

*The 13th Annual*  
**Boston University**

**Conference on  
Language  
Development**



**October 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 1988**



Boston University



**The Thirteenth Annual  
Boston University  
Conference  
on Language Development**

October 21, 22 and 23, 1988

Organized by the graduate students  
in the  
Applied Linguistics Program



New Titles from  
**Cambridge University Press**

**A Cognitive Theory of  
Consciousness**

*Bernard J. Baars*

1988/452 pp./30133-5/Cloth \$44.50

**Developing Theories of Mind**

*Edited by Janet W. Astington,  
Paul L. Harris, and David R. Olson*

1988/512 pp./35411-0/Cloth \$44.50

**From First Words to  
Grammar**

*Individual Differences and Dissociable  
Mechanisms*

*Elizabeth Bates, Inge Bretherton and  
Lynn Snyder*

1988/300 pp./34142-6/Cloth \$34.50

**Understanding Research in  
Second Language Learning**

*A Teacher's Guide to Statistics and  
Research Design*

*James Dean Brown*

*New Directions in Language Teaching*

1988/240 pp./30524-1/Cloth \$32.50

31551-4/Paper \$12.95

*Now in paperback. . .*

**Emotions, Cognition and  
Behavior**

*Edited by Carroll E. Izard, Jerome Kagan  
and Robert B. Zajonc*

1988/632 pp./31246-9/Paper \$29.95

**The Nature of Creativity**

*Contemporary Psychological Perspectives*

*Edited by Robert J. Sternberg*

1988/454 pp./33036-X/Cloth \$54.50

33892-1/Paper \$19.95

**The Psychologist's  
Companion**

*A Guide to Scientific Writing for Students and  
Researchers*

*Robert J. Sternberg*

1988/208 pp./34121-3/Cloth \$29.95

34921-4/Paper \$9.95

**The Cognitive Structure of  
Emotions**

*Andrew Ortony, Gerald L. Clore  
and Allan Collins*

1988/175 pp./35364-5/Cloth \$29.95

**Linguistics:**

**The Cambridge Survey**

*Edited by Frederick J. Newmeyer*

*Volume I: Linguistic Theory: Foundations*

1988/425 pp./30832-1/Cloth \$49.50

*Volume II: Linguistic Theory:*

*Extensions and Implications*

1988/350 pp./30833-X/Cloth \$39.50

*Volume III: Language:*

*Psychological and Biological Aspects*

1988/350 pp./30835-6/Cloth \$39.50

*Volume IV: Language:*

*The Socio-Cultural Context*

1988/350 pp./30834-8/Cloth \$39.50

**Cambridge Applied  
Linguistics Series**

**Interactive Approaches to  
Second Language Learning**

*Edited by Patricia Carrell, Joanne Devine  
and David Eskey*

1988/256 pp./35360-2/Cloth \$32.50

35874-4/Paper \$12.95

**Second Language Classrooms**

*Research on Teaching and Learning*  
*Craig Chaudron*

1988/224 pp./32775-X/Cloth \$29.95

33980-4/Paper \$11.95

**Language Learning and  
Deafness**

*Edited by Michael Strong*

1988/304 pp./34046-2/Cloth \$34.50

33579-5/Paper \$13.95

See these and other titles at the  
Cambridge exhibit

**Cambridge University Press**

32 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022

## WELCOME

We are pleased to welcome you to the Thirteenth Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development. As in the past, the conference has been totally organized and run by students in the Applied Linguistics Program at Boston University. Continuing the structure initiated last year, we have chosen to focus on three areas of language development. This year, second language acquisition/bilingualism accompanies two of last year's themes, theoretical approaches to first language acquisition and literacy.

The expansion of the conference in scope and attendance during the past years has strained our physical resources. Thus, for the first time, the conference will be held in two separate buildings (though in close proximity) on all three days. We hope that any inconvenience caused by this will be compensated for by the benefits of more comfortable meeting spaces.

We again wish to thank the faculty in the Program of Applied Linguistics for their continued support. In particular, Carol Neidle, the chair of the Program, has been more than generous in her material and spiritual support of this conference.

Like planners of high rise buildings, we considered skipping the ominous label Thirteenth for our Conference in hopes of avoiding a catastrophe. Perhaps our decision to ignore our superstitious predilections was a mistake. Dr. James Paul Gee, who has served brilliantly as Conference advisor for the sixth time, will be leaving Boston University at the end of this semester. In addition to Jim's adroit guidance of this conference, his exceptional classroom presence and genuine friendship will sorely be missed.

To all of you attending this year's conference, whether it's your thirteenth time or your first, we thank you for your support. Enjoy!

The 1988 Conference Committee  
Steve Griffin, Chair  
Cindy Ballenger  
Eileen Buianowski  
Elaine Crowder  
Magda Gubala-Ryzak  
Barbara Ann Kearney  
Donna Lardiere  
Yunhee Lee  
Laraine Prasinis  
Marnie Reed Murphy  
Lorrie Verplaeste

## *New from MIT*

### **CONCEPTS, KINDS, AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT**

*Frank C. Keil*

Frank Keil provides a coherent account of how concepts and word meanings develop in children, adding to our understanding of the representational nature of concepts and word meanings at all ages.

A Bradford Book.

February \$22.50

### **MISSING THE MEANING?**

A Cognitive Neuropsychological Study of Processing of Words by an Aphasic Patient

*David Howard and Sue Franklin*

A Bradford Book.

February \$25.00

### **A COURSE IN GB SYNTAX**

Lectures on Binding and Empty Categories

*Howard Lasnik and Juan Uriagereka*

\$15.00 paper (\$30.00 cloth)

### **LANGUAGE AND PROBLEMS OF KNOWLEDGE**

The Managua Lectures

*Noam Chomsky*

\$8.95 paper (\$20.00 cloth)

*Available in Paperback*

### **JAPANESE TONE STRUCTURE**

*Janet B. Pierrehumbert and Mary E. Beckman*

Building from a thorough, phonetically grounded description of accent and intonation in Tokyo Japanese, this book also attempts to develop an explicit account of surface phonological representation.  
\$15.95 paper (\$30.00 cloth)

### **TELLING THE AMERICAN STORY A Structural and Cultural Analysis of Conversational Storytelling**

*Livia Polanyi*

A Bradford Book.

\$9.95 paper

### **LECTURES ON LANGUAGE CONTACT**

*Ilse Lehiste*

\$10.95 paper (\$20.00 cloth)

### **DIALOGUES**

*Roman Jakobson and Krystyna Pomorska*

Foreword by Morris Halle  
\$9.95 paper (\$20.00 cloth)

**Come visit our table at the BU  
Conference meeting!**

**The MIT Press**

55 Hayward Street • Cambridge, MA  
02142

## ***ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF REVIEW COMMITTEE***

The Conference Committee wishes to thank the following people for their aid in the selection of this year's papers:

Helen Cairns, City University of New York  
Stephen Crain, University of Connecticut  
Suzanne Flynn, Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
James Paul Gee, Boston University  
Sarah Michaels, Education Development Center, Newton, MA  
Beatrice Mikulecky, Boston University  
William Rutherford, University of Southern California  
Catherine Snow, Harvard University  
Kenneth Wexler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

# SPEAKING YOUR LANGUAGE

---

## CATEGORIES AND PROCESSES IN LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Edited by **Yonata Levy**, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*  
**Izchak M. Schlesinger**, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*  
**Martin D.S. Braine**, *New York University*  
cloth: 0-8058-0151-0. 296pp. (tent). 1988. \$36.00.

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE RESEARCHERS: Essays in Honor of Roger Brown

Edited by **Frank S. Kessel**, *University of Houston*  
cloth: 0-89859-906-7. 440pp. 1988. \$59.95.  
paper: 0-8058-0063-8. 440pp. 1988. \$24.95

### *Journals*

## METAPHOR AND SYMBOLIC ACTIVITY

Editor: **Howard R. Pollio**, *University of Tennessee, Knoxville*  
Associate Editors: **Robert H. Hoffman**, *Adelphi University*  
**Michael K. Smith**, *University of Tennessee, Knoxville*  
Subscription Rate: Volume 4, 1989  
\$30.00 Individual; \$75.00 Institution

### *Forthcoming*

## LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: A Journal of Developmental Linguistics

Editors: **Robert Berwick**, *MIT*  
**Thomas Roeper**, *University of Massachusetts*  
**Kenneth Wexler**, *MIT*

To order, visit our booth or write:

**Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers**  
365 Broadway, Hillsdale, New Jersey 07642  
(201) 666-4110

---

## BOOKS AND JOURNALS FROM LEA

## **GENERAL INFORMATION**

### **Registration:**

REGISTRATION will be held on Friday, October 21, from **11:30 a.m.** to **5 p.m.** in the lobby of the **School of Education**, and from **6:00 p.m.** to **8:00 p.m.** in the **Metcalf Science Center Lobby**. Registration for the Friday Literacy Session, *Teachers as Researchers* will be held **8:30 to 9:30** in the **Castle**.

Registration on Saturday, October 22 (starting at **8:00 a.m.**) and Sunday, October 23 (starting at **8:30 a.m.**) will take place in the **Metcalf Science Center Lobby and School of Education Lobby**.

### **Locations:**

#### **FRIDAY, OCTOBER 21:**

*LITERACY: Teachers as Researchers*--**The Castle**, 225 Bay State Road.

*LANGUAGE ACQUISITION* (Semantics, Cognition, and Grammar) --**School of Education Auditorium**, 605 Commonwealth Avenue.

*KEYNOTE ADDRESS and RECEPTION*-- **Metcalf Science Center Auditorium**, 590 Commonwealth Avenue.

#### **SATURDAY, OCTOBER 22 and SUNDAY, OCTOBER 23**

*LITERACY*-- **School of Education Auditorium**, 605 Commonwealth Avenue.

*LANGUAGE ACQUISITION* --**Metcalf Science Center Auditorium**, 590 Commonwealth Avenue

*SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION/ BILINGUALISM*-**Metcalf Science Center Room 115**, 590 Commonwealth Avenue

*SATURDAY NIGHT DINNER and SOCIAL--The Castle, 225 Bay State Road.*

**Keynote Address:**

DR. MELISSA BOWERMAN, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Netherlands, will deliver the Keynote Address at 8:00 p.m. on **Friday** in the Metcalf Science Center Auditorium.

**RECEPTION:** Immediately following the Keynote Address, you are cordially invited to a Wine and Cheese Reception in the adjacent lounge.

**Conference Amenities:**

**PUBLISHERS' EXHIBITS:** Exhibits will be located on the ground floor of the Metcalf Science Center all day Saturday and Sunday. A list of exhibitors may be found at the back of this handbook.

**COFFEE:** Coffee, decaf, and tea will be served for most of Saturday and Sunday in both the Metcalf Science Center and the School of Education. Also, on Sunday, bagels and cream cheese will be available at 8:30 a.m. on the ground floor of the Metcalf Science Center only.

**SATURDAY NIGHT DINNER and SOCIAL (7:00 p.m. to midnight):** Enjoy a Chinese buffet dinner, cash bar, and live music at the Castle. Cash bar opens at 7:00, dinner will be served from 7:30-9:00. For those eating dinner elsewhere, please stop by for drink, music, and socializing after 9:00 p.m.

**Other Information:**

**SIGN LANGUAGE INTERPRETERS:** Interpreters will be available for all sessions. Please inquire at the registration desk when you arrive.

**MESSAGE BOARD:** You may leave messages on the board located near the registration desk in the Metcalf Science Center.

**BADGES:** Please be sure to wear your badge at all times in order to comply with Boston University security regulations.

**PARKING:** Parking spaces are available in Boston University lots for \$5 per day. Be sure to mention that you are attending the Language Conference.

# Thought & Language / Language & Reading

EDITED BY  
MARYANNE WOLF  
MARK K. McQUILLAN  
EUGENE RADWIN  
PREFACE BY  
JEANNE S. CHALL

Two decades of research in reading, linguistics, and cognition.

Among the contributors are:

Martin L. Albert	Jeanne S. Chall	David Harman	David R. Olson
Ursula Bellugi	Carol Chomsky	Jonathan Kozol	Paul M. Postal
Roger Brown	Paulo Freire	Eric H. Lenneberg	I. A. Richards
John B. Carroll	Norman Geschwind	Raven I. McDavid, Jr.	Sylvia Scribner
Courtney B. Cazden	Jean Berko Gleason	R. P. McDermott	Frank R. Vellutino



**HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW**

Longfellow Hall, 13 Appian Way  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
Call to order: (617) 495-3432

732 pages  
Reprint Book No. 14  
\$14.95

*For over fifty years  
a standard of excellence  
in education*



## **The HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW**

WHEN YOU SUBSCRIBE to the *Harvard Educational Review* you join an international audience of over ten thousand educators, administrators, and policymakers who look to the *Review* for the best of today's educational scholarship and research. Each issue provides penetrating analyses of education's most difficult problems, along with constructive suggestions for change.

PUBLISHED FOR OVER HALF A CENTURY, the *Review* has earned its place as the most highly respected journal of education in the United States. Subscribe to the *Review* and give yourself a valuable resource for understanding today's educational problems.

### **Subscription Rates**

*(four issues per year)*

	<i>Individual</i>	<i>Institutional</i>
One year	\$30.00	\$55.00
Two years	\$48.00	\$90.00

## **Harvard Educational Review**

LONGFELLOW HALL, 13 APPIAN WAY,  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

(617) 495-3432

## SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

Location Key: **SED** - School of Education, 605 Commonwealth Avenue  
**CAS** - The Castle, 225 Bay State Road  
**MSC** - Metcalf Center for Science and Engineering,  
590 Commonwealth Avenue

---

### FRIDAY 21

---

- CAS** 9:00am-4:00pm .
- All-day Literacy workshop, *Teachers as Researchers* (Registration 8:30am to 9:30am.)
- SED** 11:30 am  
1:30pm-5:15pm
- Registration begins, Lobby
  - First Language Acquisition, Auditorium (Room 130)
- MSC** 6:00pm  
8:00pm
- Registration for Keynote Address
  - Keynote Address, Auditorium. Reception follows.

---

### SATURDAY 22

---

- MSC** Starting at 9:00 am  
9:00am--5:00pm
- First Language Acquisition, Auditorium
  - Second Language Acquisition/ Bilingualism, Rm 115
  - Publishers' Exhibits, Ground Floor/Dining area
- SED** 9:00 am
- Literacy, School of Education, Auditorium

---

### SUNDAY 23

---

- MSC** Starting at 9:30 am  
9:00am - 5:00pm
- First Language Acquisition, Auditorium
  - Second Language Acquisition/ Bilingualism, Rm 115
  - Publishers' Exhibits, Ground Floor/Dining area
- SED** 9:30 am
- Literacy, School of Education, Auditorium
- 
-

• CONFERENCE PROGRAM •

KEYNOTE ADDRESS:

*The Role of Meaning in Grammatical Development:  
The Continuing Challenge to Theories of Language Acquisition*

DR. MELISSA BOWERMAN

Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics - The Netherlands  
Metcalf Science Center Auditorium  
Friday Evening, 8:00pm

---

**FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION SESSIONS**

FRIDAY AFTERNOON 1:30 - 5:15

*Semantics, Cognition, and Grammar*

- 1:30        **VIRGINIA GATHERCOLE**, Florida International University  
*Contrast: A Semantic Constraint?*
- 2:00        **KATHY HIRSH-PASEK**, Temple University, **LETITIA NAIGLES**, Yale University, **ROBERTA GOLINKOFF**, University of Delaware, **LILA R. GLEITMAN & HENRY GLEITMAN**, University of Pennsylvania  
*Syntactic Bootstrapping: Evidence from Comprehension*
- 2:30        **LILA R. GLEITMAN**, University of Pennsylvania  
*More on Syntactic Constraints*
- 3:00        **MICHAEL MARATSOS**, University of Minnesota  
*Vote Yes on Nouns for Semantic Bootstrapping*
- 3:30        Break

*FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION*

*FRIDAY AFTERNOON (continued)*

- 3:45      **DEDRE GENTNER**, University of Illinois  
*Cognitive and Linguistic Determinism: Object Reference  
and Relational Reference*
- 4:15      **STEVEN PINKER**, Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
*The Autonomy of Semantics: Implications for Language  
Acquisition*
- 4:45      **EVE CLARK**, Stanford University  
*Evidence for the Notion "Source" in Language Acquisition*

*SATURDAY MORNING 9:00 - 12:00 noon*

*WH- Movement*

- 9:00      **JILL DE VILLIERS**, Smith College , **TOM ROEPER &  
ANNE VAINNIKKA**, University of Mass, Amherst  
*The Acquisition of Long-Distance Rules*
- 9:25      **HELEN GOODLUCK**, University of Ottawa  
*Operator Movement, Arguments, and Adjuncts in the  
Grammar of 4-7 Year Olds*
- 9:50      **MARIE LABELLE**, University of Ottawa  
*Predication, WH-Movement, and the Development of  
Relative Clauses*
- 10:15     **ANITA MORYADAS**, Hampshire College  
*Acquisition of Structural Constraints on Qualifiers*
- 10:40     **KARIN STROMSWOLD**, Massachusetts Institute of  
Technology & Harvard Medical School  
*The Structure of Children's WH-Questions*

*FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION*  
*SATURDAY MORNING (continued)*

- 11:05      **STEPHEN CRAIN & ROSALIND THORNTON**,  
University of Connecticut  
*Acquisition of \*that-trace Effects*
- 11:30      **TOM ROEPER**, Discussant  
*Discussion*

*SATURDAY AFTERNOON 1:30 - 5:15*

*Acquisition of Control and Anaphora*

- 1:30      **HELEN SMITH CAIRNS & DANA MCDANIEL**,  
Queens College  
*The Acquisition of Control Principles in the Grammars  
of Young Children*
- 2:05      **JANET COHEN SHERMAN**, Massachusetts Institute of  
Technology, & **BARBARA LUST**, Cornell University  
*Children Are in Control*
- 2:40      **KENNETH WEXLER**, Massachusetts Institute of  
Technology  
*Aspects of the Acquisition of Control*
- 3:30      **NINA HYAMS & SIGRIDUR SIGURJONSDOTTIR**,  
University of California, Los Angeles  
*A Cross-Linguistic Comparison of the Development of  
Referentially Dependent Elements*
- 4:05      **CELIA JAKUBOWICZ & LIS OLSEN**, Laboratoire de  
Psychologie Expérimentale, Paris  
*The Acquisition of Reflexive Anaphors & Pronominals  
in Danish*

*FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION*  
*SATURDAY AFTERNOON (continued)*

- 4:40        **YU-CHIN CHIEN**, University of California, Irvine, &  
**KENNETH WEXLER**, MIT  
*Children's Acquisition of Binding Principles*

*SUNDAY MORNING 9:30 - 1:00*

*Functional Linguistic Theory*

- 9:30        **VIRGINIA MARCHMAN, ELIZABETH BATES, A.  
BURKARDT & A. GOOD**, University of California,  
San Diego  
*Functional Constraints on the Acquisition of the Passive:  
Toward a Model of the Competence to Perform*
- 10:00        **CLIFTON PYE & PEDRO QUIXTAN POZ**, University  
of Kansas  
*The Acquisition of Passives and Anti-Passives in Quiche  
Mayan*
- 10:30        **ROBERT VAN VALIN, JR.**, University of California,  
Davis  
*Functional Linguistic Theory and Language Acquisition*
- 11:00        Break
- 11:15        **MATTHEW RISPOLI**, University of California, Berkeley  
*The Acquisition of Verb Subcategorization in a Functionalist  
Framework*
- 11:45        **SOONJA CHOI**, San Diego State University  
*Early Development of Epistemic Modality in Korean Children*

*FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION*  
*SUNDAY MORNING (continued)*

- 12:15      **BERNARD KAPLAN, NANCY BUDWIG, & MICHAEL BAMBERG**, Clark University  
*Have We Lost the Notion of Development in Studying Child Language ?*

*SUNDAY AFTERNOON - 2:00-4:15*

*Maturation, Parameters, & Theories of Development*

- 2:00      **ROBIN CLARK**, Carnegie Mellon University  
*The Problem of Causality in Models of Language Learnability*
- 2:35      **JURGEN WEISSENBORN**, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Netherlands  
*Null Subjects in Early Grammars: Implications for Parameter-Setting Theories*
- 3:10      **EITHNE GUILFOYLE & MARIE NOONAN**, McGill University  
*Functional Categories and Language Acquisition*
- 3:45      **RICK KAZMAN**, Carnegie Mellon University  
*Null Arguments & the Acquisition of Case and Infl*

## LITERACY SESSIONS

FRIDAY, 9:30 - 4:00

### *Teachers as Researchers*

- 10:00      **SUSAN L. LYTLE & MARILYN COCHRAN-SMITH**, University of Pennsylvania  
*Learning from Teacher Research: Analysis of Texts and Contexts*
- 12:00 noon    Lunch
- 1:00        **MARGERY MILLER & KAREN ALLAN**, Lesley College  
*Teaching-Researching Communities: Their Impact on Literacy Learning*
- 2:30        Break
- 2:45        **VIVIAN ZAMEL, ROBERTA ADAMS, JOAN FRUTKOFF, & LISA SANTAGATE**, University of Massachusetts- Boston  
*The Writing Teacher as Researcher: What We Can See for Ourselves*

*LITERACY*

*SATURDAY MORNING, 9:00 - 12:30*

*Discourse, Social Class and Literacy*

- 9:00           **ELINOR OCHS, RUTH SMITH, & CAROLYN TAYLOR**, University of Southern California  
*Putting Problems on the Table: Dinner and Literacy*
- 10:30           Break
- 10:45           **CATHERINE E. SNOW, & PATTON O. TABORS**,  
Harvard Graduate School of Education  
*Development of Decontextualized Language Skills in  
Low Income Preschool Children*
- 11:30           **SARAH MICHAELS**, Education Development Center,  
Newton, MA & **BERTRAM BRUCE**, BB&N Laboratories,  
Cambridge, MA  
*Different Ways of Talking, Doing, and Learning Science -  
In That Order: A Preliminary Exploration*

*SATURDAY AFTERNOON, 2:00 - 5:30*

*Classroom Practices and Literacy*

- 2:00           **DEBORAH THOMPSON**, Tennessee State University  
*Accessing Literacy in Two Inner City Classrooms*
- 2:45           **GEN LING CHANG, MEI LIAN LAM, & GORDON WELLS**, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education  
*Children's Acquisition of Oral and Written Literacy  
Through Collaborative Learning*
- 3:30           Break

LITERACY

SATURDAY AFTERNOON (continued)

- 3:45           **DENNIS SAYERS**, Multifunctional Resource Center,  
University of Hartford  
*De Orilla a Orilla (From Shore to Shore): Bilingual Literacy  
and International Computer Writing Networks*
- 4:30           **CATHERINE WALSH**, University of Massachusetts-  
Amherst  
*Towards Speaking One's Voice and Reading One's Reality:  
A Critical Literacy Project with At Risk Latino Students*

SUNDAY MORNING, 9:30 - 1:00

*Texts and Reader/Writer Relationships*

- 9:30           **DAVID OLSON**, Ontario Center for Studies in Education  
*Children's Understanding of Texts and Interpretations*
- 10:15          **SUZANNE DE CASTELL**, Simon Fraser University  
*Teaching the Textbook*
- 11:15          **KIMBERLY KINSLER**, Hunter College  
*Using a Cognitive Apprenticeship Model in the Remediation  
of College Students*
- 12:00 noon   **JUDY DIAMONDSTONE & NANZETTA  
MERRIMAN**, Harvard Graduate School of Education  
*"I Don't Want to Look Like That Man, I Don't Want to Talk  
Like That Man": Voice and Identity in Academic Discourse*



## **SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION/ BILINGUALISM**

*SATURDAY MORNING, 9:00 - 12:15*

### *Second Language Learning and Language Use*

- 9:00        **KENJI HAKUTA**, University of California at Santa Cruz  
*Translation Ability in Bilingual Children*
- 9:40        **SHANA POPLACK**, University of Ottawa  
*Language Contact and Linguistic Variation*
- 10:20        Break
- 10:40        **FRED GENESEE**, McGill University  
*Early Bilingual Development: One Language or Two*
- 11:20        **LORAIN OBLER**, City University of New York Graduate  
School  
*Talent in Second Language Acquisition*

*SATURDAY AFTERNOON, 2:00 - 5:15*

### *Spontaneous Second Language Acquisition in Adults*

- 2:00        Introduction to National Science Foundation Project
- 2:15        **WOLFGANG KLEIN & CLIVE PERDUE**, Max Planck  
Institute for Psycholinguistics  
*Utterance Structure*
- 2:45        **RAINER DIETRICH**, University of Heidelberg  
*The European Science Foundation Project on "Second  
Language Acquisition of Adult Immigrants": The Temporality  
Study*

**SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION/ BILINGUALISM**  
**SATURDAY AFTERNOON** (*continued*)

- 3:15        **THOM HUEBNER**, Stanford University  
*Establishing Point of View in a Second Language*
- 3:45        **Break**
- 4:00        **MARGARET SIMONOT**, Ealing College of Higher  
Education, London  
*Procedures Used to Achieve Understanding in L2*
- 4:30        **PETER JORDENS**, Free University of Amsterdam  
*The Acquisition of Word Order in L2 Dutch and German*

**SUNDAY MORNING**, 9:30 - 1:00

*Theoretical Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*

- 9:30        **HELMUT ZOBL**, Carleton University, Ottawa  
*The Uneven Growth of Metalinguistic Knowledge*
- 10:00       **WILLIAM RUTHERFORD**, University of Southern  
California  
*The Question of Preemption in SLA*
- 10:30       **JACQUELYN SCHACHTER**, University of Southern  
California  
*On the Issue of Completeness in Adult Second Language  
Acquisition*
- 11:00       **Break**
- 11:20       **SUZANNE FLYNN**, Massachusetts Institute of  
Technology, & **OLGA BROWN**, Boston  
University  
*Three Types of Adult Second Language Learning*

*SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION / BILINGUALISM*  
*SUNDAY MORNING (continued)*

- 11:50      **LYDIA WHITE**, McGill University  
*Linguistic Universals, Markedness, and Learnability:  
Reconciling Different Approaches*

*SUNDAY AFTERNOON 2:00 - 4:00*

*Markedness*

- 2:00      **CRAIG CHAUDRON & KATE PARKER**, University  
of Hawaii at Manoa  
*Discourse Markedness and Structural Markedness: The  
Acquisition of English Noun Phrases*
- 2:30      **FRED ECKMAN**, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee  
*The Structural Conformity Hypothesis and Consonant  
Clusters in the Interlanguages of ESL Learners*
- 3:00      **MARGARET THOMAS**, Harvard University  
*The Interpretation of English Reflexive Pronouns by  
Non-Native Speakers*
- 3:30      **GITA MARTOHARDJONO**, Cornell University  
*Effects of Markedness on the Acquisition of Binding Domains*

## LANGUAGE ACQUISITION ABSTRACTS

Virginia C. Gathercole, Florida International University

### *Contrast: A Semantic Constraint?*

This paper challenges three positions of Lexical Contrast Theory: (1) It is not clear that languages rule out absolute synonyms, and even if it is hard to find absolute synonyms, the explanation for this does not necessarily lie in LC Theory. (2) The evidence cited from child language in support of the theory admits of alternative explanations. (3) The "logic" of assuming Contrast leads to insurmountable difficulties in the acquisition of irregular forms and allomorphs. An alternative to Contrast is proposed. This draws on the child's drive towards the adult system, the development of nonlinguistic concepts, the acquisition of language in context, and the use of the Cooperative Principle by participants in conversational exchanges to account for those features of language and language acquisition that Contrast was designed to explain.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Kathy Hirsh-Pasek**, Temple University, **Letitia Naigles**, Yale University, **Roberta M. Golinkoff**, University of Delaware, **Lila R. Gleitman** and **Henry Gleitman**, University of Pennsylvania

### *Syntactic Bootstrapping: Evidence from Comprehension*

Syntactic bootstrapping refers to the process by which children estimate verb meaning by attending to the syntactic (subcategorization) frames that surround the verb (Naigles, Gleitman & Gleitman, in press). Thus, within the class of motion verbs a transitive frame will often imply some causal action, "Cookie Monster blicks Big Bird," while an intransitive frame will not, "Big Bird and Cookie Monster are blicking." This study asked whether infants and toddlers could use this somewhat predictable relationship between the syntax and the semantics to assist them in verb learning. 132 subjects in three age groups (20, 24, and 29 months) participated in a language comprehension task that assessed their ability to distinguish between transitive and intransitive frames for both known (turn) and unknown (flex) verbs. The procedure used was the preferential looking paradigm (Golinkoff and Hirsh-Pasek, 1981) in which infants sat midway between two video scenes that portrayed either a causal

action (Cookie Monster turning Big Bird) or a concurrent scene (Cookie Monster and Big Bird turning together). A centrally placed linguistic stimulus played either the transitive sentence, "Find Cookie Monster turning Big Bird," or the intransitive sentence, "Find Cookie Monster and Big Bird turning." Last year, we reported that infants as young as 24 months of age would look significantly longer at the matching screen (the causal scene) when they heard the transitive audio, but would look randomly at both screens with the intransitive audio. This year we varied the intransitive audio in two ways: (1) 20 toddlers heard, "Cookie Monster is turning with Big Bird," (the WITH condition), and (2) 16 toddlers heard, "Cookie Monster and Big Bird are turning," (the AND/ARE condition). In each case the 29 month olds now showed a significant preference for the matching (concurrent) screen. These results offer strong evidence for syntactic bootstrapping and point to the fact that toddlers as young as 2 and a half years of age are using syntactic information like auxiliary agreement and prepositional marking to assist them in the bootstrapping process.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Lila R. Gleitman**, University of Pennsylvania

*More on Syntactic Constraints*

Abstract unavailable.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Michael Maratsos**, University of Minnesota

*Vote Yes on Nouns for Semantic Bootstrapping*

Semantic bootstrapping refers to the thesis that semantic properties, like concrete objecthood or agency, form an initial cue for formal categories in children's development. In this paper, it is argued for nouns that this is certainly true on three grounds: 1) the cross-linguistic pattern of form class organizations, in which the presence of a noun category is the only potentially universal property; 2) the fact that distributional property types of analyses which successfully differentiate verbs from adjectives among the predicate categories would in themselves lead to there being no noun category in

languages like English; 3) general analytical usefulness of the noun-object (or related semantic property) as an "anchor" for distributional analyses; 4) the related general conceptual stability of objects, as opposed to non-object conceptual properties. In fact, it is argued that objecthood remains a necessary internal brace for the definition of the adult noun category, a stronger property than simply serving as initial cue for a subsequent unified formal analysis. The case of nouns is contrasted to the case of verbs, for which small-scale distributional analyses are found to be crucial on various analytic and developmental grounds.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Dedre Gentner**, University of Illinois

***Cognitive and Linguistic Determinism: Object Reference and Relational Reference***

Abstract unavailable.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Steven Pinker**, Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, MIT

***The Autonomy of Lexical Semantics: Implications for Language Acquisition***

How children learn which verbs in their language take which argument structures is a difficult acquisition problem. Part of the solution is that verbs' meanings predict their argument structures. For example, verbs of "type of communicated message" can appear in the double-object form (*She told him a story/asked him a question/leaked him the news*), as can verbs of "instrument of communication" (*I'll e-mail/fax/telex you a copy*), but verbs of "manner of communication" cannot (*\*She shouted/whispered/muttered me the news*), nor can verbs of "truth value of communicated message" (*\*She said/proved/claimed/affirmed me nothing*). Syntactic differences contingent on these extremely subtle semantic differences pervade the verb lexicon and — presumably are used by learners to predict how a verb can be used. But it

appears that these aspects of meaning and the grouping of verbs into classes with similar syntactic behavior is not completely predictable on either conceptual or linguistic grounds, and they can differ from language to language. Therefore lexical semantics must be an autonomous level of linguistic representation, not reducible to conceptual categories or to syntactic subcategories, that a child must learn as part of the language. This raises some hypotheses about the interaction of syntax and semantics in language development, some of which have been confirmed in experiments, and about how children bootstrap themselves into grammar.

\* \* \* \* \*

Eve Clark, Stanford University

### *Evidence for the Notion "Source" in Language Acquisition*

When young children describe events, they do not always make use of conventional means to mark oblique arguments. In early passives, for example, they may mark oblique agents with *from* rather than conventional *by* (*I was caught from you before*). They also make use of *from* in lieu of conventional *because* (*Then I cried from a bit from you go get him*). *By* and *because* emerge only later for agents and causes. Such uses, I argue, stem from children's conceptualization of agents and causes, as well as possessors and standards of comparison, for instance, as types of SOURCE. After presenting evidence for the notion of source, I examine some of the implications of this child category for both thematic roles and the notion of a hierarchy of thematic roles.

\*\*\*\*\*

Jill de Villiers, Smith College; Tom Roeper and Anne Vainikka,  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

### *The Acquisition of Long-Distance Rules*

How does a child acquire long distance rules? Sentences like "What he went to play with" from the Adam corpus at 3 yrs. suggest that LD rules are available early. How then are constraints learned? Three questions were asked. Do children have successive cyclic movement? Do they know that one wh-word can block another? Do they know that adjuncts differ from arguments?

We tested minimal pairs like: a) How did he say he hurt himself where how can refer to either say or hurt, and b) how did he say when he hurt himself in which how can only refer to say. In one experiment with 17 children from 3.5 to 6, all allowed LD movement sometimes with cases like (a) and none allowed it with (b). This shows that a medial COMP can be a "Barrier" in the sense of Chomsky (1986).

A second round shows that *arguments* (what) can have a direct LD connection because of lexical government (they are subcategorized by the verb), while *adjuncts* (how) must have an intermediate trace. Thus LD movement is possible with (c) Who did Bert ask how to paint and not with (d) How did Bert ask who to paint, which requires that how link to ask. 25 children were tested in a story experiment in which both who and how could be answered for each verb. A pragmatic bias toward LD-movement was included for (d). Analysis of variance shows that children respect the distinction between arguments and adjuncts. They answer ask for how rather than paint, but either ask or paint for who. Nevertheless, the grammar of the younger children is not fully adult. The major error they make in interpretation lies in answering the medial wh-word, especially if the first wh-word is an adjunct the medial word is an argument. This pattern of interpretations is predictable if the younger children do not yet fully control successive-cyclic movement. Since successive cyclic movement is absent in many languages, their grammar may reflect the "unmarked" form.

\* \* \* \* \*

Helen Goodluck, University of Ottawa

### *Operator Movement, Arguments and Adjuncts in the Grammar of 4-7 Year Olds*

In adult English an object gap is permitted in purpose clauses.

1. Jim chose Bill to sing to.

In an act-out experiment with 43 4-7 year old children (with Dawne Behne) we find that such object gaps are frequently not recognized, consistent with relatively late development of operator movement in purpose clauses. The adult grammar does not permit object gaps in temporal adjuncts,

2, \*Jim hit Bill before singing to.

Children distinguish between purpose clauses and temporal adjuncts, permitting an object gap more frequently in the former clause type (our test is based on the interpretation of an optionally transitive preposition in the embedded clause).

An explanatory account of performance with temporals with respect to object gaps can be given if children know that this complement type is S-attached, contrary to some previous analyses of control constructions in children's grammars. I am currently extending this study to overt wh-movement and hope to report results from the new work.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Marie Labelle**, University of Ottawa

***Prediction, WH-Movement, and the Development of Relative Clauses***

This study describes the acquisition of relative clauses by French children (2-6) on the basis of spontaneous and elicited utterances. We show that relative clauses develop from a predication structure of the type [NP S'] (as in <<Voilà Pierre qui arrive>>), with the NP antecedent serving as subject of an S' predicate. The child later integrates the predicative S' within an NP. Concurrently, the internal structure of the relative evolves from that of a clause without an overt WH-phrase, and even sometimes without a gap, to that of a regular WH-movement construction.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Anita Moryadas**, Hampshire College

***Acquisition of Structural Constraints on Quantifiers***

There has been some study of children's understanding of quantifiers, but not of their interaction in complex sentences. The present study explored children's interpretation of quantifier interaction in complex sentences with a quantifier in each clause. Two different theories, Subjacency and the Binding theory, were tested using a set of eight sentences and a picture selection task. Twenty-nine children aged 5 years to 9 years, 5 months were tested. The data were analyzed using ANOVAs for allowance of ambiguity and preferred interpretation. Results show that variables chosen for this study do have an effect, although neither theory correctly predicted the children's performance on this task. More work is needed to determine when children's performance becomes adult.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Karin Stromswold**, M.I.T. and Harvard Medical School

*The Structure of Children's WH-Questions*

In this paper, I discuss children's acquisition of subject, object, argument, and adjunct questions and relate these acquisitional findings to current linguistic theory. Using a computer search, I culled all 16,000 *wh*-questions asked in the ChiLDES transcripts of 12 children. Using this *wh*-corpus, I determined that the children asked simple object questions before simple subject questions, and simple argument questions before simple adjunct questions. I also found that children inverted subject and auxiliary in argument questions before they began inverting in adjunct questions. I also examined long-distance subject, object, argument, and adjunct questions. I found that children acquired long-distance subject questions after they had acquired long-distance object questions.

It is possible that children master object questions before subject or adjunct questions because object traces are theta-governed whereas adjunct and subject traces are antecedent-governed.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Stephen Crain** and **Rosalind Thornton**, University of Connecticut

*Acquisition of \*that-trace Effects*

This study investigates the acquisition of long-distance Wh-questions such as those in the *\*that-trace* paradigm below:

- 1a) Who do you think Cookie Monster likes?
- b) Who do you think **that** Cookie Monster likes?
- 2a) Who do you think likes Cookie Monster?
- b) Who do you think **\*that** likes Cookie Monster?

Presumably, Universal Grammar, and not exposure to linguistic data, informs children of the ungrammaticality of 2 b), given that children do not have access to "negative data". We reexamine recalcitrant data from previous research on

\*that-trace effects, and present new findings which are in keeping with the precepts of Universal Grammar. In our study, we adopted the methodology of elicited production, evoking questions corresponding to the paradigm above from 20 children (mean age 4;3). A particularly interesting finding was that the utterances of four of the younger children, and one older child, contained a WH-word in the intermediate COMP position, as in *Who do you think who's in the can?*. This type of question, although ungrammatical in English, is an option made available by Universal Grammar, since it is observed in several languages.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Helen Smith Cairns & Dana McDaniel, Queens College**

***The Acquisition of Control Principles in the Grammars of Young Children***

Our work, as well as that of others, has described a set of stages in the child's acquisition of control in complement and adjunct structures. We will report evidence for these stages from two studies, one cross-sectional, the other longitudinal. Among our findings is that there is a previously unattested initial stage in which children lack control. We also replicated the finding that some children appear to have controlled pronouns in adjunct clauses. However, we show that this is a phenomenon related to a general co-reference requirement and is not restricted to pronouns. Further, we will suggest that all children do not progress through all the control stages. Our theory is that the child's processing strategies prior to grammatical development influence the initial shape of the grammar, subject, of course, to universal constraints.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Janet Cohen Sherman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Massachusetts General Hospital, and Barbara Lust, Cornell University**

***Children Are in Control***

In this paper we study first language acquisition of a particular type of anaphora termed "control," such as exemplified in "John tells Tom PRO to leave." We first analyze theoretically what is essential to knowledge of the particular

properties of anaphora in these structures, that is, what critically constitutes a "control domain." We then argue on the basis of experimental evidence that the first language acquisition of this type of structure is best characterized by a continuous knowledge of the basic structural principles necessary to characterizing this control domain, and not by a discontinuous, strategy-based stage-like progression, which involves a qualitative shift from non-structural to adult structure-dependent knowledge. Although there is developmental change during the acquisition process, the evidence suggests that this change lies in the lexical learning and not in structural learning. We argue that the full set of acquisition data on the field of control today can be reconciled in terms of this proposal. On the basis of our evidence, we speculate on the general role of Universal Grammar in first language acquisition of anaphora, which is reflected in these control data.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Kenneth Wexler**, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

*Aspects of the Acquisition of Control*

This paper presents some general guidelines towards a theory of the acquisition of control. In particular, the question is looked at of what children know about the structural relations between a controller and the position controlled. A central distinction is made between control into subcategorized positions and control into adjunct positions. It is predicted that subcategorized control will appear correctly before adjunct control. Comparison is made with the empirical literature on the acquisition of control.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Nina Hyams** and **Sigridur Sigurjonsdottir**, University of California at Los Angeles

*A Cross-Linguistic Comparison of the Development of Referentially Dependent Elements*

This paper reexamines Binding Theory from both a developmental and cross-linguistic perspective. The modification of the Binding Theory is brought on by the results of an experimental study on anaphor resolution by Icelandic-

speaking children, but Icelandic is a language which allows long-distance anaphora in certain contexts (Thrainsson, 1976a,b).

In our study we obtained the result that Icelandic-speaking children do not appear to adhere to the Subset Principle (Berwick, 1982; Wexler & Manzini, 1987), that is at no point do they prefer a local antecedent for the reflexive 'sig'. This is in marker contrast to the results obtained for Chinese (Chien & Wexler, 1987b) and Korean (Lee & Wexler, 1987), which both allow long-distance anaphora.

We will propose that our results do not challenge the WSubset Principle, but rather have to do with the fact that Icelandic does not have a long-distance anaphora, as the reflexive pronoun is actually a variable bound by a null operator. We will suggest that the apparent long-distance anaphora in Chinese and Korean may also be instances of operator-variable binding, and that the differences between the Icelandic children's responses and the Korean and Chinese children's responses may have to do with the different values these languages pick for the pro-drop parameter.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Celia Jakubowicz**, Laboratoire de Psychologie Experimentale, CNRS - Paris, & **Lis Olsen**, University of Copenhagen, Linguistic Department, Laboratoire de Psychologie Experimentale, Paris

### *The Acquisition of Reflexive Anaphors and Pronominals in Danish*

In this paper, we report an empirical study on reflexive anaphors and pronominals in Danish. The pronoun *ham/hende* (third person singular, masculine and feminine respectively) behaves like *him* in English: it must be locally free. With respect to anaphors, Danish (as well as the other Scandinavian languages) differs from English in that Danish has three different morphological realizations of third person reflexive: *sig*, *sig selv*, *ham/hende selv*. Further, Danish, in contrast to English, allows two of these reflexives (*sig* and *ham/hende selv*) to be bound outside of a local domain, under different conditions. However, these forms are not specified for long distance binding only; in the context of certain verb classes, they may or must be locally bound. Since the distribution of Danish anaphors and pronouns is rather complex, and in our view the Subset Condition (Wexler and Manzini, 1987)

does not hold in Danish, it is not obvious, from a learnability point of view, how children can master these facts.

The present study is concerned with the interpretation of *sig* in a context of obligatory long distance binding, locally bound *sig selv* and the pronoun *ham/hende*. The question to be answered is: how do young children establish the correct coreferential relations between each of these expressions and its antecedent?

Previous studies of English (Jakubowicz, 1984, Solan, 1985, Wexler and Chien, 1985), Dutch (Deutch, Koster and Koster, 1986), French (Jakubowicz, 1987) and Spanish (Padilla Rivera, 1985) found young children correctly interpreting sentences with local anaphors more frequently than similar sentences containing pronouns. Data from an act-out task and from an elicited production task of 80 Danish speaking children and 10 adults replicate this finding. Further results indicate that long distance binding of *sig* is mastered only at age 9. Three to eight year olds bind locally *sig* in a context where, as shown by the adult responses, only long distance binding is correct. Following Jakubowicz (1984) and Lust (1986), we conclude that locality conditions constrain children's linguistic behavior when the differentiation of lexical items is not yet established. Young children appear not to be able to distinguish *ham* from *sig selv*. Further, as suggested by the production data, children may first use *selv* as a morphological marker of locality. To explain the lag between *sig* versus *sig selv*, we turn to differences that follow from linguistic theory. First, the distribution of *sig* and *sig selv* is constrained by lexical properties of verb classes, and these classes must be established through experience. Second, syntactic evidence indicates that the two forms also differ in their argumental status: in Chomsky's 1986 Theory of X-bar, *sig* would qualify as a head and *sig selv* as a maximal projection. We explore how these differences together explain this delay, and discuss these assumptions in terms of Binding Theory and markedness considerations.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Yu-Chin Chien and Kenneth Wexler**, University of California at Irvine  
*Children's Acquisition of Binding Principles*

In this paper, we report one experimental study concerning English-speaking

children's acquisition of two important concepts, namely, the antecedent possibilities for reflexives and pronouns. A modified grammaticality judgement task was used to test children's knowledge of Chomsky's Binding Principles A and B (1981) and Montalbetti and Wexler's reinterpreted Principle B (1985) which states that only pronouns as bound variables are subject to Principle B.

The results indicated that children around age 5 and a half demonstrated their knowledge of Principle A. They knew that a reflexive must be coindexed with a local c-commanding antecedent. Children in the same age range also knew the reinterpreted Principle B. That is, the children rarely allowed a pronoun to be bound by a local quantified antecedent. In other words, for children, pronouns as bound variables must be free in their governing category. At the same time, we replicated our earlier results (Wexler and Chien, 1985, Chien and Wexler, 1987) which showed that children at this age allowed pronouns to be coreferential with a local c-commanding definite noun-phrase antecedent.

\* \* \* \* \*

V.A. Marchman, E. Bates, A. Burkardt, A. Good, The University of California, San Diego

*Functional Constraints on the Acquisition of the Passive:  
Toward a Model of the Competence to Perform*

Although passive constructions occur infrequently in the child's linguistic environment (Brown, 1973), children productively use well-formed passives in their early speech (Pinker, Lebeaux, and Frost, 1987). Furthermore, they obey the same discourse constraints that govern passive production in adults by producing passives far more often when the patient is in focus (Turner and Rommetveit, 1967; Bates, et al., in preparation). However, there are developmental restrictions on the range of conditions under which passivization can occur. For example, children are much more likely to produce a passive with prototypic transitive action verbs (Maratsos, et al., 1985; Pinker et al., 1987). In experiments designed to eliminate extrinsic factors, Crain and his colleagues have argued that such limitations reflect lexical, pragmatic and/or performance facts that obscure our view of the acquisition of syntactic rules (i.e. competence).

Our approach to the acquisition of syntax complements these by emphasizing developmental changes in the *accessibility* of the passive (and various subcomponents of the passive) across a range of discourse and event conditions. In two experiments, children ages 3 to 11 and adults described 24 events presented in an animated film. The events involved various simple 2 character activities, or complex 3 character events varied in terms of the roles played by the various characters in a two-action sequence. Subjects described the actions or events in a (1) free description, and/or (2) probed condition (i.e., characters were topicalized with the probe "tell me about the - - - - -").

First, young children do indeed appear to "have" knowledge of the passive: 60% of 3-4 year olds produced at least one passive, and 30% produced at least one full passive (i.e. a "be" passive with a by-phrase). However, the accessibility of the passive increases across development. Young children produce passives only 16% of the time compared with adults (54%) and 7 year olds (42%) in the same discourse conditions. They also seem to prefer a particular subset of the various passive forms in English (e.g., get > be, truncated > full). Second passives are generally more frequent in response to a question about the patient, as well as when describing prototypical transitive events, compared with dative and especially, locative items. Lastly, in all ages, passives were produced least often on those items in which the probed character is the patient in one action, and then switches to play an agent role (i.e., exhibits less "patience").

Other discourse effects suggest that the developmental increase in production of the most common adult-like passive form, the full "be" passive with by-phrase, is not a simple function of syntactic maturity, nor of linguistic or cognitive load. For children (but not for adults), passives produced on the complex 3-character events were particularly likely to use an "immature" verb (get), but include a by-phrase. The explanation for the effect can rest in the discourse demands posed by a complex event: children are more likely to include a by-phrase under those discourse conditions when it is *useful* to disambiguate the agent role. These results suggest that the usage of particular types of passive constructions is differentially predicted by the event type and discourse constraints demanded of the task at hand, in interaction with syntactic competence. We hope to add to the body of research of the acquisition of complex grammatical structures by outlining a model of children's developing abilities to access particular linguistic forms in the service of particular discourse functions; that is, a principled account of the relationship between linguistic

knowledge and language use.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Clifton Pye and Pedro Quixtan Poz**, The University of Kansas

*The Acquisition of Passives and Antipassives in Quiche Mayan*

In this paper, I will present spontaneous and elicited language data on passive and antipassive constructions in Quiche, a Mayan language spoken in the western highland region of Guatemala. The Quiche passive serves to focus attention on the state of the object while the antipassive focuses on the subject. Both the passive and antipassive constructions serve an important function in disambiguating grammatical relations in sentences with two third person participants.

By the age of two and a half Quiche speakers are using both constructions in their spontaneous utterances. By the age of five Quiche children correctly identified the referent of passive and antipassive constructions in both a picture-identification task and an act out task. Late acquisition of passives (and antipassives) is therefore not a developmental necessity. My discussion will focus on explanations of the children's success in acquiring the functional aspects of nonactive voices in Quiche.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Robert D. Van Valin, Jr.**, The University of California, Davis

*Functionalist Linguistic Theory and Language Acquisition*

The purpose of this paper is to argue that attention to theory and theoretical issues is essential for functionalist-oriented child language researchers and that Role and Reference Grammar [RRG](Foley and Van Valin 1984 and subsequent work), a substantive theory built on well-established semantic and pragmatic concepts, provides a theoretical framework which addresses issues of concern for such researchers.

I will discuss the acquisition of island constraints, long assumed to be the paradigm case of an unlearnable formal principle, and show how the RRG theory of these constraints (Van Valin, 1986) lays out a plausible hypothesis as

to how they are learned from evidence readily available to the learner (and in so doing provides a way of viewing the input) and how it provides an explanation for the remarkable data reported in Wilson and Peters, 1988. The result will be an account of how something allegedly unlearnable can be learned and an illustration of the kind of contribution that functionalist linguistic theory can make to acquisition studies.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Matthew Rispoli**, The University of California, Berkeley

***The Acquisition of Verb Subcategorization in a Functionalist Framework***

This paper takes a functionalist perspective on the development of verb subcategorization. The acquisition of verb subcategorization is viewed as the construction of a verb's logical structure (LS), a concept developed in the Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) framework. The LS motivates a verb's syntactic specifications through linking rules which reflect, in part, universals, and, in part, language specific generalizations. Crucial information in the input and context for the construction of an LS are cues to the meaning and use of verbs, not arrays of explicit NP arguments with syntactic encoding. Information about three semantic dimensions figure in the construction of the LS: (1) animacy of the theme or patient referent (whether implied or explicit); (2) intentionality of the theme or patient referent as expressed by morphemes that imply the intentional origin of an action; and (3) the temporal contour of an action, in particular, whether a verb entails a culmination point.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Soonja Choi**, San Diego State University

***Early Development of Epistemic Modality in Korean Children***

Korean, an SOV language, has an obligatory class of modal forms which denote degrees of certainty and/or source of information of the proposition. (e.g., "Younghi-ka Seoul-ey kat-ci. It is certain that Younghi went to Seoul.) These sentence-ending forms occur in the spoken language particularly when exchanging information in conversation.

We examine the development of sentence-ending modal forms in the early spontaneous speech of four Korean children (between 1;7 and 3;5). Six forms are identified to be productively used by all children. Furthermore, the order in which these forms are acquired is uniform among the children. The order is described in four phases which show a gradual development of the children's epistemic system. 1) Unassimilated information (expressed by the form -ta) 2) Assimilated information (-e/ya); 3) Distinction between information shared with the caregiver (-ci) and information obtained from somebody else (i.e. reported speech) (-tae); 4) Uncertainty of information (-tey) because of two conflicting pieces of evidence available to the child. These results show that Korean children start developing their epistemic system early, even before expressing deontic meaning (e.g., desire). Analysis of the caregiver's input suggests that the early acquisition of epistemic modality result from the interaction between the particular structure of language and the child's cognitive development.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Bernard Kaplan, Nancy Budwig, and Michael Bamberg, Clark University**

### ***Have We Lost the Notion of Development in Studying Child Language?***

Examining language acquisition from a functional perspective has highlighted the extent to which children's use of particular linguistic devices differs from adult speakers of a given language. Much of this research though has not been explicitly developmental in nature--we know very little about how children's early linguistic systems evolve into ones that match adult usage. Changes in children's linguistic systems can only be understood in light of a developmental theory. In our presentation we will draw upon the developmental framework outlined by Werner and Kaplan (1963). After reviewing core aspects of the general theory, we will discuss Werner and Kaplan's claims of functional shifts taking place from concrete human action models to syntactic relations of a more abstract sort. We will illustrate how this approach can be applied to current empirical research. In concluding, revisions of Werner and Kaplan's theory will be suggested.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Robin Clark**, Department of Philosophy, Carnegie Mellon University

*The Problem of Causality in Models of Language Learnability*

The "parameter-setting" model of language acquisition has great intuitive appeal since it limits the set of hypotheses entertained by the learner to a finite number. I will argue that learnability does not follow as a matter of course in these models unless some account is given of the causal connection between the input data and parameter-setting. Models of causality in systems where the knowledge state changes over time (as in language acquisition) can be extremely expensive computationally; indeed, I will give some linguistic evidence that indicates the difficulties faced by the learner in connecting input data with the parameters. Finally, I will provide a learning model, based on the maturation hypothesis, that circumvents much of the potential cost of the parameter-setting framework.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Jurgen Weissenborn**, Max-Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics

*Null Subjects in Early Grammars: Implications for Parameter Setting Theories*

Recent GB acquisition proposals relate the absence of subjects across languages to versions of the Pro-Drop Parameter. The present study shows some difficulties with this approach, and suggests some modifications.

One problem is that the theory underlying Hyams' (1987) analysis incorrectly predicts that German verb-second constructions should allow no thematic null subjects. Secondly, she accounts for optionally missing expletives, but her account is not extended to obligatorily null expletives, which also occur. Third, accounts of Hyams and others of the Null Subject phenomenon, which relate the resetting of the parameter to the child's mastery of verbal inflection, incorrectly predict that at no stage should inflection be mastered but subjects still be absent. Data from French (Weissenborn, 1987) disconfirm this.

We consider several possible revisions: 1) the null subject may be identified by several elements in the same language; 2) adult and child licensing principles differ; 3) parameter setting is not "instantaneous"; 4) knowledge of inflection

must be combined with knowledge of other principles, which may differ from language to language.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Eithne Guilfoyle and Maire Noonan**, McGill University  
*Functional Categories and Language Acquisition*

In this paper we propose a theory of language acquisition whereby structures emerge at different maturational stages, but the principles of UG remain constant during all stages of language acquisition. This proposal avoids the problems of both the Continuity and the Maturational stages, and yet can explain a wide range of data.

Following Abney (1986), Fukui and Speas (1986), la Montagne and Travis (1987), we assume a distinction between lexical and functional categories. Lexical categories are those with intrinsic semantic content (NP, PP, AP, and VP) while functional categories have little semantic content (IP, CP, and DP, KP). We also assume that in child and adult grammars the subject is base-generated within the VP and is raised to SPEC of I at S-Structure (Koopman and Sportiche, 1985), (Fukui and Speas, 1986). It follows that a child grammar without functional categories will differ from the adult grammar with functional categories in predictable ways.

We claim that lexical categories emerge before functional categories, thus functional categories are not present in the early stages of language acquisition. We predict therefore, that auxiliaries, tense-marking, determiners and (certain) prepositions do not appear in early child grammars. In the adult grammar these elements appear in the head of a functional category, and hence are unavailable in early grammars. This proposal also predicts that early child grammars lack movement as there is not landing site for the moved element. As a result, early child grammars of English lack sub-aux inversion, and early child grammars of German lack V-movement (word order is always SOV in the early stages). NP-movement is impossible in early child grammars as there is no SPEC of I, which is the only possible landing site for a moved NP (the only no-theta marked NP position), hence there are no syntactic passives or raising in early grammars.

Since we propose that children acquire lexical categories before functional categories, a maturational view of language acquisition is implied only in the

sense that we allow for structure to be acquired in a fixed order. However, we assume that principles and constraints on structural representation will fall out once the relevant structures emerge. In other words, we maintain the strong hypothesis that children's grammars do **not** violate UG at any point. The only concession made is that structure emerges in the proposed order, and the principles of UG which apply to functional projections hold vacuously in the early stages.

The proposal being made here is more restrictive than the Maturational Hypothesis of Borer and Wexler (1986), as we claim that only structures but not principles may mature. Unlike their proposal, our analysis does not permit the generation of 'wild grammars' at any stage. However, as we predict that structures emerge in a fixed order, our proposal avoids the 'trigger' problem faced by the Continuity hypothesis where all changes in the grammar must be traced to some external trigger in the language being learned.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Rick Kazman**, Carnegie Mellon University

### *Null Arguments and the Acquisition of Case and Infl*

When examining the spontaneous productions of children in the null subject stage several striking phenomena may be observed. Children at this stage seem to not have the ability to assign abstract Case, often omitting the prepositions "of" and "for" and the genitive marker "-s", and they have not deduced Infl as a distinct X' node.

However, at the stage when subjects become obligatory, many phenomena, such as overt Case-marking (as evidenced in genitives, partitives, pronoun categories, etc.), use of copulas, use of auxiliaries and infinitive-marking "to" appear to approach adult competence. It is possible to simple account for this array of facts, by hypothesizing two changes which occur in the child's grammar at this time: Infl develops as a distinct X' node, and the ability to Case-mark matures. Furthermore, it is the development of Infl which allows for the reanalysis of the Morphological Uniformity parameter (MUP), causing verb arguments to become obligatory. The interaction of the development of Case-marking and Infl results in the ability to analyze copula constructions. Thus, these two parametric changes in the child's grammar account for a large, seeming unrelated set of phenomena.

## *LITERACY ABSTRACTS*

Susan L. Lytle and Marilyn Cochran-Smith, University of Pennsylvania

### *Learning from Teacher Research: Analysis of Texts and Contexts*

Over the last fifteen years there have been intensive efforts to extend the research base of knowledge about teaching. Neither interpretive nor process-product research on teaching, however, has foregrounded the teacher's role in generating knowledge. What is missing are the voices of teachers themselves, the questions teachers ask, the ways teachers use writing in their work lives, and the interpretive frames teachers use to understand and improve their own classroom practice. In this paper we argue that both the university community and the community of school-based teachers ought to acknowledge as "research" a wide range of teachers' writing about their work. We analyze teachers' writing by genre, context, function, audience and theoretical frames using the term, "teacher research," to include a wide range of teacher discourse, including journals, retrospective accounts, classroom studies, and essays on theory and practice. In this session participants will have the opportunity to explore the assumptions and implications of this perspective for university research and school practice.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Margery Stamen Miller and Karen Kuelthau Allan, Lesley College  
Graduate School**

***Teaching-Researching Communities: Their Impact on Literacy Learning***

Too often in traditional educational research, the university professor assumes the role of researcher, the classroom teacher is assigned the role of implementer, and the students adopt the role of receptive learners. This discrete demarcation of roles has fostered a separation of theory and practice. On one hand, educational researchers take their questions from one another rather than from the classrooms they are trying to improve and on the other, teachers can not or do not translate research findings into instructional changes for their own classrooms.

In contrast, communities which are forming the quiet revolution in education (Britton, 1987) are ones in which teaching, researching, and learning intersect rather than remain separate. We will focus on educational collaboration which brings together teaching researchers from the college, researching teachers from classrooms, and actively learning students. Because each group of participants contributes a different perspective in this intersection of researching, teaching, and learning, their collaboration, as a whole, is enriched and extended.

From our study of this collaboration we have observed two trends which have particular import for college-based and school-based classrooms. First, the classroom practitioners', as well as the college professors', teaching has broadened to become a process of reflective action. Secondly, both groups of teachers have found that their own literacy is enhanced as they design literacy environments and document the literacy endeavors of their students.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Vivian Zamel, Roberta Adams, Joan Frutkoff and Lisa Santagate  
University of Massachusetts, Boston**

***The Writing Teacher as Researcher: What We Can See For Ourselves***

Given the impact that the teacher-as-researcher movement has had on the

teaching of writing, I encourage and invite teachers enrolled in my graduate course on ESL writing to investigate and explore their own teaching contexts as a course project. At the same time, I collect data about these teachers' previous learning experiences, their attitudes toward writing, and their evolving thoughts about the nature of writing.

This presentation will describe both what I have discovered about these teachers as writers and what they in turn have found as they examined their own teaching and inquired into the behavior and growth of their ESL/bilingual students as writers. Their findings and my own underline the importance of raising questions about and researching one's classroom and one's students, for as teachers become teacher-researchers, they gain insights into the processes of teaching and writing and come to view the two as analogous.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Elinor Ochs, Ruth Smith and Carolyn Taylor**, University of Southern California

***Putting Problems on the Table: Dinner and Literacy***

This paper examines dinner conversations of white, English-speaking American families varying in socio-economic status. It documents how family members solve problems at dinner through narrative activities. Narratives family members construct include past time narratives such as stories and reports and future narratives such as plans and agendas. In our framework, stories and plans are goal-driven and entail problem-solving, whereas reports and agendas do not.

Families that utilize dinnertime for storytelling and planning socialize children into problem-solving and communication skills associated with literacy activities privileged in school and other institutions. Family members co-construct stories and plans, eliciting and providing settings, actions, and reactions. In some cases, they redefine the problems and/or goals of an initial teller's story or plan. These co-authored narratives not only socialize children into preferred strategies for solving problems but also provide conceptual and communicative tools for weighing alternative definitions of problems and goals.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Catherine E. Snow** and **Patton O. Tabors**, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University

*Development of Decontextualized Language Skills in Low Income Preschool Children*

Research on language acquisition and on social facilitation of language has concentrated on the development of sentence level skills as measured by changes in length, complexity and completeness of single utterances. But children also need to develop text level language skills like narration, description, explanation, and argumentation, i.e. decontextualized language skills.

Control of these text level skills shows more individual variability across children, and across ethnic and social class as well, than does control of sentence level skills. Nevertheless, there is very little evidence available about the social interactive experiences that contribute to the development of text level skills; and what evidence there is does not extend to the earliest age groups when these skills are first being developed. We will outline a longitudinal study which is being undertaken to examine the social prerequisites to the development of decontextualized language skills in low income preschool aged children from white and Black families. The discussion will focus on the theoretical and methodological bases for the study, the data collection process, and preliminary findings.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Sarah Michaels**, Educational Development Center, and **Bertram Bruce**, BB&N Laboratories

*Different Ways of Talking, Doing, and Learning Science - In That Order: A Preliminary Exploration*

This paper reports on preliminary findings from a case study of science learning in a fourth grade, multi-ethnic classroom, focussing on a social studies/science unit on seasonal change. Through an analysis of children's discourse, the school text, and classroom activities, we studied the multiple layers of assumptions and meanings that students, the teacher, and school textbook bring together, and how children differentially acquire the discourse of science.

The primary data consist of individual, open-ended interviews in which children were asked about their understanding of seasonal change and the source of that understanding. On the basis of the interviews, it became clear that NONE of the children understood what causes the seasons to change (nor do many adults who were taught in similar ways). More interestingly, it became apparent that students from different backgrounds had different facts and different ways of integrating facts into causal explanations.

We will present a preliminary analysis of the audio and videotaped interview protocols, looking at how the students' language reveals different assumptions about the priorities and relevance of various sources of knowledge -- from the textbook, school activities, family, or other out-of-school activities. We will also discuss the ways that the adult interviewers' expectations and assumptions about science and scientific reasoning influenced the student's discourse in the interview.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Deborah L. Thompson, Tennessee State University**

*Accessing Literacy in Two Inner City Classrooms*

Upon entering school, children from different backgrounds and varying preparations begin a trek towards becoming literate, with their peers and teachers serving as guides during this journey. These "journeys" are comprised of a variety of events each demanding different interactional rules and competencies. This paper explores some of the strategies children in two inner city classrooms with contrasting instructional orientations (whole language and traditional/skills) employ in their attempts to access literacy. The focus of the investigation is on the social interactions of specific literacy events (e.g., rugtime, reading group, partner reading/writing) in which children engage as they go through the school year learning to read and write,

\* \* \* \* \*

Gen Ling Chang, Mei Lian Lam and Gordon Wells, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

*Children's Acquisition of Oral and Written Literacy Through Collaborative Learning*

The researchers in this study share the view that literacy exists among individuals in any social unit of organization, connecting them to a range of experiences, and yet to different consequences of meaningfulness and use. Just like adults, children's literacy development is mediated as much by the nature of their skills at any one point in time as by their orientations towards literacy gained from socialization processes at home and in school. We report an ethnographic study of the effects of collaborative group-writing among fourth graders in two classrooms. Different types of literacy competencies and orientations displayed in the children's collaborative exchanges are contrasted. They provide examples of children's patterned assumptions about literacy, and how the formats of participation in literacy events have varying consequences for different children. These findings are tied to pedagogical implications.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dennis Sayers , New England Multifunctional Resource Center ,  
University of Hartford

*'De Orilla a Orilla ' (From Shore to Shore): Bilingual Literacy & International Computer Writing Networks*

De Orilla a Orilla (From Shore to Shore ) is an international computer network that since 1985 has linked young writers in US bilingual, ESL and foreign language programs (French and Spanish ) with their counterparts in Argentina, Canada, Mexico and Puerto Rico. This presentation examines the historical roots and present status of long-distance exchanges between "sister classes" as one vehicle for promoting critical thinking and bilingual literacy.

Three recent studies of sister class exchanges between teachers in New Haven, Connecticut, San Diego, California and Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico have focused on a particular activity structure as a context for literacy development: the role of student-directed Editorial Boards in the production of a jointly published

newsletter. These case studies illustrate how computer writing networks can offer teachers and researchers a literacy laboratory where their traditional roles become fused. Both investigators and educators can build theories, test hypotheses and refine pedagogy around many issues of interest for contemporary research: the interaction of speaking and writing in two languages; the impact of audience awareness on text; and the simultaneous development of mother-tongue and second-language literacy skills through networking.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Catherine E. Walsh**, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

***Towards Speaking One's Voice and Reading One's Reality: A Critical Literacy Project with At Risk Latino Secondary Students***

This paper is grounded in the belief that institutional, curricular, linguistic, and pedagogical practices in schools promote the high dropout rate and disproportionate "at risk" categorization of Latinos. Negated are students' culture and lived experiences; silenced are their voices.

The focus of this paper is on restoring students' voices and rooting the curriculum in the realities of students' lives. Described is a critical literacy project undertaken with at risk Latino secondary students in an urban school district. Through the use of social drama, video, photography, peer interviews and discussion, and student-created text, the participants interrogated their own educational experience and that of their Latino peers as well as the numerous educational, sociolinguistic, and cultural arrangements which promoted and maintained their "at risk" status. The paper discusses the literacy-based strategies which enabled students to begin to more critically view their world and provides actual examples of student-created written and visual text.

\* \* \* \* \*

David Olson, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

*Children's Understanding of Texts and Interpretations*

I shall consider children's understanding of what is "given" in a text, and their understanding of the possibilities of ambiguity, interpretation and misinterpretation. The critical achievement appears to be children's grasping of the notion of the "autonomy of text", the recognition that a text may have a meaning distinguishable from that intended by the speaker or that constructed by the listener.

\* \* \* \* \*

Suzanne de Castell, Simon Fraser University, British Columbia

*Teaching the Textbook*

Much of what has been written and said about reader/writer/text relations, it will be suggested, particularly that work emerging from the field of literary criticism, may fail to apply very well to the special case of relations among reader, writer, and textbook. For the many kinds of texts available to the modern reader, the school textbook occupies a unique and significant social role: to represent to each generation of students a sanctioned version of human knowledge and culture. In addition to its ascribed epistemological authority, moreover, the text book bears substantial institutional authority. Because textbooks constitute the primary locus of instructional interaction between teachers and students, they are routinely deployed as devices for the management of power relations in the classroom. Textbooks are compulsory reading, and textbook interpretation is invariably mediated by the teacher. Tests of textbook knowledge provide the principal basis for accountability between schools and state education authorities. And teacher-mediation itself may be prescribed by textbooks whose mass-marketing strategy, increasingly, is the "teacher-proofing" of text-based instruction. What possibilities, then, exist for students to take up any authentic relationship with their textbooks? Thus constrained within a nexus of institutional and corporate controls, the school textbook may often appear to be more of an obstacle to the educational enterprise than a vehicle for its achievement.

This paper discusses differences between forms of personal identity and

"interpretive community" which may be constituted by literary texts and fact-stating textbooks respectively. School textbooks will be treated as a unique form of document (from the latin, *docere*: to teach) which, in Smith's (1978) analysis, encode the peculiar literate social practice of constructing unified textual "fact" out of diversified lived actuality. The categorical and conceptual procedures of "fact-stating" textbooks, it will be argued, constitute an interpretive schema which not only confers objectivity to the subject matter studied, but- reciprocally- constitutes student-readers as an interpretive community of a very different and possibly complementary kind to that constituted in transaction with the literary text.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Kimberly Kinsler, Hunter College**

***Using a Cognitive Apprenticeship Model in the Remediation of College Students***

The research reported here was an exploratory study in fostering metacognitive reasoning and behavior in college students in need of writing remediation, using a cognitive apprenticeship model. Subjects were 34 undergraduates enrolled in one of two sections of a developmental writing course at a 4-year college in New York City. For both the control and experimental conditions, instruction was identical, except for the revision phase. With the control condition, students submitted their essay drafts to the instructor, who in turn wrote corrections and comments directly on their texts. For the experimental condition, students revised their essays in small, guided peer-revision groups, in which each student assumed one of four possible roles: writer/reader, organization, unity, and support. From the perspective of their guided listener roles, students critiqued the writer/reader's essays.

Students in both groups then used the respective feedback to rewrite their final texts. No significant difference was found between the control and experimental groups in their pass/fail rate on the exit essay examination. A post hoc microanalysis indicated significant differences between the groups in the organization, unity and support of their essays. However, no differences were found between the groups in their use of language and grammar, which were found to be the only subvariables to correlate with students' pass/fail rates.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Judy Diamondstone and Nanzetta Merriman, Harvard School of Education**

***"I Don't Want to Look Like That Man, I Don't Want to Talk Like That Man, I Don't Want to Act Like That Man": Voice and Identity in Academic Discourse***

This collaborative study examines the development of a Black Harvard M.A. student's academic discourse in the context of dialogs with a White colleague over course papers. A dramatic re-enactment of actual dialogs will serve as the basis for discussion of differences in black and white styles, and the kind of interaction required to bridge those differences. We ask, what is required, pedagogically, for inner city students to gain control of academic discourse in a way that will amplify their own identity and purposes? Both authors provide interpretations of the work.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Kurt W. Fischer, Harvard Graduate School of Education**

***The Effects of Context on Competence and the Role of Literate Practices in Cognitive Development***

Contrary to common belief, a competence is characteristic not of a person but of a person-in-a-context. One piece of evidence for this proposition is the finding that environmental support powerfully affects the individual's level of competence within a domain. For example, the developmental level of understanding social interactions is high when assessment conditions provide support for understanding. But as soon as the support is removed, the individual's competence immediately drops to a lower, stable level. This effect is strong in childhood, but it seems to become progressively more powerful in adolescence and adulthood.

An important effect of literate practices is to provide techniques for environmental support of high-level understanding and to allow the person to control the use of those techniques. For arithmetical or epistemological concepts, for example, people can use text or diagrams to support their own understanding and thus raise their own effective competence. Assessments of

the cognitive effects of literate practices that prevent people from using their literacy tools cannot detect this real effect of literate practices on competence.

\* \* \* \* \*

**J. L. Lemke**, City University of New York, Brooklyn College School of Education

*Literacy, Language Conflict, and Social Change*

Can we realistically expect that "good" Standardized English will ever be spoken or written by the vast majority of Americans? The naively optimistic belief that education can make this happen ignores too much of what we know about the relations of language to culture and social values, the role of language in the construction of personal identity and social relationships, language and social conflict, mechanisms of social domination, and the forces that lead to language change and social change.

Insistence on Standardized English as the only legitimate medium for school literacy depends on beliefs about the need for language standardization in society which are more ideological than scientific. The alternative is a policy encouraging a Diversified English, which would recognize the value of cultural diversity and the reality of social conflict among speech communities. It is Diversified English, and not the standardized dialect of any single social group, that is likely to become the first world language.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION / BILINGUALISM ABSTRACTS**

**Kenji Hakuta**, University of California at Santa Cruz

### ***Translation Ability in Bilingual Children***

Several studies of translation ability in Spanish-English bilingual children are reported. One study was conducted to assess skills in Puerto Rican children who had experience translating for family members. Subjects were assessed in their proficiency in the two languages. Translation tasks involved isolated words, sentences in isolation, sentences in the context of a short story, and whole stories. Results indicated that the subjects are very good translators. They made infrequent errors of language confusion and made few errors of literal translation. Analysis of individual difference showed Spanish proficiency to predict translation from English to Spanish and English proficiency from Spanish to English. Evidence was also found to suggest the existence of a "translation proficiency" that is independent of the proficiency in the two languages. A second study assessed the extent to which translation ability is wide-spread in a less selected population. The results indicated that most bilingual students are good translators. A third study addressed experimentally the role of meaning processing in errors of literal translation.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Shana Poplack**, University of Ottawa

### ***Language Contact and Linguistic Variation***

The mixing of two languages in bilingual discourse may be the result of a number of (incommensurable) processes. Because all result in sentences containing elements of two languages, they are often confounded, with the result that data generated by one are used as evidence about another, making the establishment of conditions on their occurrence difficult if not impossible. Based on natural speech data from typologically different and similar language pairs, a variationist analysis of language contact phenomena reveals four

mechanisms for incorporating other language material into L<sub>1</sub> discourse, each of which is shown to be governed by different constraints, and to predominate in at least one well-documented bilingual community.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Fred Genesee**, McGill University

*Early Bilingual Development: One Language or Two*

It is commonly thought that children learning two languages simultaneously during infancy go through a stage when they cannot differentiate their two languages. Virtually all studies of infant bilingual development have found that bilingual children mix elements from their two languages. These results have been interpreted as evidence for a unitary, undifferentiated language system (the unitary language system hypothesis). The empirical basis for these claims is re-examined and it is argued that, contrary to most extant interpretations, bilingual children may develop differentiated language systems from the beginning and they may be able to use their developing languages in contextually sensitive ways. A call for more serious attention to be possible role of parental input in the form of mixed utterances is made.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Loraine K. Obler, Ph.D.**, CUNY Graduate School, Program in Speech and Hearing Sciences

*Talent in Second Language Acquisition*

Defining talent and lack of it in second language acquisition/learning involves considering pace of acquisition as well as success in various linguistic realms from the phonological through morphological and syntactic to pragmatic. Comprehension as well as production variables must be taken into account.

Explanations for talent in second-language acquisition/learning have traditionally focussed on motivation and attitude. When a neurolinguistic approach is taken instead, a test battery evaluating cognitive skills that may be associated with or dissociated from the talent is administered. Results suggest, for example, that high intelligence is not crucial for exceptionally good L<sub>2</sub> acquisition/learning, nor does it preclude exceptionally poor L<sub>2</sub>

acquisition/learning. Better than average verbal but not non-verbal memory have been reported for exceptional L2 learner-acquirers, while better than average visuo-spatial abilities have been reported for untalented L2 learners-acquirers.

Such findings lead to a neurocognitive understanding of skill isolability in L2 aptitude, and suggest a link to the Geschwind-Galaburda explanation of specific talents or disabilities on the basis of unusual cellular organization in the brain.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Wolfgang Klein and Clive Perdue**, Max-Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen

### *Development of Utterance Structure*

This study set out to investigate word order constraints in utterances of second language narrative discourse, and why these constraints change during the acquisition process. The results are based on twenty, longitudinally observed adult learners of Dutch, French, English and German. The main elicitation technique was a film retelling, repeated three times for each informant at approximately ten month intervals. Two other task types were selectively examined.

It was found that learners develop in specifiable ways towards a "basic variety", where a coalition of three constraints governs the relative ordering of the major constituents of the utterance: this "basic variety" allows learners minimally to (re)tell a story, and is largely invariant over the source- and target- language pairings analysed. Further development can be largely interpreted as learners' attempting to express meanings where the basic constraints do not coalesce, and is more dependent on source- and target-language characteristics.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Rainer Dietrich**, University of Heidelberg

***The European Science Foundation Project on "SLA of Adult Immigrants": The Temporality Study***

The paper contributes to a larger presentation of the ESF-Project as a whole. It will focus on (1) the aims, (2) the data, (3) the theoretical frame and the methods of the analysis and (4) on the results of the substudy of temporality. Emphasis will be laid on the results. Integrating findings from six coordinated local projects in five European countries, the paper tries to display a general picture of the adult learner's acquisition of the system of temporality in a second language. The presentation will be structured along the following questions:

- How do adult learners organize their L2-system in the domain of temporal reference in the early stages of acquisition?
- Which are the linguistic means used to express temporal concepts in early L2 of adult learners?
- Which developmental processes can be observed both on the level of temporal concepts and of the linguistic expressions?

Furthermore, results of crosslinguistic comparisons and some hypotheses on causal factors for individual variation will be reported and discussed.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Tom Huebner**, Stanford University

***Establishing Point of View in a Second Language***

Recent literature in linguistics has focused on the relationship between cognitive and perceptual structures and the encoding of these structures in natural languages. The current paper assumes this perspective in examining longitudinal case study data from the European Science Foundation Project on adult second language acquisition. The area of particular concern is what has variously been called speaker orientation, empathy perspective or viewpoint.

Over a period of eighteen months, R, an untutored native Punjabi-speaking learner of English, develops a system for encoding viewpoint which, though internally consistent, reflects structures in neither his first nor the target language. Special attention is paid to his evolving systems of quoted speech, reference, and dative constructions. It is suggested that this system reflects transfer at the functional level. It is further argued that cognitive organization as reflected in viewpoint marking affects the ways in which target language forms are taken into the learner variety. Specific reference is made to the incorporation of present participle forms.

The findings have significance for notions of simplified register, misunderstanding in cross-cultural contexts, and for approaches to the grammaticization of language.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Margaret H. Simonot**, Ealing College of Higher Education

### *Procedures Used to Achieve Understanding in L2*

The data on which this paper is based are taken from near-authentic interactions between native and non-native speakers of those European language involved in the ESF project, i.e. Dutch, English, French, German, and Swedish.

The paper examines the ways in which adult learners of a second language achieve understanding from an interactional point of view. In other words, it examines the process of understanding as one of trying to make sense of what is being said while simultaneously trying to make one's own meaning.

In particular, the paper will concentrate on two issues: firstly, it deals with the identification of causes of non-understanding. In doing this, it identifies the contextual variables involved and evaluates the way in which they interrelate. Secondly, it explores the ways in which resolution of difficulties with understanding can take place through cooperation between interactants.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Peter Jordens**, The Free University of Amsterdam

*The Acquisition of Word Order in L2 Dutch and German*

In this paper I will evaluate the research that has been carried out on the acquisition of word order properties in L2 Dutch and German by native speakers of Romance languages, by native speakers of Moroccan and Turkish, and by native speakers of English.

Dutch and German are both languages with underlying SOV and Verb Second. Depending on whether underlying word order is SOV (as in Turkish) or SVO (as in Romance languages, Moroccan, and English), acquisitional problems are different. However, it can be shown that for both types of L2 learners there is one particular order of development which can be explained within a restructuring model. Within this account L2 learners have to find out that Dutch and German have underlying SOV before they are able to acquire Verb Second. It will be shown that the acquisition of underlying SOV is possible after finite and non-finite verb categories are discriminated both in terms of morphological and positional differences. Verb Second is acquired as soon as COMP<sup>r</sup> is going to become identified as relevant for the positioning of INFL.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Helmut Zobl**, Carleton University

*The Uneven Growth of Metalinguistic Knowledge*

A task eliciting grammaticality judgements and corrections from adult learners of English revealed a dichotomy in metalinguistic growth. On some grammatical properties informants display a steady growth curve in their ability to detect and correct grammatical violations. This type of development is noticeable with constructions which modular linguistic theory would identify as domain-specific. A different, flat pattern is observed with linguistic elements whose mental representations presumably involve several knowledge sources, e.g., tense and lexical items.

This uneven growth has implications for proposals concerning modular

functioning in adult acquisition. The flat pattern lends partial support to the Competition Model (Felix 1985), according to which representations from an all-purpose cognitive system compete with the language faculty. But the incremental growth pattern suggests that this model overestimates the penetrability of the domain-specific module. Additional supporting evidence for the autonomous functioning of the domain-specific system is adduced from a variety of sources.

\* \* \* \* \*

**William Rutherford**, University of Southern California

### *The Question of Preemption in SLA*

A need to solve the no-negative-evidence problem in primary language (PL) development has given rise to theories of learnability such as the Subset Principle, the Uniqueness Hypothesis, the Competition Model, and others. Some of these theories have recently been examined for possible solutions to the similar no-negative-evidence problem in non-primary language (NPL) acquisition as well. Notwithstanding the well-documented similarities between the two, acquisition of NPLs is strikingly different from that of PLs in a number of important ways (e.g. "partial outcome," influence of extra knowledge sources, varying intuitions, etc.). Such differences have yet to be satisfactorily accounted for by recourse to any of the current theories; NPL acquisition cannot, for example, be called PL acquisition minus operation of the Subset Principle. This paper will discuss the issue with regard to those theories of learnability that are preemption-based and will suggest the kinds of problems that SLA poses for learnability theories in general.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Jacquelyn Schachter**, University of Southern California

***On the Issue of Completeness in Adult Second Language Acquisition***

I examine evidence for presence of one principle of UG, Subjacency, in the adult-acquired grammars of proficient nonnative speakers of English: 1) Koreans, whose native language shows no Subjacency effects; 2) Chinese and Indonesians, whose native language show fewer Subjacency effects than English; 3) Dutch, whose native language shows Subjacency effects similar to those of English. If these subjects show the same Subjacency effects in English as native speakers, then UG must still be available for adult language learning and completeness in second language grammars is possible; if not, then UG must not be available and completeness cannot be possible.

Grammaticality judgement tests were given on a set of sentences containing a variety of structures (islands) and Subjacency violations involving them. Analysis shows that though all groups correctly judged grammatical sentences (containing islands), only the Dutch correctly judged ungrammatical sentences (containing Subjacency violations); the Koreans performed randomly. The results support the conclusion that completeness is not possible in adult-acquired grammars since adults no longer have access to UG.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Suzanne Flynn**, MIT and **Olga Brown**, Boston University

***Three Types of Adult Second Language Learning***

Emerging theories about the adult second language acquisition process can be characterized in terms of two general approaches: those that are strongly biologically based and those that are not. Biologically driven approaches focus on isolating a common set of deductive learning principles available in both the first and second language acquisition processes. Non-biologically derived theories focus on isolating sets of inductive learning principles that are not necessarily shared by both first and second language learners. Each of these approaches reflects a distinct conception of the nature of the language learning process as well as a distinct perspective on what constitutes the critical language phenomena to be investigated. Exclusively maintaining either one of these

orientations results in a partial perspective on the adult second language acquisition process.

A more refined and differentiated picture of this language learning task can be derived by looking for evidence of different types of learning within a specific structure. We demonstrate this by investigating the acquisition of four different types of restrictive relative clauses in English (sents. 1-4) in an elicited production task by three groups of adults learning English as a second language (Chinese, Japanese and Spanish).

Subject/Subject:

1. The student who called the gentleman answered the policeman.

Subject/Subject:

2. The policeman who the student called greeted the businessman.

Object/Object:

3. The boss introduced the gentleman who questioned the lawyer.

Object/Object:

4. The diplomat questioned the gentleman who the student called.

Results of this investigation demonstrate that at least three different types of learning are involved in the acquisition of these and related structures:

1. Learning that involves parameters.
2. Learning that involves core non-parametric properties.
3. Learning that involves neither parametrically controlled nor core properties of the language.

Each of these learning processes results in a distinct, tractable pattern of acquisition. In the first case, "learning" only takes place in the case in which the first and second language differ in parametric values. In the second case, adult patterns replicate those for children learning the target language as their first language, regardless of the match/mismatch between the first and second language. In the last case, learning follows from a set of inductive principles and adult learning patterns only coincidentally match those of children learning a first language.

We will discuss the possible relationships among these varieties of learning and demonstrate how these different learning patterns are consistent with a general

parameter-setting model of Universal Grammar for second language acquisition.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Lydia White**, McGill University

***Linguistic Universals, Markedness and Learnability: Reconciling Different Approaches.***

There are currently two different approaches to universals in second language acquisition, one stemming from the typological universals of people like Greenberg (1965) and the other from Chomskyan Universal Grammar. These two approaches often identify very different properties of language as universal. Associated with each approach is a concept of markedness. Typologists define markedness implicational: given a universal of the form "If P then Q", P is marked (Hawkins 1987). Current theories of language learnability define markedness in terms of the subset principle (Berwick 1985; Wexler and Manzini 1987). Given two grammars in a subset/superset relation, the superset grammar is marked. Although coming from very different perspectives, these two definitions of markedness appear to coincide in what they would identify as marked, in principle at least, and they overlap in the predictions they make for L1 acquisition. Similarities and differences between the predictions of these two definitions of markedness for L2 acquisition will be discussed.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Craig Chaudron** and **Kate Parker**, Center for Second Language Classroom Research, University of Hawaii at Manoa

***Discourse Markedness and Structural Markedness: The Acquisition of English Noun Phrases***

This study investigates second language acquisition of English noun phrases in discourse, examining the effect of discourse markedness and structural markedness on the development of noun phrase use.

English L2 noun phrase forms are examined within three universal discourse contexts: current, known, and new reference to topics. The target noun phrase forms include  $\emptyset$  anaphora, pronouns, and nouns with markers of definiteness

and indefiniteness, including left-dislocation and existential phrases. Based on expectedness within discourse, the least marked discourse context is reference to a current topic, and the most marked context is the introduction of a new referent as topic. Based on formal complexity,  $\emptyset$  anaphora is the least marked structural form, and left-dislocated and existential noun phrase are the most marked.

Free production and elicited imitation recall tasks, involving picture sequences which manipulated the three discourse contexts, tested Japanese learners' acquisition of noun phrase forms. They were evaluated by comparison with NS production. The results support predictions that L2 learners distinguish between discourse contexts, acquiring more target-like forms in the least marked context first, and that they acquire the least marked structural forms earlier than the more marked ones.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Fred R. Eckman**, University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee

*The Structural Conformity Hypothesis and Consonant Clusters in the Interlanguages of ESL Learners*

This paper reports on the results of a cross-sectional and longitudinal study aimed at testing the following hypothesis:

Structural Conformity Hypothesis:

Interlanguages will conform to the same typological markedness constraints that primary languages obey.

Specifically, this study tested the above hypotheses with respect to several universal generalizations about initial and final consonant clusters (Greenberg 1966) by collecting relevant data from the interlanguage of several ESL learners whose native language does not have initial and final consonant clusters. It was found that the universal generalizations tested were for the most part upheld by the subjects' interlanguages, supporting the Structural Conformity Hypothesis. Since this Hypothesis is more general than, and therefore more easily falsifiable than competing hypotheses, which focus on learner errors, (e.g. the Markedness Differential Hypothesis), it follows that the SCH should be adopted in favor of these other hypotheses.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Margaret Thomas**, Department of Linguistics Harvard University

***The interpretation of English reflexive pronouns by non-native speakers***

Ninety-six intermediate-level L2 learners of English of various language backgrounds responded to a 30-item multiple-choice questionnaire requiring them to identify the antecedent of a reflexive pronoun. There are two types of sentences. In the first, the reflexive is a direct object in an embedded finite clause; the potential antecedents are the clausemate and matrix subjects. The second type of sentence is mono-clausal; the reflexive is the object of a preposition and the potential antecedents are its clausemate direct object and subject.

The L2 learners differ from a native-speaker control group in that they do not require that a reflexive take a clausemate antecedent, but both groups share a preference for subject over non-subject antecedents. These results can not be accounted for by transfer of L1 grammar into L2, since both L1=Spanish and L2=Chinese subgroups respond similarly although their native-language grammars treat reflexives differently. Nor are the subjects recapitulating the course of L1 acquisition since there is evidence that very young children identify reflexives with clausemate antecedents, but do not prefer subject over non-subject antecedent until much later. An extension of Wexler & Manzini's 1987 parameter-setting model of L1 acquisition to these L2 data also has trouble accounting for the results since the high incidence of long-distance binding of reflexives indicates that these L2 learners have set the 'governing category' parameter too widely without positive evidence.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Gita Martohardjono**, Cornell University, Dept. of Modern Languages and Linguistics

***Effects of Markedness on the Acquisition of Binding Domains: Two Models***

Wexler and Manzini (1987) propose that markedness arises as a result of a principle pertaining to a separate learning module, the Subset Principle. This is

illustrated in the setting of binding domains for anaphors and pronouns: in Manzini and Wexler's model, Binding Theory is parametrized in that Universal Grammar provides the learner with 5 possible binding domains for anaphors or pronouns (the Governing Category Parameter). The choice as to which domain is pertinent for a given item is then determined by the Subset Principle, which designates the domain resulting in the smallest possible language as the unmarked one. The relative markedness value of a binding domain is therefore determined by the interaction between the learning module and options provided by UG.

In this paper, we further expand this hypothesis by examining in detail two ways in which the markedness hierarchy could arise during the actual acquisition procedure. One possible interpretation of Manzini and Wexler's proposal is that the hierarchy arises and remains in effect only during the computation of the smallest possible domain which is consistent with the data. This view suggests that the relative markedness value determined by the Subset Principle would have no bearing in adult grammars, i.e. once the parameter has been set for a given item. Another possible interpretation is that the markedness hierarchy remains effective even after the acquisition mechanism has set the parameter. This view implies that relative markedness values of binding domains, although established by the Subset Principle, are separately stored in UG.

We show that these two models make different predictions regarding the patterns of first as well as second language acquisition. Consider the possible effects of Manzini and Wexler's markedness hierarchy on Second Language Acquisition (SLA), for example, that on Japanese learners of English: According to their hypothesis, anaphors in English are associated with value a) of the Governing Category Parameter, while the Japanese anaphor zibun is associated with value e). The markedness scale for anaphors designates value a) as the least marked and e) as the most marked value. Both our models A and B allow second Language Acquisition of binding domains to parallel the course of First Language Acquisition. Hence, the Japanese learner of English would have little problem assigning value a) to an anaphor like himself (cf. also Finer and Broselow 1985). However, this would be true for model A only if the Subset Principle is operative in SLA. In contrast, Model B, where markedness values to a certain extent independent of the learning module, predicts that markedness effects should still be present even if the Subset Principle does not guide SLA. Similarly it is possible with one model, but not the other, to predict the direction

of diachronic change with regard to binding domains. One model thus constitutes a stronger hypothesis in that it enables more specific and testable predictions, which will be discussed along with some theoretical considerations entailed by the two models.

## *INDEX OF CONFERENCE SPEAKERS*

<b>Name</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Time</b>
Adams, Roberta	Literacy	Friday
Allan, Karen	Literacy	Friday
Bamberg, Michael	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Bates, Elizabeth	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Brown, Olga	Second Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Bruce, Bertram	Literacy	Saturday A.M.
Budwig, Nancy	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Burkardt, A.	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Cairns, Helen Smith	Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Chang, Gen Ling	Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Chaudron, Craig	Second Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
Chien, Yu-Chin	Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Choi, Soonja	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Clark, Eve	Language Acquisition	Friday P.M.
Clark, Robin	Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
Cochran-Smith, Marilyn	Literacy	Friday
Crain, Stephen	Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
de Castell, Suzanne	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Deitrich, Rainer	Second Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Diamondstone, Judy	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Eckman, Fred	Second Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
Fischer, Kurt W.	Literacy	Sunday P.M.
Flynn, Suzanne	Second Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Gathercole, Virginia	Language Acquisition	Friday P.M.
Genesee, Fred	Second Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.
Gentner, Dedre	Language Acquisition	Friday P.M.
Gleitman, Henry	Language Acquisition	Friday P.M.
Gleitman, Lila	Language Acquisition	Friday P.M.
Golinkoff, Roberta	Language Acquisition	Friday P.M.
Good, A.	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Goodluck, Helen	Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.
Guilfoyle, Eithne	Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
Hakuta, Kenji	Second Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.
Hirsh-Pasek, Kathy	Language Acquisition	Friday P.M.
Heubner, Thom	Second Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Hyams, Nina	Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Jakubowicz, Celia	Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.

Jordens, Peter	Second Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Kaplan, Bernard	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Kazman, Rick	Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
Kinsler, Kimberly	Literacy	Sunday A.M.
Klein, Wolfgang	Second Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Labelle, Marie	Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.
Lam, Mei Lian	Literacy	Saturday P.M.
Lemke, Jay	Literacy	Sunday P.M.
Lust, Barbara	Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Lytle, Susan L.	Literacy	Friday
Maratsos, Michael	Language Acquisition	Friday P.M.
Marchman, Virginia	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Martohardjono, Gita	Second Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
McDaniel, Dana	Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
McDermott, R.P.	Literacy	Sunday P.M.
Merriman, Nanzetta	Literacy	Sunday A.M.
Michaels, Sarah	Literacy	Saturday A.M.
Miller, Margery	Literacy	Friday
Moryadas, Anita	Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.
Naigles, Letitia	Language Acquisition	Friday P.M.
Noonan, Marie	Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
Obler, Loraine	Second Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.
Ochs, Elinor	Literacy	Saturday A.M.
Olsen, Lis	Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
Olson, David	Literacy	Sunday A.M.
Parker, Kate	Second Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
Perdue, Clive	Second Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Pinker, Steven	Language Acquisition	Friday P.M.
Poplack, Shana	Second Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.
Poz, Pedro Quixtan	Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.
Pye, Clifton	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Rispoli, Matthew	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Roeper, Tom	Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.
Rutherford, William	Second Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Santagate, Lisa	Literacy	Friday P.M.
Sayers, Dennis	Literacy	Saturday P.M.
Schachter, Jacquelyn	Second Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Sherman, Janet Cohen	Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Sigurjonsdottir, Sigridur	Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Simonot, Margaret	Second Language Acquisition	Saturday P.M.
Smith, Ruth	Literacy	Saturday A.M.
Snow, Catherine	Literacy	Saturday A.M.
Stromswold, Karin	Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.

Tabors, Patton	Literacy	Saturday A.M.
Taylor, Carolyn	Literacy	Saturday A.M.
Thomas, Margaret	Second Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
Thompson, Deborah	Literacy	Saturday P.M.
Thornton, Rosalind	Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
Vainnikka, Anne	Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.
Valin, Robert Van	Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Weissenborn, Jurgen	Language Acquisition	Sunday P.M.
Wells, Gordon	Literacy	Saturday P.M.
Wexler, Kenneth	Language Acquisition	Saturday A.M.
White, Lydia	Second Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.
Zamel, Vivian	Literacy	Friday
Zobl, Helmut	Second Language Acquisition	Sunday A.M.

## Addresses of First Authors

Helen Smith Cairns  
Queens College  
PHL00  
Flushing, New York 11367

Gen Ling Chang  
Department of Curriculum  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education  
252 Bloor St. W.  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M5S 1V6

Craig Chaudron  
Department of English as a Second Language  
1890 East-West Road  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Yu-Chin Chien  
School of Social Sciences  
University of California at Irvine  
Irvine, CA 92717

Soonja Choi  
Department of Linguistics  
San Diego State University  
San Diego, CA 92182

Eve Clark  
Department of Linguistics  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

Robin Clark  
Department of Philosophy  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Stephen Crain  
University of Connecticut  
Department of Linguistics, U-145  
Storrs, CT 06268

Suzanne de Castell  
Faculty of Education  
Simon Fraser University  
Burnaby, British Columbia  
Canada V5A 1S6

Rainer Deitrich  
Universitat Heidelberg  
Seminar Fur Deutsch als Fremdsprachenphilologic  
Plock 55, 6900 Heidelberg  
Federal Republic of Germany

Jill de Villiers  
Department of Psychology  
Clark Science Center  
Smith College  
Northampton, MA 01063

Judy Diamondstone  
12A Lake St.  
Somerville, MA 02147

Fred Eckman  
Department of Linguistics  
University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee  
Box 413  
Milwaukee, WI 53201

Kurt Fischer  
Harvard Graduate School of Education  
Larsen Hall  
Appian Way  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Suzanne Flynn  
Department of Linguistics  
MIT E10-008  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Virginia Gathercole  
Department of English  
Florida International University  
University Park  
Miami, FL 33199

Fred Genesee  
Department of Psychology  
McGill University  
1205 Dr. Penfield Dr.  
Montreal, Quebec  
Canada H3A 1B1

Dedre Gentner  
Department of Psychology  
University of Illinois  
603 E. Daniel St.  
Champaign, IL 61820

Lila Gleitman  
Department of Psychology  
University of Pennsylvania  
3815 Walnut St.  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6196

Helen Goodluck  
Department of Linguistics  
University of Ottawa  
78 Laurier E.  
Ottawa, Ontario  
Canada K1N 6N5

Eithne Guilfoyle  
Department of Linguistics  
McGill University  
1001 Sherbrooke St. W.  
Montreal, Canada H3J 1T4

Kenji Hakuta  
Board of Studies in Education  
Merrill College  
University of California  
Santa Cruz, CA 95064

Kathy Hirsh-Pasek  
Department of Psychology  
Temple University  
13th & Cecil B. Moore St.  
Philadelphia, PA 19122

Tom Huebner  
Department of Education  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

Nina Hyams  
Department of Linguistics  
UCLA  
405 Hilgard Ave.  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Celia Jakubowicz  
Laboratoire de Psychologie Experimentale, CNRS  
28 Rue Serpente  
75006 Paris, France

Peter Jordens  
Free University of Amsterdam  
Postbus 7161  
1007 MC Amsterdam  
The Netherlands

Bernard Kaplan  
Department of Psychology  
Clark University  
Worcester, MA 01610

Rick Kazman  
Department of Philosophy  
135 Baker Hall  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Kimberly Kinsler  
Department of Educational Foundations  
Hunter College  
695 Park Ave.  
New York City, NY 10021

Marie Labelle  
Department of Linguistics  
University of Ottawa  
550 Cumberland St.  
Ottawa, Ontario  
Canada K1N 6N5

Jay Lemke  
School of Education  
Brooklyn College  
Brooklyn, New York 11210

Susan Lytle  
Graduate School of Education  
University of Pennsylvania  
3700 Walnut St.  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6216

Virginia Marchman  
Department of Psychology  
C-009  
University of California at San Diego  
La Jolla, CA 92093

Michael Maratsos  
Institute of Child Development  
University of Minnesota  
51 East River Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Gita Martohardjono  
Department of Modern Linguistics  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York 14853

R.P. McDermott  
Teachers College  
Columbia University

Sarah Michaels  
Education Development Center  
Newton, MA

Margery Miller  
The Graduate School  
Education Division  
Lesley College  
29 Everett St.  
Cambridge, MA 02238

Anita Moryadas  
142A Chandler St.  
Boston, MA 02116

Lorraine Obler  
48 Wallingford Road  
Brighton, MA 02135

Elinor Ochs  
Department of Linguistics  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1693

David Olson  
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education  
252 Bloor St. W.  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M5S 1V6

Clive Perdue  
Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics  
Postbus 310  
NL-6500 AH Nijmegen  
The Netherlands

Steven Pinker  
Department of Brain & Cognitive Science  
MIT  
E10-018  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Shana Poplack  
Department of Arts and Linguistics  
University of Ottawa  
550 Cumberland  
Ottawa, Ontario  
Canada K1N-6N5

Clifton Pye  
Department of Linguistics  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Matthew Rispoli  
Bureau of Child Research  
Juniper Gardens Language Project  
Gateway Center Tower II, Suite 830  
Fourth and State  
Kansas City, Kansas 66106

William Rutherford  
Department of Linguistics  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1693

Dennis Sayers  
Harvard Graduate School of Education  
Larsen Hall 514  
Appian Way  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Jacqueline Schachter  
Department of Linguistics  
University of Southern California  
Los Angeles, California 90089-1693

Janet Cohen Sherman  
Department of Brain & Cognitive Science  
MIT  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Margaret Simonet  
c/o Max-Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics  
Postbus 310  
NL-6500 AH Nijmegen  
The Netherlands

Catherine Snow  
Harvard Graduate School of Education  
Larsen Hall  
Appian Way  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Karin Stromswold  
Department of Brain & Cognitive Science  
E10-108  
MIT  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Margaret Thomas  
19 Irving St. #3  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Deborah Thompson  
Center for Excellence: Basic Skills  
Tennessee State University  
3500 John Merritt Boulevard  
Nashville, Tenn. 37209

Robert D. Van Valin, Jr.  
Linguistics Program  
University of California  
Davis, CA 95616

Catherine Walsh  
250 Stuart St., Room 1105  
University of Massachusetts  
Boston, MA 02116

Jurpen Weissenborn  
Max-Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics  
Wundtlaan 1  
6525 XD Nijmegen  
The Netherlands

Kenneth Wexler  
Department of Brain & Cognitive Sciences  
MIT  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Lydia White  
Department of Linguistics  
McGill University  
1001 Sherbourne St. W.  
Montreal, Quebec  
Canada H3A 1G5

Vivian Zamel  
English Department  
University of Massachusetts  
Boston, MA 02125

Helmut Zobl  
Department of Linguistics  
Carleton University  
Ottawa, Canada  
K1S 5B6

DIRECTORY OF EXHIBITORS

Ablex Publishing Corporation  
355 Chestnut St.  
Norwood, NJ 07648

Cambridge University Press  
32 East 57th St.  
New York, NY 10022

Communication Skill Builders  
3830 E. Bellevue  
P.O. Box 42050  
Tuscon, AR 85733

Educational Productions  
4925 SW Humphrey Park Crest  
Portland, OR 97221

Harvard University Press  
79 Garden St.  
Cambridge, MA 02138

Heinemann Boynton/Cook  
70 Court St.  
Portsmouth, NH 03081

Hogrefe & Huber Publishers  
12-14 Bruce Park Avenue  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M4P 2S3

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates  
365 Broadway  
Hillsdale, NJ 07642

Longman Inc.  
95 Church St.  
White Plains, NY 10601

S. Karger AG  
Medical & Scientific Publishers  
P.O. Box CH-4009  
Basel, Switzerland

Kluwer Academic Publishers  
101 Phillip Dr.  
Norwell, MA 02061

The MIT Press  
55 Hayward Street  
Cambridge, MA 02142

Newbury House Publishers  
10 East 53rd Street  
New York, NY 10022

The University of Chicago Press  
5801 Ellis Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60637-1496











