Modeling developmental changes in infants' discrimination of English vowels

Megha Sundara & Connor Mayer, UCLA Department of Linguistics

 Two mechanisms Bottom-up: Domain-general distributional learning (e.g. Saffran et al., 1996) Interactive: Concurrent word learning facilitates learning of phonetic categories (e.g., Swingley, 2009) Distributional vs. Interactive learning Both mechanisms available in the first year
 Bottom-up: Domain-general distributional learning (e.g. Saffran et al., 1996) Interactive: Concurrent word learning facilitates learning of phonetic categories (e.g., Swingley, 2009) Distributional vs. Interactive learning Both mechanisms available in the first year
 Interactive: Concurrent word learning facilitates learning of phonetic categories (e.g., Swingley, 2009) Distributional vs. Interactive learning Both mechanisms available in the first year
 Distributional vs. Interactive learning Both mechanisms available in the first year
 Both mechanisms available in the first year
of life
 Distributional learning: 6- to 8-mo (Maye et al., 2002)
 Interactive learning: 6- to 9-mo (Bergelson & Swingley, 2012)
 Computational implementation – Feldman et al.'s (2013) Bayesian model
 Input Input Acoustic distribution: steady state F1 & F2 from Hillenbrand corpus
 Frequencies of words: CHILDES corpora
 Interactive model outperforms distributional learning model
Part 1: Computational model
 Part 1: Computational model Replication & Extension of Feldman et al. (2013)
 Part 1: Computational model Replication & Extension of Feldman et al. (2013) Added phonetic cues to models (a) temporal cues: duration (b) duramic apartrel every 0.51; 0.52; 0.52
 Part 1: Computational model Replication & Extension of Feldman et al. (2013) Added phonetic cues to models (a) temporal cues: duration (b) dynamic spectral cues: Δ F1; Δ F2; Δ F3 (c) Other cues: f0, F3 & F4
 Part 1: Computational model Replication & Extension of Feldman et al. (2013) Added phonetic cues to models (a) temporal cues: duration (b) dynamic spectral cues: Δ F1; Δ F2; Δ F3 (c) Other cues: f0, F3 & F4 Re-ran distributional and interactive models on different subset of cues

- F-score (0 worst; 1 perfect)
- Every Interactive model outperforms its distributional counterpart

		Рс	ırt 1: Modelin	g RESULTS				
		Rea	l categories in t	the input = 12	,			
	Cuos		Distribution	aal Madala		ntoractivo N/	lodolc	
Nadal 1, E1 E2 (Ealdman at al. 2012)			Distributional Wodels		12 cc	12 actors E compare O CE		
Nodel 2: $F1$, $F2$ (relation et al. 2015)			8 categories; F-score: 0.40		12 categories; F-score: 0.65			
Nodel 2: F1, F2, F3, duration 100000			8 categories; F-score: 0.46		12 categories; F-score: 0.76			
Model J: E1, E2, E3, dur., $\Delta E1$, $\Delta E2$, $A E3$			11 categories; F-score: 0.71		12 categories, F-score. 0.90			
woder 4: F1,	FZ, F3, αur., Δ F1,	$\Delta FZ, \Delta F3$	II categories;	F-Score: U.73		itegories; F-s	core: 0.92	
Model	l performance dis	stinguishing	vowel pairs (pro	portion correc ⁻	t)	Гбоо		
Vowel pairs	vel pairs Low-dimens Distributional (Feldman et		Low-dimensior	n High-dim	ension	Coh	t sizes	
			Interactive Mod	el Distribu	tional	Mono	Bilingual	
	(reidman e	l dl)	(reiuman et al		IEI	English	Dinigual	
/e/ - /ɛ/	0.76		0 95	0.9	6	1.06	0.61	
/i/ - /т/	0.70	0.68		0.9	0	0.83	0.44	
/e/ - /т/	0.00		0.00	0.9	8	0.22	0.17	
/~//+/	0.07		U, , T	0.5				
		•	Ch	nance!				
	Part 2:	Infants' c	liscrimination	n of English	front vo	wels		
		• Stimu	uli produced by 8	fomale talkers	from Hille	onbrand Corr	אווכ	
3100 +	×/e/							
2700 +++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	××× ↓/1/	 Visua 	I Habituation Pro	oceaure				
	×	– C	ompletely infant-	-controlled				
1900		- 5	0% decline in loo	king time, 3-tri	al windov	v		
1500		– H	abituation condit	tion counterba	lanced			
400 500	600 700 800 F1 (Hz)	• V	owels produced by	4 talkers				
		_ T	set trials vowals	by 2 now talko	rs / catog	Srv Fi	pure 2 : Set-up	
igure 1 : F1 & F2	at vowel steady stat	:e – 16		by Z new tarker	s / catego	JIY		
	Part 2: RESUL	rs on info	ants' discrimi	nation of En	glish fro	ont vowel	S	
Monoli	ngual & hilingual	infants dis	riminato all vow	ol naire avcant	for Englis	$h/o/_/t/at$	2-months	
							5-monuns	
Eng	glish /i/-/I/	10	English /e/-/1/ English /e/-/1/			glish /e/-/ε/ (Sundara & Scutellaro, 2011)		
	 ✓ 	V		x x		Cha	anged Vowel 🗆 Same Vowel	
8		8			_ 8	Т		
6		6 —			_ 6			
4 —		4 -			_ 4			
2					2 —			
						Dilingual Dilingual	Monolingual	
0 Monolingual	Bilingual Monolingual	0 Bilingual	Monolingual Bilingual N	Monolingual Bilingual	Englis	sh	English	
English 4-month of	English	olds	English A-month-olds	English 8-month-olds	4	-month-olds	8-month-olds	
4-month-c	6-month-c	103	4-1101111-0105	0-11101111-010S				



Nodeling vs. Infant discrimination IMPLICATIONS for Development

4-months,

English-learning infants discriminate /e/-/ε /; /i/ - /ɪ/ & /e/ - /ɪ/

ith language experience, at 8-months,

English-learning infants discriminate /e/-/ɛ /; /i/ - /ɪ/

They do <u>not</u> discriminate /e/ - /I/

teractive models outperform Englisharning infants at 8-months on /e/ - /I/

Optimal high-dimension distributional model also outperforms English-learning infants at 8-months

est fit to 8-mo-olds' discrimination data

Low-dimension distributional model **Future Directions**

lexical bootstrapping available at later age for children with larger vocabularies? Not till 18-months; 12- to 18-month-olds also fail to discriminate /e/ - /ı/ urrently working on an interactive model nat temporarily ignores (sometimes elevant) some distributional cues

REFERENCES

elson, E. & Swingley, D. (2012). At 6 to 9 months, human infants know the ning of many common nouns. PNAS, 109, 3253-3258. man, N.H., Griffiths, T.L., Goldwater, S., Morgan, J.L. (2013). A role for the eloping lexicon in phonetic category acquisition. Psych. Review, 120(4), 751enbrand, J. et al. (1995). Acoustic characteristics of American English Vowels. *97(5),* 3099-3111.

e, J. Werker, J., Gerken, L. (2002). Infant sensitivity to distributional rmation can affect phonetic discrimination. *Cognition*, 82, B101-B111. ran, J.R., Aslin, R.N., Newport, E.L. (1996). Statistical learning by 8-month-old nts. Science, 274(5294), 1926-1928.

dara, M. & Scutellaro, A. (2011). Rhythmic distance between languages affects development of speech perception in bilingual infants. J of Phonetics, 39(4), 513.

ngley, D. (2009). Contributions of infant word learning to language elopment. Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. B, 364, 3617-3622.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Hendrickson, Anya Mancillas, Robyn Orfitelli and oria Mateu for help with infant recruitment and data ection.