b were not.

12b. Budak lelaki me-meluk monyet.
    child man meN-hug monkey
    ‘The boy is hugging the monkey.’

![Responses to Production Task](image)

Fig. 1. Responses to production task. N=100 for both conditions.
A large proportion of responses were errors, with slightly more correct responses in the non-reversible condition. If we look at the data on an individual level, we see that the correct responses were accounted for by only 6 of the participants. It is possible then that the high error rate is partly caused by a lack of understanding of the task. For example, one participant aged 8;6 consistently produced declarative sentences describing the correct NP. Nevertheless, among the participants a child as young as 5;1 managed to produce correct responses. This child also produced more correct responses for patient-condition items than agent-condition items.

As the responses varied widely from complete sentences to sentence fragments, a strict criterion for responses was imposed. Only unprompted overt relative-clause responses were taken into account. Of these, head nouns which were selected correctly were marked as targets, while responses with the wrong head noun selected were marked as head errors. Head errors were also divided into whether it was in the wrong or right picture. Reversal errors were those in which the child produced the correct head noun, but reversed the role of the head noun. Responses which were unclear were marked as ambiguous.

The majority of errors were responses which do not contain relativiser yang.

**4.1. COMPREHENSION RESULTS.** The responses were marked according to the criteria used in the production task. Items which were selected correctly were marked as targets, while items where the wrong head noun was selected were marked as head errors. Head errors were also divided into whether it was in the wrong or right picture. Reversal errors were those in which the child selected the correct head noun, but reversed the role of the head noun. Selections which were unclear were marked as ambiguous.
13. ‘Stick the sticker under the boy carried by the girl.’
Target: boy on left
Head error, right picture: girl on left
Head error, wrong picture: girl on right
Reversal: boy on right

Overall, the children performed much better in the comprehension task relative to the production task, especially in the agent relative-clause condition. In the patient relative-clause condition, target selections were just below chance. A closer look at the individual data revealed that only a few of the children were responsible for the bulk of these target selections. 4 of the children scored at least 4 out of 5 for the patient subject condition, while none of the children aged 6;0 or younger scored more than 2 target responses.

Moreover, reversal errors were far more frequent in the patient relative-clause condition than in the agent relative-clause condition. Such errors involved reversing the role of the head noun. In the patient relative clause condition, this meant that the head noun (the patient) was treated as an agent, such as in (13a) where instead of selecting the boy who was carried by the girl, the child selected the boy carrying the girl. The child therefore
interpreted the relative clause as an agent relative clause. This asymmetry in reversal patterns (where reversals in patient relative clauses were more common than reversals in agent relative clauses) is common among children acquiring a variety of languages, and is typically taken to indicate that the relative clause type with more reversal errors poses a greater processing challenge for children (Arnon 2010). Thus this is a second type of evidence that shows that Malay children prefer relativizing NPs with agent roles.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION. While the children did not show any clear preference for relativizing agents or patients in the production data, there is a clear advantage for comprehending agent-role items over patient-role items.

Although older children tended to perform better in both tasks, there were still 8- and 7-year-olds who did not produce any target items in the production task. This is not to say that they could not produce relative clauses, as they might have misunderstood the requirements of the task. They described the intended head nouns by using different methods, such as a series of simple sentences. Nevertheless, children as young as 5;1 produced target responses in production, and all children had at least 1 target response in the comprehension task.

It is also worth noting that even in a language which allows both SRC and ORC, there is a type preference of thematic role within the SRC of that language. Tjung’s (2009) claim of non-markedness of Indonesian passives compared to active forms is supported for Malaysian Malay by the production data here. However, comprehension does not appear to follow this pattern.

We therefore conclude that Malay is another language in which an asymmetry in relative clauses can be observed. In Malay, patient relative clauses are more challenging for children than agent relative clauses. While this situation may not seem like a surprising result, it is a noteworthy one, given how strong this tendency is cross-linguistically. The first reason is that this feature has never been documented before for Malay, and so provides a new point of comparison for the field of linguistics. Second, it should be noted that in the context of affixed verbs Malay treats both agent relative clauses and patient relative clauses as morphologically equally complex. That is, neither form is more complex than the other—they both contain one prefix. Moreover, one form cannot be said to derive from the other. Thus morphologically, there does not seem to be a preference for one form or the other, and yet the universally-observed agent relative clause preference is still observed in Malay.

Much work remains to be done on this topic, including questions of whether this preference is exhibited in other related phenomena, e.g., wh-questions, topicalization, etc. Moreover, it is unclear whether this same tendency can be documented in adults, though the dependent measures will likely have to be far more sensitive than those used in this current study. Finally, the properties of Malay child-directed speech needs to be analyzed to see if this tendency might have as its source the frequency of patterns in the input. All of these are intriguing questions, which we retain for future research.
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