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Introduction

The word segmentation problem: when and how infants begin to segment word-like forms from the continuous speech stream?

Early word segmentation plays a crucial role in language acquisition (i.e., word learning, syntax – Newman et al., 2006; Singh et al., 2012)
Introduction

- Segmentation abilities in typically developing infants have been shown to vary across languages (e.g., Jusczyk & Aslin, 1995; Jusczyk et al., 1999; Seidl & Johnson, 2006; Hohle & Weissenborn, 2003, 2005; Bosch et al, 2013; Nazi et al., 2006; Mersad et al., 2010; Nazi et al., 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Monosyllabic</th>
<th>Bisyllabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trochaic</td>
<td>Iambic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>7.5m</td>
<td>7.5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>7-9m</td>
<td>9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish/Catalan</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>7.5m?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

- **Rhythmic properties** of a language (i.e., stress based, syllable based) may be utilised to begin segmenting continuous speech – what the infant relies on (Nazzi et al. 2006)

- Word position may be crucial also due to prosody: Words at **utterance edges/boundaries** easier to segment than those in the middle (Seidl & Johnson, 2006; Johnson et al., 2014)
  - Edge provides particularly **salient cues** e.g. duration and pitch cues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Rhythm</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Edge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Stress-timed</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Stress-timed</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Syllable-timed</td>
<td>Syllable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Present study

- First attempt to study emerging segmentation abilities in European Portuguese (EP) learning infants.

- **EP rhythm** displays both stress and syllable timing properties, unlike English or Spanish (Frota & Vigário 2001).

- Also, unlike other languages, EP provides strong cues to high prosodic phrase boundaries and word boundaries, but not to lower phrase boundaries (Vigário, 2003; Frota 2014).
Aims

- Identify at what point in development segmentation abilities emerge

- Investigate whether **prosody** constrains early word segmentation abilities in EP in comparison with other languages
  - Monosyllabic segmentation earlier/later
  - Effect of **prosodic salience** (prosodic boundaries)
Two studies

EP learning infants’ ability to segment monosyllabic word forms

STUDY 1
5-6 months and 8-9 months

STUDY 2
12 months
Method – Study 1

Participants

- **5-6 months:**
  - 20 infants from monolingual homes in the Lisbon area
    (11 boys, mean age 6m 3d, range 4m 19d – 7m 11d)
  - 5 infants excluded due to fussiness (1), risk of autism (1), not needed (3)

- **8-9 months:**
  - 20 infants from monolingual homes in the Lisbon area
    (12 boys, mean age 9m 2d, range 7m 27d – 10m 8d)
  - 0 infants excluded
Method – Study 1

Materials

- 4 monosyllabic pseudo words (CVC/CVG)
  - Ful, Queu, Pis, Sau
- 2 passages constructed for each word, one for middle and one for end sentences

A Marta pôs o seu [blue] na mesa.
Fizemos festas ao [red] vermelho.
Nunca comi [green] com morangos.
O Tó desenhou um [yellow] bonito.
Conheço [orange] doce do Algarve.
Eles disseram [pink] muitas vezes.

Os vizinhos brincam com o teu [blue].
Estão sempre a falar-nos do [red].
Elas viajavam muito de [green].
Os anões adoram bolachas e [yellow].
Quero agradecer tudo ao [orange].
A Dora anda no seu grande [pink].
Method – Study 1

Internal to the Intonational Phrase (IP)

Final Intonational Phrase edge (=sentence)

Less Prominent

Prosodically Prominent
## Method – Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>End</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Length (ms)</td>
<td>2000.63</td>
<td>143.36</td>
<td>1952.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable Duration Before Boundary (ms)</td>
<td>308.79</td>
<td>52.49</td>
<td>494.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable Duration After Boundary (ms)</td>
<td>203.46</td>
<td>67.98</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Range (hz)</td>
<td>-24.52</td>
<td>32.32</td>
<td>-59.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Reset (HZ)</td>
<td>-17.75</td>
<td>39.04</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonal Event</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>L%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Method – Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Medial: PhP</th>
<th></th>
<th>Medial: PW</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Length (ms)</td>
<td>2022.69</td>
<td>94.20</td>
<td>1974.55</td>
<td>187.73</td>
<td>.81, (p = .43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable Duration Before Boundary (ms)</td>
<td>326.77</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>287.55</td>
<td>53.16</td>
<td>1.93, (p = .07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable Duration After Boundary (ms)</td>
<td>162.62</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>251.73</td>
<td>66.45</td>
<td>4.2, (p &lt; .001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Range (hz)</td>
<td>35.95</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>36.99</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>.15, (p = .89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonal Event</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure: modified version of the Visual Habituation Paradigm (Stager & Werker, 1997; Altvater-Mackensen & Mani, 2013)
### Method Study 1

#### Familiarisation
- Alternating trials
- 25 secs accumulated listening time to each

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage 1 – End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passage 2 – mid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randomised order</td>
<td>Randomised order</td>
<td>Randomised order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word 1 – familiar end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word 2 – familiar mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word 3 – novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word 4 – novel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word 1 – familiar end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word 2 – familiar mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word 3 – novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word 4 – novel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word 1 – familiar end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word 2 – familiar mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word 3 – novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word 4 – novel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trials continue until infant looks away for more than 2 consecutive seconds, or the sound file ends

Segmentation demonstrated by longer looking times to familiar word forms compared with novel
Results Study 1

5-6 months:
- Significant effect of item status ($F(2,38) = 13.24, p < .001, \eta^2 = .41$).
  - end and middle ($t(19) = 3.38, p < .01$)
  - end and distracter ($t(19) = 4.72, p < .001$)
  - middle and distracter ($t(19) = .91, p = .37$).

8-9 months:
- Significant effect of item status ($F(2,38) = 16.72, p < .001, \eta^2 = .47$).
  - end and middle ($t(19) = 3.44, p < .01$)
  - end and distracter ($t(19) = 6.71, p < .001$)
  - middle and distracter ($t(19) = 2.12, p < .05$).

Internal collapses lower prosodic boundary with just a word boundary

Only at IP edge

Some development
Method – Study 2

Participants

- **12 months (medial IP):**
  - 20 infants from monolingual homes in the Lisbon area
    (10 boys, mean age 12m 2d, range 10m 24d – 13m 19d)
  - 2 infants excluded due to fussiness

- **12 months (medial PW):**
  - 20 infants from monolingual homes in the Lisbon area
    (11 Boys, mean age 12m 10d, range 10m 15d – 14m 22d)
  - 3 infants excluded, 2 due to fussiness, 1 experimenter error
Method Study 2

Materials

- Same 4 monosyllabic pseudo words
  - Ful, Queu, Pis, Sau

- Procedure similar as for younger age groups
  - Only familiarised with words in middle of sentences

As rãs gostam de __, em vez de musgo fresco.
Comprado o __, voltamos ao parque.
Desde que viu o __, não quis brincar mais.
Oferecemos-te __, mas ficaste triste.
Quanto à luz __, nunca foi testada.
Vocês prendem o __, porém ele fugiu.
Method Study 2
Materials

- Same 4 monosyllabic pseudo words
  - Ful, Queu, Pis, Sau

Non-prominent internal position, with absence of any phrase boundary

Procedure similar as for younger age groups
  - Only familiarised with words in middle of sentences

- A caixa contém ful vermelho na tampa.
- Aquele grande ful branco é da Quica.
- Comeram muito ful doce na praia.
- Hoje vi um ful castanho mas duro.
- O amigo do ful português fugiu.
- O outro ful branco foi de mercedes.
Method – Study 2

Sentence internal
Intonational Phrase edge

Non-prominent internal position, no phrase boundary

Prosodically Prominent

NOT Prominent
# Method – Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IP Boundary</th>
<th>PW Boundary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Length (ms)</td>
<td>2740</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2320</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable Duration Before Boundary (ms)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllable Duration After Boundary (ms)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Range (hz)</td>
<td>85.92</td>
<td>37.43</td>
<td>-29.59</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Reset (HZ)</td>
<td>-93.45</td>
<td>34.06</td>
<td>-30.58</td>
<td>21.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonal Event</td>
<td>H%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results Study 2

- Significant effect of item status - F(1,18) = 23.6, p < .001, \( \eta^2 = .57 \)

At internal IP edge

Similar behaviour, segmentation wise, to 5-6 month olds at final IP boundaries (=sentence edge)
Results Study 2

- Significant effect of item status - $F(1,18) = 23.6$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .57$

- No significant effect of item status - $F(1,18) = 1.776$, $p > .1$, $\eta^2 = .090$
Conclusions

- EP learning infants at 5-6 months are able to segment continuous speech only when the word is located at the high prosodic edge (IP boundary, the end of the sentence)
  - In line with recent findings for English learning infants, but against those for Spanish/Catalan infants showing segmentation at 6 months regardless of prosody

- At 8-9 months, EP infants start to segment words in the middle of sentences (lower boundaries), but still demonstrate an advantage for words at the end of sentences
Conclusions

- Portuguese 12-month-old infants are able to segment words in sentence **medial** position, when target word precedes a **IP boundary** (despite the absence of a pause)

- This shows a sensitivity to prosody in early segmentation, beyond the edge vs. internal position

![Diagram showing the development of IP edge segmentation]

- **Final IP edge only**: 5-6
- **Internal lower edges start**: 8-9
- **Internal IP edge**: 12
- **Not plain internal**: 12
Prosody matters!

Prosody constrains the emergence and development of early segmentation in EP, in the first year.
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Conclusions

- These findings add to our existing knowledge of the emergence of segmentation abilities
  - What cues constrain, or are utilised, during the development of this ability.

- New findings in a prosodically ‘atypical’ language, EP, not previously studied for word segmentation.