

## Ch 5 case studies

- **“Children have to be taught language”**

---

*Background preparation:*

- *Kaplan (2016), Ch 5, sec 5.3*

# 1. Myths and research questions

- Ch 5 “myth”: ‘Children have to be taught language’
- Case-study section (5.3) theme:
  - ‘Do parents correct their children’s mistakes?’
    - What kinds of “mistakes” are investigated in these case studies?
- How does the case-study theme relate to...
  - The “myth”
  - Topics presented in the rest of the chapter (discussed last time)?

## 2. Brown & Hanlon (1970)

- Participants, methods
  - Transcripts of mother-child interactions
    - Adam, Eve, Sarah
    - recorded weekly for several years
- Focus of the analysis was parent responses to
  - Yes-no questions
  - *wh* questions
  - Tag questions (“..., isn’t it?”)
  - Negative sentences

## 2. Brown & Hanlon (1970)

- Results: Sequiturs/non-sequiturs

*Table 5.1 Proportions of parents' sequiturs and non sequiturs in response to children's primitive (P) and well-formed (WF) utterances, by grammatical construction. Roger Brown and Camille Hanlon, Derivational complexity and order of acquisition in child speech, Cognition and the Development of Language, J. R. Hayes, ed., 1970, Table 1.10. Reprinted by permission of John Wiley & Sons.*

	Yes-No		Wh		Tags		Negatives		Means		
	P	WF	P	WF	P	WF	P	WF	P	WF	
Sequiturs	.70	.83	.44	.45			.70	.31	.61	.53	Eve
Non Sequiturs	.18	.13	.37	.18			.20	.49	.25	.27	
Sequiturs	.48	.46	.45	.37	.54	.56	.00	.24	.31	.36	Adam
Non Sequiturs	.50	.43	.50	.52	.42	.44	.86	.52	.62	.49	
Sequiturs	.47	.52	.38	.52	.52	.36	.33	.41	.42	.45	Sarah
Non Sequiturs	.53	.47	.62	.43	.48	.57	.56	.51	.55	.50	
									.45	.45	Means
									.47	.42	

## 2. Brown & Hanlon (1970)

- Results: Approvals/disapprovals

*Table 5.2 Parents' approvals and disapprovals in response to children's correct and incorrect utterances. Roger Brown and Camille Hanlon, Derivational complexity and order of acquisition in child speech, Cognition and the Development of Language, J. R. Hayes, ed., 1970, Table 1.11. Reprinted by permission of John Wiley & Sons.*

Stage II								
Sarah			Adam			Eve		
	Correct	Incorrect		Correct	Incorrect		Correct	Incorrect
App.	4	9	App.	4	3	App.	6	19
Dis.	4	6	Dis.	2	0	Dis.	3	5
Stage V								
Sarah			Adam			Eve		
	Correct	Incorrect		Correct	Incorrect		Correct	Incorrect
App.	23	4	App.	13	6	App.	33	29
Dis.	12	2	Dis.	7	1	Dis.	12	15

## 2. Brown & Hanlon (1970)

### Discussion:

- What were the big-picture and measurable RQs for these two studies?
  - What is a **measurable** RQ?
- Concerns or critiques about the studies?
- How do these studies relate to the Ch 5 themes?

### 3. Hirsh-Pasek et al. (1984)

- Participants, methods
  - Video of 30-min mother-child interaction
    - 40 middle-class mother-child pairs
    - Children aged 2–5 years
- How the utterances were coded
  - Children: well-formed / ill-formed
  - Parents: approval / disapproval / neither
    - strict repetition / loose rep. / non-rep.

### 3. Hirsh-Pasek et al. (1984)

- Results: Approvals/disapprovals

*Table 5.3 Mothers' approval and disapproval in response to children's well-formed and ill-formed utterances. Kathy Hirsh-Pasek, Rebecca Treiman, and Maita Schneiderman, Brown & Hanlon revisited: Mothers' sensitivity to ungrammatical forms, Journal of Child Language 1984, Table 2. Reprinted by permission of Cambridge University Press.*

	Approval	Disapproval
Well-formed	147	29
Ill-formed	38	6

### 3. Hirsh-Pasek et al. (1984)

- Results: Repetitions

Table 5.4 *Mothers' repetitions and non-repetitions of children's well-formed and ill-formed utterances, broken down by age. Kathy Hirsh-Pasek, Rebecca Treiman, and Maita Schneiderman, Brown & Hanlon revisited: Mothers' sensitivity to ungrammatical forms, Journal of Child Language 1984, Table 3. Reprinted by permission of Cambridge University Press.*

	Repeated	Not repeated	
Two-year-olds			
Well-formed	42	307	$\chi^2(1) = 6.93$
Ill-formed	42	160	$P < 0.01$
Three-year-olds			
Well-formed	45	219	$\chi^2(1) = 0.40$
Ill-formed	10	66	n.s.
Four-year-olds			
Well-formed	30	261	$\chi^2(1) = 0.0001$
Ill-formed	6	57	n.s.
Five-year-olds			
Well-formed	32	462	$\chi^2(1) = 1.36$
Ill-formed	6	44	n.s.

### 3. Hirsh-Pasek et al. (1984)

#### **Discussion:**

- What were the big-picture and measurable RQs for these two studies?
- Concerns or critiques about the studies?
- How do these studies relate to the Ch 5 themes?

## 4. Saxton (2000)

- Participants, methods
  - Eve's corpus
  - All utterances containing a relevant error
- How the utterances were coded
  - Eve: irreg. verb, no noun plural, no subject, ...
  - Parent:
    - negative evidence (repeats/corrects)
    - negative feedback (something wrong)
    - adult move-on
    - positive input (correct, difft words)
    - Non-error-contingent clarification qn

## 4. Saxton (2000)

- Results (all)

*Table 5.5 Eve's self-corrections after adult responses. Adapted from Table 2 of Matthew Saxton, Negative evidence and negative feedback: Immediate effects on the grammaticality of child speech, First Language 20, pp. 221–252, copyright 2000. Reprinted by permission of SAGE Publications.*

Adult response	Use correct		Persist-with-error		Child move-on	
Negative evidence	157	7.8%	344	17.2%	1505	75.0%
Negative feedback	69	6.6%	241	22.9%	744	70.6%
Adult move-ons	56	2.9%	453	23.4%	1424	73.7%
Positive input	629	6.5%	1506	15.6%	7495	77.8%

## 4. Saxton (2000)

- Results (comparison; “use correct” %)

*Table 5.6 Eve’s responses to adult responses over the entire 9-month observation period and from the point at which she had attained 50% accuracy. Adapted from Table 3 of Matthew Saxton, Negative evidence and negative feedback: Immediate effects on the grammaticality of child speech, First Language 20, pp. 221–252, copyright 2000. Reprinted by permission of SAGE Publications.*

Adult response	All data	Data from 50% accuracy
Negative evidence	7.8% (157)	20.5% (84)
Negative feedback	6.6% (69)	17.4% (40)
Adult move-ons	2.9% (56)	7.1% (32)
Positive input	6.5% (629)	9.5% (465)

## 4. Saxton (2000)

### **Discussion:**

- What were the big-picture and measurable RQs for this study?
- Concerns or critiques about the study?
- How does this study relate to the Ch 5 themes?

## 5. Morgan et al. (1995)

- Participants, methods
  - Adam, Eve, Sarah
  - Similar to Saxton (2000)
- Error types examined
  - *wh* questions
  - Missing determiners

## 5. Morgan et al. (1995)

- Results
  - Parents more likely to repeat if ill-formed
  - Children **not** more likely to self-correct after parent move-ons

### **Discussion:**

- What were the big-picture and measurable RQs for this study?
- Concerns or critiques about the study?
- How does this study relate to the Ch 5 themes?

## 6. Discussion

- Ch 5 “myth”: ‘Children have to be taught language’
- Case-study section (5.3) theme:
  - ‘Do parents correct their children’s mistakes?’
    - What kinds of “mistakes” are investigated in these case studies?
- How does the case-study theme relate to...
  - The “myth”
  - Topics presented in the rest of the chapter (discussed last time)?

## 6. Discussion

- What is the structure of this chapter?

### 5.1 Culture-specific beliefs about language acquisition

#### (5.2 The '30-million-word gap')

5.2.1 Evidence for gramm. rules in young children

5.2.2 Can language acquisition be deficient?

5.2.3 Biases and confounds in lg. assessment

### 5.3 Case study: Do parents correct their children's mistakes?

- To what extent is this chapter telling a 'single story'?

## 6. Discussion

- Revisiting the chapter introduction

Kaplan (2016: 79–80):

This chapter focuses on the idea that parents teach language to their children explicitly.

One question we will explore is whether the parent-as-language-teacher is a universal model of child rearing...

Parents' role in child language acquisition isn't just theoretically interesting; it also has important real-world consequences.