Psych 215L: Language Acquisition

Lecture 2
The Mechanism of Acquisition
and
Some Child Language Research Methods

Levels of Representation
Marr (1982)

Describing vs. Explaining

“…it gradually became clear that something important was missing that was not present in either of the disciplines of neurophysiology or psychophysics. The key observation is that neurophysiology and psychophysics have as their business to describe the behavior of cells or of subjects but not to explain such behavior….What are the problems in doing it that need explaining, and what level of description should such explanations be sought?” - Marr (1982)

On Explaining (Marr 1982)

“…[need] a clear understanding of what is to be computed, how it is to be done, the physical assumptions on which the method is based, and some kind of analysis of the algorithms that are capable of carrying it out.”

“This was what was missing - the analysis of the problem as an information-processing task. Such analysis does not usurp an understanding at the other levels - of neurons or of computer programs - but it is a necessary complement to them, since without it there can be no real understanding of the function of all those neurons.”
On Explaining (Marr 1982)

"But the important point is that if the notion of different types of understanding is taken very seriously, it allows the study of the information-processing basis of perception to be made rigorous. It becomes possible, by separating explanations into different levels, to make explicit statements about what is being computed and why and to construct theories stating that what is being computed is optimal in some sense or is guaranteed to function correctly. The ad hoc element is removed…"

Our goal: Substitute "language acquisition" for "perception".

The three levels

Computational
What is the goal of the computation? What is the logic of the strategy by which it can be carried out?

Algorithmic
How can this computational theory be implemented in a procedure? What is the representation for the input and output, and what is the algorithm for the transformation?

Implementational
How can the representation and algorithm be realized physically?

The three levels: An example with the cash register

Computational
What does this device do? Arithmetic (ex: addition).
Addition: Mapping a pair of numbers to another number.

Algorithmic
(3,4) → 7 (often written (3+4=7))
Properties:
(3+4) = (4+3) [commutative]
(3+4)+5 = 3+(4+5) [associative]
(3+0) = 3 [identity element]
(3+ -3) = 0 [inverse element]

Implementational
True no matter how numbers are represented: this is what is being computed
The three levels: An example with the cash register

Computational
What does this device do?
Arithmetic (ex: addition).
Addition: Mapping a pair of numbers to another number.

Algorithmic
What is the input, output, and method of transformation?
Input: arabic numerals (0,1,2,3,4…)
Output: arabic numerals (0,1,2,3,4…)
Method of transformation: rules of addition, where least significant digits are added first and sums over 9 have their next digit carried over to the next column

\[
\begin{array}{c}
99 \\
+ 5 \\
\hline
14 \\
\end{array}
\]
The three levels: An example with the cash register

Computational
What does this device do?
Arithmetic (ex: addition).
Addition: Mapping a pair of numbers to another number.

Algorithmic
What is the input, output, and method of transformation?
Input: arabic numerals (0,1,2,3,4…)
Output: arabic numerals (0,1,2,3,4…)
Method of transformation: rules of addition

Implementational
How can the representation and algorithm be realized physically?
A series of electrical and mechanical components inside the cash register.

Marr (1982)
“Although algorithms and mechanisms are empirically more accessible, it is the top level, the level of computational theory, which is critically important from an information-processing point of view. The reason for this is that the nature of the computations that underlie perception depends more upon the computational problems that have to be solved than upon the particular hardware in which their solutions are implemented. To phrase the matter another way, an algorithm is likely to be understood more readily by understanding the nature of the problem being solved than by examining the mechanism (and the hardware) in which it is embodied.”

Mapping the Framework: Algorithmic Theory of Language Learning
Goal: Understanding the “how” of language learning
First, we need a computational-level description of the learning problem.
Computational Problem: Divide sounds into contrastive categories (Speech perception, phoneme identification)

who's afraid of the big bad wolf

Mapping the Framework: Algorithmic Theory of Language Learning
Goal: Understanding the “how” of language learning
First, we need a computational-level description of the learning problem.
Computational Problem: Divide spoken speech into words (Word segmentation)

húwzəfriːdərəbɪŋbædˈwʊlf
húwzəfriːdə bɪˈgɪŋ bæd ˈwʊlf
who’s afraid of the big bad wolf
Mapping the Framework: Algorithmic Theory of Language Learning

Goal: Understanding the “how” of language learning

First, we need a computational-level description of the learning problem.

Computational Problem: Identify the concept a word is associated with
(Word-meaning mapping)

“I love my daxes.”

Dax = that specific toy, teddy bear, stuffed animal, toy, object, …?

Second, we need to be able to identify the algorithmic-level description:

Input = sounds, syllables, words, phrases, …
Output = sound categories, words, grammatical categories, sentences, …
Method = statistical learning, algebraic learning, prior knowledge about how human languages work, …
Framework for language learning  
(algorithmic-level)

What are the hypotheses available (for generating the output from the input)?
Ex: general word order patterns

Input: words (adjective and noun)
Output: ordered pair

Adjective before noun (ex: English)
red apple

Noun before adjective (ex: Spanish)
manzana roja
apple red

What data are available, and should the learner use all of them?
Ex: exceptions to general word order patterns

Ignore special use of adjective before noun in Spanish
Special use: If the adjective is naturally associated with the noun:
la blanca nieve
the white snow

Why not usual order? Snow is naturally white.

Experimental Methods:
What, When, and Where
A useful indirect measurement

Head Turn Preference Procedure

Infant sits on caretaker’s lap. The wall in front of the infant has a green light mounted in the center of it. The walls on the sides of the infant have red lights mounted in the center of them, and there are speakers hidden behind the red lights.

Sounds are played from the two speakers mounted at eye-level to the left and right of the infant. The sounds start when the infant looks towards the blinking side light, and end when the infant looks away for more than two seconds.

A useful indirect measurement

Head Turn Preference Procedure

Thus, the infant essentially controls how long he or she hears the sounds. Differential preference for one type of sound over the other is used as evidence that infants can detect a difference between the types of sounds.

Note on infant attention:

Familiarity vs. Novelty Effects

For procedures that involve measuring where children prefer to look (such as head turn preference), sometimes children seem to have a “familiarity preference” where they prefer to look at something similar to what they habituated to. Other times, children seem to have a “novelty” preference where they prefer to look at something different to what they habituated to.

Kidd, Plantadosi, & Aslin (2010, 2012) provide some evidence that this may have to do with the informational content of the test stimulus. There may be a “Goldilocks” effect where children prefer to look at stimuli that are neither too boring nor too surprising, but are instead “just right” for learning, given the child’s current knowledge state.
Computational Methods:
How

Computational Methods

Why use computational modeling?
“Given a model of some aspect of language acquisition, implementing it as a computational system and evaluating it on naturally occurring corpora has a number of compelling advantages. First of all by implementing the system, we can be sure that the algorithm is fully specified, and the acquisition model does not resort to hand-waving at crucial points. Secondly, by evaluating it on real linguistic data, we can see whether naturally occurring distributions of examples in corpora provide sufficient information to support the studied claims across a divergent range of acquisition theories. Thirdly, study of the system can identify the mechanisms that cause changes in the algorithm’s hypotheses during the course of acquisition. Finally, the computational resources required of the model can be concretely assessed and (not so concretely) compared against the resources that might be available to a human language learner.” - Clark & Sakas 2011

Control over the entire learning mechanism:
- what hypotheses the (digital) child considers
- what data the child learns from
- how the child updates beliefs in different hypotheses

Ground with empirical data available
- want to make this as realistic as possible (ex: use actual data distributions, cognitively plausible update procedures)
- a good source of empirical data: CHILDES database

http://childes.psy.cmu.edu/

Download annotated transcripts from the database.
Download the program to search these transcripts, and its manual.
Gauges of modeling success & contributions to science

Formal sufficiency: does the model learn what it’s supposed to learn when it’s supposed to learn it from the data it’s supposed to learn it from? (also noted as important by Frank 2012; additionally Frank (2012) asks does it make the same mistakes that children do? He calls this fidelity.)

Developmental compatibility: Does it learn in a psychologically plausible way? Is this something children could feasibly do?

Explanatory power: what’s the crucial part of the model that makes it work? How does this impact the larger language acquisition story?

Additional quality of successful models: Efficient representation

Efficient representation, part 1: “…representations within these models should be efficient compressions of input data at the desired level of analysis…”

Efficient representation, part 2: “…models should include some bias towards parsimony in the representations they learn…a parsimony bias is in its essence, the imposition of some cost on learning such that if one thing is learned, another will not be…”

…”models that [frame] the problem as learning a parsimonious set of explanatory regularities like words, morphemes, categories, or rules—expressive units that [allow] for efficient compression—are more successful…”

Sample learning models


Learning the interpretation of referential elements (Regier & Gahl 2004, Foraker et al. 2007, 2009, Pearl & Lidz 2009, Pearl & Mis 2011): learning to identify syntactic category and semantic referent of one from segmented speech and referents in the world
Sample learning models


Stress (Pearl 2008, Pearl 2011, Legate & Yang 2011): learning to identify correct stress patterns (and rules behind them) from words with stress contours

General Modeling Process

Pearl 2010
(1) Decide what kind of learner the model represents (ex: normally developing 6-month-old child learning first language)

(2) Decide what data the child learns from (ex: Bernstein corpus from CHILDES) and how the child processes that data (ex: data divided into syllables)

(3) Decide what hypotheses the child has (ex: what the words are) and what information is being tracked in the input (ex: transitional probability between syllables)

(4) Decide how belief in different hypotheses is updated (ex: based on transitional probability minima between syllables)

Pearl 2010
(5) Decide what the measure of success is
  - precision and recall (ex: finding the right words in a word segmentation task)
  - matching an observed performance trajectory (ex: English past tense acquisition often has a U-shaped curve)
  - achieving a certain knowledge state by the end of the learning period (ex: knowing there are 4 vowel categories at the end of a phoneme identification task)
  - making correct generalizations (ex: preferring a correctly formed sentence over an incorrectly formed one)

Statistical Learning, Inductive Bias, & Bayesian Inference in Language Acquisition Research

Pearl & Goldwater forthcoming

"Language acquisition is a problem of induction: the child learner is faced with a set of specific linguistic examples and must infer some abstract linguistic knowledge that allows the child to generalize beyond the observed data, i.e., to both understand and generate new examples. Many different generalizations are logically possible given any particular set of input data, yet different children within a linguistic community end up with the same adult grammars. This fact suggests that children are biased towards making certain kinds of generalizations rather than others."
Statistical Learning, Inductive Bias, & Bayesian Inference in Language Acquisition Research

Pearl & Goldwater forthcoming

"In the Bayesian view of learning, inductive bias consists of a combination of hard and soft constraints. Hard constraints make certain grammars impossible for any human to acquire; in the language of Bayesian modeling, these impossible grammars are outside the learner's hypothesis space. Grammars inside the hypothesis space are learnable given the right input data, but they may not all be equally easy to learn. Soft constraints, implemented in the form of a probability distribution over the hypothesis space, mean that the learner will be biased towards certain of these grammars more than others."

Saffran et al. proposed that some aspects of acquisition were “best characterized as resulting from innately biased statistical learning mechanisms rather than innate knowledge”.

Evidence for domain-general probabilistic learning abilities in infants
- Denison et al. forthcoming: 6-month-olds (prob reasoning)
- Roseberry et al. 2011: 7- to 9-month-olds (prob tracking)
- Davis et al. 2011: 10-month-olds (prob matching)

Question 1: What kinds of statistical patterns are human language learners sensitive to?

- Thiessen & Saffran (2003): 7-month-olds prefer syllable transitional probability cues over language-specific stress cues when segmenting words, while 9-month-olds show the reverse preference.
- Graf Estes, Evans, Alibali, & Saffran (2007): word-like units that are segmented using transitional probability are viewed by 17-month-olds as better candidates for labels of objects.
- Thompson & Newport (2007): adults can use transitional probability between grammatical categories to identify word sequences that are in the same phrase, a precursor to more complex syntactic knowledge.
Question 1: What kinds of statistical patterns are human language learners sensitive to?

Other statistics involving relationships of adjacent units: backward transitional probability (Perruchet & Desaulty 2008, Pelucchi, Hay, & Saffran 2009b) and mutual information (Swingley 2005).

Non-adjacent dependencies:
- Newport & Aslin (2004): non-adjacent statistical dependencies between consonants and between vowels, but not between entire syllables
- Mintz (2002, 2003, 2006): frequent frames used to categorize words. (ex: the___one is a frame that could occur with big, other, pretty, etc.).

More sophisticated statistics/inferences:
- Yu & Smith (2007) and Smith & Yu (2008): Both adults and 12-to-14-month-old infants can track probabilities of word-meaning associations across multiple trials where any specific word within a given trial was ambiguous as to its meaning.

- Xu & Tenenbaum (2007): investigated how humans learn the appropriate set of referents for basic (cat), subordinate (tabby), and superordinate (animal) words. Both adults and children between the ages of 3 and 5 are capable of integrating the likelihood of an event occurring into their internal models of word-meaning mapping in a way easily predicted by standard Bayesian inference techniques.

Question 2: To what extent are these statistical learning abilities specific to the domain of language, or even to humans?

Not specific to language:
- Saffran et al. (1999): both infants and adults can segment non-linguistic auditory sequences (musical tones) based on the same kind of transitional probability cues that were used in the original syllable-based studies. Similar results have been obtained in the visual domain using both temporally ordered sequences of stimuli (Kirkham et al., 2002) and spatially organized visual “scenes” (Fiser and Aslin, 2002).

Not (always) specific to humans:
- Hauser et al. (2001): cotton-top tamarins can segment the same kind of artificial speech stimuli used in the original Saffran et al. (1996) segmentation experiments as well as human infants.

- Saffran et al. (2008): tamarins could also learn some simple grammatical structures based on statistical information, but were unable to learn patterns as complex as those learned by infants.
Question 3: What kinds of knowledge can be learned from the statistical information available?

Something more easily investigated through computational modeling studies rather than traditional experimental techniques.

The Bayesian approach
- offers a concrete way to examine what knowledge is required for acquisition, and whether that required knowledge is domain-specific or domain-general, without committing to either view a priori.
- has led to the investigation of a new set of questions that previous approaches have not considered: whether human language learners can be viewed as being optimal statistical learners (i.e., making optimal use of the statistical information in the data), and in what situations.
- can potentially address the question of why they make the generalizations they do, i.e., because these generalizations are statistically optimal given the available data and any learning biases, innate or otherwise.

- Also, may be different ways to approximate Bayesian inference that are not so resource-intensive. Bonawitz, Denison, Chen, Gopnik, & Griffiths (2011) discuss a simple sequential algorithm called Win-Stay, Lose-Shift that matches human behavior consistent with Bayesian inference.

- Some evidence that infants are sensitive to certain kinds of information that we would expect Bayesian learners to be sensitive to: Gweon et al. (2010) show that 12- to 18-month-old children alter their inferences, based on where the sample is drawn from.

- Makes the space of hypotheses considered by the language learner explicit (doesn’t matter whether they are based on domain-specific or domain-general cognitive constraints)
- Encodes the learner’s biases by assigning an explicit probability distribution over these hypotheses.
- Can operate over the kinds of highly structured representations that many linguists believe are correct (e.g., Regier & Gahl 2004, Foraker et al. 2009, Pearl & Litz 2009, Pearl & Mi 2011, Perfors et al. 2011).
The Bayesian approach

\[ P(\text{hypothesis} \mid \text{data}) = P(\text{data} \mid \text{hypothesis}) \times P(\text{hypothesis}) \]

- Posterior likelihood of hypothesis
- Likelihood of observed data
- Prior belief in hypothesis

“The product of priors and likelihoods often has an intuitive interpretation in terms of balancing between a general sense of plausibility based on background knowledge and the data-driven sense of a “suspicious coincidence.” In other words, it captures the tradeoff between the complexity of an explanation and how well it fits the observed data.” – Perfors et al. 2011, Bayesian tutorial

Usual three steps of a Bayesian model:

1) Define hypothesis space – which hypotheses are under consideration?

2) Define prior distribution over hypotheses – which are more/less likely?

3) Define likelihood update – how does data affect learner’s belief?

Figure 6: Hypothesis A is too simple, fitting the observed data poorly; C is too complex; while B is “just right.” A Bayesian analysis naturally ensures that the best explanation of the data optimizes a tradeoff between complexity and fit, as in B.

From Perfors et al. 2011, Bayesian Tutorial
The Bayesian approach

Hypothesis space can contain multiple levels of representation -- shows power of bootstrapping (using preliminary or uncertain information in one part of the grammar to help constrain learning in another part of the grammar, and vice versa)

Goldwater et al. (2006, 2009): two levels of representation -- words and phonemes -- though only one of these (words) is unobserved in the input and must be learned.
Johnson (2008): learning both syllable structure and words from unsegmented phonemic input improved word segmentation in a Bayesian model similar to that of Goldwater et al.
Feldman et al. (2009): simultaneously learning phonetic categories and the lexical items containing those categories led to more successful categorization than learning phonetic categories alone.
Yuan et al. (2011): simultaneously learning individual word meaning and more abstract features involved in word meaning

A note on hierarchical Bayesian models: Allow generalizations at multiple levels. (Dewar & Xu (2010): 9-month-olds can do this.)

Learner uses observable data to learn about properties of bags in general (ex: uniform vs. mixed distribution), not just properties of individual bags.
Analogy: bags = language properties

From Kemp, Perfors, & Tenenbaum (2007)

Some studies looking at how Bayesian inference might be implemented:

- Pearl, Goldwater, and Steyvers 2010, 2011, Phillips & Pearl 2012: implementing Bayesian inference in constrained learners with limitations on memory and processing
- Shi, Griffiths, Feldman, & Sanborn 2010: exemplar models may provide a possible mechanism for implementing Bayesian inference, and have identifiable neural correlates.

Note: intended to provide a declarative description of what is being learned, not necessarily how the learning is implemented.

Instead: only assume that the human mind implements some type of algorithm (perhaps a very heuristic one) that is able to approximately identify the posterior distribution over hypotheses.
Statistical Learning, Inductive Bias, & Bayesian Inference in Language Acquisition Research

The Bayesian approach

A main contribution: provide a way to formally evaluate claims about children’s hypothesis space.

- Can indicate if certain constraints or restrictions are required in order to learn some aspect of linguistic knowledge (e.g., Regier & Gahl 2004, Perfors, Tenenbaum, & Regier 2011, Foraker et al. 2009, Pearl & Lidz 2009, Pearl & Mis 2011, Perfors et al. 2011).

- If a Bayesian learner looking for the optimal hypothesis given the data cannot converge on the correct hypothesis, this suggests that the current conception of the hypothesis space cannot be correct. Required knowledge may take the form of an additional constraint on the hypothesis space that gives preference to certain hypotheses over others, or eliminates some hypotheses entirely.

Experimental Methods

How do we tell what infants know, or use, or are sensitive to?

Researchers use indirect measurement techniques.

High Amplitude Sucking (HAS)

Infants are awake and in a quietly alert state. They are placed in a comfortable reclined chair and offered a sterilized pacifier that is connected to a pressure transducer and a computer via a piece of rubber tubing. Once the infant has begun sucking, the computer measures the infant’s average sucking amplitude (strength of the sucks).
Experimental Methods
How do we tell what infants know, or use, or are sensitive to?
Researchers use indirect measurement techniques.
High Amplitude Sucking (HAS)

A sound is presented to the infant every time a strong or “high amplitude” suck occurs. Infants quickly learn that their sucking controls the sounds, and they will suck more strongly and more often to hear sounds they like the most. The sucking rate can also be measured to see if an infant notices when new sounds are played.
Researchers use indirect measurement techniques.

**High Amplitude Sucking (HAS)**

Infants have sophisticated discrimination abilities, but they don’t abstract sounds into categories the way that adults do.

Infant perception: “da” “ta”

Adult perception: “da” “ta”

**Eyetracking:** measures fixations on target picture

"Where's the baby?"
ERPs: Event-related brain potentials, gauged via electrode caps. The location of ERPs associated with different mental activities is taken as a clue to the area of the brain responsible for those activities.

Good: non-invasive, relatively undemanding on the subject, provide precise timing on brain events

Bad: poor information on exact location of ERP since just monitoring the scalp

Brain-imaging techniques: gauge what part of the brain is active as subjects perform certain tasks

PET scans: Positron emission topography scans
- subjects inhale low-level radioactive gas or injected with glucose tagged with radioactive substance
- experimenters can see which parts of the brain are using more glucose (requiring the most energy)

fMRI scans: functional magnetic resonance imaging
- subjects have to be very still inside MRI machine, which is expensive to operate
- experimenters can see which parts of the brain are getting more blood flow or consuming more oxygen

Brain-imaging techniques: gauge what part of the brain is active as subjects perform certain tasks

MEG: Magnetoencephalography
- subjects have to be very still
- experimenters can see which parts of the brain are active

Optical Topography: Near-infrared spectroscopy (NIRS)
- transmission of light through the tissues of the brain is affected by hemoglobin concentration changes, which can be detected