#### LING 101 • Lecture outline

- Child language acquisition
- Acquisition of phonology

#### Background reading:

- CL Ch 9, §1, "The study of language acquisition"
- CL Ch 9, §2, "Phonological development"

- Adults can speak and understand their native language(s) because they have a lexicon and mental grammar of that language:
  - lexicon

mental grammar

- Adults can speak and understand their native language(s) because they have a lexicon and mental grammar of that language:
  - lexicon where sounds, meaning, and other unpredictable information are stored for each morpheme
  - mental grammar rules and principles that handle systematic patterns, including phonology, morphology, and syntax

- Adults can speak and understand their native language(s) because they have a lexicon and mental grammar of that language
- How does a child acquiring a native language (first language; L1) get to this target adult state?
  - lexicon:
  - mental grammar:

- Adults can speak and understand their native language(s) because they have a lexicon and mental grammar of that language
- How does a child acquiring a native language
   (first language; L1) get to this target adult state?
  - lexicon: morpheme sound and meaning information must be learned and stored
  - mental grammar: How does this develop?
- Any (normally developing) infant has the potential to develop the mental grammar of any language

- Proposal:
  - Infants all start out with their mental grammar at the same (universal) original/default settings: "Universal Grammar"
  - When infants are exposed to language data, they
    will begin to develop the mental grammar
    needed to produce and comprehend a
    particular adult language (the target language)

We can analyze each stage of a child's developing mental grammar with the same tools we use for adult languages

## 2. L1 acquisition and mental grammar

- A child in the process of acquiring a language goes through different stages of development
  - These stages reflect intermediate mental grammars on the way to the adult grammar
- A child often shows variable behavior
  - A rule may be applied only some of the time
  - Multiple versions of a rule may be in use
- But we can still find a great deal of systematicity in children's language behavior

## 2. L1 acquisition and mental grammar

- "Learning" a native language is not the same as learning to do math or ride a bike
  - This is why the term acquisition, not "learning," is typically used for this process
- Children do not acquire language because their parents "teach" it to them
  - More about this in a later class
- Children acquire language through contact between
  - the **language data** in the environment
  - the (universal) acquisition mechanism of the mental grammar

## 2. L1 acquisition and mental grammar

- Studying the process of language acquisition can give us important insight into:
  - the nature of the mental grammar for a particular language
  - the range of the characteristics of **possible** human mental grammars: Are there 'mistakes' that children never make?

- Distinguishing different speech sounds
  - 6-8 months: Infants can distinguish among almost all of the sound categories used in the world's languages
  - 10-12 months: Infants have difficulty distinguishing sound categories that are **not contrastive** in their target language
- What does this change suggest about the child's mental grammar?

 10-12 months: Infants have difficulty distinguishing sound categories that are **not contrastive** in their target language

- This developmental change is evidence for the beginning of a language-specific phonological grammar
  - They are developing an inventory of contrastive sounds (**phonemes**)

- Babbling approximately 6 to 12 months
  - The most frequent consonants used in babbling are very consistent even for babies acquiring different target languages

Table 9.1 from *CL*, p 353 | What generalizations can we make?

#### **Cross-linguistic similarities in babbling**

Frequently found	Infrequently found
p b m	fνθð
t d n	$\int 3  \mathbf{t}  \mathbf{d}  3$
k g	l r <mark>ŋ</mark>
<mark>s h</mark> w j	

Table 9.1 from *CL*, p 353 | What generalizations can we make?

#### **Cross-linguistic similarities in babbling**

Frequently found	Infrequently found
p b m	fνθð
t d n	J z f dz I r n
k g	l r <mark>ŋ</mark>
<mark>s h</mark> w j	

- Labials are common
- Oral and nasal stops are common
- Fricatives are rare, except [s, h]
- Liquids are rare but glides are common

- Babbling approximately 6 to 12 months
  - The most frequent consonants used in babbling are very consistent across target languages
  - The most frequent consonants used are also frequent sounds in adult languages
- Does this tell us something about UG? (This question is controversial!)

- Babbling approximately 6 to 12 months
  - The most frequent consonants used in babbling are very consistent across target languages
  - The most frequent consonants used are also frequent sounds in adult languages
- Does this tell us about UG? (Controversial!)
  - Maybe these consonants are typically early and common because **UG prefers them**
  - But maybe it is because of articulation and perception factors that do not depend on UG

- Individual children develop differently, but some general patterns can be observed:
  - Vowels develop before consonants
  - Stops are usually the earliest consonants
  - Labial is usually the first place of articulation (note: sighted children only!)
  - New phoneme categories are distinguished in word-initial position before other positions

What factors might lead to these patterns?

- In many cases, children are able to distinguish between phonemes they hear even before they can produce them
  - How do we know this?
  - What are the implications for the child's mental grammar?

- In many cases, children are able to distinguish between phonemes they hear even before they can produce them
- We often find that comprehension is more adultlike than production
  - Example: A child pronounces both mouse and mouth as [maws], but can point to the correct pictures in a comprehension experiment
- What are the implications of this pattern?

- A child pronounces both mouse and mouth as [maws], but can point to the correct pictures in a comprehension experiment
- What are the implications of this pattern?
  - How is each of these morphemes represented in the child's mental lexicon?

- A child pronounces both mouse and mouth as [maws], but can point to the correct pictures in a comprehension experiment
- What are the implications of this pattern?
  - How is each of these morphemes represented in the child's **mental lexicon**?
    - 💢 /maws/
  - How can we explain the child's pronunciation?
     [maws]

• If a child has an adult-like <u>phonemic</u> form, but produces a non-adult-like <u>phonetic</u> form...

- Phonemic form:  $\Leftrightarrow$  /maw $\theta$ /

- Phonetic form: [maws]

• If a child has an adult-like <u>phonemic</u> form, but produces a non-adult-like <u>phonetic</u> form...

- Phonemic form:  $\Leftrightarrow$  /maw $\theta$ /

- Phonetic form: [maws]

 The child's developing grammar must have a phonological rule that is not part of the adult grammar

- Writing child-specific phonological rules
  - Same as for adult phonological rules:
    - Rule format (A → B / X \_\_ Y)
    - Use of sound properties
  - One difference: A child-specific rule may have no environment if a certain natural class changes into something else everywhere
    - Rule in such a case is only "A → B", no " / ..."
- *Mouth* example: A rule for /maw $\theta$ /  $\rightarrow$  [maws]?

- Writing child-specific phonological rules
  - Same as for adult phonological rules:
    - Rule format (A → B / X \_\_ Y)
    - Use of sound properties
  - One difference: A child-specific rule may have no environment if a certain natural class changes into something else everywhere
    - Rule in such a case is only "A → B", no " / ..."
- Mouth example: voiceless interdental → alveolar

Example from A, age 1;11

```
(a) (b) (c) 

<u>cup</u> [<u>tnp</u>] <u>goat</u> [<u>dowt</u>] <u>dog</u> [do<u>t</u>] 

o<u>kay</u> [o<u>tej</u>] <u>Grampa</u> [<u>dæmpə</u>] <u>egg</u> [ej<u>t</u>] 

for<u>k</u> [foɪt] <u>digger</u> [dɪdɹ]
```

What systematic patterns can we see here?

(Hint: Think about **phonetic properties** and **natural classes**)

What rule(s) should we propose for A at this stage?

Example from A, age 1;11

```
(a) (b) (c) 

<u>cup</u> [<u>tnp</u>] <u>goat</u> [<u>dowt</u>] <u>dog</u> [do<u>t</u>] 

o<u>kay</u> [o<u>tej</u>] <u>Grampa</u> [<u>dæmpə</u>] <u>egg</u> [ej<u>t</u>] 

for<u>k</u> [foɪt] <u>digger</u> [dɪdɹ]
```

- What systematic patterns can we see here?
  - /k/ produced as [t] in all positions
  - /g/ produced as [d] in initial and medial positions and as [t] in final position
- General rule?

Example from A, age 1;11

```
(a) (b) (c) 

<u>cup</u> [<u>tnp</u>] <u>goat</u> [<u>dowt</u>] <u>dog</u> [do<u>t</u>] 

o<u>kay</u> [o<u>tej</u>] <u>Grampa</u> [<u>dæmpə</u>] <u>egg</u> [ej<u>t</u>] 

for<u>k</u> [foɪt] <u>digger</u> [dɪdɹ]
```

- What systematic patterns can we see here?
  - /k/ produced as [t] in all positions
  - /g/ produced as [d] in initial and medial positions and as [t] in final position
- Generalize? Velar stops → alveolar

Apparently also: Voiced stops → voiceless / \_#

- A consistently applied this rule until about age 2;6
  - Then 2 wks of **variable** [t]~[k] for /k/ (likewise /g/)
    Sometimes, A would visibly **correct** her first production:
    "[tʌp]...[kʌp]"
  - After that, she settled on consistent [k] and [g]
  - Only one lexical item showed confusion about which phoneme it contained: *gear* [ dia ]

- A consistently applied this rule until about age 2;6
  - Then 2 wks of **variable** [t]~[k] for /k/ (likewise /g/) Sometimes, A would visibly **correct** her first production: "[tʌp]...[kʌp]"
  - After that, she settled on consistent [k] and [g]
  - Only one lexical item showed confusion about which phoneme it contained: *gear* [ dia ]
- Just for fun: This actually happened, literally last week, when I misheard something A said about a bad smell (A is now 4;6)
  - "No, I didn't say *tar*, I said *car*! Not T-A-R. C-A-R."

- Naturalistic approach
  - Observe and record child language
  - Online data repository: <u>CHILDES</u>
- Advantages of the naturalistic approach

Disadvantages

- Naturalistic approach
  - Observe and record child language
  - Online data repository: <u>CHILDES</u>
- Advantages of the naturalistic approach
  - Data comparatively easy to collect
  - Shows language as it is used in context
- Disadvantages
  - Rare structures may not be collected
  - How can we tell what a child's mental grammar will accept as grammatical?

- Experimental approach
  - Explicitly test children's ability to produce, comprehend, or imitate language
- Advantages of this approach

Disadvantages

- Experimental approach
  - Explicitly test children's ability to produce, comprehend, or imitate language
- Advantages of this approach
  - Can study comprehension
  - Can investigate specific linguistic structures
- Disadvantages
  - Difficult to design good experiments for children
  - The relatively artificial context may affect aspects of children's language behavior

Examples of experimental methods used in child language research

- Video
  - Infant Language Lab (1999) Johns Hopkins
     Video is old, but shows actual infants being tested
- Research lab web sites with photos & information about the methods they use
  - Bergelson Lab Duke U
  - <u>BabyLab</u> U Potsdam
  - <u>Penn Infant Language Center</u> U Pennsylvania