SHATZ 1978   5 MAY 2020

When performance looks better than competence can account for...

≡: The action-based strategy :≡

<u>Response heuristic proposed</u>: use action in context to make a response
    unless some linguistic or nonlinguistic element indicates otherwise   ⤷ useful for poor comprehension
      ⤷ a return for us to intention-reading & speech act inference

→ hard to assess competence when interaction is designed for success (leads to overestimation of skills)
     ⤷ "natural" part of parenting young kids (a "palliative")

· directive language is common but formatted in many ways (e.g. direct vs. indirect)
· triadic joint attention = recognizing particip. w/ interactive framework + attention to objects & actions (Piaget-style)
· referential discovery precedes fully symbolic lg use (here & now topics vs. not)
· response procedures of other sorts build up over time, incl. linguistic cues :

     Respond with action a or with action on an object o unless l or c is present,
     where a and o are members of the set S, l is a member of the set L, and c is a
     member of the set C (p. 277)

     S = set of actions / objects identifiable from the speech stream
     L = set of constraint markers identifiable in the linguistic input
     C = set of constraint markers identifiable from the physical/interpersonal/social context

· ~~STOP-ACTION~~ markers (e.g. 'where') elicit specific responses, canonically
   non-action responses

EXP 1

- 18 middle-class 19-34 mo Eng learners (L/M/H MLU scores)
- 5 toy sets, 8 utterances w/ diff forms, randomized
- Sentences used by experimenter in live interaction (video)
   w/ fillers & minimal other responses (17-40 completed trials)
- check for use of meaningful (action / informing? action) responses

{ **91%** ACTION RESP }
   { 9% INFORMING }

TYPES { **80+%** ACTION RESP }

RESPONSE { 98—93—83 % ACTION MEANINGFUL
   L   M   H
   ———————
      MLU }

3 { no evidence for STOP-ACTION use

IN A "NEUTRAL" SITUATION, ACTION RESPONSES DOMINATE OVER SENTENCE TYPES & POTENTIAL "STOP-ACTION" CUES **BUT** MORE LIN-GUISTICALLY SOPHISTICATED KIDS PRODUCE NON-ACTION ~~RESPONSES~~ RESPONSES OCCASIONALLY

EXP 2

- M & H MLU preps from Exp I
- 12 toy sets w/ 4 sentence types (complex - see Methods)
- Sentences embedded in directive (imperative) or informing context

	CONTEXT		
ACTION			INFORMING
M H			M H
84 vs. 88 % Act resps	DURING SET-UP →		82 vs 85 % info resps
90 vs. 94 %			47 vs 72 %

"Can you..." sentences slightly trickier for M kids

SUMMARY

- No evidence for direct intention-grammar mappings — unlikely for early development
- Support instead for general cognitive strategies
   ⤷ plausibility of messages, estimated simplistically by words heard & possible actions
- Competent responding develops via stop-action dev. & direct feedback / correction / repair

CONTEXTUALLY AFFORDED / RELEVANT ACTIONS