Take-Home Final Exam
due by 5 pm on Wednesday, 15 December, at Avery 347

Ground rules:
(1) Please do this exam entirely on your own. It is cheating to talk to anyone but me about it.
(2) Please do not try to find the original articles and books the data are from. It won't help and
the goal here is for you to analyze this new data yourself.
(3) The maximum length for each answer is 2 double-spaced pages.
(4) Anything illegible or over the maximum page length will be treated as though it is doesn't
exist.
(5) Each answer is worth 20 points, giving a possible total of 100 points for the entire exam.

1. Answer EITHER
A. Define the mutual exclusivity hypothesis and describe the facts that it was intended to
account for.

OR

B. Using Harris and Chasin’s taxonomy as represented in Table 1 below, categorize each of
the words in Table 2 below as a Personal Name, Object Name, Context-Bound Object Word or
Action Word. Discuss any problems you have categorizing any words. In particular, discuss
places where you need more contextual information and what kind of contextual information you
would need to determine the category to which the word belongs.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal name</td>
<td>Unique name for people, family pets, favourite toys</td>
<td>Lamby – toy lamb used as comforter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dylan – family cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object name</td>
<td>Corresponding to Nelson’s (1973) ‘general nominal’ category; only including words that were understood in at least two different behavioural contexts</td>
<td>Cat – family cat, novel picture of cats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nose – teddy’s nose, own nose, mother’s nose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context-bound object word</td>
<td>Object words that were understood in only one behavioural context</td>
<td>Bird – when indoors, looks out of window to garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Car – waves on hearing word or sound of car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action word</td>
<td>All words or phrases that were associated with actions rather than with objects</td>
<td>Down – squats down on haunches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch – goes to kitchen and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attempts to climb into high chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from “Developments in early lexical comprehension: a comparison of parental report and controlled testing”, by
Productive Words of a Child 1;6

| [ʔəʔo] | ‘uhoh’ | used when a mistake is made or some intentional act is committed which resembles an accident (e.g., dropping something) |
| [æbu] | ‘apple’ | used to name or request an apple |
| [dɪdi] | ‘kitty’ | used to name a cat or while chasing a cat or when present in a place in which cats were observed on some prior occasion |
| [æp] ~ [ʌbʌ] | ‘up’ | used while climbing, sitting up, standing up, tiptoeing, raising objects or to request that someone else lift something including himself |
| [nəʊ] ~ [næʊ] | ‘no’ | used to refuse or reject |
| [nəʊ] | ‘nose’ | used when pointing at nose in playing a game: “Where’s your nose?” etc. |
| [ai] | ‘eye’ | used when pointing at eye in same game |
| [daɪ] | ‘Guy’ | used to refer to his older brother, Guy |
| [ti] | ‘tree’ | used when pointing at trees |

2. Answer EITHER

A. Children often use lexical items for things that adults would not. Some kinds of misapplications are quite common; some are not documented at all. Describe how people have accounted for the fact that children will often use dog to mean any four-legged animal or daddy to mean any man, but they won’t use dog to mean tail or ears or daddy to mean the action of picking up a child.

OR

B. Compare an L1 speaker and an adult L2 speaker in acquiring their first ten words in production. How do their experiences and early patterns of acquisition differ?

3. Answer EITHER

A. It has been claimed (repeatedly) that children cannot make use of negative evidence in acquiring their first language. Much anecdotal evidence has been offered up in support of this claim. What else might account for the failure of children to make use of the negative evidence in interactions like the nobody-don’t-like-me or the nother-one-spoon stories?

OR

B. We have seen at least one case in which negative evidence does appear to be used by L2 learners. Describe the difference between that negative evidence and the kind language students typically get.
4. Answer EITHER

A. What is the critical period hypothesis? What kind of evidence is used to support the existence of a critical period in acquiring a language? Be specific and refer to the appropriate papers from class.

OR

A. The following data from an Arabic L1/English L2 speaker came from four meetings during the beginning of the speaker’s study of English.

**Time 1:**
- No (as an imperative)
- No English (to mean “I don’t speak English”)

**Time 2:**
- No (in answer to a question)
- I can’t speak English.
- My husband not here.
- Not raining.

**Time 3:**
- No (in answer to a question) I can’t speak English.
- My husband not here.
- My husband not home.
- Don’t touch.
- Don’t touch it

**Time 4:**
- My husband not here.
- Hani not sleeping.
- I can’t speak English.
- No, I can’t understand.
- I don’t now.
- Don’t eat.
- No, this is ... (in answer to a question)

How are these data consistent with or different from the typical pattern of an L2 speaker acquiring English negatives?

5. Answer EITHER

A. Zobl (1980 as presented in Braidi, *The Acquisition of Second Language Syntax*: 45-6) noted that while questions like *Is the breakfast is good?* are common in both L1 and L2 acquisition of English, L1 speakers of French produce many more of these sentences than other L2 learners of English and they “overwhelming confine” this construction to sentences with subjects with noun heads as opposed to those with pronominal subjects (so they rarely produce sentences like *Is it is good?*) Zobl used this data together with the following data from French to make an argument for transfer/interference.

(a) Il est touriste. “He is a tourist”
(b) Marc est touriste. “Mark is a tourist”
(c) Est-il touriste? “Is he a tourist?”
(d) Marc est-il touriste? “Is Mark a tourist?”
(e) Est-ce que Marc est touriste?
   Is-it that Mark is tourist “Is Mark a tourist?”
(f) *Est Marc touriste? “Is Marc a tourist?”

Summarize the argument that can be made here in favor of a transfer analysis for the pattern of errors found in the usage of L1 French speakers.

OR

B. Read the attached paper (Santelmann et al.) and summarize (briefly) the argument in favor of UG on the basis of the pattern of inversion found in the language of very young English-speaking children.