

Borrowing, age of acquisition and rates of change

Introduction

We test whether rates of lexical replacement can be predicted by age of acquisition. The key variables in the dataset `pagel/loanword9.csv` are:

- word: orthographic form
- borrowing: whether the word is borrowed into English, according to WOLD
- phonology: phonological form, according to CELEX
- phonlength: number of phonological segments
- AoA: age of acquisition, according to Kuperman et al. (2012)
- sublexzipf: frequency from SUBTLEX
- pagel_rate: rate of lexical replacement according to Pagel, Atkinson & Meade (2007)
- cat: part of speech of the word

Pagel, Atkinson & Meade find that lexical replacement rates are higher for less frequent words, though the baseline rate differs by part of speech. We use mixed effects modelling to investigate the effects of length, age of acquisition and concreteness, with random intercepts for part of speech.

Load libraries

```
library(lme4)
library(sjPlot)
library(ggplot2)
library(gplots)
library(gridExtra)
```

Load data

Scale and center all variables:

```
d = read.csv("../pagel/loanword9.csv", stringsAsFactors = F)
d$pagel_rate = as.numeric(d$pagel_rate)
```

```
## Warning: NAs introduced by coercion
```

```
d$AoA = as.numeric(d$AoA)
```

```
## Warning: NAs introduced by coercion
```

```
d$sublexzipf = as.numeric(d$sublexzipf)
```

```
## Warning: NAs introduced by coercion
```

```
d$phonlength = as.numeric(d$phonlength)
d$conc = as.numeric(d$conc)
```

```
## Warning: NAs introduced by coercion
```

```


# group borrowing confidence
d$borrowing[d$borrowing==2] = 1
d$borrowing[d$borrowing==3] = NA
d$borrowing[d$borrowing==4] = 5
d$borrowing[d$borrowing==7] = NA

# complete cases only
d = d[complete.cases(d[,c("borrowing", 'AoA', 'phonlength', 'conc', 'pagel_rate')]),]

```

Plot raw data:


```
plotmeans(d$pagel_rate~d$borrowing)
```



```

ggplot(d, aes(AoA, as.numeric(pagel_rate))) +
  geom_point() + stat_smooth(method="lm") +
  ylab("Rate of replacement")

```



Scale variables for analysis:

```
d$pagel_rate = scale(d$pagel_rate)
d$AoA.scale = scale(d$AoA)
d$subtlexzipf.scale = scale(d$subtlexzipf)
d$phonlength.scale = scale(d$phonlength)
d$conc.scale = scale(d$conc)

# most frequent category as intercept
d$borrowing = factor(d$borrowing, levels=c(5,1), labels = c("no", "yes"))
d$borrowing.num = as.numeric(d$borrowing)-1
```

Modelling

Null model:

```
m0 = lmer(pagel_rate ~ 1 + (1|cat), data=d)
```

As expected, borrowed words have a higher rate of change:

```
m1 = lmer(pagel_rate ~
  borrowing +
  (1|cat),
  data = d)
anova(m0, m1)
```

```
## refitting model(s) with ML (instead of REML)
```

```
## Data: d
## Models:
## m0: pagel_rate ~ 1 + (1 | cat)
## m1: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + (1 | cat)
##      Df      AIC      BIC logLik deviance Chisq Chi Df Pr(>Chisq)
## m0  3 528.17 537.90 -261.09  522.17
## m1  4 518.80 531.77 -255.40  510.80 11.371      1 0.000746 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

The original model in Pagel et al. found relationships between rate of change, frequency and length:

```
m2 = lmer(pagel_rate ~
  borrowing +
  subtllexzipf.scale +
  (1 | cat),
  data = d)
m3 = lmer(pagel_rate ~
  borrowing +
  subtllexzipf.scale +
  phonlength.scale +
  (1 | cat),
  data = d)
anova(m1,m2,m3)
```

```
## refitting model(s) with ML (instead of REML)
```

```
## Data: d
## Models:
## m1: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + (1 | cat)
## m2: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + subtllexzipf.scale + (1 | cat)
## m3: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + subtllexzipf.scale + phonlength.scale +
## m3:      (1 | cat)
##      Df      AIC      BIC logLik deviance Chisq Chi Df Pr(>Chisq)
## m1  4 518.80 531.77 -255.40  510.80
## m2  5 509.09 525.30 -249.55  499.09 11.7106      1 0.0006214 ***
## m3  6 505.04 524.49 -246.52  493.04  6.0557      1 0.0138616 *
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

```
summary(m3)
```

```
## Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']
## Formula: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + subtllexzipf.scale + phonlength.scale +
##      (1 | cat)
##      Data: d
##
## REML criterion at convergence: 502.9
##
## Scaled residuals:
##      Min      1Q  Median      3Q      Max
## -2.0268 -0.6162 -0.2251  0.5129  2.7396
##
## Random effects:
##      Groups      Name      Variance Std.Dev.
##      cat      (Intercept) 0.2484    0.4984
```

```
## Residual          0.7513  0.8668
## Number of obs: 189, groups:  cat, 10
##
## Fixed effects:
##               Estimate Std. Error t value
## (Intercept)    0.01825   0.20291   0.090
## borrowingyes   0.49831   0.18476   2.697
## subtlxzipf.scale -0.24474   0.08498  -2.880
## phnlength.scale  0.16917   0.06898   2.452
##
## Correlation of Fixed Effects:
##          (Intr) brrwng sbtnlx.
## borrowingys -0.127
## sbtnlxzpf.sc -0.308  0.039
## phnlnlngth.sc  0.050 -0.197  0.215
```

Indeed, both length and frequency are significant predictors of rate of change.

We can test whether there are non-linear effects for frequency and length:

```
m3.freq2 = lmer(pagel_rate ~
  borrowing +
  subtlxzipf.scale +
  I(subtlxzipf.scale^2) +
  phnlength.scale +
  (1 | cat),
  data = d)
m3.len2 = lmer(pagel_rate ~
  borrowing +
  subtlxzipf.scale +
  I(phnlength.scale^2) +
  phnlength.scale +
  (1 | cat),
  data = d)
anova(m3, m3.freq2)

## refitting model(s) with ML (instead of REML)

## Data: d
## Models:
## m3: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + subtlxzipf.scale + phnlength.scale +
## m3:      (1 | cat)
## m3.freq2: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + subtlxzipf.scale + I(subtlxzipf.scale^2) +
## m3.freq2:      phnlength.scale + (1 | cat)
##           Df    AIC    BIC logLik deviance Chisq Chi Df Pr(>Chisq)
## m3           6 505.04 524.49 -246.52  493.04
## m3.freq2     7 507.02 529.72 -246.51  493.02 0.0115      1    0.9147
anova(m3, m3.len2)
```

```
## refitting model(s) with ML (instead of REML)

## Data: d
## Models:
## m3: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + subtlxzipf.scale + phnlength.scale +
## m3:      (1 | cat)
## m3.len2: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + subtlxzipf.scale + I(phnlength.scale^2) +
```

```
## m3.len2:      phonlength.scale + (1 | cat)
##           Df      AIC      BIC logLik deviance Chisq Chi Df Pr(>Chisq)
## m3           6 505.04 524.49 -246.52  493.04
## m3.len2      7 505.16 527.86 -245.58  491.16 1.871      1      0.1714
```

There is no significant non-linear (quadratic) effect of frequency or length.

We can now add age of acquisition:

```
m4 = lmer(pagel_rate ~
  borrowing +
  phonlength.scale +
  subtlxzipf.scale +
  AoA.scale +
  (1 | cat),
  data = d)
anova(m3,m4)

## refitting model(s) with ML (instead of REML)

## Data: d
## Models:
## m3: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + subtlxzipf.scale + phonlength.scale +
## m3:      (1 | cat)
## m4: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + phonlength.scale + subtlxzipf.scale +
## m4:      AoA.scale + (1 | cat)
##      Df      AIC      BIC logLik deviance Chisq Chi Df Pr(>Chisq)
## m3    6 505.04 524.49 -246.52  493.04
## m4    7 500.55 523.24 -243.27  486.55 6.4894      1      0.01085 *
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

summary(m4)
```

```
## Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']
## Formula: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + phonlength.scale + subtlxzipf.scale +
##      AoA.scale + (1 | cat)
##      Data: d
##
## REML criterion at convergence: 500.1
##
## Scaled residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -2.0850 -0.6595 -0.1920  0.4955  2.8777
##
## Random effects:
##      Groups   Name                Variance Std.Dev.
##      cat      (Intercept)  0.2093     0.4575
##      Residual                0.7338     0.8566
## Number of obs: 189, groups:  cat, 10
##
## Fixed effects:
##              Estimate Std. Error t value
## (Intercept)   -0.06110    0.19282  -0.317
## borrowingyes    0.50080    0.18250   2.744
## phonlength.scale 0.15176    0.06849   2.216
## subtlxzipf.scale -0.15846    0.08969  -1.767
```

```
## AoA.scale          0.17481    0.06942    2.518
##
## Correlation of Fixed Effects:
##          (Intr) brrwng phnltn. sbtlx.
## borrowingys -0.132
## phnlnlngth.sc  0.067 -0.196
## sbtlxzipf.sc -0.345  0.038  0.163
## AoA.scale    -0.160  0.005 -0.103  0.372
```

Age of acquisition significantly improves the model and has an effect size similar to length (also, frequency has a much weaker effect).

Add concreteness:

```
m5 = lmer(pagel_rate ~
          phonlength.scale +
          subtlxzipf.scale +
          AoA.scale +
          borrowing +
          conc.scale +
          (1|cat),
          data = d)
anova(m4,m5)
```

```
## refitting model(s) with ML (instead of REML)
```

```
## Data: d
## Models:
## m4: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + phonlength.scale + subtlxzipf.scale +
## m4:      AoA.scale + (1 | cat)
## m5: pagel_rate ~ phonlength.scale + subtlxzipf.scale + AoA.scale +
## m5:      borrowing + conc.scale + (1 | cat)
##      Df      AIC      BIC logLik deviance Chisq Chi Df Pr(>Chisq)
## m4   7 500.55 523.24 -243.27  486.55
## m5   8 501.03 526.96 -242.51  485.03 1.5177      1      0.218
```

Concreteness does not significantly improve the fit of the model.

Final model:

```
finalModel = m4
summary(finalModel)


## Linear mixed model fit by REML ['lmerMod']
## Formula: pagel_rate ~ borrowing + phonlength.scale + subtlxzipf.scale +
##      AoA.scale + (1 | cat)
##      Data: d
##
## REML criterion at convergence: 500.1
##
## Scaled residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -2.0850 -0.6595 -0.1920  0.4955  2.8777
##
## Random effects:
##      Groups      Name              Variance Std.Dev.
```

```
## cat      (Intercept) 0.2093  0.4575
## Residual      0.7338  0.8566
## Number of obs: 189, groups:  cat, 10
##
## Fixed effects:
##              Estimate Std. Error t value
## (Intercept)   -0.06110   0.19282  -0.317
## borrowingyes    0.50080   0.18250   2.744
## phonlength.scale 0.15176   0.06849   2.216
## subtlxzipf.scale -0.15846   0.08969  -1.767
## AoA.scale       0.17481   0.06942   2.518
##
## Correlation of Fixed Effects:
##              (Intr) brrwng phnltn. sbtlx.
## borrowingys -0.132
## phnlngth.sc  0.067 -0.196
## sbtlxzipf.sc -0.345  0.038  0.163
## AoA.scale    -0.160  0.005 -0.103  0.372
```

Random intercepts for part of speech:

```
sjp.lmer(finalModel)
```

```
## Plotting random effects...
```



Model estimates

```
px =sjp.lmer(finalModel, 'eff', c("AoA.scale","phonlength.scale","subtlexzipf.scale"),
             show.ci = T, prnt.plot = F, facet.grid = F)
```

```
## Warning: package 'bindrcpp' was built under R version 3.3.2
```

```
pr.sc = attr(d$pagel_rate,"scaled:scale")
pr.cn = attr(d$pagel_rate,"scaled:center")
# length
p1 = px$plot.list[[1]]
p1$data$x = p1$data$x *attr(d$phonlength.scale,"scaled:scale") +
  attr(d$phonlength.scale,"scaled:center")
p1$data$y = p1$data$y * pr.sc + pr.cn
p1$data$lower = p1$data$lower * pr.sc + pr.cn
p1$data$upper = p1$data$upper * pr.sc + pr.cn
p1 = p1 + ggtitle("Rates of change (English)") +
  xlab("Word Length") +
  ylab("")+
  ylab("Rate of lexical replacement")+
  coord_cartesian(ylim=c(1.5,6))


# frequency
p2 = px$plot.list[[2]]
p2$data$x = p2$data$x *attr(d$subtlexzipf.scale,"scaled:scale") +
  attr(d$subtlexzipf.scale,"scaled:center")
p2$data$y = p2$data$y * pr.sc + pr.cn
p2$data$lower = p2$data$lower * pr.sc + pr.cn
p2$data$upper = p2$data$upper * pr.sc + pr.cn
p2 = p2 + ggtitle("") +
  xlab("Frequency") +
  ylab("")+
  coord_cartesian(ylim=c(1.5,6))

# Age of acquisition
p3 = px$plot.list[[3]]
p3$data$x = p3$data$x *attr(d$AoA.scale,"scaled:scale") +
  attr(d$AoA.scale,"scaled:center")
p3$data$y = p3$data$y * pr.sc + pr.cn
p3$data$lower = p3$data$lower * pr.sc + pr.cn
p3$data$upper = p3$data$upper * pr.sc + pr.cn
p3 = p3 + ggtitle("") +
  xlab("Age of acquisition") +
  ylab("") +
  coord_cartesian(ylim=c(1.5,6))
pdf(file='../results/graphs/Pagel_RatesOfChange.pdf',
    height =3,width = 8)
grid.arrange(p1,p2,p3, nrow=1)
dev.off()
```

```
## pdf
```

```
## 2
```

```
grid.arrange(p1,p2,p3, nrow=1)
```



Summary

There was a significant main effect of whether the word is borrowed (log likelihood difference = 5.7 , df = 1 , Chi Squared = 11.37 , p = 0.00075).

There was a significant main effect of frequency (log likelihood difference = 5.9 , df = 1 , Chi Squared = 11.71 , p = 0.00062).

There was a significant main effect of word length (log likelihood difference = 3 , df = 1 , Chi Squared = 6.06 , p = 0.014).

There was a significant main effect of age of acquisition (log likelihood difference = 3.2 , df = 1 , Chi Squared = 6.49 , p = 0.011).

There was no significant main effect of concreteness (log likelihood difference = 0.76 , df = 1 , Chi Squared = 1.52 , p = 0.22).

Rates of change are higher for:

- Borrowed words
- Less frequent words
- Longer words
- Words acquired later in childhood

References

- Kuperman, V., Stadthagen-Gonzalez, H., & Brysbaert, M. (2012). Age-of-acquisition ratings for 30,000 English words. *Behavior Research Methods*, 44(4), 978-990.
- Pagel, M., Atkinson, Q. D., & Meade, A. (2007). Frequency of word-use predicts rates of lexical evolution throughout Indo-European history. *Nature*, 449(7163), 717-720.