Language transfer in ASL/English Bimodal Bilingual children with CIs

Kathryn Davidson
Corina Goodwin
Diane Lillo-Martin

University of Connecticut, Storrs

Theoretical Issues in Sign Language Research, London
July 12, 2013
Acknowledgments

• Warm thanks to:
  – Bimodal bilingual children and their families
  – Research assistants and collaborators

• Financial support from:
  – Award Number R01DC009263 from the National Institutes of Health (National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders). *The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIDCD or the NIH.*
Research question

• Children all over the world successfully acquire two or more languages, including signed and spoken languages.

• In contrast, children with cochlear implants are often encouraged to focus solely on spoken language to the exclusion of any sign language input.

Here we investigate the effect of bimodal (ASL/English) bilingualism on the English speech of children with cochlear implants who also have deaf, signing parents.
Overview

• Background
  • Development of bimodal bilingualism
  • Bimodal bilingual children with cochlear implants

• Our focus in this study: Determiner use
  • Syntax
  • Pragmatics

• New conclusions
  • Positive effect of sign language on children with CIs
  • The development of sensitivity to the linguistic context in older (age 3-6 years) bimodal bilingual children
BACKGROUND
Bimodal bilingualism

Most studies of sign/spoken (“bimodal”) bilingualism involve:
• Hearing CODAs (adults) and KODAS (kids)
  1. Learn a sign language from their deaf parents
  2. Learn a spoken language

But there are also:
• Children who are born deaf, with deaf parents, and who:
  1. Learn a sign language from their deaf parents
  2. Have cochlear implants that provide access to spoken language

We investigate this second group, who have access to full ASL from birth, focusing (here) on how ASL affects their English
Language in children with CIs

**Typical children with CIs**
- Have hearing parents, little access to language before implant
- In U.S. most attend English language programs, and as a group lag behind hearing peers on spoken language tests (Nicolas and Geers 2008, Geers et al. 2009)

**Bimodal bilingual children with CIs**
- If lack of access to a language in the first year(s) of life is holding back typical children with CIs, native signing children with CIs may perform better on English tests
- *Early supporting evidence:*
  - Hassanzadeh (2012) finds children with CIs and deaf parents outperform children with CIs and hearing parents on spoken Persian
  - Davidson et al. (under review) find children with CIs and deaf parents equal to kados on standardized English tests
Our study focuses on articles:

*Prosodically light*: Children with CIs may face perceptual challenges

*Transferring directly from ASL doesn’t lead to target English; there are differences in:*

### Syntax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASL does not require overt articles (like, e.g. Chinese)</th>
<th>English does require overt articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAT JUMP</td>
<td>A cat jumped, <em>the</em> cat purred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Semantics/pragmatics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASL uses spatial loci for tracking references</th>
<th>English uses definite/indefinite articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun phrases can corefer if they share the same locus</td>
<td><em>a, an</em> establish new referent <em>the</em> identifies unique, given referents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English article acquisition

Syntax
• First production as young as 1;04, but still omitted in required contexts much later
  (Brown 1973; Demuth & McCullough 2009; Kupisch et. al 2009)

Pragmatics
• Experiments suggest continuing problems with pragmatically appropriate use of definite vs. indefinite articles up to age 4
  (Ionin et al. 2004; Schaeffer & Matthewson 2005)

Few studies of either topic beyond age 4 in spoken or bilingual children
OUR STUDY
Data collection

We analyzed free play sessions (20-55 mins.) at ages:
  3 years, 3 years 6 months, 4 years, 5 years, 6 years

From:
- ASL/English bilingual children with CIs (“CI”)
- ASL/English bilingual children with typical hearing (“Koda”)
- Cantonese/English bilingual children (“Spoken Bilingual”)
- Monolingual English children (“Monolingual”)

Language Targets:
- One English target session (with hearing experimenters, family)
- For CIs and Kodas, also: one ASL target session (with deaf experimenters, deaf family)
## Distribution of participants

### English target sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>English Monolingual</th>
<th>KODA</th>
<th>CI†</th>
<th>Cantonese Bilingual*</th>
<th>KODA</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3;00</td>
<td>JOY</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>ELI</td>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>ELI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3;06</td>
<td>JOY</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>ELI</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>ELI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4;00</td>
<td>Braunwald*</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>ELI</td>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>ELI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5;00</td>
<td>LEX</td>
<td>NIK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>LEX</td>
<td>NIK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6;00</td>
<td>LEX</td>
<td>GIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LEX</td>
<td>GIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Braunwald, Darren, Janet from CHILDES corpus (MacWhinney 2000)
† Age of implantation: ELI = 13 mo., NIK = 16 mo., GIA = 19 mo.
## Language modality, age 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target language</th>
<th>Total Utterances</th>
<th>Total English Utterances</th>
<th>Total ASL Utterances</th>
<th>Total Bimodal Utterances*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI 3;00</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI 3;00</td>
<td>ASL</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koda 3;00</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koda 3;00</td>
<td>ASL</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*any combination of meaningful sign and speech, including whispering while signing (Guerrera et al. 2013)
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Coding procedure

Each session was hand-coded in ELAN for each noun phrase:

- Separated out noun phrases that don’t require articles (pronouns, bare plurals, names)
- Coded completely Adult-Like (CAL) or Not Adult-Like (NAL)
- NAL noun phrases coded for:
  - Article omission (syntax)
  - Pragmatic inappropriateness of overt article (pragmatics), ruled conservatively
RESULTS
## Results: % Omitted Determiners in English Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>English Monolingual</th>
<th>KODA</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>Chinese Bilingual</th>
<th>KODA</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3;00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3;06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4;00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5;00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6;00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Syntax – Summary

✓ In English target sessions, all children omitted determiners at age 3, but in all cases this decreased with age

✓ In ASL target sessions at the same ages, more variation
  • ASL influence, not developmental stage (cf. English sessions)
  • As early as age 3, children are becoming proficient at separating English and ASL contexts

✓ In English target sessions at every age, the signing child with a CI performed similarly to the Koda
## % Pragmatically inappropriate determiners in English Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>English Monolingual</th>
<th>KODA</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>Chinese Bilingual</th>
<th>KODA</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3;00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3;06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4;00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5;00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6;00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pragmatics– Summary

✓ In English target sessions, all younger children produced pragmatically inappropriate determiners
  • decreasing in frequency with age
  • slower development than article omission

✓ In ASL target sessions at the same ages, fewer pragmatic mistakes, likely because few determiners were used at all

✓ In English target sessions at every age, signing children with CIs performed similarly to Kodas
General Discussion

Development of bimodal bilingualism
- Young (age 1-3) bimodal children frequently code-blend (Quadros, Lillo-Martin, Kouliodobrova & Chen Pichler, earlier), while...
- Older (age 3;6-6) bimodal bilinguals children are acquiring awareness of the linguistic environment: English target sessions look increasingly different from ASL target sessions

Effect of bimodal bilingualism on children with CIs
- Native signing children with CIs perform in English on par with their typically hearing peers
  - We conclude that sign language is not only *not harmful*, but can be *helpful* for English language development (preventing a lag in language development)
  - Supports the importance of language in first year(s) of life
Thank you
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