

A. Introduction

In this paper, I analyze the syntactic and pragmatic development of two videos. The two videos show two kids, Tiffany and Matteo, where Tiffany displays her syntactic development and Matteo his pragmatic development. I will describe and give examples of the syntactic and pragmatic features found in each of the two videos as well as quote and explain the examples found.

B. Analysis: Part 1 (Video 1)

I analyze the first video of Tiffany and her mother in this paragraph and examine Tiffany's syntactic development. In the first video, Tiffany demonstrates her syntactic development with her mother. When she first begins talking with her mother in the video, she says "I did everything right in my room.", which is a seven-word utterance and seven morphemes. She also says "I was going to my work.", which is a six-word utterance with six morphemes, "It had flowers on it.", which is a five-word utterance with six morphemes, "I did everything right.", which is a four-word utterance with four morphemes, and "Can you see it now?" which is a five-word utterance with five morphemes, "And someone didn't put it in there", which is a seven-word utterance with eight morphemes, "Cause I'm not going to love you any seconds.", a nine-word utterance with eleven morphemes, and various one-word utterances like "Nothing" and "No. She exhibits ranges anywhere from one-word utterances in her sentences as a response to her mother like when she says "No." to twenty-five-word utterances in a sentence like when she was talking about a doughnut "Because I didn't want to but I got out my room and someone frozen it and I eat it, and Daddy was mad at me.". Approximately she produces around five point four words as her mean length of utterance in accordance with the utterances previously stated. Throughout the video she produces statements, questions and negatives. This

is seen when she says “I did everything right”, which is a statement in response to her mother, “Can you see it now?”, which is a question she asks her mother, and “He wasn’t going anywhere” and “No he’s not”, which are negative statements Tiffany states to her mother. When Tiffany says, “I got out of my room and someone frozen it” she forgot to add the past tense of the auxiliary verb “have”, which is “had” to complete the verb phrase “had frozen”. It is possible that she also could have meant to say the past tense of the verb “freeze”, which is “froze”. She also says, “No he’s not” after her mother says “He was in here with Mommy” where Tiffany uses the present tense instead of the past tense of the verb “is”. When Tiffany talks about her father, she was conjoining a lot of the things she was talking about, “I popped Daddy and he was crying and he was in time-out and then he wasn’t going anywhere.” She uses the conjunction “and” correctly albeit many times in one utterance. Tiffany also uses anaphoric pronouns like when she talks about Miles and her father, “He took it out”, where she uses the anaphoric pronoun “He” in place of her father and “No he’s not”, where she uses the anaphoric pronoun “He” again but this time to refer to Miles. While Tiffany uses these later-developing constructions, she has trouble when describing her “work” leading to object-gaps while talking about it “I was going to my work. It had flowers on it, and it had cake on it, and strawberries on it, like that.” The object-gap happens when Tiffany didn’t put together the head noun “work” with the relative clauses “flowers, cake and strawberries” and separated the head noun and relative clauses into two sentences. All in all, Tiffany shows great syntactic development in her video and demonstrates an above average mean length of utterance for her age. While she has problems with verb tenses, she is able to show that she can make statements, negatives and questions in conversation as well as later-developing constructions in the form of using anaphoric pronouns to a good extent.

C. Analysis: Part 2(Video 2)

In this second paragraph, I analyze the video of Matteo and his mother and examine his pragmatic development. The first thing I notice is how poorly Matteo approaches turn-taking with his mother. He constantly interrupts her throughout the video, closing his eyes and saying “Look at- listen to me!”. He says this in the middle of what his mother is saying various times and calling her mother by her first name Linda. He is still learning how to understand conversational boundaries and obvious cues, which lead him to interrupt his mother with irrelevant comments. He also doesn’t follow any Gricean Maxims throughout his conversation. His statements don’t have any quality like when he says “Everything they do at this house, you can’t trust everything at Grandma’s house.” and shortly thereafter “Then what?” as a response to when his mother said that she has to yell at him and his brother. The statements that Matteo says do not have any quality to them because they aren’t provided with evidence. When his mother says “I said no cupcakes and you tried to get cupcakes and you tried to ask Grandma.”, Matteo’s response was “If you do something - if you get - you’re gonna burn your butt.”, which has little to no relation to what his mother told him. Talking about burning his butt when his mother was talking about punishment means there is a lack of relation in his sentences and also a lack of manner because these responses are ambiguous and unclear. When it comes to initiating topics or maintaining them, who does them to an extent but not well. For example, when Matteo’s mother says “He’s your little bob bops but he doesn’t listen.” he responds with “But Linda, honey, honey, look at- look at this. Right now you can’t do anything if you can’t get everything out of this wall.”. This shows that he can’t really stay on topic or maintain them while replying to his mother. He doesn’t defend his little brother but changes the topic entirely to talking about the wall of the house. Although he has trouble with this, he shows demonstrations of repairing conversational breakdowns. This is seen when he says “This-this-this thing. This-this-this-thing”

and then grabs the tablecloth that's on the table to show specifically what he's referring to. He also says "Okay then what?" as a response to ask his mother what the problem was after she says "Okay?". In doing so, he exhibits some form of repairing conversational breakdowns when speaking to his mother in the video. Overall, Matteo is still working on his pragmatic development in the video. Even though he shows some level of repairing conversation breakdowns, he has problems with turn-taking, doesn't really follow most of the Gricean Maxims and has trouble with staying on topic.

D. Conclusion

In conclusion, both Tiffany and Matteo show their syntactic and pragmatic developments respectively. Tiffany has displayed above-average levels of syntactic development with a high mean length of utterance, the ability to make different types of sentences, and later-developing constructions. Matteo, on the other hand, shows that he is still learning and improving his skills in his pragmatic development. He has trouble turn-taking, following Gricean Maxims and maintaining topics while showing a level of repairing conversational breakdowns. Both children are still developing and show levels of syntactic and pragmatic developments in their videos.