Investigating child language acquisition using computational cognitive modeling: How to understand kids using math

Lisa Pearl University of California, Irvine





Lisa S. Pearl Professor Department of Language Science SSPB 2219 University of California, Irvine Ipearl@uci.edu

October 21, 2024 Department of Linguistics USC

















child language acquisition: extraction of language information by young children













One question: What kind of language information exactly is the target?





则









One example of target language information: knowledge about *wh*-dependencies







for instance, which wh-dependencies are strongly dispreferred vs. preferred

This kitty was bought as a present for someone.



Lily thinks this kitty is pretty.



What does Lily think ____what is pretty, and who does she think it's for ___who?





knowledge about *wh*-dependencies

for instance, which *wh*-dependencies are strongly dispreferred vs. preferred

The kitty's antics make Lily laugh.



She wants to get him in order to pet him.





What did Lily get ___what in order to pet ___what?

What did Lily get ____what and then pet ____what?

What did Lily get ____what before petting ___what?







knowledge about wh-dependencies

for instance, which *wh*-dependencies are strongly dispreferred vs. preferred

This puppy is also really adorable.





Lily wants to pet him too, but she has to get the kitty first.



What did Lily get the kitty in order to pet _______?

What did Lily get the kitty and then pet ___what?

What did Lily get the kitty before petting ___what?



knowledge about wh-dependencies



The frequency of lexical items can also affect the judged acceptability of *wh*-dependencies.





Elizabeth knows that Jack saw something. She feels the need to tell someone else about it.

She's a bit unhappy about the situation.





knowledge about *wh*-dependencies





So how can children acquire this (and other) target knowledge? How does the magical process of acquisition work?







I primarily use quantitative methods like computational cognitive modeling

to try to figure this out.







Computational cognitive modeling lets us explore theoretical ideas precisely, and evaluate how well any particular theory can explain empirical data on children's language acquisition.





Math is at the heart of this tool.

al and the







One main part: Counting things (sometimes we count a lot of things)





Another part: principled reasoning based on those counts





counting





 $p(Generalization | Data) \propto p(Generalization) \cdot p(Data | Generalization)$



But what do we count and reason over? How do we connect that information to language acquisition?





computational cognitive modeling



We can use computational cognitive modeling to encode a child's acquisition process very precisely.









A basic distinction: What's external vs. internal to the child





We can observe external things like the behavior the child demonstrates.





We can't observe internal things like what the child can perceive from the input signal.





We can't observe internal things like what additional filtering there might be before the child learns from that intake.







We can't observe internal things like how the inference process works.







We can't observe Behavior Input internal things like what External state the child's Internal Perceptual Encoding **Output Generation** developing knowledge and developing cognitive systems are in. Developing systems Perceptual Intake Developing Developing non-linguistic linguistic systems systems Developing knowledge Constraints & filters Developing Developing Acquisitional Intake non-linguistic linguistic knowledge knowledge Learning Inference





We can't observe Behavior Input internal things like how External these developing Internal Perceptual Encoding **Output Generation** components impact everything else internal. **Developing systems** Perceptual Intake Developing Developing non-linguistic linguistic systems systems Developing knowledge Developing Constraints & filters Developing Acquisitional Intake non-linguistic linguistic knowledge knowledge Learning Inference





We can't observe internal things like how the child generates the output we eventually can observe.







In a computational cognitive model, we try to implement all these parts of the acquisition process to **be the same** as how they work in children.



For some parts, we draw on available empirical data. For other parts, we rely on the acquisition theory we're trying to evaluate.



Let's see how this works for the acquisition of some knowledge about *wh*-dependencies.



...which involve constraints over *wh*-dependencies.





This kitty was bought as a present for someone.



Lily thinks this kitty is pretty.



What does Lily think ____what is pretty, and who does she think it's for ___who?



There's a dependency between the *wh*-word *who* and where it's understood (the gap)

Who does Lily think the kitty for__who is pretty?






There's a dependency between the *wh*-word *who* and where it's understood (the gap)





Who does Lily think the kitty for ___who is pretty?

This dependency is strongly dispreferred in English.



There's a dependency between the *wh*-word *who* and where it's understood (the gap)





Who does Lily think the kitty for ___who is pretty?

This dependency is strongly dispreferred in English.

One explanation: The dependency crosses a "syntactic island", which is latent structure the mind imposes on this sequence of words. A *wh*-dependency can't cross this structure. (metaphor: it can't "get out of" an island) [Ross 1967]





Who does Lily think the kitty for ___who is pretty?

Subject island



Jack is somewhat tricksy.

He claimed he bought something.



Syn	ntactic islands
	Ross 1967
Who does Lily think the kitty forwho is pretty?	Subject island
What did Jack make the claim that he bought	what? Complex NP island

Jack is somewhat tricksy.

He claimed he bought something.

Elizabeth wondered if he actually did and what it was.

What did Elizabeth wonder whether Jack bought ______?



Syntactic islands	
Ross 1967	
Who does Lily think the kitty forwho is pretty? Subject island	
What did Jack make the claim that he boughtwhat? Complex NP island	
What did Elizabeth wonder whether Jack bought Whether island	Jack is somewhat tricksy.
He clain	ned he bought something.

Elizabeth worried it was something dangerous.







Important: It's not about the length of the dependency.

(Chomsky 1965, Ross 1967)



Important: It's not about the length of the dependency. (Chomsky 1965, Ross 1967)

What did Elizabeth think ______?

Elizabeth





Important: It's not about the length of the dependency. (Chomsky 1965, Ross 1967)

What did Elizabeth think Jack said _______

Elizabeth



Jack





Syntactic islands

Who does Lily think the kitty for ___who is pretty? Subject island What did Jack make the claim that he bought ____what? Complex NP island What did Elizabeth wonder whether Jack bought ________ Whether island What did Elizabeth worry if Jack bought ____what? Adjunct island

Important: It's not about the length of the dependency. (Chomsky 1965, Ross 1967)

What did Elizabeth think Jack said Lily saw ________

Elizabeth







Lily





> English adults judge these island-crossing dependencies to be far less acceptable than many others, including others that are very similar except that they don't cross syntactic islands (Sprouse et al. 2012).





What did Jack make the claim that he bought ___what?Complex NP islandWhat did Elizabeth wonder whether Jack bought ___what?Whether islandWhat did Elizabeth worry if Jack bought ___what?Adjunct island



English-learning children strongly disprefer one of these islandcrossing dependencies compared to others (de Villiers et al. 2008).







What did Jack make the claim that he bought ____what? Complex NP island What did Elizabeth wonder whether Jack bought ___what? Whether island What did Elizabeth worry if Jack bought ___what? Adjunct island

> These judgments and (dis)preferences are a measurable observable behavior that can signal the successful acquisition of syntactic island knowledge.









Sprouse et al. 2012: magnitude estimation judgments

• factorial definition controlling for two salient properties of island-crossing dependencies



presence of an island structure (non-island vs. island)



Sprouse et al. 2012



Х

length of dependency (matrix vs. embedded) presence of an island structure (non-island vs. island)

Subject island stimuli

Who __ thinks [the necklace is expensive]?mWhat does Jack think [__ is expensive]?embedWho __ thinks [the necklace for Lily] is expensive?m*Who does Jack think [the necklace for __] is expensive?embed

matrix | non-island embedded | non-island matrix | island embedded | island



Х

length of dependency (matrix vs. embedded) presence of an island structure (non-island vs. island)

Whether island stimuli

Who __ thinks [that Jack stole the necklace]? What does the teacher think [that Jack stole __]? Who __ wonders [whether Jack stole the necklace]? *What does the teacher wonder [whether Jack stole __]?

matrix | non-island embedded | non-island matrix | island embedded | island



Х

length of dependency (matrix vs. embedded) presence of an island structure (non-island vs. island)

Adjunct island stimuli

Who __ thinks [that Lily forgot the necklace]? matrix | non-island What does the teacher think [that Lily forgot __]? embedded | non-island Who __ worries [if Lily forgot the necklace]? matrix | island *What does the teacher worry [if Lily forgot __]? embedded | island



Complex NP island stimuli

Who __ claimed [that Lily forgot the necklace]? What did the teacher claim [that Lily forgot __]? emb Who __ made [the claim that Lily forgot the necklace]? *What did the teacher make [the claim that Lily forgot __]? emb

matrix | non-island embedded | non-island matrix | island embedded | island



Syntactic island = **superadditive** interaction of the two factors. This is additional unacceptability that arises when the two factors — length & presence of an island structure — are combined, above and beyond the independent contribution of each factor.







































Sprouse et al. (2012): acceptability judgments from 173 adult subjects



(non-parallel lines)





Sprouse et al. (2012): acceptability judgments from 173 adult subjects



(positive difference)





Sprouse et al. (2012): acceptability judgments from 173 adult subjects



superadditivity for all four island types

= knowledge that dependencies crossing these island structures are dispreferred.

















Child knowledge as measured by preferred interpretation behavior

De Villiers et al. 2008: How do children prefer to interpret potentially ambiguous *wh*-questions?




preferred interpretation behavior

How do children prefer to interpret potentially ambiguous wh-questions?

context





How do children prefer to interpret potentially ambiguous wh-questions?

context















How do children prefer to interpret potentially ambiguous wh-questions?

What did the boy fix the cat that was lying on the table with ______?







preferred interpretation behavior

How do children prefer to interpret potentially ambiguous wh-questions?

What did the boy [fix the cat that was lying on the table [with ___what]]?







How do children prefer to interpret potentially ambiguous wh-questions?

What did the boy [fix [the cat [that [was [lying [on [the table [with __what]]]]]]]?





0.25 0.50 0.75 1.00 Child Preference

preferred interpretation behavior

How do children prefer to interpret potentially ambiguous wh-questions?

What did the boy fix the cat that was lying on the table with <u>__what</u>?

children strongly prefer this interpretation





How do children prefer to interpret potentially ambiguous wh-questions?

What did the boy fix the cat that was lying on the table with ______?







0.25

0.50

Child Preference

0.75

1.00



What did the boy [fix [the cat [that [was [lying [on [the table [with ___what]]]]]]]?

This means they strongly disprefer the *wh*-dependency this interpretation relies on.



0.25

0.50

Child Preference

0.75

1.00







0.50 Child Preference

preferred interpretation behavior

How do children prefer to interpret potentially ambiguous wh-questions?

What did the boy [fix [NP the cat [that [was [lying [on [the table [with ___what]]]]]]?

+ other *wh*-dependencies 0.25 0.50 0.00 0.75 1.00 Child Preference Who did the little sister ask how to see __? What did the mother say she bought __? Who did the boy ask what to bring ? Who did the policewoman How did the mom learn what to bake _? help to call _? How did the girl ask where to ride ?? How did the boy who sneezed drink the milk











measurable observable behavior







Liu et al 2019, 2022: Acceptability of *wh*-dependencies can depend on the lexical item in the main verb.



What did she whine [that he saw _]? What did she mumble [that he saw _]?

Adult acceptability judgment behavior

...can depend on the lexical item in the main verb



oportion Acceptable

murmur

whine

learn

know

hate forget

Log verb frame frequency

Adult acceptability judgment behavior

...can depend on the lexical item in the main verb

Important pattern: Positive correlation between main verb with CP frequency and judged acceptability.



frequency of main verb with CP (log-transformed)

hope

learn

know

hate forget

Log verb frame frequency

oportion Acceptable

murmur

whine



frequency of main verb with CP (log-transformed)



Land and a stand of the stand o







How long do children have to learn?





How long do children have to learn?



De Villiers et al. 2008: Data from four-year-olds.

1.00







What input do children get?





What input do children get?



We can estimate this from samples of child-directed speech.



This is the acquisition problem





Let's map this to how we characterized the acquisition process before



Pearl 2023 JoCL











This is where a theory of acquisition comes in.





one learning theory for *wh*-dependencies

Pearl & Sprouse 2013 Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.





Pearl & Sprouse 2013 Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



View *wh*-dependencies in terms of their building blocks and track (count) those building blocks in the input.





Pearl & Sprouse 2013 Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



building blocks of wh-dependencies



Dependencies represented as a sequence of container nodes

What phrases contain the gap (but not the *wh*-word)?





Pearl & Sprouse 2013 Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



building blocks of wh-dependencies



Dependencies represented as a sequence of container nodes

What phrases contain the gap (but not the *wh*-word)?





Pearl & Sprouse 2013 Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



building blocks of wh-dependencies



Dependencies represented as a sequence of container nodes

What phrases contain the gap (but not the *wh*-word)?




Pearl & Sprouse 2013 Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



building blocks of wh-dependencies



Dependencies represented as a sequence of container nodes

What phrases contain the gap (but not the *wh*-word)?





Pearl & Sprouse 2013 Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



building blocks of wh-dependencies



What __ happened? = What [IP __ happened]? = start-IP-end What did you see __? = What did [IP you [VP see __]]? = start-IP-VP-end

What did she want to do __ ? = What did [IP she [VP want [IP to [VP do __]]]]? = start-IP-VP-IP-VP-end

(Much) less acceptable dependencies have low probability segments

CP Who [_{IP} Lily [_{VP} think [_{CP-that} [_{IP} [_{NP} the kitty [_{PP} for __]] was pretty ?]]]] did start-IP-VP-CPthat-IP-NP-PP-end



Pearl & Sprouse 2013 Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



building blocks of wh-dependencies

What ____happened? = What [IP ____happened]? = start-IP-end What did you see __? = What did [IP you [VP see __]]? = start-IP-VP-end

What did she want to do __ ? = What did [IP she [VP want [IP to [VP do __]]]]? = start-IP-VP-IP-VP-end

(Much) less acceptable dependencies have low probability segments

 [CP Who
 did
 [IP Lily
 [VP think [CP-that [IP [NP the kitty [PP for __]] was pretty ?]]]]

 Start-IP-VP-CPthat-IP-NP-PP-end

 So if children break these dependencies into smaller building blocks, they can identify if a dependency has bad segments (made up of one or more low probability building blocks).



Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



Theory: The child tries to learn what the "best" building blocks are





ESS .

Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.

Guiding intuition:

the "best" building blocks are the most "efficient" ones.





Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.







Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.

Efficient building blocks allow the representation of current and future *wh*-dependencies to be more probable.



Why? One idea: Higher probability *wh*-dependencies are faster to process (comprehending or producing).





Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



learning efficient building blocks





How? Look for building blocks that are a balance between

(1) how big they are

(2) how fast they are to put together to make a *wh*-dependency



Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



learning efficient building blocks

a balance between (1) how big they are



(2) how fast they are to put together to make a *wh*-dependency

 CP $N\dot{P}_1$ did ΙP What ŃŶ ŴΡ Pro ĈР she say that ÌP ŃŶ ŇΡ NP_1 Pro he saw

What did she say that he saw __ ?



Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



learning efficient building blocks



a balance between
(1) how big they are
(2) how fast they are to put together to make a *wh*-dependency



start-IPpast-VPsay-CPthat-IPpast-VPsee-end





Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.

learning efficient building blocks



a balance between
(1) how big they are
(2) how fast they are to put together to make a *wh*-dependency

start-IPpast-VPsay-CPthat-IPpast-VPsee-end

Blocks can be small, so that many of them make up a *wh*-dependency









Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



learning efficient building blocks



a balance between
(1) how big they are
(2) how fast they are to put together to make a *wh*-dependency

start-IPpast-VPsay-CPthat-IPpast-VPsee-end



It may be slower to put together many small blocks.





Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



learning efficient building blocks a balance between

a balance between
(1) how big they are
(2) how fast they are to put together to make a *wh*-dependency

start-IPpast-VPsay-CPthat-IPpast-VPsee-end

many smaller

slower because many

But these blocks may get reused, so that makes them faster to access.







Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



learning efficient building blocks

(1)

a balance between
(1) how big they are
(2) how fast they are to put together to make a *wh*-dependency

start-IPpast-VPsay-CPthat-IPpast-VPsee-end





Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



learning efficient building blocks



a balance between
(1) how big they are
(2) how fast they are to put together to make a *wh*-dependency

start-IPpast-VPsay-CPthat-IPpast-VPsee-end





Blocks can be big, so that only one makes up a *wh*-dependency



Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



see





Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



I earning efficient building blocks a balance between (1) how big they are (2) how fast they are to put together to make a *wh*-dependency
Start-IPpast-VPsay-CPthat-IPpast-VPsee-end
Many smaller







Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



learning efficient building blocks

(1) how big they are
(2) how fast they are to put together to

make a *wh*-dependency



start-IPpast-VPsay-CPthat-IPpast-VPsee-end





faster because one

It may be slower to access if the block is used rarely.



Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.





a balance between
(1) how big they are
(2) how fast they are to put together to make a *wh*-dependency

start-IPpast-VPsay-CPthat-IPpast-VPsee-end



The most efficient option is probably a balance of bigger and smaller blocks that collectively are faster to access and put together.









Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



end

learning efficient building blocks



a balance between
(1) how big they are
(2) how fast they are to put together to make a *wh*-dependency

 $start\text{-}\mathsf{IP}_{past}\text{-}\mathsf{VP}_{say}\text{-}\mathsf{CP}_{that}\text{-}\mathsf{IP}_{past}\text{-}\mathsf{VP}_{see}\text{-}end$







Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



learning efficient building blocks

How can children find the best balance?











Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.

Use Bayesian inference to search through the hypothesis space of all possible building blocks (O'Donnell 2015) and find an efficient set for children's input.





Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.

Note: There's a considerable body of evidence suggesting that young children are capable of Bayesian inference

(3 years: Xu & Tenenbaum, 2007; 9 months: Gerken, 2006; Dewar & Xu, 2010; Gerken, 2010; 6 months: Denison, Reed, & Xu, 2011, among many others)
— though they're likely approximating this mental computation as best they can.



Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.









Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.



We'll see if this modeled child can learn the target knowledge that real children learn.









Estimated from the CHILDES Treebank (Pearl & Sprouse 2013)



12.7K *wh*-dependencies from the CHILDES Treebank (Pearl & Sprouse 2013) of speech directed at 25 children between the ages of 1 and 5 years old.





This lets us estimate which *wh*-dependencies children hear and how often they hear them (the *wh*-dependency distribution).













wh-dependency (18 months \leq age < 60 months)

How many minutes is this? In particular, children are awake for only a certain portion of the day at different ages (Davis et al. 2004).

Pearl & Sprouse 2013, Bates & Pearl 2019, Pearl & Bates 2022 Dickson et al. 2022, 2024, in prep.




A more detailed look at the input



A more detailed look at the input



A more detailed look at the input











Memory is an important part of processing dependencies (McElree et al. 2003).











Children's short term memory, along with related abilities like encoding information with context and maintaining attention, develops over time (Paris 1978, Gathercole et al. 2004, Fandakova et al. 2014).







*wh-*dependency distribution

Upshot: Children might **not take in** all the *wh*-dependency distribution information in their input.







wh-dependency distribution

Learner intake: Some parts of any particular *wh*-dependency may be forgotten in the moment.









see













*wh-*dependency distribution Learner intake: Some parts of any particular *wh*-dependency may be forgotten in the moment.







Pearl & Sprouse 2013, Bates & Pearl 2019, Pearl & Bates 2022 Dickson et al. 2022, 2024, in prep.





A reminder of the measurable target behavior patterns







Our modeled child can generate almost all of these target patterns.







A closer look at these target patterns.



Liu et al. 2019, 2022



Dickson et al. 2022, 2024, in prep.









A closer look at these target patterns.



Liu et al. 2019, 2022





Liu et al. 2019, 2022



Dickson et al. 2022, 2024, in prep.







A closer look at these target patterns.



Liu et al. 2019, 2022



Child Preference

De Villiers et al. 2008



De Villiers et al. 2008



De Villiers et al. 2008









Takeaway: Modeled learners implementing this learning theory can generate most of the observed target behavior patterns, even with human(-like) memory limitations.





What did she VERB [that he saw _]?









Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.

This means the modeled child, who encoded the "efficient building blocks" learning theory, was able to generate almost all of children's target behavior.














Takeaway: This learning theory (implemented by the modeled child using math) is pretty good at capturing children's target behavior.





Takeaway: So, it may be a pretty good explanation for how children acquire (some) syntactic island knowledge from their input.



Dickson, Pearl, & Futrell 2022, 2024, in prep.

What about other syntactic island knowledge? And other knowledge about *wh*-dependencies?





The kitty's antics make Lily laugh.



She wants to get him in order to pet him.





What did Lily get ____what and then pet ____what?

What did Lily get ____what before petting ____what?





Some other *wh*-dependency knowledge

This puppy is also really adorable.





Lily wants to pet him too, but she has to get the kitty first.



What did Lily get the kitty in order to pet ___what?
What did Lily get the kitty and then pet ___what?
What did Lily get the kitty before petting ___what?









Some child preferences we know about *wh*-dependencies (which we can mostly explain)

What did the boy [fix [NP the cat [that [was [lying [on [the table [with ___what]]]]]]]?



De Villiers et al. 2008





Some child preferences we know about *wh*-dependencies (which we can mostly explain)

Who did [the policewoman [help [to [call ___who]]]]? VS. Who did [the policewoman [help ___who] [to call]]? Complex NP + other *wh*-dependencies 0.00 0.25 0.50 1.00 0.75 **Child Preference**

De Villiers et al. 2008



Some child preferences we know about *wh*-dependencies (still to explain)





Some child preferences we know about *wh*-dependencies (still to explain)

Where did [Lizzie [say to someone [that [she was going to catch butterflies ___where]]]]?





Some child preferences we know about *wh*-dependencies (still to explain)

Where did [Lizzie [tell someone [that [she was going to catch butterflies ___where]]]]?









Could this learning theory about the right building blocks explain how these preferences develop?



say _____where say to someone ____where tell someone ____where









Omaki al. 2014



This learning theory was able to explain the development of a lot of target knowledge even when there were some (hopefully child-like) memory limitations.





What happens if other abilities are also developing?





















startAnother idea: mis-parsing the input and being unable to revise in time (Trueswell et al. 1999, Snedeker 2013, Omaki & Lidz 2015) IP past VP say





Some other discoveries from my research group, using computational cognitive modeling





Children transform the input signal they encounter in order to learn.

















Sometimes acquisition success may result only when the data intake for acquisition is a selective subset of the available input.





(*basic word order*: Pearl 2005a,b, 2007, Pearl and Weinberg 2007; *metrical stress*: Pearl 2007, 2008, 2009, 2011, Pearl, Ho and Detrano 2014, 2016, Pearl 2017; *English anaphoric one*: Pearl 2007, Pearl and Lidz 2009; *syntactic islands*: Pearl and Sprouse 2013a,b, Pearl 2014, Pearl and Sprouse 2015; *English passive*: Nguyen and Pearl 2019, 2021)





However, sometimes acquisition success may also occur by taking a broader perspective on what counts as relevant data.





(Pearl 2023a; *English anaphoric one*: Pearl and Mis 2011, 2016; *syntactic islands*: Pearl and Sprouse 2013a,b, Pearl 2014, Pearl and Sprouse 2015, Pearl 2017, Bates and Pearl 2019, Pearl and Bates 2022; *English passive*: Nguyen and Pearl 2018, 2019, 2021).







To learn some types of linguistic knowledge, children may need to have language-specific knowledge built into their minds — however the exact form of this knowledge may be different than what we previously thought.

(English anaphoric one: Pearl and Lidz 2009, Pearl and Mis 2011, 2016; syntactic islands: Pearl and Sprouse 2013a,b, Pearl 2014, Pearl and Sprouse 2015, Dickson, Pearl and Futrell 2022, Dickson, Futrell, & Pearl 2024; linking theories: Pearl and Sprouse 2019, 2021)







Children's linguistic knowledge may sometimes be far more well-developed than we realize earlier than we realize, with strong similarities between child and adult representations





(*closed-class syntactic categories*: Bates, Pearl and Braunwald 2018; *quantifier scope ambiguity resolution*: Savinelli, Scontras and Pearl 2017, 2018, Scontras and Pearl 2021; *adjective ordering preferences*: Bar-Sever, Lee, Scontras and Pearl 2018; *pronoun interpretation*: Forsythe and Pearl 2019, Pearl and Forsythe under review)





"Different" doesn't automatically mean "worse" when it comes to language development.









While there is certainly input variation across socio-economic status, the same language learning outcome could still occur, despite the variation. So, interventions targeted at "fixing" the input aren't likely to be effective.



syntactic islands: Bates and Pearl 2019, Pearl and Bates 2022



Even if the representations of very young children may not match adult representations, they can still be "good enough" for helping other acquisition processes get started.

early speech segmentation: Phillips and Pearl 2012, 2014a,b, 2015a,b,c, Pearl and Phillips 2018; *early syntactic categorization*: Bar-Sever and Pearl 2016





Learners with processing constraints (like children) may sometimes learn better than learners with fewer limitations ("less is more").

speech segmentation: Pearl, Goldwater and Steyvers 2010, 2011, Phillips and Pearl 2012, 2015c

Take home

Computational cognitive modeling is one way to use math to investigate the magical process of child language acquisition

















Take home

It allows us to implement learning theories concretely, evaluate them, and better understand how they (and potentially children) work.

















 $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{1} \\ \overline{\mathbf{x}}^{T} + \frac{\mathbf{1} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{1} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{1} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{1} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \right) \\ \overline{\mathbf{x}}^{T} + \frac{\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{1} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \right) \\ \overline{\mathbf{x}}^{T} + \frac{\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \\ \overline{\mathbf{x}}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \right) \\ \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \right) \\ \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \right) \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) + \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \right) \right) \\ \mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}^{T} \left(\mathbf{x}$

 $\begin{array}{c} & -2\zeta \sqrt{2} z = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + (1 + \zeta \sqrt{2}) + \frac{1}{2} + (2 + \zeta \sqrt{2}) + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + (2 + \zeta \sqrt{2}) + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}$

Take home

So let's keep using this wonderful tool to investigate child language acquisition!

















 $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-1}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left((x^{2}) + (y^{2}) + (\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{x^{2}}{\sqrt{1-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-1}} \left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}} \left((x^{2}) + (y^{2}) + (\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{x^{2}}{\sqrt{1-1}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-1}} \frac{1}$

 $\begin{array}{c} & (a - a) \zeta A^{2} & (a + a) \zeta (a + a) \\ (a + a) \zeta (a + a) \zeta (a + a) \zeta (a + a) \zeta (a + a) \\ (a + a) \zeta (a + a) \zeta (a + a) \zeta (a + a) \\ (a + a) \zeta (a + a) \zeta (a + a) \zeta (a + a) \\ (a + a) \\$

Thank you!

Niels Dickson





Richard



Jon



UCSD Linguistics 2020 **BUCLD 2018** ForMA Group 2020 UMD Linguistics 2020 **BUCLD 2021** SCiL 2022 UArizona Linguistics 2022 **UPenn 2023** Pomona Acquisition Workshop 2024 CSU Fullerton Linguistics Students Association 2024 UCI QuantLang Collective









Alandi Bates



UChicago LEAP 2022







2.

