The staging process was used for ease of exposition. The data come from four different children who are at different ages. Their linguistic maturity does not necessarily correspond to their chronological age. Furthermore, each child was recorded for a different length of time, making the comparison of data difficult. Thus some sort of staging process was required. It should be mentioned that the staging process does pool data across children, but I believe this does not obscure any facts that are of importance to this study. In other words, the relevant trends are observable in both the staged data as well as the individual children's monthly files. I provide the figures for each child individually in tables 3C.1-4 after the figures, and the monthly files for omissions have been provided in appendix 4C.

The staging data presented in chapters 3-5 suggest that the order of grammatical maturity for these four children is as follows:

(1) Hawa < Mustafa < Fauzia < Hassan

Additionally, Mustafa's files are broken into three sections, ranging from stage 1 to stage 3. The staging criteria were three: MLU (mean length of utterance in morphemes), V Ratio (ratio of verbal utterances to total utterances), and %MPH (the % of ambiguous filler prefixes on verbs). Below I present the graphs for each criterion individually. I have arranged the data for each child roughly relative to the four stages, with Hawa'a data on the left, Mustafa's data spanning three stages, Fauzia's data in stage 3 and Hassan's data on the right in stage 4.

The first figure (figure 3C.1) shows MLU. This is the clearest of the three graphs, showing that the children's data is in fact ordered as in (1).

Notable points in this data are the low in Mustafa's file 17 (noted on the graph). This entire period was a time when Mustafa was suffering from a terrible sickness. He was in and out of hospital, and this data recording was a particularly bad one. We see that this affected more than just his MLU, as his V Ratio and %MPH scores are significantly affected as well (see figures 3C.2 and 3C.3 below, where data point 17 is noted). Mustafa's sickness began at file 12 and ran through file 18. Nevertheless, the overall trend remains clear that in the early files Mustafa was significantly less mature on all three counts than in later stages.

Figure 3C.2 shows the V Ratio for each child, again arranged roughly relative to the stages in which they have been assigned. The vertical axis represents age, and the horizontal axis represents data points (at



approximately 2 week intervals). There is a considerable amount of variation from file to file, but the overall trend remains clear. Notice data point 17 for Mustafa which is particularly low.



Finally, figure 3C.3 shows the %MPH rates for each child. This figure appear to contradict the general trend of the previous two figures, but recall the developmental pattern of MPHs discussed in chapter 3. We saw a graph from Veneziano & Sinclair (2000) which describes the development of MPHs as occurring on the following path: initially MPHs are rare in the speech of the child, then there is a spurt in MPHs, followed by a gradual decline. Hawa's rate of MPHs is relatively high compared to Mustafs's early files (which are supposed to be in the same stage). However, there is variation from child to child as to how frequent MPHs are overall in their speech. Some children never produce MPHs, going in stead from the single

word stage to the multi-word stage without a period of MPHs (Peters,

2001). Some children produce MPHs at rates of over 50%, others at 20%.



Hawa produces MPHs at a rate of 30%-60% (the first data point has very few utterances, and so the rate of 100% is misleading), while Mustafa produces MPHs at a rate of approximately 20%. The surge in MPHs around data point 17 can be attributed to his sickness. The other two children produce very few MPHs, as would be expected given their other linguistic measures.

Below I present the figures for each child by file. The final file for Fauzia is not included in the staging data at any point because of its minimal size (hence difficulty in calculating MLU and the other two criteria).

File	Age	MLU	V Ratio	%MPH
HAW01	2;2.01	1.54	0.077364	100%
HAW02	2;3.01	2.06	0.082863	50%
HAW03	2;3.14	2.13	0.190476	25%
HAW04	2;3.27	2.23	0.087028	41%
HAW05	2;4.24	2.37	0.140625	57%
HAW06	2;5.22	2.39	0.141026	68%
HAW07	2;6.05	2.46	0.172468	54%

Table 3C.1 Age, MLU, V Ratio and %MPH for Hawa

Table 3C.2 Age, MLU, V Ratio and %MPH for Mustafa

File	Age	MLU	V Ratio	%MPH
MUS01	2;0.16	1.52	0.085714	0%
MUS02	2;1.05	2.19	0.10625	0%
MUS03	2;2.01	2.29	0.16701	6%
MUS04	2;2.22	1.93	0.098101	6%
MUS05	2;3.05	2.2	0.080425	26%
MUS06	2;3.17	3.31	0.101266	13%
MUS07	2;4.01	3.08	0.09324	6%
MUS08	2;4.22	2.94	0.110048	10%
MUS09	2;4.29	3.04	0.179153	19%
MUS10	2;5.12	2.79	0.127789	29%
MUS11	2;5.20	2.76	0.105932	15%
MUS12	2;6.03	2.33	0.171429	100%
MUS13	2;6.14	2.32	0.056075	17%
MUS14	2;6.24	2.28	0.121739	38%
MUS15	2;7.01	2.3	0.118998	45%
MUS16	2;7.17	2.65	0.094787	33%
MUS17	2;7.30	2.19	0.036885	57%
MUS18	2;8.11	3.04	0.132394	30%
MUS19	2;8.25	3.05	0.175393	36%
MUS20	2;9.06	2.78	0.174731	35%
MUS21	2;9.16	3.38	0.257373	34%
MUS22	2;10.03	3.87	0.217125	23%
MUS23	2;10.10	3.57	0.179739	18%

Table 3C.3 Age, MLU, V Ratio and %MPH for Fauzia

File	Age	MLU	V Ratio	%MPH
FAU01	1;8.01	2.97	0.208108	0%
FAU02	1;9.01	3.66	0.172542	10%
FAU03	1;9.14	3.4	0.238213	12%
FAU04	1;10.02	3.28	0.166144	6%
FAU05	1;11.01	3.47	0.177711	21%
FAU06	1;11.27	3.93	0.213256	19%
FAU07	2;0.26	6.1	0.591195	5%
FAU08	2;1.07	3.35	0.232628	11%
FAU09	2;1.22	3.26	0.217391	0%

Table 3C.4 Age, MLU, V Ratio and %MPH for Hassan

File	Age	MLU	V Ratio	%MPH
HAS01	2;10.13	3.15	0.301616	9%
HAS02	2;10.27	3.46	0.301837	2%
HAS03	2;11.11	3.47	0.228228	10%
HAS04	3;0.01	4.23	0.405612	6%