Multimodal predictors of early object noun recognition in Tseltal Kennedy Casey ^{1,2} & Marisa Casillas¹

Contact: kcasey@princeton.edu

Background

Caregiver object labeling and child object handling make unique contributions to early word learning in Western communities ^{1,2}

Ethnographic accounts of Tseltal (Mayan) early language environments describe them as nonchild-centered and non-object-centered ³⁻⁵

Early Tseltal vocabularies include an overrepresentation of verbs, and not nouns⁶

What are the contributions of adult object labeling and child object handling to Tseltal children's early noun learning?

Key findings

Overall above-chance salience-corrected LWL accuracy, measured as the relative increase in proportion looking to a given stimulus image when it appeared as the labeled target vs. unlabeled distracter (β = 0.19, *SE* = 0.01, *p* < 0.001)

² Department of Psychology, Princeton University

Significant age-related increases in LWL accuracy scores ($\beta = 0.01$, *SE* = 0.002, *p* < 0.001; **Figure 1**) and speed of target noun recognition

No significant effect of adult object labeling frequency or child object handling frequency on overall accuracy scores (*p*s > 0.05; **Figure 2**)



Figure 1: Age-related increases in overall salience-corrected LWL accuracy



Looking-while-listening experiment in the field

Participants

N = 62 Tseltal-learning children Age range = 0;09.09-3;11.24 (mean = 2;07.02)

Design

30 common community-specific object nouns "Experi-tent" setup with stimulus images displayed on laptop



Exploratory growth-curve analyses¹⁰ reveal mixed evidence for the effect of the two multimodal input predictors on looking trajectories (**Figure 3**), including the following notable results:

- Two- and three-way interactions between labeling/ handling frequency and the linear and cubic time terms (ps < 0.01)
- Negative two-way interaction between participant age and labeling (*p* < 0.001) but not handling frequency (*p* = 0.816)

1.00 -

on

Figure 2: Item effects (no overall impact of multimodal input predictors on salience-corrected LWL accuracy)



Figure 3: Growth-curve analyses (mixed evidence for the effect of multimodal input predictors on looking trajectories)

Gaze coded offline in ELAN⁶ and peyecoder⁷, with analyses based on the window from 365–2005ms following target noun onset



Input predictors estimated from daylong photo-linked audio recordings

N = 43 children up to age 4;0 (31 overlapping with the LWL sample)

~9 hrs of continuous audio from a child-worn recorder Photos captured ~2 times per minute using a child-worn camera with a 180° fisheye lens



Discussion

Reliable evidence of early object noun recognition in a non-Western community where child-directed language is relatively infrequent and object noun labeling is relatively rare see also 11

Equivocal evidence for the specific influence of adult object labeling frequency and child object handling frequency on Tseltal children's online word recognition, but preliminary results suggest an advantage for objects that are among the most frequently labeled *and* handled in this Mayan community

Future research is needed to (a) consider the impact of overhearable language on Tseltal children's word learning, (b) more densely sample children's multimodal home language experiences, (c) understand the frequency of co-occurrence between object labeling and handling, and (d) test for links between individual children's input patterns and their word learning outcomes

Adult object labeling frequency estimated from 9 x 5-minute transcribed, randomly selected clips (target-child-directed language only)⁸

Child object handling frequency counted across all full daylong photo streams ⁹



References

[1] Muraki, E. J., Siddiqui, I. A., & Pexman, P. M. (2022). Quantifying children's sensorimotor experience: Child body–object interaction ratings for 3359 English words. *Behavior Research Methods*, *54*, 2864–2877.

[2] Suarez-Rivera, C., Linn, E., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2022). From play to language: Infants' actions on objects cascade to word learning. *Language Learning*, *72*(4), 1092-1127.

[3] Brown, P. (2011). The cultural organization of attention. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Socialization* (pp. 29–55). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

[4] Brown, P. (2014). The interactional context of language learning in Tzeltal. In I. Arnon, M. Casillas, C. Kurumada, & B. Estigarribia (Eds.), *Language in Interaction: Studies in Honor of Eve V. Clark* (pp. 51–82). Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.
[5] Casillas, M., Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (2020). Early language experience in a Tseltal Mayan village. *Child Development*, *91*(5), 1819-1835.

[6] ELAN [Computer software]. (2023). Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Language Archive.

[7] Olson, R. H., Pomper, R., Potter, C. E., Hay, J. F., Saffran, J. R., Ellis Weismer, S., & Lew-Williams, C. (2020). Peyecoder: An open-source program for coding eye movements. Zenodo.
[8] Casillas, M., Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (2017). Casillas HomeBank Corpus.
[9] Casey, K., Elliott, M., Mickiewicz, E., Silva Mandujano, A., Shorter, K., Duquette, M., Bergelson, E., & Casillas, M. (2022). Sticks, leaves, buckets, and bowls: Distributional patterns of children's at-home object handling in two subsistence societies. In J. Culbertson, A. Perfors, H. Rabagliati, & V. Ramenzoni (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 44th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 927-933).

[10] Mirman, D. (2014). *Growth Curve Analysis and Visualization using R*. Chapman; Hall/CRC.
[11] Foushee, R., & Srinivasan, M. (under review). Evidence for early lexical knowledge in infants primarily exposed to overheard speech.

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to the participants and their families for contributing to this research. This work would not have been possible without annotation help from Mary Elliott, Carla Escalante, Cielke Hendricks, Jordyn Martin, & Ine Alvarez van Tussenbroek.