ACQUIRING CONVERSATIONAL SKILLS IN FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: INNATE CAPACITY OR THE FRUIT OF INSTRUCTION?[*]

Melania Evelyn Sánchez Reed
Universidad de Málaga
melaniasanchez@uma.es

Simultaneously the most simple and the most complex achievement that we accomplish in our lives, the true nature of first language acquisition has awakened the interest of the world's greatest thinkers as far back as the ancient world. This article presents the analysis of a transcription belonging to the CHILDES database that records the speech performance of a British infant girl of two years and four months of age, with the aim of using this analysis to support a twofold discussion: a) whether language acquisition is an innate capacity or whether it is the result of learning and teaching; and b) the importance and influence of the role of the parent or caretaker (focusing on the use of caretaker-talk) and the general environment of the child to elicit language skills and reach successful language learning. We argue in favour of the crucial role this input plays in the development of the infant's conversational skills.

Key words: *First language acquisition, caretaker-talk, innateness, speech environment.*

A la vez el más simple y más complejo de los logros que alcanzamos en nuestra vida, la adquisición de la primera lengua ha despertado el interés de los más célebres pensadores. Este artículo presenta el análisis de una transcripción ubicada en base de datos CHILDES que recoge una muestra del habla de una niña británica de dos años y cuatro meses con el objetivo de emplear este análisis para apoyar un doble debate: a) si la adquisición de la lengua es una capacidad innata o el

resultado del aprendizaje y la enseñanza; y b) la importancia e influencia del padre o tutor (centrándonos en el uso del habla materna) y el entorno del niño para suscitar una competencia lingüística y alcanzar un aprendizaje del lenguaje satisfactorio, argumentando el papel crucial que desempeñan estas influencias externas en el desarrollo de las habilidades lingüísticas del niño.

Palabras clave: *Adquisición de la primera lengua, habla materna, innatismo, entorno del habla.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Learning a first language is, simultaneously, the most simple and the most complex achievement that we accomplish in our lives, as Leonard Bloomfield once put it: "this is doubtless the greatest intellectual feat any one of us is ever required to perform" (Bloomfield 1976: 29). Precisely because of this dichotomy, the origin of first language acquisition has awakened the interest of the world's greatest thinkers as far back as the ancient world. Plato himself "felt that the world-meaning mapping in some form was innate", and Sanskrit grammarians "debated over twelve centuries whether meaning was god-given (possibly innate) or was learned from older convention" (Atique 2009: 8).

This article presents the analysis of a transcription belonging to the CHILDES[1] database that records the speech performance of a British girl named Ella of two years and four months of age with the aim of using this analysis to support a twofold discussion: a) whether language acquisition is an innate capacity or whether it is the result of learning and teaching; and b) the importance and influence of the role of the parent or caretaker (focusing on the use of caretaker-talk) and the general environment of the child to elicit language skills and reach successful language learning. For this reason, the aim of this analysis is not only to describe the main features of the child's utterances, but also those of the caretaker, as it is argued that the input the infant receives plays a crucial role in the development of the child's conversational skills. Both points will be argued in view of the different theories that have been suggested over the years to account for the

origin of first language acquisition, and for the importance of the role of the parent or caretaker.

2. FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: STRUCTURALISM VS. GENERATIVISM

Dealing with first language acquisition or, what is the same, the origin of language, we have the basic notions provided by the structuralist and generativist paradigms, led by Saussure and Chomsky, respectively. Structuralism is an empirical approach that maintains that the human mind is a "tabula rasa, empty, unstructured, uniform as far as cognitive structure is concerned" (Chomsky 1979), that is, waiting for outside data to be introduced. However, this theory is not sustainable, mainly, because when children are acquiring their native language(s) they constantly produce utterances that they have never been exposed to, a feat that would be impossible to achieve if the production of language relied solely on the reproduction of outside input. Generative grammar, on the other hand, argues that the only explanation for the human ability to create entirely new utterances without apparent outside instruction is that we are genetically endowed with an innate competence for language acquisition and production. We have the ability to create an infinite number of never-before-heard utterances with the knowledge of a finite set of rules, which are, conversely, learnt from outside input. The innate capacity for language production is owed to the child's Language Acquisition Device (LAD). Chomsky's term LAD refers to a genetic device in the brain which makes language acquisition come naturally to human beings. The LAD is then stimulated by outside input so that the process of language acquisition and production can develop, different outside inputs resulting in the development of different languages. This genetic endowment came to be known as Universal Grammar (UG).

Subsequent to Chomsky's theories in the 1950's, criticisms arose against the generativist theory of innateness. It was argued that the concept of LAD was "unsupported by evolutionary anthropology, which tended to show a gradual adaptation of the human brain and vocal chords to the use of language, rather than a sudden appearance of a complete set of binary parameters delineating the whole spectrum

of possible grammars ever to have existed and ever to exist" (Atique 2009: 19). Bearing this in mind, Atique proposes that "while all theories of language acquisition posit some degree of innateness, a less convoluted theory might involve less innate structure and more learning" (Atique 2009: 20). This theory suggests, therefore, that language acquisition is, in fact, a combination of outside input and an inherent innate capacity.

Therefore, although Chomsky suggests abandoning the empirical approach in order to explain first language acquisition, a certain amount of learning is also key in language learning. Nonetheless, it is a fact that the theory of innateness cannot be cast aside either, as some have suggested; one theory cannot be discussed without the other. The abandonment of empiricism results an impossible feat, as rationalist theories have no alternative but to be studied through empirical data. Language must by force be studied through its use, as nobody can yet get inside the brain to see how it works. Performance can be our only mirror of competence, and this competence may very well be innate. But, the truth remains that, despite all these centuries of research on the subject, little is known about the true nature of language acquisition and the origin of language.

3. THREE THEORIES FOR FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Bearing in mind the two aforementioned major paradigms (structuralism and generativism), we can move on to discuss the three most common approaches to the phenomenon of language acquisition: a) the behaviourist approach; b) the innatist approach; and c) the interactionist approach.

The behaviourist approach, which was very popular until the beginnings of the 1960´s, believes language acquisition to be the result of a process of imitation that is supported by both positive and negative reinforcement. To put it in simple terms, children will copy their parent's speech and depending on the response they get, whether they get praised or corrected, they will know whether what they said was right or wrong and be able to build their grammatical knowledge. However, this theory, rooted within the structuralist paradigm, has

many flaws to it. Children come up with utterances which they have never come across, such as **drived* (the regularisation of an irregular verb), and, on the other hand, function words, undoubtedly the most used words in adult speech, take some time to appear in child speech. Furthermore, children only appear to imitate utterances they have used before and only seem to learn rules when they are at the appropriate stage in their development. For example, take the following conversation (McNeill 1966: 69 cited in Hudson 2000: 138):

> Child: Nobody don't like me.
> Mother: No, say 'Nobody likes me.'
> Child: Nobody don't like me.
> [Eight repetitions of this dialogue, then:]
> Mother: No, now listen carefully. Say '*Nobody likes me*.'
> Child: Oh! Nobody don't *likes* me.

This implies that if language acquisition were exclusively a matter of imitation a situation like this would never occur. At first, the child is not even aware that he is saying anything wrong and does not seem acknowledge the difference between his utterance and his mother's. And later, when he tries to correct himself, he only picks up on the *-s* suffix of the verb. Children, therefore, seem to ignore those features "which are beyond their level of competence" (Hudson 2000: 138).

In turn, the innatist approach, led by Chomsky, appeared in the 1960's within the generativist paradigm and suggested that language competence is innate, developing the UG theory. Children are simply born with a capacity for language learning, enabled by the LAD in the brain which activates this ability when exposed to the right external input. Cruttenden presents Chomsky's three basic arguments to support the innateness of language acquisition:

> a) the existence of language universals, "generalizations which have as their scope all languages" (Greenberg 2005: 9). Languages seem to share intrinsic characteristics, such as structure-dependency,[2] that "cannot possibly be due to anything other than a specific cognitive capacity in man" (Cruttenden 1979: 101);

b) the poor constructions of everyday speech. If human beings were not endowed with a natural predisposition for language learning, the feat would result impossible as "language is so poorly constructed and impaired in performance (by hesitations, repetitions, false starts and so on)" (Cruttenden 1979: 102); and

c) the speed of language learning. "Language could not be learnt with the speed it is unless the child were preprogrammed to do" (Cruttenden 1979: 103). However, innatism "does not eliminate the adult world as a source of linguistic knowledge […] adult language presents the relevant information that allows the child to select from the Universal Grammar those grammatical principles specific to the particular language that the child will acquire" (Ochs and Schieffelin 2009: 298).

Finally, the interactionist approach "focuses not only on structures and mechanisms internal to the child, but also on the powerful influence that experiential and social factors have in concert with unobservable mental faculties" (Gerber and Wankoff 2009: 59), arguing that what is crucial for the development of first language acquisition is actually the interaction between this innate capacity and the environment in which the child develops. A child, therefore, needs a one-to-one interaction with an adult speaker for language acquisition to be successful. Furthermore, this theory supports the need for caretaker-talk, a simplified register that is adapted to the given capacity of the child in question to help him or her learn the language. This last approach leads us to the paper's second principal discussion: the importance of caretaker-talk and the environment for the successful acquisition of our first language.

4. COMMUNICATING WITH CHILDREN: CARETAKER-TALK

Caretaker-talk (also known as child-directed speech 'CDS', motherese or baby-talk 'BT') is a simplified model of speech used to address small infants. It is a slower and more paused speech that uses

very simple sentence structures, and a great amount of questions, repetitions and imperatives; all this, typically combined with a higher pitch and a more exaggerated intonation than that of the adult register whilst holding eye-to-eye contact with the child.

Roger Brown distinguished two major processes involved in caretaker-talk (which he refers to as BT): a) simplification-clarification; and b) expressive-affective. The first process involves a basic simplification of language with the "probable desire to communicate, to be understood, with, perhaps, some interest also in teaching the language". The second process, in turn, includes an "expression of affection" with the further aim of capturing the child's attention (Brown 1977: 4-5). I would like to note that Grover Hudson makes a point of distinguishing between the terms caretaker-talk and baby-talk (BT), and, to my mind, quite rightly so. Caretaker-talk is, in fact, what Roger Brown is describing under the term BT. Hudson makes an amusing point when he says that using baby-talk to teach babies to speak is as useful as "driving like a 16-year-old would be for teaching a 16-year-old to drive", that is, completely and utterly useless. As he says, "babies already talk like babies, so what is the earthly use of parents doing the same?" (Brown 1977: 10). Many parents actually refuse to use such simplified registers. However, all they probably delete are the silly words and the overly exaggerated high pitched voice of BT, most likely still employing many features of caretaker-talk, such as pauses, imperatives, repetitions, etc. as the use of this register seems to appear naturally in all of us.

"Conversation with an interested adult may be more crucial to the acquisition of syntax than any particular techniques used by the adult" (Snow 1977: 39). This suggests that the key to language learning is actually the interaction between the child and parent. Adults must express interest when communicating with children and give them their undivided attention. A powerful argument in favor of the importance of interaction is the proof that just exposure to the language is not enough for its successful acquisition. Yule discusses the case of a normal child who was brought up by his deaf parents. This child interacted with his parents through sign language and only accessed speech through television and radio. As a result, he did not develop conversational speaking skills, but learned sign language

successfully. Therefore, "the crucial requirement appears to be the opportunity to interact with others via language" (Yule 2006: 150).

Another important issue is that using language effectively does not only involve the mastery of a set of grammatical rules: what of pragmatics? People are constantly conveying meanings that they have not literally expressed and children, surprisingly enough, pick this up very soon. Roger Brown disagrees with Blount and Van de Geest's assumption that children learn the syntax and semantics of their language before mastering the pragmatic angle, and supports his claim with a real life example of a child perfectly understanding the pragmatic meaning of an utterance spoken to him by his mother. In this case, the mother always said to the child: 'Why don't you...' and the young boy immediately took this to be an order, which is the pragmatic meaning of the sentence, even though, really, it is a normal interrogative question that should grammatically demand an explanatory answer. However, the child never got confused (Brown 1977: 23).

5. ANALISING FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION: A TRANSCRIPTION FROM THE CHILDES DATABASE

This section presents the analysis of a transcription taken from the CHILDES database, so as to see examples of real-life child-parent speech performances. The transcription shows the speech utterances of young Ella, an infant of British nationality aged two years and four months. The document, which dates back to 1998, belongs to Dr. Michael Forrester, the child's father. He is a professor in the department of psychology of the University of Kent and he transcribed various speech performances of his daughter, Ella, from the age of one to the age of three years and six months (Forrester 2002). These performances were recorded on video and then transcribed. The video captions are also available to the researcher through the database, although they have not been employed for the present analysis which is solely based on the typed transcription.[3] The transcribed conversation takes place within a natural everyday environment. The child is in her own home and in the company of her parents, this situation allowing the child to express herself naturally, a feat that is

commonly unachievable if the child is interviewed by an unknown researcher in an unknown environment.

The speakers included in the recorded conversation are Ella and her father Michael. Silvia Forrester, her mother, is also present but she does not intervene. Their conversation takes place in the family's kitchen. The father opens the conversation by asking his daughter what she wants for breakfast: "do you want some banana or toast?" To which the child answers "no, I like (nu)tella".[4] Note here that she is using the negative adverb 'no' plus a simple sentence made up of a subject, a verb and an object. Her father suggests banana or toast, which she immediately refuses and then suggests something she likes (*nutella*). Then he repeats her answer, "nutella alright", thus reinforcing it. Notice that he says the word *nutella* properly, whereas the girl just managed to say "tella". We see he tries to correct her utterance. She then states again her wish to have *nutella*, but still says: "I want (nu)tella", not saying the word properly. Therefore, her father's correction has not served its purpose, this being clear argument for not supporting the imitation theory of language acquisition. Note also that now she uses the verb "want" which is actually the verb that was used to ask the question in the first place. Again, we see that she forms a subject + verb + object sentence. Then, Ella points to a camera and asks what it is by saying "I don't know (wh)at (th)at". In this utterance, firstly, her pronunciation is faulty as she is unable to say the consonant groups -wh and -th, omitting them altogether, and secondly, the sentence ungrammatical. An adult would say: "I don't know what that is" or maybe "What's that? I don't know". We do not know what construction the child is angling for, maybe neither, as we cannot fully judge child's grammar with the standards of adult grammar. In fact, Maria Teresa Guasti does not even consider these kind of sentences to be ungrammatical, arguing that they belong to children's grammar (Guasti 2004: 11).

The next line, "a camera", is also uttered by Ella, so she is actually answering her own question. This can be taken as an example of self-repair, that is, to correct or resolve ones own utterances. Furthermore, it would be a case of spontaneous self-repair, being "produced or initiated by an ongoing speaker" (Forrester and Cherington 2009: 169).[5] Instances of self-repair have been found in

child-speech as early as age one, generally in the form of "skills of combining sound change with gesture", this way "altering […] actions in pursuit of a response" (Forrester 2008: 106). Also, note that "during naturally occurring talk, speakers and listeners display orientation towards providing opportunities for speakers to repair their own talk as opposed to being explicitly corrected" (Forrester and Cherington 2009: 168). Therefore, the parent plays a specific role in eliciting a response from the child. Going back to the transcript, as we can see, Ella is given enough time to realise for herself the answer to her own question, not being provided with an immediate answer. Ella, of course, really knows the answer, as it does not take her very long to realise, maybe at a closer glance, that the object is in fact a camera, to which she utters "ohhh waa gaaa", using the exclamation oh!, this way acknowledging her recognition of the object. The father then questions her again: "What're you doing with my camera?". It is a common trait in caretaker-talk to question children, as this encourages them to speak and, also, the rising tone of a question helps to attract their attention. Ella laughs in response and answers that she is "holding it". The fact that she laughs implies that she understands the pragmatic implications of her father's question: that she should not be touching the camera. Here we must also note the use of the verb suffix *-ing*, which is actually listed by Brown as being the first grammatical morpheme acquired (Brown 1973: 271 cited in Hudson 2000: 127) and, precisely, at the age of two, Ella's age. Furthermore, we see that she already masters the use of the object pronoun 'it'. The father continues to give her a warning and tells her to be careful with the camera and that "its not a to:::y". We see that he is using lengthened speech when saying "toy", this way he is emphasising his message, prolonging the word, again, to capture the child's attention.

The last part of the conversation shows how the child gets distressed because she misunderstands her father's words and thinks she is being called a baby. Ella is asked a simple question: "what pictures do we take with the camera?" to which she answers with a perfectly grammatically structured sentence, "I can't remember", consisting of a subject, an auxiliary verb, the negative particle not, and a verb in the infinitive. Furthermore, she uses the contracted form of cannot, the most common form in speech. The father then repeats the question: "you can't remember?", this way, positively reinforcing

what she has just said. And then he utters the sentence that causes Ella's confusion: "did we take pictures when Ella was very small?" She answers by shouting "no", lengthening the vowel ("no::o"), and says "I'm not tiny baby, dada". Note only one error in this utterance, that of the absence of the indefinite article <a>; the indefinite articles <a>/<an> are among the later functional words that children master, generally at the age of three (Brown 1973: 271 cited in Hudson 2000: 127). Ella's father then tries to convince her that he was referring to when she *was* a baby, and tells her not to shout at him because it is naughty. We see how he is teaching her manners as learning a language is not only about learning a set of grammatical rules, but also a social code. Ella just continues to stress more and more strongly that she is not a baby: "no, I do, I'm not a baby". It is interesting that this time she uses the indefinite article <a>. Above it was stated that <a>/<an> appeared at a later stage of development (around three years of age), but Ella is already using them at two years and four months of age. Ella then says she is "a big girl", using basic adjectives (big/small). The father agrees with her and says she is "a very big big girl", positively reinforcing her and emphasising how big she is with the repetition of the adjective. She continues to utter a sentence that has an unintelligible word "I'm xxx[6] a little baby", but immediately corrects herself by saying "I am not a little baby", showing another example of self-repair. In this last utterance, two elements are of importance. From a syntactical point of view, we find the use of the expanded form of the first person singular personal pronoun and the verb *to be*, most likely, Ella realises that full forms are more forceful. From a semantic point of view, in turn, we find the use of the word *little*. Note that this is the first time that this word has appeared in the conversation, previously we have read "small" and "tiny". This shows that Ella can already handle several labels for the same concept, i.e. synonyms. Finally, the transcription ends will Ella still trying to explain that she is not a baby: "I'm not a little baby, a big".

Concerning Ella's performance we observe that her sentences, although simple, are perfectly grammatical most of the time. At two years old, she seems to go beyond the telegraphic two-word sentences that are associated with her age group. She constructs sentences which are made up by a subject, a verb and an object, (the canonical order for English sentences), she uses the indefinite articles <a>/<an> which

are among the last grammatical morphemes acquired. However, a grammatical morpheme listed by Hudson as being acquired around two years and six months of age is the use of the irregular past tense (Hudson 2000: 127), which Ella does not use at all. All the verbs she employs are in the present tense. Moreover, when the father speaks to her about the past she does not understand and becomes annoyed. So, her grasp of the past tense is obviously not fully established. Granted, Ella is still two months away from the age appointed for the mastery of this feature, but we have also just seen that she masters the use of the indefinite article, a feature identified at a considerably later stage of development. Naturally, this is because the different stages of language development are only general approximations based on regularities found in child language acquisition. Each child will develop the different features of his/her language in unique ways and so, although there are certain maxims that can indeed be generalised, such as the appearance of a child's first words at about one year of age, the fact is that a particular age cannot be identified with specific verbal achievements with any degree of accuracy.

Regarding the father's utterances, we generally see that he questions her ("do you want some banana or toast?", "What're you doing with my camera?") and reinforces and corrects her utterances by repeating them ("nutella alright"). Therefore, the main features that were distinguished above for caretaker-talk are reflected in this real-life extract. However, recalling Hudson's aforementioned division between caretaker-talk and BT, I would like to note that Ella's father does not make use of the BT that Hudson criticises. Indeed, he employs child-directed speech in his constant use of questions and repetitions, but no diminutives or, let us say, 'silly' noises are employed for the child's benefit. Ella is a little old for BT as this speech tends to be reserved for babies under one year of age. Nevertheless, it is a fact that many adults continue to employ this register, much to the child's irritation, well into their second, third or even four year of life.

6. THE USES OF CARE-TAKER TALK

Caretaker-talk has been much discussed as a main tool for language teaching, but evidence has shown that it is rather a matter of

securing communication with the child than a conscious attempt at teaching a language. In the 1970's, Garnica, who studied the importance of child-directed speech in language acquisition, interviewed a group of mothers and asked them whether they were aware of a change in register when talking to their young children, and, not only were they aware of it, but argued that it actually "helped them to communicate" (Brown 1977: 14). The data collected from Garnica's interviews, therefore, suggests that mothers use caretaker-talk "not with the tutorial goal in mind, but to control attention, improve intelligibility, [and] mark utterances as directed at the child" (Brown 1977: 16).

Concerning response to caretaker-talk, a study performed in 1973 by Stratton and Connoly revealed that young children definitely do respond to the higher pitched sounds that characterise this register. Their study was carried out with three to five-day-old babies and consisted in exposing the infants to different sound frequencies and measuring their heart-rate responses to these sounds. The results revealed that "500 Hz is a frequency that infants favor perceptually" and that this was the usual frequency in which adults spoke to children, "whereas much of the speech of adult to adult […] would be in a lower, less perceptually salient range" (Sachs 1977: 53). Furthermore, going back to Garnica's interviews, one of the interviewees claimed the following (Garnica 1977: 87):

There are plenty of times I don't stop to think that he's two and I'll just mumble something at him or make some kind of demand on him and don't really think about whether or not he can understand it. And that's when he's most likely not to respond at all.

So, in view of these facts, we can assume that children respond to caretaker-talk, not only because of the high-pitched tone used, which they favour but, more importantly, because of the attention that is being given to them when adults speak in this register. Children are fully aware that this speech is only directed at them. Therefore, when they hear it, they know that they are getting the adult's undivided attention, which is, above all, what all children want.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the interactionist approach to language acquisition appears to be the most satisfactory one, as evidence points to the fact that it is the interaction between the parent or caretaker and the child that allows the latter to develop speech competence, and that the mere exposure to speech is insufficient for language to develop successfully. Let us recall the aforementioned case of the boy who only received speech input from television and radio programmes because his parents were deaf and who, as a result, never did acquire competent speech. Finally, concerning the innateness of language acquisition, human beings are undoubtedly endowed with a genetic disposition for language development. This innate disposition, however, lies dormant and must be awakened by exposing the child to an optimum environment for language learning, that in which continuous access to language input and, most importantly, active interaction with other speakers of any language(s) are available.

NOTES

[1] Child Language Data Exchange System.
[2] Structure-dependency argues that "all linguistic processes [belonging to any language] are dependent on the details of the structure to which they apply" (Cook and Newson 2007: 234).
[3] The full transcription is included at the end of this article in an appendix. I would like to thank Dr. Michael Forrester (University of Kent) for giving me permission to provide this document, and also Dr. Brian MacWhinney (Carnegie Mellon University), main researcher in the construction of the CHILDES database, for his kind assistance.
[4] Word fragments appearing in brackets have been omitted from speech, following the CLAN transcription guidelines employed in the CHILDES database (MacWhinney 2010: 48). See MacWhinney's 2010 *The CHILDES Project: Tools for Analyzing Talk* (http://childes.psy.cmu.edu/manuals/clan.pdf) to read the full CLAN manual.
[5] Forrester and Cherrington distinguish two main different types of self-repair "spontaneously produced" or "other-initiated", i.e.

when someone else has triggered the correction (2009: 169).

[6] Note the use of the symbol 'xxx' to indicate unintelligible vocal material, following the CLAN transcription guidelines employed in the CHILDES database (MacWhinney 2010: 21).

WORKS CITED

Atique, Samina. 2009 "Psycholinguistics and Language Teaching Methodology", Islamabad: Allama Iqbal Open University.
Consulted on the 20th of April 2010
  • http://www.scribd.com/doc/23033766/Psycholinguistics-TEFL.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1976. *Language*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Brown, Roger. 1973. *A First Language: the Early Stages*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. Cited in Hudson, Grover. 2000. *Essential Introductory Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Brown, Roger. 1977. Introduction. *Talking to Children: Language input and Acquisition*. Ed. Catherine E. Snow and Charles A. Ferguson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-27.

Chomsky, Noam. 1979 "Empiricism and Rationalism". *Language and Responsibility: Based on Conversations with Mitsou Ronat*. New York:
Pantheon. Consulted on the 20th of April 2010.
  • http://www.chomsky.info/books/responsibility02.htm

Cook, Vivian James and Mark Newson. 2007. *Chomsky's Universal Grammar: an Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Cruttenden, Alan. 1979. *Language in Infancy and Childhood: a Linguistic Introduction to Language Acquisition*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.

Forrester, M. 2002 "Appropriating Cultural Conceptions of Childhood: Participation in Conversation". *Childhood: A Global Journal of Child Research*, 9: 255-278.

Forrester, M. 2008 "The Emergence of Self-Repair: A Case Study of One Child During the Early Preschool Years". *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 41(1): 99-128.

Forrester, M. and Sarah M. Cherington. 2009 "The Development of Other-related Conversational Skills: A Case Study of Conversational Repair During the Early Years". *First Language*, 29(2): 167-192.

Garnica, Olga K. 1977 "Some Prosodic and Paralinguistic Features of Speech to Young Children", ed. Catherine E. Snow and Charles A. Ferguson. *Talking to Children: Language input and Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gerber, Sima and Lorain Szabo Wankoff. 2010 "Historical and Contemporary Views of the Nature-Nurture Debate: A Continuum of Perspectives for the Speech-Language Pathologist", ed. Brian B. Shulman and Nina C. Capone. *Language Development: Foundations, Processes, and Clinical Applications*. Sudbury: Jones & Bartlett Publishers. 55-94.

Greenberg, Joseph Harold. 2005. Language Universals: with Special Reference to Feature Hierarchies. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter

Guasti, Maria Teresa. 2004. *Language Acquisition: The Growth of Grammar*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Hudson, Grover. 2000. *Essential Introductory Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

MacWhinney, B. 2010. *The CHILDES Project: Tools for Analyzing Talk. Third Edition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Consulted on the 20th of April 2010.
   • http://childes.psy.cmu.edu/manuals/clan.pdf

McNeil, David. 1966. *The Genesis of Language, a Psycholinguistic Approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Cited in Hudson, Grover. 2000. *Essential Introductory Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Ochs, Elinor and Bambi B. Schieffelin. 2009 "Language Acquisition and Socialization: Three Developmental Stories and Their Implications", ed. Alessandro Duranti. *Linguistic Anthropology: a Reader*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. 296-328.

Sachs, Jacqueline. 1977 "The Adaptive Significance of Linguistic Input to Prelinguistic Infants", ed. Catherine E. Snow and Charles A. Ferguson. *Talking to Children: Language input and Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snow, Catherine E. 1977 "Mothers' Speech Research: from Input to Interaction", ed. Catherine E. Snow and Charles A. Ferguson. *Talking to Children: Language input and Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yule, George. 2006. *The Study of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX: THE TRANSCRIPTION

Clan - [biggirl]
@Begin
@Languages:en
@Participants:E Ella Target_Child, F Mike Father, M
Silvia Mother
@Options:CA
@ID:en|Forrester|E|2;4.|female|||Target_Child||
@ID:en|Forrester|F|||||Father||
@ID:en|Forrester|M|||||Mother||
@Media:biggirl, video
@Transcriber:Mike Forrester
@Comment:Ella is 28 months old.
@Comment:Here is a picture:
*F:do you want some banana or some toast →
%gpx:child touching camera near high-chair
*E:no I like (nu)tella →
*F:nutella alright →
*E:I want(nu)tella →
*E:I don't know (wh)at (th)at →
*E:a camera →
*E:ohhh waa gaaa →
*F:what're you doing with my camera ↗
*E:he he
(0.5) hmm holding it holding it →
*F:be careful with it →
*E:oh, why ↗
*F:you know why →
*E:why ↗
*F:because it's ⌈not →
*E: ⌈wha wha wha →
(0.5)
*F:its not a to:::y →
*E:he (.) hey hey &=laugh →
*E:&=sings →
%gpx:continuing to touch camera .
*F:what pictures do we take with the camera ↗
 (1.)

*E:I can't remember →
*F:you can't remember ↗
*F:did we take pictures when Ella was very small ↗
(2.)
*E:no::o →
*F:she was tiny tiny baby →
*E:no::o →
*F:+, no →
*E:I'm not *tiny baby, dada* →
*F:I didn't say you were (.) →
*F:I said when you were →
(1.5)
*F:don't shout at me (.) →
*F:that's naughty
(1.) →
*E:no, I do, I'm not a baby →
*E:I'm (1.) eh a big girl →
%gpx:while saying big girl, she rocks back and strongly
withdraws her hands to her lap in what Forrester calls a
body pout
*F:you are →
*F:a very big big girl →
*E:I'm xxx a little baby →
*E:I am not a little baby →
*F:what darling ↗
*E:I'm not a little baby, a big →
@End