# Final - Unit 8-11 Reading

## Reading Unit 8

BICS – Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills

- Conversational fluency in a language

CALP – Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

- Students' ability to understand and express, in both oral and written modes, concepts and ideas that are relevant to success in school

The Developmental Interdependence Model

- This hypothesis proposes that the development of competence in a second language (L2) is partially a function of the type of competence already developed in L1 at the time when intensive exposure to L2 begins
    - The more developed or proficient L1, the easier it may be to develop L2. For those whose L1 is at a lower stage of growth achieving proficiency in L2 will be more difficult

The Threshold Hypothesis

- For bilinguals, the positive cognitive effects of bilingualism are dependent on the linguistic competence in both languages.
- there may be threshold levels of linguistic competence which a bilingual child must attain both in order to avoid cognitive disadvantages and allow the potentially beneficial aspects of bilingualism to influence his cognitive and academic functioning
- Need certain amount of proficiency in both languages to make the advantage to show up
- In the Threshold Theory Cummins (1987, as cited in Lyon, 1996) has referred to three kinds of bilingualism: Proficient Bilingualism; Partial Bilingualism; and Limited

Bilingualism. In the first one there are age-appropriate levels in both languages, in the second age-appropriate level in one of the languages, and in the third low levels in both languages.

- Age appropriate level(level this age should obtain)

## Readings for Unit 9:

[1]

Certain verbs can be used in different linguistic frames, i.e. transitively and intransitively- John broke the glass/ The glass broke.
Timberlake ripped the costume/ The costume ripped.
The first one uses a transitive frame (Sub Ob V)and is an agentive description- there is an explicitly mentioned agent that performs the action
The second uses an intransitive frame and is a non-agentive description- it lacks the direct mention of an agent causing the action.
Experiment 1:
Participants (236 Stanford undergrads) read either the agentive or the non-agentive account about an individual (Mrs. Smith) who was involved in a restaurant fire.
They then answered two questions- one about how much Mrs. Smith is to be blamed for the accident (scale of 1 to 7), one about how much Mrs. Smith should have to pay.
Results- The choice of linguistic frame used in the description influenced people's judgments of both blame and financial liability.
Participants who read the agentive account blamed Mrs. Smith more than did participants who read the non-agentive account
Participants who got the agentive report ruled that Mrs. Smith should pay $247 (36%) more in fines than did participants who got the non-agentive report.
Experiment 2:
Participants got an agentive or non-agentive accident description, and also learned of a blame attribution generated by an independent review panel. This panel attributed low, middle, or high blame to the person involved in the accident. After learning how blameworthy other people judged the person to be, participants determined the person's financial liability for the property damage.
This study tested both the influence of language and independent blame reports in participants' determination of financial liability.
As in exp 1, participants read either the agentive or the non-agentive narrative. They also learned that an independent panel judged the person to be either a 1 (low), a 4

(middle), or a 7 (high) in terms of blame.
Participants then answered a financial liability question Thus, participants in exp 2 answered only the financial liability question.
Overall, people judged that Mrs. Smith should pay more in damages when the independent panel ruled her to be highly to blame than when the panel assigned her a middle level of blame, which was higher than then when she was ruled to be of low.
Interestingly, language also influenced financial liability judgments. Mrs. Smith was held responsible for $153 (or 26%) more in damages by people who got the agentive report than by those who got the non-agentive report.

[2]
This is an interesting paper on the effects of grammatical gender (masculine, feminine, neuter) in
languages like Spanish and German, and whether inanimate nouns (e.g. ‘bridge’, ‘table’,
‘moon’) are understood differently in different languages due to their grammatical gender.
Please familiarize yourselves with the hypothesis, how it has been tested, and the results. There
may be a question on this in the final exam.
Grammatical gender- Some languages assign gender to all inanimate objects, i.e., tables, chairs, buses etc. can be taken to be masculine or feminine grammatically
Mental representation of objects is influenced by the grammatical gender of the objects in people’s native language
German and Spanish speakers were taught some random object name pairs (eg. Apple à Patrick or Patricia).
The gender of the assigned names matched that of the gender of the object in the native language of the speaker 50% times
Such objects were chosen that had opposite genders in Spanish and German (eg. Apple, which is masculine in German, feminine in Spanish)
Results- Both German and Spanish speakers remembered the assigned proper names better when the gender of the name matched with the grammatical gender of the object the name was paired with
German and Spanish speakers were also asked to describe a set of objects that had different grammatical genders in the two languages with 3 adjectives
Results- The subjects used different adjectives for words that have masculine gender in

their language ( adjectives like big, dangerous etc.) and for words that have feminine gender in their language (adjectives like tiny, beautiful)
Thus, German and Spanish speakers were found to use very different adjectives to describe the same object as the objects chosen for the experiment had different grammatical genders in Spanish and English
Similar results were observed in non-linguistic tasks like picture-matching.
Conclusion- Grammatical distinction in a language can potentially bias people's mental representation of inanimate objects.

## Reading Unit 10

### Main Proposal:

When previous study of the difference in men and women conversation mainly focused on the impact of social power or psychological difference, this chapter reinterpret the findings of previous study from the perspective of cultural differences between men and women in their conceptions of friendly conversation, their rules for engaging in it, and their rules for interpreting it.

### The specific ways that the authors suggest misunderstandings can occur in male-female communication:

1. There are two interpretations of the meaning of questions. Women seem to see questions as a part of conversational maintenance, while men seem to view them primarily as requests for information.
2. There are two conventions for beginning an utterance and linking it to the preceding utterance. Women's rules seem to call for an explicit acknowledgment of what has been said and making a connection to it. Men seem to have no such rule and in fact some male strategies call for ignoring the preceding comments.
3. There are different interpretations of displays of verbal aggressiveness. Women seem to interpret overt aggressiveness as personally directed, negative, and disruptive. Men seem to view it as one conventional organizing structure for conversational flow.
4. There appear to be two different attitudes towards problem sharing and advice giving. Women tend to discuss problems with one another, sharing experiences and offering reassurances. Men, in contrast, tend to hear women, and other men, who

present them with problems as making explicit requests for solutions. They respond by giving advice, by acting as experts, lecturing to their audiences.